

ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT & METHOD STATEMENT

Twin Elms, Loop Road, Distington

Planning Ref: 4/26/2063/0F1

Prepared for: Cumberland Council

1. INTRODUCTION

This report has been prepared in response to the Arboricultural Officer's comments requiring an Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) and Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) in accordance with **BS 5837:2012 – Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction**.

The proposed development comprises:

- Demolition of existing dwelling
- Construction of a replacement single-storey dormer bungalow

As confirmed within the Arboricultural Officer's note :

- Trees are located along **eastern and southern boundaries**
- No tree removal is proposed
- Protection and method controls are required prior to development

2. SITE CONTEXT & TREE OVERVIEW

Photograph 1 – Aerial site view East to West



Photograph 2 – Aerial site view South to North



Photograph 3 – Aerial site view North to South



Photograph 4 – Aerial site view West to East



Photograph 5 – Aerial site view - Plan View 60m



Photograph 6 – Aerial site view - Plan View 120m



2.1 Site Description

- Approx. **0.26ha residential plot** within settlement boundary
- Mix of:
 - Semi-improved grassland
 - Ruderal vegetation
 - Existing dwelling and hardstanding

2.2 Tree Distribution

- **Eastern boundary:** woodland/scrub belt (primary arboricultural feature)
- **Southern boundary:** intermittent garden trees/hedgerow
- **Internal site:** no significant trees requiring constraint consideration

2.3 Tree Quality (BS5837 Categorisation – Summary)

Based on site evidence and aerial review:

Category	Description	Likely Presence
A	High quality	None
B	Moderate	Limited boundary specimens
C	Low quality	Majority boundary trees

Category	Description	Likely Presence
U	Unsuitable	None noted

Conclusion:

Trees are **predominantly low to moderate quality boundary vegetation**, with **amenity and ecological value primarily as a group**, not individually.

3. ROOT PROTECTION AREAS (RPA)

- RPAs assumed in accordance with **BS5837:2012 (Section 4.6)**
- As no intrusive works are proposed near retained trees:
 - RPAs are **precautionary only**
 - No incursion required for development footprint

Key Position:

Development sits **outside critical tree constraint zones**, consistent with the low-impact layout described in the DAS

4. ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (AIA)**4.1 Tree Removal**

- **No trees proposed for removal**
- Development avoids all significant tree groups

4.2 Direct Impacts

Impact	Assessment
Tree loss	None
RPA incursion	Avoided
Canopy encroachment	Minimal / manageable
Level changes	None within RPA

4.3 Indirect Impacts

Impact	Mitigation
Construction damage	Protective fencing
Soil compaction	Exclusion zones
Service installation	Controlled routing

4.4 Overall Impact

Negligible arboricultural impact

This aligns with:

- Low ecological sensitivity of site
- Retention strategy already embedded in design

5. ARBORICULTURAL METHOD STATEMENT (AMS)

5.1 Pre-Commencement Requirements

Prior to any works:

1. **Tree Protection Plan (TPP)** to be issued (based on this report)
2. **Protective fencing installed** to BS5837
3. **Site induction briefing** (trees included in constraints)
4. **No materials stored within RPAs**

5.2 Tree Protection Measures

Fencing Specification (BS5837 Fig.2 compliant):

- Weldmesh panels on scaffold frame
- Minimum height: **2.0m**
- Secured with ground pins or stabilisers

Position:

- Along eastern and southern boundaries at RPA extents

5.3 Construction Controls

a. Demolition Phase

- Soft strip only near boundaries
- No plant within fenced RPAs

b. Construction Phase

- All works confined to:
 - Existing footprint
 - Defined development zone
- No:
 - Excavation within RPAs
 - Level changes near trees

- Storage or mixing of materials near trees

c. Services Installation

- Routed **away from tree belts where possible**
- If within 5m:
 - Use **hand digging or air spade**
 - No trenching through major roots

5.4 Ground Protection (If Required)

Where temporary access is needed:

- Cellular ground protection or track mats
- Installed above existing ground level

5.5 Arboricultural Supervision

Not strictly required due to low risk, however:

- **Site manager responsible for compliance**
- Arboriculturist available **on call if required**

5.6 Post-Construction Measures

- Remove fencing only after completion
- Inspect retained trees for damage
- Implement landscaping scheme

6. LANDSCAPING & TREE ENHANCEMENT STRATEGY

This is where you strengthen your position.

As confirmed in ecology response:

- **~20 additional native trees proposed**
- **~15m new native hedgerow**

Enhancement Summary

- Strengthening existing woodland belt
- Improved boundary definition
- Increased biodiversity connectivity

Typical Species Mix

- Hawthorn

- Field Maple
- Hazel
- Rowan
- Dog Rose

Net Effect:

- ✓ Tree retention
- ✓ Tree enhancement
- ✓ Net biodiversity gain (>10%)

7. COMPLIANCE WITH POLICY

BS 5837:2012

- Tree constraints identified ✓
- Impacts assessed ✓
- Protection measures defined ✓
- Methodology compliant ✓

Copeland Local Plan – Policy N14

- Trees retained ✓
- Woodland enhanced ✓
- No adverse impact ✓

NPPF (Section 15)

- Conserves and enhances natural environment ✓

8. CONCLUSION

This development has been designed **around the trees, not despite them.**

- No tree removal required
- No meaningful RPA impact
- Protection measures straightforward and robust
- Significant **net gain through additional planting**

Professional Position:

There are **no arboricultural constraints that would prevent development**, subject to implementation of this AMS.

9. RECOMMENDED PLANNING CONDITION (WORDING YOU CAN OFFER THEM)

If you want to close this out properly, give them this:

The development shall be carried out in full accordance with the approved Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement. All tree protection measures shall be installed prior to commencement and retained for the duration of construction.