## JEFFERSON PARK WHITEHAVEN

## **Pre-development Arboricultural Report**

Prepared for:

**Thomas Armstrong Construction** 

On:

17 June 2021

By:

Alistair Hearn

HND (Urb.For.), RFS (Cert.Arb.), M.Arbor.A.

## **Treescapes Consultancy Ltd.**

Reference No. AH/AIA/170621

All rights in this report are reserved. You may not reproduce or transmit, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, or store in any retrieval system of any nature, any part of this report without our written permission. The content and format are for the exclusive use of the addressee in dealing with this site. You may not sell, lend, hire out, or divulge any of the content to a third party not directly involved with this site, without our written consent.

## © Treescapes Consultancy Ltd.

# CONTENTS

1		INTRODUCTION	3
	1.1	Instruction	
	1.2	Qualifications and Experience	
	1.3	Documents and Information	
	1.4	Development Proposal	
	1.5	Report Limitations	3
2		SITE VISIT AND OBSERVATIONS	4
	2.1	Site Visit	
	2.2	Site Description	
	2.3	Tree Identification and Location	
	2.4	Tree Observations	
3		REFERENCES, PLANNING POLICY AND GUIDANCE	5
	3.1	National Policy	5
	3.2	British Standard: Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction –	
		Recommendations (BS 5837, 2012)	5
	3.3	Copeland Local Plan (2017-2035): Policy N10PO: Woodlands and Trees	
	3.4	Copeland Local Plan (2017-2035): Policy N2PO: Biodiversity Net Gain	
4		TREE CONSTRAINTS	7
	4.1	Tree Retention Category – BS 5837 (2012)	7
	4.2	Tree Constraints – Above Ground	-
	4.3	Tree Constraints – Below Ground	
5		ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT	
	5.1	Above Ground – Tree Trunk and Crown Structure	
	5.2	Below Ground – The Roots and Soil	
	5.3	Shading from Trees	
	5.4	Site Levels	
	5.5	Ground Surface Materials	
	5.6 5.7	Site Access Storage of Materials and Equipment	
	5.8	Activity under Trees	
~	0.0	RECOMMENDATIONS	
6	6.1	General Precautions	
	6.2	Tree Work – Construction Recommendations	
	6.3	Tree Work Standards	
	6.4	Design and Construction Considerations	
	6.5	Root Protection Area – Tree Protection Barriers	
	6.6	Tree Planting	
	6.7	Tree Management – Future Inspections	. 13
7	-	LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS	
•	7.1	Protected Trees	
	7.2	Wildlife Conservation Legislation	
8		CONCLUSIONS	
9		REFERENCES	
3			. 13

## PLANS

Plan 1	Tree constraints plan of the existing site layout	
Plan 2	Tree constraints plan of the proposed site layout	
Plan 3	Tree protection plan of the proposed site layout	
		Page 1/27

# APPENDICES

Appendix 1	The Experience and Qualifications of Alistair Hearn	19
Appendix 2	Extracts from the British Standard: <i>Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction – Recommendations</i> (BS 5837, 2012)	20
Appendix 3	Table 1 from the British Standard: Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and         Construction – Recommendations (BS 5837, 2012)	22
Appendix 4	Explanatory Notes for Appendices 5 & 6	23
Appendix 5	Tree Data Schedule	24
Appendix 6	Tree Work Schedule	26
Appendix 7	British Standard: BS 5837 <i>Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Constructio Recommendations</i> (2012): Tree Protection Barrier	

### **1 INTRODUCTION**

#### 1.1 Instruction

Thomas Armstrong Construction, on behalf of Home Group, instructed Treescapes Consultancy Ltd to inspect the significant trees that the construction of the proposed development may affect at Jefferson Park, Whitehaven, Cumbria, CA28 9HE. Our instruction includes providing a pre-development report on the arboricultural impacts of the development proposals.

We have compiled our report in accordance with the British Standard: BS 5837, Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations (2012) and where necessary, followed this guidance when suggesting solutions to implement the proposals.

#### 1.2 Qualifications and Experience

We have based our report on our site observations and information provided and reached our conclusions in light of our experience. We have experience and qualifications in arboriculture and list the details in Appendix 1.

#### **1.3 Documents and Information**

Thomas Armstrong Construction provided us with a topographic survey of the existing site layout and a plan of the proposed site layout. We have not checked the accuracy of these plans, or the plotted tree locations.

#### 1.4 Development Proposal

The proposal is to construct 15 residential properties on the site.

Plan 1 shows the existing site layout and Plan 2 shows the proposed site layout

#### 1.5 Report Limitations

This report:

- is only concerned with assessing the condition of the trees on, or adjacent to, the site affected by the development proposals;
- does not take account of whether the trees could affect the soil in the area and cause tree related subsidence damage;
- is based on the documents provided and the information collected during the site visit;
- contains recommendations concerning work that should be carried out to responsibly manage the risks posed to and by the trees, and where necessary, reduce those risks to an acceptable level. However, even after carrying out the recommended work, there is a risk failure could still occur, especially during extreme weather conditions and/or if there are major hidden defects;
- does not take into account the possibility of extreme weather events;
- cannot account for future outbreaks of pests or diseases;
- does not take into account mechanical operations carried out in the vicinity of the trees which could affect their health and stability; and
- does not contain data collected with technical decay detection equipment

## 2 SITE VISIT AND OBSERVATIONS

#### 2.1 Site Visit

We visited the site and inspected the trees on 16 June 2021. All our observations were from ground level without detailed investigations, and we estimated all dimensions unless otherwise indicated.

We did not have access to the trees outside the site boundary, so have confined our observations of them to that which was visible from within the property.

The weather during our survey was overcast, damp, and still, with average visibility.

#### 2.2 Site Description

Jefferson Park is a residential estate about 1.1km south of Whitehaven town centre, at Ordnance Survey grid reference NX 974 167. The site generally slopes to the east and covers an area of approximately 3.4ha. It is currently surrounded be residential properties, and has a woodland bordering the south-western boundary.

#### 2.3 Tree Identification and Location

Plan 1, Plan 2 and Plan 3 show the locations of the significant trees on the site and on adjacent properties. Thomas Armstrong Construction have based their plans on a topographic survey, which included the tree locations.

The plans included in this report are for illustrative purposes only. We do not recommend directly scaling measurements from these plans – all measurements should be checked on site. All relevant information is contained within this report, the topographic site survey and other documents submitted with the planning application.

#### 2.4 Tree Observations

We visually inspected the significant trees and recorded information on their species, dimensions and condition, as well as any initial management recommendations. Appendix 5 contains a schedule of the trees and groups.

The cohesive groups of trees, which have similar attributes both aerodynamically and visually, often have greater value as a group rather than individuals. Consequently, we have recorded data for these trees as a distinct group in the schedule at Appendix 5.

## **3 REFERENCES, PLANNING POLICY AND GUIDANCE**

#### 3.1 National Policy

Section 197 in the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 makes it the duty of Local Planning Authorities (LPAs), *'in the interests of amenity*,' to protect trees, when granting planning permission, either by the imposition of conditions or serving Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs).

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) mentions trees and should be taken into account.

170. Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:

*b)* recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland;

175. When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should apply the following principles:

c) development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists;

#### Annex 2: Glossary

Ancient or veteran tree: A tree which, because of its age, size and condition, is of exceptional biodiversity, cultural or heritage value. All ancient trees are veteran trees. Not all veteran trees are old enough to be ancient but are old relative to other trees of the same species. Very few trees of any species reach the ancient life-stage.

Ancient woodland: An area that has been wooded continuously since at least 1600 AD. It includes ancient semi-natural woodland and plantations on ancient woodland sites (PAWS).

Irreplaceable habitat: Habitats which would be technically very difficult (or take a very significant time) to restore, recreate or replace once destroyed, taking into account their age, uniqueness, species diversity or rarity. They include ancient woodland, ancient and veteran trees, blanket bog, limestone pavement, sand dunes, salt marsh and lowland fen.

# 3.2 British Standard: Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations (BS 5837, 2012)

The British Standard: *Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction* – *Recommendations* (BS 5837, 2012) contains guidance on how to assess trees in or close to proposed development and information to include in pre-development arboricultural reports submitted with planning applications. Appendices 2 and 3 contain relevant extracts from BS 5837 (2012).

#### 3.3 Copeland Local Plan (2017-2035): Policy N10PO: Woodlands and Trees

*Existing trees which contribute positively to the visual amenity and environmental value of their location will be protected.* 

Development proposals which are likely to affect any trees within the Borough will be required to:

1) Include an arboricultural assessment as to whether any of those trees are worthy of retention and protection by means of a Tree Preservation Order

2) Submit proposals to replace or relocate any trees that are to be removed with net provision at a minimum ratio of 2:1. Replacement trees should be on site and with native species where possible.

Any proposed works to trees within Conservation Areas, or those with Tree Protection Orders, will be required to include an arboricultural survey to justify why works are necessary and that the works proposed will, where possible, not adversely affect the amenity value of the area.

New development should not result in the loss of or damage to ancient woodland or veteran or aged trees outside woodland unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a compensation strategy exists.'

### 3.4 Copeland Local Plan (2017-2035): Policy N2PO: Biodiversity Net Gain

*All development, with the exception of that listed in paragraph 49.8.10 above, must provide a minimum of 10% biodiversity net gain over and above existing site levels. This is in addition to any compensatory habitat provided under Policy N1PO. Net gain should be delivered on site where possible. Where on-site provision is not appropriate, provision must be made elsewhere in order of the following preference:* 

1. Off site in an area identified as a Local Nature Recovery Network;

2. Off site on an alternative suitable site within the Borough

3. Through the purchase of an appropriate amount of national biodiversity units/credits.

Details must be submitted to, and agreed in writing by the Council, before the development can commence.

Sites where net gain is provided (on or off site) must be managed and monitored by the applicant or an appropriate body funded by the applicant for a minimum period of 30 years. Annual monitoring reports detailing the sites condition post-enhancement must be submitted to the Council each year over this period.

Where there is evidence of deliberate neglect or damage to any of the Boroughs protected habitats and species in order to reduce its biodiversity value their deteriorated condition will not be taken into consideration and previous ecological records of the site and/or the ecological potential of the site will be used to decide the acceptability of any development proposals.'

### **4 TREE CONSTRAINTS**

#### 4.1 Tree Retention Category – BS 5837 (2012)

Using the guidance given in Table 1 of BS 5837 (2012), we have assessed the quality of the trees retention category and recorded the results in the schedule at Appendix 5. Appendix 3 contains a copy of Table 1 from BS 5837 (2012).

The following colour scheme represents the tree retention categories on Plan 1, Plan 2 and Plan 3:

Red:	Retention Category U –	A tree in such a condition that it cannot realistically be retained as a living tree in the context of the current land use for longer than 10 years unless it is in a little frequented area and it is desired to retain it for wildlife.
Green:	Retention Category A –	Trees of high quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 40 years.
Blue:	Retention Category B –	Trees of moderate quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 20 years.
Grey:	Retention Category C –	Trees of low quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 10 years, or young trees with a stem diameter below 150 mm.

BS 5837 (2012) states in Table 1 that trees with trunk diameters less than 150mm should be allocated to Retention Category C. Section 4.5.10 states:

'Particular care is needed when evaluating young trees, especially where they occur as individual specimens. Where these are less than 150 mm stem diameter at 1.5m above adjacent ground level, it might be acceptable and relatively straightforward to mitigate their loss, if necessary, with similar new tree planting. Alternatively, it might be practicable to relocate such trees within the site (e.g. using a tree spade). Whilst the presence of young trees of good form and vitality is generally desirable (i.e. those trees which have the potential to develop into quality mature specimens), they need not necessarily be a significant constraint on the site's potential.'

'NOTE It is sometimes possible to relocate mature trees. However, as this is a costly and complex operation with a variable chance of success, it is a viable option only in exceptional cases.'

In the local area and in the wider environment, a large number of trees contribute to the landscape character of the area. This report does not have the capacity to discuss this treescape at length – it only includes those trees on or immediately adjacent to the site.

We surveyed 13 trees, and classed them as three individual trees (2T, 5T, & 6T), two groups of trees (1G & 3G) and one woodland (4W). We assessed the 13 trees as:

- 0 as Category A;
- 1 as Category B;
- 12 as Category C; and
- 0 as Category U

The trees and groups assessed as categories A and B are of moderate to high quality and therefore should be considered a constraint to development. The low and poor quality trees and groups in categories C and U should not present a significant constraint to development.

We consider none of the trees with trunk diameters less than 150mm at 1.5m should constrain the development of the site.

#### 4.2 Tree Constraints – Above Ground

Plan 1 shows the existing site layout, the locations of the trees and their crowns. If retained, tree canopies are the vertical constraints to development. Pruning in accordance with good arboricultural practice can sometimes provide adequate clearance to implement the development proposals.

#### 4.3 Tree Constraints – Below Ground

Plan 1 also shows the root protection areas (RPAs) of the trees. This is the minimum area of soil required by the roots to maintain healthy growth and is a development constraint. In some locations, altering this area is necessary to reflect the topography of the site and the adjacent land.

Root damage is often not visible from the surface and can create safety issues with tree stability. Damaged roots and compacted soil can restrict the amount of moisture and nutrients available to the tree and possibly lead to a premature decline in tree health.

## 5 ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

#### 5.1 Above Ground – Tree Trunk and Crown Structure

Plan 2 shows the proposed layout, the locations of the trees and the spread of their crown.

No trees are growing within the proposed layout footprint of the development.

The crowns of two low quality trees (No.3 in group 1G & No.7 in group 3G) will overhang one proposed house.

#### 5.2 Below Ground – The Roots and Soil

Plan 2 also shows the root protection areas (RPAs) and their proximity to the proposed layout.

The proposed building layout will encroach into the calculated RPA for two low-quality trees (Nos.5 & 7 in group 3G). And a garden area will encroach into the calculated RPA of one low-quality tree (No.6 in group 3G).

Given the current condition and low quality of these four trees, planting replacement trees can create a tree feature with a longer life expectancy that enhances the area for future generations.

Constructing the development without due regard to the RPAs of the retained trees could have a detrimental effect on their health and longevity.

#### 5.3 Shading from Trees

Tall trees to the south and west of the proposed building can create shade throughout the day. Carefully consider the aspect of habitable rooms and the proximity and height of adjacent trees.

#### 5.4 Site Levels

Altering the ground level within the RPA of a retained tree may have a detrimental impact on its health and longevity.

#### 5.5 Ground Surface Materials

Altering the ground cover, such as using impervious or semi-pervious surface materials to cover areas that were previously vegetated soil, will alter the moisture content and recharge of the soil and its oxygen and carbon dioxide content. This could have a detrimental effect on the health of tree roots.

#### 5.6 Site Access

Vehicles and plant operating or parking on unprotected soil within the RPA of a retained tree could compact or contaminate it and this could have a detrimental impact on its long-term condition and longevity.

Vehicle movements under the crown of a tree could damage its trunk and/or branches. This could potentially create a safety hazard and reduce its life expectancy.

#### 5.7 Storage of Materials and Equipment

Storing equipment and materials close to trees increases the likelihood of physical damage to trunks and branches. Fuel spillages and cement-mixer washings are detrimental to the soil and root systems. Storage of materials and plant equipment

should be on existing hard-standing areas, ideally outside the RPAs. If there is no alternative, adequately protect any nearby trees and protect the soil to minimise any harmful impacts.

#### 5.8 Activity under Trees

Activity under tree crowns, such as mixing cement, storing equipment, plant and materials, or lighting fires, may damage tree branches or stems, or could compact or pollute the soil.

## **6 RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### 6.1 General Precautions

The following general precautions should ensure the health and longevity of the trees. We suggest enforcing these general precautions within the RPAs during the construction phase and in locations where new trees will be established:

- No soil disturbance, including compaction
- No change in the soil level, by stripping or filling
- No excavation, without prior discussion with the Arboricultural Consultant and/or the Local Planning Authority
- No redirection of surface water runoff into or out of the RPA
- No temporary buildings, sheds, or offices, without prior discussion with the Arboricultural Consultant and/or the Local Planning Authority
- No storage of materials or fuel
- No dumping of materials, whether into a skip or onto the ground
- No fires within 10m of the RPA or tree canopy, whichever is greater
- No vehicles, including parking
- No operation of plant equipment, without prior discussion with the Arboricultural Consultant and/or the Local Planning Authority
- No refuelling of mechanical equipment
- No storage or mixing of cement
- No washing of cement mixers within or uphill of the RPA
- Follow the guidance contained within the Street Works UK Volume 4 (Guidelines for the Planning, Installation and Maintenance of Utility Apparatus in Proximity to Trees (Issue 2, 2007); <u>www.streetworks.org.uk</u> (accessed 17/06/21)) when installing underground services within the RPA of a tree.

If necessary, we can provide a site monitoring role to ensure adequate tree protection measures are employed at critical stages of the construction process and in accordance with BS 5837 (2012).

#### 6.2 Tree Work – Construction Recommendations

Appendix 6 contains a schedule of the recommended tree work.

#### 6.2.1 Felling

Currently, we recommend felling four trees to implement the proposals: ID No.3 in group 1G, and ID Nos.5, 6, & 7 in group 3G.

#### 6.2.2 Pruning

Currently, we have not made any pruning recommendations. Some pruning work might be required if conflicting branches become evident as the construction work progresses.

#### 6.3 Tree Work Standards

We recommend using a suitably qualified, competent, experienced, and insured contractor to carry out the tree work. The contractor should carry out their work in accordance with current industry safety standards and the recommendations contained in the British Standard – BS 3998, *Tree work – Recommendations* (2010) – as modified by research that is more recent.

Where necessary, we can organise prospective contractors to submit tenders for the proposed tree work. We can also provide a supervisory role to ensure the works comply with current safety standards and BS 3998 (2010) and current best practice.

#### 6.4 Design and Construction Considerations

The construction process and site operations can adversely affect trees in many ways. Consequently, all members of the design team will need to be aware of the tree protection requirements and make provision for them throughout the development process. To avoid unnecessary damage to the retained trees during the construction process, we recommend involving the project arboriculturist during the architectural, engineering and landscape design processes.

Where necessary, we can provide feedback at each stage of the architectural, engineering and landscape design processes. We can also provide a site supervisory role to ensure the retained trees have adequate protection during the construction process.

#### 6.5 Root Protection Area – Tree Protection Barriers

Erect protective fencing along the line of the construction exclusion zone (CEZ) shown in Plan 3. This will prevent construction activity that could cause damage close to the retained trees. No plant equipment or vehicles should operate within the protective fencing without suitable ground protection and authorisation.

The fencing must be robust enough to withstand impacts from machinery and plant equipment operating in the area. In areas where lighter plant and machinery (typically <2t) are operating, I recommend using either:

- 2 m tall welded mesh panels on rubber or concrete feet joined together using a least two anti-tamper couplers, installed so that they can only be removed from inside the fence. Support the panels on the inner side with stabilizer struts, secured with ground pins. Where the fencing is erected on hard surfacing or it is otherwise unfeasible to use ground pins, mount the stabilizer struts onto a block tray;
- wooden posts (Ø75-100mm x 1.8m) driven securely into the ground (300-500mm) every 2m, with top and bottom wooden rails (2m x 25mm x 100mm) attached securely to the posts to create a rigid structure and chestnut paling fencing (1.25-1.5m high) attached securely to the rails every 300-400mm; or, if ground conditions dictate,
- metal road-pins (1.2m) securely driven into the ground (200-300mm) at 2m centres, supporting orange mesh barrier fencing (1m high) securely attached to the pins using strong cable ties (4.8mm x 300mm).

In areas where large machinery and construction traffic (typically >2t) will operate, we advise using the fencing detailed in Appendix 7, the default specification recommended in BS 5837 (2012).

The protective fencing should be erected prior to any other development activity taking place and remain in place for the duration of the construction phase.

#### 6.6 Tree Planting

We recommend planting a number of trees of suitable species in appropriate locations to enhance the visual character of the site and ensure that trees remain part of the landscape for decades to come.

Protect areas for tree planting from soil compaction and contamination during the construction phase using the same design of temporary barriers used to protect existing trees. Alternatively, if compacted or contaminated, the soil will have to be suitably remediated or replaced to enable the trees to grow.

If required, Treescapes Consultancy Ltd. Can produce a tree planting plan for the proposed development.

#### 6.7 Tree Management – Future Inspections

Due to the size of a number of the trees, their condition and locations close to residential buildings, roads, and car parking, we advise a suitably qualified, experienced and insured arboricultural consultant inspect them every two to three years and after tree altering weather events, such as drought or windstorms.

## 7 LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

#### 7.1 Protected Trees

We understand a Tree Preservation Order – TPO 68 (1999) – protects some of the trees in this report.

It will therefore be necessary to obtain permission from the Local Planning Authority (LPA) before any work, other than certain exempted operations, can be carried out to them. The work specified in this report is necessary for their reasonable management and should be acceptable to the LPA. Tree owners, however, should appreciate that they may take an alternative point of view and have the option to refuse to grant consent.

We understand that full planning consent allows the minimum amount of work to protected trees necessary to implement the consented development without requiring permission under tree protection legislation – this should be checked with a solicitor or planning consultant.

#### 7.2 Wildlife Conservation Legislation

Most birds' nests have legal protection while in use; also, bats and their roosts have legal protection whether in use or not. Tree surgeons should be aware of their duties under the legislation to protect wildlife and should carry out their site assessment and work accordingly. If you suspect bats use the area, consult English Nature.

The Bat Conservation Trust produce a useful webpage for managing trees and bats: <u>www.bats.org.uk/our-work/landscapes-for-bats/bats-and-woodland/woodland-wildlife-toolkit</u> (viewed 17/06/21). This links to a Government webpage (<u>www.gov.uk/guidance/manage-and-protect-woodland-wildlife</u> – viewed 17/06/21), which states:

'You must comply with regulations protecting wildlife species and habitats when you're managing woodland and planning forestry operations. These include the European protected species (EPS) listed in the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 and the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.

It's an offence to:

deliberately capture, injure, kill or cause significant disturbance to a protected species

deliberately destroy the eggs of a protected species

damage or destroy protected species' breeding sites or resting places (such as a bat roost in a tree or a dormouse nest on the woodland floor)

You must carry out planned operations carefully, making the necessary checks, and you may need a wildlife licence in certain circumstances. If you follow good practice you should be able to carry out most activities without the need for a licence – but to do so you may just have to modify or reschedule some of your management proposals or practices.'

### 8 CONCLUSIONS

Based on the information discussed in this report, and provided all the technical recommendations it contains are followed, I consider the proposed development can be implemented in accordance with the guidance contained in BS 5837 (2012) with minimal impact on important trees to be retained.

We recommend involving the project arboriculturist during the architectural, engineering, and landscape design processes to avoid unnecessary damage to the retained trees during the construction process.

Alistair Hearn HND(Urb.For.), Cert.Arb.(RFS), M.Arbor.A.

## 9 **REFERENCES**

Anon, 2005. *Woodland Management for Bats*. Forestry Commission, Wetherby. 15 pp.

BS 5837, 2012. Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations

BS 3998, 2010. Tree work - Recommendations



	Legend 1C EC	High ( Green Blue = Low ( Grey =	anopy spread a be Feature ID r 5837 retention clocation and l s, Tree ID nun 7 retention ca clocation CATEG Quality Trees = Category A = Category B Quality Trees = Category C = Category U area (RPA) lin ccordance with	the labelled hber tegory. ORIES				
N Sun path SCALE: 1:500 @ A3								
	1 5	Metres 10 15	20					
		NOTES:						
This is a colo difficult to int		lack and white	reproductions	might be				
The tree locations are taken from the topographic survey. Check all dimensions on site.								
PLAN 1	PLAN 1 Tree constraints plan showing the existing site layout							
SITE: JEFFERSON PARK	PREPARED FOR: Thomas Armstro	ong Construction	Pre-development Repor					
©Treescapes (	Consultancy Ltd.	PAGE: 16/27	REF. No.: AH/AIA/160621	DATE: 17/06/2021				



	Legend 1C EC	High ( Green Blue = Low ( Grey =	anopy spread a be Feature ID r 5837 retention clocation and l s, Tree ID nun 7 retention ca clocation CATEG Quality Trees = Category A = Category B Quality Trees = Category C = Category U area (RPA) lin ccordance with	number the labelled nber itegory. <b>ORIES</b>				
N Sun path SCALE: 1:500 @ A3								
	1 5	Metres 10 15	20					
		NOTES:						
		lack and white	reproductions	might be				
difficult to interpret The tree locations are taken from the topographic survey. Check all dimensions on site.								
PLAN 2	PLAN 2 Tree constraints plan showing the proposed site layout							
SITE: JEFFERSON PARK	PREPARED FOR: Thomas Armstro	ong Construction	Pre-development Repor					
©Treescapes 0	Consultancy Ltd.	PAGE: 17/27	REF. No.: AH/AIA/160621	DATE: 17/06/2021				



	Legend 1C	High Green Blue Low Grey	anopy spread a he Feature ID 5837 retention ees - showing k location and es, Tree ID nur	the labelled mber ategory.					
CEZ		Construction ex of protective fe		EZ). Line					
×		Trees propose facilitate the p							
$\begin{tabular}{lllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$									
PLAN 3	PLAN 3 Tree protection plan showing the proposed site layout								
SITE: JEFFERSON PARK	PREPARED FOR: Thomas Armstro	ong Construction	Pre-development Repor						
©Treescapes	©Treescapes Consultancy Ltd. PAGE: REF. No.: DATE: 18/27 AH/AIA/160621 17/06/2021								

#### **Appendix 1** The Experience and Qualifications of Alistair Hearn

#### Qualifications

In 2001, the Royal Forestry Society awarded Alistair the Certificate in Arboriculture, from the National School of Forestry at Newton Rigg, Penrith.

In 2004, Alistair passed a Higher National Diploma in Urban Forestry, from the National School of Forestry at Newton Rigg, Penrith.

In 2005, Alistair became a Professional Member of the Arboricultural Association.

#### Practical Experience

Alistair has been working and studying within the field of arboriculture for over 20 years, first as a tree surgeon and latterly in an advisory capacity. Until July 2004, Alistair worked within the practical field of arboriculture, carrying out tree surgery for local and national clients. Since August 2004, Alistair has been working as an arboricultural consultant with Capita Symonds Ltd. This work involved various large-scale tree condition and safety surveys, along with carrying out detailed tree inspections. More recently, he concentrated on trees in relation to construction and the planning system. This involved providing the relevant tree surveys, implication assessments and protection plans for development applications. Alistair also provided Salford City Council with advice on tree preservation orders, trees in conservation areas and trees in development applications. While acting as an arboricultural consultant he has been involved with a number of commissions covering a variety of different aspects of arboriculture:

- surveying and making safety recommendations for trees on school sites in Cumbria;
- putting tree work out to tender and managing the resulting contracts;
- evaluating tree quality on development sites, assessing the impacts of development proposals on those trees to be retained, making recommendations, advising on protection methods, and outlining mitigation measures; and
- involved with carrying out a 'drive-by' scoping survey of 2500 miles of highway for Lancashire County Council
- Assessing trees affected by development proposals and where necessary making recommendations to minimise damage.
- Compiling arboricultural reports to advise property owners about the risks trees may pose.

#### Continuing Professional Development

Alistair Hearn attends conferences, seminars and workshops run by forestry and arboricultural organisations, colleges and universities.

#### Relevant Experience

Alistair Hearn has spent over 25 years working with trees, some of which he considers pose a high level of risk. This has informed his decision making process for judging how much risk the trees pose and the remedial work required to make a tree safe.

#### Membership of Professional Organisations

In addition to being a Professional Member of the Arboricultural Association, Alistair Hearn is a member of the Royal Forestry Society of England, Wales, and Northern Ireland.

### Appendix 2

Extracts from the British Standard: *Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction – Recommendations* (BS 5837, 2012)

#### Tree Categorisation

The trees have been categorised as recommended in Section 4.5, Tree categorization method and Table 1 of the standard (BS 5837, 2012). A copy of Table 1 is included as Appendix 3.

#### **Tree Constraints**

Section 5 of BS 5837 recommends producing a tree constraints plan (TCP) showing the trees and an area around them referred to as the root protection area (RPA). The RPA is a calculated area of soil sufficient to provide enough water and nutrients for the tree to remain in a healthy condition. The RPA is equal to the area of a circle with a radius 12 times the diameter of the trunk measured 1.5m above the ground. Alternatively, for multi-stemmed trees with more than five stems, the RPA is equal to the area of a circle with a radius equal to 12 times their mean trunk diameter measured at 1.5m above the ground level.

In Section 5.2.3, the Standard states:

'The following factors should also be taken into account during the design process:

a) the presence of tree preservation orders, conservation areas or other regulatory protection;

b) potential incompatibilities between the layout and trees proposed for retention;

c) the working and access space needed for the construction of the proposed development;

NOTE This might involve access facilitation pruning, or the use of a height restriction bar to prohibit tall vehicles accessing a site containing trees with low canopies.

d) the effect that construction requirements might have on the amenity value of trees, both on and near the site, including the effects of pruning to facilitate access and working space;

e) the requirement to protect the overhanging canopies of trees where they could be damaged by machinery, vehicles, barriers or scaffolding, where it will be necessary to increase the extent of the tree protection barriers to contain the canopy;

f) infrastructure requirements in relation to trees, e.g. easements for underground or above-ground apparatus; highway safety and visibility splays; and other infrastructural provisions, such as substations, refuse stores, lighting, signage, solar collectors, satellite dishes and CCTV sightlines;

- g) the proposed end use of the space adjacent to retained trees;
- h) the potential for new planting to provide mitigation for any losses.'

Tree Protection

The RPA forms the basis for a construction exclusion zone (CEZ) and requires protection during the development by means of barriers and/or ground protection fit for

ensuring the successful long-term retention of the trees. Section 6.2.1.1 of the standard states:

'All trees that are being retained on site should be protected by barriers and/or ground protection (see 5.5) before any materials or machinery are brought onto the site, and before any demolition, development or stripping of soil commences. Where all activity can be excluded from the RPA, vertical barriers should be erected to create a construction exclusion zone. Where, due to site constraints, construction activity cannot be fully or permanently excluded in this manner from all or part of a tree's RPA, appropriate ground protection should be installed.'

#### **Tree Protection Barriers**

With regard to barriers erected to protect the retained trees, Section 6.2.2.1 of the standard states:

'Barriers should be fit for the purpose of excluding construction activity and appropriate to the degree and proximity of work taking place around the retained tree(s). Barriers should be maintained to ensure that they remain rigid and complete.'

In addition, Section 6.2.2.2 states:

'The default specification should consist of a vertical and horizontal scaffold framework, well braced to resist impacts, as illustrated in Figure 2. The vertical tubes should be spaced at a maximum interval of 3 m and driven securely into the ground. Onto this framework, welded mesh panels should be securely fixed. Care should be exercised when locating the vertical poles to avoid underground services and, in the case of the bracing poles, also to avoid contact with structural roots. If the presence of underground services precludes the use of driven poles, an alternative specification should be prepared in conjunction with the project arboriculturist that provides an equal level of protection. Such alternatives could include the attachment of the panels to a free-standing scaffold support framework.'

Appendix 7of this report is a diagram of a tree protection barrier based default specification shown in BS 5837 (2012).

### **Appendix 3**

Table 1 from the British Standard: *Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction – Recommendations* (BS 5837, 2012)

Table 1 – Cascade Chart for Tree Quality Assessment									
TREES UNSUITABLE FOR RETENTION (see Note)									
<ul> <li>Category U Those in such a condition that they cannot realistically be retained as living trees in the context of the current land use for longer than 10 years</li> <li>Trees that have a serious, irremediable, structural defect, such that their early loss is expected due to collapse, including those that will become unviable after removal of other category U trees (e.g. where, for whatever reason, the loss of companion shelter cannot be mitigated by pruning)</li> <li>Trees that are dead or are showing signs of significant, immediate, and irreversible overall decline</li> <li>Trees infected with pathogens of significance to the health and/or safety of other trees nearby, or very low quality trees suppressing adjacent trees of better quality</li> <li>NOTE Category U trees can have existing or potential conservation value which it might be desirable to preserve; see 4.5.7 below.</li> </ul>									
	TREES TO BE CONSID	ERED FOR RETENTION							
Category and Definition	1. Mainly arboricultural qualities	2. Mainly landscape qualities	3. Mainly cultural values, including conservation						
Category A Trees of high quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 40 years	Trees that are particularly good examples of their species, especially if rare or unusual; or those that are essential components of groups or formal or semi-formal arboricultural features (e.g. the dominant and/or principal trees within an avenue)	Trees, groups or woodlands of particular visual importance as arboricultural and/or landscape features	Trees, groups or woodlands of significant conservation, historical, commemorative or other value (e.g. veteran trees or wood-pasture)						
Category B Trees of moderate quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 20 years	Trees that might be included in category A, but are downgraded because of impaired condition (e.g. presence of significant though remediable defects, including unsympathetic past management and storm damage), such that they are unlikely to be suitable for retention for beyond 40 years; or trees lacking the special quality necessary to merit the category A designation	Trees present in numbers, usually growing as groups or woodlands, such that they attract a higher collective rating than they might as individuals; or trees occurring as collectives but situated so as to make little visual contribution to the wider locality	Trees with material conservation or other cultural value						
Category C Trees of low quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 10 years, or young trees with a stem diameter below 150 mm	Unremarkable trees of very	Trees present in groups or woodlands, but without this conferring on them significantly greater collective landscape value; and/or trees offering low or only temporary/transient landscape benefits							

Table 1 – Cascade Chart for Tree Quality Assessment

BS 5837 (2012) Section 4.5.7 states:

'Where trees would otherwise be categorized as U, but have identifiable conservation, heritage or landscape value, even though only for the short term, they may be upgraded, although they might be suitable for retention only where issues concerning their safety can be appropriately managed.'

- **Mathematical Abbreviations:** > = Greater than: < = Less than.
- **Compass Bearing:** N = north; S = south; E = east; W = west; NE = north-east; NW = north-west; SE = south-east; SW = south-west.
- Estimated Measurements: The symbol '#' will be used to indicate when measurements have been estimated.
- Feature & Tree ID Number: This is the number used to indicate the trees approximate position on Plans 1, 2, & 3.
- **Species:** The species identification is based on visual observations and the common English name of what the tree appeared to be.
- **Trunk Diameter:** The trunk diameter measured 1.5m above ground level with a diameter tape. If branches are below 1.5m, the trunk diameter will be measured below and indicated with a '¥' symbol. More than one figure indicates the individual has a number of stems. If the measurement is estimated '#' will appear in the column.
- **Tree Height:** The height of the tree measured with a Truepulse laser rangefinder and recorded in metres.
- **Crown Radius:** The distance recorded in metres from the tree trunk to one or some of the cardinal points of the compass.
- Age Class: Assessed as either:
  - Sapling = a size which could be easily transplanted;
  - Semi-mature = prior to seed bearing age and could be transplanted with care;
  - Early Mature = early maturity, not fully grown but of seed bearing age and may have achieved mature height;
  - Mature = fully grown, annual growth is much reduced;
  - Old Mature = old for the species, possibly starting to decline;
  - Ancient = exceptionally old for the species, the crown may be retrenching, provides many opportunities for wildlife and is likely to be an important habitat.
- Health Class: Classified as either:
  - Normal Vitality = normal growth and twig extension;
  - Moderate Vitality = reduced twig extension but other than that few signs of ill-health;
  - Early Decline = reduced twig extension and some dead twigs in the outer canopy;
  - Mid-decline = small internodes, the canopy may be thinning and contain dead twigs and/or branches in the outer canopy, older branch wounds that haven't occluded may be decaying and forming cavities;
  - Severe Decline = sparse crown, numerous dead twigs and branches in the outer canopy, older branch wounds likely to be decaying and forming cavities;
  - o Dead.
- **Structural Condition Class:** A visual assessment of the tree's current condition and simple evaluation. Described as either: Good, Moderate, or Poor.
- **BS 5837 Retention Category:** The retention category assessed using the guidance in Table 1 of BS 5837, 2012 [see Appendix 3].
  - **U** (Red on plan) Those in such a condition that they cannot realistically be retained as living trees in the context of the current land use for longer than 10 years
  - A (Green on plan) Trees of high quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 40 years
  - B (Blue on plan) Trees of moderate quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 20 years
  - C (Grey on plan) Trees of low quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 10 years, or young trees with a stem diameter below 150 mm
- **Recommended Work:** General description of recommended work.
- **RPA Radius:** The radius of a circular Root Protection Area (RPA) in metres as specified using the guidance contained in BS 5837 (2012).
- **RPA Area:** The area of the Root Protection Area (RPA) in square metres as specified using the guidance contained in BS 5837 (2012).

## Appendix 5

Tree Data Schedule

Feature No.	Tree ID No.	Species	Trunk Diameter	Number of Stems	Tree Height	Crown Radius	Age Class	Health Class	Structural Condition Class	BS5837 Retention Category	Recommended Work	RPA Radius	RPA Area
1G	1	Birch	120mm; 170mm; 170mm; 170mm; 220mm; 250mm; 250mm;	7 No. Stems	12.2m	5.2m	Mature	Normal Vitality	Moderate	С	None	6m	113m²
	2	Goat Willow	310mm	1 No. Stems	11.3m	4.4m	Mature	Normal Vitality	Good	С	None	3.6m	41m²
	3	Oak	260mm	1 No. Stems	8.5m	4.8m	Early Mature	Normal Vitality	Good	С	Fell to facilitate the proposed development	3m	28m²
2Т	4	Whitebeam	190mm; 220mm; 250mm; 270mm; 290mm; 380mm	6 No. Stems	18.3m	9m	Mature	Mid- decline	Moderate	C1	None	7.8m	191m²
	5	Sycamore	160mm; 180mm; 220mm; 250mm; 360mm	5 No. Stems	14.3m	4.9m	Early Mature	Normal Vitality	Moderate	С	Fell to facilitate the proposed development	6.6m	137m²
3G	6	Sycamore	350mm	1 No. Stems	14.3m	2.6m	Mature	Normal Vitality	Moderate	С	Fell to facilitate the proposed development	4.2m	55m²
	7	Sycamore	280mm	1 No. Stems	9.9m	3.9m	Early Mature	Normal Vitality	Moderate	С	Fell to facilitate the proposed development	3.3m	34m²
4W	8	Oak	200mm; 300¥#mm	2 No. Stems	14m	4m	Early Mature	Early Decline	Moderate	С	None	4.2m	55m²

Page 24/27

Feature No.	Tree ID No.	Species	Trunk Diameter	Number of Stems	Tree Height	Crown Radius	Age Class	Health Class	Structural Condition Class	BS5837 Retention Category	Recommended Work	RPA Radius	RPA Area
	9	Sycamore	500¥#mm	1 No. Stems	14m	4.1m	Mature	Early Decline	Moderate	С	None	6m	113m²
	10	Sycamore	400#mm	1 No. Stems	15m	4.7m	Mature	Moderate Vitality	Good	С	None	4.8m	72m²
	11	Oak	400#mm	1 No. Stems	16.2m	7.4m	Mature	Normal Vitality	Good	В	None	4.8m	72m²
5T	12	Sycamore	400mm	1 No. Stems	11.3m	6m	Mature	Moderate Vitality	Moderate	C1	None	4.8m	72m²
6Т	13	Oak	130mm	1 No. Stems	5.6m	3m	Early Mature	Normal Vitality	Good	C1	None	1.5m	7m²

Page 25/27

## Appendix 6

Tree Work Schedule

Feature No.	Tree ID No.	Species	Trunk Diameter	BS5837 Retention Category	Recommended Work
1G	3	Oak	260mm	С	Fell to facilitate the proposed development
	5	Sycamore	160mm; 180mm; 220mm; 250mm; 360mm	С	Fell to facilitate the proposed development
3G	6	Sycamore	350mm	С	Fell to facilitate the proposed development
	7	Sycamore	280mm	C	Fell to facilitate the proposed development

## Appendix 7

British Standard: BS 5837 *Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction - Recommendations* (2012): Default Specification for Protection Barrier



JEFFERSON PARK - Pre-development Arboricultural Report Prepared for Thomas Armstrong Construction ©Treescapes Consultancy Ltd. Re

Page 27/27

## **Treescapes Consultancy Ltd.**

Briggs House Farm Helsington Kendal Cumbria LA8 8AG

Telephone: 07710 751970

Email: <u>alistair.hearn@treescapesconsultancy.co.uk</u> Website: <u>www.treescapesconsultancy.co.uk</u>