



Arboricultural Impact Assessment

Mowbray's Close, Romford

On behalf of

London Borough of Havering

Author	Geoff Clack BA(Hons) NDArb TechArborA
Quality Reviewer	Gary Meadowcroft Dip.Arb (RFS) M.arbor.A
Report Status	Rev ~
Date of Issue	29/06/22

Professional Service • Pragmatic Solutions
Ecology, Arboriculture, Countryside Management


Phone: 01268 711 021 Email: team@ses-eco.co.uk website: www.ses-eco.co.uk
Address: Unit 1, The Sudbury Stables, Sudbury Road, Downham, Essex, CM11 1LB

Executive summary

An arboricultural survey has been carried out, and this report prepared to support a planning application at Mowbray's Close, Romford.

1. Details of all trees forming the survey can be found in Appendix 3, including specific comments in relation to their condition and quality.
2. The area subject to survey includes 14 individual trees, 2 groups of trees, 1 hedge and 6 shrubs/scrub areas.
3. The proposed layout will require the removal of 6 individual trees, 2 groups of trees and 3 shrubs.
4. The theoretical Root Protection Areas (RPAs) of trees T20 and T22 will be incurred into by the design layout. Root investigations will be carried out under arboricultural supervision before the commencement of works in order to confirm if roots are present at these locations, with a view to minor root pruning, if necessary. If significant roots are identified at this location, then alternative 'no-dig' design solutions such as a cellular confinement system will be required. (see Appendix 6 for methods of work close to trees).
5. Tree Protective Fencing (TPF) for all retained trees will be provided by the existing 3rd Party boundary fencing along the site redline boundary.
6. Provided precautions to protect the retained trees are specified and implemented through the measures included in this report, the development proposal will have minimal impact on the retained trees or their wider contribution to amenity and character.
7. If the recommendations made within this report are followed, the development will be achievable in arboricultural terms and should be acceptable to the Local Planning Authority.

<u>Tree Survey Summary</u>	A	B	C	U	TOTAL
Trees	1	0	4	9	14
Groups	0	0	0	2	2
Hedges	0	0	1	0	1
Scrub/Shrubs	0	0	2	4	6
TOTAL	1	0	7	15	23



INDEX

CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION	4
2.0	SITE VISIT AND OBSERVATIONS	5
3.0	ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT.....	8
4.0	PRELIMINARY ARBORICULTURAL METHOD STATEMENT	10
5.0	CONCLUSIONS	12
APPENDIX 1:	SURVEY AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION	13
APPENDIX 2:	KEY TO TREE SURVEY SHEET AND SUMMARY	15
APPENDIX 3:	TREE SURVEY SCHEDULE	17
APPENDIX 4:	TREE CONSTRAINTS PLAN (TCP) & TREE PROTECTION PLAN (TPP)	19
APPENDIX 5:	TREE PROTECTION BARRIERS & GROUND PROTECTION DESIGN	20
APPENDIX 6:	METHODS OF WORK CLOSE TO TREES	24
APPENDIX 7:	TREE WORK SCHEDULE	29
APPENDIX 8:	SPECIFIC REPORT CAVEAT AND REFERENCES	30

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Instruction

Southern Ecological Solutions Ltd. has been instructed to produce an Arboricultural Impact Assessment in support of a planning application at Mowbray's Close, Romford. It has been produced in accordance with the principles of British Standard *BS 5837:2012, Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations* and includes the following information to accompany a planning application:

- *details of significant trees including an assessment of condition using BS 5837 categorisation;*
- *a plan showing tree survey information, retention categorisation and root protection areas;*
- *an assessment of the impact of the proposal on trees, any wider impact on the local amenity and any impact trees may have on the proposed development;*
- *a preliminary arboricultural method statement dealing with the protection and management of the trees to be retained;*
- *a schedule of tree works to facilitate construction.*

1.2 Scope and purpose of this report

This report covers trees within the site boundary and its immediate proximity. It is concerned with the impact the development may have on trees, and the effect retained trees may have on the development. Its purpose is to allow the Local Planning Authority to assess the tree information as part of the planning submission.

2.0 Site Visit and Observations

2.1 Site visit

A site visit was undertaken on the 16th June 2022 by Geoff Clack of Southern Ecological Solutions. The weather conditions were clear and dry.

2.2 Site description

The site is located to the east of Mowbrays Close and is composed of unoccupied garages and hardstanding to the south with an open area to the north. It is bordered by residential back gardens.

The survey boundary is indicated by the redline boundary as per the map below.



Figure 1 – Redline boundary of the survey area

2.3 The subject trees

The area subject to survey includes 14 individual trees, 2 groups of trees, 1 hedge and 6 shrubs/scrub areas.

All trees were categorised in accordance with Section 4.5 and Table 1 of BS5837.

Table 1 BS5837 Categorisation Summary

	A	B	C	U	TOTAL
Trees	1	0	4	9	14
Groups	0	0	0	2	2
Woodlands	0	0	0	0	0
Hedges	0	0	1	0	1
Scrub/Shrubs	0	0	2	4	6
TOTAL	1	0	7	15	23

2.4 Tree Preservations Orders

2.5 Tree Preservations Orders: a search in the interactive map of Havering Council web page shows that the trees are not subject to a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)




Figure 2 - Capture of Haveing Council interactive web site for TPOs

Please note the following in relation to vegetation clearance: anyone wishing to undertake works to prune or remove a tree with a Tree Preservation Order or within a Conservation Area will require written authorisation from the Local Planning Authority before any works can proceed.

However, works required as part of planning consent does not need additional consent.

3.0 Arboricultural Impact Assessment

3.1 Summary of the impact on trees

Development can adversely impact on trees by causing them to be removed to facilitate the development, or in the future, by adversely affecting their potential for retention through a disturbance in Root Protection Areas (RPAs)¹ or through post development pressures to prune or remove.

At the design stage, disturbance within the RPA should be avoided. If unavoidable, (which may need demonstrating), consideration must be given to any construction activity such as demolition, including removal of existing hard surfaces, changing soil levels and the provision of services where within RPAs, as well as new surfaces and structures.

Construction of hard surfaces and other construction may be acceptable within RPAs providing specialist methods of design and construction are used. This will often result in the use of minimal or no-dig methods which result in higher finished levels which must be allowed for during design due to the effect on access thresholds and structure heights etc.

The ability of trees to tolerate some disturbance depends on individual circumstances including prevailing site conditions, tree species, age and condition and this will be assessed by the project arboriculturist.

Protection measures, usually a combination of barriers and ground protection, must be in place before any works (including site clearance) begin, and stay in place for as long as a risk of damage remains (please refer to the Tree Protection Plan - TPP). The protection of trees must take account of the buildability of the proposal, including services, and ensure that all activities, such as storage of materials, parking and the use of plant and vehicles, can be accommodated outside of RPAs. Particular care and planning are necessary for the operation of excavators, lifting machinery and cranes to ensure all vehicle movement and lifting operations will not impact on retained trees.

¹ *Root Protection Area (RPA) - A layout design tool indicating the minimum area surrounding the tree that contains sufficient rooting volume to maintain the tree's viability, and where the protection of the roots and soil structure is treated as a priority. Assessed according to the recommendations set out in clause 4.6 of BS 5837. It is calculated by multiplying the radius squared by 3.142. Clause 4.6.2 of BS 5837 states that the RPA may be changed in shape, considering local site factors, species tolerance, condition and root morphology.*

3.2 Tree protection plan (TPP)

Trees to be retained are coloured coded based on their tree category, whilst trees required for removal to facilitate the development have red hatch lines inside a red circle representing the tree crown spread. Tree Protective Fencing (TPF) for all retained trees will be provided by the existing 3rd Party boundary fencing along the site redline boundary.

3.3 Trees to be removed

The proposed layout will require the removal of 6 individual trees, 2 groups of trees and 3 shrubs.

Table 2 Tree removal summary

Removal		TOTAL	Part removal		TOTAL
Trees	T3, T5, T6, T16, T17 and T19	6	Trees		0
Groups	G15, G18	2	Groups		0
Woodlands		0	Woodlands		0
Hedges		0	Hedges		0
Shrubs	S2, S4, S21	3	Shrubs		0

3.4 Trees to be pruned

T20 and T22 will require crown pruning cutback works.

Opportunities for remedial pruning works to low crowns etc. can be identified at later stages in the development process where deemed appropriate. A full Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) can be produced detailing any pruning works required to accommodate the proposed design layout and/or for access around the site from canopy obstruction. All tree pruning/felling work to facilitate the development can be found in Appendix 7.

3.5 Root protection area incursions

The theoretical Root Protection Areas (RPAs) of trees T20 and T22 will be incurred into by the design layout. Root investigations will be carried out under arboricultural supervision before the commencement of works in order to confirm if roots are present at these locations, with a view to minor root pruning, if necessary. If significant roots are identified at this location, then alternative 'no-dig' design solutions such as a cellular confinement system will be required. (see Appendix 6 for methods of work close to trees).

4.0 Preliminary Arboricultural Method Statement

4.1 Introduction

This section is a preliminary arboricultural method statement specifying the methodology to be used for the protection of trees and works close to trees that have the potential to result in the loss of or damage to a tree. It includes details of site management and supervision required for successful tree retention.

4.2 Site clearance

Damage can easily be caused to trees to be retained during initial site clearance. Therefore, tree protection barriers must be in place before site clearance to protect retained trees identified in Appendix 3.

4.3 Site and fuel storage, cement mixing and washing points

All site storage areas, cement mixing and washing points for equipment and vehicles and fuel storage must be outside RPAs. No discharge of potential contaminants will occur within 10 m of a retained tree stem or where there is a risk of run-off into RPAs.

4.4 Tree protection barriers

Appendix 5 includes guidance for protective barriers based on BS 5837:2012. The approximate location of the barriers and the CEZs is shown on the TPP. The precise location of the barriers and other protective measures will be confirmed at the pre-commencement meeting before any demolition or construction activities (including site clearance) start.

4.5 Ground protection

In areas where it is not possible to erect protective barriers, ground protection must be used to protect the RPAs of retained trees. Where it has been agreed during the design stage that vehicular or pedestrian access for the construction operation may take place within the CEZ, the possible effects of construction activity should be addressed by a combination of barriers and ground protection. The position of the barrier may be within the CEZ at the edge of the agreed working zone, but the soil structure beyond the barrier to the edge of the CEZ shall be protected with ground protection.

4.6 Precautions when working in CEZs

Only work agreed with the Local Planning Authority can be carried out within CEZs. Any works must be carried out in accordance with the details as set out in Appendix 6 which are summarised below.

4.7 Installation of new surfacing

Full details of the new surfacing proposed within the RPAs of trees to be retained is not known at the time of writing. However, if resurfacing is required within the RPAs of any trees it will be necessary to use non-standard methods of construction. Ideally, new substrates and finished surfaces should be of a porous design to allow water and an air passage in and out.

4.8 Installation of new services

The exact location of services is often difficult to establish until construction is in progress. Where existing services within RPAs require upgrading or new services have to be installed in RPAs, conventional excavation techniques are unacceptable, and great care must be taken to minimise any disturbance. Trenchless installation should be the preferred option, but if that is not feasible, any excavation must be carried out by hand or using a compressed air lance. The methodology must comply with *NJUG Volume 4: Guidelines for the Planning, installation and Maintenance of Utility Apparatus in Proximity to Trees*.

4.9 Tree works

Recommendations for tree works can be found in the tree works schedule in Appendix 7. All works shall be in accordance with *BS 3998:2010*, or in accordance with current best practice. The use of a competent tree surgery contractor is necessary to comply with this (follow the link for a list of Arboricultural Association approved contractors [Directory of Tree Surgeons - Arboricultural Association](#)). The main contractor and tree surgery contractor must ensure that any necessary consents have been received from the Local Planning Authority regarding planning constraints in regard to trees and that no protected species or habitats are harmed whilst carrying out site clearance or tree surgery works.

5.0 Conclusions

- 5.1** The proposed layout will require the removal of 6 individual trees, 2 groups of trees and 3 shrubs.
- 5.2** The theoretical Root Protection Areas (RPAs) of trees T20 and T22 will be incurred into by the design layout. Root investigations will be carried out under arboricultural supervision before the commencement of works in order to confirm if roots are present at these locations, with a view to minor root pruning, if necessary. If significant roots are identified at this location, then alternative 'no-dig' design solutions such as a cellular confinement system will be required. (see Appendix 6 for methods of work close to trees).
- 5.3** Tree Protective Fencing (TPF) for all retained trees will be provided by the existing 3rd Party boundary fencing along the site redline boundary.
- 5.4** Provided precautions to protect the retained trees are specified and implemented through the measures included in this report, the development proposal will have minimal impact on the retained trees or their wider contribution to amenity and character.
- 5.5** If the recommendations made within this report are followed, the development will be achievable in arboricultural terms and should be acceptable to the Local Planning Authority.

Appendix 1: Survey and Background Information

1.1 Limitations

A detailed topographical plan showing the locations of individual trees was provided by the client and used for the tree survey, so the positions of the trees were understood to be accurate, and SES Ltd accepts no liability for the accuracy of any tree survey drawings based on the topographical plan supplied by the client.

Trees are living organisms whose health and the condition can change rapidly and all trees, even healthy ones, are at risk from unpredictable climatic and manmade events. The assessment of risk for any tree is based upon factors evident at the time of the inspection and the interpretation of those factors by suitably qualified inspectors. The health, condition and safety of trees should be checked on a basis commensurate with the level of risk and preferably on an annual basis.

1.2 Methods

The trees were surveyed from ground level without detailed investigations. All trees with a trunk diameter of 75 mm or above² were surveyed. All dimensions were estimated unless otherwise indicated. Obvious hedges and shrub masses were identified where appropriate. Information collected is in accordance with recommendations in *Subsection 4.4.2.5 of BS 5837:2012* and includes species, height, diameter, branch spread, crown clearance, age class, physiological condition, structural condition and remaining contribution. Each tree was then allocated one of four categories (U, A, B or C) to reflect its suitability as a material constraint on development.

1.3 Documents and information received

- *Topographical plan*
- *Proposed plan*

1.4 Contact

Name	Company/organisation	Tel. no.
Geoff Clack	SES Arboriculture Ltd	+44 (0)1268 711021

² *BS 5837 recommends that in most circumstances all trees over 75mm stem diameter should be included in a pre-planning land and tree survey*

1.5 Reference documents

- *British Standards Institution (2012) BS 5837: Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations;*
- *British Standards Institute (2010) BS 3998: Tree work – Recommendations;*
- *DETR Tree Preservation Orders – A Guide to the Law and Good Practice;*
- *National Joint Utilities Group (2007) Volume 4, Issue 2: Guidelines for the planning, installation and maintenance of utility apparatus in proximity to trees;*
- *DTLR (2001) Principles of Tree Hazard Assessment and Management - David Lonsdale.*

1.6 Legal Constraints and Liabilities

1.6.1 Occupiers Liability 1957 and 1984

The Occupiers Liability Act places a duty of care to ensure that no reasonably foreseeable harm takes place due to tree defects. Therefore, this report includes recommendations within the tree tables for work required for safety reasons. 'Common sense risk management of trees (National Tree Safety Group 2012)' states that *'the owner of the land on which a tree stands, together with any party who has control over the tree's management, owes a duty of care at common law to all people who might be injured by the tree. The duty of care is to take reasonable care to avoid acts or omissions that cause a reasonably foreseeable risk of injury to persons or property.'*

1.6.2 Common Law

This enables pruning back of the crown and roots of trees on adjacent land where they overhang neighbouring property, providing the work is reasonable and does not cause harm. This right does not override TPO and CA legislation.

1.6.3 Ecological Constraints

The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, as amended, The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 and the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000, provide statutory protection to species of flora and fauna including birds, bats and other species that are associated with trees. These could impose significant constraints on the use and timing of access to the site. It is the responsibility of the main contractor and tree surgery contractor to ensure that no protected species are harmed whilst carrying out site clearance or tree surgery works. Unless competent to do so, the advice of an ecologist must be sought.

Appendix 2: Key to Tree Survey Sheet and Summary

Measurements	Life Stage	Structural and physiological condition	Root Protection Area (RPA)
Height - Measured using a digital laser clinometer (m)	Young trees up to ten years of age	Good: Trees with only a few minor defects and in good overall health needing little, if any attention	• The RPA Radius column provides the extent of an equivalent circle from the center of the stem (m). • The RPA is calculated using the formulae described in paragraph 4.6.1 of British Standard 5837: 2012 and is indicative of the rooting area required for a tree to be successfully retained. Tree roots extend beyond the calculated RPA in many cases and where possible a greater distance should be protected.
Stem diameter – DBH. Diameter measured (mm) in accordance with Annex C of the BS5837	Semi-mature trees less than 1/3 life expectancy	Fair: Trees with minor rectifiable defects or in the early stages of stress from which it may recover	
Crown Spread - Measured using a digital laser clinometer radially from the main stem (m)	Early mature trees 1/3 – 2/3 life expectancy	Poor: Trees with major structural and/or physiological defects such that it is unlikely the tree will recover in the long term	
	Mature trees over 2/3 life expectancy	Dead: This could also apply to trees in an advanced state of decline and unlikely to recover	
	Over mature declining or moribund trees of low vigor	The BS category particular consideration has been given to the following • The health, vigor and condition of each tree • The presence of any structural defects in each tree/group and its future life expectancy • The size and form of each tree/group and its suitability within the context of a proposed development • The location of each tree relative to existing site features e.g. its screening value or landscape features • Age class and life expectancy	
	Veteran tree possessing certain attributes relating to veteran trees		

Abbreviations		BS cat: Category in accordance with Table 1 and section 4.5 of BS 5837.	
T – Tree	Feature surveyed as individual tree. Included multi stem trees	Category A	High quality and value (non-fiscal) with at least 40 years remaining life expectancy.
G – Group of trees	Land under a stand of trees with a maximum size of 0.25 hectare.	Category B	Moderate quality and value with at least 20 years remaining life expectancy.
W – Woodland	Land under a stand of trees with, or the potential to achieve, tree canopy cover of 20% or more. The minimum size of woodland Forestry Commission Scotland can grant-aid is 0.25 hectare.	Category C	Low quality and value with at least 10 years remaining life expectancy, or young trees with a stem diameter below 150 mm
H - Hedge	A hedgerow is a boundary line of bushes which can include trees and is protected if it's: more than 20m long with gaps of 20m or less in its length.	Category U	Unsuitable for retention. Existing condition is such that they cannot be realistically retained as living trees in the context of the current land use for longer than 10 years. Note, category U trees can have existing or potential conservation value which it might be desirable to preserve.
# - Estimated value.	See observation for further information	Subcategories	(1) - Mainly arboricultural values (2) - Mainly landscape values (3) - Mainly cultural values including conservation.
VTA – Visual Tree Assessment	Non-invasive method of examining the health and structural condition of individual trees.		

2.1 Appendix Summary

Table 3 BS5837 category summary with tree numbers

SUMMARY	Individual Trees	Total	Groups of Trees, Woodlands, Hedges & Shrubs.	Total
Category U - Unsuitable	T3, T5, T6, T10, T12, T14, T16, T17, T19	9	S2, S4, S13, G15, G18, S21	6
Category A (High Quality / Value)	T22	1		0
Category B (Moderate Quality / Value)		0		0
Category C (Low Quality / Value)	T8, T9, T11, T20	4	S1, S7, H23	3

Table 4 Life stage and BS5837 category summary

SUMMARY	A	B	C	U	TOTAL
Young	0	0	4	9	13
Early Mature	0	0	0	0	0
Semi Mature	0	0	0	6	6
Mature	1	0	3	0	4
Post Mature	0	0	0	0	0
Late Mature	0	0	0	0	0
Ancient / Veteran	0	0	0	0	0
Dead	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	1	0	7	15	23

Appendix 3: Tree Survey Schedule

Client: London Borough of Havering

Surveyed by: Geoff Clack of Southern Ecological Solutions

Weather: clear and dry

Site: Mowbray's Close, Romford

Survey Date: 16th June 2022

Abbreviations	
# - Estimated value.	See observation for further information
com - Combined stem diameter	In accordance with BS5837:2012

Tree No.	Species	Life Stage	No of Stems	Stem Diameter - DBH (mm)	Height (m)	Crown Spread (m)								Structural Condition	Physiological Condition	Observations	Life Expectancy	BS5837 Category	RPA Radius (m)	RPA Area (m2)
						N	NE	E	SE	S	SW	W	NW							
S1	Pyracantha sp. (Pyracantha)	Young	5	60 com	2	0.5		0.5		0.5		0.5		Fair	Fair	Located in front garden of 9 Mowbray's Close. Garden shrub.	10+	C2	0.8	2.0
S2	Laburnum sp. (Laburnum sp.)	Young	5	60 com	2	0.5		0.5		0.1		0.5		Poor	Fair	Abutting fence of 9 Mowbray's Close. Multistem regrowth from felled stump.	10+	U	0.8	2.0
T3	Acer pseudoplatanus (Sycamore)	Young	5	150 com	4	1.0		1.0		1.0		1.0		Poor	Fair	Abutting fence of 9 Mowbray's Close. Multistem regrowth from felled stump.	>10	U	1.9	11.1
S4	Laburnum sp. (Laburnum sp.)	Young	5	60 com	2	0.5		0.5		0.1		0.5		Poor	Fair	Abutting fence of 9 Mowbray's Close. Multistem regrowth from felled stump.	10+	U	0.8	2.0
T5	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	Young	3	80 com	3	0.5		0.5		0.1		0.5		Poor	Fair	Abutting fence of 9 Mowbray's Close. Multistem regrowth from felled stump.	>10	U	1.0	3.4
T6	Crataegus monogyna (Common Hawthorn/Quick/May)	Semi Mature	2	210 com	5	2.5		2.5		2.5		2.5		Poor	Poor	Tree growing from under corner wall. Tree 80% dead - in terminal decline.	>10	U	2.5	20.4
S7	Philadelphus sp. (Mock Orange sp.)	Young	5	40 com	2	1.0		1.0		1.0		1.0		Fair	Fair	Ornamental shrub in adjacent garden.	10+	C2	0.5	0.9
T8	Cupressocyparis leylandii (Leyland Cypress)	Mature	1	400 #	12	5.0		5.0		5.0		5.0		Fair	Poor	Offsite. Sparse. Unable to access tree fully - data estimated.	10+	C2	4.8	72.4
T9	Cupressocyparis leylandii (Leyland Cypress)	Mature	1	400 #	12	5.0		5.0		5.0		5.0		Fair	Poor	Offsite. Sparse. Unable to access tree fully - data estimated.	10+	C2	4.8	72.4
T10	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	Young	3	80 com	3	1.0		0.1		1.0		1.0		Poor	Fair	Abutting wall. Multistem regrowth from felled stump.	>10	U	1.0	3.4
T11	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	Young	1	220 #	7	3.0		3.0		3.0		3.0		Fair	Fair	Offsite. Unable to access tree fully - data estimated.	10+	C2	2.6	21.9
T12	Salix caprea (Goat Willow/Great Sallow)	Young	6	70 com	3	0.1		1.0		1.0		1.0		Poor	Fair	Self-seeded, abutting garage Multistem regrowth from felled stump.	>10	U	0.9	2.4
S13	Buddleja sp. (Buddleja)	Young	5	80 com	3	2.5		2.5		2.5		2.5		Poor	Poor	Self-seeded buddleia shrub in poor condition.	>10	U	1.1	3.6
T14	Pyrus sp. (Pear sp.)	Semi Mature	1	250	6	2.5		2.5		2.5		2.5		Poor	Fair	Tree has 25 degree lean to south from recent rootplate movement as evidenced by crown form. Decay pocket evident at base.	10+	U	3.0	28.3

Tree Survey Schedule

Client: London Borough of Havering
Site: Mowbrays Close, Romford

Surveyed by Geoff Clack of Southern Ecological Solutions
Survey Date: 16th June 2022

Weather: clear and dry

Abbreviations	
# - Estimated value.	See observation for further information
VTA – Visual Tree Assessment	Non-invasive method of examining the health and structural condition of individual trees.
com – Combined stem diameter	In accordance with BS5837:2012

Tree No.	Species	Life Stage	No of Stems	Stem Diameter - DBH (mm)	Height (m)	Crown Spread (m)								Structural Condition	Physiological Condition	Observations	Life Expectancy	BS5837 Category	RPA Radius (m)	RPA Area (m2)
						N	NE	E	SE	S	SW	W	NW							
G15	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	Young	~	See Observations	5	See Tree Survey Plan								Poor	Fair	Group of self-seeded ash. Average stem diameter:50mm.	>10	U	See Tree Survey Plan	See Tree Survey Plan
T16	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	Semi Mature	3	430 com	10	3.0		6.0		6.0		6.0		Poor	Fair	Structurally poor with congested stems at base.	>10	U	5.2	84.8
T17	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	Semi Mature	2	250 com	9	3.0		3.0		1.0		2.0		Poor	Fair	Structurally poor with congested fork at crownbreak. Asymmetrical and Suppressed. Sparse crown.	>10	U	3.0	28.3
G18	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	Semi Mature	~	See Observations	n/a	See Tree Survey Plan								Poor	Poor	Group of 4 poor form ash self-set ash growing from under fence. Average stem diameter: 150mm. Asymmetrical and suppressed.	>10	U	See Tree Survey Plan	See Tree Survey Plan
T19	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	Semi Mature	2	250 com	9	1.0		3.0		4.0		4.0		Poor	Fair	Structurally poor with congested fork with included bark at crownbreak. Asymmetrical and Suppressed. Sparse crown.	>10	U	3.0	28.3
T20	Cupressocyparis leylandii (Leyland Cypress)	Mature	1	400 #	12	5.0		5.0		5.0		5.0		Fair	Poor	Offsite. Sparse. Unable to access tree fully - data estimated.	10+	C2	4.8	72.4
S21	unrecognized (Unrecognised)	Young	5	60 com	2	1.0		1.0		1.0		1.0		Fair	Poor	Ornamental shrub.	>10	U	0.8	2.0
T22	Quercus robur (English Oak)	Mature	1	750 #	16	8.0		8.0		8.0		8.0		Good	Good	Offsite. Unable to access tree fully - data estimated. Lowest branch over site 2m above ground.	40+	A2	9.0	254.5
H23	Cupressocyparis leylandii (Leyland Cypress)	Young	~	See Observations	2.5	See Tree Survey Plan								Fair	Fair	Offsite. Leylandii hedge.	10+	C2	See Tree Survey Plan	See Tree Survey Plan


Appendix 4: Tree Constraints Plan (TCP) & Tree Protection Plan (TPP)

See attached plans x 2 on the following pages:

1 x Tree Constraints Plan (TCP) – As Existing

1 x Tree Protection Plan (TPP) – As Proposed

As Existing



Key



Category A - Trees of high quality
with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 40 years



Category B - Trees of moderate quality
with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 20 years



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



Category U - Trees unsuitable for retention
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




Group of trees (G) / hedgerows (H) / woodlands (W) / shrub (S) - Colour coded according to categories above



Root Protection Area (RPA)



Survey boundary line



Root Protection Area (RPA)
Tree reference number
Example Tree Representation
Location of the stem (colour coded)
Crown spread (colour coded)

NOTE:
TO BE PRINTED IN COLOUR AT A3 SIZE



Southern Ecological Solutions,
Sudbury Stables,
Downham,
Essex CM11 1LB
Phone: 01268 711021
Website: www.ses-eco.co.uk

Rev	Update	Date

Site

Mowbrays Close, Romford

Client

London Borough of Havering

Drawing title

Tree Constraints Plan

Drawing no.

TCP/Mowbrays Close/27-06-22

	Scale	Date
	1/200@A3	27-06-22
Revision	Drawn by	Checked by
~	GC	GM

As Proposed

Note 1:
Tree Protective Fencing (TPF) for all retained trees will be provided by the existing 3rd Party boundary fencing along the redline boundary.

Note 2:
The theoretical Root Protection Areas (RPAs) of trees T20 and T22 will be incurred into by the design layout. Root investigations will be carried out under arboricultural supervision before the commencement of works in order to confirm if roots are present at these locations, with a view to minor root pruning, if necessary. If significant roots are identified at this location, then alternative 'no-dig' design solutions such as a cellular confinement system will be required. (see Appendix 6 in accompanying report for methods of work close to trees).

Note 3:
The theoretical RPAs of T8 to T11 unlikely to extend into site under existing hardstanding and garages, or be affected by proposed landscaping

Key

**Category A - Trees of high quality**
with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 40 years

**Category B - Trees of moderate quality**
with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 20 years

**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

**Category U - Trees unsuitable for retention**
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

**Group of trees (G) / hedgerows (H) / woodlands (W) / shrub (S)** - Colour coded according to categories above

**Root Protection Area (RPA)**

**Survey boundary line**

**Crown pruning cutback and Root investigations required:**
(see report for details)

NOTE:


TO BE PRINTED IN COLOUR AT A3 SIZE



Southern Ecological Solutions,
Sudbury Stables,
Downham,
Essex CM11 1LB

Phone: 01268 711021
Website: www.ses-eco.co.uk

Rev	Update	Date
Site		
Mowbrays Close, Romford		
Client		
London Borough of Havering		
Drawing title		
Tree Protection Plan		
Drawing no.		
TCP/Mowbrays Close/27-06-22		
	Scale	Date
	1/200@A3	27-06-22
Revision	Drawn by	Checked by
~	GC	GM



Appendix 5: Tree Protection Barriers & Ground Protection Design

Barriers should be fit for the purpose of excluding construction activity and appropriate to the degree and proximity of work taking place. The default specification will be in accordance with *Section 6.2.2.2 of BS 5837:2012*, as set out below.

5.1 Specifications

Barrier shall be a minimum 2 m high. It shall consist of a vertical and horizontal scaffold framework, well braced to resist impacts, as illustrated below. The vertical tubes should be spaced at a minimum interval of 3 m and driven securely into the ground. Onto this framework, welded mesh panels should be securely fixed. See Figure 2 overleaf.

Where site circumstances and the associated risk of damaging incursions into the RPA do not necessitate the default level of protection, an alternative specification may be used if agreed with the local authority. An example would be 'Heras' type welded mesh panels on rubber or concrete feet. The panels should be joined together using a minimum of two anti-tamper couplers, installed so that they can only be removed from inside the fence. The panels should be supported on the inner side by stabiliser struts. See Figure 3 overleaf. All-weather notices should be attached to the barrier with words such as 'TREE PROTECTION ZONE - NO ACCESS'.

5.2 Location

Barriers shall be positioned on the perimeter of the Root Protection Area to define the Construction Exclusion Zone or as specified in the Tree Protection Plan.

The Tree Protective Fencing is represented on the Tree Protection Plan by a black linetype containing the letters 'TPF'.

Figure 3 Example of welded mesh barriers in use




Figure 5 Default specification or protective barrier





Figure 4 Examples of above-ground stabilizing system



Figures above are reproduced with the permission of the British Standards Institute.

5.3 Ground protection

In areas where it is not possible to erect protective fencing, ground protection must be used to protect the CEZ of trees. Where it has been agreed during the design stage, and as shown on the tree protection plan, that vehicular or pedestrian access for the construction operation may take place within the CEZ, the possible effects of construction activity should be addressed by a combination of barriers and ground protection. The position of the barrier may be within the CEZ at the edge of the agreed working zone, but the soil structure beyond the barrier to the edge of the CEZ should be protected with ground protection. This must be installed before any site activity takes place to protect soil structure and tree roots.

Ground protection must be fit for the purpose of supporting any traffic entering or using the site without being distorted or causing compaction of underlying soil. It might comprise one of the following:

- *“for pedestrian movements or the erection of scaffolding within the RPA the installation of ground protection in the form of a single thickness of scaffold boards either on top of a driven scaffold frame, so as to form a suspended walkway, or on top of a compression-resistant layer (e.g. 100 mm depth of woodchip laid onto a geotextile;*
- *for pedestrian-operated plant up to a gross weight of 2 t, proprietary, inter-linked ground protection boards or panels placed on top of a compression-resistant layer (e.g. 150 mm depth of woodchip), laid onto a geotextile membrane; or for wheeled or tracked construction traffic exceeding 2 t gross weight, an alternative system (e.g. proprietary systems or pre-cast reinforced concrete slabs) to an engineering specification designed in conjunction with arboricultural advice, to accommodate the likely loading to which it will be subjected.*

The following is a list of suppliers of temporary ground protection including polymer, metal or wooden panels. Other companies supply similar products, and the following are given only as an example:

- www.ground-guards.co.uk
- www.trakmatseurope.com
- www.centriforce.com
- www.marwoodgroup.co.uk
- www.groundtrax.com

Cellular confinement no-dig systems can also be used.

Figure 6 Examples of proprietary ground protection panels



Appendix 6: Methods of Work Close to Trees

6.1.1 Guidance for working within RPAs

(This chapter sets out the general principles that must be followed when working in RPAs).

6.1.2 Removal of hard surfaces within RPAs

All structures including hard surfaces, walls and fences within CEZs must be removed following the methods detailed below to minimise damage to tree roots.

The use of conventional tracked and wheeled machinery causes damage to soil structure from compaction and damage to roots from excavation and must not be used within the CEZ. All areas of hard surfacing requiring removal within a CEZ will be broken up using a hand-held pneumatic drill or mounted hydraulic breaker attached to a digger located outside the CEZ. The broken rubble will then be removed by hand.

The only exception to this is where the hard surface is of such a size as not to be reachable from outside the CEZ. In this situation, a rubber tracked mini digger will be used. The maximum working height of the machine must be less than the lowest branch of any overhanging trees.

The mini digger will work from the existing hard surface pulling the debris away from the tree/s.

No excavation of existing soil beneath the hard surface will take place.

Immediately after removal of the hard surface, topsoil or sharp sand must be used to cover the soil surface and any roots to prevent drying out.

Upon completion, the protective fencing must be moved out to the edge of the CEZ or ground protection used if access is required.

6.1.3 Services

The location and direction of new services should be designed to allow for services to be routed away from the RPAs of retained trees.

If any services need to run through a CEZ, the main contractor must contact the project arboriculturist before any works are undertaken. The agreement will then be sought from the LPA tree officer on methodology. Works will only begin with the agreement of the LPA. The methodology used must comply with *NJUG Volume 4: Guidelines for the Planning, Installation and Maintenance of Utility Apparatus in Proximity to Trees*, which can be summarised as:

- *hand excavate only;*
- *work carefully around roots only cutting as a last resort;*
- *do not cut roots over 25 mm in diameter without referring to the project arboriculturist, and*
- *for roots, less than 25 mm in diameter use a sharp tool to make a clean cut leaving as small a wound as possible.” (BS5837:2012)*

6.1.4 New hard surfaces within RPAs

Where it has been agreed with the LPA that hard surfaces are acceptable within RPAs of retained trees, these will require designing to be of above ground, no-dig construction to minimise the impact on tree roots and soil structure. In addition, finished surfaces of the car parking and paved areas will need to be of a porous design to allow water and an air passage in and out.

An illustrative example of a cellular confinement no-dig system can be found below. The actual system will need to be designed by a structural engineer to accommodate the loadings anticipated

The principles to follow are:

- *“no excavation other than the removal of existing hard surfaces if required, or the removal of surface vegetation and no more than 50 mm of leaf litter, vegetation debris etc.;*
- *a method to spread and support the load of the hard surface and anticipated usage without causing compaction of the soil structure beneath;*
- *the use of a porous sub-base and finishing layer to allow water and air diffusion in and out of the soil;*
- *porosity must be designed to be long-term and not to block with fine particles in the short-term; therefore irregular, no-fines aggregate must be used; and*
- *the pH of the aggregate must be considered as many conventional road stones have very high pH values which can damage susceptible trees and therefore aggregates with a near neutral pH should be preferred.” (BS5837:2012)*

6.2 Examples of a Cellular Confinement System

Figure 7 Cellular Confinement System - Transition detail (Ramp)




Figure 8 Cellular Confinement System - Transition detail (Flat)




Figure 9 Cellular Confinement System - Kerb Edging




Figure 10 Cellular Confinement System - Timber Edging




Figure 11 Examples of Cellweb filling with angular stone



6.3 Fencing within RPAs

Where posts are to be installed within RPAs, the holes must be dug carefully by hand. If roots with a diameter of 25 mm or greater are found, the position of the post must be moved. Roots smaller than 25 mm diameter can be cut with sharp tools leaving as small a wound as possible. The sides of the hole should be lined with an impermeable membrane such as plastic sheeting to prevent the caustic and toxic effects of wet cement in the concrete from damaging tree roots. In the event the of finding roots greater than 25 mm whereby the posts cannot be relocated, special construction methods will need to be used with onsite supervision. The detail of which will form part of the Arboricultural Method Statement.

6.4 Landscaping works within RPAs

Landscape operations within tree protection zones have the potential to damage trees if not carried out with care; in addition, the removal of protective fencing to carry out landscape operations may allow other contractors in previously protected areas.

If protective fencing is taken down to facilitate landscaping operations, the area of the CEZ must be delineated by pins and marker tape, spray paint, or some other method to clearly show the extent of the CEZ.

The preparation of soil for planting and turfing must be carried out by hand where within CEZs. Cultivation should be kept to a minimum and new topsoil added must not exceed 100mm in depth within 1m of the stem of any tree.

Topsoil and other materials must be transported by wheelbarrow on running boards when working within CEZs.

Appendix 7: Tree Work Schedule

Tree No.	Species	Proposed Works	Reason	BS5837 Category
S2	Laburnum sp. (Laburnum sp.)	Removal	To accommodate the layout	U
T3	Acer pseudoplatanus (Sycamore)	Removal	To accommodate the layout	U
S4	Laburnum sp. (Laburnum sp.)	Removal	To accommodate the layout	U
T5	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	Removal	To accommodate the layout	U
T6	Crataegus monogyna (Common Hawthorn/Quick/May)	Removal	To accommodate the layout	U
T17	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	Removal	To accommodate the layout	U
G18	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	Removal	To accommodate the layout	U
T19	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	Removal	To accommodate the layout	U
T20	Cupressocyparis leylandii (Leyland Cypress)	Crown Pruning Cutback	To accommodate the layout	C2
S21	unrecognized (Unrecognised)	Removal	To accommodate the layout	U
T22	Quercus robur (English Oak)	Crown Pruning Cutback	To accommodate the layout	A2

Appendix 8: Specific Report Caveat and References

- 8.1 The survey is concerned solely with arboricultural issues.
- 8.2 Trees are dynamic living organisms whose health and the condition can change rapidly. Any changes to the tree or conditions close to the tree may change the stability and condition of the tree and a further examination would be required and may affect the validity of this report.
- 8.3 Hedges and dense tree belts often contain more than one species of vegetation and in certain circumstances it may not be possible (due to density, size, time of year) to identify all species within a hedge or dense tree belt. In this eventuality the tree schedule will identify this as may contain high water demanding species and, in these cases, a further survey will be required ahead of the design process.
- 8.4 Vegetation can establish very quickly on and off site. It is the responsibility of the client to ensure that prior to the design of hard landscaped areas, infrastructure and foundations where trees need to be considered as part of the design process, a walkover survey is instructed and undertaken to identify any vegetation that may alter the designs as required by the NHBC Guidelines Chapter 4.2 and any other building standard or regulation relevant to the proximity of trees and development.
- 8.5 The arboriculturist must be involved at all stages throughout the development process to ensure that any impacts to trees and from trees have been considered and that any design or layout changes are checked as soon as possible to avoid delays and changes that may be necessary after review.
- 8.6 In order for SES to provide comment in respect of impacts to trees within the Arboricultural Impact Assessment and the Arboricultural Method Statement we will require the most up to date details of the design and, where known the drainage and utility runs as soon as possible. SES cannot be held responsible in the event of changes to a design or layout that may affect the impact to trees or a negative response from planning authorities where the most up to date information has not been provided or is not received by us where time permits that we can assess the layout changes and provide our view.
- 8.7 When working with the constraints of trees the design should follow a mitigation hierarchy and look to avoid all root protection areas where possible. Where this can't be achieved the arboriculturist will provide advice in respect of retention, loss or working within a Root Protection Area.
- 8.8 This report is valid for 12 months.

8.9 Copyright and non-disclosure

The content and layout of this report are subject to copyright owned by SES Ltd to the extent that copyright has been legally assigned to us by another party or is used by SES Ltd under license. This report may not be copied or used without a prior written agreement for any purpose other than the purpose indicated in this report.