



ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT For

**Acacia Grove
Copthorne Road
Copthorne
Crawley**

22nd September 2023

Prepared by

Andrew Day HND Arb. M.Arbor.A, CEnv

☎ +44 0333 242 7344 ☎ 0777 231 7770 💻 andy@andrewdayconsultancy.com

5 Brook Place, Halstead, Essex CO9 1DG

All rights in this report are reserved. No part of it may be reproduced or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, or stored in any retrieval system of any nature, without our written permission. Its content and format are for the exclusive use of the addressee in dealing with this site. It may not be sold, loaned, hired out or divulged to any third party not directly involved in this site without our written consent.

© (Andrew Day Arboricultural Consultancy Ltd)

Scope

The purpose of this report is to provide Arboricultural advice in relation to identifying the constraints of trees on site and in the neighbouring woodland land, in relation to a development proposal to utilise the site for vehicle parking. Commenting on how the trees could be impacted and if protection measures will be required to safeguard them from damage.

Table of Contents

	Page
1 Introduction	4
2 Appraisal	5
3 Conclusions	7
4 Other Considerations	7

Appendices

1 Qualifications and Experience	11
2 Site Specific Information	10
3 Limitations and Qualifications	14
4 Tree Constraints Plan	16

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Brief:

This report has been prepared at the request of Peter Smith Architects Ltd the project architect on behalf of the site owners, to identify the constraints of the trees on site and in the woodland adjacent to it. Assessing how they could be impacted by implementing the proposal and if any protection measures are required.

1.2 Qualifications and experience:

My experience and qualifications in arboriculture and list the details in **Appendix 1**.

1.3 Documents and information provided:

A plan of the site and the area of the proposed layout.

1.4 Relevant background information:

The woodland adjacent to the site is on a ground level approximately 2m below the level of the site, with a boundary fence on the edges preventing any access.

The site is completely covered in a hard surface, with numerous vehicles parked.

1.5 Scope of this report:

This report is only concerned with trees identified within the tree survey in **Appendix 3**, which are on site, adjacent to the area the focus of this report and the neighbouring land.

2 APPRAISAL

2.1 Brief site description:

The Site consists of open hardstanding which is used for the storage of cars with a portacabin on the southern boundary. Some trees are present on site in an area outside of the remit of this application to the northeast, a woodland runs parallel with the north and western boundary but on a ground level significantly lower than the site. To the south of the Site are industrial open yards with a tyre garage and a petrol filling station fronting Copthorne Road. There are commercial and residential uses to the southeast and southwest.

2.2 Condition of the trees and management considerations:

T1, T2, T3, T4, T15 & T16 appear to be in a healthy condition, as do the trees in the adjacent woodland as far as could be assessed from the site. However, T6 – T14 are dead or in terminal decline and should be removed to prevent them causing harm to persons or property if they should fail. These trees are located outside of the application area but have been recorded due to their condition and potential risk to persons or property.

No management works are considered necessary at this moment in time for T1, T2, T3, T4, T15 & T16.

Please refer to the tree survey in **Appendix 3** for more details.

2.3 Suitability of the trees for the location:

Apart from the trees identified as being dead or in terminal decline that could impact on users of the site or property, I am not aware of any conflict with the other trees or those in the woodland in regard to the and the usage of the property. Therefore, these so the trees could be considered to be suitable, and no management works required at present.

2.4 Constraints of the trees:

The calculated tree constraints of T1 & T2 show that the RPA (Root Protection Area) of T1 will be crossed to utilise the site for the vehicle manoeuvring, and part of the outer RPA of T2 as well. However, the site is completely covered already in hard surface and appears to have been used for vehicle movement and parking for a long time without impacting on these trees. Therefore, no mitigation needs to be in place to address this. The only way T1 which is on the application site could be impacted is via collision damage to the main stem because the canopy height is sufficient it is unlikely to be affected. To prevent this tree being damaged by collision when manoeuvring vehicles, a low wooden barrier could be erected 0.5m from the base of the stem. T2 is outside of the application area, but the same type of barrier could be placed around this tree and the other trees that need to be retained.

The woodland that runs adjacent to the northern and western boundary will not be impacted by the proposed usage of the site, because the canopy overhang is minimal and what does is high enough where collision damage is unlikely to be an issue. The site is about 2m above the woodland floor, so soil compaction will not be an issue, a high fence runs along the boundary that prevents vehicles accidentally drive over or the trees be impacted in other ways.

The proposed layout for the vehicle storage usage will not have any more or less impact on the trees than is currently being experienced.

The tree constraints plan in **Appendix 4** shows the locations of the trees in relation to the proposed layout. Because the constraints of the trees are already protected by the existing hard surfacing or as with the woodland, on a ground level significantly lower than the site where the trees will not be impacted, no protection measures are required in this case apart from a low wooden barrier installed around the stem of T1 to prevent collision damage.

3 CONCLUSIONS

- The only tree within the application area is T1, the other trees are outside the application area where they will not be impacted.
- The entire site is covered in hard surfacing and appears to have been like this for some time. The woodland area adjacent to the northern and western boundary is on a ground level about 2m lower than that of the site with little or no overhang to the site where it will be an issue because it is minimal and at a height where collision damage is unlikely to occur.
- T1 can be protected from potential collision damage by installing a low-level wooden barrier and careful vehicle manoeuvring to allow the usage to continue without impacting on the trees.
- The proposed usage of the site will not impact on the trees or the adjacent woodland any more or less than it currently does.

4 OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Trees subject to statutory controls:

I have told that some of the trees are covered by a TPO (Tree Preservation Order). I suggest that the local authority is contacted to confirm this and kept updated with any proposed tree works so as to form a good working relationship and to prevent misunderstandings or contravention of protection measures. This statement is meant for readers of this report as an advisory, to make sure they make the relevant checks so as not contravene any protection status the tree may have.

*Andrew Day HND Arb
For Andrew Day Arboricultural Consultancy Ltd.*

SITE PHOTOGRAPHS



Showing T1 – T3 and existing hard surface



Showing T1 – T16 with existing hard surface



Showing the wooded area to the west of the site, the difference in level and space between the site and the trees

Brief qualifications and experience of Andrew Day

I hold a Higher National Diploma in Arboriculture. I have been working in the field of arboriculture for approximately 20 years, spending time as a contracting arborist undertaking all aspects of practical arboriculture both in the UK and Europe. I have also worked within local government as a tree officer working for a variety of local authorities. I have a broad experience of both the practical and theoretical aspects of arboriculture having worked within the public and private sector.

1. Qualifications:

Higher National Diploma in Arboriculture (1996)

NPTC (National Proficiency Training Council) units 20, 21 and 22

Lantra professional tree inspection certificate

2. Practical experience:

Prior to establishing my company, I worked for a private Arboriculture company for three years undertaking many practical aspects of Arboriculture. I moved on from this to become a local authority tree officer for five years, my duties included consultation on planning matters with regard to trees, advice to the general public, managing the council's tree stock and liaising with other professionals on Arboricultural related issues. I was approached by an established tree contracting and consulting company in Essex to develop and run the consultancy department as their principal consultant which I did for three years.

SITE SPECIFIC INFORMATION

Explanatory Notes

Tree Survey

Explanatory Notes

Measurements/estimates: All dimensions are estimates unless otherwise indicated. Measurements taken with a tape or clinometer are indicated with a '*'. Less reliable estimated dimensions are indicated with a '?'.

Species: The species identification is based on visual observations and the common English name of what the tree appeared to be is listed first, with the botanical name after in brackets. In some instances, it may be difficult to identify a particular tree quickly and accurately without further detailed investigations. Where there is some doubt of the precise species of tree, it is indicated it with a '?' after the name in order to avoid delay in the production of the report. The botanical name is followed by the abbreviation sp if only the genus is known. The species listed for groups and hedges represent the main component and there may be other minor species not listed.

Height: Height is estimating height to the nearest metre.

Spread: The maximum crown spread is visually estimated to the nearest metre of the total crown spread diameter. It should be noted that the crown of some trees can be one side, however this usually indicated within the report.

Diameter: These figures relate to 1.5m above ground level and are recorded in centimetres. Estimate measurements are banded 0-10cm, 11-20, 21-30 etc. If appropriate, diameter is measure with a diameter tape. 'M' indicates trees or shrubs with multiple stems. 'AV' indicates average and is the average of two stems when dealing with twin stem trees.

Estimated Age: Age is assessed as **M** mature (last one third of life expectancy), **EM** early mature (one third to two thirds life expectancy) and **Y** young (less than one third life expectancy).

FSB: First significant branch from ground level (direction shown on tree protection / constraints plan)

SULE: This is the estimated Safe Useful Life Expectancy of the tree. Trees can live longer than this value but can pose a risk to persons or property.

RPR: Radius of root protection area around the tree /group

RPA: Root protection area for tree or group

BS 5837 2012 - On the basis of this assessment, trees can be divided into one of the following categories:

A - Trees whose retention is most desirable, High category

B - Trees where is desirable, Moderate category

C - Trees which could be retained, Low category

U - Trees that cannot realistically be retained; Fell category

Tag	Name	Age	Diameter	Height	Crown Hgt	FSB Hgt	Crown Spread (N S E W) (m)				Life Exp	Recommendations	Category	RPR	RPA
T1	Betula pendula (Silver Birch)	M	350	12	4	1	6	5	5	4	20+	No works required at present.	C1	4.2	55.42
T2	Quercus robur (Common Oak)	M	350	13	5	4	5	5	5	5	20+	No works required at present.	C1	4.2	55.42
T3	Betula pendula (Silver Birch)	M	250	12	4	1	5	6	5	4	20+	No works required at present.	C2	3	28.28
T4	Pinus sylvestris (Scots Pine)	M	450	16	14	13	4	4	4	4	20+	No works required at present.	C1	5.4	91.62
T5	Pinus sylvestris (Scots Pine)	M	450	16	14	13	4	4	4	4	20+	Remove.	U	5.4	91.62
T6	Pinus sylvestris (Scots Pine)	M	450	16	14	13	4	4	4	4	20+	Remove.	U	5.4	91.62
T7	Pinus sylvestris (Scots Pine)	M	450	16	14	13	4	4	4	4	20+	Remove.	U	5.4	91.62
T8	Larix decidua (European Larch)	M	350	16	11	11	3	3	3	3	<10	Remove.	U	4.2	55.42
T9	Pinus sylvestris (Scots Pine)	M	450	16	14	13	4	4	4	4	20+	Remove.	U	5.4	91.62
T10	Pinus sylvestris (Scots Pine)	M	450	16	14	13	4	4	4	4	20+	Remove.	U	5.4	91.62
T11	Pinus sylvestris (Scots Pine)	M	450	16	14	13	4	4	4	4	20+	Remove.	U	5.4	91.62
T12	Pinus sylvestris (Scots Pine)	M	450	16	14	13	4	4	4	4	20+	Remove.	U	5.4	91.62
T13	Pinus sylvestris (Scots Pine)	M	450	16	14	13	4	4	4	4	20+	Remove.	U	5.4	91.62
T14	Pinus sylvestris (Scots Pine)	M	450	16	14	13	4	4	4	4	20+	Remove.	U	5.4	91.62

Tag	Name	Age	Diameter	Height	Crown Hgt	FSB Hgt	Crown Spread (N S E W) (m)				Life Exp	Recommendations	Category	RPR	RPA
T15	Quercus robur (Common Oak)	M	350	13	5	4	5	5	5	5	20+	No works required at present.	C1	4.2	55.42
T16	Pinus sylvestris (Scots Pine)	M	450	16	14	13	4	4	4	4	20+	No works required at present.	C1	5.4	91.62

LIMITATIONS AND QUALIFICATIONS

LIMITATIONS AND QUALIFICATIONS

Unless specifically mentioned the report will only be concerned with ground inspections. No below ground inspections will be carried out without prior confirmation from the client that such works should be undertaken. This report is for the purposes of identifying the constraints of trees in relation to development and not a health and safety assessment of the trees. A cursory assessment of the trees health and condition will be recorded, but this is not to be taken as a detailed assessment of its structural condition, health, and management recommendations in relation to this. A separate tree inspection regime focusing on these aspects will need to be undertaken if this is required.

The validity, accuracy and findings of this report will be directly related to the accuracy of the information made available during the inspection process. No checking of independent data will be undertaken, Andrew Day Arboricultural Consultancy will not be responsible for the recommendations within this report where essential data are not made available or are inaccurate.

This report will remain valid for one year from the date of inspection but will become invalid if any tree works not recommended within the report are undertaken, soil levels around the trees are altered in any way and if any building works which were not disclosed during the inspection are undertaken. If extreme weather changes occur such as heavy winds, snow etc., the trees will need to be re-inspected to ensure their condition has not been affected or has altered from the initial inspection details obtained.

If any of the above occurs, then it is strongly recommended that a new tree inspection is carried out.

It will be appreciated, and deemed to be accepted by the client that the formulation of the recommendations for the management of the trees will be guided by the following:

1. The need to avoid reasonably foreseeable damage.
2. The arboricultural considerations – Tree safety, good Arboricultural practice and aesthetics.

The client is deemed to have accepted the limitation placed on the recommendations by the sources quoted in the attached report. Where time constraints or the client limits sources, this may lead to an incomplete quantification of the risk.

TREE CONSTRAINTS PLAN

(Not to Scale. Please refer to separate A3 plan if scaling is required)

