

Arboricultural Implications Report & Method Statement

Proposed development at White Lodge
Ockley Lane
Burgess Hill
West Sussex RH15 0BP

Client: Mr Barry Holding
Date: November 2024

Contents

1.	Introduction.....	3
1.1	Scope of report.....	3
1.2	Site description and proposals	3
1.3	Tree survey.....	4
1.4	Statutory designations	5
1.5	Non-statutory designation	5
2.	Arboricultural Implications Assessment (AIA)	6
2.1	Basis of assessment	6
2.2	Tree removals.....	6
	<i>Table 1</i> – Tree removals.....	6
2.3	Incursions into root protection areas ('RPAs').....	7
	<i>Table 2</i> – Encroachments into RPAs.....	7
2.4	Future relationship of proposed development to retained trees.....	7
2.5	Arboricultural implications – summary.....	8
3.	Implications of proposal for ancient woodland.....	9
3.1	Status of identified ancient woodland area	9
3.2	Implications for proposed vehicle access.....	10
3.3	Effects of proposed access.....	12
3.4	Implications for ancient woodland - summary.....	13
4.	Arboricultural method statement (AMS)	14
4.1	Pre-start requirements, liaison & communication	14
4.2	Tree removals and pruning	14
4.3	Protective fencing.....	14
4.4	Demolition.....	15
4.5	Supervised excavations.....	16
4.6	Underground services	17
4.7	Landscaping.....	17
4.8	Supervision & monitoring	18
	<i>Table 3</i> - Timings of supervision and monitoring visits.....	19

APPENDIX 1 – Tree Schedule

APPENDIX 2 – Tree Protection Plan

1. Introduction

1.1 Scope of report

- 1.1.1 This report assesses the arboricultural implications of the proposed construction of a new dwelling and integral garage at White Lodge, Ockley Lane, Burgess Hill; and details what actions need to be taken to prevent or minimise unacceptable damage to retained trees during the construction period.
- 1.1.2 The report has been drawn up to comply with the planning requirements of the Local Planning Authority ('LPA'), Mid Sussex District Council, which specify that an arboricultural implications assessment ('AIA'), arboricultural method statement ('AMS') and tree protection plan ('TPP') are submitted to accompany planning applications affecting sites where trees are present or are in the immediate vicinity; and in accordance with the recommendations of British Standard BS 5837: 2012, *Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations* ('BS 5837').
- 1.1.3 The AMS at **Section 4** of the report is designed to reflect the principles of the tree protection required for the proposed development, and should not be read as a definitive engineering or construction statement for this site. If required, matters relating to the construction detail or engineering performance of any protective measures specified should be referred to a qualified architect or structural engineer, for further information and specification which may be necessary for their practical implementation in a manner that satisfactorily ensures their protective intention or function.

1.2 Site description and proposals

- 1.2.1 White Lodge is an existing two storey detached dwelling located off the west side of Ockley Lane, which runs approximately north-south between Burgess Hill to the north, and Hassocks to the south. The house is on an L-shaped footprint, facing north-east, with an integral garage and a driveway and hardstanding to the front. It has a large, roughly rectangular garden extending over some 95m by 70m, which lies to the south and west of the house. It sits within a loose cluster of other large residential dwellings, with agricultural land to the west and east of these, and with a block of woodland beyond the neighbouring property to the south.
- 1.2.2 The southern half of the garden is largely occupied by a levelled area which was formerly a hard tennis court, but which is now disused. At the south-east corner of the property, there is a second vehicle access point from Ockley Lane, with a five-bar gate, serving a Calor gas tank, and with a semi-derelict detached garage building immediately to the north, just inside the property boundary. The strip of ground northward of this, leading towards the house, bears a number of trees, interspersed with various informal lean-to structures against the boundary fence used as log stores, together with further log storage on pallets, and sundry other domestic items. Part of the area is occupied with soil mounds, likely to have been created by deposition of spoil from the original levelling of the former tennis court; and part has been levelled and covered with a layer of wood chippings.

- 1.2.3 The proposed development comprises the construction of a detached, two storey five-bedroomed house on the former tennis court area, with an adjoining 1.5 storey outbuilding to provide garaging and garden storage, with a home office/hobby studio area above. The main aspects of the proposed dwelling would be to the east and west. The dwelling is proposed to be served by a new access off Ockley Lane, leading to a forecourt, also on the former tennis court area. The existing garaging and entrance are to be removed and returned to soft landscaping.

1.3 Tree survey

- 1.3.1 The trees on the site within the vicinity of the proposed development were surveyed by David Archer, MArborA, on the 6th January and 13th April 2023. Their details are set out in the tree schedule at **Appendix 1** to this report. The survey recorded 25 individual trees, two tree groups, one of which is a row of Leyland Cypress, and a further Leyland Cypress hedge marking the northern edge of the former tennis court. The survey thus accurately reflects the tree cover present on site in the vicinity of the proposed development and is as shown in the left-hand panel of the tree protection plan ('TPP') attached to this report at **Appendix 2**.
- 1.3.2 Of the 25 individual trees surveyed, the majority (7) are Common Ash, approximately half of which are seriously affected by Ash Dieback Disease (*Hymenoscyphus fraxineus*). Four Sycamore and four English Oaks are present, two of the latter being off-site to the south of the property. The two English Elm recorded are both dead, as a result of Dutch Elm Disease (*Ophiostoma novo-ulmi*). The remaining trees comprise Field Maple (2), Holly (2), and one each of Hawthorn and Hazel.
- 1.3.3 Three of the individual trees recorded are assessed under the BS 5837 categorisation system as category 'U' trees, that is to say trees with less than 10 years' remaining useful life, and which should therefore be removed irrespective of any proposed development. These include the two dead Elms. Only one tree is of sufficient quality to warrant a category 'A' grading, this being tree 23, the English Oak off-site to the south of the property. Five trees are recorded as being of moderate quality (category 'B'), whilst the remaining 16 trees are assessed as being of low quality and value (category 'C'), with anticipated remaining useful lifespans of 10 to 20 years only.
- 1.3.4 The majority of the trees surveyed stand within the area adjacent to the eastern boundary of the property on Ockley Lane, to the south of the proposed new access point, and collectively provide some screening over this section, but do not appear as a continuous wooded canopy.
- 1.3.5 Further to the above surveys, within the curtilage of the existing garden, three trees, nos. 5, 24 & 25 have been removed.

1.4 Statutory designations

- 1.4.1 From the mapping information on the Local Planning Authority's website¹, no trees within the site are shown to be the subject of a Tree Preservation Order ('TPO'), and the site is not in a Conservation Area. In these circumstances, the LPA's permission for the removal or pruning of any trees within the property would not be required, and prior notification of the intention to carry out any such works would not be necessary.
- 1.4.2 Moreover, as the trees stand within a residential garden, any tree felling would not be subject to the requirement to obtain a Felling Licence from the Forestry Commission, under the provisions of the Forestry Act 1967 (as amended).

1.5 Non-statutory designation

- 1.5.1 The narrow strip of land along the Ockley Lane frontage of the site, leading from the south-east corner of the property by the gated access, Calor gas tank and dilapidated garage building, extending northwards to the southern edge of the existing main driveway entrance to White Lodge, is identified as ancient semi-natural woodland ('ASNW') within the January 2010 Revision of the Ancient Woodland Inventory for West Sussex. The neighbouring property to the south is also listed as ASNW. They are included in Natural England's Provisional Inventory of Ancient Woodland (the 'AWI') and is notated as such on the DEFRA Multi-Agency Geographic Information for the Countryside mapping (the 'MAGIC' map).
- 1.5.2 'Ancient woodland' describes woodland areas presumed to have been continuously wooded since 1600AD and are likely to have acquired value for biodiversity through having remained as stable and undisturbed habitats over that time period. As such, they are deemed to be 'irreplaceable' habitats under the National Planning Policy Framework ('NPPF'), and the provisions of paragraph 180(c) of the current (July 2021) version of the NPPF are applicable to the consideration of planning proposals which might affect them.
- 1.5.3 The particular status and validity of the areas designated in this instance are considered in more detail later in this report. However, it is clear these areas have been substantially altered over recent years by soil deposition and domestic gardening thereby removing any true value they may possess. They are certainly not "stable & undisturbed".

¹ Accessed on 17th May 2023.

2. Arboricultural Implications Assessment (AIA)

2.1 Basis of assessment

- 2.1.1 The TPP at **Appendix 2** shows the finalized proposals overlaid onto the tree locations and constraints plan derived from the tree survey. The implications assessment below is based on this drawing.
- 2.1.2 The left-hand panel of the TPP shows the tree locations and constraints plan in relation to the existing site and identifies the trees which are to be removed as a result of the proposals, whilst the right-hand panel shows the protection measures required during the construction period for the trees which are to be retained.

2.2 Tree removals

- 2.2.1 The proposed development will require the removal of the trees listed in *Table 1* below.
- 2.2.2 No pruning of the retained trees is identified as being required to permit construction of the proposed development.

Tree no.	Species	Height	BS category	Work required	Reason for work
3	Sycamore	16m	C	Remove	Proximity to access driveway
4	Sycamore	15m	C	Remove	Proximity to access driveway
G2	Various	4m	C	Remove	Within access driveway

Table 1 – Tree removals

- 2.2.3 The two Sycamores proposed for removal are category 'C' trees of low quality, tree 3 having a suppressed and thinning crown, and tree 4 also being heavily suppressed and exhibiting upper crown dieback. Group G2 is a small group of self-sown saplings with extensive ivy cover.
- 2.2.4 In view of their locations, sizes and condition, in our opinion the removal of the will not have any significant impact on the site's appearance from external viewpoints, or on the overall character of the area. None of the trees to be removed are within the strip of land designated as ASNW, and there are no trees within this area that require removal in order to enable the proposals to proceed.
- 2.2.5 All other trees identified within the survey will be retained, including those few which are of higher categories, as they are either unaffected by the proposal, or can be successfully protected during the construction period, as shown on the tree protection plan.

2.3 Incursions into root protection areas ('RPAs')

2.3.1 The proposed development will encroach into the RPAs of the trees listed in *Table 2* overleaf. The feature of the proposal which will cause the encroachment, and the percentage of the relevant tree's RPA which will be affected, are listed in each case.

2.3.2 In all two cases, the encroachments identified are fractional, involving less than 2% of the RPA of any of the relevant trees, all of which benefit from having ample available compensatory soil rooting volumes in other directions away from the encroachments, which are not impinged upon or affected by the proposals. For this reason, the very minor encroachments involved are very unlikely to have any significant impact on the respective trees' health or vitality, subject to the protective measures identified and further detailed in the AMS section of this report.

Tree no.	Species	Height	BS category	Encroachment type	% of RPA affected	Protection/mitigation
1	English Oak	17m	B	Southern edge of proposed access	1.8%	Supervised manual excavation of formation edge
2	Field Maple	14m	C	Southern edge of proposed access	1.05%	Supervised manual excavation of formation edge

Table 2 – Encroachments into RPAs

2.3.3 Due to the small percentages of the respective RPAs affected, therefore, and subject to the protective measures indicated on the TPP, the minor encroachments identified will not compromise the trees' health or longevity.

2.4 Future relationship of proposed development to retained trees

2.4.1 The proposed dwelling will be located at a minimum distance of approximately 18m to the nearest of the retained trees within the belt along the eastern site boundary, a distance which in our opinion will be easily sufficient to prevent perceptions on the part of future occupiers that the trees are too close or oppressive, and therefore to allay any potential safety apprehensions which might arise as a consequence.

2.4.2 The footprint of the proposed 1.5 storey outbuilding lies partially within the so-called "shading arc" of the retained off-site English Oak tree 23, as drawn in accordance with the recommendations of BS 5837, in order to illustrate the traverse of a tree's shadow during the course of the main part of the day. As building does not have any habitable rooms shading should not be considered an issue. The residential dwelling does not fall within the shading arcs from the trees along the southern of the site.

- 2.4.3 Although we understand that a formal analysis under BR 209 *Site layout planning for daylight and sunlight – A guide to good practice* has not been undertaken in this case, in our opinion the relationship of the proposed dwelling to the off-site trees is such that its internal habitable rooms will enjoy satisfactory access to daylight and sunlight throughout the day. On this basis, it is unlikely that the proposal will give rise to future irresistible occupier pressure for the removal of the retained off-site tree due to perceived excessive reduction of internal daylighting or obstruction of sunlight.
- 2.4.4 Similarly, the relationship of the proposed amenity spaces to the retained trees allows for satisfactory extents of unshaded space for the new dwelling. On this basis, we consider it very unlikely that the proposal will give rise to future irresistible occupier pressure for the removal of any of the retained trees on the grounds of excessive garden shading.

2.5 Arboricultural implications – summary

- 2.5.1 The trees within and adjacent to the site have been surveyed in accordance with BS 5837, and the implications of the proposal have been assessed in relation to its findings.
- 2.5.2 As assessed and detailed above, the proposal will therefore not have any significant impacts on trees of importance to the amenity of the locality, or on the quality of the local landscape. Subject to the measures identified on the TPP and specified in the AMS below, all other trees identified within the survey are either unaffected by the proposal, or can be successfully protected during the construction period.
- 2.5.3 The implementation of these measures, and adherence to them during the construction period, can be satisfactorily ensured by means of an appropriate condition, on the grant of planning permission.

3. Implications of proposal for ancient woodland

3.1 Status of identified ancient woodland area

- 3.1.1 As noted above, the neighbouring garden to the south and the strip of land along the eastern boundary of the garden of White Lodge, from its southern boundary up to the edge of the existing main driveway, is designated as Ancient Semi-Natural Woodland within the January 2010 Revision of the Ancient Woodland Inventory for West Sussex. As shown on the MAGIC mapping, the eastern strip in question measures approximately 77m in length by an average width of around 12m, giving an area of around 850m² in total.
- 3.1.2 As the introduction to the Revision of the Ancient Woodland Inventory for West Sussex explains, the 2010 revision was undertaken in order to update the previous inventory of ancient woodland for the county, which was published in 1989, and for the first time, woodlands of below 2 hectares in extent were considered. The 1989 inventory recorded a total area of 16,874 ha of ancient woodland in the county, and as a result of the 2010 revision, the recorded total area rose to 21,375 ha, a rise of 4,501 ha, representing an increase from around 8.3% of the county's area to 10.5% being designated as ancient woodland. The number of separate parcels of woodland, however, was over two and a half times that of the original 1989 inventory, this gain being mostly attributable to small parcels of woodland of less than 2 ha in size.
- 3.1.3 Careful examination of Map 2 appended to the 2010 Revised West Sussex Inventory document shows that the linear strip on the east boundary of White Lodge is an area which was only added to the Ancient Woodland Inventory as a result of the revision exercise in 2010, despite it being evident that it lies within a long-standing domestic garden and subject to long established soil disturbance and felling. It was not previously recorded in the 1989 Inventory.
- 3.1.4 As the revision document makes clear in its discussion of its methodology, the revision of the West Sussex Ancient Woodland Inventory was primarily a desk-based mapping exercise, taking as its main evidence base the so-called 'Epoch 1' 25-inch to 1-mile Ordnance Survey maps of the County, published in 1869 to 1875. Only a sample of sites were surveyed on the ground, and these tended to be concentrated around settlements or areas of development or settlement expansion. Moreover, the document acknowledges that *"Whilst the methodology aims to be systematic and robust, because of the regional scope of this research, the methods are, by necessity, relatively simple and quick, with more detailed historical and field surveys confined to a priority set of sites. The inventory is therefore inclusive, meaning that the default for borderline sites, or those for which data is lacking, is that they are retained on the inventory, thus ensuring they can be considered in future surveys."*

- 3.1.5 Later in the document (Section 6.1), under the heading “Limitations of the survey”, it is recognised that *“There will, however, always be limitations with the types of evidence used in assessing ancient woodland status and these need to be considered by all users of the dataset....No decision based on historical map evidence relating to woodland can be completely infallible and a project such as this must inevitably make many such decisions. This is especially true where woods of diverse historical character, which have been little studied in this way before, are concerned”*(emphasis added).
- 3.1.6 It is clear from the above that for the reasons which are identified and acknowledged within the study itself, the designation of any particular woodland parcel on the Ancient Woodland Inventory should be regarded as provisional, and not necessarily definitive. Indeed, at national level, Natural England refers to the inventory as a whole as the “Provisional Inventory of Ancient Woodland” for this exact reason. The West Sussex Ancient Woodland revision report does not list the woodlands or locations which were actually visited or subject to ground survey in order to verify the indications of the desk-based study. In cases where, as here, where these parcels of woodland have very likely not been subject to ground survey as part of the revision exercise, and has long formed part of domestic gardens, the validity and robustness of the designation as ‘ancient woodland’ must therefore be open to critical question.
- 3.1.7 The implications of this background for the consideration of proposed development within specific areas of ancient woodland are considered below.

3.2 Implications for proposed vehicle access

- 3.2.1 In her report on an earlier planning application (DM/22/3607) for a secondary vehicle access to White Lodge (to replace the existing entrance at the site’s south-east corner) the Council’s Planning Officer stated *“There is a strip of ancient woodland that runs along the eastern boundary of the property, which connects to Ockley Wood to the south....It is acknowledged that the ancient woodland is located within a domestic curtilage, however Natural England Maps do show this area as being designated and therefore must be treated as such.”*This comment ignores the caveats that NE make in respect of the ASNW assessments in that they acknowledge that “ground truth” is a factor to consider when assessing such sites. Her report went on to argue that insufficient information had been supplied to demonstrate that the ancient woodland would not be harmed as a result of the proposal, and that no wholly exceptional reasons had been adduced to justify it, nor a compensation strategy submitted, thereby failing to satisfy the requirements of paragraphs 179(b), 180(a) and 180 (c) of the NPPF. Her report also described the access, as it was then proposed, as being *“across a more relatively undisturbed area”*.

- 3.2.2 However, in a recent appeal decision, also within West Sussex, which similarly involved a proposed vehicular access into an existing residential property crossing an area identified as ancient woodland on the 2010 West Sussex Inventory Revision, the Inspector made it clear that the mere existence of the ancient woodland designation was not, in itself, a sufficient basis on which to engage or trigger the policy restrictions imposed by paragraph 180(c) of the NPPF (appeal reference APP/Z3825/D/22/3304724, 6th March 2023), stating as follows: *“However, in my view the Council’s assessment and conclusions, and the objection by the Woodland Trust, are materially offset by the grounds of appeal and in particular three principal considerations. These are firstly the contextual evidence of the land’s designation as part of the aforementioned Inventory in 2010; secondly the qualitative assessment of the woodland in terms of both its existing condition and the effect of the construction of the gravel drive, and thirdly the safeguards against harm that would be secured by a condition on a permission requiring the works to be carried out in full accordance with an AMS to be first agreed by the Council.”*
- 3.2.3 On the first of these issues, the Inspector was satisfied, in the absence of any evidence of notification to, or consultation with, the property’s owners at the date of the production of the Revised Ancient Woodland Inventory, that *“it is clear that the status as Ancient Woodland was conferred on the basis of a Desktop Study, albeit no doubt supported by historic maps”*.
- 3.2.4 In relation to the second issue, the Inspector gave detailed consideration to factual evidence of works undertaken within the appeal site and their effects on the area subject of the designation, concluding that *“Accordingly, it is appropriate to give significant weight to the altered landform and condition of the designated area in appraising the development against local and national policy”*.
- 3.2.5 Finally, on the third issue the Inspector stated that *“the appeal scheme can be implemented within the constraints and opportunities set out within an AMS...Whilst much of the work on an AMS has already been carried out as part of the appellant’s evidence, a condition on a permission can be imposed that further secures the retention and protection of the existing trees and the site’s remaining ecological value.”*
- 3.2.6 It is clear from the above that in the Inspector’s considerations were guided and informed by critical analysis of the particular context, facts and circumstances pertaining to the area included within the Ancient Woodland Inventory in the relevant case, rather than by mere reliance on the existence of the mapping designation to justify refusal of the proposal before him. This contrasts sharply with the approach taken by Mid Sussex Council’s Planning Officer in relation to the previously refused access application DM/22/3607 at this site.
- 3.2.7 It is therefore appropriate to consider the specifics of the new access which is proposed to serve the new dwelling in this case, in relation to its effects on the portion of the designated strip it would traverse, and taking the present condition of the relevant land into account, including the effects of its long-standing domestic usage.

3.3 Effects of proposed access

- 3.3.1 As is shown on the proposed site plan and in the right-hand panel of the TPP, the proposed access would cross the strip of ground mapped as ASNW at a point approximately half-way along the Ockley Lane frontage between the existing main access to White Lodge to the north, and the secondary gated access to the south. Its length across the designated area would be approximately 11.5m, by 3.5m in width, amounting to an area of approximately 42.3m² only. This only equates to just under 5% of the overall area of the mapped ASNW strip within the garden of White Lodge.
- 3.3.2 As the preceding sections of this report make clear, the construction of the access will not require the removal of any trees, and its location has been selected for exactly this reason. Similarly, subject to the measures identified and discussed, the fractional encroachments into the RPAs of the nearest two trees to the south (trees 1 and 2) will not result in any adverse effects on their health or longevity.
- 3.3.3 It is recognised that in terms of biodiversity, the value of ancient woodlands derives not only from the tree cover which they bear, but also from the seedbank of native ground flora species within their soils which have remained undisturbed for long periods, allowing the establishment and spread of flora species which are slow to colonise new areas; and from the populations of invertebrate species which such conditions may support.
- 3.3.4 In this case, however, as noted above, the strip of ground over which the access is proposed to pass does not comprise undisturbed woodland soils. The area has been extensively altered over the course of time by the repeated passage of vehicles and garden equipment, the use of a significant proportion of the area for storage of logs and other materials and machinery, and the effects of general domestic residential usage. On-site evidence suggests that parts of the area have been used for the deposition of soil previously removed from elsewhere in the garden; and part of the relevant land has been levelled and covered with a layer of wood chippings. In these circumstances, it seems unlikely that any significant undisturbed seedbank of native flora species and any associated invertebrate populations will have survived or be capable of re-establishment or regeneration.
- 3.3.5 On this basis, it is reasonable to conclude that any biodiversity value which the site may once have had previously, prior to it being incorporated into a domestic residential garden, will have effectively been lost as a result of this fundamental historical change in its context, and the disturbance and uses which will have resulted from this. Correspondingly, it follows that the construction of the small section of the access across the area will not result in the additional net loss of any biodiversity value normally associated with areas of ancient woodland that have not undergone profound disturbance or alteration.

- 3.3.6 For the same reasons, it is unlikely in our view that the construction of the 42.3m² section of the access could reasonably be held likely to result in the further deterioration of any remaining biodiversity value of the sections of the mapped ASNW areas to the north and south. These have been similarly disturbed and degraded as a result of the past domestic and storage uses, including the construction of the various lean-to structures upon them, and passage of vehicles etc. The construction of the access section can be achieved without it being necessary to encroach into the areas to either side of it, and consequently no additional disruption or disturbance of these areas will occur.
- 3.3.7 In our assessment, any significant loss of any remaining biodiversity value as ASNW from the strips of land north and south of the access is very unlikely, given their present uses and condition. However, to safeguard against unnecessary additional disturbance to these retained areas resulting from the construction operations, the locations of the temporary protective barriers shown in the right-hand panel of the TPP have been arranged to prevent any encroachment of plant, machinery or materials into them, confining construction operations to within the alignment of the access itself only.
- 3.3.8 Provided that the protective barriers are maintained in place for the duration of the construction, which can be assured through the imposition of suitable conditions on the grant of planning permission, and enforced by a requirement for regular monitoring throughout the construction process, in our opinion the development and associated works will not result in any additional or further deterioration of the remaining areas mapped as ASNW.

3.4 Implications for ancient woodland - summary

- 3.4.1 The circumstances of this site and proposal can be seen to be directly comparable or indeed analogous to those considered by the Inspector in the appeal case referred to above. Specifically, when subjected to analysis of the context of its inclusion within the Ancient Woodland Inventory, consideration of the land's present condition and uses, and taking account of the ability to prevent further loss or deterioration of the adjoining areas, the validity of reliance purely on the existence of the mapping designation to justify refusal of the proposed development can be considered inadequate and insufficient.
- 3.4.2 For these reasons, we conclude that subject to implementation of the protective measures specified in the AMS which follows below, and adherence to them for the duration of the construction period, the proposed development will not result in the loss of any area of ASNW which can reasonably be considered to be of any significance, in terms of either its extent as a proportion of the mapped area within the grounds of White Lodge, or of any value it retains as potential biodiversity habitat. Likewise, the proposal will not result in any further or additional deterioration of the remaining areas to the north and south of the new access, given the extent to which these have already been affected by the long-standing domestic residential context and its associated usage and activities.

4. Arboricultural method statement (AMS)

4.1 Pre-start requirements, liaison & communication

- 4.1.1 Before any works of any description take place on the site, the applicant, landowner or promoter of the proposed development ('the developer') shall appoint a suitably qualified arboricultural consultant to act as the supervising arboriculturist for the project, in order to ensure that the specified tree protection measures are carried out during the entire construction process. Confirmation of this appointment, and details of the supervising arboriculturist appointed, shall be provided to the LPA before any works commence.
- 4.1.2 Before any works commence on site, the developer shall convene a pre-start meeting. This should be attended by the developer or project manager, the site manager, the groundwork contractor, the supervising arboriculturist and, if so required by the LPA, the LPA tree officer. The meeting will be led by the supervising arboriculturist, who will ensure that the sequence and methods of tree protection specified in this statement are fully explained and understood by all parties. Reporting procedures, arboricultural supervision requirements, and frequency of monitoring visits (as detailed in **Section 4.8** and *Table 3* of this AMS) will be discussed and agreed, and relevant contact details exchanged. Any modifications to this statement arising from this meeting will be recorded and the revisions circulated to all parties.
- 4.1.3 A copy of this method statement, together with the TPP, shall be given to all personnel who have control over works of any nature within the root protection areas (RPAs) of the trees which are to be retained. The developer will ensure that adequate instruction is given for the implementation of the protection measures outlined within this statement.

4.2 Tree removals and pruning

- 4.2.1 The trees listed in *Table 1* above shall be felled to ground level; stumps shall be ground out to 450mm below ground level.

4.3 Protective fencing

- 4.3.1 No vehicles of any kind shall enter the site, nor any works commence, until the root protection areas of the retained trees, as shown on the TPP, have been protected by the erection of protective fencing to the specification found in BS 5837, Section 6.2. The location of the fencing is denoted by the continuous bold purple lines on the TPP.
- 4.3.2 The protective fencing shall be at least 2.1m in height and comprise standard 'Heras' welded mesh fence panels mounted on rubber or concrete feet. The panels shall be fixed to each other with at least two anti-tamper clamps, installed so that they can only be removed from inside the fence.

- 4.3.3 The fencing shall be supported on the side closest to the retained trees by stabiliser struts braced to the ground at an angle of 45 degrees, and attached to a base plate secured to the ground with ground pins. Where the fencing is to be erected on retained hard surfacing or it is otherwise unfeasible to use ground pins, e.g. due to the presence of underground services, the stabiliser struts should be mounted on a block tray. Notices stating "*Tree Protection Zone – Keep Out*" will be attached with cable ties to every other panel.
- 4.3.4 Fine green mesh shall be attached to the fence line adjacent to the southern boundary sufficient to reduce any dust incursion into the off-site garden.
- 4.3.5 No activity of any kind shall be undertaken behind the protective fencing; there shall be no topsoil stripping, no storage of materials, no access for vehicles or personnel, and no excavation or changes in soil level of any kind.
- 4.3.6 Areas for storing or mixing of fuels, oils or cement shall be agreed at the pre-start meeting and none of these areas shall be within the area behind the protective fencing.
- 4.3.7 No fixtures of any nature shall be attached to the retained trees, and no fires shall be lit in any position where heat could affect their foliage or branches.
- 4.3.8 When the installation of the protective fencing is complete, the supervising arboriculturist shall be informed so that they may come and inspect it. If it complies with this statement, the supervising arboriculturist will record the fact and notify the client and LPA.
- 4.3.9 If the protective fencing is accidentally damaged or knocked over, the damaged sections shall be immediately marked with high visibility tape or with mesh fencing. The damaged sections shall be replaced or repaired to the original specification within 48 hours. All events of this nature must be recorded and reported to the supervising arboriculturist.
- 4.3.10 The protective fencing will not be moved, dismantled or relocated without the prior approval of the supervising arboriculturist. When the construction period is complete the fencing may then be removed, but only after first informing the supervising arboriculturist of this intention.

4.4 Demolition

- 4.4.1 Where indicated on the plan, demolition of the existing structure and removal of existing site entrance within RPAs of retained trees shall be undertaken under direct on-site arboricultural supervision. Where possible, the existing hard surfaces within retained trees' RPAs shall be left in situ during the demolition, to provide continuing protection to underlying roots and soil, in the locations denoted in red cross hatching on the TPP.
- 4.4.2 Machinery and vehicles used for the demolition of structures shall be stationed and operated either outside the RPAs, or on existing floorslabs or hard surfacing, reinforced as necessary with additional temporary ground protection to support the working loads without distortion or compaction of underlying soil.

- 4.4.3 Structures shall be demolished so that materials are pulled away from retained trees' RPAs and are stockpiled and loaded away without vehicles encroaching into or traversing them. If existing foundations cannot be left in situ, they shall be broken up using pneumatic or hydraulic breakers, and removed using an excavator fitted with a toothless grading bucket, situated outside the RPAs or on existing floorslabs or hard surfacing, and pulling the material back away from the RPAs before lifting it out of the ground.
- 4.4.4 Where existing hard surfacing is to be removed within RPAs, the wearing course will be broken up using a hand-held pneumatic breaker, and removed using hand tools and wheelbarrows. Where it is necessary to remove the sub-base this shall be undertaken using digging forks to loosen the material, which will then be removed using hand tools and wheelbarrows. At the discretion of the supervising arboriculturist, it may be possible to use an excavator using a hydraulic breaker and a toothless grading bucket. If an excavator is to be used it must be situated outside the RPAs, either on top of the hard surfacing and working away from the RPAs, or from temporary ground protection.
- 4.4.5 Any tree roots exposed by the removal of hard surfaces or foundations of structures shall be immediately protected and kept damp by covering with wet hessian. A covering layer of topsoil will be applied as soon as is practicably possible.
- 4.4.6 Where areas exposed by the removal of hard surfacing are to be reinstated to soft landscaping, the underlying areas shall be lightly decompacted by hand forking over to a maximum of 100mm depth, followed by addition of clean topsoil to BS 3882: 2015, *Specification for topsoil*, to match surrounding levels. If the areas will be exposed to construction traffic movements or activity during the course of remaining construction operations, they shall either be fenced off with protective fencing, or protected by temporary ground protection, in accordance with the specifications given in the relevant sections above.

4.5 Supervised excavations

- 4.5.1 Where denoted by bold brown lines on the TPP, excavations for the formation edges of new access drive and parking bays shall be undertaken under direct on-site arboricultural supervision. The first 750mm depth of the excavation (or the required depth if this is less than 750mm) shall be excavated using hand tools only.
- 4.5.2 Where excavation below 750mm depth is required, this may be undertaken by machine, provided that it is carried out under direct on-site arboricultural supervision, and the machinery is stationed and operated either outside the RPAs of retained trees, or on existing hard surfacing, or on suitable ground protection, and there is adequate clearance from the crowns of retained trees.

4.6 Underground services

4.6.1 Other than the proposed storm and foul drainage scheme, detailed drawings of proposed underground services have not been produced at this stage of the planning process, thus any potential impacts between trees shown retained on the TPP and proposed services have not been identified.

4.6.2 However, there is more than enough space within the proposed access drive to install a services trench without making any impact on the retained trees adjacent.

4.7 Landscaping

4.7.1 On completion of construction works, but prior to the commencement of any landscaping works within the protected area behind the protective fencing the developer shall arrange a meeting with the site manager, the supervising arboriculturist and the landscape contractor. The details of this part of the method statement shall be discussed in relation to the proposed landscape operations and a clear sequence of operations established.

4.7.2 Within the RPAs the following principles will be maintained:

- Existing ground levels shall not be substantially altered.
- No plant or vehicles shall enter the RPA.
- No fuels or chemicals shall be stored within any of these areas.
- Any excavation required for fence posts, log retaining walls or any other landscape structures shall be undertaken by hand, under direct arboricultural supervision. If roots are encountered then the position of the excavation shall be moved to a new location. If this is not possible then any roots with a diameter less than 25mm may be cut cleanly by hand. Any exposed roots shall be re-covered within 24hrs of excavation.
- No structure shall be fastened in any way to the trunks of the retained trees.
- No drainage or irrigation pipes shall be installed within the RPAs of the retained trees.
- Any unwanted vegetation shall be removed by hand.

4.8 Supervision & monitoring

- 4.8.1 At the start of the construction process the supervising arboriculturist shall visit the site on the occasions specified to inspect the tree protection measures (fencing and ground protection) as installed. If these measures comply with the specifications detailed in this method statement, statements of compliance shall be sent to the developer and copied to the LPA.
- 4.8.2 The supervising arboriculturist shall then visit the site at on a regular basis, as agreed at the pre-start meeting, or when specifically required as set out in *Table 3* below, to ensure that the tree protection measures are kept in place and functioning as designed. Regular contact will be maintained with the site manager to determine any forthcoming operations that may make an impact on these tree protection measures and if arboricultural supervision is required. A record of all monitoring visits will be kept, and copies sent to the developer and the LPA following each visit.
- 4.8.3 The site manager shall give at least 72 hours' notice to the supervising arboriculturist of any operations, e.g. excavations of proposed foundations etc., which may make an impact on the RPAs of the retained trees.
- 4.8.4 Any alterations or variations in drawings for the site that are in, or within, the RPAs of the retained trees shall be referred in the first instance to the supervising arboriculturist for advice. If these changes make any kind of impact on the retained trees the supervising arboriculturist shall suggest changes that will either avoid damage to the retained trees or offer solutions to minimize the impact. If required, the supervising arboriculturist will liaise with the LPA's tree officer to agree a way forward, since any alterations to the approved details may require the LPA's prior written agreement. Following these consultations, the supervising arboriculturist shall issue revisions to the TPP and/or this AMS that reflect the changes.
- 4.8.5 Where any operations carried out by the developer deviate substantially from this AMS, work must cease immediately and the LPA be informed in writing. A meeting will be convened between the developer, the supervising arboriculturist, the LPA tree officer and the site manager to determine the best method to mitigate any damage that may have occurred. Work shall not be recommenced until appropriate action has been agreed to the LPA's satisfaction.

Visit no.	Trees affected/ relevant	Timing of visit	Function carried out
1	All	Prior to the start of any construction works.	To lead the pre-start meeting.
2	All	Following tree felling and erection of protective fencing.	To check protective fencing have been installed in the correct locations and to the correct standard.
3	All	At agreed intervals during the construction phase.	To check the protective fencing remain in place and that activities which would be harmful to trees are not being carried out.
4	All	At any other time which is sensitive in arboricultural terms.	To ensure retained trees are protected from development activities.

Table 3 - Timings of supervision and monitoring visits

4.8.6 This report and method statement have been prepared on the basis of the details of the proposal provided to us at the time of their preparation. Should these be amended or revised at any stage during the planning process, the amended details should be referred to us to determine whether any of the findings of the report, or specifications of the method statement, require revision in the light of the changes.

David Archer Associates
November 2024

APPENDIX 1 – Tree Schedule

Notes for the Tree Schedule

This schedule is based on an inspection carried out by David Archer on the 6th January, the 13st April, and the 28th November 2023. Deciduous trees were not in leaf. The information contained in this schedule reflects the conditions of those specimens at the time of inspection. They were inspected from the ground only; they were not climbed and no internal investigations were undertaken, thus no guarantee may be given as to their structural integrity. As trees are dynamic organisms and subject to continual change no dimensions expressed in this schedule may be relied upon for development purposes for more than 24 months from the date of survey. Estimated dimensions are marked 'est'.

1. **No:** Expressed in sequential order starting from number 1 – woodlands, groups & hedges are prefixed as W, G, & H respectively.
2. **Species:** The common name as given in "Collins Tree Guide", Johnson & More (2004).
3. **Height:** Estimated with the aid of a 'Disto' laser range finder and expressed in metres.
4. **Trunk Diameter:** Measured at 1.5m above ground level and expressed in millimetres to the nearest 10mm; where multiple stems are present they are measured individually and a cumulative total calculated in accordance with BS5837 (2012).
5. **Radial Crown Spread:** Distance in metres from the centre of the trunk to each cardinal point of the compass and rounded up to the nearest half metre.
6. **Crown Clearance:** Mean height from adjacent ground level to the lowest point of the crown.
7. **Height to First Branch:** Height, in metres, of the first significant branch (100mm) or to crown break from ground level.
8. **Life Stage:** Young, Semi mature, Mature, Veteran/Ancient.
9. **Physiology:** Health and condition of the tree in comparison to a typical specimen of species and age: Good, Average, Below Average, Poor, Dead.
10. **Structure:** The structural condition of the tree based on an assessment of any visible roots, trunk and crown, noting the presence of any defects or decay: Good, Moderate, Indifferent, Poor, Hazardous.
11. **Landscape Value:** Reflecting the importance of the tree in the local landscape. High, Moderate, Low, Nil.
12. **Estimated Years:** Estimate of remaining contribution expressed in years < 10, 10-20, 20-40, 40+.
13. **Comments:** Notes relating to health and condition, structure and form, estimated life expectancy and importance within the local landscape.
14. **Category:** - A rating given to individual trees based on Table 1 in the British Standard, BS 5837 (2012) "*Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations*".

Category 'U' - Trees in such a condition that any existing value would be lost within 10 years and which should, in the current context, be removed for reasons of sound arboriculture management.

Category 'A' - Trees of high quality and value; in such a condition as to be able to make a substantial contribution (Normally a minimum of 40 years).

Category 'B' - Trees of moderate quality and value; those in such a condition as to make a significant contribution (Normally a minimum of 20 years).

Category 'C' - Trees of low quality and value; currently in adequate condition to remain until new planting could be established (Normally a minimum of 10 years), or young trees with a stem diameter below 150mm.

Sub-categories (where appropriate); 1 – Mainly arboricultural qualities; 2 – Mainly landscape qualities; 3 – Mainly cultural values, including conservation.

No.	Species	Height	Trunk Dia.	Radial Crown Spread	Crown Clearance	Height to 1st Branch	Life Stage	Physiology	Structure	Landscape Value	Est. Years	Comments	Category
1	English Oak	17m	630mm	5m	8m	7m	Mature	Good	Good	Moderate	40+	No significant visible structural defects; form and structure typical for species; of high quality but just moderate value.	B
2	Field Maple	14m	190mm 350mm	4.5m	6m	6m	Mature	Average	Average	Moderate	40+	Coppice stool consisting of two live stems and one dead stem; crown heavily suppressed by T1; still of moderate quality but low value.	C
3	Sycamore	16m	260mm	3m	5m	4m	Semi-mature	Below average	Average	Low	20-40	Crown suppressed by T1; upper crown thinning; of low quality and value.	C
4	Sycamore	15m	170mm 180mm	2m	4m	4m	Semi-mature	Below average	Below average	Low	20-40	Upper crown dying back; heavily suppressed; of low quality and value.	C
5	Tree no longer present.												
6	Ash	17m	470mm	5.5m	7m	6m	Mature	Good	Average	Moderate	10-20	No significant visible structural defects; form and structure typical for species; outgrown coppice stool; small subsidiary stem at base; damage on lower trunk and base; of moderate quality and value.	B
7	Sycamore	9m	250mm	2m	4m	5m	Semi-mature	Below average	Below average	Low	20-40	Heavy bark damage on lower trunk; of low quality and value.	C
8	Sycamore	16m	410mm	3.5m	7m	6m	Mature	Good	Good	Moderate	10-20	No significant visible structural defects; form and structure typical for species; of high quality but just moderate value.	B
9	Ash	16m	430mm	2.5m	8m	2m	Semi-mature	Poor	Below average	Moderate	<10	Heavy infection of Ash Dieback.	U
10	Field Maple	8m	150mm	1.5m	3m	3m	Young	Average	Average	Low	40+	Heavily suppressed by T9; of moderate quality but low value.	C
11	Ash	16m	430mm	3.5m	9m	7m	Semi-mature	Below average	Average	Moderate	10-20	Small cavity at 0.75 high; of low quality but moderate value.	C
12	Ash	12m	380mm	N0.5m E8.5m S2.5m W0.5m	7m	5m	Semi-mature	Below average	Below average	Low	10-20	Asymmetrical crown inclined over public highway; of low quality but moderate value.	C
13	English Elm	7m	150mm	1.5m	3m	3m	Dead	Dead	Hazardous	Low	Dead	Dead Elm.	U
14	Ash	4m	100mm	0.5m	2m	2m	Young	Poor	Average	Low	10-20	Heavily suppressed by adjacent tree; of low quality and value.	C

No.	Species	Height	Trunk Dia.	Radial Crown Spread	Crown Clearance	Height to 1st Branch	Life Stage	Physiology	Structure	Landscape Value	Est. Years	Comments	Category
15	English Elm	9m	210mm	2m	6m	5m	Dead	Dead	Hazardous	Low	Dead	Dead Elm.	U
16	Ash	17m	370mm	N3m E0.5m S0.5m W5m	12m	8m	Mature	Below average	Average	Moderate	10-20	Infected with Ash Die-back; of low quality but moderate value.	C
17	Ash	17m	7mm	N2m E4m S4m W1.5m	7m	2m	Mature	Below average	Average	Moderate	10-20	Infected with Ash-Dieback; of low quality but moderate value.	C
18	Hazel	4m	180mm @250mm	2m	0m	0m	Semi-mature	Average	Average	Low	40+	Coppice stool; of moderate quality but low value.	C
19	English Oak	18m	640mm	5m	4m	4m	Mature	Good	Average	Moderate	40+	Off-site tree; no significant visible structural defects; form & structure typical for species and age; of high quality but just moderate value.	B
20	Holly	6m	110mm 100mm	2.5m	1m	2m	Semi-mature	Average	Average	Low	40+	Of moderate quality but low value.	C
21	Sycamore	10m	170mm 130mm	2m	3m	3m	Young	Average	Average	Moderate	20-40	Of low quality and value.	C
22	Sycamore	11m	200mm	2m	5m	5m	Young	Average	Below average	Low	20-40	Poor upper crown conformation; suppressed by adjacent trees; of low quality and value.	C
23	English Oak	19m	780mm est	10m	7m	5m	Mature	Good	Good	High	40+	Off-site tree; no significant visible structural defects; form & structure typical for species and age; of high quality and value.	A
24	Tree no longer present.												
25	Tree no longer present.												
26	Hazel	8m	220mm 140mm	N5m E0.5m S0.5m W0.5m	4m	4m	Over-mature	Average	Below average	Low	20-40	Off-site tree; old coppice stool; ivy to centre of crown; asymmetrical crown inclined over the site; of low quality and value.	C
27	English Oak	18m	600mm ivy	7m	5m	6m	Mature	Below average	Average	Moderate	40+	Off-site tree; very heavy ivy through crown; of moderate quality and value.	B
28	English Oak	16m	510mm est	4.5m	9m	5m	Mature	Average	Average	Moderate	40+	Off-site tree; no significant visible structural defects; form & structure typical for species and age; of moderate quality and value.	B

No.	Species	Height	Trunk Dia.	Radial Crown Spread	Crown Clearance	Height to 1st Branch	Life Stage	Physiology	Structure	Landscape Value	Est. Years	Comments	Category
29	Lawson Cypress	16m	450mm est	2.5m	1m	1m	Mature	Good	Good	Moderate	40+	Off-site tree; no significant visible structural defects; form & structure typical for species and age; of moderate quality and value.	B
30	Flowering Cherry	4m	160mm est	1.5m	2m	1m	Over-mature	Poor	Hazardous	Nil	<10	Off-site tree; heavy lvy; asymmetrical crown inclined over the drive; poor crown conformation; of short term potential only.	U
31	Ash	16m	410mm est	3.5m	8m	6m	Mature	Below average	Average	Moderate	<10	Off-site tree; early infection of Ash Dieback; of short term potential only.	C
32	English Oak	7m	320mm	N0.5m E0.5m S6m W4m	6m	4m	Over-mature	Below average	Below average	Low	<10	Heavily suppressed by TE; dieback in upper crown; poor crown conformation; of low quality and value.	C
33	Yew	5m	170mm 190mm	3.5m	2m	1m	Semi-mature	Good	Good	Low	40+	Off-site tree; twin stemmed from 1m high, no included bark; of moderate quality but low value.	C
34	Sycamore	16m	340mm est	N1m E0.5m S3.5m W4m	8m	6m	Mature	Good	Average	Moderate	40+	Off-site tree; suppressed by Tc; of moderate quality and value.	B
35	Ash	16m	400mm est	N1m E2m S4m W3m	8m	5m	Mature	Below average	Average	Moderate	<10	Off-site tree; ash dieback in upper crown; of low quality and value.	C
G1	Leyland Cypress	7m	Avg 150mm	2.5m	1m	1m	Semi-mature	Below average	Below average	Moderate	20-40	Recently topped at 7m high; has some screening value to adjacent property; of low quality but moderate value.	C
G2	Various	4m	Avg 100mm	1.5m	0m	0m	Young	Below average	Below average	Low	20-40	Small group of self sown native species; lvy through the crowns; of low quality and value.	C
H1	Leyland Cypress	4m	Avg 150mm	1m	0m	0m	Mature	Below average	Average	Moderate	20-40	Screening hedge regularly trimmed; many bare patches on south side; provides some internal screening; of low quality but moderate value.	C

APPENDIX 2 – Tree Protection Plan

