



**33 Willow Park,
Haywards Heath**

**Arboricultural Implications Assessment and
Method Statement**

Revision A

April 2025



Client	Will Dyer
Job name	33 Willow Park, Haywards Heath
Report title	Arboricultural Implications Assessment and Method Statement
File reference	25-1903-Report-A

	Name	Position	Date
Author	Neil Taylor	Arboricultural Consultant	April 2025

Report Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Site Description.....	1
1.2	Proposed Works	1
1.3	Aims of Study	1
2	Methodology	2
3	Assessment	3
3.1	Tree Character Groups.....	3
4	Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA).....	4
4.1	Methodology	4
4.2	Assessment	4
5	Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS).....	5
5.1	Methodology	5
5.2	Demolition within the RPA of Retained Trees	5
5.3	Construction within the RPA of Retained Trees.....	5
5.4	Services.....	5
5.5	Tree Protection.....	5
6	Conclusion.....	6
7	Appendices.....	7

1 Introduction

1.1 Site Description

33 Willow Park, Haywards Heath (the "site") is situated approximately a mile southeast of the centre of Haywards Heath and is suburban in nature. The site is bound to the east, south and west by residential dwellings and to the north by Willow Park.

According to Mid-Sussex District Council's website, trees subject to tree preservation order (TPO) are present within the neighbouring gardens to the north and south of the site. The trees are no longer present, and no sign of the trees having been recently removed was visible at the time of the survey.

1.2 Proposed Works

The demolition of the existing conservatory and the construction of an extension to the rear of the dwelling are proposed.

1.3 Aims of Study

To inform a planning application, Canopy Consultancy has been commissioned by Will Dyer to undertake a tree survey of the site, in accordance with British Standard (BS) 5837:2012 "Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction - Recommendations".

The aim of this report is to present the results of the survey, including a Tree Survey Schedule (TSS), an Arboricultural Implications Assessment (AIA), and an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS). A Tree Protection Plan (TPP) has also been produced and accompanies this report as a separate drawing.

This report in no way constitutes a health and safety survey report. Where concerns for tree health and safety exist, the necessary and appropriate tree inspections should be carried out.

2 Methodology

The trees were inspected from ground level by consultant arboriculturist Neil Taylor on the 13th of February 2025. Measurements were taken in accordance with the recommendations set out in the BS 5837:2012. Canopy spreads were measured and plotted to the four compass points. Where direct access was not possible measurements have been estimated. The surveyed trees are colour coded on the accompanying tree survey drawing according to their relevant BS category.

The tree data collected is used to enable the current canopy spread of the surveyed trees and the Root Protection Area (RPA) to be plotted on the accompanying TPP. The RPA is defined by the formula in paragraph 4.6 from the BS 5837:2012 and may be refined by taking into account current on-site constraints to root activity such as buildings, earthworks and hard paving. This forms part of the design process for the proposed development.

3 Assessment

3.1 Tree Character Groups

The detailed results of the tree survey are provided in the TSS, in Appendix 1. In summary, the trees on the site are in a good condition and vary in terms of amenity value provided to the wider landscape. The trees can be divided into two distinct character groups as follows:

1. The first character group includes the larger, young trees found growing in the neighbouring gardens. The trees in this character group are in a good condition and provide a degree of amenity to the local area.
2. The second character group includes the smaller, young trees found growing on the site's southwestern boundary. The trees in this character group are in a good condition but due to their size are of limited amenity value to the local area.

4 Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA)

4.1 Methodology

The AIA uses the information obtained in the tree survey to identify areas where the proposed construction may be at odds with accepted standards, in terms of a tree's requirements for space in which to maintain existing roots and shoots, and space for future growth.

The quality and relative importance of each tree is illustrated as a coloured polygon. The colour used relates to the BS categories as follows: A - green, B - blue, C - grey and U - red (see accompanying drawing reference 25-1903-TPP). In general the design process will try to retain A and B category trees. Proposed construction will therefore normally be excluded from the RPA of A and B category trees. Red trees are discounted as they are recommended for removal.

Details of the trees surveyed are given in the TSS (Appendix 1). The juxtaposition of the proposed development in relation to existing tree locations are shown on the accompanying TPP drawing, reference 25-1903-TPP.

The AIA considers existing site conditions and the effect that they may have on the development of the surveyed trees root systems. Hard structures such as building and paved roads and paths can influence the root activity of trees by reducing the availability of both moisture and nutrients.

4.2 Assessment

Refer to the accompanying TPP, drawing, reference 25-1903-TPP, for the relationship between the proposed development and the trees on and adjacent to the site.

- The following trees will be removed to enable the proposed development:

T2	to enable the construction of an extension.
T3	to allow for landscape improvements.
T4	to allow for landscape improvements.

- There will be no demolition within the RPA of a retained tree.
- There will be no construction within the RPA of a retained tree.

5 Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS)

5.1 Methodology

The AMS provides the means by which retained trees and hedges can be protected throughout the development.

The movement of demolition and construction machinery in close proximity to trees may cause compaction of the soil which affects the tree's ability to absorb moisture and nutrients. The RPAs of retained trees and hedges will be protected by a tree protection barrier as described in paragraph 5.5 below and shown on the accompanying TPP, drawing number 25-1903-TPP.

5.2 Demolition within the RPA of Retained Trees

There will be no demolition within the RPA of a retained tree.

5.3 Construction within the RPA of Retained Trees

There will be no construction within the RPA of a retained tree.

No materials or spoil is to be stored within the RPA of a retained tree.

In order to avoid damage to the retained trees the tree surgery and felling work identified in the accompanying tree survey schedule will be carried out prior to the occupation of the site by the building contractor. The work will be carried out in accordance with BS 3998:2010.

5.4 Services

There will be no new underground services within the RPA of a retained tree.

5.5 Tree Protection

All trees that are to be retained within the survey area are offsite and of a sufficient distance from the boundary so as to not require a protective barrier to protect their RPAs.

6 Conclusion

Canopy Consultancy was commissioned by Will Dyer to carry out a tree survey at the site. The results of the survey indicate that the trees within the survey area vary considerably in terms of condition and contribution to the amenity of the wider landscape.

A total of three individual trees will be removed to enable the proposed development. All trees to be removed are within the C category due to their size.

Overall, there are no known overriding arboricultural constraints which would prevent the proposed development from going ahead.

7 Appendices

<i>Will Dyer</i>	<i>33 Willow Park, Haywards Heath</i>
------------------	---------------------------------------

Appendix 1: Tree Survey Schedule

Project:	33 Willow Park, Haywards Heath							BS 5837 2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction-	Surveyed by		NT				
Ref:	25-1903								Weather		Clear				
Date:	13.02.25								Tagged		No				
Client:	Will Dyer														
				Canopy Spread											
Tree No.	Species	Height (m)	Stem Dia (mm)	N	E	S	W	Stems	Height of crown clearance	Age class	Physiological condition problems/comments	Structural condition	Preliminary management recommendations	Estimated remaining contribution years	BS category
T1	Acer saccharinum (Silver Maple)	6	200	2	2	2	2	1	2	Y	Good - Previously reduced. Off site.	Good	None	40+	B2
T2	Cupressus sp. (Cypress)	3	75	1	1	1	1	1	0	Y	Good	Good	None	40+	C1
T3	Cupressus sp. (Cypress)	3	75	1	1	1	1	1	0	Y	Good	Good	None	40+	C1
T4	Cupressus sp. (Cypress)	3	75	1	1	1	1	1	0	Y	Good	Good	None	40+	C1
T5	Carpinus betulus (Hornbeam)	6	200	2	2	2	2	1	2	Y	Good - Previously reduced. Off site.	Good	None	40+	B2