



ARBORICULTURAL APPRAISAL
(In Support of an Outline Planning Application)

Hillside
Lower Wokingham Road
Crowthorne

20th July 2026

Prepared by

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

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 identify the arboricultural constraints associated with the trees present both within and adjacent to the site, and to assess the proposed outline development layout in relation to those constraints. The report considers the likely direct and indirect effects of the development on retained trees and whether the indicative layout is capable of being implemented whilst safeguarding those trees identified for retention.

Where potential conflicts have been identified, the report outlines how these can be addressed through recognised arboricultural and engineering solutions. Detailed tree protection measures, construction methodologies and any specialised foundation or surfacing requirements will be determined once a detailed (frozen) design has been agreed and will be presented within an Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan, if required.

Table of Contents

	Page
1 Introduction	4
2 Appraisal	5
3 Conclusions	9
4 Other Considerations	10

Appendices

1 Qualifications and Experience	11
2 Site Photographs	12
3 Site Specific Information	13
4 Limitations and Qualifications	17
5 Tree Constraints Plan	19

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Brief:

This report has been prepared on behalf of Mr B. Cole, the site owner, in support of an outline planning application. Its purpose is to identify the arboricultural constraints associated with the trees present on and adjacent to the site and to assess whether the indicative development layout is capable of being accommodated whilst retaining those trees identified for retention. Detailed tree protection measures, construction methodologies and any specialised engineering solutions, where required, will be developed following agreement of a detailed (frozen) design.

1.2 Qualifications and experience:

I have based this report on my site observations and the provided information, and I have come to conclusions in the light of my experience. I have experience and qualifications in arboriculture and list the details in **Appendix 1**.

1.3 Documents and information provided:

A plan showing the extent of the site and the architect's indicative layout.

1.4 Relevant background information:

Some trees are located within third-party ownership and have therefore been assessed from within the application site and publicly accessible areas only, where necessary to assess their relationship with the proposed development.

1.5 Scope of this report:

This report is concerned only with those trees located on or adjacent to the site that could reasonably be affected by the proposed development. It identifies the arboricultural constraints associated with those trees and assesses whether the proposed outline layout is capable of being accommodated whilst retaining those trees identified for retention.

2 APPRAISAL

2.1 Brief site description:

The site is a piece of land positioned between residential properties and is fenced off, with a vehicular access to the main road that is existing. It is covered in grass and is open, with trees located mainly on the boundary's and beyond in third party land.

2.2 Condition of the trees:

The trees appear to be generally in a healthy condition with no signs of pests or diseases normally associated with the species. Trees in third party ownership could only be assessed from the confines of the site but appear to have a normal vigour.

A more detailed analysis of the trees can be found in **Appendix 3**.

2.3 Suitability of the trees for location and management requirements at present:

The trees currently could be considered as suitable for the location, I am not aware of any conflict with the site, its usage, or the properties adjacent.

No management is considered necessary at present.

2.4 Potential impacts of the proposal on the trees

The proposed outline layout has been assessed against the arboricultural constraints identified during the survey. The potential impacts are shown on the Tree Protection Plan and include tree removal, development within the Root Protection Areas (RPAs) of retained trees and the construction of access surfacing within the RPA of T1.

The proposal demonstrates that the site can be developed whilst retaining the majority of the existing trees. The identified impacts and the measures available to address them are considered below.

2.4.1 Tree removal and pruning

T14 and T16 will require removal to accommodate the proposed development. Their removal is considered acceptable in arboricultural terms and will not result in the loss of the more significant tree cover associated with the site.

The remaining trees are shown as retained. No pruning is currently identified as necessary to accommodate the proposed layout. Should minor facilitation pruning become necessary following detailed design, this will be specified within the final tree works schedule and undertaken in accordance with BS3998:2010.

All tree works will be subject to confirmation of any statutory protection and the requirements of relevant wildlife legislation.

2.4.2 T1 – proposed building within the RPA

A minor part of the proposed building extends into the outer RPA of T1. The extent of the incursion is limited and is not considered to prevent the tree from being retained.

Before the final foundation design is confirmed, hand-excavated assessment trenches will be undertaken where necessary to establish the presence, size and depth of roots within the affected area. These investigations will be completed under arboricultural supervision.

The results will be provided to the project engineer so that the foundation design can respond to the rooting conditions encountered. Suitable measures may include locally deepened or adjusted foundations, bridging over significant roots or a pile-and-beam solution where necessary. The final design will avoid the unnecessary severance of significant roots and will be detailed within the Arboricultural Method Statement.

2.4.3 T1 – access within the RPA

Part of the proposed access extends through the RPA of T1. This section will be constructed using a no-dig method to avoid excavation and minimise additional ground compaction.

The surface will be formed above the existing ground level using a suitable load-spreading cellular confinement system installed over a permeable separation layer. The detailed design will take account of the anticipated loading, existing ground conditions and proposed finished levels.

No excavation, soil stripping or reduction in existing levels will take place within the RPA unless specifically agreed following arboricultural assessment. Edge restraints will be designed to avoid continuous trench foundations, with pegs or localised supports used where appropriate.

The final construction specification and transition between the no-dig surface and conventionally constructed areas outside the RPA will be agreed as part of the detailed design.

2.4.4 G2 – Plot 11 incursion

A minor part of the proposed building at Plot 11 extends into the outer RPA of G2. The incursion is limited in extent and is not considered likely to prevent the group from being retained.

The affected area will be investigated using hand-excavated assessment trenches where necessary to determine the presence and distribution of roots. The findings will inform the final foundation design.

Where roots capable of retention are encountered, the foundation will be adjusted or designed to bridge over them. Excavation within the RPA will be undertaken using hand tools and under arboricultural supervision until the rooting conditions have been established. Any roots requiring pruning will be cut cleanly by the supervising arboriculturist using suitable sharp tools.

2.4.5 Ecological works within the RPAs of G1 and G2

Limited works associated with ecological enhancement are shown within the outer RPAs of G1 and G2. These works will be carried out using methods that avoid unnecessary excavation, ground compaction and root damage.

Where excavation is required, it will be undertaken carefully using hand tools and under arboricultural supervision. Existing roots will be retained and worked around wherever reasonably practicable. The detailed ecological proposals and construction methodology will be reviewed alongside the arboricultural constraints before works commence.

2.4.6 Services and drainage

The detailed positions of new services and drainage have not been confirmed at this outline stage. These will be designed outside the RPAs of retained trees wherever practicable.

Where a service connection cannot reasonably avoid an RPA, an appropriate method will be agreed before work begins. This may include hand excavation, trenchless installation or the use of existing service routes. Any work within an RPA will be undertaken in accordance with a detailed method statement and under arboricultural supervision where required.

2.4.7 Tree protection during construction

The Tree Protection Plan identifies the indicative position of protective fencing and the areas requiring specialised working methods. The fencing will establish Construction Exclusion Zones around retained trees and will be installed before demolition, site clearance or construction work begins.

No storage of materials, movement of plant, excavation, changes in ground level or mixing of potentially harmful materials will take place within the protected areas.

Where access is required within an RPA before the permanent no-dig surface has been installed, suitable temporary ground protection will be provided to prevent soil compaction and damage to surface roots.

Once the layout and engineering design have been agreed and frozen, the tree protection measures, assessment trenches, foundation solutions, no-dig construction and arboricultural supervision requirements will be confirmed within a detailed Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan.

The proposal also provides an opportunity for additional planting to be incorporated into the detailed design to enhance biodiversity, screening and the long-term amenity of the site.

Overall, the Tree Protection Plan demonstrates that the identified impacts can be addressed through recognised arboricultural and engineering methods. Subject to the detailed measures described above, the proposed development can be accommodated without significant adverse impact on the trees identified for retention.

3 CONCLUSIONS

- The proposed outline development has been assessed against the arboricultural constraints identified during the tree survey and shown on the accompanying Tree Constraints Plan and Tree Protection Plan.
- The layout has been designed to retain the majority of the existing tree cover and demonstrates that the principal arboricultural constraints have been taken into account during the evolution of the proposals. Whilst limited impacts have been identified, including the removal of T14 and T16, localised incursions into the Root Protection Areas of retained trees and the construction of part of the proposed access within the RPA of T1, these impacts are considered capable of being satisfactorily addressed through recognised arboricultural and engineering techniques.
- The Tree Protection Plan identifies the principal areas where retained trees could potentially be affected during construction. Appropriate measures, including tree protection fencing, no-dig construction, hand excavation, assessment trenches, arboricultural supervision and, where necessary, specialist foundation solutions, provide a suitable framework to ensure retained trees can be safeguarded throughout the development process.
- As this is an outline planning application, the layout remains indicative and the detailed engineering design has not yet been undertaken. Once a detailed (frozen) design has been agreed, the proposed development will be supported by a detailed Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan, together with any additional engineering information necessary to demonstrate how retained trees will be protected during construction.
- The proposal also provides an opportunity to incorporate additional tree and shrub planting within the detailed landscape design to enhance biodiversity, strengthen the site's long-term landscape character and provide future arboricultural benefits.
- Overall, it is considered that the proposed outline development can be accommodated without resulting in significant adverse arboricultural impacts and that the development is capable of complying with the recommendations of BS5837:2012. Subject to the implementation of the measures outlined within this report and the preparation of detailed arboricultural documentation at the detailed design stage, there are no arboricultural reasons why outline planning permission should not be granted.

4 OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

4.1 Trees subject to statutory controls:

The statutory protection status of the trees has not been independently verified as part of this assessment. It is recommended that the Local Planning Authority is consulted to establish whether any of the trees are protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO), Conservation Area designation or any other statutory restriction before any tree works are undertaken.

Where statutory protection applies, the appropriate consent must be obtained prior to carrying out any works, unless an exemption is applicable.

This section is provided for advisory purposes only and should not be relied upon as confirmation of the statutory protection status of any tree.

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

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 PHOTOGRAPHS



Showing T1 & an existing entrance



Showing T11 – T13 & G1



Showing ground level change along western boundary around T14 & T15



Showing existing hard surface, shell of a building and G2

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 quickly and accurately identify a particular tree 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.

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, or have no great visual prominence, Low category
- U** - Trees of such a condition that they cannot 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	Quercus robur (Common Oak)	M	750	15	2	2	4	6	5	4	20+	No works required at present. A minor encroachment into the outer RPA is proposed together with a section of no-dig access. Assessment trenches will be undertaken where necessary to inform the detailed foundation design. Any works within the RPA will be carried out in accordance with an Arboricultural Method Statement under arboricultural supervision.	B2	9	254.5
T2	Betula pendula (Silver Birch)	M	300	10	4	3	4	4	4	4	20+	No works required at present, in third party ownership.	C1	3.6	40.72
T3	Betula pendula (Silver Birch)	M	300	12	8	8	3	3	3	3	20+	No works required at present, in third party ownership.	C1	3.6	40.72
T4	Betula pendula (Silver Birch)	M	350	12	4	5	4	4	4	3	20+	No works required at present, in third party ownership.	C1	4.2	55.42
T5	Pinus Spp	M	400	13	9	9	5	4	5	3	20+	No works required at present, in third party ownership.	C1	4.8	72.39
T6	Pinus Spp	M	400	13	9	9	3	3	5	4	20+	No works required at present, in third party ownership.	C1	4.8	72.39
T7	Pinus Spp	M	400	13	9	6	4	3	3	4	20+	No works required at present, in third party ownership.	C1	4.8	72.39
T8	Betula pendula (Silver Birch)	M	300	10	4	3	4	4	4	4	20+	No works required at present, in third party ownership.	C1	3.6	40.72
T9	Betula pendula (Silver Birch)	M	300	10	4	3	4	4	4	4	20+	No works required at present, in third party ownership.	B3	3.6	40.72
T10	X Cupressocyparis leylandii (Leyland Cypress)	M	300	10	1	1	4	4	4	4	20+	No works required at present, in third party ownership	C2	3.6	40.72

Tag	Name	Age	Diameter	Height	Crown Hgt	FSB Hgt	Crown Spread (N S E W) (m)				Life Exp	Recommendations	Category	RPR	RPA
T11	Pinus sylvestris (Scots Pine)	M	450	13	9	9	4	4	5	5	20+	No works required at present, in third party ownership	B3	5.4	91.62
T12	Pinus sylvestris (Scots Pine)	M	400	11	9	9	4	4	3	4	20+	No works required at present, in third party ownership.	C1	4.8	72.39
T13	Pinus sylvestris (Scots Pine)	M	400	11	9	9	4	3	4	4	20+	No works required at present, in third party ownership.	C1	4.8	72.39
G1	Betula pendula (Silver Birch),Laurus nobilis (Bay),Quercus robur (Common Oak),Pinus Spp	M	400	14	1	1	5	5	5	5	20+	No works required at present. Minor ecological works are proposed within the outer RPA. Any excavation will be undertaken using hand tools under arboricultural supervision in accordance with the Arboricultural Method Statement. Trees are within third-party ownership.	C1	4.8	72.39
T14	Pinus Spp	M	600	13	9	9	5	5	5	5	20+	Remove to facilitate the proposed development.	C1	7.2	162.88
T15	Ilex aquifolium (Holly)	M	250	9	1	1	3	2	1	2	20+	No works required at present, on a ground level about 0.5m below that of the site.	C3	3	28.28
G2	Betula pendula (Silver Birch),Laurus nobilis (Bay),X Cupressocyparis leylandii (Leyland Cypress),Quercus robur (Common Oak),Pinus Spp	M	400	15	3	3	5	5	5	5	20+	No works required at present. A minor RPA incursion is proposed to facilitate Plot 11 together with limited ecological works within the outer RPA. Assessment trenches will be undertaken where necessary to inform the detailed foundation design. Any works within the RPA will be undertaken in accordance with the Arboricultural Method Statement under arboricultural supervision. Trees are within third-party ownership.	C1	4.8	72.39
T16	Acer Pseudoplatanus (Sycamore)	M	450	15	4	4	5	5	5	5	20+	Remove to facilitate the proposed development.	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)

