



ROAVR | GROUP

Project: 25_5837_02_07
Site: Hutts Farm Cottage, Blagrove Lane RG41 4AX
Client: Bob Ryan



*This Report is the copyright of Woodland Solutions Northern Limited t/a ROAVR Group.
Any unauthorised reproduction or usage by any person other than the addressee is strictly prohibited.*

Project Number:	25_5837_02_07
Report Type:	Tree Survey, Arboricultural Impact Assessment & Arboricultural Method Statement
Site Address:	Hutts Farm Cottage, Blagrove Lane RG41 4AX

Role:	Name:	Date:
Instructing Party	Bob Ryan	04/02/2025
Customer	Bob Ryan	13/02/2025
Surveyor	Connor Harmsworth	13/02/2025
Consultant	Alexander Barnes - BSc Arb, MArborA	21/03/2025

Revision History		
Date:	Version number:	Summary of changes:
21/03/2025	1.0	First Review (Internal)
21/03/2025	1.0	First Issue
31/07/2025	2.0	Second Issue – AIA and AMS updated to reflect revised proposals reducing the scheme from five to three dwellings.

Arboricultural impact assessment

Table of Contents

- 1 Introduction and Scope
2. Site Conditions & Site Surroundings
3. Drawings
4. Arboricultural Impact Assessment - Site Specific
5. Limitations

Appendix 1 – Site Location

Appendix 2 – Arboricultural Data Tables

Appendix 3 - Arboricultural Plans

Validation Statement for the Local Planning Authority.

This report includes the following for LPA validation purposes:

- A **tree survey and tree constraints plan** showing the existing trees, their category rating and above and below ground constraints shown on an OS extract OR a topographical survey
- An **arboricultural impact assessment** which describes how the development will affect local character from a tree perspective
- **Appendices** highlighting tree related information including the **arboricultural data tables**

Customer Action Points.

- ☐ - reporting complete - send to your Local Planning Authority
- ☐ - on planning award contact us with your decision notice

1. Introduction & Scope:

This arboricultural assessment has been prepared in accordance with BS5837:2012, providing the necessary information for the Local Planning Authority to assess the potential impact of the proposed development on local character and amenity from a tree perspective.

The brief was to survey the tree population on-site and identify any arboricultural constraints to the proposed development. The assessment includes all trees with a stem diameter greater than 75mm measured at 1.5 metres above ground level, as required by BS5837.

Tree surveys were conducted using ground-based inspections and the Visual Tree Assessment (VTA) method. A sounding hammer was used to assess for decay where relevant, but no invasive techniques were employed at this stage. Root Protection Areas (RPAs) were calculated in line with the methodology set out in BS5837.

Key elements of the report include:

- A Tree Constraints Plan, illustrating the position of trees on the site.
- Arboricultural data tables providing information on tree species, condition, and dimensions.
- Grouping or designation of groups and woodlands where areas were uniform in species, age, or geography, as permitted under BS5837.

This report will assist the planning process by evaluating the impact of the proposed development on the existing tree stock. Section 4 includes the Arboricultural Impact Assessment, which examines constraints posed by trees both above ground (e.g., crown spread) and below ground (e.g., RPAs).

Report Author.

ROAVR (ROAVR Group) was formed in 2010 and since then has carried out arboricultural consultancy Nationwide with directly employed consultants. Our consultants are all individual members of the Arboricultural Association and the report author is listed in the document control sheet.

Photographic Plates.



Photographic plate showing T1 (left) and T2 (right). (ROAVR, 2024)



Photographic plate showing T3 (left through to T7 (right). (ROAVR, 2024)



Photographic plate showing T15 (right) through to T18 (left). (ROAVR, 2024)



Photographic plate showing T22 (centre). (ROAVR, 2024)



Photographic plate looking south down Blagrove Lane. (ROAVR, 2024)



Photographic plate T21 (right), Belgrove Lane (centre) & H1 (left).

2. Site Conditions & Site Surroundings

- 2.1 The site is situated in Wokingham in the Wokingham Borough Council control area. The site is located on the south side of the town and has a rural feel.
- 2.2 The site is home to a detached cottage with associated hard and soft landscape.
- 2.3 The wider locality is predominantly rural in nature. The site is accessed via a private driveway located just off Blagrove Lane.
- 2.4 A desktop assessment confirms that the site is not within a Conservation Area. However, there are three individually protected trees and an area of trees subject to a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) on-site. Additionally, eight trees subject to a TPO are located within 15 metres east of the site.
- 2.5 All desktop assessment data was cross checked and validated on the 14/02/2025 using the web portal provided by the local planning authority.

<https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/d76c713282874f3da74b3e46bc473d3f/>




Image plate showing the desktop analysis results of the surveyed plot. (Wokingham Borough Council, 2025)

- 2.6 Works to protected trees require consent from the local planning authority. In the case of TPO's an application must be made. In the case of conservation areas a notification must be made. TPO applications take up to eight weeks, conservation area notifications take six weeks.

- 2.7 Certain exemptions apply; for example the removal of deadwood. In the case of dangerous trees 5-days written notice should be given to the local authority (in the cases of immediate danger the work should proceed, but the local authority contacted as soon as possible afterwards) with the works evidenced by photographs and video where possible. You should also check to ensure the works are exempt from the requirements of a felling licence.

<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2012/605/regulation/14/made>

- 2.8 It should be noted that planning consent overrides protected trees, where the works or removal are necessary for development to proceed and have been highlighted in the tree survey documents.

- 2.9 Bats. Under current legislation it is an offence to 'intentionally or recklessly disturb a bat' or 'damage, destroy or block access to the resting place of any bat'. For further details consultation must be made with the Statutory Nature Conservancy Organisation. Where relevant any current ecological surveys for the site will take precedence in this matter. Trees provide numerous 'potential roosting features' for a wide range of bat species. It is therefore crucial that any trees proposed for removal are checked by an appropriately competent person before any felling or ivy stripping works commence.

<https://www.bats.org.uk/advice/bats-and-the-law>

- 2.10 Birds. It is an offence to kill, injure or take any wild bird; or take, damage or destroy the nest of any wild bird while it is in use or being built. Therefore work likely to disturb nesting birds must be avoided from late March to August. All birds, their nest and eggs are protected by law.

<https://www.rspb.org.uk/birds-and-wildlife/advice/wildlife-and-the-law/wildlife-and-countryside-act/>

3. Drawings

- 3.1 Appended to this report is a tree constraints plan, tree assessment plan and tree protection plan.
- 3.2 The tree constraints plan has been produced using a topographical survey plan. Tree positions and data have been applied using our survey handset as an onsite exercise with the constraints plan being produced as a PDF through Auto CAD.
- 3.3 An autoCAD .dwg file of the tree constraints is available on request for project stakeholders to utilise.
- 3.4 The *Tree Constraints Plan* shows the existing layout. For each tree the stem location is indicated and scaled according to its diameter, the canopy is indicated according to measurements taken along the four cardinal points of the compass. Root protection areas (RPAs) are indicated which are calculated according to the guidelines within BS 5837 (2012).
- 3.5 Where appropriate, the shapes of the RPAs have been amended to reflect actual site conditions or where trees have been heavily pruned. The 'original' RPAs are indicated as a dashed line whereas the amended RPAs are indicated as a solid line. Any variation to this approach will be highlighted on the appropriate plans.
- 3.6 The *Tree Assessment Plan / Arboricultural Impact Assessment* indicates the tree constraints with the proposals overlaid. Where applicable, this plan shows where works are proposed in Root Protection Areas and which trees are to be pruned or removed. This plan accompanies the Impact Assessment which is to be found in Section 4.
- 3.7 The *Tree Protection Plan (if applicable)* shows the protection measures that are to be installed during the construction phase. This plan accompanies an arboricultural method statement where applicable and commissioned.

4. Arboricultural Impact Assessment - Site Specific

4.1. Tree Quality Statement.

The tree stock surveyed comprises predominantly mature Common Oak (*Quercus robur*) with several Hazel (*Corylus avellana*), Wych Elm (*Ulmus glabra*), Horse Chestnut (*Aesculus hippocastanum*), Wild Cherry (*Prunus avium*), and Cherry Laurel (*Prunus laurocerasus*). The general condition of the tree stock is good, with many trees showing no significant defects and a life expectancy of over 40 years. The majority of the mature oaks are high quality, categorised as A1, with substantial stem diameters, balanced crown structures, and no notable structural or physiological issues apart from some ivy growth and minor broken branches in the crowns. These features are typical and manageable.

Several trees fall into category B1, including smaller oaks and a horse chestnut with minor root disturbance due to site activity. These trees remain suitable for retention but may require careful protection during any site operations. The Hazel groups are mostly multi-stemmed, with fair condition and short-term life expectancy, categorised as C1. These are of lower arboricultural value, with common features such as stem cavities, basal division, and limited future contribution. The Wych Elms surveyed show signs of decline, low vitality, and dieback, with one tree categorised as unsuitable (U) due to significant crown decline and structural issues. Other elms are in fair condition but have limited longevity, making them less significant in the long-term landscape.

4.2. Scope and Context

This assessment evaluates the direct and indirect impacts of the proposed development of three detached dwellings at Hutts Farm Cottages on nearby trees. It is based on:

- Tree data schedule and categorisation (BS5837:2012)
- Tree Assessment Plan (ROAVR Group, Dwg. No. 25_5837_02_07 Rev 2)
- Site proposals (Paul Edwards Architecture, Dwg. No. 2685-08)

4.3. Summary of Tree Quality

- 41 individually surveyed trees and 1 hedgerow (H1)
- 15 trees categorised as A (high quality)
- 10 trees categorised as B (moderate quality)
- 15 trees categorised as C (low quality)
- 1 tree categorised as U (unsuitable for retention)
- Root Protection Areas (RPAs) plotted and overlaid on the Tree Assessment Plan.

4.4. Identified Tree Impacts

4.4.1. Tree Removal

- T22 (Quercus robur – Category B1):
Required to be removed to facilitate the proposed new vehicle access.
 - Direct conflict with the alignment of the entrance
 - Not suitable for retention within the design context
- Approx. 6 metres of mixed species hedgerow (H1 – Category C3):
To be removed for visibility splays and access.
 - Minor landscape value
 - Can be mitigated through replanting

4.4.2. Proposed Boundary Fence

- A new 1.8-metre-high close-boarded fence is proposed adjacent to T1 and T2 (both Category A1 Quercus robur).
 - Fence alignment passes radially through RPAs and close to stems

Impact and Recommendation:

- All fence post holes must be:
 - Probed to 600 mm to check for roots
 - Excavated by hand or airspade under arboricultural supervision
 - Adjusted if significant roots are encountered

4.4.3. Proposed New Access

- Encroaches into RPA of T21 (Quercus robur – Category A1)
 - The tree is off-site, sitting approx. 0.5 metres above road level
 - Existing tarmac hardstanding between base and proposed works

Assessment:

- Root presence in this zone likely limited due to level change and existing surfacing
- However, precautionary working is still required

Mitigation:

- All excavations to be by hand under arboricultural supervision
- Roots ≤ 25 mm may be pruned with sharp secateurs
- New surface to be:
 - Constructed on a no-dig basis
 - Laid over a cellular confinement system (e.g. Cellweb)
 - Permeable to allow water/air to reach roots

4.4.4. Plot 3 Pedestrian Path

- Encroaches into the RPA of T23 (Corylus avellana – Category C1)

Mitigation:

- Path to be constructed using a permeable finish
- No-dig construction method required

4.4.5. Plot 1 Foundation

- Very minor encroachment into the edge of T19's (Quercus robur – Category A1) RPA

Assessment:

- Encroachment is negligible
- Conventional strip foundations are considered acceptable in this location

4.5. Tree Protection and Construction Safeguards

- All retained trees to be protected using tree protection fencing (as per BS5837:2012)
- Arboricultural supervision required for:
 - Fence post excavation near T1 and T2
 - New access construction near T21
- No materials, plant or machinery to be stored within RPAs unless otherwise agreed

4.6. Conclusions

- Only one moderate-quality tree (T22) and a short section of low-quality hedgerow require removal
- All high-quality (Category A) trees are retained
- Proposed development is feasible with careful planning and arboricultural supervision
- Where RPAs are affected, impacts are minor and acceptable with the proposed mitigation

5. Limitations

- 5.1 ROAVR has prepared this Report for the sole use of the above named Client/Agent in accordance with our terms of business, under which our services were performed. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this Report or any other services provided by us.
- 5.2 This Report may not be relied upon by any other party without the prior and express written agreement of ROAVR. The assessments made assume that the land use will continue for their current purpose without significant change. ROAVR has not independently verified information obtained from third parties.
- 5.3 This report, video walkthrough, data tables and raw data remain the copyright of ROAVR until such time as any monies owed are settled in full and the report may be withdrawn at any time.
- 5.4 This report, site visit, plans and conclusions are proportional to the proposals and in some cases a simple plan based impact assessment may be all that is required.
- 5.5 Important - to ensure fair allocation of resources, we allow you ten working days to review the report and issue any feedback, beyond that changes are chargeable.
- 5.6 For references and further information regarding tree survey process visit: <https://www.roavr-group.co.uk/roavr-group/survey/sp-3-arboriculture/>

Should you require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact us at any time.

Mr. Alexander Barnes, BSc Arb, MArborA
Consultant Arborist

Alexander Barnes



Prepared by: Alexander Barnes
Checked by: Peter Haine

Appendix 1 – Site Location



(Google Earth, 2025)

Appendix 2 – Arboricultural Data Tables

Key to Arboricultural Data Tables


Tree Number	Reference no. T1, T2 etc. for trees; H for hedgerows; G for Groups and W for woodlands.
Species	Tree species <i>Fagus sylvatica</i> ; <i>Quercus robur</i> - Latin names.
Age Class	The estimated age class of the tree (relative to species) Y - Young SM - Semi-mature EM - Early-mature M - Mature OM - Over-mature or V - Veteran
Height (Crown Height)	Height of the tree in metres. (Height of the crown above ground level in metres)
Number of Stems	Number of clear stems above 1.5 metres
Diameter at Breast Height	Diameter of stem (mm) at breast height (1.5 metres above ground).
Crown Spread (N, S, E, W)	The maximum spread of the tree's canopy measured from the stem in four directions (North, East, South, West).
Life Expectancy	Estimated safe, usable life expectancy.
Physical Description	Details of tree type, quality, location etc
Comments	Any comments or remarks recorded by the surveyor
Management Recommendations	Recommendations (regardless of the development proposals if available) for removal, retention and/or remedial arboricultural works.
RPA offset from stem	Radius of the root protection area measured in metres
Category Rating	Tree categorisation based on section 4.5 of BS 5837 (2012) Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations: A – Trees of high quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 40 years. B – Trees of moderate quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 20 years. C – Trees of low quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 10 years, or young trees with a stem diameter below 150mm U – Trees in such a condition that they cannot realistically be retained as living trees in the context of the current land use for longer than 10 years Subcategories: 1: Mainly arboricultural & aesthetic qualities 2: Mainly landscape qualities 3: Mainly cultural values, including conservation

Tree Number	Species	Age Class	DBH	Height (crown height)	N	E	S	W	Condition	Life Expectancy	Physical Description	Comments	Managment Recommendations	RPA offset from stem.	Category Rating
1	Quercus robur (Common Oak)	M	840	15(3.5)	10	10	10	10	Good	40+	None	None	None	319.25	A1
2	Quercus robur (Common Oak)	M	630	13(3.5)	9	9	5	7	Good	40+	None	None	None	179.58	A1
3	Quercus robur (Common Oak)	M	200,210	13(4)	1.5	1.5	5	5	Good	20+	Stem divides at ground level.	None	None	38.05	B1
4	Quercus robur (Common Oak)	M	620	16(3.5)	9	5	8	3	Good	40+	None	None	None	173.92	A1
5	Quercus robur (Common Oak)	M	500	15(3.5)	4.5	5	4	2	Good	40+	None	None	None	113.11	A1
6	Quercus robur (Common Oak)	M	240	15(3.5)	2	4	4	4	Good	40+	None	None	None	26.06	A1
7	Aesculus hippocastanum (Horse Chestnut)	M	210,250	13(3.5)	4	4	4	4	Good	20+	None	Dumper tracks through RPA on the North West, exposing roots.	None	48.04	B1
8	Quercus robur (Common Oak)	M	350	15(3.5)	3	3	4	4	Good	40+	None	None	None	55.42	A1
9	Quercus robur (Common Oak)	M	500	15(3.5)	2	7	7	7	Good	40+	None	None	None	113.11	A1
10	Ulmus glabra (Wych Elm)	SM	150	4.5(1)	1.5	2	2	1.5	Fair	10+	None	None	None	10.18	C1
11	Ulmus glabra (Wych Elm)	SM	80,77	4.5(1)	2	1.5	1.5	2	Fair	10+	None	None	None	5.56	C1
12	Ulmus glabra (Wych Elm)	SM	100	4.5(1)	1.5	2	2	1.5	Fair	10+	None	None	None	4.52	C1
13	Ulmus glabra (Wych Elm)	SM	110	4.5(1)	1.5	2	2	1.5	Poor	<10	Low vitality. Declining. Dieback in crown. Low bud/leaf density. Broken branches in crown.	None	None	5.47	U
14	Ulmus glabra (Wych Elm)	M	180	7(1)	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	Fair	10+	None	None	None	14.66	C1
15	Quercus robur (Common Oak)	M	650	13(3.5)	5	5	8	8	Good	40+	Ivy on tree. Broken branches in crown.	None	None	191.16	A1
16	Quercus robur (Common Oak)	M	300	8(2)	5.5	1	5.5	5.5	Good	20+	Leaning South. Ivy on tree.	None	None	40.72	B1
17	Quercus robur (Common Oak)	M	1300	19(4)	10	13.5	13.5	13.5	Good	40+	Ivy on tree. Broken branches in crown.	None	None	706.95	A1
18	Quercus robur (Common Oak)	M	1200	19(4)	13	13	8	13	Good	40+	Ivy on tree. Broken branches in crown.	None	None	651.53	A1
19	Quercus robur (Common Oak)	M	850	16(4)	11	11	8	11	Good	40+	Ivy on tree. Broken branches in crown.	None	None	326.89	A1
20	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	M	400,180,80,120	15(7)	5	5	5	5	Good	20+	Ivy on tree. Unable to inspect stem due to Ivy. Stem divides at ground level.	None	None	96.43	B1
21	Quercus robur (Common Oak)	M	900	16(4)	13	13	13	13	Good	40+	Ivy on tree. Broken branches in crown.	None	None	366.48	A1
22	Quercus robur (Common Oak)	M	190	8(2)	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	Good	20+	Tree located within raised bed.	None	None	16.33	B1
23	Corylus avellana (Hazel)	EM	100,80,75,77,120,130,75,80,88,90,95,98,150,185	5(1.5)	4	4	4	4	Fair	10+	Cavity on stem. Stem divides at ground level.	None	None	73.6	C1
24	Crataegus monogyna (Hawthorn)	M	160,80,130	5(2.5)	3	1	3	3	Fair	10+	Ivy on tree. Unable to inspect stem due to Ivy.	None	None	22.06	C1
25	Corylus avellana (Hazel)	EM	100,80,75,77,120,75,80,88,90,95	5(1.5)	4	4	2	4	Fair	10+	Stem divides at ground level.	None	None	35.9	C1


26	<i>Corylus avellana</i> (Hazel)	EM	100,80,75,77,120,75,80,88,9 0,95	5(1.5)	4	4	4	4	Fair	10+	Stem divides at ground level.	None	None	35.9	C1
27	<i>Corylus avellana</i> (Hazel)	EM	100,80,75,77,120,75,80,88,9 0,95	5(1.5)	4	4	4	4	Fair	10+	Stem divides at ground level.	None	None	35.9	C1
28	<i>Corylus avellana</i> (Hazel)	SM	100,80,75,77,120,75,80,88,9 0,95	5(1.5)	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	Fair	10+	Stem divides at ground level.	None	None	35.9	C1
29	<i>Quercus robur</i> (Common Oak)	M	850	16(4)	11	11	11	11	Good	40+	Ivy on tree. Broken branches in crown.	None	None	326.89	A1
30	<i>Quercus robur</i> (Common Oak)	M	190	8(2)	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	Good	20+	Tree located within raised bed.	None	None	16.33	B1
31	<i>Crataegus monogyna</i> (Hawthorn)	M	160,130,130	5(2.5)	3.5	2	3.5	3.5	Fair	10+	Ivy on tree. Unable to inspect stem due to Ivy.	None	None	26.97	C1
32	<i>Corylus avellana</i> (Hazel)	EM	80,120,130,150,90,100,110	7(1.5)	4	3	4	4	Fair	10+	Stem divides at ground level.	None	None	40.95	C1
33	<i>Corylus avellana</i> (Hazel)	EM	80,120,130,150,90,100,110	7(1.5)	4	3	3	4	Fair	10+	Stem divides at ground level.	None	None	40.95	C1
34	<i>Corylus avellana</i> (Hazel)	SM	100,80,75,77,120,75,80,88,9 0,95	5(1.5)	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	Fair	10+	Stem divides at ground level.	None	None	35.9	C1
35	<i>Quercus robur</i> (Common Oak)	M	200	10(1.5)	2.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	Good	40+	None	None	None	18.1	A1
36	<i>Quercus robur</i> (Common Oak)	M	230	10(1.5)	3.5	3.5	2.5	3.5	Good	40+	None	None	None	23.93	A1
37	<i>Corylus avellana</i> (Hazel)	SM	100,80,75,77,120,75,80,88,9 0,95	5(1.5)	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	Fair	10+	Stem divides at ground level.	None	None	35.9	C1
38	<i>Quercus robur</i> (Common Oak)	M	850	16(4)	11	7	11	11	Good	40+	Ivy on tree. Broken branches in crown.	None	None	326.89	A1
39	<i>Quercus robur</i> (Common Oak)	M	650	16(4)	10	10	10	5	Good	40+	Ivy on tree. Broken branches in crown.	None	None	191.16	A1
1	<i>Prunus laurocerasus</i> (Cherry Laurel)	Y	50	3(0.5)	1	1	1	1	Fair	10+	None	None	None	1.13	C3
40	<i>Prunus avium</i> (Wild Cherry)	M	250	9(2)	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	Good	20+	None	Off site.	None	28.28	B1
41	<i>Quercus robur</i> (Common Oak)	M	360	12(3.5)	5	5	5	5	Good	40+	None	None	None	58.64	A1

Appendix 3 – Arboricultural Plans


Key




Trees
Showing Canopy extents, category
colour and tag number (with category).




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




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




Category C
Trees of low quality with an estimated
remaining life expectancy of at least 10
years, or young trees with a stem
diameter below 150 mm.



Category U
Trees in such a condition that they can
not realistically be retained as living
trees in the context of the current land
use for longer than 10 years.




BS 5837:2012 Root Protection Area



ROAVR Group, Marr House
Beechwood Business Park, Inverness, IV2 3BW
www.roavr-group.co.uk
support@roavr-group.co.uk
01463 667302

Drawing Title		Scale/Sheet		Date	
Tree Constraints Plan		1:250 @ A1		14/02/2025	
Client	Drawing No		Rev	Drawn By	Chkd By
Bob Ryan	25_5837_02_07		1	PH	MH
Site/Project		General Notes			
Hutts Farm Cottage, Blagrove lane RG41 4AX		Do not scale off drawing - refer to the tree data schedule for accurate crown spread measurements. Depictions of tree canopies are based on measurements taken to four cardinal compass points. No liability of any kind is accepted for any omissions or inaccuracies in respect of this plan. The original of this drawing was produced in colour; a monochrome copy should not be relied upon. All rights reserved.			



Trees
Showing Canopy extents, category
colour and tag number (with category).

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

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


Category C
Trees of low quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 10 years, or young trees with a stem diameter below 150 mm.

Category U
Trees in such a condition that they can not realistically be retained as living trees in the context of the current land use for longer than 10 years.

BS 5837:2012 Root Protection Area



Drawing Title		Scale/Sheet		Date	
Tree Assessment Plan		1:250 @ A1		28/07/2025	
Client	Drawing No	Rev	Drawn By	Checked By	
Bob Ryan	25_5837_02_07	2	PH	MH	
Site/Project		General Notes Do not scale off drawing - refer to the tree data schedule for accurate crown spread measurements. Depictions of tree canopies are based on measurements taken to four cardinal compass points. No liability of any kind is assumed for any omissions or inaccuracies in respect of this plan. The original of this drawing was produced in colour; a monochrome copy should not be relied upon. All rights reserved.			
Hutts Farm Cottage, Blagrove lane RG41 4AX					



Arboricultural method statement

Table Of Contents:

1. Method Statement [Introduction and Overview]
 2. Pre Construction Measures
 3. Fence Post Installation near T1 & T2
 4. Construction of New Access near T21
 5. Path Construction for Plot 3
 6. Foundation for Plot 1 Near T19
 7. General Site Management Measures
 8. Supervision & Monitoring
 9. Post-Construction Landscaping
 10. Limitations
- Appendix 1 – Tree Protection Plan

Validation Statement for the Local Planning Authority.

This report includes the following for LPA validation purposes:

- An **arboricultural method statement** which specifies tree protection measures and implementation strategy
- **Appendices** including the **tree protection plan**

1. Method Statement [Introduction and Overview]

This Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) outlines the measures to be implemented before and during development to ensure retained trees are protected, in accordance with BS5837:2012. It supports the findings of the Arboricultural Impact Assessment (ROAVR, July 2025)

2. Pre Construction Measures

2.1. Protective fencing will be installed around the Root Protection Areas (RPAs) of all retained trees and groups prior to any site activity, including demolition, delivery of materials or groundworks.

- Fencing shall be specified as per Figure 2 of BS5837:2012 (weldmesh panels on a scaffold frame).
- Fencing shall remain in place and be intact for the full duration of the works.
- The fenced area is to be treated as a Construction Exclusion Zone (CEZ). No access, storage, or ground disturbance is permitted within the CEZ.

Figure 2 - Default specification for protective barrier




Image plates showing tree protection fencing and signage.




Image plate showing tree protective plywood boxes

2.2. Ground Protection and Access

Where access within the RPA is unavoidable temporary ground protection shall be installed:

- Ground protection must be capable of supporting construction traffic without deformation.
- It should comprise a three-layer system: a geotextile membrane, a compressible layer (e.g. woodchip), and track matting or ground reinforcement panels.



Image plate showing synthetic ground protection boards

3. Fence Post Installation near T1 & T2

- Fence passes through RPAs of two high-quality oaks.
- All post positions:
 - Must be manually probed to 600 mm
 - Must be excavated by hand or airspade
 - Must be adaptable on-site to avoid significant roots
- Arboricultural supervision is mandatory throughout this task.

4. Construction of New Access near T21

- T21 is off-site; however, its RPA is marginally affected.
- The base of the tree sits approx. 0.5 m above Belgrove Lane, separated by tarmac.
- Excavations for the access must:
 - Be carried out by hand under supervision
 - Avoid severing roots >25 mm
 - Roots <25 mm may be cleanly pruned by the arborist
- Surfacing must be constructed using:
 - A no-dig method
 - Permeable specification
 - A cellular confinement system (e.g. Cellweb) over a geotextile membrane

5. Path Construction for Plot 3

- Encroaches into RPA of T23 (Hazel, C1)
- Construct using:
 - A no-dig method
 - Permeable materials such as gravel or resin-bound gravel
 - Base laid on geotextile membrane; no compaction of underlying soil

6. Foundation for Plot 1 Near T19

- Minor clipping of RPA edge
- No significant rooting anticipated
- Conventional strip foundation acceptable
- One-off arboricultural inspection at the time of excavation

7. General Site Management Measures

- No materials, plant, spoil or machinery to be stored or moved within RPAs.
- No discharge of cement washings, fuel or other chemicals within RPAs.
- Any works requiring access within the RPA must be agreed in advance with the project arborist.

8. Supervision & Monitoring

Visit No.	Timing	Purpose of Visit	Trees/Features Involved	Action / Outcome
1	<i>Prior to commencement of any site activity</i>	<i>Install and inspect tree protection fencing and signage</i>	<i>All retained trees</i>	<i>Fencing locations checked and signed off. Adjustments if needed.</i>
2	<i>During boundary fence post hole installation</i>	<i>Supervise manual probing and excavation of post holes</i>	<i>T1, T2</i>	<i>Confirm root presence; adjust post positions as required</i>
3	<i>During excavation of new access through RPA</i>	<i>Supervise hand-digging of access and inspect for root presence</i>	<i>T21</i>	<i>Manage exposed roots. Approve installation of Cellweb system</i>
4	<i>During installation of Plot 3 footpath</i>	<i>Inspect and monitor no-dig, permeable path construction</i>	<i>T23</i>	<i>Confirm correct materials and installation method</i>
5	<i>During foundation excavation near T19</i>	<i>One-off inspection of strip foundation trench along eastern edge</i>	<i>T19</i>	<i>Confirm no significant roots exposed; approve continuation</i>

9. Post-Construction Landscaping

- No soil level changes within RPAs without arborist advice.
- Where replanting is proposed to compensate for the loss of T22 and H1, native species should be used.

10. Limitations

- 10.1 ROAVR has prepared this Report for the sole use of the above named Client/Agent in accordance with our terms of business, under which our services were performed. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this Report or any other services provided by us.
- 10.2 This Report may not be relied upon by any other party without the prior and express written agreement of ROAVR. The assessments made assume that the land use will continue for their current purpose without significant change. ROAVR has not independently verified information obtained from third parties.
- 10.3 This report, video walkthrough, data tables and raw data remain the copyright of ROAVR until such time as any monies owed are settled in full and the report may be withdrawn at any time.
- 10.4 This report, site visit, plans and conclusions are proportional to the proposals and in some cases a simple plan based impact assessment may be all that is required.
- 10.5 Important - to ensure fair allocation of resources, we allow you ten working days to review the report and issue any feedback, beyond that changes are chargeable.
- 10.6 For references and further information regarding tree survey process visit: <https://www.roavr-group.co.uk/roavr-group/survey/sp-3-arboriculture/>

Should you require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact us at any time.

Mr. Alexander Barnes, BSc Arb, MArborA
Consultant Arborist

Alexander Barnes



ROAVR | GROUP

Prepared by: Alexander Barnes
Checked by: Peter Haine

Appendix 1 – Tree Protection Plan

T1-B



Hutts Farm Cottage,
Blagrove lane RG41 4AX

	General Notes
--	---------------

--	--	--

General Notes
Do not scale off drawing - refer to the tree data schedule for accurate crown spread measurements.
Depictions of tree canopies are based on measurements taken to four cardinal compass points.
No liability of any kind is accepted for any omissions or inaccuracies in respect of this plan.
The original of this drawing was produced in colour; a monochrome copy should not be relied upon.
All rights reserved.

