



ARBORICULTURAL PLANNING CONSULTANTS

THE OLD POST OFFICE
DORKING ROAD
TADWORTH
SURREY KT20 5SA

Tel: (01737) 813058
E-mail: sja@sjatrees.co.uk

Directors: Simon R. M. Jones Dip. Arb. (RFS), FArborA,
RCArborA. (Managing)
Frank P. S. Spooner BSc (Hons), MArborA, TechCert
(ArborA), RCArborA. (Operations)

Arboricultural Implications Report
Reserved Matters Application
Linear Park Phase 3A
Arborfield Green
Berkshire

and

Compliance with Conditions nos. 15 and 17 of
Outline Permission O/2014/2280

August 2024

Ref. SJA air 25301-01

SUMMARY

S1. On the basis of our assessment, we conclude that the arboricultural impact of this scheme is of negligible magnitude, as defined according to the categories set out in **Table 1** of this report.

S2. Our assessment of the impacts of the proposals on the existing trees concludes that no ancient, veteran, notable or mature trees, no category 'A' or 'B' trees, and no trees of high landscape or biodiversity value are to be removed. None of the trees on site that make an important or significant contribution to the character of the local landscape are to be removed. The proposed removal of an 8m section of the hawthorn group (G65) will represent no alteration to the main arboricultural features of the site, or to the overall arboricultural character of the site and will not have an adverse impact on the arboricultural character and appearance of the local landscape.

S3. As the existing trees are located no closer than 3m to the proposed structures (attenuation basin, sub-station or roads), there will be adequate working space for construction close to trees, and a reasonable margin of clearance for future growth.

S4. The incursions into the Root Protection Area of the English oak no. 939 to be retained is minor, and subject to implementation of the measures recommended on the Tree Protection Plan and set out at **Appendix 1**, no significant or long-term damage will occur to the oak, or the other retained trees, root systems or rooting environments.

S5. There are no ancient or veteran trees on or near this site and no trees identified as such or as locally notable on the WDVTA website. Therefore, condition 17 is deemed to have been satisfied without the need for a separate submission.

S6. As the scheme protects and retains existing trees and hedges wherever reasonably practicable, only proposes the removal of a small section of hawthorn that would not have a significant deleterious impact on the local landscape, incorporates high quality planting throughout the site and would not result in the loss or fragmentation of green infrastructure, it complies with Policy CC03 of the Wokingham Borough Managing Development Delivery Document (MDD).

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION	4
2. PLANNING CONTEXT	8
3. THE TREES	15
4. TREES TO BE REMOVED	18
5. TREES TO BE PRUNED	20
6. ROOT PROTECTION AREA INCURSIONS.....	21
7. CONCLUSIONS.....	23

APPENDICES

- 1. Methodology**
- 2. Outline arboricultural method statement**
- 3. Tree survey schedule (SJA tss 25301-01)**
- 4. Tree protection plan (SJA TPP 25301-041)**

© Simon Jones Associates Ltd. 2025

All rights in this document are reserved. No part of it may be amended or altered, reproduced or transmitted, in any form or by any means, or stored in any retrieval system of any nature, without our written permission. Its content and format are for the exclusive use of Crest Nicholson Chiltern in dealing with this site. It may not be sold, lent, hired out or divulged to any third party not directly involved with this site without the written consent of Simon Jones Associates Ltd. However, it may be reproduced, without amendment, by the Local Planning Authority (LPA), and be posted on the LPA website, to assist in consideration of an application for the proposed development referred to in Section 1.

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1.1. Instructions

1.1.1. SJAtrees has been instructed by Crest Nicholson to visit Linear Park, Phase 3A, Arborfield Green, and to survey the trees growing on or immediately adjacent to this site.

1.1.2. We are further asked to identify which trees are worthy of retention within a proposed development of the site; to assess the implications of the development proposals on these specimens, and to advise how they should be protected from unacceptable damage during construction.

1.2. Scope of report

1.2.1. This report and its appendices reflect the scope of our instructions, as set out above. Its principal purpose is to accompany a reserved matters application for the Linear Park, Phase 3A, relating to the outline planning permission (Ref: O/2014/2208) to be submitted to Wokingham Borough Council (“the LPA”). It is also intended that this report will comply with Conditions 15 and 17 of the outline planning permission, thus enabling their simultaneous discharge with the reserved matters decision (as it is a pre-commencement condition, the discharge of Condition 16 will be dealt with in a separate and subsequent application). This report also complies with local validation requirements.

1.2.2. This report complies also with the recommendations of British Standard BS 5837:2012, *Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations* (‘BS5837’). However, the British Standard is not a Code of Practice that consists of written rules outlining how actions or decision must be taken and it ‘should not be quoted as if it were a specification¹’; it is a set of recommendations intended to ‘assist decision-making with regard to existing and proposed trees in the

¹ British Standard BS 5837:2012. *Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations*; Foreword. *The British Standards Institution*.

context of design, demolition and construction². It does not form part of planning policy; but it is a material consideration to which weight is likely to be given.

1.2.3. The proposed development comprises the Application for approval of Reserved Matters pursuant to Outline Planning Consent O/2014/2280 dated 02/04/2015.

1.2.4. This report summarises and sets out the main conclusions of the baseline data collected during the tree survey and identifies those trees or groups of trees whose removal could result in a significant adverse impact on the character or appearance of the local area (Section 3). It then details and assesses the impacts of the proposed development on individual trees and groups of trees, including those to be removed (Section 4), those to be pruned (Section 5) and those which might incur root damage that might threaten their viability (Section 6). A summary and conclusions, with regard to local planning policy, are presented in Section 7.

1.3. Site inspection

1.3.1. An original site wide tree inspection was undertaken by SJAtrees between January and April 2014. Weather conditions ranged from clear, dry and bright to overcast with heavy rain. In January to March deciduous trees were not in leaf but in April deciduous trees were in partial leaf.

1.3.2. A further inspection was carried out by Richard Mulholland on Tuesday the 24th June 2025. Weather conditions at this time were clear, dry and bright. Deciduous trees were in leaf.

1.4. Site description

1.4.1. The site is located in the central green corridor that divides the wider northern and southern portions of Arborfield Green, between the residential development area of Parcel N (still to come forward) and Bohunt School and Arborfield Green Leisure Centre to the south, as shown in **Figure 1** below.

² *Ibid.*, p.1, Introduction.



Figure 1: Site location shown on Google aerial image

1.4.2. The site is approximately 0.55ha in size, and is currently comprised of grassed open space with a row of trees along the southern boundary.

1.5. Soil type

1.5.1. The British Geological Survey Solid and Drift Geology map of the area indicates the site lies on London Clay. This suggests that the soil is likely to be susceptible to compaction.

1.6. Statutory controls

1.6.1. There are a total of 23 Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) made by Wokingham Borough Council in force across the garrison site and surrounding areas. Six of these were made in 2014 and one in February 2015, the seven newer TPOs (those made in 2014 and 2015) were confirmed in May 2015.

1.6.2. Of the trees that are relevant to this application, seven are covered by one of those TPOs; that being TPO no. 1480 or 2014. The trees protected by TPOs are identified within our tree survey schedule at **Appendix 2** and on the accompanying tree protection plan (depicted with dark blue TPO reference numbers and outlines

where more than one tree is protected).

1.6.3. The site is not within a conservation area.

2. PLANNING CONTEXT

2.1. Planning policy - national

2.1.1. Under Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, local authorities have a statutory duty to consider the protection and planting of trees when considering planning applications. The effects of proposed development on trees are therefore a material consideration, and this is normally reflected in local planning policies.

2.1.2. The National Planning Policy Framework ('NPPF')³ sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these should be applied in both plan and decision-making. Paragraph 2 makes it clear that the NPPF is itself a material consideration in the determination of planning application. Paragraph 11 states that **"Plans and decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development."**

2.1.3. In paragraph 135, within Section 12 "Achieving well-designed places" the NPPF states: **"Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:**

- a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;**
- b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;**
- c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);**
- d) establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit;**

³ The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (December 2024). Department for Levelling Up, Housing & Communities

e) optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development (including green and other public space) and support local facilities and transport networks; and

f) create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.”

2.1.4. Paragraph 136 in this section states: **“Trees make an important contribution to the character and quality of urban environments, and can also help mitigate and adapt to climate change. Planning policies and decisions should ensure that new streets are tree-lined, that opportunities are taken to incorporate trees elsewhere in developments (such as parks and community orchards), that appropriate measures are in place to secure the long-term maintenance of newly-planted trees, and that existing trees are retained wherever possible. Applicants and local planning authorities should work with highways officers and tree officers to ensure that the right trees are planted in the right places, and solutions are found that are compatible with highways standards and the needs of different users.”**

2.1.5. The section titled **“Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change”** states at paragraph 162: **“Plans should take a proactive approach to mitigating and adapting to climate change, taking into account the long-term implications for flood risk, coastal change, water supply, biodiversity and landscapes, and the risk of overheating and drought from rising temperatures . Policies should support appropriate measures to ensure the future health and resilience of communities and infrastructure to climate change impacts, such as providing space for physical protection measures, or making provision for the possible future relocation of vulnerable development and infrastructure.”**

2.1.6. In paragraph 187, within Section 15 **“Conserving and enhancing the natural environment”** the NPPF states: **“Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:**

a) protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan);

b) recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider

benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland;

[...] d) minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures and incorporating features which support priority or threatened species such as swifts, bats and hedgehogs;

e) preventing new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability. Development should, wherever possible, help to improve local environmental conditions such as air and water quality, taking into account relevant information such as river basin management plans; [...]

2.1.7. In paragraph 193, under the ‘Habitats and biodiversity’ section, the NPPF states: **“When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should apply the following principles:**

c) development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists....”

2.2. Planning policy- local

2.2.1. The tree related conditions associated with the outline planning permission (Ref: O/2014//2208) refer to Policies CP1, CP3 and CP7 of the Wokingham Borough Core Strategy Development Plan document (adopted – 29 January 2010); Policies CC03 and TB21 of the Managing Development Delivery Local Plan and refers to the Arborfield Strategic Development Location Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) adopted in 2011.

2.2.2. Core Strategy **Policy CP1 – Sustainable Development** and **CP3 – General Principles for development** contain no specific references to trees but are the basis upon which more detailed policies have been developed. However, core principles within these policies do refer to the protection and enhancement of the environment, landscape features and the support of flora and fauna.

2.2.3. Core Strategy Policy CP7 – Biodiversity states:

“Sites designated as of importance for nature conservation at an international or national level will be conserved and enhanced and inappropriate development will be resisted. The degree of protection given will be appropriate to the status of the site in terms of its international or national importance.

Development:

A) Which may harm county designated sites (Local Wildlife Sites in Berkshire), whether directly or indirectly, or

B) Which may harm habitats or, species of principle importance in England for nature conservation, veteran trees or features of the landscape that are of major importance for wild flora and fauna (including wildlife and river corridors), whether directly or indirectly, or

C) That compromises the implementation of the national, regional, county and local biodiversity action plans will be only permitted if it has been clearly demonstrated that the need for the proposal outweighs the need to safeguard the nature conservation importance, that no alternative site that would result in less or no harm is available which will meet the need, and:

i) Mitigation measures can be put in place to prevent damaging impacts;

or

ii) Appropriate compensation measures to offset the scale and kind of losses are provided.”

2.2.4. Policy CC03 – Green Infrastructure, Trees and Landscaping of the Local Plan includes the following section that is relevant to existing trees:

“2. Development proposals should demonstrate how they have considered and achieved the following criteria within scheme proposals:

a) Provide new or protect and enhance the Borough’s Green Infrastructure networks, including the need to mitigate potential impacts of new development

b) Promote accessibility, linkages and permeability between and within existing green corridors including public rights of way such as footpaths, cycleways and bridleways

c) Promote the integration of the scheme with any adjoining public open space or

countryside

d) Protect and retain existing trees, hedges and other landscape features

e) Incorporate high quality, ideally, native planting and landscaping as an integral part of the scheme.

3. Development proposals which would result in the loss, fragmentation or isolation of areas of green infrastructure will not be acceptable.”

2.2.5. Policy TB21 - Landscape Character of the Local Plan, which is relevant to trees and woodlands that contribute to the landscape, states:

“1. Proposals must demonstrate how they have addressed the requirements of the Council’s Landscape Character Assessment, including the landscape quality; landscape strategy; landscape sensitivity and key issues.

2. Proposals shall retain or enhance the condition, character and features that contribute to the landscape.”

2.2.6. The Wokingham Borough Council supplementary planning document (SPD) ‘Arborfield Garrison Strategic Development Location’ (October 2012) states at 2.2.1. “The main physical constraints affecting the SDL have been identified as: pockets of mature woodland, trees and hedgerows, including formal avenues of trees on parts of the Garrison and green corridors along watercourses and drainage ditches, which would need to be incorporated into the overall landscape strategy for the SDL”.

2.2.7. The SPD continues at 2.4.10: “The SPDs have been created with a view to retaining the best of the established trees and open spaces as well as preserving protected wildlife and their habitats. Additional protection will be afforded by use of Tree Preservation Orders and use of planning conditions”; and then at 3.1.2.: “Set within an attractive landscape, Arborfield Garrison’s large scale mature trees, watercourses and historic buildings provide an important context for a distinct settlement which draws its character references from these natural and well established features, the retention of which are important.”

2.2.8. At Design Principle 1a(i) the SPD states: “The landscape framework should seek to integrate and afford importance to all existing landscape features, including the local topography, hedgerows, the existing tree pattern including avenues of trees associated with the Garrison (such as the distinctive horse chestnuts adjoining Nuffield

Road and the remnant avenues of oak around West Court), watercourses (including that bisecting the SDL broadly from east to north west feeding into the existing balancing lake in the north eastern part of the SDL adjoining Biggs Lane, and that which runs from the centre of the SDL southwards), ponds, wetland areas, grassland, footpaths and bridleways. A detailed tree survey should be undertaken to inform the applicant's masterplanning exercise."

2.3. Neighbourhood policy context

2.3.1. This site is covered by the Arborfield and Barkham Neighbourhood Plan. Whilst there are several references to trees in that document there are no specific policies relating to trees.

2.4. Planning History

2.4.1. The outline planning application (Ref: O/2014/2280) for Arborfield Garrison was granted approval by the LPA in April 2015. The decision notice for the outline planning permission contains a comprehensive set of conditions. This report and its appendices has been written with a view to complying with and discharging condition numbers 15, 16 and 17. All other pre-commencement conditions and those conditions that must be discharged prior to submission of the first RM application have been dealt with by the applicants. We have been involved throughout that process.

2.4.2. Condition No. 15 states:

"The reserved matters for each phase of the development shall include an updated Arboricultural Implications Assessment for that area. The Assessment will inform the Arboricultural Method Statement for Works and the landscaping scheme for that area."

2.4.3. Condition No. 16 states:

"i. No development or other operation shall commence within each phase until a scheme which provides for the retention and protection of trees, shrubs and hedges growing on or adjacent that phase in accordance with BS5837: 2012 has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority (the Approved Scheme); the tree protection measures approved shall be implemented in complete accordance with the Approved Scheme for the duration of the development of that phase including, (unless otherwise provided by the Approved Scheme) demolition, all

site preparation work, tree felling, tree pruning, demolition works, soil moving, temporary access construction and or widening or any other operation involving use of motorised vehicles or construction machinery.

ii. No development in any phase (including any tree felling, tree pruning, demolition works, soil moving, temporary access construction and or widening or any other operation involving use of motorised vehicles or construction machinery) shall commence until the local planning authority has been provided (by way of a written notice) with a period of no less than 7 working days to inspect the implementation of the measures identified in the Approved Scheme on-site.

iii. No excavations for services, storage of material or machinery, parking of vehicles, deposit or excavation of soil or rubble, lighting of fires or disposal of liquids shall take place within an area designated as being fenced off or otherwise protected in the approved scheme.

iv. The fencing or other works which are part of the approved scheme shall not be moved or removed, temporarily or otherwise, until all works including external works in the phase have been completed and all equipment, machinery and surplus materials removed from the phase, unless the prior approval of the Local Planning Authority has first been sought and obtained.”

2.4.4. Condition No. 17 States:

“The reserved matters applications for each phase of the development shall include a detailed veteran and aged tree mitigation strategy. Each detailed veteran and aged tree mitigation strategy shall include the following:

a. Veteran and aged tree buffer zone of sufficient size to allow for the long-term retention of the trees. These buffer zones should have a radius of not less than 15 x the DBH and should not include formal POS or areas of private garden other than in exceptional circumstances.

b. Individual veteran and aged tree management plans including details of all the tree works that are required to maintain the trees ecological value.

The management plans should cover a period of 10 years from the commencement of development of that phase. The mitigation strategy shall be implemented in accordance with the approved plan unless otherwise approved in writing by the local planning authority.”

3. THE TREES

3.1. Survey findings

3.1.1. We surveyed 13 individual trees and one group of trees growing within or adjacent to the site. Their details can be found in the tree survey schedule at **Appendix 2**.

3.1.2. The trees within and adjacent to the site are all broadleaves with a range of species and age classes. The most numerous species on the site is English oak that account for nearly 50% of the local tree population. The oak are the dominant species of the immediate locality with numerous large, mature specimens that form significant landscape features.

3.2. Irreplaceable habitat: ancient woodland

3.2.1. There are no woodlands within or abutting the site that are classified as 'Ancient'. Ancient woodland is defined as "any area that's been wooded continuously since at least 1600 AD" and is considered an important and irreplaceable habitat.

3.3. Irreplaceable habitat: ancient or veteran trees

3.3.1. There are no trees within or abutting the site that can be classified as 'Ancient' or 'Veteran'. Ancient and veteran trees are also considered to be irreplaceable habitats, and contribute to a site's biodiversity, cultural and heritage value, and the National Planning Policy Framework (see below) states that development resulting in the loss or deterioration of ancient or veteran trees should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists.

3.4. Trees that contribute to the character of the local landscape

3.4.1. The main arboricultural features within or adjacent to the site, whose removal we consider would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the local landscape, on amenity or on biodiversity, are as follows:

- the significant components (English oaks nos. 939, 947 and 949) of the row of trees along the south boundary of the site; and

- the established trees and tree belts to the north and north-east of site.

3.5. Other trees

3.5.1. Three individual trees (nos. 943, 945 and 948) are unsuitable for retention, irrespective of the proposals, in that they are 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. However, as can be seen below, these trees are not shown to be removed as part of the proposals. These trees have been assessed as category 'U' and are indicated on the accompanying tree protection plan by **bracketed red** numbers.

3.5.2. There are no category 'A' trees on or adjacent to the site. Four trees have been assessed as category 'B', and the remaining are assessed as category 'C' trees specimens.

3.5.3. The group of hawthorn trees has been assessed as category 'C'.

3.6. Assessment of arboricultural impacts

3.6.1. The arboricultural impacts of the proposed drainage and civils layouts by Woods Hardwick, drawing no. 19632-ARB-100-014 Rev B, have been assessed by overlaying this onto the TCP and are discussed in the following sections of this report and are shown on the tree protection plan (TPP) presented at **Appendix 4**.

3.6.2. The TPP identifies where trees are to be removed to accommodate the proposed development, because they are situated within the footprints of proposed structures or surfaces, or because in our judgment they are too close to these structures or surfaces to enable them to be retained. These are shown by means of **red outlines** on the TPP.

3.6.3. The TPP also shows how trees to be retained will be protected from damage during construction, and the measures identified are set out and described in the outline arboricultural method statement at **Appendix 2** of this report. The implementation of, and adherence to, these measures can readily be secured by the imposition of appropriate planning conditions.

3.6.4. Details of the impacts identified within these categories, and our assessment

of their respective significance, are analysed in Sections 4 to 6 below.

3.6.5. Based on these findings, we have assessed the magnitude of the overall arboricultural impact of the proposals according to the categories defined in **Table 1** below.

Impact	Description
High	Total loss of or major alteration to main elements/ features/ characteristics of the baseline, post-development situation fundamentally different
Medium	Partial loss of or alteration to main elements/ features/ characteristics of the baseline, post-development situation will be partially changed
Low	Minor loss of or alteration to main elements/ features/ characteristics of the baseline, post-development changes will be discernible but the underlying situation will remain similar to the baseline
Negligible	Very minor loss of or alteration to main elements/ features/ characteristics of the baseline, post-development changes will be barely discernible, approximating to the 'no change' situation

Table 1: Magnitude of impacts⁴

⁴ Determination of magnitude based on DETR (2000) Guidance on the Methodology for Multi-Modal Studies, as modified and extended.

4. TREES TO BE REMOVED

4.1. Details

4.1.1. To accommodate the proposed development, as shown on the proposed layout plan, an 8m section of the hawthorn group (G65) is to be removed to accommodate the attenuation basin (C72) outfall to the existing ditch.

4.2. Assessment

4.2.1. As there are no ancient or veteran trees on site, none will be removed.

4.2.2. All those trees that make a significant contribution to the character and appearance of the local landscape, to amenity or to biodiversity (see paragraph 3.2.1), will be retained.

4.2.3. None of the trees to be removed are mature specimens of species of large ultimate size: all the trees to be cleared are young, semi-mature or of small ultimate size. The significance of this is threefold. Firstly, for obvious reasons mature trees tend to be larger in size and therefore are likely to be more visible and to make a greater contribution to the landscape. Secondly, mature trees are more likely to have formed associations with wildlife and to support other flora or fauna (for example, young trees infrequently contain splits, cracks or cavities that might provide roosting sites for bats); and thirdly, mature trees have a significantly greater capacity than smaller trees to actively sequester and store carbon⁵. Accordingly, the removal of no large mature trees on or adjacent to the site minimises the impacts on the benefits that mature trees provide in relation to smaller ones.

4.2.4. The hawthorn group is comprised of small individuals (5m tall with trunk diameters no greater than 250mm) that are ivy-covered and of low arboricultural quality. The group is assessed as category 'C', the removal of an 8m section of the hawthorns will be mitigated through the retention of the remaining 80% of the group,

⁵ Stephenson N. L., Das A. J., Zavala M. A. (2014) Rate of tree carbon accumulation increases continuously with tree size. *Nature*, volume 507.

and through the proposed soft landscaping plans. For these reasons, their removal will have no significant impact on the character or appearance of the area.

4.2.5. In the light of these considerations, and taking account of the numbers, sizes and locations of the trees to be retained, including those that are off-site, the felling of an 8m section of the hawthorn group (G65) will represent no alteration to the main arboricultural features of the site.

5. TREES TO BE PRUNED

5.1. Details

5.1.1. None of the trees to be retained are to be pruned to facilitate implementation of the proposals.

5.2. Assessment

5.2.1. As the existing trees are located no closer than 3m to the proposed structures (attenuation basin, sub-station or roads), there will be adequate working space for construction close to trees, and a reasonable margin of clearance for future growth.

6. ROOT PROTECTION AREA INCURSIONS

6.1. Details

6.1.1. To ascertain whether the proposals will cause any significant harm to the roots or the rooting environments of the trees to be retained, we have calculated appropriate root protection areas ('RPAs') for these specimens, based as a minimum on the methodology set out in section 4.6 of BS5837. The RPA is defined in this document as a **"layout design tool indicating the minimum area around a tree deemed to contain sufficient roots and rooting volume to maintain the tree's viability; and where the protection of the roots and soil structure is treated as a priority"**.⁶

6.1.2. Consequently, a tree within the RPA of which no disturbance will occur can be regarded as one that will not suffer any significant or long-lasting harm because of the proposals and will therefore remain 'viable'. However, as the Standard makes clear⁷, some disturbance within its RPA does not mean that a tree will necessarily suffer significant harm or cease to be viable; this will depend on several factors, including the extent and nature of the disturbance; the age, species and physiological condition of the tree; the morphology, disposition and depth of the roots; the type and structure of the soil; and the extent of mitigation measures undertaken. Accordingly, an assessment of these criteria may mean that an RPA incursion can be justified.

6.1.3. The south eastern berm around the attenuation basin (C72) encroaches into the RPA of the English oak no. 939, equating to an incursion of 21.8m² or 2.9% of the tree's RPA.

6.2. Assessment

6.2.1. The incursions into the RPA of the oak is by a berm, and taking account of the proposed and existing ground levels, the berm can be installed above soil level,

⁶ British Standard BS 5837:2012. Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations; para. 3.7.

⁷ Ibid., para 5.3.1.

thereby, avoiding the need to excavation into the soil that could result in root severance or damage within the RPA.

6.2.2. The soil mounding will be imported and deposited onto the area by a machine/plan situated to the north, outside of the RPA and the construction exclusion zone, this will prevent any excavation and soil compaction of the specimen's rooting environment.

6.2.3. The deposited material will be comprised of large angular aggregate that will have sufficient permeability and porosity to allow the flow of air and water to the soil beneath.

6.2.4. The area of soil mounting extends to no more than 2.9% of the oak's RPA and does not exceed the 20% maximum incursion into currently unsurfaced ground recommended in BS 5837⁸. The specimen displays average physiological health, so whilst the oak is an established mature tree, its physiological health, species tolerance of root disturbance, the proposed mitigation measures and small area impacted, indicate that there is no reason that the specimen will not readily tolerate the incursion into its RPA.

6.2.5. Implementation of measures to prevent other incursions into the RPAs of retained trees and to protect them during construction can be assured by the erection of appropriate protective fencing, as shown on the TPP at **Appendix 4**.

6.2.6. Accordingly, subject to implementation of the above measures, and considering the ages, current physiological condition and tolerance of disturbance of these retained trees, no significant or long-term damage to their root systems or environments will occur as a result of the proposed development.

⁸ BS 5837, paragraph 7.4.2.3.

7. CONCLUSIONS

7.1. Summary

7.1.1. Our assessment of the impacts of the proposals on the existing trees concludes that no ancient, veteran, notable or mature trees, no category 'A' or 'B' trees, and no trees of high landscape or biodiversity value are to be removed. None of the trees on site that make an important or significant contribution to the character of the local landscape are to be removed. The proposed removal of an 8m section of the hawthorn group (G65) will represent no alteration to the main arboricultural features of the site, or to the overall arboricultural character of the site and will not have an adverse impact on the arboricultural character and appearance of the local landscape.

7.1.2. As the existing trees are located no closer than 3m to the proposed structures (attenuation basin, sub-station or roads), there will be adequate working space for construction close to trees, and a reasonable margin of clearance for future growth.

7.1.3. The incursions into the Root Protection Area of the English oak no. 939 to be retained is minor, and subject to implementation of the measures recommended on the Tree Protection Plan and set out at **Appendix 1**, no significant or long-term damage will occur to the oak, or the other retained trees, root systems or rooting environments.

7.2. Compliance with national planning policy

7.2.1. As the proposals will retain all the trees that make an important or significant contribution to the character of the local landscape site, its arboricultural attractiveness, history and landscape character and setting will be maintained, thereby complying with Paragraph 135 (c) of the National Planning Policy Framework.

7.2.2. Whilst some trees are to be removed, there is no duty in planning policy to retain all existing trees in all circumstances. Paragraph 136 of the NPPF states (*italics added for emphasis*): “**Planning policies and decisions should ensure... that existing trees are retained *wherever possible***”; and thereby recognises circumstances in which

it might not be possible to retain every tree. Accordingly, the proposed removal of trees does not mean that this application must thereby be refused; and does not mean it conflicts with this paragraph of the NPPF.

7.2.3. The proposals do not necessitate the removal of any mature trees of large ultimate size, which make the greatest contribution to carbon sequestration and storage, surface water run-off, biodiversity and landscape and air temperature and cleanliness; for all of which, appropriate space for their retention is provided. Accordingly, insofar as this relates to existing trees, the scheme can be seen to have taken a proactive approach to mitigating climate change and thereby complies with Paragraph 162 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

7.2.4. As the proposals will not result in the loss or deterioration of any ancient woodland or any ancient or veteran trees, they comply with paragraph 193 (c) of the NPPF.

7.3. Compliance with local planning policy

7.3.1. As there are no ancient or veteran trees on or near this site, as the 18 trees that are categorised as locally notable (as they are recorded on the WDVTA website) will not sustain significant or long-term harm and because the trees which play an important role in the wildlife corridors (the linear park, the northern corridor and the interlinking spines) will be retained and protected, the proposals comply with **Policy CP7** of the Wokingham Borough Council Core Strategy.

7.3.2. As the scheme protects and retains existing trees and hedges wherever reasonably practicable, only proposes the removal of a small section of hawthorn that would not have a significant deleterious impact on the local landscape, incorporates high quality planting throughout the site and would not result in the loss or fragmentation of green infrastructure, it complies with Policy **CC03** of the Wokingham Borough Managing Development Delivery Document (MDD).

7.3.3. As the proposals retain and enhance existing landscape features in respect of trees, they also comply with **Policy TB21** of the MDD.

7.3.4. Our detailed tree survey has informed the detailed design and layout of this site. The proposals have incorporated the mature trees and trees lining green

corridors. The main arboricultural features have been identified and are all to be retained. Therefore, this reserved matters application is also in accordance with the 'Arborfield Garrison Strategic Development Location SPD'.

7.3.5. This report is to be read in conjunction with the survey schedule and tree protection plan (**Appendices 3 and 4**). Together these documents form a detailed arboricultural assessment and set out the impacts of the scheme in terms of tree removal, pruning and RPA incursions. This report sets out how retained trees will be protected from harm during the development and the outline AMS at **Appendix 2**, adds further detail and specifications to these protection measures. Therefore, this report and accompanying TPP comply with Condition 15 of the outline planning permission (Ref: O/2014/2280).

7.3.6. Discharge of Condition 16 is not currently sought because further detail is needed for the exact location of various elements of infrastructure. Condition 16 will be discharged separately once this detail is known.

7.3.7. As there are no aged, veteran or ancient trees present on or near the site and the locally notable specimens have been afforded appropriate protection measures, and none of the veteran trees present on the wider site will be harmed by the proposals, this report and its appendices are sufficient to comply with Condition 17 of the outline planning permission.

7.4. Conclusion

7.4.1. On the basis of our assessment, we conclude that the arboricultural impact of this scheme is of negligible magnitude, as defined according to the categories set out in **Table 1** of this report.

APPENDIX 1

Methodology

A1.1. Tree survey and baseline information

A1.1.1. We surveyed individual trees with trunk diameters of 75mm and above⁹, trees with trunk diameters of 150mm and above growing in groups or woodlands, and shrub masses, hedges and hedgerows¹⁰ growing within or immediately adjacent to the site; and recorded their locations, species, dimensions, ages, condition, and visual importance in accordance with BS 5837 recommendations.

A1.1.2. The baseline information collected during the site survey was recorded on site using a hand-held digital device. This information was then imported into an Excel spreadsheet and used to produce the tree survey schedule at **Appendix 3**. The numbers assigned to the trees in the tree survey schedule correspond with those shown on the appended tree protection plan.

A1.1.3. We surveyed trees as groups where they have grown together to form cohesive arboricultural features, either aerodynamically (trees that provide companion shelter), visually (e.g., avenues or screens) or culturally¹¹. However, where it might be necessary to differentiate between specific trees within these groups, we also surveyed these individually.

A1.1.4. We inspected the trees from the ground only, aided by binoculars as appropriate, but did not climb them. We took no samples of wood, roots or fungi. We did not undertake a full hazard or risk assessment of the trees, and therefore can give no guarantee, either expressed or implied, of their safety or stability.

A1.1.5. Whilst we categorised the trees in accordance with BS 5837 (details of the criteria used for this process can be found in the notes that accompany the tree survey schedule), we assessed the trees' suitability for retention against national, regional and local planning policies. We applied this methodology in line with the NPPF's presumption in favour of sustainable development, giving greater weighting to the contribution of a tree to the character and appearance of the local landscape, to amenity, or to biodiversity, where its removal might have a significant adverse impact on these factors.

A1.2. Tree constraints

A1.2.1. In line with the NPPF's presumption in favour of sustainable development, we assessed whether any trees should be retained in the context of the proposed development. Our assessment of which trees might have to be retained, and which can be removed, is based on:

9 BS 5837, paragraph 4.2.4 b), recommends that all trees over 75mm stem diameter should be included in a pre-planning land and tree survey.

10 Ibid., 4.4.2.7

11 Ibid., 4.4.2.3

A1.2.2. whether any trees are classed as ‘ancient’ or ‘veteran’, and thereby are designated as ‘irreplaceable habitats’;¹²

A1.2.3. which trees contribute to local character and history, including to the surrounding landscape setting; which trees contribute to biodiversity; and which trees help mitigate and adapt to climate change; and whose removal would thereby be unlikely to comply with national planning policy guidance;

A1.2.4. which trees are important to the local landscape, such that their removal would be contrary to local planning policies:

A1.2.5. our assessment of the tree’s quality, value and remaining life expectancy, in accordance with BS5837:2012, as summarised in the notes that accompany the tree survey schedule; and

A1.2.6. the plans approved as part of the existing Outline planning permission.

A1.2.7. As trees growing outside the boundaries of the site are in the control of others, we have assumed they will be retained, irrespective of their size, age or condition.

A1.2.8. Whilst we have categorised trees in accordance with BS 5837, we have not used these categorisations as the main criterion of whether specimens might be removed or should be retained. Trees in categories ‘A’, ‘B’ and ‘C’ are all a material consideration in the development process; but the retention of category ‘C’ trees, being of low quality or of only limited or short-term potential, will not normally be considered necessary should they impose a significant constraint on development.

A1.2.9. Furthermore, BS 5837 makes it clear that young trees, even those of good form and vitality, which have the potential to develop into quality specimens when mature **“need not necessarily be a significant constraint on the site’s potential”**¹³.

A1.2.10. Moreover, BS 5837 states that **“.... care should be taken to avoid misplaced tree retention; attempts to retain too many or unsuitable trees on a site can result in excessive pressure on the trees during demolition or construction work, or post-completion demands for their removal”**¹⁴.

A1.2.11. The ‘Root Protection Areas’ (RPAs)¹⁵ of the trees identified for retention were calculated in accordance with Section 4.6 of BS 5837; and were assessed taking account of factors such as the likely tolerance of a tree to root disturbance or damage, the morphology and disposition of roots as influenced by existing site

¹² The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (December 2024). Paragraph 193 (c).

¹³ BS 5837, 4.5.10.

¹⁴ Ibid., 5.1.1.

¹⁵ Ibid., paragraph 3.7. “The minimum area around a retained tree “deemed to contain sufficient roots and rooting volume to maintain the tree’s viability, and where the protection of the roots and soil structure is treated as a priority.”

conditions (including the presence of existing roads or structures), as well as soil type, topography and drainage.

A1.2.12. The British Standard BS 5837 calculates RPAs based on a standard 12 times trunk diameter. However, in our experience the response of trees to root severance or damage is not standard and tends to be less effective in the case of large mature specimens of species with a known intolerance of disturbance. Accordingly, where considered appropriate, we have increased the RPAs of such specimens by calculating them based on an increased factor of trunk diameter.

A1.2.13. Based on these principles and recommendations, the tree survey and assessment of suitability for retention informed the production of a tree constraints plan (TCP) which indicates the most suitable trees for retention, and their associated below-ground and above-ground constraints.

A1.2.14. As a design tool, the TCP also indicates how close to those trees selected for retention the proposed development could be positioned, in terms of three key criteria:

- a). avoidance of unacceptable root damage; and
- b). avoidance of the necessity for unacceptable pruning works.

APPENDIX 2

Outline Arboricultural Method Statement

A2.1. Tree Protection Plan

A2.1.1. The TPP at Appendix 4 shows the general and specific provisions to be taken during construction of the proposed development, to ensure that no unacceptable damage is caused to the root systems, trunks or crowns of the trees identified for retention. These measures are indicated by coloured notations in areas where construction activities are to occur either within, or in proximity to, retained trees, as described in the relevant panels on the drawing.

A2.2. Pre-start meeting

A2.2.1. Prior to the commencement of any site clearance, ground preparation, or construction works the developer will convene a pre-start site meeting. This shall be attended by the developer's contract manager or site manager, , the fencing/boarding contractor, the groundwork contractor(s) and the arboricultural consultant. The LPA tree officer will be invited to attend. At that meeting contact numbers will be exchanged, and the methods of tree protection shall be fully discussed, so that all aspects of their implementation and sequencing are made clear to all parties. Any clarifications or modifications to the TPP required as a result of the meeting shall be circulated to all attendees.

A2.3. Site clearance

A2.3.1. No clearance of trees or other vegetation shall be undertaken until after the pre-start meeting and after the erection of the tree protection fencing (see below). If any vegetation clearance is required behind the line of the protection fencing this will be made clear at the pre-start meeting and arrangements will be made to do this prior to the fencing's erection, under the supervision of the arboricultural consultant, who will ensure it doesn't cause any soil compaction or damage to the roots of trees to be retained.

A2.3.2. Except where within the RPAs of trees to be retained, all trees and other vegetation to be removed may be cut down or grubbed out as appropriate; but within the RPAs of trees to be retained, trees and vegetation will be cut by hand to ground level and stumps will be either left in place or ground out with a lightweight self-powered stump grinding machine. No excavators, tractors or other vehicles will enter the RPAs.

A2.4. Ground preparation

A2.4.1. No ground preparation or excavation of any kind, including topsoil stripping or ground levelling, shall be undertaken until after the pre-start meeting and after the erection of the tree protection fencing (see below).

A2.5. Tree protection fencing

A2.5.1. Construction exclusion zones (CEZs) will be formed by erecting protective fencing around the RPAs of all on-site trees to the specification recommended in BS 5837, Section 6.2, prior to the commencement of construction. This will consist of a scaffold framework comprising a vertical and horizontal framework, well braced to resist impacts, with vertical tubes spaced at maximum intervals of 3.5m. Onto this,

welded mesh panels should be securely fixed with wire or scaffold clamps, as shown in **Figure 2** of that document. "**TREE PROTECTION ZONE - KEEP OUT**" or similar notices will be attached with cable ties to every third panel.

A2.5.2. The RPAs of the off-site trees will also be enforced by the erection of protective fencing to the same specification, prior to the commencement of construction, thereby safeguarding them from incursions by plant or machinery, storage and mixing of materials, or other construction-related activities which could have a detrimental effect on their root systems.

A2.5.3. The recommended positions of the protective fencing are shown by **bold blue lines** on the TPP. The precise positioning of the fencing around the trees will be considered in conjunction with any other protective hoarding/fencing which may be required around the site boundary.

A2.5.4. Within the CEZs safeguarded by the protective fencing, there will be no changes in ground levels, **no soil stripping**, and no plant, equipment, or materials will be stored. Oil, bitumen, diesel, and cement will not be stored or discharged within 10m of any trees. Areas for the storage or mixing of such materials will be agreed in advance and be clearly marked. No notice boards, or power or telephone cables, will be attached to any of the trees. No fires will be lit within 10m of any part of any tree.

A2.6. Proposed soil mounding within RPAs

A2.6.1. Unacceptable damage to the roots and rooting environments of the trees to be retained during the construction of proposed berm that encroach within RPA of English oak no. 939 will be avoided by being installed above existing soil level, to avoid digging and thus severing of roots; and an appropriate ground covering will be used beneath the aggregate, to prevent or minimise compaction of the soil. This will be done in accordance with Section 7.4 of BS 5837. The locations where these measures will be required are marked by red **cross-hatching** on the TPP.

APPENDIX 3

Tree Survey Schedule



ARBORICULTURAL PLANNING CONSULTANTS

THE OLD POST OFFICE
DORKING ROAD
TADWORTH
SURREY KT20 5SA

Tel: (01737) 813058
E-mail: sja@sjatrees.co.uk

Directors: Simon R. M. Jones Dip. Arb. (RFS), FArborA.,
RCArborA. (Managing)
Frank P. S. Spooner BSc (Hons), MArborA, TechCert (ArborA)
(Operations)

Preliminary Tree Survey Schedule

Linear Park Phase 3A, Arborfield Green

June 2025

SJA tss 25301-01

Tree Survey Schedule: Explanatory Notes

Linear Park Phase 3A, Arborfield Green

This schedule is based on a tree inspection undertaken by Rebecca Gawthorpe, Tom Wawman and Frank Spooner of SJATrees (the trading name of Simon Jones Associates between Friday the 10th January and Friday 25th April 2014. A site visit was then carried out by Rebecca Gawthorpe, Tom Wawman and Ben Jameson on the 24th and 25th July 2014. A further inspection was carried out by Richard Mulholland on Tuesday the 24th June 2025. Weather conditions at this time were clear, dry and bright. Deciduous trees were in leaf.

The information contained in this schedule covers only those trees that were examined, and reflects the condition of these specimens at the time of inspection. We did not have access to the trees from any adjacent properties; observations are thus confined to what was visible from within the site and from surrounding public areas.

The trees were inspected from the ground only and were not climbed, and no samples of wood, roots or fungi were taken. A full hazard or risk assessment of the trees was not undertaken, and therefore no guarantee, either expressed or implied, of their safety or stability can be given.

Trees are dynamic organisms and are subject to continual growth and change; therefore the dimensions and assessments presented in this schedule should not be relied upon in relation to any development of the site for more than twelve months from the survey date.

1. Tree no.

Given in sequential order, commencing at "804". Numbers correspond with numbering on topographical survey plan.

2. TPO no.

Number assigned to trees in the Wokingham Borough Council Tree Preservation Orders no. 1455/2012 and 1480/2014, as shown in the TPO schedule and plan.

3. Species.

'Common names' are given, taken from MITCHELL, A. (1978) A Field Guide to the Trees of Britain and Northern Europe.

4. Height.

Estimated with the aid of a hypsometer, given in metres.

5. Trunk diameter.

Trunk diameter measured at approx. 1.5m above ground level; or where the trunk forks into separate stems between ground level and 1.5m, measured at the narrowest point beneath the fork. Given in millimetres.

6. Radial crown spread.

The linear extent of branches from the base of the trunk to the main cardinal points, rounded up to the closest half metre, unless shown otherwise. For small trees with reasonably symmetrical crowns, a single averaged figure is quoted.

7. Crown break.

Height above ground and direction of growth of first significant

8. Crown clearance.

Distance from adjacent ground level to lowest part of lowest branch, in metres.

9. Age class.

Young: Seedling, sapling or recently planted tree; not yet producing flowers or seeds; strong apical dominance.

Semi-mature: Trunk often still smooth-barked; producing flowers and/or seeds; strong apical dominance, not yet achieved ultimate height.

Mature: Apical dominance lost, tree close to ultimate height.

Over-mature: Mature, but in decline, no crown retrenchment

Veteran: Mature, with a large trunk diameter for species; but showing signs of veteranisation, irrespective of actual age, with decay or hollowing, a crown showing retrenchment and a structure characteristic of the latter stages of life.

Ancient: Beyond typical age range and with a very large trunk diameter for species; with extensive decay or hollowing, a crown that has undergone retrenchment and a structure characteristic of the latter stages of life.

10. Physiology.

Health, condition and function of the tree, in comparison to a normal specimen of its species and age.

11. Structure.

Structural condition of the tree – based on both the structure of its roots, trunk and major stems and branches, and on the presence of any structural defects or decay.

Good: No significant morphological or structural defects, and an upright and reasonably symmetrical structure.

Moderate: No significant pathological defects, but a slightly impaired morphological structure; however, not to the extent that the tree is at immediate or early risk of collapse.

Indifferent: Significant morphological or pathological defects; but these are either remediable or do not put the tree at immediate or early risk of collapse.

Poor: Significant and irreparable morphological or pathological defects, such that there may be a risk of failure or collapse.

Hazardous: Significant and irreparable morphological or pathological defects, with a risk of imminent collapse.

12. Comments.

Where appropriate comments have been made relating to:

- Health and condition
- Safety, particularly close to areas of public access
- Structure and form
- Estimated life expectancy or potential
- Visibility and impact in the local landscape

13. Category.

Based on the British Standard "Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations", BS 5837: 2012; adjusted to give a greater weighting to trees that contribute to the character and appearance of the local landscape, to amenity, or to arboricultural biodiversity.

Category 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.

- (1) Trees that have a serious, irremediable, structural defect, such that their early loss is expected due to collapse, including those that will become unviable after removal of other category 'U' trees (e.g. where, for whatever reason, the loss of companion shelter cannot be mitigated by pruning).
- (2) Trees that are dead or are showing signs of significant, immediate, and irreversible overall decline.
- (3) Trees infected with pathogens of significance to the health and/or safety of other trees nearby, or very low quality trees suppressing adjacent trees of better quality.

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

- (1) Trees that are particularly good examples of their species, especially if rare or unusual.
- (2) Trees, groups or woodlands of particular visual importance as arboricultural and/or landscape features.
- (3) Trees, groups or woodlands of significant conservation, historical, commemorative or other value.

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

- (1) Trees that might be included in category 'A', but are downgraded because of impaired condition (e.g. presence of significant though remediable defects including unsympathetic past management and minor storm damage) such that they are unlikely to be suitable for retention for beyond 40 years; or trees lacking the special quality necessary to merit the category 'A' designation.
- (2) Trees present in numbers, usually growing as groups or woodlands, such that they form distinct landscape features, thereby attracting a higher collective rating than they might as individuals; or trees present in numbers but situated so as to make little visual contribution to the wider locality.
- (3) Trees with material conservation or other cultural value.

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 150mm.

- (1) Unremarkable trees of very limited merit or of such impaired condition that they do not qualify in higher categories.
- (2) Trees present in groups or woodlands, but without this conferring on them significantly greater collective landscape value, and/or trees offering low or only temporary landscape benefits.
- (3) Trees with no material limited conservation or other cultural value.

TREE SURVEY SCHEDULE

Linear Park Phase 3A, Arborfield Green

No.	TPO no.	Species	Height	Trunk diameter	Radial crown spread	Crown break	Crown clearance	Age class	Physio -logy	Structure	Comments	Category
804		English oak	16m	770mm ivy	N 7.5m E 7m S 7.8m W 7m	2m	2m	Mature	Average	Moderate	Prominent buttress roots; tensile unions throughout crown where visible; no significant defects observed; dominant spreading crown; obscured from public view.	B (1)
805		Hybrid black poplar	26m	1270mm ivy	N 8m E 9m S 10m W 11m	E 5m	E 7m	Mature	Average	Moderate	No significant defects observed at base; main trunk heavily covered in ivy with crown suppressed to the N; forms part of a larger group of poplars growing along this boundary fence line; readily visible in views from surrounding residential properties that lie to the E; of moderate quality and landscape value; of medium-term potential.	C (1)
806		Hybrid black poplar	13m	3 @175mm est.	3m	2m S	1.5m	Young	Average	Moderate	Tri-stemmed from base; drawn-up specimen with Height/Diameter ratio greater than 50: at risk of failure if companion shelter removed; of moderate quality and of medium-term potential; but of low landscape value.	C (1)
808		Ash	15m	500mm est.	10.5m	4m	1m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Unable to inspect base due to dense vegetation; heavily ivy-covered trunk and lower structural limbs; tensile unions throughout crown where visible; minor die-back at branch extremities; inessential component of group it which it stands.	C (1)
809		English oak	17m	780mm ivy	6m	2m	0.5m	Mature	Average	Indifferent	No significant defects observed at base; ivy-covered trunk; tensile unions throughout crown where visible; minor deadwood throughout crown; significant component of group in which it stands.	B (1)
810	T26 1480/ 2014	English oak	20m	1030mm	N 9m E 9m S 7.8m W 9.5m	3.5m	E 1m	Mature	Below average	Indifferent	Prominent buttress roots; 800mm cavity between buttress on N side, probe can be inserted 800mm, evidence of fauna activity within cavity; 150mm cavity on W side; cavities are likely coalescing; no difference in tone when buttresses tested with acoustic hammer; occluding pruning wounds with heartwood exposed on S side at 2m, 4m and 5m; deadwood throughout crown structure with minor deadwood at branch extremities and more significant deadwood in the lower crown; shorter than average shoot extension and sparse crown; epicormic growth on structural limbs; woodpecker holes throughout structure, 4 observed; woodpecker hole at 5m W side with detritus on stem below; dominant spreading crown; significant component of the group in which it stands.	B (13)
811	T25 1480/ 2014	English oak	17m	1100mm ivy	N 8m E 5m S 5.6m W 7m	3m	E 1m	Mature	Below average	Indifferent	Prominent buttress roots; differences in tone on S lower trunk up to 1m when tested with acoustic hammer suggesting internal decay, bark lifting in associated area; tensile unions throughout crown where visible; short shoot extensions and minor deadwood at branch extremities; above average epicormic growth on structural limbs; significant component of group in which it stands.	B (1)

No.	TPO no.	Species	Height	Trunk diameter	Radial crown spread	Crown break	Crown clearance	Age class	Physio -logy	Structure	Comments	Category
812	T24 1480/2014	English oak	15m	900mm est.	5.5m	4m	4m	Mature	Below average	Indifferent	Unable to inspect base due to dense vegetation; ivy-covered trunk and lower structural limbs; much deadwood, epicormic growth and un-occluded pruning wounds throughout structure; sparsely foliated crown with short shoot extensions; inessential component of group in which it stands.	C (1)
813		Hawthorn	5.5m	6 @ 100mm	N 3m E 3.5m S 3m W 3m	N 1m	0.5m	Young	Average	Indifferent	Multi-stemmed from base; small ornamental tree; of moderate quality and of long-term potential; but of low landscape value.	C (1)
938		Hawthorn	6m	235mm est.	N 3m E 3.5m S 2.5m W 2m	N 1.5m	1m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Of only low-level screening value; of moderate quality and of long-term potential; but of low landscape value.	C (1)
939	T23 1480/2014	English oak	19m	1040mm ivy	N 10m E 13.3m S 12.5m W 6.8m	5m	E 1.5m	Mature	Average	Indifferent	No significant defects observed at base; heavy ivy-cover on trunk; tensile unions throughout crown where visible; slightly reduced shoot extensions on N side of crown resulting in a slightly sparse crown; minor deadwood at branch extremities; dominant spreading crown; significant component of group in which it stands;	B (12)
941		Ash	10m	165mm	3.5m	S 3.5m	S 3m	Young	Average	Moderate	Small self-seeded specimen; single trunk; minor die-back at branch extremities consistent with "Ash Die-back Disease"; inessential component of group in which it stands.	C (1)
942		English oak	10m	400mm est.	N 4m E 3.5m S 4m W 3m	W 3m	N 2m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Twin-stemmed from 2m; heavily ivy-covered; growing adjacent to a ditch and associated stream; of moderate quality and of long-term potential; but of low landscape value.	C (12)
943	T22 1480/2014	English oak	10m	750mm ivy est.	6m	W 5m	S 2m	Mature	Dead	Dead	Dead tree.	U
944		Hawthorn	8m	300mm est.	N 3m E 4m S 2m W 4m	N 2m	1m	Semi-mature	Below average	Indifferent	Specimen entirely swamped in ivy with only the uppermost crown visible; heavily suppressed; growing adjacent to ditch and associated stream; of low quality, of low landscape value, and of short-term potential only.	C (123)
945	T21 1480/2014	Ash	14m	400mm est.	7.5m	3m	5m	Semi-mature	Low	Poor	Significant die-back in crown consistent with "Ash Die-back Disease"; unsuitable for retention.	U
946		Hawthorn	7m	145mm 200mm 75mm	N 3m E 3m S 2.5m W 2m	S 1m	S 1.5m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Twin-stemmed from base; suppressed specimen; of moderate quality and of medium-term potential; but of low landscape value.	C (1)
947	T20 1480/2014	English oak	14m	500mm ivy	N 5.8m E 6.5m S 6m W 6m	2.5m	E 0.5m	Semi-mature	Average	Moderate	No significant defects observed at base; ivy cover on trunk and structural limbs; tensile unions throughout crown where visible; significant component of group in which it stands.	B (12)

No.	TPO no.	Species	Height	Trunk diameter	Radial crown spread	Crown break	Crown clearance	Age class	Physio - logy	Structure	Comments	Category
948		English oak	4m	400mm est.	3m	0m	0m	Mature	Dead	Dead	Dead ivy covered stump.	U
949	T19 1480/ 2014	English oak	16m	920mm ivy	N 8.5m E 8.5m S 9m W 8.5m	4m	E 1m	Mature	Average	Indifferent	No significant defects observed at base; Ø30mm occluding cavity at 1m on N side, probe can be inserted 300mm into cavity; black staining on bark emanating from cavity consistent with bacterial infection; dull tone when tested with acoustic hammer around trunk circumference at 1m indicating internal decay; ivy on trunk and lower scaffold limbs; tensile unions throughout crown where visible; tear-out wound at 6m E side, occluding; minor deadwood in N crown; significant component of group in which it stands.	B (12)
992		Sycamore	14m	460mm	N 6m NE 2m E 6m S 6m W 6m	3m	0.5m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	No significant defects observed at base; single trunk; tensile unions throughout crown where visible; suppressed from NE by adjacent specimens; inessential component of the group in which it stands.	C (1)
993		Silver birch	15m	440mm	N 5.3m E 5m S 4.4m W 4.8m	2.5m	1.5m	Semi-mature	Average	Moderate	No significant defects observed; tensile unions throughout crown where visible; significant component of group in which it stands.	B (2)
1271- 1272		English oak	10m	300mm est.	N 5m E 5m S 6m W 5m	1m	1m	Young	Average	Moderate	Aerodynamic pair with meshing crowns providing companion shelter; drawn-up and mutually suppressed; of moderate quality and of long-term potential; but of low landscape value; inessential components of group in which they stands.	C (1)
1273	T7 1455/ 2012	English oak	13.5m	440mm est.	N 6m E 6m S 6.5m W 6m	2m	0m	Semi-mature	Average	Moderate	Single trunk; open grown crown; inessential component of group in which it stands; of moderate quality and landscape value; of long-term potential.	B (12)
1274	T8 1455/ 2012	English oak	6m	190mm est.	N 1m E 4m S 4m W 1m	1m	2m	Young	Average	Poor	Canopy suppressed from crown break by canopy of adjacent tree; inessential component of group in which it stands; of low quality, of low landscape value, but of long-term potential.	C (123)
1275		English oak	9m	280mm est.	N 5m E 5m S 5.5m W 5m	2m	2m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Ivy-covered trunk and crown; visible from public open space however of small size and therefore of low landscape value; inessential component of group in which it stands; of moderate quality and of long-term potential; but of low landscape value.	C (1)
1276	T9 1455/ 2012	English oak	16m	1140mm ivy	7.8m	4m	4m	Mature	Average	Indifferent	Dense bramble and vegetation cover at base impedes inspection; prominent buttress roots; black staining on trunk up to 2m on NW side; heavy ivy-cover on trunk and structural limbs; tear-out wound at 6-7m N side Ø250mm leaving 2m hollow stump with Ø120mm occluding wound; Ø120mm storm damaged branch at 4m on E side; minor deadwood in higher crown; dominant spreading crown, significant component of group in which it stands.	B (1)

No.	TPO no.	Species	Height	Trunk diameter	Radial crown spread	Crown break	Crown clearance	Age class	Physio - logy	Structure	Comments	Category
1279		Ash	14m	2 @ 200mm 330mm 350mm 295mm	N 5m E 5m S 6m W 5m	S 2m	S 1m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Multi-stemmed from base; drawn-up specimen with Height/Diameter ratio greater than 50: at risk of failure if companion shelter removed; bud density appears normal; of no more than moderate quality; of moderate landscape value; of long-term potential.	B (12)
1280		English oak	12m	310mm	N 3.5m E 6m S 6m W 4.5m	SE 2m	SE 1m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Single trunk; suppressed crown as overtopped by adjacent specimens; of reduced potential due to being overtopped and heavily suppressed by adjacent group. of moderate quality and of medium-term potential; but of low landscape value.	C (1)
1281	T26 1455/ 2012	English oak	26m	1100mm ivy	N 9.5m E 11.2m S 5.5m W 9.8m	6m	1m	Mature	Average	Moderate	Prominent buttress roots; single trunk; ivy-covered trunk; tensile unions throughout crown where visible; 5m long, Ø200mm dead limb heading SW at 6m; woodpecker holes evident; dominant spreading crown; significant component of group in which it stands.	B (1)
1282		Hawthorn	7m	225mm 125mm	N 4m E 3m S 3m W 3m	N 2m	1.75m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Tri-stemmed from base; inessential component of landscape; of only low-level screening value; of moderate quality and of medium-term potential; but of low landscape value.	C (1)
1283- 1284	T27 1455/ 2012	English oak	#1283 18m #1284 10m	#1283 535mm ivy #1284 535mm ivy	N 4.8m E 8.5m S 7m W 8.5m	0.5m	0.5m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	No significant defects observed at base; aerodynamic pair with meshing crowns providing companion shelter; #1283 dominant of the pair supressing #1284; inessential components of the group in which they stand.	C (1)
1285	T28 1455/ 2012	English oak	17m	1070mm	N 6.8m E 12m S 14m W 6.8m	2m	1m	Mature	Average	Indifferent	Occluding wound S side at base with heart wood exposed, 600mm at widest point, top of wound at 3-4m though exact point obscured by ivy-cover; hollowing detected when tested with acoustic hammer on W and E sides from base up to 2m; lower crown forming from established epicormic growth at 1.5m - 2m; woodpecker hole at 3.5m and another cavity from failed branch at same point; significant tear-out wound at 7m on S side, may of prompted lower crown to form; tensile unions throughout crown where visible; significant component of group in which it stands.	B (13)
1286	T29 1455/ 2012	English oak	22m	1550mm ivy	N 14.2m E 11.5m S 12.8m W 11.5m	E 2m	E 1m	Mature	Average	Moderate	Prominent buttress roots; no evidence of internal decay when tested with acoustic hammer; established ivy on lower trunk; single trunk to 5m; multi-stemmed at 5m with tensile main unions; ivy-covered structural limbs; tensile unions throughout crown where visible; deadwood throughout crown as expected for age and species; no signs of retrenchment; notable tree; dominant spreading crown; significant component of group in which it stands and significant feature of the landscape.	A (1)

No.	TPO no.	Species	Height	Trunk diameter	Radial crown spread	Crown break	Crown clearance	Age class	Physio - logy	Structure	Comments	Category
1287		Hawthorn	7m	340mm est. 350mm est. 275mm est.	N 4m E 5m S 4m W 5m	N 2m	3m	Mature	Average	Indifferent	Tri-stemmed from base; inessential component of landscape; of moderate quality and of medium-term potential; but of low landscape value.	C (1)
1401		Ash	12m	8 @ 180mm est.	5.5m	2m	2m	Young	Average	Poor	Off-site tree; multi-stemmed from base with tight compression forks and included bark; stems are mutually suppressed and drawn up; inessential component of group in which it stands; of low quality, of low landscape value, but of long-term potential.	C (123)
1402-1403		False acacia	#1402 12m #1403 15m	200mm est. 240mm est.	5m	3m	3m	Mature	Average	Indifferent	Off-site trees; inessential components of group in which they stand; aerodynamic group with meshing crowns providing companion shelter; of moderate quality and of long-term potential; but of low landscape value.	C (1)
1405		Hybrid black poplar	25.5m	420mm est.	5m	3m	3m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Off-site tree; large branch on S side has failed at 8m and is lying on the ground, ivy covered trunk to a height of about 8m; inessential component of group in which it stands; of moderate quality and of long-term potential; but of low landscape value.	C (1)
1407		Leyland cypress	5m	90mm est.	1m	0m	0m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Off-site tree; inessential component of group in which it stands; of moderate quality and of long-term potential; but of low landscape value.	C (1)
1408		Sycamore	12m	2 @ 300mm est.	N 5m E 2m S 5m W 6m	1m	W 3m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Supressed to E; unremarkable tree of very limited merit.	C (1)
1409		Purple maple	13m	2 @ 300mm est.	7m	1m	S 5m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Off-site tree; unable to access base due to vegetation and boundary fence; twin-stemmed; ivy-covered; unremarkable tree of very limited merit.	C (1)
1411		Leyland cypress	6m	320mm est.	2m	.5m	0m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Inessential component of group in which it stands; of moderate quality and of long-term potential; but of low landscape value.	C (1)
1412		Sycamore	23m	420mm est. 450mm est. 450mm est.	6m N 6m E 6m S 6m W	8m	8m	Mature	Average	Indifferent	Off-site tree; three stemmed at 1m; inessential component of group in which it stands; of moderate quality and landscape value; of long-term potential.	B (12)
1537	A1 1455/2012	English oak	18m	880mm ivy	6.5m	NW 1.5m	5m	Mature	Average	Moderate	No significant defects observed at base; heavily ivy-covered; tensile unions throughout crown, where visible; dominant spreading crown; significant component of group in which it stands.	B (1)
1538	A1 1455/2012	English oak	18m	850mm ivy	N 5m E 8m S 5m W 5m	E 3m	E 5m	Mature	Average	Moderate	No significant defects observed at base; heavily ivy-covered; tensile unions throughout crown, where visible; dominant spreading crown; significant component of group in which it stands.	B (1)

No.	TPO no.	Species	Height	Trunk diameter	Radial crown spread	Crown break	Crown clearance	Age class	Physio -logy	Structure	Comments	Category
1539	A1 1455/2012	English oak	16m	740mm	N 6.8m E 6.5m S 6.5m W 3m	3m	6m	Mature	Below average	Moderate	No significant defects observed at base; tensile unions throughout crown, where visible; above average dead wood in crown; above average epicormic growth on structural limbs; inessential component of the group in which it stands.	C (1)
1541		Common pear	16m	400mm est.	5m	3m	6m	Mature	Average	Indifferent	Off-site tree; no significant defects observed.	C (1)
1542	A1 1455/2012	Sycamore	13m	420mm	4m	W 4m	10m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Single trunk; inessential component of group in which it stands; of moderate quality and of medium-term potential; but of low landscape value.	C (1)
1544	A1 1455/2012	Beech	12m	530mm	3m	3m	3m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Heavily ivy-covered, twin-stemmed at 3m; sparse crown with lower than average bud density, drawn up and suppressed; inessential component of group in which it stands; of moderate quality and of long-term potential; but of low landscape value.	C (1)
G065		Hawthorn	Max 5m	Max 250mm est.	3m W 3.5m	N 1m	0.5m	Semi-mature	Below average	Indifferent	Heavily ivy-covered; of only low-level screening value; of low quality, of low landscape value, but of medium-term potential.	C (123)
G083		Hybrid black poplar	Max 16m	Max 325mm	N 3.5m E 4m S 3m W 3m	N 1m	2m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Group of drawn-up, mutually suppressed specimens; of moderate quality and of medium-term potential; but of low landscape value.	C (1)
G085	T11 1455/2012	Various	Max 13m	Max 300mm	7m	N 0.5m	0.5m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Species comprise English oak and hawthorn; aerodynamic group with meshing crowns providing companion shelter; provides effective screening at this location; of moderate quality and of medium-term potential; but of low landscape value.	C (12)
G086		Hybrid black poplar	Max 28m	Max 500mm	N 7m E 10m S 8m W 10m	NW 3m	NW 3m	Semi-mature	Average	Poor	Group of drawn-up, mutually suppressed specimens; heavily ivy-covered; bud density appears normal; readily visible in views from surrounding public places; inessential component of landscape; of low quality; of moderate landscape value; of medium-term potential.	C (2)
G087		Hybrid black poplar	Max 17m	Max 400mm	N 5m E 8m S 4m	E 4m	E 7m	Semi-mature	Average	Poor	Group of drawn-up, mutually suppressed specimens; one-sided crown as suppressed by adjacent specimens; inessential component of landscape; of low quality, of low landscape value, but of medium-term potential.	C (123)
G088		Various	Max 10m	Max 200mm est.	3m	1m	2m	Young	Below average	Indifferent	Species comprise poplar, goat willow and sycamore; of low quality, low landscape value, but of medium-term potential.	C (1)
G089	G2 1455/2012	English oak	Max 12m	Max 385mm	N 4m E 8m S 4m W 4.5m	W 1m	2.5m	Semi-mature	Average	Moderate	Single trunks; bud density appears normal; aerodynamic group with meshing crowns providing companion shelter; of moderate quality and of long-term potential; but of low landscape value.	C (12)
G090		Beech	Max 18m	Max 300mm	7m	2m	1m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	No evidence of recent pruning or management; heavily ivy-covered; drawn-up and mutually suppressed; of moderate quality and landscape value; of long-term potential.	B (12)

No.	TPO no.	Species	Height	Trunk diameter	Radial crown spread	Crown break	Crown clearance	Age class	Physio -logy	Structure	Comments	Category
G119		Various	Max 8m	Max 180mm est.	3m	1m	0m	Young	Average	Indifferent	Species comprise elder, plum, self-seeded ash; an understorey of brambles; specimen growing within grounds of ATIL visibility restricted to internal views only; inessential component of landscape; of moderate quality but of low landscape value, and of short-term potential only.	C (1)
G151	A1 1455/ 2012	Various	Max 16m	Max 350mm	N 4m E 7m S 5m W 4m	N 1m	0.5m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Species comprise English oak, field maple and hawthorn; belt of closely growing specimens; aerodynamic group with meshing crowns providing companion shelter; provides effective screening at this location; of moderate quality and landscape value; of medium-term potential.	B (12)

Root Protection Areas (RPAs)

Root Protection Areas have been calculated in accordance with paragraph 4.6.1 of the British Standard 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations', BS 5837:2012. This is the minimum area which should be left undisturbed around each retained tree. RPAs are portrayed initially as a circle of a fixed radius from the centre of the trunk; but where there appear to be restrictions to root growth the circle is modified to reflect more accurately the likely distribution of roots.

Tree No.	Species	RPA	RPA Radius
804	English oak	268.2m ²	9.2m
805	Hybrid black poplar	729.7m ²	15.24m
806	Hybrid black poplar	41.6m ²	3.64m
808	Ash	41.6m ²	6.0m
809	English oak	275.2m ²	9.4m
810	English oak	749.9m ²	15.45m
811	English oak	855.3m ²	16.5m
812	English oak	366.4m ²	10.8m
813	Hawthorn	27.1m ²	2.94m
938	Hawthorn	25.0m ²	2.82m
939	English oak	764.5m ²	15.6m
941	Ash	12.3m ²	1.98m
942	English oak	63.6m ²	4.5m
943	English oak	254.5m ²	9.0m
944	Hawthorn	40.7m ²	3.6m
945	Ash	72.4m ²	4.8m
946	Hawthorn	30.2m ²	3.1m
947	English oak	113.1m ²	6.0m
948	English oak	72.4m ²	4.8m
949	English oak	382.9m ²	11.0m
992	Sycamore	95.7m ²	5.5m
993	Silver birch	87.6m ²	5.3m
1271-1272	English oak	40.7m ²	3.6m
		40.7m ²	3.6m
1273	English oak	87.6m ²	5.28m
1274	English oak	16.3m ²	2.28m
1275	English oak	35.5m ²	3.36m
1276	English oak	918.6m ²	17.1m
1279	Ash	211.5m ²	8.2m
1280	English oak	43.5m ²	3.72m
1281	English oak	855.3m ²	16.5m
1282	Hawthorn	30.0m ²	3.09m
1283-1284	English oak	129.5m ²	6.4m
		129.5m ²	6.4m
1285	English oak	809.3m ²	16.05m
1286	English oak	1698.2m ²	23.25m
1287	Hawthorn	141.9m ²	6.72m
1401	Ash	117.3m ²	6.11m
1402-1403	False acacia	18.1m ²	2.4m
		26.1m ²	2.88m
1405	Hybrid black poplar	79.8m ²	5.04m
1407	Leyland cypress	7.1m ²	1.5m

1408	Sycamore	81.4m ²	5.1m
1409	Purple maple	81.4m ²	5.1m
1411	Leyland cypress	46.3m ²	3.84m
1412	Sycamore	263.0m ²	9.15m
1537	English oak	350.3m ²	10.6m
1538	English oak	326.9m ²	10.2m
1539	English oak	247.7m ²	8.9m
1541	Common pear	72.4m ²	4.8m
1542	Sycamore	79.8m ²	5.04m
1544	Beech	127.1m ²	6.36m
G065	Hawthorn	28.3m ²	3.0m
G083	Hybrid black poplar	47.8m ²	3.9m
G085	Various	40.7m ²	3.6m
G086	Hybrid black poplar	113.1m ²	6.0m
G087	Hybrid black poplar	72.4m ²	4.8m
G088	Various	18.1m ²	2.4m
G089	English oak	67.1m ²	4.62m
G090	Beech	40.7m ²	3.6m
G119	Various	14.7m ²	2.16m
G151	Various	55.4m ²	4.2m

APPENDIX 4

Tree Protection Plan

