Arboricultural Impact Assessment

David Wilson Homes Southern

Land off Camp Road, Upper Heyford

Ref:	22-0773
Version:	5
Date:	April 2024
Author:	Ben Jones BSc (Hons) MSc DipArb TechArborA
Position:	Arboricultural Consultant

Northamptonshire Office

7-8 Melbourne House Corbygate Business Park Weldon Northamptonshire NN17 5JG 01536 408 840 contact@nicholsonsgb.com

Oxfordshire Office The Park North Aston Oxfordshire OX25 6HL

01869 340342 contact@nicholsonsgb.com



This page has intentionally been left blank

DOCUMENT CONTROL SHEET

Arboriculture Project Team										
Sam Hargreaves	Arboricultural Services Manager									
Freddy McCreery BSc (Hons) MArborA	Senior Arboricultural Consultant									
Ben Jones BSc (Hons) MSc DipArb TechArborA	Arboricultural Consultant									
Tom Smith BA (Hons)	Arboricultural Surveyor									
Franca Potts	Project Administrator									

REVISION HISTORY

Rev	Description of change	Date	Initials
DRAFT	Original draft	02.09.2022	BJ
1	Finalised revision	29.09.2022	BJ
2	Report revised to reflect updated site plan	04.08.2023	BJ
3	Report revised to reflect updated site plan	15.09.2023	BJ
4	Report revised to reflect updated site plan	12.04.2024	BJ
5	Minor amendments to report following client feedback	30.04.2024	BJ

COPYRIGHT ©

The copyright of this document remains with Nicholsons. Its' contents must not be copied or reproduced in whole or in part for any purpose without the written consent of Nicholsons.

DISCLAIMER

While all reasonable efforts have been made to identify abnormalities in the subject trees, the statements made in this report do not take into account the effects of extreme weather events, vandalism or accidents, or changes to the site that may affect trees that have taken place since the date of the survey. Nicholsons does not accept any responsibility in connection with these factors.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Nicholsons has been instructed to undertake a site visit to verify existing arboricultural survey data and to prepare an updated Arboricultural Impact Assessment in support of proposed development at a site off Camp Road, Upper Heyford.

The development proposal is for a residential development comprising up to 123 no. new properties with associated access points off Camp Road and internal access roads.

A verification site visit was undertaken on 30th August 2022 and confirmed that there has been little to no change in the condition of tree stock recorded across the site.

The arboricultural impact of this development proposal involves the partial removal of a hedgerow (H28) along the southern site boundary to facilitate the site entrance. It should be noted that this hedgerow was deemed to be of low arboricultural value during the tree survey and subsequent site visits. Its partial loss from site is therefore not expected to incur significant impacts to the overall amenity of the site.

It is also expected that construction facilitation pruning works will be required along the southern and eastern site boundaries to provide adequate space for proposed construction works. Such pruning is expected to be of a relatively minor nature and unlikely to impact significantly upon the long-term health of retained trees.

Additional management pruning will also be required to an individual tree (T2) to ensure its safe retention within the site. This will involve removing the existing crown and managing the tree as a pollarded specimen.

All retained trees within, or directly adjacent, to the site will be protected through a combination of tree protective measures. This will predominantly consist of tree protective fencing, but permanent ground protection will also be required. These measures will ensure that retained trees remain free from significant harm throughout the development phases.

No ancient or veteran trees are present on or adjacent to the site, so there is no conflict with national planning policy or guidance. Furthermore, those trees of important arboricultural and amenity value will be retained and protected in accordance with BS5837:2012 recommendations. Therefore, the scheme also complies with local planning policy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	INTRODUCTION	7
	Instruction	7
	Site Description	7
	Caveats and Limitations	7
2.	TREE SURVEY AND CONSTRAINTS	8
	Scope	8
	Tree Survey	8
	Tree Constraints	8
	Soils	9
	Statutory Considerations	9
	National and Local Planning Policies	
3.	ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT	
	Design Principles	
	Development Proposal	
	Arboricultural Impacts	
	Arboricultural Impact Assessment	
	Principles of Protection of Retained Trees	
	Planning Policy Impact	15
4.	REFERENCES & BIBLIOGRAPHY	
5		17

Attachments

Description	Reference	Version
Tree Schedule	22-0776	1
Tree Constraints Plan	22-0727	1
Arboricultural Impact Plan	22-0728	6
Draft Tree Protection Plan	22-0729	6

PURPOSE OF DOCUMENT

This report has been commissioned to provide an assessment of the trees at land off Camp Road, Upper Heyford in accordance with the guidelines provided by BS5837:2012 *Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations*.

It consists of:

- A Tree Survey that records all relevant information about the trees on or adjacent to the site that may be impacted by the proposals. This includes a Tree Constraints Plan that shows the location of the trees on the site irrespective of any development considerations.
- An Arboricultural Impact Assessment to consider the impact that the development proposal may have on the trees. It provides details of how any adverse impact will be mitigated (including indicative protection measures) and includes an Arboricultural Impact Plan. This shows the location of the trees in relation to the proposed development and the above and below ground constraints posed by the trees. It will also show an illustration of the recommended tree protection measures on a Draft Tree Protection Plan.

The purpose of this report is to demonstrate how the tree constraints have been considered in the design and layout of the site. It also provides the local authority (Cherwell District Council) with the necessary information to assess the tree issues associated with the planning application.

1. INTRODUCTION

Instruction

1.1 Written instruction was received from David Wilson Homes Southern on 25th July 2022 to undertake a site visit, to verify existing tree survey data, and to prepare an Arboricultural Impact Assessment to supplement an outline planning application for a proposed residential development at land off Camp Road in Upper Heyford.

Site Description

- 1.2 The site is a plot of defunct agricultural land, situated directly off Camp Road in Upper Heyford. The site is located on the eastern fringes of Upper Heyford and is bordered by agricultural land to the north and east, and by existing residential development to the south and west.
- 1.3 The site itself is dominated by tussock grass and tall ruderals, with grouped and individual trees situated almost entirely along the eastern and western site boundaries.
- 1.4 Trees recorded during the tree surveys (April 2021 and August 2022) were generally noted to be of good to fair arboricultural quality and of a semi-mature to early-mature standing.

Caveats and Limitations

- 1.5 While all reasonable efforts have been made to identify defects in the subject trees, the statements made in this report do not take into account the effects of extreme weather events, vandalism or accidents, or changes to the site that may affect trees that have taken place since the date of the survey.
- 1.6 While the author warranties that the survey has been undertaken in accordance with industry best practice recommendations and guidance, no warranty is provided in relation to changes to the site that occur after the date of the survey that may have an impact on the tree stock present at the time of the survey.
- 1.7 The comments and observations made within this report will cease to be valid either within two years of the date of the survey (unless specifically stated elsewhere within the report), or when site conditions change or any works to trees take place that have not been specified within this report, whichever is the sooner.
- 1.8 A site visit to verify existing survey data has been undertaken with the benefit of Tree Constraints Plans prepared by Nicholsons and using topographical survey plan provided by the client. The location of all trees, hedges and groups detailed in this report have relied upon the detail provided in this survey and no warranty is given by Nicholsons as to the accuracy of this data.
- 1.9 This survey has been limited to identifying arboricultural features within the site. It therefore does not include any ecological assessment or landscape appraisal of trees, groups, woodlands or hedges beyond the scope of BS5837.

2. TREE SURVEY AND CONSTRAINTS

Scope

- 2.1 The survey has been carried out in accordance with the recommendations laid down by BS5837:2012 *Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction Recommendations*.
- 2.2 The information collected during the survey has been used to assist in the preparation of a report to accompany a planning application. This report includes:
 - A schedule of the relevant trees to include basis data and condition assessment;
 - A Tree Constraints Plan (TCP) that provides illustrative information on the constraints posed by trees to any development proposal;
 - An appraisal of the impact that the proposed development may have on the trees and the resulting impact this may have on the local amenity.
- 2.3 The purpose of the tree survey has been to provide guidance to the developer on the existing tree stock and to inform the site design and layout. The results of the survey allow the opportunity to balance the retention of significant trees against the opportunity to enhance the existing tree stock through proactive management.

Tree Survey

- 2.4 Tree surveys of the site were undertaken in April 2021 by Steve Westmore (Senior Arboricultural Consultant).
- 2.5 A subsequent site visit to verify the survey data was undertaken on 30th August 2022 by Ben Jones (Arboricultural Consultant).
- 2.6 A copy of the recorded data can be seen in the tree schedule (Ref 22-0776) attached to this report.
- 2.7 The tree survey considered all trees that have the potential to be impacted by any development proposals. This included trees that are outside the application boundary, but within influencing distance. The extent of the tree survey has been marked on the TCP.
- 2.8 The tree survey has been undertaken without influence of the proposed site layout and prior to any works being undertaken on the site.

Tree Constraints

- 2.9 The above ground constraints posed by canopy spread are plotted as a continuous line around the tree, shown in the corresponding BS5837 retention category colour.
- 2.10 The below ground constraints posed by the Root Protection Area (RPA) have been plotted as a magenta line with the text RPA inscribed, and the extent of the RPA has been hatched.
- 2.11 A summary of the assessment of the quality of trees, groups of trees, hedges and woodlands that have been identified on the site is summarised in **Table 1**.

Table 1: An overview of the quality of trees on the site

	Category	Category	Category	Total
	В	C	U	
Trees	4	9	4	17
Hedges	-	4	-	4
Groups	2	4	1	7
Total	6	17	5	28

2.12 Full details of the assessment criteria for the tree survey can be found in **Appendix 1**.

Soils

- 2.13 An online search has been undertaken with the BGS Geology Viewer¹ to provide a summary of the geological materials that underlie the site. This shows:
 - Bedrock: White Limestone Formation
 - Superficial deposits: N/A

Statutory Considerations

- 2.14 A search has been undertaken on the Local Planning Authority (LPA) website² to determine the presence or otherwise of Tree Preservation Orders or Conservation Areas.
- 2.15 The online search confirmed that there are no trees subject to TPO within or directly adjacent to the site. However, the site is partially situated within the RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area (Figure 1).



Figure 1: Outcome of online search confirming no TPOs on site, but partial incursion into RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area, as shown in red (Source: Cherwell District Council).

2.16 The Conservation Area appears to impact upon trees along the western site boundary (i.e. H7-G27 inclusive).

¹ https://www.bgs.ac.uk/map-viewers/bgs-geology-viewer/

² https://www.cherwell.gov.uk/info/7/environment/280/tree-preservation-orders

2.17 No direct communication has been made with the LPA to confirm the details above. Confirmation of the protected status of trees on or adjacent to the site should be sought from Cherwell District Council prior to any works commencing on site.

National and Local Planning Policies

National Planning Policy Framework 2021

- 2.18 National Planning Policy is currently defined by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). This provides the most current and up to date planning guidance.
- 2.19 At the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, and specifically states that for decision making, the LPA should be approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay.
- 2.20 Section 15 of the NPPF recognises the importance of conserving and enhancing the natural environment, and specifically acknowledges the role of trees and woodland in the provision of natural capital and ecosystem services.
- 2.21 It further acknowledges the importance of ancient woodlands and veteran trees for habitats and biodiversity and requires that planning consent should be refused where development schemes require the removal of such features unless there are wholly exceptional reasons, stating that:

"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." (Paragraph 180, c)

2.22 Where the LPA does not have a development plan or the development plan is out of date, the LPA should grant planning consent insofar as the development proposals do not breach the NPPF.

Local Planning Policy

- 2.23 The land off Camp Road, Upper Heyford is located within the boundary of the Cherwell District Council planning authority. The LPA has a statutory obligation to ensure that provision is made for the protection of trees through section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act (1990). Cherwell District Council has prepared a specific development plan which includes trees and the natural environment. This plan is the Adopted Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031.
- 2.24 A review of the plan has been undertaken to assist design and layout of the site. This has ensured that the existing trees on site have been considered in the context of planning policy and have influenced the design proposals submitted as part of this application.

Adopted Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031

- 2.25 The relevant policies to this development proposal are:
 - Policy ESD 10: Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity and the Natural Environment; and
 - Policy ESD 13: Local Landscape Protection and Enhancement.
- 2.26 The full details of these policies are outlined in **Appendix 2**.

3. ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Design Principles

- 3.1 The development proposal submitted as part of this application has been directly and indirectly influenced by the existing tree cover on site.
- 3.2 The default position has been that no buildings will be sited within the tree canopy or root protection area of any retained tree.

Development Proposal

- 3.3 The proposed residential development involves construction of up to 123 no. new properties with associated access points off Camp Road and internal access roads.
- 3.4 This report has relied upon the following drawings and documents that have been prepared as part of this planning application:

Provider	Reference	Title	Date Provided
Interlock Surveys	140720	Topographical Survey	3 rd March 2021
		– Camp Road, Upper	
		Heyford	
Green World	PHO/GW0085/1 Rev A	Survey of Land East of	3 rd March 2021
Surveys		Larsen Road, Upper	
		Hayford [sic]	
Focus on Design	0778-102 D.14	Planning Layout	10 th April 2024

Table 2: Documentation Provided

Arboricultural Impacts

- 3.5 The Arboricultural Impacts from this development proposal are graphically presented in the Arboricultural Impact Plan (AIP) that is attached to this report.
- 3.6 The AIP helps to identify:
 - Trees that have the potential to be impacted by the design proposal;
 - Trees that are to be removed; and
 - Trees that require facilitation pruning.

Tree Removals

3.7 The proposed development will require the partial removal of H28, along the southern site boundary, to facilitate creation of new access points off Camp Road.

Tree pruning or other remedial works

- 3.8 The completion of construction facilitation pruning works will be required across the site.
- 3.9 In particular, lateral crown reductions of H1 and H28 will be required to reduce potential conflicts with adjacent construction.
- 3.10 Minor crown lifts of T5 and T6 will also be required to provide clearance for proposed construction and landscaping works beneath.

- 3.11 The current iteration of the proposed layout includes for the retention of an individual crack willow (T2) along the eastern site boundary. This tree was assessed as being of negligible, Category U, retention value during the survey. The tree exhibited numerous structural abnormalities that have the potential to lead to future failure.
- 3.12 To facilitate the safe retention of T2, it is therefore recommended that the crown of the tree be removed, and the height of the tree reduced to 1.5 m above ground level. The tree should then be managed as a pollarded specimen through subsequent pruning regimes.
- 3.13 The full extent of pruning works required on site should be determined during a precommencement site meeting between the Arboricultural Clerk of Works (ACoW) and site manager).

Trees to be retained

- 3.14 The remaining three hedgerows, all 17 individual trees and all seven tree groups are to be fully retained within the proposed development.
- 3.15 This represents a retention of approximately 96% of total tree stock recorded within and directly adjacent to the site.

Arboricultural Impact Assessment

- 3.16 The hedgerow requiring partial removal along the southern site boundary (H28) was noted in the tree survey to be of low arboricultural quality.
- 3.17 Additionally, only relatively small sections of the hedgerow (approx. 4.0 m wide strips) are to be removed to create proposed access points.
- 3.18 As such, it is considered that the overall amenity and value of the hedgerow will remain largely intact.
- 3.19 The construction facilitation pruning works identified are considered to be of a relatively minor nature and unlikely to impact negatively upon the long-term health of retained trees.
- 3.20 These works should be carried out by suitably experienced, Arboricultural Associationaccredited tree surgeons.

The Impact of Buildings

- 3.21 It is understood that no new buildings are to be sited within the RPAs of retained trees on site.
- 3.22 As such, impacts to retained trees from this aspect of development are not anticipated.

Impact of New Surfaces (Permanent and temporary)

Permanent

- 3.23 New permanent hard surfacing is proposed within the RPAs of two retained trees (T2 and T5) situated along the eastern site boundary, to create a new access road, a turn circle for proposed residential properties and informal pedestrian footpaths.
- 3.24 To minimise the potential impacts to the roots of retained trees from these works, the installation of permanent ground protection, in the form of new hard surfacing, will be required within the RPAs of T2 and T5.
- 3.25 In this respect, a 'no-dig' ground protection system, with a porous wearing layer, will be required. Further details of this method of protection are provided in subsequent sections of this report.
- 3.26 Providing that the protection measures detailed in this report are adhered to, the overall impact to trees from the provision of new hard surfacing in close proximity to retained trees is considered minor.

Temporary

- 3.27 The provision of working space will be required within the RPAs of several retained trees and groups. Working space is required to allow for construction access in these respective areas without impacting upon tree roots.
- 3.28 In this respect, the prior installation of temporary ground protection measures will be required. Temporary ground protection measures are identified on the DTTP with green hatching.
- 3.29 Details of such measures should be outlined in an Arboricultural Method Statement for this site.

Impact of Underground Services

- 3.30 It is understood that no excavations associated with the installation of new underground services are to take place within the RPAs of retained trees.
- 3.31 As such, impacts to retained trees from this aspect of development are not anticipated.

Principles of Protection of Retained Trees

- 3.32 The successful retention of those trees that will remain on the site will be dependent upon the quality and maintenance of any protection system that is put in place.
- 3.33 Indicative tree protection measures have been considered within this report and are graphically presented in the Draft Tree Protection Plan (DTPP).

- 3.34 The following principles for the protection of retained trees will be adopted by the developer during the construction of the new properties:
 - All retained trees will be protected by fencing that will form a construction exclusion zone (CEZ). The fencing has been indicated on the TPP by a dashed black line with the orange diagonal hatching showing the CEZ.
 - There will be no storage of materials, or access for construction workers or machinery within any CEZ.
 - There will be no level changes within a CEZ.
 - There will be no excavation within a CEZ. All utilities and underground services will be located outside the CEZ or tap into existing service routes.
 - Any storage or mixing station located outside of a CEZ will be located in a place that minimises the risk of contaminated runoff entering the CEZ and damaging the rooting environment. This may be achieved by using a non-permeable membrane on the ground, surrounded by sandbags to contain any spillage.
 - There will be no fires within a CEZ.
 - There will no use of herbicides within CEZ.
- 3.35 It is anticipated that an Arboricultural Method Statement will be required as a condition of any planning consent to provide detail of how the necessary tree protection can be implemented.
- 3.36 The processes of construction are highly unlikely to have a detrimental effect upon the health of the retained trees assuming tree protection recommendations made in this report are adhered to at all times by the contractors.

Planning Policy Impact

- 3.37 The proposed development has been designed so that, wherever possible, healthy trees are retained and incorporated into the new scheme.
- 3.38 There are no ancient woodlands or veteran trees within or near to the site. Therefore, there is no conflict with national planning policy guidance.
- 3.39 The completion of minor tree pruning works will be required to facilitate construction access for several aspects of the proposed development. However, this can be achieved within the realms of good arboricultural practice, and this again is in accordance with local planning policies.
- 3.40 Specific tree protection measures have been recommended to ensure that all trees within the site can be retained as a direct result of the proposal. As such, there are no arboricultural reasons to prevent this scheme going forward.

4. **REFERENCES & BIBLIOGRAPHY**

British Standards Institution (2012) *BS5837: Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – recommendations*. London: BSI

British Standards Institution (2010) BS3998: Tree Works – recommendations. London: BSI

Cherwell District Council (2022). Adopted Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2030. [online] Available at: https://www.cherwell.gov.uk/downloads/download/45/adopted-cherwell-local-plan-2011-2031-part-1-incorporating-policy-bicester-13-re-adopted-on-19-december-2016 [Accessed: 31st August 2022].

Cherwell District Council (2022). Tree Preservation Orders. [online] Available at: https://www.cherwell.gov.uk/info/7/environment/280/tree-preservation-orders [Accessed: 31st August 2022].

Mapapps.bgs.ac.uk. (2022). *Geology of Britain viewer* | British Geological Survey (BGS). [online] Available at: https://www.bgs.ac.uk/map-viewers/bgs-geology-viewer/ [Accessed: 31st August 2022].

Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (2021). *The National Planning Policy Framework*. London: HMSO.

5. APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Tree Survey Criteria (BS5837:2012)

5.1 The assessment of the trees has been carried out in accordance with the guidance provided in paragraph 4.4.2.6 of BS5837 which recommends that:

4.4.2.6 The measurement conventions should be as follows.

- a) height, crown spread and crown clearance should be recorded to the nearest half metre (crown spread should be rounded up) for dimensions up to 10 m and the nearest whole metre for dimensions over 10 m;
- b) stem diameter should be recorded in millimetres, rounded to the nearest 10 mm (0.01 m);
- c) estimated dimensions (e.g. for off-site or otherwise inaccessible trees where accurate data cannot be recovered) should be clearly identified as such (e.g. suffixed with a "#").

Plate 1 - Source: BS5837 (2012) p.7

- 5.2 All observations were made from ground level, without detailed investigation with regard to the general condition of the tree.
- 5.3 Trees that are located outside of the application boundary (red line) to a distance of 15m have been considered as part of this survey and have been annotated on the accompanying plan as such.
- 5.4 The trees are categorised in an order defined in **Table 1** of BS5837, a copy of which can be seen below in **Figure 1**, but which can be summarised as:
 - **A Category** Trees of high quality and value in such a condition as to be able to make a substantial contribution for a minimum of 40 years.
 - **B Category** Trees of moderate quality and value in such a condition as to make a significant contribution for a minimum 20 years.
 - **C Category** Trees of low quality and value currently in adequate condition able to remain until new planting can be established. These trees are expected to remain for a minimum of 10 years. It also includes young trees with a stem diameter less than 150mm measured at 1.5 metres above ground level.
 - **U Category** Trees in such a condition that any existing value would be lost within 10 years and which should, in the current context, be removed for reasons of sound arboricultural or forestry management.
- 5.5 Additionally, BS5837 (2012) provides subcategories 1-3 within the category system outlined above which indicate the area(s) in which a tree or group retention value lies. Details of those subcategories is provided in Table 1 of BS5837, and a copy of this table is reproduced below:

ldentification on plan		See Table 2					See Table 2	See Table 2	See Table 2
		s expected due to collapse, (e.g. where, for whatever	overall decline trees nearby, or very low	ht be desirable to preserve;	3 Mainly cultural values, including conservation		Trees, groups or woodlands of significant conservation, historical, commemorative or other value (e.g. veteran trees or wood-pasture)	Trees with material conservation or other cultural value	Trees with no material conservation or other cultural value
apro priate)		 e, structural defect, such that their early loss i iable after removal of other category U trees cannot be mitigated by pruning) 	gns of significant, immediate, and irreversible ulficance to the health and/or safety of other t es of better quality	ą or potential conservation value which it migł	2 Mainly landscape qualities		Trees, groups or woodlands of particular visual importance as arboricultural and/or landscape features	Trees present in numbers, usually growing as groups or woodlands, such that they attract a higher collective rating than they might as individuals; or trees occurring as collectives but situated so as to make little visual contribution to the wider locality	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/transient landscape benefits
Criteria (including subcategories where ap	(see Note)	 Trees that have a serious, irremediabl including those that will become unvir reason, the loss of companion shelter 	 Trees that are dead or are showing si Trees infected with pathogens of sign quality trees suppressing adjacent tree 	NOTE Category U trees can have existing see 4.5.7.	1 Mainly arboricultural qualities	intion	Trees that are particularly good examples of their species, especially if rare or unusual: or those that are essential components of groups or formal or semi-formal arboricultural features (e.g. the dominant and/or principal trees within an avenue)	Trees that might be included in category A, but are downgraded because of significant though presence of significant though remediable defects, including unsympathetic past management and storm damage), such that they are unlikely to be suitable for retertion for beyond 40 years; or trees lacking the special quality necessary to merit the category A designation	Unremarkable trees of very limited merit or such impaired condition that they do not qualify in higher categories
Category and definition	Trees unsuitable for retention (Category U Those 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 wars			Trees to be considered for rete	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

22-0773 LAND OFF CAMP ROAD UPPER HEYFORD UPDATED AIA V5 BJ 300424 Page 18 of 21

Appendix 2: Planning Policies from Adopted Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2030

5.6 Policy ESD 10: Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity and the Natural Environment

Policy ESD 10: Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity and the Natural Environment

Protection and enhancement of biodiversity and the natural environment will be achieved by the following:

- In considering proposals for development, a net gain in biodiversity will be sought by protecting, managing, enhancing and extending existing resources, and by creating new resources
- The protection of trees will be encouraged, with an aim to increase the number of trees in the District
- The reuse of soils will be sought
- If significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or as a last resort, compensated for, then development will not be permitted.
- Development which would result in damage to or loss of a site of international value will be subject to the Habitats Regulations Assessment process and will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that there will be no likely significant effects on the international site or that effects can be mitigated
- Development which would result in damage to or loss of a site of biodiversity or geological value of national importance will not be permitted unless the benefits of the development clearly outweigh the harm it would cause to the site and the wider national network of SSSIs, and the loss can be mitigated to achieve a net gain in biodiversity/geodiversity
- Development which would result in damage to or loss of a site of biodiversity or geological value of regional or local importance including habitats of species of principal importance for biodiversity will not be permitted unless the benefits of the development clearly outweigh the harm it would cause to the site, and the loss can be mitigated to achieve a net gain in biodiversity/geodiversity
- Development proposals will be expected to incorporate features to encourage biodiversity, and retain and where possible enhance existing features of nature conservation value within the site. Existing ecological networks should be identified and maintained to avoid habitat fragmentation, and ecological corridors should form an essential component of green infrastructure provision in association with new development to ensure habitat connectivity
- Relevant habitat and species surveys and associated reports will be required to accompany planning applications which may affect a site, habitat or species of known or potential ecological value

- Air quality assessments will also be required for development proposals that would be likely to have a significantly adverse impact on biodiversity by generating an increase in air pollution
- Planning conditions/obligations will be used to secure net gains in biodiversity by helping to deliver Biodiversity Action Plan targets and/or meeting the aims of Conservation Target Areas. Developments for which these are the principal aims will be viewed favourably
- A monitoring and management plan will be required for biodiversity features on site to ensure their long term suitable management.

5.7 Policy ESD 13: Local Landscape Protection and Enhancement

Policy ESD 13: Local Landscape Protection and Enhancement

Opportunities will be sought to secure the enhancement of the character and appearance of the landscape, particularly in urban fringe locations, through the restoration, management or enhancement of existing landscapes, features or habitats and where appropriate the creation of new ones, including the planting of woodlands, trees and hedgerows.

Development will be expected to respect and enhance local landscape character, securing appropriate mitigation where damage to local landscape character cannot be avoided. Proposals will not be permitted if they would:

- Cause undue visual intrusion into the open countryside
- Cause undue harm to important natural landscape features and topography
- Be inconsistent with local character
- Impact on areas judged to have a high level of tranquillity
- Harm the setting of settlements, buildings, structures or other landmark features, or
- Harm the historic value of the landscape.

Development proposals should have regard to the information and advice contained in the Council's Countryside Design Summary Supplementary Planning Guidance, and the Oxfordshire Wildlife and Landscape Study (OWLS), and be accompanied by a landscape assessment where appropriate.

Leading solutions for the natural environment

Environmental Planning

Arboriculture Ecology and Biodiversity Net Gain Green Infrastructure Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) Expert Witness Natural Capital Appraisal Building with Nature Soils and Land Restoration

Garden & Landscape Design and Construction

Garden Design and Construction Landscape Design and Construction Landscape Contracting Garden & Landscape Maintenance

Forestry, Woodland and Tree Management

Forestry New Woodland Design and Creation Tree Risk Survey and Management Advice Vacant & Derelict Land Tree Surgery

Oxfordshire: The Park, North Aston, OX25 6HL | 01869 340342 Northamptonshire: 7-8 Melbourne House, Corbygate Business Park, Weldon, NN17 5JG | 01536 408840

contact@nicholsonsgb.com | www.nicholsonsgb.com



Client:	David Wilson Homes	David Wilson Homes Southern													Reference: 22-0776			
Site	Land off Camp Road	Unner	Heyford			Survey	or(s).	Ren Ione	as MSc BS	c (Hons) Din Arb	TechArborA					Date of survey:	31st August 2022	
Site.	Land on Camp Road,	, opper	neyioru			Juivey	01(3).	Demooring	Noto	This schodule	a forms a varification and consolidation of the Addendum (Def. 20 EE21) and D	have 2 (20 FEAE) survivus corried out in Anril 2021				Date of Survey.	5131 August 2022	
	Key to Notations												ERC	r	Sub category			
Stem Dia:	Stem diameter (mm) at 1.5n	m above err	ound level		Y Y	Young		Trees that h	nave not vet	reached 1/3 of the	ir expected mature height	Category			Enc	1-N	Jainly Arboricultural	
c.c.	Height of crown clearance a	bove groun	nd level		SM	Semi Mati	ure	Trees that h	nave reached	d 1/3 of their expec	ted mature height	A	High Quality & Vali	ue	40+	2-	Mainly Landscape	
L.B.	Lowest branch height in met	ters			EM	Early Mate	ure	Trees that h	nave reached	d 2/3 of their expec	ted mature height	В	Moderate Quality	& Value	20+	3	- Mainly Cultural	
D.L.B.	Direction of Lowest Branch				M	Mature		Close to full	I height and	crown size		c	Low Quality & Valu	ie	10+			
E.R.C	Estimated Remaining Contri	ibution (in y	years)		OM	Over Matu	ure Close to full height and crown size while			crown size while m	ain-stem diameter increases more slowly	U	Unsuitable for rete	ention	<10			
					v	Veteran		A tree that	has survived	the rigours of life a	and shows signs of ancientness							
Physiological of	condition (PC)	Good - No	o significant he	alth problems		Eair - Sum	ntoms of he	alth that can	he remedia	ted	Poor - Significant ill bealth			If a tree is des	ignated as veteran	the RPA calculation is de	termined as 15x the stem diameter for	
	1.1 (6.4)		1.10.1.1			run sym	promision ne	and that can	beremedia	100			NOTES:	greater prote	tion		termined as 15x the stern diameter for	
Structural con	laition (SC)	G000 - NO	o significant ab	normalities		Fair - Sign	ificant abnor	malities that	t can be rem	ediated	Poor - Significant abnormalities with no remedy			-				
Tree No	Species	H (m)	Stom Dia	No of Stome		((m)	1 R (m)	DIR (m)	A.g.o.	Condition	Observations	Percommondations	FRC	Cat	Sub Cat	RRA (m2)	RDA Radial distance (m)	
	openeo	,	Stem Dia.	No or sterns	Canopy (m)	ee (iii)	LD (III)	010 (111)	Age	condition	COSET VELICITS	Recommendations	Line		bab cat		IN A Radial distance (III)	
H1	Hawthorn, Common (Crataegus monogyna)	2.5	90	1	N - 1.5 E - 1.5 S - 1.5 W - 1.5	-	-	North	м	PC - Fair SC - Fair	2015 - Boundary hedgerow of hawthorn, elder and blackthorn that stretches length of eastern boundary. Evidence that it has previously been managed through flailing and laying. Hedge provides marginal low level screen and habitat value but agricultural field has been cultivated close to canopy and probably limits root spread. 2021 - No change in condition. Additional species of sycamore, goat willow and sporadic dead elm noted.	If retained continue to manage through flailing and plant up any gaps.	10+	с	2	5	1.20	
T2	Willow, Crack (Salix fragilis)	11.5	1200	1	N - 6 E - 8.5 S - 9 W - 4	3	2	West	ом	PC - Poor SC - Poor	2015 - Unable to access stem - all measurements estimated. Evidence of decaying stem and tree is multi stemmed from 1.5m. Lowest southern and western limbs have failed into site. Failed western limbs have been cut back to boundary. Numerous large deadwood throughout. 2021 - No change in condition.	If retained pollard at 1.5m in 1 year and manage as pollard through management regime.	<10	U	-	651	14.40	
T3	Elm (Ulmus sp.)	5	300	1	N - 1.5 E - 2.5 S - 2 W - 2	2	2	West	EM	PC - Poor SC - Poor	2015 - Dead tree within hedgerow. 2021 - Tree has failed into hedgerow. 2022 - No change in condition.	No action required.	<10	U	-	41	3.60	
T4	Elder (Sambucus nigra)	1	0	5	N - 0 E - 0 S - 0 W - 0	-	-	-	-	PC - Poor SC - Poor	2015 - Hedgerow tree which has previously been flailed. Can be easily replaced and has no retention value. 2021 - Tree has failed into hedgerow. 2022 - No change in condition.	No action required.	<10	U	-	-		
T5	Qak, Pedunculate (Quercus robur)	9	790	1	N - 7 E - 5 S - 4.5 W - 7	2	3	West	м	PC - Fair SC - Fair	2015 - Tree located in hedgerow with dense ivy clad stem and crown. Squat form for species and age but fairly prominent tree on eastern boundary. 2021 - No change in condition. 2022 - Minor hazard beam cracking on west side of crown, approx. 4.0 m above ground level.	If retained consider severing ivy and reinspect for health and safety purposes.	10+	с	1	290	9.60	
T6	Oak, Pedunculate (Quercus robur)	11	810	1	N - 6 E - 8 S - 8.5 W - 9	3	3	w	М	PC - Fair SC - Fair	2015 - Unable to access - measures estimated. Located in hedgerow. Minor deadwood throughout. 2022 - Minor and moderate deadwood in lower crown. Upper crown sparse in areas.	No action required.	20+	в	1	290	9.60	
H7	Mixed Species (N/A)	7	130	1	N - 3 E - 3 S - 3 W - 3	-	-	E	EM	PC - Fair SC - Poor	2015 - Dense ivy clad hedge of Hawthorn, Ash, Elm, Field maple, Sycamore. Height, age and condition varies. Several gaps along length. Provides partial screen to properties west. 2022 - No change in condition.	If retained, supplementary plant.	10+	С	2	7	1.50	

								Key to Notations					
			Age Class			Definition			Category Grading			ERC	Sub category
Stem Dia:	Stem diameter (mm) at 1.5m	above ground level	Y Young			Young Trees that have not yet reached 1/3 of their expected mature height			Category				1 - Mainly Arboricultural
c.c.	Height of crown clearance at	oove ground level	el SM Semi Mature Trees that have reached 1/3 of their expected mature height			ected mature height	А	High Quality & Val	ue	40+	2 - Mainly Landscape		
L.B.	Lowest branch height in met	ers	EM Early Mature			Early Mature Trees that have reached 2/3 of their expected mature height			В	Moderate Quality	& Value	20+	3 - Mainly Cultural
D.L.B.	Direction of Lowest Branch	irection of Lowest Branch		Mature		Close to full height an	d crown size		C	Low Quality & Valu	Je	10+	
E.R.C	Estimated Remaining Contrib	oution (in years)	ом	Over Mat	ure	Close to full height an	d crown size while m	main-stem diameter increases more slowly	U	Unsuitable for ret	ention	<10	
			v	Veteran		A tree that has survive	d the rigours of life	e and shows signs of ancientness					
Physiological o	ysiological condition (PC) Good - No significant health problems			Fair - Sym	nptoms of he	ealth that can be remed	iated	Poor - Significant ill health		NOTES:	If a tree is designated as veteran, the RPA calculation is determined as 15x the stem		the RPA calculation is determined as 15x the stem diameter for
Structural condition (SC) G		Good - No significant abnormalities		Fair - Significant abnormalities that can be remediated		mediated	Poor - Significant abnormalities with no remedy		Nones.	greater protect	tion		

Tree No.	Species	H (m)	Stem Dia.	No of Stems	Canopy (m)	CC (m)	LB (m)	DLB (m)	Age	Condition	Observations	Recommendations	ERC	Cat.	Sub Cat	RPA (m2)	RPA Radial distance (m)
Т8	Sycamore (Acer pseudoplatanus)	10	400	1	N - 5 E - 4.5 S - 6 W - 4	4	1	E	EM	PC - Good SC - Fair	2015 - Not plotted on Topo - position on plan remains indicative. Unable to access - all measurements estimated. Partially ivy clad stem and located in hedgerow. 2022 - No change in condition.	No action required.	10+	с	1	72	4.80
G9	Mixed Species (N/A)	12	200	1	N - 4 E - 4 S - 4 W - 4	1	1	E	EM	PC - Fair SC - Fair	2015 - Not plotted on Topo - all measurements estimated. 4 Sycamore and 1 Ash. Majority ivy clad. Measurements estimated and averaged. More prominent treees in hedgerow (14m length). 2022 - No change in condition.	No action required.	10+	с	2	18	2.40
T10	Sycamore (Acer pseudoplatanus)	10	190	1	N - 2 E - 2.5 S - 2 W - 2.5	2	3	E	EM	PC - Fair SC - Fair	2015 - Not plotted on Topo - position on plan remains indicative. Unable to access - all measurements estimated. Dense ivy clad stem. Stem bifurcates at 7m. 2022 - No change in condition.	No action required.	10+	с	1	18	2.40
G11	Sycamore (Acer pseudoplatanus)	9	300	1	N - 3.5 E - 4.5 S - 3.5 W - 4	2	2	E	EM	PC - Good SC - Fair	2015 - Not plotted on Topo - position on plan remains indicative. Unable to access - all measurements estimated. 2 trees that share mutual canopy. (10m south of BT cover). 2022 - No change in condition.	No action required.	10+	с	2	41	3.60
H12	Hawthorn, Common (Crataegus monogyna)	4.5	130	1	N - 2 E - 2 S - 2 W - 2	-		E	EM	PC - Good SC - Fair	2015 - Mixed species group of hawthorn, blackthorn and elder that stretches western boundary. Managed through flailing eastern side to facilitate clearance of access drive. Several gaps along length but provides low and mid level screen to adjacent properties. Overall height varies along length of group. 2021 - No change in condition. Additional species of oak and ash noted within group. 2022 - No change in condition.	Can be relatively easily replaced but considering retaining for screening value. If retained plant gaps to maintain boundary screen.	10+	с	2	7	1.50
T13	Ash, Common (Fraxinus excelsior)	8	404	6	N - 5.5 E - 6 S - 6 W - 5.5	3	1	N	EM	PC - Fair SC - Fair	2015 - Unable to access stem - all measurements estimated. Multi stemmed from base and growing through mesh fence with partially ivy clad stems. 2022 - No change in condition.	No action required.	10+	с	1	72	4.80
T14	Ash, Common (Fraxinus excelsior)	5.5	160	1	N - 4 E - 4 S - 2 W - 0.5	3	2	E	EM	PC - Fair SC - Poor	2015 - Unable to access stem - all measurements estimated. Heavily suppressed by larger neighbour and majority crown weight east. 2022 - No change in condition.	Removal will benefit neighbouring tree of better long term life expectancy.	10+	С	1	10	1.80

								Key to Notations						
			Age Class			Definition			Category Grading			ERC	Sub category	
Stem Dia:	Stem diameter (mm) at 1.5m	above ground level	Y	Young Trees that have not yet reached 1/3 of			eached 1/3 of thei	ir expected mature height	Category				1 - Mainly Arboricultural	
c.c.	Height of crown clearance at	of crown clearance above ground level SM Semi Mature Trees that have reached 1/3 of their expected mature height			ted mature height	А	High Quality & Val	ue	40+	2 - Mainly Landscape				
L.B.	Lowest branch height in met	nt in meters EM			est branch height in meters EM Early Mature Trees that have reached 2/3 of their expected mature height			ted mature height	В	Moderate Quality	& Value	20+	3 - Mainly Cultural	
D.L.B.	Direction of Lowest Branch		м	Mature		Close to full height and cr	rown size		c	Low Quality & Valu	ıe	10+		
E.R.C	Estimated Remaining Contrib	oution (in years)	OM Over Mature Close to full height and crown size while main-stem diameter increases more slowly			U	Unsuitable for ret	ention	<10					
	•		v	Veteran		A tree that has survived t	the rigours of life a	and shows signs of ancientness						
Physiological	hysiological condition (PC) Good - No significant health problems			Fair - Sym	ptoms of he	alth that can be remediate	ed	Poor - Significant ill health		NOTES:	If a tree is des	tree is designated as veteran, the RPA calculation is determined as 15x the stem diameter fo		
Structural condition (SC) Good - No s		Good - No significant abnormalities		Fair - Sign	ificant abno	nt abnormalities that can be remediated P		Poor - Significant abnormalities with no remedy		Notes.	greater protection			

Tree No.	Species	H (m)	Stem Dia.	No of Stems	Canopy (m)	CC (m)	LB (m)	DLB (m)	Age	Condition	Observations	Recommendations	ERC	Cat.	Sub Cat	RPA (m2)	RPA Radial distance (m)
G15	Ash, Common (Fraxinus excelsior)	9	300	1	N - 3.5 E - 4.5 S - 6 W - 5	3	1	E	EM	PC - Fair SC - Fair	2015 - Unable to access stems - all measurements estimated. Group consists of x1 ash and x3 sycamore that share mutual canopy. Ash has dense ivy but otherwise good group. 2021 - No change in condition. 2022 - No change in condition.	If retained consider severing ivy.	10+	с	2	41	3.60
G16	Maple, Norway (Acer platanoides)	11	300	1	N - 5 E - 5.5 S - 5 W - 6	3	-	S	EM	PC - Good SC - Fair	2015 - Unable to access stems - all measurements estimated. Consists of x1 norway maple and x1 prunus. Both multi stemmed from base but good future potential. 2021 - No change in condition. 2022 - No change in condition.	No action required.	20+	В	2	41	3.60
T17	Sycamore (Acer pseudoplatanus)	10	275	3	N - 5 E - 4 S - 4 W - 4	3	2	S	EM	PC - Good SC - Fair	2015 - Unable to access stem - all measurements estimated. x3 stems from base and tree with good future potential. 2021 - No change in condition. 2022 - No change in condition.	No action required.	20+	В	1	34	3.30
T18	Ash, Common (Fraxinus excelsior)	13.5	502	6	N - 7.5 E - 8 S - 7 W - 6	4	2	S	м	PC - Good SC - Fair	2015 - Unable to access stem - all measurements estimated. Multi stemmed from base with partial ivy cover. Telephone wire noted through central canopy but good future potential. 2021 - No change in condition. Although potential Ash Dieback (ADB) in upper crown. 2022 - No change in condition.	If retained, monitor for further signs of ADB.	20+	в	1	113	6.00
G19	Cherry (Prunus sp.)	10	150	1	N - 2.5 E - 3.5 S - 3 W - 3	3	1	s	EM	PC - Fair SC - Fair	2015 - Unable to access stems - all measurements estimated. x1 prunus and x1 sycamore which are insignificant trees and can be easily replaced. 2021 - No change in condition. 2022 - No change in condition.	No action required.	10+	с	2	10	1.80
T20	Sycamore (Acer pseudoplatanus)	9.5	200	1	N - 4 E - 4 S - 1 W - 3	3	3	N	EM	PC - Fair SC - Fair	2015 - Unable to access stem - all measurements estimated. Majority crown weight north and suppressed by larger neighbours. 2021 - No change in condition. 2022 - No change in condition.	No action required.	10+	с	1	18	2.40
T21	Ash, Common (Fraxinus excelsior)	12	360	1	N - 7 E - 5.5 S - 1 W - 2	3	5	E	М	PC - Fair SC - Fair	2015 - Majority crown weight north and suppressed by larger neighbour due south. Evidence of lowest eastern limb broken through contact with vehicle. 2021 - No change in condition. Although potential Ash Dieback (ADB) in upper crown. 2022 - No change in condition.	Consider removal as this will benefit larger neighbour of better quality. If retained, monitor for further signs of ADB.	10+	с	1	55	4.20

	Key to Notations														
			Age Class			Definition			Category Grading			ERC	Sub category		
Stem Dia:	Stem diameter (mm) at 1.5m	Stem diameter (mm) at 1.5m above ground level		Young		Trees that have not yet reached 1/3 of the		eir expected mature height	Category				1 - Mainly Arboricultural		
c.c.	Height of crown clearance at	SM	Semi Mat	ture	Trees that have	eached 1/3 of their expe	ected mature height	A		High Quality & Value		2 - Mainly Landscape			
L.B.	Lowest branch height in met	EM	Early Mat	ture	Trees that have	eached 2/3 of their expe	ected mature height	B	Moderate Quality & Value		20+	3 - Mainly Cultural			
D.L.B.	Direction of Lowest Branch	м	Mature		Close to full hei	it and crown size		C	Low Quality & Val	Low Quality & Value					
E.R.C	Estimated Remaining Contrib	Remaining Contribution (in years)		Over Mat	ture	Close to full height and crown size while m		main-stem diameter increases more slowly	U	Unsuitable for retention		un <10			
			v	Veteran		A tree that has	rvived the rigours of life	e and shows signs of ancientness							
Physiological condition (PC)		Good - No significant health problems		Fair - Syn	Fair - Symptoms of health that can be remediated		mediated	Poor - Significant ill health		NOTES	If a tree is desi	If a tree is designated as veteran, the RPA calculation is determined as 15x the stem diameter for greater protection			
Structural condition (SC)		Good - No significant abnormalities		Fair - Significant abnormalities that can be remediated		e remediated	Poor - Significant abnormalities with no remedy			greater protec					

Tree No.	Species	H (m)	Stem Dia.	No of Stems	Canopy (m)	CC (m)	LB (m)	DLB (m)	Age	Condition	Observations	Recommendations	ERC	Cat.	Sub Cat	RPA (m2)	RPA Radial distance (m)
T22	Cherry (Prunus sp.)	8	300	1	N - 5 E - 2 S - 1 W - 4.5	2	2	N	EM	PC - Poor SC - Poor	2015 - Unable to access stem - all measurements estimated. Dense ivy cover and all weight north due to suppression by larger neighbour south. 2021 - No change in condition. 2022 - No change in condition.	Fell.	<10	υ		41	3.60
T23	Sycamore (Acer pseudoplatanus)	14	762	4	N - 6 E - 6 S - 4.5 W - 6	3	-	N	М	PC - Good SC - Fair	2015 - Unable to access stems - all measurements estimated. Multi stemmed from base with partial ivy cover. Very prominent tree on western boundary. 2021 - No change in condition. 2022 - No change in condition.	If retained consider severing ivy and reinspection for health and safety purposes as unions at base were not visible.	20+	В	1	254	9.00
T24	Sycamore (Acer pseudoplatanus)	11	370	1	N - 0 E - 5 S - 6 W - 4.5	3	2	E	М	PC - Fair SC - Fair	2015 - Majority crown weight south and suppressed by larger neighbour due north. 2021 - No change in condition. 2022 - No change in condition.	Consider removal as this will benefit larger neighbour of better quality.	10+	с	1	64	4.50
G25	Sycamore (Acer pseudoplatanus)	10	290	1	N - 3 E - 3 S - 3 W - 3	3	1	E	EM	PC - Good SC - Fair	2015 - Mixed species group on western boundary. Consists of x5 sycamore and x1 prunus which provide mid level screen to neighbouring site. 2021 - No change in condition. 2022 - No change in condition.	No action required.	20+	В	2	41	3.60
T26	Sycamore (Acer pseudoplatanus)	8	232	4	N - 2.5 E - 3.5 S - 2.5 W - 3	3	-	N	EM	PC - Fair SC - Fair	2015 - Multi stemmed from base and insignificant tree that can be easily replaced. 2021 - No change in condition. 2022 - No change in condition.	No action required.	10+	с	1	23	2.70
G27	Elm (Ulmus sp.)	6	90	1	N - 1.5 E - 1.5 S - 1.5 W - 1.5	2	1	E	Y	PC - Poor SC - Poor	2015 - Several dead stems within hedgerow. 2021 - No change in condition. 2022 - No change in condition.	Fell without removing hedgerow.	<10	U	-	5	1.20
H28	Hawthorn, Common (Crataegus monogyna)	1	80	1	N - 1.5 E - 1.5 S - 1.5 W - 1.5	-	-	N	М	PC - Fair SC - Fair	2015 - Low cut hedgerow on southern boundary which has been managed through flailing. Consists of hawthorn, sycamore and elder. Provides very marginal habitat value but limited visual quality due to overall height. 2021 - No change in condition. 2022 - No change in condition.	If retained continue to manage through flailing and plant up any gaps.	10+	С	3	3	0.90





