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## Report Caveats

## Full Legal Disclaimer

This report was prepared as a report of work instructed by client (as specified). Neither Environmental Services nor any associated company, nor any of their employees, nor any of their contractors, subcontractors or their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or any third party's use or the report and its findings. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favouring by Environmental Services or any associated company. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of Environmental Services or any associated company.

## Copyright \& Non-Disclosure Notice

The content, layout and any supporting digital files associated with this report are subject to copyright owned by Environmental Services. Exceptions to this are present where that copyright has been legally assigned to us by another party/ organisation. In addition Environmental Services may utilise content generated under license. Reproduction, scanning, copying or distribution of this report in any form is prohibited without prior written agreement

## Third Party Disclaimer

Neither the Environmental Services nor any of its associated companies, sub-contractors or suppliers will be responsible or liable for any claim of loss or damage resulting from the third party use of the information contained within this report.

## Specific - Trees

All tree inspections, unless specified, have been undertaken from ground level and using non-invasive techniques. Comments contained within the report on the condition and risk associated with any tree relate to the condition of the tree at the date and time of survey. Please note that the condition of trees is subject to change. This change may occur, but is not limited to biological and non-biological factors as well as mechanical/ physical changes to conditions in the proximity of the tree. Trees should be inspected at intervals relative to identified site risks and in accordance with relevant HSE and Central Government guidance. Environmental Services can provide further information on this matter if required.

Please note no statutory control checks have been undertaken (unless specified). Where tree surgery works have been identified these works are based on the assumption that planning is approved, no tree works should be undertaken prior to determination of this application without up to date confirmation of the Tree Preservation Order / Conservation Area Status of the vegetation. All works should be undertaken in accordance with the appropriate Duty of Care. This should include, for example, site specific risk assessments and due diligence inspections for the presence of protected species.

Any comment relating to $3^{\text {rd }}$ party trees has been made without full access to the tree(s). Should these trees have any impact on the proposed development we would advise you to instruct us to contact the $3^{r d}$ party and undertake further inspection work.
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### 1.0 Introduction

1.1 Environmental Services have been appointed by Ridge \& Partners LLP to provide advice on the arboricultural issues relating to the proposed development of the above site.
1.2 We undertook a Pre-Development Tree Condition Survey (see Appendix 1), on $14^{\text {th }}$ July 2016. This survey assessed the condition of the tree resource, categorised the trees and provided the Root Protection Area (RPA) information according to the BS5837:2012 "Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations".
1.3 Following preparation of our Tree Condition Survey we received a copy of the layout drawing showing the development proposal for the site.
1.4 Our detailed check with the Local Planning Authority has confirmed the following trees are subject to statutory protection:

|  | A | B | C | U |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  Tree Preservation <br> Order  | No TPO Present <br> onsite | No TPO Present <br> onsite | No TPO Present <br> onsite | No TPO Present <br> onsite |
| Conservation Area | All 'A' category <br> trees | All 'B' category <br> trees | All 'C' category <br> trees |  <br> T52 |

1.5 In addition we note the site is located within RAF Bicester Conservation Area.
1.6 The tree numbers used in this report refer to the tree numbers used in our Tree Condition Survey.
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### 2.0 Executive Summary

2.1 RAF Bicester was occupied by the military from 1916 and became part of the RAF in 1918 used as a Training Depot. By 1928 the airfield had been transformed into a state-of-the-art Bomber Station. Through the Second World War RAF Bicester progressively became a maintenance unit dealing with airplanes and motor transport.
2.2 Currently, there are two proposed sites under consideration as detailed in the appendix. The first site is located south of the Gliding Centre. It consists of grass land occasionally used by the Windrusher's Gliding Club. The second site is located to the north of the existing development and is similar in nature to the first site, containing short grass and existing tarmac surfaces used for access around the airfield. The sites are adjacent to the A4421, the road running along the western and southern boundary of the RAF Bicester site. The surrounding area consists of the airfield and existing buildings between the two sites and to the east. To the south is largely Greenfield and semi-detached residential properties. To the west is a mix of residential properties and a business park located on the other side of the A4421. The trees on the site surround each boundary with mature trees of high amenity value with younger trees located within the site amongst the existing buildings, most of low quality and landscape value.
2.3 The development proposal is currently in very early stages. Bicester Heritage has undertaken some initial master planning for future developments and has identified two projects which they would now like to progress with, these are set out below.

1. Independent Hotel: 350 Bed Hotel including gym, spa and conferencing facilities;
2. Garages with Accommodation (GWA): 60 units which provide garages with associated accommodation.
2.4 A summary of the affected trees is detailed in the table below:

| Impact | Reason | A | B | C | U |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Trees to be <br> removed | To facilitate the <br> development or due <br> to their condition (U <br> cat) | Not known at <br> present | Not known at <br> present | Not known at <br> present | T5, T31, T41 <br> \& T52 |
| Trees with RPA <br> encroachment | To facilitate <br> construction | Not known at <br> present | Not known at <br> present | Not known at <br> present | Nil |
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### 3.0 Scope of Tree Survey

3.1 To carry out a tree condition survey on the trees and hedgerows at and immediately adjacent to the site, identifying any hazard trees and making recommendations for those trees to be retained and low amenity value and hazard trees to be replaced.
3.2 To undertake the tree survey in accordance with the principles of BS5837: 2012 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations'.
3.3 To produce a tree constraints plan (TCP), showing the location of surveyed trees, their BS5837: 2012 categorisation, the theoretical Root Protection Areas (RPA).
3.4 To carry out an arboricultural impact assessment on the effect of the new development at the site identifying the construction exclusion zones (CEZ) shown on the tree protection plan (TPP). This will also show the locations for tree protective fencing, any temporary ground protection required and identify 'No-Dig’ zones for RPAs shown outside of CEZs.
3.5 The purpose of this report is to comment on the arboricultural implication of the proposed development and to aid the preservation of trees to be retained at and adjacent to the site during the construction works by setting out the tree protection methods, construction techniques and working practices that are to be adopted on this site.
3.6 If the guidelines and principles outlined in this report are not adhered to, as with all development sites there is a risk that the construction activities will result in damage to and potentially the death of the retained trees. Damage to the trees will significantly increase the risk of their health declining and may increase the risk of their complete or partial failure.

### 4.0 Terms of Reference

4.1 Reference Documents:

- BS5837:2012 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - recommendations'
- BS3998:2010 ‘Tree work - recommendations’
- NJUG 4 - National Joint Utilities Group "Guidelines for the planning, installation and maintenance of utility apparatus in proximity to trees. Volume 4, issue 2. London: NJUG 2007"
- Information from the Cherwell District \& South Northants Councils plan and website
- BGS Open Source Soil Data http://www.bgs.ac.uk/nercsoilportal/maps.html
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### 5.0 Description of Site and Proposed Works

5.1 The site consists of 348 acres of a historic 1920s RAF bomber stations. There are multiple redbrick buildings, hangars, tree-lined avenues and airfield to provide an authentic period setting.
5.2 The immediate and distant landscape character is that of a semi -rural setting with a wide open airfield into a rural vista with a tree lined boundary to the South and West protecting against the A4421 road.
5.3 The topography of the site is generally level, and historically landscaped with no adverse topographical features.

| Site Location (OS) | Site Location (BGS Soil) |
| :--- | :---: |
| OX265HA |  |
| Summary <br> Cornbrash Formation - Limestone. Sedimentary Bedrock formed approximately 161 to 168 million <br> years ago in the Jurassic Period. Local environment previously dominated by shallow carbonate <br> seas. (soil) Information from BGS online. |  |

5.4 The underlying site soil has been identified as limestone. This decreases the risk of damage to the trees by way of site compaction as this soil type is less prone to compaction. Trees in this soil type generally explore a greater depth of soil horizons.
5.5 All comments regarding soils should be verified with onsite geotechnical investigations and laboratory testing with foundation depth and design undertaken by a structural engineer in accordance with the requirements of NHBC Chapter 4.2.

## Preliminary Arboricultural Implication Assessment <br> Bicester Airfield <br> Ridge \& Partners LLP

### 6.0 The Trees

6.1 There were 70 Individual trees, 8 groups and 1 woodland area surveyed onsite or immediately adjacent to the site boundary.
6.2 By BS5837:2012 categorisation individually there were; 1 ' A ' category trees, 26 ' B ' category trees and 39 ' C ' category trees. By group and Woodland Area there were 8 ' C ' category groups and 1 ' C ’ category Woodland. In total there were 4 ' $U$ ' category individual trees which were identified as in poor condition or dead/in-decline with less than ten years useful life expectancy. These should be felled and replaced regardless of any impact of the development proposal.
6.3 The trees can be summarized as follows:

| BS 5837 Cat | A | B | C | U |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Specific Trees | T50 | $\begin{gathered} \text { T14, T15, T20, T27, } \\ \text { T28, T32, T42, T43, } \\ \text { T44, T46, T47, T49, } \\ \text { T51, T55, T56, T57, } \\ \text { T58, T59, T60, T61, } \\ \text { T63, T64, T65, T67, } \\ \text { T68 \& T69 } \end{gathered}$ | W1, TG1, TG2, TG3, TG4, TG5, TG6, TG7, TG8, T1, T2, T3, T4, T6, T7, T8, T9, T10, T11, T12, T13, T16, T17, T18, T19, T21, T22, T23, T24, T25, T26, T29, T30, T33, T34, T35, T36, T37, T38, T39, T40, T45, T48, T53, T54, T62, T66 \& T70 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { T5, T31, } \\ & \text { T41 \& T52 } \end{aligned}$ |
| Total Number | 1 | 26 | 39 Individual Trees <br> 1 Woodland \& 8 Tree Groups | 4 |

6.4 The trees locations vary throughout the site however all trees contribute to the internal treescape within the immediate and distant landscape setting.
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### 7.0 Arboricultural Impact Assessment

### 7.1 Tree Removals

7.1 The 4 Individual trees to be removed, by BS5837:2012 category, are: U-T5, T31, T41 \& T52

The 1 tree group to be removed, by BS5837:2012 category, is:
C - TG8
This is due to poor specimen trees of low quality and value.
7.1.1 The exact number of trees constraining the proposed is unknown to date, once the location of the proposed has been decided exact numbers of constrained trees will be identified.
7.1.2 Every effort will be made to reduce the removal of trees from the site. However, to mitigate the tree loss proposed, the Local Planning Authority is invited to secure a detailed Landscaping Proposal by way of Planning Condition.

### 7.2 Root Protection Area (RPA) Incursions

7.2.1 At current the following incursions into the RPA's of trees to be retained is not known.

### 7.3 Foundations

7.3.1 It is not known at current if the foundations of the proposal will encroach into the RPA of retained trees.

### 7.4 Services

7.4.1 The route of any services needs to be carefully considered so as to avoid unnecessary encroachment into retained trees RPA's.
7.4.2 These should, where possible, not encroach within the RPAs of retained trees, and currently the precise location of new excavations for services is not known. Where excavations slightly encroach into adjacent tree RPA's their excavation should only be considered when supervised by the consultant arboriculturist from Environmental Services and may need to be undertaken using an 'Airspade'/hand tool combination.
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### 7.5 Ground Levels

7.5.1 It is currently not known if changes to existing ground levels are proposed within the RPA's of retained trees.

### 7.6 Shading

7.6.1 No shading issues have been identified with the preliminary proposal at this stage on the basis of the orientation of the tree resource relative to the proposed areas.

### 7.7 Site Supervision/ Monitoring

7.7.1 Most damage to trees on developments sites is caused inadvertently and to ensure continued protection during development a system of site monitoring is proposed.
7.7.2 Basic checks will ensure that protective fencing remains intact. Any unforeseen issues can also be identified and discussed before damage to the tree(s) occurs.
7.7.3 The Local Planning Authority is invited to secure the following schedule by way of Planning Condition. To be effective the Local Planning Authority must provide us with a copy of the formal Decision Notice to ensure we can then contact and follow up the proposed monitoring. A copy of the Decision Notice should be emailed to planning@innovation-environmental.co.uk. The number of proposed visits is driven by the scale of the proposal
7.7.4 A more detailed explanation of what will be assessed during the proposed monitoring visits is contained in Appendix 5.

| Visit | Date | Status |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Pre-commencement Inspections <br> Attend site to inspect type and location of tree <br> protection and any temporary ground protection prior to <br> development commencing and discuss any issues <br> associated with demolition/ enabling works | TBC | Incomplete |
| Site Inspection <br> Attend site to confirm fencing remains in place and <br> supervise etc. | TBC | Incomplete |
| Site Inspection <br> Attend site to confirm fencing remains in place and <br> supervise etc. | TBC | Incomplete |
| Site Inspection <br> Attend site to confirm fencing remains in place and <br> supervise etc. | TBC | Incomplete |
| Site Inspection <br> Final site visit to confirm that no damage has been <br> done to retained trees/ identify any remedial actions in <br> the event damage has occurred. Assess any required <br> tree surgery following construction | TBC | Incomplete |
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### 8.0 Recommendations

8.1 The preliminary tree works recommended are included in the tree tables contained within this report within the tree works schedule at Appendix 5.
8.2 That during the construction build phase, following current consultation with the arboriculturist, adequate provision is made for the protection of existing trees on site and the areas to be planted with new trees and shrubs.
8.3 That by liaison with the council tree officer, formal agreement should be sought regarding the tree pruning required and tree protection methods employed to protect retained trees. These will be via the production of a site specific method statement (SSMS) and will include:

- Tree protective fencing as shown on the tree protective plan
- No ground excavations within tree RPAs, unless approved by the tree officer
- Any anti-compaction measures taken
- The specific location of services trenches where possible to avoid excavations within RPAs, or if necessary to be undertaken by hand dig only
- Specific methods for construction of site access routes and new drainage ditches close to or within retained trees RPAs
8.4 Pre-commencement site meetings should be arranged to discuss the recommendations in this and subsequent reports and method statements. Copies of all relevant arboricultural reports should be available on site.
8.5 The SSMS should be developed further with the contractor through the development process to include comments made by them and the client and design team as well as council officers. A copy of the tree report, including the site specific method statements and tree protection plan is kept on site at all times.
8.6 That details of site inspection / supervision visits by the consultant arboriculturist are recorded and sent to the council tree officer with copies retained by the site manager.
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### 9.0 Conclusions

9.1 The site is located within a semi-rural landscape setting, there are many significant amenity value trees on site. Most of which are ' B ' category standard trees. The dominant individual tree species on this site is Sycamore, Beech, Whitebeam and Hornbeam as the other standard trees present. All of these trees are protected within the conservation area of RAF Bicester. Most of the trees are in need of some basic crown pruning works due to their lack of recent management.
9.2 It is currently not known the exact number of trees in direct conflict with the proposed. However four trees are ' $U$ ' category and should be felled regardless of the constraining development. One ' C ' category group has been recommended for removal due to poor form and low quality specimen trees.
9.3 Tree protection measures, once the proposed has been set may include the use of cellular confinement sub-base systems, and the installation of tree protective fencing and temporary ground protection will adequately protect the other retained trees RPAs if accompanied by detailed methods and supervision by a consultant arboriculturist.
9.4 Sufficient development room will be available after protection measures are instigated as described within this report. Excavations within retained tree RPAs for construction operations such as; service trenches; changes in levels, foundations excavations and removal of existing hard surfacing will be avoided where possible.
9.5 The development of the site will bring an opportunity for best practice tree management of the remaining trees and group areas on the site and an opportunity for further native tree and hedgerow planting. All tree works, translocation and landscape replacement tree planting will require agreement with the council officers.


Jonnie Setterfield. BSc (Hons) Consultant Arboriculturist
$11^{\text {th }}$ August 2016
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Appendix 1 - Key to Tree Survey Sheets

## Key

| BS 5837 Cat | Description |
| :---: | :---: |
| A | Those of high quality and value: in such a condition as to be able to make a <br> substantial contribution ( $>40$ years) |
| B | Those trees of moderate quality and value: those in such a condition as to make a <br> significant contribution ( $>20$ years) |
| C | Those trees of low quality and value: currently in adequate condition to remain until <br> new planting could be established ( $>10$ years) |
| U | Those in such a condition that any existing value would be lost within 10 years and <br> which should, in the current context, be removed regardless of development |

Note: Sub categories are denoted in the tree survey data (A1, B1, C2 etc.). You are referred to the BS for further detail if required.

| Tree No. | T (tree), G (group), H (hedge), W (woodland) + Ref No. |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Species | Common Name |  |  |
| $\mathbf{H t} \mathbf{( m )}$ | Measured height in metres |  |  |
| DBH (m) | Diameter at 1.5m above ground level |  |  |
| Branch Spread | In m to cardinal points |  |  |
| Cr Ht Clearance (m) | Overall height of lowest branches from the ground level on side of proposed <br> development |  |  |
| Life Stage | Young, Semi-Mature, Early-Mature, Mature, Over-Mature |  |  |
| General Observations | Observations on the condition of the tree(s) |  |  |
| Tree Work Specification | Proposed tree works in accordance with BS3998 |  |  |
| BS Cat | See above |  |  |
| Life Exp | Estimated remaining contribution in years. |  |  |
| RPA Radius(m) | Radius of the trees Root Protection Area measured from the trunk to the <br> edge of the RPA circle in metres |  |  |
| RPA (m2) | Overall Root Protection Area in m2 |  |  |
| Indicates where tree data may have been estimated as tree was <br> offsite/restricted access/dense vegetation hindering full inspection |  |  |  |
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Appendix 2 - Tree Survey Sheets

| Tree No. | Species | DBH | No of Stems | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Ht} \\ (\mathrm{~m}) \end{gathered}$ | N | E | S | W | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BS } \\ & \text { Cat } \end{aligned}$ | Age Class | Life Expect | Cr Ht <br> (m) | Observation | Recommendations | $\begin{aligned} & \text { RPA } \\ & \text { (m2) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| W1 | Mixed Species woodland mainly comprising of Ash, Elm, Acer sp and Prunus sp with other understory species. | 0.25 | M/s | 12 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | C2 | EarlyMature | 10_19 | 1 | Woodland boundary trees, between airfield and highway. No significant recent crown management. Dutch elm disease present.3rd party offsite trees, unable to fully inspect. Offsite boundary trees with overhanging branches. | No Works. | 20 |
| TG1 | Ash. Elm. Elder and Hawthorn. | 0.2 | M/s | 6 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | C2 | EarlyMature | 10_19 | 0.5 | Poor form, shape and condition. Unable to inspect due to restricted access. Offsite boundary tree with overhanging branches. Hedgerow standard tree. Self-set, pioneer tree. Dead Elms | Cut back to boundary line, and remove all dead elm trees. | 13 |
| TG2 | Ash, Sycamore Elm, Elder and Hawthorn. | 0.2 | M/s | 6 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | C2 | EarlyMature | 10_19 | 0.5 | Poor form, shape and condition. Unable to inspect due to restricted access. Offsite boundary tree with overhanging branches. Hedgerow standard tree. Self-set, pioneer tree. Dead Elms | Cut back to boundary line, and remove all dead elm trees. | 13 |
| TG3 | Hawthorn, Elder, Elm and Prunus sp | 0.22 | M/s | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | C2 | EarlyMature | 10_19 | 1 | Poor form, shape and condition. Offsite boundary tree with overhanging branches. Dead Elms | Remove all dead elms | 15 |
| TG4 | Hawthorn, Elder, Elm, Ash and Prunus sp | 0.22 | M/s | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | C2 | EarlyMature | 10_19 | 1 | Poor form, shape and condition. Dead Elms | Remove all dead elms | 15 |
| TG5 | Ash, Apple, Elm, Elder, Sycamore, Norway Maple, Field Maple, Hawthorn and Prunus Sp | 0.27 | M/s | 8 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | C2 | EarlyMature | 10_19 | 1 | Average form, shape and condition. Hedgerow standard tree. Mixed hedge - managed / unmanaged. No significant recent crown management. Tree located near to highway, boundary trees. | No Works. | 23 |


| Tree No. | Species | DBH | No of Stems | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Ht} \\ (\mathrm{~m}) \end{gathered}$ | N | E | S | W | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BS } \\ & \text { Cat } \end{aligned}$ | Age Class | Life Expect | Cr Ht <br> (m) | Observation | Recommendations | $\begin{aligned} & \text { RPA } \\ & \text { (m2) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TG6 | Apple, Hawthorn, Elder, Prunus | 0.25 | M/s | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | C2 | EarlyMature | 10_19 | 0.5 | Poor form (Asymmetric canopy), shape and condition. Unable to inspect due to restricted access. No significant recent crown management. Self-set, pioneer tree. Mixed hedge - managed/ unmanaged. Hedgerow standard trees. | No Works. | 20 |
| TG7 | Hawthorn, Cherry, Field maple, Birch, Alder and Acer sp | 0.18 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | C1 | EarlyMature | 10_19 | 2 | Average form, shape and condition. Young newly established tree. 3rd party offsite tree, unable to fully inspect. Highway boundary trees. | No Works. | 15 |
| TG8 | Sycamore. Elm. Elder. | 0.25 | M/s | 8 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | C2 | EarlyMature | 10_19 | 1 | Poor form, shape and condition. Self-set, pioneer tree. Young newly established tree. Dead elms | Fell to ground level. | 20 |
| T1 | Walnut. | 0.35 | M/s | 7.5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | C2 | EarlyMature | 10_19 | 2 | Average form, shape and condition. Co-dominant tree with included unions. Multiple pruning wounds on main stem. | No Works. | 38 |
| T2 | Norway Maple. | 0.28 | M/s | 8.5 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | C2 | EarlyMature | 10_19 | 1 | Poor form (Asymmetric canopy), shape and condition. Unable to inspect due to restricted access. Offsite boundary tree with overhanging branches. 3rd party offsite tree, unable to fully inspect. | No Works. | 25 |
| T3 | Sycamore | 0.26 | M/s | 8.5 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | C2 | EarlyMature | 10_19 | 1 | Poor form (Asymmetric canopy), shape and condition. Unable to inspect due to restricted access. Offsite boundary tree with overhanging branches. 3rd party offsite tree, unable to fully inspect. | No Works. | 21 |


| Tree No. | Species | DBH | No of Stems | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Ht} \\ (\mathrm{~m}) \end{gathered}$ | N | E | S | W | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BS } \\ & \text { Cat } \end{aligned}$ | Age Class | Life Expect | Cr Ht <br> (m) | Observation | Recommendations | $\begin{aligned} & \text { RPA } \\ & \text { (m2) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| T4 | Ash. | 0.3 | 1 | 8 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | C2 | EarlyMature | 10_19 | 2 | Poor form, shape and condition. Unable to inspect due to restricted access. Offsite boundary tree with overhanging branches. Hedgerow standard tree. | No Works. | 41 |
| T5 | Elm. | 0.18 | M/s | 6 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | U | EarlyMature | <10 | 1 | Poor form (Asymmetric canopy), shape and condition. Dutch elm disease | Fell to ground level. | 10 |
| T6 | Norway Maple | 0.26 | M/s | 8.5 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | C2 | EarlyMature | 10_19 | 1 | Poor form (Asymmetric canopy), shape and condition. Unable to inspect due to restricted access. Offsite boundary tree with overhanging branches. 3rd party offsite tree, unable to fully inspect. | No Works. | 21 |
| T7 | Field Maple. | 0.14 | 1 | 6.5 | 2 | 1.5 | 2 | 3 | C2 | EarlyMature | 10_19 | 2 | Poor form (Asymmetric canopy), shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. 3rd party offsite tree, unable to fully inspect. | No Works. | 9 |
| T8 | Norway Maple | 0.38 | M/s | 8.5 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | C2 | EarlyMature | 10_19 | 1 | Poor form (Asymmetric canopy), shape and condition. Unable to inspect due to restricted access. Offsite boundary tree with overhanging branches. 3rd party offsite tree, unable to fully inspect. | No Works. | 45 |
| T9 | Ash. | 0.24 | M/s | 8.5 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | C2 | EarlyMature | 10_19 | 1 | Poor form (Asymmetric canopy), shape and condition. Unable to inspect due to restricted access. Offsite boundary tree with overhanging branches. 3rd party offsite tree, unable to fully inspect. | No Works. | 18 |


| Tree No. | Species | DBH | No of Stems | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Ht} \\ (\mathrm{~m}) \end{gathered}$ | N | E | S | W | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BS } \\ & \text { Cat } \end{aligned}$ | Age Class | Life Expect | Cr Ht (m) | Observation | Recommendations | $\begin{aligned} & \text { RPA } \\ & \text { (m2) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| T10 | Cherry. | 0.09 | M/s | 5 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | C1 | EarlyMature | 10_19 | 2 | Average form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Co-dominant tree with included unions. Young newly established tree. Tree located on driving course potential soil compaction. | No Works. | 3 |
| T11 | Hawthorn. | 0.08 | M/s | 3 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | C1 | SemiMature | 10_19 | 1 | Average form, shape and condition. Co-dominant tree with included unions. Potential compaction due to driving course. | No Works. | 2 |
| T12 | Hornbeam | 0.74 | 2 | 17.4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | C1 | Mature | 10_19 | 2 | Average form, shape and condition. <br> No significant recent crown management. Co-dominant tree with major stem included union. Damaged bark with sound woo exposed. Multiple pruning wounds on main stem with minor decay. | Cut branches back from fence by 2 m | 172 |
| T13 | Hornbeam | 0.49 | 2 | 12.7 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | C1 | Mature | 10_19 | 2 | Average form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Co-dominant tree with included union. Multiple pruning wounds on main stem with minor decay. | Cut branches back from fence by 2 m | 75 |
| T14 | Sycamore. | 0.36 | 1 | 14 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | B2 | Mature | 20_39 | 3.5 | Average form, shape and condition. Subject to crown management Lifted. Soil compacted within rooting zone vehicle tracks. | No Works. | 59 |
| T15 | Norway Maple. | 0.4 | 1 | 14 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | B2 | Mature | 20_39 | 3.5 | Average form, shape and condition. Subject to crown management Lifted. Soil compacted within rooting zone vehicle tracks. Root girdling base of stem. | No Works. | 72 |


| Tree No. | Species | DBH | No of Stems | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{Ht} \\ & (\mathrm{~m}) \end{aligned}$ | N | E | S | W | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BS } \\ & \text { Cat } \end{aligned}$ | Age Class | Life Expect | Cr Ht <br> (m) | Observation | Recommendations | $\begin{aligned} & \text { RPA } \\ & \text { (m2) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| T16 | Sycamore. | 0.47 | 1 | 16 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 3 | C2 | Mature | 20_39 | 3.5 | Average form, shape and condition. Subject to crown management Lifted. Soil compacted within rooting zone vehicle tracks. Multiple Pruning wounds on main stem. | No Works. | 100 |
| T17 | Hornbeam | 0.41 | 2 | 12.7 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 4 | C1 | Mature | 10_19 | 2.5 | . No significant recent crown management. Co-dominant tree with included union. Multiple pruning wounds on main stem with minor decay. Poor form (Asymmetric canopy), shape and condition. Soil heavily compacted within rooting zone. | Cut branches back from fence by $2 m$ | 53 |
| T18 | Hornbeam | 0.46 | 2 | 14.5 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | C1 | Mature | 10_19 | 2.5 | No significant recent crown management. Co-dominant tree with included union. Multiple pruning wounds on main stem with minor decay. Poor form (Asymmetric canopy), shape and condition. Soil heavily compacted within rooting zone. | Cut branches back from fence by $2 m$ | 66 |
| T19 | Hornbeam | 0.49 | 2 | 12.7 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 4 | C1 | Mature | 10_19 | 2.5 | No significant recent crown management. Co-dominant tree with included union. Multiple pruning wounds on main stem with minor decay. Poor form (Asymmetric canopy), shape and condition. Soil heavily compacted within rooting zone. | Cut branches back from fence by 2 m | 75 |
| T20 | Western Red Cedar. | 0.6 | 1 | 16.7 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | B1 | Mature | 20_39 | 1.7 | Good form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. | No Works. | 163 |


| Tree No. | Species | DBH | No of Stems | Ht (m) | N | E | S | W | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BS } \\ & \text { Cat } \end{aligned}$ | Age Class | Life Expect | Cr Ht (m) | Observation | Recommendations | $\begin{aligned} & \text { RPA } \\ & \text { (m2) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| T21 | Sycamore. | 0.81 | 1 | 18.4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | C2 | Mature | 10_19 | 3 | Poor form (Asymmetric canopy), shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Ivy clad crown and stem unable to fully inspect. | Cut back from fence by 2 mSever ivy at 2 m from ground level and remove section. | 297 |
| T22 | Norway Maple. | 0.81 | 1 | 17.8 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 5 | C2 | Mature | 10_19 | 5 | Poor form (Asymmetric canopy), shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Ivy clad crown and stem unable to fully inspect. Dense crown, major crown deadwood. | Sever ivy at $2 m$ from ground level and remove section. Remove dead wood $>5 \mathrm{~cm}$ diameter throughout the crown / overhanging site. | 297 |
| T23 | Hawthorn. | 0.19 | M/s | 4.3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | C2 | Mature | 20_39 | 0.5 | Average form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. | No Works. | 11 |
| T24 | Goat Willow. | 0.38 | M/s | 6.7 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | C2 | EarlyMature | 10_19 | 0 | Poor form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Co-dominant tree with included unions. Hedgerow standard tree. Unable to inspect due to restricted access. | Remove basal vegetation and re-inspect root crown. | 45 |
| T25 | Goat Willow. | 0.37 | M/s | 6.9 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | C2 | EarlyMature | 10_19 | 0 | Poor form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Co-dominant tree with included unions. Hedgerow standard tree. Unable to inspect due to restricted access. | Remove basal vegetation and re-inspect root crown. | 43 |
| T26 | Sycamore. | 0.14 | 2 | 5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | C2 | EarlyMature | 10_19 | 0 | Poor form (Asymmetric canopy), shape and condition. Unable to inspect due to restricted access. Ivy clad crown and stem unable to fully inspect. | Sever ivy at 2 m from ground level and remove section. | 6 |
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| Tree No. | Species | DBH | No of Stems | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Ht} \\ (\mathrm{~m}) \end{gathered}$ | N | E | S | W | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BS } \\ & \text { Cat } \end{aligned}$ | Age Class | Life Expect | Cr Ht <br> (m) | Observation | Recommendations | $\begin{aligned} & \text { RPA } \\ & \text { (m2) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| T27 | Hornbeam. | 0.57 | 1 | 14.8 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | B1 | Mature | 20_39 | 3 | Average form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Co-dominant tree with included unions. | No Works. | 147 |
| T28 | Lime. | 0.69 | 1 | 17.2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | B1 | Mature | 20_39 | 3.5 | Average form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Ivy clad crown and stem unable to fully inspect. | Sever ivy at $2 m$ from ground level and remove section. | 215 |
| T29 | Rowan. | 0.27 | M/s | 5.3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | C1 | EarlyMature | 10_19 | 2 | Poor form (Asymmetric canopy), shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Multiple stemmed tree - with basal included unions. Sparse crown showing signs of stress with crown retrenchment. | No Works. | 23 |
| T30 | Rowan. | 0.31 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | C1 | EarlyMature | 10_19 | 2 | Average form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Sparse crown showing signs of stress with crown retrenchment. Tree located on bomb shelter | Tag 1424 | 43 |
| T31 | Silver Birch. | 0.38 | 1 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | U | EarlyMature | <10 | 3 | Poor form (Asymmetric canopy), shape and condition. Sparse crown showing signs of stress with crown retrenchment. Cavity between buttress roots with early/moderate decay. | Fell to ground level. | 65 |
| T32 | Sycamore. | 0.7 | 1 | 18.2 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | B2 | Mature | 20_39 | 2 | Average form, shape and condition. Dense crown, moderate/major crown deadwood. No significant recent crown management. | Remove dead wood $>5 \mathrm{~cm}$ diameter throughout the crown/overhanging site. | 222 |
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| Tree No. | Species | DBH | No of Stems | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{Ht} \\ & (\mathrm{~m}) \end{aligned}$ | N | E | S | W | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BS } \\ & \text { Cat } \end{aligned}$ | Age Class | Life Expect | Cr Ht (m) | Observation | Recommendations | $\begin{aligned} & \text { RPA } \\ & \text { (m2) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| T33 | Sycamore. | 0.65 | 2 | 16.5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | C2 | Mature | 10_19 | 2 | Poor form, shape and condition. Unable to inspect due to restricted access. Ivy clad crown and stem unable to fully inspect. Co-dominant tree with included unions. Dense crown, moderate/major crown deadwood. | Sever ivy at 2 m from ground level and remove section. Remove basal vegetation and re-inspect root crown. | 133 |
| T34 | Sycamore. | 0.25 | 2 | 12 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | C2 | Mature | 10_19 | 2 | Poor form, shape and condition. Unable to inspect due to restricted access. Ivy clad crown and stem unable to fully inspect. Co-dominant tree with included unions. Dense crown, moderate/major crown deadwood. | Sever ivy at $2 m$ from ground level and remove section. Remove basal vegetation and re-inspect root crown. | 20 |
| T35 | Sycamore. | 0.25 | 2 | 12 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | C2 | Mature | 10_19 | 2 | Poor form, shape and condition. Unable to inspect due to restricted access. Ivy clad crown and stem unable to fully inspect. Co-dominant tree with included unions. Dense crown, moderate/major crown deadwood. | Sever ivy at $2 m$ from ground level and remove section. Remove basal vegetation and re-inspect root crown. | 20 |
| T36 | Whitebeam. | 0.53 | 1 | 9.7 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | C2 | Mature | 10_19 | 4 | Average form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Central leader lost in past stag-headed crown, naturally reducing. Fiber buckling on stem at 6 m . Decay cavity at base of stem major decay. | Climbing inspection to measure the extent of branch decay. | 127 |
| T37 | Sycamore. | 0.4 | 1 | 11 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | C2 | Mature | 10_19 | 5 | Poor form (Asymmetric canopy), shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Dense crown, low/moderate crown deadwood. | Remove dead wood $>5 \mathrm{~cm}$ diameter throughout the crown / overhanging site. | 72 |
| T38 | Whitebeam. | 0.45 | 1 | 9 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | C1 | Mature | 10_19 | 3 | Average form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Wounding to buttress roots - Mower/Strimmer damage. | No Works. | 92 |


| Tree No. | Species | DBH | No of Stems | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Ht} \\ (\mathrm{~m}) \end{gathered}$ | N | E | S | W | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BS } \\ & \text { Cat } \end{aligned}$ | Age Class | Life Expect | Cr Ht (m) | Observation | Recommendations | $\begin{aligned} & \text { RPA } \\ & \text { (m2) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| T39 | Whitebeam. | 0.41 | 1 | 9 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | C1 | Mature | 10_19 | 3 | Average form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Wounding to buttress roots - Mower/Strimmer damage. | No Works. | 76 |
| T40 | Sycamore. | 0.39 | 1 | 11 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | C2 | Mature | 10_19 | 2.5 | Poor form (Asymmetric canopy), shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. | No Works. | 69 |
| T41 | Sycamore. | 0.71 | 1 | 18 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 4 | U | Mature | <10 | 5 | Poor form (Asymmetric canopy), shape and condition. Dense crown, moderate/major crown deadwood. Sparse crown showing signs of stress with crown retrenchment. Cavity between buttress roots with moderate/major decay. Decay cavity on main stem. | Fell to ground level. | 228 |
| T42 | Whitebeam. | 0.55 | 1 | 11 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | B1 | Mature | 10_19 | 3 | Average form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. | No Works. | 137 |
| T43 | Sycamore. | 0.45 | 1 | 11 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | B1 | Mature | 10_19 | 6 | Average form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Dense crown, moderate/major crown deadwood. | Remove dead wood $>5 \mathrm{~cm}$ diameter throughout the crown / overhanging site. | 92 |
| T44 | Whitebeam. | 0.64 | 1 | 12.4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | B1 | Mature | 20_39 | 4 | Average form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Decay branches on central stems with moderatelmajor decay. | Climbing inspection to measure the extent of decay | 185 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 30716102 \\ & \text { N V I } \end{aligned}$ | ONMEN | SE | V I C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $24 \mid P$ a g e |  |

BS5837 Pre-Development Tree Condition Survey
Bicester Airfield
Ridge \& Partners LLP

| Tree No. | Species | DBH | No of Stems | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Ht} \\ (\mathrm{~m}) \end{gathered}$ | N | E | S | W | BS | Age Class | Life Expect | Cr Ht (m) | Observation | Recommendations | $\begin{aligned} & \text { RPA } \\ & \text { (m2) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| T45 | Sycamore. | 0.44 | 1 | 11 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | C1 | Mature | 10_19 | 2 | Average form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Dense crown, moderate/major crown deadwood. Multiple pruning wounds on main stem with moderate decay cavities. | Remove dead wood $>5 \mathrm{~cm}$ diameter throughout the crown / overhanging site. | 88 |
| T46 | Whitebeam. | 0.64 | 1 | 12.4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | B1 | Mature | 20_39 | 4 | Average form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Decay branches on central stems with moderate\major decay. | Climbing inspection to measure the extent of decay | 185 |
| T47 | Whitebeam. | 0.61 | 1 | 12.4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | B1 | Mature | 20_39 | 4 | Average form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Decay branches on central stems with moderate\major decay. | Climbing inspection to measure the extent of decay | 168 |
| T48 | Sycamore. | 0.5 | 1 | 13.4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | C2 | Mature | 10_19 | 6 | Average form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Twin stemmed tree at 2 m with moderate included union. Tree located on bomb shelter bank. | No Works. | 113 |
| T49 | Whitebeam. | 0.62 | 1 | 12 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | B1 | EarlyMature | 20_39 | 2 | Average form, shape and condition. Tree located on bomb shelter, multiple pruning wounds. | No Works. | 174 |
| T50 | Laburnum. | 100 | M/s | 9 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | A3 | Veteran | 20_39 | 2 | Subject to crown management - <br> Lifted Thinned. Lapse multiple stemmed coppice stool - with included unions. Dense crown, low/moderate crown deadwood. Codominant tree with included unions. | No Works. | 707 |


| Tree No. | Species | DBH | No of Stems | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Ht} \\ (\mathrm{~m}) \end{gathered}$ | N | E | S | W | BS | Age Class | Life Expect | Cr Ht (m) | Observation | Recommendations | $\begin{aligned} & \text { RPA } \\ & \text { (m2) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| T51 | Whitebeam. | 0.62 | 1 | 12.4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | B1 | Mature | 20_39 | 4 | Average form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Decay branches on central stems with moderate\major decay. | Climbing inspection to measure the extent of decay | 174 |
| T52 | Whitebeam. | 0.49 | 1 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | U | Mature | <10 | 3 | Sparse crown showing signs of stress with crown retrenchment. Tree colonised by fungi thought to be Innotus sp. | Fell to ground level. | 109 |
| T53 | Laburnum. | 0.45 | 1 | 9 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | C2 | EarlyMature | 10_19 | 2.4 | Average form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Multiple pruning wounds and stem cracking on main stem. Decay pocket at 1.6 m in height. | No Works. | 92 |
| T54 | Laburnum. | 0.51 | 1 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | C2 | EarlyMature | 10_19 | 2.4 | Average form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Multiple pruning wounds and stem cracking on main stem. Dense crown, low/moderate crown deadwood. | Remove dead wood $>5 \mathrm{~cm}$ diameter throughout the crown / overhanging site. | 118 |
| T55 | Norway Maple. | 0.78 | 1 | 18.6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | B2 | Mature | 20_39 | 3 | Good form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Helical trunk wound with Blunt nosed/Knife edged reaction wood. Dense crown, lower crown deadwood. | No Works. | 275 |
| T56 | Sycamore. | 0.84 | 1 | 18 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 | B2 | Mature | 20_39 | 2.4 | Average form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Twin stemmed tree at 2.4 m with moderate included union. | No Works. | 319 |


| Tree No. | Species | DBH | No of Stems | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{Ht} \\ & (\mathrm{~m}) \end{aligned}$ | N | E | S | W | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BS } \\ & \text { Cat } \end{aligned}$ | Age Class | Life Expect | Cr Ht <br> (m) | Observation | Recommendations | $\begin{aligned} & \text { RPA } \\ & \text { (m2) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| T57 | Beech | 0.71 | 1 | 18 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 | B2 | Mature | 20_39 | 2.4 | Average form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Twin stemmed tree at 2.4 m with moderate included union. Possibly ustulina at base. | Insert flexible restraint system between codominant stems. Reinspect in 6months to confirm if ustulina. | 228 |
| T58 | Beech | 0.57 | 1 | 18 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 | B2 | Mature | 20_39 | 2.4 | Average form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Multiple stemmed tree at 3.2 m with moderate included union. Natural grafting in crown. | Insert flexible restraint system between codominant stems. | 147 |
| T59 | Beech. | 0.46 | 1 | 19.8 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | B2 | Mature | 20_39 | 0 | Good form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. | No Works. | 96 |
| T60 | Beech | 0.8 | 1 | 22 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | B2 | Mature | 20_39 | 2.4 | Average form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Twin stemmed tree at 6.4 m with moderate included union. Dense crown, moderate/major crown deadwood. | Insert flexible restraint system between codominant stems. Remove dead wood $>5 \mathrm{~cm}$ diameter throughout the crown / overhanging site. | 290 |
| T61 | Beech | 0.69 | 2 | 18 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 | B2 | Mature | 20_39 | 3.2 | Average form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Twin stemmed tree at 1.1 m with moderate included union. | Insert flexible restraint system between codominant stems. | 150 |
| T62 | Sycamore. | 0.49 | 1 | 18 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | C2 | Mature | 10_19 | 3 | Poor form (Asymmetric canopy), shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. | No Works. | 109 |
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| Tree No. | Species | DBH | No of Stems | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Ht} \\ (\mathrm{~m}) \end{gathered}$ | N | E | S | W | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BS } \\ & \text { Cat } \end{aligned}$ | Age Class | Life Expect | Cr Ht <br> (m) | Observation | Recommendations | $\begin{aligned} & \text { RPA } \\ & \text { (m2) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| T63 | Sycamore. | 0.98 | 1 | 21 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | B2 | Mature | 20_39 | 2 | Average form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Twin stemmed tree at 1.6 m with moderate included union. Dense crown, moderate/major crown deadwood. | Remove dead wood $>5 \mathrm{~cm}$ diameter throughout the crown/overhanging site. | 434 |
| T64 | Sycamore. | 0.56 | 1 | 15.8 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | B2 | Mature | 20_39 | 2.4 | Average form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. | No Works. | 142 |
| T65 | Sycamore. | 0.68 | M/s | 18 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | B2 | Mature | 20_39 | 3.5 | Average form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Dense crown, moderate/major crown deadwood. | Remove dead wood $>5 \mathrm{~cm}$ diameter throughout the crown/overhanging site. | 145 |
| T66 | Silver Birch. | 0.54 | 1 | 11 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | C2 | Mature | 10_19 | 0 | Average form, shape and condition. lvy clad crown and stem unable to fully inspect. | Sever ivy at 2 m from ground level and remove section. | 132 |
| T67 | Sycamore. | 0.96 | M/s | 19 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | B2 | Mature | 20_39 | 3.5 | Average form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Dense crown, moderate/major crown deadwood. Ivy clad crown and stem unable to fully inspect. | Remove dead wood $>5 \mathrm{~cm}$ diameter throughout the crown/overhanging site. Sever ivy at $2 m$ from ground level and remove section. | 290 |
| T68 | Norway Maple. | 0.55 | 1 | 16.8 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | B2 | Mature | 20_39 | 3 | Average form, shape and condition. Dense crown, low/moderate crown deadwood. No significant recent crown management. | Remove dead wood $>5 \mathrm{~cm}$ diameter throughout the crown/overhanging site. | 137 |


| Tree No. | Species | DBH | No of Stems | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{Ht} \\ & (\mathrm{~m}) \end{aligned}$ | N | E | S | w | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BS } \\ & \text { Cat } \end{aligned}$ | Age Class | Life Expect | $\underset{(\mathrm{m})}{\mathrm{Cr} \mathrm{Ht}}$ | Observation | Recommendations | $\begin{aligned} & \text { RPA } \\ & \text { (m2) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| T69 | Whitebeam. | 0.5 | 1 | 12.4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | B1 | Mature | 20_39 | 4 | Average form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Decay branches on central stems with moderatelmajor decay. | Climbing inspection to measure the extent of decay | 113 |
| T70 | Laburnum. | 0.38 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | C2 | EarlyMature | 10_19 | 2.4 | Average form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Multiple pruning wounds and stem cracking on main stem. Decay pocket at 1.6 m in height. | No Works. | 65 |
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Appendix 5 - Tree Works Schedule
NOTE: All tree works to be undertaken in accordance with BS 3998:2010 'Tree work - Recommendations'. All pruning cuts to be made at suitable growing points, in line with the principles of natural target pruning. <(In accordance to the current proposed design layout provided>).

## Tree Works Schedule

| Tree No. | Species | Proposed Tree Works | Reason | BS <br> Cat |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TG1 | Ash. Elm. Elder and Hawthorn. | Cut back to boundary line, and remove all dead elm trees. | Poor form, shape and condition. Unable to inspect due to restricted access. Offsite boundary tree with overhanging branches. Hedgerow standard tree. Self-set, pioneer tree. Dead Elms | C2 |
| TG2 | Ash, Sycamore, Elm, Elder and Hawthorn. | Cut back to boundary line, and remove all dead elm trees. | Poor form, shape and condition. Unable to inspect due to restricted access. Offsite boundary tree with overhanging branches. Hedgerow standard tree. Self-set, pioneer tree. Dead Elms | C2 |
| TG3 | Hawthorn, Elder, Elm and Prunus sp | Remove all dead elms | Poor form, shape and condition. Offsite boundary tree with overhanging branches. Dead Elms | C2 |
| TG4 | Hawthorn, Elder, Elm, Ash and Prunus sp | Remove all dead elms | Poor form, shape and condition. Dead Elms | C2 |
| T12 | Hornbeam | Cut branches back from fence by 2 m | Average form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Co-dominant tree with major stem included union. Damaged bark with sound woo exposed. Multiple pruning wounds on main stem with minor decay. | C1 |
| T13 | Hornbeam | Cut branches back from fence by 2 m | Average form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Co-dominant tree with included union. Multiple pruning wounds on main stem with minor decay. | C1 |
| T17 | Hornbeam | Cut branches back from fence by 2 m | . No significant recent crown management. Co-dominant tree with included union. Multiple pruning wounds on main stem with minor decay. Poor form (Asymmetric canopy), shape and condition. Soil heavily compacted within rooting zone. | C1 |
| T18 | Hornbeam | Cut branches back from fence by 2 m | . No significant recent crown management. Co-dominant tree with included union. Multiple pruning wounds on main stem with minor decay. Poor form (Asymmetric canopy), shape and condition. Soil heavily compacted within rooting zone. | C1 |
| T19 | Hornbeam | Cut branches back from fence by 2 m | . No significant recent crown management. Co-dominant tree with included union. Multiple pruning wounds on main stem with minor decay. Poor form (Asymmetric canopy), shape and condition. Soil heavily compacted within rooting zone. | C1 |
| T21 | Sycamore. | Cut back from fence by 2 mSever ivy at 2 m from ground level and remove section. | Poor form (Asymmetric canopy), shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Ivy clad crown and stem unable to fully inspect. | C2 |
| T22 | Norway Maple. | Sever ivy at $2 m$ from ground level and remove section. Remove dead wood $>5 \mathrm{~cm}$ diameter throughout the crown / overhanging site. | Poor form (Asymmetric canopy), shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Ivy clad crown and stem unable to fully inspect. Dense crown, major crown deadwood. | C2 |
| T24 | Goat Willow. | Remove basal vegetation and re-inspect root crown. | Poor form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Co-dominant tree with included unions. Hedgerow standard tree. Unable to inspect due to restricted access. | C2 |
| T25 | Goat Willow. | Remove basal vegetation and re-inspect root crown. | Poor form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Co-dominant tree with included unions. Hedgerow standard tree. Unable to inspect due to restricted access. | C2 |
| T26 | Sycamore. | Sever ivy at $2 m$ from ground level and remove section. | Poor form (Asymmetric canopy), shape and condition. Unable to inspect due to restricted access. Ivy clad crown and stem b32unable to fully inspect. | C2 |
| T28 | Lime. | Sever ivy at $2 m$ from ground level and remove section. | Average form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Ivy clad crown and stem unable to fully inspect. | B1 |
| T30 | Rowan. | Tag 1424 | Average form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Sparse crown showing signs of stress with crown retrenchment. Tree located on bomb shelter | C1 |
| T32 | Sycamore. | Remove dead wood $>5 \mathrm{~cm}$ diameter throughout the crown / overhanging site. | Average form, shape and condition. Dense crown, moderate/major crown deadwood. No significant recent crown management. | B2 |
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| Tree No. | Species | Proposed Tree Works | Reason | BS <br> Cat |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| T33 | Sycamore. | Sever ivy at $2 m$ from ground level and remove section. Remove basal vegetation and re-inspect root crown. | Poor form, shape and condition. Unable to inspect due to restricted access. Ivy clad crown and stem unable to fully inspect. Co-dominant tree with included unions. Dense crown, moderate/major crown deadwood. | C2 |
| T34 | Sycamore. | Sever ivy at 2 m from ground level and remove section. Remove basal vegetation and re-inspect root crown. | Poor form, shape and condition. Unable to inspect due to restricted access. Ivy clad crown and stem b33unable to fully inspect. Co-dominant tree with included unions. Dense crown, moderate/major crown deadwood. | C2 |
| T35 | Sycamore. | Sever ivy at 2 m from ground level and remove section. Remove basal vegetation and re-inspect root crown. | Poor form, shape and condition. Unable to inspect due to restricted access. Ivy clad crown and stem unable to fully inspect. Co-dominant tree with included unions. Dense crown, moderate/major crown deadwood. | C2 |
| T36 | Whitebeam. | Climbing inspection to measure the extent of branch decay. | Average form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Central leader lost in past stag-headed crown, naturally reducing. Fiber buckling on stem at 6 m . Decay cavity at base of stem major decay. | C2 |
| T37 | Sycamore. | Remove dead wood $>5 \mathrm{~cm}$ diameter throughout the crown / overhanging site. | Poor form (Asymmetric canopy), shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Dense crown, low/moderate crown deadwood. | C2 |
| T43 | Sycamore. | Remove dead wood $>5 \mathrm{~cm}$ diameter throughout the crown / overhanging site. | Average form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Dense crown, moderate/major crown deadwood. | B1 |
| T44 | Whitebeam. | Climbing inspection to measure the extent of decay | Average form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Decay branches on central stems with moderatelmajor decay. | B1 |
| T45 | Sycamore. | Remove dead wood $>5 \mathrm{~cm}$ diameter throughout the crown / overhanging site. | Average form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Dense crown, moderate/major crown deadwood. Multiple pruning wounds on main stem with moderate decay cavities. | C1 |
| T46 | Whitebeam. | Climbing inspection to measure the extent of decay | Average form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Decay branches on central stems with moderatelmajor decay. | B1 |
| T47 | Whitebeam. | Climbing inspection to measure the extent of decay | Average form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Decay branches on central stems with moderatelmajor decay. | B1 |
| T51 | Whitebeam. | Climbing inspection to measure the extent of decay | Average form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Decay branches on central stems with moderatelmajor decay. | B1 |
| T54 | Laburnum. | Remove dead wood $>5 \mathrm{~cm}$ diameter throughout the crown / overhanging site. | Average form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Multiple pruning wounds and stem cracking on main stem. Dense crown, low/moderate crown deadwood. | C2 |
| T57 | Beech | Insert flexible restraint system between codominant stems. Re-inspect in 6 months to confirm if ustulina. | Average form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Twin stemmed tree at 2.4 m with moderate included union. Possibly ustulina at base. | B2 |
| T58 | Beech | Insert flexible restraint system between codominant stems. | Average form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Multiple stemmed tree at 3.2 m with moderate included union. Natural grafting in crown. | B2 |
| T60 | Beech | Insert flexible restraint system between codominant stems. Remove dead wood $>5 \mathrm{~cm}$ diameter throughout the crown / overhanging site. | Average form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Twin stemmed tree at 6.4 m with moderate included union. Dense crown, moderate/major crown deadwood. | B2 |
| T61 | Beech | Insert flexible restraint system between codominant stems. | Average form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Twin stemmed tree at 1.1 m with moderate included union. | B2 |
| T63 | Sycamore. | Remove dead wood $>5 \mathrm{~cm}$ diameter throughout the crown / overhanging site. | Average form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Twin stemmed tree at 1.6 m with moderate included union. Dense crown, moderate/major crown deadwood. | B2 |
| T65 | Sycamore. | Remove dead wood $>5 \mathrm{~cm}$ diameter throughout the crown / overhanging site. | Average form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Dense crown, moderate/major crown deadwood. | B2 |
| T66 | Silver Birch. | Sever ivy at $2 m$ from ground level and remove section. | Average form, shape and condition. Ivy clad crown and stem b33unable to fully inspect. | C2 |
| T67 | Sycamore. | Remove dead wood $>5 \mathrm{~cm}$ diameter throughout the crown / overhanging site. | Average form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Dense crown, moderate/major crown deadwood. lvy clad crown and stem unable to fully inspect. | B2 |
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| Tree No. | Species | Proposed Tree Works | Reason | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BS } \\ & \text { Cat } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Sever ivy at $2 m$ from ground level and remove section. |  |  |
| T68 | Norway Maple. | Remove dead wood $>5 \mathrm{~cm}$ diameter throughout the crown / overhanging site. | Average form, shape and condition. Dense crown, low/moderate crown deadwood. No significant recent crown management. | B2 |
| T69 | Whitebeam. | Climbing inspection to measure the extent of decay | Average form, shape and condition. No significant recent crown management. Decay branches on central stems with moderatelmajor decay. | B1 |

To Be Removed

| Tree No. | Species | Proposed Tree Works | Observations | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BS } \\ & \text { Cat } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TG8 | Sycamore. Elm. Elder. | Fell to ground level. | Poor form, shape and condition. Self-set, pioneer tree. Young newly established tree. Dead elms | C2 |
| T5 | Elm. | Fell to ground level. | Poor form (Asymmetric canopy), shape and condition. Dutch elm disease | U |
| T31 | Silver Birch. | Fell to ground level. | Poor form (Asymmetric canopy), shape and condition. Sparse crown showing signs of stress with crown retrenchment. Cavity between buttress roots with early/moderate decay. | U |
| T41 | Sycamore. | Fell to ground level. | Poor form (Asymmetric canopy), shape and condition. Dense crown, moderate/major crown deadwood. Sparse crown showing signs of stress with crown retrenchment. Cavity between buttress roots with moderate/major decay. Decay cavity on main stem. | U |
| T52 | Whitebeam. | Fell to ground level. | Sparse crown showing signs of stress with crown retrenchment. Tree colonised by fungi thought to be Innotus sp. | U |
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## Appendix 6 - Site Inspection \& Monitoring Schedule

In order to ensure that the principals of tree protection set out in the statement are adhered to, it is important to set out communication details for key individuals and tasks that require supervision. These details should be retained by all relevant parties and available on site at all times. Relevant parties will be advised of any changes in personnel or contractor during the development process.

To ensure that the construction process is undertaken with minimal disturbance to the retained tree stock, we recommend that an experienced Environmental Services arboricultural consultant be appointed to undertake regular inspections of the site according to a site inspection / supervision schedule below.

It is our experience that a mix of scheduled and unannounced site visits are appropriate these unannounced inspections will serve to identify any damage to the Tree Protection Fencing, poor working practices, potential problems and points of conflict between the construction process and the health of the trees. These reports will include recommendations for remedial action.

During these visits any changes to the proposed works will be discussed, their impact assessed and recommendations for best practice will be outlined. After each of these visits a copy of the report should be sent to the Site Agent, Local Authority Tree Officer and Client. The remedial action undertaken will be recorded on the next visit.

It should be noted that these visits will only be undertaken if a written instruction is received from the client prior to commencement of works on site.

With reference to relevant published guidance, the methodology of this statement follows a logical sequence essential to the efficacy of the protection measures. References may include: British Standard 5837:2012 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations'; British Standard 3998:2010 'Tree Work - Recommendations' and National Joint Utilities Group 'Guidelines for the planning, installation and maintenance of utility apparatus in proximity to trees, Volume 4' 2007.

It is essential to the successful implementation of the principals set out in this document that effective supervision and enforcement are implemented from the outset as detailed in the following construction phases.
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| Constraints Item | Site <br> Supervision <br> required | Number <br> of <br> Visits <br> Expected | Timing of <br> Site Visits | Actual <br> Visit Date |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Tree works operations | Optional | Visit 1 | Prior to <br> construction | TBC |
| Pre-commencement meeting between <br> relevant parties informing Council of <br> development start date | Yes | Visit 2 | Prior to site <br> clearance | TBC |
| Establishment \& protection of Root <br> Protection Areas (RPA) for retained trees to <br> 'sign off' installed tree protection fencing <br> and temporary ground protection | Yes | Visit 2 | Prior to site <br> clearance | TBC |
| Changes in soil levels in close proximity to <br> retained trees - retaining walls | Yes | Visit 3 | During site <br> clearance <br> phase | TBC |
| Location of temporary access route through <br> l adjacent to the retained trees and for <br> access for construction vehicles and <br> avoidance of compaction to the RPA of <br> retained trees | Yes | Visit 3 | During <br> construction <br> phase | TBC |
| Protection and prevention of damage to <br> retained tree canopies during construction | Yes | Visit 3 | During <br> construction <br> phase | TBC |
| Installation of 'Reduced / No-dig' special <br> surfacing within / through retained tree <br> RPAs | Yes | Visit 4 | During <br> construction <br> phase | TBC |
| Excavation of services trenches in close <br> proximity to retained trees | Possible | Visit 5 | During <br> construction <br> phase | TBC |
| Generic construction site constraints: <br> 1 Site office / Welfare unit location <br> 2 Temporary toilets <br> 3 Siting of bonfires <br> 4 Location of contaminant storage and <br> washout areas <br> 5 Location of stripped <br> topsoil | Yes | Visit 3 | TBuring <br> construction <br> phase | TBC |
| Post construction site assessment for any <br> required remedial treeworks operations <br> recommendations. | Yes | Visit 6 | Post <br> construction | TBC |
| \begin{tabular}{l}
\end{tabular} |  | TB |  |  |
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## Appendix 7 - BS5837: 2012 Tree Constraints \& Protection Methods

## Phase 1 Pre-Construction Meeting

Prior to commencement of the works an onsite meeting will be held with all relevant parties including the site agent and appointed Environmental Services arboricultural consultant of works. The purpose of this meeting is to record site features including tree condition, agree tree works (See Tree Works Schedule, location of site storage and welfare facilities and the location of tree protection measures.

## Phase 2 Tree Protection Measures

Subject to planning the Tree Protection Measures outlined in this report will be revisited in detail based on the working drawings, construction programme and method statement to be prepared.

Tree protection fencing should be installed prior to any demolition or ground-works commencing, remain in place throughout construction and be removed only after completion.

The provision of tree protection and light tree surgery will reduce the risk of direct damage to the retained trees. The demolition and construction process should not be commenced until the tree surgery works has been completed and the protective areas have been fenced off.

Tree protection will be installed as per the Tree Protection Plan which will be agreed with the Local Authority Tree Officer and with reference to the British Standard 58372012 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations'. Prior to commencing any demolition or construction works, the fencing will be inspected by the appointed Environmental Services Arboricultural consultant.

Within the fenced zone, no materials or chemicals should be stored at any time, no fires should be lit, no pedestrian or vehicle traffic, and level changes within these areas should be kept to an absolute minimum. Every effort should be taken to protect a maximum possible area of the root system.

Within the Root Protection Area no level changes or excavation within the RPA should be undertaken without the consent of the LPA Tree Officer.

Clear notices are to be fixed to the outside of the fencing with words such as 'TREE PROTECTION AREA - NO ACCESS OR WORKING WITHIN THIS AREA’. See Appendix 8.
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The site agent, all contractors and other relevant personnel are to be informed of the role of the Tree Protection Fencing and their importance. A copy of the Tree Protection Plan will be displayed on site at all times during construction.

## Phase 3 Demolition and Enabling Works

Prior to any works commencing on site the Tree Protection Fencing will be erected. During demolition programme and enabling works the existing front access will be in use. Any plant or vehicles engaged in the demolition works will operate outside the fenced off No-Dig / Root Protection Areas.

## Phase 4 Locations of Site Offices Compound and Storage Area

The site office, welfare facilities, storage yard and contractors parking area need to be located within an area of the site that is outside the Root Protection Area (RPA). The compound will remain at least 1 metre outside the RPA with access from the main access road.

All fuel storage and loose cement / sand to be batched and stored in the compound area.

## Phase 5 Groundworks, Level Changes, Foundations and Services

All spoil, including excavated soil and demolition material will be removed from site or stored in a location remote from any tree protection barriers.

With regard to the drawings provided the construction of foundations for the new build is located beyond the Root Protection Area (RPA) of retained trees, therefore with regard to the health of the retained trees no specialised foundation design is required. If the subsoil is found to be plastic, the foundations will be specified to take into account the potential influence of the vegetation on the moisture content and volume of the subsoil.

We recommend that all drainage and underground service routes are located beyond the RPA of all the retained trees. If the service runs are to be located within the RPA, we recommend that this matter is dealt with by method statement secured by planning condition. If services are located within the RPA special implementation techniques such as moleing, airspade, or hand digging may be required by the LPA. In the majority of cases, however, careful excavation with a low tonnage mechanical excavator supervised by the Environmental Services consultant arboriculturist can adequately undertake services excavations. When tree roots are encountered, hand digging and root protection can then be undertaken as and when they are observed.
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## Phase 6 Dismantling Protection Barriers

Dismantling the protection barriers around retained trees may be required to allow completion of final surface treatments and landscaping. Supervision of this exercise and control of the landscaping thereafter will be administered by the appointed Environmental Services arboricultural consultant. The removal of the Tree Protection Fencing is not an opportunity for machinery to access the previously fenced off area.

No further excavation will be carried out during this process and soils levels will not be raised above that existing by greater than 100 mm and not within 2 m of the trunk. Any removal of existing structures within the Root Protection Area including gardens type walls or paths will be carried out by hand.
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Appendix 8 - Tree and Ground Protection Specification
on retained hard surfacing or it is otherwise unfeasible to use ground pins, e.g. due to the presence of underground services, the stabilizer struts should be mounted on a block tray (Figure 3b).
NOTET Examples of configurations for steel mesh perimeter fencing systems are given in B5 1722-18.
NOTE 2 It might be feasible on some sites to use temporary site office buildings as components of the tree prorection barriers, provided these can be installed and removed without damaging the retained trees or their rooting environment.

6,2.2.4 All-weather notices should be attached to the barrier with words such as: "CONSTRUCTION EXCLUSION ZONE - NO ACCESS".

Figure 2 Default specification for protective barrier
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Figure 3 Examples of above-ground stabilizing systems


### 6.2.3 Ground protection during demolition and construction

6.2.3.1 Where construction working space or temporary construction access is justified within the RPA, this should be facilitated by a set-back in the alignment of the tree protection barrier. In such areas, suitable existing hard surfacing that is not proposed for re-use as part of the finished design shauld be retained to act as temporary ground protection during construction, rather than being removed during demolition. The suitability of such surfacing for this purpose should be evaluated by the project arboriculturist and an engineer as appropriate.

Suggested protective fencing warning sign format


TREE PROTECTION AREA
KEEP OUT
(TOWN \& COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990)
the Vegetation protected by this fence is PROTECTED BY PLANNING CONDITIONS AND/OR IS THE SUBJECT OF A TREE PRESERVATION ORDER.

IF YOU REQUIRE ACCESS INTO THIS AREA PLEASE CONTACT
planning@innovation-environmental.co.uk
$T:+44$ (0)330 3801036

Appendix 9 - Temporary Ground Protection Specification

BS5837 recognizes that incursions in to the construction inclusion zones will be required at times during some developments.

## The objective is to minimize soil compaction

Example 1-for pedestrian movements only, a single thickness of scaffold boards places either on top of a driven scaffold frame, so as to form a suspended walkway, or on top of a compression-resistant layer (e.g.) 100 mm depth of woodchip), laid on to a geotextile membrane.

Example 2 - For pedestrian-operated plant up to a gross weight of $2 t$, proprietary inter-linked ground protection boards placed on top of a compression-resistant layer (e.g. 150mm depth of woodchip), laid onto a geotextile membrane;

Example 3 - For wheeled or tracked construction traffic exceeding 2 t gross weight, an alternative system (e.g. proprietary systems or pre-cast reinforced concrete slabs) to an engineering specification designed conjunction with arboricultural advice, to accommodate the likely loading to which it will be subjected.

WOODEN BOARDING/TRACK-WAY


GEOTEXTILE MEMBRANE
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