Arboricultural Statement

Phase 5C, Phase 8C, and Trenchard, Upper Heyford

On behalf Heyford Park Settlements LP
$11^{\text {th }}$ February 2019

Prepared by: Michael Paginton TechArborA

BS5837:2012 'TREES IN RELATION TO DESIGN, DEMOLITION AND CONSTRUCTION RECOMMENDATIONS'

## Contents

1 Introduction ..... 1
2 Documents and Information Received ..... 3
3 Arboricultural Impact Assessment: Phase 5C ..... 4
4 Arboricultural Impact Assessment: Phase 8C ..... 7
5 Arboricultural Impact Assessment: Trenchard ..... 10
APPENDIX 1: Phase 5C Tree Survey Schedule ..... 13
APPENDIX 2: Phase 5C Tree Survey and Constraint's Plan ..... 14
APPENDIX 3: Phase 8C Tree Survey Schedule ..... 15
APPENDIX 4: Phase 8C Tree Survey and Constraint's Plan ..... 16
APPENDIX 5: Phase Trenchard Tree Survey Schedule ..... 17
APPENDIX 6: Trenchard Tree Survey and Constraint's Plan ..... 18
APPENDIX 7: Phase 5C Proposed Planning Layout ..... 19
APPENDIX 8: Phase 5C Tree Retention/Removal and Protection Plan ..... 20
APPENDIX 9: Phase 8C Proposed Planning Layout ..... 21
APPENDIX 10: Phase 8C Tree Retention/Removal and Protection Plan ..... 22
APPENDIX 11: Trenchard Proposed Planning Layout ..... 23
APPENDIX 12: Trenchard Tree Retention/Removal and Protection Plan. ..... 24

REVISIONS:

| Date | Rev | Description | Initials |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 11.02 .19 | - | First Issue | MGP |

## 1 Introduction

1.1 LandArb Solutions Ltd have been instructed by Heyford Park Settlements LP to prepare an Arboricultural Impact Assessment to accompany a planning application for residential development relating to Phases 5C, 8C and Trenchard at former RAF Upper Heyford.
1.2 Each of the three phases (5C, 8C and Trenchard) are within areas where previous planning applications for development have been approved, including:

- Phase 5C - Approved Reserved Matters Application 17/00973/REM and Approved Reserved Matters Application 16/00627/REM relating to Phase 5;
- Phase 8C - Approved Reserved Matters Application 16/00864/REM relating to Phase 8 trident; and
- Trenchard - Approved Application 16/00196/F.
1.3 Each of the above applications was supported by Arboricultural Impacts Assessments which identified required tree loss, impacts to retained trees and required protection and mitigation measures for each site.


## Tree survey update

1.4 A RAF Upper Heyford site wide tree survey was undertaken by Pegasus Group between 2013-2017. Additional land parcels were further added to this site wide tree survey by Wet Waddy ADP in September 2017.
1.5 The previous Pegasus Group site wide tree survey has formed the arboricultural baseline for further arboricultural assessments in support of planning applications for development.
1.6 With regard to this application for proposed development relating to Phases 5C, 8C and Trenchard a tree re-survey in accordance with BS.5837:2012 was carried out by LandArb Solutions on $24^{\text {th }}$ January 2019. A tree re-survey was required to ensure the arboricultural baseline for Phase 5C, 8C and Trenchard was accurate and up to date;
given that tree removals and other development works have been undertaken/implemented as part of previous permissions within each area.
1.7 The results of the tree re-survey are set out within revised tree survey schedules and shown on revised tree survey and constraints plans relevant to each phase. These are set out within the following appendices:

- Appendix 1 - Phase 5C Tree Survey Schedule;
- Appendix 2 - Phase 5C Tree Survey and Constraint's Plan;
- Appendix 3 - Phase 8C Tree Survey Schedule;
- Appendix 4 - Phase 8C Tree Survey and Constraint's Plan;
- Appendix 5 - Trenchard Tree Survey Schedule; and
- Appendix 6 - Trenchard Tree Survey and Constraint's Plan.


## Arboricultural Impact Assessment requirement

1.8 This Arboricultural Impact Assessment has been prepared to assess the potential direct and indirect impacts of new development proposals for Phase 5C, 8C and Trenchard. This assessment has had regard to the following:

- Previous land use and presence of existing/previous (now demolished) built form;
- Previous approved planning permissions for residential development relevant to Phase 5C, 8C and Trenchard; and
- Findings/conclusions from each Arboricultural Impact Assessment prepared in support of the previous approved planning applications.
1.9 This Arboricultural Impact Assessment therefore provides an assessment of the potential impacts of current development proposals for each phase (5C, 8C and Trenchard) against/in comparison with the previous consented schemes with regard to existing/retained trees.


## 2 Documents and Information Received

2.1 For the purposes of preparing this Arboricultural Impact Assessment LandArb Solutions were provided with the following information:

1. Site wide tree survey and tree survey schedule prepared by Pegasus Group between 2013-2017.
2. Site wide tree survey partial update prepared by West Waddy ADP dated September 2017.
3. Phase 5C Planning Layout, Focus Design, drawing 0521-PH8C-102, dated December 2018
4. Phase 8C Planning Layout, Focus Design, drawing 0521-PH8A-102, dated December 2018
5. Trenchard Planning Layout, Focus Design, drawing 0521-TR-1002, dated October 2018
6. Phase 8A and 8C detailed planting proposals (dwg 1619 A5 8A 06-07D) by Focus Design.
7. Phase 5C detailed planting proposals (dwg 1619 A8 5C 01 i) by Focus Design.
8. Trenchard detailed planting proposals (dwg 1619 A4 01 M) by Focus Design.

## 3 Arboricultural Impact Assessment: Phase 5C

3.1 With reference to BS5837:2012 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction', this AIA evaluates the direct and indirect effects of the Phase 5C proposals (see Appendix 7) on the site's arboricultural resource.

## Background

3.2 Phase 5C contains only two trees, a mature hornbeam (T336) and mature beech (T337).
3.3 There are two relevant planning permissions that cover the current site area for Phase 5 C.

- Approved Reserved Matters Application 17/00973/REM; and
- Approved Reserved Matters Application 16/00627/REM
3.4 Reserved Matters Application 17/00973/REM granted consent for the erection of 17 dwellings to the south of Camp Road, of which two detached dwellings are located in the north part of the current Phase 5C site.
3.5 Reserved Matters Application 16/00627/REM granted consent for 60 dwellings and public open space as part of Phase 5. Trees T336 and T337 were included as part of this application. They were identified as trees to be retained and were designed into public open space


## Phase 5C Development Proposals

3.6 Phase 5C proposals are for the erection of eleven residential dwellings. As set out above, two previous planning permission consent to residential development in the Phase 5C site re with current proposals effectively changing the number/type of units in this area.

## Assessment of the Impacts of Phase 5C

3.7 Phase 5C proposals have been overlaid with the tree survey and are shown on the Tree Retention/Removal and Protection Plan in Appendix 8.
3.8 Proposals retain T336 and T337 within an area of public open space.
3.9 When comparing the current Phase 5C development proposals with the previous consented development proposals discussed above, it can be seen that the changes to the unit numbers/layout design does not have any significant implications for the retained trees T336 and T337. Although the current proposed Phase 5C plot 13 is set closer to T337 than the previous consented scheme, the dwelling remains outside of the RPA and canopy of the tree. Furthermore, the orientation of the dwelling remains on a north to south axis therefore not fronting T337 or locating any associated residential amenity space adjacent/underneath the canopy. In this context, no overbearing or shading issued are envisaged that would lead to post development pressures to prune or fell either tree.
3.10 It is noted that a new garden path encroaches slightly into the outer eastern RPA of T337 when previous proposed development did not. However, it is important to note that much of the eastern and northern RPA of T337 comprises/comprised tarmac hard surfacing associated with the former land use. This tarmac hard surfacing is being removed as part of the previous consented scheme. In this context, although current Phase 5C proposals located a garden path within the outer RPA of T337, this will not be located within an area where previous hard surfacing has not already existed and is of a very minor extent. More importantly, overall in this area, there will be a significant reduction in hard surfacing from the RPA of T337 compared to the previous land use.

## Tree Protection

3.11 To protection both T336 and T337 from potential above and below ground damage/impacts from construction activities, temporary tree protection fencing will
need to be installed as shown on the Tree Retention/Removal and Protection Plan (Appendix 8).

## Summary

3.1 Having reviewed the proposed Phase 5C planning layout it is concluded that proposals are acceptable from an arboricultural perspective for the following reasons:

- No survey items require removal and can be retained
- No tree works are required to implement proposals
- Both T336 and T337 are retained within an area of public open space.

Proposals have respected the arboricultural constraints of the site and located new dwellings and built development outside of the RPAs and away from the retained trees.

- Retained trees can be adequately protected from harm during the construction process.
- Proposals do not undermine the previous planning permissions relevant to the site in relation to tree retention.


## 4 Arboricultural Impact Assessment: Phase 8C

4.1 With reference to BS5837:2012 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction', this AIA evaluates the direct and indirect effects of the Phase 8C proposals (See Appendix 9) on the site's arboricultural resource.

## Background

4.2 Phase 8 C is located within the southern part of the overall Phase 8 Trident site area. A Reserve Matters Application (16/00864/REM) for Phase 8 Trident was approved on $23^{\text {rd }}$ December 2016. This application was supported by an Arboricultural Impact Assessment prepared by Pegasus Group (D.0341, dated 15.04.16).
4.3 Since the approval of Application 16/00864/REM, hard surfacing/standing in the 8C area (and wider Phase 8 site) has been demolished/removed in accordance with the permission. This has included the removal of trees that were identified to be removed on the Phase 8 Tree Retention/Removal Plan (Drawing D.0341_95) set out within the Phase 8 Arboricultural Impact Assessment by Pegasus Group dated 15.04.16.
4.4 Phase 8 proposals the subject of consented application 16/00864/REM that are of relevance to the current Phase 8C site area included the erection of two blocks of flats comprising of 15 residential units along with new residential parking.

## Phase 8C Development Proposals

4.5 Phase 8C proposals are for the erection of two blocks of flats comprising 14 units with accompanying residential parking.

## Assessment of the Impacts of Phase 8C

4.6 Phase 8C proposals have been overlaid with the tree survey and are shown on the Tree Retention/Removal and Protection Plan in Appendix 10.
4.7 As shown, proposals can retain all existing trees within the site area.
4.8 When comparing the current Phase 8C development proposals with the previous consented development proposals for Phase 8 which relate to the Phase 8C site area, it can be seen that there has been no material change that has any significant
implications for the retained trees. The proposed two blocks of flats remain in the previously approved locations and orientation as does the associated car parking area. In this context, no new hard surfacing or hard standing is proposed within any RPA and development continues to avoid RPAs.
4.9 It is noted that the existing concrete pathway that runs to the south of T451 and north of T1431, T1432, T1432 and T1480 was to be retained as part of consented Phase 8 proposals. However, Phase 8C proposals will remove this hard surfacing as well as the concrete footpath running to the east of T1477-T1480. Phase 8C proposals will lead to the removal of existing hard surfacing from the RPA of these retained trees and return to open space. In this context, this is considered to be a positive improvement and betterment compared to previous Phase 8 proposals in this area.

## Tree Protection

4.10 In order to avoid potential direct and indirect impacts to retained trees from construction activities, temporary tree protection fencing will need to be installed as shown on the Tree Retention/Removal and Protection Plan (Appendix 10).
4.11 Tree protection fencing will need to be installed within its primary position prior to and for the duration of construction activities. Fencing is to be adjusted to its secondary positions following the removal of hard surfacing from the RPAs of T1431, T1433, T451 and T1475-T1480
4.12 When removing the concrete path from the eastern RPA of T1475-T1480 and T1433, and path from between T451, T1431 and T1480 it is recommended that the following working method is adopted:

- Hard surfacing is to be broken up and lifted out using hand tools. If lightweight mechanical plant is required this must operate from existing areas of hard surfacing working backwards.
- Works should progress backwards over existing hard surfacing areas to avoid encroaching into exposed areas of the RPAs once hard surfacing sections are removed
- Once hard surfacing is removed, the ground should be made up to surrounding levels using clean topsoil.
- No mechanical plant is to enter any exposed area of the RPAs. No material are to be stored or excavations occur within any exposed RPA.


## Summary

4.13 Having reviewed the proposed Phase 8C Planning Layout it is concluded that proposals are acceptable from an arboricultural perspective for the following reasons:

- No survey items require removal and all can be retained;
- No tree works are required to implement proposals;
- All retained trees will be retained within an areas of public open space.
- Proposals have respected the arboricultural constraints of the site and located new development outside of the RPAs and away from the retained trees.
- Proposals will lead to the removal of hard surfacing from the RPAs of T1477-T1480 and T451 and T1431.
- Retained trees can be adequately protected from harm during the construction process.
- Proposals do not undermine the previous planning permission for Phase 8 (16/00864/REM) relevant to the 8C site area in relation to tree retention and arboricultural impacts.


## 5 Arboricultural Impact Assessment: Trenchard

5.1 With reference to BS5837:2012 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction', this AIA evaluates the direct and indirect effects of the development proposals for site known as Trenchard (See Appendix 11) on the site's arboricultural resource.

## Background

5.2 Planning permission was granted in August 2016 for the demolition of existing bungalows and erection of 13 new dwellings (Application 16/00196/F).
5.3 This application was supported by an Arboricultural Impact Assessment prepared by Pegasus Group date 15.01.16. This Impact Assessment related to a slightly earlier scheme where 16 dwellings were to be constructed rather than 13 that were approved.
5.4 Since the approval of Application 16/00196/F the existing bungalows and hard surfacing have been demolished and removed.

## Trenchard Development Proposals

5.5 Current Trenchard development proposals are for the erection of thirty-one new dwellings. The site redline is the same as the previous consented Application 16/00196/F .

## Assessment of the Impacts of Trenchard Proposals

5.6 Trenchard site proposals have been overlaid with the tree survey and are shown on the Tree Retention/Removal and Protection Plan in Appendix 12.
5.7 There are few trees within the Trenchard site boundary. Other than a small concentration of trees on the southern part of the site the majority are located outside of the site boundary.
5.8 It can be seen that proposals seek to increase the number and density of units on site. When comparing with the previous approved site layout with the current proposed scheme, there are no significant change in terms of implications for trees. Current
proposals increase the density and unit numbers inside the areas previously approved for new dwellings.
5.9 As shown on the Tee Retention/Removal and Protection Plan (Appendix 12) two trees are shown for removal. T838 is of low quality and was previously identified for removal in relation to the previous application. T 1553 is a very low quality prunus tree. Although not picked up by the previous tree survey that informed the previous application, it is considered T1553 would have been identified for removal anyway due to it low quality and condition. Overall the removal of both T838 and T1553 as part of current Trenchard Proposals is considered to be acceptable. In addition, overhanging branches and dense ivy on the northern boundary along the chain link fence will require removal. Again this is considered to be acceptable.
5.10 Trees to the south of the site (T809-T812) are to be retained. These were shown to be retained in relation to the previous consented scheme and there has been no change in terms of built form in relation to their RPAs. As can be seen they will be retained within the current public open space.

## Tree Protection

5.11 All retained trees can be protected from potential harm using Temporary Tree Protection Fencing in accordance with BS.5837:2012 as shown on the Tree Retention/Removal and Protection Plan (Appendix 12). In relation to off-site trees T808, T813, T815, T834, T843, and T842 temporary fencing should be installed to prevent access to their RPAs unless site hoarding is erected around the site, in which case fencing would not be required. G840 is located off site to the north of the site behind a concrete post and chain-link fence. A deep drainage ditch is set between the fence and mature trees beyond. Although the default RPAs of trees within G840 are shown to encroach into the site, in reality the presence of the deep ditch is likely to have acted as a root barrier. In this context, additional protection fencing is not required.

## Summary

5.12 Having reviewed the proposed Trenchard planning layout it is concluded that proposals are acceptable from an arboricultural perspective for the following reasons:

- Only two surveyed items are to be removed. Both are low quality (Category C).
- No tree works are required to implement proposals
- Proposals have respected the arboricultural constraints of the site and locate new dwellings and built development outside of the RPAs and away from the retained trees.
- Retained trees can be adequately protected from harm during the construction process.
- Proposals do not undermine the previous planning permission relevant to the site in relation to tree retention.
- New tree planting as part of landscape proposals will result in a significant enhancement of the amenity of the site as well as increase the number of trees on site and species diversity.


## APPENDIX 1: Phase 5C Tree Survey Schedule

| 24.01.19 |  | Site: Upper Heyford |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Surveyor: MP |  |  |  | Client: |  | Dorchester Group | Structural Condition | PhysiologicalCondition | Job no: LAS 42 |  | RPA radius |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Species | Height | $\left.\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Es} \\ \text { tim } \\ \text { at } \\ \mathrm{et} \end{gathered} \right\rvert\,$ | Stem dia | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { Es } \\ \text { ti } \\ \text { it } \\ \text { at } \\ \text { et } \end{array}\right\|$ | read |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Crown clearance height |  |  |  |  |  | General observations <br> Physiological and structural condition. Preliminary management recommendations |  |  |  |  |  | RPA area |
| Ref number |  |  |  |  |  | N | $\left.\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { Est } \\ \text { ima } \\ \text { te } \end{array} \right\rvert\,$ | S | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { Est } \\ \text { ima } \\ \text { te } \end{array}\right\|$ | E | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { Est } \\ \text { ima } \\ \text { te } \end{array}\right\|$ | w | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { Estim } \\ \text { ate } \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \text { st } \\ \text { branch } \end{gathered}$ | $\left.\begin{gathered} \text { Esti } \\ \text { mat } \\ \text { e } \end{gathered} \right\rvert\,$ | 1st branch direction | Canopy | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { Esti } \\ \text { mat } \\ \text { e } \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|c\|} \hline \text { Life } \\ \text { stage } \end{array}$ |  |  |  | ULE | Quality grading |  |  |
| T336 | Hormbeam | 16 | - | 620 |  | 7 | - | 7 | - | 5.5 | - | 6 | - | N/A | - | N/A | 2.5 |  | M | Forks at 2 m . Fallen branch from stem on northern side. Good shape. Minor deadwood pruned in the past, minor fused branches, good bud coverage and leaf bearing structure | Good | Good | 20+ | B1 | 7.4 | 173.9 |
| T337 | Beech (Common) | 18 | - | 780 |  | 9 | - | 8.5 | - | 9 | - | 6 | - | N/A | - | N/A | 3 |  | M | Multi stemmed from 2 m , lower canopy pruned in the past, tree leans to the east, included union east side. Multiple pruning wounds, well occluded. | Good | Good | 20+ | B1 | 9.4 | 275.3 |

## APPENDIX 2: Phase 5C Tree Survey and Constraint's Plan



APPENDIX 3: Phase 8C Tree Survey Schedule

| Date 24.01.19 |  | Site: Upper Heyford |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Surveyor: MP |  |  |  | Client: |  | Dorchester Group | Structural Condition | Physiological Condition | Job no: LAS 42 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Species | Height | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \mathrm{Es} \\ \text { tim } \\ \mathrm{at} \\ \mathrm{et} \end{array}\right\|$ | Stem dia |  | Spread |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Crown clearance height |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Life } \\ \text { stage } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ref number |  |  |  |  |  | N | $\left.\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { Est } \\ \text { ima } \\ \text { te } \end{array} \right\rvert\,$ | S | $\begin{array}{\|c\|c\|c\|} \hline \text { ima } \\ \text { ima } \\ \text { te } \end{array}$ | E | $\begin{gathered} \text { Est } \\ \text { ima } \\ \text { te } \end{gathered}$ | w | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { Estim } \\ \text { ate } \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \text { st } \\ \text { branch } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Esti } \\ \text { mat } \\ \mathrm{e} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { 1st branch } \\ \text { direction } \end{array}$ | Canopy | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { Esti } \\ \text { mat } \\ \mathrm{e} \end{array}$ |  | General observations <br> Physiological and structural condition. Preliminary management recommendations |  |  | ULE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Quality } \\ & \text { grading } \end{aligned}$ | RPA radius | RPA area |
| T451 | Cypress (Lawson) | 15 |  | 400 | - | 3 |  | 3 | - | 3 | - | 3 | - | N/A | - | N/A | 0 | - | M | Dense needle cover, canopy to the floor, some minor broken branches | Good | Fair | 20+ | B1 | 4.8 | 72.4 |
| T461 | Chery (Wid) | 11 | - | 340 | - | 3 | - | 6 | - | 4 | - | 4 | - | 5 | - | West | 2 | - | M | Exposed roots. Recent pruning wounds. Weak low fork at base. Twin stem, southern stem leans south. Suppressed to north. Unable to access to check previous measurements. | Fair | Poor | 10+ | C1 | 4.1 | 52.2 |
| T465 | Whitebeam | 11 |  | 650 | - | 4 |  | 4 | - | 5 | - | 5 |  | N/A | - | N/A | 2 |  | OMG | Dead leader with dead fungal fruiting bodies on southern limb, significant decay in base of central limb which grows out to east this needs inspecting or removing, tree towards e de o\& life expectancy. | Poor | Poor | <10 | C1 | 7.8 | 191.2 |
| T467 | Birch (Silver) | 15 | - | 510 | - | 6 |  | 6 | - | 10 | - | 3 | - | 5 | - | East | 3 | - | M | Leans east. Good tree. Growth at base removed, large spreading limbs to east | Fair | Fair | 10 | B1 | 6.1 | 117.7 |
| T1431 | Norway maple | 18 | - | 580 | - | 8 | - | 7 | - | 5 | - | 7 | - | 4.5 | - | North | 1.5 | - | M | Exposed roots, dense canopy, pruned in the past, minor to moderate deadwood. | Fair | Good | 20+ | B1 | 7.0 | 152 |
| T1432 | Norway maple | 18 | - | 520 | - | 5 |  | 8 | - | 5 | - | 5 | - | 4 | - | South | 5 | - | M | Some exposed and damaged roots, wound on stem north side, minor to moderate deadwood, pruned in past, dense canopy. | Fair | Fair | 20+ | B1 | 6.2 | 122 |
| T1433 | Norway maple | 18 | - | 410 |  | 4.5 |  | 4 | - | 6 | - | 5 | - | 4 | - | West | 3 | - | M | Pruned in past, moderate internal deadwood, dense canopy. | Fair | Fair | 20+ | B1 | 4.9 | 76 |
| T1472 | Sycamore | 14 |  | 390 | - | 3.5 |  | 4 | - | 4 | - | 4 | - | 3 | - | South | 2 | - | M | minor deadwood, some thinning to canopy edge, some exposed roots pruned in past | Fair | Fair | 20+ | B1 | 4.7 | 69 |
| T1473 | Sycamore | 13 | - | 360 | - | 4 | - | 4 | - | 4.5 | - | 5 | - | 3 | - | West | 3 | - | M | Some exposed roots, thin internal canopy, pruned in past, some deadwood, concrete pa5h set to the east, | Fair | Fair | 20+ | B1 | 4.3 | 59 |
| T1474 | Sycamore | 13 | - | 370 | - | 3 | - | 4 | - | 6 | - | 5 | - | 3 | - | West | 2.5 | - | M | Thin internal canopy, minor to moderate deadwood, some snapped branches suppressed canopy north side | Fair | Fair | 20+ | B1 | 4.4 | 62 |
| T1475 | Sycamore | 12 | - | 250 | - | 4 | - | 3 | - | 4 | - | 4 | - | 3 | - | South | 2.5 | - | M | Moderate deadwood, thin canopy structure, low quality | Fair | Fair | 10 | C1 | 3.0 | 28 |
| T1477 | Sycamore | 10 | - | 280 | - | 3 | - | 3 | - | 3 | - | 4 | - | 2 | - | East | 2 | - | M | Pruned in past, union at 2.5 m , some snapped branches, concrete path to east, low quality | Fair | Fair | 10 | C1 | 3.4 | 35 |
| T1478 | Sycamore | 10.5 |  | 300 |  | 3.5 |  | 2.5 | - | 4.5 | - | 5 |  | 3 | - | North | 2 |  | M | Suppressed southern canopy, pruned in past, minor deadwood, tin canopy structure, low quality tree | Fair | Fair | 10 | C1 | 3.6 | 41 |
| T1479 | Sycamore | 13 | - | 490 | - | 4 | - | 5 | - | 6 | - | 7 | - | 2.5 | - | South east | 4 | - | M | Some exposed roots, dense canopy, good shape, minor deadwood, evidence of past branch loss. Concrete path to east | Fair | Fair | 20+ | B1 | 5.9 | 109 |
| T1480 | Sycamore | 14 | - | 350 | - | 3.5 | - | 3.5 | - | 6 | - | 4.5 | - | 5 | - | East | 5 | - | M | Moderate deadwood in crown with dead north eastern limb needs removing, some exposed roots, pruned in past, some dieback, supressed on south western side, thinning canopy. Low quality. | Fair | Fair | 10+ | C1 | 4.2 | 55 |

## APPENDIX 4: Phase 8C Tree Survey and Constraint's Plan



## KEY - BS 5837 : 2012 Categories

(0) Tree Category A - High Quality

- A Category - Hedgerow, Group, Woodland
(0)Tree Category B - Moderate Quality
- B Category - Hedgerow, Group, Woodland
(0) Tree Category C - Low Quality
- C Category - Hedgerow, Group, Woodland

Tree Category U - Unsuitable for Retention
i- Root Protection Area to BS:5837:2012

- Shrub Mass / Offsite Tree
$\ddot{\oplus}$

LANDARB SOLUTIONS

| Cilient |
| :---: |
| Dorchester |


| Project |
| :--- |
| Upeer Heyford - Parcel 8 C |

Description:
Tree Survey and Constraints Plan
Stats: Planning
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { Scale: } \\ \text { 1:200 ©A1 } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Drawn I Checked } \\ \text { DP }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Date: } \\ \text { MP }\end{array} & \begin{array}{ll}\text { 030212019 }\end{array}\end{array}$
Job Number:
LAS 42

## APPENDIX 5: Phase Trenchard Tree Survey Schedule

| Date 24.01.19 |  | Site: Upper Heyford |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Surveyor: MP |  |  |  | Client: |  | Dorchester Group | Structural Condition | Physiological Condition | Job no: LAS 42 |  | RPA radius | RPA area |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Species | Height | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Es } \\ \text { tim } \\ \text { at } \\ \mathrm{e} \end{array}$ | Stem dia | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Es } \\ \text { ti } \\ \text { ti } \\ \text { at } \\ \text { at } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Spread |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Crown clearance height |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ref number |  |  |  |  |  | N | $\begin{array}{\|c\|c\|c\|c\|} \hline \text { Est } \\ \text { ima } \\ \text { te } \end{array}$ | s | $\begin{array}{\|c\|c\|c\|c\|} \hline \text { Est } \\ \text { ima } \\ \text { a } \end{array}$ | E | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { Est } \\ \text { ima } \\ \text { te } \end{array}$ | w | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Estim } \\ \text { ate } \end{gathered}\right.$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} 1 \text { st } \\ \text { branch } \end{gathered}\right.$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|c\|} \hline \text { Esti } \\ \text { mat } \\ \mathrm{e} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 1st branch direction | Canopy | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Esti } \\ \text { mat } \\ \mathrm{e} \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Life } \\ \text { stage } \end{gathered}$ | General observations <br> Physiological and structural condition. Preliminary management recommendations |  |  | ULE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Quality } \\ & \text { grading } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| T808 | Whitebeam | 9 | \# | 400 |  | 5.5 |  | 5.5 |  | 4.5 |  | 5.5 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 | - | M | Unable to access, set within neighbouring property | Good | Fair | 20+ | B1 | 4.8 | 72 |
| T809 | Ash (Common) | 9 |  | 250 |  | 3 | - | 3 | - | 3 | \# | 2.5 | \# | 1.5 | \# | South | 2 | \# | EM | Good form. Low extension growth. | Good | Fair | 10+ | C1 | 3.0 | 28 |
| T810 | Sycamore | 10 | - | 480 | - | 4 | - | 6 |  | 6 | - | 5 |  | 2 | \# | South | 2 | \# | M | Pruned in p past, broad canopy, | Good | Fair | $20+$ | B1 | 5.8 | 104 |
| T811 | Oak (Red) | 8 | - | 220 | - | 3 | - | 3 | - | 4 | - | 3 | - | 2 | \# | North | 2 | \# | EM | Lower canopy pruned in past, no central leader co-dominant, | Fair | Good | 10+ | C1 | 2.6 | 22 |
| T812 | Oak (Red) | 8 |  | 250 | - | 3 | - | 4 | - | 4 | - | 5 | - | 2 | - | North west | 2 | \# | EM | Minor bark damage at base south side, good canopy shape, | Good | Good | 20 | B1 | 3.0 | 28 |
| T813 | Sycamore | 9.5 | - | 370 | - | 4 | - | 4 |  | 4 | - | 4 | - | 2 | \# | South | 2.5 | \# | Em | Broad crown set in garden area, lower canopy pruned in past, | Fair | Fair | 20+ | B1 | 4.4 | 62 |
| T815 | Oak (Red) | 11 |  | 280 | - | 5 |  | 7 |  | 5 | \# | 4.5 | - | 2 | \# | West | 2.5 | \# | EM | No significant defects | Good | Good | $20+$ | B1 | 3.4 | 35 |
| T834 | Birch (Silver) | 15 | - | 630 | - | 7 | - | 8 | - | 8 | \# | 6 | - | 2.5 | \# | West | 2 | \# | ом | Large tree pruned in last, good leaf bearing structure, minor bark damage at base, minor decay in pruning wound eastern side. | Good | Good | 10+ | B1 | 7.6 | 180 |
| T838 | Cypress (Lawson) | 6 | \# | 250 | \# | 2 | - | 2 | - | 2 | - | 2 | - | 0 | - |  | 0 | - | M | Set on boundary, limb snapped out east side, low quality | Fair | Fair | 10+ | C2 | 3.0 | 28 |
| G840 | Scots pine, sycamore, ash | 15 | \# | 500 | \# |  |  |  | As on | on plan |  |  |  | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | M | Offsite mature tree group. Dense ivy overhanging the fence, self set species within. Drainage ditch, watercourse south side. | Fair | Fair | 10 | C2 | 6.0 | 113 |
| T842 | Birch (Silver) | 15 |  | 350 | - | 3.5 | - | 3.5 |  | 4 | - | 4 |  | ${ }^{3}$ | \# | South | ${ }^{2}$ | \# | M | Small wound eastern side at base partially occluded, good canopy structure and shape, no significant defects | Good | Good | 40+ | A1 | 4.2 | 55 |
| T843 | Ash (Common) | 14 | - | 500 | \# | 8.5 | - | 7 | - | 7 | \# | 8 | - | 3.5 | \# | West | 3 | \# | M | Offsite. Large multi-stemmed tree. | Fair | Good | 10+ | C1 | 6.0 | 113 |
| T1553 | Chery plumb. | 5.0 | - | 170 |  | 2 |  | 3 |  | 2.5 |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | SM | Ground excavated near base, leans to south, suppressed canopy north side | Fair | Fair | 10+ | C1 | 2.0 | 13 |

APPENDIX 6: Trenchard Tree Survey and Constraint’s Plan

KEY - BS 5837: 2012 Categories



## APPENDIX 8: Phase 5C Tree Retention/Removal and Protection Plan


6. Tree Category B - Moderate Quality

R Root Protection Area to BS:5837:2012
--- Tree Protection Barrier to BS:5837:2012
All weather information notices to read 'Construction Exclusion Zone - Keep out' A2 in size. To be attached to tree protection barriers
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APPENDIX 10: Phase 8C Tree Retention/Removal and Protection Plan
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## APPENDIX 12: TRENCHARD Tree Retention/Removal and Protection Plan

    Root Protection Area to BS:5837:2012
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