ARBTECH

BS5837:2012
Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations

Tree Survey

Sawbridgeworth Town Council

Town Green

Bell Street

CM21 9AQ

11 October 2020

Author: Jon Hartley BSc (Hons) MArborA

Introduction

Arbtech Consulting Limited (Arbtech) received written instruction on 15 September 2020 from Sawbridgeworth Town Council to attend Town Green, Bell Street, CM21 9AQ (site) to undertake an arboricultural survey a to BS5837:2012 guidance to assess trees, hedges and major shrub groups growing on and within influencing distance of the site and to produce a Schedule of trees, Tree Constraints Plan, Arboricultural Impact Assessment , Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan.

I am Jon Hartley, an arboricultural surveyor at Arbtech Consulting Ltd. I undertook the tree survey on 07 October 2020 and subsequently, have produced this summary of my findings.

I passed the RFS Certificate of Arboriculture in 2000 after a short time working in the industry. During a six-year spell in Australia, I passed the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) level 5 Diploma in arboriculture. I also now hold a BSc (Hons) degree in Arboriculture and Urban Forestry and the obligatory LANTRA Professional Tree Inspector certification. I benefit from professional industry experience spanning 20 years. I have professional memberships with the Consulting Arborist Society and the Arboricultural Association and an associate membership with the Institute of Chartered Foresters.

The advice below and appended is underwritten by our Professional Indemnity insurance for the business practice of Arboricultural Consultancy in the sum of one million Pounds Sterling in each and every claim.

Table 1: Documents referred to.

Document	Reference No.
Topographical Survey	THESU-J-0023
LPA pre-app comments	N/A
British Standard 5837:2012	“BS5837”
Tree Survey Schedule	Arbtech TS 01
Tree Constraints Plan	Arbtech TCP 01

Tree Survey

Survey: An arboricultural survey to BS5837 of all trees within impacting distance of the site was undertaken by Sawbridgeworth Town Council on 07 October 2020.

During the survey, I categorised the trees using “Table 1 – Cascade chart for tree quality assessment” of the BS5837:2012 (see Appendix 1).

A total of 31No. individual trees were surveyed. Details for each of the trees surveyed are provided in the Schedule of Trees (see Appendix 2).

Table 2: Documents upon which this tree survey has been based.

Document	Originator	Reference Number	Title
Topographical Survey	TSH	THESU-J-0023	Topographical Survey

Limitations: The survey was made at ground level using visual observation only. Detailed examinations, such as climbing inspections and decay detection equipment were not employed, though may form part of the survey's management recommendations. Measurements were taken using specialist tapes, laser and GPS devices. Where this was not possible, measurements are estimated.

Scope: Pre-development tree surveys make arboricultural management recommendations based exclusively upon the individual tree or group of trees condition relative to their present context (*i.e. not in relation to the proposed development*).

Legal Status: No statutory protection check has been performed. BS5837 does not draw any distinction between trees subject to statutory protection, such as a Tree Preservation Order ("TPO"), and those trees without. This is principally because a detailed planning consent overrides any TPO protection. Consequently, we do not seek to offer any comparison between or infer any difference in the quality or importance of TPO trees and other trees.

* For more information on the surveyed trees please see Arbtech Consulting Ltd, Tree Survey Schedule (Appendix 1), Tree Survey Report and Tree Constraints Plan.

Site description

Area of public access amenity space between car park and high street with seating and tree cover.



Figure 1: Aerial Image of Approximate Site Boundary (Google Earth)

It is proposed to redevelop the site to ‘Create an area of social intercourse and a venue for town event.’

It is likely that arboricultural impacts can be addressed with arboricultural methodology or minor amendments to the proposal.

BS5837:2012 Scope

This standard recognises that there can be problems for development close to existing trees which are to be retained, and of planting trees close to existing structures. This standard sets out to assist those concerned with trees in relation to construction to form balanced judgements. It does not set out to put arguments for or against development, or for the removal or retention of trees. Where development, including demolition, is to occur, the standard provides guidance on how to decide which trees are appropriate for retention, on the means of protecting these trees during development, including demolition and construction work, and on the means of incorporating trees into the developed landscape.

Methodology

The methodology used to assess the trees was the British Standard 5837:2012 'Trees in Relation to Construction' tree survey method. The aim of the survey is to establish which trees are moderate and good quality; suitable for retention and justifying protection. And, which trees are low or poor quality; either undesirable or unsuitable to retain and protect.

The tree survey includes all trees included in the land survey red line boundary plan, as well as any that may have been missed, and it should categorize trees or groups of trees, including woodlands for their quality and value within the existing context, in a transparent, understandable and systematic way. Where the arboriculturist has deemed it appropriate, the trees have been tagged with small metal or plastic tags, placed as high as is convenient on the stem of each tree.

Whilst master plan proposals for the development of the site might be available, the trees have been surveyed without taking these into consideration. All detailed design work on site layout should take into consideration the results of the tree survey (and the TCP).

Trees forming groups and areas of woodland (including orchards, wood pasture and historic parkland) are identified and considered as groups where the arboriculturist has determined that this is appropriate, particularly where they contain a variety of species and age classes that could aid long-term management. It is often expedient to assess the quality and value of such groups of trees as a whole, rather than as individuals. However, an assessment of individuals within any group has been undertaken if they are open-grown or if there is a need to differentiate between them.

The quality and value of each tree or group of trees has been recorded by allocating it to one of the four categories: A, B, C, or U (highest to lowest quality respectively). The categories are differentiated on the tree survey plan by colour, or by suffixing the category adjacent to the tree identification number on the TCP.

The survey schedule lists all the trees or groups of trees. The following information is also provided:

I. reference number (to be recorded on the tree survey plan);
II. species (common or scientific names);
III. height in meters (m);
IV. stem diameter in millimetres (mm) at 1.5 m above adjacent ground level or immediately above the root flare for multi-stemmed trees;
V. branch spread in meters taken at the four cardinal compass points;
VI. height of crown clearance above adjacent ground level in meters (m);
VII. age class (Newly planted, Young, Semi-mature, Early mature, Mature, Over mature);
VIII. physiological condition (e.g. good, fair, poor, decline and dead);
IX. structural condition (e.g. good, fair, poor and ivy);
X. preliminary management recommendations, including further investigation of suspected defects that require more detailed assessment and potential for wildlife habitat; and
XI. The retention category referring to the quality and useful contribution in years; **U** = <10yrs; **A** = >40yrs; **B** = >20yrs; **C** = >10yrs. The retention subcategory referring to the type of amenity; 1 = Arboricultural; 2 = Landscape; 3 = Cultural including conservation (see Table 1 Cascade chart for tree quality assessment).

Definitions

Arboriculturist

An arboriculturist (or arboricultural consultant) is a person who has, through relevant education, training and experience, gained recognized qualifications and expertise in the field of trees in relation to construction.

Tree Survey

A tree survey should be undertaken by an arboriculturist and should record information about the trees on a site independently of and prior to any specific design for development. As a subsequent task, and with reference to a design or potential design, the results of the survey should be included in the preparation of a tree constraints plan, which should be used to assist with site layout design.

Tree Constraints Plan

A TCP is a plan, typically delivered as an AutoCAD drawing (.dxf or .dwg file format), prepared by an arboriculturist for the purposes of layout design showing the root protection area and representing the effect that the mature height and spread of retained trees will have on layouts through shade, dominance, etc.

Root Protection Area

An RPA is a layout design tool indicating the area surrounding a tree that contains sufficient rooting volume to ensure the survival of the tree, shown in plan form in m².

Construction Exclusion Zone (also termed Tree Protection Zone)

A construction exclusion or tree protection zone is an area based on the RPA (in m²), identified by an arboriculturist, to be protected during development, including demolition and construction work, by the use of barriers and/or ground protection fit for purpose to ensure the successful long-term retention of a tree.

Arboricultural Impact Assessment

This is a study, undertaken by an arboriculturist, to identify, evaluate and possibly mitigate the extent of direct and indirect impacts on existing trees that may arise as a result of the implementation of any site layout proposal.

Tree Protection Plan

A TPP is a plan, typically delivered as an AutoCAD drawing (.dwg file format), prepared by an arboriculturist showing the finalized layout proposals, tree retention and tree and landscape protection measures detailed within the arboricultural method statement, which can be shown graphically.

Arboricultural Method Statement

This is a methodology for the implementation of any aspect of development that has the potential to result in loss of or damage to a tree. The AMS is likely to include details of an on-site tree protection monitoring regime.

Recommendations

We have not seen the proposed scheme and make the following recommendation to ensure that there are no irrevocable issues to the proposed retained trees and so that no conditions relating to arboriculture are attached to any planning consent secured; obtain an arboricultural report to include:

a) An arboricultural impact assessment (AIA);

b) An arboricultural method statement (AMS); and

c) A tree protection plan drawing (TPP).

Limitations

Trees were inspected from using visual observation from ground level only. Trees were not climbed or inspected below ground level. Inaccessible trees will have best estimates made about the location, physical dimensions and characteristics. Trees have been grouped where BS5837 guides us that it is expedient to do so. Trees have been excluded from the survey if they are found by us to be sufficiently far away from the proposed developable area or if they are outside of the red line boundary plan showing the expectations of our Client for the extent of the survey. BS5837 does not draw any distinction between trees subject to statutory protection, such as a Tree Preservation Order ("TPO"), and those trees without. This is principally because a detailed planning consent overrides any TPO protection. Consequently, we do not seek to offer any comparison between or infer any difference in the quality or importance of TPO trees and other trees.

Appendices

The following documents were released to the Client as appendices to this report:

- Survey Schedule (.pdf)
- Tree Constraints Plan drawing (.dwg/.dxf & .pdf)

If you require clarification of information contained herein, please do not hesitate to contact us via 01244 660558.

Yours Sincerely,

Jon Hartley BSc (Hons) MArborA
Senior Consultant

07860951396
01227373287
jh@arbtech.co.uk

Appendix 1: Table 1 Cascade chart for tree quality assessment

ARBTECH

BS5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations

Table 1 Cascade chart for tree quality assessment

Category and definition	Criteria (including subcategories when appropriate			Identification on plan
Trees unsuitable for retention (see Note)				
Category U Those in such a condition that they cannot realistically be retained as living trees in the context of the current land use for longer than 10 years	• Trees that have serious, irremediable, structural defect, such that their early loss is expected due to collapse, including those that will become unviable after removal of other category U trees (e.g. where, for whatever reason, the loss of companion shelter cannot be mitigated by pruning) • Trees that are dead or are showing signs of significant, immediate, and irreversible overall decline • Trees infected with pathogens of significance to the health and/or safety of other trees nearby, or very low quality trees suppressing adjacent trees of better quality *NOTE Category U trees can have existing or potential conservation value which might be desirable to preserve; see 4.5.7.*			Dark red
	1 Mainly arboricultural qualities	**2 Mainly landscape qualities**	**3 Mainly cultural values, including conservation**	
Trees to be considered for retention				
Category A **Trees of high quality** with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 40 years	Trees that are particularly good examples of their species, especially if rare or unusual; or those that are essential components of groups or formal or semi-formal arboricultural features (e.g. the dominant and/or principal trees within an avenue)	Trees, groups or woodlands of particular visual importance as arboricultural and/or landscape features	Trees, groups or woodlands of significant conservation, historical, commemorative or other value (e.g. veteran trees or wood-pasture)	Light green
Category B **Trees of moderate quality** with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 20 years	Trees that might be included in category A, but are downgraded because of impaired condition (e.g. presence of significant though remedial defects, including unsympathetic management and storm damage), such that they are unlikely to be suitable for retention of beyond 40 years; or trees lacking the special quality necessary to merit the category A designation	Trees present in numbers, usually growing as groups or woodlands, such that they attract a higher collective rating than they might as individuals; or trees occurring as collectives but situated so as to make little visual contribution to the wider locality	Trees with material conservation or other cultural value	Mid blue
Category C **Trees of low quality** with an estimated remaining expectancy of at least 10 years, or young trees with a stem diameter below 150mm	Unremarkable trees of very limited merit or such impaired condition that they do not qualify in higher categories	Trees present in groups or woodlands, but without this conferring on them significantly greater collective landscape value; and/or trees offering low or only temporary/transient landscape value	Trees with no material conservation or other cultural value	Grey

Appendix 2: Schedule of Trees

BS5837:2012 Tree Survey

Arbtech Consulting Ltd.
Unit 3, Well House Barns
Chester Road
Chester
Cheshire
CH4 0DH
Phone: 01244661170

Client: Sawbridgeworth Town Council
Project: Town Green, Bell Street, CM21 9AQ
Survey Date: 07/10/2020
Surveyor: Jon Hartley

ARBTECH

Tree and Tag No / Species	Hght (m)	Stems No	Stems Ø (mm)	Crown Spread (m)	Crown Clear (m)	Age	RP A (m²) R (m)	Phys Condition	Structural Condition	Preliminary Recommendations / Survey Comment	Cat ERC
T01											
Norway Maple *Acer platanoides*	9	1	520	N 3 E 4 S 4 W 3	5 5 5 5	M	A: 122.3 R: 6.23	Good	C: Fair S: Good B: Good	Recently crown reduced to current dimensions, all pruning cuts made to suitable growth points and generally no larger than 60mm diameter.	**B.1.2** 20+ yrs
T02											
Common Horse Chestnut *Aesculus hippocastanum*	12	1	560	N 3.5 E 5.5 S 6 W 3	6 5 6 6	M	A: 141.9 R: 6.72	Fair	C: Fair S: Good B: Good	Regularly pruned approximately maintain ground clearance; surface roots with some girdling at root crown; leaf minor moth present with approximately 50% foliage density at time of survey with leaf fall well under way.	**B.1.2** 20+ yrs
T03											
Sycamore *Acer pseudoplatanus*	14	1	610	N 5 E 5 S 4.5 W 5.5	6 7 8 7	M	A: 168.4 R: 7.32	Good	C: Fair S: Good B: Good	Three codominant stems with unions at 2m and 4m; compensatory surface root growth suggests historical partial windthrow; northern stem bifurcates at 6m with included bark and two seams of reaction wood generation for 700mm suggesting poor attachment, removal of this branch would result in a poor form; naturally occurring deadwood in lower crown.	**B.1.2** 20+ yrs

Age Classifications: N Newly planted; Y Young; SM Semi-mature; EM Early Mature; M Mature; OM Over Mature

Condition: C Crown; S Stem; B Basal area

Stems: Ø Diameter; (Eq) Equivalent stem diameter using BS5837:2012 definition

ERC: Estimated Remaining Contributio

Tree and Tag No Species	Hght (m)	Stems No	Stems Ø (mm)	Crown Spread (m)	Crown Clear (m)	Age	RP A (m²) R (m)	Phys Condition	Structural Condition	Preliminary Recommendations Survey Comment	Cat ERC
T04											
Common Ash *Fraxinus excelsior*	14	1	320	N 3.5 10 E 6 6 S 1.5 12 W 3.5 9		EM	A: 46.3 R: 3.83	Fair	C: Fair S: Good B: Good	Two codominant stems from 2.5m, union tensile in nature; asymmetrical crown distribution due to proximity of companion trees; historical stem wound on east side at 1m now occluded; pruning works have removed all branches to to 7m; low foliage density, defoliating insects present unidentifiable due to crown height.	**B.1.2** 20+ yrs
T05											
Common Ash *Fraxinus excelsior*	14	1	370	N 7.5 4 E 6 6 S 2 12 W 1.5 5		EM	A: 61.9 R: 4.43	Fair	C: Fair S: Good B: Good	Two codominant stems from 2m, union tensile in nature; asymmetrical crown distribution due to proximity of companion trees; low foliage density, defoliating insects present unidentifiable due to crown height.	**B.1.2** 20+ yrs
T06											
Common Ash *Fraxinus excelsior*	14	1	400	N 4.5 7 E 3 9 S 6 6 W 4 8		EM	A: 72.4 R: 4.8	Good	C: Good S: Good B: Good	Three codominant stems from 2m and 3m, unions tensile in nature; defoliating insects present unidentifiable due to crown height.	**B.1.2** 20+ yrs
T07											
Common Yew *Taxus baccata*	6	2	206 (Eq)	N 1 2 E 2.5 2 S 3 2 W 2.5 2		SM	A: 19.2 R: 2.47	Good	C: Good S: Good B: Good	Under storey tree overtopped by ash and sycamore.	**C.1** 40+ yrs
T08											
Common Yew *Taxus baccata*	7	3	269 (Eq)	N 3.5 2 E 3.5 2 S 2 2 W 3.5 2		SM	A: 32.8 R: 3.23	Good	C: Good S: Good B: Good	Under storey tree overtopped by ash and sycamore.	**C.1** 40+ yrs

Age Classifications: N Newly planted; Y Young; SM Semi-mature; EM Early Mature; M Mature; OM Over Mature

Condition: C Crown; S Stem; B Basal area

Stems: Ø Diameter; (Eq) Equivalent stem diameter using BS5837:2012 definition

ERC: Estimated Remaining Contributio

Tree and Tag No Species	Hght (m)	Stems No	Ø (mm)	Crown Spread (m)	Clear (m)	Age	RP A (m²) R (m)	Phys Condition	Structural Condition	Preliminary Recommendations Survey Comment	Cat ERC
T09											
Sycamore *Acer pseudoplatanus*	14	2	354 (Eq)	N 3.2 6 E 3 7 S 4 6 W 3.5 9		EM	A: 56.6 R: 4.24	Good	C: Good S: Good B: Fair	Two codominant stems from ground level with included bark at union.	**B.1.2** 20+ yrs
T10											
Sycamore *Acer pseudoplatanus*	15	2	382 (Eq)	N 3.2 9 E 3 7 S 2.5 7 W 6 4		EM	A: 66.1 R: 4.58	Good	C: Good S: Good B: Fair	Two codominant stems from ground level with included bark at union.	**B.1.2** 20+ yrs
T11											
Norway Maple *Acer platanoides*	12	1	280	N 2 3 E 1.5 7 S 3 3 W 4 2		EM	A: 35.5 R: 3.36	Fair	C: Fair S: Good B: Good	Localised leaf necrosis; epicormic regeneration within crown; asymmetrical crown distribution due to proximity of companion trees.	**C.1.2** 10+ yrs
T12											
Sycamore *Acer pseudoplatanus*	13	1	290	N 5.5 4 E 4 6 S 1.5 7 W 4.5 3.5		EM	A: 38.1 R: 3.48	Good	C: Good S: Good B: Good	Asymmetrical crown distribution due to proximity of companion trees.	**B.1.2** 20+ yrs
T13											
Small-Leafed Lime *Tilia cordata*	12	1	380	N 3.5 4 E 4.5 4 S 4 4 W 5 3		EM	A: 65.3 R: 4.55	Good	C: Good S: Good B: Good	Two codominant stems from 2m; recent service trench 2m from base on west side.	**B.1.2** 20+ yrs
T14											
Sycamore *Acer pseudoplatanus*	15	1	300	N 4 4 E 3 3 S 4 2 W 3.5 4		EM	A: 40.7 R: 3.59	Good	C: Good S: Good B: Good	No significant features noted.	**B.1.2** 20+ yrs

Age Classifications: N Newly planted; Y Young; SM Semi-mature; EM Early Mature; M Mature; OM Over Mature

Condition: C Crown; S Stem; B Basal area

Stems: Ø Diameter; (Eq) Equivalent stem diameter using BS5837:2012 definition

ERC: Estimated Remaining Contributio

Tree and Tag No Species	Hght (m)	Stems No	Stems Ø (mm)	Crown Spread (m)	Crown Clear (m)	Age	RP A (m²) R (m)	Phys Condition	Structural Condition	Preliminary Recommendations Survey Comment	Cat ERC
T15											
Common Yew *Taxus baccata*	5	1	110	N 2 E 1.5 S 1.5 W 3	2 2 2 2	SM	A: 5.5 R: 1.32	Good	C: Good S: Good B: Good	No significant features noted.	C.1 40+ yrs
T16											
Cherry *Prunus sp.*	11	2	338 (Eq)	N 3 E 3.5 S 4.5 W 3	6 6 3 6	EM	A: 51.8 R: 4.06	Good	C: Fair S: Good B: Good	Two codominant stems from 1m.	B.1.2 20+ yrs
T17											
Cherry *Prunus sp.*	11	1	250	N 3 E 1 S 2.5 W 4.5	4 6 4 2.5	EM	A: 28.3 R: 3	Good	C: Fair S: Good B: Good	Secondary stem from base wrapping the trunk to 1m; asymmetrical crown distribution due to proximity of companion tree.	C.1.2 20+ yrs
T18											
Sycamore *Acer pseudoplatanus*	16	1	380	N 4 E 4 S 5 W 5	5 7 8 7	M	A: 65.3 R: 4.55	Good	C: Good S: Not visible B: Not visible	Ivy obscures inspection of base and stem from ground level to 11m.	B.1.2 20+ yrs
T19											
Plum *Prunus Domestica*	7	1	170	N 2.5 E 1.5 S 2 W 2.5	2 2 2 2	EM	A: 13.1 R: 2.04	Good	C: Good S: Not visible B: Not visible	Ivy obscures inspection of base and stem from ground level to 4m.	C.1 20+ yrs
T20											
Plum *Prunus Domestica*	9	1	270	N 2 E 5 S 4 W 3.5	5 4 4 4	M	A: 33 R: 3.24	Fair	C: Fair S: Not visible B: Not visible	Asymmetrical crown distribution due to proximity of companion tree; ivy obscures inspection of base and stem from ground level to 6m.	C.1 10+ yrs

Age Classifications: N Newly planted; Y Young; SM Semi-mature; EM Early Mature; M Mature; OM Over Mature

Condition: C Crown; S Stem; B Basal area

Stems: Ø Diameter; (Eq) Equivalent stem diameter using BS5837:2012 definition

ERC: Estimated Remaining Contributio

Tree and Tag No Species	Hght (m)	Stems No	Stems Ø (mm)	Crown Spread (m)	Crown Clear (m)	Age	RP A (m²) R (m)	Phys Condition	Structural Condition	Preliminary Recommendations Survey Comment	Cat ERC
T21											
Huntingdon Elm *Ulmus x hollandica 'Vegeta'*	12	1	300	N 4 E 2.5 S 5 W 5	4 8 2 5	EM	A: 40.7 R: 3.59	Fair	C: Good S: Good B: Poor	Localised die back due to recent service trench 2m north of base.	C.1 10+ yrs
T22											
Copper Beech *Fagus sylvatica 'Purpurea'*	24	1	1260	N 11 E 10.5 S 10 W 11	2 2 2 2	M	A: 707 R: 15	Good	C: Good S: Good B: Good	Two codominant stems from 3m; new buttress roots all round suggesting some factor which needed compensating for, no fungal fruiting bodies found, no dysfunction detected with sounding hammer; flat area on on west side at base.	A.1.2.3 40+ yrs
T23											
Sycamore *Acer pseudoplatanus*	6	1	310	N 1.5 E 0 S 2 W 2.5	3 3 3 3	EM	A: 43.5 R: 3.72	Poor	C: Poor S: Fair B: Good	Topped at 4m; dieback in limited regeneration; ivy obscures inspection of stem and base from ground level to apex.	C.1 10+ yrs
T24											
Common Lime *Tilia europaea*	8	1	400	N 4 E 4 S 4 W 4	2 2 2 2	EM	A: 72.4 R: 4.8	Good	C: Fair S: Good B: Good	Member of linear group of six such limes managed as high pollards: last pollarded approximately 10yrs ago; trees likely to impact the adjacent listed wall.	B.1.2 40+ yrs
T25											
Common Lime *Tilia europaea*	6	1	280	N 3 E 3 S 3 W 3	2 2 2 2	EM	A: 35.5 R: 3.36	Good	C: Fair S: Good B: Good	Member of linear group of six such limes managed as high pollards: last pollarded approximately 10yrs ago; trees likely to impact the adjacent listed wall.	B.1.2 40+ yrs
T26											
Common Lime *Tilia europaea*	8	1	430	N 4 E 4 S 4 W 4	2 2 2 2	EM	A: 83.7 R: 5.16	Good	C: Fair S: Good B: Good	Member of linear group of six such limes managed as high pollards: last pollarded approximately 10yrs ago; trees likely to impact the adjacent listed wall.	B.1.2 40+ yrs

Age Classifications: N Newly planted; Y Young; SM Semi-mature; EM Early Mature; M Mature; OM Over Mature

Condition: C Crown; S Stem; B Basal area

Stems: Ø Diameter; (Eq) Equivalent stem diameter using BS5837:2012 definition

ERC: Estimated Remaining Contributio

Tree and Tag No Species	Hght (m)	Stems No	Stems Ø (mm)	Crown Spread (m)	Crown Clear (m)	Age	RP A (m²) R (m)	Phys Condition	Structural Condition	Preliminary Recommendations Survey Comment	Cat ERC
T27											
Common Lime *Tilia europaea*	6	1	240	N 3 2 E 3 2 S 3 2 W 3 2		EM	A: 26.1 R: 2.88	Fair	C: Fair S: Good B: Good	Member of linear group of six such limes managed as high pollards: last pollarded approximately 10yrs ago; trees likely to impact the adjacent listed wall.	C.1.2 10+ yrs
T28											
Common Lime *Tilia europaea*	8	1	340	N 3 2 E 3 2 S 3 2 W 3 2		EM	A: 52.3 R: 4.08	Good	C: Fair S: Good B: Good	Member of linear group of six such limes managed as high pollards: last pollarded approximately 10yrs ago; trees likely to impact the adjacent listed wall.	B.1.2 40+ yrs
T29											
Common Lime *Tilia europaea*	10	1	470	N 4 2 E 4 2 S 4 2 W 4 2		EM	A: 99.9 R: 5.63	Good	C: Fair S: Good B: Good	Member of linear group of six such limes managed as high pollards: last pollarded approximately 10yrs ago; trees likely to impact the adjacent listed wall.	B.1.2 40+ yrs
T30										Estimated Measurements	
Common Ash *Fraxinus excelsior*	10	1	180	N 0 6 E 1 6 S 2 6 W 1 6		EM	A: 14.7 R: 2.16	Dead	C: Poor S: Poor B: Poor	Standing dead tree.	U n/a
T31											
Common Yew *Taxus baccata*	12	1	790	N 6 3 E 6 3 S 4 3 W 5.5 3		M	A: 282.4 R: 9.48	Fair	C: Good S: Good B: Good	Lower than normal foliage density throughout crown.	B.1 40+ yrs

Age Classifications: N Newly planted; EM Early Mature; Y Young; M Mature; SM Semi-mature; OM Over Mature

Condition: C Crown; S Stem; B Basal area

Stems: Ø Diameter; (Eq) Equivalent stem diameter using BS5837:2012 definition

ERC: Estimated Remaining Contributio

Appendix 3: Tree Constraints Plan

Indicative only

Tree Categories

Trees are categorised in accordance with the cascade chart in Table 1 of the British Standard BS 5837:2012 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations'

Category 'U' - Trees in such condition that they cannot realistically be retained as living trees in context of the current land use for longer than 10 years.
Category 'A' - Trees of high quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 40 years.
Category 'B' - Trees of moderate quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 20 years.
Category 'C' - Trees of low quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 10 years, or young trees with a stem diameter below 150mm.

Root Protection Area

In order to avoid damage to the roots or rooting environment of retained trees, the Root Protection Areas (RPAs) should be plotted around each of the category A, B and C trees. This is a minimum area in m^2 which should be left undisturbed around each retained tree.

The RPA is calculated using the British Standard BS 5837:2012 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations.

The calculated RPA is capped to 707m^2, which is the equivalent to a circle with a radius of 15m. Where there appears to be restrictions to root growth the root protection area is reshaped to more accurately reflect the likely distribution of the roots.

Tree Survey Report

Please refer to Arbtech Consulting Ltd. Tree Survey Report and Tree Schedule for full details on all surveyed trees, hedgerows and major shrub groups.
All trees were surveyed and categorised in accordance with the guidance as set out in the British Standard BS5837:2012 Tree in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations.

We make the following recommendation to ensure that no conditions relating to arboriculture are attached to any planning consent secured: obtain and arboricultural report to include:
a) An arboricultural impact assessment (AIA);
b) An arboricultural method statement (AMS); and
c) A tree protection plan (TPP).

Rev:	Date:	Notes:

ARBTECH
Unit 3, Well House Barns, Chester, CH4 0DH
https://arbtech.co.uk, 01244 661170

Project:
Town Green
Bell Street
CM21 9AQ

Client:
Sawbridgeworth Town Council

Drawing:
Tree Constraints Plan

Based on:
THESU-J-0023

Drawing No:	Rev:
Arbtech TCP 01	--

Date:	Scale:	Drawn:
Oct 2020	1:100 @ A0	JCH

Key:

Tree Nos.: T01 | Tree Canopies: | Trunks:
RPAs: | Category 'U' trees: | Category 'A' trees:
Category 'B' trees: | Category 'C' trees:

All dimensions should be checked on site. No dimensions are to be scaled from this drawing.
Please notify us of any discrepancies found. Arbtech Consulting Ltd. cannot be held responsible for inaccuracies in any information supplied by third parties.
This drawing is designed to reflect the principles of the layout or design only, and relates only to the protection of retained trees.
This drawing is not to be read as a definitive part of the engineering or construction designs or method statement. An architect or structural engineer should be contacted over any matters of construction, detailing or specification and for any standards or regulatory requirements relating to proposed structures, hard surfacing or underground services.
This drawing was produced in colour - a monochrome copy should not be relied upon.

0m 1m 3m 5m 10m 15m 20m

Document Production Record

Document number	Editor	Signature	Position	Issue number	Date
Arbtech TSR 01	Jon Hartley		Senior Consultant	1	11/10/2020

Limitations

Arbtech Consulting Ltd has prepared this Report for the sole use of the above-named Client/Agent in accordance with our terms of business, under which our services were performed. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this Report or any other services provided by us. This Report may not be relied upon by any other party without the prior and express written agreement of Arbtech Consulting Ltd. The assessments made assume that the sites and facilities will continue to be used for their current purpose without significant change. The conclusions and recommendations contained in this Report are based upon information provided by others and upon the assumption that all relevant information has been provided by those parties from whom it has been requested. Information obtained from third parties has not been independently verified by Arbtech Consulting Ltd.

Copyright