



Membership No.FE00604

**Mark Hinsley
Arboricultural
Consultants Ltd.**
MSc Res Man (Arb), OND (Arb), F.Arbor.A

Established 1994



Tel: 01202 876177 Company Reg. No. 07232825 VAT Reg. No. 7303996
Reg. Office Address: Office F11, 10 Whittle Road, Ferndown, Dorset, England BH21 7RU

Our Ref: 6556-GS/JC/IMP/06/22

20th June 2022

Mr & Mrs Collis
49 Cliddesden Road
Basingstoke
Hants
RG21 3ET

Dear Mr & Mrs Collis.

RE: Trees at 49 Cliddesden Road, Basingstoke, Hants, RG21 3ET.

Brief: To survey the trees on the above site, comment upon their condition and suitability for retention on the site of the proposed development; indicate the constraints the retention of the trees will place upon such a proposal.

Inspected by: J Christopher

Dates of inspection: 15th June 2022

Survey Technique

The surveyed trees were visually assessed from ground level as far as access allowed. No climbing inspections or invasive examination techniques were carried out. Access to some trees was restricted, in such cases the descriptions of the trees given in the survey schedule are subject to the tree being free of significant defects that were not clearly visible. Detail on the individual trees assessed is given in the survey schedule using the format in BS5837: 2012 'Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction – Recommendations', please read in conjunction with the enclosed Tree Survey Plan. The columns and abbreviations used are:

Senior Consultant: Mark Hinsley MSc Res Man(Arb), OND(Arb), F.ArborA
Consultant: John Christopher FdScArb, HNC Building Studies
Arboriculturalist: Kym Brooks NDArb
Technician: Rebecca Hinsley BA (Hons), FdArt & Design
Support staff: Claire Perry, Teresa O'Neale

email: markhinsley@treeadvice.info
email: johnchristopher@treeadvice.info
email: kymbrooks@treeadvice.info
email: enquiries@treeadvice.info

TREE SURVEY FOR 49 CLIDDESSEN ROAD, BASINGSTOKE, HANTS, RG21 3ET.

Survey Technique

The surveyed trees were visually assessed from ground level as far as access allowed. No climbing inspections or invasive examination techniques were carried out. Access to some trees was restricted, in such cases the descriptions of the trees given in the survey schedule are subject to the tree being free of significant defects that were not clearly visible. Detail on the individual trees assessed is given in the survey schedule using the format in BS5837: 2012 'Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction – Recommendations', please read in conjunction with the enclosed Tree Survey Plan.

The columns and abbreviations used are:

Column 1 = T – Tree number marked on the submitted plan.

Column 2 = The Latin binomial and common name if applicable.

Column 3 = Hgt – Approximate tree height, in metres; to the nearest 0.5m if under 10m.

Column 4 = Dbh – Diameter (rounded to the nearest 10mm). Single stemmed trees, at 1.5m above ground level. Low branched trees, at the narrowest point below the fork. Trunks with irregular swellings, at the narrowest point below the swelling. Multi stemmed trees, each stem measured at 1.5m above ground level. # estimated value if unable to gain access.

Column 5 = RPA – The Root Protection Area: radius measured in metres from the centre of the trunk.

Column 6 = B/S – Approximate branch spread to the four cardinal points of the compass, in metres.

Column 7 = FSB – Height of first significant branch above ground level in metres and direction of growth

Column 8 = C/C – Height of canopy above ground level, in metres.

Column 8 = Age – Age class as representation of passage through normal life cycle – Y=Young,

SM= Semi-Mature, EM = Early Mature, M=Mature, FM = Fully Mature, OM = Over Mature.

Column 9 = R/C – Estimated remaining contribution, in years.

Column 10 = Cat – BS5837: 2012 Survey category.

Categories are:-

- U** **Trees unsuitable for retention** (Red on plan)
Trees that can not realistically be retained, in the context of the current land use, for longer than 10 years.
- A** **Trees of high quality** (Green on plan)
Trees able to make a substantial contribution for a minimum of 40 years.
Particularly good examples of trees, or essential components of groups of arboricultural features e.g. avenues. Visual importance or significant conservation, historical or other value. Veteran trees, especially if ancient.
- B** **Trees of moderate quality** (Blue on plan)
Those in such a condition as to be able to make a significant contribution for a minimum of 20 years. Might be category A but have defects or lack special qualities; or growing in a high value group. Has conservation or cultural values.
- C** **Trees of low quality** (Grey on plan)
Unremarkable trees of limited merit, with a life expectancy of at least 10 years; or growing in a low value group. Also young trees with a stem diameter of below 150mm.

Column 11 = General Observations - notes re structural and/or physiological condition, and/or preliminary management recommendations.

SURVEY SCHEDULE

T	Name & Species	Hgt	Dbh	RPA	B/S	C/C	Age	R/C	Cat	General Observations
T1	Cotoneaster <i>Cotoneaster</i> sp	6	200 160	3.10m	N3 E4 S2 W4 FSB N2	2 2 2 2	M	20- 40	C	Overgrown ornamental shrub. Provides good screening between properties.
T2	Small Leaved Lime <i>Tilia cordata</i>	16	550	6.60m	N4 E3 S3 W3 FSB N2	4 4 4 4	FM	40+	B	Good tree. Could not thoroughly inspect due to dense understorey.
T3	Sycamore <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	16	300	3.60m	N4 E1 S3 W3 FSB	3 6 6 6	M	40+	B	Part suppressed. Could not thoroughly inspect due to dense understorey.
T4	Sycamore <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	16	850	10.20m	N6 E4 S5 W6 FSB	5 5 5 5	FM	40+	B	Multi stemmed at 3m. Dominant. Could not thoroughly inspect due to dense understorey.
T5	London Plane <i>Platanus x hispanica</i>	16	700	8.40m	N6 E3 S6 W6 FSB	1 3 3 3	FM	40+	B	Good tree. Could not thoroughly inspect due to dense understorey.
T6	Bay <i>Laurus nobilis</i>	7	450 at base	4.50m	N3 E2 S2 W2 FSB	3 3 3 3	M	20- 40	C	Located within neighbouring property. Multi stemmed overgrown shrub. Could not thoroughly inspect due to dense understorey.

General Constraints:

When considering the retention of trees in a planning context, preference should be given to retaining trees in categories A and B as these are the trees that contribute most to the amenity of the site and surroundings for the longest time.

Category C trees are of lesser importance, they would not usually be retained where they would impose a significant restraint on development.

Trees placed in the removal 'U' category are assessed upon their condition and not on any planning proposals which may require the removal of the tree for other reasons; category U trees are unsuitable for retention in a development context and should be removed for sound arboricultural reasons.

Groups of even low value trees may have a collective screening or group value in the landscape that is higher than the individual categories of the component trees might suggest.

The enclosed tree survey plan indicates the initial root protection areas produced from the survey data. The Root Protection Areas (RPA's) for the trees have been calculated using the formula given in to BS5837:2012. This is the recommended area around the tree in square metres within which no construction, excavation, soil stripping, level changes or other potentially harmful activities should take place unless appropriate precautions or techniques are employed to avoid root damage. Barriers should protect this area for the duration of any development works to avoid damage to the root system.

Adequate space should also be allowed for future growth, particularly around young and middle-aged trees.

These root protection areas have been scaled onto a flat plan. However, they represent a linear measurement to be taken across the topography of the ground. On steeply sloping areas a linear ground measurement will not extend so far across the plan as a flat ground measurement. It therefore follows that, on the steep areas of the site, it could be possible to create a more accurate, across the ground, root protection area measurement and marginally reduce some of the root protection areas from the limits shown on the enclosed plan.

The root protection areas deal only with the physical protection of the root system, other issues such as shade and dominance may still need to be addressed

Development Proposal:

It is proposed to construct a detached garage and store to the southern aspect of the existing dwelling house.

Arboricultural Impact Assessment:

The tree survey has been undertaken using the guidance in BS5837: 2012 Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction – Recommendations.

The development proposal does not require the felling of any of the trees found on site, however, some minor pruning will be required to facilitate the construction of the garage and store and to create working room around the structure during its construction.

T1 Cotoneaster's northern canopy aspect will be pruned back by 1.5m to create a reasonable separation between building lines and canopy extents. It is my view that whilst T1 Cotoneaster offers good screening between the development site and the neighbouring property to the south, T1 is little more than an overgrown ornamental planting that is of little relevance to the Town and Country Planning Act. The required pruning will not be notably detrimental to T1 and is more in line with annual garden management of the resource.

The footprint of the proposed garage and store falls within the root protection areas of T1 Cotoneaster and T2 Small Leaved Lime. When utilising the guidance found in BS5837:2012, it would be usual for the introduction of built form into the area to be constructed using an entirely above ground method of construction to retain existing tree root systems unharmed. However, the ground conditions directly to the north of both T1 & T2 is made up of tarmac hard surfacing, which creates an inhospitable rooting environment for tree root systems throughout its build up. In this instance it would be arboriculturally acceptable to allow a relatively shallow foundation excavation though the depth of the hard surfacing build up to allow a floor slab and foundation that marries existing ground levels to be created. The use of pads or mini piles with a ground beam are also an appropriate method of founding the structure, should ground conditions allow their use.

Should the design require it, the installation of new drainage runs, services and soakaways is achievable without the need for excavations within the root protection areas of retained trees.

Tree protection measures will be required for the project. To the south and rear of the dwelling the existing hard surfacing should be retained where practicable to act as ground protection during the development. Tree protection barriers will also be required to separate retained tree root protection areas from the working area. For this project BS5837:2012 figure 3 barriers, those being Heras panels located in 'shoes' and secured to one another with scaffolding clamps will be appropriate for the project.

In my opinion, the development proposals do not raise any arboriculturally unacceptable impacts for retained trees. The approval of this planning application will not result in any change to the character of the area nor will pruning works be required post the development of the site.

The accompanying Tree Protection Plan 6556-GS locates the tree protection measures on the drawing, their placement on site will be required throughout the development period.

If you require any further information at this stage, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Yours sincerely

John Christopher
Mark Hinsley Arboricultural Consultants Ltd.