



1250.bjh.let

13th June 2022

Mr & Mrs Bradley
Wildfowlers
Shore Road
Bosham

Dear Mr & Mrs Bradley,

Arboricultural Assessment
for Wildfowlers, Shore Road, Bosham

I am pleased to confirm that having attended site on Wednesday 1st June to carry out the Tree Survey works I am now in a position to offer you advice on the constraints which trees could place on the viability of the re-development of this site and the likelihood of success through the Planning process.

Tree Survey Schedule

This acts as an inventory of the trees present on site at the time of my inspection which may have the potential to be a constraint on the redevelopment of the site.

You will see that the trees are graded **A**, **B**, **C** and **U** in accordance with BS5837:2012 recommendations and according to their appearance and condition.

I would ask that you refer to the tree survey notes included within the report for further guidance on definitions for each category grading.

Root Protection Schedule

This defines the minimum root protection areas (RPA's) which will need to be applied and respected in order to comply with British Standard 5837:2012 Recommendations. You will see that where there is no perceived constraint to the rooting pattern the RPA is shown as a circle whose radius is measured from the centre of the trees trunk. Where there is a perceived constraint to rooting then BS5837 requires that the Arboricultural Consultant estimates the most likely pattern of rooting and also shows this as a polygon equivalent to the same area as the circle.

Please note that some Local Authorities apply the British Standard 5837:2012 Recommendations '20% ruling' which means that if your development overlaps the RPA's by 20% or more of previously open/undeveloped ground then it can be used as a reason for refusal.

Tree Constraints Plan – BH 01/02

This is a graphical/visual representation of the tree survey data that has been collected – primarily crown spreads and colour coded trunk centres to show a trees grading.

Tree RPA's [blue dotted circles and blue dashed polygons] are shown as well on the same plan.

Any development that is shown to be taking place within a trees RPA requires that we provide the Planners with a detailed Arboricultural Method Statement covering the mitigation measures which will be applied to protect tree roots and/or minimise damage.

Tree Stock Overview & Design Guidance

The tree survey covers 12 Individual trees and 3 Groups.

The following comments are based on the P15 Plan from IAS which shows tree removals to facilitate the layout proposed.

Tree 1 Weeping Willow – A moderate B graded mature tree in fairly good condition that seems to be unaffected by the proposals.

Group 1 Apples – A moderate B graded grouping of mature trees in fairly good condition that seem to be unaffected by the proposals.

Group 2 Birches – One tree has already fallen/been removed from this group and the remainder are mature trees of moderate B grading but the plans show them to be removed to accommodate the new parking courtyard arrangements. I have no particular preference to see them retained.

Group 3 Holly etc – A scruffy grouping of small shrubby trees of limited value. I have no particular preference to see them retained.

Tree 2 Strawberry Tree – This tree has fallen to one side in the past and re-settled and whilst it is now safe it is scruffy and spreading in habit. I have no particular preference to see it retained.

Tree 3 Walnut – Shown to be removed to accommodate the revised car parking courtyard. I think this is a shame as this is a good example (moderate B grading) of the species and I would encourage you to review this situation and try to retain this tree if at all possible.

Tree 4 Magnolia – A suppressed tree of limited value and merit. I have no particular preference to see it retained.

Tree 5 Goat Willow – A self seeded tree of limited value and merit. I have no particular preference to see it retained.

Tree 6 Strawberry Tree – Off site tree. We appear to be clear of it from the layout plans but will need to be careful in removing the existing structure within the site to avoid unnecessary root disturbance.

Tree 7 Tulip Tree – Whilst we could in theory retain this tree it has the potential to be a large specimen of at least 20m height with 10m radial spread so does not sit well here if we are trying to retain it. It could possibly be transplanted but I feel that the cost of this would be better spent in planting a new tree on the front lawn or alternatively along the rear boundary behind the Tennis Court.

Tree 8 Foxglove Tree – A fine tree of high amenity value and high A grading – as shame to put it under pressure from the Swimming Pool? Can we not move the Pool at least 1m northwards as tree 9 is going?

Tree 9 Apple – A good example of an Apple tree, but at the end of the day it is only a fruit tree and if it has to go then so be it.

Tree 10 Cherry – beyond the zone of influence of the development but it has decay/stability issues and has a short life expectancy. Perhaps remove it and plant the new Tulip Tree here?

Tree 11 Sweet Chestnut – A really good tree of high amenity value and A grading that merits retention and protection. The new patio area will impinge into its RPA so mitigation measures will need to be applied to protect its root system.

Tree 12 Irish Yew – This small evergreen tree could in theory be retained but I would not advise it as it will be hard up against the Bay Window obscuring views out.

I hope these comments are of assistance to you and I will leave you to discuss the various options with your development team and await further instructions.

Yours sincerely,

