Arboricultural Statement and Tree Survey

for Prior Approval for Change of Use

5 Acres,

Holywell Lane,

Upchurch,

Kent,

ME9 7HN

**Prepared for Mr Kenney** 



A trading name of RG Consultancy Ltd

Prepared by Peter Wilkins BA(Hons) MArborA. MIEnvSc. CEnv. Our Ref 0623 10862 September 2023

# **Contents**

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Arboricultural Statement
- 3.0 Conclusion

# Appendix 1

Tree Condition Survey Tree Survey Plan

Tree Protection Plan

## 1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 This Arboricultural statement has been prepared on behalf of Mr Kenney to inform a Prior Approval application for the change of use of agricultural buildings to two dwellinghouses in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q (as amended) on the site known as '5 Acres', Holywell Lane, Upchurch, Kent, ME9 7HN.
- 1.2 We visited the site in May 2023 to undertake a Pre-Development Tree Condition Survey (See Appendix 1). Following our site visit we have been provided with a copy of the proposed drawings prepared by Studio Spicer which are submitted as part of this prior approval application. (See Appendix 1).

## 2.0 Arboricultural Impact Assessment

- 2.1 The wider 5 Acres site is currently occupied by two areas of orchards with a camping facility, and static caravans and a number of outbuildings and storage containers. There is a track accessing the site from Holywell Lane to the south-western boundary. The 'L-shaped' site slopes gently uphill from the north-east to the south-west. The site is managed by regular grass cutting.
- 2.2 The barn which is subject to the Prior Approval application is located in the south-western corner of the site. This is remote from the orchard areas and is in an area which is remote from any on-site trees.
- 2.3 The hedgerow to the rear of the barn will be protected by the erection of Tree Protection Fencing as shown on the Tree Protection Plan (See Appendix 1).
- 2.4 To the rear of the barn there are two off-site ash trees T4 and T5 on raised ground beyond the boundary of the site, to the south-western side of the barn. The ash trees in this area as across much of the UK are showing symptoms of Ash Dieback Disease and the remaining lifeexpectancies and long-term future of ash trees in this area are likely to be compromised by this disease.
- 2.5 The proposed conversion of the barn does not increase the size of the existing barn and does not encroach any closer to the off-site trees than the existing barn.
- 2.6 With regard to the topography of the site, their off-site location the boundary fence and vegetation that is to be retained the impact of the proposed works on the nearby vegetation will be negligible.

- 2.7 To protect the Root Protection Area (RPA) of the ash trees in addition to the Tree Protection Fencing the existing on-site open ground between the barn and the site boundary within the RPA of the ash trees is protected during works from compaction by the use of temporary nodig hardstanding. (See the Tree Protection Plan Appendix 1).
- 2.8 This temporary ground protection can be a suitable sheet material such as 'Tufftrak' or a nodig permeable surface laid on a woven geotextile membrane using a cellular confinement system such as "Geoweb".
- 2.9 The underground services and drainage route is remote from any retained trees.
- 2.10 There are no construction works proposed in proximity to the orchards and other trees on or off-site.
- 2.11 Due to the location and nature of the proposed works all the remaining on and off-site vegetation can be retained and protected during the construction works by defining the working area and keeping all works away from retained trees as per the BS5837 (2012) guidance.

# 3.0 Conclusion

- 3.1 The British Standard BS5837:2012 contains clear and current recommendations for a best practice approach to the assessment, retention and protection of trees on development sites. The prior approval notification has followed this guidance by:
  - Assessing the quality of the trees and considering the benefits and constraints to development of the site in relation to the quality of the tree resource.
  - Seeking arboricultural advice to inform the layout and design of the proposed development.
- 3.2 The proposed works do not require the removal of any trees or vegetation. The existing trees including the orchards and hedgerows can be successfully retained and protected during the proposed works.
- 3.3 The protection of retained trees during the proposed development works can be achieved by following the guidance outlined in this report.
- 3.4 The wider site includes significant opportunities for new tree and hedgerow planting, management and creation of new habitats by very simple actions such as changing the mowing regime in some parts of the site.

Peter Wilkins BA(Hons) MArborA. MIEnvSc. CEnv. Our Ref 0623 10862 September 2023 Appendix 1

**Tree Condition Survey** 

**Tree Survey Plan** 

**Tree Protection Plan** 

Tree Survey for 5 Acres, Holywell Lane, Upchurch, Kent, ME9 7HN

**Prepared for Mr Kenney** 



A trading name of RG Consultancy Limited

Prepared by Peter Wilkins BA(Hons) MArborA. MIEnvSc. CEnv. Our Ref 0623 10862 June 2023

### Tree Survey for 5 Acres, Upchurch, Kent, ME9 7HN

#### 1.0 Introduction

This survey has been undertaken following instructions received from Spicer Studios on behalf of Mr Kenney, we have been asked to assess the condition of trees located within and close to the boundary of the site. The site was visited in May 2023 and an assessment of the trees' condition was made in accordance with BS 5837 (2012) Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations'.

#### 2.0 Survey Methodology

We have surveyed all the individual trees and groups of trees located within and close to the boundary of the site. The objective of the survey is to collect tree data relevant to the proposed redevelopment of the site and to categorise individual trees or tree groups in accordance with BS 5837 (2012) 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations' based on their condition, quality and future potential.

The purpose of the categories within BS5837 2012, is not to determine whether retention of trees is desirable, '*The purpose of the tree categorization method, which should be applied by an arboriculturist, is to identify the quality and value (in a non-fiscal sense) of the existing tree stock, allowing informed decisions to be made concerning which trees should be removed or retained in the event of development occurring.*' (BS5837 2012 Section 4.5.2). This survey should therefore be regarded as an initial appraisal and observations, assessments or recommendations relating to tree protection zones, remedial tree works, protective fencing, foundation design, material specification are beyond the scope of this report.

The location of the trees/ tree groups is shown on the attached drawing. A detailed inspection with respect to decay, defects and hazard is not included.

TABLE 1

Tree No.	Species	Hgt (m)	Dia. @ 1.5m (mm)	No of Stem s	CS N (m)	CS E (m)	CS S (m)	CS W (m)	Age Clas s	Form	Conditio n	ER CY	Description	Proposed Works	BS Cat
G1	Mixed Fruit Trees	5	300	1	3	3	3	3	М	A	A	40+	A group of mature apple trees with some younger plum trees growing to the western part of the site. These trees are to the southern side of the existing access track. The apple trees are of variable quality with some trees having significant decay and large cavities in the trunks. The plum trees are being planted to replace apple trees which have died and been removed. These trees are remote from the buildings and static caravans on site and will be unaffected by the proposed works.	No Works	В3
H2	Mixed hedge	6	200	m/s	2	2	2	2	М	А	А	40+	A mixed hedge including hawthorn, damson, ivy and dog rose with some ash that runs along the southern boundary of the site.	No Works	B2
Т3	Ash	11	200	1	3	4	3	4	SM	А	А	20-39	A semi-mature, ash tree growing within the hedgerow H2. Ash Dieback Disease is likely to impact on the remaining life-expectancy of this tree. See Note 1	No Works	C1
Т4	Ash	15	400, 350	2	5	7	6	8	М	А	А	20-39	An off-site mature, twin-stemmed ash tree growing beyond the hedgerow H2. Ash Dieback Disease is likely to impact on the remaining life-expectancy of this tree. See Note 1	No Works	С3
Т5	Ash	8	200	1	2	2	2	2	SM	А	А	20-39	An off-site semi-mature, ash tree growing to the northern side of T4 close to the hedgerow H2. Ash Dieback Disease is likely to impact on the remaining life-expectancy of this tree. See Note 1	No Works	С3
G6	Hazel and Hawthorn	5	250	m/s	2	2	2	2	м	A	A	20-39	An off-site linear group of group of hazel and hawthorn located beyond the western boundary of the site. G6, T7 and G8 form a liner group growing along an off-site field boundary that runs perpendicular to the western boundary	No Works	С3
Т7	Field maple	11	300	1	4	4	4	3	М	А	А	20-39	An off-site mature tree located beyond the western boundary of the site. G6, T7 and G8 form a linear group growing along an off-site field boundary that runs perpendicular to the western boundary	No Works	С3
G8	Row of Leyland cypress	10	200	1	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	м	A	A	20-39	An off-site linear group of group of hazel and hawthorn located beyond the western boundary of the site. G6, T7 and G8 form a linear group growing along an off-site field boundary that runs perpendicular to the western boundary	No Works	С3
Т9	Oak	17	780	1	8	7	7	8	м	А	А	40+	A mature oak tree growing to the western boundary of the site. This tree has a lower stem removed and has been crown lifted.	No Works	B1
T10	Cherry	11	320, 200	2	4	4	4	4	М	А	А	20-39	An off-site mature cherry tree growing beyond the northern boundary of the site.	No Works	C3
T11	Cherry	10	330	m/s	5	4	4	4	SM	А	А	20-39	An off-site mature multi-stemmed cherry tree growing beyond the northern boundary of the site.	No Works	C3

Tree No.	Species	Hgt (m)	Dia. @ 1.5m (mm)	No of Stem s	CS N (m)	CS E (m)	CS S (E)	CS W (m)	Age Clas s	Form	Conditio n	ER CY	Description	Proposed Works	BS Cat
T12	Ash	3	1200, 700, 700	3	1	0	1	2	OM	Ρ	Ρ	10-19	A mature multi-stemmed tree growing to the western boundary of the site. This tree has recent been reduced to 2m in height, there is significant decay and a large cavity in the lower trunk. There is very limited regrowth following these works. See Note 1	No Works	СЗ
G13	Mixed Fruit Trees	5	300	1	3	3	3	3	М	A	A	40+	A group of mature plum and apple trees growing to the northern part of the site. These trees are remote from the buildings and static caravans on site and will be unaffected by the proposed works.	No Works	В3
T14	Oak	16	500	1	6	6	6	6	EM	A	A	40+	An early-mature oak tree growing to the northern part of the site. This tree is remote from the existing buildings and static caravans on site and will be unaffected by the proposed works.	No Works	B1
T15	Oak	13	340	1	6	5	5	5	EM	A	А	40+	An early-mature oak tree growing to the northern part of the site. This tree is remote from the existing buildings and static caravans on site and will be unaffected by the proposed works.	No Works	B1
T16	Holly	4	200	m/s	2	2	2	2	М	A	А	40+	A small mature tree growing to the northern part of the site. This tree is remote from the existing buildings and static caravans on site and will be unaffected by the proposed works.	No Works	C1
G17	Mixed Fruit Trees	6	300	m/s	3	3	3	3	М	A	А	40+	A group of mature apple trees growing to the northern part of the site. These trees are remote from the buildings and static caravans on site and will be unaffected by the proposed works.	No Works	В3
H18	Mixed hedge	3	150	m/s	1	1	1	1	М	A/P	A/P	40+	A short section of intermittent predominately damson hedge to the northern boundary of the site.	No Works	C2

### Note 1 Ash Dieback Disease

First confirmed in the UK in 2012, ash dieback (also known as Chalara or Chalara ash dieback) is a disease of ash trees caused by a fungus called *Hymenoscyphus fraxineus (*formerly known as *Chalara fraxinea).* This disease has spread quickly and is now affecting ash trees and woodlands across the UK, leading to the death of thousands of trees. Ash dieback has already caused widespread damage in continental Europe. There is no cure for ash dieback, but some ash trees can tolerate or resist infection. Investigating this natural resistance could be the best way to secure the future of the UK's ash trees. Ash dieback is a disease that affects ash (*Fraxinus*) trees, caused by a fungus called *Hymenoscyphus fraxineus*. The fungus has two stages to its lifecycle - a sexual stage, which helps the fungus spread, and an asexual stage, which is what grows on the tree and causes damage. The fungus blocks water transport in the tree, leading to lesions in the bark, leaf loss and the dieback of the crown. The main symptoms of ash dieback are:

- Dead branches
- Blackening of leaves, which often hang on the tree.
- Discoloured stems, often with a diamond-shaped lesion where a leaf was attached.
- Trees may eventually drop limbs, collapse or fall.

The symptoms are often easier to spot in mid-late summer, when a healthy ash should be in full leaf. It becomes much harder in autumn, when leaves are naturally changing colour and falling.

Once a tree is infected the disease is usually fatal - but a limited number of trees may be tolerant or resistant to infection. Mature ash trees infected by ash dieback may survive for several years but often succumb to a secondary attack by other pests or pathogens, including honey fungus, which can cause butt or root rot and lead to the tree falling. As the disease progresses it makes the main branches and stem brittle and prone to partial or complete failure.

## Table 2 Cascade chart for tree quality assessment

	Trees unsuitable for r	retention (See Note)		
Category and definition	Criteria (including subcategories where appropriat	e		Stem Colour Identification on plan
<b>Category U</b> 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.	<ul> <li>Trees that have a serious, irremediable, structural d including those that will become unviable after rer where, for whatever reason, the loss of companion</li> <li>Trees that are dead or are showing signs of significa</li> <li>Trees infected with pathogens of significance to th quality trees suppressing adjacent trees of better q</li> <li>NOTE Category U trees can have existing or potential companion</li> </ul>	efect, such that their early loss is expected due noval of other category U trees (e.g. shelter cannot be mitigated by pruning) ant, immediate, and irreversible overall decline he health and/or safety of other trees nearby, uality nservation value which it might be desirable to	to collapse, or very low o preserve; see 4.5.7.	Red
	Trees to be conside	red for retention		
	1 Mainly arboricultural qualities	2 Mainly landscape qualities	3 Mainly cultural values, including conservation	
<b>Category A</b> 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 See Table 2 of significant conservation, historical, commemorative or other value (e.g. veteran trees or wood- pasture)	Green
<b>Category B</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 remediable defects, including unsympathetic past management and storm damage), such that they are unlikely to be suitable for retention for 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	Blue
<b>Category C</b> Trees of low quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 10 years, or young trees with a stem diameter below 150 mm.	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 benefits	Trees with no material conservation or other cultural value	Grey

From BS 5837 (2012) Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations

<u>KEY</u>

Tree No.	Species	Hgt (m)	Dia. @ 1.5m (mm)	No of Stems	CS N (m)	CS E (m)	CS S (m)	CS W (m)	Cond	Form	Age Class	ER CY	Description	Proposed Works (to be confirmed on receipt of layout)	BS Cat
-------------	---------	---------	------------------------	-------------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	------	------	--------------	----------	-------------	---	-----------

Tree No.	Tree number identified on copy of Tree Survey Drawing								
Species:	Common/English name								
Hgt (m)	ight of tree (measured to nearest whole metre)								
Dia @ 1.5m (mm)	ameter of stem/trunk measured at 1.5 metres above ground level (or immediately above the root flare for multi-stemmed trees).								
No. of stems	Number of stems								
CS (m) Crown Spread	Maximum branch extent measured at the four compass points								
Condition	G-Good A-Average P-Poor Dead								
Form	G-Good A-Average P-Poor Dead								
Age Class	YYoungSMSemi-matureEMEarly matureMMatureOMOver MatureVVeteran								
ERCY:	Estimated Remaining Contribution in Years								
BS Category	See Table 1 Cascade chart for tree quality assessment From BS 5837 (2012) Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations								

Tree Survey Plan

i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i
Coordinates and Levels based on OS derived from GPS.
Sheet Layout
NOTES
<section-header><section-header><section-header><section-header><section-header><section-header><text><text><text><text><text><text><text></text></text></text></text></text></text></text></section-header></section-header></section-header></section-header></section-header></section-header>
ME9 7HN Sheet 1 of 5 Tree Survey Plan For Mr Kenney <b>Ruskins Tree Consultancy</b> <sup>01277 84990</sup> info@ruskins-tree-consultancy.co.uk
Scale         1:200 @ A0         Drawn by           Date         05/06/2023         PW           Project No.         0623 10862         Checked by           Dwg. No.         TSP 1         *



Coordinates and Levels based on OS derived from GPS.
Sheet Layout
2
NOTES
Extent of Tree Canopy Theoretical Root Protection Area (BS5837) BS 5837 Category (See Below) Tree Survey Number
BS 5837 Category (See Tree Survey for further details)
<u>Category U</u> Red Stem Disc Those in such a condition that any existing value would be lost within 10 years and which should in the current context, be removed for reasons of sound arboricultural management.
<u>Category A</u> Green Stem Disc Those of high quality and value: – in such a condition as to be able to make a substantial contribution (a minimum of 40 years is suggested). <u>Category B</u> Blue Stem Disc
Those of moderate quality and value: - those in such a condition as to make a significant contribution (a minimum of 20 years is suggested) <u>Category C</u> Grey Stem Disc Those of low quality and value: - currently in adequate
condition to remain until new planting could be established (a minimum of 10 years is suggested), or young trees with a stem diameter below 150 mm.
5 Acres, Hollywell Lane, Upchurch, Kent, ME9 7HN
Sheet 2 of 5 Tree Survey Plan For Mr Kenney
Ruskins Tree Consultancy 01277 849990 info@ruskins-tree-consultancy.co.uk www.ruskins-tree-consultancy.co.uk
Scale         1:200 @ A0         Drawn by           Date         05/06/2023         PW           Project No.         0623 10862         Checked by           Dwg. No.         TSP 1         *







![](_page_17_Figure_0.jpeg)

**Tree Protection Plan** 

![](_page_19_Picture_0.jpeg)