



## Arboricultural Impact Assessment

**613-615 Green Lanes Palmers Green London  
N13 4EP**

*On behalf of*

**Vivendi Architects Ltd**

Author	Ian Dalton DipArbL4 (ABC)
Quality Reviewer	Gary Meadowcroft DIP. Arb RFS ABC L6 M.Arbor.A
Report Status	Rev ~
Date of Issue	09 <sup>th</sup> November 2023

**Professional Service • Pragmatic Solutions**  
Ecology, Arboriculture, Countryside Management


Phone: 01268 711 021 Email: [team@ses-eco.co.uk](mailto:team@ses-eco.co.uk) website: [www.ses-eco.co.uk](http://www.ses-eco.co.uk)  
Address: Unit 1, The Sudbury Stables, Sudbury Road, Downham, Essex, CM11 1LB

## Executive summary

An arboricultural survey has been carried out, and this report prepared to support a planning application at 613-615 Green Lanes Palmers Green London N13 4EP.

1. Details of all trees forming the survey can be found in Appendix 3, including specific comments in relation to their condition and quality.
2. The area subject to survey includes 9 individual trees and 1 group of trees.
3. No individual trees will require removal to accommodate the proposed layout.
4. No Root Protection Areas (RPAs) of any retained trees will be incurred into by the design layout, only the construction of a proposed cycle store which is lightweight construction that will not require any excavations.
5. Extension of the building will be vertical only, with no excavations planned within the RPAs of the existing trees. Therefore, the root systems of the existing trees will not be disturbed.
6. Provided precautions to protect the retained trees are specified and implemented through the measures included in this report, the development proposal will have minimal impact on the retained trees or their wider contribution to amenity and character.
7. If the recommendations made within this report are followed, the development will be achievable in arboricultural terms, and we are confident that it will be acceptable to the Local Planning Authority.

<u>Tree Survey Summary</u>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>Trees</b>	0	0	9	0	<b>9</b>
<b>Groups</b>	0	0	1	0	<b>1</b>
<b>Woodlands</b>	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
<b>Hedges</b>	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
<b>Scrub/Shrubs</b>	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>



# INDEX

---

## CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION .....	4
2.0	SITE VISIT AND OBSERVATIONS .....	5
3.0	ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT .....	8
4.0	PRELIMINARY ARBORICULTURAL METHOD STATEMENT .....	10
5.0	CONCLUSIONS .....	12
APPENDIX 1:	SURVEY AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION.....	13
APPENDIX 2:	KEY TO TREE SURVEY SHEET AND SUMMARY.....	15
APPENDIX 3:	TREE SURVEY SCHEDULE (BS5837) .....	17
APPENDIX 4:	TREE PROTECTION BARRIERS & GROUND PROTECTION DESIGN .....	18
APPENDIX 5:	METHODS OF WORK CLOSE TO TREES.....	24
APPENDIX 6:	SPECIFIC REPORT CAVEAT AND REFERENCES.....	29
APPENDIX 7:	TREE WORK SCHEDULE .....	30
APPENDIX 8:	TREE PROTECTION PLAN (TPP) .....	31

## **1.0 Introduction**

### **1.1 Instruction**

Southern Ecological Solutions Ltd. has been instructed to produce an Arboricultural Impact Assessment in support of a planning application at 613-615 Green Lanes Palmers Green London N13 4EP. It has been produced in accordance with the principles of British Standard *BS 5837:2012, Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations* and includes the following information to accompany a planning application:

- *details of significant trees including an assessment of condition using BS 5837 categorisation;*
- *a plan showing tree survey information, retention categorisation and root protection areas;*
- *an assessment of the impact of the proposal on trees, any wider impact on the local amenity and any impact trees may have on the proposed development;*
- *a preliminary arboricultural method statement dealing with the protection and management of the trees to be retained;*
- *a schedule of tree works to facilitate construction.*

### **1.2 Scope and purpose of this report**

This report covers trees within the site boundary and its immediate proximity. It is concerned with the impact the development may have on trees, and the effect retained trees may have on the development. Its purpose is to allow the Local Planning Authority to assess the tree information as part of the planning submission.

## 2.0 Site Visit and Observations

### 2.1 Site visit

A site visit was undertaken on the 7th November 2023 by Ian Dalton of Southern Ecological Solutions. The weather conditions were clear and dry.

### 2.2 Site description

The site is located to the east of Greens Lane and is a residential property with commercial units at the front, with trees in neighbouring properties to the north and to the south.

The survey boundary is indicated by the redline boundary as per the map below.



Figure 1 – Redline boundary of the survey area

### 2.3 The subject trees

The area subject to survey includes 9 individual trees and 1 group of trees.

All trees were categorised in accordance with Section 4.5 and Table 1 of BS5837.

**Table 1 BS5837 Categorisation Summary**

	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>Trees</b>	0	0	9	0	<b>9</b>
<b>Groups</b>	0	0	1	0	<b>1</b>
<b>Woodlands</b>	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
<b>Hedges</b>	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
<b>Scrub/Shrubs</b>	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>

## 2.4 Tree Preservation Orders – Conservation Areas:

2.5 Tree Preservation Orders: a search in the interactive map of Enfield Council web page on 09/11/23 shows that the trees are not within a Conservation Area (CA) or subject to a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)




Figure 2 - Capture of Enfield Council interactive web site for TPOs and CAs of the area.

*Please note the following in relation to vegetation clearance: anyone wishing to undertake works to prune or remove a tree with a Tree Preservation Order or within a Conservation Area will require written authorisation from the Local Planning Authority before any works can proceed.*

*However, works required as part of planning consent does not need additional consent.*

## **3.0 Arboricultural Impact Assessment**

### **3.1 Summary of the impact on trees**

Development can adversely impact on trees by causing them to be removed to facilitate the development, or in the future, by adversely affecting their potential for retention through a disturbance in Root Protection Areas (RPAs) or through post development pressures to prune or remove.

At the design stage, disturbance within the RPA should be avoided. If unavoidable, (which may need demonstrating), consideration must be given to any construction activity such as demolition, including removal of existing hard surfaces, changing soil levels and the provision of services where within RPAs, as well as new surfaces and structures.

Construction of hard surfaces and other construction may be acceptable within RPAs providing specialist methods of design and construction are used. This will often result in the use of minimal or no-dig methods which result in higher finished levels which must be allowed for during design due to the effect on access thresholds and structure heights etc.

The ability of trees to tolerate some disturbance depends on individual circumstances including prevailing site conditions, tree species, age and condition and this will be assessed by the project arboriculturist.

Protection measures, usually a combination of barriers and ground protection, must be in place before any works (including site clearance) begin, and stay in place for as long as a risk of damage remains (please refer to the Tree Protection Plan - TPP). The protection of trees must take account of the buildability of the proposal, including services, and ensure that all activities, such as storage of materials, parking and the use of plant and vehicles, can be accommodated outside of RPAs. Particular care and planning are necessary for the operation of excavators, lifting machinery and cranes to ensure all vehicle movement and lifting operations will not impact on retained trees.

### **3.2 Tree protection plan (TPP)**

Trees to be retained are colour coded based on their tree category, whilst trees required for removal to facilitate the development have red hatch lines inside a red circle representing the tree crown spread. Tree protection is shown as barriers and/or ground protection defining the Construction Exclusion Zone (CEZ) , and any areas requiring non-standard methods of demolition or construction are shown.

### 3.3 Trees to be removed

No individual trees will require removal to accommodate the proposed layout.

**Table 2 Tree removal summary**

Removal		TOTAL	Part removal		TOTAL
Trees		0	Trees		0
Groups		0	Groups		0
Woodlands		0	Woodlands		0
Hedges		0	Hedges		0
Shrubs		0	Shrubs		0

### 3.4 Trees to be pruned

Trees T3, T4, T5 and T6 will require some pruning of lateral branches back to the boundary to facilitate the erection of scaffolding. See Appendix 7 for the Tree Works Schedule.

### 3.5 Root protection area incursions

No Root Protection Areas (RPAs) of any retained trees will be incurred into by the design layout, only the construction of a proposed cycle store which is lightweight construction that will not require any excavations. Extension of the building will be vertical only, with no excavations planned. Therefore, the root systems of the existing trees will not be disturbed.

## **4.0 Preliminary Arboricultural Method Statement**

### **4.1 Introduction**

This section is a preliminary arboricultural method statement specifying the methodology to be used for the protection of trees and works close to trees that have the potential to result in the loss of or damage to a tree. It includes details of site management and supervision required for successful tree retention.

### **4.2 Site clearance**

Damage can easily be caused to trees to be retained during initial site clearance. Therefore, tree protection barriers must be in place before site clearance to protect retained trees identified in Appendix 4.

### **4.3 Site and fuel storage, cement mixing and washing points**

All site storage areas, cement mixing and washing points for equipment and vehicles and fuel storage must be outside RPAs. No discharge of potential contaminants will occur within 10 m of a retained tree stem or where there is a risk of run-off into RPAs.

### **4.4 Tree protection barriers**

Appendix 4 includes guidance for protective barriers based on BS 5837:2012. The approximate location of the barriers and the CEZs is shown on the TPP. The precise location of the barriers and other protective measures will be confirmed at the pre-commencement meeting before any demolition or construction activities (including site clearance) start.

### **4.5 Ground protection**

In areas where it is not possible to erect protective barriers, ground protection must be used to protect the RPAs of retained trees. Where it has been agreed during the design stage that vehicular or pedestrian access for the construction operation may take place within the CEZ, the possible effects of construction activity should be addressed by a combination of barriers and ground protection. The position of the barrier may be within the CEZ at the edge of the agreed working zone, but the soil structure beyond the barrier to the edge of the CEZ shall be protected with ground protection.

### **4.6 Precautions when working in CEZs**

Only work agreed with the Local Planning Authority can be carried out within CEZs. Any works must be carried out in accordance with the details as set out in Appendix 5 which are summarised below.

#### **4.7 Installation of new surfacing**

Full details of the new surfacing proposed within the RPAs of trees to be retained is not known at the time of writing. However, if resurfacing is required within the RPAs of any trees it will be necessary to use non-standard methods of construction. Ideally, new substrates and finished surfaces should be of a porous design to allow water and an air passage in and out.

#### **4.8 Installation of new services**

The exact location of services is often difficult to establish until construction is in progress. Where existing services within RPAs require upgrading or new services have to be installed in RPAs, conventional excavation techniques are unacceptable, and great care must be taken to minimise any disturbance. Trenchless installation should be the preferred option, but if that is not feasible, any excavation must be carried out by hand or using a compressed air lance. The methodology must comply with *NJUG Volume 4: Guidelines for the Planning, installation and Maintenance of Utility Apparatus in Proximity to Trees*.

#### **4.9 Tree works**

Recommendations for tree works can be found in the tree works schedule in Appendix 7. All works shall be in accordance with *BS 3998:2010*, or in accordance with current best practice. The use of a competent tree surgery contractor is necessary to comply with this (follow the link for a list of Arboricultural Association approved contractors [Directory of Tree Surgeons - Arboricultural Association](#)). The main contractor and tree surgery contractor must ensure that any necessary consents have been received from the Local Planning Authority regarding planning constraints in regard to trees and that no protected species or habitats are harmed whilst carrying out site clearance or tree surgery works.

## **5.0 Conclusions**

- 5.1** No individual trees will require removal to accommodate the proposed layout.
- 5.2** No Root Protection Areas (RPAs) of any retained trees will be incurred into by the design layout, only the construction of a proposed cycle store which is lightweight construction that will not require any excavations. Extension of the building will be vertical only, with no excavations planned. Therefore, the root systems of the existing trees will not be disturbed.
- 5.3** Provided precautions to protect the identified trees are specified and implemented through the measures included in this report; the development proposal will have minimal impact on the retained trees or their wider contribution to amenity and character.
- 5.4** If the recommendations made within this report are followed, the development will be achievable in arboricultural terms and should be acceptable to the Local Planning Authority.

## Appendix 1: Survey and Background Information

### 1.1 Limitations

A detailed topographical plan showing the locations of individual trees was provided by the client and used for the tree survey, so the positions of the trees were understood to be accurate, and SES Ltd accepts no liability for the accuracy of any tree survey drawings based on the topographical plan supplied by the client.

Trees are living organisms whose health and the condition can change rapidly and all trees, even healthy ones, are at risk from unpredictable climatic and manmade events. The assessment of risk for any tree is based upon factors evident at the time of the inspection and the interpretation of those factors by suitably qualified inspectors. The health, condition and safety of trees should be checked on a basis commensurate with the level of risk and preferably on an annual basis.

### 1.2 Methods

The trees were surveyed from ground level without detailed investigations. All trees with a trunk diameter of 75 mm or above were surveyed. All dimensions were estimated unless otherwise indicated. Obvious hedges and shrub masses were identified where appropriate. Information collected is in accordance with recommendations in *Subsection 4.4.2.5 of BS 5837:2012* and includes species, height, diameter, branch spread, crown clearance, age class, physiological condition, structural condition and remaining contribution. Each tree was then allocated one of four categories (U, A, B or C) to reflect its suitability as a material constraint on development.

### 1.3 Documents and information received

- *Topographical plan*
- *Proposed plan*

### 1.4 Contact

Name	Company/organisation	Tel. no.
Ian Dalton	SES Arboriculture Ltd	+44 (0)1268 711021

## 1.5 Reference documents

- *British Standards Institution (2012) BS 5837: Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations;*
- *British Standards Institute (2010) BS 3998: Tree work – Recommendations;*
- *DETR Tree Preservation Orders – A Guide to the Law and Good Practice;*
- *National Joint Utilities Group (2007) Volume 4, Issue 2: Guidelines for the planning, installation and maintenance of utility apparatus in proximity to trees;*
- *DTLR (2001) Principles of Tree Hazard Assessment and Management - David Lonsdale.*

## 1.6 Legal Constraints and Liabilities

### 1.6.1 Occupiers Liability 1957 and 1984

The Occupiers Liability Act places a duty of care to ensure that no reasonably foreseeable harm takes place due to tree defects. Therefore, this report includes recommendations within the tree tables for work required for safety reasons. 'Common sense risk management of trees (National Tree Safety Group 2012)' states that *'the owner of the land on which a tree stands, together with any party who has control over the tree's management, owes a duty of care at common law to all people who might be injured by the tree. The duty of care is to take reasonable care to avoid acts or omissions that cause a reasonably foreseeable risk of injury to persons or property.'*

### 1.6.2 Common Law

This enables pruning back of the crown and roots of trees on adjacent land where they overhang neighbouring property, providing the work is reasonable and does not cause harm. This right does not override TPO and CA legislation.

### 1.6.3 Ecological Constraints

The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, as amended, The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 and the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000, provide statutory protection to species of flora and fauna including birds, bats and other species that are associated with trees. These could impose significant constraints on the use and timing of access to the site. It is the responsibility of the main contractor and tree surgery contractor to ensure that no protected species are harmed whilst carrying out site clearance or tree surgery works. Unless competent to do so, the advice of an ecologist must be sought.

## Appendix 2: Key to Tree Survey Sheet and Summary

Measurements	Life Stage	Structural and physiological condition	Root Protection Area (RPA)
<b>Height</b> - Measured using a digital laser clinometer (m)	<b>Young</b> trees up to ten years of age	<b>Good:</b> Trees with only a few minor defects and in good overall health needing little, if any attention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The RPA Radius column provides the extent of an equivalent circle from the center of the stem (m).</li> <li>• The RPA is calculated using the formulae described in paragraph 4.6.1 of British Standard 5837: 2012 and is indicative of the rooting area required for a tree to be successfully retained. Tree roots extend beyond the calculated RPA in many cases and where possible a greater distance should be protected.</li> </ul>
<b>Stem diameter</b> – DBH. Diameter measured (mm) in accordance with Annex C of the BS5837	<b>Semi-mature</b> trees less than 1/3 life expectancy	<b>Fair:</b> Trees with minor rectifiable defects or in the early stages of stress from which it may recover	
<b>Crown Spread</b> - Measured using a digital laser clinometer radially from the main stem (m)	<b>Early mature</b> trees 1/3 – 2/3 life expectancy	<b>Poor:</b> Trees with major structural and/or physiological defects such that it is unlikely the tree will recover in the long term	
	<b>Mature</b> trees over 2/3 life expectancy	<b>Dead:</b> This could also apply to trees in an advanced state of decline and unlikely to recover	
	<b>Over mature</b> declining or moribund trees of low vigor  <b>Veteran</b> tree possessing certain attributes relating to veteran trees	The BS category particular consideration has been given to the following <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The health, vigor and condition of each tree</li> <li>• The presence of any structural defects in each tree/group and its future life expectancy</li> <li>• The size and form of each tree/group and its suitability within the context of a proposed development</li> <li>• The location of each tree relative to existing site features e.g. its screening value or landscape features</li> <li>• Age class and life expectancy</li> </ul>	

Abbreviations		BS cat: Category in accordance with Table 1 and section 4.5 of BS 5837.	
<b>T</b> – Tree	Feature surveyed as individual tree. Included multi stem trees	<b>Category A</b>	High quality and value (non-fiscal) with at least 40 years remaining life expectancy.
<b>G</b> – Group of trees	Land under a stand of trees with a maximum size of 0.25 hectare.		<b>Category B</b>
<b>W</b> – Woodland	Land under a stand of trees with, or the potential to achieve, tree canopy cover of 20% or more. The minimum size of woodland Forestry Commission Scotland can grant-aid is 0.25 hectare.	<b>Category C</b>	
<b>H</b> - Hedge	A hedgerow is a boundary line of bushes which can include trees and is protected if it's: more than 20m long with gaps of 20m or less in its length.		<b>Category U</b>
<b>#</b> - Estimated value.	See observation for further information	<b>Subcategories</b>	
<b>VTA</b> – Visual Tree Assessment	Non-invasive method of examining the health and structural condition of individual trees.		(2) - Mainly landscape values
			(3) - Mainly cultural values including conservation.

## 2.1 Appendix Summary

**Table 3 BS5837 category summary with tree numbers**

SUMMARY	Individual Trees	Total	Groups of Trees, Woodlands, Hedges & Shrubs.	Total
Category U - Unsuitable		0		0
Category A (High Quality / Value)		0		0
Category B (Moderate Quality / Value)		0		0
Category C (Low Quality / Value)	T2, T3, T4, T5, T6, T7, T8, T9, T10	9	G1	1

**Table 4 Life stage and BS5837 category summary**

SUMMARY	A	B	C	U	TOTAL
Young	0	0	1	0	1
Early Mature	0	0	6	0	6
Semi Mature	0	0	3	0	3
Mature	0	0	0	0	0
Post Mature	0	0	0	0	0
Late Mature	0	0	0	0	0
Ancient / Veteran	0	0	0	0	0
Dead	0	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	0	0	10	0	10

# - Estimated value.	See observation for further information
com – Combined stem diameter	In accordance with BS5837:2012

### Appendix 3: Tree Survey Schedule (BS5837)

Site: 613-615 Green Lanes Palmers Green London N13 4EP

Client: Vivendi Architects Ltd

Survey Date: 7th November 2023

Surveyed By: Ian Dalton

Weather: clear and dry

Tree No.	Species	Life Stage	No of Stems	Stem Diameter - DBH (mm)	Height (m)	Crown Spread (m)								Structural Condition	Physiological Condition	Observations	Life Expectancy	BS5837 Category	RPA Radius (m)	RPA Area (m2)
						N	NE	E	SE	S	SW	W	NW							
G1	Quercus ilex (Holm Oak)	Semi Mature	1	80	6	2.0		2.0		2.0		2.0		Fair	Fair	Offsite in neighbouring garden data is estimated. Group of young Holm Oaks forming a hedge.	10+	C2	1.0	2.9
T2	Laurocerasus sp. (Laurel)	Semi Mature	1	100	6	2.0		2.0		2.0		2.0		Fair	Fair	Offsite in neighbouring garden data is estimated.	10+	C3	1.2	4.5
T3	Cupressocyparis leylandii (Leyland Cypress)	Early Mature	1	400	10	3.5		3.5		3.5		3.5		Fair	Fair	Offsite in neighbouring garden data is estimated. Leylandii, topped at 8m.	10+	C2	4.8	72.4
T4	Cupressocyparis leylandii (Leyland Cypress)	Early Mature	1	150	10	1.5		1.5		1.5		1.5		Fair	Fair	Offsite in neighbouring garden data is estimated. Leylandii, topped at 8m.	10+	C2	1.8	10.2
T5	Cupressocyparis leylandii (Leyland Cypress)	Early Mature	1	350	10	2.5		2.5		2.5		2.5		Fair	Fair	Offsite in neighbouring garden data is estimated. Leylandii, topped at 8m.	10+	C2	4.2	55.4
T6	Cupressocyparis leylandii (Leyland Cypress)	Early Mature	1	300	10	2.5		2.5		2.5		2.5		Fair	Fair	Offsite in neighbouring garden data is estimated. Leylandii, topped at 8m.	10+	C2	3.6	40.7
T7	Acer pseudoplatanus (Sycamore)	Young	3	110 com	8	1.0		1.0		1.0		1.0		Fair	Fair	Offsite in neighbouring garden data is estimated. Low quality self seeded Sycamore.	10+	C3	1.4	6.2
T8	Ilex aquifolium (Holly)	Semi Mature	2	210 com	10	2.0		2.0		2.0		2.0		Fair	Fair	Offsite in neighbouring garden data is estimated. Ivy clad.	10+	C3	2.5	20.4
T9	Robinia pseudoacacia 'Frisia' (Golden False Acacia)	Early Mature	1	470	16	4.0		4.0		4.0		4.0		Poor	Fair	Offsite tree. Decay and dessicated bark on main stem at 6m, Structurally poor. Rubbing limbs at 7m. Stem bifurcates at 3.5m, dessicated bark on top of union.	10+	C2	5.6	99.9
T10	Robinia pseudoacacia 'Frisia' (Golden False Acacia)	Early Mature	1	460	16	4.0		4.0		4.0		4.0		Poor	Fair	Offsite tree. Decay and dessicated bark on main stem at 6m, Structurally poor. Stem bifurcates at 4m, tight fork. Large bark wound from base of stem up to 4m.	10+	C2	5.5	95.7

## **Appendix 4: Tree Protection Barriers & Ground Protection Design**

Barriers should be fit for the purpose of excluding construction activity and appropriate to the degree and proximity of work taking place. The default specification will be in accordance with *Section 6.2.2.2 of BS 5837:2012*, as set out below.

### **4.1 Specifications**

Barrier shall be a minimum 2 m high. It shall consist of a vertical and horizontal scaffold framework, well braced to resist impacts, as illustrated below. The vertical tubes should be spaced at a minimum interval of 3 m and driven securely into the ground. Onto this framework, welded mesh panels should be securely fixed. See Figure 2 overleaf.


Where site circumstances and the associated risk of damaging incursions into the RPA do not necessitate the default level of protection, an alternative specification may be used if agreed with the local authority. An example would be 'Heras' type welded mesh panels on rubber or concrete feet. The panels should be joined together using a minimum of two anti-tamper couplers, installed so that they can only be removed from inside the fence. The panels should be supported on the inner side by stabiliser struts. See Figure 3 overleaf. All-weather notices should be attached to the barrier with words such as 'TREE PROTECTION ZONE - NO ACCESS (see figure 6 overleaf).

### **4.2 Location**


Barriers shall be positioned on the perimeter of the Root Protection Area to define the Construction Exclusion Zone or as specified in the Tree Protection Plan.

The Tree Protective Fencing is represented on the Tree Protection Plan by a black linetype containing the letters 'TPF'.


**Figure 3 Example of welded mesh barriers in use**



**Figure 5 Default specification of protective barrier**



**Figure 4 Examples of above-ground stabilizing system**



*Figures above are reproduced with the permission of the British Standards Institute.*



Figure 6 - Examples of Protective Fencing Signing



### 4.3 Box Hoarding

In constricted areas where it is not possible to erect protective fencing, box hoarding must be used to protect the stems of trees and must be installed before any site activity takes place. Plyboard boards attached to a supporting framework surrounding the trunk reduces the impact of accidental impact.



#### 4.4 Ground protection

In areas where it is not possible to erect protective fencing, ground protection must be used to protect the CEZ of trees. Where it has been agreed during the design stage, and as shown on the tree protection plan, that vehicular or pedestrian access for the construction operation may take place within the CEZ, the possible effects of construction activity should be addressed by a combination of barriers and ground protection. The position of the barrier may be within the CEZ at the edge of the agreed working zone, but the soil structure beyond the barrier to the edge of the CEZ should be protected with ground protection. This must be installed before any site activity takes place to protect soil structure and tree roots.

Ground protection must be fit for the purpose of supporting any traffic entering or using the site without being distorted or causing compaction of underlying soil. It might comprise one of the following:

- *“for pedestrian movements or the erection of scaffolding within the RPA the installation of ground protection in the form of a single thickness of scaffold boards either on top of a driven scaffold frame, so as to form a suspended walkway, or on top of a compression-resistant layer (e.g. 100 mm depth of woodchip laid onto a geotextile);*
- *for pedestrian-operated plant up to a gross weight of 2 t, proprietary, inter-linked ground protection boards or panels placed on top of a compression-resistant layer (e.g. 150 mm depth of woodchip), laid onto a geotextile membrane; or for wheeled or tracked construction traffic exceeding 2 t gross weight, an alternative system (e.g. proprietary systems or pre-cast reinforced concrete slabs) to an engineering specification designed in conjunction with arboricultural advice, to accommodate the likely loading to which it will be subjected.*

The following is a list of suppliers of temporary ground protection including polymer, metal or wooden panels. Other companies supply similar products, and the following are given only as an example:

- [www.ground-guards.co.uk](http://www.ground-guards.co.uk)
- [www.trakmatseurope.com](http://www.trakmatseurope.com)
- [www.centriforce.com](http://www.centriforce.com)
- [www.marwoodgroup.co.uk](http://www.marwoodgroup.co.uk)
- [www.groundtrax.com](http://www.groundtrax.com)

Cellular confinement no-dig systems can also be used.

**Figure 7 Examples of proprietary ground protection panels**



## **Appendix 5: Methods of Work Close to Trees**

### **5.1.1 Guidance for working within RPAs**

(This chapter sets out the general principles that must be followed when working in RPAs).

### **5.1.2 Removal of hard surfaces within RPAs**

All structures including hard surfaces, walls and fences within CEZs must be removed following the methods detailed below to minimise damage to tree roots.

The use of conventional tracked and wheeled machinery causes damage to soil structure from compaction and damage to roots from excavation and must not be used within the CEZ. All areas of hard surfacing requiring removal within a CEZ will be broken up using a hand-held pneumatic drill or mounted hydraulic breaker attached to a digger located outside the CEZ. The broken rubble will then be removed by hand.

The only exception to this is where the hard surface is of such a size as not to be reachable from outside the CEZ. In this situation, a rubber tracked mini digger will be used. The maximum working height of the machine must be less than the lowest branch of any overhanging trees.

The mini digger will work from the existing hard surface pulling the debris away from the tree/s.

No excavation of existing soil beneath the hard surface will take place.

Immediately after removal of the hard surface, topsoil or sharp sand must be used to cover the soil surface and any roots to prevent drying out.

Upon completion, the protective fencing must be moved out to the edge of the CEZ or ground protection used if access is required.

### **5.1.3 Services**

The location and direction of new services should be designed to allow for services to be routed away from the RPAs of retained trees.

If any services need to run through a CEZ, the main contractor must contact the project arboriculturist before any works are undertaken. The agreement will then be sought from the LPA tree officer on methodology. Works will only begin with the agreement of the LPA. The methodology used must comply with *NJUG Volume 4: Guidelines for the Planning, Installation and Maintenance of Utility Apparatus in Proximity to Trees*, which can be summarised as:

- *hand excavate only;*
- *work carefully around roots only cutting as a last resort;*
- *do not cut roots over 25 mm in diameter without referring to the project arboriculturist, and*
- *for roots, less than 25 mm in diameter use a sharp tool to make a clean cut leaving as small a wound as possible.” (BS5837:2012)*

#### **5.1.4 New hard surfaces within RPAs**

Where it has been agreed with the LPA that hard surfaces are acceptable within RPAs of retained trees, these will require designing to be of above ground, no-dig construction to minimise the impact on tree roots and soil structure. In addition, finished surfaces of the car parking and paved areas will need to be of a porous design to allow water and an air passage in and out.


An illustrative example of a cellular confinement no-dig system can be found below. The actual system will need to be designed by a structural engineer to accommodate the loadings anticipated

The principles to follow are:


- *“no excavation other than the removal of existing hard surfaces if required, or the removal of surface vegetation and no more than 50 mm of leaf litter, vegetation debris etc.;*
- *a method to spread and support the load of the hard surface and anticipated usage without causing compaction of the soil structure beneath;*
- *the use of a porous sub-base and finishing layer to allow water and air diffusion in and out of the soil;*
- *porosity must be designed to be long-term and not to block with fine particles in the short-term; therefore irregular, no-fines aggregate must be used; and*
- *the pH of the aggregate must be considered as many conventional road stones have very high pH values which can damage susceptible trees and therefore aggregates with a near neutral pH should be preferred.” (BS5837:2012)*

## 5.2 Examples of a Cellular Confinement System


**Figure 8 Cellular Confinement System - Transition detail (Ramp)**




**Figure 9 Cellular Confinement System - Transition detail (Flat)**



**Figure 10 Cellular Confinement System - Kerb Edging**



**Figure 11 Cellular Confinement System - Timber Edging**



**Figure 12 Examples of Cellweb filling with angular stone**



### **5.3 Fencing within RPAs**

Where posts are to be installed within RPAs, the holes must be dug carefully by hand. If roots with a diameter of 25 mm or greater are found, the position of the post must be moved. Roots smaller than 25 mm diameter can be cut with sharp tools leaving as small a wound as possible. The sides of the hole should be lined with an impermeable membrane such as plastic sheeting to prevent the caustic and toxic effects of wet cement in the concrete from damaging tree roots. In the event the of finding roots greater than 25 mm whereby the posts cannot be relocated, special construction methods will need to be used with onsite supervision. The detail of which will form part of the Arboricultural Method Statement.

### **5.4 Landscaping works within RPAs**

Landscape operations within tree protection zones have the potential to damage trees if not carried out with care; in addition, the removal of protective fencing to carry out landscape operations may allow other contractors in previously protected areas.

If protective fencing is taken down to facilitate landscaping operations, the area of the CEZ must be delineated by pins and marker tape, spray paint, or some other method to clearly show the extent of the CEZ.

The preparation of soil for planting and turfing must be carried out by hand where within CEZs. Cultivation should be kept to a minimum and new topsoil added must not exceed 100mm in depth within 1m of the stem of any tree.

Topsoil and other materials must be transported by wheelbarrow on running boards when working within CEZs.

## **Appendix 6: Specific Report Caveat and References**

- 6.1 The survey is concerned solely with arboricultural issues.
- 6.2 Trees are dynamic living organisms whose health and the condition can change rapidly. Any changes to the tree or conditions close to the tree may change the stability and condition of the tree and a further examination would be required and may affect the validity of this report.
- 6.3 Hedges and dense tree belts often contain more than one species of vegetation and in certain circumstances it may not be possible (due to density, size, time of year) to identify all species within a hedge or dense tree belt. In this eventuality the tree schedule will identify this as may contain high water demanding species and, in these cases, a further survey will be required ahead of the design process.
- 6.4 Vegetation can establish very quickly on and off site. It is the responsibility of the client to ensure that prior to the design of hard landscaped areas, infrastructure and foundations where trees need to be considered as part of the design process, a walkover survey is instructed and undertaken to identify any vegetation that may alter the designs as required by the NHBC Guidelines Chapter 4.2 and any other building standard or regulation relevant to the proximity of trees and development.
- 6.5 The arboriculturist must be involved at all stages throughout the development process to ensure that any impacts to trees and from trees have been considered and that any design or layout changes are checked as soon as possible to avoid delays and changes that may be necessary after review.
- 6.6 In order for SES to provide comment in respect of impacts to trees within the Arboricultural Impact Assessment and the Arboricultural Method Statement we will require the most up to date details of the design and, where known the drainage and utility runs as soon as possible. SES cannot be held responsible in the event of changes to a design or layout that may affect the impact to trees or a negative response from planning authorities where the most up to date information has not been provided or is not received by us where time permits that we can assess the layout changes and provide our view.
- 6.7 When working with the constraints of trees the design should follow a mitigation hierarchy and look to avoid all root protection areas where possible. Where this can't be achieved the arboriculturist will provide advice in respect of retention, loss or working within a Root Protection Area.
- 6.8 This report is valid for 12 months.

### **6.9 Copyright and non-disclosure**

The content and layout of this report are subject to copyright owned by SES Ltd to the extent that copyright has been legally assigned to us by another party or is used by SES Ltd under license. This report may not be copied or used without a prior written agreement for any purpose other than the purpose indicated in this report.

## Appendix 7: Tree Work Schedule

Tree No.	Species	Proposed Works	Reason	BS5837 Category
T3	Cupressocyparis leylandii (Leyland Cypress)	Pruning	Pruning of lateral branches back to boundary to facilitate the erection of scaffolding	C2
T4	Cupressocyparis leylandii (Leyland Cypress)	Pruning	Pruning of lateral branches back to boundary to facilitate the erection of scaffolding	C2
T5	Cupressocyparis leylandii (Leyland Cypress)	Pruning	Pruning of lateral branches back to boundary to facilitate the erection of scaffolding	C2
T6	Cupressocyparis leylandii (Leyland Cypress)	Pruning	Pruning of lateral branches back to boundary to facilitate the erection of scaffolding	C2

There may be a need to undertake facilitative pruning to retained trees at varying times in order to ensure that the canopies of trees are not damaged by on site activities, one such example would be site plant catching branches that extend into the site or where low canopies are restricting access. This work would only be done where a risk has been identified and assessed by the project arboricultural consultant along with evidence to support the work with a small report and before and after photos. It is assumed that permission given off the back of this AIA has acknowledged this, but where possible we will always endeavour to liaise with the LA.

**Appendix 8: Tree Protection Plan (TPP)**


**See attached plan on the following page**

**NOTE:** G1 to T2, T7 and T8 plotted by Tree Inspector using GPS, and in relation to satellite imagery and topographical features on the ground. Topographical data for G1 to T2, T7 and T8 was not available at the time of survey - location accuracy cannot therefore be guaranteed.

Proposed cycle store to be constructed onto existing hard-standing within RPAs that will not require any excavations.


Existing fence (6ft tall) will serve as tree protection fencing

Hoarding will be erected around the perimeter of the site prior to the commencement of any works which will serve as effective Tree Protection Fencing for T19 and T10



**Key**

-  **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 150 mm
-  **Category U - Trees unsuitable for retention**  
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
-  **Group of trees (G) / Hedgerows (H) / Woodlands (W) / Shrub (S)**  
Colour coded according to categories above
-  Root Protection Area (RPA)
-  Redline boundary
-  Trees to be removed
-  Tree Protective Fencing (TPF)
-  Proposed cycle store to be constructed onto existing hard-standing within RPAs that will not require any excavations.
-  Existing building within RPA. No excavation within RPA is required.



**NOTE:**  
TO BE PRINTED IN COLOUR AT A2 SIZE

**Notes**  
1. All tree locations are based on the topographical survey:  
Drawing no: 1849-bp-topo  
Dated: N/A  
2. This drawing to be read in conjunction with all related Southern Ecological Solutions reports.

 **Southern Ecological Solutions, Sudbury Stables, Downham, Essex CM11 1LB**  
Phone: 01268 711021  
Website: www.ses-eco.co.uk

Rev	Update	Date

**Site**  
Green Lanes (613-615), Palmers Green, London N13 4EP

**Client**  
Vivendi Architects Ltd

**Drawing title**  
Tree Protection Plan for Arboricultural Impact Assessment

**Drawing no.** TPP/Green Lanes (613-615)/09-11-23

Scale	Date	
1/150@A2	09-11-23	
Revision	Drawn by	Checked by
~	ID	TI

Scale 1/150 