

# Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA)

Conifers, Merley Park Road, Ashington, Poole BH21 3DD

Report reference number 360/AIA/1

Author Richard Nicholson

Client Mr and Mrs Nicholas

13 December 2023

---

	Section
<b>Summary</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
Purpose of report	
Context	
Site description	
<b>The Development</b>	<b>3</b>
Extent of changes proposed	
Effect of the proposals	
<b>Recommendations and conclusions</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Appendix</b>	
Tree Survey and Schedule	A

---

This report, all plans and other associated material remains the property of Richard Nicholson Arboricultural Planning Consultant (RNapc) until paid for in full. Copyright and intellectual property rights remain with RNapc. The contents of this report are valid at the time of writing. RNapc shall not be liable for any use of this report other than for the purposes for which it was produced. If more than 12 months have elapsed since the date of this report, further advice should be taken before you rely on the contents of this report. Notwithstanding any provision within the RNapc Terms and Conditions, RNapc shall not be liable for any losses, however incurred, arising as a result of reliance on this report by the client or any third party more than 12 months after the date of this report

## 1 Summary

---

In terms of trees and landscape, the impacts are going to be limited to

- the effect on the rooting environment of Silver Birch T001 of the proposed timber framed car port.

T001-T005 are important landscape trees that make a significant contribution to the character and appearance of the local area. These trees are worthy of the TPO and are to be retained and protected from construction impacts.

## 2 Introduction

---

### Purpose

---

<b>This Arboricultural Impact Assessment has been written for the LPA to grant planning permission</b>	1 This Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) identifies and assesses the significance of the effect of direct and indirect impacts on trees and where necessary recommends mitigation. The AIA and accompanying Tree Survey Schedule (Appendix A), Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) (360/AMS/1) which sets out the construction parameters based on the physiological needs of the trees, Tree Constraints Plan 360/TPP/1, Tree Protection Plan RNapc/360/TPP/1, support the planning application for development of this site.
--	---

---

### Context

---

<b>Local Plan Policy requirements are met by the retention of the significant trees.</b>	2 With regard to trees and landscape, Poole Local Plan Policy PP27 states: <b>(1) General</b> <i>Development will be permitted provided that, where relevant, it:</i> <i>(a) reflects or enhances local patterns of development and neighbouring buildings in terms of: (v) landscaping;</i> <i>(b) responds to natural features on the site and does not result in the loss of trees that make a significant contribution, either individually or cumulatively, to the character and local climate of the area. Any scheme that requires the removal of trees should, where appropriate, include replacement trees to mitigate their loss.</i>
--	---

---

---

<b>The proposals comply with the National Planning Policy Framework</b>	3	These proposals comply with the NPPF in terms of achieving sustainable development, good design and conserving the natural environment by retaining all of the significant trees on and adjacent the site. Paragraphs 55 and 56 of the NPPF deal with planning conditions. Sufficient detail has been provided so an enforceable planning condition requiring the trees to be protected can be based on the accompanying Tree Protection Plan 360/TPP/1 and Method Statement 360/AMS/1.
---	---	---

---

#### Site description

<b>The significant trees are being retained</b>	4	Silver Birches T001 and T005 and Oaks T003 and T004 are the significant trees on and adjoining the site and have been classified as category B1 in accordance with Table 1 of BS5837:2012 <i>Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations</i> (BS5837:2012).  The other trees are either are too young to be included in the 1989 TPO (T006 and T009) or are in really poor condition due to the pruning history (T002 and T007). These trees are not worthy of a TPO because of their condition and would be better removed and replaced with new landscaping as part of the redevelopment of the site. I consider that there will be no loss of amenity within the wider setting.
---	---	---

---

<b>Soils allow rooting to depth</b>	5	Cranfield Institute Land Information System records naturally very wet acid sandy and loamy soils. There is normally no impediment to trees being able to root freely to normal depth in such soils.
-------------------------------------	---	--

---

<b>Site factors will have affected the root protection area (RPA)</b>	6	The area at the front of the property is laid to tarmac and there is some evidence of rooting beneath the surface. I anticipate that the root system of Oak T004 will also extend beneath the tarmac and I have therefore shown the RPAs as circles in accordance with the recommendation in paragraphs 4.6.2 and 4.6.3 of BS5837:2012.
---	---	---

---

### **3 The Development**

---

#### Extent of changes proposed

<b>Proposed tree pruning and removals are shown on the TCP with dashed crowns</b>	7	This report serves as an application for consent with the grant of planning permission being deemed consent for the proposed work. If the Council require an application for tree work, it can be supplied.  The tree work is listed in the Tree Survey data at Appendix A.
---	---	---

---

<b>The new timber framed car port is within the RPA of T001</b>	8	<p>The proposal is for a detached double timber framed car port to be constructed at the front of the property. The existing tarmac drive provides the approach.</p> <p>The base of the garage will be a 100mm thick cellular confinement system filled with 4-20mm angular washed non-calcareous stone. The client has a choice of wearing courses from gravel to a concrete slab poured onto the cellular confinement system with an impermeable layer between.</p> <p>The purpose of the cellular confinement system is to create a load suspension layer without requiring excavation into the root protection area. It spreads the load of the vehicles and at 100mm thick, adds little to the loading on the soil. Data from Greenfix indicates that 100mm thickness load is less than .25 ton per m<sup>2</sup> as a load spreading reinforced raft structure. The base does not support the structure but provides a floor for parked cars.</p> <p>Beneath the base is a perforated pipe linked to the guttering downpipe that will prevent a rain shadow by allowing roof runoff back into the rooting substrate. The idea is that the CO<sub>2</sub> given off by root respiration is attracted to H<sub>2</sub>O which, as it drains into the soil creates a void which is replaced by new O<sub>2</sub>.</p>
<b>Excavations are kept to a minimum</b>	9	<p>There will need to be a levels change of around 150mm which on this site will involve removing surface vegetation to the original soil levels. The posts supporting the frame will be located onto ground screws which have a diameter of between 60 and 70mm. The accompanying AMS provides a specification for the works.</p>
<b>The level of information supplied meets the requirements of BS5837:2012</b>	10	<p>The recommendation in BS5827:2012) section 6.1 requires a precautionary approach towards tree protection and working in the Root Protection Area (RPA). It suggests that an arboricultural method statement (AMS) should be appropriate to the proposals. An AMS (360/AMS/1) has been attached to this bundle.</p>
<b>Mitigation through design of the garage</b>	11	<p>BS5837:2012 default position (<i>5.3 Proximity of structures to trees</i>) is that structures are located outside the RPA of trees to be retained. However, where there is an overriding justification for construction within the RPA and technical solutions are available that prevent damage to trees, the Arboriculturist should demonstrate that a tree can be remain viable and that the area lost to encroachment can be compensated for elsewhere; and propose mitigation to improve the soil environment that is used by the tree for growth.</p> <p>On this site there will be no excavation into the soil surface. The RPA of Silver Birch T001 extends in the other directions completely unaffected by the proposals.</p>

---

## Effect of proposals

---

No Impact on landscape and amenity	12	The significant trees can be retained and protected from construction impacts. The loss of the smaller trees is not significant because of their condition and short useful life expectancy, and they will be replaced by new landscaping. Accordingly, there will be no adverse impact on the character and appearance of the local area.
No Impact on tree physiology health	13	The proposals have been designed to mitigate the impacts of the structure on T001 to a reasonable level and my view is that it should have no long-term deleterious effect on the growth of the tree. A small area of the RPA is to be covered by the footprint of the proposed structure. The structure is lightly loaded on groundscrews and the floor of the structure requires no excavation.
Magnitude: Mitigation reduces the impact on the rooting environment	14	The design of the proposals in terms of levels and layout has been based the data gathered on site. The mitigation, set out in the AMS and the tree protection plan is based on the findings of this impact assessment. My view is that the mitigation of impacts has been managed to reasonable levels during the design stage. The AMS (360/AMS/1) deals with the mitigating short term impacts on the physiological demands of the retained trees.

---

## **4 Recommendation and conclusions**

---

Tree Protection Plans RNapc/360/TPP/1; Tree Constraints Plan 360/TPP/1; Arboricultural Method Statement 360/AMS/1

---

There are no supportable or reasonable grounds for refusing permission in terms of trees	15	The scheme is compliant Local Plan Policy PP27. It accords with the principles set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. It is technically compliant with BS5837:2012 and the way in which that Standard has been applied.
--	----	---

---

**A Appendix A Tree Survey Schedule**

Reference	Common Name	Retention Category	Stem Diameter (mm)	RPA: Radius (m), Area (m <sup>2</sup> )	Comments	Height (m)	Crown spread North	Crown spread East	Crown spread South	Crown spread West	Life Stage	Physiological Condition	Structural Condition	Remaining Contribution
T001	Silver Birch	B1	850	Radius: 10.2 Area: 327	Crown lift to 5m where required	18					Mature	Fair	Fair	20+ Years
T002	Willow	C2	450	Radius: 5.4 Area: 92	Large branch fracture W. <b>REMOVE</b>	15	2	3	5	5	Early Mature	Poor	Physical Defect	<10 years
T003	Silver Birch	B1	530	Radius: 6.4 Area: 129		19	6	5	6.5	7	Early Mature	Good	Good	20+ Years
T004	English Oak	B1	700	Radius: 8.4 Area: 222		17	9	8	9	5	Early Mature	Fair	Fair	40+ Years
T005	Silver Birch	B1	800	Radius: 9.6 Area: 290		16					Mature	Fair	Fair	20+ Years
T006	Sweet Gum	C2	240	Radius: 2.9 Area: 26	Not old enough for the TPO. Previously topped. <b>REMOVE</b>	11	3	3	3	3	Semi Mature	Fair	Poor	30+ Years
T007	Plum	C2	300	Radius: 3.6 Area: 41	Topped tree <b>REMOVE</b>	5	3	3	3	3	Early Mature	Fair	Poor	10+ Years
T008	Silver Birch	B2	350	Radius: 4.2 Area: 55		15	4	4	4	4	Early Mature	Fair	Fair	20+ Years
T009	Cherry	C2	150	Radius: 1.8 Area: 10	Not old enough for the TPO. Previously topped. <b>REMOVE</b>	6	3	3	3	3	Young	Fair	Fair	10+ Years