# Walnut Farm 68 Worminghall Road Oakley

# **British Standard 5837:2012 Arboricultural Report**

Tom Hurley BSc(For)Hons, MArborA

15<sup>th</sup> February 2024

Advanced Arboriculture Ltd • Venmore Barn • Woodbury • Exeter • Devon • EX5 1LD • t: 01395 239002 • e: info@advancedarb.com • w: www.advancedarb.com

### **Table of Contents**

#### Section

Introduction and Heads of Terms

Tree Stock Appraisal

Arboricultural Impact Assessment

Tree Works Recommendations

Arboricultural Data Tables

Photographs

Arboricultural Drawings (including Arboricultural Guidance Sheets)

Drawings and Arboricultural Guidance Sheets included within this report:

- Tree Location Plan
- Tree Constraints Plan
- AGS408 Demolition of Structures and Surfaces Near Trees

Page	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
10	
14	



### **Introduction and Heads of Terms**

Project Reference	TH/B949/0124
Site Address	Walnut Farm, 68 Worminghall Road, Oakley
Instruction	JCE Planning & Architectural Consultancy
Lead Surveyor	Tom Hurley, BSc(For)Hons, MArborA
Report Author	Tom Hurley, BSc(For)Hons, MArborA
Report Checked By	Joel Gray, FdSc (Arb), NCF Arb, Cert Arb (ABC, RFS), MArborA
Report Published	15 <sup>th</sup> February 2024
Revision	1.0

#### Heads of Terms and Document Limitations

The purpose of this report is to provide a full arboricultural appraisal of the site and consider the effect of any construction proposals based on the data collected, following the principles of British Standard 5837:2012 *Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations*. As well as informing the overall design and layout of the site, the report shall provide a supporting statement for a planning application to the local planning authority. This report has been undertaken in accordance with the instructions of the client and is intended for their sole and specific use. Any transfer of ownership of this report will require the written consent of the original client and Advanced Arboriculture Ltd reserve the right to charge a fee for the preparation of any future Letters of Resilience.

The report has been prepared based on information available to Advanced Arboriculture Ltd at the time of writing, however, further technical, topographical, arboricultural, architectural, ecological or engineering information may come to light at any point subsequent to the site survey, including after the relevant arboricultural conditions have been cleared. It is the responsibility of the client or their delegated team to draw any changes in the project scope to our attention at the earliest opportunity.

Trees are dynamic structures and advice should be taken on validity two years after the survey was undertaken. The report may not be considered valid after more than three years. The report has been prepared using all reasonable skill and care. Opinions are provided in good faith.

The scheduling and implementation of any tree protection measures detailed in the report also remains the responsibility of the client or their delegated team. Whilst the project team may appoint any suitably qualified third-party arboricultural supervisor, Advanced Arboriculture Ltd are able to take on this role subject to the project manager's formal instruction.

Advanced Arboriculture Ltd shall not be held liable for any unauthorised deviation from the tree management recommendations, the tree protection measures and the project scheduling detailed within this report.

This report, its drawings, Arboricultural Guidance Sheets and any photographs remain © Advanced Arboriculture Ltd.



### **Tree Stock Appraisal**

The proposed development plot at Walnut Farm in Oakley presently comprises an extended domestic garden which is accessed from the public highway via an existing driveway which enters the site in the north-eastern corner.

In addition to the existing dwelling located towards the northern end of the plot, there is a converted stables in the north-western corner and outbuildings on the southern boundary.

To the north of the plot is another private dwelling while the southern and western boundaries neighbour an access to the small industrial unit to the north-west.

There are a total of eight individual trees within the site's redline boundary, along with a further neighbouring tree to the north whose constraints will extend into the site. There is also three sections of hedgerow and an area of trees.

The first five individual trees are all located along the northern fringe of the site. Apple T1 and Lawson Cypress T3 are both small British Standard 5837:2012 category C ornamental specimens with limited visual amenity value or future potential, with neighbouring Goat Willow T3 being another category C tree which has been reduced in the past.

Pear T4 is an interesting, old specimen which has been heavily reduced in the past but is still thriving; this is considered to be a category A specimen by virtue of its age and likely historic association. Holly T5 is a category B specimen which has also been reduced in the past, though, like Pear T4, its secluded location limits its visual amenity value.

Towards the southern end of the western boundary is a line of two category A Field Maple stems along with one category C Ash. All of these trees are young specimens, though the Ash almost certainly has a limited future potential by virtue of its likely susceptibility to Ash Dieback Disease.

Walnut T9 is located centrally on the southern lawn and is a good quality, category B tree. Its compromised structural form at the point of main crown break is the reason for its downgrading from a category A specimen. Area A1 comprises a category A line of Field Maple stems running along the southern boundary of the site. These trees have excellent future potential and high amenity value as they can be clearly seen from Worminghall Road. The Hawthorn understorey further enhances the screening value of this line of trees.

Hedge H1 is a young pleached feature which runs immediately adjacent to the northern boundary fenceline. Whilst barely visible from the public highway, its screening value between the two properties is valuable.

Hedge H2 runs immediately to the west of Field Maples T6 and T8 and has been managed by clipping. There is a Laurel hedge immediately to the west but the Hawthorn is the dominant feature from within the garden.

Hedgerow H3 extends along the eastern roadside boundary. There is a high proportion of Elm present within the hedgerow, and many of these have already succumbed to Dutch Elm Disease, with the remainder expected to succumb in the near future. The remainder of the hedgerow is primarily Hawthorn and this maintains a reasonable screen between the road and the proposed development plot.

Hedge features H1 through H3 are all category B assets.

A comprehensive commentary on each tree, including full spatial data, is provided within the attached Arboricultural Data Tables.

#### A Note on Ash

Ash Dieback Disease (ADD) is now widespread throughout the UK, though specific symptoms are not always obvious on more mature trees in the early stages of infection. The rate of decline of infected trees and the long-term prognosis for the health of Ash trees generally is currently uncertain. Some sources suggest that the UK may experience losses of up to 90% or more of its Ash trees in some areas; woodland trees in particular appear to be particularly prone to decline.

The identification of ADD infected Ash can be difficult from around October through early June, when trees are normally not in full leaf, unless the trees are very severely affected and contain large sections of deadwood.

Once infected, trees can decline rapidly and quickly lose their structural integrity. On reaching less than 50% of their normal foliar density, they are likely to require removal where they pose a threat to persons or property. Such trees can be become unpredictable and dangerous to fell or even to dismantle using normal rope access techniques, and may thus require removal using a mobile elevated work platform (MEWP) or other machinery. Hence, where trees in an early stage of infection are in locations that are inaccessible to machinery and would pose a risk to persons or property if they declined further, it may be appropriate to consider their pre-emptive removal while it is still possible to deal with them safely using conventional techniques. Each tree will need to be considered on its own merits, but the removal of good quality trees as a precautionary measure is unlikely to be recommended at this stage.

Current recommendations on those sites where Ash trees are present within falling distance of significant targets are that trees be inspected regularly, so as to account for the potentially rapid decline of currently healthy trees should ADD occur; this also applies where we may have not noted specific cases of ADD on a site at the time of survey, but we have no doubt that the disease will be present throughout the locality. Should any Ash trees on site show signs of rapid defoliation or dieback then further advice from an experienced arboriculturist should be sought.

When considering the longer-term management of Ash trees on a site, our advice is that, where such trees are within falling distance of significant targets or otherwise present a significant constraint to the site, then lesser quality trees are unlikely to be worthy of consideration for longer term retention. In these cases, removal of these lesser-quality Ash trees and their replacement with suitable alternative may well result in a net gain in amenity, landscape and biodiversity values for the site over the medium to long term.



## **Arboricultural Impact Assessment**

The site is the subject of an outline planning application for four dwellings with all matters reserved excluding access. The boundary lines for the four plots are all shown on the attached Tree Constraints Plan, along with the proposed access routes serving each plot. It is noted that site has already benefitted from planning consent in 2023 (Buckinghamshire Council reference: 23/02923/APP) which included the demolition of the existing dwelling and its replacement with a single, large, detached dwelling and detached garage.

The proposals have sought arboricultural advice at an early stage and this has enabled the project team to develop a layout which offers four new plots, each of which can accommodate a new detached dwelling along with garden space and parking, without encountering any undue arboricultural constraints, including rooting, canopy spreads and shading; this also includes a good allowance for future growth of trees.

Plot 1 is the south-easternmost plot on the site. The central section of the site is entirely clear and can sustain the future growth of Walnut T9 and the Field Maple stems which comprise area A1. The new access into the south-eastern corner of the site will necessitate the clearance of a very small section of the Hawthorn understorey within area A1, however, all of the Field Maple stems can be retained in their entirety.

Plots 2 and 3 extend north from plot 1 and are accessed via a new entrance which will need to be cut through hedgerow H3. This offers a good opportunity to re-establish the management of this site boundary feature, and it is noted that the visibility splays required for the new access do not impact on the hedgerow at all.

Plot 4 is the largest plot and extends along the western half of the site. The access is as per existing and there is ample space to accommodate a dwelling, parking and amenity space. It is noted that the proposed site divisions specifically allow for the retention of Walnut T9 within the ownership of plot 4 so as to maximise the potential for the safe retention of this attractive specimen.

As this is only an outline application, it is beyond the scope of this report to consider the provision of services within the layout, however, it is clear that there is space available within the site to allow for service trenches to be dug without any risk of harm to retained trees.

Also, as an outline application, there is no detailed design to apply to a Tree Protection Plan and Arboricultural Method Statement, however, it is reasonable to expect these to be submitted as a condition of any consent, along with a detailed Arboricultural Impact Assessment.

Overall, is it clear that the proposals allow for the retention of all key trees with a negligible risk of any harm as a consequence of construction activities; the most significant impact is associated with the removal of a section of hedgerow H3, and this is balanced by the opportunity to actively manage the retained sections of this frontage screen. The site division and access configuration is therefore considered to be sustainable from an arboricultural perspective subject to the appropriate care being taken during construction, and robust protective fencing and ground protection being installed and maintained for the duration of the project.

Whilst the proposals are considered to be arboriculturally sustainable, a full detailed Tree Protection Plan and Arboricultural Method Statement have not yet been prepared as further practical design, construction and engineering specifics are required before any tree protection measures can be finalised. It is therefore expected that any outline planning consent granted by the local planning authority will include a precommencement condition requiring the submission of a detailed tree protection statement. Advanced Arboriculture Ltd are able to produce this on request.

### **Recommendations and Conclusions**



### **Tree Works Recommendations**

Ref	Species	Proposed Works
A1	Hawthorn	Remove small section of Hawthorn stems at the western end to accommodate access to plot 1
H3	Mixed species	<ul> <li>Remove central section of hedgerow to accommodate access to plots 2 and 3</li> </ul>

#### **Informatives**

These works are required to facilitate the access detailed within the outline planning application, however, it is not anticipated that the works would be undertaken until such a time as a detailed reserved matters application has been determined.

The appointed tree work contractor must ensure that all tree works comply with British Standard 3998:2010 *Tree Works – Recommendations* and it is strongly advised that the appointed tree contractor is Arboricultural Association Approved to ensure high standards and a consistency of work.

Under the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 & Countryside & Rights of Way Act 2000 it is an offence to recklessly damage or destroy the nest of a wild bird whilst in use or being built; planning consent does not provide a defence against prosecution under these Acts. Trees, shrubs and hedgerows on this site may contain nesting birds between 1st March and 31st August and it is advisable to undertake a survey of the site before commencing any vegetation removal between these dates, to ensure that no nesting birds are present. Advanced Arboriculture are able to undertake a survey to identify the presence of bats or nesting birds if required at the request of the client.



Cascade Chart For Tree Quality Assessment (Source: British Standard 5837:2012)

Category and c	definition	Criteria (including su	bcategories whe	re approp	oriate)			
Trees unsuitab	ble for retention							
<b>Category U</b> Those in such a as living trees in 10 years	a condition that they cannot realistically be retained n the context or the current land use for longer than	<ul> <li>Trees that have a where, for whatev</li> <li>Trees that are dea</li> <li>Trees infected wit Note: Category U trees</li> </ul>	serious, irremedial ver reason, the loss ad or are showing s h pathogens of sig s can have existing	ble, struct of compa signs of si nificance or poten	ural defect, such anion shelter can gnificant, immedi to the health and <i>tial conservation</i>	that their early loss is expected due to collapse not be mitigated by pruning) iate, and irreversible overall decline /or safety of other trees nearby, or very low quali- value which it may be desirable to preserve	including those that v ity trees suppressing	will beco adjacen
		1. Mainly arboricultu	iral qualities			2. Mainly landscape qualities		3. Ma
Trees to be co	nsidered for retention							
<b>Category A</b> Trees of high qu 40 years	uality with an estimated life expectancy of at least	Trees that are particula especially if rare or un components of groups features (e.g. the domi avenue)	arly good examples usual: or those tha or formal or semi- inant and/or princip	s of their s t are esse formal art pal trees v	species, ential poricultural vithin an	Trees, groups or woodlands of particular visua arboricultural and/or landscape features	al importance as	Trees comn pastu
Category B Trees of modera expectancy of a	ate quality with an estimated remaining life at least 20 years	Trees that might be ind because of impaired or remediable defects, ind and storm damage), so retention for beyond 40 necessary to merit the	cluded in category ondition (e.g. prese cluding unsympath uch that they are u 0 years; or trees la category A design	A, but are ence of sig etic past nlikely to cking the ation	downgraded gnificant though management be suitable for special quality	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 a wider locality		Trees comn pastu
<b>Category C</b> Trees of low qua at least 10 years 150mm	ality with an estimated remaining life expectancy or s, or young trees with a stem diameter below	Unremarkable trees of condition that they so	f a very limited mer not qualify in highe	it or such r categori	an impaired es	Trees present in groups or woodlands, but wit on them significantly greater collective landsc trees offering low or only temporary/transient	hout this conferring ape value; and/or landscape benefits	Trees
Abbreviation: Tree No	s used in the survey are as follows: Corresponding to plan		Cr Ht	Heia	ht of crown ab	ove around level		Р
Species	Common name		Age Class	Y	Youna (arov	wn to less than one third of life		Dea
Ht	Detailed in metres		- <b>3</b>	MA	expectancy	Cy) BS Cat		
Sprd	Crown spread as measured at the four ca of the compass	ardinal points			Middle Aged (grown to between one to two- thirds of life expectancy)		m/s	Briti Der
Stem Dia	Diameter at breast height in mm (1.5 me ground level), or measured in accordanc prescribed British Standard protocol in th multi-stemmed specimens (see Annex C	tres above e with the le case of in British	M		Mature (gro expectancy Over Matur	(grown to over two thirds of normal life ancy) # ature		diar Der pos
Standard 5837:2012 for full details)				v Cafa				
RPA	Root Protection Area radius in metres (de the British Standard 5837:2012 formulae	erived from )	Cond	Safe	lition, both phy	sectancy range in years		
Ht to L/B	Crown height, as measured to the height branch	of the lowest		G F	Good (trees with no significant defects) Fair (trees with some defects amenable to			
Dir	Direction from which the lowest branch a	rises			surgery)			

me unviable after removal of other category U trees (e.g.

t trees of better quality

ainly cultural values, including conservation

s, groups or woodlands of significant conservation, historical, memorative or other value (e.g. veteran trees or woodure)

s, groups or woodlands of significant conservation, historical, memorative or other value (e.g. veteran trees or wood ure

with no material conservation or other cultural value

Poor (trees with significant defects)

ad Dead

tish Standard 5837:2012 Category (see Table 1 in tish Standard 5837:2012 for full details)

notes multistem tree along with the individual stem meters

notes estimated value where access was not ssible



Data: Ind	lividual Trees			Site Refe	rence: Th	H/B949/01	24 Loca	ation: Wa	Inut Farm	n, 68 Wor	minghall	Road, Oakley Inspection Date: 11th January 202	4 Lead Surveyor: Tom Hurley	
Tree No.	Species	Height (m)	Cr Sprd (m)	Stem Dia (mm)	RPA Rad (m)	RPA Area (m²)	LB Ht (m)	Cr Ht (m)	Age Cl	SULE	Cond Phys/Str	Observations	Recommendations	BS Cat
T1	Apple	6.0	N: 2.5 E: 2.5 S: 2.0 W: 2.0	160 (m/s: 120, 100)	1.80	10	2.0/S	1.5	Y	10-20	G/F	<ul> <li>Twin-stemmed specimen adjacent driveway</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>No works required at the present time</li> </ul>	C1
T2	Goat Willow	12.0	N: 3.5 E: 4.5 S: 6.0 W: 8.0	450 #	5.40	92	2.0/S	2.5	MA	20-40	G/F	<ul> <li>Neighbouring tree which has been reduced in the past</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>No works required at the present time</li> </ul>	C1
Т3	Lawson Cypress	11.0	N: 2.5 E: 2.0 S: 3.0 W: 2.5	320	3.90	48	2.0/S	1.0	Y	20-40	G/F	<ul> <li>Ornamental conifer</li> <li>Compression fork at ~2.0m</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>No works required at the present time</li> </ul>	C1
T4	Pear	10.0	N: 6.0 E: 4.5 S: 4.5 W: 4.0	560	6.60	137	2.0/N	2.0	Μ	>40	G/F	<ul> <li>Fine-quality specimen which has been heavily reduced in this past</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>No works required at the present time</li> </ul>	A3
T5	Holly	7.5	N: 3.0 E: 2.5 S: 2.5 W: 2.5	330	3.90	48	2.0/S	2.0	Μ	>40	G/F	<ul> <li>Robust specimen which has been reduced to a height of ~3.5m in the past</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>No works required at the present time</li> </ul>	B2
Т6	Field Maple	7.5	N: 2.5 E: 3.0 S: 3.0 W: 3.0	200	2.40	18	1.5/S	2.0	Y	>40	G/G	Well-balanced specimen with an indistinct leader	<ul> <li>No works required at the present time</li> </ul>	A1
Τ7	Ash	7.0	N: 1.5 E: 2.5 S: 2.0 W: 2.5	140	1.80	10	2.0/N	2.0	Y	10-20	G/F	<ul> <li>Young specimen likely to succumb to Ash Dieback</li> <li>Disease</li> <li>Indistinct leader</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>No works required at the present time</li> </ul>	C1
Т8	Field Maple	7.0	N: 2.5 E: 2.5 S: 3.5 W: 2.0	180	2.10	14	2.0/S	2.0	Y	>40	G/G	Young specimen with excellent future potential	<ul> <li>No works required at the present time</li> </ul>	A1
Т9	Walnut	6.0	N: 3.0 E: 3.5 S: 3.0 W: 3.5	200	2.40	18	1.5/E	2.0	Y	>40	G/F	<ul> <li>Good-quality young specimen which forks into three stems at ~1.5m</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>No works required at the present time</li> </ul>	B1



Data: Are	eas/Hedges			Site Refe	erence: Th	I/B949/01	24 Loc	ation: Wa	Inut Farn	n, 68 Wor	minghall	Road, Oakley Inspection Date: 11th January 202	4 Lead Surveyor: Tom Hurley	
Ref No.	Species	Height (m)	Cr Sprd (m)	Stem Dia (mm)	RPA Rad (m)	RPA Area (m²)	LB Ht (m)	Cr Ht (m)	Age Cl	SULE	Cond Phys/Str	Observations	Recommendations	BS Cat
A1	• Field Maple • Hawthorn	<8.0	Max: 5.0m	<250	<3.00	<28	>=2.0	>=2.0	Y	>40	G/G	<ul> <li>Line of good quality young specimens established between domestic garden and adjacent commercial access driveway</li> <li>Field Maple stems have excellent future potential</li> <li>Hawthorn hedgerow forms understorey</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Continue to manage Hawthorn understorey by clipping</li> <li>Remove short section of Hawthorn at eastern end of hedgerow to accommodate new access into plot 1</li> </ul>	A2
H1	• Hornbeam	<4.5	Max: 1.0m	<80	<0.90	<3	>=2.0	>=2.0	Υ	>40	G/G	<ul> <li>Relatively young pleached hedge</li> </ul>	• Continue to manage by pleaching	B1
H2	• Hawthorn	<3.0	Max: 0.5m	<80	<0.90	<3	>=0.0	>=0.0	Y	>40	G/F	<ul> <li>Clipped hedge on western boundary of site</li> <li>Laurel hedge located immediately to the west</li> </ul>	• Continue to manage by clipping	B3
НЗ	• Hawthorn • Elm	<7.0	Max: 2.5m	<200	<2.40	<18	>=0.0	>=0.0	Y-MA	>40	P-G/P-G	<ul> <li>Road-frontage hedgerow in keeping with rural setting</li> <li>Elms are succumbing to Dutch Elm Disease</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Clear central section to accommodate new access</li> <li>Continue to manage by clipping</li> <li>Remove dead Elms on an ongoing basis</li> </ul>	B3







Notes
Copies of these photographs in JPEG format are available from Advanced Arboriculture on
request.
Drawing Title:
Photographs
Location: Walnut Farm
Oakley
15.02.2024         TH/B949/0124         1.2           Scale:         Paper Size:         Drawn By:
n/a A3 TH
Advanced Arboriculture Venmore Barn
Devon EX5 1LD
e: info@advancedarb.com
All photographs © Advanced Arboriculture



JPEG format are available from Advanced Arboriculture on	
request.	
Drawing Title: Photographs	
Walnut Farm	
Oakley	
Project Keterence:         Ketvision:           15.02.2024         TH/B949/0124         1.2           Scalo:         Basar Gize:         Data R	
n/a A3 TH	
Advanced Arboriculture	
Woodbury	
Devon EX5 1LD	
t: 01395 239002	
t: 01395 239002 e: info@advancedarb.com w: www.advancedarb.com	

Notes



All photographs © Advanced Arboriculture.











All drawings © Advanced Arboriculture.