Arboricultural impact appraisal and method statement

Former Police Station, 133 Windmill Street, Gravesend, Kent DA12 1BB

Jeremy Barrell **BSc FArborA DipArb CBiol FICFor FRICS**

barrell TREE CONSULTANCY

18th August 2026
21203-AIA3-JB

Site location and report purpose

Site location

The red line shows the approximate site boundary and is illustrative only.

Report purpose

This arboricultural impact appraisal report provides sufficient information for the local planning authority (LPA) to consider the effect of the proposed development on local character from a tree perspective. It fully complies with BS 5837 advice relating to the planning application stage of the process and meets national standard planning application validation requirements.

More specifically, the development proposal is a redevelopment of retirement living accommodation for older people comprising 67 retirement apartments including communal facilities, access, car parking, and landscaping at the Former Police Station, 133 Windmill Street, Gravesend, Kent DA12 1BB.

This report includes:

- A **tree protection plan** illustrating tree locations, categories, the location of the proposed development, and the proposed tree protection measures.
- An **arboricultural impact appraisal** (section 1 of the report) providing an analysis of the tree issues to assist the LPA in assessing the impact on local character.
- An **arboricultural method statement** (section 2 of the report) describing how retained trees will be protected and managed during the development activity.
- **Appendices** (**Appendix 1** – Background administrative information and data collection; **Appendix 2** – Tree schedule and explanatory notes; and, **Appendix 3** – QR Codes for Site Guidance Notes (SGNs).
- A companion document to supplement the main report titled ***Manual for managing trees on development sites*** **(Version 3.0)**, which provides explanations of how retained trees will be managed on site in the form of SGNs covering the relevant issues.

© Barrell Tree Consultancy

1 Arboricultural impact assessment

1.1 Relevant background explanations

Dave Cashman carried out the original site visit on 14th February 2022, and Lewis Fraser carried out a second visit on 29th October 2025, but both have subsequently left the company, so Jeremy Barrell has written this report based on the latest layout.

1.2 Summary of trees affected and protected by the proposal

From our review of the constraints and the proposed layout, our assessment of the impact on trees, both during and after development, is summarised as follows:

1. **Tree removals:** No trees will be removed because of these works, and so there will be no impact on local character for that reason.
2. **Tree pruning:** No trees will be pruned because of these works, and so there will be no impact on local character for that reason.
3. **The impact of works in root protection areas (RPAs):** All the RPAs of retained trees will be protected, and there will be no significant encroachment during the demolition activity. However, a new path is proposed within the RPA of tree T10, which will require special precautions, as described in 1.7 below.

Note on tree protection: All retained trees will be protected by using existing hard surfacing, new temporary ground protection, and new barrier fencing, which will be installed in the locations shown on the tree protection plan in accordance with SGN 2 *Fencing protected trees* and SGN 3 *Ground protection*.

1.3 RPA adjustment

Trees T1, T2, and T3

BS 5837 (4.6.2 & 4.6.3) makes provision for adjusting the nominal circular RPA, if justified by pre-existing site conditions or other factors, if the total RPA is equivalent to the nominal circular RPA. On this site, we have assessed that this can be reasonably applied to these trees because of the historic building on the eastern boundary with Windmill Street, which had a substantial boundary brick wall and basement element restricting root growth into the site, and we include Figures 1 and 2 to illustrate this point.

1.4 Insignificant encroachment into RPAs

Trees T4, T5, T6, T9, T10, and T11

There is minor encroachment into the nominal circular RPAs for these trees in the form of new soft landscaping and a new building (Tree T11). BS 5837 (5.3.1) allows encroachment if it is low impact and carefully controlled, and in our experience, healthy trees can tolerate minor incursions without significant adverse impacts on health. In any event, these works should improve historic conditions by removing hard surfacing from the RPAs and improving soil conditions.

In summary, if the guidance set out in the Manual accompanying this report is followed, we believe the proposed works can be implemented near these trees without significant adverse impact on them or local character.

© Barrell Tree Consultancy

1 Arboricultural impact assessment

Figure 1 (14/02/22): Showing T2 and T3 in 2021 growing offsite adjacent to the highway, with the now demolished building and significant boundary brick wall to the left separating the trees from the site. The basement ventilation shafts, highlighted by the yellow arrow, can also be seen, and will have restricted significant root activity into the site.

Figure 2 (29/10/25): Showing T1, T2, and T3 from left to right, and the building now demolished.

© Barrell Tree Consultancy

1 Arboricultural impact assessment

1.5 The impact of tree removals on local character

No trees will be removed as part of this development, so there will be no impact on local character for that reason.

1.6 The impact of tree pruning on local character

Other than pruning for normal maintenance, no trees will be pruned because of this development, and so there will be no impact on local character for that reason.

1.7 The impact of work in precautionary areas

There will be encroachment into the RPA of tree T10 in the form of new no-dig surfacing. We have carefully reviewed the levels in these areas, and it is feasible to install custom-designed no-dig surfacing without significantly disturbing the RPA. Based on our previous experience installing this surfacing summarised in SGN 9 *Installing/upgrading surfacing in RPAs* in the attached Manual, we are confident that it can be implemented without any long-term detrimental impact on tree health, with the details to be agreed as part of a planning condition. This surfacing solution is consistent with the guidance in BS 5837 (8.6), and is appropriate in this situation.

In summary, if the guidance set out in SGN 7 is observed, we believe that the proposed works can be implemented without any long-term detrimental impact on tree health and, therefore, local character. All new surfacing must be installed before any construction access is granted to prevent damage to the RPA.

1.8 Post development considerations

Our assessment is that there will be no adverse impacts through future pressure to fell or severely prune retained trees once the development is completed and occupied.

1.9 New tree planting to enhance local character

New tree planting is feasible to supplement retained trees and enhance local character, and could include heavy-standard or semi-mature specimens. The final selection of species, size, and location would be agreed with the LPA through a planning condition. All new trees will be specified and planted in accordance with the recommendations in BS 8545 (2014) *Trees: from nursery to independence in the landscape – Recommendations*. Our preliminary assessment is that there is sufficient space to plant new trees in locations where they can reach a significant height without excessive inconvenience and remain sustainable in the long term, significantly improving the site's potential to contribute to local character.

1.10 Unanticipated upgrading of existing services or installation of new services

Retained trees may be adversely affected by the installation of new services and/or the upgrading of existing services if that work encroaches into their RPAs. However, it is often difficult to know the detail of service locations until the construction is in progress, and sometimes encroachment into RPAs is unavoidable. Where possible, the default approach must be to use any existing service runs and keep all new services outside RPAs. Where existing services within RPAs require upgrading, or new services must be installed in RPAs, take great care to minimise any disturbance.

© Barrell Tree Consultancy

1 Arboricultural impact assessment

Trenchless installation will be the preferred option, but if that is not feasible, any excavation must be carried out by hand, in accordance with the guidelines in SGN 11 *Installing services in RPAs*.

1.11 Summary of impact on local character

No trees will be removed or pruned as a result of this proposal, and all significant boundary tree cover will remain intact. There is space for tree planting, and a landscaping scheme will be feasible if an appropriate condition is applied. The construction activity has the potential to adversely affect retained trees if proper protective measures are not taken. However, if adequate precautions to protect the retained trees are specified and implemented through the arboricultural method statement included in this report, then the development proposal will have no detrimental impact on the contribution of trees to local character.

For these reasons, we conclude that the proposed development would not cause an unacceptable or adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area from a tree perspective.

© Barrell Tree Consultancy

2 Arboricultural method statement

2.1 Site Guidance Notes (SGNs)

This section of the report identifies which trees on this site will be protected and managed, and by what means. This site-specific summary is supplemented by more detailed explanations and descriptions of specific operations set out in the accompanying *Manual for managing trees on development sites*. That document is a compilation of 12 individual SGNs addressing the following tree protection and management issues that regularly arise in the construction phase of development:

- SGN 1 *Monitoring tree protection* (https://www.barrelltreecare.co.uk/assets/Uploads/SGN-1-Monitoring-V3.pdf)
- SGN 2 *Fencing protected trees* (https://www.barrelltreecare.co.uk/assets/Uploads/SGN-2-Fencing-V3.pdf)
- SGN 3 *Ground protection* (https://www.barrelltreecare.co.uk/assets/Uploads/SGN-3-Ground-Protection-V3.pdf)
- SGN 4 *Pollution control* (https://www.barrelltreecare.co.uk/assets/Uploads/SGN-4-Pollution-V3.pdf)
- SGN 5 *Site cranes & piling rigs* (https://www.barrelltreecare.co.uk/assets/Uploads/SGN-5-Cranes-Rigs-V3.pdf)
- SGN 6 *Height restrictions* (https://www.barrelltreecare.co.uk/assets/Uploads/SGN-6-Height-V3.pdf)
- SGN 7 *Excavating in RPAs* (https://www.barrelltreecare.co.uk/assets/Uploads/SGN-7-Excavation-in-RPAs-V3.pdf)
- SGN 8 *Removing surfacing and structures in RPAs* (https://www.barrelltreecare.co.uk/assets/Uploads/SGN-8-Removing-Surfaces-V3.pdf)
- SGN 9 *Installing/upgrading surfacing in RPAs* (https://www.barrelltreecare.co.uk/assets/Uploads/SGN-9-Installing-Surfacing-V3.pdf)
- SGN 10 *Installing structures in RPAs* (https://www.barrelltreecare.co.uk/assets/Uploads/SGN-10-Structures-V3.pdf)
- SGN 11 *Installing services in RPAs* (https://www.barrelltreecare.co.uk/assets/Uploads/SGN-11-Services-V3.pdf)
- SGN 12 *Landscaping in RPAs* (https://www.barrelltreecare.co.uk/assets/Uploads/SGN-12-Landscaping-V3.pdf)

NOTE: Each individual SGN can be downloaded by using the links above and the QR Code links in Appendix 3.

2.2 Identification of areas to be protected

The tree protection plan shows the areas where protective measures are necessary. The fencing location is shown by the heavy black dashed lines, with the construction exclusion zone behind as the lighter black diagonal hatch, and temporary ground protection is shown by a blue fill. The yellow fill shows the area where special precautions will be required when installing the new no-dig construction path.

2.3 Arboricultural supervision

An arboricultural consultant will be appointed to advise on the tree management for the site and to attend:

- a pre-commencement meeting before any work starts;

© Barrell Tree Consultancy

- regular supervision visits to oversee the agreed tree protection, as agreed at the pre-commencement meeting; and
- further supervision visits, as necessary, to oversee any unexpected works that could affect trees.

The detail of how the arboricultural supervision will be carried out is explained in SGN 1 *Monitoring tree protection* in the accompanying Manual.

2.4 Table 2: Summary of the site operations requiring arboricultural input

For this site, arboricultural input will be needed for the following operations:

Brief operation summary	Trees affected	Location of detailed explanations
Pre-commencement meeting: Meeting on site with all parties to agree protective measures, as described in SGN 1. Will be carried out before any significant site works begin.	All retained trees	SGN 1 *Monitoring tree protection*
Installing fencing and ground protection: Agreed tree protection measures will be installed and checked, as described in SGN 2 and SGN 3. Will be completed before any significant site works begin.	T5, T6, T10	Tree protection plan, SGN 2 *Fencing protected trees*, and SGN 3 *Ground protection*
Pollution control near retained trees: Any pollution control measures identified during risk assessment will be installed as described in SGN 4. Will be completed before any potential pollutants arrive on site.	All retained trees	SGN 4 *Pollution control*
Regular arboricultural supervision: Provision will be made to carry out and record agreed arboricultural supervision, as described in SGN 1.	All retained trees	SGN 1 *Monitoring tree protection*
Excavating in RPAs: These operations will be carried out as described in SGN 7.	T10	SGN 7 *Excavating in RPAs*
Removing surfacing and structures in RPAs: These operations will be carried out as described in SGN 8.	T4, T5, T6, T9, T10, T11	SGN 8 *Removing surfacing and structures in RPAs*
Installing/upgrading surfacing in RPAs: These operations will be carried out as described in SGN 9.	T10	SGN 9 *Installing/upgrading surfacing in RPAs*
Installing services in RPAs: These operations will be carried out as described in SGN 11.	All retained trees	SGN 11 *Installing services in RPAs*
Landscaping in RPAs: These operations will be carried out as described in SGN 12.	All retained trees	SGN 12 *Landscaping in RPAs*
Removing tree protection: Protection can only be removed when there is no risk of damage to retained trees, as described in SGN 1.	All retained trees	SGN 1 *Monitoring tree protection*

The operations summarised in this table, and supplemented by the more detailed explanations set out in the SGNs and the rest of this document, form the arboricultural method statement for this site. The Site Manager will ensure that all site personnel know and understand its details and any agreed amendments. Copies of the agreed documents will be available on site. All personnel who

© Barrell Tree Consultancy

could impact trees will be briefed on the specific tree protection requirements as part of the site induction procedures. This requirement will be written into the site management documentation.

If unanticipated issues arise on site requiring work approved by the LPA, but not referenced in the above explanations, for example the unexpected need to install services in RPAs, or landscaping in RPAs, further guidance on how to manage them can be found in the accompanying Manual.

© Barrell Tree Consultancy

Appendix 1: Background administrative information and data collection

A1.1 Table 3: Background administrative information

	Background administrative information
Report date & reference	18th August 2026; 21203-AIA3-JB
Tree protection plan reference	21203-TPP-05
Instructing client	Churchill Living Limited
Instructions	Visit the site, assess the relevant trees, prepare a schedule of their details, describe the proposal's impact on those trees, and identify tree protection issues in an arboricultural method statement with a tree protection plan.
Provided documents	• Topographical survey, drawing reference Graves-End Prelim Cad Draft, received by email on 8th November 2021 • Layout drawing reference 20085GD [HOUSING 21] SITE PLAN, received by email on 27th November 2025
Report author and credentials	Lewis Fraser and Jeremy Barrell are Chartered Arboriculturists (www.charteredforesters.org), and Registered Consultants of the Arboricultural Association (https://www.trees.org.uk/Registered-Consultant-Directory), and are fully qualified to undertake the assessments in this report.
Report limitations	This report does not consider ecological or archaeological issues, or any other matter beyond the assessment of the trees.
Technical references	In preparing the analysis in this report, we considered the guidance and advice in the following technical references: • Climate Change Act (2008) www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2008/27/contents • Town and Country Planning Act 1990 www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1990/8/contents • National Planning Policy Framework, published by the MHCLG www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2 • BS 5837 (2012) *Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations*, https://shop.bsigroup.com/ProductDetail?pid=000000000030213642 • BS 8545 (2014) *Trees: from nursery to independence in the landscape – Recommendations*, https://shop.bsigroup.com/ProductDetail?pid=000000000030219672 • BS 3998 (2010) *Tree work – Recommendations*, BSI https://shop.bsigroup.com/ProductDetail?pid=000000000030089960 • *Trees in the Townscape: A Guide for Decision Makers*, published by the Trees & Design Action Group http://www.tdag.org.uk/ • *Trees in Hard Landscapes: A Guide for Delivery*, published by the Trees & Design Action Group www.tdag.org.uk/ • National Joint Utilities Group (2007) Volume 4, Issue 2: *Guidelines for the planning, installation and maintenance of utility apparatus in proximity to trees* http://streetworks.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/V4-Trees-Issue-2-16-11-2007.pdf
BS 5837 compliance	This report is BS 5837 compliant. *BS 5837 (2012) Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations* is 10 years old. Since its publication, there have been significant advancements in technology and thinking, informed by a decade of practical experience of putting principles into practice. In the document

© Barrell Tree Consultancy

Appendix 1: Background administrative information and data collection

	Background administrative information
	Foreword, it states: *"Any user claiming compliance with this British Standard is expected to be able to justify any course of action that deviates from its recommendations"*. This statement provides the opportunity for practitioners to claim compliance while moving best practice forward in the context of emerging technology, ideas, and experience. Although much of the BS 5837 content remains relevant and useful for managing trees in a planning context, there are now several aspects that are dated, and it is no longer appropriate to rigidly apply them to current planning submissions. Barrell Tree Consultancy (BTC) specialises in managing trees on development sites and retains a complete paper archive of every project it has carried out since starting business in 1980, with a digital data base listing those from 2004. In the decade since BS 5837 was published (April 2012), interrogation of the BTC archive confirms that we have been involved in a total of 3,884 projects, of which we estimate that about 3,845 were development related, and it is that depth of experience that informs the following statements on BS 5837 compliance. All BTC reports are prepared to be BS 5837 compliant and, although explanations are not explicitly required to claim compliance, the justifications for any deviations from its recommendations are set out below, referenced by the BS clause number: 1. **4.3 – soil assessment:** All BTC consultants have basic training relating to soil assessment and regularly deal with soil issues during their daily work, but none are soil specialists and BTC has no specialist investigation equipment for carrying out the type of soil assessment listed in this BS clause. In a modern development context, it is not for arboricultural consultants to demand or carry out professional soil investigations, and BTC does not do that. However, we will review soil information provided from appropriate specialists, if available, and incorporate that into our assessments. 2. **4.4.2.1 – tagging trees:** In some instances, it is not appropriate to tag trees, e.g., sensitive species, trees that are easily identified without a tag, inadequate access, project confidentiality, client instructions to the contrary, etc, and so although there will be a presumption to tag trees where feasible and appropriate, that may not be possible or necessary in every instance. 3. **4.4.2.5 *e*) – branch spread:** BTC only work from provided topographical surveys and where the branch spreads are shown correctly on those surveys, there is not normally any practical need to regurgitate that information in a schedule. Additionally, in closely spaced groups or in treacherous terrain, it is sometimes not safe or realistically possible to collect this data for every tree. For these reasons, BTC normally only collects crown spread data to the four cardinal points where the provided topographical survey is assessed as unreliable, or where a full canopy cover assessment is requested, and it is both safe and practically feasible to do so. 4. **4.4.2.5 *f*) – branch and canopy height:** In the absence of any definition of '*canopy*' or '*significant*' relating to branches in the *Terms and definitions* clause, and the lack of any practical guidance for reliably assessing these characteristics, BTC has adopted the following default

© Barrell Tree Consultancy

	Background administrative information
	position. We will only identify the height and orientation of branches where they have the potential to be damaged by vehicular access, i.e., below a height of 6 m, or where their removal would be beyond what the tree could tolerate during normal maintenance management, i.e., the branch removal would significantly adversely affect the health of the tree and potentially compromise its current safe useful life expectancy. 5. **4.4.2.5 *g*) – life stage:** BS 5387 offers examples, but no definitions of what those examples mean. In the absence of a specific BS 5837 recommendation, BTC has reviewed the concept of maturity in a planning context, taking maturity to be a simplistic indication of a tree's ability to cope with change and its potential for further growth. For the purposes of development site advice, BTC conceptualises useful life-stage descriptions as; **young** indicating a potential to significantly increase in size and a high ability to cope with change; **maturing** indicating some potential to increase in size and a medium ability to cope with change; and, **mature** indicating little potential to increase in size and low ability to cope with change. 6. **4.4.2.5 *i*) – estimated remaining contribution:** BTC accepts the category recommendations in Table 1 on the remaining contribution in the context of category, i.e., greater than 40 years for A trees, greater than 20 years for B trees, at least 10 years for C trees, and less than 10 years for U trees, and so this is also not listed separately in the schedule. 7. **4.5.4 – subcategories:** BTC adopts a presumption that all trees are subcategory 1 (Mainly arboricultural qualities) unless noted to the contrary, and so for conciseness and to avoid complication, the subcategory is not listed in the schedule unless it is 2 or 3. 8. **Table 2 and 4.4.2 – colour coding:** The colours included in this table take no account of the inability of some people to distinguish between red and green, which is not helpful to people suffering with this form of colour blindness. To address this discriminatory failing with the BS approach, BTC has adopted a more intuitively obvious regime of green and blue colours, which can be easily distinguished by colour-blind people, with the best category A and B trees (High and moderate quality) being green, and the lower category C and U trees (Low quality and unsuitable for retention) as blue. The differentiation between the two categories in each colour is provided by symbols rather than using different colours. This is clearly shown on the plan key, so there can be no doubt about what category a tree is, which is an intuitive approach to avoiding discrimination of colour-blind people. In any event, the tree category is now included next to each number, so there can be no question about the category and BS 5837 compliance. 9. **5.2.1 – RPAs:** This clause recommends that the RPAs for category A, B, and C trees are shown as the existing constraints on the plans used in the "*concept and design*", i.e., the tree constraints plan. However, the BS does not explicitly recommend that all those constraints are shown on the tree protection plan, which is logical because only category A (High

© Barrell Tree Consultancy

	Background administrative information
	quality), and category B (Moderate quality) trees can realistically be material constraints, with category C (Low quality) and category U (Unsuitable for retention) trees obviously unsuitable to be determinative of the final design. Although it is not a BS recommendation to include the RPAs of category C trees on the tree protection plan because they cannot be material constraints, it is sometimes helpful as an informative to be able to see them if category C are planned for retention to assess if that is feasible. For that reason, BTC tree protection plans show the RPAs of category C trees as a thin grey line rather than the thicker grey line denoting category A and B RPAs. 10. **5.2.2 Notes 1 and 2 – shading:** These notes offer general information on how shading can be assessed, which is presented in italics. The implications of the convention of using italics within the BS is set out in the Foreword as: *"Commentary, explanation and general informative material is presented in smaller italic type, and does not constitute a normative element."* Our interpretation of that statement is that the application of Notes 1 and 2 is not part of the BS recommendations, and is not necessary for BS 5837 compliance. In our experience, the assessment of daylight issues is a specialist discipline and way beyond our expertise as arboriculturists, and so we would defer to an appropriate specialist, where any detailed guidance is required.

A1.2 Table 4: Data collection

	Data collection
Date of site visits	14th February 2022 and 29th October 2025.
People present during site visits	David Cashman on 1st visit and Lewis Fraser on 2nd visit.
Weather and visibility	Dull and damp, with average visibility during 1st visit, and dull, still, and damp, with good visibility during 2nd visit.
Limitations to observations	• The inspection of the trees for the purposes of assessing their condition and work requirements was made on the basis that they will be annually inspected in the future to identify any changes in condition and review the original recommendations. For these reasons, the tree assessment advice only remains valid for one year from the date that the trees were last inspected. • All observations were of a preliminary nature and did not involve any climbing or detailed investigation beyond what was visible from accessible points at ground level. • All dimensions were estimated unless otherwise indicated.
Statutory protection through tree preservation orders and conservation areas	Our assessment of the trees has been made independently of any statutory protection that may apply. However, if any tree works are proposed before a planning consent is issued, then a check with the LPA must be carried out before any tree works are carried out.
Tree location and numbering	Each arboricultural feature was inspected, and the numbering scheme is shown on the tree protection plan. Where significant trees were found on site that were not included on the provided land survey, their approximate positions are illustrated on the tree protection plan.

© Barrell Tree Consultancy

Appendix 1: Background administrative information and data collection

	Data collection
Crown spreads	Crown radial spreads were estimated to the nearest metre and represent our assessment of the viable crown dimensions that would be retainable after normal management. For clarification, the viable crown spread is the size of the main body of the crown, and not necessarily the furthest extent of odd branches that extend out beyond this core of the crown.
Recording of tree data	For each identified arboricultural feature, the information collected was recorded on the tree schedule in Appendix 2 and the tree protection plan.
Calculation of RPAs	The RPAs were calculated as recommended in BS 5837, and the nominal RPA radius for each tree is listed in the tree schedule in Appendix 2. Where appropriate, RPAs for trees on the site were adjusted as recommended in BS 5837 and illustrated on the plan.

© Barrell Tree Consultancy

Appendix 2: Tree schedule and explanatory notes

NOTE: Colour annotation is A & B trees with green background; C trees with blue background.

Tree no	Species	Height (m)	Diameter (cm) @ 1.5 m	Maturity	Low branches	Category	Notes	Tree works	RPA radius (m)
All retained trees								Carry out safety check and lift over site to 3–4 m as necessary.	
T1	London plane	15	75*	Mature		A			9
T2	London plane	16	82.5*	Mature		A			9.9
T3	London plane	16	80*	Mature		A			9.6
T4	Lime	5	15*	Young		C	Small young tree		1.8
T5	Lime	8	42.5*	Mature		C	Basal decay, lost leader through historic storm damage, decaying central stem		5.1
T6	Lime	18	60*	Mature		B	Historically crown reduced, decaying stems		7.2
T7	Lime	5	12.5*	Young		C	Small young tree		1.5
T8	Lime	4	10*	Young		C	Small young tree		1.2
T9	Lime	5	15*	Young		C	Small young tree		1.8
T10	Lime	18	70*	Mature		B	Trunk decay at 1.5 m to west, large decay cavity above, historically crown reduced, decay cavities in canopy		8.4
T11	Lime	8	22.5*	Maturing		C			2.7
T12	Rowan	8	25*	Maturing		C			3

© Barrell Tree Consultancy

Appendix 2: Tree schedule and explanatory notes

Explanatory notes

- **Abbreviations:**
  T: Tree
- **Botanical tree names:**

Lime	:	*Tilia* sp
London plane	:	*Platanus x hispanica*
Rowan	:	*Sorbus aucuparia*

- **BS 5837 (2012) compliance:** All data has been collected based on the recommendations set out in subsection 4.4 of BS 5837.
- **Tree survey and site limitations:** Each tree was surveyed by a quick visual check from ground level. Where access to the base of a tree was restricted, its attributes were assessed from the nearest point of access. No climbing inspections or detailed investigations were carried out. Where heavy ivy was present, the tree condition was assessed based on what could be seen from the ground.
- **Crown spreads:** Crown radial spreads were estimated to the nearest metre and represent our assessment of the viable crown dimensions that would be retainable after normal management. For clarification, the viable crown spread is the size of the main body of the crown, and not necessarily the furthest extent of overextended or rogue branches that spread beyond this crown core.
- **Dimensions:** All dimensions are estimated unless otherwise indicated with an asterisk (*) after the figure.
- **Species:** Species identification is based on visual observations. Where there is some doubt over tree identity, sp is noted after the genus name to indicate that the species cannot be reliably identified at the time of the survey. Where there is more than one species in a group, only the most frequent are noted, and not all the species present may be listed.
- **Height:** Height is estimated to provide a broad indication of the size of the tree.
- **Trunk diameter:** Trunk diameter is estimated or measured (with a diameter tape), at the discretion of the consultant, and is usually rounded up to the nearest centimetre. Estimates may be made where access is restricted, direct measurement is prevented by ivy on the trunk, or the tree is assessed as low quality. The point of measurement and the adjustments for stem variations are as advised in Figure C1 of BS 5837. Individual diameters for multiple stems are recorded in the notes, with the calculated cumulative diameter recorded in the diameter column.
- **Maturity:** In a planning context, maturity provides a simplistic indication of a tree's ability to cope with change and its potential for further growth. For the purposes of this report, young indicates a potential to significantly increase in size and a high ability to cope with change, maturing indicates some potential to increase in size and a medium ability to cope with change, and mature indicates little potential to increase in size and limited ability to cope with change.
- **Low branches:** Any low branches that would not be feasible for removal during normal management and should be considered as a design constraint are noted here and explained in the notes.
- **Category:** Our assessment automatically considered tree physiological/structural condition (BS 5837, 4.4.2.5h), and so these are not listed separately in the schedule. Additionally, the category accounts for the remaining contribution (BS 5837, 4.4.2.5i) as being greater than 40 years for A trees, greater than 20 years for B trees, at least 10 years for C trees, and less than 10 years for U trees, and so this is also not listed separately in the schedule. Category A, B and C trees are automatically listed as sub-category '1' unless otherwise stated.
- **Notes:** Only relevant features relating to physiological or structural conditions and low branches that may help clarify the categorisation are recorded. If there are no notes, then the presumption should be that no relevant features were observed.
- **RPAs:** The RPAs were calculated as recommended in BS 5837, and the nominal RPA radius for each tree was listed, irrespective of any modifying factors. Where appropriate, RPAs for trees on the site may have been adjusted as recommended in BS 5837 and illustrated on the plan.

© Barrell Tree Consultancy

Appendix 2: Tree schedule and explanatory notes

- **Future tree safety checks:** Due to the time that may elapse between the original survey and the start of development, all trees should be checked as part of the standard risk management process before any works start on site. Our survey of the trees was conducted on the basis that a check would be carried out within one year of the visit and that tree safety would be reviewed annually from that date.

© Barrell Tree Consultancy

Appendix 3: QR Codes for SGNs (Scan with reader to download)

SGN 1 *Monitoring tree protection*	SGN 2 *Fencing protected trees*	SGN 3 *Ground protection*
SGN 4 *Pollution control*	SGN 5 *Site cranes & piling rigs*	SGN 6 *Height restrictions*
SGN 7 *Excavating in RPAs*	SGN 8 *Removing surfacing and structures in RPAs*	SGN 9 *Installing/upgrading surfacing in RPAs*
SGN 10 *Installing structures in RPAs*	SGN 11 *Installing services in RPAs*	SGN 12 *Landscaping in RPAs*

© Barrell Tree Consultancy

barrell
TREE CONSULTANCY

Field House Fordingbridge Business Park Fordingbridge Hampshire SP6 1BD
☎ 01425 651470 info@barrelltreecare.co.uk www.barrelltreecare.co.uk