

Arboricultural Impact Assessment

Dene Holm, Northfleet, Gravesend

20th January 2026

Applicant: Building Construction Partnership

*To accompany a full planning application for a Proposed 60 bed class
C2 Care Home with 6 associated rehabilitation apartments*



A M Belson
RCArborA, DipArb RFS, Tech Cert (ArborA)



The Tree House, Unit 1A First End,
Station Road, Uppingham,
Rutland LE15 9TX
T: 01572 823637
E: info@belsontreesurvey.co.uk
W: belsontreesurvey.co.uk

CONTENTS

SUMMARY	1
1 INTRODUCTION	2
1.1 INSTRUCTIONS	2
1.2 COMPETENCE AND PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY	2
1.3 PROJECT CONTEXT	3
1.4 SOURCE DATA	3
1.5 COMPLIANCE WITH BS5837:2012	4
2 CONSTRAINTS	5
2.1 SITE CONTEXT	5
2.2 STATUTORY PROTECTION	6
2.3 ARBORICULTURAL SURVEY	7
2.4 ECOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	7
3 NATIONAL AND LOCAL POLICY	8
3.1 NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK (NPPF)	8
3.2 COUNCIL LOCAL PLAN/ POLICIES	8
3.3 CONCLUSIONS	9
4 CRITERIA	10
4.1 PROTECTION OF ROOT SYSTEM	10
4.2 PROTECTION OF TREE ABOVE GROUND	11
5 IMPACT ANALYSIS	12
5.1 SITE LAYOUT	12
5.2 ENGINEERING, DRAINAGE AND SERVICES	13
5.3 LIVABILITY	14
5.4 FUTURE GROWTH AND PRESSURE TO PRUNE	14
6 TREE REMOVALS AND WORKS	15
6.1 TREE REMOVALS	15
6.2 PRUNING	15
7 CONCLUSIONS	16
7.1 DESIGN	16
7.2 PROTECTION	16
7.3 DEMOLITION	16
7.4 CONSTRUCTION METHODS	16
7.5 CONSTRUCTION SITE MANAGEMENT	16
7.6 POST CONSTRUCTION	16
Appendix A – Tree Survey Explanatory Notes	ii
Appendix B – Tree Survey Data	iii
Appendix C – Arboricultural Impact Plan	viii

DOCUMENT HISTORY

Revision	Layout Assessed	Author	Reviewer	Date
-	1485PL-RDT-ZZ-XX-DR-A-1100-RevP01	AMB	TC	20/1/2026

FILE REFERENCES:

This Report File Ref: 5925.Gravesend.RDT.AIA

Arboricultural Impact Plan: 5925.Gravesend.RDT.AIP

This report has been prepared and provided in accordance with the six Core Principles of the Arboricultural Association Code of Conduct and Ethics. Every reasonable attempt has been made to comply with all relevant industry standards, including British Standard 5837:2012 (Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations.)

SUMMARY

It is my opinion that the proposed development is supportable from an arboricultural perspective and the effects of the retained trees on the liveability in the care home is acceptable.

The specific impacts of the proposal are:

- The proposed development will require the loss of three Category B trees, eight Category 'C' trees and some Category 'C' hedging.
- Some facilitation pruning will be required.
- A robust landscaping scheme can be secured by way of Condition to mitigate the tree removal.

Protection of the retained trees has been detailed in an Arboricultural Method Statement, which accompanies this assessment.

Signed:



A M Belson
RCArborA, DipArb RFS, Tech Cert (ArborA)

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Instructions

- 1.1.1 This assessment was commissioned by RDT Architects on behalf of the Applicant because trees are a material consideration and this report is required to support a full planning application.
- 1.1.2 The first instruction was to survey the trees on or adjoining the site in line with the recommendations of BS5837: 2012 and to provide a plan of arboricultural constraints in the first instance to inform design.
- 1.1.3 The second instruction was to draw a plan showing the tree constraints overlaid to the submitted planning drawing so that the impact could be assessed, and to write an Arboricultural Impact Assessment report to accompany the application.

1.2 Competence and Professional Responsibility

- 1.2.1 All survey work, assessments and reporting were carried out by Andrew Belson RCarborA, DipArb RFS, Tech Cert (ArborA).
- 1.2.2 I am a Registered Consultant of the Arboricultural Association. (RC Licence No: RC202) and have worked as a consultant for over 20 years. I hold the Arboricultural Association's Technician's Certificate and the Royal Forestry Society's Professional Diploma, which is a level 6 qualification equivalent to an Honours degree.
- 1.2.3 I have over 20 years of experience in arboricultural consultancy. His expertise includes extensive work on tree surveys and assessments to support planning applications, as well as the preparation of Arboricultural Method Statements and the provision of site supervision and Arboricultural Clerk of Works services during development.

1.3 Project context

- 1.3.1 I surveyed the trees on or adjoining the site on 14th August 2025 and this data has been used to inform the layout of the site. The results of that survey are found at Appendix B.
- 1.3.2 The Applicant intends to submit a full planning application.
- 1.3.3 The Applicant received pre-planning advice from the local planning authority that a full Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Arboricultural Method Statement is required to support the planning application.
- 1.3.4 An Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan has been produced and accompanies this assessment.

1.4 Source data

- 1.4.1 The data that has been used to inform this impact assessment comprises:

SOURCE	ANY ISSUES	CONCLUSION
TOPOGRAPHICAL SURVEY: BES25201 Rev A	None	The marked locations are adequate for the purpose of this assessment.
BS5837 TREE SURVEY	None	I consider that the survey has been carried out in accordance with BS5837.
PROPOSED SITE PLAN: 1485PL-RDT-ZZ-XX-DR-A-1100-RevP01	None	This drawing was adequate for the purposes of this assessment.
DRAINAGE STRATEGY: 6565-DENE-ICS-01-XX-DR-C-0001-Rev P03	None	This drawing was adequate for the purposes of this assessment.

- 1.4.2 Note: This assessment is specific to the drawings listed above and cannot be generalised.

1.5 Compliance with BS5837:2012

- 1.5.1 This is an assessment of the elements recommended by BS5837: 2012 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction'.
- 1.5.2 Evidence of a tree survey conducted to BS5837:2012, including tree categorisation (BS5837 section 4.4 and 4.5) can be found in Appendix A (explanatory notes) and Appendix B (Survey Data Table).
- 1.5.3 An Arboricultural Impact Plan showing the trees and their RPAs overlaid to the proposed layout, indicating trees for retention and removal. (BS5837 section 4.5 and 4.6) can be found in Appendix C.
- 1.5.4 Consideration of any relevant policy, legislation or statutory protection affecting the site. (BS5837 section 5.2.3) (see section 3)
- 1.5.5 Throughout the report there is evidence of my assessment of the implication of the proposal and its acceptability based upon:
- The relationship between the trees and the proposed layout.
 - Indicated tree losses (BS5837 section 5.2.3 and 5.4.3)
 - The potential impact of RPA incursions (BS5837 section 5.3.1 and 5.3.2)
 - Factors which may affect the reasonable enjoyment of the proposed structures such as shading, screening and privacy (BS5837 section 5.3.4)
 - Future growth and/or pressures for removal or pruning (BS5837 section 5.3.4)
 - Factors that may affect foundation design (BS5837 Annex A)
 - Foreseeable issues with the planned demolition/construction of the proposed layout such as working space and access. (BS5837 section 5.4.2)

2 CONSTRAINTS

2.1 Site context

Location

2.1.1 The site is located on Dene Holm Road, off Coldharbour Road, within the south-eastern suburbs of Gravesend.



Fig. 1 Location of site marked in red © Google Maps 2024

Overview

2.1.2 At the time of survey, the site was occupied by a former residential care home with associated parking, visitor and service access, and landscaped areas.

Topography

- 2.1.3 The land rises significantly toward the east.
- 2.1.4 The topography of the site is complex and reference must be made to the full topographical survey for more details. Most of the topographical survey information is not shown on the drawings appended to this document for clarity of the information presented.

Soil and Geology

- 2.1.5 With reference to Figure 4.3, Volume 1 'Tree Root Damage to Buildings' (P G Biddle), some soils can have shrinkable characteristics (i.e., they are susceptible to volume changes in response to variations in moisture content).
- 2.1.6 Understanding the impact of trees on soil moisture content and considering the potential effects of changes in soil volume on foundations are critical for ensuring both the stability of the built environment and the preservation of retained trees. Chapter 4.2 of the National House Building Council Standards specifically addresses the requirements and considerations related to trees and shrinkable soils. It offers guidance to developers, engineers, and builders on how to assess the risks associated with trees and shrinkable soils in a development site and implement appropriate measures to mitigate these risks effectively.
- 2.1.7 The British Geological Survey of England and Wales identifies the bedrock geology at this location as Thanet Formation-Sand. No superficial deposits were noted.
- 2.1.8 The drainage strategy report which accompanies this application says that LandIS mapping indicates that the land is "free draining and consists of slightly acid loamy soils".
- 2.1.9 Sandy soil is much more resistant to damage through compaction and much less likely to be shrinkable.
- 2.1.10 This data may not be accurate at a site level but it is considered adequate to inform the project at this stage and it provides a general context that has been used to inform an Arboricultural Method Statement which accompanies this application. An engineer may require more specific information to inform foundation design and engineer drainage, road construction and other built structures.

2.2 Statutory protection

- 2.2.1 This site does not lie within a Conservation Area.
- 2.2.2 None of the trees surveyed are included in a Tree Preservation Order.

2.3 Arboricultural survey

- 2.3.1 The trees inspected are growing both within the site and on neighbouring land.
- 2.3.2 In general, the trees are low quality, with many having been subjected to low quality pruning.
- 2.3.3 The full table of survey data can be found in Appendix B.

2.4 Ecological considerations

- 2.4.1 Protected species such as nesting birds, bats, dormice, and reptiles play important roles in local ecosystems and are safeguarded by various laws and regulations.
- 2.4.2 Any contractors on site will assume responsibility under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), the Conservation of Habitat Regulations 2010 (as amended), and the Countryside Rights of Way Act 2000. They are required to take all reasonable measures to identify the presence of protected species such as nesting birds, bats, dormice, and reptiles in the work area and its surroundings.

3 NATIONAL AND LOCAL POLICY

3.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

- 3.1.1 The NPPF (updated in December 2024, with minor amendments in February 2025) contemplates the importance of trees in the context of development and sets out principles and requirements to inform planning decisions. In particular, Section 12: Achieving well-designed and beautiful places, Paragraph 136 states that “planning policies and decisions should ensure that ... existing trees are retained wherever possible.”
- 3.1.2 This application retains few trees but other planning considerations have greater weight due to the value of the proposal set against the overall tree quality.

3.2 Council Local Plan/ Policies

- 3.2.1 During the planning application process, Gravesham Borough Council will evaluate whether the proposed development complies with the objectives and requirements set out in the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (Adopted September 2014). Of relevance to this assessment, Policy CS12 (Green Infrastructure) seeks to protect and enhance green infrastructure assets, and Policy CS19 (Development and Design Principles) requires development to respond positively to the existing natural environment and local character.
- 3.2.2 In addition, the Design for Gravesham Design Code Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (Adopted May 2024) addresses trees in development in Design Principle 6.11 (p.121), which states:
- a. Where proposed works may impact existing trees, the applicant must follow British Standard 5837:2012 ‘Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition & Construction: Recommendations’ with oversight by a qualified arboriculturalist.
 - d. If existing trees must be felled, mitigation planting within the development must be like-for-like in canopy cover or girth size.
 - j. Assumption towards the retention of trees should prevail due to the benefits posed.
 - l. Applicants should discuss their proposals with the tree officer to understand how trees can best work for their site.

3.3 Conclusions

- 3.3.1 This proposal meets NPPF and Gravesham Borough Council requirements by ensuring that the trees at this site have been a material consideration and providing evidence of a survey and implications assessment to BS5837.
- 3.3.2 There is also an Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan which accompanies this application describing how tree protection measures and construction techniques will be used to assure the protection and retention of the trees where possible.
- 3.3.3 Replacement planting to obtain the canopy cover required can be secured by way of Condition.

4 CRITERIA

4.1 Protection of root system

4.1.1 Construction activities can cause damage to the root system of a tree in several ways:

- Physical damage Excavation for construction or the digging of trenches to install underground utilities can result in root damage such as the loss of bark, splits or complete severance.
- Changes in ground levels. Elevating soil levels can lead to root death through asphyxiation. Reducing soil levels can result in the loss of the beneficial humus layer and root loss.
- Soil compaction. Heavy machinery or vehicles operating near trees can lead to soil compaction. The degree to which this is significant will depend on the soil on the site but in principle, compaction reduces or removes pore spaces in the soil structure. This in turn can lead to root death through asphyxiation. During construction, ground can be protected from damage through the use of barriers or a suitable ground protection system.
- Soil contamination. construction materials, Materials such as fuel, chemicals, lime, cement, and waste water can cause root death, either through chemical action or asphyxiation. A site must be organized in such a way to prevent damage.
- Heat. Fires can not only damage the tree above ground but the heat can also cause root death. Fires should ideally be avoided on most sites but on larger sites, it may be practical to accommodate a fire, providing it is a suitable distance from retained trees.

4.1.2 In its simplest form, the Root Protection Area (RPA) is a circle which is drawn on plans to indicate an area that is adequate for a tree's normal needs such as anchorage, moisture and nutrient absorption. It is described in British Standard 5837 as a "layout design tool" and in most cases the radius of the circle is calculated by multiplying the diameter of the main stem of the tree by 12. The shape can be adjusted to account for the possible or absolute effect of sub-surface features on the rooting environment. The Arboricultural Impact Plan (see Appendix C) shows the Root Protection Area (RPA) as a magenta circle or polygon around each tree or group of trees.

4.1.3 Trees rely on their root systems to absorb water, nutrients, and provide stability. Severe root damage can lead to decline, poor growth, or even the eventual death of the tree. The degree of damage also depends on the health of the tree, its age, the species, and the overall site conditions. The results of damage can take several years to become evident.

- 4.1.4 BS5837 (paragraph 5.3.1) states that the RPA is the area where, if the trees are retained, ideally no excavation should take place; the soil level should not be raised or lowered; no materials should be stacked; there must be no contamination and no services should be routed. However, trees are remarkably resilient, and some root loss can typically be tolerated in a tree of normal health and vigour.
- 4.1.5 An incursion into a Root Protection Area can be superficial (as with a driveway constructed over the existing ground level for example) or may involve partial or complete root loss within the area. BS5837 contemplates the possibility that there may be justification for construction within the RPA and that technical solutions can be used to mitigate the effects of an incursion. The Project Arboriculturalist is charged with demonstrating that the tree can remain viable, that the area lost to encroachment can be compensated for elsewhere, and to propose mitigation methods.

4.2 Protection of tree above ground

- 4.2.1 The Arboricultural Impact Plan (see Appendix C) shows the tree canopy as an indented green circle or dashed polygon which takes account of any variations in crown spread at the four cardinal points.
- 4.2.2 During construction, the aerial parts of the tree are at risk from potential physical damage due to contact with plant or vehicles. This can be avoided through effective site management, pruning to create sufficient space for the vehicles to pass under, or using protective barriers to create a safe distance between construction activities and tree canopies. The height of the lower crown above ground is shown in the Tree Survey Table (Appendix B).

5 IMPACT ANALYSIS

5.1 Site layout

5.1.1 The proposed site layout is for a 60-bed class C2 Care Home with 6 associated rehabilitation apartments.

5.1.2 Detailed implications of the proposed site layout are as-per the following table:

Tree reference	Species	Category	Impact	Justification	Mitigation
1	Norway Maple	C1	Crown needs lifting to improve access	Previously pruned	Minimise pruning required
Group A	Leyland Cypress	C2	Must be removed for access in the layout shown	Low quality hedge	Replacement planting
3	Norway Maple	C1	Must be removed for access in the layout shown	Previously pruned. Low quality tree	Replacement planting
4	Norway Maple	C1	Must be removed for access in the layout shown	Previously pruned. Low quality tree	Replacement planting
8	Elder	C1	Must be removed for the layout shown	Low quality tree.	Replacement planting
9	Cherry	C1	Must be removed for a retaining wall in the layout shown	Low quality tree.	Replacement planting
10	Elder	C1	Must be removed for the layout shown	Low quality tree.	Replacement planting
11	Juniper	C1	Must be removed for the layout shown	Low quality tree.	Replacement planting
12	Winter Flowering Cherry	C1	Must be removed for the layout shown	Young tree. Easily replaced	Replacement planting
13	Hawthorn	B1	Must be removed for the layout shown	Collateral tree loss	Replacement planting
14	Crab Apple	C1	Must be removed for the layout shown	Low quality tree.	Replacement planting

Tree reference	Species	Category	Impact	Justification	Mitigation
15	Purple Leaf Plum	B1	Must be removed for the layout shown	Collateral tree loss	Replacement planting
16	Dogwood	B1	Must be removed due to engineering requirements.	Collateral tree loss	Replacement planting
17	Crab Apple	B1	Cellular soakaway and part of the driveway encroaches slightly into Root Protection Area.	The excavation required is tolerable and unlikely to have a significant effect on the tree. There is ample space for compensatory rooting.	Minimise excavation

5.2 Engineering, drainage and services

5.2.1 General principles will apply as follows:

- Foundations will be designed in accordance with the Project Engineer's calculations.
- Subject to engineering constraints, trenching for the installations of piped services, cables and conduits will be located beyond the Root Protection Areas drawn. Where trenching in Root Protection Areas is unavoidable, the trench will be excavated under arboricultural supervision using a method that minimises root loss.

5.2.2 As the soil on site is sandy, it is particularly suited to excavation with an AirSpade (if required). This will allow excavations to take place in and around the various root systems that lie within the likely service run without causing any significant damage.

5.3 Livability

Screening

- 5.3.1 Screening provides a means to create separation, privacy, and aesthetic enhancement in both residential and commercial contexts. It helps shield properties from unwanted views, reduces noise pollution, and can contribute to the overall visual character of the area.
- 5.3.2 All the perimeter screening offered by Group B will be lost.
- 5.3.3 The loss of screening can be mitigated through replacement planting.

Shade

- 5.3.4 The shade footprint that may be cast by the trees has been shown as a grey hatch on the Arboricultural Impact Plan (see Appendix C). The shade area is based on a solar inclination of 45 degrees in line with the median suggested by BS5837: 2012 that covers the main daylight hours. This simplifies the actual shade area that may affect the site, but it is considered to be a good representation of the area in question.
- 5.3.5 Shading is minimal but due to the type of development proposed, it will not be affected by shade cast by trees.

5.4 Future growth and pressure to prune

- 5.4.1 I would not expect any significant future growth in the retained trees.

6 TREE REMOVALS AND WORKS

6.1 Tree removals

6.1.1 The proposed development will result in the loss of most of the trees.

6.1.2 Trees which are implicated for removal as a result of the proposed development are indicated on the Arboricultural Impact Plan (see Appendix C) by way of a red dashed line and listed below:

REF.	SPECIES
Group A	Leyland Cypress
3	Norway Maple
4	Norway Maple
8	Elder
9	Cherry
10	Elder
11	Juniper
12	Winter Flowering Cherry
13	Hawthorn
14	Crab Apple
15	Purple Leaf Plum
16	Dogwood

6.2 Pruning

6.2.1 Some facilitation pruning will be required.

7 CONCLUSIONS

7.1 Design

7.1.1 The current indicative layout has been achieved through an informed design process.

7.2 Protection

7.2.1 The order in which the works are implemented will need to be carefully considered in order to provide the most successful tree protection scheme.

7.2.2 A high standard of site management will be essential to avoid damage to retained trees.

7.2.3 Full details of a tree protection methodology have been provided in an Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan accompanying this application.

7.3 Demolition

7.3.1 The demolition of the existing buildings involves work close to the retained trees. Therefore, the methods of demolition must be controlled through site management, and the plant, equipment and staff involved.

7.4 Construction methods

7.4.1 Should it be required, it is entirely practical to install services within the rootzones of the retained trees because the soil is sandy and ideally suited to AirSpade excavation.

7.5 Construction site management

7.5.1 Space will be at a premium for the receipt, storage and handling of materials and for the movement of plant and machinery. Therefore, in order to avoid accidental damage, a suitable tree protection scheme must be implemented before development begins.

7.6 Post construction

7.6.1 The detail of the landscape scheme and how it will be maintained can be secured by Condition of any Consent.

Appendices

Appendix A – Tree Survey Explanatory Notes

Identification

All significant trees within and adjoining the site were surveyed in accordance with British Standard 5837.

Individual trees within the site have been numbered. Two groups of trees were identified and designated a letter. Reference to the trees' locations can be made using the plans appended to this report.

Limitations

The tree survey was carried out for the purpose of informing the planning process. Relevant structural defects and aspects of tree condition are noted in the tree survey table in Appendix B; however, a full hazard assessment has not been carried out.

As trees and shrubs are living organisms whose health and condition can change rapidly, conclusions and recommendations are only valid for one year. The health, condition and safety of trees should be checked regularly, preferably annually.

It may have been necessary to estimate some measurements when assessing trees on neighbouring land. This will not generally affect the conclusions of this report.

No invasive investigations were carried out to assess the internal condition of the trees. Should this be required, it will be highlighted in the report.

The soil was not examined and no soil samples were taken. Should soil analysis be indicated, this will be recommended in the report.

Appendix B – Tree Survey Data

Key	
Age Class	Y = Young (Less than 1/3 of normal expected life) OM = Over-mature or in decline SM = Semi-mature (1/3 – 2/3 of normal expected life) V = Veteran M = Mature
Main Stem Diameter	Measured at 1.5 metres above ground or in accordance BS5837: 2012 Annex C and D
Height	Estimated or measured with clinometer where considered critical (m)
Crown spread	At cardinal points (m)
RPA (Radius)/(Area)	Distance in metres from centre of tree to achieve a circular Root Protection Area/ Root Protection Area in square metres.
Remaining Contribution	Estimated number of years the tree may contribute in a safe condition
Category	See table overleaf for definitions

Note: This survey is an assessment of the existing site and any recommendations are preliminary and do not reflect a particular layout or proposal

BS5837:2021 Cascade Chart for Tree Quality Assessment Trees to be considered for retention

Category and definition	Criteria (including subcategories where appropriate)			Identification on Plan
Trees unsuitable for retention				
Category U Trees 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	• Trees that have a serious, irremediable, structural defect, such that their early loss is expected due to collapse, including those that will become unviable after removal of other category U trees (e.g. where, for whatever reason, the loss of companion shelter cannot be mitigated by pruning) • Trees that are dead or are showing signs of significant, immediate, and irreversible overall decline • Trees infected with pathogens of significance to the health and/or safety of other trees nearby, or very low quality trees suppressing adjacent trees of better quality NOTE: Category U trees can have existing or potential conservation value which it might be desirable to preserve			
	1. Mainly arboricultural qualities	2. Mainly landscape qualities	3. Mainly cultural values, including conservation	
Category A Trees of high quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 40 years	Trees that are particularly good examples of their species, especially if rare or unusual; or those that are essential components of groups or formal or semi-formal arboricultural features (e.g. the dominant and/or principal trees within an avenue)	Trees, groups or woodlands of particular visual importance as arboricultural and/or landscape features	Trees, groups or woodlands of significant conservation, historical, commemorative or other value (e.g. veteran trees or wood-pasture)	
Category B Trees of moderate quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 20 years	Trees that might be included in category A, but are downgraded because of impaired condition (e.g. presence of significant though remediable defects, including unsympathetic past management and storm damage), such that they are unlikely to be suitable for detention for beyond 40 years; or trees lacking the special quality necessary to merit the category A designation	Trees present in numbers, usually growing as groups or woodlands, such that they attract a higher collective rating than they might as individuals; or trees occurring as collectives but situated so as to make little visual contribution to the wider locality	Trees with material conservation or other cultural value	
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	Unremarkable trees of very limited merit or such impaired condition that they do not qualify in higher categories	Trees present in groups or woodlands, but without this conferring on them significantly greater collective landscape value; and/or trees offering low or only temporary/transient landscape benefits	Trees with no material conservation or other cultural value	

ref.	Species	Age Class	Observations: Factors affecting the quality and value of the trees	Ø m/s (mm)	Height (m)	Lower crown height (m)	Ultimate height (m)	Crown Spread N (m)	Crown Spread S (m)	Crown Spread E (m)	Crown Spread W (m)	Category	Remaining Contribution (yrs)	Preliminary management recommendations	RPA radius (m)	RPA (m ²)
1	Norway Maple	SM	Dieback in crown. Causing direct damage to retaining wall	300	10	2	10	4.5	4.5	3.5	3.5	C1	20+	Not suitable for retention.	3.6	40.72
2	Beech	Y	Tree on neighbouring property therefore not closely inspected. Previously pruned	150	8	2	8	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	C1	40+	No work required.	1.8	10.18
Group A	Leyland Cypress	Y	Not site appropriate. Not worthy of retention.	100	10	0	18	3	3	3	3	C2	40+	Fell and replace.	1.2	4.52
3	Norway Maple	M	Multi-stemmed form. Not worthy of retention. Previously cut at 10m to a low standard. Phytophthora bleeds on stems	682	14	2	14	5	5	5	5	C1	20+	Fell and replace.	8.18	210.24
4	Norway Maple	SM	No visible defects seen. Suppressed.	300	12	2	12	2	3	4	3	C1	40+	Could be retained with space. No work required.	3.6	40.72
5	Box Elder	M	Suckers around stem base. Previously cut at 5m to a low standard.	400	9	2.5	9	4	4	4	4	C1/C2	20+	Remove dead wood greater than 25mm in diameter. Remove broken/damaged branches.	4.8	72.39
6	Box Elder	M	Suckers around stem base. Previously cut at 5m to a low standard.	350	8	2.5	8	4	4	4	4	C1/C2	20+	Remove dead wood greater than 25mm in diameter. Remove broken/damaged branches.	4.2	55.42

ref.	Species	Age Class	Observations: Factors affecting the quality and value of the trees	Ø m/s (mm)	Height (m)	Lower crown height (m)	Ultimate height (m)	Crown Spread N (m)	Crown Spread S (m)	Crown Spread E (m)	Crown Spread W (m)	Category	Remaining Contribution (yrs)	Preliminary management recommendations	RPA radius (m)	RPA (m ²)
7	Cherry	Y	No visible defects seen.	150	5	1.5	12	2.5	1.5	2.5	2.5	C1	20+	Could be retained with space. No work required.	1.8	10.18
8	Elder	M	Now in last third of safe useful life expectancy. Not worthy of retention. Dieback in crown.	500	6	2	6	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	C1	<10	Fell and replace.	6	113.11
Group B	Portugal Laurel, Elder, Myrobalan Plum	M	Lapsed hedge with natural generation growth	250	8	0	8	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	C2	40+	Could be retained. Remove Elder. Cut retained boundary plants as a hedge	3	28.28
9	Cherry	SM	No visible defects seen. Unlikely to be considered suitable for retention.	173	5	1.5	12	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	C1	40+	Fell and replace.	2.08	13.59
10	Elder	M	Multi-stemmed form. Unlikely to be considered suitable for retention.	250	6	0.5	12	2	2	2	2	C1	20+	Fell and replace.	3	28.28
11	Juniper	M	Multi-stemmed form. Unlikely to be considered suitable for retention.	300	4	0	4	0	2	2	2	C1	40+	Fell and replace.	3.6	40.72
12	Winter Flowering Cherry	Y	Multi-stemmed form.	87	5	1	8	2	2	2	2	C1	40+	Could be retained with space.	1.04	3.4
13	Hawthorn	M	Scattered minor dead wood throughout crown. Previously pruned	450	5	1.5	8	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	B1	40+	Could be retained with space. Remove dead wood greater than 25mm in diameter.	5.4	91.62
14	Crab Apple	SM	Not worthy of retention. Dieback in crown.	200	6	1.5	6	3.5	3	3.5	3.5	C1	10+	Fell and replace.	2.4	18.1

ref.	Species	Age Class	Observations: Factors affecting the quality and value of the trees	Ø m/s (mm)	Height (m)	Lower crown height (m)	Ultimate height (m)	Crown Spread N (m)	Crown Spread S (m)	Crown Spread E (m)	Crown Spread W (m)	Category	Remaining Contribution (yrs)	Preliminary management recommendations	RPA radius (m)	RPA (m ²)
15	Purple Leaf Plum	M	No visible defects seen. Now in last third of safe useful life expectancy.	400	6	1.5	6	4	2	6	4.5	B1	20+	Could be retained in the short-term. No work required.	4.8	72.39
16	Dogwood	M	Multi-stemmed form. No visible defects seen.	500	10	1.5	10	4	2	6	4.5	B1	40+	Could be retained with space. No work required.	6	113.11
17	Crab Apple	M	No visible defects seen. Suppressed. Scattered minor dead wood throughout crown.	300	7	1.5	7	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	B1	40+	Could be retained. Remove dead wood greater than 25mm in diameter.	3.6	40.72

Appendix C – Arboricultural Impact Plan

1:200 Plan follows. To be printed in colour on A1.

This drawing is the property of Andrew Belson Arboricultural Consultant. Copyright is reserved by him and the drawing is issued on the condition that it is not copied, reproduced, retained or disclosed to any unauthorised person either wholly or in part without the consent of Andrew Belson.

NOTES Based on survey drawing BES25201 Rev A and Proposed site plan 1465PL-RDT-ZZ-XX-DR-A-1100-RevP01 and Drainage Plan 6565-DENE-ICS-01-XX-DR-C-0001-Rev P03
The original of this drawing was produced in colour - a monochrome copy should not be relied upon.

KEY

- GRADE A TREES
- GRADE B TREES
- GRADE C TREES
- GRADE U TREES
- ROOT PROTECTION AREA
- CANOPY OUTLINE - INDIVIDUAL TREE
- CANOPY OUTLINE - GROUPS
- TREES TO BE REMOVED
- ROOT PROTECTION AREA OF TREES TO BE REMOVED
- INDICATIVE SHADE AREA

- FOOTPATH - RESIN BOUND (BUFF COLOUR)
- PATIO - PROPOSED FLAG PAVING
- FENCE
- LAND AREA ASSIGNED TO ALTERNATIVE TITLE PLANS AS PER DEEDS
- RETAINING WALL
- PROPOSED LEVELS
- EXISTING LEVELS

Rev	Description	Date

Purpose of Issue
Planning

Andrew Belson Ltd
Arboricultural Consultant
The Tree House, 1a First End
Station Road, Uppingham
Oakham LE15 9TX
t: 01572 823637
e: info@belsontreesurvey.co.uk
Client

Building Construction
Partnership

Project
**Dene Holm
Northfleet, Gravesham**

Drawing Title
ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT PLAN

Drawn AMB	Checked 	Reviewed 	Date 20/01/2026
Job No. 5925	Scale 1:200	Sheet Size A1	Revision
Drawing Number 5925.Gravesend.RDT.AIP			

