



Jack Pine Trees Ltd

ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Development: Demolition of existing cottage and construction of five new dwellings.

Client: Rupert Norwood

Site:
19, Red Pit,
Dilton Marsh,
Warminster,
Wiltshire,
BA13 4BJ.

Agent:
Rachel Tadman,
Tadman Planning Consultants Ltd.,
14, The Glebe,
Timsbury,
Bath,
BA2 0LT.

Author:
Stephen Clark BSc. (Hons) Env. Sci., MICFor, MArborA
Jack Pine Trees Ltd, 122, Bloomfield Road, Bristol, BS4 3RD.
T: 0117 377 8432
M: [REDACTED]
E: info@jackpinetrees.co.uk
W: www.jackpinetrees.co.uk

Date: January 2025

CONTENTS

Contents	2
Summary	3
Introduction	4
Background information	4
Scope of survey	4
Limitations	4
Inspection notes	5
Site description	5
Tree description	6
Discussion	6
Conclusion	8
References	9
Appendix 1 – Tree survey results	
Appendix 2 – Tree Constraints Plan	
Appendix 3 – Arboricultural Impact Assessment Drawing	
Appendix 4 – Tree Protection Plan	

Summary

Jack Pine Trees Ltd were engaged by Rupert Norwood to carry out a preliminary arboricultural assessment for the proposed development of 19, Red Pit, Dilton Marsh, Warminster, BA13 4BJ, and provide a report to British Standard BS 5837:2012: Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations.

The survey is restricted to the vegetation in and adjacent to the property's garden, and the trees associated with this proposal are a mixture of established garden amenity trees, fruit trees and shrubs. The majority of the trees and shrubs are in a reasonable to poor condition and generally do not achieve high retention values. However, T1, T8, T11, T26 and T56 are categorised as 'B1' for their amenity, landscape contribution, longevity and ecological value.

The proposed development is to demolish the existing cottage and build five new dwellings on the site, as shown on the indicative site plan. This will require the loss of trees G2 - G9, T10, T18, T19, G22, T23, T24, T35 - T52, G54 and T55.

Once the tree felling and remedial works are complete, the tree protection measures for the retained trees T1, T8, T11, T13 - T17, T20- 21, T25-27, T29 - T34, T53 and T56 will be installed.

This will include the use of a 'no dig' cellular confinement system such as Cellweb® TRP <https://www.geosyn.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/Cellweb-TRP-Technical-Support-Package-.pdf> for the access road and parking areas and will be installed with a working surface while the demolition and construction phases take place. The working surface will be replaced with the finished surface at the completion of the construction phase.

A series of tree protection fences (TPF) will be constructed using Heras® fencing, around the retained trees, as detailed on the Tree Protection Plan (TPP). This will create construction exclusion zones (CEZs) to enable the successful retention of the trees during the demolition and construction phases.

When the demolition phase has been completed, ground protection will be installed adjacent to TPF for T25 & T26 to further protect the RPA from additional compaction during the construction phase.

The final layout of the site and such details as whether pile and beam foundations will be required in any of the dwellings will be addressed at reserved matters. After which, the demolition and construction phases should be detailed further in an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) to accompany the TPP.

The site is not in a Conservation Area and does not have a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) associated with it.

It is recommended that the biodiversity net gain for this project will be provided through offsite planting and a robust landscaping scheme that includes high nectar, pollinator friendly, shrubs and plants in the landscape areas.

1.0 Introduction.

1.1 Background Information.

I was instructed by Mr Rupert Norwood, in writing, to undertake a pre-development arboricultural impact assessment to BS5837:2012 for the trees at 19, Red Pit, Dilton Marsh, Warminster, BA13 4BJ.

1.2 Scope of Survey.

- 1.2.1 Examine the principal trees associated with the site as highlighted on the supplied drawing.
- 1.2.2 Undertake a visual assessment of the condition of the trees.
- 1.2.3 Make recommendations for remedial work to enhance tree longevity and address any safety issues.
- 1.2.4 Estimate the potential future contribution that the trees may have to the site.
- 1.2.5 Provide nominal retention categories for trees regarding possible future development of the site.
- 1.2.6 Provide an assessment of the impact on the trees and an arboricultural method statement for the successful retention of the trees during the construction process.

1.3 Limitations.

- 1.3.1 No documented information has been provided at the time of inspection regarding the following:

Historical circumstances and background relating to past planting and management of trees on the site.

Historic details of past land use, including mining.

The location and condition of drains and service runs.

The nature of soils and load bearing strata.

- 1.3.2 On consultation with the Wiltshire Council website, it was confirmed that the site is not in a Conservation Area and no Tree Preservation Orders are associated with the site.
- 1.3.3 Condition notes and recommendations are restricted to arboricultural considerations associated with the proposed development.

1.4 Inspection Notes.

- 1.4.1 The site was inspected by Stephen Clark BSc. (Hons) Env. Sci., MICFor, MArborA on January 31st, 2025. Weather conditions were clear and bright.
- 1.4.2 The survey was carried out commencing with the Leyland Cypress *Cupressocyparis leylandii* T1 and proceeded in a clockwise direction around the site, concluding with the Silver Birch *Betula pendula*, T56.
- 1.4.3 When assessing the trees, the following factors have been taken into consideration – species, maturity, structural condition, risk posed to people, roads and buildings in the event of failure, and likely response to remedial works.
- 1.4.4 The trees were inspected from ground level only and all measurements are approximate.
- 1.4.5 Age class of trees has been divided into juvenile, semi-mature, early mature, fully mature and veteran.
- 1.4.6 A nominal retention value has also been given to the trees based on landscape contribution, health, maturity and life expectancy:-

A -	High:-	Prominent landscape trees of good form and health with good long-term life expectancy. Rare, historically and/or ecologically important specimens. Contribution of at least 40 years. (Shaded green on plan).
B -	Moderate:-	Mature trees of reasonable health and form but requiring remedial work. Tree groups with high collective value. Contribution of at least 20 years. (Shaded blue on plan).
C -	Low:-	Trees that may be safely retained (with or without remedial work), but of no particular merit. Trees with low life expectancy. Young trees that may be replaced. Contribution of at least 10 years. (Shaded grey on plan).
U -	Remove:-	Dead, decayed, dying or dangerous trees. Contribution less than 10 years. (Shaded red on plan).

2.0 The Site.

- 2.1 The site is situated at 19, Red Pit, Dilton Marsh, BA13 4BJ. It consists of an existing detached cottage with associated mature gardens to front and rear.
- 2.2 The project is to demolish the existing cottage and build five new dwellings in the existing garden.

3.0 The Trees.

- 3.1 The trees associated with the proposed development are various mature ornamental trees, fruit trees and shrubs in the garden of 19, Red Pit, Dilton Marsh, Warminster.
- 3.2 Due to the past management, disease, overcrowding and the condition of the mature trees and shrubs, they have mostly achieved the retention categories of 'C1' and 'U', with T1, T8, T11, T26 and T56 achieving 'B1'.
- 3.3 The trees are not situated in a Conservation Area, and there are no Tree Preservation Orders associated with the site.

4.0 Discussion.

4.1 Context

- 4.1.1 This report is a preliminary arboricultural condition assessment and is written to British Standard 5837:2012 - Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations. At this stage it is intended to inform the construction process and identify the impact on the existing trees.

4.2 Above ground considerations

Effects of the development on or near the site

- 4.2.1 The proposed development requires the removal of trees G2, G3, T4, G5, H6, H7, G9, T10, T18, T19, G22, T23, T24, T28, T35, T36 - T39, T40, T41 - T52, G54 and T55.

Pruning works to accommodate the development process.

- 4.2.2 The trees that require pre-commencement pruning are as follows:

- G2 – H7, G9, T10, T12, T18 – 19, G22 – T24, T28, T35 - T52, T54 and T55 – fell.
- T1 – crown lift over entrance and prune from LV electricity cable.
- T8 and T11 crown lift and reduce lateral limbs to provide adequate clearance for the construction of plot 1.
- T11 – crown lift and reduce lateral limbs to provide adequate clearance over the new road.
- T25, T26, T29, T31, T32, T52 and T53 – crown lift to facilitate the installation of the TPF.

4.3 Below ground considerations.

- 4.3.1 The primary concern for the proposed development is the potential impact on the roots of the trees on and adjacent to the development site and the excavation required to facilitate the development.
- 4.3.2 The installation of the new access road will impact trees T1, T11, T20 & T21. Without details of the existing and final spot heights on site, it is not possible to accurately identify the full impact on the RPAs of the retained trees. However, given the extent of the potential impact, it is recommended that the use of a 'no dig' cellular confinement system, such as Cellweb® <https://www.geosyn.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/Cellweb-TRP-Technical-Support-Package-.pdf> is used to construct the access road where possible, to reduce the potential impact and ongoing compaction of the retained tree's roots.
- 4.3.3 A 'no dig' cellular confinement system, such as Cellweb® should also be used to construct the driveways, footpaths and parking spaces for Plots 2, 3 & 5.
- 4.3.4 Part of the house and parking space of Plot 2 also intrude into the RPA of T11, and the construction of the foundations on this side of the building should use a less intrusive method, such as pile and beam, to minimise the potential impact on the tree's root system.
- 4.3.5 The building and patio of Plot 3 also intrude into the RPA of T25 & T26, and the RPA should be protected by constructing the foundations on this side of the house with a less intrusive foundation, such as pile and beam, with the patio being laid on to a 'no dig' cellular confinement system to minimise damage to the roots.

4.4 Access

- 4.4.1 Access to the development site is from Red Pit, via the existing entrance gate.

4.5 Demolition and Construction phase considerations.

- 4.5.1 Once the tree removal and remedial tree work has been completed, the installation of the 'no dig' cellular confinement systems should take place before any other activity on site commences. When these are installed, the TPF's should be constructed using Heras® fencing, as shown on the TPP, to create a CEZ around the retained trees to prevent damage to their crowns and RPAs before the demolition and construction phases commence.
- 4.5.2 No fires should take place within 5m of the retained trees, and the location of the mixing zones and storage of building materials should be identified to ensure the trees, or their RPAs, are not damaged during the construction of the proposed dwellings.

- 4.5.2 An Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) will be required to detail the construction processes on this site to ensure the successful retention of the retained trees.

4.6 Landscape design and biodiversity gain

- 4.6.1 The mitigation for the loss of the trees and the provision of biodiversity net gain in relation to this development is provided for by offsite planting and a detailed landscape scheme.

5.0 Conclusions

- 5.1 The trees associated with this property mainly achieve the retention values of 'U', 'C1' and 'B1', as shown on drawing 250218-19RP-TCP-NB. The proposed development at 19, Red Pit is to demolish the existing building and build five new dwellings in the existing garden.
- 5.2 The development of the site will result in the removal of trees G2, G3, T4, G5, H6, H7, G9, T10, T18, T19, G22, T23, T24, T28, T35 – 39, T40 – 52, T54 & T55, which should be felled prior to commencement of the demolition phase of the development.
- 5.3 The access road and parking spaces that intrude into the RPAs of retained trees, should be constructed using a 'no dig' cellular confinement system which should be installed with a working top layer, prior to the commencement of the demolition phase, along with the TPF's as shown on the TPP.
- 5.4 Once the demolition phase has been successfully completed, the ground protection for T26 can be installed and the construction phase can commence.
- 5.5 When the proposed development has been confirmed, details such as pile and beam foundations can be identified as reserved matters, and an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) will be required to detail the demolition and construction processes on this site. It should include the phasing of the operations, details of the tree protection measures, arboricultural supervision and any specialist construction measures required to ensure the successful retention of the retained trees on this site.
- 5.6 Mitigation for the loss of trees and provision of biodiversity net gain will be provided through a robust landscape scheme at reserved matters stage.
- 5.7 All tree work should be undertaken prior to the development, conform to BS3998:2010 'Recommendations for Tree Work', and be carried out by a recognised contractor.

References

Lonsdale, D. (1999) *Principles of Tree Hazard Assessment and Management*. HMSO.

Mattheck, C. & Breloer, H. (1994) *The Body Language of Trees: A Handbook for Failure Analysis: No. 4 (Research for Amenity Trees)*. HMSO.

British Standards Institute, (2012) *BS 5837:2012 Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction - Recommendations*. London.

British Standards Institute, (2010). *BS 3998: 2010 Tree Work - Recommendations*. London.

Appendix 1

Tree Survey Results

19, Red Pit,
Dilton Marsh,
Warminster,
BA13 4BJ.

No.	Species	Height (m)	Stem Ø (mm)	RPA Radius (m)	RPA (m²)	N S E W	CC	MA	Structure	Vitality	Structural Condition/Site Notes	Recommendations	Estimated Useful Contribution (Years)	Retention Category
1	Leyland Cypress <i>x Cupressocyparis leylandii</i>	16.2	810	9.72	296.66	7 8 6 6	1.2 S	MA	F	F	Forks at approx. 1.8m to give multiple stems that support a full crown. Tree forms a joint canopy with T55. Multiple crossing and rubbing limbs present. Some limb fusion visible. Past pruning wounds also present. LV cable running through crown. Overhangs neighbouring garden.	Prune from LV wires	>20	B1
2	Hedge	8	115 115 107 106 65	3.46	37.59	4 4 2 5	1.5 W	MA	F-P	F-P	Mature Hazel coppice with hawthorn and Plum. Young Hazel regrowth forms hedge and has been pruned back to the boundary line by the neighbour.	No action	>20	C1
3	Cherry Laurel <i>Prunus laurocerasus</i>	6	119 79 76 109 96	3.26	33.37	6 3 4 4	0 E	MA	F-P	F	Multi-stem specimen growing over garage and car port. Crown suppressed with asymmetry to north. Bark damage and subsequent decay visible on numerous stems.	Re-coppice	<10	U

No.	Species	Height (m)	Stem Ø (mm)	RPA Radius (m)	RPA (m ²)	N S E W	CC	MA	Vitality	Structure	Structural Condition/Site Notes	Recommendations	Estimated Useful Contribution (Years)	Retention Category
4	Hazel <i>Corylus avellana</i>	8	119 134 131 91 157	3.46	37.59	2 4 4 4 3	1 E	MA	F	F	Multi-stem specimen growing between the garage and car port and touching the roofs. Forms a group canopy with T3 and has a crown asymmetry to the south. Tight forks. Crossing and rubbing limbs present. Past pruning wounds visible. Ivy growing on several of the stems.	Prune from garage and car port	>20	C1
5	Fig <i>Ficus sp.</i>	4	Av. 65	2.21	15.34	0 3 3 3 3	0 S	EM	F- P	F- P	Multi-stem Fig overgrown with <i>Lonicera sp.</i> and bramble. Growing adjacent to the south wall of the garage. Suppressed by T4 with crown asymmetry to south.	Remove bramble Crown lift hazel	>10	C1
6	Hedge	2.5	Av. 120	4.55	65.01	2 2 2 2 2	0 W	EM	F	F	Bay and Leyland Cypress managed as formal hedge.	No action	>20	C1
7	Hedge	3.5	Av. 50	1.90	11.34	2.5 2.5 2.5 2.5	1.2 E	EM	F	F	Privet managed as a formal hedge and cut back to boundary line on neighbour's side.	No action	>10	C3

No.	Species	Height (m)	Stem Ø (mm)	RPA Radius (m)	RPA (m²)	N S E W	CC	MA	Vitality	Structure	Structural Condition/Site Notes	Recommendations	Estimated Useful Contribution (Years)	Retention Category
8	Silver Birch <i>Betula pendula</i>	15	# 700	8.40	221.56	9 10 10 7	1 N	MA	F- P	F- P	Neighbour's tree. Crown asymmetry to south and east due to loss of previously adjacent tree. No access to inspect. Appears to be in reasonable condition.	Crown lift to 3m over vegetable patch	>20	B1
9	Cherry Laurel <i>Prunus laurocerasus</i>	5	Av. 150	5.06	80.39		1 S	MA	F	F	Dimensions as shown.	Prune from garage roof	>20	C3
10	Dead	4.5	172	2.06	13.33	3 1 1 3	3 N	D	P	P	Dead tree supporting rose.	Remove dead limb over path	<10	U
11	Silver Birch <i>Betula pendula</i>	16	464 765	10.74	362.19	9 7 9 8	0.5 S	MA	F- P	F- P	Ivy clad specimen. Forks at approx. 0.65m to give 2No. Stems. Ivy prevents full inspection. Water pocket visible in fork. Exudation at approx. 0.4m on south aspect. Crown asymmetry to southeast due group canopy. Past pruning wounds and tear wounds with minor decay visible. Crossing and rubbing limbs. Major dead wood present. Squirrel dray in upper crown.	Sever ivy to facilitate full inspection	>20	B1

No.	Species	Height (m)	Stem Ø (mm)	RPA Radius (m)	RPA (m²)	N S E W	CC	MA	Vitality	Structure	Structural Condition/Site Notes	Recommendations	Estimated Useful Contribution (Years)	Retention Category
12	Lawson Cypress <i>Chamaecyparis lawsoniana</i>	3	#110	1.32	4.88	3 3 3 3	0.3 S	SM	F	F	Suppressed tree.	No action	>20	C1
13	Holly <i>Ilex aquifolium</i>	3.5	# 80	0.96	2.89	2 2 2 2	0.2 S	SM	F-P	F	Neighbour's tree. Previously topped.	No action	>20	C1
14	Cherry Laurel <i>Prunus laurocerasus</i>	4	#100	1.20	4.52	3 3 3 3	0.3 S	SM	F	F	Suppressed tree with crown asymmetry to east.	No action	>20	C1
15	Deodar Cedar <i>Cedrus deodara</i>	3	87	1.04	3.40	3 2.5 2.5 2.5	0.1 E	SM	F	F	Suppressed tree.	No action	>20	C1
16	Corsican Pine <i>Pinus nigra subsp. laricio</i>	7	233	2.80	24.62	3 2 1 3	1.5 E	SM	P	F	Suppressed with lean to northwest. Previously topped. Historic bark damage at approx. 1.2m. Dead wood present.	No action	>20	C1

No.	Species	Height (m)	Stem Ø (mm)	RPA Radius (m)	RPA (m²)	N S E W	CC	MA	Vitality	Structure	Structural Condition/Site Notes	Recommendations	Estimated Useful Contribution (Years)	Retention Category
17	Elder <i>Sambucus nigra</i>	6	Av. 76	2.41	18.24	2 3 3 3	1 N	MA	F- P	F- P	Multi-stem from base. Congested crown with crossing and rubbing limbs and dead wood present. Past pruning wounds with decay visible.	No action	>10	U
18	Arizona Cypress <i>Cupressus arizonica</i>	13	513	6.16	119.15	4 3 4 4	1.8 W	MA	F- P	F- P	Ivy clad specimen. Part of group canopy. Slight lean and crown asymmetry to northwest. Dead wood present.	No action	>20	C1
19	Hazel <i>Corylus avellana</i>	4.5	Av. 76	2.41	18.24	5 1 6 3	0.6 E	MA	F- P	F- P	Suppressed multi-stem specimen with crown asymmetry to east. Bark wound on east stem. Crossing and rubbing limbs present.	No action	>20	C3
20	Leyland Cypress <i>x Cupressocyparis leylandii</i>	14	720 @ 0.4m	8.64	234.40	5 6 6 6	1.8 S	MA	F- P	F	Boundary tree overhanging two neighbouring gardens. Neighbour's compost heap at base. Forks at approx. 0.4m to give a wide multi-stem crown. Previously topped at approx. 5m with regrowth to current height. Dead stems visible in centre of crown.	No action	>20	C1

No.	Species	Height (m)	Stem Ø (mm)	RPA Radius (m)	RPA (m²)	N S E W	CC	MA	Vitality	Structure	Structural Condition/Site Notes	Recommendations	Estimated Useful Contribution (Years)	Retention Category
21	Leyland Cypress <i>x Cupressocyparis leylandii</i>	12	394	4.73	70.25	5 8 0 5	0.5 N	EM	F- P	F- P	Suppressed tree with crown asymmetry to west.	No action	>20	C1
22	Group	8	Av. 95	2.79	24.44		0 N	MA	F- P	F	Group of Bamboo, Hazel and Western Red Cedar. Cut back to neighbour's boundary as shown.	No action	>20	C1
23	English Oak <i>Quercus robur</i>	12	224	2.69	22.72	3 3 3 3	4 N	SM	F	F	Congested with bamboo.	No action	>40	C1
24	Plum <i>Prunus sp.</i>	6	115 @ 1m	1.38	5.98	2 2 2 2	1.6 N	EM	P	F	Congested with bramble.	Prune from conservatory	>10	C1
25	Hazel <i>Corylus avellana</i>	8	Av. 100	2.94	27.14	2 3 4 1	0.5 N	MA	F- P	F- P	Suppressed boundary tree.	No action	>20	C3

No.	Species	Height (m)	Stem Ø (mm)	RPA Radius (m)	RPA (m²)	N S E W	CC	MA	Vitality	Structure	Structural Condition/Site Notes	Recommendations	Estimated Useful Contribution (Years)	Retention Category
26	Crack Willow <i>Salix fragilis</i>	13	#700	8.40	221.56	3 0 1 6	2 N	OM	F- P	F- P	Ivy clad specimen. Historic pollard with hollow stem and decay visible. Crown asymmetry to west. Sycamore growing from pollard point.	No action	<20	B3
27	Hedge	1.5	Av. 10	0.29	0.26		0 E	MA	F- P	F	<i>Lonicera nitida</i> and hazel hedge.	No action	>10	C3
28	Ash <i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>	5.5	Av. 75	2.20	15.20	3 4 3 2	1 S	SM	F- P	F	Epicormic regrowth from stump.	No action	<10	U
29	Western Red Cedar <i>Thuja plicata</i>	4	#80	0.96	2.89	1.5 2 1 2	0.2 S	SM	F- P	F	Suppressed tree.	No action	>20	C1
30	Apple <i>Malus domestica</i>	5	253 223	4.05	51.50	4 5 5 4	0.3 E	FM	P	F- P	Forks at approx. 0.4m to give 2No. Stems with wound and cavity at fork. Crown asymmetry to south and east. Further wounds and cavities visible on stems. Past pruning wounds with decay visible. Congested crown.	No action	>20	C1

No.	Species	Height (m)	Stem Ø (mm)	RPA Radius (m)	RPA (m²)	N S E W	CC	MA	Vitality	Structure	Structural Condition/Site Notes	Recommendations	Estimated Useful Contribution (Years)	Retention Category
31	Hazel/Ash	8	Av. 70	2.66	22.22	3 2 3 3	0.2 S	SM	F- P	F- P	Multi-stem group between boundary fences.	No action	>10	C3
32	Lawson Cypress <i>Chamaecyparis lawsoniana</i>	4.5	#70	0.84	2.22	2 1.5 2.5 2	0 N	SM	P	F	Suppressed tree.	No action	>20	C1
33	Ash <i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>	8	70 60	1.17	4.30	0.5 0.5 0.5 0.5	1.8 S	SM	P	P	Congested with bramble.	No action	<10	U
34	<i>Prunus sp.</i>	3.5	50 50	0.85	2.27	2.5 2.5 2.5 2.5	1.2 N	EM	P	P	Past pruning wounds present.	No action	>10	C1
35	<i>Prunus sp.</i>	2.5	61	0.73	1.67	4 2 5 5	0.8 S	EM	P	P	Bark wound/trimmer damage with bark necrosis. <i>Phellinus sp.</i> fruiting bodies present. Tree in decline.	Fell	<10	U

No.	Species	Height (m)	Stem Ø (mm)	RPA Radius (m)	RPA (m²)	N S E W	CC	MA	Vitality	Structure	Structural Condition/Site Notes	Recommendations	Estimated Useful Contribution (Years)	Retention Category
36	Bay <i>Laurus nobilis</i>	4.5	Av. 110	4.17	54.60	2.5 2.5 2.5 2.5	0 S	MA	F	F	Managed specimen.	No action	>20	C1
37	Lawson Cypress <i>Chamaecyparis lawsoniana</i>	11	#200 300 400 600	9.67	293.62	4 2 5 5	1.2 E	MA	F-P	F-P	Ivy clad specimen. Forks at approx. 0.4m to give 4No. Stems which subsequently fork to form the crown. Past pruning wounds create asymmetry to west. Electricity cable through crown. Ivy clad stems prevent full inspection.	No action	>20	C1
38	Juniper <i>Juniperus sp.</i>	4	Av. 40	1.52	7.26	2 2 2 2	0.1 N	MA	F-P	F	Part of group canopy. Electricity cable through crown.	No action	>10	C3
39	Hawthorn <i>Crataegus monogyna</i>	8	#400 @ 0.7m	4.80	72.35	4 1 3 4	1.2 E	MA	F-P	F-P	Ivy clad stem prevents full inspection. Bramble through crown. Lean with crown asymmetry to north due to joint canopy.	Sever ivy Prune from electricity pole	>10	C1

No.	Species	Height (m)	Stem Ø (mm)	RPA Radius (m)	RPA (m ²)	S E W	CC	MA	Vitality	Structure	Structural Condition/Site Notes	Recommendations	Estimated Useful Contribution (Years)	Retention Category
40	Holly <i>Ilex aquifolium</i>	8.5	#100 80 100	1.95	11.94	3 3 3 3	0 N	EM	F	F	Multi-stem specimen. Crown congested with bramble.	No action	>20	C1
41	Cherry Laurel <i>Prunus laurocerasus</i>	5	Av. 100	3.39	36.09	3 1 3 2	0 S	EM	F	F	Ivy clad dead stem collapsing into Cherry Laurel and electricity wires.	Fell dead stem Coppice Cherry Laurel	<10 >10	U C1
42	<i>Prunus</i> sp.	4	43	0.52	0.85	2 1 1 2	1 S	SM	P	P	<i>Pseudomonas syringae</i> present.	No action	<10	C1
43	Hazel <i>Corylus avellana</i>	5	Av. 60	2.28	16.32		0.2 E	MA	P	F-P	Dimensions as shown. Multi-stem specimen previously topped at approx. 1.8m and regrown to current dimensions. Crown asymmetry to east. Crown congested with ivy and bramble from adjacent dead stem.	No action	>10	C1

No.	Species	Height (m)	Stem Ø (mm)	RPA Radius (m)	RPA (m ²)	SEW	CC	MA	Vitality	Structure	Structural Condition/Site Notes	Recommendations	Estimated Useful Contribution (Years)	Retention Category
44	Hazel <i>Corylus avellana</i>	5.5	Av. 70	2.66	22.18		0.1 W	MA	F- P	F- P	Multi-stem specimen previously topped at approx. 2m and regrown to current dimensions.	No action	>20	C1
45	<i>Magnolia sp.</i>	4.5	152 @ 0.4m	1.82	10.40	4 2 4 2	0.4 SW	MA	F- P	F- P	Ornamental specimen with significant crown asymmetry to north and east due to adjacent Hazel.	No action	>20	C1
46	Leyland Cypress x <i>Cupressocypris leylandii</i>	5	Av. 250	7.35	169.63		0.2 S	MA	F- P	F	Managed at approx. 5m by utility company. Dimensions as shown. LV circuit above hedge.	No action	>20	C1
47	Apple <i>Malus domestica</i>	5	267	3.20	32.15	5 1 4 3	0.4 W	FM	P	F- P	Collapsed tree with multiple recovering stems. Root plate lifted - dead roots visible. Congested crown. Canker present. Epicormic growth present. Significant asymmetry to north.	No action	>20	C1

No.	Species	Height (m)	Stem Ø (mm)	RPA Radius (m)	RPA (m ²)	SEW	CC	MA	Vitality	Structure	Structural Condition/Site Notes	Recommendations	Estimated Useful Contribution (Years)	Retention Category
48	Group	7	Av. 150	5.69	101.66		1 S	EM	F	F	Dimensions as shown.	No action	>10	C3
49	Apple <i>Malus domestica</i>	3.5	118	1.42	6.33	1 2 4 0	0.5 W	OM	P	F-P	Collapsed stem. Significant decay in basal wound.	No action	>10	C1
50	Apple <i>Malus domestica</i>	4.5	98	1.18	4.37	2 2 7 0	0.4 W	OM	P	F-P	Propped collapsed specimen with phoenix stem.	No action	>10	C1
51	Apple <i>Malus domestica</i>	5	133 75	1.83	10.52	4 1 4 3	0.6 W	FM	P	F-P	Collapsing tree - propped. Congested crown with crown asymmetry to north. Crossing and rubbing limbs. Past pruning wounds present.	No action	>10	C1
52	Pear <i>Pyrus sp.</i>	8.5	195	2.34	17.19	2 3 3 3	1.5 S	FM	F-P	F-P	Forks at approx. 0.9m. Crown asymmetry to south due to adjacent Leyland Cypress. Ivy clad stem. Congested crown.	No action	>10	C1

No.	Species	Height (m)	Stem Ø (mm)	RPA Radius (m)	RPA (m ²)	N S E W	CC	MA	Vitality	Structure	Structural Condition/Site Notes	Recommendations	Estimated Useful Contribution (Years)	Retention Category
53	Leyland Cypress <i>x Cupressocyparis leylandii</i>	7	#450	4.80	72.35	3 3 3 4	0.2 S	MA	P	F-P	Multi-stem specimen previously topped at approx. 3m and regrown to current dimensions.	No action	>20	C1
54	Cherry Laurel <i>Prunus laurocerasus</i>	6	Av. 130	4.41	61.07		0 S	MA	F-P	F-P	Dimensions as shown. Suppressed group with past pruning wounds visible.	No action	>20	C3
55	Leyland Cypress <i>x Cupressocyparis leylandii</i>	18	965	11.58	421.06	6 8 6 7	1.8 W	MA	F-P	F-P	Mature specimen with parking area and footpath adjacent to stem. Forks at approx. 4m, with a tight fork present, to give 3No. Scaffold stems. Full crown with asymmetry to south. Reduced vitality visible in crown extremities - possible Corineum canker infection.	No action	>10	C1
56	Silver Birch <i>Betula pendula</i>	12	299	3.59	40.47	4 5 5 4	1.8 W	EM	F	F	Street tree.	No action	>20	B1

Key:

Survey data:

HT:	Height in metres.
Stem Diameter:	Diameter in millimetres of stem at 1.5m above adjacent ground level.
Root Protection Area (RPA) radius:	Radius of root protection area from stem.
RPA (m ²)	Root protection area in metres squared.
Spread:	Crown spread measured in metres as radius from stem to North, South, East and West.
CC:	Height in metres of crown clearance above adjacent ground level and direction of lowest limb.
Life stage:	JU = Juvenile SM = Semi Mature EM = Early Mature MA = Fully Mature OM = Over Mature
Physiological Condition:	G = Good F = Fair P = Poor
ULE	Estimated useful contribution (Years):
Retention Category:	Category grading - U = Remove. A = High quality and value. B = Moderate quality and value. C = Low quality and value.
Subcategories -	1 = Mainly arboricultural values. 2 = Mainly landscape values. 3 = Mainly cultural values including conservation.

Tree work recommendations:

Formative prune -	Remove major dead wood, damaged, crossing and rubbing limbs.
Crown thin -	Selective removal of a percentage of laterals evenly throughout canopy whilst maintaining overall size and shape of crown.
Crown reduction -	Overall reduction of height and spread whilst retaining natural form of tree.
Crown lift -	Remove and/or prune low branches to raise crown above ground level.

Table 1 Cascade chart for tree quality assessment

Category and definition	Criteria (including subcategories where appropriate)			Identification on plan
Trees unsuitable for retention (see Note)				
Category U Those in such a condition that they cannot realistically be retained as living trees in the context of the current land use for longer than 10 years	- 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 <i>NOTE Category U trees can have existing or potential conservation value which it might be desirable to preserve; see 4.5.7.</i>			See Table 2
	1 Mainly arboricultural qualities	2 Mainly landscape qualities	3 Mainly cultural values, including conservation	
Trees to be considered for retention				
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)	See Table 2
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 retention 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	See Table 2
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	See Table 2



Appendix 2

Tree Constraints Plan

19, Red Pit,
Dilton Marsh,
Warminster,
BA13 4BJ.

Drawing number: 250801-19RP-ACP-Rev A-NB

Appendix 3

Arboricultural Impact Assessment Drawing

19, Red Pit,
Dilton Marsh,
Warminster,
BA13 4BJ.

Drawing number: 250801-19RP-AIA-Rev B-NB

Appendix 4

Tree Protection Plan

19, Red Pit,
Dilton Marsh,
Warminster,
BA13 4BJ.

Drawing number: 250801-19RP-TPP-Rev A-NB