



ARBORICULTURAL PLANNING CONSULTANTS

THE OLD POST OFFICE
DORKING ROAD
TADWORTH
SURREY KT20 5SA

Tel: (01737) 813058
E-mail: sja@sjatrees.co.uk

Directors: Simon R. M. Jones Dip. Arb. (RFS), FArborA.,
RCArborA. (Managing)
Frank P. S. Spooner BSc (Hons), MArborA, TechCert
(ArborA), RCArborA. (Operations)

Arboricultural Implications Report

Proposed development at

Land at Malmesbury Road

Cricklade

March 2026

Ref. SJA air 25636-01

SUMMARY

S1. On the basis of our assessment, we conclude that the arboricultural impact of this scheme is of negligible magnitude, as defined according to the categories set out in **Table 1** of this report.

S2. There is no ancient woodland, woodpasture or parkland within or abutting the site and consequently the proposals will cause no loss of or harm to irreplaceable habitat.

S3. Our assessment of the impacts of the proposals on the existing trees concludes that all trees are to be retained, including those that are mature, assessed as category 'B' trees, or of high landscape or biodiversity value. The proposed sections of the five hedgerows to be removed will represent no alteration to the main arboricultural features of the site, only a minor alteration to the overall arboricultural character of the site and will not have an adverse impact on the arboricultural character and appearance of the local landscape.

S4. The potential locations of the proposed dwellings and their associated private gardens are not likely to be shaded by retained trees to the extent that this will interfere with their reasonable use or enjoyment by incoming occupiers, which might otherwise lead to pressure on the Local Planning Authority to permit felling or severe pruning that it could not reasonably resist.

S5. There will be no incursions into the Root Protection Areas (RPAs) of any of the trees to be retained.

S6. As the proposed development, does not remove trees that significantly contribute to the landscape character, the locally distinctive pattern of trees and tree belts are preserved and the arboricultural contribution to the local green network is protected. As such, it complies with Policies CP51, CP52 and GP57 of the adopted Wiltshire Council Core Strategy (January 2015).

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION	4
2. PLANNING CONTEXT	8
3. THE TREES	13
4. TREES TO BE REMOVED	17
5. TREES TO BE PRUNED	19
6. ROOT PROTECTION AREA INCURSIONS	20
7. RELATIONSHIP OF RETAINED TREES TO NEW DWELLINGS	21
8. MITIGATION AND BENEFITS	24
9. CONCLUSIONS	25

APPENDICES

- 1. Methodology**
- 2. Outline arboricultural method statement**
- 3. Tree survey schedule (SJA tss 25636-01)**
- 4. Tree protection plan (SJA TPP 25636-041)**

© Simon Jones Associates Ltd. 2026

All rights in this document are reserved. No part of it may be amended or altered, reproduced or transmitted, in any form or by any means, or stored in any retrieval system of any nature, without our written permission. Its content and format are for the exclusive use of Mac Mic Strategic Land Limited in dealing with this site. It may not be sold, lent, hired out or divulged to any third party not directly involved with this site without the written consent of Simon Jones Associates Ltd. However, it may be reproduced, without amendment, by the Local Planning Authority (LPA), and be posted on the LPA website, to assist in consideration of an application for the proposed development referred to in Section 1.

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1.1. Instructions

1.1.1. SJAtrees has been instructed by Mac Mic Strategic Land Limited to visit Land at Malmesbury Road, Cricklade, and to survey the trees growing on or immediately adjacent to this site.

1.1.2. We are further asked to identify which trees are worthy of retention within a proposed development of the site; to assess the implications of the development proposals on these specimens, and to advise how they should be protected from unacceptable damage during construction.

1.2. Scope of report

1.2.1. This report and its appendices reflect the scope of our instructions, as set out above. It is intended to accompany an outline planning application to be submitted to Wiltshire Council (“the LPA”) and complies with local validation requirements.

1.2.2. It complies also with the recommendations of British Standard BS 5837:2012, *Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations* (‘BS 5837’). However, the British Standard is not a Code of Practice that consists of written rules outlining how actions or decision must be taken and it **“should not be quoted as if it were a specification¹”**; it is a set of recommendations intended to **“assist decision-making with regard to existing and proposed trees in the context of design, demolition and construction²”**.

1.2.3. The proposed development comprises the erection of up to 315 dwellings with associated access and infrastructure including Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace.

1.2.4. This report summarises and sets out the main conclusions of the baseline data

¹ British Standard BS 5837:2012. Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations; Foreword. The British Standards Institution.

² Ibid., p.1, Introduction.

collected during the tree survey and identifies those trees or groups of trees whose removal could result in a significant adverse impact on the character or appearance of the local area (Section 3). It then details and assesses the impacts of the proposed development on individual trees and groups of trees, including those to be removed (Section 4), those to be pruned (Section 5), those which might incur root damage that might threaten their viability (Section 6) and those that might become under pressure for removal after occupation because of shading or apprehension (Section 7). The arboricultural mitigation and benefits of the scheme are set out in Section 8. A summary and conclusions, with regard to local planning policy, are presented in Section 9.

1.3. Site inspection

1.3.1. A site visit and tree inspection were undertaken by Finn Cullerne of SJAtrees on Tuesday 23rd August 2022 and Thursday 20th July 2023. Weather conditions at both times the time were clear, dry and bright. Deciduous trees were in full leaf. A site 'walkover' was conducted by Finn Cullerne on 6th January 2026 to update the survey information. The weather was overcast with occasional light snow and sunny spells. Deciduous trees were not in leaf.

1.4. Site description

1.4.1. The total site area is 20.72ha and is comprised of a northern and southern parcel. The northern parcel is 3.5ha in size and is located to the north of Stones Lane with the National Cycle Network Route 45 to the north-east. The southern parcel is 17.22ha in size and is located to the north of Malmesbury Road, a main route into the town from the west. Stones Lane forms the northern boundary and serves a farms and properties to the west of the site.



Figure 1: Site location shown on Google aerial image

1.4.2. The southern parcel slopes gently from its high point in the south-west corner of the site at 105m AOD, down to the north-east corner of the parcel at 90m AOD. The northern parcel is generally flat. The site is comprised of agricultural fields divided by and bounded by a series of hedgerows and tree belts.

1.4.3. Historical maps indicate that the site record that the site has remained largely unchanged agricultural land since records began.

1.5. Soil type

1.5.1. The British Geological Survey Solid and Drift Geology map of the area indicates the site overlies a bedrock of Oxford Clay Formation (mudstone), but there is no information on the likely superficial deposits. A series of three trial pit records (ref: SU09SE865 to SU09SE87) at Horsey Dwon Bridge, 80m to the northeast of the site on Stones Lane, shows a fine layer of topsoil to 0.1m below ground level (bgl) overlying stiff brown mottled clay (identified as probably Oxford Clay) to the depth of the pit at 2.5m.

1.5.2. The class of soil in this area is recorded on the Soilscape (England) maps on the Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs ('Defra') Magic website as a

slowly permeable, seasonally wet, slightly acid, but base-rich loamy and clay soil. The class of soil and the indications of the British Geological Survey map suggest that trees may be shallow-rooted and that the soil is likely to be susceptible to compaction.

1.6. Statutory controls

1.6.1. At the time of writing none of these trees are covered by a tree preservation order (TPO).

1.6.2. The site is not within a conservation area, and therefore there are no constraints relating to existing trees in this regard.

2. PLANNING CONTEXT

2.1. Planning history

2.1.1. A review of the planning history of this site on the planning section of the LPA website reveals no previous applications for development.

2.2. Planning policy - national

2.2.1. Under Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, local authorities have a statutory duty to consider the protection and planting of trees when considering planning applications. The effects of proposed development on trees are therefore a material consideration, and this is normally reflected in local planning policies.

2.2.2. The National Planning Policy Framework ('NPPF')³ sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these should be applied in both plan and decision-making. Paragraph 2 makes it clear that the NPPF is itself a material consideration in the determination of planning application. Paragraph 11 states that **"Plans and decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development."**

2.2.3. In paragraph 135, within Section 12 **"Achieving well-designed places"** the NPPF states:

"Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:

- a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;**
- b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;**
- c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built**

³ The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (December 2024). Department for Levelling Up, Housing & Communities

environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);

d) establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit;

e) optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development (including green and other public space) and support local facilities and transport networks; and

f) create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.”

2.2.4. Paragraph 136 in this section states:

“Trees make an important contribution to the character and quality of urban environments, and can also help mitigate and adapt to climate change. Planning policies and decisions should ensure that new streets are tree-lined, that opportunities are taken to incorporate trees elsewhere in developments (such as parks and community orchards), that appropriate measures are in place to secure the long-term maintenance of newly-planted trees, and that existing trees are retained wherever possible. Applicants and local planning authorities should work with highways officers and tree officers to ensure that the right trees are planted in the right places, and solutions are found that are compatible with highways standards and the needs of different users.”

2.2.5. The section titled “Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change” states at paragraph 162:

“Plans should take a proactive approach to mitigating and adapting to climate change, taking into account the long-term implications for flood risk, coastal change, water supply, biodiversity and landscapes, and the risk of overheating and drought from rising temperatures . Policies should support appropriate measures to ensure the future health and resilience of communities and infrastructure to climate change impacts, such as providing space for physical protection measures, or making provision for the possible future relocation of vulnerable development and

infrastructure.”

2.2.6. In paragraph 187, within Section 15 **“Conserving and enhancing the natural environment”** the NPPF states:

“Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:

a) protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan);

b) recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland;

[...] d) minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures and incorporating features which support priority or threatened species such as swifts, bats and hedgehogs;

e) preventing new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability. Development should, wherever possible, help to improve local environmental conditions such as air and water quality, taking into account relevant information such as river basin management plans; [...]”

2.2.7. In paragraph 193, under the **“Habitats and biodiversity”** section, the NPPF states:

2.2.8. **“When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should apply the following principles:**

c) development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists....”

2.2.9. This report will conclude whether this scheme meets the requirements of the NPPF. The publication of the draft NPPF on 16th December 2025 is noted; but as this

is only a draft and may change through the consultation process, this report does not seek to comment on how the scheme meets its suggested requirements. However, it does note the direction of travel on sustainable development and on the relationship between proposed developments and existing trees and woodlands.

2.3. Local planning policy

2.3.1. Local planning policies are contained in the adopted Wiltshire Council Core Strategy (January 2015).

2.3.2. The relevant section of Policy CP 51 of the core strategy states:

“Development should protect, conserve and where possible enhance landscape character and must not have a harmful impact upon landscape character, while any negative impacts must be mitigated as far as possible through sensitive design and landscape measures. Proposals should be informed by and sympathetic to the distinctive character areas identified in the relevant Landscape Character Assessment(s) and any other relevant assessments and studies. In particular, proposals will need to demonstrate that the following aspects of landscape character have been conserved and where possible enhanced through sensitive design, landscape mitigation and enhancement measures:

i. The locally distinctive pattern and species composition of natural features such as trees, hedgerows, woodland, field boundaries, watercourses and waterbodies.

ii. The locally distinctive character of settlements and their landscape settings (...)”

2.3.3. The relevant section of Policy CP 52 of the core strategy states, *inter alia*:

“Development shall make provision for the retention and enhancement of Wiltshire’s green infrastructure network, and shall ensure that suitable links to the network are provided and maintained. Where development is permitted developers will be required to:

i. retain and enhance existing on site green infrastructure

iii. put measures in place to ensure appropriate long-term management of any green infrastructure directly related to the development (...)

v. identify and provide opportunities to enhance and improve linkages between the

natural and historic landscapes of Wiltshire.

If damage or loss of existing green infrastructure is unavoidable, the creation of new or replacement green infrastructure equal to or above its current value and quality, that maintains the integrity and functionality of the green infrastructure network, will be required (...)

2.3.4. The relevant section of Policy CP 57 of the core strategy states:

“A high standard of design is required in all new developments, including extensions, alterations, and changes of use of existing buildings. Development is expected to create a strong sense of place through drawing on the local context and being complementary to the locality. Applications for new development must be accompanied by appropriate information to demonstrate how the proposal will make a positive contribution to the character of Wiltshire through:

i. enhancing local distinctiveness by responding to the value of the natural and historic environment, relating positively to its landscape setting and the existing pattern of development and responding to local topography by ensuring that important views into, within and out of the site are to be retained and enhanced

ii. the retention and enhancement of existing important landscaping and natural features, (e.g. trees, hedges, banks and watercourses), in order to take opportunities to enhance biodiversity, create wildlife and recreational corridors, effectively integrate the development into its setting and to justify and mitigate against any losses that may occur through the development opportunities to enhance and improve linkages between the natural and historic landscapes of Wiltshire.

If damage or loss of existing green infrastructure is unavoidable, the creation of new or replacement green infrastructure equal to or above its current value and quality, that maintains the integrity and functionality of the green infrastructure network, will be required (...)

2.4. Neighbourhood planning policy

2.4.1. The site is within the Cricklade Neighbourhood area, which is covered by the made Cricklade Neighbourhood Plan 2026. None of the policies of the plan, or the supporting text, sets out the approach in regard to arboriculture.

3. THE TREES

3.1. Survey findings

3.1.1. We surveyed 41 individual trees, ten groups of trees and ten hedgerows growing within or immediately adjacent to the site. Their details can be found in the tree survey schedule at **Appendix 2**.

3.1.2. The character of the site is one of agricultural fields bound by a network of hedgerows and tree belts. The arboricultural character of the site is of native broadleaves with the most common species likely to be hawthorn due to the extensive lengths of hedgerows; however, of the specimen trees, ash is the most common but due to the decline of the ash on site, the most dominant species in terms of contribution to the landscape is English oak.

3.1.3. The age demographic of the tree population is heavily weighted towards the semi-mature age class (66%) with only 22% being mature and the remaining 12% comprised of young trees. There are no ancient, veteran or notable trees on site. The age class distribution is reflected in the sizes of trees on site with relatively few large-canopied trees. The arboricultural character of the site is consistent with the surrounding area.

3.2. Irreplaceable habitat: ancient woodland

3.2.1. There are no woodlands within or abutting the site that are classified as 'Ancient'. Ancient woodland is defined as “**any area that's been wooded continuously since at least 1600 AD**” and is considered an important and irreplaceable habitat.

3.3. Irreplaceable habitat: ancient or veteran trees

3.3.1. There are no trees within or abutting the site that can be classified as 'Ancient' or 'Veteran'. Ancient and veteran trees are also considered to be irreplaceable habitats, and contribute to a site's biodiversity, cultural and heritage value, and the National Planning Policy Framework (see below) states that development resulting in the loss or deterioration of ancient or veteran trees should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists.

3.4. Irreplaceable habitat: ancient woodpasture or parkland

3.4.1. The Natural England Woodpasture and Parkland Inventory update shows no areas of woodpasture or parkland within or adjacent to the site.

3.5. Trees that contribute to the character of the local landscape

As noted above in Section 2.3, local planning policies require the retention of trees that are, or contribute to “**existing important landscaping and natural features.**” The individuals and groups of trees within or adjacent to the site, whose attributes we consider meet these criteria, are as follows:

- the mature English oaks (nos. 17-20) growing within the hedgerow along the south boundary of the southern parcel, which are readily visible from Common Hill;
- the established tree belt (G4), including the established ash (nos. 41 and 42), growing along the boundaries of the northeast corner of the southern site, which area readily visible from the public right of way Cric30;
- the small, wooded copse (G5) growing in the western corner of the northern parcel, which is visible from Stones Lane; and
- the off-site belt of trees (G7) growing along the raised banks of the national cycleway no. 45.

3.6. Other trees

3.6.1. Three individual trees (nos. 10, 19 and 34) are 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. However, as can be seen below, these trees are not necessarily shown to be removed as part of the proposals; some may be outside the development footprint or may be outside the red line boundary and in third-party ownership. These trees have been assessed as category ‘U’ and are indicated on the accompanying tree protection plan by **bracketed red** numbers.

3.6.2. There are nine mature trees growing on or immediately adjacent to the site; but one of these (field maple no. 14) is of species of small ultimate size. A further three are ash (nos. 11, 41 and 42) with varying degrees of infection with ash dieback, so

these are likely of medium-term potential only. The remaining 5 mature trees of large ultimate size and long-term potential, some of these are readily visible in views from public viewpoints and so make a significant contribution to the landscape; others do not.

3.6.3. There are no category 'A' trees, but there are seven 'B' specimens (nos. 6, 13, 17, 18, 20, 36 and 42). The remaining 31 trees are assessed as category 'C' trees, being either of low quality, very limited merit, only low landscape benefits, no material cultural or conservation value, or only limited or short-term potential; or young trees with trunk diameters below 150mm; or a combination of these.

3.6.4. Of the groups of trees and hedgerows, none have been assessed as category 'A', four (G3, G4, G7 and H10) as category 'B', and the remaining 16 as category 'C'.

3.7. Assessment of arboricultural impacts

3.7.1. The arboricultural impacts of the proposed Framework Plan, drawing no. 10542-RL-XX-00-DR-MP-0002-P02 have been assessed by overlaying this onto the TCP and are discussed in the following sections of this report and are shown on the tree protection plan (TPP) presented at **Appendix 4**.

3.7.2. The TPP identifies the groups of trees and hedgerows to be removed to accommodate the proposed development, either because they are situated within the footprints of proposed structures or surfaces, or because in our judgment they are too close to these structures or surfaces to enable them to be retained. These are shown by means of **red dashed lines** on the TPP.

3.7.3. The TPP also shows how trees to be retained will be protected from damage during construction, and the measures identified are set out and described in the outline arboricultural method statement at **Appendix 2** of this report. The implementation of, and adherence to, these measures can readily be secured by the imposition of appropriate planning conditions.

3.7.4. Details of the impacts identified within these categories, and our assessment of their respective significance, are analysed in Sections 4 to 8 below.

3.7.5. Based on these findings, we have assessed the magnitude of the overall

arboricultural impact of the proposals according to the categories defined in **Table 1** below.

Impact	Description
High	Total loss of or major alteration to main elements/ features/ characteristics of the baseline, post-development situation fundamentally different
Medium	Partial loss of or alteration to main elements/ features/ characteristics of the baseline, post-development situation will be partially changed
Low	Minor loss of or alteration to main elements/ features/ characteristics of the baseline, post-development changes will be discernible but the underlying situation will remain similar to the baseline
Negligible	Very minor loss of or alteration to main elements/ features/ characteristics of the baseline, post-development changes will be barely discernible, approximating to the 'no change' situation

Table 1: Magnitude of impacts⁴

⁴ Determination of magnitude based on DETR (2000) Guidance on the Methodology for Multi-Modal Studies, as modified and extended.

4. TREES TO BE REMOVED

4.1. Details

4.1.1. To accommodate the proposed development, as shown on the proposed layout plan, none of the individually surveyed trees are to be removed; however, sections of five hedgerows are to be removed to accommodate access and internal connectivity.

4.1.2. Details of the hedgerow sections to be removed, including their dimensions, age class and British Standard categorisation, are shown and listed on the TPP and at **Table 2** below.

Tree no.	Species	Height	Trunk diameter	Age class	BS category	Length to be removed
G8	Various	Max 12m Avg 9m	Min 75mm Avg 275mm	Various	C (23)	12m section removed equating to 9% of feature
H2	Various	Min 1m Avg 1.5m	Max 200mm Avg 50mm	Semi-mature	C (3)	15m section removed equating to 6% of feature
H3	Various	Min 1m Avg 1.5m	Max 200mm Avg 50mm	Semi-mature	C (13)	3 sections removed: 10m, 20m and 15m equating to 15% of the feature
H6	Various	Min 2m Avg 3m	Max 200mm Avg 170mm	Various	C (123)	30m section removed, equating to 9% of the feature
H9	Various	1m	Max 175mm Avg 95mm	Semi-mature	C (13)	6m section removed, equating to 4% of the feature

Table 2: Sections of hedgerow to be removed

4.2. Assessment

4.2.1. As there are no ancient or veteran trees on site, none will be removed.

4.2.2. All those trees or groups of trees that make a significant contribution to the character and appearance of the local landscape, to amenity or to biodiversity (see paragraph 3.2.1), will be retained.

4.2.3. The proposed sections of hedgerow to be removed are to accommodate the main site access from Common Hill and for the connectivity of pedestrian, cycle and vehicular routes across the site with a pedestrian only link to the northern parcel. The proposals retained the majority of the hedgerows on site, and the proposed removals,

will largely be mitigated by the retention of the remaining lengths along with replacement hedgerow planting elsewhere on the site.

4.2.4. As the hedgerows are squat features, the visual impact of the sections to be removed will be largely screened in views from the surrounding public realm (roads and public rights of ways) by the retained vegetation. The access points into the site from Common Hill and from Stones Lane will be more visible, but the arboricultural character of hedgerow lined roads with occasional specimen trees will be retained.

4.2.5. None of the trees to be removed are mature specimens of species of large ultimate size: all the sections of hedgerow to be cleared are young, semi-mature or of small ultimate size. The significance of this is threefold. Firstly, for obvious reasons mature trees tend to be larger in size and therefore are likely to be more visible and to make a greater contribution to the landscape. Secondly, mature trees are more likely to have formed associations with wildlife and to support other flora or fauna (for example, young trees infrequently contain splits, cracks or cavities that might provide roosting sites for bats); and thirdly, mature trees have a significantly greater capacity than smaller trees to actively sequester and store carbon⁵. Accordingly, the removal of no large mature trees on or adjacent to the site minimises the impacts on the benefits that mature trees provide in relation to smaller ones.

4.2.6. None of the individual trees to be removed are covered by a TPO (see 1.6.1 above).

4.2.7. In the light of these considerations, and taking account of the numbers, sizes and locations of the trees to be retained, including those that are off-site, the felling of sections of five hedgerows will represent no alteration to the main arboricultural features of the site and only a minor alteration to the wider arboricultural character of the site.

⁵ Stephenson N. L., Das A. J., Zavala M. A. (2014) Rate of tree carbon accumulation increases continuously with tree size. *Nature*, volume 507.

5. TREES TO BE PRUNED

5.1. Details

5.1.1. None of the retained trees to be retained are to be pruned to facilitate implementation of the proposals.

5.2. Assessment

5.2.1. As the plans and level of detail are appropriate to an outline application, there is insufficient detail to undertake a detailed assessment of the relationship between the proposed dwellings and the retained canopies.

5.2.2. Our assessment based on the Framework Plan highlights that there is sufficient clearance (15m at its closest) between the residential development and the retained tree canopies to ensure adequate space to accommodate construction, future canopy growth and to avoid future pressure that would lead to inappropriate attempts to prune or fell the retained trees.

5.2.3. These trees will continue to grow; but an analysis of the ultimate genetic crown spreads of these specimens shows that none of them are likely to ever need pruning to keep them clear of the proposed dwellings as they are at a greater distance from them than the spread, they are capable of achieving.

6. ROOT PROTECTION AREA INCURSIONS

6.1. Details

6.1.1. To ascertain whether the proposals will cause any significant harm to the roots or the rooting environments of the trees to be retained, we have calculated appropriate root protection areas ('RPAs') for these specimens, based as a minimum on the methodology set out in section 4.6 of BS5837: 2012. The RPA is defined in this document as a **"layout design tool indicating the minimum area around a tree deemed to contain sufficient roots and rooting volume to maintain the tree's viability; and where the protection of the roots and soil structure is treated as a priority"**.⁶

6.1.2. Consequently, a tree within the RPA of which no disturbance will occur can be regarded as one that will not suffer any significant or long-lasting harm because of the proposals and will therefore remain 'viable'.

6.1.3. No parts of any proposed buildings or associated hard surfacing are within the RPAs of any of the trees to be retained.

6.2. Assessment

6.2.1. As no parts of the proposed dwellings or other structures abut or are within the RPAs of any of the trees to be retained, subject to the implementation of protective measures specified below and on the TPP, their construction will not cause unacceptable damage to roots or rooting environments as a result of root severance or damage, or compaction or pollution of the soil.

⁶ British Standard BS 5837:2012. Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations; para. 3.7.

7. RELATIONSHIP OF RETAINED TREES TO NEW DWELLINGS

7.1. Shading

7.1.1. As the plans and level of detail are appropriate to an outline application, there is insufficient detail to undertake an assessment of the relationship between the retained trees and the proposed dwellings. However, a review of the Framework Plan highlights that the proposed development parcels are located outside of the shadow patterns of retained trees (a shading arc between the north-west and the east extending to the same distance as the height of the tree).

7.1.2. Therefore, it is highly unlikely that new dwellings will be shaded by retained trees to the extent that this will interfere with their reasonable use or enjoyment by incoming occupiers; which might otherwise lead to future occupants foreseeably seeking to prune or fell trees to mitigate tree related shading issues.

7.2. Apprehension

7.2.1. Apprehension in relation to trees occurs normally with residents or occupiers who live beneath or close to the crowns of large trees, and become fearful that branches, stems or even a whole tree could fail and harm them or their property. Consequently, this is most likely to occur if trees are large, particularly in relation to the size or height of the houses or apartments in which the resident lives, if properties are located close to or even beneath their crowns, and if there has been a history of recent failures nearby. Other factors might include the wind exposure of the tree concerned, the orientation of the property in relation to the tree and the prevailing winds, and the noise made by the tree as the wind passes through the crown (there can be significant differences in the type and volume of noise made by wind as it passes through trees).

7.2.2. In this case apprehension is most unlikely to be common, or to be of a degree that might result in future occupants seeking to inappropriately prune or fell trees as a result. This is because the dwellings within the residential development areas in the concept masterplan can be designed to be no closer than 15m from the trunks of any retained large-canopies trees (of any age class), which ensures that the canopies of

these trees will not grow in close proximity to the buildings, nor will they over shadow or dominate the windows of the properties or amenity spaces, which ensures that relationship between the future occupants and the retained canopies will not result in foreseeable apprehension.

7.3. Future requests for consent to fell

7.3.1. Former government advice, contained in the DETR “Blue Book”⁷, stated at paragraph 5.11 (1) (ii) that **“incoming occupiers of properties will want trees to be in harmony with their surroundings without casting excessive shade or otherwise unreasonably interfering with their prospects of reasonably enjoying their property. Layouts may require careful adjustment to prevent trees from causing unreasonable inconvenience, leading inevitably to requests for consents to fell.”**⁸

7.3.2. This document was superseded in March 2014 by online government guidance on ‘Tree Preservation Orders and trees in conservation areas’ (www.gov.uk); but this remains sound advice. It suggests that for there to be requests for removal, all the following elements should be capable of being demonstrated:

- That the proximity of retained trees to the proposed development is unreasonable, taking account of their size, species, orientation, growth and other relevant factors;
- That requests for consent to fell or unacceptably or repeatedly prune retained trees will inevitably be forthcoming from future occupiers, rather than merely being possible;
- That such future pressure will be for the felling or heavy pruning of the trees concerned, rather than for minor pruning or tree surgery work; and finally
- That such requests to fell or prune could not reasonably be refused by the LPA.

7.3.3. Based on the above factors, there is no indication that there will be a foreseeable risk of future pressure to remove the trees. Furthermore, if thought

⁷ (2000) Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions (2000). Tree Preservation Orders – A guide to the Law and Good Practice. *Building Research Establishment*

⁸ British Standard BS 8206: Part 2 (1992). *British Standards Institute*.

necessary, the LPA could make a TPO prior to occupation so that any intention to prune would require a Regulation 14 tree work application to be submitted.

7.3.4. Accordingly, the proposals comply with British Standard guidance on the likely impacts of the existing trees on the proposed development, as set out at paragraph 5.3.4.

8. MITIGATION AND BENEFITS

8.1. Replacement planting

8.1.1. Apart from the complete absence of alteration to the main arboricultural features of the site as set out above, the proposals incorporate considerable space to accommodate replacement tree planting.

8.1.2. This will increase the number of trees on site, which once established will enhance the local landscape and strengthen the existing arboricultural framework of the site for the ongoing and long-term character of the site. The planting proposals will also provide replacement hedgerow planting equal to the lengths of hedgerow removed.

8.2. Tree and hedgerow management

8.2.1. The proposals will have benefits on those trees and hedgerows to be retained, in that it will prompt an enhanced frequency and standard of management, possibly including supplemental watering, mulching and formative pruning; and may benefit from proposed buildings that provide wind shelter and thus lower physical or structural stress.

8.2.2. Compared to the current agricultural environment of the trees, the proposed development will prevent exposure to agrochemical spraying and fertilizer runoff, and it will protect them from livestock browsing and intensive soil compaction common in fields.

8.2.3. In addition, the proposals will allow the trees to contribute to surface water runoff and to the prevention of soil erosion, it will maintain and continue to provide wildlife habitat, and it will allow the trees to continue to sequester and store carbon.

9. CONCLUSIONS

9.1. Summary

9.1.1. There is no ancient woodland, woodpasture or parkland within or abutting the site and consequently the proposals will cause no loss of or harm to irreplaceable habitat.

9.1.2. Our assessment of the impacts of the proposals on the existing trees concludes that all trees are to be retained, including those that are mature, assessed as category 'B' trees, or of high landscape or biodiversity value. The proposed sections of the five hedgerows to be removed will represent no alteration to the main arboricultural features of the site, only a minor alteration to the overall arboricultural character of the site and will not have an adverse impact on the arboricultural character and appearance of the local landscape.

9.1.3. The potential locations of the proposed dwellings and their associated private gardens are not likely to be shaded by retained trees to the extent that this will interfere with their reasonable use or enjoyment by incoming occupiers, which might otherwise lead to pressure on the Local Planning Authority to permit felling or severe pruning that it could not reasonably resist.

9.1.4. There will be no incursions into the Root Protection Areas (RPAs) of any of the trees to be retained.

9.1.5. The potential locations of the proposed dwellings and their associated private gardens are not likely to be shaded by retained trees to the extent that this will interfere with their reasonable use or enjoyment by incoming occupiers, which might otherwise lead to pressure on the Local Planning Authority to permit felling or severe pruning that it could not reasonably resist.

9.2. Compliance with national planning policy

9.2.1. As the proposals will retain all the trees that make an important or significant contribution to the character of the local landscape, the site's arboricultural attractiveness, history, landscape character and setting will be maintained, thereby complying with Paragraph 135 (c) of the National Planning Policy Framework.

9.2.2. Although some trees are to be removed, there is no duty in planning policy to retain all existing trees in all circumstances. Paragraph 136 of the NPPF states (*italics added for emphasis*): “**Planning policies and decisions should ensure... that existing trees are retained wherever possible**”; and thereby recognises circumstances in which it might not be possible to retain every tree. Accordingly, the proposed removal of trees does not mean that this application must thereby be refused; and does not mean it conflicts with this paragraph of the NPPF.

9.2.3. The proposals do not necessitate the removal of any mature trees of large ultimate size, which make the greatest contribution to carbon sequestration and storage, surface water run-off, biodiversity and landscape and air temperature and cleanliness; for all of which, appropriate space for their retention is provided. Accordingly, insofar as this relates to existing trees, the scheme can be seen to have taken a proactive approach to mitigating climate change and thereby complies with Paragraph 162 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

9.2.4. As the proposals will not result in the loss or deterioration of any ancient woodland or any ancient or veteran trees, they comply with paragraph 193 (c) of the NPPF.

9.3. Compliance with local planning policy

9.3.1. As the proposed development, does not remove trees that significantly contribute to the landscape character, the locally distinctive pattern of trees and tree belts are preserved and the arboricultural contribution to the local green network is protected. As such, it complies with Policies CP51, CP52 and GP57 of the adopted Wiltshire Council Core Strategy (January 2015).

9.4. Conclusion

9.4.1. On the basis of our assessment, we conclude that the arboricultural impact of this scheme is of negligible magnitude, as defined according to the categories set out in **Table 1** of this report.

APPENDIX 1

Methodology

A1.1. Tree survey and baseline information

A1.1.1. We surveyed individual trees with trunk diameters of 75mm and above⁹, trees with trunk diameters of 150mm and above growing in groups or woodlands, and shrub masses, hedges and hedgerows¹⁰ growing within or immediately adjacent to the site; and recorded their locations, species, dimensions, ages, condition, and visual importance in accordance with BS 5837 recommendations.

A1.1.2. The baseline information collected during the site survey was recorded on site using a hand-held digital device. This information was then imported into an Excel spreadsheet and used to produce the tree survey schedule at **Appendix 3**. The numbers assigned to the trees in the tree survey schedule correspond with those shown on the appended tree locations and protection plans.

A1.1.3. We surveyed trees as groups where they have grown together to form cohesive arboricultural features, either aerodynamically (trees that provide companion shelter), visually (e.g., avenues or screens) or culturally¹¹. However, where it might be necessary to differentiate between specific trees within these groups, we also surveyed these individually.

A1.1.4. We inspected the trees from the ground only, aided by binoculars as appropriate, but did not climb them. We took no samples of wood, roots or fungi. We did not undertake a full hazard or risk assessment of the trees, and therefore can give no guarantee, either expressed or implied, of their safety or stability.

A1.1.5. We categorised the trees in accordance with BS 5837 (details of the criteria used for this process can be found in the notes that accompany the tree survey schedule); but we also assessed the trees' suitability for retention against national, and local planning policies. We applied this methodology in line with the NPPF's presumption in favour of sustainable development, giving greater weighting to the contribution of a tree to the character and appearance of the local landscape, to amenity, or to biodiversity, where its removal might have a significant adverse impact on these factors.

A1.2. Tree constraints

A1.2.1. In line with the NPPF's presumption in favour of sustainable development, we assessed whether any trees should be retained in the context of the proposed development. Our assessment of which trees might have to be retained, and which can be removed, is based on:

A1.2.2. whether any trees are classed as 'ancient' or 'veteran', and thereby are

⁹ BS 5837, paragraph 4.2.4 b), recommends that all trees over 75mm stem diameter should be included in a pre-planning land and tree survey.

¹⁰ Ibid., 4.4.2.7

¹¹ Ibid., 4.4.2.3

designated as 'irreplaceable habitats';¹²

A1.2.3. which trees contribute to local character and history, including to the surrounding landscape setting; which trees contribute to biodiversity; and which trees help mitigate and adapt to climate change; and whose removal would thereby be unlikely to comply with national planning policy guidance;

A1.2.4. which trees are important to the local landscape, such that their removal would be contrary to local planning policies: specifically, Policies CP 51, 52 and 57 of the Wiltshire Local Plan, as set out above;

A1.2.5. our assessment of the trees' quality, value and remaining life expectancy, in accordance with BS5837:2012, as summarised in the notes that accompany the tree survey schedule.

A1.2.6. As trees growing outside the boundaries of the site are in the control of others, we have assumed they will be retained, irrespective of their size, age or condition.

A1.2.7. Although we have categorised trees in accordance with BS 5837, we have not used these categorisations as the main criterion of whether specimens might be removed or should be retained. Trees in categories 'A', 'B' and 'C' are all a material consideration in the development process; but the retention of category 'C' trees, being of low quality or of only limited or short-term potential, will not normally be considered necessary should they impose a significant constraint on development.

A1.2.8. Furthermore, BS 5837 makes it clear that young trees, even those of good form and vitality, which have the potential to develop into quality specimens when mature **"need not necessarily be a significant constraint on the site's potential"**¹³.

A1.2.9. Moreover, BS 5837 states that **".... care should be taken to avoid misplaced tree retention; attempts to retain too many or unsuitable trees on a site can result in excessive pressure on the trees during demolition or construction work, or post-completion demands for their removal"**¹⁴.

A1.2.10. The 'Root Protection Areas' (RPAs)¹⁵ of the trees identified for retention were calculated in accordance with Section 4.6 of BS 5837; and were assessed taking account of factors such as the likely tolerance of a tree to root disturbance or damage, the morphology and disposition of roots as influenced by existing site conditions (including the presence of existing roads or structures), as well as soil type, topography and drainage. Where considered appropriate, the shapes of the RPAs (although not their areas) were modified based on these considerations, so

¹² The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (December 2024). Paragraph 193 (c).

¹³ BS 5837, 4.5.10.

¹⁴ Ibid., 5.1.1.

¹⁵ Ibid., paragraph 3.7. "The minimum area around a retained tree "deemed to contain sufficient roots and rooting volume to maintain the tree's viability, and where the protection of the roots and soil structure is treated as a priority."

that they reflect more accurately the likely root distribution of the relevant trees.

A1.2.11. To assess whether the trees identified for retention would be in a sustainable relationship with proposed dwellings (without casting excessive shade or otherwise unreasonably interfering with incoming residents' prospects of enjoying their properties, and thereby leading inevitably to requests for consents to fell), we plotted a segment or "shading arc" from each trunk, with a radius equal to the current height of the tree concerned, from due north-west to due east. This gave an indication of potential direct obstruction of sunlight and the shadow pattern cast through the main part of the day¹⁶.

A1.2.12. Based on these principles and recommendations, the tree survey and assessment of suitability for retention informed the production of a tree constraints plan (TCP) which indicates the most suitable trees for retention, and their associated below-ground and above-ground constraints.

A1.2.13. As a design tool, the TCP also indicates how close to those trees selected for retention the proposed development could be positioned, in terms of three key criteria:

- a). avoidance of unacceptable root damage;
- b). avoidance of the necessity for unacceptable pruning works; and
- c). avoidance of future felling or pruning works to prevent unacceptable shading or apprehension on behalf of the occupants.

¹⁶ Ibid., paragraph 5.2.2 Note 1.

APPENDIX 2

Outline Arboricultural Method Statement

A2.1. Tree Protection Plan

A2.1.1. The TPP at Appendix 4 shows the general and specific provisions to be taken during construction of the proposed development, to ensure that no unacceptable damage is caused to the root systems, trunks or crowns of the trees identified for retention. These measures are indicated by coloured notations in areas where construction activities are to occur either within, or in proximity to, retained trees, as described in the relevant panels on the drawing.

A2.2. Pre-start meeting

A2.2.1. Prior to the commencement of any **site clearance, ground preparation, or** construction works the developer will convene a pre-start site meeting. This shall be attended by the developer's contract manager or site manager, the fencing/boarding contractor, the groundwork contractor(s) and the arboricultural consultant. The LPA tree officer will be invited to attend. At that meeting contact numbers will be exchanged, and the methods of tree protection shall be fully discussed, so that all aspects of their implementation and sequencing are made clear to all parties. Any clarifications or modifications to the TPP required as a result of the meeting shall be circulated to all attendees.

A2.3. Site clearance

A2.3.1. No clearance of trees or other vegetation shall be undertaken until after the pre-start meeting and after the erection of the tree protection fencing (see below). If any vegetation clearance is required behind the line of the protection fencing this will be made clear at the pre-start meeting and arrangements will be made to do this prior to the fencing's erection, under the supervision of the arboricultural consultant, who will ensure it doesn't cause any soil compaction or damage to the roots of trees to be retained.

A2.3.2. Except where within the RPAs of trees to be retained, all trees and other vegetation to be removed may be cut down or grubbed out as appropriate; but within the RPAs of trees to be retained, trees and vegetation will be cut by hand to ground level and stumps will be either left in place or ground out with a lightweight self-powered stump grinding machine. No excavators, tractors or other vehicles will enter the RPAs.

A2.4. Ground preparation

A2.4.1. No ground preparation or excavation of any kind, including topsoil stripping or ground levelling, shall be undertaken until after the pre-start meeting and after the erection of the tree protection fencing (see below).

A2.5. Tree protection fencing

A2.5.1. Construction exclusion zones (CEZs) will be formed by erecting protective fencing around the RPAs of all on-site trees to the specification recommended in BS 5837, Section 6.2, prior to the commencement of construction. This will consist of a scaffold framework comprising a vertical and horizontal framework, well braced to resist impacts, with vertical tubes spaced at maximum intervals of 3.5m. Onto this,

welded mesh panels should be securely fixed with wire or scaffold clamps, as shown in **Figure 2** of that document. "**TREE PROTECTION ZONE - KEEP OUT**" or similar notices will be attached with cable ties to every third panel.

A2.5.2. The RPAs of the off-site trees will also be enforced by the erection of protective fencing to the same specification, prior to the commencement of construction, thereby safeguarding them from incursions by plant or machinery, storage and mixing of materials, or other construction-related activities which could have a detrimental effect on their root systems.

A2.5.3. The recommended positions of the protective fencing are shown by **bold blue lines** on the TPP. The precise positioning of the fencing around the trees will be considered in conjunction with any other protective hoarding/fencing which may be required around the site boundary.

A2.5.4. Within the CEZs safeguarded by the protective fencing, there will be no changes in ground levels, **no soil stripping**, and no plant, equipment, or materials will be stored. Oil, bitumen, diesel, and cement will not be stored or discharged within 10m of any trees. Areas for the storage or mixing of such materials will be agreed in advance and be clearly marked. No notice boards, or power or telephone cables, will be attached to any of the trees. No fires will be lit within 10m of any part of any tree.

APPENDIX 3

Tree Survey Schedule



ARBORICULTURAL PLANNING CONSULTANTS

THE OLD POST OFFICE
DORKING ROAD
TADWORTH
SURREY KT20 5SA

Tel: (01737) 813058
E-mail: sja@sjatrees.co.uk

Directors: Simon R. M. Jones Dip. Arb. (RFS), FArborA.,
RCArborA. (Managing)
Frank P. S. Spooner BSc (Hons), MArborA, TechCert (ArborA)
(Operations)

Preliminary Tree Survey Schedule

Land North of Malmesbury Road, Cricklade

January 2026

SJA ref: 25636-01

Tree Survey Schedule: Explanatory Notes

Land North of Malmesbury Road, Cricklade

This schedule is based on a tree inspection undertaken by Finn Cullerne of SJA trees (the trading name of Simon Jones Associates Ltd.), on Tuesday 23rd August 2022 and Thursday 20th July 2023. Weather conditions at both times the time were clear, dry and bright. Deciduous trees were in full leaf. A site 'walkover' was conducted by Finn Cullerne on 6th January 2026 to update the survey information. The weather was overcast with occasional light snow and sunny spells. Deciduous trees were not in leaf.

The information contained in this schedule covers only those trees that were examined, and reflects the condition of these specimens at the time of inspection. We did not have access to the trees from any adjacent properties; observations are thus confined to what was visible from within the site and from surrounding public areas.

The trees were inspected from the ground only and were not climbed, and no samples of wood, roots or fungi were taken. A full hazard or risk assessment of the trees was not undertaken, and therefore no guarantee, either expressed or implied, of their safety or stability can be given.

Trees are dynamic organisms and are subject to continual growth and change; therefore the dimensions and assessments presented in this schedule should not be relied upon in relation to any development of the site for more than twelve months from the survey date.

1. Tree no.

Given in sequential order, commencing at "1".

2. Species.

'Common names' are given, taken from MITCHELL, A. (1978) A Field Guide to the Trees of Britain and Northern Europe.

3. Height.

Estimated with the aid of a hypsometer, given in metres.

4. Trunk diameter.

Trunk diameter measured at approx. 1.5m above ground level; or where the trunk forks into separate stems between ground level and 1.5m, measured at the narrowest point beneath the fork. Given in millimetres.

5. Radial crown spread.

The linear extent of branches from the base of the trunk to the main cardinal points, rounded up to the closest half metre, unless shown otherwise. For small trees with reasonably symmetrical crowns, a single averaged figure is quoted.

6. Crown break.

Height above ground and direction of growth of first significant live branch.

7. Crown clearance.

Distance from adjacent ground level to lowest part of lowest branch, in metres.

8. Age class.

Young: Seedling, sapling or recently planted tree; not yet producing flowers or seeds; strong apical dominance.

Semi-mature: Trunk often still smooth-barked; producing flowers and/or seeds; strong apical dominance, not yet achieved ultimate height.

Mature: Apical dominance lost, tree close to ultimate height.

Over-mature: Mature, but in decline, no crown retrenchment

Veteran: Mature, with a large trunk diameter for species; but showing signs of veteranisation, irrespective of actual age, with decay or hollowing, and a crown showing retrenchment and a structure characteristic of the latter stages of life.

Ancient: Beyond the typical age range and with a very large trunk diameter for species; with extensive decay or hollowing; and a crown that has undergone retrenchment and has a structure characteristic of the latter stages of life.

9. Physiology.

Health, condition and function of the tree, in comparison to a normal specimen of its species and age.

10. Structure.

Structural condition of the tree – based on both the structure of its roots, trunk and major stems and branches, and on the presence of any structural defects or decay.

Good: No significant morphological or structural defects, and an upright and reasonably symmetrical structure.

Moderate: No significant pathological defects, but a slightly impaired morphological structure; however, not to the extent that the tree is at immediate or early risk of collapse.

Indifferent: Significant morphological or pathological defects; but these are either remediable or do not put the tree at immediate or early risk of collapse.

Poor: Significant and irreparable morphological or pathological defects, such that there may be a risk of failure or collapse.

Hazardous: Significant and irreparable morphological or pathological defects, with a risk of imminent collapse.

11. Comments.

Where appropriate comments have been made relating to:

- Health and condition
- Safety, particularly close to areas of public access
- Structure and form
- Estimated life expectancy or potential
- Visibility and impact in the local landscape

12. Category.

Based on the British Standard "Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations", BS 5837: 2012; adjusted to give a greater weighting to trees that contribute to the character and appearance of the local landscape, to amenity, or to arboricultural biodiversity.

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.

- (1) 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).
- (2) Trees that are dead or are showing signs of significant, immediate, and irreversible overall decline.
- (3) 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.

Category A: Trees of high quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 40 years.

- (1) Trees that are particularly good examples of their species, especially if rare or unusual.
- (2) Trees, groups or woodlands of particular visual importance as arboricultural and/or landscape features.
- (3) Trees, groups or woodlands of significant conservation, historical, commemorative or other value.

Category B: Trees of moderate quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 20 years.

- (1) 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 minor 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.
- (2) Trees present in numbers, usually growing as groups or woodlands, such that they form distinct landscape features, thereby attracting a higher collective rating than they might as individuals; or trees present in numbers but situated so as to make little visual contribution to the wider locality.
- (3) 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 150mm.

- (1) Unremarkable trees of very limited merit or of such impaired condition that they do not qualify in higher categories.
- (2) 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 landscape benefits.
- (3) Trees with no material limited conservation or other cultural value.

TREE SURVEY SCHEDULE

Land North of Malmesbury Road, Cricklade

No.	Species	Height	Trunk diameter	Radial crown spread	Crown break	Crown clearance	Age class	Physio -logy	Structure	Comments	Category
1	Ash	8m	255mm 265mm 195mm 220mm all ivy	N 6.7m E 6.5m S 5.4m W 5.2m	0m	2m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Multi-stemmed ash from ground level, tight basal unions with visibility obscured by ivy and dense undergrowth; lapsed coppice specimen; squat, spreading canopy; readily visible from Stones Lane but not prominent or significant in the local landscape.	C (23)
2	Ash	8.5m	375mm	N 5m E 5.1m S 4.1m W 4.4m	2.5m	2m	Semi-mature	Below average	Moderate	No significant defects observed at base; single upright trunk; main visible unions tensile; densely foliated inner canopy with sparse outer canopy with established tip dieback; of reduced physiological condition; readily visible from Stones Lane but not prominent or significant in the local landscape.	C (123)
3	Common lime	5m	205mm	2.8m	1.5m	2m	Semi-mature	Average	Moderate	Off-site tree; of moderate quality, but currently of low value due to small size; specimen is at the end of a road side row of limes within the highway verge to the NW; individually of limited value but contributes to a juvenile lime row along the south side of Stones Lane.	C (12)
4	Field maple	7m	6 stems @ 130mm est.	NE 3.5m SE 4.5m SW 2m W 4.5m	1m	3m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Off-site tree; field maple standard growing within hedgerow; no access so measurements estimated; multi-stemmed from ground level with tight union; small specimen of limited landscape consequence.	C (23)
5	Ash	7.5m	3 stems @ 220mm est.	N 4m E 4m S 1m W 4m	0m	3m	Semi-mature	Below average	Indifferent	Off-site tree; unremarkable tree of very limited merit.	C (3)
6	English oak	11m	500mm est.	NE 7m SE 6.5m SW 5.5m NW 7m	2.5m	2.5m	Mature	Average	Moderate	Off-site tree; no access so all measurements estimated; of at least moderate quality with no significant visible defects in views from road; readily visible from Stones Lane and contributes to the green character of the landscape.	B (1)
7	Field maple	6.4m	5 stems @ 140mm est.	3.5m	0m	2m	Semi-mature	Average	Poor	Field maple growing within hedgerow; no access to stems due to dense hedgerow; multi-stemmed from 1m with tight, weak unions; small specimen of limited landscape but contributing to continuity of hedgerow.	C (3)
8	Field maple	5.5m	335mm	N 4m E 2.9m S 3.8m W 3.4m	1m	2m	Semi-mature	Average	Moderate	Off-site tree; surface roots exposed 2m from trunk; established specimen within hedgerow; of no more than moderate quality; evidence of compacted earth from grazing animals around base; readily visible across fields and from PRoW Cric30	C (1)

No.	Species	Height	Trunk diameter	Radial crown spread	Crown break	Crown clearance	Age class	Physio -logy	Structure	Comments	Category
9	Field maple	5m	365mm	3.7m	3m	2m	Semi-mature	Below average	Indifferent	Hedgerow standard with short, squat canopy; exhibiting drought stress; unremarkable tree of very limited merit.	C (3)
10	Ash	8m	400mm ivy est.	1.7m	1m	3m	Semi-mature	Low	Poor	Heavily ivy-covered impeding full visual inspection; stag headed, dead upper canopy; small area of live canopy on lower E canopy with small leaflet development; in significant, immediate & irreversible overall decline.	U (3)
11	Ash	10m	500mm	N 3m NE 4.6m E 3.9m S 4.6m SW 6.5m W 4.6m	2.5m	3.5m	Mature	Below average	Indifferent	Surface roots exposed 4m from trunk with prominent buttress roots to S and large diameter surface roots (150mm) growing along soil bund and field boundary hedge; extensive grazing and trample damage on roots and lower trunk; heavily compacted soil; 200mm diameter wound at 2.5m on N trunk with decayed internal wood exposed; epicormic growth and dense internal canopy; sparse outer canopy with significant deadwood development and significant tip dieback consistent with progressed ash dieback or significant physiological decline; of low arboricultural quality with reduced life expectancy; readily visible across fields, but contribution to arboricultural character limited by low quality.	C (3)
12	Hawthorn	3.5m	3 stems @ 95mm	N 2.6m E 2m S 1.8m W 2m	0.5m	2m	Young	Average	Indifferent	Off-site tree; young tree with stem diameter below 150mm; unremarkable tree of very limited merit.	C (1)
13	English oak	10m	475mm est.	6.5m	3m	3m	Semi-mature	Average	Moderate	Off-site tree; no access to base so all trunk diameter and off-site measurements estimated; single upright trunk; main visible unions tensile; free from significant observable defects; of moderate quality, but screened in views from Common Hill (B4040).	B (1)
14	Field maple	11m	360mm 350mm est.	NE 4.6m SE 6m SW 5m NW 5.8m	0m	0m	Mature	Average	Indifferent	Off-site tree; growing within boundary hedge; no access to base with off-site measurements estimated; visibility of lower stems obscured by dense hedge cut low canopy; twin-stemmed from 0.5m with tight union; squat, spreading canopy; canopy on high ground resulting in visibility in long range views to E, but lacking prominence due to small size.	C (23)
16	Blackthorn	6.5m	165mm ivy	2.8m	2m	2.5m	Semi-mature	Average	Moderate	Heavily ivy-covered impeding full visual inspection; unremarkable tree of very limited merit.	C (1)
17	English oak	12m	880mm ivy	N 7.1m NE 6m E 7.8m S 7.2m W 6.7m NW 7.8m	2.5m	2m	Mature	Average	Moderate	Off-site tree; heavily ivy-covered impeding full visual inspection; no significant defects observed at base; single upright trunk; deadwood typical of species and age; main union tensile; squat, spreading canopy; significant component of the S site boundary; readily visible from the B4040 and contributing to the treed character of the area.	B (12)

No.	Species	Height	Trunk diameter	Radial crown spread	Crown break	Crown clearance	Age class	Physio -logy	Structure	Comments	Category
18	English oak	14m	815mm	N 7.2m E 6.5m S 7.8m W 8.6m	1.75m	2.5m	Mature	Average	Moderate	Off-site tree growing within boundary hedgerow; small 100mm wide, 300mm tall wound between buttress roots on N trunk base exposing sound internal wood and established wound wood response; tight compression union on low lateral branch union to trunk at 1.5m; remaining main unions tensile; ivy-covered; squat, spreading canopy; deadwood typical of species and age; crossing branches noted; significant component of the S boundary, readily visible from B4040; contributes to the character of the road.	B (12)
19	English oak	10m	600mm ivy est.	5.5m	3m	4m	Over-mature	Dead	Dead	Off-site tree; dead oak with spreading stag heads.	U (1)
20	English oak	12m	810mm ivy	N 5.4m E 6.7m S 5.9m W 9m	3m	2.5m	Mature	Average	Moderate	Off-site tree; dense established ivy on trunk, increasing trunk diameter and impeding full visual inspection; single upright trunk; main unions tensile; squat, spreading canopy; significant component of the S boundary, readily visible from the B4040 and contributes to the treed character of the road; consistent with the surrounding arboricultural character of the area.	B (12)
21-22	#21 Blackthorn and #22 Hawthorn	3m	#T21 2 stems @ 65mm #T22 3 stems @ 60mm 80mm	N 2m E 1.5m S 0.5m W 1.5m	0.5m	0.5m	Young	Average	Indifferent	Small, heavily suppressed canopies; unremarkable trees of very limited merit.	C (1)

No.	Species	Height	Trunk diameter	Radial crown spread	Crown break	Crown clearance	Age class	Physio -logy	Structure	Comments	Category
23-28	Ash	10m	#T23 235mm #T24 90mm 130mm 210mm #T25 160mm 3 stems @ 120mm 100mm #T26 160mm 140mm 265mm #T27 90mm 2 stems @ 165mm #T28 270mm 145mm 2 stems @ 90mm	4.7m	0m	1.5m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Off-site trees; dense linear row of ash with scattered dead elm (x4); understorey of blackthorn, hawthorn, ivy and rose; multi-stemmed ash, nos. 23 to 27 consistent with historically coppiced specimens with semi-mature regrowth; tall, drawn-up stems at risk of windthrow if companion support removed; mutually suppressed canopies forming single green mass in views from the surrounding landscape; of low to moderate quality; readily visible from B4040 and contributes to the treed character of the road, but of limited individual landscape impact due to small size.	C (23)
29	Hawthorn	4m	200mm ivy est.	N 3.8m E 3m S 3m W 3m	1.5m	2m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Off-site tree; no access so all measurements estimated; unremarkable tree of very limited merit.	C (1)
30-32	Sycamore	7.5m	#T30 260mm est. #T31 140mm ivy #T32 160mm	3.5m	2m	2m	Semi-mature	Below average	Moderate	Off-site trees; foliage showing signs of drought stress, likely temporary; of moderate quality, but currently of low value due to small size; of screening value; no access so all measurements estimated.	C (1)

No.	Species	Height	Trunk diameter	Radial crown spread	Crown break	Crown clearance	Age class	Physio -logy	Structure	Comments	Category
33	Elder	4.5m	7 stems @ 95mm	N 2m E 0.5m S 3m W 2.6m	0m	0.5m	Semi-mature	Low	Poor	Off-site tree; unremarkable tree of very limited merit.	C (3)
34	English elm	6m	190mm est.	2m	2.5m	3m	Semi-mature	Dead	Dead	Off-site tree; small dead elm.	U (3)
35	Field maple	9m	350mm est.	N 4.5m E 4m S 4.5m W 3.8m	0m	3.5m	Semi-mature	Average	Moderate	Off-site tree; no access To base so trunk diameter and off-site measurements estimated; no visibility of base due to dense hedge cut lower canopy and bramble undergrowth; of assumed moderate quality; of screening value.	C (12)
36	Ash	11m	340mm est.	N 6m E 6.2m S 5.7m W 5.7m	3m	2.5m	Semi-mature	Average	Moderate	Off-site tree; no access so all off-site measurements estimated; single upright trunk; main visible unions tensile; ivy-covered; free from significant observable defects; of moderate quality; visible but not prominent in views from B4040; significant component of group in which it stands.	B (1)
37	Ash	9m	270mm est.	N 3.7m E 5m SE 2.5m S 1m SW 2m W 3.6m	3.5m	3m	Semi-mature	Below average	Indifferent	Off-site tree; ivy-covered near ground; suppressed canopy; small leaflets development in outer canopy; inessential component of group in which it stands, despite visibility from B4040.	C (12)
38-39	Ash	6m	#T38 180mm ivy est. #T39 100mm	N 0m E 0m S 3m W 3m	1m	1.5m	Young	Average	Indifferent	Off-site trees; small suppressed specimens.	C (1)
40	Ash	12m	300mm 2 stems @ 220mm est. 350mm ivy	7.4m	0m	2.5m	Semi-mature	Below average	Indifferent	Off-site tree; triple-stemmed growing within boundary ditch; of limited quality with tip dieback in canopy and above average deadwood suggestive of well progressed ash dieback; of short-term potential only.	C (3)
41	Ash	10m	550mm	4.5m	1.5m	2m	Mature	Low	Poor	Trunk with large wound extending from 2m to ground level extending for a third of trunk girth, exposing heavily degraded internal wood with brown rot and mycelium; lost majority of woody and canopy mass with only small limbs 120mm retained; of deadwood habitat but limited arboricultural quality; readily visible from PRoW Cric30.	C (3)

No.	Species	Height	Trunk diameter	Radial crown spread	Crown break	Crown clearance	Age class	Physio -logy	Structure	Comments	Category
42	Ash	14m	280mm ivy est. 500mm ivy	6m	0.5m	2m	Mature	Average	Moderate	Off-site tree; no access so all measurements estimated; heavily ivy-covered, impeding full visual inspection; twin-stemmed from 1m with acute union; no signs of ash dieback; of moderate quality, free from significant observable defects; significant component of group in which it stands; readily visible from PRoW Cric30.	B (1)
G1	Common lime	6m	Avg 210mm	3m	2m	2m	Semi-mature	Average	Moderate	Off-site group of trees; row of common lime within highway verge forming juvenile but established arboricultural feature of Stones Lane.	C (1)
G2	Various	Max 11.5m Avg 7m	Max 400mm Avg 200mm	3m	1.5m	2m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Off-site group of trees; species include ash, field maple, sycamore, hawthorn, field maple and bramble; individuals of generally low quality; of screening value; visible but not prominent in views from Common Hill (B4040).	C (13)
G3	Various	Max 14m Avg 9m	Max 430mm Avg 300mm	5m	0m	0.5	Various	Average	Indifferent	Off-site belt of trees growing to S of Common Hill (B4040); predominantly ash overstorey; understorey of elm, hawthorn, blackthorn, field maple and ivy; individuals generally of low quality; cumulatively form a dense screen of trees, readily visible from the road and contributing to the treed' character of the area.	B (2)
G4	Various	Min 6m Max 14m Avg 10m	Max 550mm Avg 400mm	5m	1m	2m	Various	Below average	Moderate	Belt of trees growing along boundary ditch banks; comprised of 3 field maples, 6 ash and 3 hawthorn; dead elm also present; semi-mature to mature specimens; large cavities, storm damage, deadwood present in mature specimens, providing good habitat spaces; individuals of moderate to poor arboricultural quality but readily visible from PRoW Cric30 and compliments surrounding arboricultural character of the site but not visible from Common Hill or Stone Lane.	B (23)
G5	Various	12m	Min 150mm Max 480mm Avg 350mm	4m	2m	2.5m	Semi-mature	Below average	Indifferent	Stand of c. 20 trees in field corner; species include English oak, common lime and cherry; significant ground compaction from cattle noted, resulting in many trees in reduced physiological health, stand now fenced off with reduced evidence of ground compaction; lower 2m of canopy grazed; copse of significant potential; visible but not prominent in views from Stone Lane.	C (13)
G6	Various	12m	Avg 350mm est.	4m	2m	2m	Semi-mature	Below average	Moderate	Off-site small stand of c. 25 planted trees with ground compaction and grazing damage evident; individuals of low physiological health; species include oak, field maple, cherry and Norway maple; screened in views from Stone Lane; semi-mature trees of generally moderate structural condition.	C (13)
G7	Various	Max 14m Avg 12m	Min 75mm Max 650mm Avg 350mm	5m	1.5m	1m	Various	Average	Moderate	Off-site group of trees; belt of trees and vegetation growing along banks of national cycle route no. 45; predominantly ash standards of moderate to low quality; several specimens with no signs of ash die back; 1 mature oak noted on opposite bank with trunk diameter of 640mm; dense bramble, hawthorn and blackthorn elsewhere; predominantly semi-mature specimens; squat canopies, made more prominent by elevated topography; main arboricultural feature of the field; of screening value; gaps in vegetation open up views across site showing arable grass fields and with tree lined hedgerows.	B (2)

No.	Species	Height	Trunk diameter	Radial crown spread	Crown break	Crown clearance	Age class	Physio -logy	Structure	Comments	Category
G8	Various	Max 12m Avg 9m	Min 75mm Avg 275mm	3m	1.5m	1m	Various	Average	Moderate	Linear belt of trees growing along field boundary; comprised of semi-mature to mature trees; species include ash, field maple, hawthorn and lime; of no more than moderate quality; readily visible from Stones Lane; of screening value.	C (23)
G9	Various	Avg 2m	Avg 300mm	1.5m	0.5m	0.5m	Various	Below average	Indifferent	Area of semi-mature willow coppice, young hawthorn and dense pockets of bramble growing within field around depression and wet land area; vegetation includes several coppiced willow (approx. trunk diameter of 400mm) of which most are dead but three persist with young regrowth; low profile vegetation of limited landscape or arboricultural consequence.	C (3)
G10	Various	Avg 5m	Avg	2m	0.5m	0m	Various	Average	Indifferent	Off-site groups of trees growing along the N side of the boundary ditch and verge of Common Hill (B4040) between the site and junction of Horsey Down; species comprised of hawthorn, elm, ash, bramble to the west and cypress to the west; individuals of low to moderate quality forming dense but squat hedgerow feature, readily visible from Common Hill; distance between trunks and the kerb edge of Common Hill is c.4.5m; existing services (water) noted within verge.	C (23)
H1	Various	3m	Min 50mm Max 320mm Avg 90mm	2m	0m	0m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Field boundary hedgerow comprised of elm, hawthorn, blackthorn, elder, rose, bramble with two ash standards and a field maple; dense hedgerow of low level screening value; consistent with surrounding landscape character but not prominent in landscape; readily visible from Stones Lane.	C (123)
H2	Various	Min 1m Avg 1.5m	Max 200mm Avg 50mm	1m	0m	0m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Internal field boundary hedgerow; comprised of elm, hawthorn, crack willow, rose and field maple, blackthorn; sparser areas of hedgerow with small gaps creating a fragmented hedgerow at the northern end with elm and bramble being dominant in these areas; internal hedge used for sheltered by cattle with trample wounds and contact damage visible; of limited landscape significance; of low arboricultural quality.	C (3)
H3	Various	Min 1m Avg 1.5m	Max 200mm Avg 50mm	1m	0m	0m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Internal boundary hedgerow; comprised of hawthorn, blackthorn, rose, elder, bramble, ash and field maple; boundary ditch to the N of hedgerow; tractor access fragmenting hedgerow; of no more than moderate quality; screened in views from the surrounding roads by boundary vegetation; of low landscape value.	C (13)
H4	Various	Avg 3m	Max 250mm Avg 170mm	3m	0m	0m	Various	Average	Indifferent	Field boundary hedgerow along E site boundary; dense bramble, hawthorn, blackthorn and elm with large gap in SW corner of field; dense group of established but small trees at the southern end, adjacent to Common Hill; of low level screening value.	C (23)
H5	Various	Min 1m Max 7m Avg 5m	Max 250mm Avg 170mm	3m	0m	0m	Various	Below average	Indifferent	Field boundary hedgerow growing along W boundary of S field; species include elm, blackthorn, bramble, hawthorn, English oak, field maple and rose; high density of dead and dying elm in the southern end of hedgerow; wide hedgerow to N, but narrows to S; large 30m gap in hedgerow adjacent to recent dwelling development; of highly variable height due to different management types; of screening value.	C (23)

No.	Species	Height	Trunk diameter	Radial crown spread	Crown break	Crown clearance	Age class	Physio -logy	Structure	Comments	Category
H6	Various	Min 2m Avg 3m	Max 200mm Avg 170mm	3m	0m	0m	Various	Average	Indifferent	Boundary hedgerow growing between Common Hill (B4040) and S field boundary; species include hawthorn, blackthorn, ash, rose, elm, bramble, willow with significant standards of oak and ash; of low level screening value; readily visible from road and consistent with surrounding landscape character.	C (123)
H7	Various	Max 12m Avg 6m	Max 330mm Avg 95mm	3m	0.5m	0m	Semi-mature	Below average	Indifferent	Field boundary hedgerow, lapsed top management resulting in taller growth; species include elm, field maple, ash, hawthorn, rose, bramble; larger elm are dead and ash showing progressed ash die back; of screening value; reflects wider landscape character.	C (23)
H8	Various	1m	Avg 75mm	1m	0m	0m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Field boundary hedgerow, regularly managed; short, tight structure; comprised of predominantly elm, bramble and hawthorn with small poor quality ash specimen in the centre; of limited landscape prominence but visible in views from PRow Cric30.	C (13)
H9	Various	1m	Max 175mm Avg 95mm	Max 7.5m Avg 1.5m	0m	0m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Field boundary hedgerow, regularly managed; comprised of predominantly hawthorn, blackthorn field maple and bramble with areas of exclusively bramble with no woody species; area of established trees (circa 15) to N of field access with field maple and elm with elm dead or dying.	C (13)
H10	Various	9m	Max 470mm Avg 375mm	4m	1m	2m	Mature	Average	Moderate	Off-site group of trees; row of mature field maple and hawthorn along field boundary ditch; lapsed hedgerow management resulting in the establishment of a dense linear row of trees; several specimens in a state of collapse; windthrown ash stump in northern section; provides a mature element to the site and a green corridor.	B (23)

APPENDIX 4

Tree Protection Plan

Arboricultural Impacts: Summary		
(For details, see below)		
Impact		No. of Trees
Trees to be removed		0
Groups of trees/hedgerows to be removed		0
Groups of trees/hedgerows to have sections removed		5
Trees to be pruned		0
Trees where manual excavation needed within RPAs		0
Trees where above soil surfacing needed within RPAs		0
Sections of hedgerow to be Removed		
No	Species	Category
G8	Various- 12m section removed (9% of feature)	C (23)
H2	Various- 15m section removed (6% of feature)	C (3)
H3	Various- 45m section removed (15% of feature)	C (13)
H6	Various- 30m section removed (9% of feature)	C (123)
H9	Various- 6m section removed (4% of feature)	C (13)



Protective Fencing

To be erected prior to the commencement of all works on site, and retained in place throughout construction. To comprise either 2.4m wooden site hoarding, or a 2m high scaffolding framework, with uprights at maximum 3m spacings, every other one braced to the ground with 45 degree struts; supporting standard anti-climb 'Heras' welded mesh fence panels secured with anti-lift devices to concrete or plastic bases pinned to the ground by scaffold uprights sunk to a minimum depth of 600mm; individual panels fixed to each other with at least 2 clamps and to scaffolding with heavy-duty cable ties. 'TREE PROTECTION ZONE - KEEP OUT' or similar notices to be attached to every fifth panel.

Weldmesh panels
Standard scaffold poles
Uprights
Clamps
Ground level

2m
0.6m
3m

TREE PROTECTION FENCING as shown in BS 5837: 2012, Section 6.2.2 & Figure 2.

SJA trees ARBORICULTURAL PLANNING CONSULTANTS

Project: Land at Malmesbury Road, Cricklade

Client: Mac Mic Strategic Land Ltd

Drawing: TREE PROTECTION PLAN

Drawing no: SJA TPP 25636-041

Based on: 10542-RL-XX-00-DR-MP-0002

Drawn by: FJC Date of Issue: March 2026 Scale: 1: 600 @ A1

Checked by: FPS Tel: (01737) 813058 sja@sjatrees.co.uk

Tree nos.: 17 Category 'U' trees: 19 Canopies of trees to be retained: 17

Features to be removed: H3 Category 'B' RPA: Category 'C' RPA: 17

Protective fencing: 17

For further information refer to the SJA's Tree Survey Schedule. Do not scale from this drawing; please check all dimensions on site, and notify us of any discrepancies. SJA's (the trading name of Simon Jones Associates Ltd.) cannot be held responsible for inaccuracies in the topographical plan on which this drawing is based. © Simon Jones Associates Ltd. 2026. This drawing is copyright and may not be used or changed without the written consent of SJA's.

This drawing is based on the proposed layout plan shown and referred to above. SJA's reserves its reproduction without amendment, by the Local Planning Authority (LPA), and to its posting on the LPA website, to assist in consideration of this application only.

This drawing is designed to reflect only the principles of layout and/or design insofar as these relate to the protection of trees to be retained, and should NOT be read as a definitive engineering or construction method statement. Reference should be made to the architect or structural engineer, as appropriate, over any matters of construction detail or specification, or any engineering standards or regulatory requirements relating to proposed structures, hard surfaces or underground services.

Arboricultural Impacts: Summary		
(For details, see below)		
Impact		No. of Trees
Trees to be removed		0
Groups of trees/hedgerows to be removed		0
Groups of trees/hedgerows to have sections removed		5
Trees to be pruned		0
Trees where manual excavation needed within RPAs		0
Trees where above soil surfacing needed within RPAs		0
Sections of hedgerow to be Removed		
No	Species	Category
G8	Various- 12m section removed (9% of feature)	C (23)
H2	Various- 15m section removed (8% of feature)	C (3)
H3	Various- 45m section removed (15% of feature)	C (13)
H6	Various- 30m section removed (9% of feature)	C (123)
H9	Various- 6m section removed (4% of feature)	C (13)



Protective Fencing

To be erected prior to the commencement of all works on site, and retained in place throughout construction. To comprise either 2.4m wooden site hoarding, or a 2m high scaffolding framework, with uprights at maximum 3m spacings, every other one braced to the ground with 45 degree struts, supporting standard anti-climb 'Heras' welded mesh fence panels secured with anti-lift devices to concrete or plastic bases pinned to the ground by scaffold uprights sunk to a minimum depth of 600mm; individual panels fixed to each other with at least 2 clamps and to scaffolding with heavy-duty cable ties. *TREE PROTECTION ZONE - KEEP OUT* or similar notices to be attached to every fifth panel.

2m
0.6m
3m
Ground level

TREE PROTECTION FENCING as shown in BS 5837: 2012, Section 6.2.2 & Figure 2.

Adjacent proposed Bloor Homes development

SJA trees ARBORICULTURAL PLANNING CONSULTANTS

Project: Land at Malmesbury Road, Cricklade

Client: Mac Mic Strategic Land Ltd

Drawing: TREE PROTECTION PLAN

Drawing no: SJA TPP 25636-041

Based on: 10542-RL-XX-00-DR-MP-0002

Drawn by: FJC	Date of Issue: March 2026	Scale: 1: 600 @ A1
Checked by: FPS	Tel:(01737) 813058	sja@sjatrees.co.uk

Tree nos.: 17	Category 'U' trees: H3	Canopies of trees to be retained: [19]
Features to be removed: H3	Category 'B' RPA: [19]	Category 'C' RPA: [19]
Protective fencing: [Blue line]		

For further information refer to the SJAtrees Tree Survey Schedule. Do not scale from this drawing; please check all dimensions on site, and notify us of any discrepancies. SJAtrees (the trading name of Simon Jones Associates Ltd.) cannot be held responsible for inaccuracies in the topographical plan on which this drawing is based. © Simon Jones Associates Ltd. 2026. This drawing is copyright and may not be used or changed without the written consent of SJAtrees. This drawing is designed to reflect only the principles of layout and/or design insofar as these relate to the protection of trees to be retained, and should NOT be read as a definitive engineering or construction method statement. Reference should be made to the architect or structural engineer, as appropriate, over any matters of construction detail or specification, or any engineering standards or regulatory requirements relating to proposed structures, land surfaces or underground services.

Arboricultural Impacts: Summary		
(For details, see below)		
Impact		No. of Trees
Trees to be removed		0
Groups of trees/hedgerows to be removed		0
Groups of trees/hedgerows to have sections removed		5
Trees to be pruned		0
Trees where manual excavation needed within RPAs		0
Trees where above soil surfacing needed within RPAs		0
Sections of hedgerow to be Removed		
No	Species	Category
G8	Various- 12m section removed (9% of feature)	C (23)
H2	Various- 15m section removed (6% of feature)	C (3)
H3	Various- 45m section removed (15% of feature)	C (13)
H6	Various- 30m section removed (9% of feature)	C (123)
H9	Various- 6m section removed (4% of feature)	C (13)



Protective Fencing

To be erected prior to the commencement of all works on site, and retained in place throughout construction. To comprise either 2.4m wooden site hoarding, or a 2m high scaffolding framework, with uprights at maximum 3m spacings, every other one braced to the ground with 45 degree struts; supporting standard anti-climb 'Heras' welded mesh fence panels secured with anti-lift devices to concrete or plastic bases pinned to the ground by scaffold uprights sunk to a minimum depth of 600mm; individual panels fixed to each other with at least 2 clamps and to scaffolding with heavy-duty cable ties. "TREE PROTECTION ZONE - KEEP OUT" or similar notices to be attached to every fifth panel.

TREE PROTECTION FENCING as shown in BS 5837: 2012, Section 6.2.2 & Figure 2.



SJA trees ARBORICULTURAL PLANNING CONSULTANTS		
Project:	Land at Malmesbury Road, Cricklade	
Client:	Mac Mic Strategic Land Ltd	
Drawing:	TREE PROTECTION PLAN	
Drawing no:	SJA TPP 25636-041	
Based on:	10542-RL-XX-00-DR-MP-0002	
Drawn by:	Date of Issue:	Scale:
FJC	March 2026	1: 600 @ A1
Checked by:	Tel:(01737) 813058	sja@sjatrees.co.uk
FPS		
Tree nos.:	Category	Canopies of trees to be retained:
● 17	● [19]	
Features to be removed:	Category	Category
---H3	'B' RPA:	'C' RPA:
Protective fencing:		

For further information refer to the SJAtrees Tree Survey Schedule.
Do not scale from this drawing; please check all dimensions on site, and notify us of any discrepancies. SJAtrees (the trading name of Simon Jones Associates Ltd.) cannot be held responsible for inaccuracies in the topographical plan on which this drawing is based.
© Simon Jones Associates Ltd. 2026
This drawing is copyright and may not be used or changed without the written consent of SJAtrees.
This drawing is based on the proposed layout plan shown and referred to above.
SJAtrees authorises its reproduction without amendment, by the Local Planning Authority (LPA), and to its posting on the LPA website, to assist in consideration of this application only.
This drawing is designed to reflect only the principles of layout and/or design insofar as these relate to the protection of trees to be retained, and should NOT be read as a definitive engineering or construction method statement. Reference should be made to the architect or structural engineer, as appropriate, over any matters of construction detail or specification, or any engineering standards or regulatory requirements relating to proposed structures, hard surfaces or underground services.

