

ARBORICULTURAL SURVEY – BS 5837:2012 & CONSTRAINTS ASSESSMENT

SITE: 27a CHURCHFIELDS ROAD, SALISBURY, SP2 7NH

CLIENT: MR & MRS ARGYLE

DATE: 27 APRIL 2026

REPORT REF: AS-64-26

Contact

email: graham@gcac.co.uk

Tel: 07752 485 203



Chartered Biologist

Member of the Royal Society of Biology



Qualified Professional Tree Inspection

Lantra award November 2023

Contact details

Client:
Mr & Mrs Argyle

Planning Agent:
Sean Williams seanwilliamsplanning@outlook.com

Arboricultural Consultant:
Graham Cox Arboricultural Consultant 07752 485 203 graham@gcac.co.uk

Local Planning Authority Tree Officer:

Terms of reference

Graham Cox Arboricultural Consultant has been instructed by Mr & Mrs Argyle to carry out an arboricultural survey and assessment of trees at 27a Churchfields Road, Salisbury, SP2 7NH

British Standard 5837:2012 “Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – recommendations” has been used as a framework for gathering the information.

Report limitations

This report is based on tree condition and arboricultural findings made at the time of the site visit. All investigations were from ground level, no internal investigations were carried out and no samples were taken. Details of construction were confirmed by the owners.

This report is for the sole use of the client and should not be used for any other purposes or by any other parties.

Contents

- 1 Scope of the report**
- 2 Background**
 - 2.1 Soils**
- 3 Tree survey**
- 4 Tree details**
- 5 Summary**
- 6 Conclusions**

Appendix 1 - Tree survey schedule (separate sheet)

Appendix 2 - Tree survey plan AS-64-26 (separate sheet)

1.0 SCOPE OF THE REPORT

This document is an arboricultural survey and constraints assessment of trees at 27a Churchfields Road, Salisbury, SP2 7NH. It has been carried out in accordance with BS5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations.

It is specifically intended to identify the arboricultural constraints on and adjacent to the site and, in doing so, it takes into account its particular circumstances, including past development and use. It also assesses the potential impact of construction on the retained trees.

This report should not be read as a “tree safety” inspection, although any arboricultural management issues needing attention will be notified to the owners.

A site proposal drawing was provided by the planning agent as a base for the arboricultural information.

2.0 BACKGROUND

The site is on land between Churchfields Road, and the River Nadder. The Wiltshire Council online records suggest the site is not affected by a tree preservation order (TPO), but the property is within the Salisbury conservation area, and a degree of protection accrues to the trees by virtue of that. There appears to have been a notice in 2025 to carry out tree works to a Western Red Cedar *Thuja plicata* (PL/2025/04925). Although the online plan is a little unclear, this may be same tree that is identified in this survey as T3.

2.1 Soils

The UK Soils Observatory characterises soils in the area as fluvial clays, silts, sands and gravels. They are loamy and clayey floodplain soils, with naturally high groundwater.

Such soils tend to be locally variable, so no deduction as to their tendency to shrink or compact under load can be made without detailed on-site soil investigation.

3.0 TREE SURVEY

Four trees were surveyed in detail and categorised in accordance with BS5837:2012. They fall into the following categories:

Category	Number in each category
----------	-------------------------

C	4
---	---

The arboricultural details have been superimposed on the site plan drawing 25/88/S1 rev.A from Crickmay Stark Architects, to show BS tree categories, calculated root protection areas (RPA), and the actual canopy spreads.

4.0 TREE DETAILS

Ash T1 This Ash is an early-mature specimen. The crown is in fair condition overall, with a reasonable density. It is weighted somewhat to the south west - the north west part has the appearance of having been suppressed, perhaps by neighbouring trees, during its early growth.

There is a narrow, occluded wound running up the stem from ground level to 3m on the north west side, but this appears to be only superficial, and not structurally significant.

Fig. 1 Ash T1 view looking south, showing overall form. The decking and cabin are visible to the left.



Alder T2 This Alder is a riparian tree. It was self-set and has rooted against the brickwork of an old retaining wall, within 1.7m of the waterline (at the time of inspection). Its root development is likely to have been modified by the old retaining wall, and it will be preferentially rooting laterally along the bank where moisture and oxygen levels are optimal for the species.

The lower stem has a very significant lean (approximately 45°) to the south, over the river; however, recent growth is more upright, suggesting the lean is stable.

Fig. 2 Alder T2 view looking south east. The decking, and the crown edge of T3, are visible on the left.



Thuja plicata “Zebrina” T3, and Birch T4 The Thuja is a mature specimen, growing close to the boundary in the neighbouring property to the east. Structurally, it has a reasonable form, slightly weighted towards the river. The canopy has a lower than average vigour (it is particularly sparse on east side) which may be due to the fact that its growing conditions aren't optimal for the species. This is likely to limit longevity to significantly less than 40 years.

The Birch T4 is a very recent planting following construction. It's in the main garden area immediately north of the cabin. It appears to have established well.



Fig. 3 Thuja plicata T3 (to rear of cabin in this picture) showing the lower crown density on its east side, and Birch T4 (post construction, new planting in the garden bed). View looking south east

5.0 POTENTIAL IMPACT OF CONSTRUCTION

The calculated, or notional, RPAs for trees T1, T2 and T3, extends across the area of construction, to varying degrees (see tree constraints drawing AS-64-26). That being the case, there was some risk of inadvertent damage to tree roots during the build process, primarily through direct root severance or damage, ground compaction, and soil contamination.

It should be noted that for Alder T2, the degree of encroachment into the notional RPA is very marginal. Moreover, its growing conditions - including the presence of the old retaining wall against which it has established - will have modified its rooting pattern to such a degree that I consider it lies outside the area where direct damage is possible. Consideration of indirect damage still applies, of course.

In view of the risk of damage during the build, it is important to understand some of the details of construction. The owner has confirmed the following:

- No heavy machinery was used during construction - there was only pedestrian access.

- No re-modelling of ground levels – other than for very minor levelling for a set of wooden steps - was required. The existing levels, slopes, and existing structures, were retained in situ.
- The open structure of the decking allows rain percolation. There has been no change to the waterflow across site, and no impact upon gaseous exchange for healthy root function.
- Excavation of post holes was carried out by hand.
- Posts supporting significant loads (eg. at top and bottom of slope, and where there is a change of decking levels, were concreted-in).
- Posts within the structure were driven into the soil directly.
- Where posts were concreted-in, the pit was lined with an impermeable membrane in order to prevent soil contamination.

Some of these details are illustrated below.



Fig. 4 & 5 Left – general arrangement of the key trees in relation to the construction Right – close-up of hand-driven post, closest to the base of T1



Fig. 6 View of structures and levels retained in situ under decking.



Fig. 7 View east showing T3 in relation to the decking. Note: post-hole at the corner of the structure (visible bottom-left in this picture) was lined with impermeable lining before backfilling with concrete

5.0 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

There are a number of conclusions we can draw from the survey information, and from what we know about how the construction was carried out.

- The owners value the presence of the trees on site, and took steps to ensure they were protected during construction.
- The retained trees are in reasonable condition, and there is no evidence of damage having been caused to them during the build.
- The construction involved no engineering or altering of ground levels.

- The construction was carried out by hand.
- The structure doesn't affect the growing conditions of the retained trees.
- Although the hand excavation of the post pit by T3 was close enough, potentially, to have caused root disturbance, I consider any impact would have been negligible given the nature and extent of the work.

6.0 CONCLUSIONS

I'm satisfied that all retained trees have been integrated into the design, and were adequately safeguarded during construction. In view of this, I consider there would be no benefit from an arboricultural point of view in removing the structure.

Graham Cox MSc BSc(Hons) CBiol MRSB
Arboricultural Consultant

27 April 2026

Appendix 1 Tree Survey Schedule (separate sheet)

Appendix 2 Tree survey drawing AS-64-26 (separate sheet)