



Arboricultural impact assessment and method statement

Alderbury House, Tunnel Hill, Alderbury, Salisbury. SP5 3DW

Chris Alder MSc HNDArb FArborA MICFor RCarborA



10th July 2026
26078-AIA2-CA



Summary

This development proposal is for the installation of a new tennis pavilion, shed and associated landscape works at Alderbury House, Tunnel Hill, Alderbury, Salisbury SP5 3DW.

Retained trees will be protected during construction, in accordance with the recommendations of BS 5837 (2012), including the use of fencing and ground protection to prevent damage from the development activity.

All the significant boundary tree cover is being retained, and none of the lost trees are prominent as skyline features in the wider setting. The comprehensive new landscaping proposals will rapidly mitigate these losses and limit the impact on local character in the short term. There will be no adverse impact on local character in the wider setting in the long term.

Construction activity can adversely affect retained trees if proper protective measures are not in place. However, if adequate precautions to protect the retained trees are specified and implemented through the arboricultural method statement included in this report, the development proposal will have no detrimental impact on the trees' contribution to local character.

For these reasons, our assessment is that the proposed development would not have an unacceptable or adverse impact on the area's character and appearance from a tree perspective.

Contents

1 Introduction.....	3
1.1 Site location.....	3
1.2 Instruction	3
1.3 Development description	3
1.4 Report purpose and contents	3
2 Arboricultural impact assessment.....	5
2.1 Summary of trees affected and protected by the proposal	5
2.2 Insignificant encroachment into RPAs.....	5
2.3 The impact of tree removals on local character	5
2.4 The impact of tree pruning on local character.....	6
2.5 Post-development considerations	6
2.6 New tree planting to enhance local character	6
2.7 Unanticipated upgrading of existing services or installation of new services	6
2.8 Summary of the impact on local character	6
3 Arboricultural method statement	8
3.1 Site Guidance Notes (SGNs).....	8
3.2 Identification of areas to be protected	9
3.3 Arboricultural supervision	9
3.4 Summary of the site operations requiring arboricultural input.....	9
Appendix 1: Background administrative information and data collection	11
A1.1 Background administrative information	11
A1.2 Data collection	15
Appendix 2: Tree schedule and explanatory notes	17
Appendix 3: QR Codes for SGNs	21

1 Introduction

1.1 Site location



Figure 1: This aerial image is supplied courtesy of Google. The red lines show the approximate site boundaries and is illustrative only to identify the site within the wider setting. It must not be taken as a precise or accurate representation of the red line application boundary.

1.2 Instruction

We are instructed by Charlie Hawkes Landscape Design to visit the site, assess the relevant trees, prepare a schedule of their details, assess the proposal's impact on those trees, and describe appropriate tree protection measures in an arboricultural method statement and a tree protection plan.

1.3 Development description

The development proposal is for the installation of a new tennis pavilion, shed and associated landscape works at Alderbury House, Tunnel Hill, Alderbury, Salisbury. SP5 3DW.

1.4 Report purpose and contents

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



1 Introduction

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

2 Arboricultural impact assessment

2.1 Summary of trees affected and protected by the proposal

From our review of the constraints and the proposed layout, our assessment of the impact on trees, both during and after development, and those that need protection using special precautions, is summarised in Figure 2:

	British Standard 5837 Category		
	A (High quality)	B (Moderate quality)	C (Low quality)
Remove	None	None	T7, G12 (part), T13, T16, T17
Prune	None	None	None
Protect using special precautions See Notes below	None	None	None
Post-development pressure to fell	None	None	None

Figure 2: Summary of trees affected by the proposal (T = Tree; H = Hedge; G = Group; V = Veteran; W = Woodland).

Note on types of protection: All retained trees will be protected during development by using fencing, and only those requiring special precautions to limit the impact of encroachment are listed in Table 1.

2.2 Insignificant encroachment into RPAs

Trees T2, T8, T9, T10, and T11

There is a minor encroachment into the nominal circular RPAs for these trees. However, BS 5837 (5.3.1) permits encroachment when the new structures and surfacing are low-impact, and it can be demonstrated that any lost area can be compensated for elsewhere. In these situations, the encroachment is at the outer extent of the RPA, and relatively small compared to the area that will be left undisturbed, and provision has been made to compensate for this elsewhere near the tree. In our experience, healthy trees can tolerate minor incursions into their RPAs without significant adverse effects on health, and we expect the same for these trees. In summary, if the guidance set out in the Manual accompanying this report is observed, our view is that the proposed works can be implemented near these trees without any significant adverse impact on them, and therefore on the local character.

2.3 The impact of tree removals on local character

Trees T7, G12 (part), T13, T16, T17

These are all low-quality trees with little potential to contribute to local character, given their poor condition and small size. They are insignificant in the wider setting, and their loss will have no adverse impact on local character.

2 Arboricultural impact assessment

2.4 The impact of tree pruning on local character

Aside from routine pruning for maintenance, no trees will be pruned as a result of this development, so there will be no impact on local character through pruning.

2.5 Post-development considerations

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

2.6 New tree planting to enhance local character

To supplement retained trees and enhance local character, the project's landscape architect has specified a comprehensive new tree-planting scheme. We understand that the final selection of species, size and location is flexible and open to amendment, as appropriate. All new trees will be specified and planted in accordance with the recommendations in BS 8545 (2014) *Trees: from nursery to independence in the landscape –Recommendations*. These new trees could reach significant height without undue inconvenience and remain sustainable over the long term, significantly enhancing the site's capacity to contribute to local character.

2.7 Unanticipated upgrading of existing services or installation of new services

Retained trees may be adversely affected by the installation of new services and/or the upgrading of existing services if such work encroaches on their RPAs. However, it is often difficult to determine service locations in detail until construction is underway, and encroachment into RPAs is sometimes unavoidable. Where possible, the default approach must be to use existing service runs and keep all new services outside RPAs. Where existing services within RPAs require upgrading or new services must be installed, great care must be taken to minimise disturbance. Trenchless installation will be the preferred option; if that is not feasible, any excavation must be carried out by hand in accordance with the guidelines in SGN 11 *Installing services in RPAs*.

2.8 Summary of the impact on local character

All the significant boundary tree cover is being retained, and none of the lost trees are prominent as skyline features in the wider setting. The comprehensive new landscaping proposals will rapidly mitigate these losses and limit the impact on local character in the short term. There will be no adverse impact on local character in the wider setting in the long term.

Construction activity can adversely affect retained trees if proper protective measures are not in place. However, if adequate precautions to protect the retained trees are specified and implemented through the arboricultural method statement included in this report, the development proposal will have no detrimental impact on the trees' contribution to local character.



2 Arboricultural impact assessment

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

3 Arboricultural method statement

3.1 Site Guidance Notes (SGNs)

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

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

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

3 Arboricultural method statement

3.2 Identification of areas to be protected

The tree protection plan identifies the areas requiring protective measures. The heavy black dashed lines show the fencing location, with the construction exclusion zone behind it shown as a lighter black diagonal hatch.

3.3 Arboricultural supervision

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

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

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

3.4 Summary of the site operations requiring arboricultural input

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

Brief operation summary	Trees affected	Location of detailed explanations
Pre-commencement meeting: Meeting on site with all parties to agree on protective measures, as described in SGN 1. <u>It will be carried out before any significant site works begin.</u>	All retained trees	SGN 1 <i>Monitoring tree protection</i>
Tree felling: Contractor will carry out agreed works as described in Appendix 2. <u>It will be completed before any significant site works begin.</u>	Fell trees T7, G12 (part), T13, T16, T17	Appendix 2
Installing fencing: Agreed tree protection measures will be installed and checked, as described in SGN . <u>It will be completed before any significant site works begin.</u>	All retained trees	Tree protection plan, SGN 2 <i>Fencing protected trees</i>
Pollution control near retained trees: Any pollution control measures identified during risk assessment will be installed as described in SGN 4. <u>It will be completed before any potential pollutants arrive on site.</u>	All retained trees	SGN 4 <i>Pollution control</i>

3 Arboricultural method statement

Brief operation summary	Trees affected	Location of detailed explanations
Regular arboricultural supervision: Provision will be made to carry out and record agreed arboricultural supervision, as described in SGN 1.	All retained trees	SGN 1 <i>Monitoring tree protection</i>
Installing services in RPAs: These operations will be carried out as described in SGN 11.	All retained trees	SGN 11 <i>Installing services in RPAs</i>
Landscaping in RPAs: These operations will be carried out as described in SGN 12.	All retained trees	SGN 12 <i>Landscaping in RPAs</i>
Removing tree protection: <u>Protection can be removed only when there is no risk of damage to retained trees, as described in SGN 1.</u>	All retained trees	SGN 1 <i>Monitoring tree protection</i>

The operations summarised in this table, together with the more detailed explanations provided in the SGNs and the remainder of this document, constitute the arboricultural method statement for this site. The site manager will ensure that the details and any agreed amendments are known and understood by all site personnel. Copies of the approved documents will be available on site. All personnel who could affect trees will be briefed on the specific tree protection requirements as part of the site induction procedures. This requirement will be written into the site management documentation.

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



Appendix 1: Background administrative information and data collection

A1.1 Background administrative information

	Background administrative information
Report date and reference	10 th July 2026; 26078-AIA2-CA
Tree protection plan reference	26078-TPP-02
Instructing client	Charlie Hawkes Landscape Design
Instructions	Visit the site, assess the relevant trees, prepare a schedule of their details, describe the impact of the proposal on those trees and identify the tree protection issues in an arboricultural method statement with a tree protection plan.
Provided documents	Combined topographical survey and layout, drawing reference Alderbury House 33-L-P, received by email on 22nd June 2026
Report author and credentials	Chris Alder is a Chartered Forester (https://charteredforesters.org/), and a Registered Consultant of the Arboricultural Association (https://www.trees.org.uk/), and is fully qualified to undertake the assessments in this report (https://www.barrelltreecare.co.uk/who-we-are/)
Report limitations	This report does not consider ecological or archaeological issues, or any other matter beyond the assessment of the trees.
Technical references	In preparing the analysis in this report, we considered the guidance and advice in the following technical references: - National Planning Policy Framework, MHCLG https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2 - Town and Country Planning Act (1990) https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1990/8/contents - Climate Change Act (2008) https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2008/27/contents - BS 3998 (2010) <i>Tree work – Recommendations</i>, BSI https://shop.bsigroup.com/ProductDetail?pid=000000000030089960 - BS 5837 (2012) <i>Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations</i>, https://shop.bsigroup.com/ProductDetail?pid=000000000030213642 <i>Trees in the Townscape: A Guide for Decision Makers</i> (2012), Trees & Design Action Group http://www.tdag.org.uk/ - BS 8545 (2014) <i>Trees: from nursery to independence in the landscape – Recommendations</i> https://shop.bsigroup.com/ProductDetail?pid=000000000030219672

Appendix 1: Background administrative information and data collection

	Background administrative information
	• <i>Trees in Hard Landscapes: A Guide for Delivery</i> (2014), Trees & Design Action Group https://www.tdag.org.uk/trees-planning-and-development.html • <i>Trees, Planning and Development: A Guide for Delivery</i> – Sections One and Two (2023), Trees & Design Action Group https://www.tdag.org.uk/trees-planning-and-development.html • <i>Volume 4 - Operative Guidance Handout</i> (2026), SWUK Publications https://streetworks.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2026/01/SWUK-Publications-Volume-4-Operative-Guidance-Handout-2026.pdf
BS 5837 compliance	This report is BS 5837 compliant, with the following explanations: <i>BS 5837 (2012) Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations</i> is 10 years old. Since its publication, there have been significant advances in technology and thinking, informed by a decade of practical experience implementing these principles. In the document Foreword, it states: “Any user claiming compliance with this British Standard is expected to be able to justify any course of action that deviates from its recommendations”. This statement provides practitioners with an opportunity to demonstrate compliance while advancing best practices in the context of emerging technologies, ideas, and experience. Although much of the BS 5837 content remains relevant and useful for managing trees in a planning context, several aspects are now out of date, and it is no longer appropriate to apply them rigidly to current planning submissions. Barrell Tree Consultancy (BTC) specialises in managing trees on development sites, and we retain a complete paper archive of every project we have carried out since starting the business in 1980, with a digital database listing those from 2004. In the decade (2012–2021) since BS 5837 was published (April 2012), interrogation of the BTC archive confirms that we have been involved in a total of 3,884 projects, of which we estimate that about 3,845 were development-related, and it is that depth of experience that informs the following statements on BS 5837 compliance. All BTC reports are prepared to be BS 5837 compliant and although explanations are not explicitly required to claim compliance, the justifications for any deviations from its recommendations are set out below, referenced by the BS clause number: • 4.3 – soil assessment: All BTC consultants have basic training relating to soil assessment and regularly deal with soil issues during their daily work, but none are soil specialists, and BTC has no specialist investigation equipment for carrying out the type of soil assessment listed in this BS clause. In a modern development context, it is not the role of arboricultural consultants to demand or conduct professional soil investigations, and BTC does not do so. However, we will review soil information provided by appropriate specialists, if available, and incorporate that into our assessments.

Appendix 1: Background administrative information and data collection

Background administrative information	
4.4.2.1 – tagging trees: In some instances, it is not appropriate to tag trees, e.g., sensitive species, trees that are easily identified without a tag, inadequate access, project confidentiality, client instructions to the contrary, etc, and so although there will be a presumption to tag trees where feasible and appropriate, that may not be possible or necessary in every instance. 4.4.2.5 e) – branch spread: BTC only work from provided topographical surveys, and where the branch spreads are shown correctly on those surveys, there is not normally any practical need to regurgitate that information in a schedule. Additionally, in closely spaced groups or in treacherous terrain, it may not be safe or feasible to collect data on every tree. For these reasons, BTC normally collects crown spread data only at the four cardinal points where the provided topographical survey is assessed as unreliable, or where a complete canopy-cover assessment is requested and is both safe and practically feasible. 4.4.2.5 f) – branch and canopy height: In the absence of any definition of ‘canopy’ or ‘significant’ relating to branches in the <i>Terms and definitions</i> clause, and the lack of any practical guidance for reliably assessing these characteristics, BTC has adopted the following default position. We will only identify the height and orientation of branches where they have the potential to be damaged by vehicular access, i.e., below a height of 6 m, or where their removal would be beyond what the tree could tolerate during normal maintenance management, i.e., the branch removal would significantly adversely affect the health of the tree and potentially compromise its current safe useful life expectancy. 4.4.2.5 g) – life stage: For consistency with canopy cover assessment, and in line with the framework outlined in BS 5837, we define tree life stages based on the pace of the radial crown spread, as follows: Sapling (Young): Fast seedling growth in the nursery before planting on site, or saplings already growing on site before being selected and protected for retention. This can include young or small trees that could be easily replaced with nursery stock. Rapid (Maturing): Rapidly increasing crown footprint, but radial extension gradually reduces over two to three decades as the growth transitions to the Stable life stage. Rapid radial spread is generally exhibited by newly planted trees, or existing saplings that are retained. Stable (Mature): The crown footprint is gradually increasing by the same amount each year. This Stable life stage can last for many decades, and sometimes for centuries, in long-lived species. Static (Early over-mature): The crown footprint remains relatively unchanged over time, with increases in radial shoot extension being cancelled out by the oldest and longest lower branches gradually	

Appendix 1: Background administrative information and data collection

	Background administrative information
	drooping due to increasing leverage from end weight, or deteriorating health and/or broken branches. • Declining (Late over-mature): Erratically reducing crown footprint because of deteriorating health and/or broken branches. • 4.4.2.5 i) – estimated remaining contribution: BTC accepts the category recommendations in Table 1 on the remaining contribution in the context of category, i.e., greater than 40 years for A trees, greater than 20 years for B trees, at least 10 years for C trees, and less than 10 years for U trees, and so this is also not listed separately in the schedule. • 4.5.4 – subcategories: BTC adopts a presumption that all trees are subcategory 1 (Mainly arboricultural qualities) unless noted to the contrary, and so for conciseness and to avoid complication, the subcategory is not listed in the schedule unless it is 2 or 3. • Table 2 and 4.4.2 – colour coding: The colours included in this table take no account of the inability of some people to distinguish between red and green, which is not helpful to people suffering from this form of colour blindness. To address this discriminatory failing with the BS approach, BTC has adopted a more intuitively obvious regime of green and blue colours, which can be easily distinguished by colour-blind people, with the best category A and B trees (High and moderate quality) being green, and the lower category C and U trees (Low quality and unsuitable for retention) being blue. The distinction between the two categories in each colour is indicated by symbols rather than by different colours. This is clearly shown on the plan key, so there can be no doubt about which category a tree belongs to, which is an intuitive approach to avoiding discrimination against colour-blind people. In any event, the tree category is now displayed next to each number, so there can be no question of the category or BS 5837 compliance. • 5.2.1 – RPAs: This clause recommends that the RPAs for category A, B, and C trees are shown as the existing constraints on the plans used in the “<i>concept and design</i>”, i.e., the tree constraints plan. However, the BS does not explicitly recommend that all those constraints are shown on the tree protection plan, which is logical because only category A (High quality) and category B (Moderate quality) trees can realistically be material constraints, with category C (Low quality) and category U (Unsuitable for retention) trees obviously unsuitable to be determinative of the final design. Although it is not a BS recommendation to include the RPAs of category C trees on the tree protection plan, because they cannot be material constraints, it is sometimes helpful to include them as an informative reference if category C trees are planned for retention to assess feasibility. For that reason, BTC tree protection plans show the RPAs of category C trees as a thin grey line rather than the thicker grey line used to denote RPAs for categories A and B. • 5.2.2 Notes 1 and 2 – shading: These notes offer general information on how shading can be assessed, which is presented in italics. The

Appendix 1: Background administrative information and data collection

	Background administrative information
	implications of the convention of using italics within the BS are set out in the Foreword as: “<i>Commentary, explanation and general informative material is presented in smaller italic type, and does not constitute a normative element.</i>” Our interpretation of that statement is that the application of Notes 1 and 2 is not part of the BS recommendations, and is not necessary for BS 5837 compliance. In our experience, assessing daylight issues is a specialist discipline beyond our arboricultural expertise, so we would defer to an appropriate specialist when detailed guidance is required.

A1.2 Data collection

	Data collection
Date of site visit	24 th June 2026 and 7 th July 2026
People present during the site visit	Chris Alder
Weather and visibility	Clear, still, and dry with good visibility
Limitations to observations	• The visual check of the trees for the purposes of assessing their condition and work requirements was made on the basis that they will be annually inspected in the future to identify any changes in condition and review the original recommendations. For these reasons, the tree assessment advice remains valid for only one year from the date of the last check. • All observations were of a preliminary nature and did not involve any climbing or detailed investigation beyond what was visible from accessible points at ground level. • All dimensions were estimated unless otherwise indicated.
Statutory protection through tree preservation orders and conservation areas	Alderbury House stands within the Alderbury Conservation Area
Tree location and numbering	Each arboricultural feature was visited and checked, and the numbering scheme is shown on the tree protection plan. Where significant trees were found on site that were not included on the provided land survey, their approximate positions are illustrated as brown dots on the tree protection plan.
Crown spreads	Crown radial spreads were estimated to the nearest metre and represent our assessment of the viable crown dimensions that would be retainable after normal management. For clarification, the viable crown spread is the size of the main body of the crown, and not necessarily the furthest extent of odd branches that extend out beyond this core of the crown.



Appendix 1: Background administrative information and data collection

	Data collection
Recording of tree data	For each identified arboricultural feature, the collected information was recorded in the tree schedule in Appendix 2 and the tree protection plan.
Calculation of RPAs	The RPAs were calculated in accordance with BS 5837, and the nominal RPA radius for each tree is listed in the tree schedule in Appendix 2. Where appropriate, RPAs for trees on the site were adjusted in accordance with BS 5837, and as illustrated on the plan.

Appendix 2: Tree schedule and explanatory notes

NOTE: Colour annotation is A & B trees with green background; C & U trees with blue background; trees to be removed in red text.

Tree no	Species	Height (m)	Diameter (cm) @ 1.5 m	Maturity	Low branches	Category	Notes	Tree works	RPA radius (m)
All retained trees & hedges								Carry out safety check and lift over site to 3-4 m as necessary.	
G1	Scots pine	18	45*	Stable		B			5.4
T2	Horse chestnut	18	117.5*	Stable		C	Significant decay wounds at 2 m and 4 m, included union at 6 m, lost lateral to southwest		14.1
T3	Horse chestnut	13	60*	Stable		B	Two stems ascend from 9 m, one partially failed		7.2
T4	Horse chestnut	18	97.5*	Stable		C	Significant stem decay, leaning to west		11.7
T5	Horse chestnut	17	67.5*	Stable		B	Twin stem from 1 m, overhead power cable through crown		8.1
T6	Horse chestnut	20	80*	Stable		C	Significant stem decay		9.6
T7	Common lime	14	102.5	Static		C	Pollard at 3 m, significant decay, epicormic	Fell for development	12.3
T8	Yew	11	35*	Stable		C	Asymmetric crown, twin stem from 1 m		4.2
T9	Lime	18	70	Stable		B	Previously topped at 4 m		8.4
T10	Beech	18	55*	Stable		B	Lean to ne		6.6
T11	Sweet chestnut	20	55	Stable		B	Slender		6.6
G12	Laurel	4	15	Maturing		C	Shrub mass	Fell part	1.8
T13	Pear	3	22.5*	Stable		C	Small, poor condition	Fell for development	2.7
T14	Apple	4	40*	Stable		C	Squat		4.8



Appendix 2: Tree schedule and explanatory notes

T15	Apple	3	32.5*	Static		C	Low, wide open canopy		3.9
T16	Damson	3	17.5*	Stable		C	Small, in decline	Fell for development	2.1
T17	Apple	4	22.5*	Stable		C	Upright, regularly reduced	Fell for development	2.7
T18	Apple	3	30*	Static		C	Low, wide crown		3.6

Appendix 2: Tree schedule and explanatory notes

Explanatory notes

- **Abbreviations:**

G: Group

T: Tree

- **Botanical tree names:**

Apple: *Malus domestica*

Beech: *Fagus sylvatica*

Common lime: *Tilia x europaea*

Damson: *Prunus domestica* ssp

Horse chestnut: *Aesculus hippocastanum*

Laurel: *Prunus laurocerasus*

Pear: *Pyrus communis*

Scots pine: *Pinus sylvestris*

Sweet chestnut: *Castanea sativa*

Yew: *Taxus baccata*

- **BS 5837 (2012) compliance:** All data have been collected based on the recommendations set out in subsection 4.4 of BS 5837.
- **Tree survey and site limitations:** Each tree was surveyed using a quick visual check from ground level. Where access to a tree's base was restricted, its attributes were assessed at the nearest point of access. No climbing inspections or detailed investigations were carried out. Where heavy ivy was present, the tree's condition was assessed from the ground.
- **Crown spreads:** Crown radial spreads were estimated to the nearest metre and represent our assessment of the viable crown dimensions that would be retainable after normal management. For clarification, the viable crown spread is the size of the main body of the crown, and not necessarily the furthest extent of overextended or rogue branches that spread beyond this crown core.
- **Dimensions:** All dimensions are estimated unless otherwise indicated with an asterisk (*) after the figure.
- **Species:** Species identification is based on visual observations. Where there is some doubt over tree identity, sp is noted after the genus name to indicate that the species cannot be reliably identified at the time of the survey. Where there is more than one species in a group, only the most frequent are noted, and not all the species present may be listed.
- **Height:** Height is estimated to provide a broad indication of the size of the tree.
- **Trunk diameter:** Trunk diameter is estimated or measured (with a diameter tape), at the discretion of the consultant, and is usually rounded up to the nearest centimetre. Estimates may be made when access is restricted, direct measurement is prevented by ivy on the trunk, or the tree is assessed as low quality. The point of measurement and the adjustments for stem variations are as advised in Figure C1 of BS 5837. Individual diameters for multiple stems are recorded in the notes, with the calculated cumulative diameter recorded in the diameter column.
- **Life stage:** For consistency with canopy cover assessment, and in line with the framework outlined in BS 5837, we define tree life stages based on the pace of the radial crown spread, as follows:
 - **Sapling (Young):** Fast seedling growth in the nursery before planting on site, or saplings already growing on site before being selected and protected for retention. This can include young or small trees that could be easily replaced with nursery stock.

Appendix 2: Tree schedule and explanatory notes

- **Rapid (Maturing):** Rapidly increasing crown footprint, but radial extension gradually reduces over two to three decades as the growth transitions to the Stable life stage. Rapid radial spread is generally exhibited by newly planted trees, or existing saplings that are retained.
- **Stable (Mature):** The crown footprint is gradually increasing by the same amount each year. This Stable life stage can last for many decades, and sometimes for centuries, in long-lived species.
- **Static (Early over-mature):** The crown footprint remains relatively unchanged over time, with increases in radial shoot extension being cancelled out by the oldest and longest lower branches gradually drooping due to increasing leverage from end weight, or deteriorating health and/or broken branches.
- **Declining (Late over-mature):** Erratically reducing crown footprint because of deteriorating health and/or broken branches.

Note that 'Veteran' is an ecological classification, and the radial crown spread of individual veteran trees could fall within the stable, static, or declining categories in a canopy cover assessment context.

- **Low branches:** Any low branches that would not be feasible for removal during routine management and should be considered as a design constraint are noted here and explained in the notes.
- **Category:** Our assessment automatically considered tree physiological/structural condition (BS 5837, 4.4.2.5h), and so these are not listed separately in the schedule. Additionally, the category accounts for the remaining contribution (BS 5837, 4.4.2.5i) as being greater than 40 years for A trees, greater than 20 years for B trees, at least 10 years for C trees, and less than 10 years for U trees, and so this is also not listed separately in the schedule. Category A, B and C trees are automatically listed as sub-category '1' unless otherwise stated.
- **Notes:** Only relevant features relating to physiological or structural conditions and low branches that may help clarify the categorisation are recorded. If there are no notes, then the presumption should be that no relevant features were observed.
- **RPAs:** The RPAs were calculated as recommended in BS 5837, and the nominal RPA radius for each tree was listed, irrespective of any modifying factors. Where appropriate, RPAs for trees on the site may have been adjusted in accordance with BS 5837 and as illustrated on the plan.
- **Future tree safety checks:** Due to the time that may elapse between the original survey and the start of development, all trees should be checked as part of the standard risk management process before any works start on site. Our survey of the trees was conducted on the basis that a check would be carried out within one year of the visit and that tree safety would be reviewed annually from that date.

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

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



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