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### 1.0 INSTRUCTION

1.1 We have been instructed by DU Construction (the applicant) to carry out an Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) to assess the development proposal in relation to trees in accordance with the principles of British Standard 5837 'Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition \& Construction Recommendations' 2012.
1.2 We are instructed to prepare a report to provide information to assist all parties involved in the planning process to make balanced judgements regarding arboricultural features in relation to the proposed development on land off Gwel Y Llan, Llandegfan. As such, all trees within influencing distance to the development proposal both on and adjoining the site have been surveyed and are listed within a Tree Survey Schedule (Appendix 1) and plotted on all accompanying plans.
1.3 The stage 1 tree survey was carried out on 15 October 2023. Our appraisal of the mechanical integrity of trees on the site is enough to inform the current project. The assessment of trees is carried out from ground level without invasive investigation and the disclosure of hidden defects cannot therefore be expected. Whilst the survey is not specifically commissioned to report on matters of tree safety, we report obvious defects that are significant in relation to the existing and proposed land use. We do not carry out detailed safety inspections unless specifically instructed to do so in writing and have not carried out such inspections of trees on the proposal site.
1.4 Twenty-five individual trees (T1-T23), one group (G1) and three hedgerows (H1-H3) were surveyed and mapped on a Preliminary Tree Constraints \& Impact Assessment Plan Ref: 23/AIA/Anglesey/45, Drawing No. 1 \& 2 at Appendix 2. All arboricultural information recorded during the survey is presented within a schedule at Appendix 1.
1.5 The Arboricultural Impact Assessment is based on the proposed layout plan Ref: P1185, Drawing No: GYL-SAL-01-ZZ-DR-A-0003 (Rev P6) provided by Saer Architects.
2.0 STATUTORY CONTROLS \& PLANNING POLICY
2.1 Anglesey Council do not display Tree Preservation Order or Conservation Area designations on an interactive map and unfortunately, we have been unable to obtain this information from the Council information to date. You are advised to seek confirmation on this prior to undertaking any tree works.

### 2.2 Protected Species

2.2.1 Mature trees often contain cavities, crevices and hollows that offer potential habitat for species such as bats and barn owls. Both are afforded protection under the Schedule 5 of the Wildife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), as well as The Conservation (Natural Habitats, \&c) (Amendment) Regulations 2007.

### 2.3 Wildlife Habitats

2.3.1 Trees and hedgerows of most species provide valuable nesting sites for a wide range of birds, and it is likely that nesting birds will be present on the site during the period March to September.

### 3.0 THE SITE

3.1 The application site is agricultural land located to the north of Gwel Y Llan. Trees and hedgerows are located on the boundaries.


### 4.0 DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

4.1 Residential development with associated vehicular access and parking.
5.0 GENERAL CONSTRAINTS DATA - CONSTRUCTION EXCLUSION ZONES (CEZ's)

### 5.1 GENERAL

5.1.1 During the development process for retention trees, there may be three and even four constraints to consider: Construction Exclusion Zone (CEZ's):

- CEZ 1: Root Protection Area (see 5.2)
- CEZ 2: Tree Crown Protection (see 5.3)
- CEZ 3: Tree Dominance (see 5.4)
- CEZ 4: New Tree Planting Zone (see 5.5)

CEZ's are explained below:
5.2 CEZ 1: ROOT PROTECTION AREA (RPA)
5.2.1 The RPA, calculated in $\mathrm{m}^{2}$, should be protected before and during any demolition/construction works. This ensures the effective retention of trees by safeguarding a reliable quantum of functioning tree roots. The RPA is based on a radial measure from the centre of the tree stem, which is calculated by multiplying the stem diameter by a factor of twelve or by the (mean stem diameter ${ }^{2}$ ) x number of stems for multi-stemmed trees.
5.2.2 During the AIA 2, the derived radial measure is converted by the Arboriculturalist into the actual area to be protected, having due regard to prevailing site conditions and how these may have affected the tree(s), particularly in relation to factors affecting their likely rooting disposition. The RPA for each tree should initially be plotted as a circle centred on the base of the stem. Where pre-existing site conditions or other factors indicate that rooting has occurred asymmetrically, a polygon of equivalent area should be produced. Modifications to the shape of the RPA should reflect a soundly based arboricultural assessment of likely root distribution.
5.2.3 The means of protecting the RPA will include the installation of tree protective fencing prior to the start of any demolition or construction work on site. The prohibition of various activities within the RPA must be adhered to (e.g. mechanical excavation, soil stripping, fire lighting, material storage, lowering levels and creating excessive sealed surfacing) and may include the use of temporary ground protection and/or special engineering solutions where construction is proposed near to retention trees or within the RPA.
5.3 CEZ 2: TREE CROWN PROTECTION ZONE
5.3.1 This is the area above ground occupied by the crown (branches) of the tree, along with allowances for working space (safe working area) and if appropriate, for future growth. The extent of CEZ 2 is determined by considering the existing and future crown spread of the tree(s), bearing in mind the possibility of this being modified by an acceptable quantum of pruning.
5.3.2 Canopies of retained trees are clear of all construction works and as such access facilitation pruning is not required.

### 5.4 CEZ 3: TREE DOMINANCE ZONE

5.4.1 Trees are located to the north of the dwellings and will not cause any issues with excessive shading as a result.

### 5.5 CEZ 4: NEW PLANTING ZONE

5.5.1 Refer to landscape proposals.

### 6.0 SURVEY METHODOLOGY

6.1 The method used in the preparation of this report is based on the principles of BS 5837: 2012.

1. Tree heights were surveyed to the nearest 1 m
2. Trunk diameters were measured by use of forestry girth tape
3. The category assessment (Table 1) on which the trees is based include current and long-term arboricultural, landscape, cultural and conservation values (BS5837: 2012). This table can be found at Appendix 1
4. For clarity, the grading system is summarised from Table 2 of the BS as follows:

U grade - trees for removal, effective for less than 10 years
A grade - trees of high quality and value, effective for more than 40 years
B grade - trees of moderate quality and value, effective for more than 20 years
C grade - trees of low quality and value, effective for 10 years
Note: We have indicated colour coding on the drawing and therefore a monochrome copy should not be relied on.

### 6.2 SOIL ASSESSMENT

6.2.1 A soil assessment should be undertaken by a competent person to inform decisions relating to:

- the root protection area (RPA)
- tree protection
- new planting design; and
- foundation design to take account of retained, removed and new trees (potential soil subsidence/heave)

Tree Solutions do not undertake soil assessments and the client is advised to seek specialist advice in this respect.
7.0 JUXTAPOSITION OF TREES AND STRUCTURES

### 7.1 Below ground constraints

7.1.1 The below ground constraints are generally summarised as the root protection area (RPA). The shape of the RPA and its exact location will depend upon arboricultural considerations including likely tolerance of the tree to root disturbance; morphology and disposition of the roots when known influenced by past or existing site conditions; soil type and structure; and topography and drainage.
7.1.2 The purpose of the RPA is to prevent physical damage to tree roots and to prevent damage to the soil structure. Tree roots are damaged by soil compaction, changes in soil levels or soil contamination which could reduce tree health and/or stability.
7.1.3 Root patterns are affected by topography and characteristics of the soil or substrate. Where trees are located within proximity to existing hard standing or underground physical barriers, they are unlikely to have an even distribution of lateral roots due to restrictions in root growth created by compacted sub-grades beneath. The RPA of all trees have all been plotted unmodified as there were no underground barriers to prevent good radial root spread.

### 7.2 Underground Services

7.2.1 We have considered the broad implications of the provision of underground services but the locations of existing and proposed were not identified on the plans supplied and, in this regard, our advice is of a general nature.
7.2.2 Drainage and service runs may need to be constructed within the rooting areas of retained trees. If this is a requirement of the development it will be necessary to retain significant roots and methods of excavation, such as thrust boring or hand digging, may need to be adopted to ensure that these impacts are acceptable.
7.2.3 As with foundation design, low impact construction methods for services installation are now well established. For more information regarding underground services, reference should be made to the National Joint Utilities Group (NJUG) Publication No. 10. Volume 4 'Guidelines for the Planning, Installation and Maintenance of Utility Services in Proximity to Trees' 2007

### 8.0 DEVELOPMENT IMPACT TO TREES

8.1 Tree Solutions carried out a stage one preliminary tree survey and provided the project architect with a report in which all existing trees and their respective Root Protection Areas (RPA) were identified and plotted on a tree constraints and impact assessment plan. We are satisfied that the with the proposed special engineering solutions, the design has taken the long-term future of the trees into account and is in accordance with Anglesey Council Planning Policies and recommendations contained with BS5837: 2012.
8.2 In order to accommodate the development it will be necessary to remove tree number 7 as listed within the survey schedule at Appendix 1. This is an Ash that exhibits reduced vigour and extensive dead wood throughout its crown due to the spread of Chalara Ash Dieback. Whilst not at stage 3, the tree will inevitably succumb to complete death within the next 5 years. As such, it would be entirely inappropriate to retain it within the context of a residential housing area.
8.3 Whilst unnecessary to remove to facilitate development works, we have also recommended the removal of the remaining Ash trees along the northern boundary as they are in a state of advanced decline due to Chalara Ash Dieback.

### 9.0 PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE SCHEME

9.1 We advise that all proposed revisions having implications for trees should be referred to us for review.
10.0 CONCLUSIONS
10.1 BS 5837: 2012 contains clear and current recommendations for a best practice approach to the assessment, retention and protection of trees on development sites. The proposed development has followed this guidance by:

- Seeking arboricultural advice and undertaking a phase 1 preliminary tree survey in order to inform the layout and design of the proposed development
- Respecting the constraints posed to development of the site by high or moderate quality trees
- Acting upon arboricultural advice throughout the design process to obtain the best development proposal whilst considering the current and future tree requirements
- Trees to be removed will all be replaced with new planting
- Taking the above into consideration, we can see no viable Arboricultural grounds for refusal.


### 11.0 LIMITING CONDITIONS

- Unless stated otherwise:
- Information contained in this report covers only those trees that were examined and reflects the condition of those trees at the time of the inspection.
- The inspection is limited to visual examination of the subject trees from ground level only and without dissection, excavation, probing or coring. There is no warranty or guarantee, expressed or implied, that problems or deficiencies of the subject trees may not arise in the future.
- This report has been prepared for the sole use and benefit of the client. Any liability of Tree Solutions shall not be extended to any third party.
- No part of this report can be reproduced without the authorisation of Tree Solutions Ltd.

Appendix One
Tree Survey Schedule

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Site | LAND OFF GWEL Y LLAN, LLANDEGFAN, ANGLESEY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Surveyor | M BARDSLEY |  | Page 1 of 2 |  |  |
| Client | DU CONSTRUCTION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Assessment Dates | 18-Oct-23 |  |  |  |  |
| Brief | ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Viewing Conditions | CLEAR |  |  |  |  |
|  | Name | Age | Height (m) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Crown } \\ & \text { clear } \end{aligned}$ | North | East | South | West | $\begin{gathered} \text { Stem } \\ \text { Diameter } \\ (\mathrm{mm}) \end{gathered}$ | Vitality | Job Reference ${ }^{\text {comments }}$ | 23/AIA/ANGLESEY/45 |  | Category |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { RPA } \\ & \left(\mathrm{m}^{2}\right) \end{aligned}$ |
| Tree <br> (Tag)/Group/ <br> Woodland <br> Number |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | E.R.C | Management |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { RPA } \\ & (\mathrm{m}) \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 1 | Ash | ем | 7 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 420 | Moderate | ADB stage 1 . Well used access between tree and client site likely to have impacted on root growth. | 10> | Reinspect for ADB 2024 | C1 | 5 | 80 |
| 2 | Willow | ем | 6 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | $\begin{gathered} 2 \times 300,200 \\ (469) \end{gathered}$ | Good | Scrubby goat willow on neighbouring property, measurements estimated. trifurcates at ground level with compression unions typical of the species. | <10 | N/A | u | N/A | N/A |
| 3 | Eucalyptus | SM | 5 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 2 \times 100 \mathrm{~mm}, \\ 2 \times 150,1 \times \\ 175 \quad(309) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Good | Multi stemmed $\times 5$ as of ground level with poor form. Growing on neighbouring property. $2 \times$ stems estimated. | 10> | N/A | C1 | 3.7 | 44 |
| 4 | Eucalyptus | ем | 5 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 425 | Moderate | Unsympathetic pruning; topped at 3 m leaving large wound open to decay and heavy, unbalanced limbs over client site prone to failure. Growing on neighbouring property. | <10 | Reduce limbs overhanging site by $3 \mathrm{~m}+$ | u | N/A | N/A |
| 5 | Birch | EM | 4 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 230 | Moderate | Topped tree leaving large wound open to decay and heavy, unbalanced limbs over client site prone to failure. Possibly topped for power line. Growing on neighbouring property | <10 | Reduce limbs overhanging site by $3 \mathrm{~m}+$ | u | N/A | N/A |
| 6 | Eucalyptus | EM | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 500 | Moderate | Growing on neighbouring property with all measurements estimated. Unsympathetic pruning; topped for power line? | <10 | N/A | U | N/A | N/A |
| 7 | Ash | M | 19 | 2 | 12 | 10 | 9 | 8 | 1210 | Moderate | Large tree with ADB stage 2 , oddly localised die back particularly to south side, dead wood up to $3 \mathrm{~m} \times 200 \mathrm{~mm}$ over site. Habitat potential throughout. | <10 | Remove | C1 | 14.4 | 662 |
| 8 | Ash | SM | 8 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | $\begin{gathered} \begin{array}{c} 180,140 \\ (228) \end{array} \end{gathered}$ | Poor | ADB stage 3. Codominant with poor form and in advanced stage of decline. |  | Remove | u | N/A | N/A |
| 9 | Sycamore | EM | 14 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 550 | Good | Reasonable form that could be improved with sympathetic pruning. | 20> | Prune to shape | B2 | 6.6 | 136 |
| 10 | Sycamore | SM | 9 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 375 | Good | Ivy obscures stem preventing further inspection. Suppressed by neighbouring trees. | 10> | Sever ivy | C2 | 4.5 | 63 |
| 11 | Ash | em | 13 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 370 | Moderate | ADB stage 2. Cankered limb measuring $5 \mathrm{~m} \times 200 \mathrm{~mm}$ south side at 3 m . | 10> | Remove cankered limb | C2 | 4.4 | 62 |
| 12 | Ash | M | 15 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | $\begin{gathered} 625,475 \\ (785) \end{gathered}$ | Moderate | ADB stage 1. Co-dominant as of ground level with good tension union. | 10> | No works required | C2 | 9.4 | 279 |
| HEADINGS \& ABBREVIATIONS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tree no. |  |  |  | Reference number. refer to plan or numbered tags where applcable ( $=$ TREE, $=$ = GROUP, H = HEDGE) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SPECIIS: |  |  |  | COMMON NAME (LATIN NAMES AVAILABLE ON REQUEST) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AGE RANGE/LIFE STAGE: |  |  |  | $Y=$ YOUNG, SM = SEMI MATURE, EM = EARLY MATURE, M = MATURE, PM = POST MATURE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HEIGHT: |  |  |  | ESTIMATED AND RECORDED IN METRES. APPRoximAtely 1 IN 10 TREES ARE Measured USING A Clinometer And the remainder estimated agains the measured trees |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CROWN SPREAD: |  |  |  | MAXIMUM CROWN RADIUS MEASURED TO THE FOUR CARDINAL COMPASS POINTS FOR SINGLE SPECIMENS ONLY (MEASUREMENT FOR TREE GROUPS - MAXIMUM RADIUS OF THE GROUP) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CROWN CLEARANCE \& DIRECTION OF GROWTH: |  |  |  | Height in meters of crown clearance above adjacent ground level (to inform on ground clearance, crown/stem ratio and shading) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| STEM DIA/MUIT-STEM DIA: |  |  |  | STEM DIAMETR - MEASURED AT APPROXIMATELY 1.5 METRES ABOVE GROUND LevEL OR A COMBINATION OF STEMS FOR MULT-STEMMED TREES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vitality: |  |  |  | A MEASURE OF PHYSIOLOGICAL CONDITIIN. $\mathrm{D}=$ DEAD, MD $=$ MORIUUND, $\mathrm{P}=$ POOR, $\mathrm{M}=$ MODERATE, $\mathrm{G}=\mathrm{GOOD}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E.R.C. = ESTIMATED REMAINING CONTRIBUTION: |  |  |  | RELATIVE USEFUL LIFE EXPECTANCY (YEARS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BS 5837CATEGORY \& SUB-CATEGORY GRADING |  |  |  | A = HIGH QUALITY AND VALLE, B = MODERATE QUALTY AND VALUE, C = LOW QUALITY AND VALUE, U = UNSUUTABLE FOR RETENTION (SUB-CATEGORY ReEFRS TO ARBORICULTURAL, LANDSCAPE AND CULTURAL/CONSERVATION VALUES) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BS 5837 RADIUS \& BS 5837 RPA: |  |  |  | PROTECTIVE DISTANCE - RADIUS FROM THE CENTRE OF THE STEM TO THE LINE OF TREE PROTECTION (CONSTRUCTION EXCLUSION ZONE - CEZ) AND PROTECTIVE BARRIER ROOT PROTECTION AREA - BS 5837 (2012) ANNEX D (THE RECOMMENDATIONS STATE THAT THE RPA SHOULD BE CAPPED AT $707 \mathrm{M}^{2}$ ) NOTE - ALL CALCULATIONS ROUNDED TO NEAREST DECIMAL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



Table 1 Cascade chart for tree quality assessment
Category and definition Criteria (including subcategories where appropriate) Identification

Trees unsuitable for retention (see Note)

## Category U

Those in such a condition that they cannot realistically be retained as living trees in the context of the current land use for longer than 10 years

- Trees that have a serious, irremediable, structural defect, such that their early loss is expected due to collapse including those that will become unviable after removal of other category $U$ trees (e.g. where, for whatever reason, the loss of companion shelter cannot be mitigated by pruning)
- Trees that are dead or are showing signs of significant, immediate, and irreversible overall decline
- Trees infected with pathogens of significance to the health and/or safety of other trees nearby, or very low quality trees suppressing adjacent trees of better quality
NOTE Category $U$ trees can have existing or potential conservation value which it might be desirable to preserve; see 4.5.7.
1 Mainly arboricultural qualities 2 Mainly landscape qualities 3 Mainly cultural values,

|  | 1 Mainly arboricultural qualities | 2 Mainly landscape qualities | 3 Mainly cultural values, including conservation |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Trees to be considered for retention |  |  |  |  |
| Category A <br> Trees of high quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 40 years | Trees that are particularly good examples of their species, especially if rare or unusual; or those that are essential components of groups or formal or semi-formal arboricultural features (e.g. the dominant and/or principal trees within an avenue) | Trees, groups or woodlands of particular visual importance as arboricultural and/or landscape features | Trees, groups or woodlands of significant conservation, historical, commemorative or other value (e.g. veteran trees or wood-pasture) | See Table 2 |
| Category B <br> Trees of moderate quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 20 years | Trees that might be included in category A, but are downgraded because of impaired condition (e.g. presence of significant though remediable defects, including unsympathetic past management and storm damage), such that they are unlikely to be suitable for retention for beyond 40 years; or trees lacking the special quality necessary to merit the category A designation | Trees present in numbers, usually growing as groups or woodlands, such that they attract a higher collective rating than they might as individuals; or trees occurring as collectives but situated so as to make little visual contribution to the wider locality | Trees with material conservation or other cultural value | See Table 2 |
| Category C <br> Trees of low quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 10 years, or young trees with a stem diameter below 150 mm | Unremarkable trees of very limited merit or such impaired condition that they do not qualify in higher categories | Trees present in groups or woodlands, but without this conferring on them significantly greater collective landscape value; and/or trees offering low or only temporary/transient landscape benefits | Trees with no material conservation or other cultural value | See Table 2 |

Trees that might be included in category A, but are downgraded because of impaired condition (e.g. presence of significant though unsympathetic past management and storm damage), such that they are for spial quality necessary to merit the category A designation

Trees present in groups or woodlands, but without this conferring on them significantly greater collective landscape alue; and/or trees offering low or only temporary/transient landscape benefits

## Appendix Two

Preliminary Tree Constraints Plan


## Appendix Three

Impact Assessment Plan


## Appendix Four

Tree Protection Plan


Appendix Five
Tree Protective Measures/Method Statement

## SEQUENCE OF OPERATIONS

From commencement of the above development, the following methodology shall be implemented in the manner and sequence described:

1. Tree surgery works
2. Pre-contract site meeting - Toolbox Talk
3. Erect temporary protective fencing
4. Main construction phase
5. Removal of temporary fencing
6. Landscaping within RPA
7. Arboricultural site supervision (ACoW)

## 1. Tree Surgery Works

1. Before the erection of the temporary protective fencing, all tree removal shall be implemented in accordance with the Tree Survey Schedule at Appendix 1
2. All possible efforts must be made to prevent damage to retained trees including potential root incursion or compaction caused by vehicle access.
3. All arboricultural works shall conform to the recommendations of BS 3998 (2010) 'Recommendations for Tree Work'
4. All operatives shall be equipped with and use personal protective equipment (PPE) in accordance with current Health \& Safety Executive current directives and industry codes of practice.
5. Performance of all arboricultural operations and use of equipment shall be in accordance with current Health \& Safety Executive current directives and industry codes of practice
6. Any additional access facilitation pruning required shall be undertaken by qualified tree contractors and conform to the recommendations of BS 3998 (2010) 'Recommendations for Tree Work'

## 2. Pre-Contract Site Meeting - 'Toolbox Talk'

To outline working methods in relation to trees prior to any construction activity on site, a site meeting of the following shall take place:

1. Client
2. Main Contractor
3. Arboricultural Clerk of Works (ACoW)
4. Site Agent
5. Erect Temporary Tree Protective Fencing
6. Prior to commencement of any construction, preparation, excavation, or material deliveries the main contractor shall erect the temporary protective fencing as detailed in the 'Tree Protection Specification' and in the location indicated on the Tree Protection Plan.
7. Main Construction Phase
8. There shall be no storage of construction material, site parking, site accommodation or equipment in any area designated as the Root Protection Area (RPA) and Construction Exclusion Zone (CEZ) and enclosed by Temporary Protective Fencing
9. No materials that are likely to have an adverse effect on tree health such as oil, bitumen or cement will be stored or discharged within 10 metres of the trunk of a tree that is to be retained. No fires will be lit
10. The site agent shall supervise deliveries by self-loading crane, with vehicles positioned in such a manner that retained trees are not at risk of damage

## Cement Mixing

- The cement mixer will be laid on top of plywood boards in a position outside the RPA of any trees. The mixer will be kept in this position throughout all development work.


## Avoiding Damage to Stems and Branches

- Care shall be taken when planning site operations in proximity to trees to ensure that wide or tall loads or plant with booms, jibs and counterweights can operate without encountering retained trees. Such contact can result in serious injury resulting in safe retention impossible


## On Site Storage of Spoil and Building Materials

- Prior to and during all site construction works no spoil will be stored and no cement mixing will take place within the Root Protection Area of any tree on or adjacent to the site even if proposed site work is to be within the crown spread. Any encroachment within this protected area will only be with the prior agreement of LCC Arboricultural Officer

5. Remove all Temporary Tree Protective Fencing
6. Tree Protective fencing will only be removed upon completion of all construction work and once all machinery associated with the works has left site.
7. Landscaping within RPA of Trees
8. There shall be no rotovating of ground within any area designated as a Root Protection Area (RPA) and Construction Exclusion Zone (CEZ) and enclosed by Temporary Protective Fencing.
9. No hard-landscaping works or excavation for cables or any other service should be installed within the Root Protection Area (RPA) and Construction Exclusion Zone (CEZ) without the written consent of the LPA

## 7. Arboricultural Site Supervision - (ACoW)

1 The ACoW shall give toolbox talk training with the main contractor/sub-contractor on all tree protective measures and working practice within designated RPA's
2 The ACoW shall make visits to site to inspect all tree protection measures during all key development work within proximity to retained trees and when requested by the contractor.

| Arboricultural Clerk of Works (ACoW) |  |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |
| Name: | Alistair Henderson |
| Tel: | 01244389114 |
| Mobile: | 0776677450 |
| Email: | alistair@tree-solutions.co.uk |

## TREE PROTECTIVE FENCING

1 Before the commencement of any demolition and subsequent construction works on site (other than those set out in the schedule of tree works contained in this document), protective fencing will be erected as detailed on the Tree Protection Plan and as specified below.
2 The fencing will consist of a scaffold framework in accordance with Figure 2 of BS 5837-2012 (illustration below) comprising a metal framework, both vertical and horizontal, well braced to resist impacts. Vertical tubes will be spaced at a maximum interval of 3 m . Onto this, weldmesh panels shall be securely fixed with wire or scaffold clamps. Weldmesh panels on rubber or concrete feet are not considered resistant to impact and for this reason will not be used. The site manager or other suitably qualified appointed person will be responsible for inspecting the protective fencing daily; any damage to the fencing or breaches of the fenced area will be rectified immediately.
3 Clearly legible weatherproof signage, stating "Protected Trees - Exclusion Zone" shall be attached to the fencing 1.5 m from the ground, facing out of the Tree Protection Zone located at regular intervals along the fence line
4 The fencing will remain in place until completion of all site works and then only removed when all site traffic is removed from site
5 Other than works detailed within this method statement or approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (LPA), no works including storage or dumping of materials shall take place within the exclusion zones defined by the protective fencing.

## Protective Fencing Detail

The fence types are shown on the Tree Protection Plan with the following colour key: -

## 1. Magenta

2.0M high heavy-duty Heras panels (with extra central support bar) mounted on scaffold poles (driven into the ground) and secured with anti-tamper bolts - as illustrated below.


Tree Protective Fencing Specification



TREE PROTECTION AREA KEEP OUT !
(TOWN \& COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990) TREES ENCLOSED BY THIS FENCE ARE PROTECTED BY PLANNING CONDITIONS AND/OR ARE THE SUBJECTS OF A TREE PRESERVATION ORDER. CONTRAVENTION OF A TREE PRESERVATION ORDER MAY LEAD TO CRIMINAL PROSECUTION

ANY INCURSION INTO THE PROTECTED AREA MUST BE WITH THE WRITTEN PERMISSION OF THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY

