



Twickenham Riverside

Arboricultural Survey

For

London Borough of Richmond
upon Thames

Project No.: ALP001-008

July 2022

London & South East

Compass House
Surrey Research Park
Guildford
GU2 7AG . UK
t: +44 (0)1483 466 000

North East

Brooklands Court Business Centre
Tunstall Road
Leeds
LS11 5HL. UK
t: +44 (0)113 247 3780

North West

St James Tower
7 Charlotte Street
Manchester
M1 4DZ
t: +44 (0) 161 676 1160

Wales & South West

Sophia House
28 Cathedral Road
Cardiff
CF11 9LJ UK
t: +44 (0) 2920 660180

Midlands

605 Holly Court, Holly Farm Business Park
Honiley, Kenilworth
Warwickshire
CV8 1NP
t: +44 (0) 121 726 3494

Enquiries

e: enquiries@thomsonec.com

w: www.thomsonec.com



Project Number	Report No.
ALP001-008 (previously AALP152/001)	001

Revision No.	Date of Issue	Author	Reviewer	Approver
001	22/07/2020	Neil Francis	Neil Francis	Simon Mackrell
002	27/05/2021	Andy Poynter	Neil Francis	Simon Mackrell
003	30/07/2021	Andy Poynter	Neil Francis	Simon Mackrell
004	05/07/2022	Andy Poynter	Robert Armitage	Andy Poynter

Disclaimer:

Copyright Thomson Habitats Limited. All rights reserved.

No part of this report may be copied or reproduced by any means without prior written permission from Thomson Habitats Limited. If you have received this report in error, please destroy all copies in your possession or control and notify Thomson Habitats Limited.

This report has been prepared for the exclusive use of the commissioning party and unless otherwise agreed in writing by Thomson Habitats Limited, no other party may use, make use of or rely on the contents of the report. No liability is accepted by Thomson Habitats Limited for any use of this report, other than for the purposes for which it was originally prepared and provided.

Opinions and information provided in the report are on the basis of Thomson Habitats Limited using due skill, care and diligence in the preparation of the same and no explicit warranty is provided as to their accuracy. It should be noted and it is expressly stated that no independent verification of any of the documents or information supplied to Thomson Habitats Limited has been made.

Contents

1. Summary	5
2. Introduction	6
2.1 Development Background	6
2.2 Site Description	6
2.3 Brief and Objectives	6
2.4 Limitations	7
3. Methodology	8
3.1 Desk Study	8
3.2 Tree Survey	8
4. Results	12
4.1 Desk Study	12
4.2 Tree Survey	12
5. Recommendations.....	13
5.1 General Tree Retention Guidance.....	13
5.2 Site Specific Guidance	13
5.3 Tree Protection	14
6. Bibliography.....	15
Appendix 1 - Tree Schedule.....	16
Appendix 2 - Table of Quality Assessment	24
Appendix 3 - Example of Protective Fencing	25
Appendix 4 - Example of Protective Fencing	26
Appendix 5 - Tree Protection Fencing Notice	27

Figure 1 Site location

Figure 2 Tree Constraints Plan

1. Summary

- 1.1.1** London Borough of Richmond upon Thames is proposing the redevelopment of 1, 1A, 1B and 1C King Street; 2-4 Water Lane; the site of the former swimming pool and associated buildings, The Embankment; the Diamond Jubilee Gardens, Twickenham. (see Figure 1).
- 1.1.2** Arcadis LLP commissioned Thomson Environmental Consultants (Thomson) to undertake an arboricultural survey of trees within and adjacent to the site. The arboricultural survey was carried out in accordance with BS5837:2012 '*Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction - Recommendations*' (BS5837:2012).
- 1.1.3** All trees were categorised in accordance with the cascade chart for tree quality assessment in BS5837:2012 (see Appendix 2). Trees were given a ranking of A, B or C in descending order of value and assigned one or more subcategories qualifying the basis of that value as either arboricultural, landscape or cultural. Trees with only short-term remaining value or that require immediate removal for safety or management reasons are given a U rating.
- 1.1.4** A total of 68 individual trees and four groups of trees were recorded during the survey and are listed in the Tree Schedule. The surveyor recorded seven Category A trees, 18 Category B trees, three Category B groups of trees, 26 Category C trees, one group of Category C trees and 17 Category U trees located within or adjacent to the site (see Figure 2).
- 1.1.5** Category A, B and C trees represent a material consideration to development. Concerted effort should be made to retain A and B category trees within the development. While Category C trees should be retained where possible, they should not be retained where they would present a serious constraint to development.
- 1.1.6** In order to meet the requirements of the Local Planning Authority, an Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Arboricultural Method Statement should be undertaken once detailed plans of the proposed development are available.

2. Introduction

2.1 Development Background

2.1.1 Arcadis LLP is involved in the development of a site located at Twickenham Riverside, London. The proposed description of development is as follows:

'Demolition of existing buildings and structures and redevelopment of the site comprising 45 residential units (Use Class C3), ground floor commercial/retail/cafe (Use Class E), public house (Sui Generis), boathouse locker storage, floating pontoon and floating ecosystems with associated landscaping, re-provision of Diamond Jubilee Gardens, alterations to highway layout and parking provision and other relevant works.'

2.1.2 The development is located on an approximately 1.34ha area of land (grid reference TQ163731), shown on Figure 1. The area affected by the development is hereafter referred to as 'the site'.

2.1.3 There are a number of trees within the site and adjacent to the site boundary that may be affected by development. Detailed development plans have been submitted to the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames.

2.2 Site Description

2.2.1 The site, currently known as Diamond Jubilee Gardens, lies within the Twickenham town centre and includes the whole of the riverside area between Water and Wharf Lanes, including the Embankment, which is currently dominated by parked cars. The River Thames and Eel Pie Island lie to the south and west of the site and there is typical urban development to the north and west consisting of residential properties, commercial space and other urban infrastructure.

2.3 Brief and Objectives

2.3.1 Arcadis LLP commissioned Thomson to complete an arboricultural survey and report of the site.

2.3.2 The objective of the survey and report is to assess the condition of the existing trees on site and any off site trees that might be affected by the development, providing sufficient information to enable decisions to be made on potential design layout and tree retention for the proposed development. The brief was to complete:

- An Arboricultural Survey of trees within or immediately adjacent to the site, in line with BS5837:2012.
- Review of the Local Planning Authority's website to determine whether trees on site are subject to a Tree Preservation Order or are covered by Conservation Area restrictions.
- - An Arboricultural Report detailing our survey methods, results and recommendations, including the Tree Schedule and Tree Constraints Plan, which should be used to inform feasibility studies and design options at an early stage.

2.3.3 This report details the methods and results of the tree survey and provides the Tree Schedule and TCP. The AIA and AMS will be completed once plans for the proposed development have been finalised.

2.4 Limitations

2.4.1 The information provided within this report and in the accompanying Tree Schedule covers only those trees that were inspected and their condition at the time of survey.

2.4.2 A full hazard assessment has not been made and therefore no guarantee is given as to the structural integrity of any of the trees on site.

2.4.3 Where trees were clad in ivy (*Hedera helix*), or where dense epicormic growth or dense underplanting obscured the main stem, this was recorded in the Tree Schedule. The inspection of such trees is impeded and as such a further inspection may be required following the removal of the obstruction. The retention categories of such trees should be considered as provisional only.

2.4.4 Measurements for off-site trees have been estimated and therefore may not fully represent the related constraints.

2.4.5 Whilst this report makes general observations on the long-term potential of the trees surveyed, trees are dynamic organisms and subject to continual change, thus this report should not be relied upon for the purposes of development for more than 12 months from the date of survey (28th April 2022).

3. Methodology

3.1 Desk Study

3.1.1 Records of Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) existing at the site and Conservation Areas within or adjacent to the site were sought from London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames.

3.2 Tree Survey

3.2.1 All significant trees at the site were assessed for their potential to be affected by the development proposals. Significant trees are defined as those with a trunk diameter of greater than 75mm at 1.5m above ground level according to the survey methodology outlined in BS5837:2012. Off-site or third party trees have been included where it is likely they would influence the development.

3.2.2 The trees surveyed were inspected from ground level only and no internal investigations were undertaken.

3.2.3 Trees were categorised as single trees or those that formed part of a distinct group such as a woodland or hedgerow. Groups can be defined as cohesive arboricultural features, either aerodynamically (for example, companion shelter), visually or culturally including for biodiversity (BS5837:2012). The information recorded for each tree can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1: Information recorded for each tree during survey

Attribute	Description
Tree No.	Numerical reference given in sequential order starting at number '1', corresponding with the numbers as set out in Figure 2; trees are given the prefix 'T', groups 'G', woodlands 'W' and hedgerows 'H'.
Species	The common names are based upon on site identification and expressed according to <i>Tree Guide</i> (Johnson & More, 2004).
Height	Measured approximately from ground level with the aid of a clinometer and shown in metres (m).
Stem Diameter	Diameter measured at approximately 1.5m above ground level. In the case of multi-stemmed trees, measurement is taken of each stem at 1.5m, where there are two to five stems; or a mean stem diameter at 1.5m, where there are more than five stems. Given in millimetres (mm).
Canopy Spread	Maximum branch spread measured in metres from the centre of the trunk in the direction of the four cardinal points of the compass (or an average can be given if branches demonstrate an even spread).
Crown Clearance	Height above ground level of the first significant branch and direction of growth, and the height above ground level of the overall canopy.

Attribute	Description
Age Class	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Young - less than one-third natural life span spent; • Middle-aged - between one-third and two-thirds natural life span spent; • Mature - greater than two-thirds life span completed; • Over-mature - mature, and in an overall state of decline; • Veteran - surviving beyond the typical age range for the species with a high value in terms of conservation and amenity.
Physiological Condition	Overall health, condition and function of the tree in comparison to a 'normal' example of the species of a similar age; e.g. 'good', 'fair', 'poor' or 'dead'. If deemed necessary, these gradings may be elaborated upon in the 'Comments' section.
Structural Condition	<p>The overall structural condition of the tree including the roots, butt, trunk, limbs and their unions, and the presence of any structural defects, decay or pathological defects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good - no significant visible structural defects with a form typical for the species; • Fair - a specimen with only minor defects that are easily remedied or of no long term significance; • Poor - significant and irremediable physiological or structural defects that may lead to early or premature decline; • Hazardous - significant structural defects of such a degree that there is a risk of imminent collapse or failure. If deemed necessary, these gradings may be elaborated upon in the 'Comments' section.
Comments	Comments have been made, where appropriate, relating to location, health and condition, structure and form, estimated life expectancy, conservation value and amenity value within the local landscape.
Preliminary Management Recommendations	Tree work that should be undertaken for good arboricultural management, regardless of the requirements of the development.
Estimated Remaining Contribution	The estimated time, in years, that the tree will provide a safe contribution to the site (i.e. <10, 10-20, 20-40 and >40).

Quality Assessment

- 3.2.4** During the survey, the trees were assessed qualitatively, categorising the quality and value of the trees based on arboricultural, landscape and cultural (including conservation) features. Each tree was then placed into one of four categories. The four categories can be seen in Table 2. Definitions for these categories can be found in Appendix 2.

Table 2: Quality assessment categories

Category	Description
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.
Category A	Trees of high quality with an estimated life expectancy of at least 40 years.
Category B	Trees of moderate quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 20 years.
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.

3.2.5 Trees categorised as either A, B or C, were also allocated up to three subcategories. The subcategories chosen for each tree are dependent on the main reasons for selection of the particular category grading. The three subcategories are as follows:

1. Category grading based on mainly arboricultural qualities;
2. Category grading based on mainly landscape qualities; and
3. Category grading based on mainly cultural values, including conservation.

Root Protection Areas (RPAs)

3.2.6 Trees that are selected for retention on the site could be at risk of damage during construction, such as root damage during excavations for foundations or services, or any ground-working for landscaping. Further impacts on the trees may potentially result from vehicle movements and materials storage, including root severance, compaction of the soil and exclusion of air and water to the soil. The risk of tree damage is minimised if construction activities are planned to avoid the roots of trees.

3.2.7 The area of ground adjacent to each tree or group of trees that contains the majority of the roots can be calculated using the equation provided in the BS5837:2012. This Root Protection Area (RPA) is a radius around the tree of 12 times the stem diameter for a single stem. For multi-stemmed trees of two to five stems and greater than five stems, the cumulative stem diameters to be multiplied by 12, are calculated as per the equations in Table 3.

Table 3: Equations for the calculation of the RPA of multi-stemmed trees

Number of stems	Equation
Two to five	$\sqrt{((\text{stem diameter } 1)^2 + (\text{stem diameter } 2)^2 \dots + (\text{stem diameter } 5)^2)}$
More than five	$\sqrt{(\text{mean stem diameter})^2 \times \text{number of stems}}$

- 3.2.8** The RPA for each tree in the Tree Schedule has been calculated and, where relevant, has been adjusted to take into account site conditions. For example, when a tree is growing in a confined root space adjacent to an existing building or other solid structure that would restrict root growth in that direction, the RPA has been adjusted accordingly (see Figure 2).
- 3.2.9** The RPA for tree groups is calculated using the stem diameter of the largest tree within the group. The RPA radius is calculated as per Section 3.2.7 and then used to define the RPA by following the outline of the group's extent.
- 3.2.10** Where the calculated RPA exceeds 707m², it has been capped at this figure, as per BS5837:2012. This is equivalent to a circle with a radius of 15m or a square with approximately 26m sides.

Date of Survey

- 3.2.11** The site was visited and the survey undertaken on 2nd July 2020 by Martin Grew, Lead Arboricultural Surveyor. The site has subsequently been visited and the trees inspected by Andrew Poynter Principal Arboricultural Consultant on 4th May 2021, and subsequently on 28th April and 27th May 2022. The final visit was in the company of the council's tree officer Jane Crowther.

Weather Conditions

- 3.2.12** The weather conditions at the time of survey were cloudy and overcast. Deciduous trees were in full leaf.

4. Results

4.1 Desk Study

4.1.1 It was confirmed using the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames online mapping system on 26th July 2021 that the site is located within the Twickenham Riverside Conservation Area.

4.1.2 Under the Town and Country Planning (Tree Preservation) (England) Regulations 2012 it is prohibited to cut down, top, lop, uproot, wilfully damage or wilfully destroy; or cause or permit the cutting down, topping, lopping, uprooting, wilful damage or wilful destruction of any tree, or group of trees, subject to a TPO or that is located within a Conservation Area except with the consent of the local authority.

4.2 Tree Survey

4.2.1 A total of 68 significant individual trees and four groups of trees located within or immediately adjacent to the site boundary were recorded during the survey. A breakdown of categories can be found in Table 4. The locations of all trees, RPAs, retention categories and reference numbers are shown on Figure 2. A detailed description of each tree is given in the Tree Schedule in Appendix 1.

Table 1: Number of significant trees allocated to each retention category.

Tree Category	Number of Trees	Tree Numbers	Number of Groups	Group numbers	Total
A	7	T36, T37, T40, T41, T45, T46, T66	-	-	7
B	18	T2, T23, T29, T30, T31, T32, T33, T34, T42, T43, T44, T47, T48, T49, T50, T51, T52, T65,	3	G2, G3, G4	21
C	26	T1, T3, T5, T6, T7, T10, T12, T13, T14, T15, T16, T17, T19, T20, T22, T24, T25, T26, T27, T39, T53, T54, T56, T57, T67, T68	1	G1	27
U	17	T4, T8, T9, T11, T18, T21, T28, T35, T38, T55, T58, T59, T60, T61, T62, T63, T64,	-	-	17
Total	68		4		72

Root Protection Areas (RPAs)

4.2.2 The RPAs for the trees and groups surveyed can be seen in Figure 2. The actual RPAs, in m², for the individual trees surveyed are shown in Appendix 1.

5. Recommendations

5.1 General Tree Retention Guidance

5.1.1 All trees on site should be considered for retention where possible, with the greatest consideration given to Category A trees and then B trees where these specimens occur, and finally Category C trees. However, the retention of Category C trees should not be at the expense of an efficient design. Category U trees are recommended for removal for sound arboricultural reasons. Where trees of any category are on adjacent land, and removal is required for the development, permission must be sought from the landowner before any works can be undertaken.

5.2 Site Specific Guidance

5.2.1 Seven Category A trees were identified during the survey, of which two, T36 and T37, lie within the site boundary. These trees should be retained if possible and incorporated into any future landscaping scheme as they offer high amenity value in the local landscape. Four trees, T40, T41, T45 and T46 are located outside the eastern boundary of the site and should not be impacted by any future proposals. The final tree, T66, is located on the high street at the northern end of Water Lane.

5.2.2 Close to trees T36 and T37, are three Category B trees, T32, T33 and T34, which collectively form an imposing arboricultural feature at the top of the Gardens. Loss of these trees would affect the local landscape and they should be retained if possible. T34 was planted by HRH Princess Alexandra for the Queen's Diamond Jubilee and therefore has cultural value and effort should be made to specifically retain this tree, either in its current location, or in a more suitable one if development pressures requires it.

5.2.3 Category U trees T58, T59, T60, T61, T62, T63 and T64 are located adjacent to existing car parking and form a linear feature in poor health along The Embankment. They should be removed due to their poor condition.

5.2.4 In the southern corner of the site are three Category B Himalayan birch trees T29, T30 and T31, a species known and planted for its attractive silver, almost white, bark. Whilst loss of these trees would be regrettable, they could be considered of less importance in the landscape overall due to their smaller size.

5.2.5 Tree groups G2, G3 and G4 have been formally pruned as pleached/tabletop trees and are located within hard standing. They should be kept as part of future landscaping proposals if possible although they may impinge of future development space. They will require ongoing pruning *ad infinitum* if they are to be retained in their current form.

5.2.6 There are nine Category B trees, T42, T43, T44, T47, T48, T49, T50, T51, T52, located outside the site boundaries which are also in good condition and are positioned in locations where they offer good amenity value. Loss of these trees would also adversely affect the local landscape.

- 5.2.7** There are four Category C trees T53, T54, T56, T57 also located outside the site boundaries and development proposals should not affect them.
- 5.2.8** The 17 Category U trees T4, T8, T9, T11, T18, T21, T28, T35, T38, T55, T58, T59, T60, T61, T62, T63, T64, are in such a condition that they should be removed as part of routine arboricultural management.
- 5.2.9** Trees T35, T38, T58, T59, T60, T61, T62, T63 and T64 have declined in condition since the original survey,
- 5.2.10** The northern side of the crown of T35 is dead and T38 has some large dead limbs present that along with the dark exudates on the stem are likely to be associated with a bacterial infection that will hasten its decline.
- 5.2.11** Pin oaks T58, T59, T60, T61, T62, T63 and T64 are in varying stages of health from poor to moribund.
- 5.2.12** The Category B trees T2, T23, T65 and Category C trees T1, T3, T5, T6, T7, T10, T12, T13, T14, T15, T16, T17, T19, T20, T22, T24, T25, T26, T27 and T39 form a group of trees on the east of the gardens and largely consist of low quality trees that appear to be largely unmanaged. Loss of these trees would reduce the tree cover in the local area, but they do not offer significant amenity value and their losses could be offset through new, higher quality tree planting.
- 5.2.13** Where appropriate, preliminary management recommendations have been made for each tree surveyed and are detailed in the Tree Schedule in Appendix 1.

5.3 Tree Protection

- 5.3.1** For those trees selected to be retained as part of the redevelopment, it will be necessary to maintain Construction Exclusion Zones (CEZs) during the construction phase. The purpose of CEZs is to prevent damage to the tree roots from severance, compaction of the soil, or exclusion of air and water to the soil.

6. Bibliography

- 6.1.1 British Standards Institution (2012) BS5837:2012 *Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction - Recommendations*. BSI, London.
- 6.1.2 British Standards Institution (2010) BS 3998:2010 *Recommendations for Tree Work*. BSI, London.
- 6.1.3 Plant Health Service (2012) *Biosecurity Guidance* Forestry Commission, Edinburgh
- 6.1.4 Johnson, O. & More, D. (2004) *Collins Tree Guide*. London: HarperCollins.
- 6.1.5 Lonsdale, D. (1990) *Principles of Tree Hazard Assessment and Management*. The Stationery Office, London.
- 6.1.6 Matheny, N. & Clark, J.R. (1998) *Trees and Development*. ISA, Champaign, IL.
- 6.1.7 Mattheck, C. & Breloer, H. (1994) *The Body Language of Trees*. The Stationery Office, London.
- 6.1.8 National Joint Utilities Group (NJUG) (2007) NJUG Volume 4: *Guidelines for the Planning, Installation and Maintenance of Utility Services in Proximity to Trees*. NJUG, London.
- 6.1.9 National Tree Safety Group (2011) *Common Sense Risk Management of Trees* Forestry Commission, Edinburgh
- 6.1.10 Patch, D. & Holding, B. (2007) Arboricultural Practice Note 12: *Through the Trees to Development*. London: AAIS.
- 6.1.11 Robertson, J, Jackson, N & Smith, M (2006) *Tree Roots in the Built Environment*. The Stationery Office, London.

Appendix 1 - Tree Schedule

Tree/ Group No.	Species	Height (m)	Stem Diameter (mm)	Canopy Spread (m)				Height of Lowest Limb and Direction (m)	Crown Clearance (m)	Age Class	Estimated Remaining Contribution (years)	Condition		Comments	Preliminary Management Recommendations	BS Category	RPA (m ²)	RPA Radius (m)
				N	E	S	W					Physiology	Structure					
T1	Sycamore; <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	10	240, 140, 90	2	5	5	3	2.5SW	3	Middle-aged	10+	Fair	Fair	Variegated variety. Multistemmed from base with included unions. Ivy to 2/3 height. One sided canopy due to competition. Has previously had crown lifted.	Remove ivy and reduce/ remove smaller stems.	C2	38.6	3.6
T2	Sycamore; <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	10	250	5	2	4.5	3.5	2W	1.5	Middle-aged	20+	Good	Good	Uneven canopy due to competition, thin growth to the north. Has previously had crown lifted, leaving dead pegs. Deadwood in lower canopy. In close proximity to top of retaining wall.	Remove deadwood and pegs.	B2	28.3	3
T3	Sycamore; <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	11	260	2.5	2.5	4	5	2.5W	3.5	Middle-aged	10+	Fair	Good	Uneven canopy due to competition. Deadwood in canopy. Ivy to 1/3 height. Close to concrete swimming pool edge.	Remove ivy and deadwood	C2	30.6	3.2
T4	Sycamore; <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	7	80	0	0	0	0	-	0	Young	<10	Dead	Poor	Dead tree	Fell to ground level	U	-	-
T5	Sycamore; <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	8	80	4	2	2	4	0.5W	1	Young	10+	Fair	Fair	Very poor form. Suppressed tree. Close to concrete pool at base. Sparse canopy.	-	C2	6.6	1.5

Tree/ Group No.	Species	Height (m)	Stem Diameter (mm)	Canopy Spread (m)				Height of Lowest Limb and Direction (m)	Crown Clearance (m)	Age Class	Estimated Remaining Contribution (years)	Condition		Comments	Preliminary Management Recommendations	BS Category	RPA (m ²)	RPA Radius (m)
				N	E	S	W					Physiology	Structure					
T6	Sycamore; <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	10	150, 200, 200	5	2	4	4.5	1S	1	Middle-aged	10+	Fair	Fair	Very poor form. Suppressed tree. Close to concrete pool at base. Sparse canopy. Ivy to 1/4 height.	Remove ivy	C2	46.4	3.9
T7	Hornbeam; <i>Carpinus betulus</i>	5	90	2	0	0	0	1E	1	Young	20+	Good	Fair	Suppressed tree. Close to concrete pool at base. Sparse canopy. Ivy to 1/2 height.	Remove ivy	C2	3.7	1.1
T8	Goat willow; <i>Salix caprea</i>	7	160	0	0	0	0	1W	1	Over-mature	<10	Poor	Hazardous	Nearly dead, collapsed coppice. Close to concrete pool at base. One stem is alive still.	Fell to ground level	U	-	-
T9	Sycamore; <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	9	90	3.5	0	0	3	4S	3	Young	<10	Poor	Poor	Suppressed tree. Close to concrete pool at base. Sparse canopy. Damaged at 1m by scrap metal leaning on stem. Wilted foliage.	-	U	-	-
T10	Sycamore; <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	15	300	3	2	4	4	5NW	6	Mature	20+	Good	Fair	No lower canopy. Close to concrete pool at base. Sparse canopy. Ivy to 2/3 height.	Remove ivy.	C2	40.7	3.6
T11	Goat willow; <i>Salix caprea</i>	8.5	150	0	0	0	0	-	0	Middle-aged	<10	Dead	Hazardous	Held with ivy to live tree.	Fell to ground level	U	-	-
T12	Sycamore; <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	14	268	0	6	3.5	0	2NW	4.5	Middle-aged	10+	Good	Fair	Canopy competition. Close to concrete pool at base.	-	C2	32.5	3.3
T13	Goat willow; <i>Salix caprea</i>	10	290	1	6	3	1	4SE	4.5	Mature	10+	Poor	Fair	Deadwood in canopy. Close to concrete pool at base. Sparse canopy. Swept leaning stem se from ground level.	Remove deadwood	C2	38.0	3.5

Tree/ Group No.	Species	Height (m)	Stem Diameter (mm)	Canopy Spread (m)				Height of Lowest Limb and Direction (m)	Crown Clearance (m)	Age Class	Estimated Remaining Contribution (years)	Condition		Comments	Preliminary Management Recommendations	BS Category	RPA (m ²)	RPA Radius (m)
				N	E	S	W					Physiology	Structure					
T14	Sycamore; <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	15	250	1	4	1	5	4NW	3.5	Middle-aged	10+	Fair	Fair	No lower canopy. Close to concrete pool at base. Sparse canopy. Twin stem from 1.7m included union. Deadwood in canopy.	Remove deadwood.	C2	28.3	3
T15	Sycamore; <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	12	180	3	6	0	0	3NE	2	Middle-aged	10+	Fair	Fair	No lower canopy. Close to concrete pool at base. Sparse canopy. Suppressed leaning tree.	-	C2	14.7	2.2
T16	Sycamore; <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	14	220	3	5	2	4	5N	2	Middle-aged	10+	Good	Fair	Close to concrete pool at base. Sparse canopy. Canopy competition.	-	C2	21.9	2.7
T17	Sycamore; <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	13	220, 130	3	5	3	1	4NE	2.5	Middle-aged	10+	Good	Fair	Close to concrete pool at base. Canopy competition. Smaller stem is growing through railings. Almost no foliage on it.	Remove smaller stem	C2	29.5	3.1
T18	Silver birch; <i>Betula pendula</i>	11	160	1	4.5	1	1	6E	6	Middle-aged	<10	Poor	Fair	Close to concrete pool at base. Canopy competition. Very low vigour. Many dead branches. Leaning suppressed tree.	Fell to ground level	U	-	-
T19	Sycamore; <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	15	270	3.5	5	3	4.5	2.5E	3	Middle-aged	10+	Good	Fair	Grown through paving. Canopy competition. Ivy filled.	Remove ivy.	C2	33.0	3.3
T20	Sycamore; <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	9	100	1	0	0	0	2.5E	2.5	Young	10	Good	Fair	No lower canopy. Suppressed tree.	-	C2	4.5	1.2
T21	Goat willow; <i>Salix caprea</i>	8	280	0	0	2	5	1.7NE	3.5	Mature	<10	Poor	Poor	Mainly dead 1.7m pollard. Ivy filled.	Fell to ground level	U	35.5	3.4
T22	Sycamore; <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	14	260	4.5	5.5	4	1	2NE	2.5	Mature	20+	Good	Good	Root girdling. Ivy to 1/3 height. Suppressed one sided tree.	Remove ivy.	C2	30.6	3.2

Tree/ Group No.	Species	Height (m)	Stem Diameter (mm)	Canopy Spread (m)				Height of Lowest Limb and Direction (m)	Crown Clearance (m)	Age Class	Estimated Remaining Contribution (years)	Condition		Comments	Preliminary Management Recommendations	BS Category	RPA (m ²)	RPA Radius (m)
				N	E	S	W					Physiology	Structure					
T23	Sycamore; <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	15	360	5	5	5	5	3.5N	3	Mature	20+	Good	Good	Ivy to 1/3 height. Close proximity to retaining wall. Fence is fixed to stem.	Remove ivy. Repair fence and remove nails from tree.	B2	58.6	4.4
T24	Sycamore; <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	10	140	2	1	1	2	3W	3	Young	10	Good	Fair	Suppressed tree	Fell to remove competition from b2 tree	C2	8.9	1.7
T25	Sycamore; <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	12	220	0	3	3	3	3W	3	Middle-aged	10+	Good	Fair	Suppressed tree. Ivy filled	Remove ivy	C2	21.9	2.7
T26	Sycamore; <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	9.5	150	0	0	2.5	4	6W	4	Young	10	Good	Fair	Suppressed tree. Leaning west. Minimal canopy.	-	C2	10.2	1.9
T27	Sycamore; <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	16	250	5	4	2	5	5N	4	Mature	10+	Good	Fair	One sided canopy.	-	C2	28.3	3
T28	Sycamore; <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	9	290	0	0	0	0	-	4	Mature	< 10	Poor	Hazardous	Has failed at base and fallen into other trees.	Remove tree	U	38.0	3.5
T29	Himalayan birch; <i>Betula utilis</i>	7	120	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	1.5N	1	Young	20+	Good	Good	-	-	B1	6.5	1.5
T30	Himalayan birch; <i>Betula utilis</i>	7	140	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	1.5SE	1	Young	20+	Good	Good	-	-	B1	8.9	1.7
T31	Himalayan birch; <i>Betula utilis</i>	7	120	2	2	2	2	2NW	1	Young	20+	Good	Good	-	-	B2	6.5	1.5
T32	Indian bean tree; <i>Catalpa bignoniodes</i>	9	290	5	5	5	5	2SE	1	Mature	20+	Good	Good	Scattered small deadwood. Has been reduced before.	-	B1	38.0	3.5
T33	Indian bean tree; <i>Catalpa bignoniodes</i>	9	350	5	5	5	5	1.5W	1	Mature	20+	Good	Good	Scattered small deadwood. Has been reduced before. Low limbs on west side have been broken.	Remove torn pegs of low limbs.	B1	55.4	4.3

Tree/ Group No.	Species	Height (m)	Stem Diameter (mm)	Canopy Spread (m)				Height of Lowest Limb and Direction (m)	Crown Clearance (m)	Age Class	Estimated Remaining Contribution (years)	Condition		Comments	Preliminary Management Recommendations	BS Category	RPA (m ²)	RPA Radius (m)
				N	E	S	W					Physiology	Structure					
T34	Black poplar; <i>Populus nigra</i>	13	290	3	3	3	3	2.5SE	1.5	Young	10+	Fair	Fair	Evidence of wet-rot decay at old pruning wound. Exudate down stem. Planted by HRH Princess Alexandra for Diamond Jubilee.	-	B3	38.0	3.5
T35	Hornbeam; <i>Carpinus betulus</i>	15	550	4.5	5.5	4.5	3.5	3.5SE	2.5	Mature	10+	Fair	Fair	Bark necrosis on main stem. Dead stubs from old pruning operations in canopy. Deadwood in canopy. Thin low vigour growth over road, crown over road is now defoliated.	-	U	136.8	6.7
T36	Hornbeam; <i>Carpinus betulus</i>	15	510	5	5	5	5	0S	0	Mature	40+	Good	Good	Bark necrosis on main stem. Dead has been raised before. Small deadwood in canopy. Basal growth	Remove basal growth.	A1	117.7	6.2
T37	Hornbeam; <i>Carpinus betulus</i>	15	650	5.5	5.5	5.5	5.5	2.5S	2	Mature	40+	Good	Good	Ivy covered stem. Scattered deadwood in canopy. Has been raised before. Roots restricted by retaining wall to the north. Some damage to surface roots.	Remove ivy.	A1	191.1	7.8
T38	Hornbeam; <i>Carpinus betulus</i>	15	570	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	2.5W	2	Mature	10+	Poor	Poor	Large area of bark necrosis ground to 2m up stem. Low vigour patchy canopy. Scattered patchy deadwood in canopy. Has been raised before. Minimal rooting area.	-	U	147.0	6.9
T39	Sycamore; <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	11	280	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	-	4	Middle-aged	10+	Fair	Fair	No access measurements are estimated. Growing between gap in brick structures. Stem not visible below 4.5m.	-	C2	35.5	3.4

Tree/ Group No.	Species	Height (m)	Stem Diameter (mm)	Canopy Spread (m)				Height of Lowest Limb and Direction (m)	Crown Clearance (m)	Age Class	Estimated Remaining Contribution (years)	Condition		Comments	Preliminary Management Recommendations	BS Category	RPA (m ²)	RPA Radius (m)
				N	E	S	W					Physiology	Structure					
T40	Italian alder; <i>Alnus cordata</i>	16	530	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	3S	1.5	Mature	20+	Good	Good	-	-	A2	127.1	6.4
T41	Italian alder; <i>Alnus cordata</i>	16.5	460	5	5	5	5	3.5S	1.5	Mature	40+	Good	Good	-	-	A1	95.7	5.6
T42	Whitebeam; <i>Sorbus aria</i>	9	280	3.5	4	2	0	2.5NE	1.5	Mature	10+	Fair	Good	Suppressed one side tree. Deadwood.	Remove deadwood.	B2	35.5	3.4
T43	Sycamore; <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	9.5	300	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	-	1.5	Mature	10+	Fair	Fair	No access estimated measurements. Managed pollard.	-	B2	40.7	3.6
T44	False acacia; <i>Robinia pseudoacacia</i>	16	610	6	6	6	6	2SW	1.5	Mature	20+	Fair	Fair	Historical large tear out wound from 2m to ground. Scattered deadwood. Has been reduced before.	Raise over footpath. Remove deadwood.	B2	168.3	7.4
T45	Weeping willow; <i>Salix x sepulcralis</i> 'Chrysocoma'	15	700	7	5	2	6	5E	2	Mature	20+	Good	Fair	History of large snap outs. Has been heavily reduced.	-	A2	221.7	8.4
T46	Weeping willow; <i>Salix x sepulcralis</i> 'Chrysocoma'	15	790	4.5	6	6	6.5	2.5E	2.5	Mature	20+	Good	Fair	History of large snap outs. Has been heavily reduced.	Raise over road.	A2	282.3	9.5
T47	Pin oak; <i>Quercus palustris</i>	10	250	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	2.5E	1.5	Middle- aged	20+	Fair	Fair	Strong excurrent shape. Low vigour.	Raise over road and footpath	B1	28.3	3
T48	Pin oak; <i>Quercus palustris</i>	8.5	200	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	2.52	1.5	Middle- aged	10+	Fair	Fair	Strong excurrent shape. Low vigour. Die back at top.	Raise over road and footpath. Remove deadwood.	B1	18.1	2.4
T49	Sycamore; <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	14	400	5	5	5	5	-	1.5	Mature	10+	Good	Fair	No access estimated measurements. Pollard form	-	B2	72.4	4.9
T50	Sycamore; <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	10	280	4	4	4	4	-	2	Middle- aged	10+	Good	Fair	No access estimated measurements.	-	B2	35.5	3.4


Tree/ Group No.	Species	Height (m)	Stem Diameter (mm)	Canopy Spread (m)				Height of Lowest Limb and Direction (m)	Crown Clearance (m)	Age Class	Estimated Remaining Contribution (years)	Condition		Comments	Preliminary Management Recommendations	BS Category	RPA (m ²)	RPA Radius (m)
				N	E	S	W					Physiology	Structure					
T51	Sycamore; <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	15	350	3	3	7	4.5	-	0	Mature	20+	Fair	Fair	No access estimated measurements. One side canopy. Has been reduced before. Sparse canopy.	-	B2	55.4	4.3
T52	Ash; <i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>	15.5	400	6	4.5	6	5	-	1.5	Mature	20+	Fair	Fair	No access estimated measurements.	Raise over footpath.	B2	72.4	4.9
T53	Sycamore; <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	6.5	140	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5SW	1.5	Young	10+	Good	Good	No access estimated measurements.	Raise over carpark	C2	8.9	1.7
T54	False cypress species; <i>Chamaecyparis sp.</i>	11	200	2	2	2	2	-	0	Middle-aged	10+	Poor	Fair	No access estimated measurements. Very sparse foliage. Very low vigour.	-	C2	18.1	2.4
T55	Domestic apple; <i>Malus domestica</i>	4	280	0	0	0	0	-	0	Mature	<10	Dead	Poor	Offsite. No access estimated measurements.	Fell	U	35.5	3.4
T56	Domestic apple; <i>Malus domestica</i>	6.5	280	2	2	2	2	-	0	Mature	10+	Good	Fair	No access estimated measurements.	-	C2	35.5	3.4
T57	Elder; <i>Sambucus nigra</i>	6.5	200	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	-	0	Mature	10+	Fair	Fair	No access estimated measurements.	-	C2	18.1	2.4
T58	Pin oak; <i>Quercus palustris</i>	9	200	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	2SW	1.5	Middle-aged	10+	Fair	Fair	Strong excurrent shape. Low vigour.	Fell	U	18.1	2.4
T59	Pin oak; <i>Quercus palustris</i>	9	210	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	2.5S	1.5	Middle-aged	10+	Fair	Fair	Strong excurrent shape. Low vigour. Dieback at top. Root girded.	Fell	U	20.0	2.6
T60	Pin oak; <i>Quercus palustris</i>	8.5	220	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	2.5S	1.5	Middle-aged	10+	Fair	Fair	Strong excurrent shape. Low vigour. Dieback at top.	Fell	U	21.9	2.7
T61	Pin oak; <i>Quercus palustris</i>	8	200	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	2.5S	1.5	Middle-aged	10+	Fair	Fair	Excurrent shape. Low vigour. Dieback at top.	Fell	U	18.1	2.4
T62	Pin oak; <i>Quercus palustris</i>	9	200	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	2.5S	1.5	Middle-aged	10+	Fair	Fair	Excurrent shape. Low vigour dieback at top.	Fell	U	18.1	2.4

Tree/ Group No.	Species	Height (m)	Stem Diameter (mm)	Canopy Spread (m)				Height of Lowest Limb and Direction (m)	Crown Clearance (m)	Age Class	Estimated Remaining Contribution (years)	Condition		Comments	Preliminary Management Recommendations	BS Category	RPA (m ²)	RPA Radius (m)
				N	E	S	W					Physiology	Structure					
T63	Pin oak; <i>Quercus palustris</i>	8	220	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	2.5S	1.5	Middle-aged	10+	Fair	Fair	Excurrent shape. Dieback at top.	Fell	U	21.9	2.7
T64	Pin oak; <i>Quercus palustris</i>	8	240	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	2.5S	1.5	Middle-aged	10+	Fair	Fair	Excurrent shape. Dieback at top.	Fell	U	26.1	2.9
T65	Hornbeam; <i>Carpinus betulus</i>	7	140	2	2	2	2	1.5S	1.5	Middle-aged	20+	Good	Good	-	-	B2	8.9	1.7
T66	Pedunculate Oak; <i>Quercus robur</i>	11	460	5	7	6	6	2NW	1.5	Middle-aged	40+	Good	Good	Locally prominent tree on high street.	-	A1	95.7	5.6
T67	Callery pear; <i>Pyrus calleryana</i>	5	110	1	1	1	1	1.5W	1.5	Young	10+	Fair	Fair	Established tree although sparse crown compared to adjacent tree.	-	C1	5.5	1.32
T68	Callery pear; <i>Pyrus calleryana</i>	5	90	1	1	1	1	1.5N	1.5	Young	10+	Good	Fair	Satisfactory condition	-	C1	3.7	1.1
G1	Sycamore; <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	11	150	3	3	3	3	3	-	Middle-aged	10+	Fair	Fair	Group of low value (est. 4) ivy filled sycamore. Suppressed poor formed trees.	-	C2	-	-
G2	London plane; <i>Platanus x hispanica</i>	5.5	160	2	2	2	2	2	-	Middle-aged	20+	Good	Good	Group of pleached plane trees	Continue formal pruning programme. Remove basal growth.	B2	-	-
G3	London plane; <i>Platanus x hispanica</i>	5.5	160	2	2	2	2	2	-	Middle-aged	20+	Good	Good	Group of pleached plane trees	Continue formal pruning programme. Remove basal growth.	B2	-	-
G4	London plane; <i>Platanus x hispanica</i>	5.5	160	2	2	2	2	2	1.5	Middle-aged	20+	Good	Good	Group of pleached plane trees	Continue formal pruning programme. Remove basal growth.	B2	-	-


Appendix 2 - Table of Quality Assessment

Category and definition	Criteria (including subcategories where appropriate)			Identification on plan
Trees unsuitable for retention (see Note)				
Category U Those in such a condition that they cannot be retained as living trees in the context of the current land use for longer than 10 years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trees that have serious, irremediable, structural defects, 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 might be desirable to preserve			DARK RED
	1 Mainly arboricultural values	2 Mainly landscape values	3 Mainly cultural values, including conservation	
Trees to be considered for retention				
Category A Trees of high quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 40 years	Trees that are particularly good examples of their species, especially if rare or unusual; or those that are essential components of groups or of formal or semi-formal arboricultural features (e.g. the dominant and/or principle 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)	LIGHT GREEN
Category B Trees of moderate quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 20 years	Trees that might be included in category A, but are downgraded because of impaired condition (e.g. presence of significant though remediable defects, including unsympathetic past management and storm damage), such that they are unlikely to be suitable for retention for beyond 40 years; or trees lacking the special quality necessary to merit the category A designation	Trees present in numbers, usually growing as groups or woodlands, such that they attract a higher collective rating than they might as individuals; or trees occurring as collectives but situated so as to make little visual contribution to the wider locality	Trees with material conservation or other cultural value	MID BLUE
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	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 landscape value; and/or trees offering low or only temporary/transient landscape benefits	Trees with no material conservation or other cultural value	GREY


Appendix 3 - Example of Protective Fencing



a) Stabilizer strut with base plate secured with ground pins




b) Stabilizer strut mounted on block tray



Key

- 1 Standard scaffold poles
- 2 Heavy gauge 2 m tall galvanized tube and welded mesh infill panels
- 3 Panels secured to uprights and cross-members with wire ties
- 4 Ground level
- 5 Uprights driven into the ground until secure (minimum depth 0.6 m)
- 6 Standard scaffold clamps

Appendix 4 - Example of Protective Fencing




1. 100mm x 100mm timber posts at 1.2m centres
2. Three 100mm x 50mm timber rails
3. 12mm WBP Virola hardwood through plywood framed panels

Appendix 5 - Tree Protection Fencing Notice



Filepath: V:\Arboriculture\ALP001-008 - Arboricultural Services Twickenham Riverside\ALP001-008_1 - Twickenham Riverside Project_ongoing arboriculturalsupport2 DRAWING\ALP001008_Fig1_Sitelocation_JB_290622.mxd
 Contains Ordnance Survey data © Crown copyright and database right 2022. This map must not be copied or reproduced by any means without prior written permission from Thomson Environmental Consultants.



Client	Arcadis LLP		Drawing Ref	ALP001-008/400812/1	
Figure Number	1		Scale at A4	1:50,000	
Figure Title	Site Location		Drawn	JB	Checked
					AS
		Date	29/06/2022	Date	29/06/2022


Thomson
 environmental
 consultants

www.thomsonec.com
 enquiries@thomsonec.com

Filepath: V:\Arboriculture\ALP001-008 - Arboricultural Services, Twickenham Riverside Project_ongoing arboriculturalsupport\2 DRAWINGS\2.2 GIS\Working\ALP001008_Fig2_TCP_JB_280622.mxd

Legend

- Root Protection Area of Category 'A' Tree
- Root Protection Area of Category 'B' Tree
- Root Protection Area of Category 'C' Tree
- Root Protection Area of Category 'U' Tree
- Tree Canopy Extents
- Tree Stem Location
- Site Boundary



Map Centre Grid Reference: 516,264 173,123

Contains Ordnance Survey data
 © Crown copyright and database right 2022.

This map must not be copied or reproduced by any means without prior written permission from Thomson Environmental Consultants.

Drawing Ref
 ALP001-008/400813/1



Scale at A3
 1:450

Drawn JB	Checked AS
Date 28/06/2022	Date 28/06/2022

Client
 Arcadis LLP

Figure Number
 2a



Figure Title
 Tree Constraints Plan (TCP01)



Filepath: V:\Arboriculture\ALP001-008 - Arboricultural Services, Twickenham Riverside\ALP001-008_1 - Twickenham Riverside Project_ongoing arboricultural support\2 DRAWINGS\2.2 GIS\Working\ALP001008_Fig2_TCP_JB_280622.mxd

Legend

- Root Protection Area of Category 'A' Tree
- Root Protection Area of Category 'B' Tree
- Root Protection Area of Category 'C' Tree
- Root Protection Area of Category 'U' Tree
- Tree Canopy Extents
- Tree Stem Location
- Site Boundary



Map Centre Grid Reference: 516,330 173,206
 Contains Ordnance Survey data
 © Crown copyright and database right 2022.
 This map must not be copied or reproduced by any means without prior written permission from Thomson Environmental Consultants.

Drawing Ref ALP001-008/400813/1

Scale at A3 1:400

Drawn	Checked
JB	AS

Date	Date
28/06/2022	28/06/2022

Client Arcadis LLP

Figure Number 2b

Figure Title
Tree Constraints Plan (TCP01)

