



Arboricultural Survey to BS5837:2012

Amelia Wooley

**49 Castelnau,
London,
SW13 9RT**

01 July 2024

Fearghus Gage BSc (Hons) MArborA

Table of Contents

If this report has been released electronically the appendices referred to herein can be found in the annexed zip folder/s as .pdf files. If this report has been released in hard copy the appendices will be bound into the back of this report. Plans are annexed separately as A0, A1, A2 or A3 as appropriate.

1. Introduction	2
2. Survey	2
3. BS5837:2012 Scope	5
4. Methodology	5
5. Definitions.....	7
6. Limitations	8
7. Appendices	9
Appendix 1: Table 1 Cascade chart for tree quality assessment	10
Appendix 2: Schedule of Trees	12
Appendix 3: Tree Constraints Plan.....	17
8. Document Production Record	19

1. Introduction

Arbtech Consulting Limited (Arbtech) received written instruction on 24 June 2024 from Amelia Wooley to attend 49 Castelnau, London, SW13 9RT; grid reference, TQ 22422 76967 (site) to undertake an arboricultural survey a to BS5837:2012 guidance to assess trees, hedges and major shrub groups growing on and within influencing distance of the site and to produce a Schedule of Trees and Tree Constraints Plan.

I am Fearghus Gage, a senior arboricultural consultant for Arbtech Consulting Ltd. I undertook the tree survey on 27 June 2024 and subsequently, have produced this summary of my findings.

I hold a foundation degree (FdSc) in arboriculture, a bachelors degree (BSc (Hons)) in ecology and conservation and I am a qualified Professional Tree Inspector (LANTRA). I have experience contracting and working in arboricultural consultancy over the past eight years.

The advice below and appended is underwritten by our Professional Indemnity insurance for the business practice of Arboricultural Consultancy in the sum of one million Pounds Sterling in each and every claim.

Table 1: Documents referred to.

Document	Reference No.
Survey base drawing	N/A – Aerial imagery
LPA pre-app comments	N/A
British Standard 5837:2012	“BS5837”
Tree Survey Schedule	Arbtech TS 01
Tree Constraints Plan	Arbtech TCP 01

2. Survey

Survey: An arboricultural survey to BS5837 of all trees within impacting distance of the site was undertaken by Fearghus Gage on 27 June 2024.

During the survey I categorised the trees using “Table 1 – Cascade chart for tree quality assessment” of the BS5837:2012 (see Appendix 1).

A total of 20No. individual trees were surveyed. Details for each of the trees surveyed are provided in the Schedule of Trees (see Appendix 2).

Table 2: Documents upon which this tree survey has been based.

Document	Originator	Reference Number	Title
Survey base drawing	-	N/A – Aerial imagery	-

Limitations: The survey was made at ground level using visual observation only. Detailed examinations, such as climbing inspections and advanced decay detection equipment were not employed, though may form part of the survey's management recommendations. Measurements were taken using specialist tapes, laser, and GPS devices. Where this was not possible, measurements are estimated.

Scope: Pre-development tree surveys make arboricultural management recommendations based exclusively upon the individual tree or group of trees condition relative to their present context (*i.e. not in relation to the proposed development*).

Legal Status: No statutory protection check has been performed. BS5837 does not draw any distinction between trees subject to statutory protection, such as a Tree Preservation Order ("TPO"), and those trees without. This is principally because a detailed planning consent overrides any TPO protection. Consequently, we do not seek to offer any comparison between or infer any difference in the quality or importance of TPO trees and other trees.

* For more information on the surveyed trees please see Arbtech Consulting Ltd, Tree Survey Schedule (Appendix 1), Tree Survey Report and Tree Constraints Plan.

Site description

The site is comprised of a residential dwelling with associated parking to the front and a garden to the rear.



Figure 1: OS Map showing Site location (Bing Maps)



Figure 2: Aerial Image of Site with approximate red line boundary (Google Earth)

This content is for educational and informative purposes; parts of it are reproduced with the kind permission of BSI Global.

3. BS5837:2012 Scope

This standard recognises that there can be problems for development close to existing trees which are to be retained, and of planting trees close to existing structures. This standard sets out to assist those concerned with trees, in relation to construction, to form balanced judgements. It does not set out to put arguments for or against development, or for the removal or retention of trees. Where development, including demolition, is to occur, the standard provides guidance on how to decide which trees are appropriate for retention, on the means of protecting these trees during development, including demolition and construction work, and on the means of incorporating trees into the developed landscape.

4. Methodology

The methodology used to assess the trees was the British Standard 5837:2012 'Trees in Relation to Construction' tree survey method. The aim of the survey is to establish which trees are moderate and good quality; suitable for retention and justifying protection. And which trees are low or poor quality; either undesirable or unsuitable to retain and protect.

The tree survey includes all trees included in the land survey red line boundary plan, as well as any that may have been missed, and it should categorize trees or groups of trees, including woodlands for their quality and value within the existing context, in a transparent, understandable, and systematic way. Where the arboriculturist has deemed it appropriate, the trees have been tagged with small metal or plastic tags, placed as high as is convenient on the stem of each tree.

Whilst master plan proposals for the development of the site might be available, the trees have been surveyed without taking these into consideration. All detailed design work on site layout should take into consideration the results of the tree survey (and the TCP).

Trees forming groups and areas of woodland (including orchards, wood pasture and historic parkland) are identified and considered as groups where the arboriculturist has determined that this is appropriate, particularly where they contain a variety of species and age classes that could aid long-term management. It is often expedient to assess the quality and value of such groups of trees as a whole, rather than as individuals. However, an assessment of individuals within any group has been undertaken if they are open-grown or if there is a need to differentiate between them.

The quality and value of each tree or group of trees has been recorded by allocating it to one of the four categories: **A**, **B**, **C**, or **U** (highest to lowest quality respectively). The categories are differentiated on the tree survey plan by colour, or by suffixing the category adjacent to the tree identification number on the TCP.

The survey schedule lists all the trees or groups of trees. The following information is also provided:

- a) reference number (to be recorded on the tree survey plan);
- b) species (common or scientific names);
- c) height in meters (m);
- d) stem diameter in millimetres (mm) at 1.5m above adjacent ground level or immediately above the root flare for multi-stemmed trees;
- e) branch spread in meters taken at the four cardinal compass points;
- f) height of crown clearance above adjacent ground level in meters (m);
- g) age class (newly planted, young, semi-mature, early mature, mature, over mature);
- h) physiological condition (e.g. good, fair, poor, decline and dead);
- i) structural condition (e.g. good, fair, poor or not visible);
- j) comment about the tree, its location and preliminary management recommendations, including further investigation of suspected defects that require more detailed assessment and potential for wildlife habitat;
- k) The retention category referring to the quality and useful contribution in years; **U** = <10yrs; **A** = >40yrs; **B** = >20yrs; **C** = >10yrs. The retention subcategory referring to the type of amenity; 1 = Arboricultural; 2 = Landscape; 3 = Cultural including conservation (see Appendix 1 Cascade chart for tree quality assessment).

5. Definitions

Arboriculturist

An arboriculturist (or arboricultural consultant) is a person who has, through relevant education, training, and experience, gained recognized qualifications and expertise in the field of trees in relation to construction.

Tree Survey

A tree survey should be undertaken by an arboriculturist and should record information about the trees on a site independently of and prior to any specific design for development. As a subsequent task, and with reference to a design or potential design, the results of the survey should be included in the preparation of a tree constraints plan, which should be used to assist with site layout design.

Tree Constraints Plan

A TCP is plan, typically delivered as an AutoCAD drawing (.DWG file format), prepared by an arboriculturist for the purposes of layout design showing the root protection area and representing the effect that the mature height and spread of retained trees will have on layouts through shade, dominance, etc.

Root Protection Area

An RPA is a layout design tool indicating the area surrounding a tree that contains sufficient rooting volume to ensure the survival of the tree, shown in plan form in m².

. The AMS is likely to include details of an on-site tree protection monitoring regime.

6. Limitations

Trees were inspected from using visual observation from ground level only. Trees were not climbed or inspected below ground level. Inaccessible trees will have best estimates made about the location, physical dimensions, and characteristics. Trees have been grouped where BS5837 guides us that it is expedient to do so. Trees have been excluded from the survey if they are found by us to be sufficiently far away from the proposed developable area or if they are outside of the red line boundary plan showing the expectations of our client for the extent of the survey. BS5837 does not draw any distinction between trees subject to statutory protection, such as a Tree Preservation Order (“TPO”), and those trees without. This is principally because a detailed planning consent overrides any TPO protection. Consequently, we do not seek to offer any comparison between or infer any difference in the quality or importance of TPO trees and other trees.

7. Appendices

The following documents were released to the Client as appendices to this report:

- Survey Schedule (.PDF)
- Tree Constraints Plan drawing (.DWG & .PDF)

If you require clarification of information contained herein, please do not hesitate to contact us via 01244 661170.

Yours Sincerely,



Fearghus Gage BSc (Hons) MArborA
Senior Arboriculturist

07842 424167
fearghusgage@arbtech.co.uk

Appendix 1: Table 1 Cascade chart for tree quality assessment

BS5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations

Table 1 Cascade chart for tree quality assessment

Category and definition	Criteria (including subcategories when appropriate)			Identification on plan
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">•Trees that have 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. <i>NOTE Category U trees can have existing or potential conservation value which might be desirable to preserve; see 4.5.7.</i>			Dark red
	1 Mainly arboricultural qualities	2 Mainly landscape qualities	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 formal or semi-formal arboricultural features (e.g. the dominate 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).	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 remedial defects, including unsympathetic management and storm damage), such that they are unlikely to be suitable for retention of 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 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 collective landscape value; and/or trees offering low or only temporary/transient landscape value.	Trees with no material conservation or other cultural value.	Grey

Appendix 2: Schedule of Trees

BS5837:2012 Tree Survey

Arbtech Consulting Ltd

Client: Amelia Woolley
 Project: 49 Castelnau Road, London, SW13 9RT
 Survey Date: 27/06/2024
 Surveyor: Fearghus Gage



Unit 3, Well House Barns
 Chester Road
 Chester
 Cheshire
 CH4 0DH
 Phone: 01244 661170


Tree and Tag No Species		Hght (m)	Stems		Crown		Age	RP A (m²) R (m)	Phys Condition	Structural Condition	Preliminary Recommendations		Cat ERC
			No	Ø (mm)	Spread (m)	Clear (m)					Survey Comment		
T01													
Snowy Mespilus		7	1	100	N	2	2	EM	A: 4.5	Good	C: Good	Well formed open grown crown. Disturbance to soil within RPA at base.	C.1
Amelanchier laevis					E	1.5	2		R: 1.19		S: Good		20+ yrs
					S	1.5	2				B: Fair		
					W	2	2						
T02													
Himalayan Birch		9	1	150	N	2.5	1.5	SM	A: 10.2	Good	C: Good	Surface roots surrounding base of tree up to 1.5m from base. Spot light installed in the ground at base of tree.	C.1
Betula utilis					E	2.5	1.5		R: 1.8		S: Good		20+ yrs
					S	2.5	1.5				B: Good		
					W	2.5	1.5						
T03													
Himalayan Birch		9	1	150	N	2.5	1.5	SM	A: 10.2	Good	C: Good	Large surface roots surrounding base of tree up to 2m from base.	C.1
Betula utilis					E	2.5	1.5		R: 1.8		S: Good		20+ yrs
					S	2.5	1.5				B: Good		
					W	2.5	1.5						
T04													
Himalayan Birch		9	1	140	N	2.5	1.5	SM	A: 8.9	Good	C: Good	Surface roots surrounding base of tree up to 1.5m from base. Spot light installed in the ground at base of tree.	C.1
Betula utilis					E	2.5	1.5		R: 1.68		S: Good		20+ yrs
					S	2.5	1.5				B: Good		
					W	2.5	1.5						
Age Classifications: N Newly planted EM Early Mature Condition: C Crown Stems: Ø Diameter													
Y Young M Mature S Stem (Eq) Equivalent stem diameter using BS5837:2012 definition													
SM Semi-mature OM Over Mature B Basal area ERC: Estimated Remaining Contributio													

Tree and Tag No Species	Hght (m)	Stems		Crown		Age	RP A (m²) R (m)	Phys Condition	Structural Condition	Preliminary Recommendations			Cat ERC
		No	Ø (mm)	Spread (m)	Clear (m)					Survey Comment			
T05													
Himalayan Birch <i>Betula utilis</i>	9	1	170	N	2.5	1.5	SM	A: 13.1 R: 2.04	Good	C: Good S: Good B: Good	Surface roots surrounding base of tree up to 2m from base. Spot light installed in the ground at base of tree.		C.1 20+ yrs
T06													
Himalayan Birch <i>Betula utilis</i>	7	1	150	N	3	2	SM	A: 10.2 R: 1.8	Good	C: Good S: Good B: Good	Surface roots surrounding base of tree up to 2m from base. Spot light installed in the ground at base of tree.		C.1 20+ yrs
T07													
Himalayan Birch <i>Betula utilis</i>	6	1	120	N	2	1.5	SM	A: 6.5 R: 1.43	Good	C: Good S: Good B: Good	Growing in proximity to boundary wall.		C.1 20+ yrs
T08													
Midland Thorn <i>Crataegus oxyacantha</i>	4	3	139 (Eq)	N	1	1	SM	A: 8.7 R: 1.66	Good	C: Good S: Good B: Good	Growing in proximity to boundary wall. Multi-stemmed from base.		C.1 20+ yrs
T09											Estimated Measurements		
Holm Oak <i>Quercus ilex</i>	12	1	350	N	3.5	2	M	A: 55.4 R: 4.19	Good	C: Good S: Not visible B: Not visible	Off-site tree growing from neighbouring garden. Lower 2m of tree not visible.		B.1 40+ yrs
T10													
Himalayan Birch <i>Betula utilis</i>	9	1	180	N	2.5	1.5	SM	A: 14.7 R: 2.16	Good	C: Good S: Good B: Good	Surface roots surrounding base of tree up to 2.5m from base.		C.1 20+ yrs
Age Classifications:	N Y SM	Newly planted Young Semi-mature	EM M OM	Early Mature Mature Over Mature			Condition:	C S B	Crown Stem Basal area			Stems: ERC:	Ø Diameter (Eq) Equivalent stem diameter using BS5837:2012 definition Estimated Remaining Contributio

Tree and Tag No Species	Hght (m)	Stems		Crown		Age	RP A (m²) R (m)	Phys Condition	Structural Condition	Preliminary Recommendations			Cat ERC
		No	Ø (mm)	Spread (m)	Clear (m)					Survey Comment			
T11													
Catolina Mountain Lilac <i>Ceanothus arboreus</i>	3	2	120 (Eq)	N	1	1	SM	A: 6.6 R: 1.44	Decline	C: Fair S: Fair B: Fair	Twin-stemmed from base. Acute stem union. Stems twisted together. Crown suppressed by neighbouring birch. Minor dieback in lower crown.		U <10 yrs
T12													
Snowy Mespilus <i>Amelanchier laevis</i>	4	1	105	N	1.5	2	M	A: 5 R: 1.26	Good	C: Good S: Good B: Not visible	Base of tree not visible due to Pittosporum growing at base. Standard growth form with good open crown.		C.1 20+ yrs
T13													
Snowy Mespilus <i>Amelanchier laevis</i>	4.5	1	95	N	1.5	2	EM	A: 4.1 R: 1.14	Good	C: Good S: Good B: Good	Minor surface roots at base.		C.1 20+ yrs
T14													
Himalayan Birch <i>Betula utilis</i>	8	1	140	N	2	1.5	SM	A: 8.9 R: 1.68	Good	C: Good S: Good B: Not visible	Base not visible due to dense shrubs growing around base.		C.1 20+ yrs
T15													
Southern Magnolia <i>Magnolia grandiflora</i>	4.5	1	85	N	1	2	SM	A: 3.3 R: 1.02	Good	C: Good S: Good B: Not visible	Dense shrubs at base prevent inspection of stem base.		C.1 20+ yrs
T16													
Common Pear <i>Pyrus communis</i>	7	2	354 (Eq)	N	2.5	3	M	A: 56.6 R: 4.24	Good	C: Good S: Not visible B: Not visible	Off-site tree growing from neighbouring garden overhanging site boundary.		B.1 20+ yrs
Estimated Measurements													
Age Classifications:	N	Newly planted	EM	Early Mature	Condition:			C	Crown	Stems:	Ø	Diameter	
	Y	Young	M	Mature				S	Stem		(Eq)	Equivalent stem diameter using BS5837:2012 definition	
	SM	Semi-mature	OM	Over Mature				B	Basal area	ERC:		Estimated Remaining Contributio	

Tree and Tag No Species	Hght (m)	Stems		Crown		Age	RP A (m²) R (m)	Phys Condition	Structural Condition	Preliminary Recommendations			Cat ERC
		No	Ø (mm)	Spread (m)	Clear (m)					Survey Comment			
T17											Estimated Measurements		
Himalayan Birch <i>Betula utilis</i>	11	3	351 (Eq)	N	3.5	3	EM	A: 55.8 R: 4.21	Good	C: Good S: Not visible B: Not visible	Off-site tree growing from neighbouring garden. Lower 2.5m of stem not visible. May be three individual trees or one multi-stemmed tree.		B.1 40+ yrs
T18													
Holm Oak <i>Quercus ilex</i>	4.5	1	95	N	1	2	Y	A: 4.1 R: 1.14	Good	C: Good S: Good B: Not visible	Resin bound gravel in RPA to west. Base of tree not visible due to dense shrubs.		C.1 20+ yrs
T19													
Holm Oak <i>Quercus ilex</i>	4.5	1	95	N	1	2	Y	A: 4.1 R: 1.14	Good	C: Good S: Good B: Not visible	Resin bound gravel in RPA to west. Base of tree not visible due to dense shrubs.		C.1 20+ yrs
T20													
Chinese Privet <i>Ligustrum lucidum</i>	4	1	120	N	2	2	SM	A: 6.5 R: 1.43	Decline	C: Fair S: Good B: Not visible	Sparse foliage and dieback in crown. Resin bound gravel in RPA to west.		U <10 yrs

Appendix 3: Tree Constraints Plan



Please refer to Arbtch Consulting Ltd. Tree Survey Report and Tree Schedule for full details on all surveyed trees, hedgerows and major shrub groups.

All trees were surveyed and categorised in accordance with the guidance as set out in the British Standard BS5837:2012 Tree in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations.



All dimensions should be checked on site. No dimensions are to be scaled from this drawing.
Please notify us of any discrepancies found. Attnach Consulting Ltd. cannot be held responsible for
inaccuracies in the base drawing in which this plan is based.
This drawing is designed to reflect the principles of the layout or design only, and relates only to the
protection of retained trees.
This drawing is not to be read as a definitive part of the engineering or construction designs or method
statement. An architect or structural engineer should be contacted over any matters of construction.

8. Document Production Record

Document number	Editor	Signature	Position	Issue number	Date
Arbtech TSR 01	Fearghus Gage		Senior Arboriculturist	01	01/07/24

Limitations

Arbtech Consulting Ltd has prepared this report for the sole use of the above-named Client/Agent in accordance with our terms of business, under which our services were performed. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this report or any other services provided by us. This report may not be relied upon by any other party without the prior and express written agreement of Arbtech Consulting Ltd. The assessments made assume that the sites and facilities will continue to be used for their current purpose without significant change. The conclusions and recommendations contained in this report are based upon information provided by others and upon the assumption that all relevant information has been provided by those parties from whom it has been requested. Information obtained from third parties has not been independently verified by Arbtech Consulting Ltd.

Copyright

© This Report is the copyright of Arbtech Consulting Ltd. Any unauthorised reproduction or usage by any person other than the addressee is strictly prohibited.