



ARBORICULTURAL PLANNING CONSULTANTS

THE OLD POST OFFICE
DORKING ROAD
TADWORTH
SURREY KT20 5SA

Tel: (01737) 813058
E-mail: sja@sjatrees.co.uk

Directors: Simon R. M. Jones Dip. Arb. (RFS), FArborA.,
RCArborA. (Managing)
Frank P. S. Spooner BSc (Hons), MArborA, TechCert
(ArborA), RCArborA. (Operations)

Arboricultural Implications Report

Proposed re-development at

Cedar Cottage

Sandygate Lane

Lower Beeding

West Sussex



April 2026

Ref. SJA air 25319-01

SUMMARY

S1. On the basis of our assessment, we conclude that the arboricultural impact of this scheme is of low magnitude, as defined according to the categories set out in **Table 1** of this report.

S2. There is no ancient woodland, woodpasture or parkland within or abutting the site and consequently the proposals will cause no loss of or harm to irreplaceable habitat.

S3. Our assessment of the impacts of the proposals on the existing trees concludes that no category 'A' or 'B' trees, and no trees of high landscape or biodiversity value are to be removed. None of the trees on site that make an important contribution to the character of the local landscape are to be removed. The proposed removal of individuals and groups of trees will represent no alteration to the main arboricultural features of the property, but the removal of the trees and hedge in the northern section of the property will result in a minor alteration in the character of Sandygate Lane, but the impact is limited by the small sizes of the trees to be removed. Accordingly, the proposals will result in only a minor alteration to the overall arboricultural character of the property and will not have a significant adverse impact on the arboricultural character and appearance of the local landscape.

S4. Following the pruning specified, none of the proposed dwellings will lie within 2m of the extents of the canopies of trees to be retained, thereby providing adequate working space for construction, and a reasonable margin of clearance for future growth

S5. The incursions into the Root Protection Areas of trees to be retained are within acceptable levels, and subject to implementation of the measures recommended on the Tree Protection Plan and set out at **Appendix 1**, no significant or long-term damage to their root systems or rooting environments will occur.

S6. None of the proposed dwellings or private gardens are likely to be shaded by retained trees to the extent that this will interfere with their reasonable use or enjoyment by incoming occupiers, which might otherwise lead to pressure to fell or prune the retained trees.

S7. The proposed mitigation and arboricultural benefits of the proposals are significant; and provide more than adequate restitution for the only minor alteration to the arboricultural character of the property.

S8. The proposed development retains all trees that make an important contribution to the landscape and natural features of the local area, and the proposed removal of trees will be mitigated through the retention of the mature and larger trees of higher quality and through replacement planting. As such, the proposals comply with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Council Planning Framework.

S9. As the proposed development retains the trees that are important to green infrastructure, landscape and the character of the area, and mitigates the proposed removals of low quality trees through replacement planting, it complies with Policies SP 14 and SP 17 of the emerging Horsham District Local Plan 2023-2030 (Regulation 19 dated January 2024).

S10. As the proposed development protects the trees that contribute to the green infrastructure network and provides replacement planting to mitigate the removal of low quality trees, it complies with Policy 3 of the Lower Beeding Neighbourhood Plan 2014-2031 (September 2025).

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION	5
2. PLANNING CONTEXT	8
3. THE TREES	13
4. TREES TO BE REMOVED	16
5. TREES TO BE PRUNED	19
6. ROOT PROTECTION AREA INCURSIONS	21
7. RELATIONSHIP OF RETAINED TREES TO NEW DWELLINGS	26
8. MITIGATION AND BENEFITS	29
9. CONCLUSIONS	30

APPENDICES

1. Methodology
2. Outline arboricultural method statement
3. Tree survey schedule (SJA tss 25319-01a)
4. Tree protection plan (SJA TPP 25319-041)

© Simon Jones Associates Ltd. 2026

All rights in this document are reserved. No part of it may be amended or altered, reproduced or transmitted, in any form or by any means, or stored in any retrieval system of any nature, without our written permission. Its content and format are for the exclusive use of BlackOnyx Becketts Ltd in dealing with this site. It may not be sold, lent, hired out or divulged to any third party not directly involved with this site without the written consent of Simon Jones Associates Ltd. However, it may be reproduced, without amendment, by the Local Planning Authority (LPA), and be posted on the LPA website, to assist in consideration of an application for the proposed development referred to in Section 1.

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1.1. Instructions

1.1.1. SJAtrees has been instructed by BlackOnyx Becketts Ltd to visit Cedar Cottage, Sandygate Lane, Lower Beeding, West Sussex and to survey the trees growing on or immediately adjacent to this property.

1.1.2. We are further asked to identify which trees are worthy of retention within a proposed re-development of the property; to assess the implications of the development proposals on these specimens, and to advise how they should be protected from unacceptable damage during demolition and construction.

1.2. Scope of report

1.2.1. This report and its appendices reflect the scope of our instructions, as set out above. It is intended to accompany a planning application to be submitted to Horsham District Council (“the LPA”) and complies with local validation requirements.

1.2.2. It complies also with the recommendations of British Standard BS 5837:2012, *Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations* (‘BS 5837’). However, the British Standard is not a Code of Practice that consists of written rules outlining how actions or decision must be taken and it “should not be quoted as if it were a specification¹”; it is a set of recommendations intended to “assist decision-making with regard to existing and proposed trees in the context of design, demolition and construction²”. It doesn’t form part of planning policy; but it is a material consideration to which weight is likely to be given.

1.2.3. The proposed development comprises the erection of 24 dwellings with associated infrastructure and landscaping.

¹ British Standard BS 5837:2012. Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations; Foreword. The British Standards Institution.

² Ibid., p.1, Introduction.

1.2.4. This report summarises and sets out the main conclusions of the baseline data collected during the tree survey and identifies those trees or groups of trees whose removal could result in a significant adverse impact on the character or appearance of the local area (Section 3). It then details and assesses the impacts of the proposed development on individual trees and groups of trees, including those to be removed (Section 4), those to be pruned (Section 5), those which might incur root damage that might threaten their viability (Section 6) and those that might become under pressure for removal after occupation because of shading or apprehension (Section 7). The arboricultural mitigation and benefits of the scheme are set out in Section 8. A summary and conclusions, with regard to local planning policy, are presented in Section 9.

1.3. Site inspection

1.3.1. A site visit and tree inspection were undertaken by Richard Mulholland of SJAtrees, on Thursday the 19th June 2025. Weather conditions at the time were clear, dry and bright. Deciduous trees were in full leaf.

1.4. Site description

1.4.1. The property is 1.08ha in size and is located on the south side of Sandygate Lane. The east and south boundaries adjoin residential properties on Trinity Field and Leechpond Hill. The west boundary adjoins the rear gardens of Sandygate lane.

1.4.2. The site is on ground that rises by 8m from its southern end to its northern end abutting Sandygate lane and currently comprises a two-storey detached house with associated front hard standing and rear garden; and a 0.8m field to the south for small livestock.

1.4.3. Historical maps and aerial photographs indicate that the north of the site was an orchard, and the south of the site was undeveloped agricultural land until sometime in the mid-twentieth century when the current dwelling was erected on the north of the site.

1.4.4. The earliest Ordnance Survey map dated 1879, shows several trees growing within the property; however, it is clear that none of these trees are still present.




Figure 1: Extract from OS map of 1879, showing some of the trees present at that time

1.5. Soil type

1.5.1. The British Geological Survey Solid and Drift Geology map of the area indicates the north of the property overlies a bedrock of Upper Tunbridge Wells sand-sandstone and siltstone, interbedded. The south of the property overlies a bedrock Upper Tunbridge Wells sand-mudstone with no superficial deposits recorded.

1.5.2. The class of soil in this area is recorded on the Soilscape (England) maps on the Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs ('Defra') Magic website as a slightly acid loamy and clayey soils with impeded drainage.

1.5.3. The class of soil and the indications of the British Geological Survey map suggest that trees may be shallow-rooted and that the soil is likely to be susceptible to compaction.

1.6. Statutory controls

1.6.1. The English oak no. 42 adjacent to the site is subject to Tree Preservation Order (TPO) no. 1422 of 2010 created by Horsham District Council.

1.6.2. The property is not within a conservation area, and therefore there are no constraints relating to existing trees in this regard.

2. PLANNING CONTEXT

2.1. Planning history

2.1.1. A review of the planning history of this site on the planning section of the LPA website reveals one previous application for re-development, as listed below:

- App DC/05/0323 (April 2005). Demolition of Cedar Cottage and erection of replacement chalet style dwelling. Approved.

2.2. National planning policy

2.2.1. Under Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, local authorities have a statutory duty to consider the protection and planting of trees when considering planning applications. The effects of proposed development on trees are therefore a material consideration, and this is normally reflected in local planning policies.

2.2.2. The National Planning Policy Framework ('NPPF')³ sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these should be applied in both plan and decision-making. Paragraph 2 makes it clear that the NPPF is itself a material consideration in the determination of planning application. Paragraph 11 states that **"Plans and decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development."**

2.2.3. In paragraph 135, within Section 12 **"Achieving well-designed places"** the NPPF states: **"Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:**

- a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;**
- b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;**

³ The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (December 2024). Department for Levelling Up, Housing & Communities

c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);

d) establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit;

e) optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development (including green and other public space) and support local facilities and transport networks; and

f) create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.”

2.2.4. Paragraph 136 in this section states: “Trees make an important contribution to the character and quality of urban environments, and can also help mitigate and adapt to climate change. Planning policies and decisions should ensure that new streets are tree-lined, that opportunities are taken to incorporate trees elsewhere in developments (such as parks and community orchards), that appropriate measures are in place to secure the long-term maintenance of newly-planted trees, and that existing trees are retained wherever possible. Applicants and local planning authorities should work with highways officers and tree officers to ensure that the right trees are planted in the right places, and solutions are found that are compatible with highways standards and the needs of different users.”

2.2.5. The section titled “Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change” states at paragraph 162: “Plans should take a proactive approach to mitigating and adapting to climate change, taking into account the long-term implications for flood risk, coastal change, water supply, biodiversity and landscapes, and the risk of overheating and drought from rising temperatures . Policies should support appropriate measures to ensure the future health and resilience of communities and infrastructure to climate change impacts, such as providing space for physical protection measures, or making provision for the possible future relocation of vulnerable development and infrastructure.”

2.2.6. In paragraph 187, within Section 15 “Conserving and enhancing the natural environment” the NPPF states: “Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:

a) protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan);

b) recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland;

[...] d) minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures and incorporating features which support priority or threatened species such as swifts, bats and hedgehogs;

e) preventing new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability. Development should, wherever possible, help to improve local environmental conditions such as air and water quality, taking into account relevant information such as river basin management plans; [...]"

2.2.7. In paragraph 193, under the “Habitats and biodiversity” section, the NPPF states: “When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should apply the following principles:

c) development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists....”

2.2.8. This report will conclude whether this scheme meets the requirements of the NPPF. The publication of the draft NPPF on 16th December 2025 is noted; but as this is only a draft and may change through the consultation process, this report does not seek to comment on how the scheme meets its suggested requirements. However, it does note the direction of travel on sustainable development and on the relationship between proposed developments and existing trees and woodlands.

2.3. Local planning policy

2.3.1. Local planning policies are contained in the Horsham District Council Planning Framework 2015.

2.3.2. The relevant section of Policy 33 Development Principles of the Planning Framework states:

“In order to conserve and enhance the natural and built environment developments shall be required to: [...] 6. Presume in favour of the retention of existing important landscape and natural features, for example trees, hedges, banks and watercourses. Development must relate sympathetically to the local landscape and justify and mitigate against any losses that may occur through the development; [...]”

2.4. Emerging local plan

2.4.1. Horsham District Council has released its emerging Horsham District Local Plan 2023-2030 (Regulation 19 dated January 2024), which contains the following relevant policies.

2.4.2. Strategic Policy 14 ‘**Countryside Protection**’ states *inter alia*:

“[...]2. In addition, all proposals must be appropriately integrated within the landscape and be of a scale appropriate to its countryside character and location. Development will be considered acceptable where it does not lead, either individually or cumulatively, to a significant increase in the overall level of activity in the countryside, and protects, conserves, and seeks to enhance, the key features and characteristics of the landscape character area in which it is located, including;

a) The development pattern of the area, its historical and ecological qualities, tranquillity and sensitivity to change;

b) The pattern of woodlands, fields, hedgerows, trees, waterbodies and other features;[...]”

2.4.3. Strategic Policy 17 ‘**Green infrastructure and Biodiversity**’ states *inter alia*:

“1. Development will be supported where it can demonstrate that it maintains and enhances the existing network of green infrastructure and contributes to the delivery of public open space, the Local Nature Recovery Strategy, Nature Recovery Network, natural capital, ecosystem services and / or biodiversity. Green Infrastructure should be integral to the design and layout of development, and new provision, including green linkages, should be provided taking into account Natural England’s green infrastructure guidance and the council’s green infrastructure strategy. Provision should seek to optimise public access to open space and nature via foot, bicycle, wheeling, and also horse as appropriate[...]

3. Proposals will be expected to retain and enhance existing priority habitats and trees, and accord with the aims and objectives of the Green Infrastructure and Local Nature Recovery Strategies. Habitat enhancement including additional hedgerow and tree planting must take account of the local landscape and habitat context. It should seek to optimise biodiversity, ecological connectivity and function, and climate change resilience. [...]

Protected Sites and Species

9. Particular consideration will be given to the hierarchy of sites and habitats, including buffer areas, within the District, or functionally linked to, as follows: [...]

b) Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs), National Nature Reserves (NNRs), Veteran Trees, Ancient Woodland and other irreplaceable habitats; [...]

10. An appropriate buffer around woodland will be required, this will be at least 15m around Ancient Woodland or greater in accordance with good practice, and consideration should be given to the potential for protected species, such as bats, and impacts on hydrology. Around ancient and veteran trees a minimum buffer zone of at least 15 times larger than the diameter of the tree, or 5 metres from the edge of the tree's canopy whichever is the larger, will be required.

11. Where the felling of a tree is necessary, for example due to disease, replacement planting with a suitable tree species, age and location to retain and enhance the link with the wider network of habitats and Green Infrastructure, will be required. [...]"

2.5. Neighbourhood planning policy

2.5.1. The Lower Beeding Neighbourhood Plan 2014-2031 (September 2025) states at Policy 3 'Green Infrastructure':

"Development proposals which seek to conserve, maintain or enhance existing green infrastructure networks will be supported.

Development proposals which incorporate landscaping and provide additional trees and hedging consistent with the rural nature of the Parish will be supported.

Proposals which would result in the loss of existing green infrastructure will not be supported unless it can be demonstrated that the development proposals bring new opportunities which mitigates or compensates any loss, whilst ensuring the protection of the existing ecosystem."

3. THE TREES

3.1. Survey findings

3.1.1. We surveyed 53 individual trees, and 15 groups of trees and two hedges growing within or immediately adjacent to the property. Their details can be found in the tree survey schedule at Appendix 2.

3.1.2. The arboricultural character of the property can be separated into two distinct characters: the northern section of the property comprises a residential garden with an abundance ornamental and exotic specimens typical of a private garden; and the southern section comprises an agricultural field with native hedgerows containing larger mature specimens.

3.1.3. The most common species is English oak, which also forms the most dominant species in the local landscape. There are also several large conifers (Scots pine no. 28, G10 and coast redwood no. 34) to the south of the site that also contribute to the arboricultural character of the area.

3.2. Irreplaceable habitat: ancient woodland

3.2.1. There are no woodlands within or abutting the property that are classified as 'Ancient'. Ancient woodland is defined as **“any area that’s been wooded continuously since at least 1600 AD”** and is considered an important and irreplaceable habitat.

3.3. Irreplaceable habitat: ancient or veteran trees

3.3.1. There are no trees within or abutting the property that can be classified as 'Ancient' or 'Veteran'. Ancient and veteran trees are also considered to be irreplaceable habitats, and contribute to a site's biodiversity, cultural and heritage value, and the National Planning Policy Framework (see below) states that development resulting in the loss or deterioration of ancient or veteran trees should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists.

3.4. Irreplaceable habitat: ancient woodpasture or parkland

3.4.1. The Natural England Woodpasture and Parkland Inventory update shows no areas of woodpasture or parkland within or adjacent to the site

3.5. Trees that contribute to the character of the local landscape

3.5.1. As noted above in Section 2.3, local planning policies require the retention of trees that “**of existing important landscape and natural features, for example trees, hedges, banks and watercourses**” The individuals and groups of trees within or adjacent to the property, whose attributes we consider meet these criteria, are as follows:

- the off-site English oak no. 19 growing adjacent to the west site boundary;
- the off-site English oak no. 42 growing adjacent to the east site boundary;
- the off-site English oaks nos. 24 and 26 growing to the west of the site; and
- the off-site coast redwood no. 34, growing adjacent to the south site boundary.

3.6. Other trees

3.6.1. There is one individual tree (English oak no. 20) which is in such a condition that it cannot realistically be retained as a living tree in the context of the current land use for longer than 10 years. However, as can be seen below, this tree is not shown to be removed as part of the proposals as it is outside the red line boundary and in third-party ownership. This tree has been assessed as category ‘U’ and is indicated on the accompanying tree protection plan.

3.6.2. There are nine mature trees of large ultimate size and long-term potential growing on or immediately adjacent to the site, the remaining trees are semi-mature or young.

3.6.3. There is one category ‘A’ tree (English oak no. 19) and five individuals assessed as category ‘B’ specimens (trees nos. 4, 22, 26, 34 and 42). The remaining 45 trees are assessed as category ‘C’ trees, being either of low quality, very limited merit, only low landscape benefits, no material cultural or conservation value, or only limited or short-term potential; or a combination of these.

3.6.4. Of the groups of trees and hedges, none have been assessed as category ‘A’, one (G10) as category ‘B’, and the remaining 16 as category ‘C’.

3.7. Assessment of arboricultural impacts

3.7.1. The arboricultural impacts of the proposed site layout drawing no. 25109 - P101D have been assessed by overlaying this onto the TCP and are discussed in the following sections of this report and are shown on the tree protection plan (TPP) presented at **Appendix 4**.

3.7.2. The TPP identifies the trees to be removed to accommodate the proposed development, either because they are situated within the footprints of proposed structures or surfaces, or because in our judgment they are too close to these structures or surfaces to enable them to be retained. These are shown by means of **red crosses** on the TPP.

3.7.3. The TPP also shows how trees to be retained will be protected from damage during demolition and construction, and the measures identified are set out and described in the outline arboricultural method statement at **Appendix 2** of this report. The implementation of, and adherence to, these measures can readily be secured by the imposition of appropriate planning conditions.

3.7.4. Details of the impacts identified within these categories, and our assessment of their respective significance, are analysed in Sections 4 to 8 below.

3.7.5. Based on these findings, we have assessed the magnitude of the overall arboricultural impact of the proposals according to the categories defined in **Table 1** below.

Impact	Description
High	Total loss of or major alteration to main elements/ features/ characteristics of the baseline, post-development situation fundamentally different
Medium	Partial loss of or alteration to main elements/ features/ characteristics of the baseline, post-development situation will be partially changed
Low	Minor loss of or alteration to main elements/ features/ characteristics of the baseline, post-development changes will be discernible but the underlying situation will remain similar to the baseline
Negligible	Very minor loss of or alteration to main elements/ features/ characteristics of the baseline, post-development changes will be barely discernible, approximating to the 'no change' situation

Table 1: Magnitude of impacts⁴

⁴ Determination of magnitude based on DETR (2000) Guidance on the Methodology for Multi-Modal Studies, as modified and extended.

4. TREES TO BE REMOVED

4.1. Details

4.1.1. To accommodate the proposed development, as shown on the proposed layout plan, 16 individual trees, three groups of trees and one hedge are to be removed, either because they are situated within the footprints of proposed structures or surfaces, or because they are too close to these to enable them to be retained.

4.1.2. Details of the trees to be removed, including their dimensions, age class and British Standard categorisation, are shown and listed on the TPP and at **Table 2** below.

Tree no.	Species	Height	Trunk diameter	Age class	BS category
2	Sweet gum	11m	330mm	Semi-mature	C (12)
3	Evergreen magnolia	6m	180mm 160mm	Semi-mature	C (1)
7	Common walnut	11.5m	710mm	Mature	C (1)
21	Common walnut	8m	220mm	Semi-mature	C (1)
43-45	Himalayan birch	#43 11m #44 10m #45 7m	#43 300mm #44 130mm #45 2 stems @ 60mm	Semi-mature	C (1)
46-47	Silver birch	#46 9m #47 12m	#46 220mm #47 130mm	Semi-mature	C (1)
48	Blue cedar	11m	360mm	Young	C (1)
49	Variegated holly	5.5m	120mm 110mm 100mm	Semi-mature	C (1)
50	Variegated sycamore	9m	250mm	Semi-mature	C (1)
52	Purple maple	10.5m	290mm	Semi-mature	C (1)
53	Goat willow	11m	270mm	Semi-mature	C (1)
54	Common walnut	8m	110mm 90mm	Semi-mature	C (1)
G2	Various	Max 6m	Max 130mm	Semi-mature	C (1)
G3	Various	Max 3m	Max 75mm est.	Semi-mature	C (1)
G15	Various	6m	Max 190mm	Semi-mature	C (1)
H1	Various	3m	Max 75mm est.	Semi-mature	C (1)

Table 2: Trees to be removed

4.2. Assessment

4.2.1. As there are no ancient or veteran trees on site, none will be removed.

4.2.2. All those trees or groups of trees that make a significant contribution to the character and appearance of the local landscape, to amenity or to biodiversity (see paragraph 3.2.1), will be retained.

4.2.3. Only one mature tree (walnut no. 7) is to be removed: all the other trees to be cleared are young, semi-mature or of small ultimate size. The significance of this is threefold. Firstly, for obvious reasons mature trees tend to be larger in size and therefore are likely to be more visible and to make a greater contribution to the landscape. Secondly, mature trees are more likely to have formed associations with wildlife and to support other flora or fauna (for example, young trees infrequently contain splits, cracks or cavities that might provide roosting sites for bats); and thirdly, mature trees have a significantly greater capacity than smaller trees to actively sequester and store carbon⁵. Accordingly, the removal of only 1 mature tree on or adjacent to the site minimises the impacts on the benefits that mature trees provide in relation to smaller ones.

4.2.4. Although the walnut no. 7 is mature, it is of limited arboricultural quality due to its previous crown management: it has been historically reduced to 5m in height with cavities forming on the pruning wounds. The specimen has a short (11.5m tall) suppressed canopy, which is only visible in glimpsed views from Sangygate Lane so makes very little contribution to the wider arboricultural character of the area.

4.2.5. As noted above, the remaining trees are semi-mature specimens that are largely ornamental or exotic species with canopy heights not exceeding 12m. The retention of the larger trees along the periphery of the site coupled with the proposed replacement planting will mitigate the visual impact of the proposed removals.

4.2.6. None of the trees to be removed are covered by a TPO (see 1.6.1 above).

⁵ Stephenson N. L., Das A. J., Zavala M. A. (2014) Rate of tree carbon accumulation increases continuously with tree size. *Nature*, volume 507.

4.2.7. All the arboricultural features (individuals, groups of trees and the hedge) to be removed are assessed as category 'C' features: these are either of low quality, low value, or short-term potential. For these reasons, their removal will have no significant impact on the character or appearance of the area.

4.2.8. In the light of these considerations, and taking account of the numbers, sizes and locations of the trees to be retained, including those that are off-site, the felling of the trees and groups identified for removal will represent no alteration to the main arboricultural features of the site, but a partial alteration to the wider arboricultural character of the site as a result of the removal of specimens visible from Sandy Gate Lane.

5. TREES TO BE PRUNED

5.1. Details

5.1.1. Two trees to be retained are to be pruned to facilitate implementation of the proposals. These are shown at **Table 3** below.

Tree no.	Species	Age class	Proposed works
1	Cherry laurel	Semi-mature	SW crown to be reduced by 3m from branch tips back to the property boundary to facilitate construction of plot no. 2
24	English oak	Mature	a)Reduce E canopy by 2.5m from branch tips to 6.1m from trunk to provide clearance for construction of plot no. 13 b)Crown lift E canopy to 3.5m above ground level over garden and parking bays

Table 3: Trees to be pruned to facilitate development

5.2. Assessment

5.2.1. None of the trees to which pruning is required are of species that are intolerant of this because they are poor at compartmentalising wounds or because their wood decays quickly so pruning is unlikely to lead to significant dieback or the formation of columns of decay.

5.2.2. The south-west crown of the off-site cherry laurel no. 1 is to be reduced by 3m from branch tips to the property boundary to facilitate construction of plot no. 2 and its amenity space. The pruning back to the boundary is consistent with the common law legal right to cut un-protected off-site trees back to one's boundary. Consequently, these works are not required just because of the proposed development: they could legally be undertaken irrespective of this scheme and could be repeated whatever the future use of the site.

5.2.3. The east crown of English oak no. 24 is to be pruned to provide 3m clearance from plot no. 13 to facilitate construction and to provide a reasonable margin of clearance for future growth. Although the oak is mature, it is of average physiological condition. Accordingly, it should all be able to tolerate the number and sizes of the proposed pruning wounds, and to compartmentalise these effectively.

5.2.4. The extent of pruning proposed to the trees is minor. In no cases will the diameter of the final cut need to exceed one-third of that of the parent stem or branch; and in no cases will the total cross-sectional area of all the cuts that need to be made exceed one-third of that of the main trunk, measured at 1.5m above ground. Branches to be removed from the oak are mostly few in number and small in size and will result in a maximum wound size no greater than 100mm in diameter; this will have an insignificant effect on the health and physiological condition of these trees and complies with the recommendations at paragraph 7.2.4 and at Table 1 of British Standard BS 3998:2010, *Tree work – Recommendations*.

5.2.5. The proposed crown lifting will comprise the removal and the shortening of only secondary branches and will not require the removal back to the trunk of any primary branches, which will avoid making pruning wounds to the trunk, and will minimise any impact on the ‘damping’ of trunk movement that the lower branches provide. Moreover, this will mean that less than 15% of live crown height will be removed and that the remaining live crown will continue to form at least two thirds of the height of the tree and the pruning will comply with the recommendations at paragraph 7.6 of British Standard BS 3998:2010, *Tree work – Recommendations*.

5.2.6. In terms of impact upon the landscape, the proposed pruning is minor in extent, and will be screened in views by either the remainder of the trees’ canopies, or by other trees growing within or adjacent to the property. It will have a negligible effect on the appearance of the trees when viewed from outside the property itself and accordingly will not detract from the character or appearance of the local area.

5.2.7. Following the pruning specified, none of the proposed dwellings will lie within 2m of the extents of the canopies of trees to be retained, thereby providing adequate working space for construction, and a reasonable margin of clearance for future growth.

6. ROOT PROTECTION AREA INCURSIONS

6.1. Details

6.1.1. To ascertain whether the proposals will cause any significant harm to the roots or the rooting environments of the trees to be retained, we have calculated appropriate root protection areas ('RPAs') for these specimens, based as a minimum on the methodology set out in section 4.6 of BS5837: 2012. The RPA is defined in this document as a **"layout design tool indicating the minimum area around a tree deemed to contain sufficient roots and rooting volume to maintain the tree's viability; and where the protection of the roots and soil structure is treated as a priority"**.⁶

6.1.2. Consequently, a tree within the RPA of which no disturbance will occur can be regarded as one that will not suffer any significant or long-lasting harm because of the proposals and will therefore remain 'viable'. However, as the Standard makes clear⁷, some disturbance within its RPA does not mean that a tree will necessarily suffer significant harm or cease to be viable; this will depend on several factors, including the extent and nature of the disturbance; the age, species and physiological condition of the tree; the morphology, disposition and depth of the roots; the type and structure of the soil; and the extent of mitigation measures undertaken. Accordingly, an assessment of these criteria may mean that an RPA incursion can be justified.

6.1.3. Parts of the proposed dwellings and hard surfacing will encroach within the RPAs of 12 trees to be retained. These are shown in **Table 4** below.

⁶ British Standard BS 5837:2012. Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations; para. 3.7.

⁷ Ibid., para 5.3.1.

Tree no.	Species	Incursion by:	Total RPA	Extent of incursion into RPA	% of RPA
1	Cherry laurel	Proposed foundations	29.3m ²	1.8m ²	6.1%
8	Lawson cypress	Proposed parking bays	52.3m ²	1.4m ²	2.7%
13	Lawson cypress	Proposed parking bays	52.3m ²	4.4m ²	8.4%
14	Lawson cypress	Proposed parking bays	52.3m ²	2.7m ²	5.2%
15	Lawson cypress	Proposed parking bays	40.7m ²	1.1m ²	2.7%
17	Lawson cypress	Proposed parking bays	36.1m ²	1m ²	2.8%
19	English oak	Proposed road and foundations *	1486.2m ²	89m ²	6%
24	English oak	Proposed foundations	224.8m ²	1.2m ²	0.5%
		Proposed parking bay		14.4m ²	6.4%
26	English oak	Proposed hard surfaces	234.5m ²	30m ²	12.8%
34	Coast redwood	Proposed foundations	662.3m ²	1.4m ²	0.2%
42	English oak	Proposed foundation	706.9m ²	0.3m ²	0.04%
51	Sycamore	Proposed road	22.9m ²	0.2m ²	0.9%

Table 4: Proposed incursions within RPAs

6.2. Assessment

6.2.1. The incursions by parts of the proposed dwellings and other structures into the RPAs of the 12 trees listed at **Table 4** extend to no more than 12.8% of individual RPAs. Any potential adverse impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated as set out below.

6.2.2. The incursions into the RPAs of trees nos. 1, 8, 13-15, 17, 19, 24, 34, 42 and 51 are by proposed foundations, roads or hard surfaces and subject to proposed levels, some degree of excavation will be required.

6.2.3. It is important to note that the RPA of English oak no. 19 has been enhanced to a 15 times trunk diameter RPA, which exceeds the RPA required by BS 5837. The enhanced RPA is applied in recognition of the intolerance to root disturbance that aged oaks display, but it should be noted was recorded as being in average physiological condition (the highest criteria in the SJA survey methodology).

6.2.4. If the RPA was calculated strictly in accordance with BS5837 its radius would have been only 15m (in comparison to the 21.75m allowed) and there would have been no RPA incursion and a 4.4m construction buffer in which there is no development proposed between the RPA and any proposed features. The construction within the enhanced RPA will be mitigated, which will minimise the extent of development pressure on the aged specimen.

6.2.5. To minimise impacts on the specimens listed in 6.2.2., including oak no. 19, all excavation within these RPAs will be undertaken manually, under the direct control and supervision of an appointed arboricultural consultant, so that any over dig into the RPAs is avoided, and any roots encountered can be treated appropriately.

6.2.6. The tree species impacted by incursions into their RPAs have been identified as good to moderate at tolerating root pruning and disturbance⁸, as shown in **Table 5**. As these specimens are of average physiological condition, there is no reason to suggest that they will not be able to tolerate the cutting of roots within these small sections of their RPAs.

Species	Tolerance
Lawson cypress	Genus listed as good, no specific information on species
English oak	Genus listed as moderate, but no information on species. Our experience indicates moderate tolerance during early development but sensitive when mature.
Coast redwood	Good
Sycamore	Moderate
Cherry laurel	No information recorded

Table 5: Species tolerance to root pruning and disturbance

⁸ MATHENY, N. P. and CLARK, J. R. (1998). Trees and Development. International Society of Arboriculture.

6.2.7. The areas lost to encroachment within the RPAs can be compensated for in the areas to the east or west of the trees, where there are extensive areas of soft landscaping suitable for root growth, contiguous to the RPAs. At present, there is likely to be significant rooting within these areas, and as they are to remain as soft landscape, root growth can continue in the future. Therefore, there will be no net loss of suitable rooting area, and no foreseeable risk of future cumulative impacts, so there is no reason to suggest that they will not be able to tolerate the cutting of roots within these small sections of their RPAs or that they will not remain viable.

6.2.8. Furthermore, within the site boundary the opportunity exists for the soil used by these trees for root growth to be improved. Subject to proposed landscaping, the soil and rooting environments within the RPAs of these specimens could be enhanced to promote improved root growth by de-compaction, aeration fertilisation or mulching, as appropriate, and this can be ensured by condition. As these trees can remain viable by being able to root in other areas, contiguous to their RPAs, and the soil environment in which they are rooting can be improved, these incursions comply with paragraph 5.3.1 of BS5837.

6.2.9. The remaining incursions into the RPAs of trees nos. 24 and 26 are by areas of proposed hard surfacing. These areas extend to no more than 12.8% of individual RPAs, and do not exceed the 20% maximum incursion into currently unsurfaced ground recommended in BS 5837⁹.

6.2.10. Taking account of existing ground levels and the likely proposed levels of these areas, these will allow for design and construction of the new or replacement surfaces to be entirely above existing soil level, and accordingly no excavation will be required. Furthermore, where appropriate, new surfaces could incorporate an appropriate cellular confinement system, filled and finished with suitable porous materials, to minimise soil compaction. To ensure no damage occurs to the roots or rooting environments of the relevant trees, installation will be undertaken under the control and supervision of the arboricultural consultant.

⁹ BS 5837, paragraph 7.4.2.3.

6.2.11. Implementation of measures to prevent other incursions into the RPAs of retained trees and to protect them during construction can be assured by the erection of appropriate protective fencing, as shown on the TPP at **Appendix 4**.

6.2.12. Accordingly, subject to implementation of the above measures, and considering the ages, current physiological condition and tolerance of disturbance of these retained trees, no significant or long-term damage to their root systems or environments will occur as a result of the proposed development.

7. RELATIONSHIP OF RETAINED TREES TO NEW DWELLINGS

7.1. Shading

7.1.1. The fenestration of the main habitable rooms (living rooms, kitchens) of three proposed dwellings (nos. 14 to 17) exclusively and directly faces trees (nos. 31 to 43) within the shadow patterns of trees to be retained; that is, they are sited in an arc between the north-west and the east of these trees and are closer to them than the current heights of these specimens.

7.1.2. The proposed dwellings are no closer than 14.5m from the trunks of the off-site trees to the south, so whilst the dwellings are within the shadow patterns, they are located at the outer edge of the shadow patterns where shading is minimal. At the summer solstice when the sun is at its highest in the sky, the extent of shading will be reduced significantly. Facing north, there will not be a significant expectation of direct sunlight; so it is most unlikely that this will be perceived as unreasonable shading and will lead to pressure to fell the trees.

7.1.3. The four silver birch (nos. 30 to 33) have relatively open canopies and light passes through the canopy to resulting in dappled shade all year round. Furthermore, as the birch will be out of leaf during the winter so shading will be alleviated during the darkest months. In addition, whilst the coast redwood (no. 34) is a tall specimen, it has a relatively narrow canopy, so the shadow it casts will also be narrow, which means the shading impact will be limited.

7.1.4. Finally, perspective on tree relating shading is likely to shift in the future with warmer drier summers and wetter winters becoming more prevalent due to climate change: the benefits of trees on the microclimate will alleviate the extremes of the weather patterns, so mature trees around the periphery of a property may be viewed as an asset as opposed to a concern in the future.

7.1.5. For these reasons, despite the relative proximity of proposed plots nos. 14 and 17 to trees nos. 30 and 34 on the south boundary, none of the proposed dwellings are likely to be shaded to the extent that this will interfere with incoming occupiers' reasonable use or enjoyment of these units, thereby leading inevitably to pressure to permit felling or severe pruning, which the LPA could not reasonably resist.

7.2. Apprehension

7.2.1. Apprehension in relation to trees occurs normally with residents or occupiers who live beneath or close to the crowns of large trees, and become fearful that branches, stems or even a whole tree could fail and harm them or their property. Consequently, this is most likely to occur if trees are large, particularly in relation to the size or height of the house in which the resident lives, if properties are located close to or even beneath their crowns, and if there has been a history of recent failures nearby. Other factors might include the wind exposure of the tree concerned, the orientation of the property in relation to the tree and the prevailing winds, and the noise made by the tree as the wind passes through the crown (there can be significant differences in the type and volume of noise made by wind as it passes through trees).

7.2.2. The similarity in the height of the houses and the trees would mean that there wouldn't be a "large tree, small building" concern that if a tree or part of it were to fall onto the block, the tree would cause extensive damage and possible harm to the occupiers. Consequently, there is no evidence to suggest that requests to fell any of these trees because of apprehension will be likely, or that they will be inevitable.

7.3. Future requests for consent to fell

7.3.1. Former government advice, contained in the DETR "Blue Book"¹⁰, stated at paragraph 5.11 (1) (ii) that **"incoming occupiers of properties will want trees to be in harmony with their surroundings without casting excessive shade or otherwise unreasonably interfering with their prospects of reasonably enjoying their property. Layouts may require careful adjustment to prevent trees from causing unreasonable inconvenience, leading inevitably to requests for consents to fell."**¹¹

7.3.2. This document was superseded in March 2014 by online government guidance on 'Tree Preservation Orders and trees in conservation areas' (www.gov.uk); but this remains sound advice. It suggests that for there to be requests for removal, all the following elements should be capable of being demonstrated:

¹⁰ (2000) Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions (2000). Tree Preservation Orders – A guide to the Law and Good Practice. *Building Research Establishment*

¹¹ British Standard BS 8206: Part 2 (1992). *British Standards Institute*.

- That the proximity of retained trees to the proposed development is unreasonable, taking account of their size, species, orientation, growth and other relevant factors;
- That requests for consent to fell or unacceptably or repeatedly prune retained trees will inevitably be forthcoming from future occupiers, rather than merely being possible;
- That such future pressure will be for the felling or heavy pruning of the trees concerned, rather than for minor pruning or tree surgery work; and finally
- That such requests to fell or prune could not reasonably be refused by the LPA.

7.3.3. The existing trees will continue to grow in the future, but as discussed above the layout responds proactively to future canopy growth such that the neither the proposed dwellings nor their associated amenity space will result in a poor relationship with the retained trees. As such, future pruning is not considered to be required to mitigate shading or canopy proximity issues.

7.3.4. In time, in common with all trees in urban and suburban areas, it is possible that some pruning will be required to mitigate defects that pose a risk to people and properties, or to prolong the life spans of the mature, aged and veteran trees. However, any future pruning can be controlled by the LPA if desired with the creation of a TPO to protect the trees of high value and to ensure good arboricultural practise is upheld. In this way, the LPA would control both the extent and quality of pruning required.

7.3.5. Accordingly, the proposals comply with British Standard guidance on the likely impacts of the existing trees on the proposed development, as set out at paragraph 5.3.4.

8. MITIGATION AND BENEFITS

8.1. Replacement planting

8.1.1. Whilst none of the main arboricultural features of the site are to be impacted, the loss of vegetations and trees visible from Sandygate Lane can be mitigated by the proposals incorporate considerable replacement tree planting.

8.1.2. This will mitigate the proposed removals identified above, improve the age class balance of the trees on site, enhance the local landscape, and re-establish a framework for the ongoing and long-term character of the site.

8.2. Tree and hedgerow management

8.2.1. The proposals will have benefits on those trees and hedgerows to be retained, in that it will prompt an enhanced frequency and standard of management, possibly including supplemental watering, mulching and formative pruning; and may benefit from proposed buildings that provide wind shelter and thus lower physical or structural stress.

8.2.2. In addition, the proposals will allow the trees to contribute to surface water runoff and to the prevention of soil erosion, it will maintain and continue to provide wildlife habitat, and it will allow the trees to continue to sequesterate and store carbon.

9. CONCLUSIONS

9.1. Summary

9.1.1. There is no ancient woodland, woodpasture or parkland within or abutting the site and consequently the proposals will cause no loss of or harm to irreplaceable habitat.

9.1.2. Our assessment of the impacts of the proposals on the existing trees concludes that no category 'A' or 'B' trees, and no trees of high landscape or biodiversity value are to be removed. None of the trees on site that make an important contribution to the character of the local landscape are to be removed. The proposed removal of individuals and groups of trees will represent no alteration to the main arboricultural features of the property, but the removal of the trees and hedge in the northern section of the property will result in a minor alteration in the character of Sandygate Lane, but the impact is limited by the small sizes of the trees to be removed. Accordingly, the proposals will result in only a minor alteration to the overall arboricultural character of the property and will not have a significant adverse impact on the arboricultural character and appearance of the local landscape.

9.1.3. Following the pruning specified, none of the proposed dwellings will lie within 2m of the extents of the canopies of trees to be retained, thereby providing adequate working space for construction, and a reasonable margin of clearance for future growth

9.1.4. The incursions into the Root Protection Areas of trees to be retained are within acceptable levels, and subject to implementation of the measures recommended on the Tree Protection Plan and set out at **Appendix 1**, no significant or long-term damage to their root systems or rooting environments will occur.

9.1.5. None of the proposed dwellings or private gardens are likely to be shaded by retained trees to the extent that this will interfere with their reasonable use or enjoyment by incoming occupiers, which might otherwise lead to pressure to fell or prune the retained trees.

9.1.6. The proposed mitigation and arboricultural benefits of the proposals are significant; and provide more than adequate restitution for the only minor alteration to the arboricultural character of the property.

9.2. Compliance with national planning policy

9.2.1. As the proposals will retain all the trees that make an important or significant contribution to the character of the local landscape, the site's arboricultural attractiveness, history, landscape character and setting will be maintained, thereby complying with Paragraph 135 (c) of the National Planning Policy Framework.

9.2.2. Although some trees are to be removed, there is no duty in planning policy to retain all existing trees in all circumstances. Paragraph 136 of the NPPF states (*italics added for emphasis*): “**Planning policies and decisions should ensure... that existing trees are retained wherever possible**”; and thereby recognises circumstances in which it might not be possible to retain every tree. Accordingly, the proposed removal of trees does not mean that this application must thereby be refused; and does not mean it conflicts with this paragraph of the NPPF.

9.2.3. The proposals do not necessitate the removal of any mature trees of large ultimate size, which make the greatest contribution to carbon sequestration and storage, surface water run-off, biodiversity and landscape and air temperature and cleanliness; for all of which, appropriate space for their retention is provided. Accordingly, insofar as this relates to existing trees, the scheme can be seen to have taken a proactive approach to mitigating climate change and thereby complies with Paragraph 162 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

9.2.4. As the proposals will not result in the loss or deterioration of any ancient woodland or any ancient or veteran trees, they comply with paragraph 193 (c) of the NPPF.

9.3. Compliance with local planning policy

9.3.1. The proposed development retains all trees that are make an important contribution to the landscape and natural features of the local area, and the proposed removal of trees will be mitigated through the retention of the mature and larger trees of higher quality and through replacement planting. As such, the proposals comply with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Council Planning Framework.

9.3.2. As the proposed development retains the trees that are important to green infrastructure, landscape and the character of the area, and mitigates the proposed removals of low quality trees through replacement planting, it complies with Policies SP 14 and SP 17 of the emerging Horsham District Local Plan 2023-2030 (Regulation 19 dated January 2024).

9.4. Compliance with neighbourhood planning policy

9.4.1. As the proposed development protects the trees that contribute to the green infrastructure network and provides replacement planting to mitigate the removal of low quality trees, it complies with Policy 3 of the Lower Beeding Neighbourhood Plan 2014-2031 (September 2025).

9.5. Conclusion

9.5.1. On the basis of our assessment, we conclude that the arboricultural impact of this scheme is of low magnitude, as defined according to the categories set out in **Table 1** of this report.

APPENDIX 1

Methodology

A1.1. Tree survey and baseline information

A1.1.1. We surveyed individual trees with trunk diameters of 75mm and above¹², trees with trunk diameters of 150mm and above growing in groups or woodlands, and shrub masses, hedges and hedgerows¹³ growing within or immediately adjacent to the property; and recorded their locations, species, dimensions, ages, condition, and visual importance in accordance with BS 5837 recommendations.

A1.1.2. The baseline information collected during the site survey was recorded on site using a hand-held digital device. This information was then imported into an Excel spreadsheet and used to produce the tree survey schedule at **Appendix 3**. The numbers assigned to the trees in the tree survey schedule correspond with those shown on the appended tree protection plan.

A1.1.3. We surveyed trees as groups where they have grown together to form cohesive arboricultural features, either aerodynamically (trees that provide companion shelter), visually (e.g., avenues or screens) or culturally¹⁴. However, where it might be necessary to differentiate between specific trees within these groups, we also surveyed these individually.

A1.1.4. We inspected the trees from the ground only, aided by binoculars as appropriate, but did not climb them. We took no samples of wood, roots or fungi. We did not undertake a full hazard or risk assessment of the trees, and therefore can give no guarantee, either expressed or implied, of their safety or stability.

A1.1.5. We categorised the trees in accordance with BS 5837 (details of the criteria used for this process can be found in the notes that accompany the tree survey schedule); but we also assessed the trees' suitability for retention against national, and local planning policies. We applied this methodology in line with the NPPF's presumption in favour of sustainable development, giving greater weighting to the contribution of a tree to the character and appearance of the local landscape, to amenity, or to biodiversity, where its removal might have a significant adverse impact on these factors.

A1.2. Tree constraints

A1.2.1. In line with the NPPF's presumption in favour of sustainable development, we assessed whether any trees should be retained in the context of the proposed development / re-development. Our assessment of which trees might have to be retained, and which can be removed, is based on:

12 BS 5837, paragraph 4.2.4 b), recommends that all trees over 75mm stem diameter should be included in a pre-planning land and tree survey.

13 Ibid., 4.4.2.7

14 Ibid., 4.4.2.3

A1.2.2. whether any trees are classed as ‘ancient’ or ‘veteran’, and thereby are designated as ‘irreplaceable habitats’;¹⁵

A1.2.3. which trees contribute to local character and history, including to the surrounding landscape setting; which trees contribute to biodiversity; and which trees help mitigate and adapt to climate change; and whose removal would thereby be unlikely to comply with national planning policy guidance;

A1.2.4. which trees are important to the local landscape, such that their removal would be contrary to local planning policies:

A1.2.5. our assessment of the tree’s’ quality, value and remaining life expectancy, in accordance with BS5837:2012, as summarised in the notes that accompany the tree survey schedule.

A1.2.6. As trees growing outside the boundaries of the site are in the control of others, we have assumed they will be retained, irrespective of their size, age or condition.

A1.2.7. Although we have categorised trees in accordance with BS 5837, we have not used these categorisations as the main criterion of whether specimens might be removed or should be retained. Trees in categories ‘A’, ‘B’ and ‘C’ are all a material consideration in the development process; but the retention of category ‘C’ trees, being of low quality or of only limited or short-term potential, will not normally be considered necessary should they impose a significant constraint on development.

A1.2.8. Furthermore, BS 5837 makes it clear that young trees, even those of good form and vitality, which have the potential to develop into quality specimens when mature “**need not necessarily be a significant constraint on the site’s potential**”¹⁶.

A1.2.9. Moreover, BS 5837 states that “**.... care should be taken to avoid misplaced tree retention; attempts to retain too many or unsuitable trees on a site can result in excessive pressure on the trees during demolition or construction work, or post-completion demands for their removal**”¹⁷.

A1.2.10. The ‘Root Protection Areas’ (RPAs)¹⁸ of the trees identified for retention were calculated in accordance with Section 4.6 of BS 5837; and were assessed taking account of factors such as the likely tolerance of a tree to root disturbance or damage, the morphology and disposition of roots as influenced by existing site conditions (including the presence of existing roads or structures), as well as soil type, topography and drainage. Where considered appropriate, the shapes of the

¹⁵ The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (December 2024). Paragraph 193 (c).

¹⁶ BS 5837, 4.5.10.

¹⁷ Ibid., 5.1.1.

¹⁸ Ibid., paragraph 3.7. “The minimum area around a retained tree “deemed to contain sufficient roots and rooting volume to maintain the tree’s viability, and where the protection of the roots and soil structure is treated as a priority.”

RPA's (although not their areas) were modified based on these considerations, so that they reflect more accurately the likely root distribution of the relevant trees.

A1.2.11. The British Standard BS 5837 calculates RPA's based on a standard 12 times trunk diameter. However, in our experience the response of trees to root severance or damage is not standard and tends to be less effective in the case of large mature specimens of species with a known intolerance of disturbance. Accordingly, where considered appropriate, we have increased the RPA's of such specimens by calculating them based on an increased factor of trunk diameter.

A1.2.12. To assess whether the trees identified for retention would be in a sustainable relationship with proposed dwellings (without casting excessive shade or otherwise unreasonably interfering with incoming residents' prospects of enjoying their properties, and thereby leading inevitably to requests for consents to fell), we plotted a segment or "shading arc" from each trunk, with a radius equal to the current height of the tree concerned, from due north-west to due east. This gave an indication of potential direct obstruction of sunlight and the shadow pattern cast through the main part of the day¹⁹.

A1.2.13. Based on these principles and recommendations, the tree survey and assessment of suitability for retention informed the production of a tree constraints plan (TCP) which indicates the most suitable trees for retention, and their associated below-ground and above-ground constraints.

A1.2.14. As a design tool, the TCP also indicates how close to those trees selected for retention the proposed development could be positioned, in terms of three key criteria:

- a). avoidance of unacceptable root damage;
- b). avoidance of the necessity for unacceptable pruning works; and
- c). avoidance of future felling or pruning works to prevent unacceptable shading or apprehension on behalf of the occupants.

¹⁹ Ibid., paragraph 5.2.2 Note 1.

APPENDIX 2

Outline Arboricultural Method Statement

A2.1. Tree Protection Plan

A2.1.1. The TPP at Appendix 4 shows the general and specific provisions to be taken during construction of the proposed development, to ensure that no unacceptable damage is caused to the root systems, trunks or crowns of the trees identified for retention. These measures are indicated by coloured notations in areas where construction activities are to occur either within, or in proximity to, retained trees, as described in the relevant panels on the drawing.

A2.2. Pre-start meeting

A2.2.1. Prior to the commencement of any site clearance, ground preparation, demolition or construction works the developer will convene a pre-start site meeting. This shall be attended by the developer's contract manager or site manager, the demolition contractor, the fencing/boarding contractor, the groundwork contractor(s) and the arboricultural consultant. The LPA tree officer will be invited to attend. If appropriate, the tree felling/surgery contractor should also attend. At that meeting contact numbers will be exchanged, and the methods of tree protection shall be fully discussed, so that all aspects of their implementation and sequencing are made clear to all parties. Any clarifications or modifications to the TPP required as a result of the meeting shall be circulated to all attendees.

A2.3. Site clearance

A2.3.1. No clearance of trees or other vegetation shall be undertaken until after the pre-start meeting and after the erection of the tree protection fencing (see below). If any vegetation clearance is required behind the line of the protection fencing this will be made clear at the pre-start meeting and arrangements will be made to do this prior to the fencing's erection, under the supervision of the arboricultural consultant, who will ensure it doesn't cause any soil compaction or damage to the roots of trees to be retained.

A2.3.2. Except where within the RPAs of trees to be retained, all trees and other vegetation to be removed may be cut down or grubbed out as appropriate; but within the RPAs of trees to be retained, trees and vegetation will be cut by hand to ground level and stumps will be either left in place or ground out with a lightweight self-powered stump grinding machine. No excavators, tractors or other vehicles will enter the RPAs.

A2.4. Ground preparation and demolition

A2.4.1. No ground preparation or excavation of any kind, including topsoil stripping or ground levelling, shall be undertaken until after the pre-start meeting and after the erection of the tree protection fencing (see below).

A2.4.2. Demolition of existing buildings and removal of existing areas of hard surfacing that abut or overlie RPAs will be undertaken with care, under the control and supervision of an appointed arboricultural consultant, to ensure that this is undertaken in a way that minimises excavation, disturbance and compaction of the soil within or adjacent to these RPAs.

A2.5. Tree protection fencing

A2.5.1. Construction exclusion zones (CEZs) will be formed by erecting protective fencing around the RPAs of all on-site trees to the specification recommended in BS 5837, Section 6.2, prior to the commencement of construction. This will consist of a scaffold framework comprising a vertical and horizontal framework, well braced to resist impacts, with vertical tubes spaced at maximum intervals of 3.5m. Onto this, welded mesh panels should be securely fixed with wire or scaffold clamps, as shown in **Figure 2** of that document. "**TREE PROTECTION ZONE - KEEP OUT**" or similar notices will be attached with cable ties to every third panel.

A2.5.2. The RPAs of the off-site trees will also be enforced by the erection of protective fencing to the same specification, prior to the commencement of construction, thereby safeguarding them from incursions by plant or machinery, storage and mixing of materials, or other construction-related activities which could have a detrimental effect on their root systems.

A2.5.3. The recommended positions of the protective fencing are shown by **bold blue lines** on the TPP. The precise positioning of the fencing around the trees will be considered in conjunction with any other protective hoarding/fencing which may be required around the site boundary.

A2.5.4. Within the CEZs safeguarded by the protective fencing, there will be no changes in ground levels, **no soil stripping**, and no plant, equipment, or materials will be stored. Oil, bitumen, diesel, and cement will not be stored or discharged within 10m of any trees. Areas for the storage or mixing of such materials will be agreed in advance and be clearly marked. No notice boards, or power or telephone cables, will be attached to any of the trees. No fires will be lit within 10m of any part of any tree.

A2.6. Manual excavation within RPAs

A2.6.1. The first 750mm depth of excavations required within the RPAs of the trees to be retained (as shown by **bold orange lines** on the TPP) will be dug by hand, using a compressed air soil pick if appropriate, and under on-site arboricultural supervision, to safeguard against the possibility of unacceptable root damage being caused to these specimens. Any roots encountered of over 25mm diameter will be cut back cleanly to the face of the dig nearest to the tree, using a sharp hand saw or secateurs, and their cut ends covered with hessian to prevent desiccation.

A2.7. Proposed hard surfaces within RPAs

A2.7.1. Unacceptable damage to the roots and rooting environments of the trees to be retained during the construction of proposed hard surfaces that encroach within RPAs will be avoided by building them above existing soil level, to avoid digging and thus severing of roots; and an appropriate ground covering will be used beneath the sub-base, to prevent or minimise compaction of the soil. This will be done in accordance with Section 7.4 of BS 5837. The locations where these measures will be required are marked by red **cross-hatching** on the TPP.

APPENDIX 3

Tree Survey Schedule



ARBORICULTURAL PLANNING CONSULTANTS

THE OLD POST OFFICE
DORKING ROAD
TADWORTH
SURREY KT20 5SA

Tel: (01737) 813058
E-mail: sja@sjatrees.co.uk

Directors: Simon R. M. Jones Dip. Arb. (RFS), FArborA.,
RCArborA. (Managing)
Frank P. S. Spooner BSc (Hons), MArborA, TechCert (ArborA)
(Operations)

Tree Survey Schedule

Cedar Cottage, Sandygate Lane, Lower Beeding

June 2025

SJA tss 25319-01

Tree Survey Schedule: Explanatory Notes

Cedar Cottage, Sandygate Lane, Lower Beeding

This schedule is based on a tree inspection undertaken by Richard Mulholland of SJAtrees (the trading name of Simon Jones Associates Ltd.), on Thursday the 19th June 2025. Weather conditions at the time were clear, dry and bright. Deciduous trees were in full leaf.

The information contained in this schedule covers only those trees that were examined, and reflects the condition of these specimens at the time of inspection. We did not have access to the trees from any adjacent properties; observations are thus confined to what was visible from within the site and from surrounding public areas.

The trees were inspected from the ground only and were not climbed, and no samples of wood, roots or fungi were taken. A full hazard or risk assessment of the trees was not undertaken, and therefore no guarantee, either expressed or implied, of their safety or stability can be given.

Trees are dynamic organisms and are subject to continual growth and change; therefore the dimensions and assessments presented in this schedule should not be relied upon in relation to any development of the site for more than twelve months from the survey date.

1. Tree no.

Given in sequential order, commencing at "1". Numbers correspond with numbering on topographical survey plan.

2. Species.

'Common names' are given, taken from MITCHELL, A. (1978) A Field Guide to the Trees of Britain and Northern Europe.

3. Height.

Estimated with the aid of a hypsometer, given in metres.

4. Trunk diameter.

Trunk diameter measured at approx. 1.5m above ground level; or where the trunk forks into separate stems between ground level and 1.5m, measured at the narrowest point beneath the fork. Given in millimetres.

5. Radial crown spread.

The linear extent of branches from the base of the trunk to the main cardinal points, rounded up to the closest half metre, unless shown otherwise. For small trees with reasonably symmetrical crowns, a single averaged figure is quoted.

6. Crown break.

Height above ground and direction of growth of first significant live branch.

7. Crown clearance.

Distance from adjacent ground level to lowest part of lowest branch, in metres.

8. Age class.

Young: Seedling, sapling or recently planted tree; not yet producing flowers or seeds; strong apical dominance.

Semi-mature: Trunk often still smooth-barked; producing flowers and/or seeds; strong apical dominance, not yet achieved ultimate height.

Mature: Apical dominance lost, tree close to ultimate height.

Over-mature: Mature, but in decline, no crown retrenchment

Veteran: Mature, with a large trunk diameter for species; but showing signs of veteranisation, irrespective of actual age, with decay or hollowing, a crown showing retrenchment and a structure characteristic of the latter stages of life.

Ancient: Beyond typical age range and with a very large trunk diameter for species; with extensive decay or hollowing, a crown that has undergone retrenchment and a structure characteristic of the latter stages of life.

9. Physiology.

Health, condition and function of the tree, in comparison to a normal specimen of its species and age.

10. Structure.

Structural condition of the tree – based on both the structure of its roots, trunk and major stems and branches, and on the presence of any structural defects or decay.

Good: No significant morphological or structural defects, and an upright and reasonably symmetrical structure.

Moderate: No significant pathological defects, but a slightly impaired morphological structure; however, not to the extent that the tree is at immediate or early risk of collapse.

Indifferent: Significant morphological or pathological defects; but these are either remediable or do not put the tree at immediate or early risk of collapse.

Poor: Significant and irreparable morphological or pathological defects, such that there may be a risk of failure or collapse.

Hazardous: Significant and irreparable morphological or pathological defects, with a risk of imminent collapse.

11. Comments.

Where appropriate comments have been made relating to:

- Health and condition
- Safety, particularly close to areas of public access
- Structure and form
- Estimated life expectancy or potential
- Visibility and impact in the local landscape

12. Category.

Based on the British Standard "Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations", BS 5837: 2012; adjusted to give a greater weighting to trees that contribute to the character and appearance of the local landscape, to amenity, or to arboricultural biodiversity.

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.

(1) Trees that have a serious, irreparable, 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).

(2) Trees that are dead or are showing signs of significant, immediate, and irreversible overall decline.

(3) 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.

Category A: Trees of high quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 40 years.

(1) Trees that are particularly good examples of their species, especially if rare or unusual.

(2) Trees, groups or woodlands of particular visual importance as arboricultural and/or landscape features.

(3) Trees, groups or woodlands of significant conservation, historical, commemorative or other value.

Category B: Trees of moderate quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 20 years.

(1) 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 minor 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.

(2) Trees present in numbers, usually growing as groups or woodlands, such that they form distinct landscape features, thereby attracting a higher collective rating than they might as individuals; or trees present in numbers but situated so as to make little visual contribution to the wider locality.

(3) Trees with material conservation or other cultural value.

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.

(1) Unremarkable trees of very limited merit or of such impaired condition that they do not qualify in higher categories.

(2) 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 landscape benefits.

(3) Trees with no material limited conservation or other cultural value.

TREE SURVEY SCHEDULE
Cedar Cottage, Sandygate Lane, Lower Beeding

No.	TPO no.	Species	Height	Trunk diameter	Radial crown spread	Crown break	Crown clearance	Age class	Physio - logy	Structure	Comments	Category
1		Cherry Laurel	6.5m	4 stems @ 80mm. 4 stems @ 100mm all est.	N 3.5m E 3.5m S 3.6m W 3.5m	0m	W 2m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Off-site tree; multi-stemmed from base; small ornamental tree; obscured from majority of public view.	C (1)
2		Sweet gum	11m	330mm	N 4.1m E 4m S 3.8m W 4m	2m	1m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	No significant defects observed; of moderate quality, but currently of low value due to small size; readily visible from Sandygate Lane (B2115)	B (2)
3		Evergreen magnolia	6m	180mm 160mm	N 2.5m E 3.2m S 2.8m W 3.5m	2m	1m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Twin-stemmed from base, tight compression fork with evidence of included bark; small ornamental tree; narrow views from Sandygate Lane (B2115).	C (1)
4		English oak	20m	1000mm est.	10.6m	3.5m	5m	Mature	Average	Indifferent	Off-site tree; tensile unions through out crown where visible; dominant spreading crown; significant feature of landscape; prominent on Sandygate Lane (B2115).	B (12)
5		Variegated sycamore	5m	150mm est.	3.9m	1.5m	1m	Semi-mature	Average	Moderate	Off-site tree; small ornamental tree; narrow views from Sandygate Lane (B2115).	C (1)
6		Lawson cypress	10.5m	320mm est.	3.5m	0.5m	S 0m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Off-site tree; unremarkable tree of very limited merit; narrow views from Sandygate Lane (B2115).	C (1)
7		Common walnut	11.5m	710mm	N 8.4m E 8m S 7.3m W 3m	3m	E 1.5m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	No defects observed at base; historic heavy reduction at 5m, regrowth forms crown; many cavities at pruning points; significant tear-out wound at 3.5m with heartwood exposed; suppressed from NW by Leyland cypress; significant component of the group in which it stands but inessential component of the wider landscape; narrow views from Sandygate Lane (B2115).	C (1)

No.	TPO no.	Species	Height	Trunk diameter	Radial crown spread	Crown break	Crown clearance	Age class	Physio - logy	Structure	Comments	Category
8-15		Leyland cypress	Max 15m Avg 13m	#8 340mm #9 210mm #10 160mm #11 190mm #12 250mm #13 340mm #14 340mm #15 300mm	N 3.5m E 3.5m S 3.5m W 3.5m	0m	E 2m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Off-site trees; no significant defects observed at base; row of closely planted specimens designed to form a screen; drawn-up and mutually suppressed; many crossing and rubbing branches; tight compression forks with evidence of occluded bark through out structures; contributes to boundary screening; high canopies visible in narrow views from Sandygate Lane (B2115).	C (2)
16-17		Lawson cypress	12m	#16 175mm #17 200mm 200mm all est.	3.5m	0m	1m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Off-site trees; no significant defects observed at base; #17 twin-stemmed at base; row of closely planted specimens designed to form a screen; drawn-up and mutually suppressed; many crossing and rubbing branches; tight compression forks with evidence of occluded bark through out structures; contributes to boundary screening; high canopies visible in narrow views from Sandygate Lane (B2115).	C (2)
18		Sycamore	14m	420mm est.	N 6.3m NE 5.3m E 5.5m S 5.5m W 5.5m NW 5.8m	1m	E 3.5m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Off-site tree; no significant defects observed at base though unable to inspect W side; tight compression fork with evidence of included bark at 2m; lower branches on E side with historic pruning cuts at boundary line; tensile unions throughout crown where visible; inessential feature of the landscape; hidden in majority of public views.	C (1)

No.	TPO no.	Species	Height	Trunk diameter	Radial crown spread	Crown break	Crown clearance	Age class	Physio -logy	Structure	Comments	Category
19		English oak	26m	1450mm est.	N 14m E 14.5m SE 9m S 9.5m W 8m	3m	2m	Mature	Average	Indifferent	Off-site tree with no access to trunk so all off-site measurements estimated; inspection impeded by boundary vegetation and fencing; no significant defects observed at base from vantage point and no evidence of basal hollowing; established ivy on lower trunk; heavy ivy cover on structural limbs; historically lost limb at 4 m on W side, tear out wound with heartwood exposed; storm damage at 10m S side resulting in tear out wound with heartwood exposed; tensile unions throughout crown where visible; dominant spreading crown; no evidence of reduced physiological condition with average foliar density, annual extension growth and no evidence of canopy senescence or retrenchment; no evidence of fungal activity or epiphytes; specimen does not display sufficient characteristics of ancientness to be considered a veteran, but it is locally notable; significant component of group in which it stands; views from rear gardens of properties on Trinity Field and canopy visible from Sandygate Lane (B2115).	A (1)
20		English oak	15m	700mm est.	N 1m E 1m S 1m SW 11.5m W 11.5m	6m	W 6m	Mature	Average	Poor	Off-site tree; catastrophic failure at 2.5m, stem laying in field, heartwood exposed with brown cubical rot visible; structural integrity impaired; one remaining stem heading NW; obscured from majority of public views.	U
21		Common walnut	8m	220mm	N 4.5m E 3.8m S 5m W 4.5m	1.2m	1m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	No significant defects observed; of moderate quality but currently of low value due to small size; long views from rear gardens of properties on Trinity Field.	C (1)
22		Silver birch	14m	400mm est.	6m	2m	4m	Semi-mature	Average	Moderate	Off-site tree; twin-stemmed from 2m; tensile main unions; tensile unions throughout crown where visible; significant component of group in which it stands; long views from rear gardens of properties on Trinity Field.	B (1)
23		False acacia	12m	250mm est.	5m	2m	E 4m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Off-site tree; small ornamental tree; unremarkable tree of very limited merit; long views from rear gardens of properties on Trinity Field.	C (1)
24		English oak	12m	705mm	N 7.4m NE 8.3m E 9.4m SE 8.7m S 6m W 7m	2m	E 2m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Off-site tree; multi-stemmed from 2.5m, consistent with historic pollard; acute but tensile unions; dense epicormic growth in lower crown from 2m and throughout structural limbs; squat spreading crown; significant component of group in which it stands; long views from rear gardens of properties on Trinity Field.	C (12)
25		English oak	12m	380mm	N 3.5m E 5m S 3m W 5m	1.5m	E 2m	Semi-mature	Average	Moderate	Off-site tree; prominent buttress roots; single trunk; tensile unions throughout crown where visible; deadwood up to 60mm throughout crown; suppressed from N and S; inessential component of the group in which it stands; long views from rear gardens of properties on Trinity Field.	C (1)

No.	TPO no.	Species	Height	Trunk diameter	Radial crown spread	Crown break	Crown clearance	Age class	Physio -logy	Structure	Comments	Category
26		English oak	12m	720mm	N 6m NE 7.8m E 7.3m SE 7.3m S 5m W 6m	1.5m	E 2m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Off-site tree; trunk diameter measured at 1m to avoid crown break; multi-stemmed from 1.5m, consistent with historic pollard; acute but tensile main unions; squat spreading dominant crown; tensile unions throughout crown where visible; significant component of group in which it stands; long views from rear gardens of properties on Trinity Field.	B (1)
27		English oak	11m	480mm	N 5m E 5.5m S 5.8m W 5m	2.5m	E 3m	Semi-mature	Average	Moderate	Off-site tree; no significant defects observed; of moderate quality but currently of low value due to small size; contributes to boundary screening; inessential component of the landscape; long views from rear gardens of properties on Trinity Field.	C (1)
28		Scots pine	17m	650mm	N 9.3m NE 7.5m E 5m S 5m W 5m NW 7.8m	1m	N 3m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Off-site tree; no significant defects observed at base; pruning wounds on lower trunk consistent with crown raising; twin-stemmed at 2.5m acute but tensile man union; drawn up and suppressed from S; inessential component of the group in which it stands; long views from rear gardens of properties on Trinity Field.	C (1)
29		Lawson cypress	9m	320mm	2m	0.5m	N 0.5m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Off-site tree; unremarkable tree of very limited merit; long views from rear gardens of properties on Trinity Field.	C (1)
30-33		Silver birch	#30 18m #31 17m #32 16.5m #33 18m	#30 400mm #31 2 stems @ 350mm est. #32 220mm 160mm 100mm #33	N 5.8m NE 6.8m E 6m S 6m W 7m NW 7m	1m	N 1.5m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Off-site trees; #31, #32 and #33 twin-stemmed from base, tight compression forks with evidence of included bark; aerodynamic group with meshing crowns providing companion shelter; long views from rear gardens of properties on Trinity Field.	C (1)
34		Coast redwood	19m	1210mm	N 5.5m NE 6.8m E 5.5m S 5.5m W 5.5m NW 5.8m	2m	N 4m	Semi-mature	Average	Moderate	Off-site tree; no significant defects observed; non-native species, but large specimen tree contributing to the south site boundary tree line; significant component of group in which it stands; views from rear gardens of properties on Trinity Field.	B (12)
36		Hawthorn	4m	110mm	2.8m	1m	W 1.5m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Unremarkable tree of very limited merit; contributes to boundary screening; views from rear gardens of properties on Trinity Field.	C (1)
37		Field maple	8m	2 stems @ 120mm	4m	1m	W 1m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Unremarkable tree of very limited merit; contributes to boundary screening; views from rear gardens of properties on Trinity Field.	C (1)

No.	TPO no.	Species	Height	Trunk diameter	Radial crown spread	Crown break	Crown clearance	Age class	Physio -logy	Structure	Comments	Category
38-39		Holly	#38 5m #39 6m	#38 300mm #39 350mm all est.	3m	0m	W 1m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Historic heavy reduction at 2m, regrowth forms crown; unremarkable trees of very limited merit; contributes to boundary screening; views from rear gardens of properties on Trinity Field.	C (1)
40		Hazel	4.5m	4 stems @ 100mm 4 stems @ 120mm	N 4m E 2m S 4m W 4m	0m	1.5m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Coppice; recent height reduction and 4.5m; unremarkable tree of very limited merit; contributes to boundary screening; views from rear gardens of properties on Trinity Field.	C (1)
42	TPO no. /1422 of 2010: T2	English oak	25m	1000mm est.	9m	5m	4m	Mature	Average	Moderate	Off-site tree with no access to the base, so inspected at distance; no significant defects observed in long range views; 3m long, est. 200mm at widest point, tear out wound on SW side at 8m with heartwood exposed; tensile unions throughout crown where visible; deadwood up to Ø100mm in high central crown; storm damage evident in crown; dominant spreading crown; significant component of group in which it stands; views from rear gardens of properties on Trinity Field and canopy visible from Sandygate Lane (B2110).	B (12)
43-45		Himalayan birch	#43 11m #44 10m #45 7m	300mm #44 130mm #45 2	5.5m	0m	1m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Small ornamental trees; of moderate quality but currently of low value due to small size; obscured from majority of public views.	C (1)
46-47		Silver birch	#46 9m #47 12m	220mm #47 120mm	2.8m	1.5m	1m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Small ornamental trees; #47 drawn-up specimen with Height/Diameter ratio greater than 50: at risk of failure if companion shelter removed; #47 below average physiology; obscured from majority of public views.	C (1)
48		Blue cedar	11m	360mm	N 4.3m E 4.3m S 4.3m SW 5.2m W 4.3m	1.5m	1m	Young	Average	Moderate	No significant defects observed at base; single trunk; tight compression fork with evidence of included bark at 2.5m; minor deadwood throughout structure; obscured from majority of public views.	C (1)
49		Variegated holly	5.5m	120mm 110mm 100mm	3m	2m	1.5m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Small ornamental tree; obscured from majority of public views.	C (1)
50		Variegated sycamore	9m	250mm	4.5m	1m	2m	Semi-mature	Average	Moderate	Small ornamental tree; of moderate quality but currently of low value due to small size; obscured from majority of public views.	C (1)
51		Variegated sycamore	9m	225mm	3.2m	1m	3m	Semi-mature	Average	Moderate	Small ornamental tree; of moderate quality but currently of low value due to small size; obscured from majority of public views.	C (1)
52		Purple maple	10.5m	290mm	5m	1.5m	3m	Semi-mature	Average	Moderate	Small ornamental tree; of moderate quality but currently of low value due to small size; obscured from majority of public views.	C (1)

No.	TPO no.	Species	Height	Trunk diameter	Radial crown spread	Crown break	Crown clearance	Age class	Physio - logy	Structure	Comments	Category
53		Goat willow	11m	270mm	5.2m	1.5m	1.5m	Semi-mature	Average	Moderate	Tight compression forks with evidence of included bark; drawn up; obscured from majority of public views.	C (1)
54		Common walnut	8m	110mm 90mm	3.2m	2m	2m	Semi-mature	Average	Moderate	Small ornamental tree; of moderate quality but currently of low value due to small size; obscured from majority of public views.	C (1)
G1		Various	Max 5m	Max 150mm est.	N 2.5m E 2.5m S 2.5m SW 2.5m W 2.5m	1m	SW 1m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Off-site trees; two holly, one yew, one hornbeam, one privet; unremarkable tree of very limited merit; contributes to boundary screening; canopies visible from Sandygate lane (B2110).	C (1)
G2		Various	Max 6m	Max 130mm	3m	0m	0m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Small ornamental trees; Two lilac; two magnolia, one mulberry, three apple and one bay; regularly maintained; taller specimens canopies visible from Sandygate lane (B2110).	C (1)
G3		Various	Max 3m	Max 75mm est.	1.5m	0m	0m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Small ornamental trees maintained as informal hedge; two quince, one hawthorn; three red robin; visible in narrow view from Sandygate lane (B2110).	C (1)
G4		Various	4m	Max 100mm est.	3m	0m	0m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Off-site group of trees; small ornamental trees; regularly maintained; species include laurel and lilac; canopies visible from Sandygate Lane (B2110).	C (1)
G5		Various	10m	Max 180mm	N 3.5m E 3.5m S 3.5m W 3.5m	0m	E 3m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Off-site group of trees; privet, box, holly, lilac, yew; 15 specimens; E side regularly trimmed to boundary; contributes to boundary screening; obscured from majority of public view.	C (1)
G6		Common Holly	7m	Max 300mm	5.5m	0m	S 1.5m	Semi-mature	Average	Fair	Off-site group of trees; multi-stemmed from base; five specimens; contributes to boundary screening; unremarkable trees of very limited merit; obscured from majority of public view.	C (1)
G7		Various	7m	Max 300mm est.	5m	0m	0m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Off-site group of trees; two beech trees; unable to inspect base due to dense rhododendron and bramble cover, group includes various other garden shrubs; obscured from majority of public view.	C (1)
G8		Various	7m	Max 150mm	N 4m E 5m S 4m W 4m	0m	E 1.5m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Off-site group of trees; seven hawthorn and one Portuguese laurel; unremarkable trees of very limited merit; contributes to boundary screening; long views from rear gardens of properties on Trinity Fields.	C (1)
G9		Various	7m	Max 200mm	E 3.5m	0m	E 1m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Off-site group of trees; seven hawthorn and one yew; ivy-covered; contributes to boundary screening; long views from rear gardens of properties on Trinity Fields..	C (1)
G10		Various	23m	Max 700mm est.	6m	1m	2m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Off-site group of trees; two Norway spruce and one Scots pine; Scots pine suppressed by Norway spruce, resulting in unbalanced form; Norway spruce significant landscape feature; long views from rear gardens of properties on Trinity Fields.	B (2)
G11		Various	6m	Max 150mm est.	N 3.5m	0m	N 1m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Off-site group of trees; seven hawthorn, one holly, and three silver birch; contributes to boundary screening; long views from rear gardens of properties on Trinity Fields.	C (1)
G12		Various	8.5m	Max 150mm est.	N 4.5m	0m	N 1.5m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Off-site group of trees; four hazel, two goat willow, 2 hawthorn and 1 holly; contributes to boundary screening; long views from rear gardens of properties on Trinity Fields.	C (1)

No.	TPO no.	Species	Height	Trunk diameter	Radial crown spread	Crown break	Crown clearance	Age class	Physio - logy	Structure	Comments	Category
G13		Weeping willow	9m	Max 250mm est.	W 6m	2m	W 1.5m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Off-site group of trees (boundary clarification needed); row of three willows; over grown with vegetation; unremarkable tree of very limited merit; contributes to boundary screening; obscured from majority of public view.	C (1)
G14		Various	Max 8m Avg 5m	Max 250mm ivy	W 5m	0m	W 1m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Row of trees; historically a hedgerow but now individual specimens; 16 hawthorn, one holly and one elder; ivy-covered; holly is tallest specimen and heavily ivy-covered; contributes to boundary screening; unremarkable trees of very limited merit; views from rear gardens of properties on Trinity Fields.	C (2)
G15		Various	6m	Max 190mm	4m	0m	0m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Various garden trees and shrubs; two apple, one fig, one box, one magnolia, one pittosporum, three red robin, one Japanese maple, one smoke bush and two cherry also rhododendron, bamboo and other garden shrubs; small ornamental trees, regularly maintained; obscured from majority of public view.	C (1)
H1		Various	3m	Max 75mm est.	0.5m	0m	0m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Boundary hedge consisting of privet, holly, yew, beech, oak, hawthorn, hazel and ivy; regularly maintained hedge; prominent on Sandygate Lane (B2115).	C (1)
H2		Various	3.5m	Max 80mm est.	2m	0m	0m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Off-site hedge; regularly maintained hedge; species include beech, yew and holly; prominent on Sandygate Lane (B2115).	C (1)

Root Protection Areas (RPAs)

Root Protection Areas have been calculated in accordance with paragraph 4.6.1 of the British Standard 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations', BS 5837:2012. This is the minimum area which should be left undisturbed around each retained tree. RPAs are portrayed initially as a circle of a fixed radius from the centre of the trunk; but where there appear to be restrictions to root growth the circle is modified to reflect more accurately the likely distribution of roots.


<i>Tree No.</i>	<i>Species</i>	<i>RPA</i>	<i>RPA Radius</i>
1	Cherry Laurel	29.3m ²	3.1m
2	Sweet gum	49.3m ²	4.0m
3	Evergreen magnolia	26.2m ²	2.9m
4	English oak	706.9m ²	15m
5	Variegated sycamore	10.2m ²	1.8m
6	Lawson cypress	46.3m ²	3.8m
7	Common walnut	228.0m ²	8.5m
8-15	Leyland cypress	52.3m ²	4.1m
		20.0m ²	2.5m
		11.6m ²	1.9m
		16.3m ²	2.3m
		28.3m ²	3.0m
		52.3m ²	4.1m
16-17	Lawson cypress	52.3m ²	4.1m
		40.7m ²	3.6m
18	Sycamore	14.7m ²	2.2m
		36.1m ²	3.4m
19	English oak	79.8m ²	5.0m
20	English oak	1486.2m ²	21.75m
21	English oak	221.7m ²	8.4m
22	Common walnut	21.9m ²	2.6m
23	Silver birch	72.4m ²	4.8m
24	False acacia	28.3m ²	3.0m
25	English oak	224.8m ²	8.5m
26	English oak	65.3m ²	4.6m
27	English oak	234.5m ²	8.6m
28	English oak	104.2m ²	5.8m
29	Scots pine	191.1m ²	7.8m
30-33	Lawson cypress	46.3m ²	3.8m
		72.4m ²	4.8m
		110.8m ²	5.9m
		38.0m ²	3.5m
34-37	Silver birch	164.5m ²	7.2m
		662.3m ²	14.5m
		5.5m ²	1.3m
		13.0m ²	2.0m
38-39	Field maple	40.7m ²	3.6m
		55.4m ²	4.2m
40	Holly	43.8m ²	3.7m
42	Hazel	706.9m ²	15m
43-45	English oak	40.7m ²	3.6m
		7.6m ²	1.6m
		3.3m ²	1.0m
46-47	Himalayan birch	21.9m ²	2.6m
		7.6m ²	1.6m

48	Blue cedar	58.6m ²	4.3m
49	Variegated holly	16.5m ²	2.3m
50	Variegated sycamore	28.3m ²	3.0m
51	Variegated sycamore	22.9m ²	2.7m
52	Purple maple	38.0m ²	3.5m
53	Goat willow	33.0m ²	3.2m
54	Common walnut	9.1m ²	1.7m
G1	Various	10.2m ²	1.8m
G2	Various	7.6m ²	1.6m
G3	Various	2.5m ²	0.9m
G4	Various	4.5m ²	1.2m
G5	Various	14.7m ²	2.2m
G6	Common Holly	40.7m ²	3.6m
G7	Various	40.7m ²	3.6m
G8	Various	10.2m ²	1.8m
G9	Various	18.1m ²	2.4m
G10	Various	221.7m ²	8.4m
G11	Various	10.2m ²	1.8m
G12	Various	10.2m ²	1.8m
G13	Weeping willow	28.3m ²	3.0m
G14	Various	28.3m ²	3.0m
G15	Various	16.3m ²	2.3m
H1	Various	2.5m ²	0.9m
H2	Various	2.9m ²	1.0m

APPENDIX 4

Tree Protection Plan

Arboricultural Impacts: Summary			
(For details, see below)			
Impact	No. of Trees		
Trees to be removed	16		
Groups of trees/hedges to be removed	4		
TPO trees to be removed	0		
Trees to be pruned	2		
Trees where manual excavation needed within RPAs	11		
Trees where above soil surfacing needed within RPAs	2		
Trees with proposed underground services within RPAs	0		
Trees to be Removed			
No	Species	Category	
2	Sweet gum	C (12)	
3	Evergreen magnolia	C (1)	
7	Common walnut	C (1)	
21	Common walnut	C (1)	
43-45	Himalayan birch	C (1)	
46-47	Silver birch	C (1)	
48	Blue cedar	C (1)	
49	Holly	C (1)	
50	Sycamore	C (1)	
52	Purple maple	C (1)	
53	Goat willow	C (1)	
54	Common walnut	C (1)	
G2	Various	C (1)	
G3	Various	C (1)	
G15	Various	C (1)	
H1	Various	C (1)	
Total numbers of trees to be removed			
Category	No. of trees	Category	No. of trees
A	0	B	0
C	16	U	0
Trees to be pruned			
No.	Species	Works	
1	Laurel	Reduce W crown by 3m back to boundary	
24	English oak	a) Reduce east crown by 2.5m from branch tips to 6.1m from trunk b) Crown lift E crown over parking bays and garden to from 2m to 3.5m above ground level	
Pruning is to be undertaken in accordance with the British Standard Recommendations for Tree work, BS3998: 2010. Climbing irons or spikes are not to be used whilst pruning trees.			
Trees that require manual excavation within RPAs			
No.	Species	Type of structure	
1	Laurel	Proposed foundations	
8	Lawson cypress	Proposed parking bays	
13-15	Lawson cypress	Proposed parking bays	
17	Lawson cypress	Proposed parking bays	
19	English oak	Proposed road and foundations	
24	English oak	Proposed foundations	
34	Coast redwood	Proposed foundations	
42	English oak	Proposed foundations	
51	Sycamore	Proposed road	
Trees that require above soil surfacing within RPAs			
No.	Species	Type of structure	
24	English oak	Proposed parking bay	
26	English oak	Proposed driveway	



Protective Fencing

To be erected prior to the commencement of all works on site, and retained in place throughout construction. To comprise either 2.4m wooden site hoarding; or a 2m high scaffolding framework, with uprights at maximum 3m spacings, every other one braced to the ground with 45 degree struts; supporting standard anti-climb 'Heras' welded mesh fence panels secured with anti-lift devices to concrete or plastic bases pinned to the ground by scaffold uprights sunk to a minimum depth of 600mm; individual panels fixed to each other with at least 2 clamps and to scaffolding with heavy-duty cable ties. "TREE PROTECTION ZONE - KEEP OUT" or similar notices to be attached to every fifth panel.

TREE PROTECTION FENCING as shown in BS 5837: 2012, Section 6.2.2 & Figure 2.

Manual Excavation

Within root protection areas the first 750mm depth of any excavation, whether for proposed foundations, hard surfacing, or underground services shall be undertaken by hand under arboricultural supervision. The soil will be loosened with a pick or fork, and then will be cleared from roots with a compressed air soil pick. All roots will be cut cleanly with a hand saw or secateurs. The edge of the excavation closest to the trees will be covered with hessian sacking to prevent drying out, and if necessary be shuttered with an appropriate material to prevent soil collapse. Where appropriate, the soil beneath this depth may be sheet piled; and deeper excavation may be undertaken by a machine provided it works from outside the root protection areas.

Above Soil Surfacing

Proposed hard surfacing within root protection areas (RPAs) of retained trees to be constructed in accordance with section 7.4 of BS 5837: 2012, Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations. Other than the careful removal, using hand tools, of any turf layer, surfaces will be installed above existing soil level, or no deeper than the base of any existing surfacing it is replacing, so that the soil is not disturbed and no roots are severed; and an appropriate ground covering, possibly using a geogrid, a geoweb, or a combination of the two will be placed beneath the sub-base to minimise compaction of the soil in which tree roots are growing. Edge supports will also be installed above existing soil level.

Arboricultural Supervision

The arboricultural consultant will directly supervise all construction works that have to be undertaken within root protection areas. These include:

1. Location of protective fencing and ground protection.
2. Construction of above-ground hard surfacing.
3. All excavations, whether for proposed foundations, hard surfacing, or underground services.

SJA trees

ARBORICULTURAL PLANNING CONSULTANTS

Project: Cedar Cottage, Lower Beeding

Client: Black Onyx

Drawing: TREE PROTECTION PLAN

Drawing No: SJA TPP 25319-041 **Revision No:**

Based On: 25109 - P101D

Drawn By: RM **Date:** April 2026 **Scale:** 1:500 @ A2

Checked by: FJC **Tel:** (01737) 813058 **sja@sjatrees.co.uk**

Tree nos.: ● 34	Category 'U' trees: ● [20]	Canopies of trees to be retained:
Category 'A' RPA:	Category 'B' RPA:	Category 'C' RPA:
Trees to be removed:	Trees to be pruned:	Indicative pruning line:
Above soil surfacing:	Manual excavation:	Protective fencing:

For further information refer to the SJATrees Tree Survey Schedule

Do not scale from this drawing: please check all dimensions on site, and notify us of any discrepancies. SJATrees (the trading name of Simon Jones Associates Ltd.) cannot be held responsible for inaccuracies in the topographical plan on which this drawing is based. © Simon Jones Associates Ltd. 2026

This drawing is copyright and may not be used or changed without the written consent of SJATrees.

This drawing is based on the proposed layout plan shown and referred to above. SJATrees authorises its reproduction, without amendment, by the Local Planning Authority (LPA), and to its posting on the LPA website, to assist in consideration of this application only.

This drawing is designed to reflect only the principles of layout and /or design insofar as these relate to the protection of trees to be retained, and should NOT be read as a definitive engineering or construction method statement. Reference should be made to the architect or structural engineer, as appropriate, over any matters of construction detail or specification, or any engineering standards or regulatory requirements relating to proposed structures, hard surfaces or underground services.