



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 development at

Codmore Hill Industrial Estate

Pulborough

June 2026

Ref. SJA air 25568-01b

SUMMARY

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

S2. Our assessment of the impacts of the proposals on the existing trees concludes that no trees are to be removed, include that that are mature, category 'B' trees or of landscape or biodiversity value. This being an improvement over the extant permission which allowed for the removal of trees nos. 9-17. Therefore, the proposals will not result in any alteration to the main arboricultural features of the site, to the overall arboricultural character of the site and will not have an adverse impact on the arboricultural character and appearance of the local landscape.

S3. As no trees are to be pruned, and none of the proposed buildings will be within 5m of the extents of the canopies of the individual trees to be retained, there will be adequate working space for construction close to trees, and a reasonable margin of clearance for future growth.

S4. incursions into the Root Protection Areas of trees to be retained are minor, 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.

S5. The proposed mitigation and arboricultural benefits of the proposals are significant; and provide an increase in tree cover and arboricultural character of the site.

S6. On the basis of our assessment, we conclude that the arboricultural impact of this scheme is of negligible magnitude, as defined according to the categories set out in **Table 1** of this report.

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION	4
2. PLANNING CONTEXT	7
3. THE TREES	14
4. TREES TO BE REMOVED	17
5. TREES TO BE PRUNED	18
6. ROOT PROTECTION AREA INCURSIONS	20
7. MITIGATION AND BENEFITS	24
8. CONCLUSIONS	25

APPENDICES

- 1. Methodology**
- 2. Outline arboricultural method statement**
- 3. Tree survey schedule (SJA tss 25568-01)**
- 4. Tree protection plan (SJA TPP 25568-041)**

© 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 WT Lamb Holdings 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 WT Lamb Holdings to visit Codmore Hill Industrial Estate, Pulborough, and to survey the trees growing on or immediately adjacent to this site.

1.1.2. We are further asked to identify which trees are worthy of retention within a proposed development of the site; to assess the implications of the development proposals on these specimens, and to advise how they should be protected from unacceptable damage during 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 specification**¹”; 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 construction**²”. 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 a commercial building with ten units along with associated access and parking.

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). The arboricultural mitigation and benefits of the scheme are set out in Section 7. A summary and conclusions, with regard to local planning policy, are presented in Section 8.

1.3. Site inspection

1.3.1. A site visit and tree inspection were undertaken by Richard Mulholland of SJAtrees on Thursday 9th October 2025. Weather conditions at the time were clear, dry and bright. Deciduous trees were in partial leaf.

1.4. Site description

1.4.1. The site is located on the west side of Broomers Hill, as shown at **Figure 1** below, which abuts the northeast site boundary. The wider Codmore Estate adjoins the northwest boundary of the site. The east site boundary adjoins the railway with a residential property beyond. The south site boundary abuts open fields and groups of trees.



Figure 1: Site location shown on Google aerial image

1.4.2. The site is on ground that falls gently from north to south, and currently comprises an existing parking area with compacted ground to the north and central open space lined with trees and vegetation.

1.5. Soil type

1.5.1. The British Geological Survey Solid and Drift Geology map of the area indicates the site overlies bedrock of Weald Clay Formation, but there is no information on likely superficial deposits.

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 slowly permeable, seasonally wet, slightly acid but base rich loamy and clayey soil.

1.5.3. We are not aware of a site investigation or soil analysis having been undertaken; but 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. At the time of writing none of these trees are covered by a tree preservation order (TPO).

1.6.2. The site 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 several previous applications for development and minor works, the most relevant of which are listed below:

- App DC/16/2006 (September 2016) Reserved Matters pursuant to DC/13/1048- Approved December 2016
- App DC/13/1048 (June 2013) Proposed development of 10 No. B1/B8 units with 55 parking spaces, 2 disabled spaces & 10 LGV parking spaces and outline consent for a further B1/B8 unit with 10 car parking spaces. Approved September 2013

2.2. Planning policy - national

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:**

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

- 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;**
- 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 25 of the Planning Framework states, *inter alia*:

“The Natural Environment and landscape character of the District, including the landscape, landform and development pattern, together with protected landscapes and habitats will be protected against inappropriate development. The Council will support development proposals which: (...)

2. Maintain and enhances the Green Infrastructure Network and addresses any identified deficiencies in the District.”

2.3.3. The relevant section of Policy 26 of the Planning Framework states, *inter alia*:

“(...) In addition, proposals must 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, and/or conserves, and/or enhances, the key features and characteristics of the landscape character area in which it is located, including;

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

2. The pattern of woodlands, fields, hedgerows, trees, waterbodies and other features; (...)”

2.3.4. The relevant section of Policy 31 of the Planning Framework states, *inter alia*:

“1. Development will be supported where it can demonstrate that it maintains or enhances the existing network of green infrastructure. Proposals that would result in the loss of existing green infrastructure will be resisted unless it can be demonstrated that new opportunities will be provided that mitigates or compensates for this loss, and ensures that the ecosystem services of the area are retained.

2. Development proposals will be required to contribute to the enhancement of existing biodiversity, and should create and manage new habitats where appropriate. The Council will support new development which retains and /or enhances significant features of nature conservation on development sites. The Council will also support development which makes a positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces, and linkages between habitats to create local and regional ecological networks.

3. Where felling of protected trees is necessary, replacement planting with a suitable species will be required. “

2.3.5. 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 site is within the Pulborough Neighbourhood Area. The made Neighbourhood Plan 2015-2031 (September 2025) references trees in relation to specific development sites but does not include a policy that covers trees, green infrastructure or landscape.

3. THE TREES

3.1. Survey findings

3.1.1. We surveyed 15 individual trees, three groups of trees and one hedgerow and growing within or immediately adjacent to the site. Their details can be found in the tree survey schedule at **Appendix 2**.

3.1.2. The arboricultural quality of the site is limited to the vegetated boundaries around the periphery of the site, which are comprised of deciduous specimens of native, semi-naturalised and exotic species. The row of Lombardy poplars are the most common species on the site and the most dominant in the landscape. The arboricultural character of the site reflects the wider character of the local area.

3.2. Irreplaceable habitat: ancient woodland

3.2.1. There are no woodlands within or abutting the site 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 site 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 site, whose attributes we consider meet these criteria, are as follows:

- the row of Lombardy poplars nos. 9 to 17, which are visible from Broomers Hill Lane and the railway;
- the hedgerow (H1) along the western side of Broomers Hill Lane; and
- the English oak no. 4 growing in the southwest corner of the site.

3.6. Other trees

3.6.1. Two individual trees (nos. 7 and 8) are unsuitable for retention, irrespective of the proposals, in that they are 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. However, as can be seen below, these trees are not necessarily shown to be removed as part of the proposals; some may be outside the development footprint or may be outside the red line boundary and in third-party ownership. These trees have been assessed as category 'U' and are indicated on the accompanying tree protection plan by **bracketed red** numbers.

3.6.2. There is only one mature tree, the English oak no. 4, which is of large ultimate size and long-term potential, but is largely screened in views from the surrounding roads but contributes to the arboricultural character of the site.

3.6.3. There are no category 'A' trees, but there are ten category 'B' specimens. The remaining three 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. The groups of trees and the hedge have been assessed as category 'C'.

3.7. Assessment of arboricultural impacts

3.7.1. The arboricultural impacts of the proposed site layout by Place by Design, drawing no. 1749 2100 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 shows how trees to be retained will be protected from damage during 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.

3.7.3. Details of the impacts identified within these categories, and our assessment of their respective significance, are analysed in Sections 4 to 7 below.

3.7.4. 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. None of the existing trees or vegetation is to be removed to accommodate the proposed development.

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. As no trees are to be removed, there will be no arboricultural impacts in this regard. Accordingly there will be no alteration to the main arboricultural features of the site and no adverse impacts on the arboricultural character and appearance of the local landscape .

5. TREES TO BE PRUNED

5.1. Details

5.1.1. None of the trees to be retained are to be pruned to facilitate implementation of the proposals.

5.2. Assessment

5.2.1. As no trees are to be pruned, and none of the proposed buildings will be within 5m of the extents of the canopies of the individual trees to be retained, there will be adequate working space for construction close to trees, and a reasonable margin of clearance for future growth.

5.2.2. Analysis of the ultimate genetic crown spreads of the trees show that the Lombardy poplars are not likely to ever need pruning to keep them clear of the proposed buildings as they are at a greater distance from them than the spread they are capable of achieving.

5.2.3. The proposed building is located 13.6m from the trunk of the English oak no. 4, providing 6m clearance between the building and the east canopy extent of the tree. The specimen is already mature, but its canopy has the potential to grow with mature oaks typically achieving at least a 10m canopy spread.

5.2.4. Mature English oaks average growth rate is 250mm per year during their middle years (Richardson, P. J. & Gale, I. N. (1994) Tree Recognition), this means it would take at least 24 years for the specimen to span the gap to the building. The lateral growth rate is likely to be slower than the figure referenced above which relates to height gain, but it is a useful proxy for assessments.

5.2.5. It may be necessary to undertake pruning to mitigate direct contact in the future, but this can likely be limited to a crown lift so that the upper canopy is unaffected and the benefits of the specimen in terms of amenity, shade and green infrastructure can be retained and protected.

5.2.6. The group of trees (G3) along the southern boundary will grow towards the proposed buildings, so pruning is likely to be necessary in the future to ensure the trees do not come into direct contact with the building. The pruning will involve cutting back the trees (blackthorn, hawthorn and goat willow) on regular basis; however, these species tolerate regularly pruning well so there is no concern over the long-term health or viability of these trees.

5.2.7. Our assessment of the relationship between the proposed building and the retained trees concludes that the trees are well integrated into the layout with sufficient clearances between the trees and the proposed building and structures. Whilst pruning is likely to be necessary in the future, the management will be consistent with hedgerow management of the boundary vegetation, and there will be no risk of long-term decline of health or viability of the retained trees.

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"**.⁵

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 clear⁶, 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 hard surfacing will encroach within the RPAs of three of the trees to be retained. These are shown in **Table 2** below.

⁵ British Standard BS 5837:2012. Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations; para. 3.7.

⁶ Ibid., para 5.3.1.

Tree no.	Species	Incursion by:	Total RPA	Extent of incursion into RPA	% of RPA
4	English oak	Proposed parking bays	275.2m ²	34.8m ²	12.6%
14	Lombardy poplar	Proposed bike store and parking bays	113.1m ²	0.6m ²	0.5%
17	Lombardy poplar	Proposed parking bays	76m ²	6.8m ²	8.9%

Table 2: Proposed incursions within RPAs

6.2. Assessment

6.2.1. The incursions into the RPAs of trees nos. 14 and 17 are by proposed hard surfaces for a bike store and parking bays, and subject to proposed levels, some degree of excavation will be required. To minimise impacts on these specimens, 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.

6.2.2. To minimise impacts on these specimens, the structures can be designed to avoid excavation deeper than 400mm. Studies have shown that typically as much as 90% of tree root length occurs in the upper metre of the soil⁷ and so it is highly unlikely that this incursions into the RPAs will result in all the roots in these areas being severed. For example, as only the upper 400mm of the upper metre of soil will be removed, the 8.9% incursion into the RPA of the poplar no. 17 may result in a reduction of only 3.6% of roots within the RPA.

6.2.3. As a species Lombardy poplar has been identified as good to moderate at tolerating root pruning and disturbance⁸. As these specimens are semi-mature and of average physiological condition, there is no reason to suggest that it will not be able to tolerate the cutting of roots within these small sections of their RPAs.

⁷ Roberts J., Jackson N., & Smith M. (2006). Tree Roots in the Built Environment. TSO.

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

6.2.4. The areas lost to encroachment within the RPAs can be compensated for in the areas to the north, south and east of the trees, where there is an extensive areas of soft landscaping suitable for root growth, contiguous to the RPAs. At present, there is likely to be significant rooting within this area, and as it is 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 remain viable.

6.2.5. Within the RPA of English oak no. 4 there is an area of existing hard surface whose finished surface layer may be replaced. This replacement surface extends to no more than 12.6% of its RPA, and does not exceed the 20% maximum incursion into currently unsurfaced ground recommended in BS 5837⁹.

6.2.6. The footprint of the existing hard surface within the RPA is shown in **Photograph 1** below. The proposals will utilise the existing surface and install the replacement surface no deeper than the sub-base of the existing surface so that there is no excavation into the soil beneath and no severance of roots associated with the oak. In this way, there will be impact on the oak's root system.



Photograph 1: Showing the existing ground conditions within the RPA of the English oak no. 4

⁹ BS 5837, paragraph 7.4.2.3.

6.2.7. 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**.

6.2.8. 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. MITIGATION AND BENEFITS

7.1. Replacement planting

7.1.1. Although there will be no removal of trees and no alteration to the main arboricultural features of the site as set out above, the proposals can incorporate replacement tree planting to increase the tree cover on the site and provide an enhancement to the arboricultural character of the site.

7.1.2. The new planting will improve the age class balance of the trees on site, enhance the local landscape, and strengthen the existing arboricultural framework for the ongoing and long-term character of the site.

7.2. Tree and hedgerow management

7.2.1. 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.

7.2.2. 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 sequestrate and store carbon.

8. CONCLUSIONS

8.1. Summary

8.1.1. 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.

8.1.2. Our assessment of the impacts of the proposals on the existing trees concludes that no trees are to be removed, include that that are mature, category 'B' trees or of landscape or biodiversity value. This being an improvement over the extant permission which allowed for the removal of trees nos. 9-17. Therefore, the proposals will not result in any alteration to the main arboricultural features of the site, to the overall arboricultural character of the site and will not have an adverse impact on the arboricultural character and appearance of the local landscape.

8.1.3. As no trees are to be pruned, and none of the proposed buildings will be within 5m of the extents of the canopies of the individual trees to be retained, there will be adequate working space for construction close to trees, and a reasonable margin of clearance for future growth.

8.1.4. incursions into the Root Protection Areas of trees to be retained are minor, 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.

8.1.5. The proposed mitigation and arboricultural benefits of the proposals are significant; and provide an increase in tree cover and arboricultural character of the site.

8.2. Compliance with national planning policy

8.2.1. 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.

8.2.2. 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. Indeed, they allow for the retention of 9 such trees shown for removal on the extant permission. 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.

8.2.3. 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.

8.3. Compliance with local planning policy

8.3.1. As the proposed development retains all trees, including those that contribute to the local landscape, green infrastructure and ecological features, and positively integrates the retained trees into the proposed layout, it complies with Policies 25, 26, 31 and 33 of the adopted Horsham District Council Planning Framework 2015.

8.4. Conclusion

8.4.1. On the basis of our assessment, we conclude that the arboricultural impact of this scheme is of negligible 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 above¹⁰, trees with trunk diameters of 150mm and above growing in groups or woodlands, and shrub masses, hedges and hedgerows¹¹ growing within or immediately adjacent to the site; 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 culturally¹². 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. Our assessment of which trees might have to be retained, and which can be removed, is based on:

10 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.

11 Ibid., 4.4.2.7

12 Ibid., 4.4.2.3

A1.2.2. Whether any trees are classed as ‘ancient’ or ‘veteran’, and thereby are designated as ‘irreplaceable habitats’;¹³

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

A1.2.5. 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.

A1.2.6. 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.

A1.2.7. 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”**¹⁴.

A1.2.8. 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”**¹⁵.

A1.2.9. The ‘Root Protection Areas’ (RPAs)¹⁶ 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.

A1.2.10. Based on these principles and recommendations, the tree survey and assessment of suitability for retention informed the production of a tree constraints

¹³ The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (December 2024). Paragraph 193 (c).

¹⁴ BS 5837, 4.5.10.

¹⁵ Ibid., 5.1.1.

¹⁶ 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.”

plan (TCP) which indicates the most suitable trees for retention, and their associated below-ground and above-ground constraints.

A1.2.11. 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; and
- b). avoidance of the necessity for unacceptable pruning works.

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, 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 fencing/boarding contractor, the groundwork contractor(s) and the arboricultural consultant. The LPA tree officer will be invited to 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

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).

A2.5. 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

APPENDIX 4

Tree Protection Plan



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

Codmore Hill Industrial Estate, Pulborough, West Sussex

October 2025

SJ tss 25568-01

Tree Survey Schedule: Explanatory Notes

Codmore Hill Industrial Estate, Pulborough, West Sussex

This schedule is based on a tree inspection undertaken by Richard Mulholland of SJA trees (the trading name of Simon Jones Associates Ltd.), on Thursday the 9th October 2025. Weather conditions at the time were clear, dry and bright. Deciduous trees were in partial 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 irremediable morphological or pathological defects, such that there may be a risk of failure or collapse.

Hazardous: Significant and irremediable 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, irremediable, structural defect, such that their early loss is expected due to collapse, including those that will become unviable after removal of other category 'U' trees (e.g. where, for whatever reason, the loss of companion shelter cannot be mitigated by pruning).

(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

Codmore Hill Industrial Estate, Pulborough, West Sussex

No.	Species	Height	Trunk diameter	Radial crown spread	Crown break	Crown clearance	Age class	Physio -logy	Structure	Comments	Cate-gory
1	Silver birch	9.5m	265mm	N 3.5m E 4.5m S 3.5m W 3m	2m	1.5m	Semi-mature	Average	Moderate	Off-site tree; no significant defects observed at base; branch Ø100mm W, historically pruned to 1m, leaving 250mm dead stub; tensile unions throughout crown, where visible; readily visible from Broomers Hill Lane.	C (12)
2	Silver birch	11m	105mm 185mm	N 3.4m E 1m S 2.3m W 2.6m	2m	N 3m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Exposed surface roots W; twin-stemmed from base; main trunk 20° phototropic lean N; significant component of group in which it stands; readily visible at entrance of site, but obscured from public view by a narrow gap from Broomers Hill Lane.	C (2)
4	English oak	18m	780mm	7.5m	2m	2.5m	Mature	Average	Good	No significant defects observed at base; tensile unions throughout crown, where visible; minor deadwood throughout crown, consistent with age and species; dominant crown; significant component of group in which it stands; visible in narrow view from Broomers Hill Lane.	B (1)
6	Lombardy poplar	19m	380mm	1.8m	2m	1m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	No significant defects observed; tree growth habit typical of species; part of linear arboricultural feature; inessential component of the group in which it stands, but readily visible from Broomers Hill Lane and National Railway land.	B (2)
7-8	Lombardy poplar	#7 14m #8 14m	#7 340mm #8 300mm	1m	2m	2m	Semi-mature	Low	Indifferent	No significant defects observed at base; sparse and dead foliage throughout; in decline and of short-term potential only; should be removed for sound arboricultural reasons; part of linear arboricultural feature; inessential component of the group in which it stands; readily visible from Broomers Hill Lane and National Railway land.	U
9-11	Lombardy poplar	#9 19m #10 19m #11 20m	#9 400mm #10 400mm #11 500mm	2m	1m	1m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	No significant defects observed at base; trees displaying morphological and physiological features consistent with size, age, species and location; part of linear arboricultural feature; essential components of the group in which they stand; readily visible from Broomers Hill Lane and National Railway land.	B (2)
12	Lombardy poplar	17m	310mm	1.5m	1m	1m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	No significant defects observed at base; tree displaying morphological and physiological features consistent with size, age, species and location; part of linear arboricultural feature; inessential component of the group in which it stands; readily visible from Broomers Hill Lane and National Railway land.	C (2)
13-15	Lombardy poplar	#13 19m #14 20m #15 18m	#13 370mm #14 500mm #15 410mm	1.8m	1m	1m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	No significant defects observed at base; trees displaying morphological and physiological features consistent with size, age, species and location; part of linear arboricultural feature; essential component of the group in which it stands; readily visible from Broomers Hill Lane and National Railway land.	B (2)

No.	Species	Height	Trunk diameter	Radial crown spread	Crown break	Crown clearance	Age class	Physio -logy	Structure	Comments	Category
16	Lombardy poplar	17m	310mm	1.2m	1m	1m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	No significant defects observed at base; tree displaying morphological and physiological features consistent with size, age, species and location; part of linear arboricultural feature; inessential component of the group in which it stands; readily visible from Broomers Hill Lane and National Railway land.	C (2)
17	Lombardy poplar	20m	640mm	2.5m	1m	1m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Basal inspection impeded by dense bramble cover; tree displaying morphological and physiological features consistent with size, age, species and location; part of linear arboricultural feature; significant component of group in which it stands; readily visible from National Railway land.	B (2)
G1	Silver birch and flowering cherry	11m	Max 250mm Avg 100mm	NE 5m SE 1.2m SW 3.5m NW 2.8m	0m	NE 2m SW 3m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Group of 15 birch trees (80% young) and one flowering cherry; drawn-up and mutually suppressed; flowering cherry twin-stemmed from base with tight compression fork with evidence of included bark; no other significant defects observed; collectively an arboricultural landscape feature, but individually of low value; readily visible from Broomers Hill Lane.	C (2)
G2	Silver birch	Max 13m	Max 235mm Avg 150mm	N 3.5m E 4m S 3.5m W 4.5m	1m	2.5m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Group of 5 silver birch; drawn-up and mutually suppressed; no significant defects observed; visible in narrow views from Broomers Hill Lane, but otherwise obscured from public view.	C (1)
G3	Various	Max 10m	Max 150mm	5m	0m	0m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Dense group of trees; boundary screening for site E and S and internal boundary for existing carpark; hawthorn; blackthorn; goat willow, overgrown with bramble, impenetrable in parts; goat willow and hawthorn provide largest specimens; E and S boundary specimens readily visible from Broomers Hill Lane and National Railways land, internal specimens obscured from public view.	C (2)
H1	Hawthorn	Max 3m	Avg 80mm	1m	0m	0m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Regularly maintained hedge; readily visible from Broomers Hill Lane.	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	Silver birch	31.8m ²	3.2m
2	Silver birch	20.5m ²	2.6m
4	English oak	275.2m ²	9.4m
6	Lombardy poplar	65.3m ²	4.6m
7-8	Lombardy poplar	52.3m ²	4.1m
		40.7m ²	3.6m
9-11	Lombardy poplar	72.4m ²	4.8m
		72.4m ²	4.8m
		113.1m ²	6.0m
12	Lombardy poplar	43.5m ²	3.7m
13-15	Lombardy poplar	61.9m ²	4.4m
		113.1m ²	6.0m
		76.0m ²	4.9m
16	Lombardy poplar	43.5m ²	3.7m
17	Lombardy poplar	185.3m ²	7.7m
G1	Silver birch and Bird cherry	28.3m ²	3.0m
G2	Silver birch	25.0m ²	2.8m
G3	Various	10.2m ²	1.8m
H1	Hawthorn	2.9m ²	1.0m

APPENDIX 4

Tree Protection Plan

27.52

s106 Landscaping Area



27.71

Area
A

Area

G3
Various

1 Silver birch

Silver birch

G1

Silver birch & flowering cherry

G2
Silver birch

H1
Hawthorn

Lombardy poplar

Lombardy poplar

SJA Excavation for proposed hard surfacing to be undertaken manually, under arboricultural supervision; see inset panel

G3
Various

Killybegs Cottage



SJA ARBORCULTURAL PLANNING CONSULTANTS

The diagram illustrates a wire mesh panel supported by standard scaffold poles. The panel is rectangular, with a height of 2m and a width of 3m. It is held in place by wire ties. The panel is supported by standard scaffold poles, which are connected by clamps. The panel is positioned 0.6m above the ground level. The diagram also shows uprights and the ground level.

 Above Soil Surfacing

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, which is necessary to be worked with an appropriate material to prevent soil collapse. Where appropriate, a layer of 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.

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.
2. Lifting/excavation of existing hard surfaces.
3. Construction of above-ground hard surfacing.
4. Any excavation, including the hard surfaces, within and adjacent the RPAs of the Lombardy poplars.

SJA ARBORCULTURAL PLANNING CONSULTANTS

Project:	Codmore Hill Estate
----------	---------------------

Client:	W T Lamb Holdings
---------	-------------------

Drawing:	TREE PROTECTION PLAN
----------	----------------------

Drawing no:	SJA TPP 25568-041a
-------------	--------------------

Based on:	1749 2100
-----------	-----------

Drawn by:
E.I.C.

Checked by: FPS	
-----------------	--

Tree	● 4	
------	-----	--

Category	
----------	---

'B' RPA:		

above soil surfacing:		e
--------------------------	---	---

For further information refer to the SJRAEES Tree Survey Schedule

Do not scale from this drawing plan check all dimensions on a plan and notify us of any errors. The SJRAEES Associates Ltd (SJRAEES 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 SJRAEES.

This drawing is based on the proposed layout plan shown and referred to above. SJRAEES authorises its reproduction, without amendment, by the Local Planning Authority and (to be posted 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 as far as possible. It is not intended to be 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.

It is the responsibility of any engineering or construction or regulatory requirements relating to proposed structures, hard surfaces or underground services.