



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

Chapel Road

Barns Green

Horsham



May 2026

Ref. SJA air 25558-01a

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 ancient, veteran, notable or mature trees, 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 are “**existing important landscape and natural features**” are to be removed. The proposed partial removal of the groups of trees will represent no alteration to the main arboricultural features of the site, only a very minor alteration 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. The proposed pruning is minor in extent, will not detract from the health or appearance of these trees, and complies with current British Standards.

S4. The 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. 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 on the Local Planning Authority to permit felling or severe pruning that it could not reasonably resist

S6. As the proposed development will not result in the removal of trees which are “**existing important landscape and natural features**” it complies with Policies 26 and 33 of the Horsham District Council Planning Framework (November 2015).

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION	4
2. PLANNING CONTEXT	8
3. THE TREES	12
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	30
9. CONCLUSIONS	31

APPENDICES

1. Methodology
2. Outline arboricultural method statement
3. Tree survey schedule (SJA tss 25558-01)
4. Tree protection plan (SJA TPP 25558-041a)

© 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 Shanly Homes Limited 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 Shanly Homes Limited to visit Chapel Road, Barns Green, Horsham 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 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; and it is neither mentioned nor referenced in the Horsham District Council Planning Framework (November 2015), but it is a material consideration to which weight is likely to be given.

1.2.3. The proposed development comprises the full application for a residential development (Use Class C3) comprising 31 dwellings, 20 private and 11 affordable,

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.

with 35% affordable housing provision, tree boundary retention, vehicle and pedestrian access off Chapel Road, allocated and visitor car parking.

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 Edward Janes of SJAtrees on Thursday 9th October 2025. Weather conditions at the time were overcast but dry. Deciduous trees were in partial leaf.

1.4. Site description

1.4.1. The site is 1.87ha in size and is located on the west side of Chapel Road, as shown at **Figure 1** below. The north boundary adjoins Muntham Drive opposite Barns Green Village Hall. The west and south boundaries adjoin agricultural land, and the east boundary fronts Chapel Road and the rear gardens of properties on Muntham Drive and Chapel Road.



Figure 1: Site location shown on AutoCAD aerial image

1.4.2. The site is on ground that rises by approximately 9m from its south-eastern end to its north-western end adjacent to Lewes Road to its eastern end and currently comprises an open field and small stables.

1.4.3. Historical maps indicate that the site has remained undeveloped agricultural land since at least 1875 until current day.

1.4.4. The earliest Ordnance Survey map, dated 1875, shows several trees growing within the site and the surrounding hedgerows; it is clear that none of these trees are still present.

1.5. Soil type

1.5.1. The British Geological Survey Solid and Drift Geology map of the area indicates the site overlies a bedrock of Weald clay formation.

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 but base-rich loamy and clayey soil. 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.

1.6.3. One hedgerow on the site (G4) has been shown to meet the criteria to be deemed “Important” in the context of the landscape and wildlife criteria of the Hedgerows Regulations, 1997³. However, “important” hedgerows do not *have* to be retained; they are not irreplaceable habitat, and one of the explicit exemptions from the requirement to retain an “important” hedgerow is where removal is necessary to implement an approved planning permission.

³ The Hedgerows Regulations 1997; STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS 1997 No. 1160.

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 no previous applications for its development.

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')⁴ 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;

c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate

⁴ The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (December 2024). Department for Levelling Up, Housing & Communities

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 November 2015.

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

2.3.3. **“In addition, proposals must be of a scale appropriate to its countryside character and location. [...] and protects, and/or conserves, and/or enhances, the key features and characteristics of the landscape character area in which it is located, including;**

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

2.3.4. The relevant section of Policy 33 of the Planning Framework states:

2.3.5. **“In order to conserve and enhance the natural and built environment developments shall be required to:**

[...] 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”.

2.3.6. The LPA has not published any Supplementary Planning Guidance that relates either to this site, or to the protection of existing trees.

2.4. Neighbourhood planning policy

2.4.1. At the time of writing there is no Neighbourhood Plan covering the area within which the site is found.

3. THE TREES

3.1. Survey findings

3.1.1. We surveyed 52 individual trees, seven groups of trees and one hedgerow growing within or immediately adjacent to the site. Their details can be found in the tree survey schedule at **Appendix 3**.

3.1.2. The arboricultural quality of the site is characterised by densely populated belts of native broad-leaved species growing at the site's peripheries; in particular the row of small-leaved lime growing along the north boundary adjacent to Muntham Drive and the species rich hedgerow growing along the southern boundary adjacent to Smugglers Lane. Most trees on site appear to have been planted, with some self-seeded specimens interspersed throughout.

3.1.3. The majority of trees, by a small margin, are semi-mature; but there is a relatively even distribution of age classes throughout the site. The most commonly found and most dominant species on site are small-leaved lime and English oak, and the arboricultural character of the site is in keeping with the character of the surrounding 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 are “**existing important landscape and natural features**” The individuals and groups of trees within or adjacent to the site, whose attributes we consider meet these criteria, are as follows:

- the double row of limes (nos. 1-20) forming part of the avenue along Muntham Drive;
- the row of ash and English oak growing along the west boundary (nos. 24-30); and
- the English oak no. 46 growing adjacent to the site access on the west side of Chapel Road.

3.6. Other trees

3.6.1. There are 19 mature trees growing on or immediately adjacent to the site; but two of these (nos. 40 and 42) are not of species that are of large ultimate size; and are not of long-lived species, and which thereby are not of long-term potential. A further two mature trees of large ultimate size (ash trees nos. 44 and 47) are of significantly impaired physiological condition and are colonised by ‘ash die-back disease’; consequently, these are of short-term potential. Of the remaining 15 mature trees of large ultimate size and long-term potential, some of these are readily visible in views from public viewpoints and so make a significant contribution to the landscape; others do not.

3.6.2. There are no category ‘A’ trees and 20 category ‘B’ specimens. The remaining 32 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 young trees with trunk diameters below 150mm; or a combination of these.

3.6.3. Of the groups of trees and hedgerow, none have been assessed as category 'A', two as category 'B', and the remaining five as category 'C'.

3.6.4. The hedgerow (G4) growing along Smugglers Lane adjacent to the south boundary has a continuous length in excess of 20m, appears to have existed for 30 years or more, and contains at least seven different woody species, and is adjacent to a bridleway. On the basis of its archaeological and ecological features, it has been determined to be an "important" hedgerow under the Hedgerows Regulations of 1997.

3.7. Assessment of arboricultural impacts

3.7.1. The arboricultural impacts of the proposed site layout by Shanly Homes, drawing no. 1425/Pln/101 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 sections of the two groups of 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 **dashed red canopy edges** on the TPP.

3.7.3. The TPP also 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.

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

3.7.5. 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 impacts⁵

⁵ 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, two groups of trees (G5 and G7) are to be removed, either because sections of them 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 two groups of trees to be partially 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
G5	Various	Max 5m Avg 3m	Max 150mm ivy est.	Semi-mature	C (2)
G7	Various	13m	Max 635mm	Semi-mature	B (2)

Table 2: Groups of trees to be partially 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 3.5.1), will be retained.

4.2.3. None of the trees to be removed are mature specimens of species of large ultimate size: all the 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 sequesterate and store carbon⁶. Accordingly, the removal of no large mature trees on or adjacent to the site minimises the impacts on the benefits that mature trees provide in relation to smaller ones.

4.2.4. Five of the trees to be removed are young specimens, which BS5837 states **“need not necessarily be a significant constraint on the site’s potential”**.

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

4.2.6. All of the individual category ‘B’ trees are to be retained, but a small section of one category ‘B’ group of trees is to be removed (G7), as shown in **Table 2** above. However, the category this group has been assigned was based on the group as a feature, not the lower quality individual specimens it is comprised of. Therefore, the removal of this small section of trees from G7 will not involve the removal of any category ‘B’ specimens and will have a negligible impact on the feature’s contribution to the landscape.

4.2.7. The categorisation method outlined in BS5837 provides a straightforward way to classify trees based on their quality and on their landscape or cultural value. This system helps inform decisions about which trees might be retained or removed as part of a proposed development. However, a tree’s category alone does not determine whether it should be kept or be removed. The Standard does not recommend that planning decisions on tree removal should rely solely on these categories; nor does it recommend that all trees of a specific category be treated the same way. More properly, such decisions should be guided by planning policy.

4.2.8. A section of one of the category ‘C’ groups of trees (G5) on site is to be removed; the individuals that comprise this group 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.

4.2.9. The hedgerow along the south boundary, deemed to be “important” according

⁶ Stephenson N. L., Das A. J., Zavala M. A. (2014) Rate of tree carbon accumulation increases continuously with tree size. *Nature*, volume 507.

to the criteria in the Hedgerows Regulations 1997, will not be removed.

4.2.10. 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 small sections of the groups of trees identified for removal will represent no alteration to the main arboricultural features of the site.

5. TREES TO BE PRUNED

5.1. Details

5.1.1. Six trees and an 8m section of one group of 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	Small-leaved lime	Mature	Crown raise west and south-west canopy to allow 2.5m clearance from ground level to facilitate construction of proposed footpath
3	English oak	Semi-mature	Crown raise west and south-west canopy to allow 2.5m clearance from ground level to facilitate construction of proposed footpath and crown raise south canopy to 4m from ground level to facilitate construction of proposed turning head
4	Small-leaved lime	Mature	Crown raise east and south-east canopy to allow 2.5m clearance from ground level to facilitate construction of proposed footpath
10	English oak	Mature	Reduce southern canopy extents by up to 1.5m, cutting no closer to the trunk than 8m and leaving wounds no greater in diameter than 75mm to facilitate the construction of proposed parking spaces
22	English oak	Semi-mature	Reduce south-western canopy extents by up to 1m, cutting no closer to the trunk than 5.5m and leaving wounds no greater in diameter than 75mm to facilitate the construction of a proposed garage
51	Silver birch	Semi-mature	Reduce western canopy extents by up to 1.5m, cutting no closer to the trunk than 4.5m and leaving wounds no greater in diameter than 50mm to facilitate the construction of proposed footpath
G4	Various	Semi-mature	Reduce north-western extents of one 8m length of hedge adjacent to plot no. 7 by up to 1.3m leaving wounds no greater in diameter than 50mm to facilitate construction of proposed garage

Table 3: Trees to be pruned to facilitate development

5.2. Assessment

5.2.1. All but one (silver birch no. 51) of the trees to which pruning is required are of species that are tolerant of this because they are effective at compartmentalising wounds and because their wood decays slowly; so, pruning is unlikely to lead to significant die-back or the formation of columns of decay.

5.2.2. Although three of the trees to be pruned are mature, these and all the other specimens to be pruned are not of significantly impaired physiological condition. Accordingly, they should all be able to tolerate the number and sizes of the proposed pruning wounds, and to compartmentalise these effectively.

5.2.3. The extent of pruning proposed to the trees listed in **Table 3** 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 each tree are mostly few in number and small in size and will result in a maximum wound size no greater than 75mm 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*.

5.2.4. 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’*.

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

5.2.6. Following the pruning specified, none of the proposed dwellings will lie within 8m 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. 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"**.⁷

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 clear⁸, 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 building foundations and hard surfacing will encroach within the RPAs of six of the trees and one group of trees to be retained. These are shown in **Table 4** below.

⁷ British Standard BS 5837:2012. Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations; para. 3.7.

⁸ Ibid., para 5.3.1.

Tree no.	Species	Incursion by:	Total RPA	Extent of incursion into RPA	% of RPA
1	Small-leafed lime	Proposed footpath	251.1m ²	21.7m ²	8.6%
		Proposed turning head	251.1m ²	15.5 m ²	6.2%
2	Field maple	Proposed turning head	68.8m ²	4.4m ²	6.4%
3	English oak	Proposed footpath	76.0m ²	16.6m ²	21.8%
		Proposed turning head	76.0m ²	4.5m ²	5.9%
4	Small leafed lime	Proposed footpath	257.9m ²	28.8m ²	11.2%
		Proposed turning head	257.9m ²	10.0m ²	3.9%
9	Small-leafed lime	Proposed parking spaces	191.1m ²	0.2m ²	0.1%
10	English oak	Proposed parking spaces	215.4m ²	0.3m ²	0.1%
G4	Various	Proposed garage foundations	n/a	n/a	n/a

Table 4: Proposed incursions within RPAs

6.2. Assessment

6.2.1. The incursions by those elements of the proposed development into the RPAs of the six trees and one group of trees listed at **Table 4** which require some form of excavation equate to no more than 6.4% of individual RPAs. Any potential adverse impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated as set out below and shown at **Table 5**.

Tree no.	Species	Incursion	Proposed mitigation
1	Small-leaved lime	Proposed footpath and turning head	Footpath to be constructed above existing soil surface and to include a cellular confinement system to minimise soil compaction. Excavation for sub-base of turning head to be undertaken under direct on-site supervision of arboricultural consultant.
2	Field maple	Proposed turning head	Excavation for sub-base of turning head to be undertaken under direct on-site supervision of arboricultural consultant.
3	English oak	Proposed footpath and turning head	Footpath to be constructed above existing soil surface and to include a cellular confinement system to minimise soil compaction. Excavation for sub-base of turning head to be undertaken under direct on-site supervision of arboricultural consultant.
4	Small leafed lime	Proposed footpath and turning head	Footpath to be constructed above existing soil surface and to include a cellular confinement system to minimise soil compaction. Excavation for sub-base of turning head to be undertaken under direct on-site supervision of arboricultural consultant.
9	Small-leaved lime	Proposed parking spaces	Excavation for sub-base to be undertaken under direct on-site supervision of arboricultural consultant.
10	English oak	Proposed parking spaces	Excavation for sub-base to be undertaken under direct on-site supervision of arboricultural consultant.
G4	Various	Proposed garage foundations	Excavation for foundations to be undertaken under direct on-site supervision of arboricultural consultant.

Table 5: Proposed mitigation of RPA incursions

6.2.2. The incursions into the RPAs of trees nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 9, 10 and G4 are by proposed foundations, roads and parking spaces, and subject to proposed levels, some 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.

6.2.3. In our experience, as a species small-leaved lime, English oak and field maple have been identified as moderate to good at tolerating root pruning and disturbance. As these specimens are not of a significantly impaired 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.

6.2.4. The areas lost to encroachment within the RPAs of these trees can be compensated for in the areas to the east and 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 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 be able to tolerate the cutting of roots within these small sections of their RPAs or that they will not remain viable.

6.2.5. 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.

6.2.6. The incursions into the RPAs of trees nos. 1, 3 and 4 by areas of proposed footpaths can, subject to final levels detail, be installed above the existing soil surface.

6.2.7. Although the incursion of 21.8% by the proposed footpath within the RPA of the English oak no. 3 exceeds the 20% maximum incursion into currently unsurfaced ground recommended in BS 5837, this does not necessarily mean that the tree will be adversely impacted. Following research and technological advances undertaken since the publication of BS 5837 in 2012, it has since been acknowledged⁹ that the 20% figure stated in the British Standards is a **“cautious recommendation and it should not necessarily be considered an absolute limit because in some circumstances covering a higher proportion of the root zone with a permeable surface may be acceptable, provided that it has been sufficiently justified.”**

6.2.8. As lime trees nos. 1 and 4 and oak tree no. 3 are not veterans, are not of a significantly impaired physiological condition and are of species tolerant of disturbance, because the hard surfacing can be installed entirely above existing

⁹ Arboricultural Association Guidance Note 12 (2020). The use of cellular confinement systems near trees: a guide to good practice, paragraph 76.

ground levels, will not result in any excavation within their RPAs and will incorporate a suitable cellular confinement system, and because the soil is not a heavy clay and thus susceptible to compaction, there is no reason to suggest that these specimens will not be able to tolerate any soil compaction caused by the installation or use of this surfacing.

6.2.9. Taking account of existing ground levels and the likely proposed levels of these areas, these will allow for design and construction of the new 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.

6.2.10. Moreover, small-leaved lime has been shown to be more tolerant of soil compaction than other tree species, based on their effectiveness in reacting to mechanical damage quickly, in surviving anaerobic soil conditions, and in adjusting their root systems to new conditions. Coupled with the small areas of the RPAs to be surfaced and their physiological condition there is no evidence to suggest that they will not be able to tolerate any soil compaction caused by the installation or use of this surfacing.

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 question of whether trees should be included in calculations of daylighting is addressed in the Building Research Establishment guide¹⁰, which states that normally, **“trees and shrubs need not be included, partly because their shapes are almost impossible to predict, and partly because the dappled shade of a tree is more pleasant than the deep shadow of a building.”**

7.1.2. In none of the proposed new dwellings or apartments does the fenestration of their main habitable rooms (living rooms, kitchens) exclusively and directly face trees within the shadow patterns¹¹ of which they are situated; that is, where proposed dwellings or apartments sited in an arc between the north-west and the east of retained trees are closer to them than the current heights of these specimens.

7.1.3. The proposed dwelling within plot no. 1 is shaded on its south-west elevation by the English oak no. 41. However, the presence of a proposed garage on this elevation means that the ground floor, and therefore the main habitable rooms of the property, will not be affected; shading will be limited to the first floor, and therefore the bedrooms of the proposed dwelling.

7.1.4. Bedrooms need less sunlight than living rooms and kitchens¹² as they are rooms that require high levels of natural light to enable visual tasks to be undertaken. Bedrooms are not rooms that have a high demand for sun lighting; indeed, it might be considered that this is the opposite of what they require.

7.1.5. The rear garden for plot no. 1 is also partially shaded by English oak no. 41. However, as the tree belongs to a deciduous species, the shading will be reduced in

¹⁰ Littlefair, P. J., *op. cit.*

¹¹ BS 5837:2012, 5.2.2, Note 1: “An indication of potential direct obstruction of sunlight can be illustrated by plotting a segment, with a radius from the centre of the stem equal to the height of the tree, drawn from due north-west to due east, indicating the shadow pattern through the main part of the day.”

¹² Littlefair, P. J. (2011). Site layout planning for daylight and sunlight. A guide to good practice. *Building Research Establishment*

winter when it is not in leaf, and when this reduction might be most appreciated.

7.1.6. The proposed rear garden within plot no. 6 is also shaded by trees growing within the belt on the south-west boundary, specifically by field maple no. 34 and ash no. 35. As in the case of plot no. 1, both of these trees are of deciduous species, and therefore any shading will be significantly reduced during the winter. Furthermore, ash is not a densely-crowned specimen and will allow a considerable amount of light to penetrate, even when fully in leaf.

7.1.7. For these reasons, 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 proximity of the trees to the houses on Plots 1 and 6 will require regular monitoring and maintenance of the trees, so that any defects or decay are noted and acted on to prevent failures; but this is no different to the monitoring and maintenance required of most urban trees. Subject to this occurring, 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; or that, if such circumstances did occur, the LPA would not be able to resist any such requests.

7.3. Future requests for consent to fell

7.3.1. Former government advice, contained in the DETR “Blue Book”¹³, 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.”**¹⁴

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:

- 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. Although none of trees are currently covered by a TPO, the LPA could make a TPO prior to occupation so that any intention to prune would require a Regulation 14 tree work application¹⁵ to be submitted, thereby giving the LPA control over the extent of pruning.

7.3.4. As the trees along the north boundary and some of the trees along the south

¹³ (2000) Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions (2000). Tree Preservation Orders – A guide to the Law and Good Practice. *Building Research Establishment*

¹⁴ British Standard BS 8206: Part 2 (1992). *British Standards Institute*.

¹⁵ The Town and Country Planning (Tree Preservation)(England) Regulations 2012. Statutory Instrument 2012 No. 605.

boundary are on the adjacent properties, control of the extent of pruning of these specimens will lie with the trees' owners. Branches that overhang the site boundary could be cut back to the boundary without the requirement to notify or apply for consent from the LPA.

7.3.5. The existing trees will continue to grow in the future; and in time, in common with all trees in urban and suburban areas, it is possible that some pruning will be required to keep them clear of buildings. However, any future pruning could be controlled by the LPA, subject to the creation of a TPO. In this way, the LPA would control both the extent and quality of pruning required.

7.3.6. 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 5.3.4.¹⁶

¹⁶ BS 5837:2012, 5.3.4.

8. MITIGATION AND BENEFITS

8.1. Replacement planting

8.1.1. Apart from the very minor alteration to the main arboricultural features of the site as set out above, the proposals incorporate considerable replacement tree planting; this is shown on the Site Layout Plan (1425/Pln/101) submitted with this application.

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. Compared to the current agricultural environment of the trees, the proposed development will protect them from livestock browsing and intensive soil compaction common in fields.

8.2.3. 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 ancient, veteran, notable or mature trees, 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 are “**existing important landscape and natural features**” are to be removed. The proposed partial removal of the groups of trees will represent no alteration to the main arboricultural features of the site, only a very minor alteration 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.

9.1.3. The proposed pruning is minor in extent, will not detract from the health or appearance of these trees, and complies with current British Standards.

9.1.4. The 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.

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 on the Local Planning Authority to permit felling or severe pruning that it could not reasonably resist.

9.1.6. The sizes and dispositions of the proposed private gardens are such that in our assessment they will not be unduly shaded and will receive reasonable sunlight and daylight. Their use is thus unlikely to lead to future demands for felling or severe pruning of trees.

9.1.7. The proposed mitigation and arboricultural benefits of the proposals are significant; and provide more than adequate restitution for the very minor alteration to the main arboricultural features of the site.

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 small sections of two groups of 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. As the proposed development will not result in the removal of trees which are “**existing important landscape and natural features**” it complies with Policies 26 and 33 of the Horsham District Council Planning Framework (November 2015).

9.4. Conclusion

9.4.1. 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 above¹⁷ 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. 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 culturally¹⁸. 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:

A1.2.2. whether any trees are classed as 'ancient' or 'veteran', and thereby are designated as 'irreplaceable habitats';¹⁹

¹⁷ 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.

¹⁸ Ibid., 4.4.2.3

¹⁹ The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (December 2024). Paragraph 193 (c).

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 “**existing important landscape and natural features**”, such that their removal would be contrary to local planning policies: specifically, Policies 26 and 33 of the Horsham District Council Planning Framework, as set out above; and

A1.2.5. 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.

A1.2.6. 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**”²⁰.

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**”²¹.

A1.2.10. The ‘Root Protection Areas’ (RPAs)²² 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 RPAs (although not their areas) were modified based on these considerations, so that they reflect more accurately the likely root distribution of the relevant trees.

²⁰ BS 5837, 4.5.10.

²¹ Ibid., 5.1.1.

²² 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.”

A1.2.11. 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 day²³.

A1.2.12. 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.

A1.2.13. 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.

A1.2.14. The TCP was then used to inform the siting of the proposed dwellings and areas of hard surfacing, about both of which we were consulted on several occasions during the design process. In this way, it has been ensured that the existing trees have made a significant contribution to the design of the proposed development, rather than the design having dictated which trees are to be removed.

²³ 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 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. 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

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 yellow 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 **orange honeycomb-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)

Preliminary Tree Survey Schedule

Chapel Road, Barns Green, Horsham

SJA tss 25558-01

October 2025

Tree Survey Schedule: Explanatory Notes

Chapel Road, Barns Green, Horsham

This schedule is based on a tree inspection undertaken by Edward Janes of SJA trees (the trading name of Simon Jones Associates Ltd.), on Thursday the 9th October 2025. Weather conditions at the time were overcast but dry. 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".

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

Chapel Road, Barns Green, Horsham

No.	Species	Height	Trunk diameter	Radial crown spread	Crown break	Crown clearance	Age class	Physio -logy	Structure	Comments	Category
1	Small-leaved lime	15m	745mm ivy	N 6m E 6.5m S 6.6m W 6.1m	1.6m	1m	Mature	Below average	Indifferent	Off-site tree; many established basal suckers; full basal inspection prevented by dense ivy cover but appears sound where visible; three-stemmed from 1.7m showing acute unions with compression forks forming; crossing and rubbing branches throughout structure; minor deadwood throughout crown, consistent with age and species; above average epicormic growth on structural limbs; ivy covered trunk and main scaffolds; foliage of average size density and colour; significant component of group in which it stands; readily visible from Muntham Drive.	B (2)
2	Field maple	12m	390mm ivy	N 0.9m E 3m S 5.7m W 1.2m	1.8m	1.5m	Semi-mature	Below average	Indifferent	Full basal inspection prevented by dense ivy cover but appears sound where visible; ivy covered trunk and main scaffolds; well formed tensile main unions and tensile unions throughout rest of crown; minor deadwood throughout crown, consistent with age and species; above average epicormic growth on structural limbs; asymmetrical crown as suppressed by adjacent specimens; foliage of average size density and colour; contributes to boundary screening; inessential component of the group in which it stands; visible from adjacent property and in glimpses from Muntham Drive.	C (2)
3	English oak	12.5m	410mm ivy	N 4.3m E 1.1m S 7.7m W 3.5m	1.8m	2m	Semi-mature	Below average	Indifferent	Off-site tree; full basal inspection prevented by dense ivy cover but appears sound where visible; ivy covered trunk and main scaffolds; above average epicormic growth on structural limbs; minor deadwood throughout crown, consistent with age and species; well formed tensile main unions and tensile unions throughout rest of crown; asymmetrical crown as suppressed by adjacent specimens; inessential component of the group in which it stands; visible from Muntham Drive but partially screened by adjacent vegetation.	C (1)
4	Small-leaved lime	16m	755mm	N 6.1m E 4.9m S 5.7m W 6m	1.7m	1.5m	Mature	Below average	Indifferent	Off-site tree; many established basal suckers; cavity on E side of base ø300mm showing moderate decay and poor occlusion with many basal suckers emanating from cavity; crossing and rubbing branches throughout structure; three-stemmed from 2m showing tensile unions; above average epicormic growth on structural limbs; minor deadwood throughout crown, consistent with age and species; foliage of average size density and colour; significant component of group in which it stands; readily visible from Muntham Drive.	B (2)

No.	Species	Height	Trunk diameter	Radial crown spread	Crown break	Crown clearance	Age class	Physio - logy	Structure	Comments	Category
5	Small-leaved lime	16m	640mm ivy	N 5.6m E 6.7m S 7.1m W 5.3m	2m	1.8m	Mature	Below average	Moderate	Off-site tree; full basal inspection prevented by dense ivy cover but appears sound where visible; many established basal suckers; ivy covered trunk and main scaffolds; well formed tensile main unions and tensile unions throughout rest of crown; above average dead wood in crown; above average epicormic growth on structural limbs; foliage of average size density and colour; crossing and rubbing branches throughout structure; significant component of group in which it stands; readily visible from Muntham Drive.	B (2)
6	English oak	7m	350mm ivy	N 0.1m E 1.9m S 6.7m W 3.1m	2.5m	2m	Semi-mature	Below average	Indifferent	Off-site tree; full basal inspection prevented by dense ivy cover; ivy covered trunk and main scaffolds; much epicormic growth on major structural branches within inner canopy, suggestive of reduced physiological condition; miniaturised foliage; asymmetrical crown as suppressed by adjacent specimens; canopy entirely off-set from base; inessential component of the group in which it stands; visible in glimpses from Muntham Drive but largely screened from view by adjacent vegetation.	C (1)
7-8	English oak	#7 7m #8 9m	#7 380mm ivy #8 370mm both ivy	N 8.4m E 2.7m S 7.3m W 3.1m	2m	1.7m	Semi-mature	Below average	Indifferent	Off-site tree; full basal inspections prevented by dense ivy cover but appear sound where visible; ivy covered trunks and main scaffolds; #7 with sub dominant crown to #8; much epicormic growth on major structural branches within inner canopies, suggestive of reduced physiological condition; minor deadwood throughout crowns, consistent with age and species; aerodynamic pair with meshing crowns providing companion shelter; inessential components of the group in which they stand; visible in glimpses from Muntham Drive but partially screened from view by adjacent vegetation.	C (2)
9	Small-leaved lime	15.5m	650mm ivy	N 6.7m E 5.9m S 7.4m W 7.1m	2m	1.5m	Mature	Below average	Moderate	Off-site tree; full basal inspection prevented by dense ivy cover but appears sound where visible; many established basal suckers; twin-stemmed from 2m showing acute yet tensile cup union; ivy covered trunk and main scaffolds; tensile unions throughout rest of crown; minor deadwood throughout crown, consistent with age and species; above average epicormic growth on structural limbs; foliage of average size density and colour; significant component of group in which it stands; readily visible from Muntham Drive.	B (2)
10	English oak	15m	690mm ivy	N 8.6m E 7.8m S 9.8m W 5.1m	2.5m	2m	Mature	Below average	Moderate	Off-site tree; full basal inspection prevented by dense ivy cover but appears sound where visible; ivy covered trunk and main scaffolds; well formed tensile main unions and tensile unions throughout rest of crown; much epicormic growth on major structural branches within inner canopy, suggestive of reduced physiological condition; minor deadwood throughout crown, consistent with age and species; minor tear-out wounds throughout crown up to ø200mm showing no evidence of significant internal decay and moderate occlusion; foliage of average size density and colour; significant component of group in which it stands; readily visible from Muntham Drive.	B (2)

No.	Species	Height	Trunk diameter	Radial crown spread	Crown break	Crown clearance	Age class	Physio - logy	Structure	Comments	Category
11-12	English oak	16m	#11 550mm #12 510mm both ivy	N 2.1m E 6.1m S 11.6m W 7m	2.5m	2m	Semi-mature	Below average	Indifferent	Off-site tree; full basal inspections prevented by dense ivy cover but appear sound where visible; ivy covered trunks and main scaffolds; well formed tensile main unions and tensile unions throughout rest of crowns; crossing and rubbing branches throughout and between structures; much epicormic growth on major structural branches within inner canopies, suggestive of reduced physiological condition; minor deadwood throughout crowns, consistent with age and species; foliage of average size density and colour; part of aerodynamic group with meshing crowns providing companion shelter; readily visible from Muntham Drive; significant components of the group in which they stand.	B (2)
13	Small-leaved lime	15m	430mm ivy	N 7.1m E 5.1m S 4.2m W 4.1m	1.4m	2m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Off-site tree; full basal inspection prevented by dense ivy cover but appears sound where visible; ivy covered trunk and main scaffolds; twin-stemmed from 1.7m showing acute yet tensile cup union; minor epicormic growth throughout structure; minor deadwood throughout crown, consistent with age and species; tensile unions throughout rest of crown; foliage of average size density and colour; inessential component of the group in which it stands; readily visible from Muntham Drive.	C (1)
14	Wild service tree	12m	335mm	N 3.7m E 3.3m S 3.9m W 3.2m	1.5m	2m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Off-site tree; prominent buttress roots; twin-stemmed from 1.7m showing acute yet tensile union; minor deadwood throughout crown, consistent with age and species; tensile unions throughout rest of crown; crossing and rubbing branches throughout structure; foliage of average size density and colour; lower trunk has occluded iron estate fencing; species of ecological importance; contributes to boundary screening; visible from Muntham Drive; inessential component of the group in which it stands.	B (13)
15	English oak	16m	490mm ivy	N 1.5m E 2.8m S 9.8m W 5.1m	2m	2m	Semi-mature	Below average	Indifferent	Off-site tree; full basal inspection prevented by dense ivy cover but appears sound where visible; ivy covered trunk and main scaffolds; well formed tensile main unions and tensile unions throughout rest of crown; much epicormic growth on major structural branches within inner canopy, suggestive of reduced physiological condition; minor deadwood throughout crown, consistent with age and species; asymmetrical crown as suppressed by adjacent specimens; foliage of average size density and colour; significant component of group in which it stands; readily visible from Muntham Drive.	B (2)

No.	Species	Height	Trunk diameter	Radial crown spread	Crown break	Crown clearance	Age class	Physio -logy	Structure	Comments	Category
16	Small-leaved lime	15m	660mm ivy	N 5.3m E 5.5m S 6.2m W 5.8m	1.7m	1.9m	Mature	Low	Moderate	Off-site tree; full basal inspection prevented by dense ivy cover but appears sound where visible; many established basal suckers; ivy covered trunk and main scaffolds; small cavities forming at sites of previous pruning wounds; much epicormic growth on major structural branches within inner canopy, suggestive of reduced physiological condition; epicormic regeneration forms most of crown; significant reduction in canopy bud density; foliage of average size and colour; significant component of group in which it stands; readily visible from Muntham Drive.	C (2)
17	Small-leaved lime	16m	545mm ivy	N 5.3m E 5.6m S 7m W 4.5m	2.5m	2m	Mature	Average	Moderate	Off-site tree; no significant defects observed at base; many established basal suckers; ivy covered trunk and main scaffolds; minor deadwood throughout crown, consistent with age and species; well formed tensile main unions and tensile unions throughout rest of crown; minor epicormic growth throughout structure; foliage of average size density and colour; significant component of group in which it stands; readily visible from Muntham Drive.	B (2)
18	English oak	11m	405mm	N 1m E 4.3m S 6.7m W 4.2m	1.7m	2m	Semi-mature	Below average	Indifferent	No significant defects observed at base; well formed tensile main unions and tensile unions throughout rest of crown; acute union with compression fork between lower W limb and trunk; much epicormic growth on major structural branches within inner canopy, suggestive of reduced physiological condition; minor deadwood throughout crown, consistent with age and species; asymmetrical crown as suppressed by adjacent specimens; foliage of average size density and colour; inessential component of the group in which it stands; visible from Muntham Drive.	C (1)
19	Wild service tree	13m	255mm ivy	N 5.2m E 4m S 2.2m W 3.8m	3m	3m	Semi-mature	Average	Moderate	Off-site tree; full basal inspection prevented by dense ivy cover but appears sound where visible; single trunk; ivy covered trunk and main scaffolds; well formed tensile main unions and tensile unions throughout rest of crown; foliage of average size density and colour; minor deadwood throughout crown, consistent with age and species; species of ecological importance; inessential component of the group in which it stands; readily visible from Muntham Drive.	C (1)
20	Small-leaved lime	15m	670mm	N 5.4m E 5.6m S 7m W 5.2m	2m	2m	Mature	Average	Indifferent	Off-site tree; full basal inspection prevented by dense ivy cover but appears sound where visible; many basal suckers; twin-stemmed from 2m showing acute union with compression fork forming; tensile unions throughout rest of crown; minor deadwood throughout crown, consistent with age and species; minor epicormic growth throughout structure; foliage of average size density and colour; significant component of group in which it stands; readily visible from Muntham Drive.	B (2)

No.	Species	Height	Trunk diameter	Radial crown spread	Crown break	Crown clearance	Age class	Physio -logy	Structure	Comments	Category
21	English oak	16m	460mm	N 1m E 6.2m S 8.8m W 5.1m	2.5m	1.7m	Semi-mature	Below average	Indifferent	Off-site tree; no significant defects observed at base; well formed tensile main unions and tensile unions throughout rest of crown; much epicormic growth on major structural branches within inner canopy, suggestive of reduced physiological condition; minor deadwood throughout crown, consistent with age and species; foliage of average size density and colour; asymmetrical crown as suppressed by adjacent specimens; significant component of group in which it stands; readily visible from Muntham Drive.	B (2)
22	English oak	15m	430mm ivy	N 3m E 4m S 7.4m W 4.6m	2.5m	2m	Semi-mature	Below average	Moderate	Off-site tree; prominent buttress roots; ivy covered trunk and main scaffolds; well formed tensile main unions and tensile unions throughout rest of crown; much epicormic growth on major structural branches within inner canopy, suggestive of reduced physiological condition; minor deadwood throughout crown, consistent with age and species; asymmetrical crown as suppressed by adjacent specimens; foliage of average size density and colour; significant component of the group in which it stands but inessential component of the wider landscape; visible from Muntham Drive.	C (12)
23	Ash	16.5m	395mm	N 5m E 6m S 6.6m W 4.5m	3.5m	2.5m	Semi-mature	Below average	Indifferent	Off-site tree; prominent buttress roots; twin-stemmed from 2m showing acute union with compression fork forming; tensile unions throughout rest of crown; above average dead wood in crown; minor epicormic growth throughout structure; notably reduced shoot extension growths; slight reduction in canopy bud density; significant component of the group in which it stands but inessential component of the wider landscape; readily visible from Muntham Drive.	C (12)
24	English oak	18m	815mm ivy	N 9m E 6.3m S 10.5m W 8.7m	4m	4m	Mature	Below average	Moderate	Off-site tree; buttress roots with mechanical wounding on E side showing moderate occlusion and melanisation consistent with incipient decay; dead ivy covered; well formed tensile main unions and tensile unions throughout rest of crown; above average dead wood in crown; canopy density reduction of 40%; much epicormic growth on major structural branches within inner canopy, suggestive of reduced physiological condition; significant component of group in which it stands; readily visible from Muntham Drive.	B (2)
25	Ash	14.5m	600mm ivy	N 5.5m E 10m S 7.6m W 5.4m	2.5m	2.5m	Semi-mature	Below average	Moderate	Off-site tree; full basal inspection prevented by dense ivy cover but appears sound where visible; ivy covered trunk and main scaffolds; well formed tensile main unions and tensile unions throughout rest of crown; minor deadwood throughout crown, consistent with age and species; notably reduced shoot extension growths; slight reduction in canopy bud density; minor die-back at branch tips consistent with 'ash die-back disease'; significant component of group in which it stands; readily visible from PRow.	C (2)

No.	Species	Height	Trunk diameter	Radial crown spread	Crown break	Crown clearance	Age class	Physio -logy	Structure	Comments	Category
26	English oak	17m	600mm	N 7.8m E 10.3m S 7.2m W 7.5m	2m	4.5m	Mature	Below average	Moderate	Off-site tree; no significant defects observed at base; well formed tensile main unions and tensile unions throughout rest of crown; above average dead wood in crown; canopy density reduction of 30%; minor deadwood throughout crown, consistent with age and species; much epicormic growth on major structural branches within inner canopy, suggestive of reduced physiological condition; foliage of average size and colour; significant component of group in which it stands; readily visible from PRow.	B (2)
27	Ash	13m	385mm	5.9m	3.5m	5m	Semi-mature	Low	Moderate	Off-site tree; full basal inspection restricted by dense vegetation but appears sound where visible; well formed tensile main unions and tensile unions throughout rest of crown; above average dead wood in crown; significant reduction in canopy bud density; significant die-back at branch tips consistent with 'ash die-back disease'; inessential component of the group in which it stands; readily visible from PRow.	C (1)
28	English oak	15m	780mm ivy	N 7.5m E 8.1m S 4.8m W 6.8m	2m	1.7m	Mature	Below average	Moderate	Off-site tree; prominent buttress roots; ivy covered trunk and main scaffolds; well formed tensile main unions and tensile unions throughout rest of crown; much epicormic growth on major structural branches within inner canopy, suggestive of reduced physiological condition; above average dead wood in crown; foliage of average size and colour; stag-headed; significant component of group in which it stands; readily visible from PRow.	B (2)
29	English oak	13m	705mm ivy	N 5.5m E 8.4m S 2.6m W 4.8m	3m	2m	Mature	Low	Moderate	Off-site tree; small cavities forming between buttresses; ivy covered trunk and main scaffolds; well formed tensile main unions and tensile unions throughout rest of crown; NW quadrant of crown dead; above average dead wood in crown; much epicormic growth on major structural branches within inner canopy, suggestive of reduced physiological condition; suppressed crown as overtopped by adjacent specimens; foliage of average size and colour; significant component of group in which it stands; readily visible from PRow.	C (1)
30	English oak	17m	755mm ivy	N 5.1m E 9.5m S 9.3m W 9.7m	2.5m	2m	Mature	Below average	Moderate	Off-site tree; prominent buttress roots with minor mechanical wounding showing no evidence of significant internal decay and moderate occlusion; well formed tensile main unions and tensile unions throughout rest of crown; minor deadwood throughout crown, consistent with age and species; much epicormic growth on major structural branches within inner canopy, suggestive of reduced physiological condition; foliage of average size and colour; dominant crown; significant component of group in which it stands; readily visible from PRow.	B (2)

No.	Species	Height	Trunk diameter	Radial crown spread	Crown break	Crown clearance	Age class	Physio - logy	Structure	Comments	Category
31	Ash	15m	470mm ivy	N 5.8m E 6.9m S 6.3m W 6.5m	2.5m	3m	Semi-mature	Below average	Moderate	Off-site tree; full basal inspection prevented by dense ivy cover but appears sound where visible; mechanical wounding on trunk showing minor decay and near full occlusion; well formed tensile main unions and tensile unions throughout rest of crown; much epicormic growth on major structural branches within inner canopy, suggestive of reduced physiological condition; slight reduction in canopy bud density; minor die-back at branch tips consistent with 'ash die-back disease'; significant component of the group in which it stands but inessential component of the wider landscape; readily visible from PRow.	C (12)
32	Ash	12m	365mm	NE 7.2m SE 5.7m SW 5m NW 2.1m	1.7m	1.7m	Semi-mature	Below average	Indifferent	Off-site tree; no significant defects observed at base; twin-stemmed from 1.7m showing acute union with compression fork; slight reduction in canopy bud density; above average dead wood in crown; minor epicormic growth throughout structure; asymmetrical crown as suppressed by adjacent specimens; inessential component of the group in which it stands; readily visible from PRow.	C (2)
33	Field maple	10m	240mm 250mm both ivy	6.5m	2m	1.6m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Off-site tree; full basal inspection prevented by dense ivy cover but appears sound where visible; twin-stemmed from 1m showing tight compression fork; tensile unions throughout rest of crown; crossing and rubbing branches throughout structure; minor deadwood throughout crown, consistent with age and species; foliage of average size and colour; inessential component of the group in which it stands; readily visible from PRow.	C (2)
34	Field maple	10m	5 stems @ 100mm ivy est.	4.3m	1m	1.5m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Off-site tree; full basal inspection prevented by dense ivy cover but appears sound where visible; multi-stemmed from 1m showing acute unions with compression forks; ivy covered trunk and main scaffolds; minor deadwood throughout crown, consistent with age and species; crossing and rubbing branches throughout structure; foliage of average size and colour; inessential component of the group in which it stands; readily visible from PRow.	C (2)
35	Ash	9m	140mm 125mm both ivy	NE 4.4m SE 4.2m SW 4.5m NW 4.2m	1.5m	2.5m	Young	Average	Indifferent	Off-site tree; full basal inspection prevented by dense ivy cover; twin-stemmed from base showing tensile union; well formed tensile main unions and tensile unions throughout rest of crown; foliage of average size and colour; inessential component of the group in which it stands; readily visible from PRow.	C (2)
36	Field maple	8m	6 stems @ 100mm ivy est.	4m	1.5m	1.8m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Off-site tree; multi-stemmed from base showing acute unions with compression forks; ivy covered trunk and main scaffolds; crossing and rubbing branches throughout structure; foliage of average size and colour; inessential component of the group in which it stands; readily visible from PRow.	C (2)

No.	Species	Height	Trunk diameter	Radial crown spread	Crown break	Crown clearance	Age class	Physio -logy	Structure	Comments	Category
37	Ash	8m	310mm 280mm both ivy	NE 6.2m SE 4.5m SW 5m NW 5.3m	1.5m	2m	Semi-mature	Low	Indifferent	Off-site tree; full basal inspection prevented by dense ivy cover but appears sound where visible; twin-stemmed from 0.5m showing well formed tensile union; ivy covered trunk and main scaffolds; tensile unions throughout rest of crown; significant reduction in canopy bud density; significant die-back at branch tips consistent with 'ash die-back disease'; inessential component of the group in which it stands; readily visible from PRoW.	C (1)
38	Wild cherry	8m	120mm 230mm both ivy	NE 5.9m SE 5.8m SW 5.5m NW 4.9m	1m	2.5m	Young	Average	Indifferent	Off-site tree; full basal inspection prevented by dense ivy cover but appears sound where visible; twin-stemmed from base showing tensile union; ivy covered trunk and main scaffolds; minor deadwood throughout crown, consistent with age and species; foliage of average size and colour; inessential component of the group in which it stands; readily visible from PRoW.	C (2)
39	Field maple	6m	220mm 3 stems @ 100mm est. 160mm	5.1m	1.7m	2m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Off-site tree; multi-stemmed from base showing acute unions; partially ivy covered trunks and main scaffolds; crossing and rubbing branches throughout structure; minor deadwood throughout crown, consistent with age and species; foliage of average size and colour; inessential component of the group in which it stands; readily visible from PRoW.	C (2)
40	Field maple	13.5m	480mm ivy	N 8.1m E 2.9m S 6m W 7.9m	2m	1.7m	Mature	Average	Indifferent	No significant defects observed at base; ivy covered trunk and main scaffolds; well formed tensile main unions and tensile unions throughout rest of crown; asymmetrical crown as suppressed by adjacent specimens; minor deadwood throughout crown, consistent with age and species; crossing and rubbing branches throughout structure; foliage of average size density and colour; significant component of the group in which it stands but inessential component of the wider landscape; readily visible from PRoW.	B (2)
41	English oak	18.5m	770mm ivy	N 10.2m E 8.8m S 6.5m W 8.9m	2m	1.7m	Mature	Below average	Moderate	No significant defects observed at base; ivy covered trunk and main scaffolds; well formed tensile main unions and tensile unions throughout rest of crown; minor deadwood throughout crown, consistent with age and species; much epicormic growth on major structural branches within inner canopy, suggestive of reduced physiological condition; foliage of average size and colour; dominant crown; significant component of group in which it stands; readily visible from PRoW.	B (2)
42	Field maple	14m	260mm ivy 305mm	N 4.2m E 6.5m S 4m W 0.1m	2m	2m	Mature	Below average	Indifferent	Off-site tree; full basal inspection prevented by dense ivy cover but appears sound where visible; minor mechanical wounding on trunk showing no evidence of significant internal decay and moderate occlusion; twin-stemmed from near base showing tight compression fork; partially ivy covered trunk and main scaffolds; asymmetrical crown as suppressed by adjacent specimens; minor deadwood throughout crown, consistent with age and species; foliage of average size and colour; significant component of the group in which it stands but inessential component of the wider landscape; readily visible from PRoW.	B (2)

No.	Species	Height	Trunk diameter	Radial crown spread	Crown break	Crown clearance	Age class	Physio -logy	Structure	Comments	Category
43	English oak	12m	410mm ivy	N 3.8m E 4.6m S 4.5m W 4.9m	1.6m	3m	Semi-mature	Below average	Indifferent	Off-site tree; full basal inspection prevented by dense ivy cover but appears sound where visible; twin-stemmed from 1.6m showing tensile union; well formed tensile main unions and tensile unions throughout rest of crown; much epicormic growth on major structural branches within inner canopy, suggestive of reduced physiological condition; minor deadwood throughout crown, consistent with age and species; foliage of average size density and colour; inessential component of the group in which it stands; readily visible from PRoW.	C (2)
44	Ash	16.5m	350mm 300mm 200mm 490mm all ivy est.	6.5m	2.5m	3.5m	Mature	Below average	Indifferent	Off-site tree; four-stemmed from base showing acute unions; ivy covered trunks and main scaffolds; tensile unions throughout rest of crown; minor deadwood throughout crown, consistent with age and species; above average epicormic growth on structural limbs; significant reduction in canopy bud density; minor die-back at branch tips consistent with 'ash die-back disease'; significant component of group in which it stands; readily visible from PRoW.	C (2)
45	English oak	10m	300mm ivy	3.5m	2m	2m	Semi-mature	Below average	Moderate	Off-site tree; no significant defects observed at base; single trunk; well formed tensile main unions and tensile unions throughout rest of crown; much epicormic growth on major structural branches within inner canopy, suggestive of reduced physiological condition; minor deadwood throughout crown, consistent with age and species; foliage of average size and colour; inessential component of the group in which it stands; readily visible from PRoW.	C (2)
46	English oak	21m	700mm ivy est.	N 11m E 9.5m S 7.9m W 10.5m	2.5m	2.5m	Mature	Below average	Moderate	Access to trunk and full basal inspection restricted by boundary fence and dense vegetation; surveyed at distance; ivy covered trunk and main scaffolds; well formed tensile main unions and tensile unions throughout rest of crown; much epicormic growth on major structural branches within inner canopy, suggestive of reduced physiological condition; minor deadwood throughout crown, consistent with age and species; dominant crown; slight reduction in canopy bud density; foliage of average size and colour; significant component of group in which it stands; readily visible from Chapel Road.	B (2)
47	Ash	14.5m	405mm 390mm 180mm 240mm all ivy	NE 6.3m SE 9.1m SW 10m NW 1m	2.5m	3.5m	Mature	Below average	Indifferent	Off-site tree; full basal inspection prevented by dense ivy cover; multi-stemmed from base showing acute unions; dead ivy covered; tensile unions throughout rest of crown; much epicormic growth on major structural branches within inner canopy, suggestive of reduced physiological condition; minor deadwood throughout crown, consistent with age and species; slight reduction in canopy bud density; minor die-back at branch tips consistent with 'ash die-back disease'; significant component of group in which it stands; readily visible from Chapel Road.	C (12)

No.	Species	Height	Trunk diameter	Radial crown spread	Crown break	Crown clearance	Age class	Physio -logy	Structure	Comments	Category
48	Field maple	5m	300mm ivy est.	4.8m	1m	1.6m	Semi-mature	Below average	Indifferent	Access to trunk and full basal inspection restricted by boundary fence and dense vegetation; base situated in adjacent back garden; ivy covered trunk and main scaffolds; above average dead wood in crown; foliage of average size and colour; crossing and rubbing branches throughout structure; of low quality and limited arboricultural value.	C (1)
49	Ash	5m	100mm est.	2.8m	2m	2m	Young	Average	Moderate	Small self-seeded specimen; of low quality and limited arboricultural value.	C (1)
50	Silver birch	7m	280mm est.	N 2.5m E 2.5m S 3.8m W 4.1m	2m	2m	Semi-mature	Below average	Moderate	Off-site tree; access to trunk and full basal inspection restricted by boundary fence and dense vegetation; well formed tensile main unions and tensile unions throughout rest of crown; base situated in adjacent back garden; above average epicormic growth on structural limbs; foliage of average size and colour; inessential component of the group in which it stands; obscured from public view but readily visible from internal views.	C (1)
51	Silver birch	10m	320mm 295mm both est.	N 5.1m E 5.5m S 4.8m W 5.7m	2m	2m	Semi-mature	Below average	Indifferent	Off-site tree; base situated in adjacent back garden; access to trunk and full basal inspection restricted by boundary fence and dense vegetation; twin-stemmed from base showing acute union; tensile unions throughout rest of crown; above average epicormic growth on structural limbs; minor deadwood throughout crown, consistent with age and species; foliage of average size density and colour; significant component of the group in which it stands but inessential component of the wider landscape; obscured from public view but readily visible from internal views.	C (1)
52	Flowering cherry	3m	150mm 280mm both est.	5.1m	1m	1.7m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Access to trunk and full basal inspection restricted by boundary fence and dense vegetation; base situated in adjacent back garden; domestic fruit tree.	C (1)
G1	Ash	2.5m	Max 95mm	2.5m	1.4m	1.6m	Young	Average	Moderate	Two young ash specimens in NW corner of site; of low quality and limited arboricultural value.	C (1)
G2	Various	13m	Max 250mm ivy est.	5m	0.2m	0.2m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Species include hawthorn, blackthorn, ash, field maple, elder and small leaf lime; row of closely growing specimens, forming a hedge or screen; some dead and dying specimens scattered throughout but group of generally good health; crossing and rubbing branches throughout and between structures; lower quality individuals conferring greater value as part of a group; contributes to boundary screening; inessential component of the landscape; readily visible from PRow.	C (2)

No.	Species	Height	Trunk diameter	Radial crown spread	Crown break	Crown clearance	Age class	Physio -logy	Structure	Comments	Category
G3	Ash	Max 15m Avg 8m	Max 310mm ivy Avg 200mm est.	8.6m	1m	1.5m	Semi-mature	Below average	Indifferent	Off-site group of trees; group comprised of 7 individuals; full basal inspections prevented by dense ivy cover but appear sound where visible; ivy covered trunks and main scaffolds; all showing characteristics consistent with 'ash die-back disease'; aerodynamic group with meshing crowns providing companion shelter; all showing reductions in canopy bud density; minor deadwood throughout crowns, consistent with age and species; lower quality individuals conferring greater value as part of a group; individually inessential components of the group in which they stand but collectively make up a significant component of the southern boundary; readily visible from PRoW.	B (2)
G4	Various	12m	Max 200mm ivy est.	5m	0.2m	0.1m	Semi-mature	Below average	Indifferent	Species include field maple, ash, English oak, hawthorn, hazel, blackthorn, spindle, wild service tree and holly; over 100 individuals; row of closely growing specimens, forming a hedge or screen; several specimens in group of impaired physiological condition; smothered in ivy and bramble; lower quality individuals conferring greater value as part of a group; inessential component of the landscape; readily visible from PRoW.	C (2)
G5	Various	Max 5m Avg 3m	Max 150mm ivy est.	3m	0.2m	0.1m	Semi-mature	Below average	Indifferent	Species include ash, English oak, hawthorn, spindle, blackthorn and field maple; approx. 50 individuals; row of closely growing specimens, forming a hedge or screen; crossing and rubbing branches throughout and between structures; smothered in ivy and bramble; many dead specimens scattered throughout group; ashes all showing evidence of 'ash die-back disease'; lower quality individuals conferring greater value as part of a group; inessential component of the landscape; readily visible from Chapel Road.	C (2)
G6	Various	3m	Max 100mm ivy est.	3.5m	0.2m	0.1m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Species include hawthorn, cherry laurel, hazel and field maple; contributes to boundary screening; partially smothered in bramble; of low quality and limited arboricultural value.	C (2)
G7	Various	13m	Max 250mm ivy est.	7m	0.2m	0.2m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Species include hawthorn, small leaf lime, blackthorn, holly, wild service tree and English oak; approx. 80 individuals; row of closely growing specimens, forming a hedge or screen; ivy covered trunk and main scaffolds; some dead failed and dying specimens scattered throughout but group of generally good health; partially smothered in bramble; lower quality individuals conferring greater value as part of a group; contributes to boundary screening; readily visible from Muntham Drive.	B (2)
H1	Western red cedar	1.6m	Max 100mm est.	2m	0.1m	0.1m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Off-site hedge; row of closely planted specimens, designed to form a hedge or screen; frequently maintained; contributes to boundary screening; inessential component of the landscape; non-native species, out of character with surrounding area; smothered in bramble.	C (2)

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.

Tree No.	Species	RPA	RPA Radius
1	Small-leaved lime	251.1m ²	8.9m
2	Field maple	68.8m ²	4.7m
3	English oak	76.0m ²	4.9m
4	Small-leaved lime	257.9m ²	9.1m
5	Small-leaved lime	185.3m ²	7.7m
6	English oak	55.4m ²	4.2m
7-8	English oak	65.3m ²	4.6m
		61.9m ²	4.4m
9	Small-leaved lime	191.1m ²	7.8m
10	English oak	215.4m ²	8.3m
11-12	English oak	136.8m ²	6.6m
		117.7m ²	6.1m
13	Small-leaved lime	83.6m ²	5.2m
14	Wild service tree	50.8m ²	4.0m
15	English oak	108.6m ²	5.9m
16	Small-leaved lime	197.1m ²	7.9m
17	Small-leaved lime	134.4m ²	6.5m
18	English oak	74.2m ²	4.9m
19	Wild service tree	29.4m ²	3.1m
20	Small-leaved lime	203.1m ²	8.0m
21	English oak	95.7m ²	5.5m
22	English oak	83.6m ²	5.2m
23	Ash	70.6m ²	4.7m
24	English oak	300.5m ²	9.8m
25	Ash	162.9m ²	7.2m
26	English oak	162.9m ²	7.2m
27	Ash	67.1m ²	4.6m
28	English oak	275.2m ²	9.4m
29	English oak	224.8m ²	8.5m
30	English oak	257.9m ²	9.1m
31	Ash	99.9m ²	5.6m
32	Ash	60.3m ²	4.4m
33	Field maple	54.3m ²	4.2m
34	Field maple	22.6m ²	2.7m
35	Ash	15.9m ²	2.3m
36	Field maple	27.1m ²	2.9m
37	Ash	78.9m ²	5.0m
38	Wild cherry	30.4m ²	3.1m
39	Field maple	47.0m ²	3.9m
40	Field maple	104.2m ²	5.8m
41	English oak	268.2m ²	9.2m
42	Field maple	72.7m ²	4.8m
43	English oak	76.0m ²	4.9m
44	Ash	222.8m ²	8.4m

45	English oak	40.7m ²	3.6m
46	English oak	221.7m ²	8.4m
47	Ash	183.7m ²	7.6m
48	Field maple	40.7m ²	3.6m
49	Ash	4.5m ²	1.2m
50	Silver birch	35.5m ²	3.4m
51	Silver birch	85.7m ²	5.2m
52	Flowering cherry	45.6m ²	3.8m
G1	Ash	4.1m ²	1.1m
G2	Various	28.3m ²	3.0m
G3	Ash	43.5m ²	3.7m
G4	Various	18.1m ²	2.4m
G5	Various	10.2m ²	1.8m
G6	Various	4.5m ²	1.2m
G7	Various	28.3m ²	3.0m
H1	Western red cedar	4.5m ²	1.2m

APPENDIX 4

Tree Protection Plan

