



**Land South of Smugglers Lane,
Barns Green, Horsham**

**Arboricultural Implications Assessment and
Method Statement**

Revision C

July 2026



Client	Miller Homes
Job name	Land South of Smugglers Lane, Barns Green, Horsham
Report title	Arboricultural Implications Assessment and Method Statement
File reference	25-1907-Report-C

	Name	Position	Date
Author	Neil Taylor	Arboricultural Consultant	July 2026

Report Contents

1	Introduction.....	1
1.1	Site Description.....	1
1.2	Proposed Works.....	1
1.3	Aims of Study.....	1
2	Methodology.....	2
3	Assessment.....	3
3.1	Tree Character Groups.....	3
4	Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA).....	4
4.1	Methodology.....	4
4.2	Assessment.....	4
5	Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS)	7
5.1	Methodology.....	7
5.2	Demolition within the RPA of Retained Trees.....	7
5.3	Construction within the RPA of Retained Trees.....	7
5.4	Services.....	8
5.5	Tree Protection.....	9
5.6	Site Monitoring and Supervision	9
6	Conclusion.....	10
7	Appendices	11

1 Introduction

1.1 Site Description

Land south of Smugglers Lane, Barns Green, Horsham (the "site") is situated to the west of the village of Barns Green. The site currently comprises a large field and is bound to the north by Smugglers' Lane, to the east by Chapel Road, to the south by a residential development under construction and to the west by a bridle path, the other side of which is grazing land.

The trees either side of the bridle path to the west of the site have been designated as an Ancient Semi Natural Woodland (ASNW). An existing gate is present on the northeast boundary which was historically used for agricultural purposes.

1.2 Proposed Works

The construction of 68 dwellings with vehicular and pedestrian accesses, public open space, hard and soft landscaping and associated works including supporting foul and surface water drainage works and works to existing culverted watercourse on site.

1.3 Aims of Study

To inform a planning application, Canopy Consultancy has been commissioned by Miller Homes to undertake a tree survey of the site, in accordance with British Standard (BS) 5837:2012 "Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction - Recommendations".

The aim of this report is to present the results of the survey, including a Tree Survey Schedule (TSS), an Arboricultural Implications Assessment (AIA), and an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS). A Tree Protection Plan (TPP) has also been produced and accompanies this report as a separate drawing.

This report in no way constitutes a health and safety survey report. Where concerns for tree health and safety exist, the necessary and appropriate tree inspections should be carried out.

2 Methodology

The trees were inspected from ground level by consultant arboriculturist Oliver Halladay on 20th February 2025 and measurements taken in accordance with the recommendations set out in the BS 5837:2012. Canopy spreads were measured and plotted to the four compass points. Where direct access was not possible measurements have been estimated. The surveyed trees are colour coded on the accompanying tree survey drawing according to their relevant BS category.

The tree data collected is used to enable the current canopy spread of the surveyed trees and the Root Protection Area (RPA) to be plotted on the accompanying TPP. The RPA is defined by the formula in paragraph 4.6 from the BS 5837:2012 and may be refined by taking into account current on-site constraints to root activity such as buildings, earthworks and hard paving. This forms part of the design process for the proposed development.

3 Assessment

3.1 Tree Character Groups

The detailed results of the tree survey are provided in the TSS, in Appendix 1. In summary, the trees on the site are in a reasonable condition and vary in terms of amenity value provided to the wider landscape. The trees can be divided into three distinct character groups as follows:

1. The first character group includes the large mature tree found growing offsite to the southeast. The tree is in a good condition and provides significant arboricultural amenity to the local area.
2. The second character group includes the medium sized, middle-aged trees found growing on the site's boundaries. The majority of the trees in this character group are in a good condition and provide a degree of arboricultural amenity to the local area.
3. The third character group includes the smaller, young trees found growing on the site's boundaries. The majority trees in this character group are in a reasonable condition but due to their size are of limited amenity value to the local area. Included in this character group are a number of smaller trees that are suffering from ash die back (*Hymenocyphus fraxineus*).

4 Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA)

4.1 Methodology

The AIA uses the information obtained in the tree survey to identify areas where the proposed construction may be at odds with accepted standards, in terms of a tree's requirements for space in which to maintain existing roots and shoots, and space for future growth.

The quality and relative importance of each tree is illustrated as a coloured polygon. The colour used relates to the BS categories as follows: A - green, B - blue, C - grey and U - red (see accompanying drawing reference 25-1907-TPP-C). In general, the design process will try to retain A and B category trees. Proposed construction will therefore normally be excluded from the RPA of A and B category trees. Red trees are discounted as they are recommended for removal.

Details of the trees surveyed are given in the TSS (Appendix 1). The juxtaposition of the proposed development in relation to existing tree locations are shown on the accompanying TPP drawing, reference 25-1907-TPP-C.

The AIA considers existing site conditions and the effect that they may have on the development of the surveyed trees' root systems. Hard structures such as building and paved roads and paths can influence the root activity of trees by reducing the availability of both moisture and nutrients.

4.2 Assessment

Refer to the accompanying TPP, drawing, reference 25-1907-TPP-C, for the relationship between the proposed development and the trees on and adjacent to the site.

- The following tree will be removed for arboricultural reasons:

T15

- The following trees will be removed to enable the proposed development:

T80 to enable the installation of drainage ditch.

T81 to enable the installation of drainage ditch.

Part of H1 to enable the construction of a site access, installation of new drainage, widening of the existing road and to allow for mandatory sightlines for the new site entrance. A replacement hedge will be planted as part of a landscape scheme for the site.

Part of H2 installation of drainage ditch.

- There will be no demolition within the RPA of a retained tree.

- The following tree will be affected by the repairing of an existing culvert within the RPA:

T82

Excavations to access the broken culvert within the RPA will be carried out in accordance with the methodology outlined in Section 5.3 below.

- The following tree will be affected by the redirecting of the existing culvert within the RPA:

T82

Excavations will be 13 metres from the base of the tree so the chances of encountering significant roots is very low. As a precaution, excavations will be carried out in accordance with the methodology outlined in Section 5.3 below.

- The following trees will be affected by the construction of a new hard surface within the RPA:

T26 and ASNW 15 metre buffer

The proposed access path through the RPA of T26 and ASNW buffer zone utilises an existing access point, historically used for agricultural purposes.



Figure 1: Existing agricultural access viewed from bridleway

The proposed path ensures permeability of the layout in the interests of good planning and urban design. Using the proposed location negates the need to remove sections of

hedgerow and provides the opportunity to install a semi-formalised path through an existing access point that is likely to be used by future residents in any case. The installation of a semi-formalised path focuses the footfall and therefore minimises the chances of further compaction of the ground. A fence will be installed on either side of the path, which will be reinforced with planting of thorny species.

Prior to the installation of the path, the former agricultural access will be de-compacted using a Turbo-Terra Air to inject compressed air at a depth of 300mm. Refer to Section 5.3 below for details.

The proposed footpath will be porous and will be constructed in accordance with the 'no dig' principles outlined in APN12 and utilise a cellular confinement system such as Cell Web as a subbase. Refer to Section 5.3 below for details.

5 Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS)

5.1 Methodology

The AMS provides the means by which retained trees and hedges can be protected throughout the development.

The movement of demolition and construction machinery in close proximity to trees may cause compaction of the soil which affects the tree's ability to absorb moisture and nutrients. The RPAs of retained trees and hedges will be protected by a tree protection barrier as described in paragraph 5.5 below and shown on the accompanying TPP, drawing number 25-1907-TPP-C.

5.2 Demolition within the RPA of Retained Trees

There will be no demolition within the RPA of a retained tree.

5.3 Construction within the RPA of Retained Trees

Prior to construction commencing, the retained trees will be protected in accordance with the accompanying TPP, drawing number 25-1907-TPP-C.

Excavations to Access Broken Culvert

To enable the repair of the broken culvert, an access pit will be excavated using a vacuum excavator under the supervision of a suitably qualified arboriculturist. Any roots encountered with a diameter of 25mm or less will be pruned back to the edge of the trench using sharp secateurs. If roots with a diameter of greater than 25mm are uncovered, they will be protected with damp hessian and perforated drainage pipe cut lengthways so it can be placed over the section of exposed root. The protection will remain in place until the pit is backfilled.

Excavations for Redirecting Existing Culvert

Where excavations are required on the edge of the RPA of T82 for the redirecting of the existing culvert, they will be carried out by hand under the supervision of a suitably qualified arboriculturist to a depth of 800mm. Any roots encountered will be pruned back to the edge of the trench using sharp secateurs.

Construction of Footpath

The construction of the footpath through the ANSW buffer zone and RPA of T26 will be carried out once the construction of the main development has been completed. The area will be de-compacted using a Turbo-Terra Air to inject compressed air at a depth of 300mm. Injections will

be made at one metre centres, leaving a hole approximately 20mm in diameter which will be back filled with a biochar/seaweed mix to promote mycorrhizal activity.

The tree protection barrier will be relocated to allow the installation of the path. Where the new path passes through the RPA of T26 and the ASNW buffer zone, it will utilise a cellular confinement system such as Cell Web in order to minimise excavations. Guidance on the form of construction necessary to avoid root damage and loss is provided in the form of an extract of the Cell Web Product brochure for their cellular confinement system at Appendix 2.

The new path will be laid on the existing level with any hollows filled with sand.

The installation of the path will proceed in the following order:

- Lay geotextile membrane over the soil and pin into place
- Lay cellular confinement system (such as Cell Web) as specified by engineer and pin into place.
- Fill the cellular confinement system with a 'no fines' aggregate to engineer's specification. Work must be carried out progressively so that any machinery used only moves on the laid surface.
- Install timber edging (if required) as specified by engineer
- Lay geotextile membrane over filled cellular confinement system.
- Lay wearing course as specified by landscape architect.

No materials or spoil is to be stored within the RPA of a retained tree.

In order to avoid damage to the retained trees the tree surgery and felling work identified in the accompanying tree survey schedule will be carried out prior to the occupation of the site by the building contractor. The work will be carried out in accordance with BS 3998:2010.

5.4 Services

The proposed locations of service runs have not been finalised at this early stage. However, it is assumed that the services will enter site beneath the access drive and as such will likely not be within the RPAs of the retained trees. Where this is not the case, any excavations within the RPA will be carried by hand in accordance with 'broken trenches' described in NJUG 4 Section 4, an extract of which can be found in Appendix 3. This will ensure that tree roots are not damaged during the installation of the service. Roots with a diameter of 25mm or less will be pruned back to the edge of the trench with sharp secateurs. Roots with a diameter of more than 25mm will

be retained and protected by wrapping them with damp hessian which will stay in place until the trench is back filled.

5.5 Tree Protection

All trees that are to be retained on the site will be protected by the use of a tree protection barrier erected in the location shown on the accompanying TPP, drawing number 25-1907-TPP-C. The fence will consist of "Heras" type panels or similar braced at a minimum of three metre intervals with a vertical scaffold pole driven into the ground and secured to keep in place. The tree protection barrier will be erected prior to the occupation of the site by the building contractor and will only be removed once the construction phase is complete.

Where specified on the accompanying TPP drawing, reference 25-1907-TPP-C, the ground between the new building and the tree protection barrier will be protected by geotextile fabric and side butting scaffold boards or thick plywood fit for purpose, on a compressible layer (e.g. 100mm layer of woodchip over a geotextile membrane). The ground protection will be left in place until the building works are complete.

5.6 Site Monitoring and Supervision

The process of reporting to the client and LPA/Tree Officer will be by emailing the checklist form at Appendix 4. Site monitoring is to be at a frequency agreed and approved by the LPA. It will involve a site visit by the arboriculturist at selected intervals to ensure that the appropriate tree protection measures, as detailed in the approved drawings and method statements, are continually adhered to.

6 Conclusion

Canopy Consultancy was commissioned by Miller Homes to carry out a tree survey at the site. The results of the survey indicate that the trees within the survey area vary considerably in terms of condition and contribution to the amenity of the wider landscape.

A total of two individual trees, and part of two hedges will be removed to enable the proposed development. One further tree will be removed for arboricultural reasons.

The proposed development of the site provides an opportunity to plant a number of new trees and hedges as part of a landscape scheme for the site. This will improve the age range and species diversity of the trees in the local area, as well as enhancing the tree cover on the site.

Through the specified tree protection measures and construction methodology, it will be possible to minimise the impact of the proposed development on the retained trees.

Overall, there are no known overriding arboricultural constraints which would prevent the proposed development from going ahead, subject to the protection measures and construction methodologies specified within this report being correctly implemented.

7 Appendices

<i>Miller Homes</i>	<i>Land South of Smugglers Lane, Barns Green</i>
---------------------	--

Appendix 1: Tree Survey Schedule

<i>25-1907-Report-C</i>	
-------------------------	--

Project:	Barns Green, Horsham							BS 5837 2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction-	Surveyed by		OH				
Ref:	25-1907								Weather		Overcast				
Date:	20.02.25								Tagged		No				
Client:	Miller Homes														
				Canopy Spread											
Tree No.	Species	Height (m)	Stem Dia (mm)	N	E	S	W	Stems	Height of crown clearance	Age class	Physiological condition problems/comments	Structural condition	Preliminary management recommendations	Estimated remaining contribution years	BS category
T1	Quercus robur (Common Oak)	6	350	2	3	2	1	1	3	MA	Fair - suppressed. Ivy on tree. Unable to inspect stem due to Ivy. Unbalanced crown shape.	Good	None	40+	B2
T2	Quercus robur (Common Oak)	7	280	3	3	3	3	1	3	MA	Good	Good	None	40+	B2
T3	Acer campestre (Field Maple)	5.5	306	2	2	3	2	4	2.5	MA	Good	Good	None	40+	B2
T4	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	11	568	4	4	6	5	3	4	MA	Good - Ivy on tree. Multiple stems below 1.5m.	Good	None	40+	B2
T5	Quercus robur (Common Oak)	7	300	3	3	4	4	1	3	MA	Good - Ivy on tree.	Good	None	40+	B2
T6	Quercus robur (Common Oak)	7	300	3	4	3	2	1	3.5	MA	Good - Ivy on tree.	Good	None	40+	B2
T7	Acer campestre (Field Maple)	8	403	1	5	3	2	2	3	MA	Good - Ivy on tree. Stem divides at ground level.	Good	None	40+	B2
T8	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	12	666	3	5	5	3	6	3.5	MA	Good - Ivy on tree. Multiple stems below 1.5m.Lapsed hedgerow tree.	Good	None	40+	B2
T9	Quercus robur (Common Oak)	12	750	8	6	3	5	1	2	MA	Good - Ivy on tree.	Good	None	40+	A3
T10	Acer campestre (Field Maple)	9	380	5	2	4	3	1	1	MA	Fair - Low vitality. suppressed. Ivy on tree.	Good	None	20-40	C1
T11	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	11	424	2	1	4	4	2	3.5	MA	Good - Poor shape & form. Ivy on tree.	Fair - Stem divides below 1.5m. Included bark present in fork.	None	20-40	C1

Project:	Barns Green, Horsham							BS 5837 2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction-	Surveyed by		OH				
Ref:	25-1907								Weather		Overcast				
Date:	20.02.25								Tagged		No				
Client:	Miller Homes														
				Canopy Spread											
Tree No.	Species	Height (m)	Stem Dia (mm)	N	E	S	W	Stems	Height of crown clearance	Age class	Physiological condition problems/comments	Structural condition	Preliminary management recommendations	Estimated remaining contribution years	BS category
T12	Quercus robur (Common Oak)	11	280	3	1	2	3	1	3	MA	Fair - Ivy on tree.	Good	None	40+	B2
T13	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	10	526	4	2	3	3	3	2.5	MA	Good - Ivy on tree. Multiple stems below 1.5m.Lapsed hedgerow tree.	Good	None	40+	B2
T14	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	8	436	2	2	4	4	4	3	MA	Good - Ivy on tree. Multiple stems below 1.5m.	Good	None	40+	B2
T15	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	7	416	2	2	2	4	5	2.5	MA	Poor - Die back. Hymenoscyphus.	Fair	Remove tree.	<10	U
T16	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	3.5	400	1	1	1	1	1	2.5	MA	Dead - Monolith.	Poor	None	<10	U
T17	Acer campestre (Field Maple)	6	400	2	2	3	2	1	2.5	MA	Good - Multiple stems below 1.5m.	Good	None	40+	B2
T18	Acer campestre (Field Maple)	7	301	3	3	3	3	4	2.5	MA	Good - Multiple stems below 1.5m.	Good	None	40+	B2
T19	Acer campestre (Field Maple)	7	486	2	4	4	2	6	2.5	M	Good - Multiple stems below 1.5m.	Good	None	40+	B2
T20	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	10	430	4	4	3	2	1	4	MA	Good - Ivy on tree.	Fair - Multiple stems above 1.5m. Included bark present in fork.	None	20-40	C1
T21	Sorbus intermedia (Swedish Whitebeam)	6	374	2	1	1	3	5	3	M	Fair - Low vitality. Ivy on tree. Multiple stems below 1.5m.	Good	None	20-40	B2

Project:	Barns Green, Horsham							BS 5837 2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction-	Surveyed by		OH				
Ref:	25-1907								Weather		Overcast				
Date:	20.02.25								Tagged		No				
Client:	Miller Homes														
				Canopy Spread											
Tree No.	Species	Height (m)	Stem Dia (mm)	N	E	S	W	Stems	Height of crown clearance	Age class	Physiological condition problems/comments	Structural condition	Preliminary management recommendations	Estimated remaining contribution years	BS category
T22	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	11	375	1	2	4	2	2	4	MA	Goodlvy on tree. Cavity on stem.	Fair - Stem divides below 1.5m. Included bark present in fork. Decay at base.	None	10-20	C1
T23	Acer campestre (Field Maple)	11	461	2	2	4	3	6	3	MA	Good - Multiple stems below 1.5m.	Good	None	40+	B2
T24	Acer campestre (Field Maple)	10	403	2	2	4	2	3	3.5	MA	Good - Multiple stems below 1.5m.	Good	None	40+	B2
T25	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	12	330	4	4	3	4	1	3	MA	Good	Good	None	40+	B2
T26	Quercus robur (Common Oak)	13	810	7	7	5	6	1	5	M	Good - Ivy on tree. Major deadwood in crown.	Good	None	40+	A2
T27	Acer campestre (Field Maple)	7	220	3	2	3	1	1	2	MA	Fair - Poor shape & form. suppressed.	Good	None	20-40	C1
T28	Acer campestre (Field Maple)	7	170	1	1	2	1	1	2	MA	Fair - Poor shape & form. suppressed.	Good	None	20-40	C1
T29	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	9	375	4	2	2	2	2	2	MA	Good - Poor shape & form. suppressed.	Fair - Stem divides below 1.5m. Included bark present in fork.	None	20-40	C1
T30	Acer campestre (Field Maple)	9	220	1	2	4	1	1	1.5	MA	Fair - Poor shape & form. suppressed.	Good	None	20-40	C1
T31	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	9	424	5	2	1	1	2	3	MA	Good - Poor shape & form. suppressed.	Fair - Stem divides below 1.5m. Included bark present in fork.	None	20-40	C1

Project:	Barns Green, Horsham							BS 5837 2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction-	Surveyed by		OH				
Ref:	25-1907								Weather		Overcast				
Date:	20.02.25								Tagged		No				
Client:	Miller Homes														
				Canopy Spread											
Tree No.	Species	Height (m)	Stem Dia (mm)	N	E	S	W	Stems	Height of crown clearance	Age class	Physiological condition problems/comments	Structural condition	Preliminary management recommendations	Estimated remaining contribution years	BS category
T32	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	8	200	3	1	3	2	1	1.5	MA	Fair - Poor shape & form. Low vitality. suppressed.	Good	None	20-40	C1
T33	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	10	280	4	1	1	4	1	3.5	MA	Fair - Poor shape & form. Low vitality. suppressed.	Good	None	20-40	C1
T34	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	10	220	3	2	2	1	1	5	MA	Fair - Poor shape & form. Low vitality. suppressed.	Good	None	20-40	C1
T35	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	11	330	3	5	4	2	1	3	MA	Good	Good	None	40+	B2
T36	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	10	260	3	1	1	3	1	3	MA	Fair - Poor shape & form. Low vitality. suppressed.	Good	None	20-40	C1
T37	Quercus robur (Common Oak)	10	300	3	3	2	2	1	4	MA	Good	Good	None	40+	B2
T38	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	12	532	5	5	4	5	2	3	MA	Good	Fair - Stem divides below 1.5m. Included bark present in fork.	None	20-40	C1
T39	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	11	270	2	4	2	1	1	4	MA	Good	Good	None	40+	B2
T40	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	9	200	2	2	2	2	1	4	MA	Fair - Poor shape & form. Low vitality. suppressed.	Good	None	20-40	C1
T41	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	9	270	2	4	2	2	1	4	MA	Good	Good	None	40+	B2

Project:	Barns Green, Horsham							BS 5837 2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction-	Surveyed by		OH				
Ref:	25-1907								Weather		Overcast				
Date:	20.02.25								Tagged		No				
Client:	Miller Homes														
				Canopy Spread											
Tree No.	Species	Height (m)	Stem Dia (mm)	N	E	S	W	Stems	Height of crown clearance	Age class	Physiological condition problems/comments	Structural condition	Preliminary management recommendations	Estimated remaining contribution years	BS category
T42	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	7	260	2	1	1	4	1	4	MA	Fair - Poor shape & form. Low vitality. suppressed.	Good	None	20-40	C1
T43	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	9	270	2	2	3	2	1	4	MA	Fair - Poor shape & form. Low vitality. suppressed.	Good	None	20-40	C1
T44	Acer campestre (Field Maple)	6	270	2	2	2	3	1	3	MA	Good	Good	None	40+	B2
T45	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	10	384	3	3	2	2	4	3	MA	Good - Poor shape & form.	Fair - Stem divides below 1.5m. Included bark present in fork.	None	20-40	C1
T46	Acer campestre (Field Maple)	8	394	2	2	2	4	4	3	MA	Good - Multiple stems at ground level.	Good	None	40+	B2
T47	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	7	173	4	1	1	1	3	3	MA	Fair - Poor shape & form.	Fair - Stem divides below 1.5m.	None	10-20	C1
T48	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	7	219	1	2	1	1	2	3	MA	Poor - Die back.	Poor	N/A Off site	<10	U
T49	Quercus robur (Common Oak)	10	500	3	1	2	5	1	3	MA	Fair - Low vitality. Die back. Spindly.	Good	None	20-40	C1
T50	Acer campestre (Field Maple)	7	280	2	2	2	3	1	2.5	MA	Good	Good	None	40+	B2
T51	Quercus robur (Common Oak)	15	800	5	7	5	6	1	4	M	Good	Good	None	40+	A1
T52	Quercus robur (Common Oak)	8	250	2	2	2	2	1	5	Y	Good	Good	None	40+	B2

Project:	Barns Green, Horsham							BS 5837 2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction-	Surveyed by		OH				
Ref:	25-1907								Weather		Overcast				
Date:	20.02.25								Tagged		No				
Client:	Miller Homes														
				Canopy Spread											
Tree No.	Species	Height (m)	Stem Dia (mm)	N	E	S	W	Stems	Height of crown clearance	Age class	Physiological condition problems/comments	Structural condition	Preliminary management recommendations	Estimated remaining contribution years	BS category
T53	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	8	360	2	3	3	2	1	4	MA	Good	Good	None	40+	B2
T54	Quercus robur (Common Oak)	10	800	5	5	6	4	1	3	M	Good - Major deadwood in crown.	Good	None	40+	A3
T55	Quercus robur (Common Oak)	7	260	2	3	2	2	1	3.5	MA	Good - Leaning North-East.	Good	None	40+	B2
T56	Quercus robur (Common Oak)	8	450	3	5	1	3	1	3.5	MA	Good	Good	None	40+	B2
T57	Quercus robur (Common Oak)	7	280	2	1	2	2	1	3.5	MA	Good - Stem divides above 1.5m.	Good	None	40+	B2
T58	Quercus robur (Common Oak)	9	300	2	3	2	2	1	3.5	MA	Good	Good	None	40+	B2
T59	Acer campestre (Field Maple)	6	190	2	2	2	2	1	2	MA	Good	Good	None	40+	B2
T60	Acer campestre (Field Maple)	9	550	4	4	4	4	1	2.5	M	Good - Leaning East.	Good	None	40+	A2
T61	Quercus robur (Common Oak)	13	800	5	5	5	5	1	3	M	Good	Good	None	40+	A2
T62	Quercus robur (Common Oak)	7	250	1	3	3	2	1	3	MA	Fair - suppressed.	Good	None	40+	B2
T63	Quercus robur (Common Oak)	7.5	480	3	4	3	4	1	3	MA	Fair - Low vitality.	Good	None	40+	B2
T64	Quercus robur (Common Oak)	9.5	510	3	4	4	4	1	3.5	MA	Good	Good	None	40+	A2
T65	Quercus robur (Common Oak)	8	850	5	5	6	7	1	5	M	Good - Leaning East. Ivy on tree.	Good	None	40+	A2

Project:	Barns Green, Horsham							BS 5837 2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction-	Surveyed by		OH				
Ref:	25-1907								Weather		Overcast				
Date:	20.02.25								Tagged		No				
Client:	Miller Homes														
				Canopy Spread											
Tree No.	Species	Height (m)	Stem Dia (mm)	N	E	S	W	Stems	Height of crown clearance	Age class	Physiological condition problems/comments	Structural condition	Preliminary management recommendations	Estimated remaining contribution years	BS category
T66	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	7.5	250	4	2	2	2	1	4	MA	Fair - Poor shape & form. suppressed.	Good	None	20-40	C1
T67	Crataegus monogyna (Hawthorn)	4	200	2	2	2	2	1	2	MA	Fair - Poor shape & form. Ivy on tree. Broken branches in crown.	Good	None	20-40	C1
T68	Acer campestre (Field Maple)	5	250	2	2	2	2	1	1	MA	Good	Good	None	40+	B2
T69	Crataegus monogyna (Hawthorn)	3	200	2	2	2	2	1	0	MA	Fair	Good	None	20-40	C1
T70	Salix caprea (Goat Willow)	5	450	3	3	2	3	1	3	M	Good - Ivy on tree. Dieback in crown. Low bud/leaf density.	Fair - Cavity on stem. Decay at base	None	20-40	C1
T71	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	6.5	290	2	2	2	2	1	3.5	MA	Good - Ivy on tree.	Good	None	40+	B2
T72	Quercus robur (Common Oak)	6.5	300	3	1	2	3	1	3.5	MA	Fair - suppressed.	Good	None	40+	B2
T73	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	8.5	350	3	3	3	5	1	3.5	MA	Good	Good	None	40+	B2
T74	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	8.5	320	3	2	3	3	2	5	MA	Poor - Low vitality. Die back. Ivy on tree.	Fair - Stem divides at ground level.	None	10-20	C1
T75	Quercus robur (Common Oak)	8	580	5	5	5	5	1	3	MA	Good - Ivy on tree.	Good	None	40+	A2
T76	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	6.5	320	2	2	2	3	2	3	MA	Fair - Low vitality. Ivy on tree.	Fair - Stem divides below 1.5m.	None	20-40	C1
T77	Acer campestre (Field Maple)	4	212	2	2	2	2	2	3	MA	Good - Ivy on tree.	Good	None	40+	C1

Project:	Barns Green, Horsham							BS 5837 2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction-	Surveyed by		OH				
Ref:	25-1907								Weather		Overcast				
Date:	20.02.25								Tagged		No				
Client:	Miller Homes														
				Canopy Spread											
Tree No.	Species	Height (m)	Stem Dia (mm)	N	E	S	W	Stems	Height of crown clearance	Age class	Physiological condition problems/comments	Structural condition	Preliminary management recommendations	Estimated remaining contribution years	BS category
T78	Quercus robur (Common Oak)	9	350	3	3	3	3	1	2.5	MA	Good - Off site	Good	None	40+	B1
T79	Aesculus hippocastanum (Horse Chestnut)	9	450	4	3	4	3	1	2.5	MA	Good - Off site	Good	None	40+	B1
T80	Acer campestre (Field Maple)	5	150	1	1	1	1	1	2.5	MA	Good - Ivy on tree.	Good	None	20-40	C1
T81	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	5	328	4	2	1	1	3	2	MA	Fair - Poor shape & form. Ivy on tree.	Fair - Cavity on stem.	None	10-20	C1
T82	Quercus robur (Common Oak)	17	1200	7	8	7	7	1	4.5	M	Good - Off site	Good	None	40+	A1
G1	Carpinus betulus (Hornbeam)	6	Varied						MA	Good - boundary group. Off site.		Good	None	40+	C1
G2	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash),Acer campestre (Field Maple),Corylus avellana (Hazel),Crataegus monogyna (Hawthorn),Quercu s robur (Common Oak),Sorbus aucuparia (Rowan),Sorbus aria (Whitebeam),Sam bucus nigra (Elder),Prunus spinosa (Blackthorn)	4	Varied						MA	Good - boundary group. Off site.		Good	None	40+	B3

Project:	Barns Green, Horsham							BS 5837 2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction-			Surveyed by		OH				
Ref:	25-1907										Weather		Overcast				
Date:	20.02.25										Tagged		No				
Client:	Miller Homes																
				Canopy Spread													
Tree No.	Species	Height (m)	Stem Dia (mm)	N	E	S	W	Stems	Height of crown clearance	Age class	Physiological condition problems/comments	Structural condition	Preliminary management recommendations	Estimated remaining contribution years	BS category		
G3	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash),Acer campestre (Field Maple),Corylus avellana (Hazel),Crataegus monogyna (Hawthorn),Quercus robur (Common Oak),Sorbus aucuparia (Rowan),Sorbus aria (Whitebeam),Sambucus nigra (Elder),Prunus spinosa (Blackthorn)	4				Varied				MA	Good - boundary group.	Good	None	40+	B3		
G4	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash),Corylus avellana (Hazel),Crataegus monogyna (Hawthorn),Prunus spinosa (Blackthorn),Quercus robur (Common Oak)	4				Varied				MA	Fair	Good	None	20-40	C1		

Project:	Barns Green, Horsham							BS 5837 2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction-			Surveyed by		OH				
Ref:	25-1907										Weather		Overcast				
Date:	20.02.25										Tagged		No				
Client:	Miller Homes																
			Canopy Spread														
Tree No.	Species	Height (m)	Stem Dia (mm)	N	E	S	W	Stems	Height of crown clearance	Age class	Physiological condition problems/comments	Structural condition	Preliminary management recommendations	Estimated remaining contribution years	BS category		
G5	Acer campestre (Field Maple),Crataegus monogyna (Hawthorn),Fraxinus excelsior (Ash),Prunus spinosa (Blackthorn),Quercus robur (Common Oak),Salix caprea (Goat Willow)	4	Varied						MA	Fair - boundary group.	Good	None	20-40	C1			
H1	Crataegus monogyna (Hawthorn)	1.6	Varied						M	Good - boundary hedge.	Good	None	40+	C1			
H2	Crataegus monogyna (Hawthorn)	1.6	Varied						MA	Good - boundary hedge.	Good	None	40+	C1			

Appendix 2: Extract from the Cell Web product brochure

CellWeb

Tree Root Protection System



CellWeb Tree Root Protection System provides a flexible and permeable solution for protecting tree roots while creating a strong stable surface for traffic.



With increased urbanisation and more redevelopments of existing properties, the need to be mindful of the impact on the surrounding environment is more important than ever.

The demand for building site access, driveways and parking around existing trees can have a potentially fatal impact on the tree if carried out incorrectly. Tree preservation orders (TPO's) ensure that trees are not wilfully damaged. However the need for vehicle access over and around tree roots can still cause the following problems:





Problems:

- Compaction of subsoils (especially by construction traffic) causing oxygen and nutrient depletion
- Creating an impermeable surface that prevents water reaching the roots
- Changes in ground level and water table
- Damage caused during excavation
- Contamination of the subsoil

By using CellWeb Tree Root Protection System you can avoid these problems and ensure the tree's long-term future. BS 5837:1991 (revised 2005) and APN 1 provide information for the protection of trees during the construction process, and CellWeb is a well-established solution that conforms to these guidelines.


Product features



CellWeb's patented design with its unique cellular structure and perforated cell walls reduces the vertical load pressure on tree roots and prevents damage. With clean granular materials as infill, air and moisture can reach the roots to encourage healthy growth.

With no-dig solutions being the preferred option of most Arboricultural Consultants and Tree Officers, CellWeb is ideal as only the surface vegetation need be removed. As well as avoiding disruption to the roots this reduces installation time and saves money.

What's more CellWeb also cuts down the depth required for the sub base – in most cases by 50% for further cost savings. CellWeb also significantly reduces surface rutting, increasing the long-term performance of the finished surface.



Using CellWeb for tree root protection gives you these benefits:

- Reduced depth of excavation required
- Preventing the compaction of subsoils
- Preventing oxygen and nutrient depletion
- Environmentally sound
- Quick, easy and cost-effective installation
- Free technical support available

CellWeb gives you the cost-effectiveness you need at the same time as helping to preserve trees.

Geosynthetics Ltd is a leading dis

**Please call
01455 617 139**
or email sales@geosyn.co.uk
for further information.

Wide
product
range

Large
stock
holding

Next day
delivery



Access road for the National Lake District Parks Authority.

Site before construction pictured above.



CellWeb during installation.




Final surfacing.

Final surfacing

The CellWeb Tree Root Protection is totally confined within the clean stone sub base, therefore you can choose whichever surface materials are most appropriate for your installation. Some materials are more suitable than others and serious consideration should be given to the porosity of the surface for continued healthy growth of the tree. An ideal surfacing are DuoBlocks: a grass reinforcement and gravel retention system. Geosynthetics can supply these systems for a visually attractive surface that also has the advantage of being fully porous.

Loose or bonded gravels can be used as an alternative hard landscaping and CellWeb can also be used with block paviors whose porous joints will permit moisture and air transfer to the roots. Where planning allows, porous asphalt is yet another possible surfacing treatment.

Call our sales office on 01455 617 139 for more information.



istributor of geosynthetic materials in the UK

Design
service

Onsite
support

See all products
online at
geosyn.co.uk



Geosynthetics

Appendix 3: Section 4, extracted from NJUG 4

4. HOW TO AVOID DAMAGE TO TREES

This section gives general guidance on methods of work to minimise damage to trees. The local authority (or for privately owned trees, the owner or their agent), should be consulted at an early stage prior to the commencement of any works. This will reduce the potential for future conflict between trees and apparatus.

4.1 Below Ground

Wherever trees are present, precautions should be taken to minimise damage to their root systems. As the shape of the root system is unpredictable, there should be control and supervision of any works, particularly if this involves excavating through the surface 600mm, where the majority of roots develop.

4.1.1 Fine Roots

Fine roots are vulnerable to desiccation once they are exposed to the air. Larger roots have a bark layer which provides some protection against desiccation and temperature change. The greatest risk to these roots occurs when there are rapid fluctuations in air temperature around them e.g. frost and extremes of heat. It is therefore important to protect exposed roots where a trench is to be left open overnight where there is a risk of frost. In winter, before leaving the site at the end of the day, the exposed roots should be wrapped with dry sacking. This sacking must be removed before the trench is backfilled.

4.1.2 Precautions

The precautions referred to in this section are applicable to any excavations or other works occurring within the Prohibited or Precautionary Zones as illustrated in Figure 1 – 'Tree Protection Zone'.

4.1.3 Realignment

Whenever possible apparatus should always be diverted or re-aligned outside the Prohibited or Precautionary Zones. Under no circumstances can machinery be used to excavate open trenches within the Prohibited Zone.

The appropriate method of working within the Precautionary Zone should be determined in consultation with the local authority (or for privately owned trees the owner or their agent) and may depend on the following circumstances;

- the scope of the works (e.g. one-off repair or part of an extensive operation)
- degree of urgency (e.g. for restoration of supplies)
- knowledge of location of other apparatus
- soil conditions
- age, condition, quality and life expectancy of the tree

Where works are required for the laying or maintenance of any apparatus within the Prohibited or Precautionary Zones there are various techniques available to minimise damage.

Acceptable techniques in order of preference are;

a) Trenchless

Wherever possible trenchless techniques should be used. The launch and reception pits should be located outside the Prohibited or Precautionary Zones. In order to avoid damage to roots by percussive boring techniques it is recommended that the depth of run should be below 600mm. Techniques involving external lubrication of the equipment with materials other than water (e.g. oil, bentonite, etc.) must not be used when working within the Prohibited Zone. Lubricating materials other than water may be used within the Precautionary Zone following consultation and by agreement.

b) Broken Trench - Hand-dug

This technique combines hand dug trench sections with trenchless techniques if excavation is unavoidable. Excavation should be limited to where there is clear access around and below the roots. The trench is excavated by hand with precautions taken as for continuous trenching as in (c) below. Open sections of the trench should only be long enough to allow access for linking to the next section. The length of sections will be determined by local conditions, especially soil texture and cohesiveness, as well as the practical needs for access. In all cases the open sections should be kept as short as possible and outside of the Prohibited Zone.

c) Continuous Trench - Hand-dug

The use of this method must be considered only as a last resort if works are to be undertaken by agreement within the Prohibited Zone. The objective being to retain as many undamaged roots as possible.

Hand digging within the Prohibited or Precautionary zones must be undertaken with great care requiring closer supervision than normal operations.

After careful removal of the hard surface material digging must proceed with hand tools. Clumps of roots less than 25mm in diameter (including fibrous roots) should be retained in situ without damage. Throughout the excavation works great care should be taken to protect the bark around the roots.

All roots greater than 25mm diameter should be preserved and worked around. These roots must not be severed without first consulting the owner of the tree or the local authority tree officer / arboriculturist. If after consultation severance is unavoidable, roots must be cut back using a sharp tool to leave the smallest wound.

4.1.5 Backfilling

- Any reinstatement of street works in the United Kingdom must comply with the relevant national legislation (see: **Volume 6 – 'Legislation and Bibliography'**). In England this relates to the requirements of the code of practice – 'Specification for the Reinstatement of Openings in Highways' approved under the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991. Without prejudice to the requirements relating to the specification of materials and the standards of workmanship, backfilling should be carefully carried out to avoid direct damage to roots and excessive compaction of the soil around them.
- The backfill should, where possible, include the placement of an inert granular material mixed with top soil or sharp sand (not builder's sand) around the roots. This should allow the soil to be compacted for resurfacing without damage to the roots securing a local aerated zone enabling the root to survive in the longer term.
- Backfilling outside the constructed highway limits should be carried out using the excavated soil. This should not be compacted but lightly "tamped" and usually left slightly proud of the surrounding surface to allow natural settlement. Other materials should not be incorporated into the backfill.

4.1.6 Additional Precautions near Trees

- Movement of heavy mechanical plant (excavators etc.) must not be undertaken within the Prohibited Zone and should be avoided within the Precautionary Zone, except on existing hard surfaces, in order to prevent unnecessary compaction of the soil. This is particularly important on soils with a high proportion of clay. Spoil or material must not be stored within the Prohibited Zone and should be avoided within the Precautionary Zone.
- Where it is absolutely necessary to use mechanical plant within the Precautionary Zone care should be taken to avoid impact damage to the trunk and branches. A tree must not be used as an end-stop for paving slabs or other materials nor for security chaining of mechanical plant. If the trunk or branches of a tree are damaged in any way advice should be sought from the local authority tree officer / arboriculturist.

See TABLE 1 –‘Prevention of Damage to Trees Below Ground’ below for summary details regarding causes and types of damage to trees and the implications of the damage and the necessary precautions to be taken to avoid damage.

TABLE 1 - Prevention of Damage to Trees Below Ground

Causes of Damage	Type of Damage	Implications to Tree	Precautions
Trenching, mechanical digging etc.	Root severance	• The tree may fall over • Death of the root beyond the point of damage • Potential risk of infection of the tree The larger the root the greater the impact on the tree.	Hand excavate only within the Precautionary Zone. Work carefully around roots. Do not cut roots over 25mm in diameter without referring to the local authority tree officer. For roots less than 25mm in diameter use a sharp tool and make a clean cut leaving as small a wound as possible.
Trenching, mechanical digging, top soil surface removal etc.	Root bark damage	• The tree may fall over • If the damage circles the root it will cause the death of the root beyond that point • Potential risk of infection of the tree The larger the root the greater the impact on the tree.	Do not use mechanical machinery to strip the top soil within the Precautionary Zone. Hand excavate only within the Precautionary Zone. Work carefully around roots. Do not cut roots over 25mm in diameter without referring to the local authority tree officer. For roots less than 25mm use a sharp tool and make a clean cut leaving as small a wound as possible.
Vehicle movement and plant use. Material storage within the precautionary area.	Soil compaction & water saturation	Restricts or prevents passage of gaseous diffusion through soil, the roots are asphyxiated and killed affecting the whole tree.	Prevent all vehicle movement, plant use or material storage within the Precautionary Zone.
Top-soil scouring, excavation or banking up.	Alterations in soil level causing compaction or exposure of roots.	Lowering levels strips out the mass of roots over a wide area. Raising soil levels asphyxiates roots and has the same effect as soil compaction.	Avoid altering or disturbing soil levels within the Precautionary Zone.
Use of herbicides.	Poisoning of the tree via root absorption	• Death of the whole tree • Death of individual branches Damage to leaves and shoots.	The selection and application of herbicides must be undertaken by a competent person in accordance with COSHH regulations.
Spillage of oils or other materials.	Contamination of soil	Toxic and asphyxiation effects of chemicals, oils, building materials (cement, plaster, additives etc.) on the root system can kill the tree.	Never store oils, chemicals or building materials within the Precautionary Zone or within the branch spread of a tree, which ever is the greater.
Placement or replacement of underground apparatus.	Various	Death of all or part of the tree.	Effective planning and liaison with local authority tree officer, taking into consideration the position of trees, and their future growth potential and management

4.2 Above Ground

4.2.1 Damage by Pruning

Trees (including shrubs and hedges) can be damaged by inappropriate or excessive pruning. Reference should be made to the Energy Networks Association (ENA) document "Engineering Technical Report 136 Vegetation Management near Electricity Equipment – Principles of Good Practice" (see section 8 – 'Other Useful Publications') or appropriate company specific documentation for guidance on pruning.

See TABLE 2 – 'Prevention of Damage to Trees Above Ground' below for summary details regarding causes and types of damage to trees and the implications of the damage and the necessary precautions to be taken to avoid damage.

TABLE 2 - Prevention of Damage to Trees Above Ground

Causes of Damage	Type of Damage	Implications for the Tree	Precautions
Impact by vehicle or plant Physical attachment of signs or hoardings to the trunk Storage of materials at base of tree Rubbing by winch or pulling cables	Bark bruising, bark removal, damage to the wood, damage to buttress roots, abrasion to trunk	Wounding with the potential for infection ultimately resulting in death of all or part of the tree. Structural failure of the tree	Surround the trunk with protective free-standing barrier. Exclude vehicles, plant or material storage from the Precautionary Zone. Ensure sufficient clearance of cables or ropes.
Impact by vehicle or plant Rubbing by overhead cables	Bark damage to branches, breakage and splitting of branches, abrasion to branches	Structural failure of the branch. Wounding or loss of a branch with the potential for infection ultimately resulting in death of all or part of the branch or tree.	Exclude vehicles, plant or material storage from the Precautionary Zone. Ensure sufficient clearance of cables or ropes. All pruning should be carried out in accordance with BS3998 (<i>prune affected branches to give appropriate clearance from cables</i>)
Inappropriate siting of overhead apparatus, such as CCTV, lighting fixtures and communications masts and dishes.	Inappropriate pruning, unnecessary tree removal	Severely pruning tree to acquire line of sight signal for communications dish etc.	Effective planning and liaison with local authority tree officer / arboriculturist, taking into consideration the position of trees, and their future growth potential and management.
Lack of forethought in design and location of apparatus and services entries on new developments	Complete tree removal	The tree is removed unnecessarily	Agree the location and installation of services at the design stage. Consideration should be given to the creation of dedicated service routes wherever possible.
Use of herbicides	Poisoning of the tree via absorption through bark, leaves and shoots	Death of the whole tree, death of individual branches, damage to leaves and shoots	The selection and application of herbicides must be undertaken by a competent person in accordance with COSHH regulations.

Appendix 4: Programme of Site Monitoring

Land South of Smugglers Lane, Barns Green
Site Monitoring Form

To be completed by the named arboriculturist and emailed to the client and tree officer at the completion of each operation.

Arboriculturist.....

Client.....

Project Manager.....

Tree Officer.....

(The above to be filled in with names and contact numbers)

OPERATION	TIMING	DATE	COMMENTS
Pre-commencement meeting or contact with project/site manager.	Before any works or pre-works on site, including storage of materials		
Spot check of tree protection measures	Before ground works begin		
Supervision of excavations to repair the broken culvert within RPA of T82	During ground works		
Supervision of excavations to redirect culvert on edge of RPA of T82	During ground works		
Supervision of de-compaction work at existing gateway in northwest corner	Before installation of footpath		
Spot check of no dig construction of footpath through RPA of T26 and ASNW buffer	During installation of footpath		
Completion of development	Once all construction activity has been completed		