

## LAKELAND TREE CONSULTANCY ARBORICULTURAL PLANNING SPECIALIST

Arboricultural Impact Assessment

Talbot Hotel Talbot Street Chipping PR3 2QE

March 2022

## Project details

Job no.	LTC115			
Site	Talbot Hotel, Talbot Street, Chipping, PR3 2QE			
Client	Sunderland Peacock & Associates Ltd.			
Arboriculturist Jennie Keighley PhD MSc MArborA				
Local authority Ribble Valley Borough Council				
Date	7 March 2022			
Issue	Final issue for planning			

Lakeland Tree Consultancy Halton Mill, Mill Lane

Halton, Lancashire

LA2 6ND

T: 01524 874124

E: info@lakelandtreeconsultancy.co.uk

W: lakelandtreeconsultancy.co.uk



## Contents

#### Page no.

1. Executive Summary	. 1
2. Introduction	.2
3. The Site and Tree Population	.3
4. The Development Proposal and Arboricultural Impact Assessment	.4
5. Protection of Retained Trees	. 6
6. Tree Preservation Orders, Conservation Areas and Other Legal Constraints	9
References	.10

## Appendices

BS5837 Tree Protection Fencing BS5837 Tree Survey Schedule Tree Survey Plan Tree Protection Plan



## 1. Executive Summary

- 1.1 This arboricultural impact assessment relates to a planning application at the site in question for the conversion of the existing barn and former public house into residential dwellings.
- 1.2 Three individual trees, two groups of trees and a woodland were surveyed in relation to the proposed works. Assessment of the tree data in relation to the proposal plan indicates that construction of the development as proposed will require the removal of one low quality tree. One poor quality group of trees is infected with ash dieback disease and is also recommended for removal for reasons unrelated to the development proposal.
- 1.3 Several new trees and shrubs are proposed in the rear gardens of the terraced properties, the provision of which is projected to more than adequately compensate for the development-related tree loss. The specification, delivery and aftercare of new tree planting can be secured by means of a condition attached to a planning approval.
- 1.4 The retained trees can be adequately protected by means of BS5837-specification tree protection fencing, which is to be laidout as shown on the appended tree protection plan, and by following the tree protection recommendations made herein.
- 1.5 The proposals will involve the replacement of existing hard surfaces, the construction of new hard surfaces and installation of boundary fences within the RPAs of retained trees. These operations are to be carried out using special working methods, in accordance with the preliminary arboricultural method statement included herein.



## 2. Introduction

- 2.1 The client, Sunderland Peacock & Associates, instructed Lakeland Tree Consultancy to survey the trees at the site in question and undertake an arboricultural impact assessment (AIA) in relation to a planning application for the conversion of the existing barn and former public house into residential dwellings.
- 2.2 Arboriculturist Jennie Keighley PhD MSc MArborA visited the site on 28 January 2022 and surveyed the trees potentially within influencing distance of the proposed works in accordance with the British Standard guidance, BS5837 (2012) *Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction Recommendations*.
- 2.3 This report will assess the potential impacts of the proposed development in relation to the existing tree population and outline the tree protection measures needed to prevent retained trees from being damaged during the construction works.



### 3. The Site and Tree Population

- 3.1 The site is located in the centre of the village of Chipping, Lancashire, and is currently a former public house with adjacent barn, to the rear of which is an area of hard standing and the former pub beer garden (now overgrown), including a surfaced children's play area (see Figure 1). The site is bounded to the north by a young woodland, to the east by Chipping Brook, to the south by Talbot Street and to the west by a neighbouring residential property and the grounds of St Bartholomew's Church.
- 3.2 The survey identified three individual trees, two groups of trees and a woodland potentially within influencing distance of the proposed works. The positions of the surveyed trees in relation to the existing site are shown on the appended tree survey plan.
- 3.3 The retention value of the surveyed trees was categorised using the guidance given in Table 1 of BS5837 (2012), which is explained in the appended tree survey schedule. One individual tree was categorised as high quality (A-category), one individual tree and one group were categorised as moderate quality (B-category), one individual tree and the woodland were categorised as low quality (C-category) and one group was categorised as unsuitable for retention (U-category) due to its limited remaining life expectancy.



Figure 1: Google Earth image of application site (dated 24 April 2020)



## 4. The Development Proposal and Arboricultural Impact Assessment

- 4.1 The proposed site plan provided (drawing number 6521-P04-A), by Sunderland Peacock & Associates, indicates that the proposal is for the conversion of the existing barn into three terraced residential dwellings with gardens and car parking to the rear. The existing Talbot Hotel will be converted into a residential dwelling with a self-contained annex and a new driveway and car parking are to be constructed to the rear of the building.
- 4.2 The proposed site plan provided does not show proposed services or drainage at this stage, although it is anticipated that these will utilise existing infrastructure. New service trenches and drainage features, such as sewage treatment plants or surface water attenuation ponds, must be sited so as to avoid the root protection areas (RPAs) of the retained trees.
- 4.3 As shown on the appended tree protection plan and in Table 1, below, construction of the development as proposed will require the removal of one small, low quality cherry tree. Additionally, one U-category group is suffering from terminal infection with ash dieback disease and is recommended for removal for reasons unrelated to the development.



#### Table 1: Arboricultural impacts of the proposed development

ID no.	BS5837 Category	Recommendation
T2	С	Remove in order to facilitate construction of car parking area
G1	U	Remove in full due to terminal infection with ash dieback disease and associated risk of branch and stem failures
arbo ir	Total pricultural npacts	Removals: 1no. C-category tree 1no. U-category group (not development related)

#### Tree works

4.4 All tree works should be carried out by a suitably qualified, experienced and insured arborist in accordance with the British Standard guidance BS3998 (2010) *Tree work - recommendations.* 

### Compensatory tree planting

4.5 As indicated on the proposed site plan provided (drawing number 6521-P04-A), several new trees and shrubs are proposed in the rear gardens of the three terraced properties, the provision of which is projected to more than adequately compensate for the development-related tree loss. The specification, delivery and aftercare of new tree planting can be secured by means of a suitably worded condition attached to a planning approval and should be implemented in accordance with the British Standard guidance, BS8545 (2014) *Trees: from nursery to independence in the landscape - Recommendations*.



## 5. Protection of Retained Trees

### Tree protection fencing

- 5.1 Adequate protection of the retained trees during the development is paramount in ensuring their health and survival. Creating a construction exclusion zone by erecting temporary fencing around the perimeter of the trees' root protection areas (RPA) is the most effective way of protecting them during the works. It is important that tree protection fencing is secured into the ground, so that it cannot be easily moved whilst the construction works are underway.
- 5.2 For the development in question, the default BS5837 (2012) tree protection fencing specification, as shown on the appended illustration, is expected to be suitable. The fencing is to be be laid-out as indicated on the appended tree protection plan prior to any works on site, including deliveries, and shall remain in place until the development is complete. Once erected, the tree protection fencing should be labelled at regular intervals with all-weather notices stating 'TREE PROTECTION AREA KEEP OUT!'.

### Preliminary arboricultural method statement

5.3 An arboricultural method statement intends to identify site operations with reasonably foreseeable potential to adversely impact the health of trees within or close to the development site and outlines the necessary actions and precautions required during the development process to minimise the risk of causing damage to trees (see Table 2, below).



5.4 As this arboricultural method statement is provided pre-determination, it should be considered preliminary until all design details, such as services, drainage, boundary treatments and detailed construction specifications, are confirmed. It is therefore recommended that a detailed arboricultural method statement, to include a sequence of works and site monitoring schedule, be provided post-determination, should the development be approved.

Table 2: Site-specific guidance for operations within tree RPAs

Operation	BS5837 Guidance
Renewal of hard surfaces	The proposals will require the removal of existing hard surfaces, including tarmac, paving and an existing children's play area within the RPA of retained tree T1. During removal of the existing surfaces, care must be taken not to disturb tree roots that might be present directly underneath them. The existing surface shall be removed using hand-held tools only, working backwards over the area to avoid moving over the exposed ground. If replacing the hard surface, the existing sub-base should be retained in place and augmented if possible, so that root disturbance is minimised. Exposed roots are to be wrapped or covered to protect them from rapid temperature changes and prevent dessication. Wrapping shall be removed prior to backfilling, which should take place as soon as possible. To give them the best chance of recovery, retained roots should be surrounded with topsoil, uncompacted sharp sand (not builders' sand, which has high salt content that is toxic to trees) or other loose inert granular fill before installation of the new surface.
Construction of new hard surfaces	A proposed gravel driveway and car parking area with stone sett edging encroach slightly within the RPAs of retained trees T1 and G2. Where new hard surfacing is being constructed within currently soft surfaced RPA, it shall be installed above the existing soil level. There shall be no excavation into the RPAs, other than to remove surface vegetation, which must be carried out using hand-held tools. Where required, a minimal amount of infill may be used to achieve desired levels, but this must be an inert, granular material that remains gas- and water-permeable throughout its design life.
Installation of boundary fences	Where within the RPAs of retained trees, fence posts are to be sited so as to avoid any substantial tree roots. Post holes are to be dug using hand tools only and are to be lined with impermeable sheeting prior to the pouring of wet concrete to prevent toxic leachate from contaminating the RPA.



7

#### General tree protection recommendations

5.5 The following recommendations should be heeded throughout the development in order to prevent damage to retained trees: -

- Tree protection fencing shall be installed prior to any works on site, with the exception of tree works and vegetation removal
- Once in place, the tree protection fencing shall not be moved until the development is complete, unless authorised in advance by the Project Arboriculturist or LPA Tree Officer
- Vehicles and plant shall not operate within RPAs, unless there is an existing hard surface in place or load-appropriate ground protection has been installed
- Soil levels within RPAs shall not be raised or lowered, unless authorised in advance by the LPA
- Soil shall not be scraped, skimmed or mechanically compacted within RPAs. The majority of tree roots are found in the top 600mm of soil, so even a shallow scrape can cause detrimental root damage
- Materials, equipment, vehicles, skips, demolition arisings, stone or earth shall not be stored within soft-surfaced RPAs
- Oil, fuel, chemicals, cement or any other material with potential to cause damage to trees shall not be poured, stored, mixed, washed or discharged within tree RPAs. Consideration shall also be given to the topography of the site to prevent materials running towards trees
- Services and drainage shall not be installed below ground level within RPAs, unless authorised in advance by the LPA
- Surface water run-off shall not be re-diverted into or out of RPAs
- Fires shall not be lit within 15m of any tree crown or RPA
- Temporary buildings, including welfare units and portable toilets, shall not be sited within RPAs
- Notice boards, telephone cables, anchorage for equipment or any other services shall not be attached to trees
- Deliveries by crane shall be supervised by the site manager, ensuring the vehicle operates in a manner in which trees are not put at risk of damage
- Incidents with an impact or potential impact on trees shall be logged and reported to the Project Arboriculturist



## 6. Tree Preservation Orders, Conservation Areas and Other Legal Constraints

- 6.1 Trees may be subject to legal protection, by means of being covered by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) or by being located within a Conservation Area. It is an offence to cut down, uproot, top, lop, cause wilful damage or destruction of protected trees without the appropriate consent from the Local Authority. Fines for carrying out unauthorised works to protected trees can be considerable. The Local Authority must be given six-weeks' notice prior to the removal of trees within a Conservation Area with a stem diameter greater than 75mm (at a height of 1.5m above ground level). To carry out works on trees covered by a TPO, a formal application must be made to the Local Authority, which should be determined within an eight-week period.
- 6.2 According to Ribble Valley Borough Council's website, the site is within Chipping Conservation Area and trees T1 and T3, and groups G1 and G2 are evidently the subject of tree preservation order TPO no. 17 (1972) Chipping. The aforementioned legal restrictions, therefore, apply and appropriate consent must be sought for tree works that are not authorised as part of a detailed planning approval.
- 6.3 It should be noted that, subject to certain exemptions, a felling license must be obtained from the Forestry Commission for felling of trees that will equate to more than five cubic metres of timber in a calendar quarter. This does not, however, apply to tree removals that are authorised under a detailed planning approval.



- 6.4 Hedgerows meeting a particular series of criteria may be classed as 'important' and afforded legal protection under the Hedgerows Regulations 1997. It is an offence to remove an important hedgerow without appropriate consent from the Local Authority.
- 6.5 Birds, bats and certain other species are protected by the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. It is an offence to disturb wild birds within the nesting season (from March to August inclusive) and bats at any time of year, and this must be taken into account whilst carrying out tree works. The advice of a suitably qualified and licensed ecologist must be sought if the presence of birds, bats or other protected species is identified before or during tree works.

## References

British Standards Institute (2014) BS8545 Trees: from nursery to independence in the landscape - recommendations British Standards Institute (2012) BS5837 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - recommendations

British Standards Institute (2010) BS3998 Tree work - recommendations



## **BS5837 Tree Protection Fencing**



Reproduced from BS 5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations, BSI Standards Institution 2012.

## TREE PROTECTION AREA KEEP OUT!

TREES ENCLOSED BY THIS FENCE ARE PROTECTED BY PLANNING CONDITIONS AND ARE SUBJECTS OF A TREE\_PRESERVATION ORDER (TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990)

CONTRAVENTION OF TREE PRESERVATION ORDER MAY LEAD TO CRIMINAL PROSECUTION

THE FOLLOWING MUST BE OBSERVED BY ALL PERSONS:-

- THE PROTECTIVE FENCING MUST NOT BE REMOVED
- NO PERSON SHALL ENTER THE PROTECTED AREA
- NO MACHINE OR PLANT SHALL ENTER THE PROTECTED AREA
- NO MATERIALS SHALL BE STORED IN THE PROTECTED AREA
- NO SPOIL SHALL BE DEPOSITED IN THE PROTECTED AREA
- NO EXCAVATION SHALL OCCUR IN THE PROTECTED AREA

ANY INCURSION INTO THE PROTECTED AREA MUST BE WITH THE WRITTEN PERMISSION OF THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY

Tree protection fencing shall be installed as shown in the specification on the left and shall be labelled at regular intervals with all-weather notices, such as that shown above, stating "TREE PROTECTION AREA - KEEP OUT!"



# BS5837 Tree Survey Schedule

The trees surveyed have been assigned one of the following categories, in line with the guidance outlined in British Standard 5837 (2012) *Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations*: -

A Trees of high quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 40 years
 B Trees of moderate quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 20 years
 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
 U Insuitable for retention Those in such a condition that they cannot realistically be retained as living trees in the context of the current land use for longer than 10 years

T G	Tree Group	Age is classed as either: young; semi-mature, early-mature, mature or post-mature			
W H	Woodland Hedge	Life expectancy is classed as either: <10 years; 10+ years; 20+ years or 40+ years			
RPA	Root protection area	The radial RPA is calculated as twelve times the stem diameter and represents the area where protection of the tree roots during development works is essential to the tree's future health and survival			
		Where the RPA is not shown as circular on the tree survey plan, it may have been modified to take account of built structures such as buildings, roads or retaining walls			
#	Estimated values	Measurements may have been estimated where the tree is inaccessible, such as if it is located on neighbouring land or if the stem is heavily covered in ivy			
		Where trees have multiple stems, an average stem diameter may be given			
≤≥≈	$_{pprox}$ For groups of trees and hedges, measurements for the largest individual will be given or average measurements may be given where the				

individuals are approximately uniform

BS583	BS5837 Tree survey schedule											
Site Client	Talbot Hotel, Talbo Sunderland Peacod	t Street, ck & Ass	Chippi ociate:	ing, PR s Ltd.	3 2QE	Surv Cone	r <b>eyor</b> Jer <b>ditions</b> Ov	nnie Keighle ercast, gent	9 PhD MS₀ le breez	c MArborA Z <b>C</b>	Survey date Job no.	28 January 2022 LTC115
ID no.	Species Latin name	Stem diameter (mm)	Age	Height (m)#	Crown spread (m)	Crown clearance (m)	Structural condition Physiological condition	Life expectancy (years)	Radial RPA (m)	BS5837 category	General	observations
T1 Ac	Sycamore er pseudoplatanus	1110 1140	Mature	28	N 9.5 E 9.5 S 9.5 W 9.5	6	Good	20+	15	В	<ul> <li>Bifurcates near bastems</li> <li>Heavy ivy cover to partially cleared to and lower stem</li> <li>Significantly crown wounds to a diame which are fully occhave significant de</li> <li>Floodlight and wire stem of eastern leader son eastern leader another 100mm br</li> <li>Occasional minor occrown</li> </ul>	se into two codominant mid-crown has been allow inspection of base lifted in the past, leaving eter of 300mm, many of luded, but some of which ecay cavities e attached to north mid- ader secondary branch failure at a height of 12m with anch failure nearby deadwood throughout
T2	Japanese cherry Prunus serrulata	160	Mature	3	N 2.5 E 2.5 S 2.5 W 2.5	1.5	Good Good	10+	1.92	С	<ul><li>Weeping variety</li><li>Crown reduced in</li></ul>	the past



BS5	337 Tree survey sch	edule										
Site	Talbot Hotel, Talbot	Talbot Hotel, Talbot Street, Chipping, PR3 2QE			Surveyor Jennie Keighley PhD MSc MArborA			Survey date	28 January 2022			
Clien	t Sunderland Peacoc	k & Assoc	ciates Li	d.		Conditior	<b>is</b> Overcas	t, gentle bre	eeze		Job no.	LTC115
ID no.	Species Latin name	Stem diameter (mm)	Age	Height (m)#	Crown spread (m)	Crown clearance (m)	Structural condition Physiological condition	Life expectancy (years)	Radial RPA (m)	BS5837 category	Gene	ral observations
ТЗ	Sycamore Acer pseudoplatanus	850 800 400 #	Mature	26	N 9.5 E 9.5 S 9.5 W 9.5	4	Good	20+	14.8	A	<ul> <li>Located on ec prevents detail</li> <li>Trifurcates ne</li> <li>Moderately lig mid-crown inh base and sten</li> <li>Crown lifted in particulty capture</li> </ul>	lge of river bank, which led inspection ar base ht ivy cover growing to ibits detailed inspection of ns the past; wounds
G1	≈ 7no. common ash Fraxinus excelsior	≤ 300 #	Semi- mature to early- mature	≤ 16	N ≤ 4.5 E ≤ 4.5 S ≤ 4.5 W ≤ 4.5	≥ 1.25	Poor Poor	<10	≤ 3.6	U	<ul> <li>Poor quality tr group along ri</li> <li>Crowns exhibit advanced dection with the dieback disea <i>fraxineus</i>)</li> <li>Moderate to hupper crowns</li> </ul>	ees growing within linear ver bank iting signs of mid-stage to line due to terminal fungal pathogen ash se ( <i>Hymenoscyphus</i> eavy ivy cover growing to
G2	≈ 5no. sycamore Acer pseudoplatanus	≤ 300 300 300 300 #	Early- mature to mature	≤ 20	N ≤6 E ≤6 S ≤6 W ≤6	≥ 1.5	Good Good	20+	≤ 7.2	В	<ul> <li>Linear group (</li> <li>Most of trees</li> <li>Moderate to h upper crowns</li> </ul>	growing along river bank multi-stemmed from base eavy ivy cover growing to



BS583	7 Tree survey scl	hedule											
Site	Talbot Hotel, Talbo	ot Street,	Chipp	ing, PR	3 2QE	Surve	eyor	Jennie	e Keighley	<b>/</b> PhD MSc	MArborA	Survey date	28 January 2022
Client	Sunderland Peaco	ck & Ass	ociate	s Ltd.		Cond	litions	Overc	ast, gentl	e breez	e	Job no.	LTC115
ID no.	Species Latin name	Stem diameter (mm)	Age	Height (m)#	Crown spread (m)	Crown clearance (m)	Structur conditio Physiolog conditio	ral on e: gical on	Life xpectancy (years)	Radial RPA (m)	BS5837 category	General	lobservations
W1 Fi Cra	Common ash Hawthorn Holly European beech Common oak Common alder Blackthorn Bird cherry Field maple Hazel raxinus excelsior taegus monogyna Ilex aquifolium Fagus sylvatica Quercus robur Alnus glutinosa Prunus spinosa Prunus padus Acer campestre Corylus avellana	≤ 200	Young to mature	≤ 15	N ≤ 3 E ≤ 3 S ≤ 3 W ≤ 3	≥ 0	Poor t Good	to d	40+	≤ 2.4	С	<ul> <li>Located on neight not accessed to in</li> <li>Southern edge of young to semi-ma</li> <li>A significant comp exhibiting multiple infection with ash</li> </ul>	bouring land and therefore spect in detail a mixed, predominantly ture copse bonent is evidently ash symptoms of terminal dieback disease



N

W1 + 11126 + 1126 +	
+1124 +1123 +1124 +1124 +1125 +1126 +1125 +1126 +1126 +1126 +1126 +1126 +1127 +1126 +1127 +1126 +1127 +1126 +1127 +1128 +1127 +1128	

Tree Survey Schedule Summary					
ID No.	Species	Cat.			
T1	Sycamore	В			
T2	Cherry	С			
Т3	Sycamore	А			
G1	≈ 7no. ash	U			
G2	≈ 5no. sycamore	В			
W1	Various	С			

# **Tree Survey Plan**

#### BS5837 Tree retention categories:



#### Identification numbers:

T = individual tree G = group of trees H = hedge W = woodland

Site: Talbot Hotel Talbot Street Chipping PR3 2QE

Client: Sunderland Peacock & Associates

Date:	February 2022
Scale:	1:500 at A3
Drawing:	LTC115-TSP
Drawn by:	JK



Halton Mill, Mill Lane, Halton, LA2 6ND info@lakelandtreeconsultancy.co.uk 01524 874124 lakelandtreeconsultancy.co.uk



# **Tree Protection Plan**

BS5837 Tree retention categories:



Site: **Talbot Hotel Talbot Street** Chipping PR3 2QE

Client: Sunderland Peacock & Associates

Date:	March 2022
Scale:	1:500 at A3
Drawing:	LTC115-TPP
Drawn by:	JK



Halton Mill, Mill Lane, Halton, LA2 6ND info@lakelandtreeconsultancy.co.uk 01524 874124 lakelandtreeconsultancy.co.uk