

Contracting
Tree surgery
Site clearance
Health and safety
Veteran tree works
Local Authority



Rear of Eastcote Hall Farm, Barston Lane
Hampton-in-Arden, Solihull, West Midlands, B92 0HR
Tel: 01675 443400
Fax: 01675 443480
Email: enquiries@midlandforestry.co.uk
www.midlandforestry.co.uk

Consultancy
Planning
TPO
Safety
Subsidence
Management

**Arboricultural Advice in accordance with
BS 5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition & construction –
Recommendations**

**Tree Survey, Constraints Advice,
Arboricultural Impact Assessment,
Tree Retention & Removal Plan**

31 March 2025

Subject Property: Land north of Orton Road, Warton

Applicant: Richborough, Michael Ensor Caton
and Andrew Norman Caton

NORTH WARWICKSHIRE
BOROUGH COUNCIL

RECEIVED

01/04/2025

**PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION**

Table of Contents

	Page
1 INTRODUCTION	1
2 BS5837:2012 - THE ITERATIVE PROCESS	3
3 TREE CONSTRAINTS PLANNING	4
4 TREE SURVEY AND ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT	6

Appendices

1 Qualifications and experience	10
2 Tree schedule and explanatory notes	11
3 Tree Constraints Plan	21
4 Tree Retention & Removal Plan	23

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 **Brief:** We are instructed by Richborough, Michael Ensor Caton and Andrew Norman Caton to carry out an arboricultural survey of the site known as 'Land north of Orton Road, Warton' and to provide arboricultural advice in accordance with BS5837:2012 *Trees in relation to design, demolition & construction – Recommendations* (hereafter BS5837) in relation to the proposed development potential.
- 1.2 **Qualifications and experience:** I have based this report on our site observations and the provided information, and I have come to conclusions in the light of my experience. I have experience and qualifications in arboriculture and list the details in Appendix 1. Observations or comments on structural engineering and the law are made from an arboricultural perspective. Specialist professional advice should be sought to clarify such observations.
- 1.3 **The Site:** The site comprises of 6.37ha of agricultural land to the west of Warton The site is triangular in shape and is bounded by Orton Road to the south, Church Lane to the north west and residential development and an associated recreation ground to the east and north east. The tree population is located around the perimeter of the site.
- 1.4 **Description of development:** Outline planning application for the construction of up to 110 dwellings, with access, landscaping, sustainable drainage features, and associated infrastructure. All matters are reserved except for primary vehicular access from Church Road
- 1.5 **Scope of this report:** This report includes an assessment of the trees in relation to potential development in order to:
1. Record principle attributes (species, height, crown spread and stem diameter).
 2. Determine their quality and value.
 3. Identify their remaining contribution and retention grading.
 4. To show the collected data graphically on the Tree Constraints Plan.
 5. To identify the arboricultural impact of the proposal in terms the level of tree retention and removal.
 6. To graphically represent the tree retention and removal as judged against the Illustrative Framework Plan.
- 1.6 **Caveats:** This survey has been undertaken in compliance with BS5837:2012; it is not intended to be a tree safety survey. Any notes offered on structural integrity of trees are incidental, though where trees are considered to be in immediately hazardous condition (identified by red font in the Structural condition & Notes column, see below), our recommendations given for immediate intervention should be put in hand by the owner / site manager as soon as can be arranged.

Trees are dynamic living organisms capable of achieving considerable size and structural complexity. They are exposed to and can become damaged by the elements and by human activity, and have co-evolved with decay-causing organisms

that can degrade and sometimes destroy their structural integrity. Due to genetic characteristics and local micro environmental factors this integrity can be innately uncertain. The laws and forces of nature dictate a natural failure rate even among trees that are healthy and structurally sound. By their very nature, therefore, trees cannot be considered entirely hazard-free.

Tree surveys and / or tree inspections are, inherently, only a snapshot in time of the physiological and structural condition of the trees concerned.

Unless otherwise stated in our reporting material, all such surveys and inspections are undertaken from ground level and no internal inspections or tests have been undertaken. Any structural defects present might not be visible, for example being masked by vegetation, whether the tree's foliage, plants growing round the base of the tree, or climbing plants growing on the stem and into the crown.

Unless otherwise states, the survey data should be considered time-limited for planning purposes to a maximum of three years (absent revisions of BS5837, which render pre-existing data obsolete).

2 BS5837:2012 - THE ITERATIVE PROCESS

2.1 Trees and the planning system – BS5837 Annex B

2.1.1 Under the UK planning system, local authorities have a statutory duty to consider the protection and planting of trees when granting planning permission for proposed development. The potential effect of development on trees, whether statutorily protected (e.g. by a tree preservation order or by their inclusion within a conservation area) or not, is a material consideration that is taken into account in dealing with planning applications. Where trees are statutorily protected, it is important to contact the local planning authority and follow the appropriate procedures before undertaking any works that might affect the protected trees.

2.1.2 The nature and level of detail of information required to enable a local planning authority to properly consider the implications and effects of development proposals varies between stages and in relation to what is proposed. Table B.1 provides advice to both developers and local authorities on an appropriate amount of information. The term “minimum detail” is intended to reflect information that local authorities are expected to seek, whilst the term “additional information” identifies further details that might reasonably be sought, especially where any construction is proposed within the Root Protection Area (RPA)¹.

2.1.3 Table B.1 Delivery of tree-related information into the planning system

Stage of process	Minimum detail	Additional information
Pre-application	Tree survey	Tree retention/removal plan (draft)
Planning application	Tree survey (in the absence of pre-application discussions) Tree retention/removal plan (finalized) Retained trees and RPAs shown on proposed layout Strategic hard and soft landscape design, including species and location of new tree planting Arboricultural impact assessment	Existing and proposed finished levels Tree protection plan Arboricultural method statement – heads of terms Details for all special engineering within the RPA and other relevant construction details
Reserved matters/ planning conditions	Alignment of utility apparatus (including drainage), where outside the RPA or where installed using a trenchless method Dimensioned tree protection plan Arboricultural method statement – detailed Schedule of works to retained trees, e.g. access facilitation pruning Detailed hard and soft landscape design	Arboricultural site monitoring schedule Tree and landscape management plan Post-construction remedial works Landscape maintenance schedule

¹ Root Protection Area is 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

3 TREE CONSTRAINTS PLANNING – INFORMATIVES

3.1 **General:** The constraints imposed by trees are the extent of the RPA, the current and ultimate spread of the crown and species characteristics including evergreen or deciduous, density of foliage, and susceptibility to honeydew drip, branch drop fruit fall, etc.. Consideration of these in the planning of the site layout results in workable layouts likely to be considered acceptable through the planning process.

3.2 RPA: Definition and constraints

3.2.1 The area which should be protected during, and preserved intact after construction, in order to facilitate the healthy retention of trees concerned by safeguarding a reliable area of functioning tree roots.

3.2.2 For single stem trees this is typically based on a radial measure from the centre of the stem of the tree or trees, which is found by multiplying the stem diameter of the tree concerned by a factor of twelve. Trees with low crowns are measured at the narrowest point. For trees with up to five stems the theoretical diameter of the aggregate stem area of all stems is multiplied by twelve. Whilst for trees with more than five stems the theoretical radius of the aggregate mean diameter of all stems is multiplied by twelve.

3.2.3 Though normally plotted as a circle pre-existing site conditions can result in a polygonal RPA. Variations in the RPA must provide adequate protection for the root system and should take into account the following factors:

- a. the morphology and disposition of the roots, when influenced by past or existing site conditions (e.g. the presence of roads, structures and underground apparatus);
- b. topography and drainage;
- c. the soil type and structure;
- d. the likely tolerance of the tree to root disturbance or damage, based on factors such as species, age, condition and past management.

3.2.4 The means of protecting the RPA will include the installation of tree protection fencing prior to the start of work on site, the prohibition of various activities within the RPA (e.g. mechanical excavation, soil stripping, fire lighting, materials storage, lowering levels and creating excessive sealed surfacing), and may include the use of temporary ground protection and/or special engineering solutions where construction is proposed near to retention trees.

3.2.5 Conventional construction techniques are excluded from the RPA, however where construction in the RPA allows the retention of a good quality tree it can be completed with the successful retention of trees through the use of techniques that maintain the health and condition of the root system. Examples of these construction techniques are foundations using piles located to avoid major roots or cantilevered suspended slabs and vehicle and pedestrian access constructed over no-dig installation of a three-dimensional load bearing system. The input of an arboriculturist is essential to ensure the technique is appropriate to the site and an Arboricultural Method Statement must be provided detailing the implementation and timing of operations as part of the on-site tree protection regime. In all instances

of construction works within RPAs it should be demonstrated the trees can remain viable and additional areas protected to compensate for the areas under construction.

- 3.2.6 Construction of any type covering the existing open ground in RPAs is limited to an area no greater than 20% of that open ground.

3.3 Tree crown protection

- 3.3.1 This is the area above ground occupied by the crown of the tree including allowances for working space. It will also include allowance for future growth when appropriate. The extent of this area is determined by considering the existing and future crown spread of the tree(s). In certain circumstances this may be altered by an acceptable amount of pruning if considered appropriate by the arboricultural consultant and the Local Planning Authority (LPA).

- 3.3.2 The means of protecting the crown area is likely to include providing an adequate separation distance between retention trees and new structures where applicable, and may include pruning to allow access, where it is necessary and judged acceptable by the arboricultural consultant and the LPA. The tree protection fencing will provide the crown protection zone, though alternative and / or additional measures such as fixed and signed height limits can also be imposed.

3.4 Proximity of trees to structures

- 3.4.1 Tree characteristics vary considerably with species, these characteristics may include honeydew that may be damaging to surfaces, fruit that can cause slip hazards and leaves that block gulleys. Most of these issues can be eliminated at the detailed design stage to prevent post-development tree resentment.

4 TREE SURVEY AND ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

4.1 Tree survey methodology

4.1.1 A tree survey was carried out compliant with BS5837. The collected data is included as Appendix 2 and the pertinent information is shown graphically on the Tree Constraints Plan. (Appendix 3).

4.1.2 Trees are categorised in accordance with the cascade chart in Table 1 of BS5837:2012. The purpose of the categorisation process is to differentiate the quality and value of the existing tree stock so that informed decisions can be made on the retention or removal of trees.

4.1.3 The tree categories are summarised thus:

Category U: Trees unsuitable for retention that will be lost within the short term for reasons of physiology or poor structural integrity.

Category A: Trees of particularly high quality in arboricultural, landscape or cultural/conservation terms

Category B: Moderate quality trees downgraded from the high category because of significant defects, groups with a collective value through numbers rather than individual tree quality or trees with identifiable cultural or conservation values.

Category C: Trees with low value in arboricultural, landscape or cultural/conservation terms. Also includes young trees with a stem diameter of less than 150mm.

For trees in categories A – C subcategories 1, 2 & 3 are given to reflect arboricultural, landscape and cultural values respectively.

4.2 Findings of the survey

4.2.1 In the course of the tree survey we identified 9 individual trees, 3 tree groups, and 4 hedgerows. Of these it was found that they fell into the following quality and value grades:

QV Cat.	Description	No. of trees	%	No of tree groups	%	No. of hedges	%
U	Trees <u>unsuitable</u> for retention	1	11	0	0	1	25
A	Trees of particularly <u>high</u> quality	6	67	0	0	0	0
B	Trees of <u>moderate</u> quality	1	11	3	100	0	0
C	Trees of <u>low</u> quality	1	11	0	0	3	75
		9	100	3	100	4	100

4.3 Statutory Legal Protection

- 4.3.2 We carried out a search using the North Warwickshire Borough Council website on the 30th March 2025. Unfortunately the council do not provide facilities online to check for the presence of tree preservation orders or conservation areas. Checks can be made directly to the council, subject to further instruction.

4.7 Veteran Trees

- 4.7.1 The National Planning Policy Framework states at section 193 c) that *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*
- 4.7.2 There are no ancient or veteran trees, and no ancient woodland on, or adjacent to, the site.

4.5 Arboricultural Impact Assessment

- 4.5.1 In critically grading the trees to make informed decisions on the retention and removal decisions the emphasis is on the loss of lower quality trees to enable the preferential retention of better-quality trees.
- 4.5.2 The full extent of the arboricultural constraints are presented on the Tree Constraints Plan at Appendix 3. We have subsequently been provided with the Illustrative Framework Plan (ref. no. RG-M-Ai02 Rev M) and have overlaid this onto the Tree Constraints Plan to form the Tree Retention and Removal Plan (Appendix 4).
- 4.5.3 Trees with a retention span of less than 10 years for reasons connected with their physiological or structural condition are not a consideration in the planning process. These trees are graded Category U in the BS 5837 categorization method.
- 4.5.4 There is one individual tree – T7 – that is unsuitable for long-term retention. The tree is a multiple stem sycamore and two of the stems are dead from the fungal pathogen *Cryptostroma corticale*. The third stem will inevitably succumb to the disorder. This tree is shown for removal on the Tree Retention & Removal Plan.
- 4.5.5 Low quality trees are graded Category C and can generally be considered for removal to facilitate development, though consideration *may* need to be given to the mitigation for losses in the landscaping scheme.
- 4.5.6 Trees in higher categories that are considered to impose such a constraint on development that their retention would be disproportionate to their existing value are also sometimes identified for removal. This only rarely applies to Category A trees, being those of ‘high quality and value’, but can more defensibly apply to Category B trees, i.e. those of ‘moderate quality and value’. The importance of

mitigation for losses in the landscaping scheme increases substantially as the quality of trees to be removed increases.

- 4.5.7 No Category A, B or C trees will be removed to facilitate development.
- 4.5.8 The proposed access from Church Road will result in the loss of 15m of the low quality and declining hedgerow H2.
- 4.5.9 The Illustrative Framework Plan shows extensive opportunities for planting around the site, plus restoration works to the declining hedgerows on the site boundaries with Orton Road and Church Road.

4.6 Protection of Retention Trees

- 4.6.1 This report details those trees where the relationship between the proposal and the tree position, and extent of root protection area combine to facilitate the retention of the trees. However, construction operations must be managed to ensure the root protection areas are not encroached upon. Even the passage of plant or the storage of material can be damaging to the extent of resulting in tree death.
- 4.6.2 The review of the proposals undertaken does not identify material risks to retained trees and, as such, the level and detail of proposed tree retention is in fact deliverable (assuming tree protection is applied per current best practice)
- 4.6.3 A tree protection plan should be prepared detailing the means of protection for the retained trees within the application site and those immediately adjacent to the site that maybe impacted by site works. This should be addressed as a condition attached to the planning consent.

4.7 Conclusion

- 4.7.1 We consider the site can be developed with no arboricultural impacts. The single tree that is identified for removal will inevitably die and fall in a short time frame irrespective of whether the site is developed. and without the loss of any high or moderate quality trees.
- 4.7.2 Localised removal of 15m of the low quality hedgerow H2 will be required to facilitate site access from Church Road.
- 4.7.3 There is likely to be scope for planting of new trees within any development, and the restoration of the currently low-quality hedgerows. An appropriate planning condition should be anticipated, and indeed welcomed, for a landscaping scheme that encourages new tree planting and the hedgerow restoration. Both of these actions would ensure the development results in a net gain in both quality and quantity of tree and hedgerows on the site.

This completes my advice to date.



Chris Shortis Dip. Arb. (RFS), M. Arbor A., Cert MHRA

Appendix 1

Brief qualifications and experience of Chris Shortis

1. Qualifications

- Royal Forestry Society Professional Diploma in Arboriculture.
- Arboriculture Association Technician Certificate (Credit).
- National Certificate in Arboriculture and Forestry (Double Distinction).
- Professional Tree Inspection
- Licensed user of *Quantified Tree Risk Assessment*.
- Post-graduate Certificate *Multi Hazard Risk Assessment* (University of Twente)

2. Practical experience:

- Bournville Landscapes and Tree Care Ltd: Arborist.
- Midland Forestry Ltd: Arboriculturalist.
- Midland Forestry Ltd: Arboricultural Consultant
- Midland Forestry Ltd: Associate Director

3. Continuing professional development:

Midland Forestry is committed to continuing professional development to ensure all staff continue to learn and develop throughout their careers, so they keep their skills and knowledge up to date and are able to work safely, legally and effectively.

Sample of the seminars and conferences attended:

- International Society of Arboriculture conference 'Defensible Tree Management Systems'
- Practitioners guide to Visual Tree Assessment
- Arboriculture Association conference 'New Horizons in Arboriculture'
- Visual Tree Assessment, Tree Safety Diagnosis and Failure Analysis seminar by Dr. Claus Mattheck
- Preparing for and giving evidence at Public Local Inquiries
- 40th National Arboriculture Conference
- Fungal Decay Process & Applied Engineering
- The Institute of Chartered Foresters' conference Trees, People & the Built Environment
- Designing with Trees
- Capital Asset Value for Amenity Trees
- Dynamic Structural Analysis of Trees Subject to Wind Loading & the Biomechanical Implications

4. Membership of professional bodies:

- Professional Member of the Arboriculture Association.
- Member of the Royal Forestry Society.

APPENDIX 2 - Tree Survey Schedules

Explanatory Notes for Individual Trees

- **ID no.:** Trees are recorded using a site-specific unique identification number. This identification number is used for all references throughout the report and associated plans
- **Species:** The species identification is based on visual observations and the common English name of what the tree appeared to be is listed. In some instances, it may be difficult to quickly and accurately identify a particular tree without further detailed investigations. Where there is some doubt of the precise species of tree, it is indicated it with a '?' after the name in order to avoid delay in the production of the report.
- **Estimated dimensions:** Estimated dimensions are shown in *italics*.
- **Height:** Height is to the nearest metre.
- **Stem diameter(s):** This is measured at 1.5m above ground level and recorded in millimetres. Trees with low crowns are measured just above the root flare. For trees with multiple stems see 3.2.2 in main text.
- **NSWE:** The branch spread is measured in metres at the four cardinal points of the compass to derive an accurate representation of the crown.
- **Ht 1st branch:** Height above ground in metres of attachment point of first significant branch (cardinal point may be given indicating direction of lowest branch).
- **Crown Clearance:** Height of the crown above ground level at the lowest point.
- **Life Stage:** Assessed as Young, Semi-Mature, Early-Mature, Mature, Over Mature and Veteran.
- **Phys. condition:** An assessment of the physiological condition (i.e. health/ vitality) status of the tree summarised into:
 - Good: Generally in healthy condition
 - Fair: Condition satisfactory though below mean species performance
 - Poor: Tree in decline
 - Dead: Self-explanatory
- **Structural condition & Notes:** Notes on the structural integrity of the tree based on visual tree assessment, including damage,

decay fungi, pests, etc. as appropriate, plus other pertinent observations

- **Management recommendations:** Recommendations for intervention (e.g. tree surgery, felling, etc) prior to any development. Hazardous trees are highlighted within the survey schedule.
- **Ret. Span:** An estimate of the remaining contribution span that the tree or group of trees is expected to have, based on species, condition and context. The following longevity bands are used, categorised accordingly:
 - <10 Tree is dead, dying, has a severe structural defect, or will become exposed following inevitable loss of companion shelter. Possibly requires sanitation felling Unsuitable for retention
 - 10+ Short-term longevity only: replacement planting generally appropriate
 - 20+ Mid-term longevity
 - 40+ Good longevity
- **QV Grade:** Quality & Value grade classification according to BS5837
 - U - Unsuitable for retention
 - A - High retention priority
 - B - Moderate retention priority
 - C - Low retention priority
 - +subcategories 1, 2 & 3 reflecting arboricultural, landscape and cultural values respectively.
- **Proposal:** Tree retention / removal balance as shown on the Tree Retention & Removal Plan
 - RET - Trees to be retained
 - REM - Trees to be removed to facilitate development
 - U - Trees identified to be unsuitable for retention

Tree Survey Data for Individual Trees

ID No.	Species	Ht.	Dia. (mm)	N	S	W	E	Ht. 1 st br.	Cr. Clr.	Life Stage	Phys. Cond	Structural condition & Notes	Management recommendations	Ret. Span	QV Grade	Proposal
1	Pedunculate oak	15.5	710	8.0	8.0	8.8	9.8	0 E	5	M	G	Tree on the adjacent property and overhanging the site. The stem is partially obscured by ivy to 7m but there are no apparent significant defects. There is a single low branch to the east.	No action required at time of survey	40+	A1	RET
2	Pedunculate oak	7	290	2.8	2.9	2.8	4.6	2	3	Y	G	No apparent significant defects	No action required at time of survey	40+	A1	RET
3	Pedunculate oak	10	800	3.4	8.0	9.4	8.0	2	3.5	M	F	Prolific ivy on the stem and through the crown limiting the inspection. Tree appears to be outside the site boundary and on Highways land. Localised pruning of branches from power cables and the road.	Sever and remove the ivy to facilitate a confirmatory inspection	40+	A1	RET
4	Pedunculate oak	7	300	3	5	3	4	3	4	Y	F	Growing among dense holly preventing access for inspection, the crown is slightly asymmetrical from competition for light but there are no apparent significant defects	No action required at time of survey	40+	B1	RET
5	Pedunculate oak	14	670	6.4	7.9	8.7	7	3	5	M	G	Tree appears to be on Highways land with a very minor overhang of the site.	No action required at time of survey	40+	A1	RET

ID No.	Species	Ht.	Dia. (mm)	N	S	W	E	Ht. 1 st br.	Cr. Clr.	Life Stage	Phys. Cond	Structural condition & Notes	Management recommendations	Ret. Span	QV Grade	Proposal
6	Pedunculate oak	13	2x400	5.1	6.7	7.3	6.7	1.8	4	M	G	Tree appears to be on Highways land and overhangs the site. Prolific ivy on the stem and through the crown.	No action required at time of survey	40+	A1	RET
7	Sycamore	12	3x250	6.1	1.6	4.4	4.0	2	3	M	P	Three stems from ground level, two of which are dead from Cryptostroma corticale.	Remove for reasons of sound arboricultural management	<10	U	U
8	Common lime	14	760	5.2	6.4	7.1	2.3	2	4	M	F	Epicormic growth at the base and on the stem. Crown is asymmetrical from competition for light and forms a single canopy with the adjacent tree. Localised pruning of a single low branch over the road	No action required at time of survey	40+	A1	RET
9	Horse chestnut	12	740	5.2	4.4	3.7	8.9	4	3	M	F	Open cavity at the base with further investigations revealing moderate decay. Crown is asymmetrical from competition for light and forms a joint canopy with the adjacent tree.	No action required at time of survey	10+	C1	RET

Explanatory Notes for Tree groups

- **ID no.:** Unique tree group reference number.
- **Species:** The species identification is based on visual observations and the common English name of what the tree appeared to be is listed. The species listed represent the main components and there may be other minor species not listed.
- **Estimated dimensions:** Estimated dimensions are marked *.
- **Count:** Number of trees recorded within groups. Accurate count for less than 20 trees, estimated number for 20+ trees.
- **Height:** Height is to the nearest metre.
- **Stem diameter(s):** Stem diameter at 1.5m above ground level for 80 percentile member of TG. Trees with larger diameters are identified on the plan at Appendix 3.
- **MRCS:** An estimated mean radial crown spread for trees at the 80 percentile size.
- **Ht 1st branch:** Height above ground in metres of attachment point of first significant branch (cardinal point may be given indicating direction of lowest branch).
- **Crown Clearance:** Height of the crown above ground level at the lowest point.
- **Life Stage:** Assessed as Young, Semi-Mature, Early Mature, Mature, Over Mature and Veteran.
- **Phys. condition:** An assessment of the physiological condition (i.e. health/ vitality) status of the tree summarised into:
 - Good: Generally in healthy condition
 - Fair: Condition satisfactory though below mean species performance
 - Poor: Tree in decline
 - Dead: Self-explanatory
- **Structural condition & Notes:** Notes on the structural integrity of the tree based on visual tree assessment, including damage, decay fungi, pests, etc. as appropriate, plus other pertinent observations
- **Management recommendations:** Recommendations for intervention (e.g. tree surgery, felling, etc) prior to any development. Immediately hazardous trees will be notified to the client separately.
- **Ret. Span:** An estimate of the remaining contribution span that the tree or group of trees is expected to have, based on species,

condition and context. The following longevity bands are used, categorised accordingly:

- <10 Tree is dead, dying, has a severe structural defect, or will become exposed following inevitable loss of companion shelter. Possibly requires sanitation felling Unsuitable for retention
- 10+ Short-term longevity only: replacement planting generally appropriate
- 20+ Mid-term longevity
- 40+ Good longevity

- **QV Grade:** Quality & Value grade classification according to BS5837:2012
 - U** - Unsuitable for retention
 - A** - High retention priority
 - B** - Moderate retention priority
 - C** - Low retention priority
 - +subcategories 2 & 3 reflecting arboricultural, landscape and cultural values respectively.
- **Proposal:** Tree group retention / removal balance as shown on the Tree Retention & Removal Plan
 - **RET** - Tree groups to be retained
 - **PRET** – Tree groups to be partially retained
 - **REM** - Tree groups to be removed to facilitate development
 - **U** - Tree groups identified to be unsuitable for retention

Tree Survey Data for Tree Groups

ID No.	Count	Species	Ht.	Dia. (mm)	MCRS	Ht. 1 st br.	Cr. Clr.	Life Stage	Phys. Cond	Structural condition & Notes	Management recommendations	Ret. Span	QV Grade	Proposal
--------	-------	---------	-----	-----------	------	-------------------------	----------	------------	------------	------------------------------	----------------------------	-----------	----------	----------

ID No.	Count	Species	Ht.	Dia. (mm)	MCRS	Ht. 1 st br.	Cr. Clr.	Life Stage	Phys. Cond	Structural condition & Notes	Management recommendations	Ret. Span	QV Grade	Proposal
G1	15	Goat willow	4	350	3	0	0	EM	G	Dense area of Multiple stem trees in and around a pond.	No action required at time of survey	20+	B3	RET
G2	12	Aspen	15	450	5	4	5	M	G	Linear group of trees forming a continuous crown. Ivy partially obscuring the stems to 4m. Inspection limited by lack of safe access due to the proximity of the road. First tree from the east has woodpecker holes at 3.5 and 4m above ground level, third tree from the east has extensive basal decay.	ADVISORY - Remove the two trees noted due to the of failure into the road.	20+	B2	RET
G 3	3	Sycamore	14	820	7	1	4	M	G	Close-set group of trees forming a joint canopy. The end trees have multiple stems from ground level. Ivy partially obscuring the stems and branches.	No action required at time of survey	20+	B2	RET

Explanatory Notes for Hedges

- **ID no.:** Unique hedge reference number.
- **Species:** The species identification is based on visual observations and the common English name of what the trees appear to be is listed. The species listed represent the main components and there may be other minor species not listed. Unless the composition of species is even an estimate of the percentages of each species is given.
- **Estimated dimensions:** Estimated dimensions are marked *.
- **Height:** Height is to the nearest metre.
- **Mean diameter:** Stem diameter, generally at ground level, for 80-percentile member of the hedge.
- **Mean width:** An estimated mean width for each hedge.
- **Life Stage:** Assessed as Young, Semi-Mature, Early Mature, Mature & Over Mature.
- **Phys. condition:** An assessment of the physiological condition (i.e. health/ vitality) status of the hedge summarised into:
 - Good: Generally in healthy condition
 - Fair: Condition satisfactory though below mean species performance
 - Poor: Tree in decline
 - Dead: Self-explanatory
- **Structural condition & Notes:** Notes on the structural integrity of the hedge based on visual tree assessment, including damage, decay fungi, pests, etc as appropriate, plus other pertinent observations
- **Management recommendations:** Recommendations for intervention (e.g. Trimming, laying, felling, etc) prior to any development.
- **Ret. Span:** An estimate of the remaining contribution span that the hedge is expected to have, based on species, condition and context. The following longevity bands are used, categorized accordingly:
 - <10 Tree is dead, dying, has a severe structural defect, or will become exposed following inevitable loss of companion shelter. Possibly requires sanitation felling. Unsuitable for retention
 - 10+ Short-term longevity only: replacement planting generally appropriate
 - 20+ Mid-term longevity

40+ Good longevity

- **QV Grade:** Quality & Value grade classification according to BS5837: 2012

U - Unsuitable for retention

A - High retention priority

B - Moderate retention priority

C - Low retention priority

+subcategories 2 & 3 reflecting arboricultural, landscape and cultural values respectively.

- **Proposal:** Hedgerow retention / removal balance as shown on the Tree Retention & Removal Plan
 - **RET** - Hedgerows to be retained
 - **PRET** – Hedgerows to be partially retained
 - **REM** - Hedgerows to be removed to facilitate development
 - **U** - Hedgerows identified to be unsuitable for retention

Tree Survey Data for Hedges

ID. No.	Species	Ht.	Mean Dia.	Mean radius	Life Stage	Phys. Cond.	Structural condition & Notes	Management recommendations	Ret. Span	QV Grade	Proposal
H1	Hawthorn, holly, yew, pedunculate oak & elm	5	300	3	OM	P	Grown out hedgerow with prolific ivy on many members. Areas of prolific brambles, particularly where hedgerow species are absent. Many members are showing significant crown decline and dieback. Areas of elm suckers.	No action required at time of survey	10+	C2	RET

ID. No.	Species	Ht.	Mean Dia.	Mean radius	Life Stage	Phys. Cond.	Structural condition & Notes	Management recommendations	Ret. Span	QV Grade	Proposal
H2	Pedunculate oak, elm, hawthorn & holly	6	300	3.5	OM	P	Grown out hedgerow with multiple gaps developing, some of which are becoming colonised by either elm regeneration or brambles. Multiple standing dead and fallen elms.	Remove approximately 15m to facilitate the construction of the site access.	10+	C2	PRET
H 3	Elm	3	100	1.5	Y	F	Short hedgerow comprising entirely of elm regeneration, and lacking in any management.	No action required at time of survey	<10	U	RET
H 4	Hawthorn, elder, elm, holly, ash & sycamore	4	200	2	M	F	Hawthorn dominant hedgerow with no evidence of any recent management. Prolific ivy on many members and brambles are becoming prolific in places. Occasional small gaps are developing.	No action required at time of survey	10+	C2	RET

APPENDIX 3

TREE CONSTRAINTS PLAN.

Note this plan consists of one sheet and is scaled for printing at A1. It is intended to be read in colour.



Clients: Richborough, Michael Ensor Caton and Andrew Norman Caton
Instruction: Land north of Orton Road, Warton
Drawing Title: Tree Survey Constraints Plan
DWG No.: MF.2725.01B
Revision date: 20.03.25
Scale: 1:1000 @ A1

Key

Quality and Value Categories
(Shown on stem position / adjacent to ID number)

Category U	Unsuitable	Red circle
Category A	High	Green circle
Category B	Moderate	Blue circle
Category C	Low	Grey circle

NOTE: Tree/group numbers marked with an * have approximate locations.

- Tree & Group crown outlines**
- Hedgerows**
- Root protection area (RPA)**
calculated in accordance with BS5837 Table 2
- Tree outside the Redline Boundary and unaffected by works within it**

Chris Shortis Dip. Arb. (RFS) M. Arbor A.
Midland Forestry Ltd
Eastcote Hall Farm
Barston Lane
Hampton-in-Arden
Solihull
B92 0HR
Tel. 01675 443 400
e-mail: office@midlandforestry.co.uk

APPENDIX 4

TREE RETENTION & REMOVAL PLAN.

Note this plan consists of one sheet and is scaled for printing at A1. It is intended to be read in colour.





midland
forestry

Clients: Richborough, Michael Ensor Caton and Andrew Norman Caton

Instruction: Land north of Orton Road, Warton

Drawing Title: Tree Retention & Removal Plan

DWG No.: ME.2725.02

Revision date: 31.03.25

Scale: 1:1000 @ A1

Key

Quality and Value Categories
(Shown on stem position / adjacent to ID number)

Category U	Unsuitable	Red dot
Category A	High	Green dot
Category B	Moderate	Blue dot
Category C	Low	Grey dot

NOTE: Tree/group numbers marked with an * have approximate locations.

Tree & Group crown outlines (Green line)

Trees Unsuitable for retention (Red dashed line)

Hedgerows (Green wavy line)

Hedgerow to be removed to facilitate development (Blue wavy line)

Root protection area (RPA)
calculated in accordance with BS5837 Table 2 (Pink dashed line)

Indicative shading arc (Hatched area)

Tree outside the Redline Boundary and unaffected by works within it (Green circle with dot)

Indicative RPA to demonstrate above trees are unaffected. (Blue dashed line)

Chris Shortis Dip. Arb. (RFS) M. Arbor A.
Midland Forestry Ltd
Eastcote Hall Farm
Barston Lane
Hampton-in-Arden
Solihull
B92 0HR
Tel. 01675 443 400
e-mail: office@midlandforestry.co.uk