



9-May-25

BS5837 2012 Arboricultural Implications Assessment



Site:

Homelands
Penhow
Caldicot

Contents

Page

- 3. Instruction
- 4. Site location & description
- 5. Definitions
- 6. Tree data AIA – assessor comments in relation to tree report and site visit carried out 30th April 2025.
- 7. Site plan

Instruction

Following an email instruction from the client, I have been commissioned to provide a preliminary document to highlight the potential conflict with trees on site – an arboricultural implications assessment or AIA.

I hold the ABC Awards Technical Certification in Arboriculture (AA Tech Cert) and am familiar and experienced with the British Standard 5837 2012 and working with it on development sites. I have over 15 year's practical experience surrounding the planning process and trees during my work as an arboricultural consultant and contractor. My aim is to bring my knowledge and experiences into the report which then aims to help the planning process.

By utilising the guidelines of BS 5837 2012, data is taken of tree features, such as specie, height, stem diameter measured at 1.5m above ground level (to give an even sized stem taper) for single stemmed trees or an average stem diameter for multi stemmed trees. Further data is collected to assess the trees suitability for the location which uses physiological and structural assessments to give a final opinion of the trees overall condition. Further considerations are given to the trees such as rooting area and any required arboricultural management work prior to development.

Experience in working with trees is vital when providing information in relation to a BS5837 Report. BS5837 2012 recommends the use of an arboriculturalist in order to understand the trees needs on site and the trees current and future environment. In this case the arboriculturalist is James Pinder. The arboriculturalist needs to be able work out the extent of root mass occupying the area and how placing the footprint of a building near it may change the dynamics of the tree's surroundings. Once a building is placed next to trees it is also important to understand the long-term effects of aerodynamic changes on trees retained and any rain shadow created by the new structure may adjust water availability to trees. Should the development be seen to have a detrimental or significant nature to the trees then changes may be required to the buildings architecture or size to ensure minimal impact on a tree. In certain case's the tree or trees may need to be removed.

By using the data gathered to compile the report and assessing the tree's needs, an opinion can then be made on it is best to protect the trees from the development process. Root protection areas are calculated and these need to be adhered to when installing a protection at the extremity of the RPA. Under no circumstances should an RPA be lessened unless a specific method and reason is being used. All guidance contained within this report should be followed to ensure that the whole or part of the proposed development is not jeopardised.

Site Location/descriptions



- Site access from A48 by car.
- The proposed site area is a lapsed management field area surrounded by hedges.
- Proposed location is in a quiet rural location.
- The proposed site only is owned by my client. Homelands and the trees within it are in separate ownership.
- Trees on and adjacent land to the proposed.
- No tree protection currently in place.
- New planting proposed on site.

Definitions

BS 5837 2012 (Trees in relation to construction) was revised in 2012 and now supersedes the previous 1991 & 2005 editions.

Within the newer BS many definitions are given so the professional arboriculturist's are able to give an indication to planners and architects so that a common understanding of trees and how building new structures may affect the health and support of trees can be given.

Arboriculturist

A person who through relevant training, qualifications and experience in the arboricultural world is able to form an opinion on how trees may be affected through development processes.

Competent person

A person, who has had training and experience relevant to the matter in hand and is able to recognize whether it is safe to proceed with a specific site process.

Structure

Man-made object, such as a building, carriageway, path, wall, services and built or excavated earthworks.

Root protection area (RPA)

A site layout design tool that enables a pictorial representation of trees required rooting area. This area must be protected to ensure the survival of trees.

Tree constraints plan (TCP)

A clear plan diagram showing tree locations, crown spreads and rooting areas. This allows the arboriculturist to demonstrate areas where trees will affect a proposal by tree volume, height or shade.

Construction exclusion zone (CEZ)

An area clearly marked both on site and on a site plan. This area must have no construction operations carried out within.

Tree protection plan (TPP)

A scale drawing that shows tree locations, rooting areas and fencing locations on site.

Arboricultural implications assessment (AIA)

An assessment made by the arborist to identify, evaluate and possibly mitigate affects of construction process on trees.

Arboricultural method statement (AMS)

A written or toolbox talk applied method of ensuring the contractor (construction) can implement the design adjacent to existing trees.

Services

Above or below ground pipe work, wire or ducting construction that could affect trees crowns or their roots or rooting areas.

Special engineering

Designing of a structure with the physiological requirements of trees as the primary concern.

Tree AIA

Tree schedule from Macklay Davies tree report for Celtic Property carried out January 2022.
Note – the AIA applies to only the northern section field area and not Homelands itself. The building shown within the plan used in the tree report and this AIA is not happening.

1. T1. Separate ownership and not affected by proposal.
2. T2&T3 require removal due to Dead, Dying or Dangerous exemption before site occupation.
3. T7 is dead and in separate ownership and not affected by the proposal.
4. G1-T16 not affected by the proposal.
5. Entrance at north end of G2 to the proposal area has exposed some minor rooting structures within the remaining bank of retained trees due to excavation work for the access into the site. Mitigation planting of 15 native broadleaf whips required on access in flare bank top to restore hedge density.
6. H3 and H4 not affected by proposal but should utilise a TPP as per tree report (page 14, pink line with circles) along track/hedge edge and remove any existing soil and rubble back from new track edge and hedge bottom. The verge by the hedge should be a grassed 1-1.5m wide sward only and construction activity excluded for this area by TPP fencing.
7. H1 partially removed. Potential to retain remaining east section if access has been altered to the north end of H2? Low value section regardless. Minimal overall loss if removed.
8. Overall impact to perimeter trees around the proposal area is low. Simple tree protection measures as shown on the tree report TPP (page 14) will ensure boundary planting within the proposal area stays intact.
9. Site is currently in use for storage meaning that the TPP needs to be put in place asap.

Plan – from Mackley Davies Tree report Jan 22 – proposed building to be omitted

