arbtech

Arboricultural Survey to BS5837:2012

Sally Tampakis

4 Upavon Drive,
Reading,
Berkshire,
RG1 6LP

28 March 2025

Jim Green MArborA

Table of Contents

If this report has been released electronically the appendices referred to herein can be found in the annexed zip folder/s as .pdf files. If this report has been released in hard copy the appendices will be bound into the back of this report. Plans are annexed separately as A0, A1, A2 or A3 as appropriate.

1. Introduction 2
2. Survey 2
3. BS5837:2012 Scope 6
4. Methodology 6
5. Definitions 8
6. Limitations 9
7. Appendices 10
   Appendix 1: Table 1 Cascade chart for tree quality assessment 11
   Appendix 2: Schedule of Trees 13
   Appendix 3: Tree Constraints Plan 17
8. Document Production Record 19

1. Introduction

Arbtech Consulting Limited (Arbtech) received written instruction on 14th March 2025 from Sally Tampakis to attend 4 Upavon Drive, Reading, Berkshire, RG1 6LP; grid reference, SU705724 (site) to undertake an arboricultural survey to BS5837:2012 guidance to assess trees, hedges and major shrub groups growing on and within influencing distance of the site and to produce a Schedule of trees and a Tree Constraints Plan.

I am Jim Green, an arboricultural consultant at Arbtech Consulting Ltd. I undertook the tree survey on 24th March 2025 and subsequently have produced this summary of my findings.

I have over thirty years of industry experience, hold the LANTRA Professional Tree Inspection certificate and am a Professional Member of the Arboricultural Association.

The advice below and appended is underwritten by our Professional Indemnity insurance for the business practice of Arboricultural Consultancy in the sum of one million Pounds Sterling in each and every claim.

Table 1: Documents referred to.

Document	Reference No.
Survey base drawing	3346
LPA pre-app comments	N/A
British Standard 5837:2012	"BS5837"
Tree Survey Schedule	Arbtech TS 01
Tree Constraints Plan	Arbtech TCP 01

2. Survey

Survey: An arboricultural survey to BS5837 of all trees within impacting distance of the site was undertaken by Jim Green on 24th March 2025.

During the survey I categorised the trees using "Table 1 – Cascade chart for tree quality assessment" of the BS5837:2012 (see Appendix 1).

A total of 8No. individual trees, 2No. groups of trees and 1No. hedge were surveyed. Details for each of the trees surveyed are provided in the Schedule of Trees (see Appendix 2).

Multiple other small trees and shrubs occupy the site, none of which meet the minimum diameter requirements to be considered for this survey.

Table 2: Documents upon which this tree survey has been based.

Document	Originator	Reference Number	Title
Topo	DPS Surveys Ltd	3346	Topographic Survey

Limitations: The survey was made at ground level using visual observation only. Detailed examinations, such as climbing inspections and advanced decay detection equipment were not employed, though may form part of the survey's management recommendations. Measurements were taken using specialist tapes, laser, and GPS devices. Where this was not possible, measurements are estimated.

Scope: Pre-development tree surveys make arboricultural management recommendations based exclusively upon the individual tree or group of trees condition relative to their present context (*i.e. not in relation to the proposed development*).

Legal Status: No statutory protection check has been performed. BS5837 does not draw any distinction between trees subject to statutory protection, such as a Tree Preservation Order ("TPO"), and those trees without. This is principally because a detailed planning consent overrides any TPO protection. Consequently, we do not seek to offer any comparison between or infer any difference in the quality or importance of TPO trees and other trees.

* For more information on the surveyed trees please see Arbtech Consulting Ltd, Tree Survey Schedule (Appendix 1), Tree Survey Report and Tree Constraints Plan.

Site description

The site sits in a residential setting and exhibits a general level decline from north to south of approximately 1:8.

The trees surveyed are to the periphery and interspersed within the site along with a number of off-site trees.



Figure 1: OS Map (Bing Maps)

Figure 2: Aerial Image of site with ***approximate*** red line boundary (Google Earth)

Proposed scheme

The proposal is to construct a one-storey, ground floor extension to the rear.



Figure 3: Proposed scheme, drawing number PN2501-01 Rev.P2 (HEC Consultants Ltd)

This content is for educational and informative purposes; parts of it are reproduced with the kind permission of BSI Global.

3. BS5837:2012 Scope

This standard recognises that there can be problems for development close to existing trees which are to be retained, and of planting trees close to existing structures. This standard sets out to assist those concerned with trees, in relation to construction, to form balanced judgements. It does not set out to put arguments for or against development, or for the removal or retention of trees. Where development, including demolition, is to occur, the standard provides guidance on how to decide which trees are appropriate for retention, on the means of protecting these trees during development, including demolition and construction work, and on the means of incorporating trees into the developed landscape.

4. Methodology

The methodology used to assess the trees was the British Standard 5837:2012 'Trees in Relation to Construction' tree survey method. The aim of the survey is to establish which trees are moderate and good quality; suitable for retention and justifying protection. And which trees are low or poor quality; either undesirable or unsuitable to retain and protect.

The tree survey includes all trees included in the land survey red line boundary plan, as well as any that may have been missed, and it should categorize trees or groups of trees, including woodlands for their quality and value within the existing context, in a transparent, understandable, and systematic way. Where the arboriculturist has deemed it appropriate, the trees have been tagged with small metal or plastic tags, placed as high as is convenient on the stem of each tree.

Whilst master plan proposals for the development of the site might be available, the trees have been surveyed without taking these into consideration. All detailed design work on site layout should take into consideration the results of the tree survey (and the TCP).

Trees forming groups and areas of woodland (including orchards, wood pasture and historic parkland) are identified and considered as groups where the arboriculturist has determined that this is appropriate, particularly where they contain a variety of species and age classes that could aid long-term management. It is often expedient to assess the quality and value of such groups of trees as a whole, rather than as individuals. However, an assessment of individuals within any group has been undertaken if they are open-grown or if there is a need to differentiate between them.

The quality and value of each tree or group of trees has been recorded by allocating it to one of the four categories: A, B, C, or U (highest to lowest quality respectively). The categories are differentiated on the tree survey plan by colour, or by suffixing the category adjacent to the tree identification number on the TCP.

The survey schedule lists all the trees or groups of trees. The following information is also provided:

a) reference number (to be recorded on the tree survey plan);
b) species (common or scientific names);
c) height in meters (m);
d) stem diameter in millimetres (mm) at 1.5m above adjacent ground level or immediately above the root flare for multi-stemmed trees;
e) branch spread in metres taken at the four cardinal compass points;
f) height of crown clearance above adjacent ground level in metres (m);
g) age class (newly planted, young, semi-mature, early mature, mature, over mature);
h) physiological condition (e.g. good, fair, poor, decline and dead);
i) structural condition (e.g. good, fair, poor or not visible);
j) comment about the tree, its location and preliminary management recommendations, including further investigation of suspected defects that require more detailed assessment and potential for wildlife habitat;
k) The retention category referring to the quality and useful contribution in years; **U** = <10yrs; **A** = >40yrs; **B** = >20yrs; **C** = >10yrs. The retention subcategory referring to the type of amenity; 1 = Arboricultural; 2 = Landscape; 3 = Cultural including conservation (see Appendix 1 Cascade chart for tree quality assessment).

5. Definitions

Arboriculturist

An arboriculturist (or arboricultural consultant) is a person who has, through relevant education, training, and experience, gained recognized qualifications and expertise in the field of trees in relation to construction.

Tree Survey

A tree survey should be undertaken by an arboriculturist and should record information about the trees on a site independently of and prior to any specific design for development. As a subsequent task, and with reference to a design or potential design, the results of the survey should be included in the preparation of a tree constraints plan, which should be used to assist with site layout design.

Tree Constraints Plan

A TCP is a plan, typically delivered as an AutoCAD drawing (.DWG file format), prepared by an arboriculturist for the purposes of layout design showing the root protection area and representing the effect that the mature height and spread of retained trees will have on layouts through shade, dominance, etc.

Root Protection Area

An RPA is a layout design tool indicating the area surrounding a tree that contains sufficient rooting volume to ensure the survival of the tree, shown in plan form in m^2.

Construction Exclusion Zone (also termed Tree Protection Zone)

A construction exclusion or tree protection zone is an area based on the RPA (in m^2), identified by an arboriculturist, to be protected during development, including demolition and construction work, by the use of barriers and/or ground protection fit for purpose to ensure the successful long-term retention of a tree.

Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA)

This is a study, undertaken by an arboriculturist, to identify, evaluate and possibly mitigate the extent of direct and indirect impacts on existing trees that may arise as a result of the implementation of any site layout proposal.

Tree Protection Plan (TPP)

A TPP is a plan, typically delivered as an AutoCAD drawing (.DWG file format), prepared by an arboriculturist showing the finalized layout proposals, tree retention and tree and landscape protection measures detailed within the arboricultural method statement, which can be shown graphically.

Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS)

This is a methodology for the implementation of any aspect of development that has the potential to result in loss of or damage to a tree. The AMS is likely to include details of an on-site tree protection monitoring regime.

6. Limitations

Trees were inspected from using visual observation from ground level only. Trees were not climbed or inspected below ground level. Inaccessible trees will have best estimates made about the location, physical dimensions, and characteristics. Trees have been grouped where BS5837 guides us that it is expedient to do so. Trees have been excluded from the survey if they are found by us to be sufficiently far away from the proposed developable area or if they are outside of the red line boundary plan showing the expectations of our client for the extent of the survey. BS5837 does not draw any distinction between trees subject to statutory protection, such as a Tree Preservation Order ("TPO"), and those trees without. This is principally because a detailed planning consent overrides any TPO protection. Consequently, we do not seek to offer any comparison between or infer any difference in the quality or importance of TPO trees and other trees.

7. Appendices

The following documents were released to the Client as appendices to this report:

- Survey Schedule (.PDF)
- Tree Constraints Plan drawing (.DWG & .PDF)

If you require clarification of information contained herein, please do not hesitate to contact us via 01244 661170.

Yours Sincerely,

Jim Green MArborA

Arboricultural Consultant

07706323238

jimgreen@arbtech.co.uk

Appendix 1: Table 1 Cascade chart for tree quality assessment

BS5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations

Table 1 **Cascade chart for tree quality assessment**

Category and definition	Criteria (including subcategories when appropriate			Identification on plan
Trees unsuitable for retention (see Note)				
Category U 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.	▪Trees that have serious, irremediable, structural defect, such that their early loss is expected due to collapse, including those that will become unviable after removal of other category U trees (e.g. where, for whatever reason, the loss of companion shelter cannot be mitigated by pruning). ▪Trees that are dead or are showing signs of significant, immediate, and irreversible overall decline. ▪Trees infected with pathogens of significance to the health and/or safety of other trees nearby, or very low quality trees suppressing adjacent trees of better quality. *NOTE Category U trees can have existing or potential conservation value which might be desirable to preserve; see 4.5.7.*			Dark red
	1 Mainly arboricultural qualities	**2 Mainly landscape qualities**	**3 Mainly cultural values, including conservation**	
Trees to be considered for retention				
Category A **Trees of high quality** with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 40 years.	Trees that are particularly good examples of their species, especially if rare or unusual; or those that are essential components of groups or formal or semi-formal arboricultural features (e.g. the dominate and/or principal trees within an avenue).	Trees, groups, or woodlands of particular visual importance as arboricultural and/or landscape features.	Trees, groups or woodlands of significant conservation, historical, commemorative or other value (e.g. veteran trees or wood-pasture).	Light green
Category B **Trees of moderate quality** with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 20 years.	Trees that might be included in category A, but are downgraded because of impaired condition (e.g. presence of significant though remedial defects, including unsympathetic management and storm damage), such that they are unlikely to be suitable for retention of beyond 40 years; or trees lacking the special quality necessary to merit the category 'A' designation.	Trees present in numbers, usually growing as groups or woodlands, such that they attract a higher collective rating than they might as individuals; or trees occurring as collectives but situated so as to make little visual contribution to the wider locality.	Trees with material conservation or other cultural value.	Mid blue
Category C **Trees of low quality** with an estimated remaining expectancy of at least 10 years, or young trees with a stem diameter below 150mm.	Unremarkable trees of very limited merit or such impaired condition that they do not qualify in higher categories.	Trees present in groups or woodlands, but without this conferring on them significantly greater collective landscape value; and/or trees offering low or only temporary/transient landscape value.	Trees with no material conservation or other cultural value.	Grey

Appendix 2: Schedule of Trees

BS5837:2012 Tree Survey

Arbtech Consulting Ltd
Unit 3, Well House Barns
Chester Road
Chester
Cheshire
CH4 0DH
Phone: 01244661170

Client: Sally Tampakis
Project: 4 Upavon Drive
Survey Date: 24/03/2025
Surveyor: Jim Green

Tree and Tag No / Species	Hght (m)	Stems No	Stems Ø (mm)	Crown Spread (m)	Crown Clear (m)	Age	RP A (m²) R (m)	Phys Condition	Structural Condition	Preliminary Recommendations / Survey Comment	Cat ERC
G01										Estimated Measurements	
A Group *See comments for details*	14	1	200	N 3 E 3 S 3 W 3	5 4 4 5	SM	A: 18.1 R: 2.4	Good	C: Good S: Not visible B: Not visible	Off site group of two birch viewed from afar over boundary fence. Dimensions estimated for largest member of group.	C.1.2 10+ yrs
G02										Estimated Measurements	
A Group *See comments for details*	16	1	350	N 4 E 4 S 4 W 4	6 6 4 5	SM	A: 55.4 R: 4.19	Good	C: Good S: Not visible B: Not visible	Off site group of ~three trees viewed from afar over boundary fence. Species include sequoia, pine and larch. Dimensions estimated for largest member of group.	B.1.2 20+ yrs
H01											
A Hedge *See comments for details*	1	1	20	N 0.5 E 0.5 S 0.5 W 0.5	0 0 0 0	SM	A: 0.2 R: 0.25	Good	C: Good S: Good B: Good	Boundary privet hedge. Dimensions recorded for typical member of hedge.	C.1.2 10+ yrs
T01											
Common Yew *Taxus baccata*	9	1	260	N 3 E 2 S 1 W 2	4 1 2 3	SM	A: 30.6 R: 3.12	Good	C: Good S: Fair B: Good	Growing 1m south of base of sloping border which rises to north ~1:2; growing immediately adjacent neighbouring brick-building wall to west which is most likely a root barrier. Ivy encroaching mid stem.	C.1 10+ yrs

Age Classifications: N Newly planted; EM Early Mature; Y Young; M Mature; SM Semi-mature; OM Over Mature

Condition: C Crown; S Stem; B Basal area

Stems: Ø Diameter; (Eq) Equivalent stem diameter using BS5837:2012 definition

ERC: Estimated Remaining Contribution

Tree and Tag No Species	Hght (m)	Stems No	Stems Ø (mm)	Crown Spread (m)	Crown Clear (m)	Age	RP A (m²) R (m)	Phys Condition	Structural Condition	Preliminary Recommendations Survey Comment	Cat ERC
T02											
Common Yew *Taxus baccata*	1.5	3	182 (Eq)	N 0 E 0 S 0 W 0	1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5	SM	A: 15.1 R: 2.19	Fair	C: S: Fair B: Good	Ivy-clad standing stump with limited epicormic regeneration.	C.1 10+ yrs
T03											
Silver Birch *Betula pendula*	15	1	300	N 2 E 2 S 2 W 3	3 3 3 3	SM	A: 40.7 R: 3.59	Good	C: Good S: Good B: Good	Paving slab impinging base to east. Otherwise no significant features.	B.1.2 20+ yrs
T04											
Saucer Magnolia *Magnolia soulangiana*	6	2	328 (Eq)	N 3 E 4 S 5 W 4	2 2 2 2	M	A: 48.7 R: 3.93	Good	C: Good S: Good B: Good	Bifurcation at 1m into dominant and lesser stems. Heavily crown-lifted. Lateral crown heavily pruned to boundary to west.	C.1 10+ yrs
T05											
Yoshino Cherry *Prunus yedoensis*	7	1	220	N 3 E 1 S 3 W 2	2 2 3 3	SM	A: 21.9 R: 2.64	Good	C: Fair S: Fair B: Good	Historic mechanical damage to lower stem leaving open vertical cavity from 0.5-1m, necrotic timber visible. Multiple minor and hanging deadwood throughout.	C.1 10+ yrs
T06											
Common Laburnum *Laburnum anagyroides*	6	3	100 (Eq)	N 1 E 1 S 0.5 W 1	3 2 2 2	SM	A: 4.6 R: 1.21	Poor	C: Poor S: Poor B: Poor	Central stem standing-dead, western stem in decline. Crown sparse.	U <10 yrs
T07											
Common Holly *Ilex aquifolium*	6	5	234 (Eq)	N 3 E 3 S 2 W 3	2 2 2 2	SM	A: 24.7 R: 2.8	Good	C: Good S: Good B: Good	Multi-stemmed from base. Paving slab impinging base to north.	C.1.2 10+ yrs

Age Classifications:					**Condition:**			**Stems:**	
	N	Newly planted	EM	Early Mature		C	Crown	Ø	Diameter
	Y	Young	M	Mature		S	Stem	(Eq)	Equivalent stem diameter using BS5837:2012 definition
	SM	Semi-mature	OM	Over Mature		B	Basal area	**ERC:**	Estimated Remaining Contribution

Tree and Tag No Species	Hght (m)	Stems		Crown			Age	RP A (m2) R (m)	Phys Condition	Structural Condition	Preliminary Recommendations Survey Comment	Cat ERC
		No	Ø (mm)	Spread (m)	Clear (m)							
T08											Estimated Measurements	
Bay	4	1	150	N	2	1	SM	A: 10.2	Good	C: Good		C.1
Laurus nobilis				E	1	1		R: 1.8		S: Not visible	Off site tree viewed from afar over boundary fence.	10+ yrs
				S	2	1				B: Not visible		
				W	1	2						

Age Classifications:					Condition:			Stems:		
	N	Newly planted	EM	Early Mature		C	Crown		Ø	Diameter
	Y	Young	M	Mature		S	Stem		(Eq)	Equivalent stem diameter using BS5837:2012 definition
	SM	Semi-mature	OM	Over Mature		B	Basal area	ERC:		Estimated Remaining Contribution

Appendix 3: Tree Constraints Plan



Indicative only

Tree Categories

Trees are categorised in accordance with the cascade chart in Table 1 of the British Standard BS 5837:2012 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations'

Category 'U' - Trees in such condition that they cannot realistically be retained as living trees in context of the current land use for longer than 10 years.
Category 'A' - Trees of high quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 40 years.
Category 'B' - Trees of moderate quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 20 years.
Category 'C' - Trees of low quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 10 years, or young trees with a stem diameter below 150mm.

Root Protection Area

In order to avoid damage to the roots or rooting environment of retained trees, the Root Protection Areas (RPAs) should be plotted around each of the category A, B and C trees. This is a minimum area in m² which should be left undisturbed around each retained tree.

The RPA is calculated using the British Standard BS 5837:2012 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations.

The calculated RPA is capped to 707m², which is the equivalent to a circle with a radius of 15m. Where there appears to be restrictions to root growth the root protection area is reshaped to more accurately reflect the likely distribution of the roots.

Tree Survey Report

Please refer to Arbtech Consulting Ltd. Tree Survey Report and Tree Schedule for full details on all surveyed trees, hedgerows and major shrub groups.
All trees were surveyed and categorised in accordance with the guidance as set out in the British Standard BS5837:2012 Tree in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations.

We make the following recommendation to ensure that no conditions relating to arboriculture are attached to any planning consent secured: obtain and arboricultural report to include:
a) An arboricultural impact assessment (AIA);
b) An arboricultural method statement (AMS); and
c) A tree protection plan (TPP).

Rev:	Date:	Notes:
--	--	--

arbtech

Unit 3, Well House Barns, Chester, CH4 0DH
https://arbtech.co.uk, 01244 661170

Project:
4 Upavon Drive,
Reading,
Berkshire
RG1 6LP

Client:
Sally Tampakis

Drawing:
Tree Constraints Plan

Based on:
3346

Drawing No:		Rev:
Arbtech TCP 01		--
Date: Mar 2025	Scale: 1:50 @ A0	Drawn: JAG

Key:

Tree Nos.:	T01	Tree Canopies:		Trunks:	
RPAs:		Category 'U' trees:		Category 'B' trees:	
Category 'B' groups:		Category 'C' trees:		Category 'C' groups:	

All dimensions should be checked on site. No dimensions are to be scaled from this drawing.
Please notify us of any discrepancies found. Arbtech Consulting Ltd. cannot be held responsible for inaccuracies in the base drawing in which this plan is based.
This drawing is designed to reflect the principles of the layout or design only, and relates only to the protection of retained trees.
This drawing is not to be read as a definitive part of the engineering or construction designs or method statements. An architect or appropriate engineer should be contacted over any matters of construction, detailing or specification and for any standards or regulatory requirements relating to proposed structures, hard surfacing or underground services.
This drawing was produced in colour - a monochrome copy should not be relied upon.

© Arbtech Consulting Ltd, 2022

8. Document Production Record

Document number	Editor	Signature	Position	Issue number	Date
Arbtech TSR 01	Jim Green	Jim Green	Arboricultural Consultant	01	28/03/25

Limitations

Arbtech Consulting Ltd has prepared this report for the sole use of the above-named Client/Agent in accordance with our terms of business, under which our services were performed. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this report or any other services provided by us. This report may not be relied upon by any other party without the prior and express written agreement of Arbtech Consulting Ltd. The assessments made assume that the sites and facilities will continue to be used for their current purpose without significant change. The conclusions and recommendations contained in this report are based upon information provided by others and upon the assumption that all relevant information has been provided by those parties from whom it has been requested. Information obtained from third parties has not been independently verified by Arbtech Consulting Ltd.

Copyright

© This Report is the copyright of Arbtech Consulting Ltd. Any unauthorised reproduction or usage by any person other than the addressee is strictly prohibited.