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### 1.0 Introduction

1.1 Ascerta has been instructed to carry out a survey of the trees within and immediately adjacent Meliden Road, Dyserth, Phase 2 and to assess the potential impact of the development as proposed on trees within / adjacent the site in accordance with British Standard 5837: 2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations.
1.2 The site was visited on $21^{\text {st }}$ April 2020 by Robert Armitage, a competent and qualified arboriculturist with experience of the UK and European arboricultural and landscape industries within the context of the planning system. During the site visit, a survey was carried out of the trees growing both on and immediately adjacent the site to the standards contained within BS5837: 2012.
1.3 This report presents the results of the survey, provides an assessment of the impact of the development and includes recommendations for further actions, where applicable, to mitigate any potentially negative effects of the development on tree cover within the local landscape.
1.4 Our client's objective is to develop the site by the construction of thirty-three residential dwellings.

### 2.0 Planning Policy \& Relevant Legislation

3.3 The site lies within the Denbighshire County Council administrative area and is subject to the policies contained within its Local Plan. These have been taken into account when writing this report.
3.4 Checks made with the Local Planning Authority on $23^{\text {rd }}$ April 2020 via the council's online interactive map indicate that none of the trees within the site are subject to any Tree Preservation Orders and the site is not located within a Conservation Area. In advance of the commencement of any works to trees within or adjacent the site, those instructing and proposing to carry out such works should satisfy themselves that all appropriate consents are in place to prevent potential breach of legislation.
2.3 British Standard 5837: 2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction Recommendations provides current recommendations and guidance on the relationship between trees and design, demolition and the construction processes. It sets out the principles and procedures to be applied to achieve a harmonious and sustainable relationship between trees and structures.
2.4 Consideration should also be given to any impacts from the proposed development in respect of the Hedgerow Regulations 1997 and the Forestry Act 1967 (and specifically the potential need for a felling licence), as well as existing UK and European legislation relating to wildlife and nature conservation.
2.5 In accordance with the Hedgerow Regulations 1997, 'important' hedgerows (in the context of the Regulations) should not be removed without a Hedgerow Removal Notice issued by the relevant Local Authority, unless that removal is subject to an appropriate consent under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Appropriate checks should be made in advance of the commencement of works to hedgerows to establish the importance or otherwise of the hedgerow and whether there is a requirement for a Hedgerow Removal Notice distinct from any formal planning consent to be granted.
2.6 The revised National Planning Policy Framework, updated on $19^{\text {th }}$ February 2019, sets out the government's planning policies for England and Wales and how these are expected to be applied and has been considered within this report. It provides a Framework within which locally prepared plans for housing and other development can be designed and produced.

### 3.0 Survey \& Survey Methodology

3.1 We have been supplied with a digital copy of the topographical survey map for the site, which satisfies the relevant part of section 4.2 of BS5837: 2012. Features of arboricultural or landscape interest that have been excluded from the original plan (for example trees on or located off site but within a distance from the boundary of the site equal to or less than 12 times the stem diameter of that tree) have been added to the plan manually.
3.2 Eleven individual trees, five groups of trees and five hedges were originally recorded as part of the wider site including Phase 1; however, this phase of the development (Phase 2) only contains three individual trees (T6, T7 and T8), three groups of trees (G4, G5 and G6) and two hedges ( H 1 and H 2 ), the details of which can be found within Appendix 1 to this report and cross referenced with drawing P.1318.20.01 Tree Survey and Tree Removal Plan. For reference, G6 of this survey is an additional group of trees not included within the original tree survey including Phase 1.
3.3 Our original survey of the trees, including those contained with Phase 1 of the wider development, was carried out by a qualified and competent arboriculturist in accordance with sections 4.4 and 4.5 of BS5837: 2012 on $25^{\text {th }}$ January 2018. Trees located within and immediately adjacent the Phase 2 site have subsequently been re-surveyed on $21^{\text {st }}$ April 2020 to support this application. Trees surveyed have been numbered sequentially and the details required by the Standard, including a categorisation in accordance with section 4.5 and Table 1 of the Standard, have been recorded within the Tree Data Tables at Appendix 1.
3.4 Where trees are surveyed that require immediate attention, for example to abate a nuisance, prevent a serious hazard to life or property, or are affected by a pathogen or pest that could cause widespread damage unless it is controlled, notification will be issued to the relevant person or organisation such that appropriate action can be taken.

### 4.0 Potential Arboricultural Impacts

4.1 Table 1 below shows the trees that will need to be removed as part of the development of the site.

Table 1: Trees to be Removed

| T. No. | Species | HT (m) | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{\text { Stem }}{\text { DBH }} \\ & \frac{\text { DB) }}{(\mathrm{mm})} \end{aligned}$ | Cat | Reason |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| G6 | Blackthorn, Hawthorn, Sycamore, Elder and Holly | 2-10 | $\begin{array}{r} 350+ \\ 350 \end{array}$ | C2 | To accommodate the development proposal. |

4.2 Table 2 below shows trees that are proposed for retention within the development that have the potential to be negatively impacted by the development proposals.

Table 2: Summary of Potential Impacts to Retained Trees

| T. No. | Species | $\underline{\text { HT }(\mathbf{m})}$ | $\frac{\text { Stem }}{\text { DBH }}$ <br> $(\mathrm{mm})$ | $\underline{\text { Cat }}$ | Potential Impact |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Grade |  |  |
| H1 | Hawthorn <br> and Elder | 3.5 | $120 \#$ <br> average | B2 |  |
| G4 | Ash, <br> Sycamore <br> and Cypress. | 14 | 560 | B2/C2 | General construction activity. |
| T8 | Sycamore | 9 | 520 | B2 |  |

### 5.0 Tree Protection Measures

5.1 Based on the proposed layout and those trees proposed for retention, Table 3 below provides suitable protection measures/ mitigation to minimise the potential negative impacts to retained trees as stated at 4.2.

Table 3: Potential Impacts to Retained Trees \& Proposed Protection Measure / Mitigation

| $\frac{\text { Potential }}{\text { Impact }}$ | Affecting | Protection Measure / Mitigation | Description / Specification and Procedure |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Construction Phase |  |  |  |
| General construction activity | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{H} 1, \mathrm{G} 4 \text { and } \\ \text { T8 } \end{gathered}$ | - Tree Protection Fencing | Tree Protection fencing to be erected in the locations shown to the specification provided. |

5.2 On the basis of the above and the contents of this report, we do not consider the production of an Arboricultural Method Statement necessary at this stage. The erection of tree protection fencing in advance of the commencement of the development, ensuring it is retained in-situ throughout the entire construction phase, with works carried out carefully within the influencing distance of retained trees should ensure no particular adverse impact on retained trees from the proposed development.

### 6.0 Conclusions \& Recommendations

6.1 The proposals to develop the site by the construction of thirty-three residential dwellings will directly require the removal of G6.
6.2 In the absence of suitable controls, the development also has the potential to have an indirect impact on $\mathrm{H} 1, \mathrm{G} 4$ and T 8 that are proposed for retention as part of the development of the site.
6.3 Protection of retained trees from the impacts of the development proposals can be provided by:

- The erection of protective fencing in advance of the commencement of the development in the locations shown.
6.4 Compensation for the impact of the development, together with landscape and biodiversity enhancements can be achieved by way of the following:
- The planting of trees, shrubs and where applicable hedges as part of a comprehensive landscape scheme to replace any vegetation lost and to integrate the development into the wider landscape; and
- The use of a mixture of native and ornamental species within planting schemes, where those species are suited to the site and local landscape.
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Site: P.1318.20 Meliden Road, Dyserth - Phase 2 LL18 6BP
Client: Macbryde Homes
Tree Survey to BS5837:2012

Surveyor:
Survey Date:
Survey
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Landscape | Trees | Ecology

| $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{T} . \\ & \mathrm{No} \end{aligned}$ | Species | Ht (m) | StemDBH | RPA | Branch Spread |  |  |  | HtCrown Clearan ce (m) | AgeClass | $\begin{gathered} \hline \mathbf{P} \\ \text { Condition } \end{gathered}$ | Structural Condition \& General Comments | Preliminary Recommendations (not to be actioned without a valid planning consent) | Est.(yrs) | Cat |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | (m) | N | S | E | W |  |  |  |  |  |  | Grade |


| THE TREES, GROUPS AND HEDGES LISTED BELOW WERE ORIGINALLY RECORDED AS PART OF A WIDER TREE SURVEY OF THE SURROUNDING AREA TO SUPPORT PHASE 1 OF THE DEVELOPMENT (APP REF 42/2018/0923). ANY TREES NOT LISTED ARE INCLUDED WITHIN PHASE 1 AND ARE THEREFORE NOT IMPACTED BY THE PROPOSAL. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| H1 | Hawthorn and Elder | 3.5 | $120 \text { \# }$ average | 1.44 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0 | EM | F | Discontinuous linear feature previously maintained at 1.5 m but now with vigorous new growth to 3.5 m . Scrappy appearance but some retention value as individual. Stems located immediately adjacent the assumed site boundary fence. |  | 30 | B2 |
| T6 | Sycamore | 12 | 530 | 6.36 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 6 | EM | F | Previously poorly pruned in the past. Poor pruning wounds now with vigorous new epicormic growth. Remaining canopy appears full and in good vigour. Not a particularly good example of species. Low long-term retention value. | No works required at this stage. | 30 | C2 |
| T7 | Cypress | 6 | 300\# | 3.60 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 3 | 1.5 | EM | F | Typical form for species. Stem appears to be located immediately off-site. Relatively unimportant tree. | No works required at this stage. | 30 | C2 |
| G4 | Ash, Sycamore and Cypress. | 14 | 560 | 6.72 | 4 | 4 | 6.5 | 4 | 3 | Y/EM | F | Self-seed Ash and <br> Sycamore scrub. Not <br> particularly arboriculturally  <br> important. Located  <br> immediately adjacent  <br> existing road.   | No works required at this stage. | 30 | B2/C2 |

 he cost of quality development. Where trees are to be lost to accommodate a development, recommendations will be made such as to provide suitable mitigation and compensation, and to integrate the development into the wider landscape.

Key to Abbreviations \& Headings
T. No.: Tree number ( $\mathrm{T}=$ Tree, G - Group, $\mathrm{W}=$ Woodland, $\mathrm{H}=$ Hedge, Cpt. = Compartment) Stem DBH (Diameter at Breast Height): Measured at 1.5 m above ground level* Ht Crown Clearance: Canopy ground clearance
Structural Condition: Description of any observed defects
Cat. Grade: Tree quality assessment in accordance with BS5837: 2012

Ht: Approximate height of tree from ground level in metres
Branch Spread: Extent of canopy spread in metres to each of the four cardinal points P (Physiological) Condition: $\mathrm{G}=\mathrm{Good}, \mathrm{F}=$ Fair, $\mathrm{P}=$ Poor, $\mathrm{D}=$ Dead Est. (yrs): Estimated remaining contribution in years

Site: $\quad$ P.1318.20 Meliden Road, Dyserth - Phase 2 LL18 6BP Client: Macbryde Homes

Tree Survey to BS5837:2012

Robert Armitage 25 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ January, 2018 UPDATED 21 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ April 2020
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| $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{T} . \\ \mathrm{No} \end{gathered}$ | Species | Ht (m) | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Stem } \\ & \text { DBH } \\ & (\mathrm{mm}) \end{aligned}$ | RPA | Branch Spread |  |  |  | Crown Clearan ce (m) | Age Class | $\mathbf{P}$Condition | Structural Condition \& General Comments | Preliminary Recommendations (not to be actioned without a valid planning consent) | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Est. } \\ & \text { (yrs) } \end{aligned}$ | Cat |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | (m) | N | S | E | W |  |  |  |  |  |  | Grade |


| T8 | Sycamore | 9 | 520 | 6.24 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 4 | EM | F | Well balanced open grown form. Some retention value as an individual. Located approx. 3m from existing retaining wall. Poorly pruned in past with occluded branch wounds. | No works required at this stage. | 30 | B2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| G5 | Cherry | 6 | 550 | 6.60\# | 5 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | EM/M | F | Typical form for species. Not particularly good examples of species. Branch into multiple main leaders at approx. 2 m . Ornamental species. Low long-term retention value. | No works required at this stage. | 20 | B2/C2 |
| H2 | Hawthorn | 4 | 180\# average | 2.16 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | EM | F | Well established dense boundary hedging. Multiple stems thick. Provides good dense screen. Poorly maintained in past. | No works required at this stage. | 30 | B2 |
| G6 | Blackthorn, Hawthorn, Sycamore, Elder and Holly | 2-10 | $\begin{gathered} 350+ \\ 350 \end{gathered}$ | 5.93 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 0 | Y/EM | F | Predominantly high-density Blackthorn scrub to 3 m . Occasional taller Sycamore, but not particularly good examples of species. Linear group of trees along western edge of group forms an unmaintained hedge-like feature. | Remove to accommodate the development proposals. Plant replacement trees at the landscaping stage of the project. | 30 | C2 |

 he cost of quality development. Where trees are to be lost to accommodate a development, recommendations will be made such as to provide suitable mitigation and compensation, and to integrate the development into the wider landscape.
viations \& Headings
T. No.: Tree number ( $\mathrm{T}=$ Tree, G - Group, $\mathrm{W}=$ Woodland, $\mathrm{H}=$ Hedge, Cpt. = Compartment) Ht Crown Clearance: Canopy ground clearance
Structural Condition: Description of any observed defects
Cat. Grade: Tree quality assessment in accordance with BS5837: 2012
tranch Spread: Extent of canopy spread ind level in metres
(Physiological) Condition: $G=$ Good, $F=$ Fair $P=$ Po each of the four cardinal points Est. (yrs): Estimated remaining contribution in years
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