

# Ascerta

Landscape, Arboricultural & Ecological Solutions  
for the Built Environment

---

## Arboricultural Impact Assessment

---

New Brighton Road  
Mold  
CH7 6RQ

---

Ref: P.1002.18

---

September 2018

---

Revision	Date	Description
A	12 <sup>th</sup> December 2018	Update report/layout
B	29 <sup>th</sup> April 2019	Update report/layout
C	13 <sup>th</sup> August 2020	Layout Rev Q
D	21 <sup>st</sup> April 2021	Update report/layout

### Ascerta

Mere One, Mere Grange, Elton Head Road, St Helens WA9 5GG  
T: 0845 463 4404 E: [info@landscapetreeseecology.com](mailto:info@landscapetreeseecology.com)  
[www.landscapetreeseecology.com](http://www.landscapetreeseecology.com)

**P.1094.18**

**Arboricultural Impact Assessment**

**New Brighton Road  
Mold  
CH7 6RQ**

**For**

**Stewart Milne Homes  
Harrier House  
Lumsdale Road  
Cobra Business Park  
Trafford Park  
M32 0UT**

**September 2018  
(Rev D 21<sup>st</sup> April 2021)**

<b>Field Work by</b>	Helen Sullivan
<b>Document Author</b>	Helen Sullivan
<b>Technical Review</b>	Robert Armitage
<b>QA Review &amp; Approval</b>	Danielle Wood Office Manager

## Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	- 3 -
1.0 Introduction .....	- 4 -
2.0 Objectives .....	- 4 -
3.0 Planning Policy & Relevant Legislation .....	- 5 -
4.0 Survey & Survey Methodology .....	- 6 -
5.0 Survey Results & Impact Assessment .....	- 7 -
5.1 Existing Tree Cover: .....	- 7 -
5.2 Direct Impact on Trees .....	- 7 -
5.3 Compensation .....	- 7 -
5.4 Indirect Impact on Trees .....	- 7 -
5.5 Hedgerows .....	- 7 -
5.6 Potential Mitigation for Development Impacts .....	- 7 -
5.7 Potential for Shading & Nuisance .....	- 8 -
5.8 Boundary Screening .....	- 8 -
5.9 Long Term Spatial Constraints .....	- 8 -
5.10 Existing Areas of Hard Standing .....	- 8 -
5.11 Existing buildings/structures to be removed .....	- 9 -
5.12 Proposed Areas of Hard Standing .....	- 9 -
5.13 Proposed Buildings Located Adjacent / Within Root Protection Areas .....	- 9 -
5.14 Proposed Drainage & Domestic Services: .....	- 9 -
5.15 Working Space During the Construction Phase: .....	- 9 -
5.16 Access Facilitation Pruning .....	- 10 -
5.17 Protection of Planting Areas .....	- 10 -
5.18 Requirement for an Arboricultural Method Statement .....	- 10 -
5.19 Planning for New Landscaping .....	- 10 -
6.0 Tree Protection Measures .....	- 11 -
7.0 Summary of Impacts & Potential Mitigation Factors .....	- 12 -
8.0 Conclusions & Recommendations .....	- 13 -
9.0 References .....	- 14 -

Appendix 1      Tree Data Tables in accordance with Table 1 of BS5837: 2012

Appendix 2      Drawing P. 1094.18.01B *Tree Survey*  
Drawing P. 1094.18.02D *Tree Constraints & Draft Protection Drawing*

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A survey of the existing trees on and adjacent New Brighton Road, Mold, CH7 6RQ, has been carried out by a suitably qualified and competent arboriculturist in accordance with British Standard 5837: 2012 *Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations*.

The purpose of the survey and of this report is to identify the impact of the proposed development of the site on trees, both within and immediately adjacent the site, in accordance with the provisions of BS5837: 2012.

The development of the site will involve the construction of 84 residential dwellings which will require the removal of a number of existing trees and in the absence of suitable controls, also has the potential to have an indirect impact on a number of the trees proposed for retention.

Mitigation for the impact of the development can be provided in the form of the following:

- The erection of protective fencing in advance of the commencement of the development to safeguard the root systems of retained trees; and
- The agreement, in advance of the commencement of the development, together with the implementation during the construction phase, of a methodology for the protection of retained trees.
- The use of geotextiles and a 'no-dig' construction methodology where proposed hard surfaces overlap with root protection areas.

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.

## **1.0 Introduction**

- 1.1** Ascerta has been instructed to carry out a survey of the trees within and immediately adjacent New Brighton Road, Mold, CH7 6RQ 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 25<sup>th</sup> September, 2018, by Helen Sullivan, a competent and qualified arboriculturist with nine years of 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. 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.

## **2.0 Objectives**

- 2.1** Our client's objective is to develop the site by the construction of 84 residential dwellings with a new access from New Brighton Road.
- 2.2** Our objectives are as follows:
- Identify what arboricultural features exist presently within and adjacent the site and to record and categorise them in a manner consistent with BS5837: 2012;
  - Identify which trees will need to be removed directly as a result of the proposed development of the site;
  - Identify any indirect impact from the proposed development on trees proposed for retention;
  - Provide an indication of what protection measures can be implemented as part of the development of the site to ensure the physical protection of retained trees;
  - Provide recommendations for mitigation and compensation in terms of new planting or enhancement of existing features of arboricultural, landscape or ecological interest or importance; and
  - Provide any other recommendations to assist our clients in achieving their objectives whilst satisfying current legislation or policy guidance in relation to the woody vegetation on site.

### 3.0 Planning Policy Wales: Edition 10 & Relevant Legislation

- 3.1 Planning Policy Wales (PPW) sets out the land use planning policies of the Welsh Government and provides the context for land use planning in Wales. National planning policy should be taken into account in the preparation of all tiers of development plan. PPW will sit alongside the National Development Framework (NDF) which will set out where nationally important growth and infrastructure is needed and how the planning system at a national, regional and local level can deliver it by providing direction for Strategic Development Plans (SDPs) and Local Development Plans (LDPs).
- 3.2 The Welsh Government recognises in para 5.2.9 of Planning Policy Wales the importance of trees, woodlands and hedgerows, both as wildlife habitats and in terms of their contribution to landscape character and beauty. Local Planning Authorities are advised to seek to protect trees, groups of trees and areas of woodland where they have natural heritage value or contribute to the character and amenity of a particular locality.
- 3.3 The site lies within the Flintshire County Council administrative area and is subject to the policies contained within its Unitary Development Plan (UPD), Chapter 6 of the UPD is devised to meet the above standard by adopting Policy *TWH1 Development Affecting Trees and Woodlands*, which have been considered when writing this report.
- 3.4 Checks made via email with the Local Planning Authority on 2<sup>nd</sup> October, 2018, indicate that none of the trees within our survey are statutorily protected by a Tree Preservation Order 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.
- 3.5 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.
- 3.6 Notwithstanding the aforementioned policies and legislation, 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.

## **4.0 Survey & Survey Methodology**

- 4.1** We have been supplied with a digital copy of the topographical survey 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.
- 4.2** Our assessment of the soils within the site, based on local site conditions, geography, available soil maps and our own experience of soils across the United Kingdom, indicates that the soils on site are likely to contain a clay element, and that this will have a plasticity index in the low to medium range. Any further details or confirmation of the exact nature of soil conditions on site will require further, more rigorous sampling and analysis. It is not however anticipated that the clay content will cause specific issues relating to retention of trees given the impact of the development proposals, providing that consideration is given to this aspect in advance of and during the construction phase of the development. Provision will need to be made for the protection of soil structure in key areas during the construction phase and the repair of any damage post construction. Further details are provided throughout this report and final details can be secured via planning condition.
- 4.3** Our survey of the trees within and adjacent the site was carried out by a qualified and competent arboriculturist in accordance with sections 4.4 and 4.5 of BS5837: 2012 on 25<sup>th</sup> September, 2018, during dry and sunny weather conditions. Those trees surveyed have been numbered sequentially, although for the purposes of this project they have not been tagged. The trees have also been categorised in accordance with section 4.5 and Table 1 of the Standard.
- 4.4** Where relevant and where the quality of shrub masses and hedges justifies recording, details have been recorded to the tree survey plan and tree data tables.
- 4.5** 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.
- 4.6** Root Protection Areas for those trees surveyed have been calculated in accordance with the formulas within section 4.6 and Annex C of the Standard and can be found within the tree data tables that accompany this report. The tree data tables also contain a key to abbreviations used and the rationale for determining Root Protection Areas for groups of trees and woodlands (where applicable).

## 5.0 Survey Results & Impact Assessment

- 5.1 Existing Tree Cover:** Fourteen individual trees (T1-T14) Five groups of trees (G1-G5) and four hedges (H1-H4) were recorded during our survey, the details of which can be found within Appendix 1 to this report and cross referenced with drawing P.1094.18.01B *Tree Survey*.
- 5.2 Direct Impact on Trees:** The development of the site as proposed will directly require the removal of H1 (in part), H4 (in part) G1, T1, T2, G2, T5, T7, T8 and T14.
- 5.3 Compensation:** Compensation for the loss of trees and the impact on canopy cover can be provided by way of planting new trees at the landscape stage of the project. Given the nature of the proposals, the context of the site in the local landscape and the opportunities for new planting and landscaping, it is considered that in terms of canopy cover, the medium to long term impact of the development will be neutral.
- 5.4 Indirect Impact on Trees:** In the absence of suitable controls, the development may well have an indirect impact on a number of trees on and adjacent the site. Measures are therefore required during the construction phase, as described throughout this report and on supporting drawings, in order to safeguard retained trees for the long-term benefit of the landscape.
- 5.5 Hedgerows:** 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 establish the importance or otherwise of hedgerows on or within influencing distance of the site and whether there is a requirement for a Hedgerow Removal Notice distinct from any formal planning consent to be granted.
- 5.6 Potential Mitigation for Development Impacts:** Mitigation of the direct impacts from the development of the site can be provided in the form of the erection of protective fencing as indicated on the attached drawings and the use of site-specific actions adopting modern methods of construction as agreed and documented within an appropriate Arboricultural Method Statement.



## 5.0 Survey Results & Impact Assessment (Continued)

- 5.7 Potential for Shading & Nuisance:** Mature trees in urban and suburban areas add significant value and environmental benefits to properties; however, it is acknowledged that some land/property owners are averse to retaining trees close to buildings and areas of public use because of shading and other potential nuisances (leaf/fruit drop for example). Whilst efforts can be made to minimise the impact from shading by trees, it is almost inevitable that in some situations, whether in the short term from existing trees or in the long term from new trees, trees will cast shade on parts of properties, whether that be buildings, garden/open space or other areas of general use during part of the day. Generally, any shade cast from trees will be for relatively short periods and entirely acceptable given the accepted co-existence of large trees in an urban context. The acceptability or otherwise of shade is a somewhat subjective issue driven largely by land or property owner/occupier perceptions and in the majority of cases is not necessarily something that should be determined by a local planning authority. We do not consider in this case that shade will be excessive, or that any other ordinary circumstance arising from the presence of trees, for example from leaf or fruit drop, will constitute an unacceptable nuisance.
- 5.8 Boundary Screening:** Trees located adjacent to site boundaries generally make a welcome contribution to the screening of views, this site benefits from mature hedgerows located on the north and south western boundaries that will largely be retained throughout the development. Where applicable, the drawings supporting this report indicate opportunities for management of boundaries in line with project aims and objectives.
- 5.9 Long Term Spatial Constraints:** The proposed layout has been designed to meet the standards set by the local planning authority as well as current best practice guidance. Where applicable, and subject to the possibility of an element of acceptable pruning, there should generally be adequate space between new buildings and trees to limit the potential for future pressure to remove trees. Acknowledgement should however be given to the fact that property owners are largely free to plant trees as close to their property as they wish, therefore any requirement for future maintenance of existing or future vegetation should not be given any weight in the determining of this application. Whilst it is not possible to predict what actions future occupiers will seek to take in respect of trees within or adjacent properties, the existing layout, together with any vegetation management prescriptions either at this stage or in the future, is considered acceptable from a design perspective.
- 5.10 Existing Areas of Hard Standing:** There are no existing areas of hard standing located close to trees proposed for retention, therefore subject to the agreement and implementation of physical protection for those trees throughout the ground works / remediation stage of the project, there should be no arboricultural implications associated with the removal of such surfaces.

## 5.0 Survey Results & Impact Assessment (Continued)

- 5.11 Existing buildings/structures to be removed:** There are no buildings to be demolished and therefore there are no arboricultural implications associated to demolition.
- 5.12 Proposed Areas of Hard Standing:** All areas of encroachment of new hard surfacing within the root protection areas of retained trees is indicated on the drawings will require careful excavations, with an element of root pruning as required by the supervising arboriculturalist. However, larger areas of encroachment within the root protection areas of T10 and T11 will need to be constructed using suitable geotextile with a porous finished surface, this detail to be included within an Arboricultural Method Statement. The drawings appended to this report and the extent of precautionary measures required in order to safeguard retained trees are also indicated.
- 5.13 Proposed Buildings Located Adjacent / Within Root Protection Areas:** There are no areas within the proposed development where proposed buildings encroach within, or are located immediately adjacent to the Root Protection Areas of retained trees. There is therefore no need in this instance for special construction methodologies over and above the proposed arrangements for tree protection as outlined elsewhere in this report in order to safeguard trees from the impacts of construction works.
- 5.14 Proposed Drainage & Domestic Services:** At the planning application stage of the project, details of proposed drainage arrangements and provision of utility services are generally not known. During the installation process however, general guidance can be obtained from the National Joint Utilities Group Publication *Guidelines for the Planning, Installation and Maintenance of Utility Apparatus in Proximity to Trees – Volume 4* such as to minimise the impact of works on retained trees.
- 5.15 Working Space During the Construction Phase:** The site is of a size such that there will be adequate working space throughout the construction phase, with little if any potential impact on retained trees. However, it is essential that construction exclusion zones created to safeguard retained trees are not breached without prior consideration and implementation of control measures to limit any potentially negative impacts on trees.

## 5.0 Survey Results & Impact Assessment (Continued)

- 5.16 Access Facilitation Pruning:** There may be a limited number of areas within the site where an element of access facilitation pruning may be required to H1, H2, G3, G4, G5, T3 and T6-T12. Providing that these works are controlled and carried out to a minimum of the standards as contained within BS3998: 2010 *Tree work – Recommendations*, then the visual impact of the work will be minimal and will not detract from the overall landscape value of the site. Our preliminary recommendations for arboricultural works are stated within the Tree Data Tables at Appendix 1 to this report.
- 5.17 Protection of Planting Areas:** It is often desirable to fence off areas that are to be newly planted to protect the soil structure; however, works will be required across the majority of the site, therefore there is little scope to set aside areas for such treatment. Provided that adequate provisions are made for ground preparations in advance of the landscape stage, there is unlikely to be a negative impact on the viability of newly planted stock.
- 5.18 Requirement for an Arboricultural Method Statement:** It would be beneficial to agree and implement an Arboricultural Method Statement to ensure that retained trees are adequately protected from the outset and that no unnecessary harm occurs during the construction phase. Section 6 of this report contains further details of the aspects of the development that could successfully be controlled, which can in turn be subject to a suitably worded planning condition.
- 5.19 Planning for New Landscaping:** If not considered carefully at the design stage, new planting and landscaping can have an adverse impact on existing trees and cause long term problems for the built environment. Care should be taken in the design of new landscapes to prevent physical damage to retained trees during the planting process, and to ensure that schemes are designed to survive and thrive rather than compete for resources. Similarly, new trees and shrubs should not be planted where they will cause damage to structures, either directly or indirectly in the future. Table A1 at Annex A of the Standard gives advice on minimum distances for new trees from structures to avoid direct damage from future tree growth. Further advice should be sought from the project arboriculturist and a suitably qualified and experienced engineer as to the potential indirect impact of trees on structures in the long term (from clay shrinkage subsidence).

## **6.0 Tree Protection Measures**

- 6.1** Based on the proposed layout and those trees proposed for retention, the drawings attached to this report show our preliminary recommendations for the physical protection of retained trees throughout the construction phase. The plans indicate the location of protective barriers, as well as the specification for construction of the protective fencing in accordance with Figures 2 & 3 of the Standard. These barriers will form construction exclusion zones around the retained trees.
- 6.2** In addition to the erection of protective fencing, the attached drawings show areas where it would be beneficial to agree a tree protection method statement between the project arboriculturist, design & construction teams and the local planning authority tree officer. The method statement will need to address and make allowance for the following:
- All forms of access required to the site;
  - Site cabins and storage areas;
  - Proposed parking for site personnel;
  - Phasing of works;
  - Space required for excavations (including foundation excavations);
  - Any required special construction techniques (for example provision of porous surfaces);
  - The location and construction methodology for installation of services in close proximity to retained trees & hedges;
  - Any changes in ground levels and any resulting requirement for retaining structures;
  - Proposed root zone enhancement measures;
  - Working space for cranes, plant and scaffolding; and
  - Management of waste products within the site.
- 6.3** Over and above the physical tree protection measures that should form the basis for the tree protection method statement, the following details should be provided within the method statement:
- Protection of the soil structure within the proposed planted areas (where applicable);
  - Planting operations within the root protection areas of retained trees;
  - Any required/additional precautions outside of construction exclusion zones in relation to the treatment & landscaping of garden or open space areas;
  - System of arboricultural site monitoring / schedule of site visits and resulting actions.

## 7.0 Summary of Impacts & Potential Mitigation Factors

- 7.1 Table 1 below summarises the impacts of the development as proposed on tree cover within and immediately adjacent the site. Comments are also provided on potential mitigation, compensation or special measures required to minimise the impact of the development and safeguard trees proposed for retention.

*Table 1: Summary of the impacts of the development on trees within/adjacent the site.*

Issue	Affecting	Mitigation/Compensation/Special Procedures
Trees/hedges to be removed	H1 (in part), H4 (in part) G1, T1, T2, G2, T5, T7, T8 and T14	Appropriate compensation can be provided by way of new/replacement planting at the landscape stage of the project. Biodiversity enhancements can also be achieved through the landscape proposals.
Indirect physical impact on retained trees	Retained trees	Tree protection fencing should be erected to an agreed specification in advance of the commencement of the development. Key areas where works are proposed within or immediately adjacent root protection areas of retained trees should be subject to an Arboricultural Method Statement, agreed in advance as a condition of planning consent.
Provision of new hard surfaces	H1, T3, T6, T10, T11 and G5	Suitable construction methodologies are achievable, with the use of geotextiles / porous surfaces where applicable. Careful excavations with an element of root pruning when necessary. Works in this area to be overseen by project arboriculturist.
Provision of drainage/services	Unknown	Where existing services cannot be utilised, NJUG principles must be adopted to and adhered to.
Access Facilitation Pruning	H1, H2, G3, G4, G5, T3 and T6-T12	All pruning works should be carried out to a minimum of the standards contained within BS3998: 2010 <i>Tree work – Recommendations</i> .
Protective Fencing	To be erected to an agreed specification in advance of the commencement of the development and retained in-situ throughout the course of the construction phase.	

- 7.2 On the basis of the above and the contents of this report, it is considered appropriate that a Method Statement for Tree Protection be prepared to demonstrate how trees proposed for retention can be suitably safeguarded. The Method Statement can be secured by way of an appropriately worded planning condition attached to the consent for the development and should be adopted as a control document by site personnel.

## **8.0 Conclusions & Recommendations**

- 8.1** The direct and indirect impacts on tree cover as a result of the development proposals are outlined within this report and mitigation proposed accordingly that seeks where possible to satisfy local and national planning guidance and policy. Where trees are proposed for removal, replacement planting should be undertaken as part of a landscape strategy for the site in line with local plan requirements and to integrate the development into the surrounding landscape. Arrangements for the safeguarding and physical protection of retained trees should be agreed and implemented in a manner consistent with current best arboricultural management practices to minimise any potentially negative effects on long term tree cover.
- 8.2** We recommend that a landscape proposal be prepared for the site, to include where feasible, provision for the planting of a mixture of native as well as ornamental trees, shrubs and hedges, implemented as a condition of planning consent. We also recommend that tree protection measures are implemented in accordance with finalised versions of the drawings appended to this report an Arboricultural Method Statement be prepared and implemented to safeguard those trees proposed for retention.

## 9.0 References


Department for Communities and Local Government (March 2012) *National Planning Policy Framework*;

British Standard 5837: 2012 *Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations*;

National Joint Utilities Group Publication *Guidelines for the Planning, Installation and Maintenance of Utility Apparatus in Proximity to Trees – Volume 4*.

# Appendix 1



Site:	<b>P.1094.18 New Brighton Road, Mold</b>	Surveyor:	<b>Helen Sullivan</b>	 Landscape   Trees   Ecology
Client:	<b>Stewart Milne Homes</b>	Survey Date:	<b>25/09/2018</b>	
Brief:	<b>Tree Survey to BS5837:2012</b>	Survey Conditions:	<b>Dry and Sunny</b>	

Page 1 of 4

T. No	Species	Ht (m)	Stem DBH (mm)	RPA Radius	Branch Spread				Ht Crown Clearance (m)	Age Class	P Condition	Structural Condition & General Comments	Preliminary Recommendations (not to be actioned without a valid planning consent)	Est. (yrs)	Cat
				(m)	N	S	E	W							Grade
H1	Hawthorn, Hazel, Holly, Grey Willow, Ash, Juniper and Birch	2	50-150#	0.60-1.80	2	2	2	2	0	M	G	Maintained at current height. Valuable screen from road. Bramble starting to colonise understorey.	Part removal as required to facilitate development proposals. Provide hedging 'in-fill' planting where applicable. Prune to create more formal appearance.	30+	<b>B2</b>
T1	Ash	7	550#	6.60	4	3	4	4	2.5	M	P	In significant decline. Chlorotic leaf colour. Ivy clad stem. Large diameter deadwood throughout.	Remove to facilitate development proposals. Provide replacement tree planting at the Landscaping stage of the project.	<10	<b>C1</b>
T2	Sycamore	9	2 x 500#	8.49	4	4	4	4	3	M	F	Bifurcates at 0.4m. co-dominant form with natural brace at 1.5m. Located on raised level- exposed buttress roots to east. Good vigour. Balanced form. Decay cavity within main stem to southwest. Progressive decay likely to extend into main stem.	Remove to facilitate development proposals. Provide replacement tree planting at the Landscaping stage of the project.	20+	<b>C1</b>
G1	Hawthorn, Sycamore and Ash, Holly	5	50-200#	0.60-2.40	2	2	2	2	0	EM	F	Remnant hedgerow, becoming scrappy.	Remove to facilitate development proposals.	<30	<b>C2</b>
G2	Crack Willow	4.5	50-150#	0.60-1.80	4	4	4	4	0	EM	F	Multi-stemmed, typical of species. Snapped/fallen at base.	Remove to facilitate development proposals. Provide replacement tree planting at the Landscaping stage of the project.	<20	<b>C2</b>
G3	Aspen	12	100-300	1.20-3.60	4	2	3	2	2	Y/EM	F	Reasonable condition for spp. Lean towards North due to prevailing wind.	Prune to reduce branch tips away from development as necessary.	20+	<b>C2</b>

NOTE: The Category Grade applied to trees surveyed is consistent with the recommendations within Table 1 of BS5837: 2012, however this does not necessarily correlate with the visual importance of a tree within the wider landscape, nor does it dictate which trees should be retained at the 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 (T = Tree, G – Group, W = Woodland, H = Hedge, Cpt. = Compartment)  
Stem DBH (Diameter at Breast Height): Measured at 1.5m 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

Species: Common name used  
Root Protection Area Radius: Root Protection Area as per BS5837: 2012  
Age Class: Y = Young, EM = Early Mature, M = Mature, OM = Over mature, D = Dead  
Preliminary Recommendations: Made in respect of known / intended use of the site  
\* For groups of trees, the stem diameter of the largest tree in the group is generally used  
# Denotes estimated DBH where access was not possible

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: G = Good, F = Fair, P = Poor, D = Dead  
Est. (yrs): Estimated remaining contribution in years

© Ascerta

Site:	<b>P.1094.18 New Brighton Road, Mold</b>	Surveyor:	<b>Helen Sullivan</b>	 Landscape   Trees   Ecology
Client:	<b>Stewart Milne Homes</b>	Survey Date:	<b>25/09/2018</b>	
Brief:	<b>Tree Survey to BS5837:2012</b>	Survey Conditions:	<b>Dry and Sunny</b>	

Page 2 of 4

T. No	Species	Ht (m)	Stem DBH (mm)	RPA Radius	Branch Spread				Ht Crown Clearance (m)	Age Class	P Condition	Structural Condition & General Comments	Preliminary Recommendations (not to be actioned without a valid planning consent)	Est. (yrs)	Cat
				(m)	N	S	E	W							Grade
T3	Oak	6.5	600#	7.20	4	4	6	3	2	M	F	Stem emerging from Holly hedge (H2). Crown bias to north east. Squat form. Epicormic throughout. Minor deadwood.	Prune to reduce secondary branches away from development proposals by 2.5m (max).	30+	B1
H2	Holly, Alder, Goat Willow and Cherry	6.5	50-170#	0.60-2.04	2	2	2	2	0	M	F	Dense in parts/ gappy in parts. Cherry stems-dead standing.	Provide hedging 'in-fill' planting where applicable. Prune to create more formal appearance.	30+	C2
T4	Alder	7	400#	4.80	3	3	3	3	2	EM	F	Emerging from H3. Ivy clad stem. Appears in reasonable condition.	No work required at this time.	30+	C1
H3	Hazel, Ash, Holly and Hawthorn	2.5	50-200#	0.60-2.40	2	2	2	2	0	EM/M	G	Maintained at current height. Creates site boundary. Contributes to boundary screening.	Provide hedging 'in-fill' planting where applicable. Prune to create more formal appearance.	30+	B2
T5	Ash	13	870	10.44	6	7	5	7	0.5	M	G	Single stem form with slight lean to east. Fairly balanced form. Good vigour. Small diameter deadwood. Cavity at buttress roots south. Likely to extend into main stem.	Remove to facilitate development proposals. Provide replacement tree planting at the Landscaping stage of the project.	<20	C1/B1
T6	Oak	8.5	880	10.56	4	6	5	8	1	M	F	Squat form. Slight stem lean to west. Epicormic throughout canopy. Minor deadwood. Bramble and Holly understorey.	Crown lift to 4m.	30+	B1

NOTE: The Category Grade applied to trees surveyed is consistent with the recommendations within Table 1 of BS5837: 2012, however this does not necessarily correlate with the visual importance of a tree within the wider landscape, nor does it dictate which trees should be retained at the 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 (T = Tree, G – Group, W = Woodland, H = Hedge, Cpt. = Compartment)  
Stem DBH (Diameter at Breast Height): Measured at 1.5m 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

Species: Common name used  
Root Protection Area Radius: Root Protection Area as per BS5837: 2012  
Age Class: Y = Young, EM = Early Mature, M = Mature, OM = Over mature, D = Dead  
Preliminary Recommendations: Made in respect of known / intended use of the site  
\* For groups of trees, the stem diameter of the largest tree in the group is generally used  
# Denotes estimated DBH where access was not possible

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: G = Good, F = Fair, P = Poor, D = Dead  
Est. (yrs): Estimated remaining contribution in years

© Ascerta

Site:	<b>P.1094.18 New Brighton Road, Mold</b>	Surveyor:	<b>Helen Sullivan</b>	 Landscape   Trees   Ecology
Client:	<b>Stewart Milne Homes</b>	Survey Date:	<b>25/09/2018</b>	
Brief:	<b>Tree Survey to BS5837:2012</b>	Survey Conditions:	<b>Dry and Sunny</b>	

T. No	Species	Ht (m)	Stem DBH (mm)	RPA Radius	Branch Spread				Ht Crown Clearance (m)	Age Class	P Condition	Structural Condition & General Comments	Preliminary Recommendations (not to be actioned without a valid planning consent)	Est. (yrs)	Cat
				(m)	N	S	E	W							Grade
T7	Sycamore	8	300-530	3.60-6.36	3	3	3	3	2	M	F	Bifurcates at 0.5. Stem decay from previous branch loss. Large decay. Restricted growth. Cavities extending through smaller stem.	Remove to facilitate development proposals. Provide replacement tree planting at the Landscaping stage of the project.	<20	<b>C2</b>
T8	Ash	8	500-570	6.00-6.84	2	2	2	2	1.5	M	P	Bifurcate at 0.5m. Crown appears sparse. Woodpecker holes, moderate deadwood and large decay cavities throughout stems	Remove to facilitate development proposals. Provide replacement tree planting at the Landscaping stage of the project.	<10	<b>C2</b>
T9	Sycamore	8.5	750	9.00	4	4	4	4	1.5	M	G	Bifurcate at 3m. Smaller buttress cavities none-progressive decay. Balanced form. Reasonable condition.	Crown lift to 4m.	30+	<b>B1</b>
T10	Oak	11	700	8.40	5	4	5	5	1	M	G	Balanced form, spreading crown. Good vigour. Minor deadwood throughout canopy.	Crown lift to 4m.	40+	<b>A1</b>
T11	Oak	12	870	10.44	7	7	7	7	1	M	G	Balanced form, good vigour. Decay cavity at base on south. Non-progressive decay.	Crown lift to 4m. Reduce branch tips away from development proposals by 2m (max).	40+	<b>A1</b>
T12	Oak	10	750#	9.00	5	5	5	5	3	M	G	Upper canopy appears sparse. Emerging from H3. Squat form. Dense epicormic within lower canopy. Balanced form.	No work required at this time.	30+	<b>B1</b>
G4	Ash	10	350-400#	4.20-4.80	4	4	4	4	3	EM	F	Ivy clad stems. Crowns combine to make one overall canopy. Reasonable condition within H3.	Crown lift to 4m. Reduce branch tips away from development proposals by 2m (max).	<20	<b>C2</b>


NOTE: The Category Grade applied to trees surveyed is consistent with the recommendations within Table 1 of BS5837: 2012, however this does not necessarily correlate with the visual importance of a tree within the wider landscape, nor does it dictate which trees should be retained at the 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 (T = Tree, G – Group, W = Woodland, H = Hedge, Cpt. = Compartment)  
Stem DBH (Diameter at Breast Height): Measured at 1.5m 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

Species: Common name used  
Root Protection Area Radius: Root Protection Area as per BS5837: 2012  
Age Class: Y = Young, EM = Early Mature, M = Mature, OM = Over mature, D = Dead  
Preliminary Recommendations: Made in respect of known / intended use of the site  
\* For groups of trees, the stem diameter of the largest tree in the group is generally used  
# Denotes estimated DBH where access was not possible

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: G = Good, F = Fair, P = Poor, D = Dead  
Est. (yrs): Estimated remaining contribution in years

Site:	<b>P.1094.18 New Brighton Road, Mold</b>	Surveyor:	<b>Helen Sullivan</b>	 Landscape   Trees   Ecology
Client:	<b>Stewart Milne Homes</b>	Survey Date:	<b>25/09/2018</b>	
Brief:	<b>Tree Survey to BS5837:2012</b>	Survey Conditions:	<b>Dry and Sunny</b>	

Page 4 of 4

T. No	Species	Ht (m)	Stem DBH (mm)	RPA Radius	Branch Spread				Ht Crown Clearance (m)	Age Class	P Condition	Structural Condition & General Comments	Preliminary Recommendations (not to be actioned without a valid planning consent)	Est. (yrs)	Cat
				(m)	N	S	E	W							Grade
G5	Oak	8	550-650#	6.60-7.80	6	6	6	6	3	M	F	Emerging from H3. Ivy clad stems. Some minor deadwood. Squat form. Spreading/balanced canopy.	Crown lift to 4m. Reduce branch tips away from development proposals by 2m (max).	30+	<b>B2</b>
T13	Oak	14	720#	8.64	6	6	5	8	2	M	G	Emerging from H3. Ivy clad stems. Appears to bifurcate at base. Large spreading canopy. Good vigour. Possibly off-site.	No work required at this time.	30+	<b>A1</b>
H4	Hawthorn	4.5	50-150#	0.60-1.80	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	0	M	G	Unmaintained. Valuable screen into site.	Remove as shown on plan to accommodate proposed footpath. Provide hedging 'in-fill' planting where applicable. Prune to create more formal appearance.	30+	<b>B2</b>
T14	Ash	6	150+200+200	2.84	3	3	3	3	0	EM	P	Canopy appears sparse. Multi-stemmed form.	Remove to facilitate development proposals.	<10	<b>C2</b>

NOTE: The Category Grade applied to trees surveyed is consistent with the recommendations within Table 1 of BS5837: 2012, however this does not necessarily correlate with the visual importance of a tree within the wider landscape, nor does it dictate which trees should be retained at the 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 (T = Tree, G – Group, W = Woodland, H = Hedge, Cpt. = Compartment)  
Stem DBH (Diameter at Breast Height): Measured at 1.5m 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

Species: Common name used  
Root Protection Area Radius: Root Protection Area as per BS5837: 2012  
Age Class: Y = Young, EM = Early Mature, M = Mature, OM = Over mature, D = Dead  
Preliminary Recommendations: Made in respect of known / intended use of the site  
\* For groups of trees, the stem diameter of the largest tree in the group is generally used  
# Denotes estimated DBH where access was not possible

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: G = Good, F = Fair, P = Poor, D = Dead  
Est. (yrs): Estimated remaining contribution in years

© Ascerta

## Appendix 2



### KEY

 Existing tree to be removed



B	General updates	20/04/21
A	General updates	29/10/18
REV	DESCRIPTION	DATE

**Ascerta**  
Landscape | Trees | Ecology

t: 0845 463 4404  
e: [info@landscapetreeseecology.com](mailto:info@landscapetreeseecology.com)  
[www.landscapetreeseecology.com](http://www.landscapetreeseecology.com)

CLIENT:  
**Stewart Milne Homes**

PROJECT:  
New Brighton Road, Mold CH7 6RQ

DRAWING TITLE:  
Tree Survey

SCALE: 1:500 @A1	DRAWN BY: CP	DRAWING No:	REV:
DATE: 25/09/2018	CHKD BY: HM	P.1094.18.01	B



SCALE: 1:500 @A1	DRAWN BY: CP	DRAWING No:	REV:
DATE: 25/09/2018	CHKD BY: HM	P.1094.18.02	E