



James Blake Associates Ltd

Arboricultural Impact Assessment

Haverhill, Phases 2-6

on behalf of

Persimmon Homes Suffolk

7 January 2019

JBA 18/351 AR01

Over 30 Years of Service, Value and Innovation

The Black Barn, Hall Road, Lavenham, Suffolk CO10 9QX
tel: **01787 248216** fax: **01787 247264** email: jamesblake@jba-landmarc.com

Chairman: James Blake BA (Hons) Dip LA (Hons) CMLI

Company Secretary: Louise Blake BSc PGCE

Directors: Elzbieta Zebrowska MSc Eng LArch MScEnvSc CMLI : Kevin Slezacek DipArb MARborA

Associate Directors: Vivienne Jackson : Jenny Beck BA (Hons) : Marie Lowe

www.jba-landmarc.com

Registration no. 08169866 VAT no. 512412791

Project	Haverhill, Phases 2-6
Report	Arboricultural Impact Assessment
Date	7 January 2019
Author	Simon Smith <i>TechArborA</i>
Checked by	Kevin Slezacek <i>DipArb MArborA MCIHort</i>

CONTENTS PAGE

1 SUMMARY 4

2 INSTRUCTIONS 5
DOCUMENTS PROVIDED 5

3 OBSERVATIONS 6
SITE VISIT 6
SITE AND CONTEXT 6

4 VIEWS OF TREES 7

5 TECHNICAL INFORMATION 10
STATUTORY PROTECTION 10
SOILS AND GEOLOGY 10
PLANNING POLICY 10

6 ARBORICULTURAL APPRAISAL 11
IDENTIFIED IMPACTS 11
TREE REMOVALS 12
TREE PROTECTION 12
REPLACEMENT PLANTING 12

7 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 13

APPENDIX 1: TREE SURVEY SCHEDULE 14

APPENDIX 2: JBA DRAWINGS 15

1 SUMMARY

- 1.1 This Arboricultural Impact Assessment has been commissioned by Persimmon Homes Suffolk to accompany their planning submission for the construction of infrastructure roads for Phases 2-6 of their ongoing Haverhill development.
- 1.2 This report has been prepared in accordance with British Standard 5837: Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations (2012). This document provides best practice advice, assessment and guidance with regards to the design, planning and implementation of new developments.
- 1.3 This report concludes that the proposal is acceptable and while some trees and groups will be removed, they are mainly of poor form or condition with limited visual amenity, thereby minimising the impact of the development on the local landscape.

2 INSTRUCTIONS

- 2.1 James Blake Associates have been instructed to carry out a survey of trees and significant vegetation within and directly adjoining land at Haverhill, Suffolk in relation to the application for redevelopment of the site.
- 2.2 Our assessment was carried out in accordance with BS 5837:2012 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations'.
- 2.3 Details of all surveyed vegetation can be found within the Tree Survey Schedule at Appendix 1. All trees were visually inspected from ground level only and no diagnostic equipment or detailed decay investigation was carried out.
- 2.4 Our report is prepared to provide supporting evidence and justification for redevelopment in relation to the existing trees and vegetation within and neighbouring the site.

Documents provided

- 2.5 My report has been prepared with reference to the following documentation;
 - Topographical survey reference 20774se-01 Rev A by Survey Solutions
 - Phasing site layout reference 039/E/1500 Rev A by Persimmon Homes
 - Engineering layout reference 039/E/200 by Persimmon Homes

3 OBSERVATIONS

Site visit

- 3.1 The site was visited by Simon Smith on 13 December 2018 to identify, measure and locate trees and significant vegetation within and directly adjoining the site.

Site and context

- 3.2 The site comprises several fields located at the northern edge of Haverhill surrounded by woodland and fields to the north; fields to the west; and residential properties to the east, south and part of the western side.
- 3.3 The approved Haverhill Relief Road route extends across the northern side of the site, with farmland beyond.
- 3.4 Hedges, groups and scattered individual trees run along parts of the eastern, southern and western boundaries, where they abut existing residential properties. Some of the vegetation is offsite.
- 3.5 Internal to the site there are groups, hedges and areas of scrub along some field boundaries. However the overall quality varies considerably and many are of low value as individuals due to their condition, lack of visual presence or poor historical management.



Photograph 1: Showing approximate site boundary and site in relation to its surroundings

4 VIEWS OF TREES



Photograph 2: View of T1-G6 from within the site



Photograph 3: View of G7-G10 from within the site



Photograph 4: View of G10 and T11 from within the site



Photograph 5: View of G14 and G15 from within the site



Photograph 6: View of G17 from within the site



Photograph 7: View of G18-G21 from within the site



Photograph 8: View of G25-G23 from within the site



Photograph 9: View of T38 (foreground) and G29-G32 (background) from within the site

5 TECHNICAL INFORMATION

Statutory protection

- 5.1 According to West Suffolk Council website the site is not located within a Conservation Area.
- 5.2 The same website shows no trees on the site are the subject of a Tree Preservation Order.

Soils and Geology

- 5.3 This information is obtained from The British Geological Survey (online) 'Geology of Britain Viewer' but is provided only as a guideline to assist with assessment of site conditions in relation to rooting habits of trees.
- 5.4 Soil conditions have the potential to affect tree growth, rooting depth and extent, species selection and foundation design and therefore a detailed soil assessment should be carried out by a competent person.
- 5.5 Bedrock geology is described as being Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation And Seaford Chalk Formation (undifferentiated) – Chalk. Superficial deposits are shown as being Lowestoft Formation - Diamicton.

Planning policy

- 5.6 The National Planning Policy Framework sets out the government's planning policies for England and how these should be applied. The document replaces all previous documents and came into action in July 2018.
- 5.7 The NPPF supports and promotes sustainable development, which it defines as having three dimensions; social, economic and environmental. It goes on to state that these three dimensions are mutually dependent and to achieve sustainable development they must be sought simultaneously.
- 5.8 Specifically the NPPF states that "development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland or ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists".

6 ARBORICULTURAL APPRAISAL

- 6.1 The location, root protection area, crown spread and BS5837 categorisation is shown on the appended tree survey drawing at Appendix 2. Dimensions, comments and information gathered for each survey entry is provided in the tree schedule at Appendix 1.
- 6.2 Of the 53 survey entries, one was assessed as being young, 38 were semi mature, nine were early mature, two mature and three were dead.
- 6.3 The survey assessed the tree population as consisting predominantly of low to poor quality trees. Of the 53 survey entries just four were deemed to be of moderate quality and value (B category), 46 were assessed as being low quality and value (C category) and the remaining three were poor quality (U category).

Identified impacts

- 6.4 Drawings JBA 18/351 TR01 and TR02 at Appendix 2 show the proposed layout and tree removals necessary to implement the proposed development.
- 6.5 The arboricultural impacts have been assessed and are deemed to be acceptable. In respect of the proposal the following have been identified as being of most significance;
 - Tree removals
 - Tree protection requirements
 - Replacement planting

Tree removals

- 6.6 In order to implement the proposal it will be necessary to remove a total of one tree, one hedge and five groups, and parts of six groups. A further three surveyed groups and one tree will be removed as part of the relief road construction.
- 6.7 Whilst the internal vegetation to be removed is numerous its loss to public amenity is considered to be negligible due to its overall condition, lack of visual presence and the opportunity to replace with high quality planting.
- 6.8 Most of the groups and hedges have been cut back hard regularly, leaving remnants of field boundary vegetation. There is one line of more prominent vegetation across the site (G26-G32), most of which will be retained.
- 6.9 All vegetation of moderate quality and most growing around the boundaries of the site are to be retained and can be adequately protected throughout the development process.

Tree Protection

- 6.10 Drawings JBA 18/351 TP01 and TP02 at Appendix 2 show the position and extent of tree protection that will be required during construction.
- 6.11 No specialised construction methods are required and all works are outside precautionary RPAs of retained trees.
- 6.12 Tree protection will therefore consist of robust fencing secured to a solid framework as recommended within BS5837 2012.

Replacement planting

- 6.13 The development proposals include a comprehensive landscape strategy which includes significant tree planting.
- 6.14 As part of the proposals trees will be planted at key locations throughout the development, including public open spaces, around SuDS attenuation basins and in highway verges. These new trees offer the opportunity to enhance the low quality tree population that currently occupies the site and ensures the continuation of visual and green amenity for future generations.

7 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.1 The constraints that existing trees and vegetation pose to development have been assessed in accordance with BS5837: 2012 and through ongoing liaison between the design team and James Blake Associates.
- 7.2 This continuing involvement has culminated in a proposal that seeks to improve and enhance the tree scape of the site and the wider area whilst offering a sustainable approach to development.
- 7.3 All trees to be removed are of low to poor quality and most are located internally to the site thereby minimising the impact of development on the local landscape.
- 7.4 Encroachment into root protection zones has been avoided to ensure the health and stability of affected trees is not compromised and these details can be adequately secured through the use of appropriately worded planning conditions.
- 7.5 I recommend the proposal is approved subject to a planning condition requiring a detailed arboricultural method statement and tree protection plans.

APPENDIX 1: TREE SURVEY SCHEDULE

APPENDIX 2: JBA DRAWINGS