

# LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS – SMALL SITES INITIATIVE PIGOTT STREET, E14 7DN

## Preliminary BS5837:2012 Tree Survey Report

AUGUST 2019



## Pigott Street, E14 7DN

### Preliminary BS5837:2012 Tree Survey Report


Author Martin Dilworth



Checker Aline Brodzinski



Approver Martina Girvan



Report No 10030721-ARC-02-XX-RP-YY-0001-01-Arbiculture Report

Date AUGUST 2019

## VERSION CONTROL

Version	Date	Author	Changes
01	August 2019	Martin Dilworth	1 <sup>st</sup> Issue

This report dated 31 August 2019 has been prepared for London Borough of Tower Hamlets (LBTH) (the "Client") in accordance with the terms and conditions of appointment 15 April 2019 (the "Appointment") between the Client and Arcadis Consulting UK Limited ("Arcadis") for the purposes specified in the Appointment. For avoidance of doubt, no other person(s) may use or rely upon this report or its contents, and Arcadis accepts no responsibility for any such use or reliance thereon by any other third party.

# CONTENTS

<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Overview.....	1
1.2	Site Location and Setting.....	1
<b>2</b>	<b>METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>2</b>
2.1	Tree Survey Methodology.....	2
2.2	Individual Trees and General Data Capture .....	2
2.3	Categorisation.....	2
2.4	Root Protection Area.....	2
2.5	Survey Limitations.....	2
2.6	Statutory Tree Protection.....	3
<b>3</b>	<b>TREE SURVEY RESULTS .....</b>	<b>4</b>
3.1	Tree Assessment and Categorisation .....	4
3.2	Tree Species Diversity .....	4
3.3	Age Diversity .....	4
<b>4</b>	<b>DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>FURTHER WORK .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>8</b>
	<b>FIGURE 1. TREE CONSTRAINTS PLAN .....</b>	<b>9</b>
	<b>APPENDIX A. EXPLANATION OF TERMS.....</b>	<b>10</b>
	<b>APPENDIX B. TREE SCHEDULES .....</b>	<b>12</b>
	<b>APPENDIX C. PRELIMINARY ARBORICULTURAL METHOD STATEMENT .....</b>	<b>13</b>
	<b>APPENDIX D. PHOTOGRAPHS.....</b>	<b>18</b>

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Overview

Arcadis Consulting (UK) Limited (Arcadis) has been commissioned by London Borough of Tower Hamlets (LBTH) 'the Client' to undertake a number of technical surveys for a site at Pigott Street, E14 7DN ('the Site').

LBTH is seeking to unlock small, publicly-owned sites in the borough. This is with the aim to increase the supply of small surplus sites to market, potentially increase affordable housing availability and, at the same time, to encourage individual and community led housebuilders to take on the sites for development.

In preparation for marketing the sites to prospective purchasers (autumn 2019), LBTH is commissioning planning, legal and technical due diligence surveys. The purpose of the surveys is to enable purchasers to make robust and sensible proposals for the land in terms of both development-potential and land value.

The objective of this assessment is to present the potential constraints and future requirements with regards to trees and any future development.


## 1.2 Site Location and Setting

The Site is located north of Pigott Street in the London Borough of Tower Hamlets. The Site is centred at grid reference of TQ 37053 81177 and around the postcode of E14 7DN.

The Site measures approximately 0.03ha in area and is dominated by hardstanding with a significant coverage of ephemeral vegetation, particularly within the centre of the Site. In addition, areas of scattered scrub, tall ruderal vegetation and a number of scattered trees are also present within the Site. The northern and eastern boundaries of the Site are enclosed by brick-built walls, whilst the southern and western boundaries are bound by metal mesh fencing.

An aerial screen shot illustrating the Site boundary is presented in Image 1. Photographs of the Site and trees can be found in Appendix D - Photographs.

Image 1 Site Location Plan



## 2 Methodology

### 2.1 Tree Survey Methodology

An Arboricultural Survey was undertaken by Martin Dilworth FdSc MArborA (Senior Arboriculturist) on 24 July 2019 in accordance with BS 5837:2012.

Observations were conducted from ground level, utilising the “Visual Tree Assessment” (VTA) system as outlined in The Body Language of Trees, A Handbook for Failure Analysis Research for Amenity Trees No.4 (Department of the Environment, 1994) with the aid of binoculars.

The Site and its immediate surroundings were surveyed, this area is referred to as the study area.

### 2.2 Individual Trees and General Data Capture

For reference, individual trees are identified with the letter T and associated number on the Tree Schedules and a Tree Constraints Plan. The stem diameter of the trees on Site was recorded using a rounded down diameter tape at 1.5m above ground level. Measurements were taken in millimetres. The height of the subject trees was estimated to the nearest metre using a digital clinometer.

Maximum crown spread of the subject tree was measured from the centre of the trunk to the tips of the live lateral branches taken at four compass points (N-E-S-W) using a ground tape. Crown spread measurements were taken in metres.

Tree age was estimated from visual indicators (such as tree size and appearance of bark) which was taken as a provisional guide. Age estimates often need to be modified based on further information such as historical records and local knowledge.

If direct access to the tree was not possible, estimations from appropriate vantage points were taken, any limitations or estimations are presented within the survey limitations section and noted in the associated schedules.

### 2.3 Categorisation

In compliance with Table 1 of BS 5837: 2012 the trees surveyed have been categorised according to their arboricultural quality and value. A glossary of survey terms can be found in Appendix A - Explanation of Terms.

### 2.4 Root Protection Area

The Root Protection Areas (RPA) of the trees were calculated in accordance with Section 4.6.1 in BS: 5837:2012. This is calculated from the measurement of the stem diameter at 1.5m above ground level or at ground level if the tree is multi-stemmed. These are recorded in Table B2 in Appendix B and as a pink-shaded circle on the initial Tree Constraints Plan (TCP) and form the initial Construction Exclusion Zone (CEZ) to protect the trees within and adjoining the Site. The shape and size of RPAs can be amended in accordance with Section 4.6.3 in BS: 5837:2012.

Within Section 5.3.1 in BS: 5837:2012 it is stated the default position is that proposed development should not be within the RPA of retained trees, however, where there is an overriding need for construction and associated activity with the RPA of trees arboricultural mitigation should take place to protect the trees.

### 2.5 Survey Limitations

For the purposes of BS 5837: 2012, only trees with a stem diameter greater than 75mm, (measured at 1.5m above ground level), have been included within the survey. However, it should be noted that a number of individual trees and shrubs with a stem diameter of less than 75mm were present within the study area.

Only trees within the study area as defined above were assessed. The RPAs are based on a given tree stem diameter taken at 1.5m above ground level with each RPA (see Appendix B - Tree Schedules) being calculated from the above ground portions of the tree. It should be recognised that the RPA may not entirely encompass all of the tree's rooting material.




Trees are living organisms and as such their health and condition are naturally subject to change over time. Unforeseen future circumstances such as neglect, wilful damage or severe/extreme weather conditions may affect the future health and condition of the trees included in this report.

## 2.6 Statutory Tree Protection

A review of London Borough of Tower Hamlets Council's online database on the 14 August 2019 has established the Site is not located within a Conservation Area, nor are there any trees subject to a Tree Protection Order (TPO) within the study area. The nearest conservation areas are Limehouse Cut approximately 80m north of the Site and St Annes Church approximately 100m to the south-west of the Site. See Image 2 below.

Image 2: Limehouse Cut to the north and St Annes Church to the south west of the Site



### 3 Tree Survey Results

#### 3.1 Tree Assessment and Categorisation

A total of five arboricultural items were recorded within the study area as follows:

- Five individual trees on Site.

Full details of the survey data are presented within the Tree Schedules in Appendix B and Figure 1 Tree Constraints Plan.

Each arboricultural item was assigned to one of four categories, as listed below:

- Category A individual trees: No arboricultural items were identified as Category A (trees of high quality) as part of this survey;
- Category B individual trees: three individual trees were graded as Category B (trees of moderate quality) as part of this survey;
- Category C individual trees: two individual trees were graded as Category as Category C (trees of low quality) as part of this survey;
- Category U individual trees: No arboricultural items have been identified as Category U (trees of poor quality unsuitable for retention) as part of this survey due to poor structural and physiological condition.

#### 3.2 Tree Species Diversity

Three tree species were recorded during the survey and are represented throughout the study area. A summary of the species surveyed can be found within the Tree Schedule in Appendix B and also provided in Table 1. The numbers below include species of individual trees.

Table 1 Tree Species Recorded

Tree Species	Number of Individual Stems	Percentage
False-acacia ( <i>Robinia pseudoacacia</i> )	3	60%
Sour Cherry ( <i>Prunus cerasus</i> )	1	20%
Walnut ( <i>Juglans regia</i> )	1	20%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### 3.3 Age Diversity

Analysis of the data identified that the majority of the trees within the study area were within the early-mature age classification set by BS 5837: 2012 with an estimated useful life expectancy of over 20 years, as illustrated in Table 2.

Table 2 Age Diversity

Age Class	Number of Individual Stems	Percentage
Young	2	40%
Semi-mature	0	0%
Early-mature	3	60%

Age Class	Number of Individual Stems	Percentage
Mature	0	0%
Over-mature	0	0%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100%</b>



## 4 Discussion and Conclusions

A total of five arboricultural items were recorded within the study area as follows:

- Five individual trees on Site.

No individual trees were graded Category A (trees of high quality). Three individual trees were graded as Category B (trees of moderate quality). Two individual trees were graded as Category C (trees of low quality). No individual trees have been graded as Category U (trees of poor quality unsuitable for retention).

There is currently no proposed design layout and therefore it is not possible to say whether the trees would need to be removed and if there is space for any new trees to be re-provisioned on the Site. This can be determined once designs are developed.

While unlikely to prevent development, tree protection for trees to be retained and tree re-provisioning for any trees lost due to development are a material consideration for planning determination. If trees cannot be replaced on-Site due to development, off-Site options for tree re-provisioning to ensure no net loss should be considered. Individual Local Planning Authorities may ask for re-provisioning in excess of 1 to 1 for trees of Category B grade.

The main development considerations for the trees are:

- The Root Protection Area (RPA) and crowns of trees (particularly the Category B trees) to be retained within the Site; and
- The planting location, height, width and density of the crowns will cast shade on to the Site.

Should any future proposed development require tree removals or RPA incursions within RPAs of the retained trees an Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) will be required by the LPA in support of a planning application.

A bespoke Arboricultural Method Statement may be required post planning and when the construction details are known to protect the retained trees within and adjoining the Site.

All new tree planting should be in accordance with British Standard 8545: Trees: From Nursery to Independence in the Landscape – Recommendations, 2014 and all tree works must be carried out by a qualified contractor in accordance with BS3998:2010: Tree Work – Recommendations.

## 5 Further Work

Should any future proposed development require tree removals or RPA incursions within RPA's of the retained trees an Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) will be required by the LPA in support of a planning application.

The AIA should include a tree schedule, although one is provided within this report, a review of any proposed development should be undertaken to ensure that there are no additional trees within the zone of influence of the development. For example, parking requirements often extend the zone of influence.

The AIA should state the trees to be removed due to the design and access requirements and any proposed tree facilitation pruning works. This should also be accompanied by an assessment of the likely impacts due to construction activity on the trees to be retained. Indicative arboricultural mitigation measures should be provided which would include recommendations for tree re-provisioning. The AIA should be accompanied by an updated Tree Constraints Plan and a Tree Impact and Protection Plan based on the proposed design.

The AIA should also include a Tree Replacement Strategy which should take into consideration the landscape character, local treescape and biodiversity features of the immediate and adjoining areas. The species, number, size, type of stock, location and planting aids for the compensating planting should be chosen for landscape, wildlife and arboriculture values. To ensure that appropriate and sustainable planting is achieved advice should be sought from an ecologist and arboriculturist. Furthermore, liaison with the LPA Tree Officer will be necessary during the planning process to agree an approved tree compensation and or landscape scheme plan.

All new tree planting should be in accordance with British Standard 8545: Trees: From Nursery to Independence in the Landscape – Recommendations, 2014 and all tree works must be carried out by a qualified contractor in accordance with BS3998:2010: Tree Work – Recommendations.

This document encloses a Preliminary Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) (Appendix C) outlining tree protection measures. However following planning determination and when full construction measures are known a bespoke AMS may be required to ensure protection of the trees to be retained on and adjoining the Site.

## 6 References

British Standards Institution (2010) BS 3998:2010, Tree Work Recommendations.

British Standards Institution (2012) BS 5837: 2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations.

British Standards Institution (2014) BS 8545: Trees: From nursery to Independence in the Landscape – Recommendations.


Mattheck, C. and Broeler, H. DETR (1994) The Body Language of Trees: A Handbook for Failure Analysis Research for Amenity Trees No.4.

The Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, Statutory Instruments (2012) No. 605, The Town and Country (Tree Preservation) (England) Regulations 2012.

London Borough of Tower Hamlets Trees Protection Order:

<https://towerhamlets.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=b0448c3d9f254bf683e200174fc3f729> [Accessed on 14 August 2019]

## **FIGURE 1. Tree Constraints Plan**



**Legend:**

- Site Boundary
- Canopy extent of A Category tree/group
- Canopy extent of B Category tree/group
- Canopy extent of C Category tree/group
- Canopy extent of U Category tree/group
- BS 5837 Root Protection Area


NOTE:  
Same as ecology plans.

01	26 AUG 19	For Information	PN	JN	MG
Rev	Date	Description	Drawn	Check	Approv

**Client**

TRANSPORT FOR LONDON

PROJECT:  
LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS  
PIGOTT STREET



Design & Consultancy  
for natural and built assets

Registered office:  
Arcadis House  
34 York Way  
London  
N1 9AB

Coordinating office:  
Temple Quay  
Bristol BS2 0FR  
Tel: 44 (0)117 372 1200

www.arcadis.com

TITLE:

FIGURE 1  
TREE CONSTRAINTS PLAN  
PIGOTT STREET

Designed	NA	Date	NA	Signed
Drawn	PN	Date	26 AUG 19	Signed
Checked	MD	Date	26 AUG 19	Signed
Approved	MG	Date	26 AUG 19	Signed
Scale:	1:200	Datum:	AOD	
Original Size:	A3	Grid:	OS	
Suitability Code:	Sx	Project Number:	10030721	

Suitability Description:


PRELIMINARY  
NOT TO BE USED FOR CONSTRUCTION

Drawing Number:

001

Revision:

01

50mm on Original

Print Date: 2019-08-29 13:51:04

K:\Environmet UK\_GIS\10030721 - Small Sites\_Tower Hamlets\01\_Mxd (Drawings)\AutoCAD\11Tower Hamlets\_Pigott Street\_TCP.DWG

© Copyright reserved

## **APPENDIX A. Explanation of Terms**

### **Age Class**

Young – Trees in the first fifth of full life expectancy

Semi-mature – Trees in the second fifth of full life expectancy

Early-mature – Trees in the third fifth of full life expectancy

Mature – Trees in the fourth fifth of full life expectancy

Over Mature – Trees having reached full life expectancy and trees in natural decline

Veteran – Trees of interest biologically, culturally and aesthetically because of their age

### **Stem Diameter**

The diameter of the stem measured in millimetres (mm) at a height of 1.5m above ground level

### **Crown Spread**

Average measured in metres using a ground tape where possible

### **Physiological Condition**

Good – Healthy tree with no signs of ill health and signs of good extension growth for species

Fair – Trees with signs of disease, minor defects and decreased life expectancy due to physical damage

Poor – Trees with significant disease, significantly reduced life expectancy and/or under major physiological stress

Dead – Dead tree or trees with over 70% crown dieback

### **Structural Condition**

Good – Trees with no significant defects

Fair – Trees with remedial defects which require minor tree surgery works

Poor – Trees with remedial defects which require significant tree surgery works or felling

Dead – Trees which require felling

### **BS 5837 Retention Category**

Each tree, group of trees or hedge is assigned to a retention category where:

*Table A1 Categorisation of trees*

Category	Description
A	Trees of high quality and value, retention is highly desirable
B	Trees of moderate quality and value where retention is desirable
C	Trees of low quality and value, or young trees with a stem diameter <150mm. Category C trees may be retained, replaced or in the case of younger trees, relocated
U	Trees of poor quality and value, unsuitable for retention or trees which should be removed

In addition, each tree, group of trees or hedge is assigned to a retention sub-category where categorisation is for:

*Table A2 Reasons for Categorisation*

Sub-category	Reason for Categorisation
1	Mainly arboricultural qualities
2	Mainly landscape qualities
3	Mainly cultural values, including conservation



APPENDIX B. Tree Schedules

Client: London Borough of Tower Hamlets  
Survey date: 24<sup>th</sup> July 2019

Project: Pigott Street, E14 7DN  
Surveyor: Martin Dilworth FdSc MArborA (Senior Arboriculturist)

Table B1 Tree Schedule

Tree reference number	Species	Height (m)	Stem diameter (mm)	Branch spread (m)				Height of crown clearance (m)	Radius of nominal circle (m)	RPA (m²)	Age class	Physiological condition	Structural condition	Comments	Estimated remaining contribution (years)	Category grading
				N	E	S	W									
T1	False-acacia ( <i>Robinia pseudoacacia</i> )	13	420	7	7	7	7	3	Early-mature	5	79.8	Good	Fair	Major deadwood in crown	20+	B1
T2	Sour Cherry ( <i>Prunus cerasus</i> )	5	150	1	3	3	2	1	Young	1.8	10.2	Good	Good	Suppressed by adjacent trees	10+	C1
T3	False-acacia ( <i>Robinia pseudoacacia</i> )	13	350	7	5	3	6	0	Early-mature	4.2	55.4	Good	Fair	Major deadwood in crown	20+	B1
T4	False-acacia ( <i>Robinia pseudoacacia</i> )	13	380	4	5	6	7	2	Early-mature	4.5	65.3	Good	Fair	Major deadwood in crown	20+	B1
T5	Walnut ( <i>Juglans regia</i> )	3	75	2	2	2	1	0	Young	0.9	2.5	Good	Good	In raised planter	10+	C1

Table B2 Key to Categories

Tree Reference Number	Category
=T/GXX	Category A
T/GXX	Category B
T/GXX	Category C
T/GXX	Category U

## APPENDIX C. Preliminary Arboricultural Method Statement

### Overview

This Preliminary Arboricultural Method Statement provides generic best practice measures to be adopted in order to protect retained trees during the development process. It has been prepared in order to inform the planning and the construction/ development process.

### Protective Fencing

The purpose of this fencing is to provide protection to the RPA of retained trees/groups and to protect trees and hedgerows prior to their translocation. The type of fencing used shall be appropriate to the level of adjacent construction activity and shall be agreed with the Local Authority tree officer. Weather-proof notices shall be attached to any protective fencing located adjacent to retained trees displaying the words "Construction Exclusion Zone" and listing restrictions which apply. All personnel must be made aware of these restrictions.

It is anticipated that three specifications for fencing would be employed during construction.

#### Low-use areas


The system illustrated in Figure C1 is adequate to define areas of protected vegetation and exclude traffic, and comprises Cleft Chestnut Pale Fence in accordance with *BS 1722 Part 4: Specification for cleft chestnut pale fences (British Standards Institution, 1991)* supported by 150mm wooden stakes. Assembled with galvanized 14-gauge (2 mm) wire, four strands per row, peeled and pointed one end. Approximate spacing of pales 75 mm.




Figure C1 Tree Protection fencing example for low use areas

#### Medium-use areas

This system comprises anti-climb weldmesh panels connected by clamps and supported by rubber or concrete bases and bracing struts. The system is illustrated in Figure C2 and is based on *BS 5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations (British Standards Institution, 2012)* (Ref 1) guidelines. This kind of system is robust enough to withstand occasional knocks by plant machinery.



a) Stabilizer strut with base plate secured with ground pins




b) Stabilizer strut mounted on block tray

Figure C2 Tree Protection Fencing specification (extract from BS 5837)

## High-use areas

This system involves driving scaffold poles into the ground, onto which are affixed horizontal scaffold poles and diagonal bracing struts. Anti-climb weldmesh panels are secured to this scaffold framework using standard scaffold clips or wire. The system is illustrated in diagram Figure. C3 and is based on *BS 5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations* (British Standards Institution, 2012) (Ref 1) guidelines. This kind of system provides the highest level of security.



## Construction Exclusion Zone (CEZ)

The Construction Exclusion Zone (CEZ) is the area identified by an arboriculturist to be protected during development, including Site clearance and construction work, through the use of barriers and/or ground protection fit-for-purpose to ensure the successful long-term retention of a tree. The area within the construction exclusion zone is to be regarded as sacrosanct and the fencing shall not be taken down or relocated at any time.

All areas excluded by protective tree fencing shall be treated as CEZs, and the following restrictions shall apply:

- No construction activity whatsoever must occur within these areas.
- No tree works, without the written consent from the Local Authority.
- No alterations of ground levels or conditions.
- No chemicals or cement washings.
- No excavation.
- No temporary structures. \*
- No storage of soil, rubble or other materials.
- No vehicles or machinery to be used or parked without appropriate ground protection measures as per BS5837 recommendations. This will require the use of a proprietary system of reinforced concrete slabs/steel road plates on a compressible layer, or side butting scaffold boards/ 18mm plywood sheets on a compressible layer. The type of ground protection used shall be appropriate for the likely loading applied.
- No fixtures (lighting, signs etc.) to be attached to trees.
- No fires within 10 metres of the canopies of any tree or hedgerow.

1

*\*Sales Cabins or Site huts, provided they are of the Jack Leg type, can be sited to act as ground protection for the duration of the construction.*

## General Construction Activity

Since the canopies of retained trees may be in close proximity to areas of crane operation, the following restrictions will apply:

- All cranes will be sited outside the defined RPAs of retained trees / groups, and the appointed contractor will ensure all relevant personnel shall be made aware of the location of branches and the need to avoid causing damage to them.
- Prior to the implementation of lifting operations, a representative from the equipment supply company shall visit the Site and ensure all operations can be completed without causing damage to retained trees. A lifting plan will be prepared and submitted for approval prior to all lifting operations. The lifting plan will make provision for the potential for damage of retained trees.
- All lifting operations will be completed under the close direction of a qualified banksman, who will be briefed by the appointed contractor as to the need to avoid damage the stems and branches of retained trees.
- Should additional tree removal or pruning be required the Local Authority Tree Officer shall be contacted and the scope of works agreed in writing.
- All materials will be stored within designated areas and no materials shall be stored within any RPA.

## Hazardous Materials

Any mixing of cement-based materials is to take place outside the RPAs of all trees. Provision shall be made to ensure that the mixing area is contained so that no water runoff enters the RPAs of any trees. All mixers and barrows shall be cleaned within this dedicated mixing area.





All other chemicals hazardous to tree health, including petrol and diesel, are to be stored in suitable containers as specified by the Control of Substances Hazardous to Health (COSHH) Regulations (2002) (Ref 4), and kept away from the RPAs.

## Example of Protective Fencing Signs






## APPENDIX D. Photographs

Tree No.	Description	Photograph
T1	False acacia ( <i>Robinia pseudoacacia</i> )	
T2	Sour Cherry ( <i>Prunus cerasus</i> )	
T3	False acacia ( <i>Robinia pseudoacacia</i> )	
T4	False acacia ( <i>Robinia pseudoacacia</i> )	



Tree No.	Description	Photograph
T5	Walnut ( <i>Juglans regia</i> )	

**Arcadis Consulting (UK) Limited**

Arcadis House,  
34 York Way,  
London, N1 9AB  
United Kingdom

[www.arcadis.com](http://www.arcadis.com)