

In response to the tree officer's comments.

The mere fact that a tree may have a twenty year life span does not make it a B, there are a number of other facts that have to be taken into account which the officer has failed to consider.

The BS gives a minimum life span of C category of ten years. However, it is quite possible to have a life span of fifty years and still be categorised as C. To suggest otherwise shows lack of understanding of assessing the trees.

In calculating the root spread the officer has failed to read the plan annotations.

The tree has a root radius of 6.6 however, as stated on the plan, the root protection area can be a square as well as a circle.

The RPA's are based on a multiple (12) of the stem diameter usually measured at 1.5 metres from ground level, but where this is not possible, it is taken at a lower level and multiplied by a factor of 10. **BS 5837 (5.2.3)** sets out that the RPA may be represented as **a square** as well as a circle centred on the trunk. The square will be the same area as the circle but, unlike the circle, **where the distance from the tree remains constant, the distance of the sides from the centre vary from a minimum that is less than the radius to a centre to corner distance that is greater than the radius.**

It is quite obvious that the tree will have restricted root development, but then equally it may not. The officer knows nothing of the site's past history or the depths of foundations of the garage. It is entirely possible that roots from the willow are indeed beneath the garage. However, as the structure is outside the RPA based on the advice given in the BS then it has no effect anyway.

With regards to item three it is entirely possible to cross over the RPA. This is mentioned in the BS and the method statement at Appendix 2 discusses it, clearly to suggest not shows a lack of knowledge. The principle is exactly the same as a 'no-dig' structure.

Item four; the plan is annotated as such, the gross RPA was left to demonstrate that the structure can be built.

In conclusion, the report is acceptable and it has been clearly demonstrated that the proposal does not harm the trees. The comments merely show a negative view and lack of knowledge in the application of BS and elementary methods of construction.

I Murat MSc, F Arbor.A , CEnv