arbtech

**Arboricultural Survey to BS5837:2012**

**Steven Heighway**

**Queensbridge Farm**
**Overton**
**Wrexham**
**LL13 0LE**

21 January 2025

Shaun Rowe BSc (Hons) MArborA

# Table of Contents

*This report has been released electronically and the appendices have been included at the end of this report. Plans are included as A0, A1, A2 or A3 as appropriate.*

1. Introduction ..... 2
2. Survey ..... 3
3. BS5837:2012 Scope ..... 5
4. Methodology ..... 5
5. Definitions ..... 7
6. Limitations ..... 8
7. Appendices ..... 9
   Appendix 1: Table 1 Cascade chart for tree quality assessment ..... 10
   Appendix 2: Schedule of Trees ..... 12
   Appendix 3: Tree Constraints Plan ..... 16
8. Document Production Record ..... 18

# 1. Introduction

Arbtech Consulting Limited (Arbtech) received written instruction on 19th December 2024 from Steven Heighway to attend Queensbridge Farm, Overton, Wrexham, LL13 0LE; grid reference, SJ 37212 40093 (site) to undertake an arboricultural survey to BS5837:2012 guidance to assess trees, hedges and major shrub groups growing on and within influencing distance of the site and to produce a Schedule of trees, Tree Constraints Plan, Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan.

I am Shaun Rowe, an arboricultural consultant at Arbtech Consulting Ltd. I undertook the tree survey on 13th January 2025 and subsequently have produced this summary of my findings.

I hold a BSc Honours degree in Arboriculture and Urban Forestry and a BTEC Level 3 Arboriculture and have professional experience in arboriculture spanning 3 years. I hold the industry standard LANTRA Professional Tree Inspection accreditation and also hold a professional membership with the Arboricultural Association.

The advice below and appended is underwritten by our Professional Indemnity insurance for the business practice of Arboricultural Consultancy in the sum of one million Pounds Sterling in each and every claim.

**Table 1:** Documents referred to.

| Document | Reference No. |
|---|---|
| Survey base drawing | 25017-25-01 |
| LPA pre-app comments | N/A |
| British Standard 5837:2012 | “BS5837” |
| Tree Survey Schedule | Arbtech TS 01 |
| Tree Constraints Plan | Arbtech TCP 01 |

# 2. Survey

Survey: An arboricultural survey to BS5837 of all trees on and within impacting distance of the site was undertaken by Shaun Rowe on 13th January 2025.

During the survey I categorised the trees using "Table 1 – Cascade chart for tree quality assessment" of the BS5837:2012 (see Appendix 1).

A total of 7No. individual trees, 2No. groups of trees, 2No. hedges and 1No. woodland group were surveyed. Details for each of the trees surveyed are provided in the Schedule of Trees (see Appendix 2).

Multiple small trees and shrubs occupy the site, none of which meet the minimum diameter requirements to be considered for this survey.

**Table 2:** Documents upon which this tree survey has been based.

| Document | Originator | Reference Number | Title |
|---|---|---|---|
| Survey base drawing | The Survey House | 25017-25-01 | Topographic Site Survey |

Limitations: The survey was made at ground level using visual observation only. Detailed examinations, such as climbing inspections and advanced decay detection equipment were not employed, though may form part of the survey's management recommendations. Measurements were taken using specialist tapes, laser, and GPS devices. Where this was not possible, measurements are estimated.

Scope: Pre-development tree surveys make arboricultural management recommendations based exclusively upon the individual tree or group of trees condition relative to their present context (*i.e. not in relation to the proposed development*).

Legal Status: No statutory protection check has been performed. BS5837 does not draw any distinction between trees subject to statutory protection, such as a Tree Preservation Order ("TPO"), and those trees without. This is principally because a detailed planning consent overrides any TPO protection. Consequently, we do not seek to offer any comparison between or infer any difference in the quality or importance of TPO trees and other trees.

* For more information on the surveyed trees please see Arbtech Consulting Ltd, Tree Survey Schedule (Appendix 1), Tree Survey Report and Tree Constraints Plan.

### Site description

The site is located to the east of A528, Grange Road and occupies an area of existing arable land. A large, wooded area borders the sites southern boundary.





**Figure 1:** OS Map (Bing Maps)





**Figure 2**: Aerial Image of site with approximate red line boundary (Google Earth)

*This content is for educational and informative purposes; parts of it are reproduced with the kind permission of BSI Global.*

## 3. BS5837:2012 Scope

This standard recognises that there can be problems for development close to existing trees which are to be retained, and of planting trees close to existing structures. This standard sets out to assist those concerned with trees, in relation to construction, to form balanced judgements. It does not set out to put arguments for or against development, or for the removal or retention of trees. Where development, including demolition, is to occur, the standard provides guidance on how to decide which trees are appropriate for retention, on the means of protecting these trees during development, including demolition and construction work, and on the means of incorporating trees into the developed landscape.

## 4. Methodology

The methodology used to assess the trees was the British Standard 5837:2012 'Trees in Relation to Construction' tree survey method. The aim of the survey is to establish which trees are moderate and good quality; suitable for retention and justifying protection. And which trees are low or poor quality; either undesirable or unsuitable to retain and protect.

The tree survey includes all trees included in the land survey red line boundary plan, as well as any that may have been missed, and it should categorize trees or groups of trees, including woodlands for their quality and value within the existing context, in a transparent, understandable, and systematic way. Where the arboriculturist has deemed it appropriate, the trees have been tagged with small metal or plastic tags, placed as high as is convenient on the stem of each tree.

Whilst master plan proposals for the development of the site might be available, the trees have been surveyed without taking these into consideration. All detailed design work on site layout should take into consideration the results of the tree survey (and the TCP).

Trees forming groups and areas of woodland (including orchards, wood pasture and historic parkland) are identified and considered as groups where the arboriculturist has determined that this is appropriate, particularly where they contain a variety of species and age classes that could aid long-term management. It is often expedient to assess the quality and value of such groups of trees as a whole, rather than as individuals. However, an assessment of individuals within any group has been undertaken if they are open-grown or if there is a need to differentiate between them.

The quality and value of each tree or group of trees has been recorded by allocating it to one of the four categories: A, B, C, or U (highest to lowest quality respectively). The categories are differentiated on the tree survey plan by colour, or by suffixing the category adjacent to the tree identification number on the TCP.

The survey schedule lists all the trees or groups of trees. The following information is also provided:

a) reference number (to be recorded on the tree survey plan);
b) species (common or scientific names);
c) height in meters (m);
d) stem diameter in millimetres (mm) at 1.5m above adjacent ground level or immediately above the root flare for multi-stemmed trees;
e) branch spread in meters taken at the four cardinal compass points;
f) height of crown clearance above adjacent ground level in meters (m);
g) age class (newly planted, young, semi-mature, early mature, mature, over mature);
h) physiological condition (e.g. good, fair, poor, decline and dead);
i) structural condition (e.g. good, fair, poor or not visible);
j) comment about the tree, its location and preliminary management recommendations, including further investigation of suspected defects that require more detailed assessment and potential for wildlife habitat;
k) The retention category referring to the quality and useful contribution in years; **U** = <10yrs; **A** = >40yrs; **B** = >20yrs; **C** = >10yrs. The retention subcategory referring to the type of amenity; 1 = Arboricultural; 2 = Landscape; 3 = Cultural including conservation (see Appendix 1 Cascade chart for tree quality assessment).

# 5. Definitions

## Arboriculturist

An arboriculturist (or arboricultural consultant) is a person who has, through relevant education, training, and experience, gained recognized qualifications and expertise in the field of trees in relation to construction.

## Tree Survey

A tree survey should be undertaken by an arboriculturist and should record information about the trees on a site independently of and prior to any specific design for development. As a subsequent task, and with reference to a design or potential design, the results of the survey should be included in the preparation of a tree constraints plan, which should be used to assist with site layout design.

## Tree Constraints Plan

A TCP is plan, typically delivered as an AutoCAD drawing (.DWG file format), prepared by an arboriculturist for the purposes of layout design showing the root protection area and representing the effect that the mature height and spread of retained trees will have on layouts through shade, dominance, etc.

## Root Protection Area

An RPA is a layout design tool indicating the area surrounding a tree that contains sufficient rooting volume to ensure the survival of the tree, shown in plan form in $m^2$.

## Construction Exclusion Zone (also termed Tree Protection Zone)

A construction exclusion or tree protection zone is an area based on the RPA (in $m^2$), identified by an arboriculturist, to be protected during development, including demolition and construction work, by the use of barriers and/or ground protection fit for purpose to ensure the successful long-term retention of a tree.

## Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA)

This is a study, undertaken by an arboriculturist, to identify, evaluate and possibly mitigate the extent of direct and indirect impacts on existing trees that may arise as a result of the implementation of any site layout proposal.

## Tree Protection Plan (TPP)

A TPP is plan, typically delivered as an AutoCAD drawing (.DWG file format), prepared by an arboriculturist showing the finalized layout proposals, tree retention and tree and landscape protection measures detailed within the arboricultural method statement, which can be shown graphically.

### Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS)

This is a methodology for the implementation of any aspect of development that has the potential to result in loss of or damage to a tree. The AMS is likely to include details of an on-site tree protection monitoring regime.

## 6. Limitations

Trees were inspected from using visual observation from ground level only. Trees were not climbed or inspected below ground level. Inaccessible trees will have best estimates made about the location, physical dimensions, and characteristics. Trees have been grouped where BS5837 guides us that it is expedient to do so. Trees have been excluded from the survey if they are found by us to be sufficiently far away from the proposed developable area or if they are outside of the red line boundary plan showing the expectations of our client for the extent of the survey. BS5837 does not draw any distinction between trees subject to statutory protection, such as a Tree Preservation Order ("TPO"), and those trees without. This is principally because a detailed planning consent overrides any TPO protection. Consequently, we do not seek to offer any comparison between or infer any difference in the quality or importance of TPO trees and other trees.

This report does not constitute a tree safety survey, nor does it fulfil the stewards/landowners Duty of Care in relation to tree risk.

# 7. Appendices

The following documents were released to the Client as appendices to this report:

- Survey Schedule (.PDF)
- Tree Constraints Plan drawing (.DWG & .PDF)

If you require clarification of information contained herein, please do not hesitate to contact us via 01244 661170.

Yours Sincerely,



Shaun Rowe BSc (Hons) MArborA

Consultant Arboriculturist

07842 413 921

shaunrowe@arbtech.co.uk

# Appendix 1: Table 1 Cascade chart for tree quality assessment

## BS5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations

| **Table 1** | **Cascade chart for tree quality assessment** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Category and definition** | **Criteria (including subcategories when appropriate** | | | **Identification on plan** |
| Trees unsuitable for retention (see Note) | | | | |
| **Category U**<br><br>Those in such a condition that they cannot realistically be retained as living trees in the context of the current land use for longer than 10 years. | ▪Trees that have serious, irremediable, structural defect, such that their early loss is expected due to collapse, including those that will become unviable after removal of other category U trees (e.g. where, for whatever reason, the loss of companion shelter cannot be mitigated by pruning).<br>▪Trees that are dead or are showing signs of significant, immediate, and irreversible overall decline.<br>▪Trees infected with pathogens of significance to the health and/or safety of other trees nearby, or very low quality trees suppressing adjacent trees of better quality.<br>*NOTE Category U trees can have existing or potential conservation value which might be desirable to preserve; see 4.5.7.* | | | Dark red |
| | **1 Mainly arboricultural qualities** | **2 Mainly landscape qualities** | **3 Mainly cultural values, including conservation** | |
| **Trees to be considered for retention** | | | | |
| **Category A**<br><br>**Trees of high quality** with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 40 years. | Trees that are particularly good examples of their species, especially if rare or unusual; or those that are essential components of groups or formal or semi-formal arboricultural features (e.g. the dominate and/or principal trees within an avenue). | Trees, groups, or woodlands of particular visual importance as arboricultural and/or landscape features. | Trees, groups or woodlands of significant conservation, historical, commemorative or other value (e.g. veteran trees or wood-pasture). | Light green |
| **Category B**<br><br>**Trees of moderate quality** with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 20 years. | Trees that might be included in category A, but are downgraded because of impaired condition (e.g. presence of significant though remedial defects, including unsympathetic management and storm damage), such that they are unlikely to be suitable for retention of beyond 40 years; or trees lacking the special quality necessary to merit the category 'A' designation. | Trees present in numbers, usually growing as groups or woodlands, such that they attract a higher collective rating than they might as individuals; or trees occurring as collectives but situated so as to make little visual contribution to the wider locality. | Trees with material conservation or other cultural value. | Mid blue |
| **Category C**<br><br>**Trees of low quality** with an estimated remaining expectancy of at least 10 years, or young trees with a stem diameter below 150mm. | Unremarkable trees of very limited merit or such impaired condition that they do not qualify in higher categories. | Trees present in groups or woodlands, but without this conferring on them significantly greater collective landscape value; and/or trees offering low or only temporary/transient landscape value. | Trees with no material conservation or other cultural value. | Grey |

# Appendix 2: Schedule of Trees

# BS5837:2012 Tree Survey

**Arbtech Consulting Ltd.**
Chester Road
Chester
Cheshire
CH4 0DH
Phone: 01244661170
Mobile: N/A

Client: Steven Heighway
Project: Queensbridge Farm, Overton, Wrexham, LL13 0LE
Survey Date: 13/01/2025
Surveyor: Shaun Rowe

| Tree and Tag No / Species | Hght (m) | Stems No | Stems Ø (mm) | Crown Spread (m) | Crown Clear (m) | Age | RP A (m²) R (m) | Phys Condition | Structural Condition | Preliminary Recommendations / Survey Comment | Cat ERC |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| G01 | | | | | | | | | | Estimated Measurements | |
| Various | 6 | 1 | 150 | N | 2 | 1 | SM | A: 10.2 | Good | C: Good | C.2 |
| *See comments for details* | | | | E | 2 | 1 | | R: 1.8 | | S: Good | 10+ yrs |
| | | | | S | 2 | 1 | | | | B: Not visible | |
| | | | | W | 2 | 1 | | | | Group plotted indicatively to GPS and site features. Group comprised of field maple and hawthorn. Stem diameter is a maximum estimate. Ivy growth throughout. | |
| G02 | | | | | | | | | | Estimated Measurements | |
| Various | 16 | 1 | 350 | N | 4 | 4 | EM | A: 55.4 | Good | C: Good | B.2 |
| *See comments for details* | | | | E | 4 | 4 | | R: 4.19 | | S: Good | 20+ yrs |
| | | | | S | 4 | 4 | | | | B: Not visible | |
| | | | | W | 4 | 4 | | | | Group plotted indicatively to GPS and site features. Group comprised of early mature trees, individual locations not included within topographical survey. Species include poplar, silver birch, hazel and elder. Stem diameter is a maximum estimate. | |
| H01 | | | | | | | | | | Estimated Measurements | |
| A Hedge | 1.5 | 1 | 75 | N | 0.5 | 0 | SM | A: 2.5 | Good | C: Good | C.2 |
| *See comments for details* | | | | E | 0.5 | 0 | | R: 0.89 | | S: Good | 10+ yrs |
| | | | | S | 0.5 | 0 | | | | B: Not visible | |
| | | | | W | 0.5 | 0 | | | | Well maintained, small section of hedge that continues to east. Stem diameter is a maximum estimate. | |
| H02 | | | | | | | | | | Estimated Measurements | |
| A Hedge | 1.5 | 1 | 75 | N | 0.5 | 0 | SM | A: 2.5 | Good | C: Good | C.2 |
| *See comments for details* | | | | E | 0.5 | 0 | | R: 0.89 | | S: Good | 10+ yrs |
| | | | | S | 0.5 | 0 | | | | B: Not visible | |
| | | | | W | 0.5 | 0 | | | | Well maintained hedgerow. Stem diameter is a maximum estimate. | |

**Age Classifications:** N Newly planted; Y Young; SM Semi-mature; EM Early Mature; M Mature; OM Over Mature

**Condition:** C Crown; S Stem; B Basal area

**Stems:** Ø Diameter; (Eq) Equivalent stem diameter using BS5837:2012 definition

**ERC:** Estimated Remaining Contribution

| Tree and Tag No<br>Species | Hght (m) | Stems<br>No | Stems<br>Ø (mm) | Crown<br>Spread (m) | Crown<br>Clear (m) | Age | RP<br>A (m²)<br>R (m) | Phys Condition | Structural Condition | Preliminary Recommendations<br>Survey Comment | Cat<br>ERC |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T01 | | | | | | | | | | Estimated Measurements | |
| Common Oak<br>*Quercus robur* | 12 | 1 | 1300 | N 8<br>E 8.5<br>S 7.5<br>W 9 | 6<br>6<br>6<br>6 | M | A: 707<br>R: 15 | Good | C: Good<br>S: Ivy<br>B: Not visible | Tree growing within gap in hedge. Dense ivy from base into lower crown. Low level deadwood scattered around crown, typical for species. Surveyed from within field to east. Ganoderma bracket at base to southeast. Excellent landscape value. | A.1<br>40+ yrs |
| T02 | | | | | | | | | | Estimated Measurements | |
| Common Oak<br>*Quercus robur* | 14 | 1 | 1400 | N 9.5<br>E 9<br>S 10<br>W 10 | 6<br>6<br>6<br>6 | M | A: 707<br>R: 15 | Good | C: Good<br>S: Ivy<br>B: Good | Tree growing to east of hedge. Dense ivy from base into lower crown. Low level deadwood scattered around crown, typical for species. Major deadwood to southeast overhanging field. Surveyed from within field to east. Excellent landscape value. | A.1<br>40+ yrs |
| T03 | | | | | | | | | | Estimated Measurements | |
| Field Maple<br>*Acer campestre* | 8 | 3 | 308 (Eq) | N 3<br>E 5.5<br>S 2<br>W 0.5 | 4<br>4<br>4<br>4 | EM | A: 42.9<br>R: 3.69 | Good | C: Good<br>S: Good<br>B: Good | Tree growing within group. Naturally suppressed crown. Multistemmed with natural bracing present. | C.1<br>10+ yrs |
| T04 | | | | | | | | | | Estimated Measurements | |
| Common Oak<br>*Quercus robur* | 12 | 1 | 480 | N 6<br>E 5<br>S 4<br>W 6 | 6<br>6<br>6<br>6 | M | A: 104.2<br>R: 5.75 | Good | C: Good<br>S: Good<br>B: Good | Dominant tree within group. Ivy from base into central crown. Fungi fruiting c. 2 m north east of base, likely mycorrhizal. | B.1<br>20+ yrs |
| T05 | | | | | | | | | | Estimated Measurements | |
| Common Ash<br>*Fraxinus excelsior* | 15 | 1 | 550 | N 6<br>E 6<br>S 6<br>W 4 | 8<br>6<br>8<br>8 | M | A: 136.9<br>R: 6.6 | Good | C: Good<br>S: Ivy<br>B: Good | Dominant tree within group. Ivy from base into central crown. | B.1<br>20+ yrs |

**Age Classifications:** N Newly planted; Y Young; SM Semi-mature; EM Early Mature; M Mature; OM Over Mature

**Condition:** C Crown; S Stem; B Basal area

**Stems:** Ø Diameter; (Eq) Equivalent stem diameter using BS5837:2012 definition

**ERC:** Estimated Remaining Contribution

| Tree and Tag No<br>Species | Hght (m) | Stems<br>No | Stems<br>Ø (mm) | Crown<br>Spread (m) | Crown<br>Clear (m) | Age | RP<br>A (m²)<br>R (m) | Phys Condition | Structural Condition | Preliminary Recommendations<br>Survey Comment | Cat<br>ERC |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T06 | | | | | | | | | | Estimated Measurements | |
| Poplar<br>*Populus sp.* | 18 | 4 | 1072 (Eq) | N 6<br>E 6<br>S 6<br>W 6 | 10<br>10<br>10<br>10 | M | A: 519.8<br>R: 12.86 | Good | C: Good<br>S: Good<br>B: Not visible | Tree location plotted indicatively to GPS and site features. Multistemmed from base, no access to or view of basal area. Deadwood within lower crown, typical of species. | **B.1**<br>20+ yrs |
| T07 | | | | | | | | | | Estimated Measurements | |
| Unknown<br>- - | 8 | 1 | 350 | N 0.5<br>E 0.5<br>S 0.5<br>W 0.5 | 0<br>0<br>0<br>0 | EM | A: 55.4<br>R: 4.19 | Dead | C: Poor<br>S: Poor<br>B: Poor | Standing dead tree. | **U**<br><10 yrs |
| W01 | | | | | | | | | | Estimated Measurements | |
| Various<br>*See comments for details* | 18 | 1 | 600 | N 4<br>E 4<br>S 4<br>W 4 | 3<br>3<br>3<br>3 | EM | A: 162.9<br>R: 7.2 | Good | C: Good<br>S: Good<br>B: Good | Woodland located to the south of field. Stem diameter is a maximum estimate. Unmanaged woodland that is comprised mainly of poplar, Lawsons cypress and fir. Elder, larch and ash less common throughout. Few hung up and fallen trees within woodland. Dense ivy growth throughout. Limited access due to post and wire fence and ground conditions. | **B.2**<br>20+ yrs |


**Age Classifications:** N Newly planted; Y Young; SM Semi-mature; EM Early Mature; M Mature; OM Over Mature

**Condition:** C Crown; S Stem; B Basal area

**Stems:** Ø Diameter; (Eq) Equivalent stem diameter using BS5837:2012 definition

**ERC:** Estimated Remaining Contribution

# Appendix 3: Tree Constraints Plan




## Tree Categories

Trees are categorised in accordance with the cascade chart in Table 1 of the British Standard BS 5837:2012 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations'

Category 'U' - Trees in such condition that they cannot realistically be retained as living trees in context of the current land use for longer than 10 years.
Category 'A' - Trees of high quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 40 years.
Category 'B' - Trees of moderate quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 20 years.
Category 'C' - Trees of low quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 10 years, or young trees with a stem diameter below 150mm.

## Root Protection Area

In order to avoid damage to the roots or rooting environment of retained trees, the Root Protection Areas (RPAs) are plotted around each of the category A, B and C trees. This is a minimum area in $m^2$ which should be left undisturbed around each retained tree.

The RPA is calculated using the British Standard BS 5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations.

The calculated RPA is capped to 707$m^2$, which is the equivalent to a circle with a radius of 15m. Where there appears to be restrictions to root growth the root protection area is reshaped to more accurately reflect the likely distribution of the roots.

## Tree Survey Report

Please refer to Arbtech Consulting Ltd. Tree Survey Report and Tree Schedule for full details on all surveyed trees, hedges, woodlands and groups of trees/shrubs.

All trees were surveyed and categorised in accordance with the guidance as set out in the British Standard BS5837:2012 Tree in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations.

We make the following recommendation to ensure that no conditions relating to arboriculture are attached to any planning consent secured:
Obtain and arboricultural report to include:
a) An arboricultural impact assessment (AIA).
b) An arboricultural method statement (AMS).
c) A tree protection plan (TPP).

arbtech
Unit 3, Well House Barns, Chester, CH4 0DH
https://arbtech.co.uk, 01244 661170

Project:
Queensbridge Farm,
Overton,
Wrexham,
LL13 0LE

Client:
Steven Heighway

Drawing:
Tree Constraints Plan

Based on:
25017-25-01

| Drawing No: | | Rev: |
|---|---|---|
| Arbtech TCP 01 | | |
| Date: | Scale: | Drawn: |
| Jan 2025 | 1:250 @ A0 | SR |

Key:

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Tree Nos.: | T01 | Tree Canopies: | | Trunks: | |
| RPAs: | | Category 'U' trees: | | Category 'A' trees: | |
| Category 'B' trees: | | Category 'B' groups: | | Category 'C' trees: | |
| Category 'C' groups: | | | | | |

0m 1m 3m 5m 10m 15m 20m

All dimensions should be checked on site. No dimensions are to be scaled from this drawing. Any discrepancies are to be reported immediately. Arbtech Consulting Ltd. cannot be held responsible for inaccuracies in the base drawing in which this plan is based.
This drawing is designed to reflect the principles of the layout or design only, and relates only to the arboricultural aspects.
This drawing is not to be read as a definitive part of the engineering or construction designs or method statement. An architect or structural engineer should be contacted over any matters of construction, including foundation design, to ensure that all requirements or regulatory requirements relating to proposed structures, land buffering or underground services.
This drawing was produced in colour - a monochrome copy should not be relied upon.

© Arbtech Consulting Ltd. 2024

# 8. Document Production Record

| Document number | Editor | Signature | Position | Issue number | Date |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Arbtech TSR 01 | Shaun Rowe |  | Consultant Arboriculturist | 01 | 21/01/25 |

## Limitations

Arbtech Consulting Ltd has prepared this report for the sole use of the above-named Client/Agent in accordance with our terms of business, under which our services were performed. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this report or any other services provided by us. This report may not be relied upon by any other party without the prior and express written agreement of Arbtech Consulting Ltd. The assessments made assume that the sites and facilities will continue to be used for their current purpose without significant change. The conclusions and recommendations contained in this report are based upon information provided by others and upon the assumption that all relevant information has been provided by those parties from whom it has been requested. Information obtained from third parties has not been independently verified by Arbtech Consulting Ltd.

## Copyright

© This Report is the copyright of Arbtech Consulting Ltd. Any unauthorised reproduction or usage by any person other than the addressee is strictly prohibited.