TREE SOLUTIONS



Arboricultural Impact Assessment

Robinwood Activity Centre, Maes-y-Nant, Cross Lanes, Wrexham

Prepared for:

ROBINWOOD ACTIVITY CENTRES

Our Ref: 26/AIA/WXM/342

April 2026

T 07766 774508 • E info@tree-solutions.co.uk

Tree Solutions Ltd • Registration in England & Wales • Company No. 04548951

Contents:

1.0 Instruction
2.0 Statutory Controls & Planning Policy
3.0 The Site
4.0 Development Proposal
5.0 General Constraints Data – Construction Exclusion Zones
6.0 Survey Methodology
7.0 Juxtaposition of Trees & Structures
8.0 Development Impact to Trees
9.0 Proposed Revisions
10.0 Conclusions
11.0 Limiting Conditions

Appendix 1 Tree Survey Schedule
Appendix 2 Preliminary Tree Constraints Plan
Appendix 3 Arboricultural Impact Plan

1.0 INSTRUCTION

1.1 We have been instructed by Robinwood Activity Centres (the applicant) to carry out an Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) to assess the development proposal in relation to trees in accordance with the principles of British Standard 5837 'Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition & Construction - Recommendations' 2012.

1.2 We are instructed to prepare a report to provide information to assist all parties involved in the planning process to make balanced judgements regarding arboricultural features in relation to the proposed development at the Robinwood Activity Centre, Maes Y Nant, Cross Lane, Wrexham. As such, all trees within influencing distance to the development proposal both on and adjoining the site have been surveyed and are listed within a Tree Survey Schedule (***Appendix 1***) and plotted on all accompanying plans.

1.3 The stage 1 tree survey was carried out in March 2026 by Alistair Henderson, Principal Consultant to Tree Solutions Ltd. Our appraisal of the mechanical integrity of trees on the site is enough to inform the current project. The assessment of trees is carried out from ground level without invasive investigation and the disclosure of hidden defects cannot therefore be expected. Whilst the survey is not specifically commissioned to report on matters of tree safety, we report obvious defects that are significant in relation to the existing and proposed land use. We do not carry out detailed safety inspections unless specifically instructed to do so in writing and have not carried out such inspections of trees on the proposal site.

1.4 Six individual trees (T1-T6) were surveyed and mapped on a Preliminary Tree Constraints & Impact Assessment Plan Ref: 26/AIA/WXM/342, Drawing No. 1 & 2 at ***Appendix 2***. All arboricultural information recorded during the survey is presented within a schedule at ***Appendix 1***.

1.5 The Arboricultural Impact Assessment is based on the proposed layout, Drawing No: RAC-LAW-X-X-DR-A-069001 (Rev P00) provided by Lawray Architects.

2.0 STATUTORY CONTROLS & PLANNING POLICY

2.1 Several trees within the site are subject to Tree Preservation Order Ref: 116 (2007). It appears from the available plans that Tree T4 (Lime) corresponds to T17 within this Order. However, this tree is shown as crossed out and identified as removed. Clarification should therefore be sought from Wrexham County Borough Council to confirm its status and whether formal consent is required prior to undertaking any works.





Plate 1 – Extract from WCBC TPO 116 (2007) showing T17 crossed off on plan

© Tree Solutions Ltd (2026)



SCHEDULE 1 (cont)
SPECIFICATION OF TREES

Reference on Map	Description	Situation*
T8	Lime	E: 337345 N: 347022
T9	Oak	E: 337350 N: 347005
T10	Pine	E: 337455 N: 347010
~~T11~~	~~Beech~~	~~E: 337338 N: 346974~~
~~T12~~	~~Cedar~~	~~E: 337319 N: 346956~~
T13	Oak	E: 337329 N: 346945
~~T14~~	~~Beech~~	~~E: 337345 N: 346924~~
~~T15~~	~~Cedar~~	~~E: 337385 N: 346888~~
~~T16~~	~~Lime~~	~~E: 337373 N: 346874~~
~~T17~~	~~Lime~~	~~E: 337439 N: 349945~~
~~T18~~	~~Oak~~	~~E: 337473 N: 346915~~

A TPO is made in respect of 18 individual trees of various species as specified in the 1st Schedule. The trees are indicated as T1 - T18 on the plan.

Plate 2 – Extract from WCBC TPO 116 (2007) schedule showing T17 removed

2.1.2 The planning application will be assessed against relevant national and local planning policy and guidance. This includes Planning Policy Wales (Edition 12, February 2024), Future Wales, The National Plan 2040, and relevant Technical Advice Notes, including TAN 5: Nature Conservation and Planning, TAN 12: Design, and TAN 18: Transport, where applicable. At a local level, the proposals will be considered against the Wrexham Local Development Plan, including Policy EC4 (Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows), and the Council's adopted Local Planning Guidance Note 17: Trees and Development.

2.2 Natural Resources Wales Felling Licence

2.2.1 In accordance with the provisions of the Forestry Act 1967 (as amended), any tree removals taking place outside the curtilage of a domestic garden that exceed 5 cubic metres of timber volume in any one calendar quarter will require a valid Felling Licence issued by Natural Resources Wales. It should be noted that tree removals authorised through a full planning consent are exempt from the requirement for a Felling Licence, as such works are deemed to have already been assessed and approved under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2.3 Protected Species

2.3.1 Mature trees may contain features such as cavities, crevices and splits that provide potential roosting or nesting opportunities for protected species, notably bats and barn owls. All bat species and their roosts are protected under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) and are also afforded protection under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). Barn owls and all wild birds are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). Any works affecting trees with potential to support protected species should be preceded by appropriate ecological assessment and, where necessary, mitigation measures to ensure compliance with relevant legislation.

2.4 Wildlife Habitats

2.4.1 Trees and hedgerows provide suitable nesting habitat for a wide range of bird species. Under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), it is an offence to intentionally damage or destroy the nest of any wild bird whilst it is in use or being built. As such, any vegetation clearance or tree works undertaken during the main bird nesting season (typically March to September inclusive) should be preceded by a nesting bird check carried out by a suitably qualified ecologist. If active nests are identified, works must be delayed until the young have fledged and the nest is no longer in use.

3.0 THE SITE

3.1 The application site is located within the grounds of Robinwood Activity Centre, Maes y Nant, an outdoor activity centre for children. The proposed development is situated to the east of the site offices within an area of existing tarmac hardstanding. Trees are present to the north and south forming established perimeter planting.

© Tree Solutions Ltd (2026)



P1 – Site location

4.0 DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

4.1 The proposal comprises a new meeting room building to serve the outdoor activity centre.

5.0 GENERAL CONSTRAINTS DATA - CONSTRUCTION EXCLUSION ZONES (CEZ's)

5.1 GENERAL

5.1.1 *During the development process, there may be three or even four key constraints to consider in relation to retained trees. These include:*

1. ***Construction Exclusion Zones (CEZ):*** *Areas around retained trees where no construction activity, ground compaction, or material storage is permitted, to protect the root system and overall tree health.*
2. ***Crown Protection Areas (or CEZ 2):*** *Above-ground space required to accommodate the tree's existing and future crown spread, including allowances for safe working distances and potential pruning limits.*
3. ***Root Protection Areas (RPA):*** *Below-ground zones defined to safeguard the tree's root system, as per BS5837:2012 guidelines, where development and soil disturbance are strictly limited.*
4. ***Working Space Buffers (if applicable):*** *Additional space around CEZ or RPA boundaries required to ensure safe access for construction personnel and machinery, without compromising tree protection measures.*

5.2 ROOT PROTECTION AREA (RPA)

5.2.1 The RPA, expressed in square metres (m^2), must be protected both prior to and throughout any demolition or construction activities. This protection is essential to ensure the successful retention of trees by safeguarding a sufficient quantity of viable, functioning roots.

5.2.2 The RPA is derived from a radial measurement taken from the centre of the tree stem. For single-stemmed trees, this is calculated by multiplying the stem diameter (measured at 1.5 m above ground level) by a factor of 12. For multi-stemmed trees, the calculation is based on the formula: (mean stem diameter^2) × number of stems**.**

5.2.3 During the Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) process, this radial distance is converted by the Arboriculturalist into an actual area to be protected, considering the specific site conditions and any environmental or developmental influences that may have impacted the tree's rooting pattern.

5.2.4 Initially, the RPA for each tree should be represented as a circle centred on the base of the stem. However, where site conditions suggest asymmetric rooting due to factors such as physical obstructions, topography, or historic ground disturbance a polygon of equivalent area may be substituted. Any deviation from a circular RPA must be underpinned by a robust arboricultural assessment, accurately reflecting the likely distribution of roots.

© Tree Solutions Ltd (2026)

5.2.5 The RPA must be protected through the installation of appropriate tree protection fencing prior to the commencement of any demolition or construction works on site. The fencing should remain in place and be maintained for the duration of the works. No potentially harmful activities should take place within the RPA, including mechanical excavation, soil stripping, fire lighting, storage of materials or waste, ground level changes, or the installation of impermeable surfaces.

5.2.6 Where construction is required in close proximity to retained trees or within the RPA, additional measures may be necessary. These may include temporary ground protection to prevent compaction, or the use of specialist construction techniques such as no-dig or low-impact foundation solutions to minimise disturbance to the rooting environment.

5.3 CEZ 2: TREE CROWN PROTECTION ZONE

5.3.1 The Tree Crown Protection Zone (CEZ 2) is the area above ground occupied by the crown of a tree, including allowances for safe working space and, where appropriate, anticipated future crown development. The extent of CEZ 2 is determined by considering the existing and projected crown spread, with reference to any acceptable level of pruning in accordance with BS 3998:2010 Tree Work Recommendations.

5.3.2 All development works and associated infrastructure have been positioned clear of tree canopies and outside designated Construction Exclusion Zones. As a result, no access facilitation pruning is required.

5.4 CEZ 3: TREE DOMINANCE ZONE

5.4.1 Not applicable, as the proposed development does not comprise residential use and therefore no requirement for the assessment of tree dominance in relation to habitable spaces arises.

5.5 CEZ 4: NEW PLANTING ZONE

5.5.1 The tree proposed for removal will be replaced with three new native specimens within the grounds to ensure continuity of tree cover and to mitigate any loss in biodiversity value, contributing towards biodiversity net gain.

6.0 SURVEY METHODOLOGY

6.1 The method used in the preparation of this report is based on the principles of BS 5837: 2012.

1. Tree heights were surveyed to the nearest 1m
2. Trunk diameters were measured by use of forestry girth tape
3. The category assessment (Table 1) on which the trees is based include current and long-term arboricultural, landscape, cultural and conservation values (BS5837: 2012). This table can be found at ***Appendix 1***
4. For clarity, the grading system is summarised from ***Table 2*** of the BS as follows:

U grade – trees for removal, effective for less than 10 years
A grade – trees of high quality and value, effective for more than 40 years
B grade – trees of moderate quality and value, effective for more than 20 years
C grade – trees of low quality and value, effective for 10 years

Note: We have indicated colour coding on the drawing and therefore a monochrome copy should not be relied on.

6.2 SOIL ASSESSMENT

6.2.1 Tree Solutions Ltd does not undertake soil investigations as part of this commission. The client is therefore advised to seek specialist geotechnical or soil science expertise where site-specific soil assessment is required to inform the design, construction methodology, or future landscape management.

© Tree Solutions Ltd (2026)

7.0 JUXTAPOSITION OF TREES AND STRUCTURES

7.1 Below ground constraints

7.1.1 Below ground constraints are generally defined as the Root Protection Area (RPA). The shape and extent of an RPA is determined by arboricultural considerations including the likely tolerance of the tree to root disturbance, root morphology and disposition (where known), past and existing site conditions, soil type and structure, and local topography and drainage.

7.1.2 The function of the RPA is to safeguard tree roots and the soil environment that supports them. Damage to roots may occur through excavation, soil compaction, changes in soil level, or contamination, any of which can significantly reduce tree health, vitality, and stability.

7.1.3 Root distribution is strongly influenced by site conditions including soil type, drainage and the presence of physical barriers. Trees growing adjacent to hard surfaces or underground constraints often display asymmetric rooting patterns, with reduced lateral spread into unfavourable conditions. The RPA of tree number 6 has been modified and is shown running around the edge of the adjacent building and extending further within the site where a more favourable rooting environment exists. All other RPAs have been plotted as unmodified circles, as no other significant below-ground constraints were identified that would prevent normal radial root spread.

7.3 Underground Services

7.3.1 Detailed information on the alignment of proposed underground services was not available. The guidance below is therefore general and should be reviewed once detailed service layouts are prepared.

7.3.2 Where new drainage or utility runs are required near retained trees, service routes should be designed to avoid RPAs wherever reasonably practicable. If incursions into RPAs cannot be avoided, low-impact excavation techniques such as hand digging under arboricultural supervision, air-spading, or thrust-boring should be used to prevent damage to significant roots and to maintain soil structure and rooting conditions.

7.3.3 Established methods for the sensitive installation of underground services near trees are set out in the National Joint Utilities Group (NJUG) Guidelines for the Planning, Installation and Maintenance of Utility Apparatus in Proximity to Trees (Volume 4, Issue 2, 2007). These principles should be integrated into the final Construction Method Statement and Arboricultural Method Statement. Any works within or adjacent to RPAs should be undertaken under the supervision of the appointed project arboriculturist and in accordance with BS 5837:2012 and relevant local planning policy requirements.

8.0 DEVELOPMENT IMPACT TO TREES

8.1 Tree Solutions undertook a Stage 1 Tree Survey in accordance with BS5837:2012. All existing trees within and adjacent to the site were identified, surveyed and categorised, with RPAs calculated and plotted on all plans. This information has informed the layout and siting of the proposed development from the outset, ensuring that arboricultural constraints have been appropriately considered and integrated into the design process.

8.2 The proposed development requires the removal of T2, a small Whitebeam of limited arboricultural merit. The tree is located within an area of compacted subgrade and existing tarmac hardstanding, which is likely to have constrained its rooting environment and long-term viability. Whilst it provides a limited level of localised amenity, the site benefits from a strong framework of surrounding mature tree cover which contributes more significantly to the wider landscape character. Its loss can therefore be readily mitigated through replacement planting within the site. Accordingly, T2 has been categorised as Category C and is not considered a constraint to the proposed development.

8.3 The proposed development results in an incursion of approximately 13m² (c. 11%) of the RPA of T1 and 6m² (c. 5%) of T2. These values fall below the 20% guideline identified within BS5837:2012 and are considered to represent a limited level of encroachment. The incursion is also located toward the outer extent of the RPAs, further reducing the likelihood of impacting significant structural roots.

© Tree Solutions Ltd (2026)

8.3.1 The areas of incursion coincide with locations currently occupied by compacted subgrade and existing bound tarmac surfacing, as observed on site, which represent established constraints to root growth, soil structure and permeability.

8.3.2 Notwithstanding this, a precautionary approach will be adopted in accordance with BS5837:2012 to minimise potential impacts to retained trees. Construction within the RPA will be undertaken using a low-impact methodology, comprising a reinforced concrete slab designed to minimise excavation depth and avoid unnecessary disturbance to the soil profile and retained roots. Excavation will be carried out by hand under direct arboricultural supervision to allow roots to be identified, retained and, where necessary, bridged, with any pruning undertaken in accordance with BS3998:2010.

8.3.3 No machine excavation will take place within the RPA, and an arboricultural watching brief will be maintained throughout. Should significant roots (e.g. >25mm diameter or those critical to the tree's physiological or structural integrity) be encountered, works will cease in that area and the construction methodology reviewed and adapted to ensure compliance with BS5837:2012.



P2 – location of proposed building within existing hard standing area

9.0 PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE SCHEME

9.1 It is recommended that any proposed revisions to the scheme which may have implications for retained trees, or their associated Root Protection Areas should be referred to us for review and comment. This will ensure that appropriate arboricultural advice is provided at the earliest opportunity and that the scheme remains compliant with *BS 5837:2012* and best practice guidance throughout its implementation.

10.0 CONCLUSIONS

10.1 BS5837:2012 provides the recognised framework for the assessment, retention and protection of trees in relation to development. Arboricultural input has informed the design process from an early stage, with a preliminary tree survey used to identify constraints and guide the layout and siting of the proposed development.

10.2 The proposed development requires the removal of a single tree (T2), categorised as Category C. This tree is of limited arboricultural merit and is located within an area of compacted subgrade and existing hardstanding, which is likely to have constrained its growth and long-term viability. Its removal will not result in a material loss of arboricultural or landscape value and can be readily mitigated through replacement planting within the site.

© Tree Solutions Ltd (2026)

10.3 The development results in minor and localised incursions into the RPA of retained trees, equating to approximately 11% of T1 and 5% of T2. These incursions occur within areas of existing hardstanding and compacted subgrade, where rooting conditions are already constrained. Where works are required within RPAs, construction will be undertaken using a low-impact methodology, including hand excavation under arboricultural supervision and the use of a reinforced concrete slab to minimise disturbance to retained roots and the surrounding soil profile. Subject to these measures, no adverse impact on the health or stability of retained trees is anticipated.

10.4 All retained trees will be protected throughout the construction phase in accordance with the submitted Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan. Arboricultural supervision will be implemented where required to ensure compliance and to respond to any unforeseen site conditions.

10.5 The proposed development will include replacement planting to offset the removal of T2, with new trees provided on a 3:1 basis. This will ensure no net loss of tree cover and will contribute to the ongoing arboricultural and landscape value of the site.

10.6 On this basis, the proposals represent a balanced and sustainable form of development that achieves the objectives of the scheme while appropriately managing the existing tree resource. There are no arboricultural constraints that would warrant refusal of the application.

11.0 LIMITING CONDITIONS

Unless stated otherwise, the following conditions apply:

- The information contained in this report pertains only to the trees that were inspected and reflects their condition at the time of the survey.
- The findings and recommendations within this report are considered valid for a period of two years from the date of inspection.
- The inspection was limited to a visual assessment from ground level only. No invasive investigations such as dissection, excavation, probing, or coring were undertaken. As such, no warranty or guarantee, express or implied, is offered that undetected issues may not arise in the future.
- This report has been prepared solely for the use and benefit of the client. Tree Solutions Ltd accepts no liability or responsibility to any third party.
- This report may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, without the prior written consent of Tree Solutions Ltd.

© Tree Solutions Ltd (2026)

Appendix One

Tree Survey Schedule

© Tree Solutions Ltd (2026)

TREE SURVEY SCHEDULE (BS5837: 2012)

TREE SOLUTIONS

SITE:	MAES Y NANT, CROSS LANES, WREXHAM
CLIENT:	ROBINWOOD ACTIVITY CENTRES
BRIEF:	ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

SURVEYOR:	A. HENDERSON
ASSESSMENT DATE:	27/03/2026
VIEWING CONDITIONS:	CLEAR
JOB REFERENCE:	26/AIA/WXM/342

TREE NO. T - Tree G - Group H- Hedge	SPECIES (COMMON NAME)	AGE	HEIGHT (m) + CROWN CLEARANCE/ DIRECTION OF GROWTH (N.S.E.W)	RADIAL CROWN SPREAD (m) N	S	E	W	STEM/ MULTI-STEM* DIA. (mm)	VITALITY	COMMENTS	MANAGEMENT	CATEGORY & SUB-CATEGORY GRADING BS 5837	BS 5837 RADIUS (m) RPA (m^2)
T1	Yew	EM	12 1N	3	4	3.5	3.5	520	G	• Good quality tree with no obvious defects noted • Tarmac access road over primary roots to north • Co-dominant stems from 3m • E.R.C.20+	• No works	B2	6 120m²
T2	Whitebeam	EM	7 1	1.5	4	3.5	2	200	G	• Ivy clad • Not visually prominent & easily replaced • E.R.C.10+	• Remove for development and plant replacement	C1	2.5 20m²
T3	Sycamore	EM	9 1	2.5	2.5	2	2	250	G	• Naturally colonised tree • Coppiced in past • E.R.C.10	• No works	C1	3 30m²
T4	Sycamore	EM	13 1N	2	2.5	2	3	250	G	• As T3	• No works	C1	3 30m²
T5	Lime	M	18 10W	7	5	5	6.5	850	G	• Co-dominant stems from 8m • Prominent tree to site • E.R.C.40	• No works	A2	10 325m²
T6	Oak	M	17 4N	7.5	8	9	8	1090	G	• High value tree • Prominent in landscape • E.R.C.40+	• No works	A1	13 540m²

HEADINGS & ABBREVIATIONS

TREE NO.	REFERENCE NUMBER. REFER TO PLAN OR NUMBERED TAGS WHERE APPLICABLE (T = TREE, G = GROUP, H = HEDGE)
SPECIES:	COMMON NAME (LATIN NAMES AVAILABLE ON REQUEST)
AGE RANGE/LIFE STAGE:	Y = YOUNG, SM = SEMI MATURE, EM = EARLY MATURE, M = MATURE, PM = POST MATURE
HEIGHT:	ESTIMATED AND RECORDED IN METRES. APPROXIMATELY 1 IN 10 TREES ARE MEASURED USING A CLINOMETER AND THE REMAINDER ESTIMATED AGAINST THE MEASURED TREES
CROWN SPREAD:	MAXIMUM CROWN RADIUS MEASURED TO THE FOUR CARDINAL COMPASS POINTS FOR SINGLE SPECIMENS ONLY (MEASUREMENT FOR TREE GROUPS - MAXIMUM RADIUS OF THE GROUP)
CROWN CLEARANCE & DIRECTION OF GROWTH:	HEIGHT IN METERS OF CROWN CLEARANCE ABOVE ADJACENT GROUND LEVEL (TO INFORM ON GROUND CLEARANCE, CROWN/STEM RATIO AND SHADING)
STEM DIA/MULTI-STEM DIA:	STEM DIAMETER - MEASURED AT APPROXIMATELY 1.5 METRES ABOVE GROUND LEVEL OR A COMBINATION OF STEMS FOR MULTI-STEMMED TREES
VITALITY:	A MEASURE OF PHYSIOLOGICAL CONDITION. D = DEAD, MD = MORIBUND, P = POOR, M = MODERATE, G = GOOD
E.R.C. = ESTIMATED REMAINING CONTRIBUTION:	RELATIVE USEFUL LIFE EXPECTANCY (YEARS)
BS 5837CATEGORY & SUB-CATEGORY GRADING:	A = HIGH QUALITY AND VALUE, B = MODERATE QUALITY AND VALUE, C = LOW QUALITY AND VALUE, U = UNSUITABLE FOR RETENTION (SUB-CATEGORY REFERS TO ARBORICULTURAL., LANDSCAPE AND CULTURAL/CONSERVATION VALUES)
BS 5837 RADIUS & BS 5837 RPA:	PROTECTIVE DISTANCE - RADIUS FROM THE CENTRE OF THE STEM TO THE LINE OF TREE PROTECTION (CONSTRUCTION EXCLUSION ZONE - CEZ) AND PROTECTIVE BARRIER ROOT PROTECTION AREA - BS 5837 (2012) ANNEX D (THE RECOMMENDATIONS STATE THAT THE RPA SHOULD BE CAPPED AT 707 M^2) NOTE – ALL CALCULATIONS ROUNDED TO NEAREST DECIMAL

Table 1 **Cascade chart for tree quality assessment**


Category and definition	Criteria (including subcategories where appropriate)			Identification on plan
Trees unsuitable for retention (see Note)				
Category U 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 a 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) • Trees that are dead or are showing signs of significant, immediate, and irreversible overall decline • 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 *NOTE Category U trees can have existing or potential conservation value which it might be desirable to preserve; see **4.5.7**.*			See Table 2
	1 Mainly arboricultural qualities	**2 Mainly landscape qualities**	**3 Mainly cultural values, including conservation**	
Trees to be considered for retention				
Category A **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 dominant 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)	See Table 2
Category B **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 remediable defects, including unsympathetic past management and storm damage), such that they are unlikely to be suitable for retention for 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	See Table 2
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 150 mm	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 benefits	Trees with no material conservation or other cultural value	See Table 2

© The British Standards Institution 2012

Appendix Two

Preliminary Tree Constraints Plan

© Tree Solutions Ltd (2026)



Legend

Root Protection Area Modified to Account for Site Features

- Category A (High Quality)
- Category B (Moderate Quality)
- Category C (Low Quality)
- Category U (Dead/Dying/In Decline)

Client: Robinwood Activity Centre	
Project: Maes Y Nant, Cross Lanes, Wrexham	
Title: Preliminary Tree Constraints Plan	
Scale: 1:250 at A2	Date: April 2026
Drawn By: SD	Revision: -
Job Ref: 26/AIA/WXM/342	Drawing No: 01

Do not scale from this drawing all dimensions to be checked on site.

The copyright of this document resides with Tree Solutions Ltd unless assigned in writing by the company

TREE SOLUTIONS
E: info@tree-solutions.co.uk T: 07766 774508
Tree Solutions Ltd - Company No: 04548951

Appendix Three

Impact Assessment Plan

© Tree Solutions Ltd (2026)

CAR PARK

EXISTING O/H POWER

EXISTING O/H POWER

1

2

3

4

5

6

NEW MEETING ROOM BUILDING

EXISTING LODGE

EXISTING GARAGE

EXISTING MAIN BUILDING

EXISTING GIANT SWING

EXISTING STORE

EXISTING HIGH ACTIVITIES BUILDING

N

W

E

S

5m 10m

Legend

Root Protection Area Modified to Account for Site Features

Category

Crown Spread

Tree Number

Root Protection Area

- Category A (High Quality)
- Category B (Moderate Quality)
- Category C (Low Quality)
- Category U (Dead/Dying/In Decline)

Tree Proposed for Removal

Client:
Robinwood Activity Centre

Project:
Maes Y Nant, Cross Lanes, Wrexham

Title:
Arboricultural Impact Assessment

Scale:	Date:
1:250 at A2	April 2026
Drawn By:	Revision:
SD	-
Job Ref:	Drawing No:
26/AIA/WXM/342	02

Do not scale from this drawing all dimensions to be checked on site.

The copyright of this document resides with Tree Solutions Ltd unless assigned in writing by the company

TREE SOLUTIONS

E: info@tree-solutions.co.uk T: 07766 774508

Tree Solutions Ltd - Company No: 04548961