

Principal Consultant: Patrick Stileman BSc(Hons), MICFor, Dip. Arb (RFS), M. Arbor. A

9 Chestnut Drive, Berkhamsted, Hertfordshire, HP4 2JL • Tel: 01442 866112 • Fax: 01442 879388
Email: patrick@treeconsulting.co.uk • www.treeconsulting.co.uk



**Arboricultural Implication Statement for proposed
development at 61 – 65 Nightingale Road,
Rickmansworth, Herts.**

Client

Henry Homes plc

Prepared by

Patrick Stileman BSc(Hons), MICFor, Dip. Arb (RFS), M.Arbor.A

Date

3rd September 2009

Job reference

DS25040701

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 I am Patrick Stileman, Director of Patrick Stileman Ltd. I am acting on instruction of the client, Henry Homes plc. I have qualifications and experience in arboricultural consultancy, and I have given details of this in Appendix 1.

1.2 Background:

1.2.1 Henry Homes plc are submitting a new application for development at 61 – 65 Nightingale Road, Rickmansworth, Herts subsequent to the dismissal of a similar scheme at appeal on 12th January 2009. The Local Authority reference for the previous appealed scheme is 08/1089/ful.

1.2.2 The revised scheme has incorporated minor modifications to the design of the buildings and access road

1.2.3 For the previous scheme I prepared a detailed Arboricultural Implication Assessment and Arboricultural Method Statement. Given the similarities between this scheme and the previous, I consider it reasonable to outline in a document only what the different implications to trees are relative to the previous application. I discussed this with Tree and Landscape Officer James Percy-Lancaster at a site meeting with him on 24th August 2009, and he agreed that this would be acceptable. James also stated that he would be happy to defer an Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Planting Plan with the new scheme to a later date as a planning condition in the event that consent is granted.

1.3 Brief

1.3.1 I am instructed to prepare a brief Arboricultural Implication Statement outlining the additional impact to trees that the new proposed scheme will have relative to the previous scheme dismissed at appeal in January 2009. The document is to include specification of all tree work required to facilitate the development and for reasons of sound arboricultural management.

1.4 Documents

1.4.1 I have prepared an updated Tree Survey Report dated 2nd September 2009 which provides factual details of all trees on the site. This has been submitted with the new planning application. For details of all trees described in this document, see the Tree Survey Report.

1.4.2 In order to compare the new scheme with the previous, I refer to the site plan prepared by Tempietto Architects called: *revised scheme marked-up with footprint of previous proposal* drawing number 1606/02B. This drawing shows tree crowns and root protection areas (RPA's) taken from the Tree Survey Report.

1.3 **Legal status of trees:** The site is located within a Conservation Area which impacts on trees with a stem diameter in excess of 75mm. In addition to this, there is a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) in place (Nightingale Road No. 3 1987). Included within this TPO are: the pine trees within the group along the northern boundary; T36 Atlas cedar; T44 copper beech; T62 Deodar cedar; T93 – 96 sycamore x 3, Scots pine x 1.

2 REVISED DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

2.1 The principal differences between the previous planning application and the new planning application are as follows:

- The access road leading into the site is 1.4 metres wider than previously. The extra width has been gained to the west.
- The eastern boundary for Number 61 Nightingale Road has been moved closer to its house by approximately 2 metres thereby providing additional space for Plot 4 (formerly Number 63 Nightingale Road).
- The house on Plot 4 has been rotated through 90 degrees such that the house is now facing towards the new access road.
- The width of the house on Plot 3 has been reduced by around 5 metres in order to enhance views to the rear of the site when viewed from the access road.

2.2 Additional minor adjustments have been made to the houses proposed. For details refer to plan 1606/02B (showing the revised scheme marked up with the footprint of the previous proposal).

3. ADDITIONAL ARBORICULTURAL IMPLICATIONS

In this section, I discuss what impact the changes to the design outlined in Section 2 will have to trees which are different to the previous scheme. In summary I consider that the scheme provides a slight improvement overall in terms of trees.

Additional tree removal is required for 3 C grade trees of low significance; however additional meaningful space is provided for re-planting, and additional amenity space is provided around Tree 62.

3.1 T47: Silver birch

- 3.1.1 This is a small, highly slender C grade tree located on the existing boundary between the two properties. The tree is in the footprint of the building proposed for Plot 4 and it shall be removed in order to facilitate development.

3.2 T50: Lawson cypress

- 3.2.1 This is a small (4 metre height) C grade tree of low significance located between the buildings on 61 and 63 Nightingale Road. The tree is in the footprint of the building proposed for Plot 4 and it shall be removed in order to facilitate development.

3.3 T53: Sycamore

- 3.3.1 This is a middle-aged C grade tree with a height of 13 metres. The tree has relatively poor form being multi-stemmed from near ground level with tight unions developing between members. With time these unions could become hazardous, and I have accordingly assessed the tree as grade C with a retention span of between 10 and 20 years. This tree is close to the footprint of the building proposed for Plot 4 and it shall be removed in order to facilitate development.

3.4 T54: Sycamore

- 3.4.1 This is a middle-aged C grade tree with a height of 13 metres. The tree has relatively poor form being multi-stemmed from near ground level with tight unions developing between members. With time these unions could become hazardous, and I have accordingly assessed the tree as grade C with a retention span of between 10 and 20 years.
- 3.4.2 The tree currently provides some screening (albeit relatively limited being positioned behind Tree 55) and shall be retained with the development. With the loss of T53 it will be left with crown asymmetry however I do not assess that this will lead to instability. It is likely that in the future (within 10-20 years) this tree will need to be replaced. The work proposed is located outside the tree's RPA.

3.5 **T62: Deodar cedar**

- 3.5.1 The new access road extends up to but does not encroach into the RPA of this tree. I consider that the situation around this tree is improved with the new scheme: the garden width has increased providing more amenity space for the rear garden; and the garage structure shown on the previous scheme in the RPA of the tree has been removed completely, providing further useable garden space.

3.6 **T96: Sycamore**

- 3.6.1 The house on Plot 4 has moved the single-storey utility section to the north-east by approximately 1 metre up to the edge of the tree's RPA. The main section of the house however has moved back slightly further from the tree (see plan 1606/02B (showing the revised scheme marked up with the footprint of the previous proposal).
- 3.6.2 The house has been designed such that this tree will not create excessively low levels of shade such that residents are likely to request pruning or removal. The large room on the ground floor occupying the space closest to this tree has windows facing four different aspects. I do not consider that the development implications in relation to this tree are different from the implications with the previous scheme.

3.7 **Re-planting opportunities**

- 3.7.1 The revised scheme provides enhanced opportunities for planting new trees in addition to the planting proposed with the previous scheme. In particular there is space available within the widened gap between Plots 2 and 3 which could develop into a key feature when viewing the site from the access road. There is additional space available to plant a new tree at the end of the rear garden in Plot 4 adjacent to the shed. Details of tree planting and all other landscaping can be provided at a later stage as a condition to planning.

4. **SUMMARY OF TREE WORK REQUIRED.** (RTFD = Remove in order to facilitate the development. RSAM = Remove for reasons of sound arboricultural management)

Tree No	Species	Grade	Work required	Reason
8	Apple	C	Remove	RTFD
9	Plum	C	Remove	RTFD
10	Apple	C	Remove	RTFD
11	Apple	C	Remove	RTFD
12	Dogwood	C	Remove	RTFD
13	Norway spruce	C	Remove	RTFD
14	Rowan	C	Remove	RTFD
22	Corsican pine	B1, B2	Reduce crown spread on west side by approximately 2 metres	Reduce excessive crown imbalance
27	Corsican pine	R	Remove	RSAM
28	Corsican pine	R	Remove	RSAM
32	Cherry	C	Remove	RTFD
33	Sycamore	C	Remove	RTFD
34	Sycamore	C	Remove	RTFD
35	Common lime	C	Remove	RTFD
36	Atlas cedar	C	Remove	RTFD
37	Silver birch	C	Remove	RTFD
38	Monterey cypress	C	Remove	RTFD
39	Lawson cypress	C	Remove	RTFD
40	Monterey cypress	C	Remove	RTFD
47	Silver birch	C	Remove	RTFD
50	Lawson cypress	C	Remove	RTFD
51	Eucalyptus	C	Remove	RTFD
53	Sycamore	C	Remove	RTFD
58	Cherry	C	Remove	RTFD
59	Monterey cypress	R	Remove	RSAM
60	Red horse chestnut	C	Remove	RTFD
61	Cherry	B1	Remove	RTFD
73	Corsican pine	B1	Remove lowest two limbs	Reduce excessive crown imbalance
83	Weeping willow	C	Remove	RTFD
84	Silver birch	B1	Remove	RTFD
85	Ash	B1	Remove	RTFD
86	Apple	C	Remove	RTFD
G1	Leyland cypress	C	Remove	RTFD
88	Corsican pine	R	Remove	RSAM
89	Sycamore	R	Remove	RSAM
90	Apple	C	Remove	RTFD
93	Sycamore	R	Remove	RSAM
94	Sycamore	C	Remove	RSAM
95	Scots pine	R	Remove	RSAM
G5	Laurel	C	Remove	RTFD

4.1 All work specified must be carried out in accordance with BS3998 (1989).

4.2 Wildlife

- 4.2.1 Nesting birds and bats have legal protection afforded to them by Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (W&CS), and the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW). The Habitats Regulations (2007) have provided increased legal protection to European Protected Species (EPS) which includes all bat species.
- 4.2.2 It is an offence to disturb a protected species, and this includes the destruction of an active nest or bat roost.
- 4.2.3 An ecologist or the contractor (if trained as a bat surveyor) shall undertake a thorough inspection of the site prior to the start of works to ensure so far as reasonably possible that protected species will not be affected by the proposed works.
- 4.2.4 If protected species are found during the pre-work inspection, work shall not proceed without further advice being sought, and if required authorisation obtained from the relevant statutory body.

Patrick Stileman

PATRICK STILEMAN BSc(Hons), MICFor, Dip.Arb(RFS), M.Arbor.A
Chartered Arboriculturist. Arboricultural Association Registered Consultant
Director Patrick Stileman Ltd

APPENDIX 1

Qualifications and experience of Patrick Stileman *BSc(hons), MICFor, Dip.Arb(RFS), M.Arbor.A*

I am Patrick Stileman, director of Patrick Stileman Ltd Arboricultural Consultancy.

My qualifications in arboriculture are as follows:

National Certificate in Arboriculture *Nch(arb)*

The Arboricultural Associations Technicians Certificate *Tech.Cert (Arbor.A)*

The Royal Forestry Society's Professional Diploma in Arboriculture *Dip.Arb(RFS)*

In addition to the qualifications listed above which are specific to the field of arboriculture, I also hold a 2:1 honours degree in Environmental Science *BSc(Hons)*.

I hold chartered status, being a Chartered Arboriculturist and professional member of the Institute of Chartered Foresters *MICFor*.

I am a registered consultant with the Arboricultural Association. I am a member of the Arboricultural Associations Media and Communications Committee.

I am a member of the Royal Forestry Society.

I have 15 year's experience working in the arboricultural industry of which I have consulting experience for over 8 years. I am frequently instructed by professionals to provide advice and assistance relating to trees and the planning process, and I have a wide client base including developers, architects, planning consultants, and Local Planning Authorities. I am experienced with providing an arboricultural input at planning appeals at written representation, informal hearing and public local inquiry.

I am also frequently instructed to assist with tree risk assessments, and to provide guidance relating to tree safety. Past clients for this work include Local Authorities, (notably St Albans District Council, Dacorum Borough Council, Wycombe District Council, Woking District Council, Hertfordshire and Surrey County Councils), schools, housing associations and private individuals.

Other areas of my work have involved the provision of advice in relation to alleged tree related damage to buildings for domestic clients and Hertfordshire County Council; tree planting schemes; and advice relating to the general management of trees.

Prior to running my current consulting practice, I was a partner in an arboricultural contracting business in which I was involved with the practical aspect of organising, and execution of contract tree work.