

GHA Trees
5 South Drive
High Wycombe
Bucks
HP13 6JU



Glen Harding MICFor
MSc (Forestry), MArborA
t: 07884 056025
e: info@ghatrees.co.uk
www.ghatrees.co.uk

**BS5837:2012 TREE SURVEY AND
ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT:
Ickleford Cricket Club, Chambers Lane, Ickleford,
Hitchin, SG5 3YA**

Dated: 10th June 2025

Our reference: GHA/DS/160555:25

CONTENTS

Section	Subject	Page
	Instructions	3
	Executive Summary	3
	Documents Supplied	4
	Scope of Survey	4
	Survey Method	5
	The Site	6
	Subject Trees	6
	The Proposal	6
	Arboricultural Impact Assessment	6
	Post Development Pressure	7
	Tree Protection Measures and Preliminary Method Statement for Development Works	8
	Conclusion	8
	Recommendations	8
Appendix A	Site Plan / Arboricultural Impact Plan (Attached as a	
Appendix B	Tree Table	
Appendix C	Extract from BS5837:2012 – Protective Fencing	

Arboricultural Impact Assessment

Location: Ickleford Cricket Club, Chambers Lane,
Ickleford, Hitchin, SG5 3YA
Our reference: GHA/DS/160555:25
Client: Ickleford Cricket Club
Dated: 10th June 2025
Prepared by: Glen Harding MICFor, MSc (Forestry), MArborA
Date of Inspection: 13th May 2025

Instructions

Issued by – Ickleford Cricket Club

TERMS OF REFERENCE – GHA Trees were instructed to survey the subject trees within and adjacent to Ickleford Cricket Club, in order to assess their general condition and to provide a planning integration statement for the proposed new cricket nets that safeguards the long term wellbeing of the retained trees in a sustainable manner.

The writer retains the copyright of this report and its content is for the sole use of the client(s) named above. Copying of this document may only be undertaken in connection with the above instruction. Reproduction of the whole, or any part of the document without written consent from GHA Trees is forbidden. Tree work contractors, for the purpose of tendering only, may reproduce the Schedule for tree works included in the appendices.

Executive Summary

The proposal for the site is to install new cricket practice nets to replace the existing nets. The proposed scheme does not require the removal of any trees; therefore, the landscape character of the site will be unaffected by the proposal. The retained trees require protection in accordance with industry best practice and BS 5837: 2012 – Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – recommendations, in order to ensure their longevity.

Documents Supplied

The client supplied the following documents:

- Existing layout plans
- Proposed layout plans

Scope of Survey

- 1.1 The survey is concerned with the arboricultural aspects of the site only.
- 1.2 The planning status of the subject property was not investigated in detail.
- 1.3 A qualified Arboriculturist undertook the report and site visit and the contents of this report are based on this. Whilst reference may be made to built structure or soils, these are only opinions and confirmation should be obtained from a qualified expert as required.
- 1.4 Dense vegetation or climbers (such as ivy) also prohibited full inspections for some trees; this is noted where applicable.
- 1.5 No discussions took place between the surveyor and any other party.
- 1.6 The trees were inspected on the basis of the Visual Tree Assessment method expounded by Mattheck and Breleor (The body language of tree, DoE booklet Research for Amenity Trees No. 4, 1994)
- 1.7 The survey was undertaken in accord with British Standard 5837: 2012 – Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – recommendations.
- 1.8 The client's attention is drawn to the responsibilities under the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981).

Survey Method

- 2.1 The survey was conducted from ground level with the aid of binoculars if needed.
- 2.2 No tissue samples were taken nor was any internal investigation of the subject trees undertaken.
- 2.3 No soil samples were taken.
- 2.4 The height of each subject tree was estimated using a clinometer and recorded to the nearest half metre.

- 2.5 The stem diameter for each tree was measured in line with the requirements set out in BS 5837: 2012 – Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – recommendations.
- 2.6 The crown spreads were measured with an electronic distometer and recorded to the nearest half metre. Where the crown radius was notably different in any direction this has been noted on the Plan (appendix A) and within the tree table (Appendix B). The crowns of those trees that are proposed for removal, or trees where the crown spread is deemed insignificant in relation to the proposed development are not always shown on the appended plan; however their stem locations are marked for reference.
- 2.7 The Root Protection Area (RPA) for each tree is included in the tree table, both as an area, and as the radius of a circle.
- 2.8 The crown clearance was measured using a clinometer and recorded to the nearest half metre. Where it is significantly lower in one direction, this is noted within the tree table at appendix B.
- 2.9 All of the trees that were inspected during the site visit are detailed on the plan at Appendix A; this plan was produced in colour and **MUST** only be scanned or reproduced in colour. The trees on this plan are categorised and shown in the following format:

COLOUR CODING AND RATING OF TREES:

Category A – Trees of high quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 40 years. Colour = light green crown outline on plan.

Category B – Trees of moderate quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 20 years. Colour = mid blue crown outline on plan.

Category C – Trees of low quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 10 to 20 years, or young trees with a stem diameter below 150mm. Colour = uncoloured crown outline on plan.

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. Colour = red crown outline on plan.

All references to tree rating are made in accordance with BS 5837: 2012 – Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – recommendations', Table 1.

The Site

- 3.1 The site is located Ickleford Sports Club to the north of Ickleford village.
- 3.2 A good tree cover is present on the site itself as well as adjacent sites, with many semi-mature and mature trees of both native and exotic origin characterising the local area.

The Subject Trees

- 4.1 The details of the subject trees are set out in the Schedule at Appendix B.
- 4.2 Please be aware that ash tree(s) were identified during the survey. Many ash trees in the UK are suffering from 'ash dieback' (*Hymenoscyphus fraxineus*) which can cause the rapid decline of affected trees, often rendering them unsafe. Affected trees have been highlighted in the tree table at appendix B and the severity of the infection noted; however please ensure these trees are inspected regularly.
- 4.3 Of the twenty individual trees surveyed, thirteen have been assessed as BS category B, four have been assessed as BS category C with the remaining three trees being assessed as BS 5837 category U.

Category B	13 trees
Category C	4 trees
Category U	3 trees

The Proposal

- 5.1 The proposal for the site is to install new cricket practice nets to replace the existing nets.
- 5.2 The proposed location of the above structures can be seen on the appended plan.

Arboricultural Impact Assessment

PROPOSED TREE REMOVAL / RETENTION:

- 6.1 The proposed cricket net installation and all of its associated structures allows for the healthy retention of all of the trees on the site itself, and within nearby adjacent sites; therefore, the arboricultural landscape character of the site will be retained.

TREE PRUNING TO ACCOMMODATE THE PROPOSAL OR ACCESS TO THE SITE

- 6.2 The proposed cricket net installation does not lead to the requirement to prune any of the retained trees.
- 6.3 There is no part of the new structure which will have tree canopies (from trees to be retained) overhanging it and the building works can progress safely without the need for any facilitation pruning.

ASSESSMENT OF RETAINED TREES ROOT PROTECTION AREAS

- 6.4 Section 4.6.3 of BS 5837: 2012 states that the Root Protection Area (RPA) of each tree should be assessed by an arboriculturalist considering the likely morphology and disposition of the roots, when known to be influenced by past or existing site conditions.
- 6.5 Following the assessment described in section 6.4, the RPAs have all been drawn as notional circles as there are no existing site structures (visible from the available access) which are assessed to have the potential to significantly affect tree root morphology.

ASSESSED IMPACT ON RPAS BY PROPOSED STRUCTURES

- 6.6 The proposed cricket net installation is situated outside of the assessed RPAs of all of the trees; therefore these trees pose no below ground constraints on the new structure or vice versa.

Post Development Pressure

FUTURE TREE AND STRUCTURE RELATIONSHIPS

- 7.1 The retained trees are at a satisfactory distance from the proposed cricket net installation and highly unlikely to give rise to any inconvenience.
- 7.2 Some minor lateral pruning of the retained trees and shrubs may be required in the medium term; however, any such work would not have a significant impact on the health or amenity value of these trees.
- 7.3 Regular inspections of the retained trees by a suitably qualified Arboriculturalist and subsequent remedial works will ensure that the trees are maintained in a suitable manner, to exist in harmony with the new structures and its occupants for many years to come.

Tree Protection Measures and Preliminary Method Statement for Development Works

8.1 TREE PROTECTION BARRIERS

It is essential for the future health of the trees to be retained on site, that all development activity is undertaken outside the root protection zone of these trees. The position of the fence **MUST** be marked out with biodegradable marker paint on site and agreed with appropriate representatives from the LPA and contractor. The fencing **MUST** be erected **prior** to any works in the vicinity of the trees and removed only when all development activity is complete. The protective fencing **MUST** be as that shown in BS 5837 (see Appendix C). The herras panels **MUST** be joined together using a minimum of two anti-tamper couplers which **MUST** be installed so they can only be removed from the inside of the fence. The panels **MUST** supported by stabilizer struts, which **MUST** be installed on the inside and secured to the ground using pins or appropriate weights.

The Fence must be marked with a clear sign reading:

“Construction Exclusion Zone – No Access”

8.2 OTHER TREE PROTECTION PRECAUTIONS

- **NO** level alterations will occur within the RPA of any tree to be retained.
- **NO** fires lit on site within 20 metres of any tree to be retained.
- **NO** fuels, oils or substances with will be damaging to the tree shall be spilled or poured on site.
- **NO** storage of any materials within the root protections zone.

Conclusion

- 9.1 In conclusion, the principal arboricultural features within the site can be retained and adequately protected during development activities.
- 9.2 Subject to precautionary measures as detailed above, the proposal will not be injurious to trees to be retained.

Recommendations

- 10.1 Site supervision – An individual e.g. the Site Agent, must be nominated to be responsible for all arboricultural matters on site. This person must:
- a. Be present on the site the majority of the time.
 - b. Be aware of the arboricultural responsibilities.
 - c. Have the authority to stop any work that is, or has the potential to cause harm to any tree.
 - d. Be responsible for ensuring that all site personnel are aware of their responsibilities towards trees on site and the consequences of the failure to observe those responsibilities.

- e. Make immediate contact with the local authority and / or retained arboriculturalist in the event of any related tree problems occurring whether actual or potential.
- 10.2 It is recommended, that to ensure a commitment from all parties to the healthy retention of the trees, that details are passed by the architect or agent to any contractors working on site, so that the practical aspects of the above precautions are included in their method statements, and financial provision made for these.

10th June 2025

Signed:



Glen Harding MICFor, MSc (Forestry), MArborA
For and on behalf of GHA Trees

Appendix A
TREE PLAN
(see separate PDF)

Appendix B

TREE TABLE

Tree Number	Tree Name (species)	Ht (m)	Calculated Stem Diameter (mm)	Number of Stems	Root Protection Area (Radius, m)	N (m)	E (m)	S (m)	W (m)	Age Class	Clearance (m)	Estimated life expectancy	BS Category	Comments / Recommendations
T1	Cherry	8	240	1	2.88	3	3	3	3	M	4 over site	20-40	B1	No significant / notable defects observed during inspection.
T2	Sycamore	14	450	1	5.40	2	2	5	5	M	6 over site	20-40	B1	No significant / notable defects observed during inspection.
T3	Sycamore	14	410	1	4.92	4	4	2	5	M	6 over site	20-40	B1	No significant / notable defects observed during inspection.
T4	Sycamore	14	240	1	2.88	1	4	2	4	M	6 over site	20-40	B1	No significant / notable defects observed during inspection.
T5	Sycamore	10	330	1	3.96	5	2	3	5	M	5 over site	20-40	B1	No significant / notable defects observed during inspection.
T6	Ash	10	280	1	3.36	4	4	4	4	M	2	Less than 10	U	Early signs of Ash dieback noted. Minor crown dieback observed from ground level.
T7	Sycamore	10	300	1	3.60	3	3	3	3	M	4 east	20-40	B1	No significant / notable defects observed during inspection.
T8	Sycamore	10	260	1	3.12	3	2	2	3	M	5 east	20-40	B1	No significant / notable defects observed during inspection.
T9	Sycamore	10	210	1	2.52	0	0	4	1	M	5	10-20	C1	Suppressed tree of poor form.
T10	Sycamore	10	300	1	3.60	1	1	3	4	M	5	10-20	C1	Suppressed tree of poor form.
T11	Oak	14	580	1	6.96	6	7	3.5	5	M	1 south	20-40	B1	No significant / notable defects observed during inspection.

Tree Number	Tree Name (species)	Ht (m)	Calculated Stem Diameter (mm)	Number of Stems	Root Protection Area (Radius, m)	N (m)	E (m)	S (m)	W (m)	Age Class	Clearance (m)	Estimated life expectancy	BS Category	Comments / Recommendations
T12	Sycamore	13	320	1	3.84	5	5	4	5	M	2 east	20-40	B1	No significant / notable defects observed during inspection.
T13	Sycamore	8	110	1	1.32	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	M	2	10-20	C1	No significant / notable defects observed during inspection.
T14	Sycamore	14	290	1	3.48	4.5	5	3	2	M	2 east	20-40	B1	No significant / notable defects observed during inspection.
T15	Apple	4	210	1	2.52	2.5	2.5	2	2	M	1	Less than 10	U	Stem wounds on main stem from past direct damage. Unremarkable tree of modest quality and of limited value in the wider landscape.
T16	Apple	3	120	1	1.44	2	2.5	2	1	M	1.5	Less than 10	U	Stem wounds on main stem from past direct damage. Unremarkable tree of modest quality and of limited value in the wider landscape.
T17	Cherry	13	330	1	3.96	4	4.5	3	2	M	2 east	20-40	B1	No significant / notable defects observed during inspection.
T18	Cedar	8	180	1	2.16	2	2.5	2	2	M	1	20-40	B1	No significant / notable defects observed during inspection.
T19	Cedar	6	180	1	2.16	2	2.5	2	2	M	1	20-40	B1	No significant / notable defects observed during inspection.
T20	Apple	4	150	1	1.80	3	4	3	2	M	1	10-20	C1	Small tree of limited value in the wider landscape.

KEY :

Tree No: (T= individual tree, G= group of trees, W= woodland)

Age class: Young (Y), Middle aged (MA), Mature (M), Over mature (OM),
Veteran (V)

Height (Ht): Measured in metres +/- 1m

Appendix C
TREE FENCING DETAIL

Figure 3 Examples of above-ground stabilizing systems



