



Arboricultural Report

35 MORTIMERS LANE
FAIR OAK
HAMPSHIRE
SO50 7BH

AUGUST 2026

Bay Tree Cottage, 2 Bridge Street, Wickham, Hampshire, PO17 5JE
07814 403146
johnstontreeconsultancy@gmail.com

CONTENTS

Arboricultural Report

1.0	Introduction	3
2.0	Site Visit	3
3.0	Site Description	3
4.0	Tree Survey Data	3
5.0	Tree Quality Assessment	6
6.0	Root Protection Areas	6
7.0	Legal Constraints	6
8.0	Arboricultural Implications Assessment	6
9.0	Conclusions	7
	<i>Important notes and Inspection caveats</i>	9

Arboricultural Method Statement

1.0	Contact details	10
2.0	Introduction	11
3.0	Phasing of Development	11
4.0	General Arboricultural Considerations	11
5.0	Supervision and Monitoring	12
	<i>Authors Credentials</i>	13

Appendix 1	Tree Survey Plan showing Tree Quality Categories
Appendix 2	Root Protection Area Plan
Appendix 3	Tree Protection Plan
Appendix 4	Extract from BS5837:2012 – Figure 2 Default Specification for Protective Fencing
Appendix 5	Extract from BS5837:2012 – Figure 3 Examples of Above-Ground Stabilizing Systems.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This report was instructed by Ms. Malizia and Mr. Holdsworth regarding their proposed extension. The report details all trees over 75mm at 1.5m above ground level that are relevant to the siting of the proposed development at 35 Mortimers Lane, Fair Oak. The position of the trees on the site is illustrated at **Appendix 1** on the site plan.
- 1.2 The existing tree stock has been identified and graded in line with the current British Standard BS 5837 2012: Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction- Recommendations to enable informed decisions to be made regarding tree retention. The report also details methods of construction to be implemented to safeguard the retained trees.
- 1.3 This report details the constraints placed on the proposed development from the rooting area of the trees below ground and above ground by their size and position.
- 1.4 This report will therefore inform the planning process for the proposed development to minimise any negative impact on the existing tree stock and ensure that retained trees shall be in harmony with the proposed development enabling their long-term retention.

2.0 SITE VISIT

- 2.1 The site visit was undertaken on 20th July 2026. The trees were surveyed visually, externally and from ground level only. No samples or internal decay detection readings were taken for further analysis. All dimensions have been measured unless stated otherwise. Weather conditions at the time of the survey were sunny and still.

3.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

- 3.1 The site is in a residential area and is a detached house with an integral garage. The front is predominately driveway, and the rear garden has a patio, lawn and a few small trees.

4.0 TREE SURVEY DATA

- 4.1 In accordance with British Standard BS 5837 2012: Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction - Recommendations, the characteristics of trees over 75mm stem diameter measured at 1.5m above ground level (or immediately above root flare if multi-stemmed) have been recorded. The following tree data tables should be read in conjunction with the annotated site plan shown at **Appendix 1** and the legend after the tables.

Tree Number and Species	Height (m)	DBH (mm)	Branch Spread (m)				Existing Height Above Ground Level of Canopy and 1 st Significant Branch (m)	Age Class	Estimated Remaining Contribution (Years) & Physiological Condition	Comments	BS Category & Tree Work Necessary for Development	RPA (m ²)	RPA (m)
			N	S	E	W							
T1 Common Ash <i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>	6.5	270	4	3	4	3	2.5 2.5 N	SM	>10 F	In raised bed. Sound base. Kink in stem at 1m, stem curved until 2.5m. Good reaction wood. Minor past management. Ash dieback evident at forty percent of branch tips. Sparse foliage.	C1 Retain and protect	34	3.3
T2 Cherry <i>Prunus</i> sp.	4	190	3	3	3	3	1 1.5 W	SM	10-20 F	Grafted tree, rootstock unknown. Stem leans forty percent north, no evidence of root plate movement. Large surface root north. Minor past management. Crossed branch. Small amount of dieback at branch tips.	C1 Remove. Plant replacement	18	2.2
T3 Cabbage Palm <i>Corydaline</i> sp.	6	270	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	3.5 3.5 N	EM	20 G	Sound base and stem. Form typical of species.	B1 Remove	34	3.3
T4 Common Hazel <i>Corylus avellana</i>	5.5	500 @ 0.2m	4	4	0	4	1 0.2 N	M	20-40 G	Old coppice stool. No recent management. Excellent vigour.	A1 Retain and protect	113	6

Key to Terms

- Identification numbers have been used and correspond to the site plan shown at **Appendix 1**.
- Vegetation type has been categorized as one of the following: Tree (T), Hedge (H), Shrub (S), Group (G), Stump (ST)
- Species are listed by common and botanical name where appropriate.
- Where possible, measurements have been made in accordance with the conventions detailed below. Where this was not possible, due to site conditions or the vegetation being in third party ownership, dimensions have been estimated. * Indicates estimated measurement.
- Height has been recorded to the nearest half metre.
- Stem diameter has been measured at 1.5m and recorded in millimetres, except where forking or swelling has meant that this is not possible, stem diameter has then been recorded at the narrowest point below these features. Multi-stemmed trees have had individual stems measured at 1.5m. Where this was not possible the actual height where the diameter was measured is recorded. G.L. = Ground Level.
- Crown spread has been recorded to the nearest half metre. Rounded up for dimensions up to 10m and the nearest whole metre for dimensions over 10m.
- Age class has been recorded as follows:

Y	Young recently planted or establishing tree that could be transplanted without specialist equipment, i.e. up to 12-14cms-stem girth.
S/M	Semi mature. An established tree but one that has not reached its potential ultimate height and has significant growth potential.
E/M	Early mature. A tree reaching its ultimate potential height, whose growth rate is slowing down but will increase in stem diameter and crown spread, and has a safe life expectancy.
M	Mature. A mature specimen with limited potential for any significant increase in size but with a reasonable safe life expectancy.
O/M	Over mature. A senescent or moribund specimen with a limited safe life expectancy. Possibly also containing significant structural defects with attendant safety and/or duty of care implications.
- Physiological Condition has been recorded as Good, Fair or Poor.
- Recommendations for tree management have been based on current Arboricultural Best Practice as set out by the Arboricultural profession and all relevant publications.

5.0 TREE QUALITY ASSESSMENT

- 5.1 The trees have been categorized according to BS5837: 2012 as a guide to their condition and value in terms of visual amenity.
- 5.2 The trees are coloured on the plan attached at **Appendix 1** and the colours are explained in the key to the plan.

6.0 ROOT PROTECTION AREAS

- 6.1 In accordance with BS5837: 2012, the root protection area (RPA) of the trees has been calculated and shown in the tree data table and on the plan attached at **Appendix 2**.

7.0 LEGAL CONSTRAINTS

- 7.1 None of the trees are within a Conservation Area or subjects of Tree Preservation Orders on Eastleigh Borough Councils mapping system.

8.0 ARBORICULTURAL IMPLICATIONS ASSESSMENT

8.1 Description of Proposed Development

It is proposed to add a rear extension and new terrace to the property.

8.2 Drawings Used

Plans showing the existing and proposed site layouts were provided at the time of survey, scale 1: 50 @ A1. The proposed plan has been used to prepare the Tree Quality Assessment Plan (**Appendix 1**), the Root Protection Area Plan (**Appendix 2**) and the Tree Protection Plan (**Appendix 3**).

8.3 Direct Loss of Trees

Trees T2 Cherry and T3 Cabbage Palm will be removed to facilitate the proposal. Replacement species agrees with the Tree Officer will be established after the development is complete.

8.4 Position of Trees in Relation to Proposed Development

It is not considered that the proposal will increase future pressure to fell any trees retained on the site.

8.5 Protective Barriers

Protective barriers will be established to protect the RPAs and above ground parts of the trees.

8.6 Foundations

There will a small breach of the RPA of T4 Hazel by the new retaining wall and patio. This is less than 4sqm. and is not considered significant in terms of the health or longevity of the tree.

8.7 Changes in Ground Surface within RPAs

There will be a small change in ground surface of the trees mentioned above at 8.6. The surface change will be less than 1% of the total and is not considered this will be detrimental to its health or longevity.

8.8 Changes in Ground Level within the RPA

A small percentage of the RPA of T4 Hazel will have a change in ground level. This is not considered to be detrimental to its health or longevity.

8.9 Services

No new services are proposed within the RPA of the retained trees.

9.0 **CONCLUSIONS**

9.1 The trees are of mixed quality, T4 Hazel is the healthiest tree.

9.2 The Cherry that will be removed will be replaced with more suitable species to tolerate the pressures of climate change.

9.3 Tree protection barriers will prevent storage of materials and equipment within the RPAs of retained trees. There is adequate storage space on the driveway.

- 9.4 Given these conclusions the following section ‘Arboricultural Method Statement’ details the recommendations/methodology for the construction of the proposed works in terms of the effect on trees on the site.

Details within this AIA are considered correct at the time of writing but modifications may need to be made as more information becomes available.

Important Notes

The comments made regarding the health and stability of the trees within this report were correct at the time of inspection. It should be recognized that trees are dynamic structures that can never be completely predictable and may become unstable or partially unstable even in average weather conditions. Changes can occur not only to environmental triggers but also in response to biological or mechanical events.

Inspection Caveats

The inspection was carried out from ground level. Binoculars were used to observe features higher in the canopies.

Foliage, extension growth and/or bud proliferation were assessed visually.

No soil or tissue samples were taken during this inspection.

No invasive diagnostic equipment was used to detect decay.

A nylon hammer was used to test for possible decay and dead or loose bark around the lower stems and bases of the trees.

Ivy has been removed during the inspection process only where reasonable and practicable. Where this has not been possible it has been noted as a recommendation to be removed to allow detailed re-inspection.

No tree is ever absolutely safe due to the unpredictable laws and forces of nature.

ARBORICULTURAL METHOD STATEMENT**1.0 CONTACT DETAILS**

Architect	Geoff Potter	Sunstone Design The Garden House, Highbridge Road, Twyford Moors, Hampshire, SO21 1RL 01962 713873 studio@sunstonedesign.co.uk
Arboricultural Consultant	Sarah Johnston	Johnston Tree Consultancy Bay Tree Cottage, 2 Bridge Street, Wickham, Hampshire, PO17 5JE 07814 403146 johnstontreeconsultancy@gmail.com
Local Authority Case Officer	Unknown at present	Eastleigh Borough Council Eastleigh House, Upper Market Street, Eastleigh, Hampshire, SO50 9FD 02380 688000 planning@eastleigh.gov.uk
Local Authority Tree Officer	Unknown at present	Eastleigh Borough Council Tree Services Eastleigh House, Upper Market Street, Eastleigh, Hampshire, SO50 9FD 02380 688000 trees@eastleigh.gov.uk

2.0 INTRODUCTION

- 2.1 This Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) has been produced in line with BS 5837 2012: Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction-Recommendations to aid the successful retention of the trees at 35 Mortimers Lane, Fair Oak. No development shall take place on the site until this document has been submitted to and approved in writing by Eastleigh Borough Council.
- 2.2 This document sets out the methodology for all proposed works that affect trees on and adjacent to the site. Compliance with this method statement will be a requirement of all relevant contracts associated with the development proposals. Copies of this document will be available on site for inspection.
- 2.3 For details of trees to be retained and location and types of special protection methods, reference should be made to the Tree Protection Plan (TPP). A copy of which should be displayed prominently on site.

3.0 PHASING OF DEVELOPMENT

3.1 Pre Development Phase

- If requested by the Tree Officer a pre-commencement meeting with the contractor and Arboriculturalist will take place.
- Tree works to be undertaken prior to any construction work.
- Tree protection measures to be installed prior to any work taking place, evidence will be sent to the Tree Officer.

3.2 Development Phase

- Protective barriers are not to be moved without the written consent of the Tree Officer.

4.0 GENERAL ARBORICULTURAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 4.1 Protective barriers must be regarded as sacrosanct and must only be moved under direct supervision of the LPA or named Arboriculturalist to enable the undertaking of works within the RPAs of the trees, as set out in this AMS, and approved in writing by the LPA.
- 4.2 No materials, chemicals, machinery or vehicles must be stored within the RPA as defined on the TPP and identified on site by protective fencing and aboveground root protection.
- 4.3 Ground protection must not be lifted or removed without prior consultation with the LPA or named Arboriculturalist.

- 4.4 Damage caused to protective fencing or ground protection must be reported to the site supervisor and the named Arboriculturalist to ensure appropriate repair.
- 4.5 Any damage to the retained trees must be reported without delay to the site supervisor, the LPA and the named Arboriculturalist so appropriate remedial work can take place without delay.
- 4.6 No materials that are likely to have an adverse effect on tree health such as oil, bitumen or cement will be stored or discharged within 5 metres of the trunk of the retained trees or any other trees on the site.
- 4.7 No fires will be lit on site.
- 4.8 Notice boards, telephone cables or any other signage or services are not to be attached to any part of the retained trees.

5.0 SUPERVISION AND MONITORING

- 5.1 The project Arboriculturalist shall be responsible for monitoring/supervising the following works.

Establishment of protective barriers

Please note this AMS is not a contract. The retention and services of a project Arboriculturist for supervision and monitoring must be agreed prior to commencement of construction operations.

CREDENTIALS OF THE AUTHOR

Sarah Johnston M. Arbor. A., B.Sc. Arboriculture has worked in the Arboricultural profession for twenty-five years. Her experience has been gained from undertaking practical tree work as well as working as an Arboricultural Surveyor and Tree Officer for Eastleigh and Havant Borough Councils respectively. In addition, Sarah worked as a consultant for Marishal Thompson for two years from before she became self-employed. Sarah is a Professional Member of the Arboricultural Association and holds Professional Indemnity Insurance cover trading as Johnston Tree Consultancy

