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SUMMARY

Simon Jones Associates has undertaken a survey of three London plane trees growing adjacent to the site, within the pavement along the Brompton Road, in accordance with British Standard BS 5837: 2012, *Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations*.

All three of the planes will require some pruning in order to allow a two metre clearance from the south-east elevation of the building, however as this is only minor in extent it will not be to any significant or long-term detriment of the health or the appearance of these specimens or the character and appearance of the conservation area.

There are no incursions into the root protection areas (RPAs) of these trees.

The TPP shows the general and specific provisions to be taken during construction of the proposed development, to ensure that no unacceptable damage is caused to the root systems, trunks or crowns of these trees. These measures are indicated by coloured notations in areas where construction activities are in close proximity to the trees, as described in the relevant panels on the drawing.

The LPA can readily secure the implementation of and adherence to the measures shown on the TPP by the use of appropriate planning conditions.

Accordingly we conclude that, subject to the above, the proposed development does not constitute any long-term threat to the character or landscape value of the conservation area, insofar as this is contributed to by trees; and accordingly it complies with national and local planning policy.
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1. INTRODUCTION.

1.1. Instructions.

1.1.1. Simon Jones Associates Ltd. has been instructed by Smech Management Company Ltd. to visit Nos. 160-166 Brompton Road, London SW3 and to survey the trees growing on or immediately adjacent to this site.

1.1.2. We are instructed to record the trees’ locations, species, dimensions, ages, condition, and visual importance; and to categorise them in accordance with British Standard BS 5837: 2012, *Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction — Recommendations*.

1.1.3. We are further asked to identify which trees are worthy of retention in conjunction with development of the site; to assess the implications of the development proposals on these specimens, and to advise how they should be protected from unacceptable damage during demolition and construction.

1.2. Scope of report.

1.2.1. This report and the appended tree protection plan (TPP) reflect the scope of our instructions, as set out above.

1.2.2. The proposed development comprises the refurbishment and modernisation of the existing building involving the Brompton Road facade and some extension to the roof and the rear and providing additional office space on the upper floors and retail space at the ground floor with ancillary retail usage on the lower ground floor of the building. Furthermore, the proposed development will include two additional basement levels to provide ancillary office storage space including plant.

1.2.3. The report is intended to accompany a planning application to be submitted to the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea, and complies with local validation requirements, and with the recommendations of BS 5837: 2012.
1.3. Site inspection.

1.3.1. A site visit and tree inspection was undertaken by Abi St.Aubyn of Simon Jones Associates Ltd., on Monday the 9th December 2013. Weather conditions at the time were clear, dry and bright. Deciduous trees were in partial leaf.

1.3.2. The tree locations plan at Appendix 2 is based on the topographical survey plan provided.

1.3.3. The tree protection plan at Appendix 3 is based on the proposed site layout plan by Darling Associates Architects, drawings nos. PL P 099 Rev0 and PL P 0G0 Rev0.

1.4. National policy context.

1.4.1. Paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), (March 2012), states that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development:

“At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking.”

1.4.2. The NPPF makes it clear that planning permission for development should be granted unless the proposal is inconsistent with policies within the development plan, any adverse effects significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, or the NPPF itself indicates that the proposal should be refused.

1.4.3. Under Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, local authorities have a statutory duty to consider the protection and planting of trees when granting planning permission for proposed development. The effects of proposed development on trees are therefore a material consideration in dealing with planning applications. As the overriding principle of national policy in the NPPF is that planning permission should be granted unless the proposal is not consistent with development plan policies, or where the adverse effects significantly outweigh its benefits, it follows that development should only be refused on arboricultural grounds where loss of trees would have a significant and adverse impact on the character and appearance of the local landscape, on amenity or biodiversity. Against
this background, the effects of the current proposal are evaluated in the following sections of this report.

1.5. Site description.

1.5.1. The site consists of a seven storey building, fronting Nos. 160-166 Brompton Road to the southeast and a 3 storey building fronting Cheval Place to the north-west. To the north-east and south-west the site is bounded by mid-terrace buildings ranging from three to four storeys.

1.5.2. There is vehicular access to an undercroft parking area which is provided via a garage entrance from Cheval Place and a small courtyard located between the two buildings.
2. THE TREES.

2.1. Survey findings.

2.1.1. We surveyed a total of three off-site London plane trees growing within the pavement along the Brompton Road. We understand that there are no trees within the site (small central courtyard) and no trees with either canopies extending over the site or with RPAs extending into the site from Cheval Place on the north-west side.

2.1.2. The numbers assigned to the trees in the tree survey schedule correspond with those shown on the appended tree locations and protection plans.

2.2. Statutory controls.

2.2.1. We have been informed that there are no tree preservation orders (TPOs) currently in force on this site.

2.2.2. The site is within the boundaries of the Brompton Conservation Area.

2.3. Assessment of suitability for retention.

2.3.1. As these three trees are off-site specimens which are not within our clients’ ownership there was no need to carry out an exercise to assess which trees should be retained in the context of this proposed development.

2.3.2. Furthermore, these three planes are prominent street trees which are an integral part of the row of trees along the north-west side of Brompton Road and are the key arboricultural feature in closest proximity to the site.

2.3.3. We have categorised the trees in accordance with BS5837: 2012, and details of the criteria used for this process can be found in the notes that accompany the tree survey schedule. In line with the thrust of the NPPF and relevant local development policies, we have adjusted this methodology to give a greater weighting to trees that contribute to the character and appearance of the local landscape, to amenity, or to biodiversity.
2.3.4. Two of the three individuals (nos. 1 and 3) have been assessed as category 'A' due to their size, condition and prominence within the street scene. Plane no. 2 is a suppressed specimen located between nos. 1 and 3, as shown at *Photograph #1* below. It is approximately half the height of the adjacent trees and therefore although it contributes as a smaller individual within the line of planes, due to its smaller size and trunk lean, it has been assessed as a category ‘C’.

*Photograph #1*: showing plane no. 2 in the centre, no. 1 to the right and no. 3 to the left.
3. ARBORICULTURAL IMPACTS.

3.1. Trees to be removed.

3.1.1. No trees are proposed to be removed.

3.2. Trees to be pruned.

3.2.1. All three planes will need to be pruned to provide two metre clearance from the south-east elevation of the building.

3.3. Root Protection Area incursions.

3.3.1. The ‘Root Protection Areas’ (RPAs)\(^2\) of the trees to be retained have been calculated in accordance with Section 4.6 of BS 5837; and have been assessed taking account of factors such as the likely tolerance of a tree to root disturbance or damage, the morphology and disposition of roots as influenced by existing site conditions (including the presence of the road and the building of Nos. 160-166 Brompton Road), as well as soil type, topography and drainage. The shapes of the RPAs have been modified as a result of these considerations, so that they reflect more accurately their likely root distribution.

3.3.2. As can be seen on the TPP, no parts of any proposed extensions or associated hard surfacing are within the RPAs of any of the trees to be retained.

---

\(^2\) The minimum area around a retained tree “deemed to contain sufficient roots and rooting volume to maintain the tree’s viability, and where the protection of the roots and soil structure is treated as a priority.” BS 5837, paragraph 3.7.
4. ASSESSMENT.

4.1. Tree removals.

4.1.1. No trees are to be removed.

4.2. Pruning.

4.2.1. All three planes are to be pruned to allow a two metre clearance from the south-east elevation of the building. However, this pruning is minor in extent and the branches to be removed are small in size, with a maximum wound size no greater than 60mm in diameter; this will have an insignificant effect on the health and physiological condition of the trees concerned, and complies with the recommendations of British Standard BS 3998: 2010, Tree work – Recommendations.

4.2.2. In terms of impact upon the landscape, as the proposed pruning is minor it will be screened by the remainder of the trees’ canopies in views from Brompton Road, and accordingly these proposed works will not detract from the character or appearance of the conservation area.

4.2.3. Following the pruning specified, there will be a two metre clearance between the planes’ canopies and the building thereby providing adequate working space for construction, and a reasonable margin of clearance for future growth.

4.2.4. Furthermore, irrespective of this planning application the canopy of these trees will be subject to a cyclical pruning regime to maintain a suitable clearance distance between the canopy and the existing building facade.

4.3. RPA incursions.

4.3.1. No parts of the proposed extension is within the RPAs of these three trees; and therefore, subject to the implementation of protective measures specified on the TPP, their construction will not cause unacceptable damage to roots or rooting environments as a result of root severance or damage, or compaction or pollution of the soil.
4.3.2. The necessary precautions to prevent other incursions into the RPAs of retained trees and to protect them during demolition and construction can be assured by the erection of appropriate protective fencing, as shown on the TPP at Appendix 3.
5. CONCLUSION.

5.1. Summary.

5.1.1. On the basis of the above considerations we consider the arboricultural impact of this scheme to be negligible; the minor pruning required to provide adequate crown clearance to construct the proposals and to allow for future tree growth would not have an adverse impact on the long term health of the trees, or a significant or severe impact on the conservation area, and thus the proposal complies with national and local planning policies.

5.1.2. The TPP shows the general and specific provisions to be taken during construction of the proposed development, to ensure that no unacceptable damage is caused to the root systems, trunks or crowns of these trees. These measures are indicated by coloured notations in areas where construction activities are to occur in close proximity to these trees, as described in the relevant panels on the drawing.

5.1.3. The LPA can readily secure the implementation of and adherence to the measures shown on the TPP by the use of appropriate planning conditions.

5.1.4. Accordingly we conclude that, subject to the above, the proposed development does not constitute any long-term threat to the character or landscape of the conservation area, insofar as this is contributed to by trees; and accordingly it complies with national planning policy.
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### Tree Survey Schedule: Explanatory Notes

**160-166 Brompton Road, London SW3**

This schedule is based on a tree inspection undertaken by Abi St.Aubyn of Simon Jones Associates Ltd., on Monday the 9th December 2013. Weather conditions at the time were clear, dry and bright. Deciduous trees were in leaf.

The information contained in this schedule covers only those trees that were examined, and reflects the condition of these specimens at the time of inspection. We did not have access to the trees from any adjacent properties; observations are thus confined to what was visible from within the site and from surrounding public areas.

The trees were inspected from the ground only and were not climbed, and no samples of wood, roots or fungi were taken. A full hazard or risk assessment of the trees was not undertaken, and therefore no guarantee, either expressed or implied, of their safety or stability can be given.

Trees are dynamic organisms and are subject to continual growth and change; therefore the dimensions and assessments presented in this schedule should not be relied upon in relation to any development of the site for more than twelve months from the survey date.

#### 1. Tree no.
Given in sequential order, commencing at "1".

#### 2. Species.

#### 3. Height.
Estimated with the aid of a hypsometer, given in metres.

#### 4. Trunk diameter.
Trunk diameter measured at approx. 1.5m above ground level; or where the trunk forks into separate stems between ground level and 1.5m, measured at the narrowest point beneath the fork. Given in millimetres.

#### 5. Radial crown spread.
The linear extent of branches from the base of the trunk to the main cardinal points, to the closest quarter of a metre. In the cases of small trees with reasonably symmetrical crowns, a single averaged figure is quoted.

Height above ground and direction of growth of first significant live branch.

Distance from adjacent ground level to lowest part of lowest branch, in metres.

#### 8. Age class.
Young: Age less than 1/3 life expectancy
Semi-mature: 1/3 to 2/3 life expectancy
Mature: Over 2/3 life expectancy
Over-mature: Mature, and in a state of decline
Veteran: Surviving beyond the typical age range for species

#### 9. Physiology.
Health, condition and function of the tree, in comparison to a normal specimen of its species and age.

#### 10. Structure.
Structural condition of the tree – based on both the structure of its roots, trunk and major stems and branches, and on the presence of any structural defects or decay.
Very good: No significant physiological or structural defects, an upright and reasonably symmetrical structure; a particularly good example of its species.
Good: No significant physiological or structural defects, and an upright and reasonably symmetrical structure.
Moderate: No significant pathological defects, but a slightly impaired physiological structure; however, not to the extent that the tree is at immediate or early risk of collapse.
Indifferent: Significant physiological or pathological defects; but these are either remediable or do not put the tree at immediate or early risk of collapse.
Poor: Significant and irreparable physiological or pathological defects, such that there may be a risk of early or premature collapse.
Hazardous: Significant and irreparable physiological or pathological defects, such that there is a risk of imminent collapse.

#### 11. Comments.
Where appropriate comments have been made relating to:
- Health and condition
- Safety, particularly close to areas of public access
- Structure and form
- Estimated life expectancy or potential
- Visibility and impact in the local landscape

#### 12. Category.
Based on the British Standard "Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations", BS 5837: 2012, Table 1, adjusted to give a greater weighting to trees that contribute to the character and appearance of the local landscape, to amenity, or to biodiversity.

**Category U:** Trees 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, irreparable, 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.

**Category A:** Trees of high quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 40 years.
(1) Trees that are particularly good examples of their species, especially if rare or unusual.
(2) Trees, groups or woodlands of particular visual importance as arborecultural and/or landscape features.
(3) Trees, groups or woodlands of significant conservation, historical, commemorative or other value.

**Category B:** Trees of moderate quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 20 years.
(1) 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 minor 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.
(2) Trees present in numbers, usually growing as groups or woodlands, such that they form distinct landscape features, thereby attracting a higher collective rating than they might as individuals; or trees present in numbers but situated so as to make little visual contribution to the wider locality.
(3) Trees with material conservation or other cultural value.

**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.
(1) Unremarkable trees of very limited merit or of such impaired condition that they do not qualify in higher categories.
(2) 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 landscape benefits.
(3) Trees with no material limited conservation or other cultural value.

---
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## TREE SURVEY SCHEDULE
160-166 Brompton Road, London SW3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Trunk diameter</th>
<th>Radial crown spread</th>
<th>Crown break</th>
<th>Crown clearance</th>
<th>Age class</th>
<th>Physiology</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>London plane</td>
<td>17m</td>
<td>390mm</td>
<td>7.7m N 8.5m E 8m SE 8.5m S 8.7m W 4.6m NW</td>
<td>2m W</td>
<td>5m N 6m E 6m S 5m W</td>
<td>Semi-mature</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>Off site tree; growing in a gap in pavement of approx. 2m by 1m; approx. 1.1m above the level of road; single trunk to a height of 3m where it bifurcates into two co-dominant stems; union appears tensile in nature; of moderate quality and high landscape value; of long-term potential.</td>
<td>A (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>London plane</td>
<td>10m</td>
<td>250mm</td>
<td>6m N 6.5m E 7m SE 4m S 2m W 5m NW</td>
<td>1.5m W</td>
<td>3m N 4m E 4m S 3m W</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Off site tree; growing in gap in pavement approx. 1m by 2m; approx. 1.1m above the level of road; single trunk specimen; lean of approx. 30° to NE; bifurcates at a height of approx. 2m; of low quality; of moderate landscape value; of long-term potential.</td>
<td>C (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>London plane</td>
<td>21m</td>
<td>est. 650mm</td>
<td>8m N 8m E 9m SE 6m S 7.5m W 5.5m NW</td>
<td>6m E</td>
<td>6m N 7m E 7m S 6m W</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>Off site tree; growing in a gap in pavement of approx. 2.5m by 1m; approx. 1.1m above the level of road; single trunk specimen; appears to have been historically pollarded at a height of 6m; of moderate quality and high landscape value; of long-term potential.</td>
<td>A (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2 & 3

TREE LOCATION PLAN

TREE PROTECTION PLAN
LIST OF TREES

(For full details, see SJA Tree Schedule.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Trunk diameter</th>
<th>B.S. Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>London plane</td>
<td>17m</td>
<td>390mm</td>
<td>A (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>London plane</td>
<td>10m</td>
<td>250mm</td>
<td>C (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>London plane</td>
<td>21m</td>
<td>est. 650mm</td>
<td>A (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any discrepancies. Simon Jones Associates cannot be held responsible for inaccuracies. For further information refer to the SJA Tree Schedule.

Do not scale from this drawing: please check all dimensions on site, and notify us of any discrepancies.
**Site hoarding or protective fencing as per BS5837:**

- To be erected prior to the commencement of all works on site, and retained in place throughout construction.
- To comprise either 2.4m wooden site hoarding; or a 2m high scaffolding framework, with uprights at maximum 3m spacings, every other one braced to the ground with 45 degree struts; supporting standard anti-climb 'Heras' welded mesh fence panels secured with anti-lift devices to concrete or plastic bases pinned to the ground by scaffold uprights sunk to a minimum depth of 600mm; individual panels fixed to each other with at least 2 clamps and to scaffolding with heavy-duty cable ties.
- "TREE PROTECTION ZONE - KEEP OUT" or similar notices to be attached to every fifth panel.

---

**Protective Fencing**

- TREE PROTECTION FENCING as shown in BS 5837: 2012, Section 6.2.2 & Figure 2.

---

**Pruning**

- Canopies of trees to be retained:
  - Trees that will require pruning:
    - No. 1: London plane - Selective prune to obtain 2m clearance from building.
    - No. 2: London plane - Selective prune to obtain 2m clearance from building.
    - No. 3: London plane - Selective prune to obtain 2m clearance from building.

- Pruning is to be undertaken in accordance with the British Standard Recommendations for Tree work, BS3998: 2010.
- Climbing irons or spikes are not to be used whilst pruning trees.

---

**This drawing is designed to reflect only the principles of layout and/or design insofar as these relate to the protection of trees to be retained, and should NOT be read as a definitive engineering or construction method statement. Reference should be made to the architect or structural engineer, as appropriate, over any matters of construction detail or specification, or any engineering standards or regulatory requirements relating to proposed structures, hard surfaces or underground services.**

---

**For further information refer to the SJA Tree Schedule**

---

**Do not scale from this drawing: please check all dimensions on site, and notify us of any discrepancies.**
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