



---

## **ARBORICULTURAL SURVEY, IMPACT ASSESSMENT AND PROTECTION PLAN**

**ON BEHALF OF**

**OAKFORD HOMES**

**FOR**

**RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT COMPRISING 38 APARTMENTS**

**AT**

**LAND AT FORD ROAD, ARUNDEL**

Prepared by: Richard Hyett MSc, MArborA, MICFor  
Checked by: Paul Barton MSc, TechCert (ArborA), MArborA  
Reference: O.2588



**Barton Hyett Associates**  
Arboricultural Consultants

Unit 5E, Deer Park Business Centre, Eckington, Pershore, WR10 3DN



**Institute of  
Chartered Foresters**  
registered



**Arboricultural  
ASSOCIATION**  
Professional Member  
MEMBER NO: PR3525

## Validation statement for LPA application registration

This report is submitted to Arun District Council to accompany a planning application. The report contains arboricultural information relating to the proposed residential development on land at Ford Road, Arundel

For local planning authority (LPA) validation purposes, this report contains the following:

- A full tree survey compliant with the requirements of BS5837:2012 '*Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – recommendations*' undertaken by a competent and qualified arboriculturist.
- A suitably scaled plan with a north point and the tree survey information.
- An assessment of the impacts of the proposed development on the existing trees. This includes recommendations of which trees should be removed/retained and the proposed protection measures.
- Heads of Terms for an arboricultural method statement outlining appropriate methods of tree protection and any specific technical construction methods needed to implement the design proposals.

## CONTENTS:

Page No:

|     |                                                       |    |
|-----|-------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 1.  | SUMMARY                                               | 1  |
| 2.  | INTRODUCTION                                          | 2  |
| 3.  | REPORT LIMITATIONS                                    | 3  |
| 4.  | DOCUMENTS AND INFORMATION PROVIDED                    | 4  |
| 5.  | DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND TREES                         | 5  |
| 6.  | STATUTORY PROTECTION AND RELEVANT POLICIES            | 6  |
| 7.  | ARBORICULTURAL SURVEY                                 | 8  |
| 8.  | TREE SURVEY FINDINGS                                  | 9  |
| 9.  | IDENTIFICATION OF PRELIMINARY TREE CONSTRAINTS        | 10 |
| 10. | DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT                   | 12 |
| 11. | ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (AIA)                | 13 |
| 12. | TREE PROTECTION MEASURES                              | 16 |
| 13. | HEADS OF TERMS FOR AN ARBORICULTURAL METHOD STATEMENT | 17 |

## APPENDICES:

**APPENDIX 1** – TREE SURVEY METHODOLOGY AND SCHEDULE

**APPENDIX 2** – TREE SURVEY AND CONSTRAINTS PLAN

**APPENDIX 3** - TREE PRESERVATION ORDER

**APPENDIX 4** - COMBINED TREE RETENTION/REMOVAL AND PROTECTION PLAN

## REVISIONS:

| Date       | Rev | Description of revision | Initials |
|------------|-----|-------------------------|----------|
| 24/05/2019 | -   | First issue             | RH       |
|            |     |                         |          |
|            |     |                         |          |
|            |     |                         |          |

## 1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 The site is located within an existing residential area approximately 500m to the south-west of Arundel town centre. The site is a former gas works that has been decommissioned, and in part, demolished.
- 1.2 The site contains a number of self-sown trees with the notable trees in the vicinity located outside the site and around its perimeter.
- 1.3 The site is not located within a Conservation Area, however some of the trees associated to the site are currently protected by Tree Preservation Order
- 1.4 The survey identified a total of 8 individual trees and 3 tree groups. Only one of the identified survey items (G3) is located within the site itself. Of the individual trees identified 50% of were assigned to Category C. Three trees (37%) were assigned to Category B. A single Category A tree was identified. Of the three tree groups identified, the majority were assigned to Category B.
- 1.5 The default circular RPAs have been used throughout the survey. The only exception is T7.
- 1.6 Detailed planning consent is being sought for the re-development of the former gas works site
- 1.7 The proposed development is for 38 residential apartments along with access, off-street parking, amenity space and enhancements to the local footpath network.
- 1.8 The tree loss is restricted to the removal of self-sown ruderal vegetation within the site's interior. This includes buddleia and sycamore along with more established (but still self-sown) trees within G3. The species within G3 include willow, ash and sycamore. All trees to be removed are either outside the scope of BS5837:2012 or are of low-quality (Category C). The loss of these is acceptable in arboricultural terms.
- 1.9 The proposed landscape design for the site allows for the planting of new trees that can provide an enhancement to the arboricultural resource of the site in the medium-term.
- 1.10 Two potential key impacts to retained trees have been identified. These are the improvement of the highway access with the provision of a new footway adjacent to G1 and the upgrading of the existing footpath to the River Arun. The significance of these impacts can be limited through the adoption the mitigation proposed within this report. The key aspect to this approach will be ensuring the works are undertaken in an appropriate manner during the construction process.
- 1.11 In summary, the proposal development is acceptable from an arboricultural perspective.

## 2. INTRODUCTION

2.1 I am instructed by Oakford Homes, to inspect the trees that could affect or be affected by the development proposal on land known at Ford Road, Arundel; hereafter referred to as 'the site'. This report, in compliance with BS5837:2012 '*Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - recommendations*' is required to accompany the submission of a detailed planning application for residential development comprising 38 apartments.

2.2 The scope of my instruction was to visit the site and to survey relevant trees, hedges and shrub masses in accordance with BS5837:2012 and to prepare the following information:

- Tree survey summary
- Schedule of tree survey data
- Tree survey and constraints plan

2.3 With reference to the above information and BS5837:2012, I was also instructed to assess the impact of the proposed development on the site's arboricultural resource and to produce the following:

- Arboricultural impact assessment
- Details of tree retention and removal
- Details of tree protection measures

### **3. REPORT LIMITATIONS**

- 3.1 The tree survey was undertaken from ground level and observations have been made solely from visual inspections for the purposes of assessment in terms relevant to planning and development. Only binoculars, mallet and a probe have been used to aid tree assessment. No invasive or non-invasive internal decay detection devices have been used in assessing tree condition.
- 3.2 The recommendations and conclusions in this report relate only to the conditions found on this site at the time of the site visit and inspection. The recommendations contained within this report are valid for a period of 12 months from the date of this report.
- 3.3 Any significant alteration to the site that may affect the trees present, for instance changes in ground level, tree works, extreme weather events, hydrological changes etc,) may invalidate the survey findings and could necessitate a re-assessment of the trees.
- 3.4 This report is prepared for planning purposes only and does not evaluate the degree of risk posed by trees.
- 3.5 Trees are living organisms and self-supporting dynamic structures. Their physiological and structural condition can change rapidly in response to a wide range of biotic/abiotic factors. They have the potential to fail structurally, without prior manifestation of any reasonably observable symptoms. It is therefore not possible to categorically state that any tree is 'safe'.
- 3.6 It is beyond the scope of this report to comment in relation to structural damage – direct or indirect, existing or potential – that might be associated with vegetation growth, or vegetation-related soil subsidence or heave.
- 3.7 Any management recommendations set out within this report are of an advisory and preliminary nature only and relate to trees within the context of current site use. Any physical alterations to site conditions subsequent to the date of the site survey will have the potential to change/invalidate the findings and recommendations of this report.

#### **4. DOCUMENTS AND INFORMATION PROVIDED**

4.1 For the purposes of carrying out the assessment I have been provided with, and made reference to, the following information:

- Topographical Survey - Glanville - DRWG ref: 8150432/4100.
- Proposed site layout - Pope Priestley - DRWG ref: PP1249 101-04 P4.
- Vehicle access design - Paul Basham Associates - DRWG ref: 046.0005.002.

## 5. DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND TREES

5.1 The site is located within an existing residential area approximately 500m to the south-west of Arundel town centre.

- Post code: BN18 9EB
- Grid ref: TQ 01279 06728



Figure 1: aerial photo of the site with approximate boundary shown in blue. (Source: Bing Maps, 2019).

- 5.2 The site is a former gas works that has been decommissioned, and in part, demolished. The site has been vacant for a number of years. The site is bound by Ford Road to the west with public open space and residential dwellings beyond. To the north of a public right of way/access track with a pastoral field beyond. To the south is a residential dwelling on Ford Road and a pastoral field. The same field borders the site on the east with the River Arun beyond.
- 5.3 The site contains a number of self-sown trees with the notable trees in the vicinity located outside the site and around its perimeter.

## 6. STATUTORY PROTECTION AND RELEVANT POLICIES

### Statutory tree protection

6.1 I have contacted Arun District Council, the Local Planning Authority (LPA), and they have confirmed that the site is not located within a Conservation Area. However, they have confirmed that some of the trees associated to the site are currently protected by Tree Preservation Order (TPO). The TPO reference is TPO11/84/AB and a copy of the plan and schedule is included at **APPENDIX 3** of this report. The following information is provided for advisory purposes.

6.2 The trees understood to be protected by G4 of the above TPO are referenced as follows within the tree survey:

**T1, T5, T6, T7 and poplar trees within G2.** *(NB: whilst trees within G1 of the survey are sycamore and located in the area defined as G4 within the TPO it is believed these trees are not the original subjects of the TPO and have grown since the TPO was served.)*

6.3 Notwithstanding specific exceptions and in general terms, a TPO prevents the cutting down, uprooting, topping, lopping, wilful damage or wilful destruction of protected trees or woodlands without the prior written consent of the LPA.

6.4 Penalties for contravention of a TPO tend to reflect the extent of damage caused but can, in the event of a tree being destroyed, result in a fine of up to £20,000 if convicted in a Magistrates' Court, or an unlimited fine if the matter is determined by the Crown Court.

6.5 On many non-residential sites (excluding specific exceptions) there is also a statutory restriction relating to tree felling that relates to quantities of timber that can be removed within set time periods. In basic terms, it is an offence to remove more than 5 cubic metres of timber in any one calendar quarter without having first obtained a felling licence from the Forestry Commission.

6.6 Any proposed tree works that are planned to be carried out on site must be carried out in accordance with the statutory controls outlined.

### Statutory Wildlife Protection

6.7 Although preliminary visual checks from ground level of likely wildlife habitats are made at the time of surveying, detailed ecological assessments of wildlife habitats are not made by the arboriculturist and fall outside of the scope for this report.

6.8 Trees which contain holes, splits, cracks and cavities could potentially provide a habitat for protected species such as bats in addition to birds and small mammals. In some instances specialist ecological advice may be required. This may result in tree works being carried out following a detailed climbing inspection to the tree to ensure that protected species or their

nests/roosts are not disturbed. If any are found, the site manager, owner or consulting arboriculturist should be informed and appropriate action taken as recommended by the appointed Ecologist or the relevant Statutory Nature Conservation Organisation (SNCO): Natural England, Scottish Natural Heritage or Natural Resources Wales.

- 6.9 It is advised that tree/hedgerow works are carried out with the understanding that birds will generally nest in trees, hedges and shrubs between March and August. This time period only provides an indication of likely nesting times and as such diligence is required when undertaking tree works at all times.
- 6.10 Irrespective of the time of year, and other than any actions approved under General Licence, it is an offence to intentionally kill, injure or take any wild bird or to intentionally take, damage or destroy the nest or eggs of any wild bird. Ideally, tree operations should be avoided during the likely bird nesting period. However, any tree works should always only be carried out following a preliminary visual check of the vegetation.
- 6.11 For information, the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), The Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (as amended) and the Conservation of Habitat and Species Regulations 2010, form the basis of the statutory legislation for flora and fauna in England and Wales.
- 6.12 Any proposed tree works that are planned to be carried out on site must be carried out in accordance with any relevant statutory controls, outlined above.

#### **Local Plan Policy**

- 6.13 The Local Plan adopted by Arun District Council in 2018 contains the following policy in relation to trees:

*'Policy ENV DM4 Protection of Trees states that trees covered by a TPO or identified as Ancient Woodland, lying within a Conservation Area or contributing to local amenity should be protected within new development unless their removal is, in the interests of good arboricultural practice (to be informed by a tree survey); would enhance the survival of other protected trees; or the benefits of the development would outweigh the loss of trees'.*

## 7. ARBORICULTURAL SURVEY

### Site visit

- 7.1 The survey of the trees associated to the site was undertaken on the 7<sup>th</sup> May 2018. The weather at the time of the visit was overcast and raining; these conditions in no way hindered the ability to view the trees. All observations were made from ground level (aided by the Visual Tree Assessment method – Mattheck and Breloer, 1994<sup>1</sup>) and all dimensions were measured unless otherwise stated as estimated in the survey schedules.

### Methodology

- 7.2 The survey was undertaken in accordance with BS5837:2012 and the methodology is set out within **APPENDIX 1** of this report.
- 7.3 The tree survey findings are recorded in the tree survey schedule at **APPENDIX 1** of this report.
- 7.4 Within the tree survey schedule, each surveyed tree (T) or group (G) on or adjacent to the site is given a reference number which refers to its position on the tree survey and constraints plan which can be found at **APPENDIX 2** of this report.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Body Language of Trees: A Handbook for Failure Analysis (Research for Amenity Trees)

## 8. TREE SURVEY FINDINGS

- 8.1 A summary of the tree survey quality assessment findings that are relevant to the current proposals are shown in table form below:

|              | Total     | A - High quality trees whose retention is most desirable. | B - Moderate quality trees whose retention is desirable. | C - Low quality trees which could be retained but should not significantly constrain the proposal. | D - Very poor quality trees that should be removed unless they have high conservation value. |
|--------------|-----------|-----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Trees        | 8         | 1                                                         | 3                                                        | 4                                                                                                  | -                                                                                            |
| Groups       | 3         | 0                                                         | 2                                                        | 1                                                                                                  | -                                                                                            |
| Hedgerows    | 0         | -                                                         | -                                                        | -                                                                                                  | -                                                                                            |
| Woodland     | 0         | -                                                         | -                                                        | -                                                                                                  | -                                                                                            |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>11</b> | <b>1</b>                                                  | <b>5</b>                                                 | <b>5</b>                                                                                           | <b>0</b>                                                                                     |

- 8.2 The survey identified a total of 8 individual trees and 3 tree groups. Only one of the identified survey items (G3) is located within the site itself.
- 8.3 Of the individual trees identified 50% of were assigned to Category C (low-quality). Three trees (37%) were assigned to Category B (moderate-quality). A single Category A (high-quality) tree was identified. This tree is the principal arboricultural feature associated to the site, however it is located offsite and to the rear of existing dwellings on Ford Road.
- 8.4 Of the three tree groups identified, the majority were assigned to Category B (moderate quality). Both the moderate quality groups are located offsite.

## 9. IDENTIFICATION OF PRELIMINARY TREE CONSTRAINTS

- 9.1 In accordance with BS5837:2012, below ground constraints, or root protection areas (RPAs), for the surveyed trees have been plotted onto the tree survey plan for the site. These are represented as a circle centred on the base of each tree stem with a radius of 12 times stem diameter measured at 1.5m above ground level.
- 9.2 With reference to BS5837:2012, a root protection area (RPA) is defined as “a layout design tool indicating the minimum area around a 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 should be treated as a priority”. “The default position [when considering design layout in relation to RPAs] should be that structures are located outside the RPAs of trees to be retained”.
- 9.3 BS5837:2012 states (4.6.2) that, “where pre-existing site conditions or other factors indicate that rooting has occurred asymmetrically, a polygon of equivalent area should be produced.” The BS goes on to state that, “modifications to the shape of the RPA should reflect a soundly based arboricultural assessment of likely root distribution,” and that any deviation from the original circular plot should take into account:
- morphology and disposition of roots
  - topography and drainage
  - soil type and structure
  - the likely tolerance of the tree to root damage/disturbance
- 9.4 In this case the default circular RPAs have been used throughout the survey. The only exception is T7, where the presence of a change in ground level and a deep ditch has prohibited tree roots extending towards the site.
- 9.5 Root systems can be damaged in a number of ways as follows:
- Severance of a root will destroy all parts of the root beyond that point. The larger the root severed, the greater the impact on the tree. If roots are damaged close to the trunk, the anchorage and stability of the tree can be affected
  - The root bark protects the root from decay and is also essential for further root growth. If damage to the bark extends around the whole circumference, the root beyond that point will be killed
  - Soil compaction, which may occur from storage of material or passage of heavy equipment over the root area, can restrict and even prevent gaseous diffusion

through the soil, and thereby asphyxiate the roots. The roots must have oxygen for survival, growth and effective functioning.

- Lowering the soil level will strip out the mass of roots near the surface
- Raising soil levels will have the same effect as soil compaction
- Incorrect selection and application of herbicide
- Spillage of oils or other harmful materials

9.6 Above ground constraints posed by trees describe the capacity for trees to have an overbearing or dominating effect on new developments; usually post occupancy. Typical above ground constraints include a number or combination of inconveniences including shading, branch spread, movement of trees during strong winds and so on. If not adequately considered, above ground constraints can lead to repeated requests to fell or heavily prune retained and protected trees.

## 10. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

10.1 Detailed planning consent is being sought for the re-development of the former gas works site.

10.2 The description of the development is as follows:

*'Development comprising 38 residential apartments (10x1-bedroom and 28x2-bedroom units) along with access, off-street parking, amenity space and enhancements to the local footpath network'*

10.3 The current vehicle access to the site will be improved in order to serve the new development with the provision of a new footway in to the site.

10.4 The proposed layout is shown on the Combined Tree Retention/Removal And Protection Plan at **APPENDIX 4.**

## 11. ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (AIA)

- 11.1 With reference to BS5837:2012 '*Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction*', this AIA evaluates the direct and indirect effects of the proposals on the site's arboricultural resource.
- 11.2 The AIA considers the effects of any tree loss required to implement the design as well as any reasonably foreseeable potentially damaging activities proposed in the vicinity of retained trees. With reference to BS5837:2012 and the nature of the proposals, such activities might include:
- Tree removals to facilitate the design
  - Demolition of hard surfaces in proximity to retained trees
  - Soil compaction in proximity to retained trees
  - Direct impact damage to trees and roots associated with construction operations
- 11.3 The AIA is an assessment by an arboriculturist of the proposals in relation to the existing arboricultural resource on site. This assessment is in the context of tree/group qualities in order to provide evaluations of the degree of significance of the anticipated arboricultural impacts.
- 11.4 The AIA also sets out preventative measures and other mitigation proposals to reduce, insofar as possible, the level of arboricultural impact and its corresponding significance.

### **Description of proposed arboricultural losses**

- 11.5 The tree losses resulting from the development is illustrated on the Combined Tree Retention/Removal And Protection Plan at **APPENDIX 4**.
- 11.6 The tree loss is restricted to the removal of self-sown ruderal vegetation within the site's interior. This includes buddleia and sycamore along with more established (but still self-sown) trees within G3. The species within G3 include willow, ash and sycamore. All of the trees to be removed have grown opportunistically since the gas works was decommissioned.

### **Significance of proposed arboricultural losses**

- 11.7 All trees to be removed are either outside the scope of BS5837:2012 or are of low-quality (Category C). The loss of these is therefore acceptable in arboricultural terms.
- 11.8 Whilst direct mitigation for the loss of these trees is not considered necessary, the proposed landscape design for the site allows for the planting of new trees that can provide an enhancement to the arboricultural resource of the site in the medium-term.

---

Impacts on retained trees

- 11.9 A summary of potential impacts that have been considered is provided below.

Demolition and site clearance

- 11.10 Once the tree protection measures around the vehicle access and site perimeter have been installed, the demolition and site clearance can be undertaken without any impacts to retained trees.

Facilitation pruning

- 11.11 It will be necessary to carry out minor facilitation pruning to the crowns of trees within G1. This will take the form of crown lifting to provide 5m of ground clearance over the vehicle access point. The current ground clearance is approximately 4m so only a small number of branches will require pruning. This work will not impact on the overall health and vitality of the trees and is therefore considered acceptable in arboricultural terms.

Site access

- 11.12 The existing site access will need to be enlarged and improved. This will include upgrading the surfacing of the existing access and the provision of an extension to the existing footway on Ford Road. This extension will link towards the site and will, in part, be within the RPA of the trees within G1.
- 11.13 Sufficient space exists to establish the new footway without encroaching on the stems of trees within G1. There will likely be some fine roots present within the alignment of the footway and some impact on these roots is expected. However, given the species, their age and the small proportion of the RPA affected by the works the trees will tolerate the construction without any impact on their long-term health.
- 11.14 It will be essential that any works to install this footway are undertaken in accordance with an arboricultural method statement that will set out the detailed working methods required to install the footway whilst limiting the potential impacts to the trees within G1.

Service installation

- 11.15 No new services are proposed within the RPAs of retained trees.

Ground level changes

- 11.16 No ground level changes are proposed within the RPAs of retained trees.

#### Foundations

- 11.17 No foundations are proposed within the RPAs of retained trees.

#### Hard surfacing

- 11.18 No new hard surfacing is proposed within the RPAs of retained trees. However, the surface of the existing footpath that runs from the site access to the River Arun will be improved. It is preferable that any existing surfacing or sub base is left in situ with the new surface installed on top. This will remove the requirement for any excavation, and in particular within the RPA of T5.
- 11.19 Whilst it is feasible to carry out these works without impacting on T5, the detailed design of this element has not been undertaken at this stage. It must be prepared with input from the Project Arboriculturist so that impacts to T5 can be avoided. Subsequently the work must be undertaken in accordance with an arboricultural method statement.

#### Soft landscaping

- 11.20 New soft landscaping is proposed at the south-western edge of the RPA associated to T5. However, given the presence of the existing footpath and the nature of the site and its existing perimeter fence it is not anticipated that any significant roots will extend into this area. However, to fully inform the works, the excavation of a number of trial holes should be undertaken at site clearance stage. This will allow the presence or absence of roots to be confirmed so the final approach to tree protection in this area can be confirmed.

## 12. TREE PROTECTION MEASURES

- 12.1 A Combined Tree Retention/Removal And Protection Plan (TRRPP) is attached at **APPENDIX 4** of this report.
- 12.2 In accordance with BS5837:2012 the TRRPP is superimposed onto the proposed site layout plan and based on the topographical survey.
- 12.3 Where practical the TRRPP has been drawn to ensure the square metre area of the RPA's for individual trees has been maintained and also that the RPAs cover the likely rooting area of individual trees. In some places this has resulted in polygonal, square or possibly offset RPA's. Any hard surfacing and structures within the RPAs of trees to be retained are highlighted on the TRRPP. In addition, where relevant, the TPP shows indicative locations of protective barriers (forming Construction Exclusion Zones in relation to RPAs of retained trees).
- 12.4 The preparation of the TRRPP has considered the following factors where relevant:-
- Site construction access;
  - intensity and nature of construction activity;
  - contractors car parking;
  - availability of special construction techniques;
  - spatial requirements for:
    - Temporary and permanent apparatus and service runs;
    - Cranes, plant scaffolding and access during works;
    - Site huts, toilets (including drainage) and other temporary structures;
    - Storage (either temporary or long-term) of materials, spoil, fuel and mixing of concrete.
  - All changes in ground levels including location of retaining walls, steps and adequate allowance for foundations of such walls and backfillings;
- 12.5 The tree protection measures shown on the TRRPP demonstrate the feasibility of the proposed development in relation to retained trees. However, they must be implemented with specific reference to a finalised tree protection plan and an arboricultural method statement that is relevant to the proposals.

---

### 13. HEADS OF TERMS FOR AN ARBORICULTURAL METHOD STATEMENT

13.1 BS5837:2012 (Figure 1) recommends that detailed/technical design of tree protection and arboricultural methodologies should be resolved and finalised following on from the approval of the feasibility of a scheme by the relevant regulatory body.

13.2 Annex B and Table B.1 of BS5837:2012, an informative, advises that arboricultural method statement heads of terms are a sufficient level of information in order to deliver tree-related information into the planning system. The table also advises that a detailed arboricultural method statement might reasonably be required as a 'reserved matter' or planning condition.

13.3 In relation to the above site, it is anticipated that arboricultural working methods are likely to be quite straightforward. A draft, 'heads of terms' is set out below:

- Project arboriculturist – schedule of monitoring and supervision
- Pre-commencement site meeting
- Tree removals and facilitation pruning (e.g. crown lifting of G1)
- Erection of tree protection barriers (site security fencing)
- Site clearance and demolition
- Creation of site access
- Main construction phase
- Upgrade of pedestrian footpath from access to the River Arun
- Removal of tree protection barriers
- Final landscaping including tree planting.