



**Baird's Business Park,
Littlehampton**

**Arboricultural Implications Assessment and
Method Statement**

June 2026



Client	Savills
Job name	Baird's Business Park Littlehampton
Report title	Arboricultural Implications Assessment and Method Statement
File reference	26-2105-Report

	Name	Position	Date
Author	Neil Taylor	Arboricultural Consultant	June 2026

Report Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Site Description.....	1
1.2	Proposed Works	1
1.3	Aims of Study	1
2	Methodology	2
3	Assessment	3
3.1	Tree Character Groups.....	3
4	Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA).....	4
4.1	Methodology	4
4.2	Assessment	4
5	Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS)	5
5.1	Methodology	5
5.2	Demolition within the RPA of Retained Trees	5
5.3	Construction within the RPA of Retained Trees.....	5
5.4	Services.....	5
5.5	Tree Protection.....	5
5.6	Site Monitoring and Supervision	6
6	Conclusion.....	7
7	Appendices	8

1 Introduction

1.1 Site Description

Baird's Business Park, Littlehampton (the "site") comprises commercial units and the associated infrastructure. The site is situated approximately two miles west of the centre of Littlehampton. The site is bound to the north by Grevatt's Lane, to the east by a strip of woodland, to the south by Ryebank Rife and to the west by agricultural land.

1.2 Proposed Works

The erection of a replacement commercial building, parking and other associated infrastructure are proposed. The drainage strategy requires the strip of woodland to the east of the site to be crossed by a drain run to an attenuation pond in the neighbouring field. There is sufficient space for the use a directional drilling machine to negate the need for excavations in the strip of woodland. Works that are likely to affect retained trees include the installation of an exit pit and manhole in the adjacent field.

1.3 Aims of Study

To inform a planning application, Canopy Consultancy has been commissioned by Savills to undertake a tree survey of the site, in accordance with British Standard (BS) 5837:2012 "Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction - Recommendations".

The aim of this report is to present the results of the survey, including a Tree Survey Schedule (TSS), an Arboricultural Implications Assessment (AIA), and an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS). A Tree Protection Plan (TPP) has also been produced and accompanies this report as a separate drawing.

This report in no way constitutes a health and safety survey report. Where concerns for tree health and safety exist, the necessary and appropriate tree inspections should be carried out.

2 Methodology

The trees were inspected from ground level by consultant arboriculturist Oliver Halladay on the 11th of February 2026. Measurements were taken in accordance with the recommendations set out in the BS 5837:2012. Canopy spreads were measured and plotted to the four compass points. Where direct access was not possible measurements have been estimated. The surveyed trees are colour coded on the accompanying tree survey drawing according to their relevant BS category.

The tree data collected is used to enable the current canopy spread of the surveyed trees and the Root Protection Area (RPA) to be plotted on the accompanying TPP. The RPA is defined by the formula in paragraph 4.6 from the BS 5837:2012 and may be refined by taking into account current on-site constraints to root activity such as buildings, earthworks and hard paving. This forms part of the design process for the proposed development.

3 Assessment

3.1 Tree Character Groups

The detailed results of the tree survey are provided in the TSS, in Appendix 1. In summary, the trees within the survey area are struggling with strong, salt laden winds blowing in from the coastline. The trees can be divided into two distinct character groups as follows:

1. The first character group includes the medium sized, mature trees found growing across the site. The majority of the trees in this character group are in a fair condition and are showing signs of stress likely caused by salt spray from the coastline.
2. The second character group includes the smaller, young trees found growing across the site. The trees in this character group are in a good condition but due to their size are of limited amenity value to the local area.

4 Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA)

4.1 Methodology

The AIA uses the information obtained in the tree survey to identify areas where the proposed construction may be at odds with accepted standards, in terms of a tree's requirements for space in which to maintain existing roots and shoots, and space for future growth.

The quality and relative importance of each tree is illustrated as a coloured polygon. The colour used relates to the BS categories as follows: A - green, B - blue, C - grey and U - red (see accompanying drawing reference 26-2105-TPP). In general, the design process will try to retain A and B category trees. Proposed construction will therefore normally be excluded from the RPA of A and B category trees. Red trees are discounted as they are recommended for removal.

Details of the trees surveyed are given in the TSS (Appendix 1). The juxtaposition of the proposed development in relation to existing tree locations are shown on the accompanying TPP drawing, reference 26-2105-TPP.

The AIA considers existing site conditions and the effect that they may have on the development of the surveyed trees' root systems. Hard structures such as building and paved roads and paths can influence the root activity of trees by reducing the availability of both moisture and nutrients.

4.2 Assessment

Refer to the accompanying TPP, drawing, reference 26-2105-TPP, for the relationship between the proposed development and the trees on and adjacent to the site.

- No trees will be removed to enable the proposed development.
- There will be no demolition within the RPA of a retained tree.
- The following trees will be affected by the installation of a drainage run:

T18, T26 and W1

The drainage run will be installed using directional drilling with entry and exit pits placed outside of the RPA of retained trees. The drainage run will be installed at a depth of 1.5m, well below the depth of any rooting from the affected trees.

- The proposed replacement commercial building will have no impact on the retained trees as there is a significant ditch between the woodland strip and the location of the replacement building.

5 Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS)

5.1 Methodology

The AMS provides the means by which retained trees and hedges can be protected throughout the development.

The movement of demolition and construction machinery in close proximity to trees may cause compaction of the soil which affects the tree's ability to absorb moisture and nutrients. The RPAs of retained trees and hedges will be protected by a tree protection barrier as described in paragraph 5.5 below and shown on the accompanying TPP, drawing number 26-2105-TPP.

5.2 Demolition within the RPA of Retained Trees

There will be no demolition within the RPA of a retained tree.

5.3 Construction within the RPA of Retained Trees

Prior to excavations for the exit pit commencing, the retained trees will be protected in accordance with the accompanying TPP, drawing number 26-2105-TPP.

There will be no excavations within the RPA of a retained tree.

No materials or spoil is to be stored within the RPA of a retained tree.

In order to avoid damage to the retained trees the tree surgery and felling work identified in the accompanying tree survey schedule and Section 4.2 above will be carried out prior to the occupation of the site by the building contractor. The work will be carried out in accordance with BS 3998:2010.

5.4 Services

The proposed drainage run will be installed using directional drilling at a depth of 1.5m. The impact on the retained trees will be negligible.

5.5 Tree Protection

All trees that are to be retained on the site will be protected by the use of a tree protection barrier erected in the location shown on the accompanying TPP, drawing number 26-2105-TPP. The fence will consist of "Heras" type panels or similar braced at appropriate intervals and secured to keep in place. The tree protection barrier will be erected prior to the occupation of the site by the building contractor and will only be removed once the installation of the drainage run is complete.

5.6 Site Monitoring and Supervision

The process of reporting to the client and LPA/Tree Officer will be by emailing the checklist form at Appendix 2. After the pre-commencement meeting with the site manager, site monitoring is to be whenever supervision of specialist construction activities is required. It will involve a site visit by the arboriculturist to ensure that the appropriate tree protection measures, as detailed in the approved drawings and method statements, are continually adhered to. The completed checklist, along with any photographs taken, will be sent to the LPA within 5 working days of the site visit.

6 Conclusion

Canopy Consultancy was commissioned by Savills to carry out a tree survey at the site. The results of the survey indicate that the trees within the survey area provide significant amenity to the local area.

No trees will be removed to enable the proposed development.

Through the specified tree protection measures and construction methodologies, it will be possible to minimise the impact of the proposed development on the retained trees.

Overall, there are no known overriding arboricultural constraints which would prevent the proposed development from going ahead, subject to the protection measures and construction methodologies specified within this report being correctly implemented.

7 Appendices

Appendix 1: Tree Survey Schedule

Project:	Bairds Business Park, Littlehampton							BS 5837 2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction- recommendations	Surveyed by		OH				
Ref:	26-2105-TSS								Weather		Clear				
Date:	11.02.26								Tagged		No				
Client:	Savills														
				Canopy Spread											
Tree No.	Species	Height (m)	Stem Dia. (mm)	N	E	S	W	Stems	Height of crown clearance	Age class	Physiological condition problems/comments	Structural condition	Preliminary management recommendations	Estimated remaining contribution years	BS category
T1	Fagus sylvatica (Beech)	10	520	5	1	1	2	3	3	MA	Good - Stem divides below 1.5m. Crown distorted due to group pressure.	Good	None	40+	B3
T2	Fagus sylvatica (Beech)	10	562	5	2	2	4	4	1.5	MA	Good - Stem divides below 1.5m. Crown distorted due to group pressure.	Good	None	40+	B3
T3	Fagus sylvatica (Beech)	10	280	1.5	2	2	2	1	7	MA	Fair - suppressed.	Good	None	40+	C1
T4	Fagus sylvatica (Beech)	10	600	5	4	2	3	1	7	MA	Fair - Low vitality. Declining. Multiple stems above 1.5m. Included bark present in fork. Dieback in crown. Low bud/leaf density.	Fair	None	20-40	C1
T5	Fagus sylvatica (Beech)	10	361	4	3	2	1	2	7	MA	Poor - Low vitality. Declining. Stem divides below 1.5m. Dieback in crown. Low bud/leaf density.	Fair	None	10-20	C1
T6	Tilia X europaea (Common Lime)	10	420	1	6	4	2	2	1	MA	Poor - Low vitality. Declining. Dieback in crown. Low bud/leaf density.	Fair	None	10-20	C1

Project:	Bairds Business Park, Littlehampton							BS 5837 2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction- recommendations	Surveyed by		OH				
Ref:	26-2105-TSS								Weather		Clear				
Date:	11.02.26								Tagged		No				
Client:	Savills														
				Canopy Spread											
Tree No.	Species	Height (m)	Stem Dia. (mm)	N	E	S	W	Stems	Height of crown clearance	Age class	Physiological condition problems/comments	Structural condition	Preliminary management recommendations	Estimated remaining contribution years	BS category
T7	Fagus sylvatica (Beech)	9	550	2	1	1	1	1	6	MA	Poor - Low vitality. Declining. Cavity on stem. Dieback in crown. Low bud/leaf density.Moribund. Meripilus at base north.	Poor	Remove tree	<10	U
T8	Fagus sylvatica (Beech)	9	550	6	2	1	2	1	4	MA	Fair - Poor - shape & form. suppressed. Stem divides above 1.5m.	Good	None	20-40	C1
T9	Tilia X europaea (Common Lime)	10	429	6	2	1	2	2	6	MA	Good - suppressed. Stem divides above 1.5m. Crown distorted due to group pressure.	Good	None	20-40	C1
T10	Fagus sylvatica (Beech)	10	550	3	2	1	2	1	7	MA	Good - Multiple stems above 1.5m. Crown distorted due to group pressure.	Good	None	40+	B3
T11	Tilia X europaea (Common Lime)	9	270	1.5	2	2	2	1	6	MA	Poor - suppressed. Stem divides above 1.5m. Dieback in crown. Low bud/leaf density. Crown distorted due to group pressure.	Fair	None	10-20	C1

Project:	Bairds Business Park, Littlehampton							BS 5837 2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction- recommendations	Surveyed by		OH				
Ref:	26-2105-TSS								Weather		Clear				
Date:	11.02.26								Tagged		No				
Client:	Savills														
				Canopy Spread											
Tree No.	Species	Height (m)	Stem Dia. (mm)	N	E	S	W	Stems	Height of crown clearance	Age class	Physiological condition problems/comments	Structural condition	Preliminary management recommendations	Estimated remaining contribution years	BS category
T12	Fagus sylvatica (Beech)	10	350	3	2	3	2	1	6	MA	Poor - suppressed. Dieback in crown. Low bud/leaf density. Crown distorted due to group pressure.UV damage and bark necrosis to south.	Fair	None	10-20	C1
T13	Tilia X europaea (Common Lime)	8	550	1	5	2	2	1	1	MA	Fair - suppressed. Epicormics on stem. Suckers around stem base.	Good	None	20-40	C1
T14	Tilia X europaea (Common Lime)	12	580	3	5	3	4	1	7	MA	Good - Multiple stems above 1.5m.	Good	None	40+	B3
T15	Tilia X europaea (Common Lime)	10	515	6	6	2	1	2	1	MA	Fair - Low vitality. Declining. Decay present on stem. Cavity on stem. Included bark present in fork.Secondary leader failure at included union at 1m.	Poor	None	10-20	C1
T16	Fagus sylvatica (Beech)	10	375	1	3	2	1	2	6	MA	Fair - Low vitality. Cavity on stem. Dieback in crown. Low bud/leaf density. Major deadwood in crown.	Fair	None	10-20	C1
T17	Tilia X europaea (Common Lime)	10	349	1.5	4	2	1	2	4	MA	Fair - Low vitality. Stem divides below 1.5m.	Fair	None	10-20	C1

Project:	Bairds Business Park, Littlehampton							BS 5837 2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction- recommendations	Surveyed by		OH				
Ref:	26-2105-TSS								Weather		Clear				
Date:	11.02.26								Tagged		No				
Client:	Savills														
				Canopy Spread											
Tree No.	Species	Height (m)	Stem Dia. (mm)	N	E	S	W	Stems	Height of crown clearance	Age class	Physiological condition problems/comments	Structural condition	Preliminary management recommendations	Estimated remaining contribution years	BS category
T18	Tilia X europaea (Common Lime)	11	750	3	6	5	2	1	4	MA	Poor - Declining. Decay present on stem. Cavity on stem. Major bark wounding on stem. Multiple stems above 1.5m. Included bark present in fork. Dieback in crown. Broken branches in crown. Major deadwood in crown.	Poor	Remove tree	<10	U
T19	Tilia X europaea (Common Lime)	10	450	2	5	2	2	1	1	MA	Fair - Poor - shape & form. Multiple stems above 1.5m. Included bark present in fork.	Fair	None	20-40	C1
T20	Tilia X europaea (Common Lime)	11	500	2	6	4	1	1	4	MA	Good - Ivy on tree.	Good	None	40+	B3
T21	Fagus sylvatica (Beech)	9	380	1	4	2	1	1	5	MA	Poor - Declining. Dieback in crown. Moribund.	Poor	Remove tree	<10	U
T22	Tilia X europaea (Common Lime)	11	450	2	6	2	2	1	4	MA	Good - Epicormics on stem. Suckers around stem base.	Good	None	40+	B3
T23	Tilia X europaea (Common Lime)	11	400	1	6	1	1	1	2	MA	Good - Epicormics on stem. Suckers around stem base.	Good	None	40+	B3

Project:	Bairds Business Park, Littlehampton							BS 5837 2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction- recommendations	Surveyed by		OH				
Ref:	26-2105-TSS								Weather		Clear				
Date:	11.02.26								Tagged		No				
Client:	Savills														
				Canopy Spread											
Tree No.	Species	Height (m)	Stem Dia. (mm)	N	E	S	W	Stems	Height of crown clearance	Age class	Physiological condition problems/comments	Structural condition	Preliminary management recommendations	Estimated remaining contribution years	BS category
T24	Fagus sylvatica (Beech)	11	750	5	7	2	2	1	6	MA	Fair - Declining. Cavity on stem. Dieback in crown. Unbalanced crown shape. Historic southern stem failure at 4m. Northern stem adversely weighted. Tension side decay at base, Ganoderma present and active.	Fair	None	10-20	C1
T25	Fagus sylvatica (Beech)	11	480	4	4	3	3	1	3	MA	Good	Good	None	40+	B3
T26	Fagus sylvatica (Beech)	9	450	3	1	2	2	1	6	MA	Poor - Moribund.	Poor	Remove tree	<10	U
W1	Fagus sylvatica (Beech), Tilia X europaea (Common Lime)	10	Varied						MA	Fair - Woodland group. Multiple dead/dying trees within group. Stunted asymmetrical crowns, biased to north due to prevailing wind from south. Tip dieback in southern portions of crowns and crown dysfunction in trees on southern boundary due to salt laden wind.		Fair	None	40+	B3

Appendix 2: Programme of Site Monitoring

Baird's Business Park, Littlehampton Site Monitoring Form

To be completed by the named arboriculturist and emailed to the client and tree officer at the completion of each operation.

Arboriculturist.....

Client.....

Project Manager.....

Tree Officer.....

(The above to be filled in with names and contact numbers)

OPERATION	TIMING	DATE	COMMENTS
Pre-commencement meeting or contact with project/site manager.	Before any works or pre-works on site, including storage of materials		
Site visit to check tree protection barrier is as specified and in the correct location	Prior excavations beginning on site		
Completion of development	Once all construction activity has been completed		