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1. **INTRODUCTION**

1.1.1 This Arboricultural Method Statement in line with BS5837:2005 Tree in Relation to Construction - Recommendations, has been prepared in relation to the proposed development at John Hellins Primary School, Potterspury, Northamptonshire, see aerial photograph at Appendix 1.

1.1.2 The report has been commissioned to provide details of how the trees and hedges at the school will be protected through the implementation of development, relating to planning application no. 11/00071/CCD. The instruction was confirmed by Lend Lease Ltd email dated 22nd November 2011.

1.1.3 The scope of this project is singular:
- Provide an arboricultural method statement, specifically in relation to the physical protection of trees and hedges, through the course of development, both above and below ground.

2. **DOCUMENTS PROVIDED**

2.1.1 As background information the following documentation has been provided/been available to prepare this report:
- Comments from Tina Cuss of Northamptonshire County Council relating to the information required prior to a planning decision being made;
- Proposed site layout as prepared by PHP Architects dated April 2011 reference 3933/212; and
- Proposed contractors compound plan prepared by PHP Architects dated September 2011 reference 3956/013.

3. **RELEVANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

3.1 **Planning History**

3.1.1 A planning application was submitted to Northamptonshire County Council reference no. 11/00071/CCD, for the construction of a single storey brick classroom and staffroom extension and new covered play area at John Hellins Primary School. In support of the application a detailed Arboricultural Implications Assesment (AIA) reference 11-1333 010911 3372 D15 R AIA Report, was submitted following agreements made with Northamptonshire County Council.

3.1.2 Although the AIA was considered acceptable, it has been requested that an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) be prepared to provide details of how the trees and hedges will be physically protected through the course of development.

3.2 **Site Description**

3.2.1 John Hellins Primary School is located within the village of Potterspury on the northern side of the A5, with Towcester to the north and Milton Keynes to the south. The school is bound on the north, south and western sides by residential properties and associated gardens, which vary in age, style and size. To the east of the school is Browns Wood Drive for which the school is accessed from.
3.2.2 The school consists of a large single storey building located within the central and northern area of the site, with a large area of grass to the south. In the north eastern corner is an area of hard standing, which is used as a playground.

3.3 Development Proposal

3.3.1 The development proposal is to extend the existing main school building to the south into an area of hard landscaping to create two new classrooms with surrounding footpath and access. To the north of the site, a new outdoor covered area is to be created, with covered link canopy.

3.3.2 The proposal also includes reorientation of the internal teaching rooms with reception classrooms to the north and older pupils moving to the southern part of the school.

3.3.3 The details of the proposals outlined above are illustrated on the ‘Proposed Site Plan’ at Appendix 2.

3.4 Tree Protection: Legal Status

3.4.1 The Local Planning Authority (LPA) has been contacted to establish whether any trees contained within the red line boundary are protected by either a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) or are within a Conservation Area.

3.4.2 In a telephone conversation on 25th August 2011, Tina Cuss, Senior Environmental Planner, Northamptonshire County Council confirmed that there is no statutory protection of any trees on the school site.

3.4.3 If full planning consent is granted then any trees, which require felling to implement the approved plans are exempt from statutory protection. It should also be considered that any proposed tree works detailed in the Tree Schedule at Appendix 3 are also implemented as part of the planning decision consent.

3.4.4 This report does not consider the general requirements of the Forestry Act 1967 as full planning permission is exempt from the need for a felling licence.

4. ARBORICULTURAL SURVEY DATA

4.1 Data Collection

4.1.1 Site visits were undertaken on the 25th August 2011 by Peter Wharton BSc(Hons)Arb MArborA MICFor, Arboricultural Consultant at Lockhart Garratt Ltd and trees were inspected from ground level.

4.1.2 The survey recorded five individual trees. The complete data collection methodology for the tree survey is provided at Appendix 4.

4.2 BS5837:2005 Tree Categorisation

4.2.1 BS5837:2005 sets out the methodology for surveying trees on potential development sites in order to identify them within a prioritised system of retention categories, as summarised below and given in full within the BS5837:2005 Cascade Chart for Tree Retention at Appendix 3:

---

1 Peter Wharton is a sub-consultant to Lockhart Garratt.
**A Category** Trees of high quality and value in such a condition as to be able to make a substantial contribution for a minimum of 40 years

**B Category** Trees of moderate quality and value in such a condition as to make a significant contribution for a minimum 20 years

**C Category** Trees of low quality and value currently in adequate condition to remain until new planting could be established and expected to remain for a minimum of 10 years, or young trees with a stem diameter less than 150mm measured at 1.5 metres above ground level.

**R Category** Trees in such a condition that any existing value would be lost within 10 years and which should, in the current context, be removed for reasons of sound arboricultural or forestry management.

4.2.2 Additionally, BS5837:2005 provides subcategories 1-3 within the category system outlined above which indicate the area(s) in which a tree or group retention value lies. An explanation of these values is given within the BS5837:2005 Cascade Chart for Tree Retention at Appendix 3:

1. Retention values that are mainly arboricultural.
2. Retention values that are mainly landscape.
3. Retention values that are mainly cultural, including conservation.

4.2.3 In line with BS5837:2005, A and B category trees should be considered as a constraint on site and provide a substantial contribution to the site. As a result, A and B category trees should be retained and incorporated into the scheme where possible.

4.2.4 Generally C and R category trees are considered to be of low quality or are young specimens which can be readily replaced and therefore should not be a constraint in terms of future development.

4.2.5 However, it is generally considered desirable to retain trees wherever reasonably possible to ensure continuity of tree cover and to provide a mature landscape to the development.

**4.3 Summary of Data**

4.3.1 The survey contains five individual trees (see Table 1 below). The comments including species, age, condition and the BS5837:2005 retention category for each individual tree and group of trees are provided in detail in the Tree Schedule at Appendix 3.

4.3.2 The location of each individual tree and their associated constraints are illustrated on the Arboricultural Implications Plan at Appendix 2.
Table 1: Distribution of trees by BS5837:2005 tree categorisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retention Category</th>
<th>Individual Trees</th>
<th>Groups of Trees</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4 Summary of the Tree Resource

4.4.1 The trees on site are located predominantly to the south of the site within the grassed playing field, with a mix of young and middle aged trees consisting predominantly of birch, Sorbus and prunus species. To the east of the site adjacent to the main entrance is a middle-aged beech tree and to the north are two middle-aged trees consisting of a walnut and Scots pine.

4.4.2 Immediately to the south on the main school building are three mountain ash trees, which are located within close proximity to an area of hard landscaping.

4.4.3 The boundaries of the site have low-rise hedges of up to 2.5m in height, which are made up of a mix of native species including hawthorn and hazel.

4.4.4 The current survey does not include all trees on site, as the current development proposal only impacts upon a small number of trees.
5. **WORKS PHASING**

5.1.1 This method statement makes a number of recommendations for the site. For convenience, all of the recommendations in this report have been listed in Table 2 below, with the relevant sections and appendices provided.

5.1.2 In order to ensure a successful tree retention and development it is imperative that all of these recommendations are carried out in a similar order to the tabulated form below.

**Table 2: Works Phasing Programme**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE / TIMING</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>APPENDIX No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMMEDIATE</td>
<td><strong>UNDERTAKE FACILITATION PRUNING AND FELLING.</strong></td>
<td>6.1 &amp; 6.2</td>
<td>2 &amp; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMMEDIATE</td>
<td><strong>APPOINT ARBORICULTURAL CLERK OF WORKS (ACoW) TO OVERSEE ALL ARBORICULTURAL ISSUES ON SITE.</strong></td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMMEDIATE</td>
<td><strong>ERECT TREE PROTECTION FENCING TO BS: 5837:2005 SPECIFICATIONS AS APPROPRIATE.</strong></td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>2 &amp; 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMMEDIATE</td>
<td><strong>INITIAL / PRE-CONTINUANCE MEETING</strong></td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DURING CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td><strong>IMPLEMENT REPORTING PROCESS FOR ALL UNFORESEEN ARBORICULTURAL INCIDENTS</strong></td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DURING CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td><strong>IMPLEMENT USE OF PROGRESS SHEET TO BUILD UP EVIDENCE BASE OF GOOD PRACTICE ON SITE</strong></td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DURING CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td><strong>MONITORING SITE VISITS BY ACoW TO ENSURE CONTINUED COMPLIANCE</strong></td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DURING CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td><strong>WORKS WITHIN THE RPA OF T5</strong></td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td><strong>POST DEVELOPMENT INSPECTION TO IDENTIFY ANY REQUIRED REMEDIAL WORKS</strong></td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td><strong>REMEDIAL DECOMPACTATION UNDER RETAINED TREE WHERE REQUIRED</strong></td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td><strong>GENERAL MAINTENANCE / REMEDIAL TREE WORKS</strong></td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td><strong>ANNUAL TREE INSPECTION</strong></td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. **PRE DEVELOPMENT WORKS**

6.1 **Enabling Felling**

6.1.1 In undertaking the proposal as indicated on the Arboricultural Implications Plan at Appendix 2, there will be a direct loss of three trees and indirect loss of a further individual tree.

**Direct Tree Loss**

6.1.2 As a direct consequence of the proposed extension to the south of the school, there will be a loss of three mountain ash trees T1, T2 and T3.

6.1.3 T1 is considered a B category specimen, with a minimum of 20 years useful life remaining and is of superior quality to both trees T2 and T3. However, it is a small specimen that can only be viewed from within the main school site and therefore its removal will not have a detrimental impact on the area. The reason for its removal is due to the western elevation of the building, encroaching into its root protection area and canopy spread. The encroachment cannot be avoided and therefore on this occasion the tree is to be removed.

6.1.4 Trees T2 and T3 are both C category specimens, which are considered to be of poor quality. The southern elevation of the proposed extension is either located within or within close proximity to the root protection areas of both trees and due to the quality of the trees is has been considered acceptable to remove both.

6.1.5 Beyond the tree stated above there is to be a small area of hedge to be removed which currently forms the dividing barrier between the existing staff car park and outdoor area south of T5. Approximately 2m of the hedge will be removed in order to provide a fire exit for the construction workers. On completion of the project the escape route will be removed and the hedge reinstated.

**Indirect Tree Loss**

6.1.6 In addition to the direct loss of the three mountain ash trees there is also to be an indirect loss of T4 a walnut tree located to the north of the school, where there is to be a new outdoor covered play area and hard standing. T4 is considered to be a C category tree, due to its structural form with codominant stems forming from the base with a tight forking habit. The tree currently overhangs the school building and has limited undisturbed rooting area due to the existing hard surfacing, which surrounds it. In addition to this the school has also advised of the adverse health problems which the trees cause to particular pupils who have severe nut allergies. Therefore in this instance the tree is proposed for removal as the pupils safety is considered to be paramount.

6.1.7 All of the above tree removals have been discussed and agreed with both Northamptonshire County Council and South Northamptonshire Council, subject to suitable replacement planting within the grassed playing field to the south of the site. The proposed tree removal and retention is illustrated on plan reference D11-1296 at Appendix 2.

6.1.8 Prior to the planning application being made Lockhart Garratt was informed that one tree adjacently to the proposed construction access from Brownswood Drive was removed. As a result, it is not illustrated on any plans provided.
6.2 Facilitation Pruning

6.2.1 It is proposed that the western side of T5 is lifted to 3m, therefore ensuring that its lower canopy is not in contact with the outdoor classroom canopy.

6.2.2 To date the hedges that surround the site have been reduced to a more manageable size and this will be continued work on an annual basis.

6.2.3 It is likely that any new tree planting will require remedial works consisting of formative pruning whilst the trees establish. This is recommended as part of the three - five year tree management programme for the planting, maintenance and aftercare of the new trees.

6.3 Arboricultural Clerk of Works (ACoW)

6.3.1 It is recommended that the developers appoint a suitably qualified arboriculturalist to act as an Arboricultural Clerk of Works ACoW. The ACoW will be engaged to monitor and oversee the implementation of the works required in this method statement.

6.3.2 The role of the ACoW is a relatively formal one. Normally their involvement should be limited to a number of site visits where decisions can be made relatively quickly. In the case of this development the following occasions are where the ACoW will be required:

- Initial meeting (usually the pre-commencement meeting see section 6.4) – to ensure all required tree protection is in place, and to discuss any required amendments with the Local Planning Authority Senior Environmental Planner.
- Monitoring visits – Regular informal inspections to ensure that all tree protection measures are being maintained, and to inform the Site Manager where appropriate measures are not in place.
- Completion meeting – To inspect trees to assess for any required works and to confirm that the development has been sufficiently completed, and the tree protection measures can be removed.

6.3.3 The ACoW will also be the first contact for arboricultural advice for any issues that arise which are not detailed in this report, such as extra tree works, any required work within the root protection areas (RPA) of the trees on site, any damage that has occurred to any of the trees or any breach of the tree protection measures on site.

6.4 Pre – Commencement Site Meeting

6.4.1 It is recommended that a pre – commencement site meeting be undertaken prior to any onsite works commencing. This meeting will enable the Senior Environmental Planner to visit the site with the Arboricultural Clerk of Works (ACoW) and inspect the tree works undertaken, the protective fencing and to ensure all parties are satisfied that the proposed foundations to the building will not impact on the condition of any trees.

6.4.2 Regular site visits will then be undertaken following this by the ACoW to ensure protective measures are in place and file notes will be prepared and filed. Once the tree protection measures have been confirmed as acceptable, they can be “signed off” on the progress sheet (see section 6.5)
6.5 Reporting Process

6.5.1 If during the construction any damage to either the trees or the Root Protection Areas is sustained, this should be reported to the Site Manager immediately. At the earliest possible time the Site Manager should inform the ACoW, who will undertake a site visit to assess the impact on the trees and make recommendations for any required works.

6.5.2 Possible damage to the trees or the Root Protection Areas could be: collision damage to crowns of retained trees by site vehicles; excavation within Root Protection Area; dumping of soil / materials within Root Protection Area; Chemical / cement spillage into Root Protection Area or fire damage to the crown / stem of the tree.

6.6 Progress Sheet

6.6.1 During the various stages of the development it will be helpful to keep a record of the completion of the various tree protection works. This will then provide the Senior Environmental Planner, with sufficient evidence that all practicable steps have been taken to prevent damage to the trees.

6.6.2 A separate progress sheet should be completed for each completed operation. The original should be kept, with the copy of this document that will be retained by the Site Manager in the site office. Once completed a copy should be sent to the ACoW and the Senior Environmental Planner of Northamptonshire County Council.

7. TREE PROTECTION

7.1 Fencing Specification

7.1.1 Prior to any construction or vehicular movement tree protective measures must be in place. The ACoW will check this prior to the commencement of works.

7.1.2 These protective measures ensure suitable protection of trees, hedges and associated soils. The key method of tree protection is through the use of barriers/fencing.

7.1.3 The hedges although not individually surveyed have an average stem diameter at ground level of no more than 150mm and therefore the protective fencing adjacent to the boundary hedges will be set at 1.5m from the base of the hedge. This will ensure that the canopy of the hedge is also protected through the course of development. See the Tree Protection Plan at Appendix 2 for detailed location.

7.1.4 The tree protection fence/barrier once erected will not be moved or relocated without written approval from the Council. The tree protection area behind the fence/barrier (the Development Exclusion Zone) will be sacrosanct throughout development and no access will be allowed to this area including for example the storage of or moving of materials or machinery. In the Development Exclusion Zone, there will be no excavations or increases in soil level without prior written approval from the Council. The location of protective fencing is illustrated on the Tree Protection Plan at Appendix 2 and this will also be placed within the site offices.

7.1.5 The barriers will be made from scaffold in a vertical and horizontal framework, as shown as Figure 2 in BS5837:2005 with vertical tubes up to 3 metres apart. The
framework will be braced to resist impacts. On to the scaffold framework, weldmesh panels will be secured with wire or scaffold clamps and driven into the ground, see diagram at Appendix 5. This method will be implemented where the tree protective fencing is permanent and not to be moved for the entirety of the development.

7.1.6 Adjacently to T5 only, protective fencing supported using rubber weighted feet, as per the diagram at Appendix 5. The reason for placing the fencing on rubber feet in this area is as it will have to be moved in part for the removal of the existing block paving and also installation of rubberised floor. Initially the full RPA of T5 is to be respected until a point where construction of the canopy and covered play area is to be commenced. At this point with the supervision of the ACoW the protective fencing will be moved in an easterly direction to allow the installation of the timber posts as described in section 7.2 below.

7.1.7 The rear support for all tree protective fencing will be constructed by attaching a supporting strut scaffold pole to the main fencing with the other end having a pin driven through the hole into the soil for anchorage. This method will significantly reduce the risk of damaging any major roots whilst still giving the structure rigidity.

7.1.8 There will be clear and visible signs attached to the protective fencing with the following “Tree Protection Area – Keep Out” and the area will be regarded as sacrosanct by everyone. This will be checked prior to the commencement of work by the ACoWs and throughout the course of development.

7.1.9 The tree protection fencing denotes the Development Exclusion Zone. Therefore, the following must be carefully considered when planning site operations to ensure that wide or tall loads or plant with booms, jibs and counterweights can operate without coming into contact with retained trees. Any transit or traverse of plant in close proximity to trees should be conducted under the supervision of a banks person to ensure that adequate clearance from trees is maintained at all times.

7.1.10 Material that will contaminate the soil such as concrete mixing, diesel oil and vehicle washing should not be discharged within 10m of the tree stems.

7.1.11 Fires should not be lit in a position where their flames can extend to within 5m of foliage, branches or trunk. This will depend on the size of the fire and the wind direction.

7.1.12 At the end of the project the fence will be removed only after confirmation by the ACoW and Council.

7.1.13 A detailed Tree Protection Plan (see Appendix 2) will be located within the site cabins throughout the course of development. This will include details of the fencing specification and location for which the fence will be erected. This element should be conditioned for implementation.

7.2 Proposed Works within Root Protection Area of T5

Timber Posts

7.2.1 It is proposed that an outdoor canopy covered play area will be erected to the east of the existing school building adjacent to T5. The covered area consists of five timber posts being inserted into the ground onto small concrete pile foundations. To the posts there will be brackets to secure mesh filled panels too.
7.2.2 Three of the five timber posts are to be located within the RPA of T5 on western side of the tree. The extent of encroachment is approximately 1.5m into the radius of the RPA where it is anticipated that if any roots are identified they will only be small or fibrous roots at this distance. However, in the unlikely event roots greater that 25mm diameter are identified Northamptonshire County Council will be contacted and work will cease until further instruction.

7.2.3 The foundations are to be excavated for the posts with hand tools only under the supervision of the ACoW. Once excavated, the pits will be lined with a polypropylene membrane before a concrete mix is inserted to stabilise the posts. The excavation will be a square of approximately 40cm x 40cm and up to 50cm in depth. Any identified roots will be cut with sharp pruning tools, as recommended within clause 11.3.5 of BS5827:2005.

New Ground Surface

7.2.4 Currently the existing ground surface, which abuts T5, is made up of block paving. This will be removed within the RPA of T5 by hand. The surface is then to be replaced with a rubberised porous flooring. There will be no further excavation that which exists for the current block paving. As illustrated on the Tree Protection Plan the rubberised flooring is of a smaller area than the current block paving. The proposed area for the rubberised flooring is less than the existing block paving uses. Therefore the additional area which is within the RPA of T5 which have grass laid onto it. This will increase the area of soft landscaping around the tree and in turn increase the water filtration and gaseous exchange within the RPA of T5, which will be of benefit to the tree.

7.2.5 With the above guidance being followed there is unlikely to be any negative impact on the condition of the pine tree T5.

8. POST CONSTRUCTION WORKS

8.1 Post Development Inspection

8.1.1 Following the completion of the development an inspection of the condition of retained trees will be made to assess if any further tree works are required.

8.1.2 Where the soil around any tree is found to be compacted appropriate remediation will be undertaken. This will be prescribed by the ACoW and could include soil aeration or manual digging/forking to loosen the soil increasing drainage and aeration.

8.2 Annual Inspection

8.2.1 An annual inspection of trees will be undertaken post construction for the duration of two years following completion. It is not anticipated that the condition of trees will significantly change following the development’s completion, but a continued monitoring of the trees' condition will be made by the ACoW. Where appropriate remedial works will be undertaken to improve the environment for trees or to make the trees safe.

8.2.2 This annual inspection will also include an assessment of new planting included within the landscaping plan.
9. MITIGATION PLANTING

9.1 New Tree Planting

9.1.1 It is proposed to mitigate for the loss of the trees that three new trees be planted in a triangular formation to the south of the new extension, a minimum of 6m from the building. An indicative location for tree planting is provided on the Tree Protection Plan. It is proposed that either Jacquemontii birch be planted as these will provide dappled shade during the summer months. The trees should be planted from container grown stock with a girth of 14 – 16cm.

10. CONCLUSIONS

10.1.1 The tree survey for the proposed extension of the John Hellins School encompasses five individual trees. The remainder of trees across the site are not implicated by the proposals. It is noted that the most significant tree on the site is a middle aged beech tree located south of the main entrance which is to be retained.

10.1.2 As a direct result of the proposed extension of the school to the south there will be a loss of three mountain ash trees. This has been deemed acceptable with Northamptonshire County Council and their loss will be mitigated for with the planting of three new trees.

10.1.3 There will also be a further loss of one walnut tree to the north of the school. The main reason for this loss is due to the severe nut allergies that a number of pupils have. On balance, it is considered that the risk of pupils coming into contact with the fruit of this tree is high when compared to the health consequences.

10.1.4 There is to be an encroachment of the proposed outdoor covered area into the RPA of T5. The encroachment will be for the installation of three of the five posts, which will be inserted into small concrete foundations. It is not considered necessary to alter the construction methodology or location as it is likely that the foundations will only require a 40cm square hole, which can be excavated with hand tools to avoid the need for machinery within the RPA of the tree. The full RPA of the tree will be respected until this foundation excavation is required.

10.1.5 The trees to be retained will be proactively managed to ensure that trees are retained to enhance the development and the wider environment. This method statement provides detail of the measures and steps required to retain the trees through and post development.

10.1.6 It is critical that all protective fencing is installed and erected prior to the commencement of any other works on site. Following installation of tree protection a site meeting will be undertaken with the Senior Environmental Planner to ensure satisfaction of all parties prior to any on site works commencing.

11. REPORT LIMITATIONS AND QUALIFICATIONS

11.1 Report Limitations

11.1.1 This is an arboricultural report and as such no reliance should be given to comments relating to buildings, engineering or soil.

11.1.2 This is not a full arboricultural health and safety survey.
11.1.3 The inspection was undertaken from ground level.
11.1.4 Trees are growing dynamic structures. The comments of this report are valid for a period of one year from the date of report.
11.1.5 No tree is ever absolutely safe due to the unpredictable laws and forces of nature.

11.2 Qualifications
11.2.1 The principal author of this report is Peter Wharton BSc(Hons)Arb. MArborA MICFor. Peter is a Full Member and Registered Consultant of the Institute of Chartered Foresters and a Professional Member of the Arboricultural Association, International Society of Arboriculture and Consulting Arborist Society. As a sub-consultant arboriculturist at Lockhart Garratt Peter Wharton specialises in dealing with trees in relation to planning issues.
11.2.2 The project director is Justin Mumford FICFor.
11.2.3 The qualifications and experience of each consultant can be provided on request.

12. REFERENCES & RELEVANT LEGISLATION
APPENDIX 1: AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY

Aerial photograph of John Hellins School, Potterspury
APPENDIX 2: PLANS

Plans Provided by PHP Architects:
- Proposed Site Plan
- Contractor Compound

Plans Produced by Lockhart Garratt Ltd:
- Arboricultural Implications Plan (D11-1293)
- Trees Retentions and Removals Plan (D11-1296)
- Tree Protection Plan (D11-2484)
APPENDIX 3: TREE SCHEDULE

BS5837:2005 Cascade Chart for Tree Retention

Tree Schedule (Ref 11-1332)
# TREES FOR REMOVAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category and Definition</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Identification on Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category R</td>
<td>Those in such a condition that any existing value would be lost within ten years and which should, in the current context, be removed for reasons of sound arboricultural management. Trees that have a serious, immediate, structural defect, such that their early loss is expected due to collapse, including those that will become unviable after removal of other R Category trees (ie 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 safety of other trees nearby (eg Dutch elm disease), or very low quality trees suppressing adjacent trees of better quality. <strong>NOTE:</strong> Habitat reinstatement may be appropriate (eg R Category tree used as a bat roost; installation of bat box in nearby tree).</td>
<td>DARK RED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## TREES TO BE CONSIDERED FOR RETENTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category and Definition</th>
<th>Criteria – Subcategories</th>
<th>Identification on Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category A</td>
<td>Those of a high quality and value: no such a condition as to be able to make a substantial contribution (a minimum of 40 years is suggested)</td>
<td>1 Mainly arboricultural values: Trees that are particularly good examples of their species, especially if rare or unusual, or essential components of groups, or of formal or semi-formal arboricultural features (eg the dominant and/or principal trees within an avenue).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Mainly landscape values: Trees, groups or woodlands which provide a definite screening or softening effect to the locality in relation to views into or out of the site, or those of particular visual importance (eg avenues or other arboricultural features assessed as groups).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Mainly cultural values, including conservation: Trees, groups or woodlands of significant conversation, historical, commemorative or other value (eg veteran trees or woodland).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category B</td>
<td>Those of moderate quality and value: those in such a condition as to make a significant contribution (a minimum of 20 years is suggested)</td>
<td>1 Mainly arboricultural values: Trees that might be included in the high category, but are downgraded because of impaired condition (ie presence of remediable defects including sympathetic past management and minor storm damage).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Mainly landscape values: Trees present in numbers, usually as groups or woodlands, such that they form distinct landscape features, thereby attracting a higher collective rating than they might as individuals but which are not, individually, essential components of formal or semi-formal arboricultural features (eg trees of moderate quality within an avenue that includes better A Category specimens) or trees situated mainly internally to the site, therefore individually having little visual impact on the wider locality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Mainly cultural values, including conservation: Trees with clearly identifiable conservation or other cultural benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category C</td>
<td>Those of low quality and value: currently in adequate condition to remain until new planting could be established (a minimum of 10 years is suggested), or young trees with a stem diameter below 150mm</td>
<td>1 Mainly arboricultural values: Trees not qualifying in higher categories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Mainly landscape values: Trees present in groups or woodlands, but without this conferring on them significantly greater landscape value, and/or trees offering low or only temporary screening benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Mainly cultural values, including conservation: Trees with very limited conservation or other cultural benefits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Whilst C Category trees will usually not be retained where they would impose a significant constraint on development, young trees with a stem of less than 150mm should be considered for relocation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree No.</th>
<th>Tag No.</th>
<th>Species (Common Name)</th>
<th>Species (Botanical Name)</th>
<th>Height (m)</th>
<th>Stem Dia (mm)</th>
<th>Crown Spread (m)</th>
<th>Height of Crown Clearance (m)</th>
<th>Age Class</th>
<th>Phys Con</th>
<th>Struc Con</th>
<th>Additional notes</th>
<th>Preliminary works recommendations</th>
<th>Estimated remaining contribution</th>
<th>Ret Cat</th>
<th>RPA Radius (m)</th>
<th>RPA Area (m²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>No tag</td>
<td>Mountain Ash</td>
<td>Sorbus aucuparia</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>3 3 3 3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Md</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Middle aged specimen located within enclosed play ground between grassed area and hard landscaping. Good example of species. Structural canopy forms from 1.8m. Numerous tight forking unions associated with the canopy. Tree exhibits good overall form. Paving area located 1m northeast of tree.</td>
<td>Fell for purposes of development.</td>
<td>20 - 40 Years</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>No tag</td>
<td>Mountain Ash</td>
<td>Sorbus aucuparia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2.2 2.2 2 2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Md</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Specimen located within grassed enclosed area. Large occluding bark wound extending from 0 - 1.7m on western side of trunk and smaller occluding wound on eastern side at 0.5m. Structural canopy forms from 2.2m. Canopy appears slight sparse.</td>
<td>Fell for purposes of development.</td>
<td>10 - 20 Years</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>No tag</td>
<td>Mountain Ash</td>
<td>Sorbus aucuparia</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>2.2 2.2 3 2.9 3.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Mat</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Middle aged tree which abuts footpath to east. Two dying back stubs at 1.6m on south side of trunk. Codominant stems form at 2m with tight forking habit. Minor dieback of part of upper canopy. Tree exhibits well formed canopy.</td>
<td>Fell for purposes of development.</td>
<td>10 - 20 Years</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>No tag</td>
<td>Common Walnut</td>
<td>Juglans regia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>6.2 5.9 6 6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Md</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Middle aged well formed specimen located centrally to seating area and 4m northeast of school. Codominant stems form from 0.5m with tight forking habit. Canopy is encroaching onto seating are and in direct contact with school building. Canopy is dense with small diameter deadwood associated.</td>
<td>Fell due to severe nut allergies of pupils.</td>
<td>10 - 20 Years</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>No tag</td>
<td>Scots Pine</td>
<td>Pinus sylvestris</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>2.9 4 3.6 4 4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Md</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good well formed tree located within hard landscaped area. Good natural form with only very small diameter deadwood associated with the canopy.</td>
<td>Remove first course of bricks at base to allow trunk to expand.</td>
<td>20 - 40 Years</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 4: SURVEY METHODOLOGY

- The trees on the site were surveyed without reference to site layout as detailed in paragraph 4.2 of BS5837:2005.
- The position of the trees were either plotted with reference to the supplied base map data or plotted by eye where trees had been not been surveyed.
- Trees with a stem diameter <75mm were generally not surveyed as they could be easily replaced or relocated.
- Each individual tree has been given a tree identification number and the groups clearly defined for the purpose of this report.
- The tree species have been recorded with both common and botanical name. All heights were assessed using a clinometer (with an accuracy of approximately ± 10%) and where indicated in groups, the height of the tallest tree was measured unless otherwise stated.
- All stem diameters were measured at 1.5m above ground level, unless otherwise stated (“gl” is an abbreviation for ground level where diameter was measured just above root flare, “E” is an estimate and “av” is an average).
- The approximate crown spread is recorded in either the four cardinal points or is given as an average diameter for the crown especially in groups or where the crown is evenly weighted.
- The height of the ground clearance is given in metres and is an estimate of the height of the first branch union above ground level. In reality the branches of trees hang lower than this, especially in trees with a pendulous habit.
- In the absence of detailed information on the age, the following classification has been used:
  - Yng: Young trees less than 1/3 life expectancy
  - Mid: Middle age trees 1/3 – 2/3 life expectancy
  - Mat: Mature trees over 2/3 life expectancy
  - O/mat: Over-mature – declining or moribund trees of low vigour
  - Vet: Veteran trees – specimens exhibiting features of biological, cultural or aesthetic value that are characteristic of, but not exclusive to, individuals surviving beyond the typical age range for the species concerned.
  - Age class is indicative and will vary between species.
- The physiological condition has been recorded to provide an indication of the tree’s general health and vitality. The trees have been described thus:
  - Good: Generally in good health typical of the species
  - Fair: Reasonable health with few defects
  - Poor: Has significant defects which are irremediable or tree is in decline
  - Dead: Tree has died
- The structural condition of the trees has been assessed and is summarised as:
Good  Few minor defects of little overall significance
Fair   A significant defect or several small defects
Poor  Major defect present or many small defects

- Each tree was individually assessed and comments, where appropriate, were recorded for the condition of each tree’s roots, main stem and crown. General comments have also been made where appropriate with recommendations where relatively immediate works are required.

- Estimated remaining contribution has been categorised as: less than 10 years, 10-20 years, 20-40 years or over 40 years, based upon an assessment of the tree’s potential safe useful life expectancy.
APPENDIX 5: TREE PROTECTION

Tree Protection Fence Specification
Tree Protective Fencing without Rubber Feet
Tree Protective Fencing with Rubber Feet
Working within the RPA

- Platform exit at bags lift or blower
- Platform
- Protected area

- Edge of RPA
- Protective fencing
- Ground undisturbed and fabric covered to protect scaffold boards on a compressible layer

- Protected area
- Protected}

LOCKHART GARRATT LTD
Trees, Woodland, Forestry
PLANNING SUPPORT STATEMENT
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at
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prepared by
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Planning Policy Framework

The purpose of this section is to outline the local, regional and national planning policy context for the planning application site. A summary of the relevant policy and guidance is provided below.

National Policy Guidance

National Policy and Government guidance is provided in Planning Policy Guidance Notes (PPG’s) and Planning Policy Statements (PPS’s). We have taken reference from the following PPG’s/PPS’s, which we believe are relevant to the proposed development:

- PPS7: Sustainable Development in Rural Areas (2004).
- PPS10: Planning for Sustainable Waste Management (July 2005).

Additionally, taking reference from policies G3 and EV1 of the South Northamptonshire Local Plan (1997) and Policy 2 of the East Midlands Regional Plan (2009) relevant to this application.

- In order to promote high quality design and sustainable development, this proposal has regards to the following considerations:
  - The visual appearance of the development in the context of the defining characteristics of the local area and existing school. Using materials that will match and complement the existing school appearance.
  - The scale of the proposed development has been designed to sit well within the existing footprint of the existing school, which was appreciated by both school and the local community as stated in the feedback forms from the public consultation.
  - The proposals also include for a new disabled toilet which was missing from the current school.
  - The scheme has been designed to minimise any effect on the neighbouring properties, including a low level monopitch roof to the covered play. The new classroom has been sited in such a way that the existing extent of the school building is not exceeded by the development.
  - The need for measures for planning out crime. This has been achieved through designing a secure lockable outdoor covered play area that is flexible, able to be opened up whilst in use. In addition, the new classroom will have doors and windows that conform to the secure by design standards for modern door and window systems.
  - Although there will be 3 trees removed from the proximity of the new classroom it is proposed to replace these with 3 new flowering pear trees. These are attractive and highly suited to primary schools. They will positioned to achieve an attractive elevation whilst not forming future structural damage.
Statement of Community Involvement and Consultations

A Public Consultation was held at the School on Friday 30th September 2011. Invitations were issued to school parents, pupils, local residents and parish councillors.

Questionnaire and feedback forms were available to allow comments and possible concerns to be expressed, together with representatives from Northamptonshire County Council, Lend Lease, the School and pHp Architects being present to respond to queries raised and provide accurate information and clarification.

Photograph of existing school Hall to the rear of the school. The proposed classroom is proposed to the left of this.

The response received both at the event and on the feedback forms highlighted the following issues:

- The event was well supported with approximately 25 people attending with 8 leaving a response on the feedback forms (full details available on request).
- Generally, the proposed development was felt to use the available space within the existing footprint sensibly without reducing the amenities available to the students and teachers. This approach was also seen to reduce the impact on the neighbouring properties in terms of the location, layout and design.
- The design of the new covered play received very positive responses, in particular the ability to open up the sides or keep them closed and secure. The new roof, providing light and cover with minimal impact to the neighbours, was seen as a positive addition for the school.
The new classroom materials were discussed with some members of the consultation and it was agreed that going for materials to match the existing Hall building would be the more pleasing aesthetic.

Some concern was raised over the lack of a dedicated disabled toilet, as there is no existing facility within the school. Subsequently, a new disabled toilet has been added to an area that will be redundant following the alterations to the layout within the school, positioning the new disabled toilet off the main reception corridor.

Some concern was raised by the occupier of no. 4 Brownswood Drive with regards the Contractors compound to undertake the works to the covered play area. The proposal was to allow the contractor to utilise part of the school car park during the works. This was a concern as the street parking is already excessive and this would add further strain on available parking on Brownswood Drive. Therefore, it was agreed by the design team that this would be avoided and written in to the contract preliminaries to maintain the full size of the car park during school opening hours.

Additionally, the following consultations have taken place during the preparation of the Planning Application to demonstrate the inclusive approach to the design and development that has been adopted:

**Northamptonshire County Council Planning Department**

Meeting with Peter Moor on 10th August 2011 to discuss the scope of the project, highlight issues for further review/consultation and to ensure no objections in terms of principle or policy. No objections were raised in terms of principle development, building design, elevational treatment and materials, or Planning Policy.

During this meeting and subsequent conversations, it was advised that a Flood Risk Assessment and Design & Access Statement documents would not be required to be submitted as part of this application.
Design Background

Potterspury is a small, traditional village, located south of Towcester town in South Northamptonshire, on the ancient Roman road of Watling Street – now the A5.

It is characterised by small centre built predominantly of limestone buildings which follow the vernacular of Northamptonshire villages, being set along the road frontage with the building form often arranged in an organic way with differing angles of walls, stepped building lines and varying roof heights. Since the 1950's there has been significant additional housing added to Potterspury resulting in an elongated village along the A5.

The site of the Primary School is accessed from Brownswood Drive, off the high street in Potterspury. The original school access was directly off of the High Street but this has changed following additional housing developments around the school. The site is primarily flat with large playing field to the southern side. The original double pitched stone school building has been extended a number of times to form the current school. It is proposed to situate the new classroom and staff room within ‘gaps’ within the existing footprint to formulate the buildings. This, along with some minor internal alterations will organise the order of the school more succinctly.

The primary brief and raison d’etre for the scheme is to provide the school with a new classroom, to BB99 standards with associated storage. The requirement stems from a proposed new housing scheme for Potterspury, but it is widely appreciated that the school
needs extra teaching space. In addition, the project includes provision of a new staffroom and Covered Plat Area. These, and the provision for new infant toilets and a disabled toilet, will be combined with internal alterations that will allow the school to achieve its overall masterplan and develop a distinct strategic vision. Facilitating a more ordered learning environment for the school is fundamental to the design guidance within BB99 and associated guidelines.

Following site visits, we have explored various options for siting and arrangement of the required new building elements, taking account of the different areas and building form, routes into the hall from the existing classrooms and the public entrance / parent route into the new building. We have also taken account of practical considerations to ensure that the school can continue normal operations during the construction phase and the restricted access available to the rear of the site. It has been fundamental to the design to understand how the school wish to operate in the future and feel that the proposed design will facilitate this arrangement.

We were conscious that any extension should seek to minimise any impact on the existing playground areas (as explained above). The position of the new covered play area will not impact on the current playground areas, being situated in a quiet corner of the site. In order to construct the covered play it is necessary to remove the existing Walnut tree, which was also a request by the school as there are risks for children with nut allergies.

The building construction will be designed to exceed the requirements of the Building Regulations in terms of thermal performance and incorporate such environmentally sustainable elements as low energy light fittings and dual flush low water use toilets/taps. There may be an opportunity to utilise other renewable energy sources such as ground source heat pumps, solar thermal/voltaic panels which will be investigated when the project progresses to the detailed technical design stage.

The elevation design has been developed to be sympathetic to the style of the adjacent existing buildings using a palette of robust and durable traditional materials in-keeping with the setting but which also takes the opportunity to provide the school with an identity that looks towards the future.

We feel that the design of the proposed new classroom, Staff room and covered play areas and the internal alterations meet and adhere to the relevant guidance, in particular that set out in PPS1: Delivering Sustainable Development. The proposed design will join on to an existing school, providing much needed additional space and facilitating the arrangement of the school to provide a more attractive and desirable learning environment for pupils and teachers. The surrounding community will benefit with the school, ensuring a continued close relationship between the two.
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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1.1 This Arboricultural Implications Assessment in line with BS5837:2005 Tree in Relation to Construction - Recommendations, has been prepared in relation to the proposed development at John Hellins Primary School, Potterspury, Northamptonshire, see aerial photograph at Appendix 1.

1.1.2 The report has been commissioned to establish the full constraints that the trees pose on the site and to assess the impact of the current development proposal on trees within the school grounds, as per the Tree Brief dated 15th August 2011. The instruction was confirmed by Lend Lease Ltd letter dated 23rd August 2011.

1.1.3 The scope of this project is threefold:

- To undertake a survey of trees on the site and within influencing distance of the site.
- Provide a tree constraints plan for the site including root protection areas and canopy spreads.
- Provide an Arboricultural Implications Assessment (AIA) in relation to the proposed site layout. The AIA will assess the trees in relation to the proposals, the probable impact of the proposed development on the existing trees and detail protective measures for the retained trees and their soils through the construction phase.

2. DOCUMENTS PROVIDED

2.1.1 As background information the following documentation has been provided/been available to prepare this report:

- Tree Brief dated 15th August 2011, which sets out the requirements of the survey, report and a number of statements from provided by Environmental Planning Services at Northamptonshire County Council.
- Topographical survey of the site as prepared by Bruce Batcock Land and Engineering Surveyor, dated May 2011 and revised in August 2011.
- Proposed site layout as prepared by PHP Architects dated April 2011 reference 3933/212.

3. RELEVANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

3.1 Site Description

3.1.1 John Hellins Primary School is located within the village of Potterspury on the northern side of the A5, with Towcester to the north and Milton Keynes to the south. The school is bound on the north, south and western sides by residential properties and associated gardens, which vary in age, style and size. To the east of the school is Browns Wood Drive for which the school is accessed from.

3.1.2 The school consists of a large single storey building located within the central and northern area of the site, with a large area of grass to the south. In the north eastern corner is an area of hard standing, which is used as a playground.
3.2 Development Proposal

3.2.1 The development proposal is to extend the existing main school building to the south into an area of hard landscaping to create two new class rooms with surrounding footpath and access. To the north of the site a new outdoor covered area will be created with covered link canopy.

3.2.2 The proposal also includes reorientation of the internal teaching rooms with reception classrooms to the north and older pupils moving to the southern part of the school.

3.2.3 The details of the proposals outlined above are illustrated on the ‘Proposed Site Plan’ at Appendix 2.

3.3 Tree Protection: Legal Status

3.3.1 The Local Planning Authority (LPA) has been contacted to establish whether any trees contained within the red line boundary are protected by either a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) or are within a Conservation Area.

3.3.2 In a telephone conversation on 25th August 2011, Tina Cuss, Senior Environmental Planner, Northamptonshire County Council confirmed that there is no statutory protection of any trees on the school site.

3.3.3 If full planning consent is granted then any trees, which require felling to implement the approved plans are exempt from statutory protection. It should also be considered that any proposed tree works detailed in the Tree Schedule at Appendix 3 are also implemented as part of the planning decision consent.

3.3.4 This report does not consider the general requirements of the Forestry Act 1967 as full planning permission is exempt from the need for a felling licence.

4. ARBORICULTURAL SURVEY DATA

4.1 Data Collection

4.1.1 Site visits were undertaken on the 25th August 2011 by Peter Wharton BSc(Hons)Arb MArborA MICFor, Arboricultural Consultant at Lockhart Garratt Ltd and trees were inspected from ground level.

4.1.2 The survey recorded five individual trees. The complete data collection methodology for the tree survey is provided at Appendix 4.

4.2 BS5837:2005 Tree Categorisation

4.2.1 BS5837:2005 sets out the methodology for surveying trees on potential development sites in order to identify them within a prioritised system of retention categories, as summarised below and given in full at within the BS5837:2005 Cascade Chart for Tree Retention at Appendix 3:

**A Category** Trees of high quality and value in such a condition as to be able to make a substantial contribution for a minimum of 40 years

**B Category** Trees of moderate quality and value in such a condition as to make a significant contribution for a minimum 20 years

---

1 Peter Wharton is a sub-consultant to Lockhart Garratt.
C Category  Trees of low quality and value currently in adequate condition to remain until new planting could be established and expected to remain for a minimum of 10 years, or young trees with a stem diameter less than 150mm measured at 1.5 metres above ground level.

R Category  Trees in such a condition that any existing value would be lost within 10 years and which should, in the current context, be removed for reasons of sound arboricultural or forestry management.

4.2.2 Additionally, BS5837:2005 provides subcategories 1-3 within the category system outlined above which indicate the area(s) in which a tree or group retention value lies. An explanation of these values is given within the BS5837:2005 Cascade Chart for Tree Retention at Appendix 3:

1  Retention values that are mainly arboricultural.
2  Retention values that are mainly landscape.
3  Retention values that are mainly cultural, including conservation.

4.2.3 In line with BS5837:2005, A and B category trees should be considered as a constraint on site and provide a substantial contribution to the site. As a result, A and B category trees should be retained and incorporated into the scheme where possible.

4.2.4 Generally C and R category trees are considered to be of low quality or are young specimens which can be readily replaced and therefore should not be a constraint in terms of future development.

4.2.5 However, it is generally considered desirable to retain trees wherever reasonably possible to ensure continuity of tree cover and to provide a mature landscape to the development.

4.3 Summary of Data

4.3.1 The survey contains five individual trees (see Table 1 below). The comments including species, age, condition and the BS5837:2005 retention category for each individual tree and group of trees are given in detail in the Tree Schedule at Appendix 3.

4.3.2 The location of each individual tree and their associated constraints are illustrated on the Tree Constraints Plan at Appendix 2.

4.3.3 Table 1: Distribution of trees by BS5837:2005 tree categorisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retention Category</th>
<th>Individual Trees</th>
<th>Groups of Trees</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4 Description of the Tree Resource

4.4.1 The trees on site are located predominantly to the south of the site within the grassed playing field, with a mix of young and middle aged trees consisting predominantly of birch, Sorbus and prunus species. To the east of the site adjacent to the main entrance is a middle-aged beech tree and to the north are two middle-aged trees consisting of a walnut and Scots pine.

4.4.2 Immediately to the south on the main school building are three mountain ash trees, which are located within close proximity to an area of hard landscaping.

4.4.3 The boundaries of the site have low-rise hedges of up to 2.5m in height, which are made up of a mix of native species including hawthorn and hazel.

5. ARBORICULTURAL IMPLICATIONS APPRAISAL

5.1 Overview

5.1.1 The Tree Constraints Plan has been superimposed onto the ‘Proposed Site Plan’ produced by PHP Architects at Appendix 2. The resulting Arboricultural Implications Plan (at Appendix 2) indicates the relationship between the trees and the proposed school extension and new covered areas to the south and north respectively. This has helped inform the following appraisal of the potential impacts to the trees.

5.2 Site Layout and Tree Related Conflicts

5.2.1 The extension proposals have been dictated by the existing classroom layout and movement around the school. As a result there has been limited opportunity to make alterations following the tree constraints assessment. However, prior to the tree survey being undertaken site visits were made by both the Senior Environmental Planner at Northamptonshire County Council and Tree Officer at South Northamptonshire Council. The principal of the proposed tree removal as detailed below has been agreed as acceptable subject to suitable replanting.

5.3 Tree Removal and Replacements

5.3.1 In undertaking the proposal as indicated on the Arboricultural Implications Plan at Appendix 2, there will be a direct loss of three trees and indirect loss of a further individual tree.

Direct Tree Loss

5.3.2 As a direct consequence of the proposed extension to the south of the school, there will be a loss of three mountain ash trees T1, T2 and T3.

5.3.3 T1 is considered a B category specimen, with a minimum of 20 years useful life remaining and is of superior quality to both trees T2 and T3. However, it is a small specimen that can only be viewed from within the main school site and therefore its removal will not have a detrimental impact on the area. The reason for its removal is due to the western elevation of the building, encroaching into its root protection area and canopy spread. The encroachment cannot be avoided and therefore on this occasion the tree is to be removed.

5.3.4 Trees T2 and T3 are both C category specimens, which are considered to be of poor quality. The southern elevation of the proposed extension is either located
within or within close proximity to the root protection areas of both trees and due to the quality of the trees is has been considered acceptable to remove both.

5.3.5 Beyond the tree stated above there is to be a small area of hedge to be removed which current forms the dividing barrier between the existing staff car park and outdoor area south of T5. Approximately 2m of the hedge will be removed in order to provide a fire exit for the construction workers. On completion of the project the escape route will be removed and the hedge reinstated.

**Indirect Tree Loss**

5.3.6 In addition to the direct loss of the three mountain ash trees there is also to be an indirect loss of T4 a walnut tree located to the north of the school, where there is to be a new outdoor covered play area and hard standing. T4 is considered to be a C category tree, due to its structural form with codominant stems forming from the base with a tight forking habit. The tree currently overhangs the school building and has limited undisturbed rooting area due to the existing hard surfacing, which surrounds it. In addition to this the school has also advised of the adverse health problems which the trees cause to particular pupils who have severe nut allergies. Therefore in this instance the tree is proposed for removal as the pupils safety is considered to be paramount.

5.3.7 All of the above tree removals have been discussed and agreed with both Northamptonshire County Council and South Northamptonshire Council, subject to suitable replacement planting to within the grassed playing field to the south of the site. The proposed tree removal and retention is illustrated on plan reference D11-1296 at [Appendix 2](#).

5.3.8 Prior to the planning application being made Lockhart Garratt was informed that one tree adjacently to the proposed construction access from Brownswood Drive was removed. As a result, it is not illustrated on any plans provided.

5.3.9 It is proposed to mitigate for the loss of the trees that three new trees be planted in a linear formation to the south of the new extension, a minimum of 6m from the building. An indicative location for tree planting is provided on the Arboricultural Implications Plan. It is proposed that either Jacquemontii birch or field maple be planted or a mix of the two species. The trees should be planted from container grown stock with a girth of 14 – 16cm.

**5.4 Effect on Amenity and the Impact of the Proposed Development**

5.4.1 In the context of the proposed extension there is to be a loss of four trees. Of the trees to be removed trees T1, T2 and T3 can only be viewed when in the playing field to the south and T4 is obscured by surrounding trees and buildings.

5.4.2 Overall, from a public viewpoint there will be little effect on the wider tree related amenity with the current proposal.

**5.5 Below Ground Constraints**

5.5.1 The below ground constraints are generally confined to the root protection area (RPA). The RPA is a circular area with a radius 12 or 10 times the diameter of the trees measured at 1.5 m or at ground, level respectively. The RPA is the minimum area in which no ground works should be undertaken without due care in relation to the retained tree(s) in order to avoid soil compaction, root severance, changes in levels or soil contamination which could reduce future tree health and/or stability.
The shape of the RPA and its exact location will depend upon arboricultural considerations and ground conditions.

5.5.2 The RPA for the trees have been calculated as prescribed by BS5837:2005 and are shown as circles for simplicity on the Tree Constraints and Arboricultural Implications Plans, both at Appendix 2. This plan illustrates the relationship between the RPA's associated with the trees and the proposed development.

5.5.3 In addition, the Tree Schedule at Appendix 3 displays the root protection calculations for each tree or group of trees where Radius (m) is the distance of root protection from the main stem and Area (m²) is the overall root protection area.

5.5.4 The appraisal of the Arboricultural Implications Plan (Appendix 2) has indicated that following the tree removals outlined in Section 5.3 the only areas of RPA incursions through development are:

Construction of the Hard Standing to North of School

5.5.5 Currently there is hard standing surrounding the one individual B category tree to be retained, T5 a Scots pine. It is proposed that the existing small block paving be lifted and this will be replaced with a rubberised flooring. Once the block paving is removed the rubberised flooring will be laid onto the existing ground level. There will be no further excavation works and as with the existing surface, the new surface will be porous therefore having no further impact on the tree, to that which already exists. This will have no further impact on the tree and given there is hard standing already in situ the construction method will not be altered from that which exists.

5.5.6 It is noted that the extent of hard standing will be reduced within the RPA of T5 and will be replaced by grass. This will increase surface porosity and potential gaseous exchange within the RPA of T5, which will be of long-term benefit to the tree.

5.5.7 The erection of the new covered area does encroach into the RPA of T5, however this is unlikely to have any impact on the overall condition of the tree. On the eastern side of the covered area five posts of which three will be inserted within the RPA into the ground and individually set into a concrete foundation. The area of excavation is on the peripheral of the RPA, which has been disturbed for the existing hard standing and is it anticipated that if any roots are identified that these will only be fibrous and therefore regenerate. As a precautionary measure the excavation of the four areas will be undertaken with hand tools only, to reduce any conflict between the roots and foundations.

5.5.8 In addition, tree protection fencing as outlined in Section 5.7 will be utilised during the construction phase on the edge of the adjacent trees RPAs. Only when there is to be any works for the four small pile foundations within the RPA of T5 will the location of the tree protective fencing be moved.

5.6 Above Ground Constraints

5.6.1 Only one retained tree has branches that are within an influencing distance of the proposed covered play area. This tree is T5, however no works will be required as on the western side of the tree the branches have sufficient clearance not to interfere with the construction line.

5.6.2 Shading from retained trees is unlikely to be a significant problem to the new extension given that there is sufficient distance from the majority of the surrounding
trees to the south. Significant future growth that will influence the extension is unlikely, but there may be the requirement for minor future pruning.

5.6.3 All tree pruning should be undertaken to BS3998:2010 ‘Tree work – Recommendations’.

5.6.4 It is unlikely that honeydew related to leaf aphids will be a future problem on windows. With regards to leaf fall the specification of guttering should be considered in the detailed design of the school.

5.7 Tree Protection

5.7.1 It is recommended that during the construction phase of the development the key method of protecting the retained trees is through protective tree barriers/fencing enforcing the Construction Exclusion Zone (CEZ). The CEZ will be sacrosanct throughout development and no access will be allowed into this area including for example the storage of or moving of materials or machinery. The positioning the barrier/fencing is usually on the edge of the RPAs, the edge of existing hard standing or adjusted to include tree crowns to prevent damage by construction machinery.

5.7.2 The barrier/fencing will be made from scaffold in a vertical and horizontal framework, as shown at Figure 2 in BS5837:2005 (at Appendix 5) with vertical tubes up to 3 metres apart. The framework will be braced to resist impacts.

5.7.3 The Tree Protection Plan with the location of the protective tree fencing and the CEZ should be produced prior to any works commencing on site and be submitted as part of a planning condition, once planning consent is granted.

6. CONCLUSIONS

6.1.1 The tree survey for the proposed extension of the John Hellins School encompasses five individual trees. The remainder of trees across the site are not implicated by the proposals. It is noted that the most significant tree on the site is a middle aged beech tree located south of the main entrance which is to be retained.

6.1.2 As a direct result of the proposed extension of the school to the south there will be a loss of three mountain ash trees. This has been deemed acceptable with Northamptonshire County Council and their loss will be mitigated for with the planting of three new trees.

6.1.3 There will also be a further loss of one walnut tree to the north of the school. The main reason for this loss is due to the severe nut allergies that a number of pupils have. On balance, it is considered that the risk of pupils coming into contact with the fruit of this tree is high when compared to the health consequences. This has been considered acceptable and agreed in principal with the Council.

6.1.4 There is to be an encroachment of the proposed outdoor covered area into the RPA of T5. The encroachment will be for the installed for three of five posts which will be inserted into small concrete foundations. It is not considered necessary to alter the construction methodology or location as it is likely that the foundations will only require a 40cm square hole, which can be excavated with hand tools to avoid the need for machinery within the RPA of the tree. The full RPA of the tree will be respected until this foundation excavation is required.
6.1.5 The trees to be retained should be proactively managed to ensure that trees enhance the development and the wider environment.

6.1.6 The future growth, shading and apprehension from the trees on the site has been considered as well as the impact of the trees on the teaching rooms to avoid future conflicts.

6.1.7 See the full Arboricultural Method Statement which includes the methodology, specification and location of tree protection. It is recommended that an Arboricultural Clerk of Works (ACoW) is engaged to monitor the protection of the trees through the development process to ensure the implementation of any tree related planning conditions.

7. REPORT LIMITATIONS AND QUALIFICATIONS

7.1 Report Limitations

7.1.1 This is an arboricultural report and as such no reliance should be given to comments relating to buildings, engineering or soil.

7.1.2 This is not a full arboricultural health and safety survey.

7.1.3 The inspection was undertaken from ground level.

7.1.4 Trees are growing dynamic structures. The comments of this report are valid for a period of one year from the date of report.

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

7.2 Qualifications

7.2.1 The principal author of this report is Peter Wharton BSc(Hons)Arb. MArborA MICFor. Peter is a Full Member and Registered Consultant of the Institute of Chartered Foresters and a Professional Member of the Arboricultural Association, International Society of Arboriculture and Consulting Arborist Society. As a sub-consultant arboriculturist at Lockhart Garratt Peter Wharton specialises in dealing with trees in relation to planning issues.

7.2.2 The project director is Justin Mumford FICFor.

7.2.3 The qualifications and experience of each consultant can be provided on request.

8. REFERENCES & RELEVANT LEGISLATION

APPENDIX 1: AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY

Aerial photograph of John Hellins School, Potterspury
APPENDIX 2: PLANS

Plans Provided by PHP Architects:

Proposed Site Plan

Plans Produced by Lockhart Garratt Ltd:

Tree Constraints Plan (D11-1294)

Arboricultural Implications Plan (D11-1293)

Trees Retentions and Removals Plan (D11-1296)
APPENDIX 3: TREE SCHEDULE

BS5837:2005 Cascade Chart for Tree Retention

Tree Schedule (Ref 11-1332)
## BS5837:2005 Tree Schedule

### General Information

- **Client Name:** Lend Lease Consulting Ltd
- **Site:** John Hellins Primary School, Potterspury
- **Survey Date:** 25/08/2011
- **Consultant:** P. Wharton
- **Ref:** 11-1332/3372/D15
- **Tags:** N/A
- **Tree Schedule Code:** 11-1332
- **Tree Data:**
  - **Species (Common Name):** Mountain Ash
  - **Species (Botanical Name):** Sorbus aucuparia
  - **Height (m):** 4.8
  - **Stem Dia (mm):** 210
  - **Height of Crown Clearance (m):** 1.5
  - **Age Class:** Mid
  - **Phys Con:** Good
  - **Struc Con:** Good
  - **Additional notes:** Middle aged specimen located within enclosed play ground between grassed area and hard landscaping. Good example of species. Structural canopy forms from 1.8m. Numerous tight forking unions associated with the canopy. Tree exhibits good overall form. Paving area located 1m northeast of tree.
  - **Estimated remaining contribution:** 20 - 40 Years
  - **BS5837:2005 Tree Schedule Code:** 11-1332

### Tree Data Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree No.</th>
<th>Tag No.</th>
<th>Species (Common Name)</th>
<th>Species (Botanical Name)</th>
<th>Height (m)</th>
<th>Stem Dia (mm)</th>
<th>Crown Spread (m)</th>
<th>Height of Crown Clearance (m)</th>
<th>Age Class</th>
<th>Phys Con</th>
<th>Struc Con</th>
<th>Additional notes</th>
<th>Preliminary works recommendations</th>
<th>Estimated remaining contribution</th>
<th>RPA Radius (m)</th>
<th>RPA Area (m²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>No tag</td>
<td>Mountain Ash</td>
<td>Sorbus aucuparia</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>3 3 3 3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Middle aged specimen located within enclosed play ground between grassed area and hard landscaping. Good example of species. Structural canopy forms from 1.8m. Numerous tight forking unions associated with the canopy. Tree exhibits good overall form. Paving area located 1m northeast of tree.</td>
<td>Fell for purposes of development.</td>
<td>20 - 40 Years</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>No tag</td>
<td>Mountain Ash</td>
<td>Sorbus aucuparia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2.2 2.1 2.2 2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Specimen located within grassed enclosed area. Large occluding bark wound extending from 0 - 1.7m on western side of trunk and smaller occluding wound on eastern side at 0.5m. Structural canopy forms from 2.2m. Canopy appears slight sparse.</td>
<td>Fell for purposes of development.</td>
<td>10 - 20 Years</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>No tag</td>
<td>Mountain Ash</td>
<td>Sorbus aucuparia</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>2.2 3 3.9 3.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Mat</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Middle aged tree which abuts footpath to east. Two dying back stubs at 1.6m on south side of trunk. Codominant stems form at 2m with tight forking habit. Minor dieback of part of upper canopy. Tree exhibits well formed canopy.</td>
<td>Fell for purposes of development.</td>
<td>10 - 20 Years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>No tag</td>
<td>Common Walnut</td>
<td>Juglans regia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>6.2 5.9 6 6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Middle aged well formed specimen located centrally to seating area and 4m northeast of school. Codominant stems form from 0.5m with tight forking habit. Canopy is encroaching onto seating area and in direct contact with school building. Canopy is dense with small diameter deadwood associated.</td>
<td>Fell due to severe nut allergies of pupils.</td>
<td>10 - 20 Years</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>No tag</td>
<td>Scots Pine</td>
<td>Pinus sylvestris</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>2.9 4 3.8 4 4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good well formed tree located within hard landscaped area. Good natural form with only very small diameter deadwood associated with the canopy.</td>
<td>Remove first course of bricks at base to allow trunk to expand.</td>
<td>20 - 40 Years</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TREES FOR REMOVAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category and Definition</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Identification on Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category R</td>
<td>Trees that have a serious, immediate, structural defect, such that their early loss is expected due to collapse, including those that will become unviable after removal of other R Category trees (ie where, for whatever reason, the loss of companion shelter cannot be mitigated by pruning). Trees that are dead or 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 (eg Dutch elm disease), or very low quality trees suppressing adjacent trees of better quality.</td>
<td>DARK RED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Habitat reinstatement may be appropriate (eg R Category tree used as a bat roost; installation of bat box in nearby tree).

### TREES TO BE CONSIDERED FOR RETENTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category and Definition</th>
<th>Subcategories</th>
<th>Identification on Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category A</td>
<td>Trees that are particularly good examples of their species, especially if rare or unusual, or essential components of groups, or of formal or semi-formal arboricultural features (eg the dominant and/or principal trees within an avenue).</td>
<td>LIGHT GREEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category B</td>
<td>Trees that might be included in the high category, but are downgraded because of impaired condition (ie presence of remediable defects including unsympathetic past management and minor storm damage).</td>
<td>MID BLUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category C</td>
<td>Trees not qualifying in higher categories.</td>
<td>GREY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Whilst C Category trees will usually not be retained where they would impose a significant constraint on development, young trees with a stem of less than 150mm should be considered for relocation.
APPENDIX 4: SURVEY METHODOLOGY

- The trees on the site were surveyed without reference to site layout as detailed in paragraph 4.2 of BS5837:2005.
- The position of the trees were either plotted with reference to the supplied base map data or plotted by eye where trees had not been surveyed.
- Trees with a stem diameter <75mm were generally not surveyed as they could be easily replaced or relocated.
- Each individual tree has been given a tree identification number and the groups clearly defined for the purpose of this report.
- The tree species have been recorded with both common and botanical name. All heights were assessed using a clinometer (with an accuracy of approximately ± 10%) and where indicated in groups, the height of the tallest tree was measured unless otherwise stated.
- All stem diameters were measured at 1.5m above ground level, unless otherwise stated (“gl” is an abbreviation for ground level where diameter was measured just above root flare, “E” is an estimate and “av” is an average).
- The approximate crown spread is recorded in either the four cardinal points or is given as an average diameter for the crown especially in groups or where the crown is evenly weighted.
- The height of the ground clearance is given in metres and is an estimate of the height of the first branch union above ground level. In reality the branches of trees hang lower than this, especially in trees with a pendulous habit.
- In the absence of detailed information on the age, the following classification has been used:
  - Yng: Young trees less than 1/3 life expectancy
  - Mid: Middle age trees 1/3 – 2/3 life expectancy
  - Mat: Mature trees over 2/3 life expectancy
  - O/mat: Over-mature – declining or moribund trees of low vigour
  - Vet: Veteran trees – specimens exhibiting features of biological, cultural or aesthetic value that are characteristic of, but not exclusive to, individuals surviving beyond the typical age range for the species concerned.

  Age class is indicative and will vary between species.

- The physiological condition has been recorded to provide an indication of the tree’s general health and vitality. The trees have been described thus:
  - Good: Generally in good health typical of the species
  - Fair: Reasonable health with few defects
  - Poor: Has significant defects which are irremediable or tree is in decline
  - Dead: Tree has died

- The structural condition of the trees has been assessed and is summarised as:
- Each tree was individually assessed and comments, where appropriate, were recorded for the condition of each tree’s roots, main stem and crown. General comments have also been made where appropriate with recommendations where relatively immediate works are required.

- Estimated remaining contribution has been categorised as: less than 10 years, 10-20 years, 20-40 years or over 40 years, based upon an assessment of the tree’s potential safe useful life expectancy.

Good    Few minor defects of little overall significance
Fair    A significant defect or several small defects
Poor    Major defect present or many small defects
APPENDIX 5: TREE PROTECTION

Tree Protection Fence Specification
Working within the RPA

- Protective fencing
- Protected area
- Platform at edge of drillwork
- Ground undisturbed and protected by geotextile fabric and geotextile scaffold boards on a compressible layer
- Protected by geotextile fabric and geotextile scaffold boards on a compressible layer
Travel Plan

October 2011

DCSF Number 928 2076
Objectives

The objective of this travel plan is to demonstrate the school’s commitment to reducing the impact of travel to and from the school site on the environment, by encouraging those who have to travel to do so in a more environmentally friendly way and in a safer way.

The main objectives are to provide benefits to:-

- **Individuals** – through improved health, reduced stress and monetary savings.
- **The school** – through healthier and more motivated staff and pupils, reduced traffic congestion and improved access to the school site for the whole school community
- **The local environment** – through improved air quality and reduced noise, congestion and pollution
- **The wider environment** – as part of the national and global campaigns to combat problems such as global warming and obesity

This plan should be read in conjunction with the Action Plan for the Travel Plan.

Description of the school

John Hellins Primary School is a small school in the village of Potterspury, between Towcester and Milton Keynes in south western Northamptonshire. It can be accessed from the A5 and the A508. We currently have 122 pupils on roll, aged from 4 to 11 years and organised into five mixed age classes. There is currently a significant amount of building in the village, and this means our roll is increasing. Our pupil admission number has been raised from 15 to 20 in each year group and this is why we need an additional classroom. Being small means we all know every child and are able to provide an education at the heart of the village community. Most of our pupils live in the village, although we do also have a small number of children who come from other villages or towns.

The original building is Victorian and this has been added to. An old HORSA building was demolished in 2010 and was replaced with a purpose built pre-school on our grounds. This is independent of school and is run by a voluntary committee. We have a large field, two playgrounds and a sheltered quiet area. We also have a swimming pool which is used by the younger children in the summer term.

School doors are opened at 8:45 and school ends at 3:15, although we do run a lot of after school activities. Apart from school events, such as performances, meetings
and parents’ evenings, the only out of school use is by a Jazz group on Monday evenings.

We have a small car park for staff cars, but no parking for parents. Those that drive to school park on the roads close to school.

We are keen to promote walking to school as a healthy option and our Healthy Schools Award was renewed in 2010. Our Eco Council is very active and also encourages walking or cycling to school. Each year our older pupils receive Bikeability Training.

There is an hourly bus service that goes through the village. The number 89 bus goes from Milton Keynes to Northampton. Most of our families have cars.

**Travel Problems**

Many of our pupils walk to school with their parents, but due to cars parked on both sides of the road, it is difficult to see when crossing the road. This means that parents are reluctant to let children walk on their own.

At peak times cars park unsafely on the corners of roads, reducing visibility for other drivers.

Cars travel too fast on the High Street and again visibility is poor with parked cars and vans outside the village shop.

Some pupils cycle to school, but we do not have secure storage for their bikes and scooters. The School Council is looking into the possibility of buying some bike stands and lockers for cycling helmets.
**Pupil Survey**

Result of Pupil Survey conducted in October 2011

Number of pupils surveyed 115

Number of pupils responding 115

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Present Mode</th>
<th>Preferred Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>%age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parent, Staff and Governor Surveys**

A sample of parents, staff and governors were surveyed. The key findings were that

- A large percentage of parents and governors walked to school
- Staff and governors who live in the village usually walked to school
- Most concern was about the dangers of crossing Brownswood Drive and High Street at the beginning and end of the school day. There is no safe place to cross due to poor visibility caused by parked cars on both sides of the road and on corners.
- Suggestions for improvement were a zebra crossing, a crossing patrol, speed bumps, yellow lines and traffic calming
- Cars also drive too fast along the High Street.
Action Plan for Travel Plan
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**Objective:** To increase number of children who cycle to school

**Target:** Increase number of pupils cycling to school by 10% by May 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Success Criteria / Monitoring and Evaluation</th>
<th>Resp.</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>School will organise Bikeability Training each year for pupils in Years 5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>September each year</td>
<td>100% pupils take part in training and 90% successfully pass the assessments</td>
<td>PE subject</td>
<td>No cost currently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>School will purchase bike stands so that bikes can be stored safely and securely</td>
<td>January 2012</td>
<td>Use of bike stands will be monitored and demand assessed</td>
<td>Headteacher</td>
<td>School Council to raise money for this item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Children will be expected to wear helmets and storage will be provided for these during the day.</td>
<td>January 2012</td>
<td>Children will be safe when they cycle to school</td>
<td>Headteacher</td>
<td>School Council to raise money for this item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cycling is seen as a safe, environmentally friendly way of getting exercise on their way to school</td>
<td>May 2012</td>
<td>Numbers of children cycling will be monitored.</td>
<td>Headteacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Objective:** To make it safer to cross Brownswood Drive and High Street

**Target:** Reduce poor parking by 50%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Success Criteria / Monitoring and Evaluation</th>
<th>Resp.</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Conduct a survey of cars parked on Brownswood Drive over several weeks</td>
<td>November 2011</td>
<td>Repeat regularly to see impact of actions</td>
<td>Headteacher</td>
<td>Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Invite local police to observe parking at beginning and end of school day and offer suggestions</td>
<td>December 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>Headteacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Create a detailed action plan following advice from the experts. Hopefully involve the children in deciding how to manage the problem – making posters, entry in The Old Mail, polite messages on car windscreens etc</td>
<td>December 2011</td>
<td>Regular assessments of impact of actions</td>
<td>Headteacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Implement a programme of Traffic Awareness so that children are taught how to cross the road safely including assemblies, displays and visitors</td>
<td>January 2012</td>
<td>Termly monitoring of teaching and learning</td>
<td>PSHE coordinator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>