

BLADE

ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

LAND OFF ASHBY ROAD
MARKFIELD

ON BEHALF OF
ALLISON HOMES

JULY 2026

V10

BIODIVERSITY
LANDSCAPE
ARBORICULTURE
DESIGN
ECOLOGY

Report Data	
Title	Arboricultural Impact Assessment
Site Address	Land off Ashby Road, Markfield
Client	Allison Homes
Blade Reference	T-431
Date Created	20.11.2025
Surveyor	Sam Selwyn
Author	Sam Selwyn

Version	Document Title	Author	Date Issued
V5	Arboricultural Impact Assessment	Sam Selwyn	26.05.2026
V6	Arboricultural Impact Assessment	Sam Selwyn	27.05.2026
V7	Arboricultural Impact Assessment	Sam Selwyn	28.05.2026
V8	Arboricultural Impact Assessment	Sam Selwyn	17.06.2026
V9	Arboricultural Impact Assessment	Sam Selwyn	15.07.2026
V10	Arboricultural Impact Assessment	Sam Selwyn	17.07.2026

Disclosure:

This document has been prepared by BLADE Trees Ltd for the sole use of the commissioning client/s. It has been provided in accordance with the agreed scope and intended purpose. No other warranty is made as to the professional advice included in this document. It does not purport to give legal advice.

This report should not be copied or relied upon by any third party without the express prior written agreement of BLADE Trees Ltd and the commissioning client/s.

Where any appraisal is based upon information provided by third parties, it is assumed that this information is relevant, correct and complete; there has been no independent verification of information obtained from third parties unless otherwise stated. Where field investigations have been carried out these have been appropriate to the agreed scope of works and carried out to a level of detail required to achieve the stated objectives.



CONTENTS

1.0	BACKGROUND AND INSTRUCTION	4
	Purpose	4
2.0	PLANNING POLICY AND LEGISLATION	5
	National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)	5
	Local Planning Policy	6
	Tree Preservation Orders and Conservation Areas.....	7
	Protected Wildlife and Trees	8
3.0	ARBORICULTURAL ASSESSMENT	9
	Method of data collection.....	9
	Summary of data.....	9
4.0	IMPACT APPRAISAL	10
	Root Protection Areas (RPAs).....	11
	New RPA incursions	12
	Facilitation Tree Pruning	12
	Future growth	13
5.0	TREE PROTECTION	14
	Tree Protection Fencing	14
6.0	REFERENCES.....	16
7.0	CAVEATS AND LIMITATIONS.....	17
APPENDIX 1		18
	Tree Survey Schedule	18
APPENDIX 2		19
	Tree Constraints Plan	19
	Arboricultural Impact Plan	19
	Tree Protection Plan.....	19
APPENDIX 3		20
	Tree Protection Specification.....	20
		20

1.0 BACKGROUND AND INSTRUCTION

- 1.1. This report has been prepared by Sam Selwyn *Dip Arb L4 (abc), TechArborA*, Arboricultural Consultant. Sam is a technician member of the Arboricultural Association (AA) and is therefore required to uphold the professional and ethical standards within the AA Code of Conduct. Sam also holds the LANTRA award in Professional Tree Inspection.
- 1.2. This Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) has been prepared on behalf of Allison Homes, in support of a Planning Application at Land off Ashby Road, Markfield (hereafter referred to as the 'site').
- 1.3. The Proposed Development relates to a reserved matters application "*for 93 dwellings (outline ref: P/21/1260/2).*"
- 1.4. The planning application will be submitted jointly to Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council and Charnwood Borough Council (HBBC & CBC).

Purpose

- 1.5. The tree survey and AIA have been carried out in accordance with the recommendations outlined within British Standard BS5837:2012 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations'.
- 1.6. This AIA report includes:
 - A baseline survey data of existing trees, including a Tree Schedule and Tree Constraints Plan (TCP).
 - An Arboricultural Impact Assessment which evaluates the direct and indirect impacts of the Proposed Development upon the existing trees; and
 - Where necessary, provide details of mitigation and tree protection.

2.0 PLANNING POLICY AND LEGISLATION

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

- 2.1. The following paragraphs within the NPPF set out policies which guide the planning policy and decision-making process of Local Planning Authorities in relation to trees. These are as follows:

Paragraph 136

- 2.2. *Trees make an important contribution to the character and quality of urban environments and can also help mitigate and adapt to climate change. Planning policies and decisions should ensure that new streets are tree-lined, that opportunities are taken to incorporate trees elsewhere in developments (such as parks and community orchards), that appropriate measures are in place to secure the long-term maintenance of newly planted trees, and that existing trees are retained wherever possible. Applicants and local planning authorities should work with highways officers and tree officers to ensure that the right trees are planted in the right places, and solutions are found that are compatible with highways standards and the needs of different users.*

Paragraph 187 (b & d)

- 2.3. Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:

b) Recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland;

d) minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures;

Paragraph 193

- 2.4. When determining planning applications, Local Planning Authority (LPA) should apply the following principles:

a) If significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternate site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused;

b) development on land within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest, and which is likely to have an adverse effect on it (either individually or in combination with other developments), should not normally be permitted. The only exception is where the benefits of the development in the location proposed clearly outweigh both its likely impact on the features of the site that make it of special scientific interest, and any broader impacts on the national network of Sites of Special Scientific Interest;

c) Development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists.

d) Development whose primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be supported; while opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should be integrated as part of their design, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity or enhance public access to nature where this is appropriate.

Local Planning Policy

- 2.5. This AIA has considered the relevant Local Planning Policy from both HBBC & CBC, which includes:

Supplementary planning documents (SPDs)

- HBBC The Good Design Guide Parts 1 & 2.

Local planning documents

- Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council Core Strategy adopted 2009
- Charnwood local plan 2011-28
- Emerging local plan – Charnwood Local Plan 2021-37 Pre-Submission Draft – Policy EV1; Tree planting.

Policy EV1: Tree planting

We will seek to protect and enhance our natural environment by increasing the number of trees in Charnwood. We will support development that:

- *retains existing trees where appropriate;*
- *provides new tree planting on site, including replacing any removed non-woodland tree with at least three new trees; and*
- *applies the latest National Forest Planting Guidelines for development proposals within the area of the National Forest and Charnwood Forest Regional Park.*

Any new trees planted should be native species suitable for the location and be of benefit to local biodiversity. We will expect the planting of new trees to take proper consideration of long-term management and maintenance, including impact on highways and sewerage network.

Where on-site planting is not possible due to the size of site, its characteristics or the impact upon biodiversity, we will encourage trees to be planted at a suitable location outside the site.

We will encourage neighbourhood plans to identify suitable locations for additional tree planting and to promote tree planting on public and privately owned land by the wider community.

Tree Preservation Orders and Conservation Areas

2.6. A search using the online mapping services available from HBBC confirmed that several trees on the Site are protected by the following Tree Preservation Orders (TPO):

- 49/00001/TPORD. – The Leicester County Council Charnwood Forest Area Tree Preservation Order 1949 – G72 beech, copper beech, silver birch, mature Scots and Corsican pine.
- 72/00006/TPORD – Leicestershire County Council Markfield (Ashby Road & Whitwick Road) Tree Preservation Order 1972 - T3 oak.




Figure 1: HBBC Tree Preservation Order (TPO) Map - protected trees are hatched purple

2.7. The site is **not** positioned within a local Conservation Area.

Felling Licence

2.8. Tree felling is also restricted under the Forestry Act 1967. Under this Act, there is an exemption from the need for a felling licence for "Felling trees immediately required for the purpose of carrying out development authorised by planning permission (granted under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990)."

2.9. If full planning permission is granted, then any trees which require felling to implement the approved plans are exempt from this statutory protection. Outline planning permission does not provide an exemption to the regulations that control tree felling in the Forestry Act 1967.

- 2.10. All statutory controls must be reviewed in detail ahead of undertaking any tree works relevant to this arboricultural report.

Protected Wildlife and Trees

Bats

- 2.11. All species of British bat are listed as European Protected Species (EPS) on Schedule 2 of the Conservation Regulations (Annex IV (a) to the Habitats Directive). This affords bats protection under The Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019. Before undertaking any tree work or tree removal, further advice should be sought from a suitably qualified ecologist.

Nesting Birds

- 2.12. The main bird nesting season is between March and August inclusive. Current legislation relating to breeding birds, under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000, confirms that birds, as well as their nests and eggs, are protected. Before undertaking any tree work or tree removal, further advice should be sought from a suitably qualified ecologist.

3.0 ARBORICULTURAL ASSESSMENT

Method of data collection

- 3.1. The tree survey was undertaken on 20th October 2025 by Sam Selwyn.
- 3.2. The trees on the site were surveyed in accordance with the requirements of BS5837:2012. The survey recorded trees either as individual specimens or as groups, where these trees were aerodynamically, culturally or visually important as groups. The tree numbers associated with each tree are cross-referenced within the Tree Schedule and Plans in Appendices 1 and 2, respectively.

Summary of data

Trees

- 3.3. The survey recorded 29 Individual trees comprising five category A, four category B, 15 category C and five category U retention value.

Groups

- 3.4. The survey recorded eight tree groups comprising one category B and seven category C retention value.

Hedgerows

- 3.5. The survey recorded five hedgerows without assigning a BS5837:2012 retention category. All hedgerows denoted field boundaries and consisted of common hawthorn, common ash, blackthorn, hazel, dog rose, dogwood, holly and pedunculate oak.
- 3.6. Full details for all trees, groups and hedgerows can be found in the BS5837:2012 Tree Schedule in Appendix 1.
- 3.7. It should be noted that Table 1 of BS5837:2012 only gives recommendations in relation to the remaining years. A tree may be considered to have a longer remaining life, however, may still be considered to be of a lower category given its maturity, condition or overall impact on the application site.
- 3.8. The location of the trees and their associated constraints, including canopy spreads and root protection areas, are illustrated in the Tree Constraints Plan in Appendix 2. The Arboricultural Impact Plan in Appendix 2 illustrates the impact of the Proposed Development.

4.0 IMPACT APPRAISAL

- 4.1. The impact of the Proposed Development upon existing trees, groups and hedgerows is illustrated in the Arboricultural Impact Plan at Appendix 2.
- 4.2. For the purposes of this AIA, the technical planning layout to inform requirements for tree removal.
- 4.3. At the time of writing this AIA, the drainage layout is unavailable, and any subsequent impacts have not been assessed.
- 4.4. The design has sought to incorporate the existing trees and minimise the requirement for tree removal. However, having regard to the design layouts, there is a conflict between the Proposed Development and existing trees which is considered unavoidable.
- 4.5. **Table 1** details the removals and part-removals required to implement the Proposed Development.

Table 1 - Tree Removal / part-removal for Proposed Development

Table text	Retention Category				Total
	A	B	C	U	
Removal of trees for Proposed Development	-	T4	T3, T8, T13, T16, T17, T23, T24, T26	T5, T25	11
Removal of groups for Proposed Development	-	-	G2, G7	-	2
Part-removal of groups for Proposed Development	-	G1	-	-	1 part-removal
Total	-	1 + 1 part-removal	10	2	13 + (1 Part-removal)

- 4.6. Included in **Table 1** are the tree removals required to establish the main vehicle access point to the site. This access will utilise the existing field entry and must be located in this specific area due to adherence to the outline planning permission and engineering requirements for a connection to the highway on Ashby Road.
- 4.7. To ensure sufficient space for construction, as well as space for likely services and utilities, the removal of certain trees in this location is proposed. However, the overall amenity

provided by the tree group along Ashby Road should remain largely unaffected by the proposed removals. Low and poor-quality trees (category C and U) account for 85% of the proposed tree removals.

- 4.8. None of the trees proposed for removal are considered aged or veteran and therefore the principles for refusal within the NPPF (para. 193(c)) would not be considered applicable.
- 4.9. In addition to the tree removal mentioned above, the hedgerows H2, H3 and H4 will require partial removal to facilitate the proposed development.
- 4.10. The hedgerows proposed to be removed and partially removed offer only Site-level value. There will be no impact beyond the application Site.

Mitigation

- 4.11. To mitigate for the tree and hedgerow loss detailed above, soft landscaping proposals should include planting of a range of suitable tree species, including large canopy trees in areas of open space.
- 4.12. The resulting additional species will provide much-needed diversity among tree species for futureproofing against pests, diseases, and the effects of climate change.

Root Protection Areas (RPAs)

- 4.13. The RPA is an area equivalent to a circle with a radius 12 times the diameter of the trees measured at 1.5 metres for single-stemmed trees. For trees with more than one stem, one of two calculation methods should be used. In all cases, the stem diameter(s) should be measured in accordance with Annex C, and the RPA should be guided from Annex D of BS5837:2012.
- 4.14. The RPA is an area in which no groundwork should be undertaken without due care in relation to the retained tree(s) and this is to avoid soil compaction, changes in levels or soil contamination which could alter the tree's condition and/or stability. The shape of the RPA and its exact location will depend upon arboricultural considerations and ground conditions.
- 4.15. The RPA for the trees has been calculated as prescribed by BS5837:2012 and is shown as circles or polygons on the Tree Constraints Plan in Appendix 2. These plans illustrate the relationship between the RPAs associated with the trees and the proposed development.
- 4.16. In addition to the illustration of RPAs on the plans in Appendix 2, the numerical RPA radius value is provided within the Tree Schedule in Appendix 1.

New RPA incursions

4.17. The Proposed Development has been designed around existing tree constraints. However, the proposal results in new RPA incursions summarised below:

- **T6** (common beech) - New incursion of 51.7m² within a total of 308m² RPA – 17% new incursion for internal road network and visitor car park spaces.

Mitigation - Arboricultural supervision of work within the RPA.

- **T20** (pedunculate oak) - New incursion of 19.5m² within a total of 206m² RPA – 9% new incursion for internal road network.

Mitigation – Arboricultural supervision of work within the RPA.

- **One tree within G1** (Austrian pine) - New incursion of 41m² within a total of 177m² RPA – 23% new incursion for internal road network.

Mitigation - Arboricultural supervision of work within the RPA.

4.18. All new RPA incursions mentioned above will require sensitive excavation within these protected zones. To ensure foreseeable damage does not occur, a methodology for the excavation process is provided in Section 5 of this AIA.

Working within RPAs - Fencing

4.19. The Proposed Development requires the installation of garden and knee-high fencing within RPAs of retained trees positioned on the Site boundaries.

4.20. To ensure foreseeable damage does not occur during fence installation, an example methodology for the process is provided in Section 5 of this AIA. Full details of tree protection and construction methods should be detailed within an AMS following planning approval.

Facilitation Tree Pruning

4.21. In order to provide sufficient clearance for construction and future use of the Proposed Development, trees may require minor pruning work to be carried out.

4.22. Required pruning is likely to include the following:

- **H2** - Cut back the lateral spread of the hedge that overhangs the proposed visitor car parking spaces to facilitate construction.
- **G6** - Cut back the lateral spread as required to facilitate basin earthworks.

4.23. A final specification for facilitation tree pruning should be determined by the Arboricultural Clerk of Works (ACoW), following a pre-commencement site meeting with the appointed contractor.

- 4.24. Further requirements for facilitation pruning may be identified during the course of construction and should be addressed by ongoing liaison with the ACoW.

Utilities and Services

- 4.25. At the time of writing this AIA, no service details have been provided at this early stage. However, traditional excavated utilities should be routed outside of tree RPAs. Where this is not possible, it is preferable to keep the apparatus together in common ducts or apply trenchless insertion methods within RPAs. In all cases, working shall be drawn up in conjunction with the Arboricultural Clerk of Works (ACoW) and comply with Street Works UK: Publications Volume 4 – Guidelines for the planning, installation, and maintenance of Utility apparatus in proximity to Trees.
- 4.26. Full details of utilities and services routes should be provided within a detailed Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) following planning approval.

Future growth

- 4.27. Due to the location of retained trees, future growth of trees is not considered to be an issue for the Proposed Development.
- 4.28. Minor pruning of lateral branches will address any future issues where the canopy of trees encroaches towards the proposed buildings, access and parking.

5.0 TREE PROTECTION

- 5.1. Full details of tree protection measures including construction methods, engineering plans, schedule of arboricultural supervision and specific forms of tree protection, should be provided within a detailed AMS following planning approval at the detailed planning stage.
- 5.2. To ensure all tree protection measures are implemented, arboricultural supervision should be undertaken by an appointed Arboricultural Clerk of Works (ACoW). The ACoW will be a suitably qualified arboriculturist appointed by the client / contractor / other party responsible for the implementation of tree protection measures.

Tree Protection Fencing

- 5.3. The principal protection for the retained trees is provided by Tree Protection Fencing (TPF) positioned to form a Construction Exclusion Zone (CEZ) around retained trees. No access should be allowed other than for operations specified in the approved documents or those agreed with the LPA later.
- 5.4. The CEZ must be in place before the commencement of construction work on site. The TPF must not be moved or relocated without approval from the ACoW and, where necessary, approval from the Local Planning Authority.
- 5.5. The TPF specification should be fit for the purpose of excluding construction activity and appropriate to the degree and proximity of work taking place around the retained trees.
- 5.6. The most common specification, as illustrated in BS5837:2012 Figure 3b comprises welded mesh panels (Heras Fencing) on rubber or concrete feet; the panels should be joined together using a minimum of two anti-tamper couplers, installed so that they can only be removed from within the fence. The distance between fence couplers should be at least 1m and should be uniform throughout the fence. The panels should be supported on the inner side by stabiliser struts, which should normally be attached to a base plate secured with ground pins. Where the fencing is to be erected on retained hard surfacing, or it is otherwise unfeasible to use ground pins, e.g. due to the presence of underground services, the stabiliser struts should be mounted on a block tray.
- 5.7. Reusable weatherproof signage (rigid plastic or Foamex foamboard) will be attached to the fencing with words such as 'Construction Exclusion Zone - No Access'.

Excavation within RPAs

- 5.8. To construct and implement the Proposed Development, there will be a requirement for excavation within the RPAs of T6, T20 & one tree within G1. To minimise the impact on the retained trees, the following methodology should be followed.
- 5.9. All ground excavations will be carried out under the supervision of the ACoW, when within tree RPAs.
- 5.10. Paragraph 7.2.1 of BS5837:2012 recognises that although existing ground levels should be retained within the RPA, limited manual excavation within the RPA might be acceptable, subject to justification.
- 5.11. The operations should be carried out using hand-held tools where possible and preferably by compressed air soil displacement. Limited mechanical excavation may be acceptable, subject to the agreement of the ACoW.
- 5.12. Roots exposed by the compressed air excavation may be loosened and relocated / diverted to minimise any requirement for root pruning.
- 5.13. Roots smaller than 25 mm in diameter may be pruned back, making a clean cut with a suitable sharp tool (e.g. bypass secateurs or handsaw), except where they occur in clumps. Roots occurring in clumps or of 25 mm diameter and over should be severed only following consultation with the ACoW.

Fencing within RPAs

- 5.14. To ensure foreseeable damage does not occur during the installation of fencing within RPAs, the following methodology should be followed:
- 5.15. Hand-dig only methods will be adopted when working within the RPA of retained trees. The removal of the existing soft/hard surfaces within the RPAs must be undertaken under the direct supervision/guidance of the ACoW.
- 5.16. The post holes will be c.300mm x 300mm excavated using hand tools to a depth of c.650mm. Any minor identified roots <25mm diameter will be pruned back with secateurs or a root pruning hand saw. Any significant roots identified >25mm in diameter will be avoided, and if discovered, post holes will be relocated.
- 5.17. Post holes will be lined with a non-porous lining such as durable polythene to prevent leachates from concrete damaging tree roots. Post holes should be filled with concrete/postcrete just below the formation level. Finally, the polythene lining should be trimmed back and filled with clean topsoil in preparation for fixing the fence panels.

6.0 REFERENCES

- British Standard 5837:2012 'Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction - Recommendations'
- British Standard 3998:2010 'Tree work - Recommendations'
- BS8545:2014+A1:2026 Trees: from nursery to independence in the landscape – Code of Practice
- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2025
- The Forestry Act 1967
- The Town and Country Planning Act 1990
- The Town and Country Planning (Tree Preservation) (England) Regulations 2012.
- Street Works UK: Publications Volume 4 – Guidelines for the planning, installation, and maintenance of Utility apparatus in proximity to Trees

7.0 CAVEATS AND LIMITATIONS

- 7.1. The report is for the sole use of the client and its reproduction or use by anyone else is forbidden unless written consent is given by the author.
- 7.2. This is an arboricultural report and as such no reliance should be given to comments relating to buildings, engineering, soils ecological or archaeological data. If either is commented upon within the report further professional advice should be sought.
- 7.3. This is not a Tree Risk Assessment. As such, this report should not be taken to mean or imply that any of the inspected trees should be considered safe. A Tree Risk Assessment can be provided, but would be subject to additional survey requirements and further fees.
- 7.4. Trees are growing dynamic structures. Whilst reasonable effort has been made to identify defects within the trees inspected, no guarantee can be given as to the absolute safety or otherwise of any individual tree. No tree is ever absolutely safe due to the unpredictable laws and forces of nature. As a result of this, natural failure of intact trees will occur; extreme climatic conditions can cause damage to even apparently healthy trees.
- 7.5. For the purposes of this survey all dimensions of trees and their associated parts are based on estimation unless otherwise stated.
- 7.6. Trees are living organisms whose health, condition and structure can change quickly and without warning. Therefore, the contents of this report are valid for a period of one year from the date of this survey.

APPENDIX 1

Tree Survey Schedule

Client:

Allison Homes

Date of Survey:

20th October 2025

Tagged

N/A

Site:

Land at Ashby Road, Markfield

Consultant

Sam Selwyn

Weather

Cloud and rain



Sequential Reference No.	Species	Height (m)	Stem Diameter (mm)	Branch Spread (m)				Canopy Clearance (m)	Life Stage	Physiological Condition	Structural Condition	Comments / Notes	Management Recommendations (Priority)	Estimated Remaining Contribution (Years)	Category Grading	Root Protection Radius (m)
				North	East	South	West									
T1 (TPO)	Common beech	20	735	4.5	5.5	7	6	2	Mat	Good	Good	Protected by HBBC Tree Preservation Order 49/00001/TPORD 1948 - G72. Forms part of a boundary tree group feature, north east of Ashby Road. Good condition, stands out from other specimens.	No work recommended at time of assessment.	40+ years	A1	8.7
T2 (TPO)	Austrian pine	16	410	1	7	1	1	9	E/Mat	Fair	Poor	Protected by HBBC Tree Preservation Order 49/00001/TPORD 1948 - G72. Forms part of a tree boundary group feature, establishing north east of Ashby Road. Leans heavily east, partially supported by an adjacent tree. Raised ground on the north side of the root plate, a possible sign of historical root failure.	No work recommended at time of assessment.	<10 years	U	4.8
T3 (TPO)	Common beech	10	925	4	4.5	4	5	2.2	Mat	Fair	Poor	Protected by HBBC Tree Preservation Order 49/00001/TPORD 1948 - G72. Forms part of a tree group boundary feature establishing north east of Ashby Road. Major historical failure of the main stem at 6m, leaving a squat tree. Decay associated with the failure point. Fair lower canopy vitality.	Remove to facilitate Proposed Development	10 to 20 years	C1	11.1
T4 (TPO)	Austrian pine	22	610	6.5	4	6	4.5	0	Mat	Fair	Fair	Protected by HBBC Tree Preservation Order 49/00001/TPORD 1948 - G72. Forms part of the boundary tree group feature, establishing northeast of Ashby Road. Bifurcates at 3m, good union formation associated. High canopy. The tree leans north to northeast due to historical group pressure. Deadwood and storm damage observed within the upper canopy, with possible early onset decline. Prominent in the landscape, it stands out from other group specimens.	Remove to facilitate Proposed Development	20 to 40 years	B1	7.2
T5 (TPO)	Austrian pine	13	340	4	6	0.5	2	6	S/Mat	Declining	Poor	Protected by HBBC Tree Preservation Order 49/00001/TPORD 1948 - G72. Forms part of a boundary tree group feature, growing on raised ground. The majority of the canopy is dead, with only minor needles remaining. The tree leans heavily southeast, partially supported by the adjacent tree. Unlikely to provide a long-term contribution.	Remove to facilitate Proposed Development	<10 years	U	4.2
T6 (TPO)	Common beech	20	815	6	6	7	6.5	2.5	Mat	Good	Fair	Protected by HBBC Tree Preservation Order 49/00001/TPORD 1948 - G72. Forms part of the boundary tree group feature, establishing northeast of Ashby Road. Single-stemmed, well-formed tree in good condition. Infant stem lost on the south side of the main stem at ground level, minor decay associated with adaptive growth present. Stands out from other group specimens.	No work recommended at time of assessment.	40+ years	A1	9.9
T7 (TPO)	Austrian pine	13	400	3	6	0.5	0.5	4	S/Mat	Fair	Poor	Protected by HBBC Tree Preservation Order 49/00001/TPORD 1948 - G72. Forms part of a boundary tree group feature to the northeast of Ashby Road. The main stem leans, and the canopy is biased east to southeast. Fair condition growing on raised ground. Adds density to the street gate. Low canopy over the development area.	No work recommended at time of assessment.	10 to 20 years	C1	4.8
T8	Common ash	15	535	8	8.5	0	2	0	E/Mat	Fair	Declining	Edge tree canopy and main stem are heavily biased north to east. Very low canopy over the development area. Grown on raise ground. Possible partial root failure on southside tree currently stable. Deadwood and early onset of ash dieback disease observed with the canopy.	Remove to facilitate Proposed Development	10 to 20 years	C1	6.3
T9 (TPO)	Common beech	20	640	6	5	4	5.5	3	Mat	Good	Good	Protected by HBBC Tree Preservation Order 49/00001/TPORD 1948 - G72. Well-formed single stemmed tree, establishing from the boundary tree group feature positioned northeast of Ashby Road. Stands out from the group. Future growth can be expected. Strong future potential.	No work recommended at time of assessment.	40+ years	A1	7.8

Sequential Reference No.	Species	Height (m)	Stem Diameter (mm)	Branch Spread (m)				Canopy Clearance (m)	Life Stage	Physiological Condition	Structural Condition	Comments / Notes	Management Recommendations (Priority)	Estimated Remaining Contribution (Years)	Category Grading	Root Protection Radius (m)
				North	East	South	West									
T10 (TPO)	Common beech	16	690	6	4	5	3	5	Mat	Declining	Poor	Protected by HBBC Tree Preservation Order 49/00001/TPORD 1948 - G72. Forms part of the boundary tree group feature, north east of Ashby Road. Major decline associated with canopy. Primary stem at 5m on east side of the canopy is dead. Large cavity on the northeast side of mainstem at 4m and extends upwards for 1m. Major decay associated and water staining. Evidence of historical branch failures within canopy. Unlikely to provide a long-term contribution.	No work recommended at time of assessment.	<10 years	U	8.4
T11 (TPO)	Common beech	12	600	4	5	5.5	6	1	E/Mat	Fair	Fair	Protected by HBBC Tree Preservation Order 49/00001/TPORD 1948 - G72. Forms part of the boundary group feature, northeast of Ashby Road. Large longitudinal cavity observed on the east side of the main stem from ground level to a height of 5m. Adaptive growth is associated. Heartwood decay is associated. Canopy is biased west and south due to group pressure. Provides density to the treescape.	No work recommended at time of assessment.	10 to 20 years	C1	7.2
T12 (TPO)	Common beech	6	195	3	2	3	2.5	1.5	Yng	Poor	Declining	Protected by HBBC Tree Preservation Order 49/00001/TPORD 1948 - G72. Young tree establishing from within the boundary tree group feature, north east of Ashby Road. Major deadwood is associated with the canopy, with minor leaf coverage remaining. Decay and dysfunction observed on the main stem. Fungal brackets observed at the base tree on the east and south sides. Terminal decline.	No work recommended at time of assessment.	<10 years	U	2.4
T13	Pedunculate oak	12	315	4	4	4	4	1.6	S/Mat	Good	Good	Well-formed young tree establishing south west of post and rail fence within the site. Good condition, strong potential to grow into high quality specimen. Pleasing radial canopy. Low canopy clearance currently.	Remove to facilitate Proposed Development	40+ years	C1	3.9
T14	Goat willow	11	447	5	5.5	5	5	1.2	S/Mat	Fair	Fair	Establishing north east of stables from within the site. Divides into five stems at 1m, with tight union formations associated. Radial canopy has good leaf coverage and density associated. Provides collective landscape value, low arboricultural quality.	No work recommended at time of assessment.	10 to 20 years	C1	5.4
T15	Pedunculate oak	9	660	7	6.5	6.5	6	1.6	E/Mat	Good	Good	Squat oak tree growing north of timber stables within fenced area. Well-formed canopy, good leaf coverage and density associated with minor deadwood. Free from defect. Has strong potential to grow into a high-quality specimen. Future growth should be expected.	No work recommended at time of assessment.	40+ years	B1	7.8
T16	Silver birch	9	295	4	3.5	3.5	4	2	Yng	Fair	Fair	Young tree establishing from the central hedgerow on site. Well-formed and in good condition. Has strong potential to grow into a valuable specimen.	Remove to facilitate Proposed Development	20 to 40 years	C1	3.6
T17	Common ash	9	192	3	3	2.5	3	4	Yng	Fair	Fair	Young tree establishing from a hedgerow centrally on site. Bifurcates at 1m, tight union formation associated. Average canopy condition, early onset of ash dieback disease observed. Provides collective landscape value.	Remove to facilitate Proposed Development	10 to 20 years	C1	2.4
T18 (TPO)	Pedunculate oak	20	1000	9	9	9	9	6	Mat	Good	Good	Protected by HBBC Tree Preservation Order 72/00006/TPORD 1972 - T3 Off-site tree establishing from a hedgerow on the northwestern boundary. Detailed assessment restricted, all attributes estimated. Prominent in the landscape, provides amenity value.	No work recommended at time of assessment.	40+ years	A1,2	12
T19	Pedunculate oak	18	950	8	9.5	8	7	0	Mat	Good	Fair	Off-site tree establishing from a hedgerow on the northwestern boundary. Detailed assessment restricted, all attributes estimated. Prominent in the landscape, provides amenity value.	No work recommended at time of assessment.	40+ years	A1, 2	11.4

Sequential Reference No.	Species	Height (m)	Stem Diameter (mm)	Branch Spread (m)				Canopy Clearance (m)	Life Stage	Physiological Condition	Structural Condition	Comments / Notes	Management Recommendations (Priority)	Estimated Remaining Contribution (Years)	Category Grading	Root Protection Radius (m)
				North	East	South	West									
T20	Pedunculate oak	13	680	7	6	6.5	7	3	E/Mat	Good	Good	Boundary oak tree establishing off-site and subsequently not accessed to inspect in detail. All tree attributes estimated, including diameter. Well formed and in good condition, strong future potential.	No work recommended at time of assessment.	40+ years	B1	8.1
T21	Common ash	10	150	3	3	3	3	3	Yng	Fair	Fair	Young tree establishing from the central hedgerow. Bifurcates at 2m. Radial canopy. Future growth should be expected. Insignificant contribution currently.	No work recommended at time of assessment.	10 to 20 years	C1	1.8
T22	Common ash	8	149	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	4	Yng	Fair	Fair	Young tree establishing from the central hedgerow. Twin stemmed from ground level. Radial canopy. Future growth should be expected. Insignificant contribution currently.	No work recommended at time of assessment.	10 to 20 years	C1	1.8
T23	Common ash	13	590	6	7	7	7	2	Mat	Declining	Fair	Establishing centrally on site, southwest of the internal ditch network. Open-grown structure. Early onset of ash dieback disease observed. Minor to moderate deadwood associated with canopy, which hangs low over the development area. Low arboricultural quality.	Remove to facilitate Proposed Development	10 to 20 years	C1, 2	7.2
T24	Common ash	13	550	5	6	6	5.5	2.5	E/Mat	Declining	Fair	Establishing centrally on site, southwest of the internal ditch network. Open-grown structure. Early onset of ash dieback disease observed. Minor to moderate deadwood associated with the canopy, which hangs low over the over development area. Low arboricultural quality.	Remove to facilitate Proposed Development	10 to 20 years	C1, 2	6.6
T25	Common ash	18	730	6	6	6.5	6.5	3	Mat	Declining	Declining	Establishing centrally on site, southwest of internal ditch network. Open-grown structure. The main central leader is entirely dead, the remaining canopy is in decline, and ash dieback is associated. Unlikely to provide a long-term contribution.	Remove to facilitate Proposed Development	<10 years	U	8.7
T26	Common ash	17	930	7	7	7	7	2	Mat	Declining	Fair	Establishing centrally on site, southwest of internal ditch network. Open-grown structure, crown break at 4m. Sparse canopy, ash dieback associated - ash health class 2. Moderate deadwood associated, decline established and likely to deteriorate. Low canopy over development area. Low arboricultural quality.	Remove to facilitate Proposed Development	<10 years	C1, 2	11.1
T27	Field maple	8	350	4	4	4	4	2.5	S/Mat	Fair	Fair	Off-site tree and subsequently not accessible to inspect in detail. All attributes estimated.	No work recommended at time of assessment.	20 to 40 years	C1	4.2
T28	Silver birch	14	200	3	4	3	3	5	S/Mat	Good	Good	Off-site tree and subsequently not accessible to inspect in detail. Beginning to occupy its immediate landscape. Future growth should be expected. Fair potential.	No work recommended at time of assessment.	20 to 40 years	B1	2.4
T29	Field maple	7	225	4	3	2	3.5	2.2	Yng	Good	Good	Off-site tree and subsequently not accessible to inspect in detail. Overhangs the site by approximately 3m. Canopy clearance is 2m over the site.	No work recommended at time of assessment.	10 to 20 years	C1	2.7
G1 (TPO)	Common beech, Common ash, Austrian pine, Scots pine	Min 13 - Max 24	Min 245 - Max 830	See Associated Plans				3	Mat	Good	Good	Protected by HBBC Tree Preservation Order 49/00001/TPORD 1948 - G72 (Beech, Copper beech, Silver birch, Black pine and Scots pine). Linear shelterbelt trees broken into sections. Establishing on the boundary adjacent to Ashby Road. Forms cohesive sections in good condition. Highly prominent, important feature to the site. Specimens picked out individually due to changes in condition or quality. Some individuals can be expected to grow further. Dominated by beech and pine.	Part-removal to facilitate Proposed Development	20 to 40 years	B2	See Associated Plans


Sequential Reference No.	Species	Height (m)	Stem Diameter (mm)	Branch Spread (m)				Canopy Clearance (m)	Life Stage	Physiological Condition	Structural Condition	Comments / Notes	Management Recommendations (Priority)	Estimated Remaining Contribution (Years)	Category Grading	Root Protection Radius (m)
				North	East	South	West									
G2	Common beech, Common ash, Holly species, Austrian pine	Min 10 - Max 13	Min 150 - Max 390	See Associated Plans				2	S/Mat	Fair	Fair	A small group of stems establishing within a larger boundary tree group feature. Small in height. Beech stems are young and growing from an old, degraded stump. Ash tree positioned within hedgerow and likely off-site. The pine tree grows on raised ground and leans southeast due to historical group pressure. Overall, there is a distinct lower arboricultural quality than the surrounding group. Future growth of a beech and ash is likely.	Remove to facilitate Proposed Development	10 to 20 years	C2	See Associated Plans
G3	Common hawthorn, Goat willow	Min 8 - Max 10	Min 159 - Max 374	See Associated Plans				1	S/Mat	Fair	Fair	A sporadic group of trees establishing south of the stables. All specimens are multi-stemmed and likely self-set. Forms two sections of cohesive canopy. Add density to the low-level treescape. Site-level value only.	No work recommended at time of assessment.	10 to 20 years	C2	See Associated Plans
G4	Leyland cypress, Cherry laurel	Min 9 - Max 17	Min 150 - Max 500	See Associated Plans				0	E/Mat	Fair	Fair	Offsite boundary group of trees and subsequently not accessed to inspect in detail. All attributes estimated.	No work recommended at time of assessment.	10 to 20 years	C2	See Associated Plans
G5	Common hawthorn, Blackthorn, Pedunculate oak, Gorse	Min 1.8 - Max 5	Min 25 - Max 100	See Associated Plans				0	Young	Fair	Fair	A small group of scrub merged with bramble. Dense composition, detail assessment restricted. Insignificant contribution.	No work recommended at time of assessment.	10 to 20 years	C2	See Associated Plans
G6	Silver birch, Common hawthorn, Common ash, Holly species, Scots pine, Pedunculate oak	Min 9 - Max 16	Min 75 - Max 600	See Associated Plans				1	E/Mat	Fair	Fair	Offsite roadside group. Forms a linear cohesive canopy. Ash within the group is in decline. Oak within the group has strong potential. An important component for screening the A50 carriageway. Dense composition, even mix between over and under story. Bramble present at the site margin. Low canopy encroach on to the site.	No work recommended at time of assessment.	20 to 40 years	C2	See Associated Plans
G7	Osier	Ave 8	Min 40 - Max 75	See Associated Plans				4	Young	Fair	Fair	Ten small stems of osier forming a small group. Insignificant landscape contribution.	Remove to facilitate Proposed Development	10 to 20 years	C2	See Associated Plans
G8	Field maple, Sycamore, Common alder, Silver birch, Common beech	Min 10 - Max 13	Ave 250	See Associated Plans				2	S/Mat	Fair	Fair	Off-site tree group and subsequently not accessible to inspect in detail. Broken into clusters of trees. One ash tree is dead. Canopy overhangs the site by approximately 4m. Canopy clearance over the site is 2m.	No work recommended at time of assessment.	10 to 20 years	C2	See Associated Plans
H1	Blackthorn, Common hawthorn, English holly, Pedunculate oak	Min 4 - Max 6	Min 50 - Max 150	See Associated Plans				0	Mat	Fair	Fair	Mature boundary hedgerow. Dense composition. Mix of species. Unmanaged and intermixed with bramble at a low-level. Provides screening value and wildlife benefit.	No work recommended at time of assessment.	20 to 40 years	-	See Associated Plans
H2	Blackthorn, Common ash, Common hawthorn, Common hazel, Dog rose	Min 5 - Max 7	Min 50 - Max 150	See Associated Plans				0	Mat	Fair	Fair	Mature hedgerow establishing centrally on site dividing paddocks. Wider to the north east merges into scrub. Mix of species dense composition. Unmanaged, provides low-level screening and wildlife habitat.	Part-removal to facilitate Proposed Development	20 to 40 years	-	See Associated Plans
H3	Blackthorn, Common ash, Common hawthorn	Ave 4	Ave 75	See Associated Plans				0	E/Mat	Fair	Fair	Sporadic broken hedge establishing from central ditch network on site. Merges with dense bramble at paddock margins. Insignificant contribution. Unmanaged.	Part-removal to facilitate Proposed Development	10 to 20 years	-	See Associated Plans
H4	Common ash, Common hawthorn	Min 4 - Max 6	Min 50 - Max 100	See Associated Plans				0	Mat	Fair	Fair	Broken boundary hedgerow. Numerous small sections of mature mostly hawthorn. Stems of ash are beginning to establish above the average hedge height. Establishing southeast of boundary post and rail fence. Provides low-level screening in small sections. Generally unmanaged.	Part-removal to facilitate Proposed Development	20 to 40 years	-	See Associated Plans
H5	Common hawthorn, Dogwood species	Ave 4	Min 25 - Max 50	See Associated Plans				0	Mat	Fair	Fair	Linear hedge establishing off-site. Sides maintained. Provides low-level screening.	No work recommended at time of assessment.	20 to 40 years	-	See Associated Plans

APPENDIX 2

Tree Constraints Plan

Arboricultural Impact Plan

Tree Protection Plan



KEY.

Trees / Groups

- Canopy Spread
- Tree Stem
- Root Protection Area (RPA)

A Category Tree
(High quality / retention value)

B Category Tree
(Moderate quality / retention value)

C Category Tree
(Low quality / retention value)

U Category Tree
(No remaining retention value)

Hedgerows
(Not assigned BS5837:2012 category)

Notes

Trees denoted with an (*) have been plotted utilising on site features as no topographical data was available at the time of survey.



30 St Georges Square, Worcester, WR1 1HX
01905 947558
www.weareblade.co.uk

CLIENT
Allison Homes

PROJECT
Land at Ashby Road, Markfield

DRAWING TITLE
Tree Constraints Plan

DRAWING STATUS
Planning

DRAWING NO.
431-T-D-PL-TCP-V2

REVISION
V2

DRAWN
SS

CHECKED
SH


SCALE
1:500

PAPER SIZE
A1

DATE
OCT-2025

The copyright of this drawing is vested with BLADE Trees Ltd and must not be copied, or reproduced without the consent of the company.

BLADE Trees Ltd is registered in England and Wales.
Registered address 30 St Georges Square, Worcester WR1 1HX
Registered number 13385589



0 10 20 35m

V2
V1
REV

Update to include TPO information
Issue to client
Description

18/11/25
27/10/25
Date



30 St Georges Square, Worcester, WR1 1HX 01905 947558 www.wearblade.co.uk				
CLIENT				
Allison Hornes				
PROJECT				
Land at Ashby Road, Markfield				
DRAWING TITLE				
Arboricultural Impact Plan				
DRAWING STATUS				
Planning				
DRAWING NO.				REVISION
431-T-D-PL-AIP-V10				V10
DRAWN	CHECKED	SCALE	PAPER SIZE	DATE
SS	SH	1:500	A1	July 2026



Tree Protection Fencing

The principal protection for the retained trees (above and below ground) and associated soils within the Site is through the erection of Tree Protection Fencing (TPF) to create a Construction Exclusion Zone (CEZ).


Prior to any on-site demolition or construction, tree protective measures and the CEZ must be in place. TPF Specification is shown in Figure 3 (BS5837:2012) - pictured above.

The following points are critical to the function of the CEZ:

- The protective tree fencing shall be maintained throughout the development phase
- No materials, machinery, temporary structures, chemicals or fuel shall be stored within the CEZ
- No excavations or increases in soil level within the CEZ are permitted without prior written approval from the LPA
- Care should be taken to ensure that wide or tall loads or plant with booms, jibs and counterweights do not come 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
- Material which will contaminate the soil such as concrete mixing, diesel oil and vehicle washing must not be discharged within 20m of the tree stems. In the event of an accident or spillage the LPA must be notified
- Fires must 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
- Any landscaping within the CEZ must avoid soil disturbance. Therefore, re-grading and rotavators are not permitted. Any agreed soil re-profiling to facilitate final agreed levels must be carried out by hand with topsoil.

Tree Protection Fencing - BS5837 Figure 3


Figure 3 Examples of above-ground stabilizing systems



Sensitive work within RPA under Arboricultural supervision

The copyright of this drawing is vested with BLADE Trees Ltd and must not be copied, or reproduced without the consent of the company.

BLADE Trees Ltd is registered in England and Wales.
Registered address 30 St Georges Square, Worcester WR1 1HX
Registered number 13385589



0 10 20 35m

V10	Updated Site layout	16/07/26	V6	Updated layout to include sub station	27/05/26
V9	Updated Site layout	15/07/26	V5	Updated layout	26/05/26
V8	Updated layout including drainage and proposed levels	17/06/26	V4	Updated layout	08/04/26
V7	Update to include draft level plans	01/06/26	V3	Updated footpath layout	06/01/26
REV	Description	Date	V2	Updated hedge retention	04/12/25
			V1	Issue to client	20/11/25
					Date

KEY.

Trees / Groups

- Canopy Spread
- Tree Stem
- Root Protection Area (RPA)
- A Category Tree (High quality / retention value)
- B Category Tree (Moderate quality / retention value)
- C Category Tree (Low quality / retention value)
- U Category Tree (No remaining retention value)
- Hedgerows (Not assigned BS5837:2012 category)

Tree Protection

- Tree Protection Fencing
- Sensitive work methodology within RPA

Notes

Trees denoted with an (*) have been plotted utilising on site features as no topographical data was available at the time of survey.



30 St Georges Square, Worcester, WR1 1HX
01905 947558
www.weareblade.co.uk

CLIENT

Allison Homes

PROJECT

Land at Ashby Road, Markfield

DRAWING TITLE

Tree Protection Plan

DRAWING STATUS


Planning

DRAWING NO.	431-T-D-PL-TPP-V10	REVISION	V10
DRAWN	SS	CHECKED	SH
SCALE	1:500	PAPER SIZE	A1
DATE	July 2026		

APPENDIX 3

Tree Protection Specification

Figure 3 Examples of above-ground stabilizing systems



30 ST GEORGES SQUARE
WORCESTER
WR1 1HX

01905 947558
info@weareblade.co.uk
www.weareblade.co.uk

BLADE Ecology Ltd. Registered in England and Wales Number 13084460. VAT 384 3366 75.
BLADE Landscape Architects Ltd. Registered in England and Wales Number 11068394. VAT 288 9595 14.
BLADE Trees Ltd. Registered in England and Wales Number 13385589. VAT 387 2462 66.
Registered Office: 30 St Georges Square, Worcester, WR1 1HX.