



**IAIN TAVENDALE F.Arbor.A.**

---

ARBORICULTURAL CONSULTANT

16<sup>th</sup> October 2012

**Wakefield Road, Mapplewell**

**Summary of Tree Survey Findings**

To the approximate south east and southern boundaries of the site there are areas of hedgerow that exist which, by abutting adjacent residential properties, have frequently been managed to control height and spread across adjacent land to abate nuisance and permit normal enjoyment of garden areas.

Whilst such pruning operations may not always have been to the highest standards and, in many cases vegetation across the site has not been addressed, it is considered that all such material could be retained and/or reclaimed to continue to afford a suitably secure barrier and screen feature.

In the far southern corner an area of hedging H2 has been left to grow out but, this is a relatively short area and could either be reclaimed by layering or, simply removed and replanted.

G3 adjacent is a tangled area of scrub/self-set material of low quality and viability and that is beyond any normal management exercise. Again, clearance and replanting would probably be the most prudent course of action to secure this section of the boundary.

3 main areas of hedging exist within the site H3, H4 and H5. All such sections have been managed in the past to some degree but, neglected in more recent times. It is considered that they are comparatively young and have very minimal species diversity and would not, at this time, be considered to fall within the Hedgerow Act. They may however require checking by the ecologist in respect of any other issues.

If retained they should be reduced to a level that can be readily maintained by future managers and that will maximise security, screening and viability.

H6 to the western boundary is in relatively poor condition but, could be partially reclaimed by the removal of the Elder and layering of the Thorns plus replanting.

The remaining significant section of hedge is to Wakefield Road – H7 which, generally appears to be in satisfactory condition and can be managed accordingly. Should this be retained within any private curtilages, it would be recommended that it be reduced to a manageable level, say 2.5m, otherwise it is likely to be simply neglected and will reduce the quality losing any screening or visual amenity currently afforded.

Only 5 individual trees were noted on site and it is possible that of these T1, T4 and T5 are on the boundary line or immediately adjacent to the site and therefore probably beyond reasonable control. T2 and T3 are of minimal significance and could be readily replaced by any normal landscape scheme.

Within the remaining body of the site, 3 areas of comparatively dense, self-set material were identified: A1, A2 and A3. Whilst these do provide some limited amenity and whilst in many instances the material present has reasonable vitality, the vast majority of specimens are young, growing at very tight spacings and would need considerable management to attempt any retention within the development. It is also considered that they are so small and of such small diameter that they could be readily replaced in any development scheme by new material, all of which would have been produced specifically for moving and which could be inserted in appropriate locations to achieve the necessary landscaping requirements.

If any of these areas or sections can be retained a simple management programme should be produced indicating current thinning proposals and future practices to maximise establishment and quality.

G4 as identified on the plan, is again a group of self-set material of limited value and potential, and in respect of the Goat Willow present, inappropriate for retention within an urban environment. If retained in open space however it could, as for the various areas discussed be thinned and managed.

To the north of the site adjacent to the various outbuildings and stone house, other material was considered but, there were no items within the vicinity that would have any impact upon the proposed draft layouts.

In conclusion therefore it was not considered that there was any material on site that was of sufficient quality or desirability in arboricultural terms to effectively control development, and/or that could not be replaced within an appropriately designed landscape scheme.

If however, any sections of hedging or areas of self-set/scrub material could be retained, it would as detailed, simply be recommended that the hedging is

reduced to a manageable level and that the self-set saplings be thinned to retain the strongest items which would then have space to develop and create a useful feature.

Iain Tavendale F.Arbor.A