



**ARBORICULTURAL REPORT**  
**& Impact Assessment**  
**to BS5837:2012 at:**  
***347 Doncaster Road***  
***Barnsley***  
***South Yorkshire***  
***S70 3PH***

Prepared for:  
*AH Estates Ltd*  
*Church Lane,*  
*Worsbrough Village,*  
*Barnsley S70 5LQ*

Date: *May 2019*

Reference: *AWA2688*



# Contents

<b>1. Introduction .....</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1 Instructions and Brief.....	3
1.2 Survey Details.....	3
<b>2. The Site .....</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1 Location and Description .....	4
<b>3. The Trees.....</b>	<b>5</b>
3.1 Legal .....	5
3.2 Tree Survey Results .....	5
<b>4. Arboricultural Impact Assessment.....</b>	<b>7</b>
4.1 Proposed New Development.....	7
4.2 Direct Impacts.....	7
4.3 Indirect Impacts.....	7
4.4 Suitable Mitigation .....	8
4.5 Protection of the Retained Trees .....	8
<b>5. Signature .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Appendix 1: Authors Qualifications &amp; Experience .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Appendix 2: Survey Methodology and Limitations of Report .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Appendix 3: Explanation of Tree Descriptions.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Appendix 4: Tree Data .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Appendix 5: Tree Constraints Plan .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Appendix 6: Tree Impacts Plan.....</b>	<b>16</b>

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1 Instructions and Brief

- 1.1.1 We are instructed by AH Estates Ltd by way of instruction from Blue Check Consulting Ltd to visit the site and prepare our findings in a report.
- 1.1.2 The report is required in accordance with *BS 5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations*, to provide detailed, independent, arboricultural advice on the trees present, in the context of potential development.

## 1.2 Survey Details

- 1.2.1 The survey took place during May 2019.
- 1.2.2 The trees were surveyed visually from the ground using “Visual Tree Assessment” techniques and in accordance with the guiding principles of British Standard 5837:2012.
- 1.2.3 Any additional off-site trees that could impact a new development design have been included in the tree survey parameters.
- 1.2.4 The tree positions were plotted on Ordnance Survey map base-layer using enhanced GPS technology (1-2m accuracy) and laser distance measurer.
- 1.2.5 This report has been prepared by Mr Adam Winson, Chartered Arboriculturist, MSc, BSc (Hons), MICFor, MArborA, Principle and Director of AWA Tree Consultants Ltd.
- 1.2.6 The tree survey data collection was carried out by Mr Dave Farmer, FdSc (Arb), MArborA, PTI (Lantra) and Mr Patrick Rowntree, Cert Arb L3, TechArborA, Arboriculturists at AWA Tree Consultants Ltd.
- 1.2.7 Full qualifications and experience are included within **Appendix 1**. Explanatory details regarding the survey methodology are included within **Appendix 2**. A full explanation of the tree data can be found at **Appendix 3**. Full details of all the trees surveyed are found in **Appendix 4**. For tree locations refer to the Tree Constraints Plan at **Appendix 5** and for detail of the impacts of the new development refer to the Tree Impacts Plan at **Appendix 6**.

## 2. The Site

### 2.1 Location and Description

2.1.1 The site is located east of Barnsley town centre, in the Stairfoot ward.

2.1.2 The site comprises a disused residential dwelling with several associated outbuildings and an access driveway. Doncaster Road is located beyond the northern boundary, and Hunningley Close is located to the west.

2.1.3 The approximate area of the survey is highlighted in the (2018 Google Earth) image below:



## 3. The Trees

### 3.1 Legal

- 3.1.1 We completed an online check with Barnsley Council 17/05/2019. This found no Tree Preservation Orders or Conservation Areas at the site.
- 3.1.2 Due to the large potential penalties for illegally carrying out work to protected trees, before authorising any tree works a further check should be made with the Local Planning Authority to see if the trees are covered by a Tree Preservation Order or if they are within a Conservation Area (unless such works are approved by planning permission). If either applies, then statutory permission is required before any works can take place.
- 3.1.3 When appointing a tree surgeon, only properly qualified and experienced companies should be used, who have adequate Public Liability and Employer's Liability Insurance. All tree work should be carried out according to British Standard 3998:2010 *Tree Work - Recommendations*.

### 3.2 Tree Survey Results

- 3.2.1 The tree survey revealed 23 items of woody vegetation, comprised of 20 individual trees and 3 groups of trees or shrubs or hedges.
- 3.2.2 Of the surveyed trees: 2 trees are retention category 'B', and the remaining 21 trees and groups are retention category 'C' (explanatory details regarding the retention categories are included within Appendix 3).
- 3.2.3 The significant tree cover within the site consists of individual trees situated close to the boundary lines and along the southern edge of the main driveway.
- 3.2.4 Species diversity at the site is fair, with several Cherry, Sycamore, Hawthorn, Sorbus and Lawson Cypress and the occasional Elder, Robinia, Horse Chestnut, Birch and Ash. The site has a good age diversity with a mix of semi-mature and early-mature trees and the occasional mature tree.
- 3.2.5 The site's most significant tree is the mature Horse Chestnut, T1. The tree is in a relatively good condition and is relatively visually prominent, providing moderate amenity value. It has been heavily pruned in the past; however, it appears to have tolerated this work, and has good reactionary growth and now has a well-developed crown.

- 3.2.6 Situated in an inaccessible area near the southern boundary of the site, is an early mature Sycamore, T16. Limited access prevented a detailed inspection yet in general the tree appeared in fair condition and was taller than the surrounding trees. Due to the limited access, the measurements, condition values and retention category is indicative only.
- 3.2.7 Situated to the north of the site in adjacent land are three Swedish Whitebeams T4, T5 and T6. These trees are visible from the adjacent Doncaster Road, providing moderate collective value and some screening between the site and the adjacent roadside.
- 3.2.8 In the front garden area to the north of the existing dwelling are two semi-mature Sycamores T7 and T8. While not particularly noteworthy, the trees are relatively prominent, with no major visible defects.
- 3.2.9 The central areas of the site contain a variety of low value trees, G10 to T23. Many of these are situated close to and against walls or fences within the site and have been damaged by the structures, limiting their longer-term value.
- 3.2.10 Some trees were covered in dense Ivy or were inaccessible (as detailed in Appendix 4) in such cases measurements were estimated and the condition values are indicative only.
- 3.2.11 The tree Root Protection Area (RPA) detailed on the Tree Constraints Plan at Appendix 5, has been used as a layout design tool, to inform on the area around a tree where the protection of the roots and soil structure is treated as a priority.
- 3.2.12 Some lower value tree, hedge and shrub groups do not have RPAs detailed on tree plans. The detailed extent and spread of the low value groups, in conjunction with the tree schedule, is sufficient to assess the associated potential constraints.
- 3.2.13 The RPA for each tree has been plotted as a polygon centred on the base of the stem. Due to the presence of roads, structures, topography (and past tree management) the RPA is likely to be a simplified representation of the tree roots actual morphology and disposition. However, detailed modifications to the shape of the RPA would largely be based on conjecture and so have been avoided.

## 4. Arboricultural Impact Assessment

### 4.1 Proposed New Development

4.1.1 It is proposed to build 5 new residential dwellings with associated landscaping, access and facilities. The development proposals have been provided by my client and inform this arboricultural impact assessment and the Tree Impacts Plan at Appendix 6.

### 4.2 Direct Impacts

4.2.1 From assessing the new development proposals, most trees and groups within the site will require removal as they are situated in the footprint of the structures or their retention and protection throughout the development is not suitable. The trees that require removal are T1, T2, T3, T7 to T15 and T17 to T23.

4.2.2 Most of these trees are of low value, many with significant defects that are likely to limit their longer-term prospects. However, there will be a moderate loss of amenity value from the tree removals in the short term.

4.2.3 The implementation of an appropriate planting scheme throughout the site once construction has been completed could largely mitigate for the required tree removals in the longer term.

### 4.3 Indirect Impacts

4.3.1 The tree Root Protection Area (RPA) detailed on the Tree Constraints Plan at Appendix 5, has been used as a layout design tool, to inform on the area around a tree where the protection of the roots and soil structure is treated as a priority.

4.3.2 The RPA of the adjacent trees T4 and T5 encroaches close to into the site, however these trees should remain unaffected by the development provided that the current hard surface within the RPA is retained intact and care is taken throughout the demolition and construction works.

4.3.3 New car parking spaces are proposed that encroach into the RPA of T16. The construction of hard surfaces within the RPA can have negative impacts on tree roots. However, the potential negative impacts can often be overcome or minimised by employing a 'no-dig' type construction methods with a porous final surface.

- 4.3.4 The design of the new development has considered the trees crown position in relation to the dwellings. Some shade from trees may be beneficial. In particular, deciduous trees give shade in summer but allow access to sunlight in winter. However, the design proposals avoid excessive shading, and give adequate provision for future tree growth.
- 4.3.5 The buildability of the proposed development has been assessed in terms of access, adequate working space and provision for the storage of materials, including topsoil, in relation to the trees.

#### **4.4 Suitable Mitigation**

- 4.4.1 The development of the site provides an excellent opportunity to undertake substantial new tree planting throughout the site as part of a soft landscaping scheme. As such, suitable planting has the potential to mitigate for the required tree removals and, in the longer term, has the potential to improve the sites tree cover.
- 4.4.2 The removal of all significant trees within the site will result in a blank slate for any new planting scheme. Trees and shrubs can therefore be selected that are appropriate to the site and in keeping with the surrounding landscape character.

#### **4.5 Protection of the Retained Trees**

- 4.5.1 The retained trees will require protection by fencing in accordance with BS 5837: 2012, during the development phase.
- 4.5.2 An associated Arboricultural Method Statement detailing protective fencing specifications and construction methods close to the retained trees can be provided.

## 5. Signature

I trust this report provides all the required information.

Signed



.....  
**Adam Winson**, Chartered Arboriculturist, MSc, BSc (Hons), MICFor, ACIEEM.

**20<sup>th</sup> May 2019**

**AWA Tree Consultants Limited  
Union Forge  
27 Mowbray Street  
Sheffield  
S3 8EN**

[www.awatrees.com](http://www.awatrees.com)



Institute of  
Chartered Foresters  
Registered Consultant

# Appendices

**Appendix 1: Authors Qualifications and Experience**

**Appendix 2: Survey Methodology and Limitations**

**Appendix 3: Explanation of Tree Descriptions**

**Appendix 4: Tree Data**

**Appendix 5: Tree Constraints Plan**

**Appendix 6: Tree Impacts Plan**

## Appendix 1: Authors Qualifications & Experience

**Mr Adam Winson** *Chartered Arboriculturist, MSc, BSc (Hons), MICFor, MArborA, ACIEEM, QTRA Registered.*

Adam is the company Director and Principle Consultant. He has a mix of the highest level academic qualifications and relevant work experience. He has worked within the tree care profession for over 20 years, and was awarded an MSc in Arboriculture and Urban Forestry, with distinction. Adam is a Chartered Arboriculturist and a Registered Consultant with the Institute of Chartered Foresters, a Professional Member of the Arboricultural Association and has original research published by the UK Forestry Commission. His work ranges from individual expert tree inspections to managing trees on major multimillion pound housing developments and infrastructure projects. His work often involves trees with preservation orders or litigation, and he has appeared as a tree expert, at planning appeal hearings up to the Crown Court.

**Mr James Brown** *BSc (Hons) Arboriculture, MArborA.*

James has a BSc (Hons) in Arboriculture, attaining first class honours, as well as being awarded the Institute of Chartered Forester's Student award. He is a Professional Member of the Arboricultural Association and an Associate of the Institute of Chartered Foresters. James previously worked in Europe's largest tree nursery and has experience of Local Authority tree officer work. His main work consists of tree surveys for development projects and preparing Tree Protection Schemes to BS 5837:2012.

**Mr Dave Farmer** *FdSc (Arb), MArborA, PTI (Lantra).*

Dave has a Foundation Degree in Arboriculture (with Distinction) and is qualified in Professional Tree Inspection. He is a Professional Member of the Arboricultural Association and an Associate of the Institute of Chartered Foresters. Dave has many years of experience within the tree care profession, including lecturing in arboriculture. His work focuses on diagnosing potential tree risk problems, and recommending appropriate treatments and work programmes.

**Dr Felicity Stout** *Ph.D, MA, BA (Hons), Cert Ed (Forestry), TechArborA.*

Felicity has worked in the tree care profession for the last 10 years. She has a Certificate in Higher Education in Forestry, with a focus on Urban Forestry. She has practical arboricultural contractor experience and is a qualified and experienced Social Forestry practitioner. Felicity has a PhD in History, with a particular interest in the history of woodland and tree management and has published in The Arboricultural Journal on this subject.

**Mr Patrick Rowntree.** *Arboricultural Technician. Cert Arb L3. TechArborA.*

*Patrick is a trained arborist with 5 years of experience in the private and commercial sectors, both in the UK and New Zealand. Formerly a professional rugby player, Patrick was awarded a distinction in the Extended Diploma in Forestry & Arboriculture and is a technician Member of the Arboricultural Association. Patrick now uses his experience at AWA focusing on BS5837:2012 tree surveys for development projects; this involves accurate tree data collection and the preparation of tree reports to BS 5837:2012.*

## Appendix 2: Survey Methodology and Limitations of Report

The survey was undertaken in accordance with British Standard 5837:2012 *Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations*. The trees were assessed objectively and without reference to any proposed site layout. The trees were surveyed from the ground using 'Visual Tree Assessment' (VTA) methodology. VTA is appropriate and is endorsed by industry guidance. It is used by arboriculturists to evaluate the structural integrity of a tree, relying on observation of trees biomechanical and physiological features. Measurements are obtained using a diameter tape, clinometer, laser distometer and loggers tape. Where this is not practical measurements are estimated. Tree groups have been identified in instances as defined in BS 5837:2012. Shrubs and insignificant trees may have been omitted from the survey.

This report represents a BS5837 tree survey and should not be accepted as a detailed tree safety inspection report; however, tree related hazards are recorded and commented upon where observed, yet no guarantee can be given as to the absolute safety or otherwise of any individual tree. All recommended tree work must be to BS 3998:2010 - '*Tree Work: Recommendations*'.

The findings and recommendations contained within this report are valid for a period of twelve months from the date of survey. The author shall not be responsible for events which happen after this time due to factors which were not apparent at the time, and the acceptance of this report constitutes an agreement with these guidelines and terms.

## Appendix 3: Explanation of Tree Descriptions

**HEIGHT** of the tree is measured from the stem base in metres. Where the ground has a significant slope the higher ground is selected.

**CROWN HEIGHT** is an indication of the average height at which the crown begins and includes information of the first significant branch and direction of growth.

**STEM DIAMETER** is measured at 1.5 metres above (higher) ground level. Where the tree is multi-stemmed at this point; the diameter is measured close to ground level or else a combined stem diameter is calculated.

**CROWN SPREAD** is measured from the centre of the stem base to the tips of the branches in all four cardinal points.

**AGE CLASS** of the tree is described as young, semi-mature, early-mature, mature, or over-mature.

**PHYSIOLOGICAL CONDITION** is classed as good, fair, poor, or dead. This is an indication of the health of the tree and takes into account vigour, presence of disease and dieback.

**STRUCTURAL CONDITION** is classed as good, fair or poor. This is an indication of the structural integrity of the tree and takes into account significant wounds, decay and quality of branch junctions.

**LIFE EXPECTANCY** is classed as; less than 10 years, 10-20 years, 20-40 years, or more than 40 years. This is an indication of the number of years before removal of the tree is likely to be required.

### Retention Categories

**A (marked green on Appendix 5) = retention most desirable.** These trees are of very high quality and value with a good life expectancy.

**B (marked in blue on Appendix 5) = retention desirable.** These trees are of good quality and value with a significant life expectancy.

**C (marked in grey on Appendix 5) = trees which could be retained.** These trees are of low or average quality and value, and are in adequate condition to remain until new planting could be established.

**U (marked in red on Appendix 5) = trees for removal.** These trees are in such a condition that any existing value would be lost within 10 years.

TREE DATA

Tree Species		Measurements						Crown (m)				Tree Condition							Value		Management	
Tree ID	Common Name	Latin Name	Maturity	Height (m)	Stems	Stem Dia (mm)	Estimated	Ave Height	N	E	S	W	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Physiological	Structural	Life Expectancy	Amenity	Category	Works
T1	Horse Chestnut	<i>Aesculus hippocastanum</i>	Mature	15	2	460 580	No	2	3.5	5	5	3.5	Ground level changes, Soil compaction	Twin stemmed at 1m, Vertical, Old pruning wounds, Stubs, Epicormic growths, Minor cavities	Normal, Minor deadwood	Previously topped at 8m. Several minor cavities from old pruning wounds.	Fair	Fair	>40 yrs	Moderate	B	Removal required to facilitate development.
T2	Cherry	<i>Prunus sp.</i>	Early-mature	10	1	370	No	2.5	3	5	2.5	4.5	No visual defects	Multiple stemmed at 1.5m, Vertical, Old pruning wounds, Stubs, Epicormic growths, Bark damage, Tight union, Minor cavities	Minor dieback, Minor deadwood	Large elder pressing against stem and growing through crown. Phone line passes through crown.	Fair	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Moderate	C	Removal required to facilitate development.
T3	Cherry	<i>Prunus sp.</i>	Early-mature	9	1	320	No	2.5	4.5	4	2	4	No visual defects	Multiple stemmed at 1.5m, Vertical, Old pruning wounds, Stubs, Epicormic growths, Bark damage, Minor cavities	Normal, Minor deadwood	Heavily pruned in the past. Crown full of creepers.	Fair	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	Removal required to facilitate development.
T4	Swedish Whitebeam	<i>Sorbus intermedia</i>	Early-mature	8.5	1	330	No	2	3	4.5	3	3.5	No visual defects, Exposed roots	Single stemmed, Vertical, Old pruning wounds, Tight union	Normal	Situated in adjacent land.	Good	Good	>40 yrs	Moderate	C	No works required.
T5	Swedish Whitebeam	<i>Sorbus intermedia</i>	Semi-mature	9.5	1	240	No	2	2.5	3	2.5	3	No visual defects	Twin stemmed at 2m, Vertical, Old pruning wounds, Stubs	Normal, Minor deadwood	Situated in adjacent land.	Fair	Good	>40 yrs	Moderate	C	No works required.

Tree Species			Measurements					Crown (m)				Tree Condition							Value		Management	
Tree ID	Common Name	Latin Name	Maturity	Height (m)	Stems	Stem Dia (mm)	Estimated	Ave Height	N	E	S	W	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Physiological	Structural	Life Expectancy	Amenity	Category	Works
T6	Swedish Whitebeam	<i>Sorbus intermedia</i>	Early-mature	10	1	380	No	2	3.5	2	1	4.5	Exposed roots, Root damage / loss	Single stemmed, Vertical, Old pruning wounds, Ivy covered	Unbalanced, Minor deadwood	Situated in adjacent land. Minor damage to exposed roots near base. Unbalanced crown due to recently removed trees to east.	Fair	Fair	>40 yrs	Low	C	No works required.
T7	Sycamore	<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	Semi-mature	14	2	300 290	No	3.5	5	3	4.5	3.5	No visual defects	Twin stemmed at base, Vertical, Old pruning wounds, Stubs, Tight union	Normal, Minor deadwood	Surrounded by dense low brambles & nettles.	Good	Fair	>40 yrs	Moderate	C	Removal required to facilitate development.
T8	Sycamore	<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	Semi-mature	12	1	360	No	5	5	4	4.5	4	No visual defects	Single stemmed, Vertical, Old pruning wounds	Normal, Minor deadwood	Small elder shrubs at base.	Good	Good	>40 yrs	Moderate	C	Removal required to facilitate development.
G9	Elder	<i>Sambucus nigra</i>	Semi-mature	6	3	110 110 90	No	3	2.5	2.5	1.5	1.5	Ground level changes, Adjacent ground works	Multiple stemmed, Significant lean, Old pruning wounds, Bark damage, Tight union	Small / sparse, Minor dieback, Minor deadwood	Growing in a narrow strip of land full of building waste. Some stems have been recently removed near the base.	Fair	Poor	10 to 20 yrs	Low	C	Removal required to facilitate development.
G10	Leyland Cypress	<i>X Cuprocyparis leylandii</i>	Semi-mature	11	10+	140 avg	No	1.5	See plan.				No visual defects, Adjacent ground works	Single stemmed, Vertical	Normal, Minor deadwood	Unmanaged boundary hedge, situated in adjacent land.	Good	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Moderate	C	Removal required to facilitate development.

Tree ID	Tree Species		Measurements					Crown (m)				Tree Condition						Value		Management		
	Common Name	Latin Name	Maturity	Height (m)	Stems	Stem Dia (mm)	Estimated	Ave Height	N	E	S	W	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Physiological	Structural	Life Expectancy	Amenity	Category	Works
T11	Hawthorn	<i>Crataegus monogyna</i>	Semi-mature	8	2	190 110	No	2	2	3	2.5	2	No visual defects, Adjacent ground works	Twin stemmed at base, Slight lean, Old pruning wounds, Bark damage, Tight union	Normal, Minor deadwood	Large elder growing against stem and through crown. Fence causing minor stem damage from base up to 3m.	Fair	Fair	>40 yrs	Low	C	Removal required to facilitate development.
T12	Hawthorn	<i>Crataegus monogyna</i>	Semi-mature	8	2	160 140	No	2	1.5	3	2	2.5	No visual defects, Adjacent ground works	Twin stemmed at base, Vertical, Old pruning wounds, Stubs, Ivy covered, Bark damage, Tight union	Ivy in crown, Minor deadwood	Dense ivy preventing detailed inspection of north-west stem. Fence causing stem damage from base to 2m.	Fair	Fair	>40 yrs	Low	C	Removal required to facilitate development.
T13	Ash	<i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>	Semi-mature	11	1	240	No	5	3.5	3	3.5	3.5	No visual defects, Adjacent ground works	Single stemmed, Vertical, Bark damage, Old pruning wounds, Stubs	Normal, Minor deadwood	Rubble piled at base.	Good	Fair	>40 yrs	Moderate	C	Removal required to facilitate development.
T14	Hawthorn	<i>Crataegus monogyna</i>	Semi-mature	7.5	2	160 80	No	2	3	3	0.5	2.5	Ground level changes, Adjacent ground works	Twin stemmed at base, Slight lean, Old pruning wounds, Ivy covered	Ivy in crown, Minor deadwood	Ivy preventing detailed inspection of southern stem. Fence causing stem damage from base to 1.5m.	Fair	Fair	>40 yrs	Low	C	Removal required to facilitate development.
G15	Robinia	<i>Robinia pseudoacacia</i>	Semi-mature	12	10+	120	Yes	3	See plan.				No visual defects, Limited access around base	Multiple stemmed at base, Slight lean, Old pruning wounds, Bark damage, Tight union	Normal, Minor deadwood	Fire damage to northern stems.	Good	Fair	>40 yrs	Moderate	C	Removal required to facilitate development.

## TREE DATA

Tree Species			Measurements					Crown (m)				Tree Condition							Value		Management	
Tree ID	Common Name	Latin Name	Maturity	Height (m)	Stems	Stem Dia (mm)	Estimated	Ave Height	N	E	S	W	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Physiological	Structural	Life Expectancy	Amenity	Category	Works
T16	Sycamore	<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	Early-mature	15	3	280 240 210	Yes	2	3	4	4	4	No visual defects, Limited access around base	Multiple stemmed at base, Vertical, Old pruning wounds, Ivy covered, Tight union	Normal, Minor deadwood	Situated in adjacent property. Inaccessible & Ivy prevented detailed inspection.	Good	Fair	>40 yrs	Moderate	B	No works required.
T17	Elder	<i>Sambucus nigra</i>	Semi-mature	7	7	100 avg	Yes	1.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	No visual defects, Limited access around base	Multiple stemmed at base, Vertical, Old pruning wounds, Stubs, Tight union	Minor dieback, Minor deadwood		Fair	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	Removal required to facilitate development.
T18	Plum	<i>Prunus cerasifera</i>	Early-mature	10	3	230 220 180	Yes	2.5	4.5	5.5	3.5	3.5	No visual defects, Limited access around base	Multiple stemmed at base, Slight lean, Old pruning wounds, Epicormic growths, Bark damage, Ivy covered	Minor dieback, Minor deadwood	Growing against wall. Fence and barbed wire damaging lower stem. Dense ivy preventing detailed inspection of 2 southern stems.	Fair	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	Removal required to facilitate development.
T19	Robinia	<i>Robinia pseudoacacia</i>	Semi-mature	12	4	300 240 190 180	Yes	4	4	6	5	5	No visual defects, Limited access around base	Multiple stemmed at 1m, Vertical, Old pruning wounds, Stubs, Bark damage, Ivy covered	Ivy in crown, Minor dieback, Minor deadwood	Growing against brick wall. Ivy preventing detailed inspection.	Fair	Fair	10 to 20 yrs	Low	C	Removal required to facilitate development.
T20	Birch	<i>Betula pendula</i>	Semi-mature	14	1	220	Yes	7	3	3	2.5	2	No visual defects, Limited access around base	Twin stemmed at 2.5m, Vertical, Bark damage, Ivy covered	Small / sparse, Minor dieback, Moderate deadwood, Ivy in crown	Ivy preventing detailed inspection.	Fair	Fair	10 to 20 yrs	Low	C	Removal required to facilitate development.

TREE DATA

Tree Species		Measurements						Crown (m)				Tree Condition							Value		Management	
Tree ID	Common Name	Latin Name	Maturity	Height (m)	Stems	Stem Dia (mm)	Estimated	Ave Height	N	E	S	W	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Physiological	Structural	Life Expectancy	Amenity	Category	Works
T21	Birch	<i>Betula pendula</i>	Semi-mature	15	1	270	No	4	3	3.5	4	2.5	No visual defects, Limited access around base	Single stemmed, Vertical, Stubs, Ivy covered	Normal, Minor deadwood	Young Hawthorn at base.	Good	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Moderate	C	Removal required to facilitate development.
T22	Sycamore	<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	Semi-mature	14	1	270	No	4	4	2	4	3	No visual defects, Limited access around base	Single stemmed, Vertical, Old pruning wounds, Bark damage	Unbalanced, Minor deadwood	Barbed wire causing stem damage at 1m.	Good	Good	>40 yrs	Moderate	C	Removal required to facilitate development.
T23	Plum	<i>Prunus cerasifera</i>	Semi-mature	8.5	1	240	No	2.5	2.5	3	3	2	No visual defects, Limited access around base	Twin stemmed at 2m, Vertical, Old pruning wounds, Epicormic growths	Minor dieback, Minor deadwood	Holly at base. Eastern crown full of creepers.	Fair	Good	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	Removal required to facilitate development.



**Appendix 5:  
Tree Constraints Plan**  
347 Doncaster Road, Barnsley, S70 3PH  
Ref: AWA2688

BRITISH STANDARD 5837:2012  
RETENTION CATEGORIES  
Definitions of these categories can be found in Appendix 2 of the report.

SCALE: 1:200 PAPER: A2

	CATEGORY A: HIGH VALUE RETENTION MOST DESIRABLE
	CATEGORY B: MODERATE VALUE RETENTION DESIRABLE
	CATEGORY C: LOWER VALUE COULD BE RETAINED
	CATEGORY U: FOR REMOVAL
	RPA: ROOT PROTECTION AREA
	TREE STEM



  
**Appendix 6:**  
**Tree Impacts Plan**  
 347 Doncaster Road, Barnsley S70 3PH  
 Ref: AWA2688  
 BRITISH STANDARD 5837:2012  
 SCALE: 1:200 PAPER: A2

	TREE/HEDGE TO BE RETAINED
	TREE/HEDGE TO BE REMOVED
	RPA: ROOT PROTECTION AREA
	TREE STEM