ARBORICULTURAL SURVEY
to BS 5837:2005
at

Green Road
Dodworth
Barnsley

Client:
Adrian Wilkinson

Client Address:
Green Road
Dodworth, Barnsley
S75 3RR

Client Telephone:
07733227840

My Ref:
8631/SF

Contents

Contents 3
1. Introduction 5
1.1 Purpose of the Report 5
1.2 Terms of Reference 5
1.3 Scope of the Report 5
1.4 Survey details 5
2. Site Description 6
2.1 Land Use 6
2.2 Topography 6
2.3 Treescape 6
2.4 Amenity Value 6
2.5 Age Class Mix 6
2.6 Species Diversity 6
3. Explanation of Tree Descriptions 7
3.1 Measurements 7
3.2 Evaluations 7
3.3 Retention Categories 7
4. Status of the Trees 9
5. Tree Descriptions and Recommendations 9
6. Discussion 10
6.1 Tree Condition & Recommended Works 10
6.2 Potential for Development 11
6.3 General Development Advice 12
7. Conclusion 14
Appendix 1: Tree Descriptions and Recommendations 16
Appendix 2: Glossary of Terms & Abbreviations 17
Appendix 3: The Author's Qualifications 18
Appendix 4: General Guidelines 19
Appendix 5: Site Plan 20

© JCA Limited 2008

1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose of the Report

1.1.1 A report is needed at the above location to give detailed, independent, arboricultural advice on the trees present, in the particular context of potential development.

1.2 Terms of Reference

1.2.1 I am instructed by Adrian Wilkinson to visit the site and prepare my findings in a report.

1.2.2 For this purpose I have been supplied with a topographical survey; Drawing No: BM2005/1.

1.3 Scope of the Report

1.3.1 This report is compiled in accordance with *BS 5837:2005 Trees in relation to construction.* The specific design of any proposed development is not generally taken into account at this stage.

1.3.2 Preliminary recommendations are given with a view to safety and the long-term management of a sustainable tree cover.

1.3.3 All trees within the site boundary with a stem diameter above 75mm are included.

1.3.4 Where applicable smaller trees and significant shrub masses are included.

1.3.5 Where applicable trees outside the site boundary, but close enough to be affected by development, are included.

1.4 Survey details

1.4.1 The survey took place the 30th of June 2008, with an additional visit on the 3rd of October 2008.

1.4.2 The survey was conducted by Simona Ferutta.

1.4.3 Inspection was made at ground level. Further investigation, such as climbed inspections or decay detection surveys, may be recommended where appropriate.

1.4.4 Measurements were obtained using clinometers, specialist tapes or electronic distometers. Where this was not possible measurements were estimated.

1.4.5 No digging or drilling was carried out on this occasion.

© JCA Limited 2008

2. Site Description

2.1 Land Use

2.1.1 The site is currently a mix of residential properties and neglected areas surrounded by rows and groups of trees.

2.2 Topography

2.2.1 The site generally slopes downwards from the north to the south.

2.3 Treescape

2.3.1 The trees on this site have a moderate impact on the local treescape. Attention is drawn to the group of trees on the southern stream bank which has a significant impact on the local treescape. However, this group is not within the area proposed to be developed and as such have not been surveyed in detail.

2.3.2 Surrounding the site is a semi rural residential area containing a reasonable mix of garden and field boundary trees.

2.4 Amenity Value

2.4.1 The trees on site collectively provide a reasonable amenity to the surrounding area. Occasional specimens have a high amenity value.

2.5 Age Class Mix

2.5.1 The trees surveyed ranged in age from young to mature. However the trees were predominantly early-mature.

2.6 Species Diversity

2.6.1 Species surveyed include Sycamore, Ash, Horse Chestnut, Goat Willow and fruit trees. The predominant species were Sycamore and Ash. Other species being occasional, or even single, specimens.

© JCA Limited 2008

3. Explanation of Tree Descriptions

3.1 Measurements

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

3.1.2 *CROWN HEIGHT* is an indication of the average height at which the main crown begins

3.1.3 *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, just above the root buttress.

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

3.2 Evaluations

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

3.2.2 *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.

3.2.3 *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.

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

3.3 Retention Categories

3.3.1 *RETENTION CATEGORY* values for the trees are as follows:

3.3.2 ***A (marked green on the plan) = retention most desirable***
These trees are of high quality and value with a good life expectancy. They may be further sub-divided as follows:

Ai) Particularly good examples; perhaps rare or unusual species, or forming an essential part of arboricultural features e.g. avenues;

© JCA Limited 2008

Aii) Groups of trees having a significant landscape impact or with excellent screening properties, or those softening the effect of existing structures;

Aiii) Those having significant conservation or historical value e.g. veteran trees.

3.3.3 ***B (marked in blue on the plan) = retention desirable***

These trees are of moderate quality and value with a significant life expectancy. They may be further sub-divided as follows:

Bi) Trees that might be included in the high category but because of their numbers or slightly impaired condition, are downgraded in favour of the better individuals;

Bii) Groups of trees forming distinct landscape features, thereby attracting a higher collective rating than they might as individuals;

Biii) Trees with clearly identifiable conservation or other cultural benefits.

3.3.4 ***C (marked in grey on the plan) = trees which could be retained***

These trees are of low quality and value, and are in adequate condition to remain until new planting could be established. They may be further sub-divided as follows:

Ci) Trees not qualifying in higher categories;

Cii) Groups of trees which do not form a distinct landscape feature;

Ciii) Trees with very limited conservation or other cultural benefits.

3.3.5 ***R (marked in red on the plan) = trees for removal***

These trees are in such a condition that any existing value would be lost within 10 years. This may be due to any of the following:

i) Failure is likely due to serious, irredeemable, structural defects;

ii) Removal of other category R trees will render them exposed and unstable;

iii) They are in serious, overall decline or are dead;

iv) They are of low quality and suppressing adjacent trees of better quality;

v) Diseases are present which may affect the health of adjacent trees.

These trees should be removed or treated in such a way as to make them safe where they have high ecological value, such as in a woodland setting.

© JCA Limited 2008

4. Status of the Trees

4.1 A check was made on June 2008 with: Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council.

We are informed that there are five Tree Preservation Orders in force on this site which date from 1974 to 2004. The TPOs affect many of the trees within the area surveyed.

Before any work is organised, all the necessary steps to get the permission of the Local Planning Authority should be taken.

No work should be done to any trees until this permission has been granted.

4.2 Due to the large potential penalties for illegally carrying out work to protected trees, JCA recommend that a further check is carried out prior to any works being undertaken. We are able to arrange this and to organise and supervise professional contractors.

5. Tree Descriptions and Recommendations

5.1 Full details of all individual trees surveyed are recorded in the tables at Appendix 1. Please refer also to the attached plan at Appendix 5 and Section 3 above, for a full explanation of the tables and plan.

© JCA Limited 2008

6. Discussion

6.1 Tree Condition & Recommended Works

6.1.1 In total 20 items of vegetation were surveyed. They were generally found to be in good to fair condition. On this site 4 items were identified as retention category 'A', 2 items were identified as retention category 'B', 13 items were identified as retention category 'C' and 1 was retention category 'R'. See section 3.3 for an explanation of these terms.

6.1.1.1 In order to understand the relationship between the TPOs in force on the site and the items surveyed the following table has been attached:

SURVEY ITEM	TPO INCLUDED	TPO NUMBER
A1	TPO 7/1996	T1 to T16
A4	TPO 16/1974	Area A2
T5	TPO 9/1995	T2
G6	TPO 9/1995	T1
G6	TPO 7/1996	T1
G7	TPO 9/1995	Group G1
G8	TPO 7/1974	Area A1
G9	TPO 7/1974	Area A1

6.1.2 In order to get a general overview I have divided the trees as follows for the purpose of this discussion:

6.1.2.1 The older trees that have no specific defects, as described in Appendix 1. These include area **A1**. It has been recommended that Ivy is removed from the individuals within the groups and they are re-inspected for defects once this has occurred. This work is detailed in Appendix 1.

6.1.2.2 The thinning of poorer trees within **A4** will allow specimens of a good form to develop healthy crowns and should be undertaken as part of general woodland management for this area.

6.1.2.3 **T13** is dead and is thus recommended for removal; however, if the access to the tree is limited it may not require removal as a priority.

6.1.2.4 Several trees within **G8** and **G9** showed signs of Bleeding Canker of Horse Chestnut, a potentially fatal bacterial pathogen, these trees should be monitored closely for signs of further decline.

6.1.2.5 Those trees which overhang public footpaths and public highways within groups **G8** and **G9**, as described in Appendix 1, shall require future maintenance in order to maintain clearance heights for vehicular and pedestrian traffic. These heights should be 5.6m above a road and 2.5m above a footpath.

© JCA Limited 2008

6.2 Potential for Development

6.2.1 Whilst unaware of the details of the proposed development, the following comments can be made about the site in terms of its suitability for development:

6.2.2 The Root Protection Areas RPA's marked on the plan at Appendix 5 represent the desired rooting zone which should not be disturbed. The development should be designed in order to avoid the RPA's of trees to be retained.

6.2.3 The majority of trees recommended for retention are situated close to the site boundary or along a middle slant line north-west to south-east. This offers a potential window for development within the two centres of the site.

6.2.4 There are a number of high amenity trees within this site. They will enhance any proposed development and care should be taken at the design stages to ensure that these trees are retained. The highest amenity to the site is offered by the outer veteran trees which stand on the opposite stream bank.

6.2.5 The previous management has been poor and any proposed development would benefit from a landscaping scheme which introduces active tree management.

6.2.6 All development work carried out in close proximity to trees should be done so in a manner sympathetic to their needs. Otherwise the condition of the trees may deteriorate in the months and years following the development, leading to a loss of amenity and potentially hazardous trees.

6.2.7 Any proposed development should be accompanied by an Arboricultural Method Statement detailing the specific protection measures necessary for each tree or group of trees. This should specify fencing standard and positions, acceptable construction techniques, necessary tree works and the potential damage caused by demolition, soil stripping, and provision of services.

© JCA Limited 2008

6.3 General Development Advice

6.3.1 All development work to be carried out within close proximity of the retained trees should be done so in a manner sympathetic to their needs. Failing to do so could seriously affect the health and condition of the trees and may even result in tree death.

6.3.2 Root Protection Areas (RPAs) have been plotted around each tree (see the attached plan at Appendix 5). The RPAs are generally represented by a circle with the tree located at the centre.

6.3.3 It should be noted due to the presence of existing features such as roads, buildings and retaining walls, the shape of some RPA's on the site plan have been changed from a circle to give a more realistic representation of rooting patterns.

6.3.4 The RPAs represent the likely rooting zone of a tree, which should ideally remain undisturbed. The development should therefore be designed so that new structures, such as buildings, driveways, car parking spaces and paths, are positioned outside the RPAs of those trees which are to be retained.

6.3.5 On some occasions it may be possible to construct new buildings upon mini/narrow pile and beam foundations. This could allow new buildings to be constructed within the RPAs of trees without being detrimental to their long term health. A structural engineer should be consulted on the potential to use pile and beam foundations on this site prior to any plans being drawn.

6.3.6 In addition to the roots, the position of any new structure should take into account tree canopies. Adequate clearance between new structures and the canopies is required in order to avoid conflict in the future. This could be achieved by crown lifting or re-shaping the crowns of the trees or possibly by angling the roof pitch to accommodate the trees.

6.3.7 Before positioning new structures beneath the canopies of trees, consideration should be made to the potential nuisances which may arise as a result of this (e.g. dripping sap or leaf litter blocking gutters). Where buildings are to be constructed beneath the canopies of trees, controlled overflow gutters should be considered.

6.3.8 The shade that will be cast by the retained trees must also be considered when positioning new buildings. Where buildings are to be positioned within the shade cast area of trees, these should be designed in order to maximise light levels by utilising, for example, dual aspect windows, sky lights or by maximising the number and size of windows or patio doors.

6.3.9 Where possible, ground levels should not be significantly altered within the RPA of any retained tree, as this can be detrimental to their health. Raising the ground level can cause a reduction in the oxygen supply to the roots and can slow down the rate of gas

© JCA Limited 2008

exchange between the roots and the air in the soil pore space. Lowering ground levels often results in root severance or exposes roots to the air and reduces the supply of nutrients and moisture available to the roots. If ground levels do need to be altered, then this must be carried out in a sympathetic manner using specialist construction methods and materials.

6.3.10 A tree planting scheme should be considered for any proposed development scheme that will require the removal of existing vegetation. Also, when young trees require removal, in order to facilitate the proposed development, consideration should first be made as to whether it may be possible for these to be transplanted and relocated elsewhere on site instead.

6.3.11 In order to ensure the protection of the trees throughout the development, a detailed method statement is recommended. This method statement would detail tree root protection areas and the positions of protective fencing, service runs, site access and storage, specifications for special hard surfacing and a timetable of events relating to the procedures. Failure to adhere to such procedures will greatly reduce the life expectancy of the surveyed trees. A detailed Method Statement is frequently required by the local authority before planning permission is granted.

© JCA Limited 2008

7. Conclusion

7.1 The trees surveyed were generally found to be in fair and good condition.

7.2 One single tree and some trees within the groups have been recommended for removal. These are discussed in Section 6 and detailed in Appendix 1.

7.3 Some works were recommended for reasons of public safety and to ensure the long term health of the trees. These are summarised in Section 6 and detailed in Appendix 1.

7.4 It is recommended JCA provide a comprehensive Method Statement in order to ensure the continued health of trees throughout the proposed development. JCA are also able to provide planting schemes, organise and supervise tree works, and if necessary undertake climbed inspections and decay detection analysis.

© JCA Limited 2008

Appendix 1: Tree Descriptions and Recommendations

© JCA Limited 2008

Ref No.	Age & Species & *Latin Name*	Height (m)	Crown Height (m)	Stem or Cat. Diameter (cm)	Crown Spread N W E S	Observations	Recommendations	Physio-logical Condition & Structural Condition	Amenity Value	Life Expectancy (yrs)	Retention Category.
A1	Early-mature Ash, Sycamore *Fraxinus excelsior* *Acer pseudoplatanus*	9 to 13	2 to 6	10 to 40	See plan	Group of trees under TPO 7/1996 (named T2 to T16 in the Order). Single stemmed and vertical with a balanced crown. No evidence of significant pruning. No major visible defects, but suffering because of ivy. High shrubs (Elder, *Sambucus nigra*, and Hawthorn, *Crataegus monogyna*), young Ash and Goat Willow (*Salix caprea*) in the under storey. Some crowns overhanging private gardens.	Thinning of the under storey, Remove Ivy	FAIR FAIR	MOD	40+	A
A2	Young to semi-mature Ash, Sycamore *Fraxinus excelsior* *Acer pseudoplatanus*	9 to 12	2 to 6	Up to 30	See plan	No TPO trees, single stemmed and vertical with a balanced crown. High shrubs (Elder, *Sambucus nigra*, and Hawthorn, *Crataegus monogyna*) underneath. Some crowns overhanging a private garden.	Thinning of the under storey, Remove Ivy	FAIR FAIR	MOD	40+	C
T3	Mature Hawthorn *Crataegus monogyna*	6	2	22	3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5	No TPO tree, single stemmed and vertical with a balanced crown. High shrubs (Elder, *Sambucus nigra*, and Hawthorn, *Crataegus monogyna*) underneath.	No action required	FAIR FAIR	MOD	40+	C
A4	Young to semi-mature Sycamore *Acer pseudoplatanus*	Up to 14	2 to 6	Up to 35	See plan	Outer trees of a bigger area adjacent the stream banks under TPO 16/1974 (part of the area named A2 in the Order). Single stemmed and vertical with a balanced crown. Shrubs (Elder, *Sambucus nigra*, and Hawthorn, *Crataegus monogyna*), young ashes and Goat Willow (*Salix caprea*) in the under storey.	Thinning of younger trees	FAIR FAIR	MOD	40+	A
T5	Mature Sycamore *Acer pseudoplatanus*	14	3	47	3.5 3.5 3.5 4	Tree under TPO 9/1995 (named T2 in the Order). Single stemmed and vertical with a balanced crown. No evidence of significant pruning. No major visible defects.	No action required	FAIR FAIR	MOD	40+	B
G6	Early-mature Sycamore, Walnut *Acer pseudoplatanus*, *Juglans regia*	9 to 11	2 to 4	30 to 45	See plan	Trees under TPO 9/1995 (Sycamore, named T1 in the Order) and TPO 7/1996 (Walnut, named T1 in the Order). Single stemmed and vertical with a balanced crown. Walnut grown through the fence. Some crowns overhanging private gardens.	No action required	GOOD GOOD	HIGH	40+	B
G7	Young to semi-mature Ash, Sycamore, Horse Chestnut *Fraxinus excelsior* *Acer pseudoplatanus* *Aesculus hippocastanum*	6 to 9	1 to 3	Up to 30	See plan	Group of young trees, some under TPO 9/1995 (one Ash, one Horse Chestnut and seven Hawthorn- *Crataegus monogyna*- within G1 in the Order) grown after the felling of the older ones. Single stemmed and vertical with a balanced crown. No evidence of significant pruning. No major visible defects. Shrubs underneath (Elder, *Sambucus nigra*, and Hawthorn). Some crowns overhanging public footpaths. Access prevented detailed inspection.	No action required	FAIR GOOD	HIGH	40+	C
G8	Mature Sycamore Horse Chestnut *Acer pseudoplatanus* *Aesculus hippocastanum*	10 to 12	3 to 5	25 to 65	See plan	Group of trees under TPO 7/1974 (area A1 in the Order). Single stemmed and vertical with a balanced crown. Pruning wound due to crown lifting. Deadwood in lower branches. Common physiological problems found on Horse Chestnut. Some crowns overhanging public footpaths.	Monitor condition Remove deadwood	FAIR GOOD	HIGH	20-40	A

Ref No.	Age & Species & *Latin Name*	Height (m)	Crown Height (m)	Stem or Cat. Diameter (cm)	Crown Spread N W E S	Observations	Recommendations	Physio-logical Condition & Structural Condition	Amenity Value	Life Expectancy (yrs)	Retention Category
G9	Mature Sycamore Horse Chestnut *Acer pseudoplatanus Aesculus hippocastanum*	10 to 12	3 to 5	50 to 75	See plan	Group of trees under TPO 7/1974 (area A1 in the Order). Single stemmed and vertical with a balanced crown. Pruning wound due to crown lifting. Common physiological problems found on Horse Chestnut. Some crowns overhanging public footpaths and a private road.	Monitor condition	FAIR GOOD	HIGH	20-40	A
G10	Mature Fruit trees *Prunus sp.*	3	1	Up to 20	See plan	Fruit trees, single stemmed and leaning with an unbalanced crown. Deadwood. Pruning wounds. Some crowns overhanging a private road.	Remove deadwood	POOR POOR	LOW	<10	C
T11	Early-mature Yew *Taxus baccata*	10	0	42 at base	1 0 3 3	Multi-stemmed at ground level with an unbalanced crown, overwhelmed by near Horse Chestnut. Minor deadwood.	Remove deadwood	POOR POOR	LOW	10-20	C
T12	Mature Hawthorn *Crataegus monogyna*	5	1.5	34	3 3 3 3	Single stemmed and vertical with a balanced crown. No evidence of significant pruning. Minor deadwood.	Remove deadwood	GOOD FAIR	MOD	10-20	B
T13	Dead - -	7	3	32	-	Dead pruned tree.	Remove if high value targets.	DEAD DEAD	DEAD	<10	R
G14	Early-mature Lawson Cypress *X Cupressocyparis leylandii*	6 to 7	0	20 at base	See plan	Single stemmed and vertical with a balanced crown. No evidence of significant pruning. No major visible defects.	No action required	GOOD GOOD	MOD	40+	C
T15	Over-mature Pear tree *Pyrus sp.*	5	2	48 at base	0 3 4 2	*Twin-stemmed at 0.5m with an unbalanced crown.* Pruning wounds.	Monitor	FAIR FAIR	MOD	<10	C
T16	Mature Apple tree *Malus sp.*	6	2	21	1 2 3 4	Single stemmed and vertical with an unbalanced crown. No evidence of significant pruning. No major visible defects.	No action required	FAIR FAIR	MOD	40+	C
T17	Early-mature Apple *Malus sp.*	4	1.5	15 to 21	See plan	Single stemmed and vertical with a balanced crown and multi-stemmed at 1.5m with a balanced crown. Pruning wounds due to crown lifting.	No action required	GOOD GOOD	MOD	20-40	C
H18	Mature Elder, Hawthorn, Sycamore *Crataegus sp Acer sp*	2.5	0	-	See plan	Mixed hedge, recently pruned.	*No action* required	GOOD GOOD	MOD	20-40	C

Ref No.	Age & Species & *Latin Name*	Height (m)	Crown Height (m)	Stem or Cat. Diameter (cm)	Crown Spread N W E S	Observations	Recommendations	Physio-logical Condition & Structural Condition	Amenity Value	Life Expectancy (yrs)	Retention Category
H19	Semi-mature Elder, Hawthorn, *Sambucus nigra Crataegus monogyna*	2.5	0	-	See plan	Mixed hedge, recently pruned.	No action required	GOOD GOOD	M O D	20-40	C
G20	Young Western Red Cedar *Thuja plicata*	4	0 to 1	Up to 10	See plan	Group of three Western Red Cedars and a Sycamore (*Acer pseudoplatanus*). Single stemmed and vertical with a balanced crown. No evidence of significant pruning. No major visible defects.	No action required	GOOD GOOD	M O D	40+	C

Appendix 2: Glossary of Terms & Abbreviations

Arboriculture	The cultivation of trees in order to produce individual specimens of the greatest ornament, for shelter or any primary purpose other than the production of timber.
Canker	Disease damaged area of a tree, usually caused by fungus or bacteria.
Co-dominant Stem	A stem which has grown in direct competition to the main stem and which has formed a substantial size influencing the appearance of the tree.
Crown Lift	The removal of the lowest branches, usually to a given height. It allows more residual light and greater clearance underneath for vehicles etc.
Crown reduce	The reduction of a tree's height or spread while preserving its natural shape.
Crown thin	The removal of some of the density of a tree's crown, usually 5-25% allowing more light through its canopy and reducing wind resistance.
Deadwood	Either dead branches, or a procedure involving the removal of dead, dying and diseased branches.
Dieback	Where branches are beginning to show signs of death usually at the tips in the crown.
Epicormic shoots	Small branches that grow in uncharacteristic clusters around the base or the stem of a tree, usually as a result of bad pruning or some other stress factor.
Formative pruning	The trimming of a tree to remove weaknesses and irregularities which may lead to problems. The formative pruning operation is aimed at reducing the potential for future weaknesses or problems within the tree's crown.
Included bark	Where the bark on two adjoining branches or stems is growing tight together, forming a joint with limited physical strength.
Pollarding	A method of tree management in which the main trunk of the tree is cut at about 4m, and the resulting branches are then cropped on a regular basis.
Remedial pruning	The removal of old stubs, deadwood, epicormic growth, rubbing or crossing branches and other unwanted items from the tree's crown. Sometimes referred to as crown cleaning.
Topping	Topping is a form of pruning that removes terminal growth leaving a 'stub' cut end. Topping causes serious health problems to a tree.

© JCA Limited 2008

Appendix 3: The Author's Qualifications

Principal Consultant and Managing Director

Jonathan Cocking *FRES PDipArb(RFS) FArborA CBiol MIBiol.* Jonathan is a Registered Consultant and Fellow of the Arboricultural Association and sits on its Professional Committee. He has 28 years experience in the arboricultural profession and served for eight years as Senior Arboriculturist with a large local authority before establishing JCA in 1997. He has since developed JCA's portfolio of services and its extensive client base. Jonathan is a Chartered Biologist and an expert witness with much experience of litigation work.

Consulting Arboriculturists

Toby Thwaites *BSc (Hons) HND (Arboriculture).* Toby joined JCA in 1998 after graduating in Ecology at the University of Huddersfield and has since graduated in Arboriculture at the University of Lancashire. Toby is a JCA team leader and manages an office of consulting arborists.

Ivan Button *NCH (Arboriculture) BSc (Hons) PGCE.* Ivan joined JCA in 2005 after nine years having managed his own landscaping and tree surgery business. He has studied at the Universities of Leeds, Lincoln and Wales and is currently working towards a degree in arboriculture at the University of Lancashire. Ivan is a JCA team leader and manages an office of consulting arborists.

Andrew Bagshaw *FD (Arboriculture).* Andrew joined JCA in 2005 having gained several years experience in tree surgery and landscaping. He is trained in aerial rescue and is JCA's principal first aid person. He is currently working towards a degree in arboriculture at the University of Lancashire.

Adam Winson *BSc (Hons) E Con, ND (Arboriculture).* Prior to working at JCA Adam has worked as a tree surgeon for eight years for a range of private companies and Sydney City Council. Adam achieved a national award for best Dissertation on the subject of Urban Greenspace Management at Sheffield Hallam University. Adam is currently working towards an MSc in Arboriculture at the University of Lancashire.

Robert Godwin *BA (Hons) Landscape Planning, ISA Certified Arborist.* Robert joined JCA having spent several years as an arboricultural consultant particularly in relation to subsidence. He also has considerable experience in landscape and arboricultural contracting. Robert is currently working towards an MSc in Arboriculture at the University of Lancashire.

Simona Ferutta *MSc Forestry and Environmental Sciences.* Simona achieved her Msc in Forestry and Environmental Sciences at the University of Turin, Italy in 1996. She has recently joined JCA after several years in forest, crops and tree care in Italy as a professional.

Arboricultural Technician

Victoria Black. Victoria has been with JCA for over 5 years building her knowledge of the arboricultural business. She is currently working towards a degree in arboriculture at the University of Lancashire.

Andrew Bussey. Andrew joined JCA having spent 12 years doing tree surgery for various private companies and a local authority. He has various NPTC qualifications and is currently studying for his Arboricultural Technicians Certificate.

Lee Major. Lee recently joined JCA having gained his RFS Certificate in Arboriculture. Lee also has two years climbing experience, working for a local tree surgeon. He is currently working towards his degree in arboriculture at the University of Lancashire.

Administrative Staff

Andrew C Parker, GM, BA (Hons), PGCE, Practice Manager
Catherine Cocking, Accounts Manager
Sue Guest, Administrative Officer
Sally Whitwam, Administrative Assistant
Yasmin Hussain, Administrative Assistant
Alec Fielden, City and Guilds 3, CAD Technician

© JCA Limited 2008

Appendix 4: General Guidelines

A4.1 All work must be to BS 3998:1989 - '*Recommendations for tree work*'.

A4.2 Staff carrying out the work must be qualified, experienced and ideally be Arboricultural Association approved contractors, and should be covered by adequate public liability insurance.

A4.3 This report is based upon a visual inspection. The consultant 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 the guidelines and the terms listed in this report.

A4.4 Any defects seen by a contractor or the employer that were not apparent to the consultant must be brought to the consultant's attention immediately.

A4.5 No liability can be accepted by the consultant in respect of the trees unless the recommendations of this report are carried out under his supervision and within his timescale.

A4.6 It is advisable to have trees inspected by an arboricultural consultant regularly. In this instance it is recommended that these inspections are made every year.

© JCA Limited 2008

Appendix 5: Site Plan

© JCA Limited 2008

I hope that this report provides all the necessary information, but should any further advice be needed please do not hesitate to contact the author.

Signed

.....

Simona Ferutta
MSc Forestry and Environmental Sciences.

23rd October 2008

For and on behalf of ***JCA Ltd***

Registered Office:

Unit 80
Bowers Mill
Branch Road
Barkisland
Halifax
HX4 OAD

Tel. 01422 376335
Fax. 01422 376232
Email: jon@jcaac.com

www.jcaac.com

Report printed on recycled paper

© JCA Limited 2008