

**ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT
to BS 5837:2012**

at

**96 Church Hill
Royston
Barnsley
South Yorkshire
S71 4NG**

Client:

James Leishman

Client Address:

96 Church Hill
Royston
Barnsley
S71 4NG

JCA Ref:

22096/ChC

JCA Limited

Arboricultural & Ecological Consultants

Contents

1. Introduction.....	3
1.1 Purpose of the Report	3
1.2 Terms of Reference	3
1.3 Scope of the Report	3
1.4 Survey Details	3
2. Tree Descriptions and Recommendations	3
3. Arboricultural Implications Assessment (AIA)	4
3.1 Proposed Development.....	4
3.2 Tree Removals for Development.....	4
3.3 Pruning for Development	4
3.4 Temporary Protection Measures.....	5
3.5 Implications for Retained Trees	5
3.6 Remedial Measures	7
4. Summary.....	8
Appendix 1: Tree Descriptions and Recommendations	10
Appendix 2: Explanation of Tree Descriptions	11
Appendix 3: General Guidelines	14
Appendix 4: Author Qualifications	15
Appendix 5: Tree Constraints Plan.....	16
Appendix 6: Arboricultural Implications Plan	17

1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose of the Report

- 1.1.1 This Arboricultural Impact Assessment has been prepared to support the current planning application at **96 Church Hill, Barnsley**.
- 1.1.2 The purpose of this report is to assess the impact of the proposed development on the existing tree stock and outline mitigation actions, where appropriate, to minimise any potential damage to retained trees.

1.2 Terms of Reference

- 1.2.1 JCA Limited has been instructed by **James Leishman** to prepare an Arboricultural Impact Assessment for the proposed scheme.
- 1.2.2 The arboricultural survey and report conforms to the most recent specifications outlined in BS 5837: 2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations.
- 1.2.3 We have been supplied with the development layout plan, which details the proposed scheme. The tree data has been overlaid onto the proposed designs to create the Arboricultural Implications Plan, which can be found at **Appendix 6**. This provides the basis for which this Arboricultural Impact Assessment has been prepared.

1.3 Scope of the Report

- 1.3.1 This report is compiled in accordance with *BS 5837:2012 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations'* and is based on an objective assessment of the existing vegetation.
- 1.3.2 The specific design of the proposed development has been considered within the Arboricultural Implication Assessment in **Section 3** and is detailed on the Arboricultural Implications Plan at **Appendix 6**.

1.4 Survey Details

- 1.4.1 The original tree survey took place during June 2024 and was conducted by **Charles Cocking FdSc (Arboriculture), MArborA**.

2. Tree Descriptions and Recommendations

- 2.1 The tree information recorded during the original survey is detailed in the tables at **Appendix 1**. A full explanation of the tables can be found at **Appendix 2**. Please refer also to the Tree Constraints Plan at **Appendix 5** for tree locations.

3. Arboricultural Implications Assessment (AIA)

3.1 Proposed Development

- 3.1.1 It is proposed to split the existing property (No. 96 Church Hill) into two, by constructing a detached dwelling in the rear garden with a private access driveway at the front.
- 3.1.2 All tree works required to accommodate the proposals are detailed in ***bold italics*** in the recommendation columns of the tables at **Appendix 1**.

3.2 Tree Removals for Development

- 3.2.1 In order to facilitate the proposed access driveway and construction of the dwelling, it will be necessary to remove **G8, T9, T10, T11, T12**, several trees from within **G14, T15, T16, T17** and all of the trees forming **G24**.
- 3.2.2 Most of the trees requiring removal are Retention Category 'C' with the exception of **T15** and **T17** which were identified as Retention Category 'B'.
- 3.2.3 Whilst the development will require the removal of some trees within the site, there will be space for new trees to be planted within the grounds of the new property. The planting of new trees will act to mitigate the loss of the trees requiring removal and improve the visual aspect of the site.

3.3 Pruning for Development

- 3.3.1 To accommodate the construction of the dwelling, it will be necessary to prune **G18, T19** and **T20** back to the boundary line, as these are off-site trees which overhang the site.
- 3.3.2 In addition, where the footprint of the proposed dwelling encroaches the outer RPA's of **T19** and **T20** root pruning will be required, under the supervision of an appointed arboriculturist. Root pruning will accommodate the proposed building whilst preventing any 'ripping' damage, and preventing the need for specially designed foundations.

3.4 Temporary Protection Measures

3.4.1 The Protective Barrier

- 3.4.1.1 In order to ensure the effective protection of retained trees during development, a protective barrier will be installed, in accordance with BS5837: 2012 and may comprise protective fencing and/or ground protection. This will be the first job on site following the tree removal and pruning works. The fencing should ideally be positioned to protect the entire **Root Protection Area (RPA)** of the retained trees, in order to create a **Construction Exclusion Zone (CEZ)**. The installation of the protective barrier and the technical aspects of the proposals in relation to the trees should be assessed in the Arboricultural Method Statement/Tree Protection Plan.
- 3.4.1.2 Routes for pedestrian and site traffic will be located outside, and diverted away from, the RPAs of the retained trees wherever possible. Where this is not practicable, temporary protective surfaces (ground protection) must be laid over the exposed RPAs which will distribute the weight of site vehicles, machinery or pedestrians whilst allowing moisture to reach the tree rooting area beneath. Such surfaces should be constructed in accordance with BS5837: 2012.

3.5 Implications for Retained Trees

3.5.1 Works within the RPA

- 3.5.1.1 Where the proposals require work to be undertaken within the RPA of a tree which is to be retained, specialist measures must be adopted during the construction phase to avoid ground compaction and minimise root damage.

3.5.2 Demolition

- 3.5.2.1 In this case, no demolition activities are required for the proposed scheme.

3.5.3 Access/Construction of Hard Surfacing

- 3.5.3.1 In this case, the trees on the eastern boundary to the front will be removed to accommodate the proposed driveway here. As such, no specialised construction techniques/surface treatments will be required for this purpose.

3.5.4 **Building Construction / Foundation Design**

- 3.5.4.1 The footprint of proposed dwelling incurs the RPA of **T19** and **T20**. In this case, because of the minimal nature of the incursion, and as these trees are situated on third party owned land, it is considered appropriate to undertake root pruning. This will allow for the construction of the building, without causing ‘ripping’ damage to the roots, a problem commonly associated with mechanical excavation, whilst also preventing the need for specialist foundation designs.
- 3.5.4.2 Advice should always be sought from a suitably qualified Structural Engineer. The water demand of trees can be an important consideration when determining the appropriate foundation design. Due of this, water demands for the trees identified on this site are included in **Appendix 1**, in accordance with current **NHBC Standards**, for use by the appointed structural expert.

3.5.5 **Utilities**

- 3.5.5.1 Details on service routes have not been provided to JCA at this time. Where utilities need to be brought onto the site, these must be routed away from the RPAs of retained trees. An appropriate location would be underneath the proposed access driveway directly to the dwelling, as this would avoid the RPA’s of any tree to be retained.
- 3.5.5.2 All service providers should be consulted prior to commencement of works with the aim of minimising the number of service runs on the site. Any foreseeable incursions to RPAs should be communicated to the appointed arboricultural consultant and the LPA at the earliest possible time to prevent breach of planning conditions and damage to retained trees.

3.5.6 **Site Compound**

- 3.5.6.1 The site compound, which typically includes the site office, mess facilities, toilets, storage of materials and parking, must be located away from all of the trees and outside their RPAs. Care should also be taken to prevent soil contamination from chemical spillages, including petrol, diesel and oils.

3.5.7 **Tree Shade**

- 3.5.7.1 Due to the location of the proposed dwelling, issues relating to shade will only be present during the morning hours.

3.5.8 **Landscaping**

- 3.5.8.1 Proposed fence lines may be constructed within the RPA of a tree if necessary, providing that appropriate considerations are taken with regards to the well-being of the affected tree. As such, no continual trenching is to be undertaken within the RPA (e.g. for small walls onto which panel fencing is installed). Excavations must be kept to a minimum and therefore only fence designs requiring intermittent posts will be acceptable within the RPA. Fences should also be kept as far away from the main stems of the trees as is reasonably possible.
- 3.5.8.2 Any patios, garden paths or other hard surfaces within RPAs which may not be shown on the projected layout (**Appendix 6**), and in addition to those mentioned in **Section 3.5.3** (hard surfacing), may be constructed using no-dig techniques, and are implemented in accordance with BS5837: 2012. If there is any concern of damaging retained trees, further advice should be sought from a qualified Arboriculturalist.
- 3.5.8.3 No ground level changes are to be undertaken within the RPAs of retained trees, unless otherwise stated or agreed with the appointed Arboricultural Consultant or the LPA. The requirement to raise/lower ground levels within RPAs must be communicated to these parties at the earliest practical convenience.

3.6 Remedial Measures

- 3.6.1 In order to protect the retained trees during the construction phase, protective fencing needs to be installed. Protective fencing specifications and on site positioning, along with details of any necessary specialist construction methods can be provided in an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS).
- 3.6.2 The site offers scope for landscaping and tree planting. All areas identified for the new planting should also be protected by fencing during the construction phase to prevent the compaction of the soil.

4. Summary

- 4.1 A check was made with **Barnsley Metropolitan District Council** in June 2024 to determine whether any of the trees surveyed as part of this report are subject to any statutory controls.
- 4.2 We are informed that **none** of the trees within our survey are subject to any Tree Preservation Orders (TPO) and the property is not located within a Conservation Area.
- 4.3 It is proposed to split the existing property (No. 96 Church Hill) into two, by constructing a detached dwelling in the rear garden with a private access driveway at the front.
- 4.4 The arboricultural implications of the development have been considered and are discussed in **Section 3**.
- 4.5 Several trees require removal or pruning works in order to facilitate the proposed development. Tree works required to accommodate the proposals are detailed in **bold italics** in the tables at **Appendix 1**. Those trees requiring removal are shown in red on the Arboricultural Implications Plan at **Appendix 6**.
- 4.6 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.
- 4.7 The protection of retained trees can be achieved by the creation of a Construction Exclusion Zone based on the Root Protection Area of a tree. The proposed development should be accompanied by an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) detailing the specific protection measures necessary for each tree. This should specify the required fencing standard and positions (the creation of the Construction Exclusion Zone), acceptable construction techniques and necessary tree works.
- 4.8 Upon instruction JCA are able to provide a comprehensive Arboricultural Method Statement in order to ensure the continued health of trees throughout the proposed development. We are also able to provide tree planting schemes and organise tree works.
- 4.9 The data gained during the original survey provides an indication of the health of the trees. However, it does not enable a comprehensive assessment of their condition over time. Trees are living organisms which are affected by many factors including weather conditions, diseases/disorders, light levels and human activities. Due to this, the report is only valid for a period of 1 year from the date of issuing. Should an update or revision of this report be required outside of this time period, JCA may require a further site visit to ensure that the condition of the trees has not significantly changed. It is advised that the trees are inspected regularly, in the interests of risk management.

Appendices

Tree Ref.	Age Common Name <i>Botanical Name</i>	Height (m)	Crown Height (m)	Diameter (cm)	Crown Spread N W E S	Observations	Recommendations	Physiological Condition	Structural Condition	Amenity Value	NHBC Water Demand	Life Expectancy (yrs)	Retention Category
G 1	Semi-mature Mixed Species	To 5	0+	<10	See Plan	Mixed vegetation to the front adjacent to the boundary. Species include Holly, Fatsia and Spotted Laurel.	No action required at present.	GOOD	GOOD	LOW	LOW	20+	C 2
T 2	Semi-mature Holly <i>Ilex aquifolium</i>	6	2	23	2 1.75 2 3	Single-stemmed and vertical with a balanced crown. The crown overhangs the footpath.	No action required at present.	FAIR	GOOD	LOW	LOW	20+	C 2
T 3	Semi-mature Holly <i>Ilex aquifolium</i>	6	1	23	2 2.5 2 2.5	Single-stemmed and vertical with a balanced crown. The crown overhangs the footpath.	No action required at present.	FAIR	GOOD	LOW	LOW	20+	C 2
G 4	Semi-mature Mixed Species	To 5	0+	<10	See Plan	Insignificant vegetation to the front of the property. Species include Holly, Spotted Laurel, Photinia, Rowan and Larch.	No action required at present.	FAIR	FAIR	LOW	LOW to MOD	10+	C 2
T 5	Early-mature Cedar <i>Cedrus sp.</i>	15	1.5	42	3 3.25 2.25 4	Single-stemmed and vertical with a balanced crown.	No action required at present.	GOOD	GOOD	LOW	MOD	40+	1 B 2
T 6	Semi-mature Box Elder Maple <i>Acer negundo</i>	6	3.5	20	3 3.75 3 4	Single-stemmed with a slight lean and a reasonably balanced crown. Slightly sparse canopy.	No action required at present.	FAIR	GOOD	LOW	NO DATA	20+	C 1
T 7	Early-mature Holly <i>Ilex aquifolium</i>	5	1	Avg 12	2 2 2 2	Multi-stemmed at ground level with a slightly unbalanced crown.	No action required at present.	FAIR	FAIR	LOW	LOW	10+	C 2
G 8	Semi-mature Mixed Species	To 5	0+	<10	See Plan	Species include Lilac and Holly. Insignificant vegetation to the front of the property adjacent to the entrance gate.	Remove to facilitate the proposed access.	FAIR	FAIR	LOW	LOW	10+	C 2
T 9	Mature Yew <i>Taxus baccata</i>	8	2	20, 20, 50.	3.5 3.5 3.5 2.5	Multi-stemmed at ground level with a slightly unbalanced crown. Situated on the boundary close to the fence.	Remove to facilitate the proposed access.	GOOD	FAIR	LOW	MOD	20+	C 2
T 10	Early-mature Holly <i>Ilex aquifolium</i>	9	5	22	2 2 2.5 1	Single-stemmed with a slight lean and a reasonably balanced crown. Suppressed tree on the boundary close to the fence.	Remove to facilitate the proposed access.	FAIR	FAIR	LOW	LOW	10+	C 2

Tree Ref.	Age Common Name <i>Botanical Name</i>	Height (m)	Crown Height (m)	Diameter (cm)	Crown Spread N W E S	Observations	Recommendations	Physiological Condition	Structural Condition	Amenity Value	NHBC Water Demand	Life Expectancy (yrs)	Retention Category
T 11	Mature Yew <i>Taxus baccata</i>	8	2	#70	3.5 3.5 4.5 3.5	Single-stemmed and vertical with a slightly unbalanced crown. Heavily reduced canopy. Situated on the boundary close to the fence.	Remove to facilitate the proposed access.	FAIR	FAIR	LOW	MOD	20+	C 2
T 12	Early-mature Leyland Cypress <i>X Cupressocyparis leylandii</i>	6	2	42	3 2.5 2.5 2.5	Single-stemmed and vertical with a balanced crown. Topped canopy.	Remove to facilitate the proposed access.	FAIR	FAIR	LOW	HIGH	20+	C 2
T 13	Semi-mature Sweet Gum <i>Liquidambar styraciflua</i>	3	2	11, 13.	2 2 2	Twin-stemmed at ground level with a balanced crown.	No action required at present.	GOOD	FAIR	LOW	NO DATA	20+	C 1
G 14	Semi-mature Mixed Species	To 7	0+	<10	See Plan	Dense shrubbery vegetation in the rear garden. Species include Contorted Hazel, Camellia, Conifers and Maple.	Remove the section shown in red on the plan at Appendix 6 to facilitate the proposed access.	GOOD	GOOD	LOW	LOW to HIGH	20+	C 2
T 15	Mature Ash <i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>	18	4	#70	5 6 4 6	Single-stemmed with a slight lean and a reasonably balanced crown. Dense Ivy prevented a detailed inspection. Located on the boundary.	Remove to facilitate the proposed access.	FAIR	GOOD	LOW	MOD	20+	B 1
T 16	Early-mature Lawson Cypress <i>Chamaecyparis lawsoniana</i>	7	1	23	2.5 2.5 2.5 2.5	Single-stemmed and vertical with a balanced crown. Located on the boundary adjacent to the fence.	Remove to facilitate the proposed access.	GOOD	GOOD	LOW	HIGH	20+	C 1
T 17	Early-mature Norway Maple <i>Acer platanoides</i>	14	3	#45	6 6 6 6	Single-stemmed and vertical with a balanced crown. Located on the boundary. Co-dominant stem at 4m.	Remove to facilitate the proposed access.	GOOD	GOOD	MOD	MOD	40+	B 1 B 2
G 18	Semi-mature Plum <i>Prunus sp</i>	To 6	2	10, 22, 22.	See Plan	Three off site trees. Fence prevented a detailed inspection.	Prune back to the boundary line to facilitate the construction of the dwelling.	FAIR	FAIR	LOW	MOD	10+	C 2
T 19	Mature Sycamore <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	14	7	#45	5.5 5 6 5	Single-stemmed and vertical with a slightly unbalanced crown. Situated on adjacent land.	Prune back to the boundary line to facilitate the construction of the dwelling. Root pruning required under Arboricultural supervision.	GOOD	GOOD	MOD	MOD	40+	B 1
T 20	Mature Ash <i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>	17	6	#50	5 6 4.5 5	Single-stemmed and vertical with a slightly unbalanced crown. Situated on adjacent land. Onset of Ash Dieback noted.	Prune back to the boundary line to facilitate the construction of the dwelling. Root pruning required under Arboricultural supervision.	GOOD	FAIR	LOW	MOD	20+	B 1

Tree Ref.	Age Common Name <i>Botanical Name</i>	Height (m)	Crown Height (m)	Diameter (cm)	Crown Spread N W E S	Observations	Recommendations	Physiological Condition	Structural Condition	Amenity Value	NHBC Water Demand	Life Expectancy (yrs)	Retention Category
T 21	Mature Silver Birch <i>Betula pendula</i>	16	1.5	40	5 3.5 5 5	Single-stemmed and vertical with a balanced crown. Situated in the rear garden on the boundary.	No action required at present.	GOOD	GOOD	MOD	LOW	40+	B 1
G 22	Mature Leyland Cypress <i>X Cupressocyparis leylandii</i>	10	2.5	Avg. 25	See Plan	Well maintained group of trees located just off site beyond the rear boundary.	No action required at present.	GOOD	GOOD	MOD	HIGH	20+	B 2
T 23	Early-mature Norway Maple <i>Acer platanoides</i>	9	2.5	29	4.5 4 4 3	Single-stemmed and vertical with a slightly unbalanced crown. Situated in the corner of the rear garden.	No action required at present.	GOOD	GOOD	MOD	MOD	10+	B 1
G 24	Semi-mature Mixed Species	To 7	0+	Avg. 7.5	See Plan	A wide mix of ornamental trees, fruit trees and shrubs in the rear garden.	Remove entire group to facilitate the construction of the proposed dwelling.	GOOD	GOOD	LOW	LOW to MOD	20+	C 2

Appendix 2: Explanation of Tree Descriptions

A2.1 Measurements/Reference Information

- A2.1.1 *REF NUMBER*. All items surveyed are allocated a reference number preceded with a letter, identifying the type of vegetation surveyed: T = an individual tree, G = a group of trees or an area of vegetation, W = woodland, H = a hedgerow.
- A2.1.2 *SPECIES: COMMON AND BOTANICAL NAME*. The common and botanical names of the species present are noted. If the species is not clear or identifiable, then a general common name and genus will be noted.
- A2.1.3 *AGE CLASS* of the tree is described as young, semi-mature, early-mature, mature, over-mature, veteran or dead.
- A2.1.4 *HEIGHT* of the tree is measured in metres from the stem base to the top of the crown.
- A2.1.5 *CROWN HEIGHT* is an indication of the height above ground level at which the crown begins.
- A2.1.6 *STEM DIAMETER* is measured at 1.5 metres above (higher) ground level. Where the tree is multi-stemmed at this point; diameter measurements are taken for each stem. If more than five stems are present, an average stem diameter is taken. If for whatever reason it is not practical to measure multiple-stemmed trees in this way, the diameter is measured close to ground level, just above the root buttress.
- A2.1.7 *CROWN SPREAD* is measured from the centre of the stem base to the tips of the branches to all four cardinal points.
- A2.1.8 *HEIGHT AND DIRECTION OF LOWEST BRANCH*. The height and direction of the lowest significant branch is noted because of potential issues relating to clearances and the need for tree pruning.
- A2.1.9 *NHBC WATER DEMAND*. The water demand of each tree is listed in accordance with current NHBC Standards. This is included to aid structural engineers, architects and other members of the design team as it determines foundation depth and other considerations with regard to trees.

A2.2 Evaluations

- A2.2.1 *PHYSIOLOGICAL CONDITION* is classed as good, fair, poor, or dead. This is an indication of the health and vitality of the tree and takes into account vigour, presence of disease and dieback.

A2.2.2 *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.

A2.2.3 *LIFE EXPECTANCY* is classed as; 0, less than 10 years, 10+ years, 20+ years, or 40 + years. This is an indication of the minimum number of years before removal of the tree is likely to be required.

A2.2.4 *AMENITY VALUE*. A general indication is given in respect to the amenity/landscape value of the tree/group within the surrounding area.

A2.2.5 *PRIORITIES*. A priority rating is given concerning the time periods in which the recommended works should be undertaken. LOW priority works should be undertaken within 12 months of the survey, MOD (moderate) priority works should be undertaken within 6 months and HIGH priority works should be completed as soon as practically possible. If no works are recommended, N/A (not applicable) will be used.

A2.3 Retention Categories

A2.3.1 *A = Trees of high quality.*

These trees are of high quality and value with a good life expectancy (usually with an estimated remaining life expectancy of 40 years).

A2.3.2 *B (marked in blue on the Tree Constraints Plan) = Trees of moderate quality.*

These trees are of moderate quality and value with a reasonable life expectancy (usually with an estimated life expectancy of at least 20 years).

A2.3.3 *C (marked in grey on the Tree Constraints Plan) = Trees of low quality.*

These trees are of low quality and value but which are in adequate condition to remain or are young trees with a stem diameter below 15cm (usually with an estimated life expectancy of at least 10 years).

A2.3.4 Trees categorised as retention category 'A', 'B' or 'C' are then justified by being further divided into 3 subcategories:

1 = Mainly arboricultural qualities.

2 = Mainly landscape qualities.

3 = Mainly cultural values, including conservation value.

A2.3.5 U = Trees usually unsuitable for retention due to poor condition.

These trees are in such a condition that they cannot be realistically retained as living trees in the context of the current land use for longer than 10 years. This may be due to any of the following:

- 1) Failure is likely due to serious, irredeemable, structural defects.
- 2) Removal of other category U trees will render them exposed and unstable.
- 3) They are in serious, overall decline or are dead.
- 4) They are of low quality and suppressing adjacent trees of better quality.
- 5) 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.

Appendix 3: General Guidelines

- A3.1 All tree work should be undertaken to BS 3998: 2010 '*Recommendations for tree work*' or other recognised industry practice.
- A3.2 Staff carrying out the work must be qualified, experienced and ideally be Arboricultural Association approved contractors. They should be covered by adequate public liability insurance.
- A3.3 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 therein.
- A3.4 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.
- A3.5 No liability can be accepted by JCA in respect of the trees unless the recommendations of this report are carried out under the supervision of JCA and within JCA's timescale.
- A3.6 It is advisable to have trees inspected by an arboricultural consultant on a regular basis.

Appendix 4: Author Qualifications

Principal Consultant and Managing Director

Jonathan Cocking *F.R.E.S., Tech. Cert. (Arbor.A), PDipArb (RFS) FArborA CBiol MSB. MICFor.* Jonathan is a Registered Consultant and Fellow of the Arboricultural Association and sits on its Professional Committee. He has 31 years' experience in the Arboricultural profession and served for eight years as Senior Arboriculturist with a large local authority before establishing JCA in 1997. Jonathan has since developed JCA's portfolio of services and its extensive client base. He is a Chartered Biologist, a Chartered Arboriculturalist and an Expert Witness with much experience of litigation work.

Technical Director

Toby Thwaites *BSc (Hons), HND (Arboriculture), MArborA.* Toby joined JCA in 1998 after graduating in Ecology at the University of Huddersfield and has since graduated in Arboriculture at the University of Central Lancashire. A former JCA team leader and Consulting Arboriculturist, Toby is now Technical Director and oversees all office and on-site activities at JCA and is on hand to offer technical support and advice.

Operations Director

Charles Cocking *FdSc (Arboriculture), MArborA.* Charles joined JCA in January 2014 having previously worked for the company on a part time basis during 2013. Charles obtained his Foundation Degree in Arboriculture at Askham Bryan College, York, and is a Professional Member of the Arboricultural Association. Charles now oversees all internal operations for the company.

Consulting Staff: Arboriculture

Andrew Bussey. Andrew started working in consultancy at JCA in 2006 having spent 12 years working as an arborist for various private companies before joining a Local Authority forestry team. He has various NPTC qualifications, is QTRA qualified and is a LANTRA Accredited Professional Tree Inspector.

Emily Wilde *FdSc (Arboriculture).* Emily joined JCA having previously worked for various private tree surgery and consultancy companies over the past 8 years. She initially obtained a ND in Forestry & Arboriculture, followed by a FdSc in Arboriculture at Askham Bryan College, York. Emily has various NPTC certificates and is QTRA qualified.

Mick Eltringham *ND (Forestry).* Mick joined JCA after spending 12 years working in the industry for various private companies in the north and south of England. He has also spent the last five years working as a consultant for two canopy research projects in the Amazon Rainforest, working with Oxford University and the University of Arizona. He has various NPTC Qualifications.

Dan Kemp *FdSc (Arboriculture), BTEC National Diploma(Arboriculture), National Certificate In Horticulture, City & Guilds In Horticulture.* Dan joined JCA in February 2019 with nearly 30 years' experience in arboriculture with extensive Botanical and Mycological expertise. He worked as a London Tree Officer for 12 years and in several arboricultural and horticultural management posts, specialising particularly in tree risk assessments and tree related subsidence.

Luke Wickham *FdSc (Arboriculture and Urban Forestry), TechArborA.* Luke joined JCA in 2021 after obtaining his Foundation Degree in Arboriculture and Urban Forestry at Askham Bryan College. Having previously worked within the industry for the past 4 years, running his own small business and sub-contracting for local firms, Luke brings a sound knowledge and understanding of the practical and academic sides of the industry.

David de Peña *BSc (Hons) Ecology and Conservation.* After earning his degree from Manchester Metropolitan University, David worked as an ecologist at various consultancies, contributing to a wide range of projects, including major infrastructure projects across the UK. More recently, David transitioned to arboriculture and served as a surveyor for Manchester City of Trees, where he participated in a project to quantify the value of Greater Manchester's woodlands and trees.


Stella Bolam *Dip Arb L4 (ABC), TechArborA.* Stella joined JCA having previously worked at a Local Authority as a Community Forestry Project Development Officer for over two years. She holds a degree in English, gained her Level 4 Diploma in Arboriculture in 2023 and was elected as a Board Trustee for the Arboricultural Association in 2022.

Root Protection Area: RPA

THE ROOT PROTECTION AREA SHOULD IDEALLY REMAIN UNDISTURBED IF THE TREE IS TO BE RETAINED.

THE DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS SHOULD THEREFORE BE DESIGNED TO AVOID THE RPA OF ANY TREE WHICH IS TO BE RETAINED.

IF IT IS NECESSARY FOR THE DEVELOPMENT TO ENCROACH INTO THE RPA OF A TREE WHICH IS TO BE RETAINED THEN SPECIALIST CONSTRUCTION TECHNIQUES AND MATERIALS MUST BE CONSIDERED.



THIS PLAN IS TO BE PRINTED IN COLOUR AND READ IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE JCA ARBORICULTURAL REPORT (JCA REF: 22096/ChC)

Appendix 5: Tree Constraints Plan

ADDRESS: Land adjacent to 96 Church Hill,
Royston, Barnsley, South Yorkshire, S71 4NG.
JCA REF: 22096/ChC

SCALE : 1:500

PAPER SIZE : A3

SURVEYED BY: CC

DRAWN BY: CC

APPROVED BY: ME


BRITISH STANDARD 5837:2012: 4.5 RETENTION CATEGORIES

Detailed definitions of these categories are at Appendix 2 of our report. N.B. These categories do not necessarily represent or correspond to recommendations for action made in this report.

	CATEGORY A: 'RETENTION MOST DESIRABLE'
	CATEGORY B: 'RETENTION DESIRABLE'
	CATEGORY C: 'TREE WHICH COULD BE RETAINED'
	CATEGORY U: 'TREE FOR REMOVAL'
	STEM OF TREE TO BE RETAINED
	STEM OF TREE TO BE REMOVED
	ROOT PROTECTION AREA

JCA Limited
Arboricultural & Ecological Consultants





THIS PLAN IS TO BE PRINTED IN COLOUR
AND READ IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE
JCA ARBORICULTURAL REPORT
(JCA REF: 22096/ChC)

Appendix 6: Arboricultural Implications Plan

ADDRESS: 96 Church Hill, Royston,
Barnsley, South Yorkshire, S71 4NG.
JCA REF: 22096/ChC

SCALE : 1:500

PAPER SIZE : A3

	TREE TO BE RETAINED
	TREE TO BE REMOVED
	STEM OF TREE TO BE RETAINED
	STEM OF TREE TO BE REMOVED
	ROOT PROTECTION AREA
	ROOT PROTECTION AREA ENCROACHED BY THE PROPOSED DWELLING; ROOT PRUNING UNDER ARBORICULTURAL SUPERVISION REQUIRED (T19 & T20)



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.

Charles Cocking *FdSc (Arboriculture) MArborA.*

25th June 2024

For and on behalf of **JCA Ltd**

Registered Office

**Unit 80
Bowers Mill
Branch Road
Barkisland
Halifax
HX4 0AD**

**Tel: 01422 376335
Fax: 01422 376232
Email: info@jcaac.com**

www.jcaac.com

JCA Ltd. Arboricultural and Ecological Consultants
Professional Tree and Ecology Advice nationwide

ARBORICULTURAL SERVICES

Guidance for Architects and Developers

- British Standard 5837 Tree Surveys
- Arboricultural Implication Assessments (AIA)
- Arboricultural Method Statements (AMS)

Tree Advice for the Legal Profession

- Subsidence Litigation
- Personal Injury and Accident Investigation
- Expert Witness, Planning Inquiries and Appeals

Advice for Engineers, Loss Adjusters and Insurers

- Tree Surveys for Subsidence
- Heave Assessment
- Tree Root Identification

Veteran Tree Management

- Ancient Woodland Management
- Veteran Tree Management

Advice for Local Authorities and Social Housing

- Tree Safety Surveys
- Specialist Decay Detection
- Landscape and Orchard Design

Tree Health and Pest and Disease Management

- Pest and Disease Surveys
- Tree Health Checks
- Disease Mitigation and Control

ECOLOGICAL SERVICES

Ecological Pre-Planning Services

- Phase 1 Habitat Surveys
- Great Crested Newt eDNA Sampling
- Protected Species: Bat, Wintering and Nesting Bird, Badger, Amphibian, Otter, Water Vole, White-Clawed Crayfish, Dormice and Reptile Surveys.
- Preparation for Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)
- Invasive Species Surveys
- Code for Sustainable Homes

Ecological Post-Planning Services

- Biodiversity Enhancement Plans
- Protected Species Mitigation
- Ecological Management (Bat and Bird box installation and inspection)

HEAD QUARTERS:

Unit 80 Bowers Mill,
Branch Road,
Barkisland,
Halifax, HX4 0AD.

Tel: 01422 376335
Email: info@jcaac.com
Website: www.jcaac.com

