



ARBORICULTURAL REPORT & Impact Assessment to BS 5837:2012 at:

***Bank View,
Green Moor Road,
Green Moor,
Wortley,
South Yorkshire
S35 7DQ***

Prepared for:
Garry Greetham Associates

Date: *October 2021*

Reference: AWA3976



Contents

1. Introduction.....	3
1.1 Instructions and Brief	3
1.2 Survey Details	3
2. The Site.....	4
2.1 Location and Description	4
3. The Trees.....	5
3.1 Legal	5
3.2 Tree Survey Results	5
3.3 Photographs	8
4. Arboricultural Impact Assessment	9
4.1 Proposed New Development.....	9
4.2 Direct Impacts.....	9
4.3 Indirect Impacts	9
4.4 Suitable Mitigation	10
4.5 Protection of the Retained Trees.....	10
5. Signature	11
Appendix 1: Authors Qualifications & Experience.....	13
Appendix 2: Survey Methodology and Limitations of Report	14
Appendix 3: Explanation of Tree Descriptions	15
Appendix 4: Tree Data	16
Appendix 5: Tree Constraints Plan.....	17
Appendix 6: Tree Impacts Plan	18

1. Introduction

1.1 Instructions and Brief

- 1.1.1 We were instructed by Garry Greetham Associates 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 September 2021.
- 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.
- 1.2.1 The tree positions were plotted on an Ordnance Survey map base-layer using enhanced GPS technology (1-2m accuracy) and laser distance measurer.
- 1.2.2 This report has been prepared by Mr Adam Winson, Chartered Arboriculturist, MSc, BSc (Hons), MICFor, MArborA, Principle and Director of AWA Tree Consultants Ltd.
- 1.2.3 The tree survey data collection was carried out by Mr David Miller, BA (Hons), PGCE, Dip Arb L4, Arboriculturist at AWA Tree Consultants Ltd.
- 1.2.4 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 on Green Moor Road in the village of Green Moor, 2 miles northeast of Stocksbridge, South Yorkshire.
- 2.1.2 The site comprises a residential property with front and rear gardens. To the north and west is public access woodland extending away from the site. To the east is arable farmland, and to the south is Green Moor Road, giving access to the site. A public footpath borders the site's western boundary.
- 2.1.3 The approximate area of the survey is highlighted in the (2020 Google Earth) image below:



3. The Trees

3.1 Legal

- 3.1.1 An online search has been carried out with Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council on 15/10/21 to ascertain whether any trees at the site are protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) or whether the site is within a Conservation Area. As of this date no trees within the site are legally protected.
- 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 confirm if any trees are covered by a Tree Preservation Order or are within a Conservation Area. If either applies, then statutory permission is required before any works can take place (unless such work is approved as part of full planning permission).
- 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.
- 3.1.4 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 18 items of woody vegetation, comprised of 12 individual trees and 6 tree groups or hedges.
- 3.2.2 Of the surveyed trees: 2 trees are retention category 'U', 2 trees or tree groups are retention category 'A', 1 tree is retention category 'B', and 13 trees or tree groups are retention category 'C' (explanatory details regarding the retention categories are included at Appendix 3).
- 3.2.3 Full details of the surveyed trees and tree groups are provided in the attached tree data schedule at Appendix 4. General comments are provided below:
- 3.2.4 The site's most significant tree is Beech T6, situated at the corner of boundary walls at the site's western boundary. T6 is a large mature tree in good overall condition. The tree is of multiple stemmed form and is pushing into the retaining wall to the south west.
- 3.2.5 G18 forms an adjacent high value mature woodland group situated in adjacent land beyond the site's north western boundary. The group is

predominantly comprised of Oak with several Sycamore and occasional Birch and Rowan.

- 3.2.6 Cedar T13 is a moderate value tree situated to the site's eastern boundary which is in good overall condition with no significant visible defects. While prominent from within the site, the tree is not visible from any easily accessible public vantage points and provides little amenity value outside of site boundaries.
- 3.2.7 G1 and G4 form very low value adjacent shrubby tree groups situated in adjacent land beyond the site's western boundary wall. A public footpath is situated between the trees and the site. G1 is comprised of Lilac and Buddleia, while G4 is comprised of Cherry Laurel and Privet. The crowns of G1 and G4 overhang into the site.
- 3.2.8 T2, T3 and T5 from a row of early mature Birch situated in adjacent land beyond the site's western boundary wall. A public footpath is situated between the trees and the site. The trees were inaccessible and so were only given cursory inspection with measurements estimated and condition values indicative only. T2 and T3 appear in fair condition, but have minor cavities and poor pruning back to the boundary resulting in profuse epicormic growths and wounding on their stems and branches. T5 is in poorer condition, with a moderately sized cavity in the stem at 4 metres. This tree has previously been topped and regrowth from original stem has reduced the tree's crown weight. These trees have limited long term value and prospects, but within the adjacent boundary group, provide useful screening and green infrastructure for the site.
- 3.2.9 Early mature Pine T9 at the site's eastern boundary is a broad, open crowned tree with multiple stems at 2 metres. The tree has some visual value, but limited long term prospects, having multiple minor defects and only average structural integrity.
- 3.2.10 Holly T11 is also located along the east boundary of the site. The is leaning across the boundary, with almost its entire crown above the neighbouring garden. There is moderate damage to the tree's base and vigorous epicormic growths coming from its lower stem. T11 likely has limited future prospects and is recommended for removal regardless of development at the site.
- 3.2.11 Adjacent Rowan T17 is in poor condition with reduced structural and physiological integrity. The tree was inaccessible and so was only given a cursory inspection with measurements estimated and condition values indicative only. Minor and moderate deadwood throughout the tree's crown, and some decay in the stem and branches give this tree little in the way of long-term prospects.

- 3.2.12 The remaining trees and tree groups within the site are of particularly low value and should not pose any significant constraint on the development potential of the site. The low value boundary trees and tree groups provide some limited screening between the site and the adjacent land.
- 3.2.13 Sycamore T12 is situated in adjacent land to the east of the site and so was only given a cursory inspection with measurements estimated and condition values indicative only.
- 3.2.14 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.
- 3.2.15 Some lower value tree, hedge and shrub groups do not have RPAs detailed on tree plans. The detailed extent and spread of these low value groups, in conjunction with the tree schedule, is sufficient to assess the associated potential constraints.
- 3.2.16 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.

3.3 Photographs



Photo 1: T3 from east



Photo 2: T6 stem from south



Photo 3: T6 and G18



Photo 4: T6, T2-T3 and T5



Photo 5: T13 from north west



Photo 6: G18 from south

4. Arboricultural Impact Assessment

4.1 Proposed New Development

- 4.1.1 It is proposed to replace the existing residential property with a new residential property with associated access, landscaping 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, 6 trees or tree groups will require removal to facilitate the proposed new development as they are situated in the footprint of the development or their retention and protection throughout the development is not suitable.
- 4.2.2 The trees and tree groups that require removal to facilitate the proposed new development are T6, T10, T13, G14, G15 and T16.
- 4.2.3 Beech T6 is of high value retention category 'A'. It may be possible to retain the tree as part of the proposed new development, if the proposed new residential property could be constructed using specialist footings such as mini/micro pile and suspended beam or a cantilevered foundation which will not negatively impact tree roots, and with no significant ground level changes within the tree's RPA.
- 4.2.4 Cedar T13 is of moderate value retention category 'B' and while its removal will have some negative impact from within the site, the tree is not prominently visible from any easily accessible public vantage points and provides little amenity value outside of the site boundaries.
- 4.2.5 T10, G15, G15 and T16 are of low value retention category 'C' and their removal will have little negative impact.
- 4.2.6 Adjacent shrubby boundary tree group G1 will require minor crown pruning works to facilitate the development, pruning from the east as required, not pruning beyond the site boundary. It is likely the trees will readily tolerate the required pruning works and the limited amenity value they provide will not be significantly impacted.
- 4.2.7 Holly T11 is also recommended for removal regardless of development at the site.

4.3 Indirect Impacts

- 4.3.1 The tree Root Protection Area (RPA) detailed on the Tree Plans at Appendix

5 and 6, 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 Potentially damaging activities are proposed in the vicinity of retained trees. The proposed new development and associated ground level changes encroach into the RPAs of the retained adjacent Birch T2, T3 and T5. The encroachment into the RPAs is relatively minor, the existing adjacent wall and footpath situated between the trees and the site has likely limited the trees' root extension into the site, and the proposed new residential property is predominantly situated within the footprint of the existing residential property at the site. As such the retained adjacent trees should remain largely unaffected by the works provided care is taken during construction.
- 4.3.3 The design of the new development has considered the trees crown position in relation to the dwelling. 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.
- 4.3.4 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 new tree planting throughout the site as part of a soft landscaping scheme. As such, suitable new tree 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.

4.5 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 If required by the Local Planning Authority, 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*

18th October 2021

AWA Tree Consultants Limited

Union Forge
27 Mowbray Street
Sheffield
S3 8EN

www.awatrees.com



Institute of
Chartered Foresters
Registered Consultant

Appendices

- Appendix 1: Authors Qualifications and Experience**
- Appendix 2: Survey Methodology and Limitations of Report**
- 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, PTI (Lantra)*

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 joined AWA in 2016, after previously working 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.

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

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 Tom Readman *FdSc Arboriculture, Cert Arb L3, TechArborA, Valid Tree Risk-Benefit Validator*

Tom joined AWA from his previous role as a tree risk surveyor with Harrogate Borough Council, where he undertook tree risk surveys at a range of sites and prescribed suitable works. Tom also has extensive previous experience as a climbing arborist. Tom achieved a Distinction in the Foundation Degree in Arboriculture, while working at AWA, and has previously achieved Distinction Star, and was recognised as the student of the year, in the Extended Diploma in Forestry and Arboriculture. Tom's work focuses on tree risk surveys and accurate tree data collection for development projects to BS 5837:2012

Mr James Godfrey *BA (Hons), Cert Arb L3, Level 4 Forestry and Arboriculture, TechArborA*

James has extensive arboricultural experience working as a team leader in both the public and private sector. Achieving a Distinction Star in the Extended Diploma in Forestry and Arboriculture allowed James to utilise this knowledge in order to inform the maintenance and wellbeing of trees across the UK over the course of his career. During his time at Darlington Borough Council, James was responsible for on-site assessment and advising of remedial works for council owned trees. Currently, James is completing a Foundation Degree in Arboriculture and Tree Management, while working at AWA.

Mr David Miller *BA (Hons), PGCE education, Dip Arboriculture Level 4*

David joined AWA after having managed his own tree care team for 8 years and gained a wealth of experience in the tree care industry. Prior to this David spent 10 years working in secondary mainstream and special education. David has also travelled worldwide, mainly trekking and running. His main work at AWA consists of tree surveys for development projects and preparing Tree Protection Schemes 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 BS 5837:2012 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.

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 in 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 Species			Measurements				Crown (m)				Tree Condition								Value		Management
Tree ID	Common Name	Latin Name	Maturity	Height (m)	Stems	Stem Diameter (mm)	Estimated	Ave Height	N	E	S	W	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Physiological	Structural	Life Expectancy	Amenity	Category	Works
G1	Lilac. Buddleia.	<i>Syringa sp.</i> <i>Buddleia sp.</i>	Early-mature	7	10	100	Yes	0	See plan				Dense adjacent boundary group of Lilac and Buddleia. Low value. Unmanaged.				Fair	Fair	10 to 20 yrs	Low	C	Pruning works required to facilitate new development - Prune from east as required - Do not prune beyond site boundary
T2	Birch	<i>Betula pendula</i>	Early-mature	16	1	350	Yes	5	3	4	6	4	Limited access around base	Single stemmed. Slight lean. Epicormic growths. Stubs. Minor cavities	Normal. Minor deadwood	Adjacent tree. Limited access prevented detailed inspection. Leans away from site boundary. In dense group G1. Unbalanced.	Fair	Fair	10 to 20 yrs	Moderate	C	No works required
T3	Birch	<i>Betula pendula</i>	Early-mature	14	1	380	Yes	5	3	4.5	6	4	Limited access around base	Single stemmed. Slight lean. Epicormic growths. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Bark damage. Minor cavities	Normal. Minor deadwood. Snapped /hanging branches. Slightly unbalanced	Adjacent Birch. Limited access prevented detailed inspection. Beyond wall boundary. Debris and garden waste stacked around base.	Fair	Fair	10 to 20 yrs	Moderate	C	No works required
G4	Cherry Laurel. Privet.	<i>Prunus sp.</i> <i>Ligustrum sp.</i>	Early-mature	6	10	120	Yes	0	See plan				Dense overhanging adjacent boundary group of Cherry Laurel and Privet. Limited access prevented detailed inspection				Fair	Fair	10 to 20 yrs	Low	C	No works required


Tree ID	Tree Species		Maturity	Measurements				Crown (m)					Tree Condition							Value		Management
	Common Name	Latin Name		Height (m)	Stems	Stem Diameter (mm)	Estimated	Ave Height	N	E	S	W	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Physiological	Structural	Life Expectancy	Amenity	Category	Works
T5	Birch	<i>Betula pendula</i>	Early-mature	16	1	350	No	7	5.5	5	5	5	Limited access around base	Single stemmed. Slight lean. Multiple stemmed at 3m. Epicormic growths. Stubs. Bark damage. Cup-like union collecting dirt/water. Minor cavities. Minor decay	Normal. Minor deadwood. Snapped /hanging branches	Tall slender adjacent tree. Cavity in stem at 4m. Limited access prevented detailed inspection. Pruned back from site boundary. Mechanical defects.	Fair	Poor	10 to 20 yrs	Moderate	C	No works required
T6	Beech	<i>Fagus sylvatica</i>	Mature	18	3	580, 590, 310	No	5	7.5	8	7	7.5	No visual defects	Twin stemmed at 1m. Vertical. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Pruning wounds from crown lifting. Bark damage. Tight union. Minor cavities.	Normal. Minor deadwood. Well developed crown	Situated at corner of boundary walls. Pushing into retaining wall to south west. Crown raised towards site. Tight main union but defined reaction wood low on stem.	Good	Fair	>40 yrs	Moderate	A	Removal required to facilitate proposed new development
T7	Apple	<i>Malus sp.</i>	Young	5	1	120	No	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical	Normal. Old pruning wounds. Minor deadwood	Small Apple on lawn area.	Fair	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	No works required
G8	Willow. Buddleia. Cherry Laurel. Hazel.	<i>Salix sp.</i> <i>Buddleia sp.</i> <i>Prunus sp.</i> <i>Corylus sp.</i>	Early-mature	6	10	150	Yes	0	See plan				Boundary group of shrubby Goat Willow, Buddleia, Cherry Laurel and Hazel.				Fair	Fair	10 to 20 yrs	Low	C	No works required

Tree ID	Tree Species		Maturity	Measurements				Crown (m)					Tree Condition							Value		Management
	Common Name	Latin Name		Height (m)	Stems	Stem Diameter (mm)	Estimated	Ave Height	N	E	S	W	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Physiological	Structural	Life Expectancy	Amenity	Category	Works
T9	Pine	<i>Pinus nigra</i>	Early-mature	12	1	510	No	3	4.5	5.5	5	5.5	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Multiple stemmed at 2m. Vertical. Old pruning wounds. Stubs	Normal. Minor dieback. Minor deadwood. Low vigour	Occasional orange dead patches in crown. Lower crown dieback.	Fair	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Moderate	C	No works required
T10	Cherry Laurel	<i>Prunus laurocerasus</i>	Mature	7	10	130	Yes	0	4	5	4	5	Limited access around base	Multiple stemmed at base. Vertical. Stubs	Normal	Well established tree with fruit. Sprawling form.	Good	Fair	10 to 20 yrs	Low	C	Removal required to facilitate new development
T11	Holly	<i>Ilex sp.</i>	Mature	14	1	300	No	0	3	3.5	5	3.5	Limited access around base	Single stemmed. Slight lean. Epicormic growths	Normal. Unbalanced. Overhanging adjacent land	Overhanging into adjacent garden. Damage at base. Poor structure. Damaging wall. Vigorous epicormic growth at base and in crown.	Good	Poor	<10 yrs	Low	U	Removal required regardless of proposed new development
T12	Sycamore	<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	Semi-mature	7	1	250	No	1.5	2.5	3	2.5	3	Exposed roots. Soil erosion	Single stemmed. Vertical. Bark damage. Tight union. Minor cavities. Minor decay	Normal. Old pruning wounds. Snapped /hanging branches. Minor deadwood. Minor dieback	Adjacent tree. Limited access prevented detailed inspection. Large broken branches near to base. Stubs and epicormic regrowth in crown.	Fair	Poor	10 to 20 yrs	Low	C	No works required

Tree ID	Tree Species		Maturity	Measurements				Crown (m)					Tree Condition							Value		Management
	Common Name	Latin Name		Height (m)	Stems	Stem Diameter (mm)	Estimated	Ave Height	N	E	S	W	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Physiological	Structural	Life Expectancy	Amenity	Category	Works
T13	Cedar	<i>Cedrus deodara</i>	Early-mature	15	2	450, 450	No	4	5	5	5	5	No visual defects	Twin stemmed at 1m. Vertical. Stubs	Normal. Minor deadwood	Main union with good reaction wood. Some bare patches, possibly due to branch loss. Exposed site. Good prospects.	Good	Good	20 to 40 yrs	Low	B	Removal required to facilitate proposed new development
G14	Maple. Rhododendron.	<i>Acer sp. Rhododendron sp.</i>	Semi-mature	4	10	150	Yes	0	See plan				Shrubby group containing Maple and Rhododendron.				Fair	Fair	10 to 20 yrs	Low	C	Removal required to facilitate proposed new development
G15	Cherry Laurel. Lilac.	<i>Prunus sp. Syringa sp.</i>	Early-mature	4	10	100	Yes	0	See plan				Boundary group of Cherry Laurel, clipped and managed, with shrubby Lilac. Good screening potential.				Fair	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	Removal required to facilitate proposed new development
T16	Cherry	<i>Prunus sp.</i>	Semi-mature	2	1	200	No	1	2.5	2	1	1	Limited access around base	Single stemmed. Significant lean. Stubs. Ivy covered. Pruning wounds - healing poorly with some decay	Small / sparse. Minor deadwood. Unbalanced	Small stunted tree in border. Leaning out against boundary wall. Limited prospects.	Fair	Fair	10 to 20 yrs	Low	C	Removal required to facilitate proposed new development

	Tree Species			Measurements				Crown (m)					Tree Condition							Value		Management
Tree ID	Common Name	Latin Name	Maturity	Height (m)	Stems	Stem Diameter (mm)	Estimated	Ave Height	N	E	S	W	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Physiological	Structural	Life Expectancy	Amenity	Category	Works
T17	Rowan	<i>Sorbus aucuparia</i>	Early-mature	13	1	240	Yes	4	1	2	3	2	Limited access around base	Single stemmed. Vertical. Epicormic growths. Stubs. Minor decay	50% dead / absent. Small / sparse. Low vigour. Moderate dieback. Minor deadwood. Moderate deadwood. Snapped /hanging branches	Adjacent Rowan in decline. Leans away from site boundary.	Poor	Poor	<10 yrs	Low	U	No works required
G18	Oak. Sycamore. Birch. Rowan.	<i>Quercus sp.</i> <i>Acer sp.</i> <i>Betula sp.</i> <i>Sorbus sp.</i>	Early-mature	18	10	300	Yes	4	See plan				Adjacent woodland group of predominantly Oak with occasional larger Sycamore. Some Birch and Rowan. Public access by footpath through wood.				Good	Good	>40 yrs	Moderate	A	No works required







AWA
TREE CONSULTANTS

Appendix 6:
Tree Impacts Plan

Bank View, Green Moor Road, Green Moor, Wortley
Ref: AWA3976

BRITISH STANDARD 5837:2012

SCALE: 1:200 PAPER: A2

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