




BS 5837:2012

Arboricultural Impact Assessment

13th February 2026

Report No. 2604_AIA.01

Project: Land at Shaw Lane

Authored by: Matthew Lally



ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

PROJECT

Land at Shaw Lane
Carlton
Barnsley
S71 3HJ

ENVANCE

Unit 9, Acorn Business Park
Heaton Lane
Stockport
SK4 1AS
[T] 0161 327 1723
[E] enquiries@envanceuk.com
[W] www.envanceuk.com

DOCUMENT ISSUE RECORD

Date of Inspection	Surveyor	Report Version	Issue Date	Author
28.01.2026	Matthew Lally, FdSc MArborA	01	13.02.2026	Matthew Lally, FdSc MArborA

This report is the property of Envance. This report may only be reproduced or disclosed to third parties with express written consent from Envance.

All comments, conclusions and recommendations within this report are based on the information available to Envance at the time of investigation. Envance accepts no liability in cases where provided information is found to be inaccurate or misleading or if additional information exists or becomes available.



CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
1. INTRODUCTION.....	2
1.1. Author Information.....	2
1.2. Scope and Purpose of the Reports	2
1.3. Instructions & Brief	3
2. SITE VISIT & SURVEY METHODOLOGY	4
2.1. Survey Details	4
2.2. Creation of the Tree Constraints Plan	5
3. PLANNING POLICY	7
3.1. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)	7
3.2. Local Planning Policy.....	7
4. LEGISLATION	10
4.1. Statutory Considerations	10
4.2. Felling Licence.....	11
4.3. Protected Species	11
5. THE SITE, ITS SURROUNDINGS & THE TREE POPULATION	13
5.1. Site & Surroundings	13
5.2. Tree Population	13
6. ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT.....	14
6.1. Proposed Development.....	14
6.2. Impacts	14
7. MITIGATION PROPOSALS	17
7.1. Compensatory Planting	17
7.2. Root Pruning	18
7.3. Boundary and Internal Fence Construction.....	19
7.4. Installation of Utilities	19
8. ARBORICULTURAL METHOD STATEMENT REQUIREMENT.....	20
8.1. Method Statement	20
9. CAVEATS AND LIMITATIONS	21



Appendix I Tree Survey Data & Site Notes

Appendix II Glossary of Terms

Appendix III Cascade Chart

Appendix IV Tree Constraints Plan & Arboricultural Implications Plan

Appendix V Pictorial Evidence



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The proposed development site is located within a semi-rural area of Carlton in the Metropolitan Borough of Barnsley. The site currently consists of an agricultural field with a small internal pond to the north.

Trees present that could be potentially affected by the development are as follows:

Category A	Category B	Category C	Category U
0	8 Trees 10 Groups 1 Hedge	4 Trees 7 Groups 4 Hedges	0

It is proposed to construct 214 residential units along with associated access roads, parking, hardstanding areas and soft landscaping. To facilitate this development, trees requiring removal or other works are as follows:

	Tree Category. Trees Requiring Works			
Tree Work Type	Category A	Category B	Category C	Category U
Tree removal	0	1 Group 1 Partial group	2 Groups 1 Partial group 2 Partial hedges	0
Supervised excavation and root pruning	0	1 Tree	0	0



1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Author Information

1.1.1. My name is Matthew Lally and I have been working with trees for over 18 years. I have experience in both practical elements of arboriculture and in consulting. I so far hold the following Arboricultural qualifications and technical memberships:

- FdSc Arboriculture
- LANTRA Professional Tree Inspection Certificate
- VALID – Validator
- QTRA Registered User
- Professional Member of the Consulting Arborist Society
- Professional member of the Arboricultural Association
- Associate Member of the Institute of Chartered Foresters.

1.1.2. I am the author of this report and as a Professional Member of the Arboricultural Association, the Consulting Arborist Society and an Associate Member of the Institute of Chartered Foresters, I am required to uphold ethical standards laid out by these institutions and therefore I have written this report in good faith and as objectively as possible.

1.2. Scope and Purpose of the Reports

1.2.1. An Arboricultural Impact Assessment is used to detail reasonably foreseeable conflicts that a development may have with regards to trees on a given site and is intended to assist the Local Planning Authority (LPA), in this case Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council, in their assessment of the proposed development. I therefore recommend that this report along with the associated Method Statement is supplied to LPA in support of the planning application to which it pertains.

1.2.2. I have aspired in this report to provide an analysis of the impacts that the proposed development is projected to have on trees located within the site based on the information that I have available to me at the time of writing. Where practicable I have included trees on land immediately adjacent to the site that may also be impacted. I also offer guidance on suitable retained tree management and mitigation recommendations for losses or other foreseen issues.



1.3. Instructions & Brief

- 1.3.1. I was commissioned to write this Arboricultural Impact Assessment in relation to the proposed development at Land at Shaw Lane, Carlton, Barnsley.
- 1.3.2. Table 1 provides a summary of documents which have been made available for use in this report.

Table 1 Documents made available by client.

Document Type	Reference No.	Author	Date
Topographical Survey	4620	ZS Surveys Ltd	05/12/2025
Site Layout	4035-49-AWSM-XX-XX-DR-A-002 Rev P19	Vistry Group	02/02/2026

- 1.3.3. I attach below an outline overhead photograph of the area that I assessed on the 28/01/2026. (This is not necessarily the site boundary but includes trees that I deem could be impacted by the development regardless of ownership)



Figure 1. Assessment boundary plan.



2. SITE VISIT & SURVEY METHODOLOGY

2.1. Survey Details

- 2.1.1. I visited the site and surveyed the trees in accordance with Chapter 4 of BS5837:2012. I have recorded all the recommended tree metrics in the tree schedule which can be found in appendix I.
- 2.1.2. British Standard 5837:2012 'Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction - Recommendations' includes guidance for considering the relationship between existing trees and how to integrate their needs into a successful development. A harmonious and sustainable relationship between any retained trees and new structure and/or hard surfaces is at the heart of the guidance.
- 2.1.3. When recording the trees as individual trees, groups of trees, woodlands or hedge groups I have included a prefix on the tree number. Explained as follows: Individual trees (T), groups of trees (G), hedgerows (H) or woodland groups (W).
- 2.1.4. I have used the term 'group' where trees form cohesive arboricultural features either aerodynamically, visually or culturally.
- 2.1.5. I have used the term 'hedgerow' for lines of trees or shrubs less than 5m wide at the base and which are managed or have been managed under an obvious regular pruning regime.
- 2.1.6. I have used the term 'woodland' where there are at least 10 trees and the individual tree canopies generally overlap and interlink, often forming a more or less continuous canopy and trees are the dominant plant form in this area.
- 2.1.7. I carried out the survey on Wednesday 28th January 2026 by means of inspection from ground level. If the inspection was restricted for any reason such as lack of access or dense climbing plants etc, then I have noted this in the site notes in appendix I. I have included pictures of the significant trees in appendix V.
- 2.1.8. The weather conditions during the survey were dry and still and therefore did not adversely affect the quality of the inspection.



- 2.1.9. In some cases, I may decide to group trees that share very similar characteristics. This method is in line with point 4.2.4 of BS 5837:2012 and I quote 'Trees forming groups should be identified and considered as groups where the arboriculturist determines that this is appropriate. It may be appropriate to assess the quality and value of trees as a whole, rather than individuals.'
- 2.1.10. I assessed all the trees using: a grading A to C (A being of high quality and C being of the lowest quality) and U (trees in such a condition that they cannot realistically be retained as living trees in the context of the current land use for longer than 10 years). I attach in appendix III the British Standard 5837:2012 cascade chart for further details.
- 2.1.11. I have where appropriate recorded the canopy spread for each tree at four cardinal points in order to reproduce an accurate representation of the crown shape of the tree, this was generally not possible for tree groups, woodlands and hedges and therefore these were averaged and are represented by simplified representations on the plans. These representations can be seen in the plans that I have attached in appendix IV.
- 2.1.12. Assessing the potential influence of trees upon load bearing soils and the potential impact to existing and proposed structures was not included in the contract brief and I have therefore not considered this in the report. I cannot be held responsible for damage arising from such action. I recommend that you consult the relevant professional with regards to soil and structures before planning any development.
- 2.1.13. During the site visits I have inspected the trees in line with the British Standard recommendations for potentially hazardous trees and I have made appropriate recommendations where required. I note, however, that this report is not a substitute for a full tree risk assessment or management plan which are specifically designed to minimise risk and liability associated with responsibility for trees.

2.2. Creation of the Tree Constraints Plan

- 2.2.1. British Standard 5837:2012 recommends the assessment of trees is made as objectively as possible, but I note that although I do my utmost to be as objective as possible, the findings and recommendations in this report will always be my opinion. The tree categorisation method identified in the



British Standard is a tool I use on every Preliminary and Arboricultural Impact Assessment as this guidance helps to make an objective judgment of the tree quality and value of the existing tree stock and keep the judgment as consistent and fair as possible.

- 2.2.2. The Tree Constraints Plan was created using computer aided design software and the provided Topographical Survey ref: 4620. The plan shows the tree crowns, tree stems and the root protection areas in relation to the surrounding buildings and other site features.
- 2.2.3. I note that the supplied Topographical Survey plans did include a limited number of tree positions, however, most trees were not located on the plan. I have plotted the trees not represented on the plans using overhead photography and marked any tree plotted like this with the suffix "#". I note that the positions plotted on the plan by myself are estimated and therefore any dimensions should be checked on site. I do not accept any liability for inaccurately plotted trees.
- 2.2.4. The Root Protection Area is the minimum amount of root and soil around the tree that we need to retain unmolested if we want to retain these trees successfully. The Root Protection Area or RPA is calculated by a function of the size of the main stem (12x the stem diameter at 1.5m from ground level gives the radius of the RPA's circle).
- 2.2.5. I have shown the Root Protection Area (RPA) on the plans in appendix IV for each individual tree as a circle centred on the base of the stem which is based on the recommendation of the British Standard. In some cases, I will have noted onsite that there will be a root barrier likely to exist, such as roads/hard surfaces, building structures, & retaining walls that will have clearly impacted the tree roots actual morphology and disposition. In these circumstances I have amended the shape of the RPA to reflect this, without a reduction in its area.



3. PLANNING POLICY

3.1. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

3.1.1. It is my understanding that when determining planning applications, Local Planning Authority's (LPA) should apply the following principles:

- If significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternate site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused.
- Development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused unless there are wholly exceptional reasons, and a suitable compensation strategy exists.
- Development whose primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be supported; while opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should be integrated as part of their design, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity or enhance public access to nature where this is appropriate. (paragraph 193)

3.1.2. Consideration should also be taken of paragraph 136 of the NPPF which states:

Trees make an important contribution to the character and quality of urban environments, and can also help mitigate and adapt to climate change. Planning policies and decisions should ensure that new streets are tree-lined⁵², that opportunities are taken to incorporate trees elsewhere in developments (such as parks and community orchards), that appropriate measures are in place to secure the long-term maintenance of newly-planted trees, and that existing trees are retained wherever possible. Applicants and local planning authorities should work with highways officers and tree officers to ensure that the right trees are planted in the right places, and solutions are found that are compatible with highways standards and the needs of different users. (Paragraph 136)

3.2. Local Planning Policy

3.2.1. The NPPF sets out Government planning policies for England and how they should be applied. The Local Planning Authorities each use this information to guide Local Planning Policies which are used as the basis for determining planning applications. The local authority in this case, Barnsley Metropolitan



Borough Council, refers to many different policies and guidance when considering the trees and development including:

3.2.2. Barnsley Local Plan - Adopted January 2019

Policy GD1 General Development (pg.28)

Proposals for development will be approved if:

There will be no significant adverse effect on the living conditions and residential amenity of existing and future residents;

They are compatible with neighbouring land and will not significantly prejudice the current or future use of the neighbouring land;

They will not adversely affect the potential development of a wider area of land which could otherwise be available for development and safeguards access to adjacent land;

They include landscaping to provide a high quality setting for buildings, incorporating existing landscape features and ensuring that plant species and the way they are planted, hard surfaces, boundary treatments and other features appropriately reflect, protect and improve the character of the local landscape;

Any adverse impact on the environment, natural resources, waste and pollution is minimised and mitigated;

Adequate access and internal road layouts are provided to allow the complete development of the entire site for residential purposes, and to provide appropriate vehicular and pedestrian links throughout the site and into adjacent areas;

Any drains, culverts and other surface water bodies that may cross the site are considered;

Appropriate landscaped boundaries are provided where sites are adjacent to open countryside;

Any pylons are considered in the layout; and

Existing trees that are to remain on site are considered in the layout in order to avoid overshadowing.

3.2.3. Supplementary Planning Document Trees and Hedgerows - Adopted May 2019

Section 6 Layout of development (pg.6)

The Tree Survey information should inform the layout and design of the development and should ensure that, in particular, the higher retention category trees and hedgerows are retained, both in the short and long term. Plans which show the retention of high value trees or hedgerows which are too close to buildings, roads, or drainage systems or will be affected by alterations in ground level will not be approved. Sometimes it can take



several years for damage to a tree caused by development to be apparent, and in other cases future residents may wish to remove trees that are too close to their dwelling, for instance due to the overshadowing of windows or leaves dropping in gutters or on car parking areas. In considering planning applications, the Council will seek to avoid such long term problems arising as well as ensuring that the development does not lead to the unnecessary direct removal of trees and hedgerows. Generally, no buildings or works will be allowed within the RPA of any tree which it is proposed to retain because works within the key rooting area of the tree could lead to lasting damage being caused. The laying of impervious surfaces to areas previously covered with grass or gravel within or in close proximity to the RPA can lead to lack of water for trees. This means care must be taken with the provision of roads and parking areas. Intervening distances must be adequate to ensure that future residents will not feel unduly threatened in high winds and to ensure that falling branches are not likely to cause damage to property or danger to residents. This may require that in some cases buildings, garages and parking areas are located substantially beyond the canopy spreads of large trees. Where trees/hedgerows are retained within development proposals or offered by way of mitigation/enhancement planting they should be clearly differentiated from ornamental/amenity features on layout/landscaping plans with an appropriate key.



4. LEGISLATION

4.1. Statutory Considerations

4.1.1. The Town and Country Planning Act (1990) (the Act) and associated Regulations empower Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) to protect trees in the interests of amenity by making Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs). The Act also affords protection for trees with a diameter at breast height over 75 mm diameter that stand within the curtilage of a Conservation Area. An application must be made to the LPA in question to carry out works upon or to remove trees that are subject to a TPO, whilst six weeks' notice of intention must be given to carry out works upon or to remove trees within a Conservation Area that are not protected by a TPO.

4.1.2. A Tree Preservation Order (TPO) is an order made by a local planning authority to protect specific trees, groups of trees or woodlands in the interests of amenity. A TPO prohibits the:

- cutting down
- topping
- lopping
- uprooting
- wilful damage
- wilful destruction

of trees without the LPA's written consent. If consent is given, it can be subject to conditions which have to be followed. In the Secretary of State's view, cutting roots is also a prohibited activity and requires the authority's consent. Anyone found guilty of such an offence is liable and in serious cases, may result in prosecution and incur an unlimited fine.

4.1.3. I have not directly contacted the Local Planning Authority, however, I have used the online search facility on the website for the Local Planning Authority, Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council. This online service indicated that there are no Tree Preservation Orders and Conservation Areas that would apply to any trees present on, or in close proximity to the assessment site and therefore no statutory constraints would apply to the development in respect of trees. I recommend that before any tree works are undertaken confirmation of the online information should be sought from the Local Authority.




Figure 2. A screenshot of the Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council interactive map showing the location of any TPO's or Conservation Areas in relation to the site. (Accessed 03.02.26, <https://www.barnsley.gov.uk/barnsley-maps/tree-preservation-orders-map/>)

4.2. Felling Licence

- 4.2.1. Tree felling is a restricted act under the Forestry Act 1967 and the Forestry Commission controls felling by issuing felling licences. Not every tree felling project requires a felling licence, with exemptions based on location, the type of tree work, the volume and diameter of the tree, other permissions already in place, and legal and statutory undertakings. The requirement of a felling licence is not necessary where "Felling trees immediately required for the purpose of carrying out development authorised by planning permission (granted under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990) ..."
- 4.2.2. If full planning permission is granted, then any trees which require felling to implement the approved plans are exempt from this statutory protection. Outline planning permission does not provide an exemption to the regulations that control tree felling in the Forestry Act 1967.

4.3. Protected Species

- 4.3.1. Nesting birds are afforded statutory protection under the Wildlife & Countryside Act (1981) (as amended) and their potential presence should therefore be considered when clipping hedges, removing climbing plants and pruning and removing trees. The breeding period for woodlands runs from March to August inclusive. Hedges provide valuable nesting sites for many birds and clipping should therefore be avoided during March to July.



Trees, hedges and ivy should be inspected for nests prior to pruning or removal and any work likely to destroy or disturb active nests should be avoided until the young have fledged.

- 4.3.2. All bat species and their roosts are protected under Schedule 5 of the Wildlife & Countryside Act (1981) (as amended) and under Schedule 2 of the Conservation of Habitats & Species Regulations 2010 (as amended). In this respect it should be noted that it is possible that unidentified bat habitat features may be located high up in tree crowns and all personnel carrying out tree works at the site should therefore be vigilant and mindful of the possibility that roosting bats may be present in trees with such features. If any bat roosts are subsequently identified, then it is essential that works are halted immediately and that a suitably qualified and experienced ecologist investigates and advises on appropriate action prior to works continuing.
- 4.3.3. In turn, any subsequent works carried out in relation to any protected species must be carried out under guidance from a suitably qualified and experienced ecologist and in strict accordance with the guidance provided in BS42020:2013 - Biodiversity – Code of Practice for Planning and Development and, with regard to bats, in strict accordance with BS8596:2015 - Surveying for Bats in Trees and Woodlands.



5. THE SITE, ITS SURROUNDINGS & THE TREE POPULATION

5.1. Site & Surroundings

- 5.1.1. The site under consideration is located within a semi-rural area of Carlton in the Metropolitan Borough of Barnsley. The site currently consists of an agricultural field with a small internal pond to the north.
- 5.1.2. It is bordered to the north and west by further agricultural fields, the east by a railway line, and the south by Shaw Lane.

5.2. Tree Population

- 5.2.1. As noted previously, a total of twelve individual trees, seventeen groups of trees, and five hedges were surveyed for the purpose of this appraisal. They range from young to mature in age, with heights up to approximately 16 metres, maximum diametrical crown spreads up to approximately 17 metres, and stem diameters up to approximately 600 millimetres. Detailed tree dimensions and other pertinent information, such as structural defects and physiological deficiencies, are included in the Tree Schedule in Appendix I.
- 5.2.2. Under the UK's planning system trees are a material consideration in the planning and development process. Nonetheless, only trees of a suitable quality and value should be considered a material constraint to development. In this respect the Tree Schedule includes a column ('Cat. Grade') listing the trees' respective retention values, where they are rated either 'A', 'B', 'C' or 'U', as per BS5837:2012 Table 1 (appendix III). 'A' category trees are those considered to be of 'high quality' and, accordingly, the most suitable for retention, whilst 'B' category trees are those considered to be of 'moderate quality', and 'C' category trees are those considered to be of 'low quality' with a correlated low retention value. In turn, 'U' category trees are those that are considered to be 'unsuitable for retention'. In respect of the survey, it should be noted that tree quality is categorised within the existing context without taking any site development proposals into account.
- 5.2.3. As detailed in the Tree Schedule in appendix I, eight trees, ten groups and one hedge were categorised as moderate quality (i.e. 'B' category), and four trees, seven groups, and four hedges were categorised as low quality (i.e. 'C' category).



6. ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

6.1. Proposed Development

- 6.1.1. It is proposed to construct 214 residential units along with associated access roads, parking, hardstanding areas and soft landscaping. These proposals are encapsulated in the proposed site layout plan reference: 4035-49-AWSM-XX-XX-DR-A-002 Rev P19.

6.2. Impacts

- 6.2.1. I have overlayed the proposed site layout plan reference: 4035-49-AWSM-XX-XX-DR-A-002 Rev P19 onto the existing site plan using computer aided design software and found locations in which there are conflicts with existing trees. I have made this plan available in appendix IV titled Arboricultural Implications plan.
- 6.2.2. In order to fully assess the impact of the proposals, I have created an Impact Table below (Table 2) in which I detail each tree, indicate which tree/s can be retained and which need to be removed, outline any mitigation needed and give a justification for any actions outlined.
- 6.2.3. I used the aforementioned Impact Table and Arboricultural Implications Plan in my analysis to determine whether the development will have an impact on the health of each tree. Where I have determined there is an impact, I have then decided upon any mitigation measures that could be implemented to reduce the impact the proposals will have on the treescape.

Table 2. Impact Table

Tree No.	Retention Category	Can the Tree/s be Successfully Retained	Explanatory Notes & Justification
T1	B1	Yes	-
T2#	B1	Yes	-
T3#	C1	Yes	-
G4#	B2	Partial Removal	Two sections of this group require removal to facilitate the installation of new footpaths and accessways.
G5#	B2	No	This group requires removal to facilitate the installation of new footpaths and accessways.



Tree No.	Retention Category	Can the Tree/s be Successfully Retained	Explanatory Notes & Justification
T6#	B2	Yes, with mitigation	The installation of the new footpath and accessway within the RPA will require supervised root pruning and excavation
H7#	C2	Partial Removal	Three sections of this hedge require removal to facilitate the installation of new footpaths and accessways.
G8#	C2	Partial Removal	Two trees from this group require removal to facilitate the installation of new footpaths and accessways.
G9#	B2	Yes	-
G10#	C2	No	Remove to facilitate the construction of new housing plots.
G11#	C2	No	Remove to facilitate the construction of a new attenuation basin
H12#	C2	Yes	-
H13#	B2	Yes	-
H14#	C2	Partial Removal	A 14.5m section of this hedge requires removal to facilitate the construction of a new access road.
G15#	B2	Yes	-
G16a#	B2	Yes	-
G16b#	B2	Yes	-
G16c#	B2	Yes	-
H17#	C2	Yes	-
T18#	C2	Yes	-
G19#	B2	Yes	-
G20#	B2	Yes	-
T21#	B2	Yes	-
G22#	C2	Yes	-
G23#	C2	Yes	-
T24	B2	Yes	-
T25	C2	Yes	-
G26#	C2	Yes	-
T27#	C1	Yes	-
G28#	B2	Yes	-
G29#	B2	Yes	-
G30#	B3	Yes	-
T31#	B1	Yes	-



Tree No.	Retention Category	Can the Tree/s be Successfully Retained	Explanatory Notes & Justification
G32#	C2	Yes	-
T33#	B2	Yes	-
T34#	B2	Yes	-

6.2.4. I have created an Assessment Table (Table 3) to help visualise the number of trees that will or will not be impacted by the proposed development. To assess the implications of the Impact Table each tree can be categorised in the following way: -

Table 3. Assessment Table

	Trees to be Retained		Trees to be Removed	
	With No Impact	With detailed construction	Due to Condition	Due to Development
Category A	-	-	-	-
Category B	T1, T2#, G4# (Partial), G9#, H13#, G15#, G16a#, G16b#, G16c#, G19#, G20#, T21#, T24, G28#, G29#, G30#, T31#, T33#, T34#,	T6#,	-	G4# (Partial), G5#,
Category C	T3#, H7# (Partial), G8# (Partial), H12#, H14# (Partial), H17#, T18#, G22#, G23#, T25, G26# T27#, G32#,	-	-	H7# (Partial), G8# (Partial), G10#, G11#, H14# (Partial),
Category U	-	-	-	-

6.2.5. As can be seen in table 3, one category B group, one partial category B group, two category C groups, one partial category C group and two partial category C hedges require removal to facilitate this proposal. This can be mitigated as outlined in section 7.1.



7. MITIGATION PROPOSALS

7.1. Compensatory Planting

7.1.1. I have noted three groups, two partial groups and two partial hedges to be removed to facilitate this development and I therefore recommend that the loss of the trees identified in table 3 is mitigated by replacement tree planting.

7.1.2. This will have a number of benefits for the development and the character of the area. These being: -

- Give a greater diversity of age class on the site, increasing sustainability.
- Give a greater diversity of species and therefore wildlife habitat.

7.1.3. I propose a non-exhaustive list of suitable replacement trees in the schedule below, each species can be planted more than once: -

Table 4. Replacement Tree Schedule

Tree Species	Tree Size
<i>Acer campestre</i>	6 - 8 cm girth
<i>Betula pubescens</i>	6 - 8 cm girth
<i>Pinus sylvestris</i>	6 - 8 cm girth
<i>Quercus robur</i>	6 - 8 cm girth
<i>Pyrus cordata</i>	6 - 8 cm girth
<i>Sorbus aucuparia</i>	6 - 8 cm girth
<i>Alnus glutinosa</i>	6 - 8 cm girth
<i>Prunus padus</i>	6 - 8 cm girth
<i>Prunus avium</i>	6 - 8 cm girth
<i>Taxus baccata</i>	6 - 8 cm girth
<i>Sorbus aria</i>	6 - 8 cm girth
<i>Carpinus betulus</i>	6 - 8 cm girth
<i>Malus sylvestris</i>	6 - 8 cm girth
<i>Crataegus monogyna</i>	Hedge plant
<i>Ilex aquifolium</i>	Hedge plant
<i>Prunus spinosa</i>	Hedge plant
<i>Corylus avellana</i>	Hedge plant
<i>Viburnum opulus</i>	Hedge plant
<i>Euonymus europaeus</i>	Hedge plant



- 7.1.4. The extent of mitigation planting required will need to be confirmed in agreement with the Local Planning Authority once the development proposal is finalised.

7.2. Root Pruning

- 7.2.1. The proposed construction of the new access road encroaches into the RPA of T6# by approximately 10%. The tree is located on the far side of an agricultural ditch with flowing water within it. It is likely that the principal root development has followed the line of the ditch rather than extending across it. The opposite side of the ditch comprises actively managed agricultural land subject to regular ploughing, which would discourage sustained root establishment and development in that direction.
- 7.2.2. I would recommend that to facilitate the development and prevent damage to any tree roots within the RPA of this tree, all excavation should be supervised by an arboricultural consultant and any root pruning that is required should be undertaken by the arboricultural consultant.
- 7.2.3. It is my opinion that if the following points are adhered to then the long-term health and retention of T6# will not be adversely affected.
- Excavation must be carried out using hand tools to avoid direct damage to the bark of the roots. It may be possible in some instances to use specialised equipment such as high air pressure machinery to excavate the soil with minimal disturbance to roots.
 - Exposed roots will be wrapped in moist, clean hessian to prevent the roots from drying out in hot or dry weather. The hessian must be removed before backfilling.
 - Roots less than 25mm diameter may be pruned back, preferably to a growing point. A sharp cutting tool such as bypass secateurs or a handsaw should be used to leave the smallest wound possible. Roots greater than 25mm in diameter should be retained wherever possible. However, due to the points made in section 7.2.1, larger roots can be pruned on this occasion.
 - Root pruning should be carried out by an arboricultural consultant.
 - Backfilling of any excavation must be carried out by hand to avoid direct root damage or compaction, where possible. Builder sand must not be used in the backfill material.



7.3. Boundary and Internal Fence Construction

- 7.3.1. The developments proposed new boundary and internal fences could have negative implications for many of the retained trees at this site and could have negative implications for the safe useful life expectancy of these trees.
- 7.3.2. It is my opinion that any adverse effects of the installation of these fences could be mitigated if the following precautions and guidelines are adhered to:
- A fence design that allows for varying distances between fence posts will be selected.
 - Each fence post will have trial holes dug by hand to ensure that no major roots are severed.
 - If major roots are found during the digging of the trial holes, then the fence post will not be placed in this hole and the trial hole will be backfilled.
 - Posts will be placed at least 0.5 metres from any stems.
 - Panels will be no closer than 300mm to a stem to allow for yearly incremental growth.
- 7.3.3. If the above measures are adhered to then the installation of the fence will not adversely affect the safe useful life expectancy of the trees.

7.4. Installation of Utilities

- 7.4.1. I have not been informed about the locations of any new utilities; however, it is expected that utilities will be installed and therefore the excavation for the installation of new utilities could have negative implications for the retained trees on this site.
- 7.4.2. It is my opinion that if the excavation for the installation of the utilities is undertaken in line with NJUG Volume 4. 'Guidelines for the planning, installation, and maintenance of utility apparatus in proximity to trees' the safe useful life expectancy of these trees will not be adversely affected.



8. ARBORICULTURAL METHOD STATEMENT REQUIREMENT

8.1. Method Statement

- 8.1.1. To help ensure that the trees are protected onsite during the construction phase a separate Arboricultural Method Statement (ref: 2604_AMS.01) has been produced to accompany this document.



9. CAVEATS AND LIMITATIONS

- 9.1.1. The report is for the sole use of the client and its reproduction or use by anyone else is forbidden unless written consent is given by myself (Matthew Lally).
- 9.1.2. This is an arboricultural report and as such no reliance should be given to comments relating to buildings, engineering, soils, ecological or archaeological data. If either is commented upon within the report further professional advice should be sought.
- 9.1.3. This is not a Tree Risk Assessment. As such this report should not be taken to mean or imply that any of the inspected trees should be considered safe. A Tree Risk Assessment can be provided but would be subject to additional survey requirement and further fees.
- 9.1.4. Trees are growing dynamic structures. Whilst all reasonable effort has been made to identify defects within the trees inspected, no guarantee can be given as to the absolute safety or otherwise of any individual tree. No tree is ever absolutely safe due to the unpredictable laws and forces of nature. As a result of this, natural failure of intact trees will occur; extreme climatic conditions can cause damage to even apparently healthy trees.
- 9.1.5. For the purposes of this survey all dimensions of trees and their associated parts are based on estimation unless otherwise stated.
- 9.1.6. Trees are living organisms whose health, condition and structure can change quickly and without warning. Therefore, the contents of this report are valid for a period of one year from the date of this survey.



Appendix I

Tree Survey Data & Site Notes

***The recommendations in this section are based on the site survey only and are **NOT** recommendations to facilitate the development plans. See the Arboricultural METHOD STATEMENT for tree works required to facilitate the development.**

BS5837:2012 TREE SCHEDULE



DATE OF SURVEY: 28/01/2026

JOB REFERENCE: 2604_AIA.01

SITE ADDRESS: Land at Shaw Lane, Carlton, Barnsley, S71 3HJ

Tree No.	Species	Stem Dia (mm)	RPA (m ²)	RPA Radius (m)	Height (m)	Age Class	Crown Spread (m)				Crown Clearance (m)	Condition	Comments	Recommendations	Remaining Contribution	BS5837 Retention Category
							N	E	S	W						
T1	Hawthorn	200	18	2.4	5	EM	3	3	3	3	1E	A	Located on site boundary adjacent to road. Vitality appears normal and tree appears stable.	No action	40+	B1
T2#	Hawthorn	300	41	3.6	5	EM	3	3	3	3	1E	A	A multi-stemmed tree located on site boundary adjacent to road. Vitality appears normal and tree appears stable.	No action	40+	B1
T3#	Hawthorn	140	9	1.68	3	SM	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1S	A	Asymmetrical crown and stem lean due to adjacent trees. Vitality appears normal and the tree appears stable.	No action	40+	C1
G4#	Hawthorn. Field Maple. Elm. Ash. Sycamore	200	18	2.4	7	Y to SM	3	3	3	3	1S	A to C	A linear group located on either side of field boundary ditch adjacent to road. Vitality is within the normal range and the trees appear stable. Occasional small dead elm but of little concern due to location.	No action	40+	B2
G5#	Field Maple	300	41	3.6	12	SM	4	4	4	4	4N	A	A multi-stemmed group of field maple located on far side of boundary ditch relative to the site. Vitality appears normal and the trees appear stable.	No action	40+	B2
T6#	Elm	500	113	6	10	EM	4	5	5	5	3N	A	Located on site boundary on far side of ditch relative to the site. Multi-stemmed and ivy clad. Limited inspection due to access and ivy. Vitality appears normal and the tree appears stable.	No action	20+	B2
H7#	Hawthorn. Elder.	130	8	1.56	1.5	SM to EM	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0N	B	A heavily flailed and fragmented field boundary hedge. Low quality. Some trees are dead.	No action	20+	C2
G8#	Hawthorn	140	9	1.68	2	SM to EM	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0N	B to C	A heavily flailed and fragmented field boundary hedge. Low quality. Some trees are dead.	No action	10+	C2

BS5837:2012 TREE SCHEDULE



DATE OF SURVEY: 28/01/2026

JOB REFERENCE: 2604_AIA.01

SITE ADDRESS: Land at Shaw Lane, Carlton, Barnsley, S71 3HJ

Tree No.	Species	Stem Dia (mm)	RPA (m ²)	RPA Radius (m)	Height (m)	Age Class	Crown Spread (m)				Crown Clearance (m)	Condition	Comments	Recommendations	Remaining Contribution	BS5837 Retention Category
							N	E	S	W						
G9#	Hawthorn	200	18	2.4	4	SM to EM	1	1	1	1	1W	B	A fragmented lapsed boundary hedgerow. Some small dead trees within group but of little concern.	No action	40+	B2
G10#	Grey willow	200	18	2.4	5	SM	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	0W	B to C	A mixed group adjacent to internal field pond. Root plate shift evident in some trees, others have fallen over. Low quality group.	No action	10+	C2
G11#	Grey willow. Elder.	250	28	3	7	SM to EM	3	3	3	3	1N	A to B	A mixed group located within field pond area. Multi-stemmed and heavily flailed on either side of group adjacent to the fields. Low quality.	No action	20+	C2
H12#	Hawthorn	100	5	1.2	2	SM	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0N	B	A heavily trimmed and fragmented section of hedge. Located on site boundary. Low quality.	No action	20+	C2
H13#	Blackthorn. Hawthorn.	200	18	2.4	5	EM	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	0N	B	A fragmented boundary hedge. Flailed on both sides. Occasional dead tree but of little concern due to low occupancy.	No action	40+	B2
H14#	Hawthorn	100	5	1.2	3	SM	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0S	A to B	A linear boundary hedgerow, heavily pruned. Vitality appears to be within the normal range and the trees appear stable.	No action	40+	C2
G15#	Oak. Hawthorn. Birch	180	15	2.16	5	SM to EM	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	0W	A	A third-party owned group located on far side of boundary fence, not inspected, estimated measurements. Vitality appears normal and the trees appear stable.	No action	40+	B2
G16a#	Oak	540	132	6.48	16	EM	8.5	8.5	8.5	8.5	4W	A	One of a group of three trees located on far side of boundary fence. No access to inspect, estimated measurements. Vitality appears normal and the trees appear stable.	No action	40+	B2

BS5837:2012

TREE SCHEDULE



DATE OF SURVEY: 28/01/2026

JOB REFERENCE: 2604_AIA.01

SITE ADDRESS: Land at Shaw Lane, Carlton, Barnsley, S71 3HJ

Tree No.	Species	Stem Dia (mm)	RPA (m ²)	RPA Radius (m)	Height (m)	Age Class	Crown Spread (m)				Crown Clearance (m)	Condition	Comments	Recommendations	Remaining Contribution	BS5837 Retention Category
							N	E	S	W						
G16b#	Oak	600	163	7.2	16	EM	8.5	8.5	8.5	8.5	4W	A	One of a group of three trees located on far side of boundary fence. No access to inspect, estimated measurements. Vitality appears normal and the trees appear stable.	No action	40+	B2
G16c#	Oak	500	113	6	16	EM	8.5	8.5	8.5	8.5	4W	A	One of a group of three trees located on far side of boundary fence. No access to inspect, estimated measurements. Vitality appears normal and the trees appear stable.	No action	40+	B2
H17#	Hawthorn	50	1	0.6	1.5	SM	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0W	A	A well-maintained field boundary hedge within site boundary.	No action	40+	C2
T18#	Willow	200	18	2.4	7	SM	2	2	2	2	1N	A	A multi-stemmed tree located on far side of boundary hedge. No access to inspect, estimated measurements.	No action	40+	C2
G19#	Willow	300	41	3.6	10	EM	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	0N	A	A third-party owned group, no access to inspect, estimated measurements.	No action	40+	B2
G20#	Willow	200	18	2.4	9	SM	3	3	3	3	1W	A	A third-party group located approximately 5m from site boundary fence line. Vitality appears normal and the tree appears stable.	No action	40+	B2
T21#	Ash	550	137	6.6	14	EM	8	6	7	8	5W	B	A third-party owned ash located on far side of boundary fence. Early stage ash dieback disease present but unable to fully assess due to time of year. The tree appears stable with no evidence of significant risk features.	No action	20+	B2

BS5837:2012

TREE SCHEDULE



DATE OF SURVEY: 28/01/2026

JOB REFERENCE: 2604_AIA.01

SITE ADDRESS: Land at Shaw Lane, Carlton, Barnsley, S71 3HJ

Tree No.	Species	Stem Dia (mm)	RPA (m ²)	RPA Radius (m)	Height (m)	Age Class	Crown Spread (m)				Crown Clearance (m)	Condition	Comments	Recommendations	Remaining Contribution	BS5837 Retention Category
							N	E	S	W						
G22#	Ash x 4	140	9	1.68	7	SM	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	3N	B	A group of four trees located within site boundary fence. Early stage ash dieback disease present but unable to fully assess due to time of year. Trees appear stable with no significant risk features observed.	No action	10+	C2
G23#	Hawthorn	100	5	1.2	5	SM	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1N	A	A boundary group of hawthorn. Multi-stemmed. Low quality.	No action	40+	C2
T24	Ash	380	65	4.56	12	SM	4.5	2.5	6	4.5	4W	B	Located on site boundary within site boundary fencing. Asymmetrical crown. Early stage ash dieback disease but unable to fully assess due to time of year. Ploughing has occurred very close to stem.	No action	20+	B2
T25	Ash	340	52	4.08	11	SM	6	2.5	3	3.5	4N	B	Ash tree in decline. Ash dieback disease present but unable to fully assess due to time of year. Asymmetrical crown.	No action	10+	C2
G26#	Buddleia. Ash. Willow	75	3	0.9	5	SM to M	2	2	2	2	0N		A third-party owned self-set group on railway banking. Low quality.	No action	40+	C2
T27#	Ash	300	41	3.6	12	SM	1	2.5	8	6	3S	B	Asymmetrical crown. Located on site boundary at base of third-party railway bank. Ash dieback disease present but unable to fully assess due to time of year.	No action	10+	C1
G28#	Hawthorn	180	15	2.16	5	SM to EM	2	2	2	2	3W	A to C	A third-party owned group located on site boundary on railway embankment. Reduced vitality but in an acceptable condition.	No action	20+	B2
G29#	Mixed	250	28	3	10	Y to EM	3	3	3	3	0N	A to C	A mixed group located on railway embankment. Not inspected, estimated measurements.	No action	40+	B2

BS5837:2012 TREE SCHEDULE



DATE OF SURVEY: 28/01/2026

JOB REFERENCE: 2604_AIA.01

SITE ADDRESS: Land at Shaw Lane, Carlton, Barnsley, S71 3HJ

Tree No.	Species	Stem Dia (mm)	RPA (m ²)	RPA Radius (m)	Height (m)	Age Class	Crown Spread (m)				Crown Clearance (m)	Condition	Comments	Recommendations	Remaining Contribution	BS5837 Retention Category
							N	E	S	W						
G30#	Hawthorn	250	28	3	5	EM	3	3	3	3	2S	B	A third-party owned ivy clad group. Not inspected, estimated measurements. Vitality appears normal.	No action	40+	B3
T31#	Wild Cherry	220	22	2.64	10	SM	5	3	5	5.5	6W	A	An ivy clad tree located on site boundary. Stem is in contact with boundary fence. Vitality appears normal and the tree appears stable.	No action	40+	B1
G32#	Hawthorn	250	28	3	5	EM	3	3	3	3	3W	B	A boundary group. Ivy clad. No access to inspect. Vitality is reduced but trees appear stable.	No action	10+	C2
T33#	Field maple	250	28	3	12	SM	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	4W	A	Good form and vitality. Located on site boundary adjacent to boundary fence. Vitality appears normal. Tree appears stable. Third-party owned.	No action	40+	B2
T34#	Sycamore	200	18	2.4	12	SM	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	4W	A	Third-party owned trees. Vitality appears normal and tree appears stable.	No action	40+	B2



Appendix II

Glossary of Terms

The following terms are concurrent with best Arboricultural practice and within the guidelines set by the International Society of Arboriculture (ISA), the Arboricultural Association (AA) and the British Standards Institute (BSI).

Age Range:

Age is site specific and categorised:

Young (Y)	Out-planted trees that have not yet established.
Semi-Mature (SM)	Established trees up to 1/3 of expected height and crown.
Early Mature (EM)	Between 1/3 and 2/3 of expected height and crown.
Mature (M)	Between 2/3 and full expected height and crown.
Fully Mature (FM)	Full expected height and crown.
Over Mature (OM)	Crown beginning to break-up and decrease in size.
Senescent (S)	Crown in advanced stage of break-up.

Height: Height is estimated and recorded in metres.

DBH: Diameter at Breast Height is measured at 1.5m and recorded in metres. Where a tree becomes multi-stemmed below 1.5m the highest possible diameter is measured and indicated. Alternatively, above 1.5m the diameter of each stem or an average diameter is measured and indicated.

Condition: Assessment of current physiological condition and structural morphology incorporating vigour and vitality and categorised:

- A -** Tree needing little, if any attention
- B -** Tree with minor, but rectifiable defects, or in the early stages of physiological stress
- C -** Tree with significant structural and physiological flaws and/or extremely stressed
- D -** Tree that is dead, biologically/physically moribund or dangerous.

Desirability to Retain – As Outlined in Table 1 of BS 5837:2005 (Trees in Relation to Construction - Recommendations)

Definition of Physiological & Morphological Terms

Adaptive Growth - The process whereby wood formation is influenced both in quantity and in quality by the action of gravitational force and mechanical stresses on the cambial zone.

Bifurcation – Forked or divided union.

Brown Rot - Form of decay where cellulose is degraded, while lignin is only modified.

Cankers- A localised area of dead bark and cambium on a stem or branch, caused by fungal or bacterial organisms, characterised by wound wood development on the periphery. This may be annual or perennial.

Cavity - An open wound, characterised by the presence of extensive decay and resulting in a hollow.

Chlorotic Leaf - Lacking in chlorophyll, typically yellow in colour.

Compartmentalisation - The physiological process that creates the chemical and mechanical boundaries that act to limit the spread of disease and decay organisms.

Crack - Longitudinal split in stem or branch, involving bark and/or underlying wood. These may be vertically and horizontally orientated.

Decay - Process of degradation of woody tissues by fungi and bacteria through decomposition of cellulose and lignin.

Deadwood - Deadwood is often present within the crown or on the stems of trees. In some instances, it may be an indication of ill health, however, it may also indicate natural growth processes. If a target is present beneath the tree, deadwood may fall and cause injury or damage and should be removed, otherwise deadwood can remain intact for conservation purposes (insects, fungi, birds etc.).

End Weight - The concentration of foliage at the distal ends of stems and deficient in secondary branches.

Girdling Root - Root which circles and constricts the stem or roots causing death of phloem and/or cambial tissue.

Hazard Beam - An upwardly curved branch in which strong internal stresses may occur without the compensatory formation of extra wood (longitudinal splitting may occur in some cases).

- Included Bark Union** - Pattern of development at branch junctions where bark is turned inward rather than pushed out. Potential weakness due to a lack of a woody union.
- Ivy Growth** - Ivy growth may ascend into the tree's crown, increasing wind resistance, concealing potential defects and reducing the tree's photosynthetic capacity. Ivy growth is often acceptable in woodland areas as a conservation benefit.
- Live Crown Ratio** - The relative proportion of photosynthetic mass (leaf area) to overall tree height.
- Reaction Wood** - Specialised secondary xylem, which develops in response to a lean or similar mechanical stress, attempting to restore the stem to the vertical.
- Root Plate Lift** - The physical movement of the rooting plate causing soils to shift and crack. May occur during adverse weather conditions. Trees may become unstable.
- Root Protection Area** - Layout design tool indicating the minimum area around a tree deemed to contain sufficient roots and rooting volume to maintain the tree's viability, and where the protection of the roots and soil structure is treated as a priority. This area should be considered a no go area for development unless very careful mitigation measures are implemented and agreed with the LPA.
- Structural Defect** - Internal or external points of weakness, which reduce the stability of the tree.
- Suppressed** - Trees which are dominated by surrounding vegetation and whose crown development is restricted from above.
- Topping** - A highly disfiguring practice, likely to cause severe xylem dysfunction and decay in major structural parts of the wood.
- White Rot** - Form of decay where both cellulose and lignin are degraded.
- Wound** - Any injury, which induces a compartmentalisation response.
- Wound wood** - Wood with atypical anatomical features, formed in the vicinity of a wound and a term to describe the occluding tissues around a wound as opposed to the ambiguous term "callus."
- Woodland Structure** - The vertical and horizontal arrangement of trees within a group or woodland i.e. Dominant - trees with a crown above the upper layer of the canopy, Co-dominant - trees that define the general upper edge of the canopy, Intermediate - trees that have been largely overgrown by others, Suppressed - trees that have been

overgrown and occupy an understory position and grow slowly, often severely asymmetrical.

Note: The definitions described above, may not necessarily be included within the Arboricultural Survey Data.



Appendix III

Cascade Chart




Trees for removal			
Category and definition	Criteria		
Category U Those in such a condition that they cannot realistically be retained as living trees in the context of the current land use for longer than 10 years	○ Trees that have a serious, irremediable, structural defect, such that their early loss is expected due to collapse, including those that will become unviable after removal of other U Category trees (i.e. where, for whatever reason, the loss of companion shelter cannot be mitigated by pruning) ○ Trees that are dead or are showing signs of significant, immediate, and irreversible overall decline. ○ Trees infected with pathogens of significance to the health and/or safety of other trees nearby) e.g. Dutch elm disease), or very low-quality trees suppressing adjacent trees of better quality. NOTE: <i>Category U trees can have existing or potential conservation value which might be desirable to preserve; see section 4.7.5</i>		
Trees to be considered for retention			
Category and definition	Criteria and sub-categories		
	1) Mainly arboricultural values	2) Mainly landscape values	3) Mainly cultural values (including conservation)
Category A Trees of high quality: with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 40 years	Trees that are particularly good examples of their species especially if rare or unusual, or essential components of groups, or of formal or semi-formal arboricultural features (e.g. the dominant and/or principal trees within an avenue)	Trees, groups or woodlands of particular visual importance as arboricultural and or landscape features	Trees, groups or woodlands of significant conservation, historical commemorative or other value (e.g. veteran trees or wood-pastures)
Category B Those of moderate quality: with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 20 years	Trees that might be included in category A, but are downgraded because of impaired condition (e.g. presence of significant though remediable defects, including unsympathetic past management and storm damage), such that they are unlikely to be suitable for retention for beyond 40 years; or trees lacking the special quality necessary to merit the category A designation	Trees present in numbers, usually growing as groups or woodlands, such that they attract a higher collective rating than they might as individuals; or trees occurring as collectives but situated so as to make little visual contribution to the wider area	Trees with clearly identifiable conservation or other cultural benefits
Category C Those of low quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 10 years, or young trees with a stem diameter below 150mm	Unremarkable trees of very limited merit or such impaired condition that they do not qualify in the higher categories	Trees present in groups or woodlands, but without this conferring on them significantly greater landscape value, and/or trees offering low or only temporary screening benefit.	Trees with no material conservation or other cultural value



Appendix IV

Tree Constraints Plan &
Arboricultural Implications
Plan



Category A

Category B

Category C

Category U

Root Protection Area (RPA)

Position estimated on site



Scale:	Date:
1:1000 @ A1	05/02/2026

Job: 2604_AIA.01

Address
**Land at Shaw Lane, Carlton
Barnsley**

Client: _____

Drawing Number:	2604_TCP.01 (O)
Drawn by:	Matthew Lally

	TREE CONSTRAINTS PLAN Overview
--	--



Do not scale this drawing (printed or electronic version).

Contractors must check all dimensions from site.

This drawing is for use on this site only and should be used in conjunction with all relevant consultants drawings...

LEGEND

Category A

Category B

Category C

Category U

Root Protection Area (RPA)

#

Position estimated on site

Scale:	1:500 @ A1	Date:	05/02/2026
Job:	2604_AIA.01		
Address	Land at Shaw Lane, Carlton, Barnsley		
Client:	-		
Drawing Number:	2604_TCP.01 (S1)		
Drawn by:	Matthew Lally		
TREE CONSTRAINTS PLAN Sheet 1			

Do not scale this drawing (printed or electronic version).
Contractors must check all dimensions from site.
This drawing is for use on this site only and should be used in conjunction with all relevant consultants drawings...

LEGEND



- Category A
- Category B
- Category C
- Category U
- Root Protection Area (RPA)
- Position estimated on site




Scale:	1:500 @ A1	Date:	05/02/2026
Job:	2604_AIA.01		
Address	Land at Shaw Lane, Carlton, Barnsley		
Client:	-		
Drawing Number:	2604_TCP.01 (S2)		
Drawn by:	Matthew Lally		
TREE CONSTRAINTS PLAN Sheet 2			

Do not scale this drawing (printed or electronic version).
Contractors must check all dimensions from site.
This drawing is for use on this site only and should be used in conjunction with all relevant consultants drawings.

LEGEND

- Category A
- Category B
- Category C
- Category U
- Root Protection Area (RPA)
- # Position estimated on site



Scale:	1:1000 @ A1	Date:	13/02/2026
Job:	2604_AIA.01		
Address	Land at Shaw Lane, Carlton, Barnsley		
Client:	-		
Drawing Number:	2604_AIP.01 (O)		
Drawn by:	Matthew Lally		
ARBORICULTURAL IMPLICATIONS PLAN (Overview)			

Sheet 2

Sheet 1




Do not scale this drawing (printed or electronic version).

Contractors must check all dimensions from site

This drawing is for use on this site only and should be used in conjunction with all relevant consultants drawings.

LEGEND



Category A

Category B

Category C

 Category U

Root Protection Area (RPA)

Position estimated on site



Scale:	1:500 @ A1	Date:	13/02/2026
--------	------------	-------	------------

Job: 2604_AIA.01

Address
**Land at Shaw Lane, Carlton,
Barnsley**

Client: _____

Drawing 3604 AIR 01 (S2)

Drawn by: **Matthew Lally**

ARBORICULTURAL
IMPLICATIONS PLAN (Sheet 2)



Appendix V

Pictorial Evidence



Picture 1. T1, T2#, T3#



Picture 2. G4#



Picture 3. G4#. Ditch with flowing water



Picture 4. G5#



Picture 5. T6#



Picture 6. H7#



Picture 7. G8#



Picture 8. G9#



Picture 9. G10#



Picture 10, G10#, G11#



Picture 11. G11#



Picture 12. H12#



Picture 13. H13#



Picture 14. H14#



Picture 15. G15#



Picture 16. G16#



Picture 17. H17#



Picture 18. G19#



Picture 19. G20#



Picture 20. T21#



Picture 21. T24



Picture 22. G26#



Picture 23. T27#



Picture 24. G28#, G29#



Picture 25. G30#



Picture 26. G32#, T33#, T34#