

ECUS

environmental • consultancy

Tree Survey Mount Vernon Hospital - Ward 3, Barnsley



Report to:
NHS Barnsley
Estates Department
Kendray Hospital
Doncaster Road
Barnsley
S70 3RD

Report prepared by:
ECUS Ltd
Endcliffe Holt
343 Fulwood Road
Sheffield
S10 3BQ

October 2009

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANCY

Report to:

NHS Barnsley
Estates Department
Kendray Hospital
Doncaster Road
Barnsley S70 3RD

REPORT TITLE: **TREE SURVEY**

 Mount Vernon Hospital, Barnsley

REVISION: Final Report

DATE: October 2009

ORIGINATED BY: Kristina McKie, ECUS Senior Landscape Architect

Prepared by:

ECUS Ltd

Endcliffe Holt, 343 Fulwood Road

Sheffield S10 3BQ

United Kingdom

TEL: 0114 266 9292

FAX: 0114 266 8243

CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	3
2	METHODOLOGY	4
2.1	Tree Survey	4
2.2	Tree Retention	5
3	SURVEY RESULTS	6
3.1	General Site Description	6
3.2	Results of Tree Survey	6
3.3	Tree Designations	6
4	IMPACTS OF DEVELOPMENT ON TREES & RECOMMENDATIONS	7
4.1	Development Proposals	7
4.2	Tree Retention & Removal	7
4.3	Recommendations for Protection of Retained Trees	7
4.4	Tree Management Recommendations	8
5	APPENDIX – TABLE AND FIGURES	9

Table 1 – Tree Survey Schedule

Figure 1 – Location Plan (within report text)

Figure 2 – Tree Survey Plan

Figure 3 – Tree Constraints Plan

1 Introduction

- 1.1 ECUS Limited were commissioned by NHS Barnsley Primary Care Trust to undertake a tree survey in the grounds of Mount Vernon Hospital, Barnsley. The site location is shown on Figure 1 below.
- 1.2 The survey has been undertaken as part of an application for planning consent to rebuild ward 3 of the hospital. This report sets out the findings of the survey and relates these to the development proposals with recommendations for mitigation measures for potential impacts to trees. Recommendations have also been made for further work that may be required.




Figure 1: Site Location

2 Methodology

2.1 Tree Survey

2.1.1 ECUS carried out the tree survey in October 2009 when the trees were still in leaf. The survey covered trees within the site boundary. The tree survey was a ground based visual inspection carried out by landscape architects. The trees were not tagged as part of the survey.

2.1.2 The following characteristics were recorded:

- Species
- Stem diameter at 1.5m above ground level (mm).
- Estimated height (m)
- Safe Useful Life Expectancy (an estimate of the number of years that the tree is likely to remain suitable for retention).

0 (dead/dying) = less than 10 years

S (short) = 10-20 years

M (medium) = 20-40 years

L (long) = more than 40 years

- Approximate crown diameter (m)
- Condition category in accordance with *BS 5837:2005 Trees in relation to construction*. The categories listed are defined as per BS5837:2005 and briefly are:

R = Remove

A = Those of high quality and value - best trees with a long expected safe life

B = Those of moderate quality and value

C = Those of low quality and value and trees less than 15cm diameter

- Value subcategories in accordance with *BS 5837:2005*. The subcategories listed are defined as per BS5837:2005 and briefly are:

1 = Mainly arboricultural values

2 = Mainly landscape values

3 = Mainly cultural values, including conservation

- General notes about condition and any recommendations for works

- 2.1.3 A topographic survey of the site was provided. This was used as the basis for producing the tree survey plan.
- 2.1.5 The survey also included identification of any existing designations affecting trees on site such as Tree Preservation Orders and Conservation Area status by consulting with Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council officers.

2.2 Tree Retention

- 2.2.1 A Tree Constraints Plan (Figure 3) was produced to assess the impacts of the development on the existing trees by overlaying the tree survey onto the development proposals.
- 2.2.2 The Tree Constraints Plan is a design tool which shows the below ground constraints represented by the Root Protection Areas, and the above ground constraints the trees pose by virtue of their size and position. The Root Protection Areas (RPA) of each tree on site that can be adequately retained was calculated in accordance with *BS5837:2005 Trees in relation to construction* and is shown on the Tree Constraints Plan.

3 Survey Results

3.1 General Site Description

3.1.1 The site is currently a hospital comprising of a series of hospital ward buildings linked by a central corridor and has associated landscaped courtyards and grounds. The surrounding land use is predominantly residential with some areas of open fields. Worsbrough Common Primary School is located to the north west of the hospital.

3.2 Results of Tree Survey

3.2.1 The trees on site comprise of a group of trees growing on a steep slope on the south-western boundary of the hospital and small individual trees associated with the ward courtyards.

3.2.2 Table 1 describes the results of the trees surveyed and should be read in conjunction with Figure 2 Tree Survey Plan, which illustrates the location of the trees surveyed and the extent of their canopies.

3.2.3 Two trees on site have been classified as category B (moderate quality and value) and the remaining trees have been classified as category C (low quality and value). There were no category A trees (high quality and value) or category R trees (remove) identified on site.

3.3 Tree Designations

3.3.1 Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council confirmed that the trees on site are not covered by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). They also confirmed that the site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area.

4 Impacts of Development on Trees & Recommendations

4.1 Development Proposals

4.1.1 The development proposals consist of the rebuilding of ward 3. It is proposed that the new building will cover a larger footprint than the existing ward.

4.2 Tree Retention & Removal

4.2.1 The effect of the development on the existing trees is described below and shown on the Tree Constraints Plan. The Tree Constraints Plan has been produced in accordance with *BS5837:2005 Trees in relation to construction* and is shown in Figure 3.

4.2.2 The majority of the trees surveyed are to be retained. T8 is proposed for removal to accommodate the development. The canopy of T8 conflicts with the proposed building and the proposed footpath impinges on its Root Protection Area.

4.2.3 The proposed footpath to the south west of the site conflicts with the Root Protection Area of T6. The use of porous paving for the construction of the footpath should be considered and disturbance to ground levels should be minimised to prevent potential damage to the tree roots.

4.3 Recommendations for Protection of Retained Trees

4.3.1 The following section gives some suggestions as to how retained trees could best be protected during construction. More detailed guidelines for tree protection during construction are given in *BS5837:2005 - Trees in relation to construction*.

4.3.2 The root protection areas of all retained trees should be fenced and protected from site preparation and construction activities in accordance with *BS5837:2005 Trees in relation to construction*.

4.3.3 Care should be taken to protect trees during the preparation for construction works (site clearance) and during the construction works themselves to minimise the potential for damage to the trees during construction from site machinery and inappropriate storage of materials. To limit the likelihood of damage occurring during construction, we recommend that locations for the site compound and storage of materials should be specified away from retained trees. In addition, protective fencing should be erected outside the root protection area prior to construction commencing and retained throughout the construction period to physically separate the trees from the development works. The protected area should not be used for the storage of building materials and vehicles should be prevented from running over this area. The location of the protective fencing is shown on Figure 3.

4.3.4 Any excavations or alterations in ground levels within the root protection area of a tree may cause damage to tree roots and impact on the health and stability of that tree. Any excavations within the root protection area should be carried out carefully by hand and any roots that are exposed that are smaller than 25mm diameter should be carefully pruned. Roots greater than 25mm should only be severed after consultation with an arboriculturalist as this could affect the trees health and stability.

4.4 Tree Management Recommendations

- 4.4.1 It is recommended that the health of the trees be monitored on a regular basis and any remedial action taken to remove branches or trees that become unsafe. It is recommended that further inspection of all trees should normally take place at least once in every two years, unless there is a particular concern about the condition of a tree, when annual inspection may be required. All tree management work should be carried out by a suitably qualified and insured arboriculturalist to the guidance detailed within *BS3998:1989 Recommendations for tree work*.



5 Appendix – Table and Figures




Table 1 - Tree Survey Schedule

ID REF (ECUS notation on site)	Common Name	DBH (Diameter of tree stem at 1.5m height m) (in mm)	RPA (Radius of Root Protection Area in mm)	Estimated Height (in m)	Safe Useful Life Expectancy	Estimated Crown Spread (in m)	BS5837:2005 Category	Comments & Recommendations
T1	Sycamore	300	3600	10	L	7	C2	
T2	Ash	400	4800	13	L	11	C2	Some dead wood on lower branches. Majority of branches are towards the building. Recommendation: remove dead wood.
T3	Sycamore	200	2400	8	L	6	C2	Suppressed by T2.
T4	Ash	300	3600	14	L	8	C2	Lots of dead wood. Recommendation: remove dead wood.
T5	Sycamore	150	2400	10	L	4	C2	Spindly growth due to competition with nearby trees.



ID REF (ECUS notation on site)	Common Name	DBH (Diameter of tree stem at 1.5m height m) (in mm)	RPA (Radius of Root Protection Area in mm)	Estimated Height (in m)	Safe Useful Life Expectancy	Estimated Crown Spread (in m)	BS5837:2005 Category	Comments & Recommendations
T6	Sycamore	400	4800	11	L	8	B2	Good form. Twin stemmed from 2m high. Some roots exposed due to erosion of soil on slope. Rope tied to minor side branch. Some previously broken branches. Recommendation: remove rope.
T7	Sycamore	400	4800	13	L	9	C2	
T8	Whitebeam	200	2400	7	L	6	B2	
T9	Cherry	100	1200	5	L	4	C2	
T10	Cherry	150	1800	7	L	7	C2	



LEGEND


○ Tree surveyed by ECUS - location of tree centre from topographic survey

Tree categories (BS 5837:2005)

- Category A Tree
- Category B Tree
- Category C Tree
- Category R Tree







NOTES

See ECUS Tree Report for Tree Schedule.

		Endcliffe Holt 343 Fulwood Road Sheffield S10 3BQ Tel. (0114) 2669292 Fax. (0114) 2667707 www.shef.ac.uk/~ecus/			
		Job Mount Vernon Hospital - Ward 3, Barnsley			
Title Tree Survey Plan		Drawn by KM	Date Oct 09	Scale 1:250@A3	Drg. no. Figure 2





LEGEND


-  Tree surveyed by ECUS - location of tree centre from topographic survey
-  Category B Tree to be retained
-  Category C Tree to be retained
-  Tree to be removed
-  Root Protection Area
-  Protective Fencing to BS5837:2005 Trees in relation to construction (see Fig 2)

NOTES

See ECUS Tree Report for Tree Schedule.

BS5837:2005 Protective Fencing Figure 2



		Endcliffe Holt 343 Fulwood Road Sheffield S10 3BQ Tel. (0114) 2669292 Fax. (0114) 2667707 www.shef.ac.uk/~ecus/	
Job Mount Vernon Hospital - Ward 3, Barnsley			
Title Tree Constraints Plan			
Drawn by KM	Date Oct 09	Scale 1:250@A3	Drg. no. Figure 3