TREE CONSULTANTS

ARBORICULTURAL REPORT

& Impact Assessment

to **BS5837:2012** at:

Land adjacent to

71 Tingle Bridge Lane,
Hemingfield,
Barnsley,
South Yorkshire
S73 0NT

Prepared for:
Andrew Bailey Architects
Glendower House,
85 Lundhill Road,
Wombwell,
Barnsley,
South Yorkshire
S73 0RL

Date: *July 2019*

Reference: *AWA2405*

Institute of Chartered Foresters
Registered Consultant

Office: 0114 272 1124 Mobile: 0776 631 0880 Email: info@awatrees.com Website: awatrees.com
Union Forge, 27 Mowbray Street, Sheffield, S3 8EN. AWA Tree Consultants Limited. Company No. 8520123. Registered in England & Wales.

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
4. Arboricultural Impact Assessment 7
4.1 Proposed New Development 7
4.2 Direct Impacts 7
4.3 Indirect Impacts 7
4.4 Suitable Mitigation 8
4.5 Protection of the Retained Trees 8
5. Signature 9
Appendix 1: Authors Qualifications & Experience 11
Appendix 2: Survey Methodology and Limitations of Report 12
Appendix 3: Explanation of Tree Descriptions 13
Appendix 4: Tree Data 14
Appendix 5: Tree Constraints Plan 15
Appendix 6: Tree Impacts Plan 16

1. Introduction

1.1 Instructions and Brief

1.1.1 We were instructed by Andrew Bailey of Andrew Bailey Architects, 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 June 2018.

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.

1.2.4 The tree positions were plotted on Ordinance Survey map base-layer using enhanced GPS technology (1-2m accuracy) and laser distance measurer.

1.2.5 This report has been prepared by Mr Adam Winson, Chartered Arboriculturist, MSc, BSc (Hons), MICFor, MArborA, Principle and Director of AWA Tree Consultants Ltd.

1.2.6 The tree survey data collection was carried out by Mr Dave Farmer FdSc (Arb), MArborA, PTI (Lantra) and Mr Ricky Nos, BSc (Hons), FdSc (Arboriculture), TechArborA, Arboriculturists at AWA Tree Consultants.

1.2.7 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 please refer to the Tree Constraints Plan at **Appendix 5.**

2. The Site

2.1 Location and Description

2.1.1 The site is located on the Southern edge of Hemingfield, a village in the metropolitan borough of Barnsley, South Yorkshire.

2.1.2 The site currently consists of an unused open field to the centre of the site with a row of semi-mature trees on the western and southern boundaries.

2.1.3 The approximate survey area has been highlighted in the (2017 Google Earth) image below:



3. The Trees

3.1 Legal

3.1.1 Due to the large potential penalties for illegally carrying out work to protected trees, before authorising any tree works a check should be made with the Local Planning Authority to see if the trees are covered by a Tree Preservation Order or if they are within a Conservation Area (unless such works are approved by planning permission). If either applies, then statutory permission is required before any works can take place.

3.1.2 When appointing a tree surgeon, only properly qualified and experienced companies should be used, who have adequate Public Liability and Employer's Liability Insurance. 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 27 items of woody vegetation, comprised of 25 individual trees and 2 groups of trees or shrub/hedge groups.

3.2.2 Of the surveyed trees: 1 tree is a retention category `B'; and the remaining 26 trees/groups are retention category `C' (explanatory details regarding the retention categories are included within Appendix 3).

3.2.3 The significant tree cover within the site consists of semi-mature trees and shrubs along the southern and western boundaries. Most of the sites trees are naturalised pioneer species that have established on a strip of land between the site boundaries and an internal fence.

3.2.4 The central areas of the site contain little of arboricultural significance, generally consisting of grassland scrub amongst patches of dense bramble.

3.2.5 Age and species diversity at the site is relatively poor. The dominant trees on site are semi-mature Birch trees with occasional semi-mature Sycamore, Willow and Cherry.

3.2.6 The southern boundary of the site contains a dense linear group of semi mature trees (T1 - T8, T17 - T27). Collectively these trees provide moderate amenity value and screening between the adjacent residential properties and the site.

3.2.7 Several trees along this southern boundary are rubbing on the security fence, causing some bark damage to low hanging branches.

3.2.8 Along the western boundary is a wider spaced row of Birch (T11 - T16) and a Sycamore (T10). These trees collectively create good screening from the adjacent roadside and provide moderate amenity value. Most of these trees have suffered bark damage to the lower stems, consistent with the damage caused by horses.

3.2.9 The site's most significant tree is T11 an early-mature Birch situated to the west of the site. This tree is slightly larger than others on site and provides a reasonable visual amenity due to its prominent position close to a main road.

3.2.10 To the north of the site is a Rowan (T9), in a very poor condition. While it does not currently pose an unacceptable risk to people of property, it has only very limited value and prospects.

3.2.11 Some trees were covered in dense Ivy or were inaccessible (as detailed in Appendix 4) in such cases measurements were estimated and the condition values are indicative only.

3.2.12 The tree Root Protection Area (RPA) is detailed on the Tree Constraints Plan at Appendix 5. 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.

3.2.13 Some lower value tree, hedge and shrub groups do not have RPAs detailed on tree plans. The detailed extent and spread of the low value groups, in conjunction with the tree schedule, is sufficient to assess the associated potential constraints.

4. Arboricultural Impact Assessment

4.1 Proposed New Development

4.1.1 It is proposed to build three new residential dwellings 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, 16 trees or groups will require removal as they are situated in the footprint of the structure or their retention and protection throughout the development is not suitable.

4.2.2 The trees that require removal are G1 to G6, T9 and T19 to T27.

4.2.3 All of the trees that require removal are low value, retention category 'C' and their removal will have only a negligible negative arboricultural impact at the site. The tree removals can be easily mitigated against with new landscape plantings at the site.

4.3 Indirect Impacts

4.3.1 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. As such, no significant negative indirect impacts have been identified.

4.3.2 The design of the new development has considered tree crown positions in relation to the new dwellings. 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.

4.3.3 The buildability of the proposed 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.*

16th July 2019

AWA Tree Consultants Limited
Union Forge
27 Mowbray Street
Sheffield
S3 8EN

www.awatrees.com

Appendices

Appendix 1: Authors Qualifications and Experience
Appendix 2: Survey Methodology and Limitations
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.*

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 previously worked 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.

Mr Dave Farmer *FdSc (Arb), MArborA, PTI (Lantra).*

Dave has a Foundation Degree in Arboriculture (with Distinction) and is qualified in Professional Tree Inspection. He is a Professional Member of the Arboricultural Association and an Associate of the Institute of Chartered Foresters. Dave has many years of experience within the tree care profession, including lecturing in arboriculture. His work focuses on diagnosing potential tree risk problems, and recommending appropriate treatments and work programmes.

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

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 Ricky Nos BSc *(Hons),* FdSc *(Arboriculture), TechArborA.*

Ricky is a trained arborist with 10 years of experience in the private and local authority sectors, taking in all aspects of arboricultural work. He has a Foundation Degree in Arboriculture and a BSc (Honours) in Outdoor Management, and is a technician Member of the Arboricultural Association. His main work consists of tree surveys for development projects, involving tree inspections and the preparation of Tree Reports 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 BS5837 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 and includes information of the first significant branch and direction of growth.

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 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					Tree Condition							Value		Management
Tree ID	*Common Name*	*Latin Name*	*Maturity*	*Height (m)*	*Stems*	*Stem Dia (mm)*	*Estimated*	*Ave Height*	*N*	*E*	*S*	*W*	*Roots*	*Stem*	*Crown*	*Comments*	*Physiology*	*Structural*	*Life Expectancy*	*Amenity*	*Category*	*Works*
G1	Willow	*Salix caprea*	Semi-mature	5	10	50 avg	No	0	3	3	3	3	No visual defects, Soil compaction	Multiple stemmed at base, Vertical, Tight union, Bark damage	Normal	Bark damage from contact with boundary fence.	Good	Good	10 to 20 yrs	Low	C	Removal required to facilitate development
T2	Ash	*Fraxinus excelsior*	Semi-mature	5	1	110	No	2	1.5	1	1	1.5	No visual defects, Limited access around base	Single stemmed, Vertical	Normal	Base surrounded by dense shrubs.	Good	Good	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	Removal required to facilitate development
T3	Hazel	*Corylus avellana*	Semi-mature	4.5	10	50 avg	No	1	2.5	2.5	2	2.5	No visual defects	Multiple stemmed at base, Vertical, Tight union	Normal, Minor deadwood		Good	Good	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	Removal required to facilitate development
T4	Birch	*Betula pendula*	Semi-mature	6.5	1	100	No	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1	No visual defects, Limited access around base	Single stemmed, Vertical, Stubs	Normal	Base surrounded by dense shrubs.	Good	Good	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	Removal required to facilitate development
T5	Ash	*Fraxinus excelsior*	Semi-mature	5	1	110	No	2	1.5	1	1	1.5	No visual defects, Limited access around base	Single stemmed, Vertical	Normal	Base surrounded by dense shrubs.	Good	Good	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	Removal required to facilitate development
G6	Dogwood	*Cornus sanguinea*	Semi-mature	4	10	50 avg	No	1.5	1.5	2.5	1.5	2.5	No visual defects	Multiple stemmed at base, Vertical	Normal	Growing against boundary wall.	Good	Good	10 to 20 yrs	Low	C	Removal required to facilitate development

AWA TREE CONSULTANTS

	Tree Species		Measurements					Crown					Tree Condition							Value		Management
Tree ID	*Common Name*	*Latin Name*	*Maturity*	*Height (m)*	*Stems*	*Stem Dia (mm)*	*Estimated*	*Ave Height*	*N*	*E*	*S*	*W*	*Roots*	*Stem*	*Crown*	*Comments*	*Physiology*	*Structural*	*Life Expectancy*	*Amenity*	*Category*	*Works*
T7	Birch	*Betula pendula*	Semi-mature	9.5	2	170, 130	No	2	3	1.5	2.5	2.5	No visual defects, Limited access around base	Twin stemmed at base, Slight lean, Stubs	Normal, Snapped/ hanging branches	Barbed wire wrapped around stem.	Good	Good	20 to 40 yrs	Low	**C**	No works required
T8	Birch	*Betula pendula*	Semi-mature	8.5	1	120	Yes	2	2.5	2.5	2.5	1	No visual defects, Limited access around base	Single stemmed, Vertical, Stubs	Normal, Minor deadwood, Slightly unbalanced		Good	Good	20 to 40 yrs	Low	**C**	No works required
T9	Rowan	*Sorbus aucuparia*	Semi-mature	4	2	50, 70	No	2	1.5	2	1.5	1.5	No visual defects, Soil compaction	Twin stemmed at 0.5m, Vertical, Stubs, Old pruning wounds, Bark damage	Small/ sparse, Low vigour, Old pruning wounds, Minor deadwood, Minor dieback	Growing against wall, extensive bark damage on Southern side, wire around stem.	Poor	Fair	<10 yrs	Low	**C**	Removal required to facilitate development
T10	Sycamore	*Acer pseudoplatanus*	Semi-mature	8.5	1	200	No	2.5	2	2	2	1.5	No visual defects, Limited access around base	Multiple stemmed at 1m, Vertical, Epicormic growths, Stubs, Bark damage	Small/ sparse, Minor dieback, Minor deadwood	Full circumference bark damage at base.	Fair	Fair	10 to 20 yrs	Low	**C**	No works required
T11	Birch	*Betula pendula*	Semi-mature	15	1	260	No	3	4.5	4.5	2	4	No visual defects	Single stemmed, Vertical, Stubs	Normal, Minor deadwood	Overhanging adjacent bus stop.	Good	Good	20 to 40 yrs	Moderate	**B**	No works required
T12	Birch	*Betula pendula*	Semi-mature	13	1	170	No	2.5	1.5	3	2	3	No visual defects	Single stemmed, Vertical, Bark damage	Normal, Minor deadwood	Small earth bank to east of tree, bark damage near base.	Good	Good	20 to 40 yrs	Moderate	**C**	No works required

AWA TREE CONSULTANTS


	Tree Species		Measurements					Crown					Tree Condition							Value		Management
Tree ID	*Common Name*	*Latin Name*	*Maturity*	*Height (m)*	*Stems*	*Stem Dia (mm)*	*Estimated*	*Ave Height*	*N*	*E*	*S*	*W*	*Roots*	*Stem*	*Crown*	*Comments*	*Physiology*	*Structural*	*Life Expectancy*	*Amenity*	*Category*	*Works*
T13	Birch	*Betula pendula*	Semi-mature	12	1	180	No	2.5	2.5	2.5	1.5	2.5	No visual defects	Single stemmed, Vertical, Stubs, Old pruning wounds, Bark damage	Normal, Minor deadwood	Extensive bark damage near base.	Fair	Fair	10 to 20 yrs	Moderate	**C**	No works required
T14	Birch	*Betula pendula*	Semi-mature	7	1	120	No	2.5	2	1.5	1.5	2	No visual defects	Single stemmed, Vertical, Stubs, Old pruning wounds, Bark damage	Normal, Minor deadwood	Extensive bark damage near base.	Fair	Fair	10 to 20 yrs	Low	**C**	No works required
T15	Birch	*Betula pendula*	Semi-mature	12	1	180	No	2.5	1.5	2	2	2.5	No visual defects	Single stemmed, Vertical, Stubs, Old pruning wounds, Bark damage	Normal, Minor deadwood	Extensive bark damage near base.	Fair	Fair	10 to 20 yrs	Moderate	**C**	No works required
T16	Birch	*Betula pendula*	Semi-mature	10	1	140	No	2.5	3.5	2.5	2	2.5	No visual defects	Single stemmed, Vertical, Stubs, Old pruning wounds, Bark damage	Normal, Minor deadwood, Minor dieback	Extensive bark damage near base, Stones piled at base.	Fair	Fair	10 to 20 yrs	Moderate	**C**	No works required
T17	Birch	*Betula pendula*	Semi-mature	10	2	110, 140	No	2.5	2	2.5	2	2	No visual defects	Twin stemmed at base, Vertical, Stubs, Old pruning wounds, Bark damage	Normal, Minor deadwood	Extensive bark damage near base, Stones piled at base.	Fair	Fair	10 to 20 yrs	Moderate	**C**	No works required
T18	Birch	*Betula pendula*	Semi-mature	10	1	170	No	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	2	No visual defects	Single stemmed, Vertical, Stubs, Old pruning wounds, Bark damage	Normal, Minor deadwood	Minor bark damage to branches rubbing on fence.	Good	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Moderate	**C**	No works required

AWA TREE CONSULTANTS

	Tree Species		Measurements					Crown					Tree Condition							Value		Management
Tree ID	*Common Name*	*Latin Name*	*Maturity*	*Height (m)*	*Stems*	*Stem Dia (mm)*	*Estimated*	*Ave Height*	*N*	*E*	*S*	*W*	*Roots*	*Stem*	*Crown*	*Comments*	*Physiology*	*Structural*	*Life Expectancy*	*Amenity*	*Category*	*Works*
T19	Birch	*Betula pendula*	Semi-mature	7	1	80	No	2.5	1	1	1.5	0.5	No visual defects	Single stemmed, Vertical, Stubs, Old pruning wounds, Bark damage	Normal, Minor deadwood	Minor bark damage to branches rubbing on fence.	Good	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Low	**C**	Removal required to facilitate development
T20	Birch	*Betula pendula*	Semi-mature	10	1	120	No	2.5	1	1.5	2	1	No visual defects	Single stemmed, Vertical, Stubs, Old pruning wounds, Bark damage	Normal, Minor deadwood	Wire around stem at 2m high.	Good	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Moderate	**C**	Removal required to facilitate development
T21	Birch	*Betula pendula*	Semi-mature	7	1	80	No	2.5	1	1	1.5	0.5	No visual defects	Single stemmed, Vertical, Stubs, Old pruning wounds, Bark damage	Normal, Minor deadwood	Minor bark damage to branches rubbing on fence.	Good	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Low	**C**	Removal required to facilitate development
T22	Birch	*Betula pendula*	Semi-mature	7	1	80	No	2.5	1	1	1.5	0.5	No visual defects	Single stemmed, Vertical, Stubs, Old pruning wounds, Bark damage	Normal, Minor deadwood	Minor bark damage to branches rubbing on fence.	Good	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Low	**C**	Removal required to facilitate development
T23	Birch	*Betula pendula*	Semi-mature	9.5	2	130, 110	No	2.5	3	1.5	3	1.5	No visual defects	Twin stemmed at base, Vertical, Tight union	Normal, Minor deadwood		Good	Good	20 to 40 yrs	Moderate	**C**	Removal required to facilitate development
T24	Birch	*Betula pendula*	Semi-mature	9	1	100	No	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	No visual defects	Single stemmed, Vertical, Stubs, Old pruning wounds, Bark damage	Normal, Minor deadwood	Minor bark damage to branches rubbing on fence.	Fair	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Low	**C**	Removal required to facilitate development

AWA TREE CONSULTANTS

	Tree Species		Measurements					Crown					Tree Condition							Value		Management
Tree ID	*Common Name*	*Latin Name*	*Maturity*	*Height (m)*	*Stems*	*Stem Dia (mm)*	*Estimated*	*Ave Height*	*N*	*E*	*S*	*W*	*Roots*	*Stem*	*Crown*	*Comments*	*Physiology*	*Structural*	*Life Expectancy*	*Amenity*	*Category*	*Works*
T25	Birch	*Betula pendula*	Semi-mature	9	1	110	No	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	No visual defects	Single stemmed, Vertical, Stubs, Old pruning wounds, Bark damage	Normal, Minor deadwood	Minor bark damage to branches rubbing on fence.	Good	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	Removal required to facilitate development
T26	Birch	*Betula pendula*	Semi-mature	10	1	140	No	2.5	2	2.5	2.5	1	No visual defects	Single stemmed, Slight lean, Stubs, Minor cavities	Normal, Minor deadwood		Good	Good	20 to 40 yrs	Moderate	C	Removal required to facilitate development
T27	Cherry	*Prunus sp.*	Semi-mature	6.5	1	120	No	0.5	2	2	2	2	No visual defects	Twin stemmed at 0.5m, Vertical, Tight union	Normal		Good	Fair	40+ yrs	Moderate	C	Removal required to facilitate development



AWA TREE CONSULTANTS

Appendix 5: Tree Constraints Plan

Land adjacent to 71 Tingle Bridge Lane, Hemingfield, Barnsley
Ref: AWA2405

BRITISH STANDARD 5837:2012
RETENTION CATEGORIES
Definitions of these catagories can be found in Appendix 2 of the report.

SCALE: 1:200 PAPER: A3

	CATEGORY A: HIGH VALUE RETENTION MOST DESIRABLE
	CATEGORY B: MODERATE VALUE RETENTION DESIRABLE
	CATEGORY C: LOWER VALUE COULD BE RETAINED
	CATEGORY U: FOR REMOVAL
	RPA: ROOT PROTECTION AREA
	TREE STEM

Dead Cypress stem
3.5m

T9

Lilac 2.5m

1.5M EASEMENT
FROM CTR OF
375MM DIA. DRAIN

1.5M EASEMENT
FROM CTR OF
375MM DIA. DRAIN

PLOT 1
TYPE A

GARDEN

T10

GARDEN

Standing dead stem
5m

2M EASEMENT
FROM CTR OF
600MM DIA. DRAIN

T11

GARDEN

PLOT 2
TYPE B

T12

T13

T14

T15

GARDEN

GARDEN

PLOT 3
TYPE A

T4

T5

T7

T8

T16

T17

T19

T21

T23

T25

T27

T2

G1

T3

G6

T18

T20

T22

T24

T26

PLOT 2
ACCESS

PLOT 3
ACCESS

GREENWAY VIEW

NORTH

AWA TREE CONSULTANTS

Appendix 6:
Tree Impacts Plan

Land adjacent to 71 Tingle Bridge Lane, Hemingfield, Barnsley
Ref: AWA2405

BRITISH STANDARD 5837:2012

SCALE: 1:200 PAPER: A3

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