Ground Floor
5 St James Square
Boroughbridge YO51 9AS
T 01423 322371
E info@barnesassociates.co.uk
W barnesassociates.co.uk
Company number 10438116
Registered in England and Wales

Arboricultural Survey Data

Site: Dodworth, Barnsley,S75 3RR

On Behalf of: Newett Homes

Date of Survey: 01/08/2024

Date: 06/09/2024

Reference: BA230623

DOCUMENT CONTROL

Surveyed by*	Matt Metcalfe and Lloyd Barnes			**Report date**	05/09/2024
Prepared by*	Lloyd Barnes				
Reviewed by*	Sue Barnes				
Revision	A	**Date**	06/09/2024	**Notes:**	
	B				Re design- bridge moved 2m souith and properties moved
	* Refer to qualifications and experience appendix				

The following survey has been prepared from a visual assessment taken from ground level without any detailed investigation. Observations are based upon the body language of the trees and any visual indicators present at the time of inspection. This survey should be regarded as a preliminary overview; ongoing inspections will be required as specified individually. In most situations, the health, condition and safety of trees should be checked on a cyclic basis, alternating between early and late seasons to ensure a full picture of tree health is established. Inspections should only be carried out by a suitably qualified arborist.

Similarly, numerous potential defects may not be detectable dependent upon the timing of inspection; in particular, wood decay fungi may only produce external fructifications annually (rather than perennially), or may not provide external symptoms until an advanced state is achieved.

Reasonable risk management generally aims to provide a tree that can be regarded stable in normal/foreseeable, regularly experienced storm events i.e. force 10 storms. The level of risk offered by the tree will be significantly greater as the wind speed that the tree is exposed to increases beyond this level. Additionally, the threat from aerial parts, i.e., included unions, may remain even following works, although failures of such parts are likely to be limited to small diameter branches and to periods of extreme weather.

As an arborist, I am a tree specialist and use my knowledge, education, training and experience to examine trees, recommend measures to enhance their beauty and health, and attempt to reduce the risk of living near trees. As a client, you may choose to accept or disregard these recommendations or seek additional advice.

As an arborist I cannot detect every condition that could possibly lead to a tree or limb failure. Trees are living organisms that may fail in many ways, some of which we do not fully understand.

Conditions are often hidden within the tree and below the ground. As arborists, we cannot guarantee that a tree will be healthy or safe under all circumstances or for a specified period of time. Sometimes trees may appear "healthy," but may be structurally unsound. Likewise, remedial treatment, like any medicine, cannot be guaranteed.

Treatment, pruning and removal of trees may involve considerations beyond the Arboricultural perspective, such as property boundaries and ownership, disputes between neighbours, planning issues, sight lines, landlord-tenant matters etc. Arborists cannot take such issues into account unless complete and accurate information is given to them. Likewise, as an arborist I cannot accept any responsibility for the authorisation or non-authorisation of any recommended treatment or remedial measure.

Furthermore, certain trees are borderline cases as to whether they should remain or be removed. If conditions change a tree may need further monitoring in the future to determine its health and structure. Trees can be managed, but they cannot be controlled, and to live near a tree is to accept some degree of risk.

Mathematical abbreviations: > Greater than, < Less than.

Est: This includes any attributes that have been estimated.

Measurements/estimates: Measurements are taken with a tape, clinometer or laser. If dimensions are estimated, this will be indicated within the **Est** column.

Tree number: Numbered Tag attached to each stem, usually on the inside face of the stem at roughly 2.5 metres. Where the number is prefixed by a T, G, H, A, ST, S or W this denotes that the tag refers to a Tree, Group, Hedge, Area, Stump, Shrub or Woodland.

Name: Tree species are detailed by their common name- Latin can be provided upon request.

Age: I record the age as an estimate of the tree's likely span for guidance only, i.e.:

Y	**Young**	Recently established/planted tree.	**M**	**Mature**	The middle one-third of its likely expected lifespan
SM	**Semi Mature**	Fully established and growing with high vigour	**OM**	**Over Mature**	The later one-third of its likely expected life span with sign of canopy retrenchment.
EM	**Early Mature**	The first third of its likely expected lifespan	**V**	**Veteran**	An aged example of the species, typically with defects & conservation value
			A	**Ancient**	Beyond its expected Life span possible of historical interest or in a state of decline

Height: I estimate height to the nearest metre to the mean height.

Crown Height: I estimate height to the nearest half metre to the mean underside of the canopy.

FSB: The height and direction of the First Significant Branch.

Diameter: These figures relate to a measurement of the stem at 1.5m above ground level recorded in millimetres, measured with a rounded-down diameter tape.

Canopy (N S E W): I estimate the distance of the canopy radius to the nearest metre to provide a mean distance of separation between the stem and the outer canopy.

Condition: Is a personal assessment of the tree's growth rate in the current season, in comparison to other trees within the locality, region and an indicator of the tree likely response to site change.

Good	A tree of normal vitality	**Fair**	A tree of lower vitality	**Poor**	A tree of low vitality	**Dead**	A dead or very low vitality tree

Life Expectancy: Is a personal assessment of the trees likely expected remaining safe life span in years, assuming the current site management continues, or the tree is protected from significant environmental change. Trees can enter into serious decline with site changes and likewise, the expected safe life can be significantly improved following changes/improvements to site management and following remedial works.

Category: Assess in line with Table 1 BS5837 – copied below.

Symbol Guide:

BS5837	Cascade chart for tree quality assessment			
Category and definition	**Criteria (including subcategories where appropriate)**			**Identification on plan**
Trees unsuitable for retention (see Note)				
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 category U trees (e.g. 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, or very low quality trees suppressing adjacent trees of better quality *NOTE Category U trees can have existing or potential conservation value, which it might be desirable to preserve; see **4.5.7**.*			Red on Plan
Trees to be considered for retention	**1 Mainly arboricultural qualities**	**2 Mainly landscape qualities**	**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 those that are essential components of groups or 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-pasture)	Green on Plan
Category B Trees 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 locality	Trees with material conservation or other cultural value	Blue on Plan
Category C Trees of low quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 10 years, or young trees with a stem diameter below 150 mm	Unremarkable trees of very limited merit or such impaired condition that they do not qualify in higher categories	Trees present in groups or woodlands, but without this conferring on them significantly greater collective landscape value; and/or trees offering low or only temporary/transient landscape benefits	Trees with no material conservation or other cultural value	Grey on Plan

NOTE Whilst C category trees will usually not be retained where they would impose a significant constraint on development, young trees with a stem diameter of less than 150 mm should be considered for relocation.

Comments / Observations: General comments referring to tree health, structure and condition.

Management Options: Comments detailing remedial works required to improve immediate safety or improve the management of the tree.

Tree Risk Assessment: At Barnes Associates Ltd, we are experienced in the management of the risks associated with trees and have undertaken training in all of the principal methodologies in commercial use today, including Matheny and Clarke, Quantified Tree Risk Assessment (QTRA), THREATS (Tree Hazard: Risk Evaluation and Treatment System), Tree Risk Assessment Qualification (TRAQ) and VALID Tree Risk-Benefit Management & Assessment.

Having experience in several methods, it was perhaps inevitable that we developed our own system to reflect both the benefits of the other systems and changes in current legislation and court decisions, following continual study and application of tree risk management in the real world across the wide range of environments where trees can be found and in which we find ourselves.

We typically apply our BARMY (Barnes Associates Risk Method (of) Yorkshire) - we are proudly based in Yorkshire and could not resist the inclusion of the 'Y'. We openly admit this is a method based upon the THREATS, methodology. The complete details of THREATS (Tree Hazard: Risk Evaluation and Treatment System) can be found at https://www.flac.uk.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/07/THREATS-GN-June-2010.pdf
Firstly, we must thank Julian Forbes-Laird (JFL), for his work and philanthropic approach to developing and gifting this risk assessment methodology to the arboricultural and forestry world, which has been and continues to be used widely.
However, following extended use and seeing several cases go through the legal system, one small element of the THREATS system became increasingly problematic for us; namely, the THREATS system included a 'None Apparent' failure score with a 0 (zero) and a Failure Score that attributed a 0 (zero) to sites with a Target Score of None. This results in a compounding multiplication risk assessment product of 0 (zero) score, as shown in the table below. Following long-term use, this felt increasingly uncomfortable and undefendable as it is difficult for us to conclude that any tree or site offers 'No Risk', unless access is strictly controlled or restricted.

Table 1 – Shows all possible outcomes using THREATS

	Impact Score	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	4	4	4	4	4	6	6	6	6	6	6	10	10	10	10	10	10
		Small <10cm	Small <10cm	Small <10cm	Small <10cm	Small <10cm	Small <10cm	Medium 10-35cm	Medium 10-35cm	Medium 10-35cm	Medium 10-35cm	Medium 10-35cm	Medium 10-35cm	Large 35-75cm	Large 35-75cm	Large 35-75cm	Large 35-75cm	Large 35-75cm	Large 35-75cm	Very Large >75cm	Very Large >75cm	Very Large >75cm	Very Large >75cm	Very Large >75cm	Very Large >75cm
	Target Score	0	7	15	20	25	40	0	7	15	20	25	40	0	7	15	20	25	40	0	7	15	20	25	40
Failure Score		None	Very Low	Low	Medium	High	Very High	None	Very Low	Low	Medium	High	Very High	None	Very Low	Low	Medium	High	Very High	None	Very Low	Low	Medium	High	Very High
0	None Apparent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0.8	Potentially with time	0	5.6	12	16	20	32	0	22.4	48	64	80	128	0	33.6	72	96	120	192	0	56	120	160	200	320
2	Likely Foreseeable	0	14	30	40	50	80	0	56	120	160	200	320	0	84	180	240	300	480	0	140	300	400	500	800
8	Probable Soon	0	56	120	160	200	320	0	224	480	640	800	1280	0	336	720	960	1200	1920	0	560	1200	1600	2000	3200
50	Imminent Immediate	0	350	750	1000	1250	2000	0	1400	3000	4000	5000	8000	0	2100	4500	6000	7500	12000	0	3500	7500	10000	12500	20000

We could not knowingly conclude that a site or tree offered no risk, and this led to the development of BARMY to help better reflect our instincts in relation to the small but still present risk offered by trees on sites even when access is very limited. Essentially, we have copied THREATS and to JFL we are eternally thankful for opening the door. However, to better reflect the site we manage and the sites we visit, we have substituted both the descriptors for the 'Target Score' from 'None' to 'Minimal' and the Failure Score from 'None Apparent' to 'Unlikely'. In undertaking these changes, we have adjusted the scores associated with these descriptions as described below and shown in the table below. We have elevated the score from 0 to 0.4 for 'Minimal. This is simply half of THREATS 'Potentially with time' score. Additionally, we have raised the score for None from 0 to 1.5 for 'Minimal'. The results of these small changes are shown in the table below.

Table 2 – Shows all possible outcomes using BARMY

	Impact Score	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	4	4	4	4	4	6	6	6	6	6	6	10	10	10	10	10	10
		Small <10cm	Small <10cm	Small <10cm	Small <10cm	Small <10cm	Small <10cm	Medium 10-35	Medium 10-35	Medium 10-35	Medium 10-35	Medium 10-35	Medium 10-35	Large 35-75	Large 35-75	Large 35-75	Large 35-75	Large 35-75	Large 35-75	Very Large	Very Large	Very Large	Very Large	Very Large	Very Large
	Target Score	1.5	7	15	20	25	40	1.5	7	15	20	25	40	1.5	7	15	20	25	40	1.5	7	15	20	25	40
Failure Score		Minimal	Very Low	Low	Medium	High	Very High	Minimal	Very Low	Low	Medium	High	Very High	Minimal	Very Low	Low	Medium	High	Very High	Minimal	Very Low	Low	Medium	High	Very High
0.4	Unlikely	0.6	2.8	6	8	10	16	2.4	11.2	24	32	40	64	3.6	16.8	36	48	60	96	6	28	60	80	100	160
0.8	Potentially	1.2	5.6	12	16	20	32	4.8	22.4	48	64	80	128	7.2	33.6	72	96	120	192	12	56	120	160	200	320
2`	Likely	3	14	30	40	50	80	12	56	120	160	200	320	18	84	180	240	300	480	30	140	300	400	500	800
8	Probable	12	56	120	160	200	320	48	224	480	640	800	1280	72	336	720	960	1200	1920	120	560	1200	1600	2000	3200
50	Imminent	75	350	750	1000	1250	2000	300	1400	3000	4000	5000	8000	450	2100	4500	6000	7500	12000	750	3500	7500	10000	12500	20000

As can be seen from the table above, no tree now offers a Zero risk, which we would suggest better reflect the sites which we find ourselves assessing for clients. The only significant differences are that Large and Very Large trees with an Imminent failure score now are recorded as offering a Moderate Risk, which after much consideration, sits a little more comfortably with both our teams and clients.
So, whenever we are assessing trees, the BARMY method will be used and has been designed to offer all those who have responsibility for evaluating and managing trees a means of assessing them for risk in a consistent fashion.

BARMY also assists the user in determining the appropriate response to the level of identified risk, and this includes both works and intermediate control measures. The method multiplies three values together to give a threat category which guides the inspector on an appropriate response to the risk posed.

Failure Score: Identified defects in relation to species/clone history, established failure criteria & time of year are considered.

Target Score: Impact radius of identified defect against potential targets (objects or persons liable to be affected by tree defect), forward visibility available to drivers (Poor Forward Visibility / Good Forward Visibility) & whether vehicles are likely to be stationary, e.g., at junctions are all considered. If targets are liable to include unsupervised children &/or the elderly or infirm the score is increased by one category.

Impact Score: Height of fall/momentum & whether e.g., lower branches would impede the agent's descent are considered.

Table 3 – Example of the BARMY calculation method and products

Failure Score	
Likelihood of failure	Score
Imminent	50
Probable/Soon	8
Likely, foreseeable	2
Potentially with time	0.8
Unlikely	0.40

X

Target Score	
Value	Score
Very High	40
High	25
Medium	20
Low	15
Very Low	7
Minimal	1.5

X

Impact Score	
Value	Score
Very Large	10
Large	6
Medium	4
Small	1

=

BARMY - Risk Category		
Score Range	Threat Category	Priority, Recommended action & Completion deadline
4000+	7 – Extreme	Critical - Work to be carried out as soon as practically possible. i.e. <7 days or control access
2001 - 3999	6 – Serious	Urgent – Work to be carried out as soon i.e within 1 month or control access
1000 - 2000	5 – Significant	High – Work to be carried out in the near future i.e. within 3 months or restrict access
330 - 999	4 – Moderate	Moderate - Work to be carried out in the current season i.e. within 6 months or limit access
160 - 329	3 – Slight	Low – Work to be carried out before the next inspection i.e. within 18 months
50 - 159	2 – Minimal	Minor - Works to be carried out If these meet management objectives and if budgets allow
0 - 49	1 – Insignificant	Minor - Works to be carried out If these meet management objectives and if budgets allow

Unless stated otherwise, the risk assessment assumes the risk is offered over the next year.

Rootplate: Is a representation of the area under a tree that is subject to high loading and is important for tree stability. It is calculated by 4 x Diameter of the Trees stem, as detailed by C. Mattheck in 'The Body Language of Trees'.

Minimum RPA (m) – Root Protection Area: Minimum distance in metres of the position of protective fencing in line with section 4.6 of BS5837:2012. In order to avoid damage to the roots or rooting environment of retained trees, an area equivalent to a circle with a radius 12 times the stem diameter.

Tree Protection Zone (TPZ) (m) – This is an additional distance offset of 2m beyond the RPA, to provide space for growth and to act as a buffer to the RPA fence; essentially, this provides construction access, such as a zone for scaffolding.

Root Protection Area (Radius) (m) – RPA given in metres from the centre of the stem.

Root Protection Area (Area) (m^2) – The ideal total area for the RPA given in metres squared.

Buffer Zone – The magenta RPA line offers the minimum root protection area in line with BS5837, the buffer zone offers a 2m zone outside the RPA which should be considered in the project planning phase to include further protection/exclusion to protect potential tree roots and allow future growth'. It also provides access/scaffolding space outside the minimum RPA

Preliminary Arboricultural Assessment - This should not be referred to as a specification of Arboricultural Works

Est	Tag No.	Name	Age	Height (m)	Height (m)	North (m)	South (m)	East (m)	West (m)	Condition	Life Exp (Yrs)	BS5837 Category	Diameter (mm)	Stem No.	Comments	Recommendations	Risk	Rootplate (m)	Root Protection Radius (m)	Root Protection Area (m^2)
Est DBH	ST1	Common Plum	M	5	0	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	Poor	10 or less	U	400	1	Located on boundary. A standing stem with no canopy covered in ivy.	Remove the tree.	Minimal	1.6	4.8	72.39
Est DBH	T2	Lawson Cypress	EM	6	0	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	Good	20 or more	B2	100 100 100 100	4	Growing as part of a group. Buttress obscured by shrubbery. Multiple stemmed close to ground level. A balanced crown shape. Canopy is swamped by neighbouring trees. Typical foliage suggests good vitality. Good potential and reasonably located.	No works required	Insignificant	0.8	2.4	18.1
Est Pos,Est DBH	G3	Sycamore, European Holly, Goat Willow, Elder , Rhododendron	SM	8	1	3	3	3	3	Fair	10 or more	C2	100	1	Growing as part of a group. Multiple stemmed close to ground level. A fair broadleaf group with limited potential. Limited signs of management. Suspected self seeded group.	No works required Management: consider removal	Minimal	0.4	1.2	4.52
Est Pos,Est DBH	G4	Sycamore, European Holly, Elder , Rhododendron	SM	8	1	3	3	3	3	Fair	10 or more	C2	75	1	Growing as part of a group. Multiple stemmed close to ground level. A fair broadleaf group with limited potential. Limited signs of management. Suspected self seeded group.	No works required Management: consider removal	Minimal	0.3	0.9	2.55
	T5	Horse Chestnut	M	12	1	6	6	4	6	Poor	10 or less	C2	550	1	Located next to the boundary. Growing as part of a shelterbelt. Located adjacent to a retaining wall within 3m to the West. Buttress obscured by shooting. Single stem. Minor dieback visible. Moderate epicormic shoots are visible within the canopy. Broken branches visible within the canopy. Loose branches can be seen within the canopy. Wounding from branch failures visible. Unbalanced crown shape. Crown distorted due to available light. Horse chestnut leaf miner. A poor example of the species with limited potential.	Remove failed branches. Remove deadwood to improve safety.	Slight	2.2	6.6	136.87

Est	Tag No.	Name	Age	Height (m)	Height (m)	North (m)	South (m)	East (m)	West (m)	Condition	Life Exp (Yrs)	BS5837 Category	Diameter (mm)	Stem No.	Comments	Recommendations	Risk	Rootplate (m)	Root Protection Radius (m)	Root Protection Area (m^2)
Est Height	T6	Sycamore	M	20	5	3	8	3	8	Good	20 or more	B2	640	1	Growing as part of a group. Growing as part of a shelterbelt. Located adjacent to a retaining wall, footpath, road within 3m to the West. Single stem with a slight lean. Unbalanced crown shape. Crown distorted due to available light. Typical foliage suggests good vitality. Typical foliage density. A typical example with reasonable potential.	No Works required.	Insignificant	2.56	7.68	185.32
Est Height	T7	Sycamore	M	20	5	3	8	3	8	Good	20 or more	B2	650	1	Growing as part of a group. Growing as part of a shelterbelt. Located adjacent to a retaining wall, footpath, road within 3m to the West. Single stem with a slight lean. Unbalanced crown shape. Crown distorted due to available light. Canopy develops close to lighting. Typical foliage suggests good vitality. Typical foliage density. A typical example with reasonable potential.	Reduce from the utility to provide 2m clearance.	Insignificant	2.6	7.8	191.16
Est Spread,Est Height	T8	Horse Chestnut	M	20	3	4	9	8	7	Good	20 or more	B2	870	1	Growing as part of a group. Growing as part of a shelterbelt. Located adjacent to, a retaining wall, footpath, road streetlamp within 3m to the West. Single stem. biforked below the canopy with open union. Minor quantities of deadwood can be seen within the canopy. Unbalanced crown shape. Crown distorted due to available light. Canopy develops into the footpath. Canopy develops close to lighting.	Crown lift to 2.5m above path. Crown lift to 5.2m to enable vehicle access. Reduce from the utility to provide 2m clearance.	Minimal	3.48	10.44	342.46

Est	Tag No.	Name	Age	Height (m)	Height (m)	North (m)	South (m)	East (m)	West (m)	Condition	Life Exp (Yrs)	BS5837 Category	Diameter (mm)	Stem No.	Comments	Recommendations	Risk	Rootplate (m)	Root Protection Radius (m)	Root Protection Area (m^2)
Est Spread,Est Height,Est DBH	T9	Horse Chestnut	M	20	3	6	6	2	7	Good	20 or more	B2	550	1	Growing as part of a group. Growing as part of a shelterbelt. Located adjacent to a retaining wall, footpath, road within 3m to the West. Buttress obscured by Ivy. Single stem. biforked below the canopy with open union. Ivy has developed and prevented inspection. Minor quantities of deadwood can be seen within the canopy. Ivy has developed high within the canopy. Limited visual inspection of canopy. Unbalanced crown shape. Crown distorted due to available light. Canopy develops into the footpath. Canopy develops close to lighting.	Treat Ivy to prevent further growth. Crown lift to 2.5m above path. Crown lift to 5.2m to enable vehicle access.	Minimal	2.2	6.6	136.87
Est Height,Est Spread,Est DBH	T10	Sycamore	M	20	6	4	7	4	8	Good	20 or more	B2	700	1	Located next to the boundary. Growing as part of a group. Growing as part of a shelterbelt. Located adjacent to a retaining wall, footpath, road within 3m to the West. Buttress obscured by Ivy. Buttress obscured by shrubbery. Single stem. Ivy has developed and prevented inspection. Minor quantities of deadwood can be seen within the canopy. Ivy has developed high within the canopy. Limited visual inspection of canopy. A balanced crown shape. Typical foliage suggests good vitality.	Treat Ivy to prevent further growth.	Insignificant	2.8	8.4	221.7
Est Height,Est Spread,Est DBH	T11	Sycamore	M	20	6	4	7	4	8	Good	20 or more	B2	650	1	Located next to the boundary. Growing as part of a group. Growing as part of a shelterbelt. Located adjacent to, a retaining wall,footpath, road, within 3m to the West. Buttress obscured by shrubbery. Single stem. Minor quantities of deadwood can be seen within the canopy. Limited visual inspection of canopy. A balanced crown shape. Typical foliage suggests good vitality.	No works required.	Insignificant	2.6	7.8	191.16

Est	Tag No.	Name	Age	Height (m)	Height (m)	North (m)	South (m)	East (m)	West (m)	Condition	Life Exp (Yrs)	BS5837 Category	Diameter (mm)	Stem No.	Comments	Recommendations	Risk	Rootplate (m)	Root Protection Radius (m)	Root Protection Area (m^2)
	T12	Horse Chestnut	EM	6	2	4	4	4	4	Fair	10 or more	C2	150	1	Growing as part of a group. Buttress obscured by shrubbery. Single stem. Unbalanced crown shape. Canopy is swamped by neighbouring trees. A poor example of the species with limited potential.	No works required.	Insignificant	0.6	1.8	10.18
Est Spread,Est Height	T13	Horse Chestnut	EM	20	2	4	6	2	6	Good	20 or more	B2	420	1	Located next to the boundary. Growing as part of a group. Growing as part of a shelterbelt. Located adjacent to a retaining wall, footpath, road within 3.5m to the West. Buttress obscured by Ivy. Single stem. Ivy has developed and prevented inspection. Ivy has developed high within the canopy. Limited visual inspection of canopy. Horse chestnut leaf miner.	Treat Ivy to prevent further growth.	Insignificant	1.68	5.04	79.81
Est Spread,Est Height	T14	Horse Chestnut	EM	20	2	3	7	5	6	Good	20 or more	B2	450	1	Located next to the boundary. Growing as part of a group. Growing as part of a shelterbelt. Located adjacent to a retaining wall, footpath, road within 3.5m to the West. Buttress obscured by Ivy. Single stem. Ivy has developed and prevented inspection. Ivy has developed high within the canopy. Limited visual inspection of canopy. Horse chestnut leaf miner.	Treat Ivy to prevent further growth.	Insignificant	1.8	5.4	91.62
Est Spread,Est Height	T15	Sycamore	EM	14	3	2	2	4	4	Good	20 or more	B2	250	1	Growing as part of a group. Located adjacent to a retaining wall. Single stem. Minor quantities of deadwood can be seen within the canopy. Unbalanced crown shape. Crown distorted due to group pressure. Crown distorted due to available light. A typical example, but poorly located.	No works required	Insignificant	1	3	28.28

Est	Tag No.	Name	Age	Height (m)	Height (m)	North (m)	South (m)	East (m)	West (m)	Condition	Life Exp (Yrs)	BS5837 Category	Diameter (mm)	Stem No.	Comments	Recommendations	Risk	Rootplate (m)	Root Protection Radius (m)	Root Protection Area (m^2)
Est Pos,Est DBH,Est Spread	T16	Common Ash	M	16	5	3	7	3	5	Poor	10 or less	U	500	1	Located on neighbouring land. Located next to the boundary. Growing as part of a group. Multiple obstacles made inspection very limited or not possible. Single stem. Stem has failed at union at around 2m with failed part resting on the wall. Limited inspection possible	Remove the tree.	Moderate	2	6	113.11
Est Spread,Est Height,Est DBH	T17	Horse Chestnut	EM	14	2	3	7	5	6	Good	20 or more	B2	400	1	Located next to the boundary. Growing as part of a group. Growing as part of a shelterbelt. Located adjacent to a retaining wall,footpath, road within 3.5m to the West. Buttress obscured by Ivy. Single stem. Ivy has developed and prevented inspection. Ivy has developed high within the canopy. Limited visual inspection of canopy. Horse chestnut leaf miner. Limited inspection due to access and undergrowth	Treat Ivy to prevent further growth.	Insignificant	1.6	4.8	72.39
Est Height,Est Spread,Est DBH	T18	Common Ash	M	20	5	7	7	8	7	Good	20 or more	B2	700	1	Located next to the boundary. Growing as part of a group. Buttress obscured by shrubbery. Single stem. Ivy has started to develop on the main stem. Minor quantities of deadwood can be seen within the canopy. Unbalanced crown shape. Crown distorted due to available light. Typical foliage suggests good vitality. A typical example with reasonable potential.	No works required.	Insignificant	2.8	8.4	221.7
Est Pos,Est Height,Est Spread	T19	Common Walnut	EM	16	2	6	6	5	2	Good	20 or more	B2	350 350	2	Located on neighbouring land. Located on boundary. Located next to. a panel fence. Multiple obstacles made inspection very limited or not possible. Biforked close to ground level. Ivy has started to develop on the main stem. Ivy has developed high within the canopy. Limited visual inspection of canopy. Unbalanced crown shape. Crown distorted due to available light.	Treat Ivy to prevent further growth.	Insignificant	1.98	5.94	110.86

Est	Tag No.	Name	Age	Height (m)	Height (m)	North (m)	South (m)	East (m)	West (m)	Condition	Life Exp (Yrs)	BS5837 Category	Diameter (mm)	Stem No.	Comments	Recommendations	Risk	Rootplate (m)	Root Protection Radius (m)	Root Protection Area (m^2)
Est Pos,Est DBH	G20	Sycamore, Common Hawthorn	SM	5	0	2	2	2	2	Fair	10 or more	C2	100	1	Located adjacent to a panel fence. A self seeded group behind fenceline of little value	No works required.	Insignificant	0.4	1.2	4.52
Est Pos,Est DBH,Est Spread	T21	Sycamore	EM	16	3	5	5	5	5	Good	20 or more	B2	500	1	Located on neighbouring land. Buttress obscured by Ivy. Multiple obstacles made inspection very limited or not possible. Single stem. Ivy has developed and prevented inspection. Ivy has developed high within the canopy. Limited visual inspection of canopy. A balanced crown shape.	No works required.	Insignificant	2	6	113.11
Est Pos	T22	Silver Birch	EM	15	2.5	3	3	3	3	Good	20 or more	B2	150	1	Growing as part of a group. Buttress obscured by shrubbery. Single stem. A balanced crown shape. Typical foliage suggests good vitality. A good example with good potential.	No works required.	Insignificant	0.6	1.8	10.18
Est Pos,Est DBH	G23	Sycamore, Common Hawthorn, European Holly, Elder , Rhododendron	SM	8	1	3	3	3	3	Fair	10 or more	C2	100	1	Growing as part of a group. Multiple stemmed close to ground level. A fair broadleaf group with limited potential. Limited signs of management. Suspected self seeded group.	No works required	Minimal	0.4	1.2	4.52
Est Pos,Est DBH,Est Spread	G24	Leyland Cypress	EM	12	1	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	Good	20 or more	B2	200	1	Located next to the boundary. Growing as part of a group. Single stem. A typical group for the area.	No works required	Insignificant	0.8	2.4	18.1
Est DBH,Est Height,Est Pos,Est Spread	T25	Sycamore	EM	10	1	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	Good	20 or more	B2	300	1	Growing as part of a group. Growing next to a wooden fence, road, shed. Single stem. Growing close to shed limited inspection due to access Ash tree growing at base	No works required	Minimal	1.2	3.6	40.72
	T26	Common Ash	SM	10	2.5	3	2	0.5	2	Fair	10 or more	C2	150	1	Growing as part of a group. Growing next to Tarmac, wooden fence, road. Single stem with a slight lean which appears stable. Unbalanced crown shape. The canopy is suppressed by nearby trees. Limited inspection due to access. Growing underneath and though T25	No works required	Minimal	0.6	1.8	10.18

Est	Tag No.	Name	Age	Height (m)	Height (m)	North (m)	South (m)	East (m)	West (m)	Condition	Life Exp (Yrs)	BS5837 Category	Diameter (mm)	Stem No.	Comments	Recommendations	Risk	Rootplate (m)	Root Protection Radius (m)	Root Protection Area (m^2)
Est DBH,Est Group Numbers,Est Pos,Est Spread	G27	Common Ash, Common Plum, Elder	EM	10	0.5	2	2	2	2	Fair	10 or more	C2	250	1	Located on site. Growing adjacent to outbuilding. Multiple obstacles made inspection very limited or not possible. A poorly developing group of limited potential.	No works required	Minimal	1	3	28.28
Est DBH,Est Group Numbers,Est Pos,Est Spread	G28	Sycamore, Common Ash	SM	11	0.5	3	3	3	3	Fair	10 or more	C2	150	1	Located on site. Growing next to a brick wall, outbuilding. A tight union co-dominant stem is developing from the main stem. A poorly developing group at close centres affecting the establishment of the trees. Previously coppiced group growing close to garage within 25cm Likely to cause future damages.	No works required	Slight	0.6	1.8	10.18
	T29	Common Pear	M	6	0.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	Poor	10 or more	C2	300	1	Located on site. Growing as part of a group. Growing within a shrub bed. Growing next to Hard Surfacing. Single stem with a moderate lean. biforked below the canopy with open union. Ivy has developed and prevented inspection. Ivy swamps the canopy prevented inspection. A climber has started to develop on the main stem. A climber swamps the canopy, and failure is expected. A poor example of the species with limited potential.	Sever Ivy and remove Ivy to allow further inspection.	Minimal	1.2	3.6	40.72
	T30	Common Ash	SM	8	0.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	Fair	10 or more	C2	175	1	Located on site. Growing within a shrub bed. Growing next to Hard Surfacing. Triforked close to ground level. with epicormic buttress shooting. with epicormic trunk shooting. A tight union co-dominant stem is developing from the main stem. Historical impact wounding visible on the stem. Minor bark damage. Ivy has started to develop on the main stem.	No works required	Insignificant	0.7	2.1	13.86

Est	Tag No.	Name	Age	Height (m)	Height (m)	North (m)	South (m)	East (m)	West (m)	Condition	Life Exp (Yrs)	BS5837 Category	Diameter (mm)	Stem No.	Comments	Recommendations	Risk	Rootplate (m)	Root Protection Radius (m)	Root Protection Area (m^2)
	T31	Common Plum	EM	6	0.5	1.5	0.5	2	2	Fair	20 or more	B2	175	1	Located on boundary. Growing as part of a group. Growing within a hedge. Growing next to a wooden fence. Multiple stemmed close to ground level with a significant lean. multiple forks below the canopy with tight unions. Ivy has started to develop on the main stem. Unbalanced crown shape. Crown distorted due to group pressure. Crown distorted due to available light. Limited inspection due to access Tree growing through hedge	No works required	Insignificant	0.7	2.1	13.86
Est DBH,Est Group Numbers,Est Pos,Est Spread	G32	Sycamore, Common Ash, Apple, Elder , Leyland Cypress	M	9	0.5	2	2	2	2	Fair	20 or more	B2	300	1	Located on boundary. Growing next to a wooden fence. No sign of recent management. Trees are developing in hedge. Escaped hedge with multiple trees growing through Limited inspection due to access.	No works required	Minimal	1.2	3.6	40.72
	T33	Silver Birch	EM	8	0.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	Good	20 or more	B2	170	2	Located on site. Biforked close to ground level. with a marked lean and self-corrected canopy. No inspection possible. A typical canopy shape. A typical example of the species with good potential. Growing in dense vegetation	No works required	Insignificant	0.96	2.88	26.06
	T34	Goat Willow	EM	5	0.5	2	2	2	2	Fair	10 or more	C2	100	1	Located on site. Located next to the boundary. Growing as part of a group. Multiple stemmed close to ground level with a significant lean and self-corrected canopy which has failed which is laid on with ground. An included co-dominant stem is developing from the main stem. Limited inspection due to access Growing in dense vegetation	No works required	Insignificant	0.4	1.2	4.52
Est DBH,Est Group Numbers,Est Pos,Est Spread	G35	Sycamore, Common Hawthorn, Common Ash, Elder , Rowan, Common Juniper, Leyland Cypress	EM	7	0.5	2	2	2	2	Good	20 or more	B2	150	1	Located on site. Located on boundary. No sign of recent management. A typical group for the area.	No works required	Insignificant	0.6	1.8	10.18

Insert Tree Survey Schedule

Arboricultural Impact Assessment Data BS5837

Est	Tag No.	Name	Age	Height (m)	Height (m)	North (m)	South (m)	East (m)	West (m)	Condition	Life Exp (Yrs)	BS5837 Category	Diameter (mm)	Stem No.	Tree works to enable the scheme	Arboricultural Impact and Protection Measures	Risk	Rootplate (m)	Root Protection Radius (m)	Root Protection Area (m²)
Est DBH	ST1	Common Plum	M	5	0	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	Poor	10 or less	U	400	1	Remove to enable the scheme	Loss of a high stump.	Minimal	1.6	4.8	72.39
Est DBH	T2	Lawson Cypress	EM	6	0	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	Good	20 or more	B2	100 100 100 100	4	Remove to enable the scheme	Loss of a good category tree.	Insignificant	0.8	2.4	18.1
Est Pos,Est DBH	G3	Sycamore, European Holly, Goat Willow, Elder , Rhododendron	SM	8	1	3	3	3	3	Fair	10 or more	C2	100	1	Remove entire group to enable the scheme	Loss of a fair category group which is thought to be self seeded.	Minimal	0.4	1.2	4.52
Est Pos,Est DBH	G4	Sycamore, European Holly, Elder , Rhododendron	SM	8	1	3	3	3	3	Fair	10 or more	C2	75	1	Remove entire group to enable the scheme	Loss of a good category group which is thought to be self seeded.	Minimal	0.3	0.9	2.55
	T5	Horse Chestnut	M	12	1	6	6	4	6	Poor	10 or less	C2	550	1	None	RPA infringement unable to calculate accurately due to offset RPA. Tree Protection Fencing Tree Precautionary Zone Construction Exclusion Zone.	Slight	2.2	6.6	136.87
Est Height	T6	Sycamore	M	20	5	3	8	3	8	Good	20 or more	B2	640	1	None	Tree Protection Fencing Construction Exclusion Zone.	Insignificant	2.56	7.68	185.32

Est	Tag No.	Name	Age	Height (m)	Height (m)	North (m)	South (m)	East (m)	West (m)	Condition	Life Exp (Yrs)	BS5837 Category	Diameter (mm)	Stem No.	Tree works to enable the scheme	Arboricultural Impact and Protection Measures	Risk	Rootplate (m)	Root Protection Radius (m)	Root Protection Area (m^2)
Est Height	T7	Sycamore	M	20	5	3	8	3	8	Good	20 or more	B2	650	1	Nones	RPA infringement unable to calculate accurately due to offset RPA. Tree Protection Fencing Tree Precautionary Zone Construction Exclusion Zone.	Insignificant	2.6	7.8	191.16
Est Spread,Est Height	T8	Horse Chestnut	M	20	3	4	9	8	7	Good	20 or more	B2	870	1	Crown lift above access point/highway facilitating 5m for vehicles.	RPA infringement unable to calculate accurately due to offset RPA. Tree Protection Fencing Tree Precautionary Zone Construction Exclusion Zone.	Minimal	3.48	10.44	342.46
Est Spread,Est Height,Est DBH	T9	Horse Chestnut	M	20	3	6	6	2	7	Good	20 or more	B2	550	1	Crown lift above access point/highway facilitating 5m for vehicles.	RPA infringement unable to calculate accurately due to offset RPA. Tree Protection Fencing Tree Precautionary Zone Construction Exclusion Zone.	Minimal	2.2	6.6	136.87
Est Height,Est Spread,Est DBH	T10	Sycamore	M	20	6	4	7	4	8	Good	20 or more	B2	700	1	None	Tree Protection Fencing Tree Precautionary Zone Construction Exclusion Zone.	Insignificant	2.8	8.4	221.7
Est Height,Est Spread,Est DBH	T11	Sycamore	M	20	6	4	7	4	8	Good	20 or more	B2	650	1	None	Tree Protection Fencing Tree Precautionary Zone Construction Exclusion Zone.	Insignificant	2.6	7.8	191.16

Est	Tag No.	Name	Age	Height (m)	Height (m)	North (m)	South (m)	East (m)	West (m)	Condition	Life Exp (Yrs)	BS5837 Category	Diameter (mm)	Stem No.	Tree works to enable the scheme	Arboricultural Impact and Protection Measures	Risk	Rootplate (m)	Root Protection Radius (m)	Root Protection Area (m²)
	T12	Horse Chestnut	EM	6	2	4	4	4	4	Fair	10 or more	C2	150	1	None	Tree Protection Fencing Construction Exclusion Zone.	Insignificant	0.6	1.8	10.18
Est Spread,Est Height	T13	Horse Chestnut	EM	20	2	4	6	2	6	Good	20 or more	B2	420	1	None	Tree Protection Fencing Construction Exclusion Zone.	Insignificant	1.68	5.04	79.81
Est Spread,Est Height	T14	Horse Chestnut	EM	20	2	3	7	5	6	Good	20 or more	B2	450	1	None	Tree Protection Fencing Construction Exclusion Zone.	Insignificant	1.8	5.4	91.62
Est Spread,Est Height	T15	Sycamore	EM	14	3	2	2	4	4	Good	20 or more	B2	250	1	None	Tree Protection Fencing Construction Exclusion Zone.	Insignificant	1	3	28.28
Est Pos,Est DBH,Est Spread	T16	Common Ash	M	16	5	3	7	3	5	Poor	10 or less	U	500	1	Remove due to safety	Loss of poor tree.	Moderate	2	6	113.11

Est	Tag No.	Name	Age	Height (m)	Height (m)	North (m)	South (m)	East (m)	West (m)	Condition	Life Exp (Yrs)	BS5837 Category	Diameter (mm)	Stem No.	Tree works to enable the scheme	Arboricultural Impact and Protection Measures	Risk	Rootplate (m)	Root Protection Radius (m)	Root Protection Area (m²)
Est Spread,Est Height,Est DBH	T17	Horse Chestnut	EM	14	2	3	7	5	6	Good	20 or more	B2	400	1	None	Tree Protection Fencing Construction Exclusion Zone.	Insignificant	1.6	4.8	72.39
Est Height,Est Spread,Est DBH	T18	Common Ash	M	20	5	7	7	8	7	Good	20 or more	B2	700	1	None	Tree Protection Fencing Construction Exclusion Zone.	Insignificant	2.8	8.4	221.7
Est Pos,Est Height,Est Spread	T19	Common Walnut	EM	16	2	6	6	5	2	Good	20 or more	B2	350 350	2	None	Tree Protection Fencing Construction Exclusion Zone.	Insignificant	1.98	5.94	110.86
Est Pos,Est DBH	G20	Sycamore, Common Hawthorn	SM	5	0	2	2	2	2	Fair	10 or more	C2	100	1	None	Tree Protection Fencing Construction Exclusion Zone.	Insignificant	0.4	1.2	4.52

Est	Tag No.	Name	Age	Height (m)	Height (m)	North (m)	South (m)	East (m)	West (m)	Condition	Life Exp (Yrs)	BS5837 Category	Diameter (mm)	Stem No.	Tree works to enable the scheme	Arboricultural Impact and Protection Measures	Risk	Rootplate (m)	Root Protection Radius (m)	Root Protection Area (m²)
Est Pos,Est DBH,Est Spread	T21	Sycamore	EM	16	3	5	5	5	5	Good	20 or more	B2	500	1	None	Tree Protection Fencing Construction Exclusion Zone.	Insignificant	2	6	113.11
Est Pos	T22	Silver Birch	EM	15	2.5	3	3	3	3	Good	20 or more	B2	150	1	Remove to enable the scheme	Loss of a good category tree.	Insignificant	0.6	1.8	10.18
Est Pos,Est DBH	G23	Sycamore, Common Hawthorn, European Holly, Elder , Rhododendron	SM	8	1	3	3	3	3	Fair	10 or more	C2	100	1	Remove entire group to enable the scheme	Loss of a fair category group which is thought to be self seeded.	Minimal	0.4	1.2	4.52
Est Pos,Est DBH,Est Spread	G24	Leyland Cypress	EM	12	1	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	Good	20 or more	B2	200	1	None	Tree Protection Fencing Construction Exclusion Zone.	Insignificant	0.8	2.4	18.1
Est DBH,Est Height,Est Pos,Est Spread	T25	Sycamore	EM	10	1	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	Good	20 or more	B2	300	1	None	Tree Protection Fencing Construction Exclusion Zone.	Minimal	1.2	3.6	40.72
	T26	Common Ash	SM	10	2.5	3	2	0.5	2	Fair	10 or more	C2	150	1	None	Tree Protection Fencing Construction Exclusion Zone.	Minimal	0.6	1.8	10.18
Est DBH,Est Group Numbers,Est Pos,Est Spread	G27	Common Ash, Common Plum, Elder	EM	10	0.5	2	2	2	2	Fair	10 or more	C2	250	1	None	Tree Protection Fencing Construction Exclusion Zone.	Minimal	1	3	28.28

Est	Tag No.	Name	Age	Height (m)	Height (m)	North (m)	South (m)	East (m)	West (m)	Condition	Life Exp (Yrs)	BS5837 Category	Diameter (mm)	Stem No.	Tree works to enable the scheme	Arboricultural Impact and Protection Measures	Risk	Rootplate (m)	Root Protection Radius (m)	Root Protection Area (m²)
Est DBH,Est Group Numbers,Est Pos,Est Spread	G28	Sycamore, Common Ash	SM	11	0.5	3	3	3	3	Fair	10 or more	C2	150	1	Remove entire group to enable the scheme	Loss of a fair category group	Slight	0.6	1.8	10.18
	T29	Common Pear	M	6	0.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	Poor	10 or more	C2	300	1	Remove to enable the scheme	Loss of fair category tree.	Minimal	1.2	3.6	40.72
	T30	Common Ash	SM	8	0.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	Fair	10 or more	C2	175	1	Remove to enable the scheme	Loss of fair category tree.	Insignificant	0.7	2.1	13.86
	T31	Common Plum	EM	6	0.5	1.5	0.5	2	2	Fair	20 or more	B2	175	1	Remove to enable the scheme due to excessive pruning requirements to retain.	Loss of good category tree.	Insignificant	0.7	2.1	13.86
Est DBH,Est Group Numbers,Est Pos,Est Spread	G32	Sycamore, Common Ash, Apple, Elder , Leyland Cypress	M	9	0.5	2	2	2	2	Fair	20 or more	B2	300	1	None	Tree Protection Fencing Construction Exclusion Zone.	Minimal	1.2	3.6	40.72
	T33	Silver Birch	EM	8	0.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	Good	20 or more	B2	170	2	None	Tree Protection Fencing Construction Exclusion Zone.	Insignificant	0.96	2.88	26.06
	T34	Goat Willow	EM	5	0.5	2	2	2	2	Fair	10 or more	C2	100	1	None	Tree Protection Fencing Construction Exclusion Zone.	Insignificant	0.4	1.2	4.52

Est	Tag No.	Name	Age	Height (m)	Height (m)	North (m)	South (m)	East (m)	West (m)	Condition	Life Exp (Yrs)	BS5837 Category	Diameter (mm)	Stem No.	Tree works to enable the scheme	Arboricultural Impact and Protection Measures	Risk	Rootplate (m)	Root Protection Radius (m)	Root Protection Area (m^2)
Est DBH,Est Group Numbers,Est Pos,Est Spread	G35	Sycamore, Common Hawthorn, Common Ash, Elder , Rowan, Common Juniper, Leyland Cypress	EM	7	0.5	2	2	2	2	Good	20 or more	B2	150	1	None	Tree Protection Fencing Construction Exclusion Zone.	Insignificant	0.6	1.8	10.18

BARNES associates ltd
SURVEY MANAGE IMPROVE

Tree Diagnostics®

Ground Floor
5 St James Square
Boroughbridge YO51 9AS
T 01423 322371
E info@barnesassociates.co.uk
W barnesassociates.co.uk
Company number 10438116
Registered in England and Wales

TREE SURVEYS

Health & Safety Surveys
Risk Assessments
Homebuyer (Mortgage and Insurance)
Veteran & Venerable Trees
Legal & Law (TPO & Valuations)

ADVANCED ASSESSMENTS

Decay & Defect Scans
Tree Stability Checks
Tree & Plant Health Care
Root Detection & Mapping
Aerial Inspections

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

BS5837 Tree Surveys
Impact Assessments
Method Statements
Planning Conditions
CAD Plans (2D & 3D)

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

Commercial Landscape Design
LVIA (Landscape Visual Impact Assessments)
Landscape Management
Garden Design
Green Infrastructure

AA Registered CONSULTANT trees.org.uk
Arboricultural ASSOCIATION Fellow Member
ISA QUALIFICATIONS TREE RISK ASSESSMENT
VALID Tree Risk-Benefit Validator
Chartered Institute of Horticulture
QTRA Licensed User
BALI REGISTERED
Landscape Institute Registered Practice