

Clifton Villa,  
Hall Cliffe Road  
Horbury,  
Wakefield,  
West Yorkshire WF4 6BY.  
Tel & Fax. 01924 270619  
coppicelandscapes@btinternet.com

## Coppice Landscapes

Report type: **Aboricultural Implication Assessment**

Client: **Mason Building Contractors**

Site address **Land at High Street & Back Lane West, Royston,  
Barnsley**

Reference No: **AIS/SW/2009(HS,S1)**

Date: **Site visit: 17 January 2009**  
**Report completed: 18 January 2009**

## **1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT**

### 1.1

This report has been prepared to consider the arboricultural implications of a proposed residential development at land at High Street and Back Lane west Royston, Barnsley. It is understood that the initial planning application is to be submitted as an outline application. This report will make specific recommendations for arboricultural work in relation to the proposed development. The report should be read in conjunction with the tree constraints plan at appendix 1 and tree protection plan at appendix 2. Only trees considered relevant have been included in the report.

## **2. SITE**

### 2.1

Refer to the Design and Access Statement prepared by White Agus Partnership.

### 2.2

The sites most visually prominent trees comprise of 2No. Sycamore's T2 and T3 that are visually prominent as viewed from Back Lane West and though less open to prominent a lime of 7No. Crack Willow dominate the rear boundary to the site. Elsewhere the sites tree cover comprises of an occasional Sycamore, Hawthorn, Goat Willow, Holly, Birch and Cypress tree(s). The sites tree cover is weighted towards an early mature to over mature age range.

### 2.3

Tree cover within the immediate neighbourhood is poor in terms of numbers, age and species mix, being defined by the prevailing land use.

### 2.4

Due to previous site management it would be considered the majority of open soils are free draining and fertile.

## **3. NAME OF INSPECTOR.**

### 3.1

Stephen Waterson.

## **4. STATUS OF TREES.**

### 4.1

In the case of trees that are subject of Tree Preservation Order controls or planning application procedures it is essential the Local Authority's advice is sought and where necessary consent obtained before undertaking any tree removal or pruning operations. In this regard no checks have been made to ascertain the status of the sites tree cover.

## **5.0. SURVEY CONDITIONS, METHODS AND BASIS OF RECOMMENDATIONS.**

### 5.1

The survey details were prepared in accordance with BS5837 – 2005 Guide for Trees in Relation to Construction providing an assessment as to the condition of each tree and desirability for retention within the development context. The details of the tree report should be self-explanatory, however it may help to explain the following;

Unless otherwise stated all measurements are taken in metres (m).

**Stem diameter** - is measured at 1.5m above ground level or above the root flare in the case of multi-stemmed trees.

**Age of tree** - is expressed as young (y), semi mature (sm), early mature (em), mature (m), and over mature (om) and veteran (v).

**Estimated remaining contribution** – relates to a trees useful life expectancy in its current context.

**BS 5837 category grading** – is a methodology for evaluating existing tree stock and is summarized as follows;

R = Removal necessary for arboricultural management reasons and/or having a value that would be lost within 10 years in the current context (red on plan at appendix 1)

A = Trees of high quality (green on plan at appendix 1)

B = Trees of moderate quality (blue on plan at appendix 1)

C = Trees of low quality ( grey plan at appendix 1)

1 = Trees with arboricultural values

2 = Trees with mainly landscape values

3 = Trees with mainly cultural values

**RPA (radii)** -. Is the normal minimum distance specified in BS5837 table 2 in which to position protective fencing. This in turn defines the “Construction Exclusion Zone”.

**Preliminary management recommendations** – Where tree removal is recommended solely to facilitate the proposed development a statement is made to this effect.

## **6.0 ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IN SUPPORT OF RECOMMENDATIONS.**

### 6.1

A total of 11 No. individual trees and 1 No. tree group have been included in the tree survey.

### 6.2

The findings of the tree survey schedule at section 5 indicates that no trees merit a high quality (A) or moderate quality (B) category. A total of 5 No. individual trees make up the low quality (C1) category with the remaining 6 No. individual trees and 1 No. tree group falling into the removal (R) category.

### 6.3

In terms of the proposed development it is appropriate to retain trees T11 and T12.

### 6.4

With regard to the Sycamore trees T2, T3 and the group of 7 No. Crack Willow in G8 the survey findings at section 5, show these trees contain major defects, such that they will become increasingly liable to fail in extremes of weather. Accordingly it is now appropriate to remove these trees to ensure acceptable levels of public safety and in the case of G8 to make provision for replacement tree planting and boundary treatment that. It is intended that such matters can be dealt with as part of a reserved matters planning application.

### 6.5

The possibility of root damage upon foundations will need to be addressed. In this regard structures will need to be appropriately designed to have foundations that take account of roots, either past, present or future that could impact upon soil moisture levels and possibly contribute to subsidence if the structure of the soil was of a suitable nature.

## **7.0 TREE PROTECTION DURING CONSTRUCTION PROCESSES**

### 7.1

In order to ensure retained trees are protected from unnecessary damage or disturbance, protective fencing should be erected prior to commencement of any construction operations. The final column of the tree survey schedule at Section 5 indicates the Root Protection Area (RPA radii) for all trees, though in the light of my recommendations this need only apply to trees T11 and T12.

### 7.2

The RPA should be created using a robust barrier that should fully meet the requirements of BS: 5837, Section 9.2.2, namely a framework of vertical and horizontal tubular scaffold poles which should be braced sufficiently to receive weld mesh which should itself be securely fixed with wire or scaffold clamps. The fencing should be sufficiently strong to withstand impacts likely to be caused during building operations. Extracts from BS5837 can be supplied for reference purposes if required. All weather signs should also be affixed to the fencing at regular intervals stating: "CONSTRUCTION EXCLUSION ZONE KEEP OUT." Provided satisfactory tree protection is provided development need not compromise the health of retained trees. In the event that T11 and T12 are retained it is recommended the protective fencing should follow the line demonstrated at appendix 2.

## **8.0 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS**

### **8.1**

From the foregoing tree survey findings, comments and observations, it will be seen that the current proposal requires only the removal of trees in the low (C1) and remove (R) categories. Therefore should development of the site proceed, removal of those specimens identified, as being in an undesirable condition, poorly sited or of low amenity value would be in accordance with all accepted practices and relevant standards.

### **8.2**

The protection of trees and their subsequent health and future potential is totally dependent upon all persons operating within the site. Communications are vitally important to ensure that all parties understand the reason for tree protection and its continued existence. Providing all necessary tree protection works are undertaken, then retained trees and development alike will satisfactorily coexist.

### **8.3**

It is hoped that this report and recommendations provides all necessary information. However should there be any queries or should clarification of any points be required, please contact myself.

Stephen Waterson