TREE CONSULTANTS

ARBORICULTURAL REPORT

& Impact Assessment

to **BS 5837:2012** at:

Land at:

Snape Hill Street,
Darfield,
Barnsley,
S73 9LZ

Prepared for:
JR Planning Consultants

Date: *October 2024*

Reference: *AWA6299*

TMP006 – B
Template Revision 01
Auth By: APW
Date: 09/09/2024

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 6
3.3 Photographs 8
4. Arboricultural Impact Assessment 9
4.1 Proposed New Development 9
4.2 Direct Impacts 9
4.3 Indirect Impacts 9
4.4 Suitable Mitigation 10
4.5 Protection of the Retained Trees 10
5. Signature 11
Appendix 1: Authors Qualifications & Experience 13
Appendix 2: Survey Methodology and Limitations 14
Appendix 3: Explanation of Tree Descriptions 15
Appendix 4: Tree Data 16
Appendix 5: Tree Constraints Plan 17
Appendix 6: Tree Impacts Plan 18

1. Introduction

1.1 Instructions and Brief

1.1.1 We have been instructed by JR Planning Consultants 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 August 2023.

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 an Ordnance 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, Principal and Director of AWA Tree Consultants Ltd.

1.2.6 The tree survey data collection was carried out James Godfrey, BA (Hons), FdSc Arboriculture and Tree Management, TechArborA, Arboriculturist at AWA Tree Consultants Ltd.

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** and for detail of the impacts of the new development refer to the Tree Impacts Plan at **Appendix 6**.

2. The Site

2.1 Location and Description

2.1.1 The site is located in Darfield, a village within the Metropolitan Borough of Barnsley, South Yorkshire.

2.1.2 The site comprises several grassed fields and access onto Hill Street to the south. The site borders residential properties to the south, as well as access onto Snape Hill Road. The eastern boundary of the site borders open grassland, with a yard area, residential properties and access onto Hill Street to the north. Another yard area and residential properties border the sites eastern boundary.

2.1.3 The approximate area of the survey is highlighted in the (2022 Google Earth) image below:

3. The Trees

3.1 Legal

3.1.1 The following advice is for guidance purposes only. Some trees are protected by legislation, and it is essential that the legal status of trees is established prior to carrying out works to them. Unauthorised work to protected trees could lead to prosecution, resulting in enforcement action such as fines or a criminal record. Tree Preservation Orders, Conservation Areas, Planning Conditions, Felling Licences or Restrictive Covenants legally protect many trees in the UK.

3.1.2 An online search was undertaken with Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council on 28th October 2024 to check whether any trees at the site are protected by a Tree Preservation Order or are located within a Conservation Area. As of this date no trees at the site are protected by a Tree Preservation Order or are within a Conservation Area.

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

3.1.4 The Multi-Agency Geographical Information for the Countryside (MAGIC) website was used to search for areas of ancient woodlands listed on the Ancient Woodland (DEFRA 2021), and a check for catalogued Ancient and Veteran trees using the woodland trust ancient tree inventory (ATI) (Woodland Trust 2021).

3.1.5 It was confirmed that there are no designated ancient woodlands or veteran or ancient trees within the survey area.

3.1.6 Trees provide a wide range of habitats for many species, some of which are legally protected such as bats, nesting birds, badgers and dormice. It is essential that appropriate care is taken to ensure that this legislation is not contravened.

3.1.7 When appointing a tree surgeon, only properly qualified and experienced companies should be used, who have adequate Public Liability and Employer's Liability Insurance.

3.1.8 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 14 items of woody vegetation, comprised of 6 individual trees and 8 tree groups or hedges. All of the surveyed trees, tree groups or hedges are retention category 'C' (explanatory details regarding the retention categories are included at Appendix 3).

3.2.2 Full details of the surveyed trees, tree groups and hedges are provided in the attached tree data schedule at Appendix 4. General comments are provided below:

3.2.3 The significant tree cover within the site consists mainly of hedging boundary screening groups along the survey area boundaries. The occasional larger tree is situated throughout these groups. The central areas, northern field and southern areas of the site contain little of arboricultural significance, generally consisting of scrubby grassland.

3.2.4 Species diversity at the site is relatively poor. The dominant species at the site are Hawthorn, Hazel and Maple, and the occasional Birch. The hedgerows are generally comprised of Hawthorn, Elder and Blackthorn.

3.2.5 Most of the trees are semi-mature to early-mature with only occasional mature trees.

3.2.6 Birch T1 is growing on banking with signs of soil compaction around the base, likely a result of small livestock roaming within the field. T1 is likely to have limited long-term prospects, has limited amenity and is low value.

3.2.7 G2 consists primarily of a Goat Willow pollard with dense epicormic regrowth with a smaller Elder shrub growing within the southern crown. The trees within G2 provide some screening within the site but are low value and their long-term prospects are limited.

3.2.8 G3 to T9 run along the site's northern boundary. G3, T4 and T5 are Hawthorn trees growing at the top of steep banking sloping down to the south. While these trees provide some screening of the site, they contain minor defects and are low value. G6 consists of Hawthorn and Privet shrubs. There is significant compaction and excavation works to the south of the trees which may limit their long-term prospects, these trees are low value. Hazel T7 and Maple T8 and T9 are growing at the sites northwest corner, also providing effective screening but are low amenity and value.

3.2.9 G10 and G11 are unmanaged hedging groups. G10 at the sites western boundary is made up of various hedging species. It provides effective screening of the site, however the trees are low value and currently provide only limited amenity within the site or wider landscape. G11 is an unmanaged Hawthorn hedging group with occasional gaps bordering a

small scrubby grassland field. It provides screening within the site but is of low arboricultural value or interest.

3.2.10 Groups G12, G13 and G14 are growing within a scrubland area on the site's eastern boundary. G12 is a group of Elder shrubs that have overgrown their current location. Occasional stems and branches have died back and there is a climbing plant within the crowns. G13 is at the sites eastern boundary and provides effective screening. Occasional Pine within the group provide some amenity, however the group is low value overall. G14 consists of occasional low value trees and shrubs amongst dense Bramble and dead stems of small trees.

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 G12, G13 and G14 were largely inaccessible at the time of the survey. A cursory inspection of the trees was undertaken using a drone, which provides indicative conditions, measurements and positions only.

3.2.13 The tree Root Protection Area (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. However, detailed modifications to the shape of the RPA would largely be based on conjecture and so have been avoided.

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

3.3 Photographs

Photo 1: T1 growing on steep banking, looking east.

Photo 2: G2, looking north.

Photo 3: G3 to T5 growing on steep banking, looking east.

Photo 4: Soil erosion and compaction at the base of shrubs within G6, looking north.

Photo 5: T7 to G10, looking west.

Photo 6: T1, G2 and G11 to G14 within inaccessible area at the site's eastern boundary, looking north.

4. Arboricultural Impact Assessment

4.1 Proposed New Development

4.1.1 It is proposed to build a new residential development with associated access, parking, 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, 4 trees and 7 tree groups will require removal, and 1 tree group will require partial removal to facilitate the development as they are situated in the footprint of the development or their retention and protection throughout the development is not suitable.

4.2.2 The trees that require removal to facilitate the development are T4, T5, T7 and T8.

4.2.3 The tree groups that require removal to facilitate the development are G2, G3, G6, G11, G12, G13 and G14.

4.2.4 The tree group that requires partial removal to facilitate the development is G10.

4.2.5 The trees and tree groups to be removed are all lower value, retention category 'C' that provide low amenity within the site or wider landscape. Due to the low value of the trees to be removed the removals will have only a negligible negative arboricultural impact.

4.2.6 The required partial removals within group G10 will not have a significant impact on its amenity or screening value. The trees retained within G10 will readily tolerate the required removal works and their long-term potential will not be negatively impacted.

4.3 Indirect Impacts

4.3.1 The tree Root Protection Area (RPA) detailed on the Tree Plans at Appendices 5 and 6, 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 installation of new boundary fencing close to retained tree groups should not significantly adversely impact on the health or future condition of the trees, provided posts and panels type footings are used as opposed

to strip footings, with the holes for the posts dug by hand, avoiding significant tree roots where possible.

4.3.3 The design of the new development has considered the trees crown position in relation to the development. 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.

4.3.4 The buildability of the proposed development 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 An associated Arboricultural Method Statement, detailing protective fencing specifications and construction methods close to the retained trees has been provided.

5. Signature

I trust this report provides all the required information.

Signed

.....

Adam Winson, *Chartered Arboriculturist, MSc, BSc (Hons), MICFor, ACIEEM*

28th October 2024

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

Adam Winson, *Chartered Arboriculturist, MSc, BSc (Hons), MICFor, MArborA, ACIEEM, QTRA Registered*
Adam is the company Director and Principal 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 he has original research published by the UK Forestry Commission. His work ranges from individual expert tree inspections to managing trees on major 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. Adam also regularly undertakes locum Tree Officer work for several Local Planning Authorities.

James Brown, *BSc (Hons) Arboriculture, MArborA, PTI (Lantra), QTRA Registered*
James is a highly experienced and qualified Arboricultural Consultant. He has a BSc (Hons) in Arboriculture, attaining first class honours, as well as being awarded the Institute of Chartered Foresters student award. He is a Professional Member of the Arboricultural Association, an Associate of the Institute of Chartered Foresters, and he is working towards becoming a Chartered Arboriculturist. James joined AWA in 2016, he has many years' experience as an Arboricultural Consultant, he previously worked in Europe's largest container tree nursery and he has experience of local authority Tree Officer work.

James Godfrey, *BA (Hons), FdSc Arboriculture and Tree Management, TechArborA, PTI (Lantra), QTRA Registered*
James has had extensive arboricultural experience working as an arborist within the public and private sector. While working at AWA, James completed his FdSc in Arboriculture and Tree Management, graduating with a distinction and was also awarded for achieving the highest overall mark in his year. James has used his arboricultural knowledge to inform and carry out accurate tree surveys and produce detailed reports that aim to balance appropriate tree retention with the requirements of landowners.

Joe Thomas, *MSci Biology, Award L4 Arboriculture, TechArborA, QTRA Registered*
Joe achieved a first class degree in Biology with an integrated Masters (MSci) from the University of Sheffield. Additionally, he has a Level 4 Award in Arboriculture. Joe joined AWA after an Urban Forestry role with the Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust and Sheffield City Council, where he gained a variety of experience in different aspects of the arboriculture sector.

James Boyle, *HND Level 5 Arboriculture and Urban Forestry, QTRA Registered*
Jim joined AWA after having worked within the tree care profession for several years, alongside studying at college and university. During this time he gained a wealth of experience and achieved a variety of practical qualifications within the tree care industry. Jim has studied Arboriculture and Urban Forestry at Merrist Wood College in Surrey, Plumpton College in Sussex and University of Highlands and Islands in the Scottish Highlands, where he achieved a distinction in the Higher National Diploma Level 5.

Lucy Garbutt, *MSc Animal Behaviour, BSc (Hons) Biology, CIEEM membership*
Lucy graduated with a masters degree in Animal Behaviour from the UK's highest rated university, St Andrews of Scotland, immediately following the completion of her BSc degree in Biology from Lancaster University. Lucy has experience in botany and plant science and moved into arboriculture after previous experience of protected species and botanical surveys with a large environmental consulting company.

Sophie Beckerman, *BA (Hons), Dip Arboriculture Level 4, TechArborA*
Sophie has more than 10 years' experience as an arborist, working for a variety of private companies as well as undertaking tree management with Sheffield City Council Ranger Service and The Wildlife Trust. Her expertise in arboriculture is demonstrated in the practical NPTC qualifications gained, and her excellent knowledge is reflected in the L4 diploma in Arboriculture, which she completed while working. Her roles as a climbing arborist and team leader included estimating for jobs and project management, supervising tree contracting teams - ensuring that work is carried out safely and efficiently and that health and safety standards are adhered to, and risk assessments are carried out.

Appendix 2: Survey Methodology and Limitations

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 BS 5837:2012 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.

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 in 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 unsuitable for retention. These trees are in such a condition that any existing value would be lost within 10 years.

	Tree Species			Measurements				Crown (m)					Tree Condition						Value		Management
Tree ID	*Common Name*	*Latin Name*	*Maturity*	*Height (m)*	*Stems*	*Stem Diameter (mm)*	*Estimated*	*Crown height*	*N*	*E*	*S*	*W*	*Roots*	*Stem*	*Crown*	*Comments*	*Physiological*	*Structural*	*Life Expectancy*	*Amenity*	*Category*	*Works*
T1	Birch	*Betula pendula*	Young	7.5	3	110 110 70	No	1.5	2.5	2.5	1.5	2	Soil compaction. Exposed roots	Multiple stemmed at base. Vertical. Stubs. Bark damage. Minor cavities. Tight union	Old pruning wounds. Cavities. Minor deadwood. Snapped /hanging branches	Growing on steep banking. Compaction likely a result of small livestock	Poor	Fair	10 to 20 yrs	Low	C	No works required
G2	Willow Elder	*Salix sp. Sambucus sp.*	Mature	8	1	520	Yes	1	See Plan				2m Goat Willow pollard with large epicormic regrowth, Elder shrub growing within southern crown. Bark damage and tight unions, minor cavities and decay. Growing on fenceline, access prevented detailed inspection and accurate stem measurements				Fair	Fair	10 to 20 yrs	Low	C	Removal required to facilitate development
G3	Hawthorn	*Crataegus sp.*	Semi-mature	5.5	10+	90 avg	Yes	0.5	See Plan				Hawthorn shrubs growing on steep banking. Minor compaction at base from small livestock. Lower foliage grazed. Dense branches prevented detailed inspection and accurate stem measurements				Fair	Fair	>40 yrs	Low	C	Removal required to facilitate development
T4	Hawthorn	*Crataegus monogyna*	Semi-mature	3.5	6	80 avg	Yes	0.5	3	3.5	3.5	3	Exposed roots	Multiple stemmed at base. Vertical. Epicormic growths. Stubs. Bark damage. Tight union. Minor cavities. Minor decay	Cavities. Minor deadwood. Snapped /hanging branches	Growing on steep banking	Fair	Fair	>40 yrs	Low	C	Removal required to facilitate development
T5	Hawthorn	*Crataegus monogyna*	Semi-mature	4.5	6	90 avg	Yes	0.5	3.5	2.5	4	3.5	Exposed roots	Multiple stemmed at base. Vertical. Epicormic growths. Stubs. Bark damage. Tight union. Minor cavities. Minor decay	Cavities. Minor deadwood. Snapped /hanging branches	Growing on steep banking	Fair	Fair	>40 yrs	Low	C	Removal required to facilitate development

AWA TREE CONSULTANTS

	Tree Species			Measurements				Crown (m)					Tree Condition					Value		Management
Tree ID	*Common Name*	*Latin Name*	*Maturity*	*Height (m)*	*Stems*	*Stem Diameter (mm)*	*Estimated*	*Crown height*	*N*	*E*	*S*	*W*	*Roots*	*Stem*	*Crown*	*Comments*	*Physiological*	*Structural*	*Life Expectancy*	*Amenity*	*Category*	*Works*
G6	Privet Hawthorn	*Ligustrum sp. Crataegus sp.*	Semi-mature	5	10+	80 avg	Yes	0.5	See Plan				Various shrubs growing on steep banking. Soil erosion and exposed roots to south. Provide some screening value				Fair	Fair	10 to 20 yrs	Low	C	Removal required to facilitate development
T7	Hazel	*Corylus avellana*	Early-mature	7	10+	70 avg	Yes	0.5	3	4	3	2	No visual defects	Multiple stemmed at base. Vertical. Epicormic growths. Stubs. Tight union. Partially included bark	Cavities. Minor deadwood. Snapped /hanging branches	Ivy in crown prevented detailed inspection	Fair	Fair	>40 yrs	Low	C	Removal required to facilitate development
T8	Maple	*Acer campestre*	Early-mature	9	6	140 avg	Yes	1	6.5	3.5	5	3.5	Soil compaction. Exposed roots	Multiple stemmed at base. Vertical. Epicormic growths. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Bark damage. Tight union. Minor cavities. Minor decay	Old pruning wounds. Cavities. Minor deadwood. Moderate deadwood. Snapped /hanging branches		Fair	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	Removal required to facilitate development
T9	Maple	*Acer campestre*	Early-mature	9	8	130 avg	Yes	3	3	3	3	3	Soil compaction. Exposed roots	Multiple stemmed at base. Vertical. Stubs. Epicormic growths. Bark damage. Minor cavities. Minor decay	Old pruning wounds. Cavities. Minor deadwood. Moderate deadwood. Snapped /hanging branches		Fair	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	No works required

	Tree Species			Measurements				Crown (m)					Tree Condition					Value		Management
Tree ID	*Common Name*	*Latin Name*	*Maturity*	*Height (m)*	*Stems*	*Stem Diameter (mm)*	*Estimated*	*Crown height*	*N*	*E*	*S*	*W*	*Roots*	*Stem*	*Crown*	*Comments*	*Physiological*	*Structural*	*Life Expectancy*	*Amenity*	*Category*	*Works*
G10	Blackthorn Hawthorn Horse Chestnut Willow Lilac Plum	*Prunus sp.* *Crataegus sp.* *Aesculus sp.* *Salix sp.* *Lilac sp.* *Prunus sp.*	Semi-mature	7	10+	80 avg	Yes	0	See Plan				Dense unmanaged boundary hedge of various species. Effective screening to adjacent land but trees of low arboricultural value. Tight unions and bark damage throughout group				Fair	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	Partial removal required to facilitate development - Remove trees and shrubs from eastern aspect to facilitate proposed garden areas (see Appendix 6)
G11	Hawthorn	*Crataegus sp.*	Early-mature	6	10+	80 avg	Yes	0	See Plan				Unmanaged hedgerow. Occasional gaps and areas of thinner vegetation. Corrugated metal sheet fencing along the length of the group, positioned to the west of stems. Tight unions throughout group				Fair	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	Removal required to facilitate development
G12	Elder	*Sambucus sp.*	Mature	5.5	10+	80 avg	Yes	0	See Plan				Dense group growing amongst outbuildings. Climbing plant growing within crown of southern trees. Occasioanl dead stems and crown dieback. Access prevented detailed inspection and accurate measurements - cursory inspection carried out by drone				Fair	Fair	<10 yrs	Low	C	Removal required to facilitate development
G13	Pine Cherry Elder Willow	*Pinus sp.* *Prunus sp.* *Sambucus sp.* *Salix sp.*	Semi-mature	13	10+	160 avg	Yes	1	See Plan				Fence line boundary group. Majority of trees growing within adjacent land to the east and overhanging into the site. Access prevented detailed inspection and accurate measurements - cursory inspection carried out by drone				Fair	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	Removal required to facilitate development
G14	Cherry Plum Pear	*Prunus sp.* *Prunus sp.* *Pyrus sp.*	Semi-mature	5	6	100 avg	Yes	0	See Plan				Dense group amongst dense Bramble and dead stems of smaller trees throughout group. Access prevented detailed inspection and accurate measurements - cursory inspection carried out by drone				Fair	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	Removal required to facilitate development

AWA TREE CONSULTANTS

AWA TREE CONSULTANTS

Appendix 5:
Tree Constraints Plan

Land at: Snape Hill Street, Darfield, Barnsley
Ref: AWA6299

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

SCALE: 1:500 PAPER: A2

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

T8
T9
T7
G6
T5
T4
G3
T1
G2
G12
G11
G13
G14
G10
Greenspace
Plot 18
Plot 17
Plot 16
Plot 15
Plot 14
Plot 13
Plot 12
Plot 11
Plot 10
Plot 9
Plot 8
Plot 7
Plot 6
Plot 5
Plot 4
Plot 3
Plot 2
Plot 1
Plot 19
Plot 20
Plot 21
Plot 22
Plot 23
Plot 24
Plot 25
Plot 26
Plot 27
Plot 28
Plot 29
Plot 30
Plot 31
Plot 32
Plot 33
TYPE A
TYPE B
TYPE C
TYPE D
retaining wall
parking area
patio area
storage
cycle path
Patio Area
House
Garage
Garden
Houses
Offices
Grassed Banking
Snape Hill Road
The Hollows
Bus Shelter
Shaded area is proposed dwellings to allow
NORTH
AWA TREE CONSULTANTS
Appendix 6:
Tree Impacts Plan
Land at: Snape Hill Street, Darfield, Barnsley
Ref: AWA6299
BRITISH STANDARD 5837:2012
SCALE: 1:500
PAPER: A2
TREE TO BE RETAINED
TREE TO BE REMOVED
RPA: ROOT PROTECTION AREA
TREE STEM