Gmail Stephen Lonsdale <slonser@gmail.com>

Tree report for The Worsbrough Historical Society

3 messages

Lester Wainwright <enquiries@twtreeexperts.co.uk> Sun, Sep 29, 2019 at 2:40 PM
To: Slonser@gmail.com

Dear Mr Lonsdale

Please find below the tree report that you have requested.

INTRODUCTION

This report was prepared by Lester Wainwright (TW Treeexperts), at the request of Mr Stephen Lonsdale representing The Worsbrough Historical Society.

The author was instructed to assess the suitability of a proposed monument in relation to any possible effects it may have on a mature Oak tree nearby.

The main emphasis was to determine any possible damage to the root system of the tree.

SCOPE OF REPORT

The author has provided all information and details felt relevent. A brief visit and assessment was carried out to the site and required measurements taken. No test digs were felt necessary.

THE SITE

The proposed monument is to be erected on a section of land owned by Barnsley Borough Council. The area of land is on the junction of Park Road (A61) and Millers Dale at Worsbrough Bridge, (0s Grid ref. SE 35273 03768) a Public Open Space.

PROPOSED MONUMENT

A restored colliery pit tub mounted on rails and sleepers will be fixed to a reinforced concrete slab. The rails and tub will be permanently fixed to each other to prevent any movement. The monument will consist of the pit tub (in line - first part of the display nearest the tree) followed by the " Presentation Board " and then the industrial lamp, (please refer to the plans provided in the application). The pit tub base will be a concrete area 1600mm wide by 2760mm long by 300 mm deep.

THE TREE IN BRIEF

The tree in question is a good sized mature Oak tree. It is understood that it comes under a Tree Preservation Order. It is situated at the bottom end of the site at the edge of a piece of scrubland. It is also behind an electrical substation.

TREE DETAILS

Age - 160 -200 yrs

Height - 14 m

Canopy spread (drip zone) 8m

Diameter at chest height 0.9m

Distance from nearest constuction hole 18.4m

TREES IN RELATION TO DESIGN, DEMOLITION AND CONSTUCTION (BS 5837: 2012)

Please refer to the above for further information.

TREE ROOT PROTECTION AREA

This is a rough guide to calculating how close any construction may be carried out in relation to distance proximity to any trees on site. The Tree Root Protection Area "RPA" is calculated by multiplying the diameter of the tree at chest height in meters by 12 but is capped as an area with a radius of 15m (Sept 2017).

Root spread can be further than the "crown dripline" and up to 2 and half times the crown radius. Tree roots are primarily in the top 30cm because further down in the soil, oxygen becomes more limited. Roots obviously need to respire. However, other factors such as soil type/content, compaction, tree species etc can effect root spread.

The RPA in this situation was calculated as 10.8m. The tree diameter was 0.9m x 12 = 10.8m.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In general, there should be no problems undertaking the proposed construction of the monument. The distance of the first construction hole is approx. 18.4m and the RPA is recommended at 10.8m. On a construction site a Chestnut or some other temporary fencing would be put up to protect the tree at the RPA. In this case I do not think it necessary to put up any protective fencing. I do however, recommend the careful excavation for the monument by hand and not by machinery. Obviously some use of machinery may be required to lift and put in place, the pit tub. This should be kept to minimum and out of the RPA. Should however, any roots be found, then care should be taken not to damage them. Moving the hole should be considered. It is unlikely I think, that this will be required though. Also, in view of the electric substation, which would have had some excavation work carried out, I think some reduction of root spread may have occured in the direction of the proposed monument anyway. Thus reducing the likelyhood of encountering roots even further.

Should you have queries please do not hesitate to contact me.

With Regards

Lester J Wainwright

T and W Landscapers and Tree Surgeons

Stephen Lonsdale <slonser@gmail.com> Mon, Sep 30, 2019 at 12:03 AM
To: Susan Shaw <a34567@hotmail.co.uk>, JUNE PARKER <jnc.parker@blueyonder.co.uk>

[Quoted text hidden]

---

susan shaw <a34567@hotmail.co.uk> Wed, Oct 2, 2019 at 6:41 PM
To: Stephen Lonsdale <slonser@gmail.com>, JUNE PARKER <jnc.parker@blueyonder.co.uk>

Thanks Steve.
Can you print it please? I have no ink in my printer. Are you going to Freedom Riders in the morning? I am but it's my rushing week as it's my art class at 1pm.
I've got a newer computer!
Susan

From: Stephen Lonsdale <slonser@gmail.com>
Sent: 30 September 2019 00:03
To: Susan Shaw <a34567@hotmail.co.uk>; JUNE PARKER <jnc.parker@blueyonder.co.uk>
Subject: Fwd: Tree report for The Worsbrough Historical Society

[Quoted text hidden]

Whitcher Wildlife Ltd.
Ecological Consultants.

WORSBOROUGH INDUSTRIAL & SOCIAL HISTORY SOCIETY.

OS REF: SE35261 03752.

ECOLOGY SURVEY.

Ref No: 190825.

Date: 12th September 2019.

Cliff Edge, Cliff Road, Darfield, Barnsley, S73 9HR.
Tel. 01226 753271. Fax. 01226 270993.
info@whitcher-wildlife.co.uk www.whitcher-wildlife.co.uk
Company No. 4401613.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

1. INTRODUCTION.

1.1. Worsborough Industrial & Social History Society plan to install some historic artefacts in a display on an area of land between Millers Dale and Park Hill Road, Worsborough.

1.2. Whitcher Wildlife Ltd has been commissioned to carry out an ecology survey of the site to establish whether there are any issues that may affect the proposed works.

1.3. The site survey was carried out on 12th September 2019 and this report outlines the findings of that survey and makes appropriate recommendations.

****

2. SURVEY METHODOLOGY.

2.1. Prior to visiting the site, the survey area was cross referenced to maps and aerial photographs to give a general idea of the habitats and potential issues within the area and to identify potential access and walking routes.

2.2. The survey area and immediate surrounding area was thoroughly searched for evidence of badger (*Meles meles*) activity by looking for the following signs in line with Harris S, Cresswell P and Jefferies D (1989). *Surveying Badgers*. Mammal Society: -

* Badger setts.
* Badger latrines or dung pits.
* Badger snuffle holes and evidence of foraging.
* Badger paths.
* Badger prints in areas of soft mud.
* Badger hairs caught on fencing.

2.3. The survey area was searched for watercourses and where found all watercourses within the survey area and for approximately 100m in each direction were thoroughly searched for evidence of water vole (*Arvicola amphibius*) activity by looking for the following signs, in line with Dean M, Strachen R, Gow D and Andres R (2016). *The Water Vole Mitigation Handbook (The Mammal Society Mitigation Guidance Series).* Eds Fiona Mathews and Paul Chanin. The mammal Society, London: -

* Water vole burrows.
* Water vole faeces and latrines.
* Water vole feeding stations.
* Water vole runs.
* Water vole prints in areas of soft mud.
* Water vole lawns.
* Predator field signs.

2.4. The survey area was searched for watercourses and where found all watercourses within the survey area and for approximately 50m in each direction were thoroughly searched for evidence of otter (*Lutra lutra*) activity by looking for the following signs in line with the P Chanin (2003). *Monitoring the Otter* and *Conserving Natura 2000 Rivers: Monitoring Series No10 Guidelines:* -

* Otter prints in soft mud.
* Otter spraints.
* Otter Holts.

2.5. The survey area was searched for watercourses and waterbodies. Where found, and where safe to enter the water, all were thoroughly searched for the presence of crayfish, for approximately 50m in each direction of the site, by searching under rocks and logs. Where stated, crayfish traps were also deployed into the watercourse. All survey work was carried out in accordance with the *Conserving Natural 2000 Rivers Monitoring Series No 1, Protocol for Monitoring the White Clawed Crayfish.*

2.6. The survey area was searched for trees and structures and where found these were checked for potential bat roosting sites in line with Collins, J. (ed.) (2016) *Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (3rd edition)* by looking for the following signs: -

* Holes, cracks or crevices.
* Bat Droppings.

2.7. The land immediately adjacent to the survey area was assessed for bat roosting potential and bat foraging potential. Connective routes and flight lines were also assessed whilst on site and using maps of the area.

2.8. The area within 500m of the survey site was cross referenced to maps to highlight all ponds close to the site. Where possible, all ponds identified were accessed using agreed access or public rights of way to assess the potential for great crested newts (*Triturus cristatus*) to be present.

2.9. The survey area was assessed for the potential for reptiles and suitable reptile habitats. Where applicable the area was also searched for the presence of reptiles.

2.10. Where appropriate, the habitat within and surrounding the survey area was searched for species such as hazel, oak, honeysuckle, bramble and other species which may provide potential habitat for hazel dormice (*Muscardinus avellanarius*). Field signs such as feeding remains and nests were also searched for where possible, in line with P Bright, P Morris and T Mitchell-Jones *the Dormouse Conservation Handbook 2nd Edition.*

2.11. Where appropriate, the area within and surrounding the survey area was assessed for its potential to house habitat for red squirrels. Field signs of red squirrels were searched for at least every 50m, looking for any dreys, feeding signs or sightings of red squirrels.

2.12. All surveys were carried out in line with the Chartered Institute of Ecological and Environmental Management (CIEEM) survey standards and advice.

2.13. The survey was undertaken by Derek Whitcher who has over twenty years' experience of surveying for wildlife and has run his own wildlife consultancy since 1998. He has extensive experience of a wide variety of survey techniques for a variety of species of protected wildlife supplemented by attendance on a wide range of training courses through CIEEM, FSC and BCT. As a member of CIEEM he is committed to continuous professional development, a continual process of learning and career development, a condition of CIEEM membership. He holds current Natural England, CCW and NRW survey licences for, bat, great crested newt and white clawed crayfish.

****

3. SURVEY RESULTS.

3.1. Data Search Results.

3.1.1. No data search was carried out in connection with this small project in an urban area of Worsborough.

3.1.2. The MAGIC website shows Worsborough Country Park Local Nature Reserve to the south of the site at sufficient distance to be unaffected by the proposed works.

3.2. The Surveyed Area.

3.2.1. The surveyed area was beside the main road from Barnsley to Birdwell, shown on the aerial photograph below.

3.3. Survey Results.

3.3.1. The area to be affected by the proposed works is an area of grassland at the junction of Millers Dale and Park Hill Road, Worsborough, shown in the photograph below. The grassland is amenity grassland maintained by the Council and subject to regular mowing.

3.3.2. There is a row of trees along towards the back of the plot. These are ornamental acer species and will not be affected by this small development. The foundations for the scheme will be shallow and outside the root zone.

3.3.3. At the southern end of the site there is a large and mature oak tree and that also will not be affected by the proposed development.

3.3.4. There are no protected species or invasive species issues associated with the proposals.

****

4. EVALUATION OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.

4.1. The total impact of the development will be the loss of a small area of low ecological value grassland.

4.2. To compensate for that loss of habitat, three general purpose bird nest boxes will be placed in the trees along the back of the site. Standard timber nest boxes suitable for small common species of garden bird will be most appropriate for this site.

****

Prepared by:	
Derek Whitcher. BSc, MCIEEM, MCMI	Date: 16th September 2019.

Checked by:	
Jenny Roebuck. MCIEEM.	Date: 17th September 2019.

5. REFERENCES.

Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management. 2017. ***Guidelines for Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, Second Edition.*** CIEEM, Hampshire.

Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management. 2017. ***Guidelines for Ecological Report Writing, Second Edition.*** CIEEM, Hampshire.

1981. ***Wildlife and Countryside Act.*** *http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1981/69* (accessed 18/02/16)

2000. ***Countryside and Rights of Way Act.*** *http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2000/37/contents.*

2017. ***The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations.*** *http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2010/490/contents/made.*

2012. ***National Planning Policy Statement.*** *https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2*

Anon. 1995. ***Biodiversity: the UK Steering Group report. Vol 2: Action Plans.*** HMSO, London.

Joint Nature Conservation Committee. 2004 (ed.). ***Handbook for Phase 1 habitat survey: A technique for environmental audit.*** JNCC, Peterborough.

1992. ***Protection of Badgers Act.*** *https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1992/51/contents.*

Harris S, Cresswell P and Jefferies D. 1989. ***Surveying Badgers.*** Mammal Society. London.

Dean M, Strachen R, Gow D and Andres R (2016). ***The Water Vole Mitigation Handbook*** (The Mammal Society Mitigation Guidance Series). Eds Fiona Mathews and Paul Chanin. The mammal Society, London

Chanin P. 2003(a). ***Ecology of the European Otter.*** Conserving Natura 2000, Ecology Series No.10. English Nature, Peterborough.

Chanin P. 2003(b) ***Monitoring the Otter Lutra lutra.*** Conserving Natura 2000 Rivers Monitoring Series No. 10. English Nature, Peterborough.

Peay S. 2003. ***Monitoring the White-Clawed Crayfish Austropotamobius pallipes.*** Conserving Natura 2000 Rivers Monitoring Series No. 1. English Nature, Peterborough.

English Nature. 2001. ***Great Crested Newt Mitigation Guidelines.***

Langton T, Beckett C, Foster J. 2001. ***Great Crested Newt: Conservation Handbook.*** Froglife, Suffolk.

Oldham et al. 2000. ***Great Crested Newt Habitat Suitability Assessment. ARG UK Advice Note 5, May 2010.***

Collins J. (ed.) 2016. ***Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologist: Good Practice Guidelines.*** 3rd ed. The Bat Conservation Trust, London.

English Nature. 2004. ***Bat Mitigation Guidelines.*** English Nature, Peterborough, UK.

BOCC4 Eaton et al. 2015. ***Birds of Conservation Concern 4: The Population Status of Bird's in the UK, Channel Islands and Isle of Man.***

Joint Nature Conservation Committee. 2004. ***Common Standards Monitoring Guidance for Birds.*** 2004 ed. JNCC, Peterborough.

Froglife. 1999. ***Froglife Advice Sheet 10: Reptile Survey.*** Froglife, London.

Bright P, Morris P, Mitchell-Jones T. 2006. ***The Dormouse Conservation Handbook*** 2nd edition. English Nature, Peterborough.

Joint Nature Conservation Committee. 2004 (ed.). ***Common Standards Monitoring Guidance for: Reptiles and Amphibians.*** JNCC, Peterborough.

Joint Nature Conservation Committee. 1996. ***UK Strategy for Red Squirrel Conservation.*** JNCC, Peterborough.