



ARBORICULTURAL REPORT

To BS 5837:2012 at:

***Berry Moor House Farm,
Pinfold Hill Lane,
Silkstone Common,
Barnsley,
South Yorkshire
S75 4RF***

Prepared for:
Kelsey Hensby
*Berry Moor House Farm,
Pinfold Hill Lane,
Silkstone Common,
Barnsley,
South Yorkshire
S75 4RF*

Date: *April 2020*

Reference: AWA3131



Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 1. Introduction | 3 |
| 1.1 Instructions and Brief..... | 3 |
| 1.2 Survey Details..... | 3 |
| 2. The Site | 4 |
| 2.1 Location & Description | 4 |
| 3. The Trees | 5 |
| 3.1 Legal | 5 |
| 3.2 Tree Survey Results | 5 |
| 3.3 Arboricultural Development Advice..... | 7 |
| 3.4 Protection of the Retained Trees | 8 |
| 4. Signature | 9 |
| Appendix 1: Authors Qualifications & Experience | 11 |
| Appendix 2: Survey Methodology and Limitations of Report | 12 |
| Appendix 3: Explanation of Tree Descriptions | 13 |
| Appendix 4: Tree Data | 14 |
| Appendix 5: Tree Constraints Plan | 15 |

1. Introduction

1.1 Instructions and Brief

- 1.1.1 We have been instructed by Kelsey Hensby, 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 April 2020.
- 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 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, Principle and Director of AWA Tree Consultants Ltd.
- 1.2.6 The tree survey data collection was carried out by Mr Patrick Rowntree, PTI (Lantra), Cert Arb L3, 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**.

2. The Site

2.1 Location & Description

- 2.1.1 The site is located south of Silkstone Common, a village in the metropolitan borough of Barnsley, South Yorkshire.
- 2.1.2 The site currently consists of a disused farmhouse with numerous associated outbuildings and a dirt access track. The house is surrounded by agricultural fields.
- 2.1.3 The approximate survey area has been highlighted in the (2019) image below:



3. The Trees

3.1 Legal

- 3.1.1 An online check made with Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council on 06/04/2020 indicates that none of the trees within the surveyed area are protected by virtue of a Tree Preservation Order, nor are they within a conservation area. However, due to the large potential penalties for illegally carrying out work to protected trees, before authorising any tree works an additional check should be made with the Local Planning Authority to see if either applies. If so, then statutory permission is required before any works can take place.
- 3.1.2 When appointing a tree surgeon, only properly qualified and experienced companies should be used, who have adequate Public Liability and Employer's Liability Insurance. All tree work should be carried out according to British Standard 3998:2010 *Tree Work - Recommendations*.

3.2 Tree Survey Results

- 3.2.1 The tree survey revealed 28 items of woody vegetation, comprised of 28 individual trees.
- 3.2.2 Of the surveyed trees: 1 tree is retention category 'U'; 1 tree is retention category 'A', 11 trees are retention category 'B'; and the remaining 15 trees are retention category 'C' (explanatory details regarding the retention categories are included within Appendix 3).
- 3.2.3 The significant tree cover within the site consists mainly of established amenity plantings situated close to and along the site boundaries.
- 3.2.4 Species diversity at the site is relatively poor. The dominant tree species is Sycamore, with several Beech, Oak and occasional Apple and Sorbus.
- 3.2.5 The site's trees had a good age diversity with a mix of semi-mature, early-mature and mature trees.
- 3.2.6 The sites most significant tree is T19, a mature Beech situated towards the centre of the site. This tree is prominent throughout the entire site and surrounding area and provides a high level of amenity value. No major visible defects were noted and it has good long-term prospects.

- 3.2.7 To the north-east of the disused farm house is early-mature Sycamore, T10. Some minor defects were noted, but none such as to limit the prospects of this tree. It is well-established and provides a good level of amenity value.
- 3.2.8 Two rows of semi to early-mature Sycamores are located to the west of the surveyed area (T22 to T28). Individually, these trees vary in value with some having become better established than others and shading out the lower value trees, in particular category 'U' T24. This tree has subsequently died and failed at its base as a consequence of being unable to compete with the larger adjacent trees. It is now resting on the adjacent building and should be removed regardless of future development. T22, T25 and T28 are also of lower value due to various defects, but collectively the trees in this area still provide moderate amenity. However, due to the trees' close proximity to the existing barn, they may be unsuitable for retention close to future development. Should any future development necessitate the removal of these moderate value trees, a suitable replanting scheme could mitigate the negative arboricultural impact, and in the longer-term improve the sites overall tree cover.
- 3.2.9 More remote from the site are Oaks T1 to T3. These trees are in fair to good overall condition with only minor defects. They have good prospects and are of good value both individually and collectively.
- 3.2.10 Situated to the south of the site is Sycamore T17. It is located in the adjacent land along a public footpath. It has been historically pruned away from the adjacent powerlines leaving the northern aspect sparse. This has also left a number of cavities with some minor decay. This somewhat lessens the amenity value of the tree and could limit its long-term prospects. However, due to its large size and established nature, it still provides moderate amenity value to the site and land beyond.
- 3.2.11 Some trees were covered in dense Ivy or were inaccessible (as detailed in appendix 4) in such cases measurements were estimated and the condition values are indicative only.
- 3.2.12 The tree Root Protection Area (RPA) detailed on the Tree Constraints Plan at Appendix 5, has been used as a layout design tool, to inform on the area around a tree where the protection of the roots and soil structure is treated as a priority.
- 3.2.13 Some lower value tree, hedge and shrub groups do not have RPAs detailed on tree plans. The detailed extent and spread of the low value groups, in conjunction with the tree schedule, is sufficient to assess the associated

potential constraints.

3.2.14 The RPA for each tree has been plotted as a polygon centred on the base of the stem. Due to the presence of roads, structures, topography (and past tree management) the RPA is likely to be a simplified representation of the tree roots actual morphology and disposition. However, detailed modifications to the shape of the RPA would largely be based on conjecture and so have been avoided.

3.3 Arboricultural Development Advice

3.3.1 Most of the sites central area has no significant trees and so is free of any significant arboricultural impacts for any new development.

3.3.2 The higher value retention category 'B' trees and groups should be retained, where possible, and incorporated into any new development design.

3.3.3 Where suitable, those category 'C' trees and groups with reasonable future prospects (as detailed in Appendix 4) should be retained as part of any new development. However, care should be taken to avoid misplaced tree retention; attempts to retain too many or unsuitable trees on a site can result in excessive pressure on the trees during demolition or construction work, or post-completion demands for their removal.

3.3.4 If required by the development proposals, occasional lower value, retention category C trees and groups could be removed, and replacement planting would largely mitigate their losses.

3.3.5 The tree Root Protection Area (RPA) detailed on the Tree Constraints Plan at Appendix 5, should be 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.

3.3.6 If construction of new buildings is required within the trees RPA it may be possible to employ special foundation design such as mini/micro pile and suspended beam or a cantilevered foundation.

3.3.7 Construction of hard surfaces, for drives and paths, within the RPA, can have negative impacts on tree roots. However, the potential negative impacts can often be overcome or minimised by employing a 'no-dig' type construction methods with a porous final surface.

3.3.8 The design of the new development should consider the trees crown position in relation to any new dwellings. The dappled shade of a tree is more pleasant than the deep shadow of a building, and some shade from trees may be beneficial. In particular, deciduous trees give shade in summer but allow access to sunlight in winter. Whilst either shade or sunlight might be desirable, depending on the potential use of the area affected, the design should avoid unreasonable obstruction of light and should give adequate provision for future tree growth.

3.4 Protection of the Retained Trees

- 3.4.1 The retained trees may require protection by fencing in accordance with BS 5837:2012, during the development phase.
- 3.4.2 If required by the Local Planning Authority, an associated Arboricultural Method Statement, detailing protective fencing specifications and construction methods close to the retained trees can be provided.

4. Signature

I trust this report provides all the required information.

Signed



.....

Adam Winson, Chartered Arboriculturist, MSc, BSc (Hons), MICFor, AIEEM.

6th April 2020

AWA Tree Consultants Limited

Union Forge
27 Mowbray Street
Sheffield
S3 8EN

www.awatrees.com



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.

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 1: Authors Qualifications & Experience

Mr Adam Winson Chartered Arboriculturist, MSc, BSc (Hons), MICFor, MArborA, ACIEEM, QTRA Registered.

Adam is the company Director and Principle Consultant. He has a mix of the highest level academic qualifications and relevant work experience. He has worked within the tree care profession for over 20 years, and was awarded an MSc in Arboriculture and Urban Forestry, with distinction. Adam is a Chartered Arboriculturist and a Registered Consultant with the Institute of Chartered Foresters, a Professional Member of the Arboricultural Association and has original research published by the UK Forestry Commission. His work ranges from individual expert tree inspections to managing trees on major multimillion pound housing developments and infrastructure projects. His work often involves trees with preservation orders or litigation, and he has appeared as a tree expert, at planning appeal hearings up to the Crown Court.

Mr James Brown BSc (Hons) Arboriculture, MArborA. PTI (Lantra).

James has a BSc (Hons) in Arboriculture, attaining first class honours, as well as being awarded the Institute of Chartered Forester's Student award. He is a Professional Member of the Arboricultural Association and an Associate of the Institute of Chartered Foresters. James previously worked in Europe's largest tree nursery and has experience of Local Authority tree officer work. His main work consists of tree surveys for development projects and preparing Tree Protection Schemes to BS 5837:2012.

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

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

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

Felicity has worked in the tree care profession for the last 10 years. She has a Certificate in Higher Education in Forestry, with a focus on Urban Forestry. She has practical arboricultural contractor experience and is a qualified and experienced Social Forestry practitioner. Felicity has a PhD in History, with a particular interest in the history of woodland and tree management and has published in The Arboricultural Journal on this subject.

Mr Patrick Rowntree Cert Arb L3, TechArborA. PTI (Lantra).

Patrick is a trained arborist with 5 years of experience in both the private and commercial sectors and is a technician member of the Arboricultural Association. Having travelled the world, both working as an arborist and playing professional rugby, Patrick was awarded a Distinction in the Extended Diploma in Forestry & Arboriculture and is qualified in Professional Tree Inspection. Patrick now uses his work and education experience at AWA, focusing on accurate tree data collection for tree surveys for development projects and assisting the team in the preparation of tree reports and tree plans to BS 5837:2012.

Mr Drew Leeper Cert Arb L3.

Drew has over 10 years experience within the arboricultural sector and was awarded Distinction in the Extended Diploma in Forestry & Arboriculture. From working abroad in Canada as a climbing arborist and returning home to running his own tree care firm. Drew has also been fortunate enough to gain valuable experience working at the Royal Botanical Gardens of Kew. He now uses his work and education experience at AWA, focusing on accurate tree data collection for tree surveys for development projects and assisting the team in the preparation of tree reports and tree plans to BS 5837:2012.

Appendix 2: Survey Methodology and Limitations of Report

The survey was undertaken in accordance with British Standard 5837:2012 *Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations*. The trees were assessed objectively and without reference to any proposed site layout. The trees were surveyed from the ground using 'Visual Tree Assessment' (VTA) methodology. VTA is appropriate and is endorsed by industry guidance. It is used by arboriculturists to evaluate the structural integrity of a tree, relying on observation of trees biomechanical and physiological features. Measurements are obtained using a diameter tape, clinometer, laser distometer and loggers tape. Where this is not practical measurements are estimated. Tree groups have been identified in instances as defined in BS 5837:2012. Shrubs and insignificant trees may have been omitted from the survey.

This report represents a BS5837 tree survey and should not be accepted as a detailed tree safety inspection report; however, tree related hazards are recorded and commented upon where observed, yet no guarantee can be given as to the absolute safety or otherwise of any individual tree. All recommended tree work must be to BS 3998:2010 - 'Tree Work: Recommendations'.

The findings and recommendations contained within this report are valid for a period of twelve months from the date of survey. The author shall not be responsible for events which happen after this time due to factors which were not apparent at the time, and the acceptance of this report constitutes an agreement with these guidelines and terms.

Appendix 3: Explanation of Tree Descriptions

HEIGHT of the tree is measured from the stem base in metres. Where the ground has a significant slope the higher ground is selected.

CROWN HEIGHT is an indication of the average height at which the crown begins and includes information of the first significant branch and direction of growth.

STEM DIAMETER is measured at 1.5 metres above (higher) ground level. Where the tree is multi-stemmed at this point; the diameter is measured close to ground level or else a combined stem diameter is calculated.

CROWN SPREAD is measured from the centre of the stem base to the tips of the branches in all four cardinal points.

AGE CLASS of the tree is described as young, semi-mature, early-mature, mature, or over-mature.

PHYSIOLOGICAL CONDITION is classed as good, fair, poor, or dead. This is an indication of the health of the tree and takes into account vigour, presence of disease and dieback.

STRUCTURAL CONDITION is classed as good, fair or poor. This is an indication of the structural integrity of the tree and takes into account significant wounds, decay and quality of branch junctions.

LIFE EXPECTANCY is classed as; less than 10 years, 10-20 years, 20-40 years, or more than 40 years. This is an indication of the number of years before removal of the tree is likely to be required.

Retention Categories

A (marked green on Appendix 5) = retention most desirable. These trees are of very high quality and value with a good life expectancy.

B (marked in blue on Appendix 5) = retention desirable. These trees are of good quality and value with a significant life expectancy.

C (marked in grey on Appendix 5) = trees which could be retained. These trees are of low or average quality and value, and are in adequate condition to remain until new planting could be established.

U (marked in red on Appendix 5) = trees for removal. These trees are in such a condition that any existing value would be lost within 10 years.

Appendix 4: Tree Data

| Tree ID | Tree Species | | Maturity | Measurements | | | | Crown (m) | | | | Tree Condition | | | | | | Value | | Management | | |
|---------|--------------|----------------------------|--------------|--------------|-------|--------------------|-----------|------------|-----|-----|-----|----------------|---------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|---|---------------|------------|-----------------|------------|----------|--|
| | Common Name | Latin Name | | Height (m) | Stems | Stem Diameter (mm) | Estimated | Ave Height | N | E | S | W | Roots | Stem | Crown | Comments | Physiological | Structural | Life Expectancy | Amenity | Category | Works |
| T1 | Oak | <i>Quercus robur</i> | Early-mature | 11 | 1 | 710 | No | 2 | 3.5 | 4.5 | 5 | 3 | Damage to buttress roots | Single stemmed, Slight lean, Stubs, Bark damage, Old pruning wounds, Minor decay | Normal, Minor deadwood | Bark damage/girdling of stem from 0.5m to 1m caused by historic occlusion of barbed wire. | Fair | Fair | >40 yrs | Moderate | B | No works required in current site context. |
| T2 | Oak | <i>Quercus robur</i> | Early-mature | 13 | 1 | 770 | No | 3 | 4.5 | 5.5 | 6 | 5 | No visual defects | Single stemmed, Vertical, Stubs, Epicormic growths, Bark damage | Well developed crown, Minor deadwood | Bark damage to west of stem at 1m from occlusion of barbed wire. | Good | Fair | >40 yrs | High | B | No works required in current site context. |
| T3 | Oak | <i>Quercus robur</i> | Semi-mature | 8.5 | 1 | 540 | No | 2 | 4 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 4.5 | No visual defects | Single stemmed, Vertical, Stubs, Old pruning wounds, Epicormic growths, Bark damage, Minor cavities, Minor decay | Moderate deadwood | Bark damage to west of stem at 1m caused by occlusion of barbed wire. | Fair | Fair | >40 yrs | Moderate | B | No works required in current site context. |
| T4 | Sycamore | <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i> | Semi-mature | 11 | 2 | 340 320 | No | 3 | 5 | 2 | 4.5 | 5 | Soil erosion, No visual defects | Twin stemmed at base, Vertical, Stubs, Old pruning wounds, Epicormic growths | Normal, Minor deadwood | Third central co-dominant stem historically topped at 1m with some epicormic regrowth. | Fair | Fair | >40 yrs | Moderate | C | No works required in current site context. |

| Tree Species | | Measurements | | | | | | Crown (m) | | | | Tree Condition | | | | | | Value | | Management | | |
|--------------|-------------|------------------------|--------------|------------|-------|--------------------|-----------|------------|-----|-----|---|----------------|---|---|-------------------------------------|----------|---------------|------------|-----------------|------------|----------|--|
| Tree ID | Common Name | Latin Name | Maturity | Height (m) | Stems | Stem Diameter (mm) | Estimated | Ave Height | N | E | S | W | Roots | Stem | Crown | Comments | Physiological | Structural | Life Expectancy | Amenity | Category | Works |
| T5 | Beech | <i>Fagus sylvatica</i> | Semi-mature | 10 | 1 | 320 | No | 3 | 2.5 | 5 | 3 | 0.5 | Soil erosion, No visual defects | Single stemmed, Slight lean, Stubs, Old pruning wounds, Epicormic growths, Bark damage, Minor decay | Slightly unbalanced, Minor deadwood | | Fair | Fair | >40 yrs | Moderate | C | No works required in current site context. |
| T6 | Beech | <i>Fagus sylvatica</i> | Semi-mature | 11 | 1 | 410 | No | 1.5 | 2 | 4.5 | 2 | 3.5 | Exposed roots, Trenching / excavations | Single stemmed, Slight lean, Stubs, Old pruning wounds, Epicormic growths, Bark damage, Minor cavities, Minor decay | Slightly unbalanced, Minor deadwood | | Fair | Fair | >40 yrs | Moderate | C | No works required in current site context. |
| T7 | Beech | <i>Fagus sylvatica</i> | Early-mature | 11 | 1 | 580 | No | 3 | 2.5 | 3.5 | 6 | 3 | Increase in soil level, Trenching / excavations | Single stemmed, Vertical, Stubs, Old pruning wounds, Minor cavities, Minor decay | Minor deadwood, Slightly unbalanced | | Fair | Fair | >40 yrs | Moderate | B | No works required in current site context. |
| T8 | Beech | <i>Fagus sylvatica</i> | Semi-mature | 9 | 1 | 370 | No | 2 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 3 | Increase in soil level, Trenching / excavations | Single stemmed, Vertical, Stubs, Old pruning wounds, Epicormic growths, Bark damage, Minor cavities, Minor decay | Slightly unbalanced, Minor deadwood | | Fair | Fair | >40 yrs | Moderate | C | No works required in current site context. |

| Tree ID | Tree Species | | Maturity | Measurements | | | | Crown (m) | | | | Tree Condition | | | | | | Value | | Management | | |
|---------|--------------|----------------------------|--------------|--------------|-------|--------------------|-----------|------------|-----|-----|-----|----------------|-------------------|--|---|--|---------------|------------|-----------------|------------|----------|--|
| | Common Name | Latin Name | | Height (m) | Stems | Stem Diameter (mm) | Estimated | Ave Height | N | E | S | W | Roots | Stem | Crown | Comments | Physiological | Structural | Life Expectancy | Amenity | Category | Works |
| T9 | Oak | <i>Quercus robur</i> | Semi-mature | 4.5 | 1 | 250 | No | 2.5 | 4.5 | 2 | 0.5 | 2.5 | No visual defects | Single stemmed, Vertical, Stubs, Old pruning wounds, Epicormic growths, Bark damage, Minor decay | Small / sparse, Minor deadwood, Snapped /hanging branches, Unbalanced | Bark damage to stem at 1m from occlusion of barbed wire. Suppressed by adjacent Sycamore. Limited long-term value. | Poor | Fair | 10 to 20 yrs | Low | C | No works required in current site context. |
| T10 | Sycamore | <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i> | Early-mature | 16 | 1 | 740 | No | 2 | 7 | 5.5 | 6.5 | 6.5 | Exposed roots | Single stemmed, Vertical, Stubs, Old pruning wounds, Epicormic growths, Bark damage | Well developed crown, Minor deadwood | Dense epicormic growth at base and minor soil compaction from construction waste. | Good | Good | >40 yrs | High | B | No works required in current site context. |
| T11 | Apple | <i>Malus sp.</i> | Semi-mature | 5 | 1 | 170 | No | 2 | 1.5 | 2 | 1 | 1.5 | No visual defects | Multiple stemmed at 1.5m, Vertical, Stubs, Old pruning wounds, Epicormic growths, Bark damage, Minor decay | Old pruning wounds, Minor deadwood | | Fair | Fair | 20 to 40 yrs | Low | C | No works required in current site context. |
| T12 | Sycamore | <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i> | Semi-mature | 12 | 3 | 240 270 250 | No | 1.5 | 4.5 | 4 | 4 | 3 | Soil compaction | Multiple stemmed at base, Vertical, Stubs, Epicormic growths, Tight union, Partially included bark | Normal, Minor deadwood | | Fair | Fair | >40 yrs | Moderate | C | No works required in current site context. |

| Tree ID | Tree Species | | Maturity | Measurements | | | | Crown (m) | | | | Tree Condition | | | | | | Value | | Management | | |
|---------|--------------|----------------------------|-------------|--------------|-------|--------------------|-----------|------------|-----|---|-----|----------------|-------------------|---|--------------------------------------|---|---------------|------------|-----------------|------------|----------|--|
| | Common Name | Latin Name | | Height (m) | Stems | Stem Diameter (mm) | Estimated | Ave Height | N | E | S | W | Roots | Stem | Crown | Comments | Physiological | Structural | Life Expectancy | Amerity | Category | Works |
| T13 | Sycamore | <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i> | Semi-mature | 13 | 1 | 520 | No | 2.5 | 4.5 | 4 | 4.5 | 5 | No visual defects | Single stemmed, Vertical, Epicormic growths | Well developed crown, Minor deadwood | | Good | Good | >40 yrs | Moderate | B | No works required in current site context. |
| T14 | Sycamore | <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i> | Semi-mature | 5 | 10+ | 80 avg | No | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2.5 | No visual defects | Multiple stemmed at base, Vertical, Stubs, Epicormic growths, Tight union | Normal | Regrowth from failed sycamore. Limited long-term value. | Fair | Fair | 20 to 40 yrs | Low | C | No works required in current site context. |
| T15 | Sycamore | <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i> | Semi-mature | 5 | 10+ | 80 avg | No | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2.5 | No visual defects | Multiple stemmed at base, Vertical, Stubs, Epicormic growths, Tight union | Normal | Regrowth from failed sycamore. Limited long-term value. | Fair | Fair | 20 to 40 yrs | Low | C | No works required in current site context. |
| T16 | Sycamore | <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i> | Semi-mature | 5 | 10+ | 80 avg | No | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2.5 | No visual defects | Multiple stemmed at base, Vertical, Stubs, Epicormic growths, Tight union | Normal | Regrowth from failed sycamore. Limited long-term value. | Fair | Fair | 20 to 40 yrs | Low | C | No works required in current site context. |

| Tree ID | Tree Species | | Maturity | Measurements | | | | Crown (m) | | | | Tree Condition | | | | | | Value | | Management | | |
|---------|--------------|----------------------------|--------------|--------------|-------|--------------------|-----------|------------|-----|-----|-----|----------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|---------------|------------|-----------------|------------|----------|--|
| | Common Name | Latin Name | | Height (m) | Stems | Stem Diameter (mm) | Estimated | Ave Height | N | E | S | W | Roots | Stem | Crown | Comments | Physiological | Structural | Life Expectancy | Amenity | Category | Works |
| T17 | Sycamore | <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i> | Early-mature | 12 | 1 | 720 | No | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5.5 | 5.5 | Damage to buttress roots | Single stemmed, Vertical, Stubs, Old pruning wounds, Epicormic growths, Bark damage, Moderate cavity, Minor decay | Slightly unbalanced, High proportion of minor deadwood in central crown Old pruning wounds | Situated in adjacent land. Northern aspect historically crown raised away from adjacent LV powerline. Moderate cavity from large historic pruning to north of stem at 5.5m - some visible decay but good reactionary growth. | Fair | Fair | >40 yrs | Moderate | B | No works required in current site context. |
| T18 | Sycamore | <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i> | Early-mature | 15 | 1 | 610 | No | 7.5 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 4.5 | 4 | No visual defects | Single stemmed, Slight lean, Stubs, Old pruning wounds, Significant lean | Normal, Minor deadwood | Multiple large pruning wounds from historic crown raise - no visible decay. | Fair | Good | >40 yrs | High | B | No works required in current site context. |
| T19 | Beech | <i>Fagus sylvatica</i> | Mature | 17 | 1 | 1010 | No | 7 | 9 | 9.5 | 7 | 6 | No visual defects | Single stemmed, Slight lean, Old pruning wounds | Well developed crown, Minor deadwood, Old pruning wounds | Recently pruned away from house to south. | Good | Good | >40 yrs | High | A | No works required in current site context. |
| T20 | Sorbus | <i>Sorbus sp.</i> | Semi-mature | 5.5 | 1 | 190 | No | 2 | 2 | 3.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | No visual defects | Twin stemmed at 1.5m, Vertical, Stubs, Old pruning wounds, Epicormic growths | Old pruning wounds, Minor deadwood | | Fair | Good | >40 yrs | Low | C | No works required in current site context. |

| Tree ID | Tree Species | | Maturity | Measurements | | | | Crown (m) | | | | Tree Condition | | | | | Value | | Management | | | |
|---------|--------------|----------------------------|--------------|--------------|-------|--------------------|-----------|------------|-----|-----|-----|----------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------|--|---------------|------------|-----------------|----------|----------|--|
| | Common Name | Latin Name | | Height (m) | Stems | Stem Diameter (mm) | Estimated | Ave Height | N | E | S | W | Roots | Stem | Crown | Comments | Physiological | Structural | Life Expectancy | Amenity | Category | Works |
| T21 | Sycamore | <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i> | Semi-mature | 13 | 1 | 390 | No | 6 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 5 | No visual defects | Single stemmed, Vertical, Stubs, Old pruning wounds, Epicormic growths, Minor cavities, Minor decay | Small / sparse, Minor deadwood | Historically crown raised to 6m away from adjacent phone line - multiple cavities with decay and dense epicormic growth. | Fair | Fair | 20 to 40 yrs | Moderate | C | No works required in current site context. |
| T22 | Sycamore | <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i> | Early-mature | 15 | 1 | 480 | No | 4 | 2 | 6.5 | 4 | 3.5 | Damage to buttress roots | Single stemmed, Vertical, Stubs, Epicormic growths, Bark damage, Minor decay | Normal, Minor deadwood | Forming linear row of individual trees. Stem girdled at 1m by barbed wire. Multiple minor cavities with minor decay. | Fair | Fair | 20 to 40 yrs | Moderate | C | No works required in current site context. |
| T23 | Sycamore | <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i> | Early-mature | 13 | 1 | 480 | No | 4.5 | 3.5 | 6 | 3.5 | 5 | No visual defects | Single stemmed, Vertical, Epicormic growths, Minor cavities, Minor decay, Old pruning wounds | Normal, Minor deadwood | Forming linear row of individual trees. Previously crown raised away from adjacent building. Multiple minor cavities with decay to main stem. Northern aspect slightly sparse due to adjacent failed tree. | Fair | Fair | >40 yrs | Moderate | B | No works required in current site context. |

| Tree ID | Tree Species | | Maturity | Measurements | | | | Crown (m) | | | | Tree Condition | | | | | Value | | Management | | | |
|---------|--------------|----------------------------|--------------|--------------|-------|--------------------|-----------|------------|-----|-----|-----|----------------|------------------------------------|--|---|--|---------------|------------|-----------------|----------|----------|--|
| | Common Name | Latin Name | | Height (m) | Stems | Stem Diameter (mm) | Estimated | Ave Height | N | E | S | W | Roots | Stem | Crown | Comments | Physiological | Structural | Life Expectancy | Amenity | Category | Works |
| T24 | Sycamore | <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i> | Dead | 12 | 1 | 260 | No | 5 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 0.5 | Decay, Soil heave | Single stemmed, Significant lean, Stubs, Bark damage, Moderate decay | All dead / absent | Dead tree historically failed at base and now resting on adjacent building. Remove regardless of future development. | Dead | Dead | <10 yrs | Dead | U | Remove to ground level. |
| T25 | Sycamore | <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i> | Semi-mature | 12 | 1 | 290 | No | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0.5 | No visual defects | Single stemmed, Vertical, Stubs, Epicormic growths | Small / sparse, Low vigour, Major deadwood, Snapped /hanging branches | Forming linear row of individual trees. Suppressed by better established adjacent trees. Limited live growth remaining. One major dead limb to northern aspect. Limited long-term value. | Poor | Fair | 10 to 20 yrs | Low | C | No works required in current site context. |
| T26 | Sycamore | <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i> | Early-mature | 13 | 1 | 500 | No | 3 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 2.5 | 4 | Soil compaction, No visual defects | Single stemmed, Vertical, Stubs, Epicormic growths | Normal, Minor deadwood | Forming linear row of individual trees. | Good | Fair | >40 yrs | Moderate | B | No works required in current site context. |
| T27 | Sycamore | <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i> | Early-mature | 14 | 1 | 570 | No | 4 | 3 | 3 | 5.5 | 5 | No visual defects | Single stemmed, Vertical, Stubs, Epicormic growths, Moderate cavity, Minor decay | Unbalanced, Minor deadwood | Several moderate cavities with minor visible decay at 4m - good reactionary growth but dense epicormic. | Fair | Fair | >40 yrs | Moderate | B | No works required in current site context. |

| Tree Species | | Measurements | | | | | | Crown (m) | | | | Tree Condition | | | | | | Value | | Management | | |
|--------------|-------------|----------------------------|-------------|------------|-------|--------------------|-----------|------------|---|---|-----|----------------|-------------------|--|--------------------------------|---|---------------|------------|-----------------|------------|----------|--|
| Tree ID | Common Name | Latin Name | Maturity | Height (m) | Stems | Stem Diameter (mm) | Estimated | Ave Height | N | E | S | W | Roots | Stem | Crown | Comments | Physiological | Structural | Life Expectancy | Amenity | Category | Works |
| T28 | Sycamore | <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i> | Semi-mature | 12 | 1 | 350 | No | 4.5 | 2 | 3 | 3.5 | 2.5 | No visual defects | Single stemmed, Vertical, Stubs, Old pruning wounds, Epicormic growths, Bark damage, Minor cavities, Minor decay | Small / sparse, Minor deadwood | Lots of minor cavities with decay to main stem. Sparse crown owing to adjacent trees. | Fair | Fair | 20 to 40 yrs | Moderate | C | No works required in current site context. |



**Appendix 5:
Tree Constraints Plan**


Berry Moor House Farm, Silkestone Common S75 4RF
Ref: AWA3131

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: FOR REMOVAL |
| | RPA: ROOT PROTECTION AREA |
| | TREE STEM |




Appendix 5: View A
Tree Constraints Plan
 Berry Moor House Farm, Silkstone Common S75 4RF
 Ref: AWA3131

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: FOR REMOVAL |
|  | RPA: ROOT PROTECTION AREA |
|  | TREE STEM |