



Paul Clarke Esq.
Netherfield House,
Old Anna Lane,
Penistone, S36 7BW.

February 15th 2019.

Dear Mr Clarke,

Tree report; proposed extension to Netherfield House.

Lloyd Kellock, your planning agent has instructed me to undertake a tree survey to inform a planning application to extend Netherfield House. The site is not in a Conservation Area and there are no Tree Preservation Orders relating to the any of the trees within in the site. I note that the property is adjacent to a school that appears to have been built only recently. It seems that some new trees were planted to accompany this construction work but (on the Barnsley Council website) I can find no tree-related planning conditions that might affect trees close to the house.

Lloyd told me that the Planning Officer required the tree report to conform to *British Standard 5837 2012 Trees in relation to design demolition and construction – Recommendations*, which contains guidance and recommendations and is not really a specification for a tree survey. I shall however attempt to cover all the potential angles.

The presumption within BS5837 is that the trees on a site will be appraised and then the layout designed around the better trees. In this case the primary consideration with the extension is the existing building, which limits what is practical so I shall be pragmatically considering how trees might affect this and what, if anything, might be done to better accommodate trees.

The trees.

On this occasion I shall be commenting not only on trees but on large shrubs and hedges as well. This garden has managed to treat some trees as hedging plants and allow some shrubs to reach tree-like proportions. I shall comment as I see fit. A location plan is appended.

No.	Species	Comment
1.	Lodgepole Pine	Almost 6 metres tall. Almost part of a hedge but not quite.
2.	Norway Spruce group.	Up to 6 metres tall. These have been treated like a hedge, not entirely successfully, and some people might say that such treatment is wrong.
3.	Monkey Puzzle	6 metres tall with a trunk diameter of 250 mm. Companion to tree 4. Smaller False Cypresses in their shade, and a Hazel.
4.	Colorado Spruce	6 metres tall with a trunk diameter of 250 mm. Rather untidy crown, possibly due to pruning.



No.	Species	Comment
5.	Lawson Cypress	Only 2 metres tall, a regularly clipped shrub, probably formed when a tree had its top cut off.
6.	Rowan	Ivy covered, 4 metres tall, 200 mm trunk diameter. Rather inconsiderately pruned.
7.	Rowan	6 metres tall and 210 mm trunk diameter. Not pruned and much better than 6.
8.	Mahonia	This is usually a low growing shrub but has somehow managed to grow to reach tree-like proportions. It's very close to the house.
9.	Lawson Cypress hedge.	A short length of hedge dividing the rear garden. Well-clipped, over 2 metres tall but quite broad.
10.	Hazel and Beech hedge.	An even shorter length of hedge serving a not immediately obvious purpose. Well-clipped and 2 metres tall.
11.	Cherry Laurel hedge	Another well-clipped hedge extending the full length of the garden, approximately 60 metres long and almost 3 metres tall. Some Holly within it but almost purely Laurel.
12.	Lawson Cypress group.	An untidy group and almost hiding a weeping Cherry and a Japanese Maple. Some different ornamental Cyresses are tangled amongst these. No taller than 6 metres, approximately 250 mm trunk diameter.

There are numerous other small trees and shrubs around this garden and close to the house. I do not consider it necessary to include them in the above schedule but shall mention them below.

Discussion; the trees and the proposal.



Photograph 1.

Photograph 1 shows tree 1, the Lodgepole Pine. This species was widely planted in forestry plantations, but never really developed as the foresters hoped.

This has the appearance of a large shrub and might be improved by pruning. By improved I mean turned into something more like a tree, which is not to say that it should not be left as it is.

If it was the intention to turn this Pine into more of a feature; a standalone tree, it would also require the adjacent Spruce to be either pruned or removed. And I have to say that pruning Spruce is not really orthodox arboriculture.

Photograph 2 shows the Spruce group 2, with the Lodgepole Pine in the background to the left. I'm not sure if someone intended to clip them like a hedge but Norway Spruce is not really suitable for such treatment.



Photograph 2.



Photograph 3.

Photograph 3 shows the abovementioned Spruce from within the garden. It also shows Monkey Puzzle 3, and the Colorado Spruce 4. The drawings indicate that trees 3 & 4 are to be removed. I do not consider these trees to be particularly noticeable in the neighbourhood and both could be easily replaced with new planting. There are some shrubs growing beneath the trees, again nothing of such quality that they would be greatly missed.



Photograph 4.

Photograph 4 shows tree 5. This is a variety of False Cypress with blue-grey foliage and its strange shape has been achieved by topping and clipping.

The drawings show this tree removed. I do not think it would be missed.

Photograph 5 shows trees 6 & 7. The proposal appears to show tree 6 removed and tree 7 retained.



Photograph 5.



Photograph 6.

Photograph 6 is another view of tree 6 that I took in an effort to show its proximity to the existing building. The evergreen leaves are Ivy covering fences and a shed.

As far as I can tell the proposal does not involve any building here although there's a terrace in place of the ivy covered shed.

The low hedge is Box.

Photograph 7 shows the Mahonia, (or Oregon Grape *Mahonia aquifolium*) which I consider to be unusually large. It is not rare and although this is probably a cultivated variety of Mahonia I do not think it is particularly unusual beyond its size.

Mahonia is becoming something of an invasive pest in places, although it is not yet included in schedule 9. (The list of plants such as Japanese Knotweed that should not be allowed into the “wild.”)

Again the proposal indicates its removal and I don’t think it is likely to be missed. It is certainly not something that should stand in the way of any development.



Photograph 7.



Photograph 8.

Photograph 8 is a view of the False Cypress hedge 9. The drawings appear to show it retained, presumably to maintain a small, well-screened garden to the rear of the house. This garden will contain tree 7 and some other small trees and shrubs. I do not consider any of these to be noteworthy and only note that they will require regular pruning and trimming. Photograph 9 shows the area.



The exotic tree in the centre is a Cabbage Palm. These were quite common in South Yorkshire until the winter of 2010, when the frost killed all of them.

Photograph 9.

This garden appears to have been created by a person who enjoyed gardening and was an enthusiastic horticulturist. I say this because the tree in the pot at the left in photo 9, despite being barely alive could reasonably claim to be one of the rarest trees in the world. It's a Wollemi Pine which was only discovered in 1994. I shan't discuss this any further beyond noting that the enthusiastic gardener appeared to enjoy (or at least was prepared to tolerate) hedge clipping.



Photograph 10.

Photograph 10 shows the Cherry Laurel hedge, item 11. Clearly this is well maintained and equally clearly, maintaining it must be hard work. This hedge is almost purely Cherry Laurel although there are a couple of other species amongst the Laurels. This species grows very quickly and will require clipping at least annually. As well as being tedious work, I regard Cherry Laurel as an invasive pest which is starting to dominate some of South Yorkshire's woodlands. At the moment it is not included on schedule 9 but when it is revised (revision is overdue) it almost certainly will be.



Photograph 11.

Photograph 11 shows the western side of group 12. This is another nondescript assemblage of false Cypresses. The low shrub in front is Herringbone Cotoneaster and is an invasive pest which is included in Schedule 9.

Although False Cypresses are regarded with disdain by some gardeners, they are good for biodiversity in that they provide an excellent nesting environment.

Photograph 12 shows the east side of group 12. This photograph shows the patch just behind tree 4. The deciduous trees being swamped by the conifers (False Cypresses) are a variety of ornamental Cherry and a Japanese Maple.

Again, this group represents a lot of hedge-clipping work.



Photograph 12.

This concludes my observations of the trees around this project. I did not find any trees that particularly stood out in the surrounding landscape and none that should stand in the way of a modest development. This is not to say that any of the trees have anything particularly wrong with them, just that they are not of a size or stature that means they are ever likely to be anything other than a collection of garden trees.

This is a small project and it is hard to imagine the site works requiring any large scale machinery, which means that it should not be difficult to work around any retained trees and shrubs. One of the principles behind BS5837 is the protection of not only trees from accidental damage, but protecting the soils in which the trees grow. Large machines obviously exert a lot of ground pressure which might destroy the soil's structure and thus prevent root growth. However on projects like this, where most of the work is going to be undertaken using small machines and hand tools, there is no necessity to start installing heavy duty fencing. In fact it might be that all that is required is for the site workers to be

made aware of the possibility of damaging the trees, and then to act accordingly. In this case some ground protection, nothing complicated just some sheets of shuttering-ply for site workers to walk upon, might be of benefit, but installing a fence would be excessive.

Conclusions.

1. I found no trees that would justify diverting the scheme or altering the plans. The proposal seems to have pragmatically acknowledged the need to remove trees 3, 4 & 5, which in the greater scheme of things are of little consequence.
2. I consider the garden to be well-stocked with trees and shrubs, although none are of much significance outside the garden. Some trees and shrubs have clearly become overgrown to the detriment of competing nearby trees (see photo 12). Some considered pruning and removals could make the garden easier, (less onerous) to manage in the future.

3.



Photograph 13.

I see no real need to compose a complex tree protection plan for this very small project. However if it is thought necessary then fencing like that shown in photograph 13 is more than adequate to show site workers where root protection areas extend.

The root protection area (RPA) is a circle of radius 12 times the trunk diameter with the tree at the centre. (There is not much science behind this sum, which comes from BS5837, but it is widely accepted.)

4. Overall, in this particular case, I see no reason for the Planning department to be overly concerned about the trees in this garden. Although they clearly make a contribution to the neighbourhood's landscape, there is no particular shortage of trees in the immediate neighbourhood and the property is in a location (near a large school) that means maintain some trees to screen the garden from passers-by will be an imperative. These will continue to make a contribution to the neighbourhood's tree stock.

I trust you will find this helpful.

Yours faithfully,

W L Anderson. Dip.Arb(RFS). M Arbor A.

Enclosure: Tree location sketch plan. Not to scale, adapted from supplied drawings.

TREE LOCATION PLAN
Grass
NETHERFIELD HOUSE
Grass
NOT TO SCALE
15.2.2019

