

DEARNE VALLEY PARKWAY, BARNSELY
for Marshall Construction (West Yorkshire) Ltd.

REVISED ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Tree Survey Solutions
Unit 19250
PO Box 4336
Manchester
M61 0BW

Email: info@treesurveysolutions.co.uk

Web: www.treesurveysolutions.co.uk

Tel: [REDACTED]



CONTENTS

- 1.0 BACKGROUND
- 2.0 SURVEY DETAILS
- 3.0 IMPACT ASSESSMENT
- 4.0 APPROVED MITIGATION MEASURES
- 5.0 SPECIFIC MITIGATION FOR ADDITIONAL TREE REMOVALS
- 6.0 GENERAL GUIDELINES, TERMS AND CONDITIONS

DRAWING 25064/01 (REVISED TREE PROTECTION PLAN)

1.0 BACKGROUND

1.1 Brief

A revised arboricultural impact assessment has been commissioned by Marshall Construction (West Yorkshire) Ltd, following a request from the Tree Officer, Ed Jowett. This revised report is necessary due to a significant ground levels discrepancy which renders the approved scheme undeliverable along the southern boundary of the site. Following recent vegetation clearance and subsequent detailed site surveys, it has become apparent that the original topographical survey was not sufficiently accurate and was inhibited by dense understorey vegetation. Following site mobilization in March 2025, the missing levels were recorded, revealing a substantial discrepancy between the existing ground levels and the proposed finished yard levels. This necessitates an engineered solution which diverges from the approved design.

Because of safety concerns relating to the height of the banking in this area, the proposed solution is to form a battered slope from the existing (higher) ground levels along the southern boundary, down to the lower levels of the finished service yard kerb base. The proposed slope extends further south than the currently approved design and incurs the tree group G5 to a greater extent than previously expected. Additionally, a short section of retaining wall is proposed where the banking is tight to the redline boundary and an existing wall is in place immediately adjacent to the site boundary on the existing higher ground which is being retained.

The original AIA and AMS were prepared by Rosetta Landscape Design, who no longer provide arboricultural consultancy in-house. Therefore, this revised report is a collaboration between Rosetta Landscape Design and Tree Survey Solutions Ltd.

1.2 Documents Provided

To assist in the production of this report we have been provided with the following documents:

- Tree constraints plan (ref. 3784-1A)
- Trees in relation to development plan (ref. 3784-2A)
- Original arboricultural impact assessment and tree survey data (ref.3784)
- Original arboricultural method statement (ref.3784)
- Revised landscaping proposals (ref.15315-VL-L01O, 15315-VL-L02M, 15315-VL-L03O)
- Unit 3 Embankment and Tree Protection Zone (mark-up)
- Proposals – general arrangement of southern boundary wall (5419-JPG-ZZ-ZZ-M2-S-1590)
- Proposals – proposed levels (5419-JPG-XX-00-DR-Z-1201)
- Copy of correspondence with tree officer Edward Jowett dated 10.12.25

1.3 Tree Status

The interactive map on the local planning authority's website shows that that no trees are included within a Tree Preservation Order and the site does not lie within a Conservation Area.

2.0 SURVEY DETAILS

- 2.1 Once the ground level issues detailed in section 1.1 became apparent, Tree Survey Solutions were contacted to investigate the issue and assess what the additional arboricultural impact would be of the required bank stabilization works. The brief included a revision of the approved AIA (this report), plus a revised AMS and Tree Protection Plan.
- 2.2 To gain an understanding of the challenges, a site meeting was held between T.S.S. and the client on 06.01.26. A walk over of the southern boundary vegetation was undertaken, with the project engineer explaining the extent of the required cut and batter for the slope along this boundary. The existing tree data shown on the approved plans did not require updating as the existing trees themselves had not materially changed since the original tree survey.
- 2.3 The drawing accompanying the original tree report (3784/1) shows the position, canopy spread and root protection area (RPA) of the trees; drawing 25064-01 attached to this report shows these details in relation to the updated layout which incorporates impacts from the revised proposed works.

3.0 IMPACT ASSESSMENT

3.1 Context

- 3.1.1 Following the guidance of BS5837:2012 proposals for any site should ideally aim to incorporate those trees which are identified as 'A' and 'B' whereas 'C' category trees will not usually be retained where they may adversely affect the layout. The attached drawing shows part of a group of 'B' category trees removed. However, these were previously approved for removal as part of a projected highways improvement which is not now proceeding.
- 3.1.2 BS 5837:2012 states that when considering the layout of the site, and the retention of significant trees, proposals should generally be kept outside of both their Root Protection Area (RPA) and canopy spread. However, it allows for the possibility of encroaching into these areas with piled footings, access roads, footpaths, and parking areas assuming existing ground levels can be maintained, and the appropriate construction methods can be employed. This is particularly relevant where existing buildings and/or surfacing extend within the RPAs of the trees.

3.2 Site Proposals (see drawing 25064-01)

- 3.2.1 With regard to built form, the layout shows the construction of three large buildings on site, together with parking and circulation areas, all of which would be accessed from an existing roundabout to the east of Rockingham Roundabout.
- 3.2.2 With respect to the current proposed site layout all trees to the north and east could be retained insofar as the construction process is concerned, whilst part of the group (G5) to the south (and one insignificant group – G1- in the centre) would require removal. All trees shown retained on the attached plan would lie clear of any construction works.

3.3 Services and Other Considerations

- 3.3.1 Details of services to dwellings are not available currently. However, it is assessed that all these could be laid within the access road or vehicle circulation areas serving the new buildings; if this were the case none would pass through the rooting zones of retained trees.

3.4 Potential Impact on Trees

- 3.4.1 A number of tree removals need to be removed to adequately accommodate the proposed development as presently shown. These are shown on the revised tree protection plan (25064-01) and include G1, G5, G10 and T11.

3.5 Additional arboricultural impacts diverging from approved scheme

- 3.5.1 The additional arboricultural impacts arising from the proposed grounds works entirely affect G5, a linear group along the southern boundary. This group is a self-seeded group of small, young to semi-mature, mainly native trees. The principal species recorded are goat willow, silver birch, common alder, ash, English oak, hawthorn and wild cherry. The trees recorded had diameters of 75-250mm at 1.5m and there were many young suckers below 75mm diameter. The latter were either recently seeded or included root suckers from established trees.
- 3.5.2 Within G5 is an informal footpath running east to west which is shown in the photos below. Those trees on the north side of this footpath are proposed to be removed within the new ground works, those on the southern side are due to be retained. During the site visit on 06.01.26, 74 trees were identified as requiring removal to facilitate the proposed ground works and retaining wall. These are entirely located on the northern side of the informal footpath.
- 3.5.3 The photos below are included to communicate clearly the quality and density of the existing trees in the affected area. These are repeated on the Tree Protection Plan, showing the direction of the photographs taken.



Figure 1: Photo facing west. Trees on the north side of the footpath (on the right) to be removed.



Figure 2: Photo facing east. Trees on the northside (on the left) to be removed.



Figure 3: In the corner of the site facing west. Existing wall shown is to be retained which requires a short section of retaining wall in this area. The rest of the affected area is to be subjected to banking with a batter.



Figure 4: Photo facing west. Furthest, easternmost extent of proposed earthworks. Trees within photo are to be removed.

4.0 APPROVED MITIGATION MEASURES

4.1 The following trees lying within the site boundary would need to be removed to allow the development to proceed (all shown on attached drawing 25064-01). These works are approved to date.

G1 2nr Goat Willow

G5 Oak, Silver Birch, Wild Cherry, Ash, Alder, Field Maple. Goat Willow, Hawthorn, Hazel. (approximately 50% of the group).

G10 Hawthorn (two rows of overgrown hedge)

T11 Goat Willow

4.2 As indicated above, once the trees above have been removed, those retained should not be adversely affected by construction works to any significant extent. Notwithstanding this assessment, it is recommended that, following excavation, if any roots are encountered these should be cut cleanly with a hand saw and exposed root ends covered with damp hessian to minimise desiccation until the excavation can be backfilled (which should ideally be undertaken within one working day).

4.3 Prior to any building work on site undertake any essential work to retained trees on arboricultural grounds that would improve safety and benefit their future growth. This is an opportunity to undertake arboricultural work (e.g., removal of damaged limbs and dead wood, pruning as appropriate and cutting back unwanted understorey growth) that would benefit the trees on site.

- 4.4 Erect Tree Protection Fencing where construction work takes place in proximity to retained trees; the alignment of such fencing should be undertaken in line with BS 5837:2012.
- 4.5 To offset the removal of trees it is recommended to plant replacement trees to offset their loss. These are shown on the landscape proposals drawings.

5.0 SPECIFIC MITIGATION FOR ADDITIONAL TREE REMOVALS

- 5.1 In addition to the approved mitigation planting, specific replacement planting is proposed to replace the loss of the 74 trees within G5 which were not included in the original application. Following the proposed ground works, the finished banking will be utilised as the location for the replacement planting, so that the new trees will effectively compensate the loss of these trees.
- 5.2 The 74 trees lost will be replaced with a mixed native buffer planting, including 13 standard and feathered trees, 233 trees (40-60cm height) and 191 shrubs in 60cm shelters. The landscaping proposals have been revised to reflect this; for further details please refer to drawing no. 15315-VL-L010, 15315-VL-L02M & 15315-VL-L03O).

6.0 GENERAL GUIDELINES, TERMS AND CONDITIONS

- 6.1 Any tree work should be carried out by qualified Arboricultural Contractors with at least £1 million Public Liability Insurance cover.
- 6.2 Tree work must be carried out to BS3998:2010 which specifies recommendations for tree work.
- 6.3 The acceptance of this report constitutes an agreement with the terms and guidelines listed within this report.
- 6.4 No liability can be accepted by the consultant in respect of the trees unless the recommendations within this report are carried out under their supervision. Nor shall the consultant be responsible for events which happen after the time of the survey due to factors which were not evident at the time.
- 6.5 Relationships between trees and other objects such as buildings are rarely static and can at times change quite unpredictably. It should therefore be understood that the inspection and monitoring of the condition of trees is a continuing requirement which, in this instance, is recommended on an annual basis.



Scott Reid (*BSc (Hons), FdSc (arb), Dip Arb L4, ND Arb, TechArborA*).

Tree Survey Solutions

Unit 19250

PO Box 4336

Manchester

M61 0BW



info@treesurveysolutions.co.uk

www.treesurveysolutions.co.uk

Date of issue: 29.01.26

Revised: 02.02.26