James Royston
Arboricultural Consultant

Arboricultural Implication Assessment

in accordance with

BS5837:2005

at

Wortley Village

Table of Contents

1 Purpose and scope of report....3
2 The effect of the development proposals on the amenity value of trees, both on and near the site....3
3 Above and below ground constraints....6
4 Construction of the proposed development....6
5 The possibility of modifying the development to accommodate the retention of trees which would otherwise be lost....6
6 The end use of the space....6
7 Mitigation through tree planting....6
8 Consultant's qualifications and experience....7
9 Statement of truth....7
10 Contact Details....8
Appendix 1: Plans....9

1 Purpose and scope of report

This report has been created in accordance with BS5837:2005 to assess the impacts of proposed development as shown in the appendix and includes consideration of:

- The effect of the development proposals on the amenity value of trees, both on and near the site
- Above and below ground constraints
- Construction of the proposed development
- The possibility of modifying the development to accommodate the retention of trees which would otherwise be lost
- The end use of the space
- Whether tree planting could acceptably mitigate any tree losses due to development

The consultant shall not be responsible for events which happen after the date of survey due to factors which where not apparent at the time of the survey.

It is advisable to have trees regularly surveyed by a suitably qualified and experienced arboricultural consultant. In this instance it is recommended that the next survey is undertaken within 12 months of this report. If the site or adjacent areas change use, or if there are significant changes to the condition of the site or adjacent areas, or if there are significant changes to the trees surveyed, it is recommended that professional arboricultural advice is obtained.

No liability can be accepted by the consultant unless the recommendations of this report are undertaken within the time period recommended. Where no time period is indicated then recommendations should be carried out as soon as reasonably practicable.

The plans included as part of this report are based on those provided by the client or their representatives. Whilst reasonable steps are taken to ensure plans are accurate and correct, the consultant will not be responsible for errors or omissions arising due to information provided by the client or the client's representatives.

All tree works should be carried out to BS 3998:1989 - '*Recommendations for tree work'* unless otherwise specified, and by a suitably qualified, experienced and insured contractor.

2 The effect of the development proposals on the amenity value of trees, both on and near the site

Site 1
No trees are shown to be removed. There should be no change.

Site 2
Several dilapidated fruit trees and some extremely low value self set ash to be removed. No significant impact.

Site 3
A section of overgrown hedgerow to be removed to allow for development. This contains a number of small to medium sized trees, including several large hollies. This will have some minor impact on the local tree-cover. Mitigation planting should be considered, if not on this site, then elsewhere in the village.

Site 4
Only one significant tree is within potential influencing distance. The proposals show a new house and new parking for neighbouring properties. The new dwelling will be constructed within the area shown

as being a root protection area for T15. This incursion is minor, and will not have an impact on the health of T15. The new dwelling is also in an area which might be affected by shading from T15, this can be addressed by ensuring that windows to major living spaces are not in the direction of T15.
A new stone boundary wall is proposed within the root protection area of T15, this should be constructed in accordance with a BS5837:2005 method statement taking care to avoid damage to tree roots.

Site 5
No trees of significance on this site.

Site 6
This site contains a group of trees which vary from low to medium in value when considered as individuals. As a whole the group has moderate value to the local trees-scape.
The proposals show many of the trees being removed with the exception of some fairly low value trees located to the west of the site.
The removal of these trees will have a negative impact on the local tree-scape, but this impact is reduced by the screening effects of the trees shown as being retained to the West, the general high level of tree cover in the immediate and surrounding areas, and the high levels of new tree planting which is planned.

Site 7
The proposals for this site show development activity within the root protection areas of several fairly valuable trees. However, this activity is restricted to the footprint of existing buildings. On the assumption that all development is carried out to a BS5837:2005 method statement, there should be no significant physical impact on the trees to be retained.
The proposals show the removal of T20. However, minor changes to the layout and construction techniques are currently being considered which will hopefully allow this tree to be retained.

Site 8
There are no trees being removed as part of the proposals for this site. However, tree T26 is recommended for removal because of its poor condition – its retention or removal has no impact on the design proposals of this site.
Some of the woodland edge trees will require pruning to allow for the construction of the proposed garage in the north corner of the site. This pruning will be a crown lift in accordance with BS3998:2010 and will be a one off operation rather than an ongoing maintenance issue.

Site 9
Trees T28, T29 and T30 are shown as being removed on the proposal drawing. At the current time consideration is being given to retaining T30.
In order to avoid problems through shading or visual dominance, it is recommended that trees T30, T31 and T32 are crown lifted in accordance with BS3998:2010.
The proposals for this site are unlikely to have any significant impact on trees T30, T31, T32 or the adjacent woodland if all construction activity is done in accordance with a BS5837:2005 method statement.

Site 10
The proposals do not affect any trees of significance. There is one small elm tree nearby, but due to Dutch Elm Disease this tree is extremely unlikely to survive another ten years whether development occurs or not.

Site 11
The majority of the proposed changes on this site are within the footprint of existing buildings, or are located well outside any root protection areas.
There is a new car park and access proposed within the root protection area of the adjacent woodland to

the north of the site, but this car park and access can easily be constructed using established root protection techniques.
Other proposed hard surfaces are located either within the footprint of existing buildings, or existing hard surfaces.
On the assumption that all development activity will be done in accordance with a BS5837:2005 method statement, none of the trees on or adjacent to this site should be significantly affected.

Site 12
If the proposed dwelling/conversions is constructed in accordance with a BS5837:2005 method statement, none of the trees on or adjacent to this site should be significantly affected.
However, tree T34 has a number of significant defects which would normally lead to a recommendation that it is felled. An alternative option would be extreme pruning (ie topping/pollarding) as described in BS3998:2010.

Site 13
This site is made up of an established woodland plantation with fairly even aged trees. The proposal shows new car parking for walkers in this area.
Due to the existing ground levels, the spacing of the trees and the overall good condition of the trees, it is felt that creating new parking in this area could certainly be achieved with no major impact on the condition of the woodland.
However, the precise number and location of parking spaces, the precise layout of paths and access, and the details of construction of all new surfaces, should be agreed only after a detailed survey has been undertaken.
If the public is encouraged into this area of trees for recreational activities, then the overall amenity value tree-scape in this and surrounding areas will be increased as a result of the greater number of people able to enjoy it.

Site 14
There are no trees of significance on this site.

Site 15
The proposals show new car parking and a new access in this area. Where new car parking is near to trees, then this can easily be constructed using accepted low impact techniques and materials in accordance with BS5837:2005.
Consideration was given to altering the layout to accommodate the retention of T36, however it was found that this tree has severe bark damage, possibly due to numerous fires over many years, this has led to decay at the base which has left this tree with a very short safe life expectancy.
Although this tree has a fairly high amenity value, it is highly likely to be removed within the next ten years due to safety fears. BS5837:2005 is clear that trees with such a short life expectancy should not be considered as a significant constraint to development.

Overall
Although there will be negative impacts on the local tree-scape from the proposals at site 6 and site 3, and there might be a moderately valuable tree removed at site 7, overall it is felt that the proposals will have a positive impact on the local tree-scape.
These positive impacts will come from new tree planting, maintenance of existing trees and by encouraging the public to engage with trees in a positive way.

3 Above and below ground constraints

The above ground constraints include the current and expected size of crowns of existing trees which are to be retained. There should be consideration of the potential for shading, and the potential for direct damage from branches rubbing against buildings etc.

Trees at Site 1, Site 7, Site 8, Site 9, and Site 12 will require pruning to facilitate development. But this will be minor.

Trees at Site 1, Site 7, Site 11, Site 12, Site 13 and possibly at Site 15 might require some form of specialist root protection.

Shading from trees on Site 1, Site 2, Site 4, Site 6, Site 7, Site 9 and Site 12 could be an issue, but final layout and design will be done in such a way as to avoid potential problems.

4 Construction of the proposed development

On the assumption that any demolition and construction activity is undertaken in accordance with a BS5837:2005 Method Statement, it is unlikely that retained trees will suffer any significant impacts from the proposed development.

There are no indications at this stage that demolition and construction in accordance with a BS5837:2005 Method Statement would be in any way difficult.

5 The possibility of modifying the development to accommodate the retention of trees which would otherwise be lost

These proposals are created after consideration of the arboricultural issues.

6 The end use of the space

The space is to be used for a variety of uses, each site being different.

Where sites are for domestic purposes consideration has been given to shade and usable garden space.

7 Mitigation through tree planting

It is understood that there is to be considerable new planting throughout the village. The full details are not known at this stage.

8 Consultant's qualifications and experience

This report has been undertaken by James Royston who has over fifteen years experience in arboriculture, forestry, and urban forestry, of which the last six years have been spent as a full-time consultant specialising in trees and development, tree related hazards, and sustainable tree management.

Academic qualifications include:
MSc Arboriculture and Urban Forestry,
BSc (Hons) Forestry.

Recent professional development courses include:
Tree Preservation Order Workshop *by the Consulting Arborist Society*,
Trees and Mortgage/Insurance Reporting *by the Association of Mortgage Users Insurance Group*,
Professional Tree Inspection *by LANTRA Awards*,
BS5837:2005 Seminars *by the Arboricultural Association*,
The Future of Tree Risk Management part I and II *by the Treeworks Environmental Practice*,
Trees and Subsidence *by OCA Ltd*,
CTLA Tree Valuation Seminar *by the Consulting Arborist Society,*
Expert Witness Training *by Bond Solon*
THREATS training *by Julian Forbes-Laird.*

Professional associations include:
Editor for the Consulting Arborist Society,
Professional member of the Arboricultural Association,
Chartered Environmentalist.

9 Statement of truth

In accordance with my status as a Chartered Environmentalist I confirm that I believe the facts stated in my report are true and that the opinions I have expressed represent my true and complete professional opinion.

10 Contact Details

I hope this report provides all the required information. However, if further advice is needed then please contact me and I will be happy to help.

James Royston – Independent Arboricultural Consultant
MSc Arboriculture and Urban Forestry, BSc (Hons) Forestry.

Unit 28 Upper Mill
Slaithwaite
Huddersfield
HD7 5HA

01484 769 011

jr@jamesroyston.co.uk

Report completed 23rd May 2011