Clifton Villa,
Hall Cliffe Road
Horbury,
Wakefield,
West Yorkshire WF4 6BY.
Tel: 01924 270619
coppicelandscapes@btinternet.com

Coppice Landscapes

Report type: **Aboricultural Implication Assessment**

Client: **Richfield Developments**
C/o White Agus Partnership

Site address: **Land adjacent 26-28 Greenfoot Lane**
Barnsley

Reference No: **AIA.1.barn.greenfoot.ln**

Date of report: **05.07.2015**

1. CLIENT

1.1
Richfield Developments c/o White Agus Partnership, 8 Morston Business Park, Whalley Road, Barugh Green, Barnsley, S75 1HQ.

2. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

2.1
A report is needed to give detailed arboricultural advice on trees that are considered to be of significance to a proposed residential development. I am asked to make specific recommendations on arboricultural work in relation to tree cover identified on the drawings supplied by White Agus Partnership. Only trees considered relevant have been included in the report. Accompanying the report is a tree survey schedule at Section 6 and a Tree Constraints Plan at appendix 1.

3. THE SITE & ASSOCIATED TREE COVER

3.1
This irregular shaped site is accessed direct from Greenfoot Lane to the east. The site falls away moderately from its Greenfoot Lane frontage. The sites most visually prominent trees include a variety of semi mature conifers that front Greenfoot Lane and a mixture of Ash, Cherry, Pear, Maple and Sycamore that stand close to the southern and western boundaries. The open ground present appears to be satisfactorily drained. However the nature of this previously developed site will have impacted on the amount and quality of soils present.

3.2
With the exception of Barnsley General Infirmary the surrounding area is predominantly residential in character. Tree cover within the surrounding area is relatively poor in terms of numbers, age and species mix.

3.3
In addition to the above please refer to the Planning Statement submitted by White Agus Partnership.

4. NAME OF INSPECTOR.

4.1
Stephen Waterson.

5. STATUS OF TREES.

None of the sites tree cover is understood to be subject to Tree Preservation Order or Conservation Area controls. In the case of trees that are subject of Tree Preservation Order, Conservation Area or planning application procedures it is essential the Local Authority's advice is sought and where necessary consent obtained before undertaking any tree removal or pruning operations.

6.0. SURVEY CONDITIONS, METHODS AND BASIS OF RECOMMENDATIONS.

6.1
The survey details were prepared in accordance with BS5837:2012 - Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction, providing an assessment as to the condition of each tree and desirability for retention within the development context. The details of the tree report should be self-explanatory; however it may help to explain the following;

Unless otherwise stated all measurements are taken in metres (m).

Stem diameter - is measured at 1.5m above ground level.

Age of tree - is expressed as young (Y), semi mature (SM), early mature (EM), mature (M), and over mature (OM) and veteran (V).

Estimated remaining contribution – relates to a trees useful life expectancy.

BS 5837 category grading – is a methodology for evaluating existing tree stock and is summarized as follows;

U = Seriously defective having little value that would most probably be lost within 10 years in the current context
A = Trees of high quality, with a life expectancy in excess of 40 years
B = Trees of moderate quality, with a life expectancy in excess of 20 years
C = Trees of low quality, with a life expectancy in excess of 10 years

1 = Trees with arboricultural values
2 = Trees with mainly landscape values
3 = Trees with mainly cultural values

RPA (radii) - Is the normal minimum distance specified in BS5837:2012, Annex D and which ordinarily influences the siting of protective fencing, which in turn helps define the “Construction Exclusion Zone”.

Preliminary management recommendations – Where tree removal is recommended solely to facilitate the proposed development a statement is made to this effect.

Tree Ref.	Species	Stem Diameter (m)	Height (m)	Branch Spread (m) n,e,s,w	Age class	Structural, physiological condition & comments	Preliminary management recommendations	Estimated remaining contribution	BS 5837 Category	RPA (radii)
T1	Maple	0.4	15	5 5 4 4	SM	Physiological & structural condition fair. Visually prominent tree. Dual stemmed from 1.8m with characteristic included union. The easterly leader is severely constrained by embedded nylon rope.	Development loss.	10+	C2	4.8
T2	Ash	1 x 0.25 1 x 0.1	10	5 5 4 4	SM	Physiological & structural condition good. Small tree of self set origin growing out of base of security fence & within 2m of adjacent off site building. Dual stemmed tree with no potential.	Remove tree & replace within development context.	0-10	U	3.2
T3	Sycamore	0.1	7	2 2 2 2	SM	Physiological & structural condition good. Small tree of self set origin growing out of base of security fence with no potential.	Remove tree & replace within development context.	0-10	U	1.2
T4	Ash	0.75	18	8 8 8 8	M	Dominant tree. Physiological condition fair & structural condition poor. Open grown with balanced form. Bole contains major south facing cavity at 2m with hollow section present. Crown supports major snags & dead wood.	Remove tree & replace within development context.	10+	C1	9
T5	Sycamore	0.69	16	6 6 6 6	M	Dominant tree. Physiological & structural condition fair. Open grown with balanced form. Bole contains wounds with minor decay present. Bole divides at 2.5m to provide co dominant leaders. Higher up the tree pockets of decay are present. Presence of poor annual extension growth, epicormic shoots, minor snags & dead wood are indicative of poor vitality & a tree in decline. Retention feasible though due to limited remaining life expectancy removal and replacement is recommended.	Remove tree & replace within development context.	10+	C1	8.3
H6	Cypress	<0.4	16	See plan	M	Physiological & structural condition fair. Outgrown hedging feature, typical of material lacking in past management the feature is becoming gappy at the base & liable to stem damage in extremes of weather. Little future potential.	Remove hedge.	10+	C2	4.8
T7 Off site	Cherry	0.3	8	5 5 5 3	EM	Physiological & structural condition fair. Reasonable form though somewhat suppressed to south west by neighbouring off site Rowan & Birch tree.	Retain, no work required.	10+	C2	3.6

Tree Ref.	Species	Stem Diameter (m)	Height (m)	Branch Spread (m) n,e,s,w	Age class	Structural, physiological condition & comments	Preliminary management recommendations	Estimated remaining contribution	BS 5837 Category	RPA (radii)
T8	Pear	0.35	9	4 3 4 2	OM	Physiological & structural condition very poor. Outgrown Espalier with 4No. leaders from 1.5m. Extensive wounds, decay, tears & snags from area of original crown break.	Remove tree & replace within development context.	0-10	U	4.2
T9	Sycamore	0.66	16	6 5 7 7	M	Dominant tree. Physiological condition poor & structural condition fair. Open grown with reasonable form. Bole contains wounds with minor decay present. Major cavity on central stem growing between co dominant leaders. Moribund appearance, thinning crown, poor annual extension growth, minor snags & dead wood are indicative of poor vitality & a tree in decline. Constitutes a development loss. Retention feasible though due to limited remaining life expectancy removal and replacement is recommended.	Remove tree & replace within development context.	10+	C1	8
G10	1 Monkey Puzzle	0.45	9	See plan	SM	Physiological & structural condition poor. The Monkey Puzzle appears to be dying; cause unidentified, though *Phytophera spp* is suspected. Remaining Cedar & Deodar have developed into suppressed, drawn pole type trees as a consequence of overcrowding.	Remove tree & replace within development context.	10+	U	5.4
	2 x Deodar	1 x 0.25 1 x 0.3	1 x 16 1 x 17						C2	3 & 3.6
	1 Blue Atlantic Cedar	0.25	15						C2	3
T11	Cypress	0.55	17	1 2 1 1	EM	Physiological & structural condition good. Visually prominent tree competing with T12.	Development loss.	10+	C2	6.6
T12	Cypress	0.55	17	2 2 2 1	EM	Physiological condition good & structural condition fair. Visually prominent tree competing with T11. The leader is severely constrained by embedded nylon rope at 1.5m.	Development loss.	10+	C2	6.6

7.0 ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IN SUPPORT OF RECOMMENDATIONS.

7.1
The findings of the tree survey schedule at section 6 indicate 7No. individual and 2No. hedge/tree groups merit a low (C) category and 3No. trees fall into the seriously defective (U) category.

7.2
Though it is technically feasible to retain trees T1, T2, T3, T4, T5, H6, T8 and T9 such is the condition of these trees allied to their relatively short useful life expectancy it is considered preferable to remove these trees in favour of a viable replacement tree planting scheme. As such it is not proposed to retain the existing tree cover, other than an offsite Cherry tree T7.

7.3
With regard to tree and shrub planting an opportunity presents itself in the form of the proposed development to provide new plant material and where desirable replace defective or unsuitable tree and shrub material. In this regard space is available in which to plant a variety of tree species within the proposed garden areas. Such planting would help vary the age and species of tree present in the locality, providing for continuity of tree cover, to the benefit of nature conservation and visual amenity. The cumulative effect of desirable planting will mitigate for the development related tree loss, whilst enhancing the future character of the area. I would presume this is a matter the Local Planning Authority would be agreeable to conditioning as part of a planning permission.

7.4
The possibility of root damage upon foundations will need to be addressed. In this regard structures will need to be appropriately designed to have foundations that take account of roots, either past, present or future that could impact upon soil moisture levels and possibly contribute to subsidence if the structure of the soil was of a suitable nature.

7.5
In terms of the recommended tree work the developer should make the contractor (arborist) aware of the need to check for both overhead and underground services before commencing work and to obtain any necessary clearances. When instructing a contractor to undertake any tree work, it is essential to provide the arborist with details of any restrictions (i.e. a Tree Preservation Order, Conservation Area status, relevant planning conditions and ownership details) that may influence the recommendations contained in this report.

8.0 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

8.1
From the foregoing tree survey findings, comments and observations, it will be seen the development proposal requires the removal of a range of low (C) category trees and seriously defective (U) category trees. Such trees are recommended for removal on the basis of their undesirable condition, poor siting, low amenity value and practicalities associated with the building process. Equally important the proposal provides an opportunity to carry out additional landscaping that would enhance visual amenity, biodiversity and the setting of the area for the enjoyment of future generations.

8.2
It is hoped that this report and recommendations provides all necessary information. However should there be any queries or should clarification of any points be required, please contact myself.

Stephen Waterson


APPENDIX 1 – TREE CONSTRAINTS PLAN
BS 5837:2012 - category grading;
U = Seriously defective tree
A = Trees of high quality
B = Trees of moderate quality
C = Trees of low quality
BS5837 RPA radii
T9/C1
T8/U
T7/C2
H6/C2
T5
T4
T3/U
T2/U
T1/C2
T11/C2
T12/C2
G10/C2
PLOT 1
PLOT 2
PLOT 3
PLOT 4
PLOT 5
PLOT 6
PLOT 7
PLOT 8
PLOT 9
PLOT 10
PLOT 11
PLOT 12
No26-28
GREENFOOT LANE
SCALE 1:250 @ A3