

**ARBORICULTURAL REPORT
to BS 5837:2012
at
Land at Cumberworth Lane
Huddersfield
West Yorkshire
HD8**

Client:
Roger Lee Planning Ltd

Client Address:
18 Leeds Road
Methley
Leeds
LS26 9EQ

Client Telephone:
01977 516447

JCA Ref:
14057/ME

Contents

1. Introduction.....	3
1.1 Purpose of the Report	3
1.2 Terms of Reference	3
1.3 Scope of the Report	3
1.4 Survey Details	4
2. Site Description	5
2.1 Land Use.....	5
2.2 Topography.....	5
2.3 Treescape	5
2.4 Visual Amenity Value	5
2.5 Age Class Mix	5
2.6 Species Diversity	5
3. Status of the Trees	6
4. Tree Descriptions and Recommendations	6
5. Discussion Relating to the Existing Treescape.....	7
5.1 Tree Condition & Recommended Works	7
5.2 Tree Removals for Arboricultural Purposes	7
5.3 Remedial Tree Works.....	7
5.4 Monitoring / Further Investigation	7
5.5 Existing Site Constraints and General Design Advice	8
6. Conclusions.....	10
Appendix 1: Tree Descriptions and Recommendations	12
Appendix 2: Explanation of Tree Descriptions.....	13
Appendix 3: General Guidelines	16
Appendix 4: Glossary of Terms & Abbreviations	17
Appendix 5: Author Qualifications.....	19
Appendix 6: Tree Constraints Plan.....	20

1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose of the Report

- 1.1.1 This report is required at **Land at Cumberworth Lane, Denby Dale**, to provide detailed, independent, arboricultural advice on the trees present, in the context of potential development.
- 1.1.2 The purpose of this report is to summarise the findings of an arboricultural assessment of the existing vegetation at the above site; conducted in accordance with the guidelines contained within BS5837: 2012 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations'.
- 1.1.3 Where necessary, this report will outline any tree works which are required within the current context of the site. It will also grade the trees in accordance with the British Standard; which should guide the design in terms of which trees are to be retained and which trees are to be removed.

1.2 Terms of Reference

- 1.2.1 JCA Ltd has been instructed by **Roger Lee Planning Ltd** to survey the site and prepare the findings in a report.
- 1.2.2 For this purpose, an Ordnance Survey based drawing has been supplied (**Drawing No 17-092-SK01**), which forms the basis for the Tree Constraints Plan at **Appendix 6**. Tree positions were not marked on the drawing and have therefore been plotted by the surveyor on site. Whilst not as accurate as a topographical survey, our drawing is considered to provide a fair representation of the positions of the trees surveyed. Tree positions should, however, be considered indicative on the Tree Constraints Plan.

1.3 Scope of the Report

- 1.3.1 This report is compiled in accordance with *BS 5837:2012 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations'* and is based on an independent and objective assessment of the existing vegetation.
- 1.3.2 Preliminary recommendations are given with a view to the long-term management of sustainable tree cover and to uphold the interests of health and safety.
- 1.3.3 All trees within the site boundary with a stem diameter above 75mm are included.
- 1.3.4 Where applicable trees outside the site boundary, but close enough to be affected by the proposed development, are included.
- 1.3.5 The specific designs of the proposed development are not generally taken into account at this stage. This is to be detailed in an Arboricultural Impact Assessment.

1.4 Survey Details

- 1.4.1 The survey took place during the month of April 2018 and was conducted by Mick Eltringham *ND (Forestry)*.
- 1.4.2 During this survey, all trees were inspected from ground level. Further investigations, such as a climbed inspection or a decay detection survey, have not been undertaken.
- 1.4.3 Measurements were obtained using clinometers, specialist tapes or electronic distometers. Where this was not possible, measurements were estimated to the best ability of the surveyor. JCA endeavour to provide accurate information and will always take measurements unless inhibited by restricted access or other mitigating circumstances. Where measurements have been estimated, they are clearly highlighted at **Appendix 1**.

2. Site Description

2.1 Land Use

2.1.1 The site is an open field which is currently used for grazing.

2.2 Topography

2.2.1 The site slopes gently from the northern boundary down towards the southern boundary. There is a steep slope to the eastern side of the site which becomes level in the north-eastern corner.

2.3 Treescape

2.3.1 To the north of the site is open farm land with boundary vegetation containing small trees. To the east, south, and west are residential areas containing occasional garden trees of varying ages.

2.3.2 The trees on this site have a moderate impact on the local treescape.

2.4 Visual Amenity Value

2.4.1 The trees on site collectively provide a limited visual amenity to the surrounding area.

2.5 Age Class Mix

2.5.1 The trees surveyed ranged in age from young to mature. However, the trees were predominantly semi-mature and early mature.

2.6 Species Diversity

2.6.1 Species surveyed include Leyland Cypress, Western Red Cedar, Elder, Sycamore Hawthorn Holly, Yew and Prunus. The predominant species were Sycamore and Hawthorn.

3. Status of the Trees

- 3.1 We are informed that there is a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) in force on this site which protects **G5**.
- 3.2 Before any work is organised, an application form must be submitted to the Local Authority, outlining all the proposed works along with suitable justification. A waiting period of eight weeks is then required, after which time the council will either give consent to the works, refuse the works or grant a conditional consent.
- 3.3 *No work must be done to G5 until permission has been granted.*
- 3.4 The presence of a TPO represents the Local Authority's desire to retain trees within the landscape. As such, trees covered by a TPO are generally more likely to require retention within a proposed scheme and this should be taken into account during the design process. In some cases, the removal of TPO trees may be agreed upon, providing the benefits of the proposed development are deemed greater than the material loss of the trees. The value of existing vegetation is just one factor in the decision making process; all benefits of the proposed development will be taken into consideration in the usual manner.

4. Tree Descriptions and Recommendations

- 4.1 Full details of all individual trees surveyed are recorded in the tables at **Appendix 1**. A full explanation of the tables can be found at **Appendix 2**. Please refer also to the Tree Constraints Plan at **Appendix 6** for tree locations.

5. Discussion Relating to the Existing Treescape

5.1 Tree Condition & Recommended Works

- 5.1.1 The tree survey revealed a total of **10** items of vegetation (**4** individual trees, **4** groups of trees and **2** hedges). Of these, **2** groups were identified as retention category 'B', **7** trees/groups/hedges as retention category 'C' and **1** tree as category 'U'. Please refer to **Appendix 2** for retention category and definition criteria.
- 5.1.2 Within the survey, tree works may have been identified for reasons of public safety, to ensure the long-term health of the trees or for general maintenance purposes. Such recommendations have been made without regard to any projected layout and should be undertaken irrespective of development. These are summarised in the following sections. For full details on all recommendations, please refer to **Appendix 1**. For an explanation of the priority ratings, see **Appendix 2 (A2.2.5)**.

5.2 Tree Removals for Arboricultural Purposes

- 5.2.1 **1** tree (**T3**) was identified as retention category 'U'. Due to the location and the size of this tree it poses no health and safety risk, as such its removal is not necessary unless the land owner deems its removal necessary for aesthetic purposes.

5.3 Remedial Tree Works

- 5.3.1 Remedial tree works have been recommended to prevent the development of defects or for general maintenance purposes. This is relevant to **G5** and **T7** and has been recommended as a matter of **low priority**.

5.4 Monitoring / Further Investigation

- 5.4.1 In this case, no specific monitoring (re-inspecting and re-assessing) or further investigation works are considered necessary. However, all trees to be retained within the proposed development should be inspected on a regular basis in the interests of risk management.
- 5.4.2 Although the inspection was limited to **G9** due to brambles, dense low branches and location (as stated in **Appendix 1**), further inspection is not deemed necessary unless activity in this area increases.

5.5 Existing Site Constraints and General Design Advice

- 5.5.1 The following is an overview of the constraints on this site to development, along with general design considerations relating to the tree cover. The precise details of a proposed development are not known at present. The specific implications of a proposed design should be assessed within an Arboricultural Implications Assessment (AIA).
- 5.5.2 The retention categories of the trees surveyed are an indication of their overall values. The category of each item is listed at **Appendix 1** and an explanation of the retention categories is included at **Appendix 2**. As a general rule, those trees listed as retention category 'A' or 'B' are the most valuable items and as such the removal of these is likely to be met with resistance by the Local Planning Authority (LPA). Those items listed as retention category 'C' are of lesser value and the removal of these is less likely to be met with resistance by the LPA. Items listed as retention category 'U' are recommended for removal regardless of any proposals and should not present a constraint to construction. The above information should guide the design in terms of which trees are to be removed and which are to be retained. However, it should be noted that the retention of trees is just one consideration in the design process and each development will be taken for its merits.
- 5.5.3 The location of each tree is plotted on the associated Tree Constraints Plan at **Appendix 6**. This plan identifies the retention category of each tree (Retention A: green canopy, Retention B: blue canopy, Retention C: grey canopy, Retention U: red canopy), the crown spread, and also the associated rooting zone (Root Protection Area or RPA shown in gold). In order to enable the survival of trees shown to be retained within any proposals, both the canopy of the tree and its RPA must be completely avoided wherever possible. This relates to not just the location of new buildings, but also to the location of new areas of hard standing, proposed utility routes and any ground level changes (both excavations and soil piling). Where this is not possible, specialist construction methods and materials will need to be used.
- 5.5.4 Where information is available, the water demand of each tree is provided at **Appendix 1**, in accordance with NHBC Standards 2014 chapter 4.2. 'Building near trees'. The water demand of trees can affect adjacent structures and this is therefore included to inform foundation design, depth and the proximity of proposed structures to trees.
- 5.5.5 The majority of trees recommended for retention are situated close to the site boundary. This offers a potential window for development within the centre of the site.
- 5.5.6 An entrance already exists offering vehicular access to the site. If this can be retained it will minimise disturbance to tree roots and unnecessary tree removals.

- 5.5.7 Retained trees will require adequate protective measures during development. Such measures typically entail temporary protective fencing, installed to the full extent of the RPA. Where this is not entirely possible, ground protection may also comprise part of the protective measures. This includes a compaction reducing construction detail which enables a degree of construction traffic over/within the RPA.
- 5.5.8 As the RPAs of the trees will require fencing off as a protection measure, this should be brought into consideration when planning such things as access routes and material storage during development. It is accepted that in some cases it is not entirely possible to completely avoid the RPA or canopy lines within a new development. The consulting arboriculturalist should therefore be made aware of any such incursions to make comment and, where possible, advise on mitigation actions. Such details should be contained within an Arboricultural Implications Assessment (AIA).
- 5.5.9 No material storage is permitted within the RPA of retained trees unless confirmed to be acceptable by the consulting arboriculturalist. The exact details and location of protective measures should be included within an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS).
- 5.5.10 The position of the site compound is a major consideration. It is recommended that this, which typically includes the site office, facilities, toilets, storage of materials and parking, is located away from trees and outside the RPA.
- 5.5.11 Many development sites contain areas of nature conservation interest. Trees and hedgerows, in particular, can provide an important habitat for birds, bats, invertebrates and fungi and appropriate attention needs to be paid to preserving habitats throughout the development process. JCA can provide Ecological Surveys and Bat Surveys where required.
- 5.5.12 If a landscape planting scheme is proposed, consideration must be made at the planning stage as to where this is to be implemented on site. Such locations should be protected in order to prevent soil compaction and/or contamination and should therefore form part of the Construction Exclusion Zone. JCA can provide Tree Planting Schemes where required.

6. Conclusions

- 6.1 The trees surveyed were generally found to be in good condition.
- 6.2 **G5** is protected by a Tree Preservation Order.
- 6.3 **One** tree has been identified as retention category 'U', its removal would only be necessary for aesthetic purposes, as such its removal will be at the discretion of the land owner.
- 6.4 **Two** trees have been recommended for remedial works. This is to prevent the development of defects or for general maintenance purposes. These are discussed in **Section 5.3** and detailed at **Appendix 1**.
- 6.5 **One** group has been recommended for further investigation should activity in area increase. This is discussed in **Section 5.4** and detailed at **Appendix 1**.
- 6.6 Existing site constraints and general design advice has been provided in **Section 5.5**. Upon provision of specific proposals, site-specific advice can be given with regards to the impact on trees. In accordance with **Section 5.4** of **BS 5837: 2012**, the next stage on this site should be the preparation of an **Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA)**, which will illustrate and discuss the impact of the proposals on the trees and vice versa, to help to inform good design.
- 6.7 The data gained during the survey provides an indication of the health of the trees. However, it does not enable a comprehensive assessment of their condition over time. Trees are living organisms which are affected by many factors including weather conditions, diseases/disorders, light levels and human activities. Because of this, this report is only valid for a period of 1 year from the date of issuing. Should an update or revision of this report be required outside of this time period, JCA may require a further site visit to ensure that the condition of the trees has not significantly changed. It is advised that the trees are inspected regularly, in the interests of risk management.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Tree Descriptions and Recommendations

Tree Ref.	Age	Height (m)	Crown Height (m)	Height (m) and Direction of the Lowest Branch	Diameter (cm)	Crown Spread			Observations	Recommendations	Physiological Condition	Structural Condition	Amenity Value	NHBC Water Demand	Life Expectancy (yrs)	Retention Category
	Common Name					W	E	S								
H 1	Early-mature Leyland Cypress <i>X Cupressocyparis leylandii</i>	4	2	n/a n/a	Avg 40	See Plan			A boundary hedge located on adjacent land. Topped at 3m the canopy overhangs the site.	No action required	GOOD	GOOD	MOD	HIGH	20+	C 2
G 2	Early-mature Western Red Cedar <i>Thuja plicata</i>	9	2	1.5 n/a	41, 40	2.5	2.5	2.5	Consisting of two stems planted very closely, the stems lean away from each other slightly then become vertical. Metal is included into the northern stem. Minor bark damage noted between the stems.	No action required	GOOD	GOOD	LOW	MOD	20+	C 2
T 3	Semi-mature Elder <i>Sambucus nigra</i>	3	1.5	1.3 E	10, 12	1.5	1.5	1.5	A dead specimen.	No action required due to site usage.	DEAD	DEAD	DEAD	LOW	Dead	U
T 4	Semi-mature Sycamore <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	6	2	1.5 E	22	1	3.5	2	Single stemmed with a slight lean to the east. Some epicormic growth at the base, branching bias to the south due to suppression from adjacent dead Elder.	No action required	GOOD	GOOD	LOW	MOD	20+	C 1
G 5	Mature Sycamore <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	11	5	2 S	35, 44, 41, 49, 49	6	6	6	Consisting of one twin stemmed tree at 1m and three single stemmed trees, located on dilapidated field wall. Poor pruning wounds from crown lifting. Metal included into the base of the two southern stems, wire noted at 8m around one stem.	Remove wire at 8m, tidy up pruning cuts. Low	GOOD	GOOD	MOD	MOD	40+	B 2
H 6	Semi-mature Hawthorn <i>Crataegus monogyna</i>	1.5	0	n/a n/a	Avg 4	See Plan			A maintained garden hedge located on adjacent land. No major visible defects.	No action required	GOOD	GOOD	LOW	HIGH	20+	C 1
T 7	Early-mature Hawthorn <i>Crataegus monogyna</i>	5	2	1 n/a	6, 20	2	2	2	Located within H6 on adjacent land, this is single stemmed then bifurcating at 1m with a balanced crown. Clematis in crown to the east side. No major visible defects.	Sever Clematis growing into crown. Low	GOOD	GOOD	MOD	HIGH	20+	C 1
G 8	Semi-mature Sycamore <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	7	1.5	1 S	20, 10, 9, 19	1.5	2.5	1.5	Consisting of two trees. One is single stemmed bifurcating at 1m with a tight union. The second is triple stemmed from the base, wire from the adjacent fence is wrapt around two stems, old wire is included into the stems.	No action required	GOOD	GOOD	LOW	MOD	20+	C 1
G 9	Young to Mature Mixed	To 9	0+	n/a n/a	To # 30	See Plan			A boundary group consisting of mainly Hawthorn, Holly with occasional young Yew and Elder. The canopies overhang the site. Inspection was limited due to location behind fence with brambles and dense low branching. Good ecological value.	No action required	GOOD	GOOD	HIGH	LOW to HIGH	20+	B 2
T 10	Young Prunus sp. <i>Prunus sp.</i>	5	2	1.5 n/a	#10	1.5	1.5	1.5	Located at the bottom of a steep bank, this is a small insignificant specimen. Limited inspection due to access across brambles.	No action required	GOOD	GOOD	LOW	MOD	20+	C 1

Appendix 2: Explanation of Tree Descriptions

A2.1 Measurements/ Reference Information

A2.1.1 *REF NUMBER*. All items surveyed are allocated a reference number preceded with a letter, identifying the type of vegetation surveyed: T = an individual tree, G = a group of trees or an area of vegetation, W = woodland, H = a hedgerow.

A2.1.2 *SPECIES: COMMON AND BOTANICAL NAME*. The common and botanical names of the species present are noted. If the species is not clear or identifiable, then a general common name and genus will be noted.

A2.1.3 *AGE CLASS* of the tree is described as young, semi-mature, early-mature, mature, over-mature, veteran or dead.

A2.1.4 *HEIGHT* of the tree is measured in metres from the stem base to the top of the crown.

A2.1.5 *CROWN HEIGHT* is an indication of the height above ground level at which the crown begins.

A2.1.6 *STEM DIAMETER* is measured at 1.5 metres above (higher) ground level. Where the tree is multi-stemmed at this point; diameter measurements are taken for each stem. If more than five stems are present, an average stem diameter is taken. If for whatever reason it is not practical to measure multiple-stemmed trees in this way, the diameter is measured close to ground level, just above the root buttress.

A2.1.7 *CROWN SPREAD* is measured from the centre of the stem base to the tips of the branches to all four cardinal points.

A2.1.8 *HEIGHT AND DIRECTION OF LOWEST BRANCH*. The height and direction of the lowest significant branch is noted because of potential issues relating to clearances and the need for tree pruning.

A2.1.9 *NHBC WATER DEMAND*. The water demand of each tree, as listed in NHBC Standards 2010 Chapter 4.2 'Building near trees'. This is included to aid structural engineers, architects and other members of the design team as it determines foundation depth and other considerations with regard to trees.

A2.2 Evaluations

- A2.2.1 *PHYSIOLOGICAL CONDITION* is classed as good, fair, poor, or dead. This is an indication of the health and vitality of the tree and takes into account vigour, presence of disease and dieback.
- A2.2.2 *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.
- A2.2.3 *LIFE EXPECTANCY* is classed as; Dead, less than 10 years, 10+ years, 20+ years, or 40 + years. This is an indication of the minimum number of years before removal of the tree is likely to be required.
- A2.2.4 *AMENITY VALUE*. A general indication is given in respect to the amenity/landscape value of the tree/group within the surrounding area.
- A2.2.5 *PRIORITIES*. A priority rating is given concerning the time periods in which the recommended works should be undertaken. LOW priority works should be undertaken within 12 months of the survey, MOD (moderate) priority works should be undertaken within 6 months and HIGH priority works should be completed as soon as practically possible. If no works are recommended, N/A (not applicable) will be used.

A2.3 Retention Categories

- A2.3.1 *A (marked green on the plan) = Trees of high quality.*

These trees are of high quality and value with a good life expectancy (usually with an estimated remaining life expectancy of 40 years).

- A2.3.2 *B (marked in blue on the plan) = Trees of moderate quality.*

These trees are of moderate quality and value with a reasonable life expectancy (usually with an estimated life expectancy of at least 20 years).

- A2.3.3 *C (marked in grey on the plan) = Trees of low quality.*

These trees are of low quality and value but which are in adequate condition to remain or are young trees with a stem diameter below 15cm (usually with an estimated life expectancy of at least 10 years).

- A2.3.4 Trees categorised as retention category 'A', 'B' or 'C' are then justified by being further divided into 3 subcategories:

1 = Mainly arboricultural qualities.

2 = Mainly landscape qualities.

3 = Mainly cultural values, including conservation value.

A2.3.5 U (marked in red on the plan) = Trees usually unsuitable for retention due to poor condition.

These trees are in such a condition that they cannot be realistically retained as living trees in the context of the current land use for longer than 10 years. This may be due to any of the following:

- 1) Failure is likely due to serious, irredeemable, structural defects.
- 2) Removal of other category U trees will render them exposed and unstable.
- 3) They are in serious, overall decline or are dead.
- 4) They are of low quality and suppressing adjacent trees of better quality.
- 5) Diseases are present which may affect the health of adjacent trees.

These trees should be removed or treated in such a way as to make them safe where they have high ecological value, such as in a woodland setting.

Appendix 3: General Guidelines

- A3.1 All tree work should be undertaken to BS 3998: 2010 '*Recommendations for tree work*' or other recognised industry practice.
- A3.2 Staff carrying out the work must be qualified, experienced and ideally be Arboricultural Association approved contractors. They should be covered by adequate public liability insurance.
- A3.3 This report is based upon a visual inspection. The consultant 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 the guidelines and the terms listed therein.
- A3.4 Any defects seen by a contractor or the employer that were not apparent to the consultant must be brought to the consultant's attention immediately.
- A3.5 No liability can be accepted by JCA in respect of the trees unless the recommendations of this report are carried out under the supervision of JCA and within JCA's timescale.
- A3.6 It is advisable to have trees inspected by an arboricultural consultant on a regular basis.

Appendix 4: Glossary of Terms & Abbreviations

Arboriculture	The cultivation of trees in order to produce individual specimens of the greatest ornament, for shelter or any primary purpose other than the production of timber or fruit.
Canker	Disease damaged area of a tree, usually caused by fungus or bacteria affecting the bark.
Co-dominant stem	A stem which has grown in direct competition to the main stem and which has formed a substantial size influencing the appearance of the tree.
Crown lift	The removal of the lowest branches, usually to a given height. It allows more residual light and greater clearance underneath for vehicles etc.
Crown reduction	The reduction of a tree's height and spread while preserving its natural shape.
Crown thin	The removal of some of the density of a tree's crown, usually 5-15% allowing more light through its canopy and reducing wind resistance.
Deadwood	Either dead branches, or a procedure involving the removal of dead, dying and diseased branches.
Dieback	Where branches are beginning to show signs of death usually at the tips in the crown.
Epicormic shoots	Small branches that grow in clusters around the base of the stem of a tree or within the crown. This is usually as a result of bad pruning or some other stress factor, although can be a natural growth pattern for some species of tree (eg Lime species).
Formative pruning	The pruning of a tree to remove weaknesses and irregularities which may lead to future problems. The formative pruning operation is aimed at reducing the potential for future weaknesses or problems within the tree's crown and to encourage an optimal canopy shape.
Included bark	Where the bark on two adjoining branches or stems is growing tight together, forming a joint with limited physical strength.
Pollarding	A method of tree management in which the main trunk and principle branches of the tree are cut to the same height, and the resulting branches are then cropped on a regular basis.
Remedial pruning	The removal of old stubs, deadwood, epicormic growth, rubbing or crossing branches and other unwanted items from the tree's crown. Sometimes referred to as crown cleaning.

- RPA** Root Protection Area – Theoretical rooting area of a tree as defined in BS 5837:2012 *‘Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations’*.
- Topping** Topping is a form of pruning that removes terminal growth leaving a ‘stub’ cut end. Topping can cause serious health problems to a tree.

Appendix 5: Author Qualifications

Principal Consultant and Managing Director

Jonathan Cocking *F.R.E.S., Tech. Cert. (Arbor.A), PDipArb (RFS) FArborA CBiol MSB. MICFor.* Jonathan is a Registered Consultant and Fellow of the Arboricultural Association and sits on its Professional Committee. He has 31 years experience in the Arboricultural profession and served for eight years as Senior Arboriculturist with a large local authority before establishing JCA in 1997. Jonathan has since developed JCA's portfolio of services and its extensive client base. He is a Chartered Biologist, a Chartered Arboriculturalist and an Expert Witness with much experience of litigation work.

Technical Director

Toby Thwaites *BSc (Hons), HND (Arboriculture).* Toby joined JCA in 1998 after graduating in Ecology at the University of Huddersfield and has since graduated in Arboriculture at the University of Central Lancashire. A former JCA team leader and Consulting Arboriculturist, Toby is now Technical Director and oversees all office and on-site activities at JCA and is on hand to offer technical support and advice.

Consulting Staff: Arboriculture

Toby Parsons *Cert. Arb. (RFS), Tech. Cert. (Arbor.A).* Toby joined JCA after spending 6 years working as a senior climber for various Arboricultural contractors in the East Midlands and the South-West. He has gained the Level 2 Certificate in Arboriculture (RFS) and an Arboricultural Technicians Certificate. Toby is LANTRA certified in Professional Tree Inspection.

Scott Reid *ND (Arboriculture and Forestry).* Scott joined JCA after working with other consultancy companies in the south of England. He specialises in trees in relation to development and holds a National Diploma, various NPTC qualifications and is currently studying for his Level 4 Diploma in Arboriculture.

Andrew Bussey. Andrew joined JCA having spent 12 years working as a tree surgeon for various private companies and a Local Authority. He has various NPTC qualifications, is QTRA qualified and is currently studying for his Arboricultural Technicians Certificate.

Phil Humeniuk *FdSc (Arboriculture).* Phil joined JCA having spent 3 years working for various tree surgery companies and as a Tree Officer for a Local Authority. He also has several years experience working as a consultant both for JCA and for another consultancy. Phil obtained his foundation degree in Arboriculture at the University of Central Lancashire and has various NPTC's and is LANTRA certified in Professional Tree Inspection.

Emily Wilde *FdSc (Arboriculture).* Emily joined JCA having previously worked for various private tree surgery and consultancy companies over the past 8 years. She initially obtained a ND in Forestry & Arboriculture, followed by a FdSc in Arboriculture at Askham Bryan College, York. Emily has various NPTC certificates and is QTRA qualified.

Mick Eltringham *ND (Forestry).* Mick joined JCA after spending 12 years working in the industry for various private companies in the north and south of England. He has also spent the last five years working as a consultant for two canopy research projects in the Amazon Rainforest, working with Oxford University and the University of Arizona. He has various NPTC Qualifications.

Charles Cocking *(FdSc Arboriculture).* Charles joined JCA in January 2014 as an Apprentice having previously worked for the company on a part time basis during 2013. Charles obtained his Foundation Degree in Arboriculture at Askham Bryan College, York, and is now part of our qualified Arboricultural consultancy team.

Consulting Staff: Ecology

David Bodenham *BSc Ind (Hons) Zoology, MSc Biodiversity and Conservation.* David joined JCA as an addition to the expanding ecology department. An advocate of evidence based conservation, he studied Zoology (Ind) at University and moved onto an MSc in Biodiversity and Conservation where he gained the myriad of skills needed as an ecologist. With over 7 years of experience, David specialises in bat and amphibian ecology.

Jenny Butler *Bsc (Hons) Environmental Science.* Jenny joined JCA's ecology department in 2017, bringing with her a bachelor degree in Environmental Science from Bangor University. Jenny has previously worked as an Environmental Consultant for an Agri-Environment company and as a freelance ecological consultant. Jenny specialises in great crested newt and bat ecology.

Amanda Beck *Cert He in Field Ecology.* Amanda joined JCA's ecology department in 2018, previously working as a freelance Ecological Consultant in North Wales and Liverpool and as a trainee Ecologist in South Wales. Amanda has extensive practical experience in surveying for botanical, amphibians, terrestrial and marine mammals along with invertebrate research work. She has practical experience in habitat management and creation and is a CIEEM student member.

Administrative Staff

Sue Guest Administrative Team Leader.

Catherine Cocking Accounts Manager.

Lisa Hampson Marketing Manager.

Simeon Haigh *BSc (Hons).* IT Director.

Lorraine Spink Administrative Assistant.

Appendix 6: Tree Constraints Plan

Cliff Hill



Root Protection Area: RPA

THE ROOT PROTECTION AREA (RPA) INDICATES THE LIKELY ROOTING ZONE OF A TREE.

THIS AREA SHOULD IDEALLY REMAIN UNDISTURBED IF THE TREE IS TO BE RETAINED.

THE DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS SHOULD THEREFORE BE DESIGNED TO AVOID THE RPA OF ANY TREE WHICH IS TO BE RETAINED.

IF IT IS NECESSARY FOR THE DEVELOPMENT TO ENCRUCH INTO THE RPA OF A TREE WHICH IS TO BE RETAINED THEN SPECIALIST CONSTRUCTION TECHNIQUES AND MATERIALS MUST BE CONSIDERED.

Appendix 6: Tree Constraints Plan

ADDRESS: Land at Cumberworth Lane,
Denby Dale, HD8 8RU.
JCA REF: 14057a/ME

SCALE: 1:500 PAPER SIZE: A3
SURVEYED BY: ME DRAWN BY: ME APPROVED BY: CC

BRITISH STANDARD 5837:2012: 4.5
RETENTION CATEGORIES

Detailed definitions of these categories are at Appendix 2 of our report. N.B. These categories do not necessarily represent or correspond to recommendations for action made in this report.

	CATEGORY A: 'RETENTION MOST DESIRABLE'
	CATEGORY B: 'RETENTION DESIRABLE'
	CATEGORY C: 'TREE WHICH COULD BE RETAINED'
	CATEGORY U: 'TREE FOR REMOVAL'
	STEM OF TREE TO BE RETAINED
	STEM OF TREE TO BE REMOVED
	ROOT PROTECTION AREA



I hope that this report provides all the necessary information, but should any further advice be needed please do not hesitate to contact the author.

Signed

.....
Mick Eltringham *ND (Forestry)*.

16th April 2018

For and on behalf of *JCA Ltd*

Registered Office:

**Unit 80
Bowers Mill
Branch Road
Barkisland
Halifax
HX4 0AD**

**Tel. 01422 376335
Fax. 01422 376232
Email: jon@jcaac.com**

www.jcaac.com

Report printed on recycled paper

JCA Ltd. Arboricultural and Ecological Consultants

Professional Tree and Ecology Advice nationwide

ARBORICULTURAL SERVICES

Guidance for Architects and Developers

- British Standard 5837 Tree Surveys
- Arboricultural Implication Assessments (AIA)
- Arboricultural Method Statements (AMS)

Tree Advice for the Legal Profession

- Subsidence Litigation
- Personal Injury and Accident Investigation
- Expert Witness, Planning Inquiries and Appeals

Advice for Engineers, Loss Adjusters and Insurers

- Tree Surveys for Subsidence
- Heave Assessment
- Tree Root Identification

Veteran Tree Management

- Ancient Woodland Management
- Veteran Tree Management

Advice for Local Authorities and Social Housing

- Tree Safety Surveys
- Specialist Decay Detection
- Landscape and Orchard Design

Tree Health and Pest and Disease Management

- Pest and Disease Surveys
- Tree Health Checks
- Disease Mitigation and Control

ECOLOGICAL SERVICES

Ecological Pre-Planning Services

- Phase 1 Habitat Surveys
- Great Crested Newt eDNA Sampling
- Protected Species: Bat, Wintering and Nesting Bird, Badger, Amphibian, Otter, Water Vole, White-Clawed Crayfish, Dormice and Reptile Surveys.
- Preparation for Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)
- Invasive Species Surveys
- Code for Sustainable Homes

Ecological Post-Planning Services

- Biodiversity Enhancement Plans
- Protected Species Mitigation
- Ecological Management (Bat and Bird box installation and inspection)

HEAD QUARTERS:

Unit 80 Bowers Mill,
Branch Road,
Barkisland,
Halifax, HX4 0AD.

Tel: 01422 376335
Mobile: 07778 391986
Email: jon@jcaac.com
Website: www.jcaac.com

