



ARBORICULTURAL REPORT

& Impact Assessment

to **BS5837:2012** at:

***Woodhead Road,
Birstall,
Batley,
WF17 9TD***

Prepared for:
FDA Landscape Ltd

Date: *January 2024*

Reference: *AWA5815*



Contents

1. Introduction.....	3
1.1 Instructions and Brief	3
1.2 Survey Details	3
2. The Site.....	4
2.1 Location and Description	4
3. The Trees.....	5
3.1 Legal	5
3.2 Tree Survey Results	6
3.3 Photographs	8
4. Arboricultural Impact Assessment	9
4.1 Proposed New Development.....	9
4.2 Direct Impacts.....	9
4.3 Indirect Impacts	10
4.4 Suitable Mitigation	10
4.5 Protection of the Retained Trees.....	10
5. Signature	11
Appendix 1: Authors Qualifications & Experience.....	13
Appendix 2: Survey Methodology and Limitations of Report	14
Appendix 3: Explanation of Tree Descriptions	15
Appendix 4: Tree Data	16
Appendix 5: Tree Constraints Plan.....	17
Appendix 6: Tree Impacts Plan	18

1. Introduction

1.1 Instructions and Brief

- 1.1.1 We have been instructed by FDA Landscape Ltd to visit the site and prepare our findings in a report.
- 1.1.2 The report is required in accordance with BS 5837:2012 *Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations*, to provide detailed, independent, arboricultural advice on the trees present, in the context of potential development.

1.2 Survey Details

- 1.2.1 The survey took place during February 2021.
- 1.2.2 The trees were surveyed visually from the ground using “Visual Tree Assessment” techniques and in accordance with the guiding principles of British Standard 5837:2012.
- 1.2.3 Any additional off-site trees that could impact a new development design have been included in the tree survey parameters.
- 1.2.4 We have been provided with a topographical survey with tree positions plotted. Where surveyed trees were not included on the topographical survey the tree positions were plotted using enhanced GPS technology (1-2m accuracy) and laser distance measurer.
- 1.2.5 This report has been prepared by Mr Adam Winson, Chartered Arboriculturist, MSc, BSc (Hons), MICFor, MArborA, Principle and Director of AWA Tree Consultants Ltd.
- 1.2.6 The tree survey and data collection was carried out by Mr Tom Readman Cert Arb L3, Level 4 Forestry and Arboriculture, TechArborA, Arboriculturist at AWA Tree Consultants Ltd.
- 1.2.7 Full qualifications and experience are included within **Appendix 1**. Explanatory details regarding the survey methodology are included within **Appendix 2**. A full explanation of the tree data can be found at **Appendix 3**. Full details of all the trees surveyed are found in **Appendix 4**. For tree locations refer to the Tree Constraints Plan at **Appendix 5** and for detail of the impacts of the new development refer to the Tree Impacts Plan at **Appendix 6**.

2. The Site

2.1 Location and Description

- 2.1.1 The site is an empty plot in Birstall Shopping Park, a large complex of shops, restaurants and offices located to the north-east of Birstall, a market town in the Metropolitan Borough of Kirklees.
- 2.1.2 The site has previously been developed, but prior to survey had been levelled. There are several large piles of rubble, and occasional loose debris.
- 2.1.3 The approximate area of the survey is highlighted in the image below (Google Earth, 2020):



3. The Trees

3.1 Legal

- 3.1.1 The following advice is for guidance purposes only. Some trees are protected by legislation, and it is essential that the legal status of trees is established prior to carrying out works to them. Unauthorised work to protected trees could lead to prosecution, resulting in enforcement action such as fines or a criminal record. Tree Preservation Orders, Conservation Areas, Planning Conditions, Felling Licences or Restrictive Covenants legally protect many trees in the UK.
- 3.1.2 An online search was undertaken with Kirklees Council on 22/01/24 to check whether any trees at the site are protected by a Tree Preservation Order or are located within a Conservation Area. As of this date no trees at the site are protected by a Tree Preservation Order or are within a Conservation Area.
- 3.1.3 Due to the large potential penalties for illegally carrying out work to protected trees, before authorising any tree works a further check should be made with the Local Planning Authority to confirm if any trees are covered by a Tree Preservation Order or are within a Conservation Area. If either applies, then statutory permission is required before any works can take place (unless such work is approved as part of full planning permission).
- 3.1.4 The Multi-Agency Geographical Information for the Countryside (MAGIC) website was used to search for areas of ancient woodlands listed on the Ancient Woodland (DEFRA 2021), and a check for catalogued Ancient and Veteran trees using the woodland trust ancient tree inventory (ATI) (Woodland Trust 2021).
- 3.1.5 It was confirmed that there are no designated ancient woodlands or veteran or ancient trees within the survey area.
- 3.1.6 Trees provide a wide range of habitats for many species, some of which are legally protected such as bats, nesting birds, badgers and dormice. It is essential that appropriate care is taken to ensure that this legislation is not contravened.
- 3.1.7 When appointing a tree surgeon, only properly qualified and experienced companies should be used, who have adequate Public Liability and Employer's Liability Insurance. All tree work should be carried out according to British Standard 3998:2010 Tree Work - Recommendations.

3.2 Tree Survey Results

- 3.2.1 The tree survey revealed 27 items of woody vegetation, comprised of 24 individual trees and 3 groups of trees.
- 3.2.2 Of the surveyed trees: 2 trees and 1 tree group are retention category 'B' and the remaining 24 trees and groups are retention category 'C' (explanatory details regarding the retention categories are included at Appendix 3).
- 3.2.3 Species diversity at the site is relatively good, including Alder, Ash, Birch, Cherry, Maple, Poplar, Rowan and Willow. Most of the trees are semi-mature, with occasional early-mature trees.
- 3.2.4 Within the central area of the site, there is little of arboricultural significance, with the only vegetation consisting of self-set whips toward the western boundary of the site, which fall outside the scope of a BS5837 survey.
- 3.2.5 At the northern boundary of the site, close to the road, are trees T1 to T9, T26 and T27. These trees are situated in banking, and in dense understory that prevented detailed inspection. Individually the trees have limited value, but have collective value as a screen between the road and the site.
- 3.2.6 In the north-east corner of the site are Birch T14 and Cherry T15 and T16. These trees are currently in reasonable condition and have moderate amenity value, however T15 had some minor dieback and dead wood in the crown which may indicate slightly more limited long-term prospects.
- 3.2.7 At the east, south and west boundaries of the site are large, shelterbelt groups of trees G17, G23 and G25, which contain occasional larger trees T18 to T22, and T26. G23 is a large, dense group of predominantly semi-mature Birch, Alder and Pine that has moderate value as a screen between the site and buildings to the south-west. G17 and G25 have more limited collective screening value. There are occasional failed stems and branches within these groups, including a prominent, low hazard beam failure at the eastern aspect of G17. Trees in groups, including individually numbered trees, have limited individual value, but do contribute to the more moderate collective screening value of the groups.
- 3.2.1 Poplar T19, situated within G17, has a prominent hanging branch at its eastern aspect that should be removed regardless of any new development (as detailed in Appendix 4)
- 3.2.2 The remaining trees and shrubs within the site are of particularly low value and should not pose any significant constraint on the development

potential of the site.

- 3.2.3 Many of the Ash trees in the area show symptoms consistent with Chalara or Ash dieback disease. Once a tree is infected, the disease is usually fatal, either directly or indirectly. While the identified Ash trees may continue to provide landscape and wildlife benefits for some time, their long-term prospects are likely to be limited as a result of Ash dieback.
- 3.2.4 Some trees were covered in dense Ivy or were inaccessible (as detailed in Appendix 4). In such cases measurements were estimated and the condition values are indicative only.
- 3.2.5 The tree Root Protection Area (RPA) for each tree has been plotted as a polygon centred on the base of the stem. Due to the presence of roads, structures, topography (and past tree management) the RPA is likely to be a simplified representation of the tree roots actual morphology and disposition. However, detailed modifications to the shape of the RPA would largely be based on conjecture and so have been avoided.

3.3 Photographs



Photo 1: The central area of the site, viewed from the north



Photo 2: Trees at the northern boundary of the site, situated in dense shrub beds



Photo 3: T15 and T16, two of the mature trees on site



Photo 4: G17, at the eastern boundary of the site



Photo 5: G23 at the southern boundary, screening the site from adjacent office buildings



Photo 6: G25 and T26, at the western boundary of the site

4. Arboricultural Impact Assessment

4.1 Proposed New Development

4.1.1 It is proposed to build a new build a new Lidl food store, and a separate retail unit, with associated access and facilities. The development proposals have been provided by my client and inform this arboricultural impact assessment and the Tree Impacts Plan at Appendix 6.

4.2 Direct Impacts

4.2.1 From assessing the new development proposals, the removal of 9 trees and 1 tree group will be required as they are situated in the footprint of the development, or their retention and protection throughout the development is not suitable.

4.2.2 The trees and groups that are required to be removed are T4, T14, T16, T18, T19, T20, T21, T22, T24 and G25.

4.2.3 T14 and T16 are retention category 'B' trees, with limited defects and moderate amenity value. The removal of T14 and T16 will have moderate arboricultural impact.

4.2.4 The remaining trees and groups are lower value, retention category 'C'. Due to the low value of these trees to be removed the removals will have only a negligible negative arboricultural impact.

4.2.5 2 tree groups require partial removal to facilitate the development, these are G17 and G23.

4.2.6 The north-western aspect of G17 will be removed, to the boundary line. The north-western extent of G23 will be removed to facilitate the proposed foodstore, while the eastern aspect will be pruned to the boundary line to facilitate the retail unit and garden centre. Both groups will continue to provide effective screening from the road and adjacent buildings.

4.2.7 2 trees require pruning works to facilitate the development, these are T5 and T26.

4.2.8 The crown of T5 currently overhangs the proposed parking spaces and as such should be raised by 1-2m to facilitate the development. The eastern crown of T26 is currently overhanging slightly into the location of the proposed retail unit. As such, the eastern aspect of T26 should be reduced by 2 -3m to facilitate the development and provide adequate clearance for future growth.

4.3 Indirect Impacts

- 4.3.1 The tree Root Protection Area (RPA) detailed on the Tree Plans at Appendices 5 and 6, has been used as a layout design tool, to inform on the area around a tree where the protection of the roots and soil structure is treated as a priority.
- 4.3.2 New landscaping is proposed that encroaches into the edge of the RPAs of T1 – T3, T5, T11, T13, T15 and G23. The construction of hard surfaces within the RPA can have negative impacts on tree roots. However, the potential negative impacts can often be overcome or minimised by employing a 'no-dig' type construction methods with a porous final surface.
- 4.3.3 Potentially damaging activities are proposed in the vicinity of retained trees. The new development encroaches into the edge of the RPA of G17 and G23. However, part of G17 and G23 will be removed to facilitate development, and it is unlikely that the development will affect the RPA of retained trees in these groups. Additionally, as the site has been developed previously, it is unlikely the significant roots will have developed within the site boundary. As such, retained trees should remain largely unaffected by the works, provided care is taken during construction.
- 4.3.4 The buildability of the proposed development has been assessed in terms of access, adequate working space and provision for the storage of materials, including topsoil, in relation to the trees.

4.4 Suitable Mitigation

- 4.4.1 The development of the site provides an excellent opportunity to undertake new tree planting throughout the site as part of a soft landscaping scheme. As such, suitable new tree planting has the potential to mitigate for the required tree removals and, in the longer term, has the potential to improve the sites tree cover.

4.5 Protection of the Retained Trees

- 4.5.1 The retained trees may require protection by fencing in accordance with BS 5837: 2012, during the development phase.
- 4.5.2 If required by the Local Planning Authority, an associated Arboricultural Method Statement, detailing protective fencing specifications and construction methods close to the retained trees can be provided.

5. Signature

I trust this report provides all the required information.

Signed



.....
Adam Winson, Chartered Arboriculturist, MSc, BSc (Hons), MICFor, ACIEEM.

22nd January 2023

**AWA Tree Consultants Limited
Union Forge
27 Mowbray Street
Sheffield
S3 8EN**

www.awatrees.com



Institute of
Chartered Foresters
Registered Consultant

Appendices

Appendix 1: Authors Qualifications and Experience

Appendix 2: Survey Methodology and Limitations

Appendix 3: Explanation of Tree Descriptions

Appendix 4: Tree Data

Appendix 5: Tree Constraints Plan

Appendix 6: Tree Impacts Plan

Appendix 1: Authors Qualifications & Experience

Adam Winson, Chartered Arboriculturist, MSc, BSc (Hons), MICFor, MArborA, ACIEEM, QTRA Registered

Adam is the company Director and Principal Consultant. He has a mix of the highest-level academic qualifications and relevant work experience. He has worked within the tree care profession for over 20 years and was awarded an MSc in Arboriculture and Urban Forestry, with distinction. Adam is a Chartered Arboriculturist and a Registered Consultant with the Institute of Chartered Foresters, a Professional Member of the Arboricultural Association and he has original research published by the UK Forestry Commission. His work ranges from individual expert tree inspections to managing trees on major infrastructure projects. His work often involves trees with preservation orders or litigation, and he has appeared as a tree expert, at planning appeal hearings up to the crown court. Adam also regularly undertakes locum Tree Officer work for several Local Planning Authorities.

James Brown, BSc (Hons) Arboriculture, MArborA, PTI (Lantra), QTRA Registered

James is a highly experienced and qualified Arboricultural Consultant. He has a BSc (Hons) in Arboriculture, attaining first class honours, as well as being awarded the Institute of Chartered Foresters student award. He is a Professional Member of the Arboricultural Association, an Associate of the Institute of Chartered Foresters, and he is working towards becoming a Chartered Arboriculturist. James joined AWA in 2016, he has many years' experience as an Arboricultural Consultant, he previously worked in Europe's largest container tree nursery and he has experience of local authority Tree Officer work.

James Godfrey, BA (Hons), FdSc Arboriculture and Tree Management, TechArborA, PTI (Lantra), QTRA Registered

James has had extensive arboricultural experience working as an arborist within the public and private sector. While working at AWA, James completed his FdSc in Arboriculture and Tree Management, graduating with a distinction and was also awarded for achieving the highest overall mark in his year. James has used his arboricultural knowledge to inform and carry out accurate tree surveys and produce detailed reports that aim to balance appropriate tree retention with the requirements of landowners.

Joe Thomas, MSci Biology, Award L4 Arboriculture, TechArborA, QTRA Registered

Joe achieved a first class degree in Biology with an integrated Masters (MSci) from the University of Sheffield. Additionally, he has a Level 4 Award in Arboriculture. Joe joined AWA after an Urban Forestry role with the Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust and Sheffield City Council, where he gained a variety of experience in different aspects of the arboriculture sector.

Lucy Garbutt, MSc Animal Behaviour, BSc (Hons) Biology, CIEEM membership

Lucy graduated with a masters degree in Animal Behaviour from the UK's highest rated university, St Andrews of Scotland, immediately following the completion of her BSc degree in Biology from Lancaster University. Lucy has experience in botany and plant science and moved into arboriculture after previous experience of protected species and botanical surveys with a large environmental consulting company.

Sophie Beckerman, BA (Hons), Dip Arboriculture Level 4, TechArborA

Sophie has more than 10 years' experience as an arborist, working for a variety of private companies as well as undertaking tree management with Sheffield City Council Ranger Service and The Wildlife Trust. Her expertise in arboriculture is demonstrated in the practical NPTC qualifications gained, and her excellent knowledge is reflected in the L4 diploma in Arboriculture, which she completed while working. Her roles as a climbing arborist and team leader included estimating for jobs and project management, supervising tree contracting teams - ensuring that work is carried out safely and efficiently and that health and safety standards are adhered to, and risk assessments are carried out.

Mr Tom Readman Cert Arb L3, Level 4 Forestry and Arboriculture, TechArborA

Tom joined AWA from his previous role as a tree risk surveyor with Harrogate Borough Council, where he undertook tree risk surveys at a range of sites and prescribed suitable works. Tom also has extensive previous experience as a climbing arborist. Tom achieved at Distinction Star, and was recognised as the student of the year, in the Extended Diploma in Forestry and Arboriculture and is now completing a Foundation Degree in Arboriculture, while working at AWA. Tom's work focuses on tree risk surveys and accurate tree data collection for development projects to BS 5837:2012.

Appendix 2: Survey Methodology and Limitations of Report

The survey was undertaken in accordance with British Standard 5837:2012 *Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations*. The trees were assessed objectively and without reference to any proposed site layout. The trees were surveyed from the ground using 'Visual Tree Assessment' (VTA) methodology. VTA is appropriate and is endorsed by industry guidance. It is used by arboriculturists to evaluate the structural integrity of a tree, relying on observation of trees biomechanical and physiological features. Measurements are obtained using a diameter tape, clinometer, laser distometer and loggers tape. Where this is not practical measurements are estimated. Tree groups have been identified in instances as defined in BS 5837:2012. Shrubs and insignificant trees may have been omitted from the survey.

This report represents a BS5837 tree survey and should not be accepted as a detailed tree safety inspection report; however, tree related hazards are recorded and commented upon where observed, yet no guarantee can be given as to the absolute safety or otherwise of any individual tree. All recommended tree work must be to BS 3998:2010 - '*Tree Work: Recommendations*'.

The findings and recommendations contained within this report are valid for a period of twelve months from the date of survey. The author 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 these guidelines and terms.

Appendix 3: Explanation of Tree Descriptions

HEIGHT of the tree is measured from the stem base in metres. Where the ground has a significant slope the higher ground is selected.

CROWN HEIGHT is an indication of the average height at which the crown begins and includes information of the first significant branch and direction of growth.

STEM DIAMETER is measured at 1.5 metres above (higher) ground level. Where the tree is multi-stemmed at this point; the diameter is measured close to ground level or else a combined stem diameter is calculated.

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

AGE CLASS of the tree is described as young, semi-mature, early-mature, mature, or over-mature.

PHYSIOLOGICAL CONDITION is classed as good, fair, poor, or dead. This is an indication of the health of the tree and takes into account vigour, presence of disease and dieback.

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.

LIFE EXPECTANCY is classed as; less than 10 years, 10-20 years, 20-40 years, or more than 40 years. This is an indication of the number of years before removal of the tree is likely to be required.

Retention Categories

A (marked in green on Appendix 5) = retention most desirable. These trees are of very high quality and value with a good life expectancy.

B (marked in blue on Appendix 5) = retention desirable. These trees are of good quality and value with a significant life expectancy.

C (marked in black on Appendix 5) = trees which could be retained. These trees are of low or average quality and value, and are in adequate condition to remain until new planting could be established.

U (marked in red on Appendix 5) = trees for removal. These trees are in such a condition that any existing value would be lost within 10 years.

TREE DATA

Tree ID	Tree Species		Maturity	Measurements				Crown (m)				Tree Condition						Value		Management		
	Common Name	Latin Name		Height (m)	Stems	Stem Diameter (mm)	Estimated	Ave Height	N	E	S	W	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Physiological	Structural	Life Expectancy	Amenity	Category	Works
T1	Ash	<i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>	Early-mature	8.5	1	400	Yes	2	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	Limited access around base	Single stemmed at base, Vertical, Ivy covered, Stubs	Minor deadwood, Minor dieback, Overhanging into the site	Ivy prevented detailed inspection. Situated on banking. Some Ash Dieback symptoms	Fair	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Moderate	C	No works required.
T2	Rowan	<i>Sorbus aucuparia</i>	Early-mature	7	1	250	Yes	2.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	Limited access around base, Soil erosion, Exposed roots	Single stemmed at base, Multiple stemmed at 2m, Vertical, Ivy covered	Minor deadwood	Ivy prevented detailed inspection. Situated on banking, in shrub bed.	Fair	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	No works required.
T3	Maple	<i>Acer saccharinum</i>	Semi-mature	11	1	250	Yes	4	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	Limited access around base	Single stemmed, Vertical, Bark damage at north-east aspect, Ivy covered	Minor deadwood	Ivy and access prevented detailed inspection	Fair	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	No works required.
T4	Birch	<i>Betula pendula</i>	Mature	11	1	400	Yes	1	3	3.5	3.5	3	Limited access around base, Soil erosion, Exposed roots	Single stemmed, Slight lean east, Stubs, Ivy covered	Overhanging into the site, Minor deadwood, Old pruning wounds		Good	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Moderate	C	Removal required to facilitate the development.
T5	Birch	<i>Betula pendula</i>	Early-mature	10	1	300	Yes	1	3	3	3	3	Limited access around base, Soil erosion, Exposed roots	Single stemmed, Vertical, Ivy covered		Ivy and access prevented detailed inspection	Good	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	Pruning works required to facilitate the development - raise the crown by 1 - 2m to facilitate the proposed parking spaces.

Tree ID	Tree Species		Maturity	Measurements				Crown (m)				Tree Condition						Value		Management		
	Common Name	Latin Name		Height (m)	Stems	Stem Diameter (mm)	Estimated	Ave Height	N	E	S	W	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Physiological	Structural	Life Expectancy	Amenity	Category	Works
T6	Birch	<i>Betula pendula</i>	Early-mature	11	1	300	Yes	2	3	3	3	3	Limited access around base, Exposed roots, Soil erosion	Vertical, Ivy covered		Ivy and access prevented detailed inspection	Good	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	No works required.
T7	Maple	<i>Acer saccharinum</i>	Early-mature	6	1	250	Yes	2.5	4.5	4	4.5	2	Limited access around base, Exposed roots, Soil erosion	Single stemmed, Vertical, Ivy covered	Unbalanced	Ivy and access prevented detailed inspection. Suppressed by T6	Good	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	No works required.
T8	Sorbus	<i>Sorbus sp.</i>	Semi-mature	5	1	150	Yes	3	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	Limited access around base, Soil erosion, Exposed roots	Single stemmed, Vertical, Minor bark damage	Minor deadwood, Occasional tear	Access prevented detailed inspection	Fair	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	No works required.
T9	Plane	<i>Platanus x hispanica</i>	Semi-mature	6.5	1	150	Yes	3.5	2	2	2	1	Limited access around base, Soil erosion, Exposed roots	Single stemmed, Vertical	Slightly unbalanced	Aprevented detailed inspection	Good	Fair	>40 yrs	Low	C	No works required.
T10	Birch	<i>Betula pendula</i>	Semi-mature	7	1	190	No	3	3.5	2.5	1	3	No visual defects	Single stemmed, Slight lean east, Stubs	Minor deadwood		Fair	Good	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	No works required.
T11	Birch	<i>Betula pendula</i>	Semi-mature	12	1	200	Yes	2	3	3.5	4	3.5	Limited access around base	Single stemmed, Vertical	Overhanging into the site	Aprevented detailed inspection shrubs	Good	Good	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	No works required.

TREE DATA

Tree ID	Tree Species		Maturity	Measurements				Crown (m)				Tree Condition						Value		Management				
	Common Name	Latin Name		Height (m)	Stems	Stem Diameter (mm)	Estimated	Ave Height	N	E	S	W	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Physiological	Structural	Life Expectancy	Amenity	Category	Works		
T12	Rowan	<i>Sorbus aucuparia</i>	Semi-mature	5	1	100	No	2	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	Limited access around base	Single stemmed, Vertical, Epicormic growths					Fair	Good	10 to 20 yrs	Low	C	No works required.
T13	Cherry	<i>Prunus avium</i>	Semi-mature	6	1	150	Yes	2.5	3	3.5	4	3.5	Limited access around base	Single stemmed, Vertical, Bark damage, Minor decay	Moderate dieback, Minor deadwood	Bark damage with decay at north-west aspect. Shrubs prevented detailed inspection of base	Poor	Fair	10 to 20 yrs	Low	C	No works required.		
T14	Birch	<i>Betula pendula</i>	Mature	12	1	450	Yes	2.5	4	4	4	4	Limited access around base	Single stemmed, Slight lean, Ivy covered	Overhanging into the site	Ivy prevented detailed inspection. High understory	Good	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Moderate	B	Removal required to facilitate the development.		
T15	Cherry	<i>Prunus avium</i>	Mature	12	1	500	Yes	3	7	7.5	4	5.5	Limited access around base	Single stemmed, Vertical	Minor dieback, Minor deadwood, Overhanging into the site	Ivy prevented detailed inspection. High understory	Fair	Good	20 to 40 yrs	Moderate	C	No works required.		
T16	Cherry	<i>Prunus avium</i>	Mature	12	1	550	Yes	2.5	4.5	7	7	7.5	Limited access around base	Single stemmed, Vertical, Tight union, Cup-like union collecting dirt/water	Minor deadwood	Ivy prevented detailed inspection. High understory	Good	Good	20 to 40 yrs	Moderate	B	Removal required to facilitate the development.		
G17	Alder, Cherry, Willow	<i>Alnus sp., Prunus sp., Salix sp.</i>	Semi-mature	11	10+	250 avg	Yes	1.5	See Plan				Shelterbelt group at roadside. Bramble and Laurel understory, occasionally dense preventing detailed inspection. Prominent hazard beam at southern aspect. Trees have low individual value but moderate collective screening value				Fair	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Moderate	C	Partial removal required to facilitate the development.		

TREE DATA

Tree Species		Measurements						Crown (m)				Tree Condition						Value		Management		
Tree ID	Common Name	Latin Name	Maturity	Height (m)	Stems	Stem Diameter (mm)	Estimated	Ave Height	N	E	S	W	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Physiological	Structural	Life Expectancy	Amenity	Category	Works
T18	Birch	<i>Betula pendula</i>	Early-mature	15	1	350	No	3	6	6.5	3	5	No visual defects	Single stemmed, Vertical, then slight lean at 2m, Tight union	Slightly unbalanced, Overhanging into the site	Suppressed	Good	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Moderate	C	Removal required to facilitate the development.
T19	Poplar	<i>Populus x canadensis</i>	Early-mature	17	1	530	No	4	7.5	8	4.5	7	No visual defects	Single stemmed, Slight lean north	Snapped /hanging branches, Overhanging into the site	Hanging branch, due to hazard beam failure, at east aspect	Fair	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Moderate	C	Removal required to facilitate the development.
T20	Birch	<i>Betula pendula</i>	Early-mature	15	1	370	No	3	4	4.5	3	4.5	No visual defects	Single stemmed at base, Twin stemmed at 3m, Vertical	Overhanging into the site		Good	Good	20 to 40 yrs	Moderate	C	Removal required to facilitate the development.
T21	Birch	<i>Betula pendula</i>	Early-mature	15	1	350	No	3	3	4	4.5	4	No visual defects	Single stemmed, Vertical	Slightly unbalanced, Overhanging into the site		Good	Good	20 to 40 yrs	Moderate	C	Removal required to facilitate the development.
T22	Maple	<i>Acer saccharinum</i>	Early-mature	13	1	350	No	2	5	4.5	5.5	5.5	Limited access around base	Single stemmed, Vertical	Overhanging into the site	Ivy prevented detailed inspection. High understory	Good	Good	20 to 40 yrs	Moderate	C	Removal required to facilitate the development.


TREE DATA







Tree ID	Tree Species		Maturity	Measurements				Crown (m)				Tree Condition						Value		Management		
	Common Name	Latin Name		Height (m)	Stems	Stem Diameter (mm)	Estimated	Ave Height	N	E	S	W	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Physiological	Structural	Life Expectancy	Amenity	Category	Works
G23	Alder, Birch, Maple, Poplar, Pine, Willow	<i>Alnus sp., Betula sp., Acer sp., Populus sp., Pinus sp., Salix sp.</i>	Semi-mature	11	10+	250 avg	Yes	2	See Plan				Shelterbelt group at roadside, and between site and buildings to west. On banking. Cotoneaster and Laurel understory, with occasional Hazel. Access prevented detailed inspection. Some stems ivy covered. Edge stems measured to give approximate RPA. Trees have low individual value but moderate collective screening value				Good	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Moderate	B	Partial removal required to facilitate the development. Prune as required from north and east to facilitate the development - do not prune beyond boundary.
T24	Rowan	<i>Sorbus aucuparia</i>	Semi-mature	6	1	160	No	2	2	2	2	2	No visual defects	Single stemmed, Vertical, Stubs, Old pruning wounds	Single stemmed, Vertical, Stubs, Old pruning wounds	In shrub bed	Good	Good	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	Removal required to facilitate the development.
G25	Alder, Birch, Plane, Pine, Willow	<i>Alnus sp., Betula sp., Platanus., Pinus sp., Salix sp.</i>	Semi-mature	14	10+	250 avg	Yes	2	See Plan				Shelterbelt group at roadside. On banking. Cotoneaster and Laurel understory, with occasional Hazel. Access prevented detailed inspection. Some stems ivy covered. Edge stems measured to give approximate RPA. Trees have low individual value but moderate collective screening value				Good	Far	20 to 40 yrs	Moderate	C	Removal required to facilitate the development.
T26	Poplar	<i>Populus x canadensis</i>	Early-mature	17	1	550	No	4	11	10	8.5	9.5	Soil erosion, Exposed roots, Limited access around base	Single stemmed at base, Slight lean north, Twin stemmed at 3m, Ivy covered	Overhanging into the site	Ivy prevented detailed inspection. Situated on banking	Good	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Moderate	C	Pruning works required to facilitate the development - reduce the eastern crown by 2 - 3m to facilitate the proposed retail unit.

TREE DATA

Tree Species		Measurements						Crown (m)				Tree Condition						Value		Management		
Tree ID	Common Name	Latin Name	Maturity	Height (m)	Stems	Stem Diameter (mm)	Estimated	Ave Height	N	E	S	W	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Physiological	Structural	Life Expectancy	Amenity	Category	Works
T27	Rowan	<i>Sorbus aucuparia</i>	Semi-mature	6.5	1	150	Yes	3	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	Limited access around base	Single stemmed, Vertical, Bark damage south-east	Minor deadwood	Access prevented detailed inspection	Good	Good	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	No works required.
T28	Ash	<i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>	Semi-mature	7.5	1	250	Yes	3	4	4	4	4	Limited access around base	Single stemmed, Vertical		Access prevented detailed inspection	Good	Good	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	No works required.




Appendix 5:
Tree Constraints Plan
 Woodhead Road, Birstall, Batley, WF17 9TD
 Ref: AWA5815
BRITISH STANDARD 5837:2012
 RETENTION CATEGORIES
 Definitions of these categories can be
 found in Appendix 2 of the report.
 SCALE: 1:500 PAPER: A2

	CATEGORY A: HIGH VALUE RETENTION MOST DESIRABLE
	CATEGORY B: MODERATE VALUE RETENTION DESIRABLE
	CATEGORY C: LOWER VALUE COULD BE RETAINED
	CATEGORY U: UNSUITABLE FOR RETENTION
	RPA: ROOT PROTECTION AREA
	TREE STEM



AWA
TREE CONSULTANTS

Appendix 6:
Tree Impacts Plan

Woodhead Road, Birstall, Batley, WF17 9TD
Ref: AWA5815

BRITISH STANDARD 5837:2012

SCALE: 1:500 PAPER: A2

	TREE TO BE RETAINED
	TREE TO BE REMOVED
	RPA: ROOT PROTECTION AREA
	TREE STEM