



ARBORICULTURAL REPORT & Impact Assessment

to BS 5837:2012 at:

***Oldfield House Farm
Oldfield Road
Honley
Holmfirth
HD9 6RL***

Prepared for:
Mr. Josh Turner

Date: *June 2024*

Reference: *AWA6031*



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.....	9
4. Arboricultural Impact Assessment.....	10
4.1 Proposed New Development	10
4.2 Direct Impacts.....	10
4.3 Indirect Impacts.....	10
4.4 Suitable Mitigation	12
4.5 Protection of the Retained Trees	12
5. Signature	13
Appendix 1: Authors Qualifications & Experience	15
Appendix 2: Survey Methodology and Limitations of Report.....	16
Appendix 3: Explanation of Tree Descriptions	17
Appendix 4: Tree Data	18
Appendix 5: Tree Constraints Plan	19
Appendix 6: Tree Impacts Plan	20

1. Introduction

1.1 Instructions and Brief

- 1.1.1 We were instructed by Mr. Josh Turner 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 original survey took place during March 2022, with a resurvey in October 2023. The resurvey was undertaken to inspect tree works carried out as part of a planning application (2023/TWACA/92000/W) granted in August 2023. This report reflects the trees on site following these works.
- 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. The tree survey data collection was carried out by Mr James Godfrey BA (Hons), Cert Arb L3, Level 4 Forestry and Arboriculture, TechArborA, Arboriculturist at AWA Tree Consultants Ltd.
- 1.2.6 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 located south of Honley, a large village near Huddersfield, West Yorkshire.
- 2.1.2 The site is comprised of a farmhouse with associated agricultural outbuildings and a paddock of grassland. The northern and eastern boundaries are bordered by agricultural land. The western boundary also borders agricultural land, as well as a neighbouring property at the south-western boundary. To the south of the site is Oldfield Road, beyond which are fields and grassland.
- 2.1.3 The approximate area of the survey is highlighted in the image below (Google Earth, 2021):




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 has been carried out with Kirklees Council on 23rd May 2024 to ascertain whether any trees at the site are located within a Conservation Area or are protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). The site is situated within the Oldfield Conservation Area, and as such all trees within the site are legally protected. Further to this there are several trees protected by Tree Preservation Orders, as highlighted in the image below (Kirklees.gov.uk, 2024):



3.1.3 Before carrying out any works to protected trees the permission of the local planning authority must be granted. There are large potential penalties for illegally carrying out work to protected trees. Statutory permission is not required for the removal of deadwood.

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.
- 3.1.8 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 28 items of woody vegetation, comprised of 27 individual trees and 1 hedging group.
- 3.2.2 Of the surveyed trees: 1 tree is retention category 'U', 4 trees are retention category 'A', 8 trees are retention category 'B', and the remaining 15 trees and group are retention category 'C' (explanatory details regarding the retention categories are included at Appendix 3).
- 3.2.3 Full details of the surveyed trees are provided in the attached tree data schedule at Appendix 4. General comments are provided below:
- 3.2.4 There is a moderate degree of species diversity at the site, with the dominant species being Sycamore, and the occasional Ash, Birch, Lime, Plum and Willow. The hedgerows are generally comprised of Hawthorn, Holly and Elder. The site's trees have a good age diversity with a mix of semi-mature, early-mature and mature trees.
- 3.2.5 Ash T1 is growing within a small walled area at the north-western corner of the site. The mature Ash contains significant defects that limit its long-term prospects, including a *Ganoderma* fungal bracket at the base and signs of Ash dieback disease throughout the crown. Many Ash trees in the wider region are being impacted by the fungal pathogen Ash dieback disease. Once a tree is infected, the disease is usually fatal, either directly or indirectly. While some Ash trees on site may continue to provide landscape and wildlife benefits, their long-term prospects are likely to be limited because of Ash dieback.
- 3.2.6 T2 to T4 are small low value trees also growing within this walled area. They provide limited amenity value within the site or wider landscape and should not limit any potential development.

- 3.2.7 Sycamore T5 to T7 run along the north-western boundary. These mature trees are important within the local landscape and provide a good degree of amenity. They contain occasional minor defects but otherwise offer good long-term value.
- 3.2.8 T8 to T14 run along the western boundary between the site and an adjacent field. These Sycamore have recently been crown lifted and continue to provide a moderate degree of amenity, with T13 being the most prominent. It overhangs a farm building to the northeast and provides the site and local landscape with high amenity value.
- 3.2.9 T15, T16 and T17 are a mature group of Sycamore growing particularly close to a farm outbuilding. These trees provide a moderate degree of local amenity and show good long-term prospects.
- 3.2.10 T18 and T19 make up the woody vegetation within the farmhouse front garden and provide the farmhouse effective screening from the main road. Sycamore T18 is of low value overall but offers moderate amenity within the site. Weeping Single-leaved Ash T19 is a rare variant with moderate amenity and arboricultural value.
- 3.2.11 T20 is a mature Sycamore in a prominent position by the main road. It is a significant tree within the wider landscape and is likely to provide good long-term value.
- 3.2.12 G22 to T26 are located within a small orchard area, near to T31. While the hedge group G22 provides effective screening, the remaining trees are of low value, containing several defects and limited long-term prospects.
- 3.2.13 T27 and T28 are a mature Lime and Sycamore respectively. They hold a relatively prominent position within the local landscape and offer a good degree of amenity. Both trees appear in good condition following recent crown lifting works, however there is some minor bark damage on a secondary limb within the lower crown of T28.
- 3.2.14 T1 was found to have significant defects and as such is unsuitable to retain regardless of any new development (as detailed in Appendix 4). It may be suitable to manage T1 to retain their habitat value while avoiding unacceptable risk to people or property.
- 3.2.15 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.
- 3.2.16 The tree Root Protection Area (RPA) detailed on the Tree Constraints Plan at Appendix 5 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.

- 3.2.17 Some lower value tree, hedge and shrub groups do not have RPAs detailed on tree plans. The detailed extent and spread of these low value groups, in conjunction with the tree schedule, is sufficient to assess the associated potential constraints.
- 3.2.18 The 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: Overview of the site, looking south



Photo 2: Overview of the farm outbuildings and farmhouse, facing northeast



Photo 3: T5 to T7 within the site, looking west




Photo 4: Overview of trees along the southwest boundary, many overhanging adjacent farm outbuildings. Looking east



Photo 5: T20 is in a prominent location on the main road past the site, looking north-east



Photo 6: T27 and T28 are prominent within the local landscape, looking north-east

4. Arboricultural Impact Assessment

4.1 Proposed New Development

4.1.1 It is proposed to redevelop the existing farmhouse, demolish existing outbuildings and construct 3 new dwellings within the footprint of the existing farmyard, as well as associated access, landscaping, 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 4 trees will require removal to facilitate the development as they are situated in the footprint of the development.

4.2.2 The trees that require removal to facilitate the development are T15, T16, T17 and T26.

4.2.3 T26 is low value, category 'C' Plum with limited long-term prospects due to its poor physiological condition. As such, the removal of T26 will have only a negligible negative arboricultural impact.

4.2.4 T15, T16 and T17 are moderate value, retention category 'B' and their removal will have some negative arboricultural impact. However, the retention of the remaining category 'B', and the retention of all category 'A' trees on site, will minimise the visual impact resulting from the loss of T15, T16 and T17.

4.2.5 A separate application has been granted for the removal of T15, T16 and T17 (Application Number: 2024/91323).

4.2.6 The retained trees on site will provide an important element of green infrastructure, provide visual amenity and complement the new development.

4.2.1 In addition to the required removal, T1 contains significant defects and is recommended for removal regardless of development. However, standing trunks can form a valuable wildlife habitat and T1 could be retained as a standing trunk in a reduced and stabilised form, usually at 4m to 6m height, as what is known a 'habitat pole'.

4.3 Indirect Impacts

4.3.1 The tree Root Protection Area (RPA) detailed on the Tree Plans at Appendix

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 Demolition of existing structures and hardstanding is proposed close to retained trees T13 T14, T20, T27 and T28. Provided care is taken during demolition, the demolition works should not adversely impact on the health or future condition of the trees. All plant and vehicles engaged in demolition works should operate outside the trees' RPA, with the demolition works only undertaken within the footprint of existing buildings. Where existing hard surfaces are scheduled for removal, care must be taken not to disturb tree roots that might be present beneath it.
- 4.3.3 The new development encroaches close to and into the edge of the RPA of retained trees T27. Construction within the RPA can have negative impacts on tree roots. However, the encroachment into the RPA of retained trees is generally minor and the hard surfaces and footings of the existing structures are likely to have limited root development within these areas. As such, it is unlikely that significant roots will be within these areas and the retained trees should remain largely unaffected by the works, provided care is taken during construction.
- 4.3.4 A new courtyard and wall are proposed that encroaches into the RPA of T20, T27 and T28. 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.
- 4.3.5 Care must be taken during the construction of the wall elements to avoid any trenching works, or significant excavation below the existing ground levels. Careful control of activities within the area surrounding retained trees T20, T27 and T28 must be implemented.
- 4.3.6 The design of the new development has considered the trees crown position in relation to the dwellings. The design proposals will avoid excessive shading and give adequate provision for future tree growth. Some shade from trees may be beneficial. In particular, these deciduous trees give shade in summer but allow access to sunlight in winter.
- 4.3.7 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 as part of a soft landscaping scheme. As such, suitable new tree planting will 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 will require protection by fencing in accordance with BS 5837: 2012, during the development phase.

4.5.2 An associated Arboricultural Method Statement with Tree Protection Plan has been provided.

5. Signature

I trust this report provides all the required information.

Signed

.....

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

3rd June 2024

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 of Report**
- 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, PTI (Lantra), 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, PTI (Lantra), 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, PTI (Lantra), 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.

Ross Lane, FdSc Environmental Conservation, Diploma Arboriculture, TechArborA, PTI (Lantra), QTRA Registered

Ross has a diverse background spanning horticulture, arboriculture, and ecology. Ross has extensive experience conducting surveys throughout the UK and has worked on projects of all sizes, including major infrastructure projects such as HS2. In his previous role as a Tree Inspector at Derbyshire County Council, projects involved managing the county wide tree stock in relation to the ash dieback response and contributing to ambitious County Council targets of planting a million trees. Possessing technician-level membership with the Arboricultural Association, coupled with a comprehensive range of qualifications from tree risk assessment to habitat management, underscores Ross' dedication in professional arboriculture.

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 BS 5837:2012 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.

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 grey 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 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
T1	Ash	<i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>	Mature	11	1	720	No	3	6.5	7	7.5	6	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical. Epicormic growths. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Major cavity. Major decay. Decay fungi	Old pruning wounds. Cavities. Minor dieback. Moderate deadwood. Snapped /hanging branches. Overhanging adjacent land	Ganoderma bracket at base. Signs of Ash dieback	Poor	Poor	<10 yrs	Moderate	U	Recommended for removal regardless of development <i>Could be retained in a stabilised form as a 4-6m 'habitat pole'</i>
T2	Rowan	<i>Sorbus aucuparia</i>	Mature	6	10+	120 avg	Yes	1.5	4	3	4	3	No visual defects	Multiple stemmed at base. Vertical. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Bark damage. Minor cavities. Minor decay	Moderate deadwood. Snapped /hanging branches	Regrowth from old stump	Poor	Fair	10 to 20 yrs	Low	C	No works required
T3	Hawthorn	<i>Crataegus monogyna</i>	Semi-mature	6	1	150	Yes	1	1.5	1.5	1.5	2	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical. Epicormic growths. Stubs	Minor deadwood. Snapped /hanging branches	Low foliage prevented accurate stem measurement	Fair	Fair	>40 yrs	Low	C	No works required
T4	Goat Willow	<i>Salix caprea</i>	Mature	10	1	450	No	2.5	4	4.5	4.5	4	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical. Epicormic growths. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Minor cavities. Minor decay	Old pruning wounds. Cavities. Minor deadwood. Snapped /hanging branches		Fair	Fair	10 to 20 yrs	Low	C	No works required

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
T5	Sycamore	<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	Mature	14	1	860	No	1.5	8.5	9.5	6	7	No visual defects	Single stemmed at base, multiple stemmed at 2m. Vertical. Old pruning wounds. Stubs	Minor deadwood. Snapped /hanging branches. Well developed crown	Large stone pillars lying near base	Good	Good	>40 yrs	High	A	No works required
T6	Sycamore	<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	Mature	14	1	550	No	2.5	5	6.5	6	7	Girdling roots	Single stemmed. Slight lean to east. Epicormic growths. Old pruning wounds. Stubs	Minor deadwood. Snapped /hanging branches		Good	Good	>40 yrs	High	B	No works required
T7	Sycamore	<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	Mature	14	1	710	No	2.5	6.5	5	5.5	6	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical. Old pruning wounds. Stubs	Old pruning wounds. Cavities. Minor deadwood. Snapped /hanging branches		Good	Good	>40 yrs	High	B	No works required
T8	Sycamore	<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	Mature	13	1	620	No	5	7	7	6.5	5.5	No visual defects. Limited access around base	Single stemmed. Vertical. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Bark damage. Cavities. Decay. Sunken bark. Bleeds	Moderate deadwood. Snapped /hanging branches. Old pruning wounds. Cavities	Significant sunken bark and bleeding around stem at approximately 3m	Decline	Fair	10 to 20 yrs	Moderate	C	No works required
T9	Sycamore	<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	Mature	13	1	300	Yes	5	5.5	6.5	5	5	Limited access around base	Single stemmed. Vertical. Epicormic growths. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Ivy covered	Old pruning wounds. Cavities. Minor deadwood. Snapped /hanging branches	Ivy prevented detailed inspection and accurate stem measurement	Fair	Fair	>40 yrs	Moderate	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
T10	Sycamore	<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	Mature	13	1	310	Yes	5	6	5.5	5.5	5	Limited access around base	Vertical. Epicormic growths. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Bark damage. Ivy covered	Old pruning wounds. Cavities. Minor deadwood. Snapped /hanging branches	Ivy prevented detailed inspection and accurate stem measurement	Fair	Fair	>40 yrs	Moderate	C	No works required
T11	Sycamore	<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	Mature	12	1	360	Yes	5	7.5	6	8	6.5	Limited access around base	Single stemmed. Vertical. Epicormic growths. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Minor decay	Old pruning wounds. Minor deadwood. Snapped /hanging branches	Dead stubs in northern crown	Fair	Good	>40 yrs	Moderate	B	No works required
T12	Sycamore	<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	Early-mature	13	1	300	Yes	5	6.5	5	6	6	Limited access around base	Single stemmed. Vertical. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Ivy covered	Old pruning wounds. Cavities. Moderate deadwood. Snapped /hanging branches	Ivy prevented detailed inspection and accurate stem measurement	Fair	Fair	>40 yrs	Moderate	C	No works required
T13	Sycamore	<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	Mature	17	1	970	No	5	8	9.5	7.5	8	Limited access around base	Single stemmed. Slight lean to northeast. Old pruning wounds. Stubs	Old pruning wounds. Cavities. Minor deadwood. Snapped /hanging branches	Overhangs farm building to northeast. Fallen dry stone wall around stem prevented detailed inspection of roots and base	Good	Good	>40 yrs	High	A	No works required
T14	Sycamore	<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	Mature	12	1	650	No	5	6.5	7	5.5	6	Limited access around base	Single stemmed. Vertical. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Ivy covered	Old pruning wounds. Cavities. Minor deadwood. Snapped /hanging branches	Overhangs building to northeast	Good	Fair	>40 yrs	Moderate	C	No works required

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
T15	Sycamore	<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	Mature	10	1	520	No	5	5.5	2	5	5	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical. Epicormic growths. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Bark damage. Minor cavities. Minor decay	Old pruning wounds. Cavities. Minor deadwood. Snapped /hanging branches	Overhangs building and lower stem in contact with building to north	Good	Good	>40 yrs	Moderate	B	Removal required to facilitate development Permission for removal granted as separate application (App #: 2024/91323)
T16	Sycamore	<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	Mature	16	1	690	No	5	7	4	6.5	3.5	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Bark damage. Minor cavities. Minor decay	Old pruning wounds. Cavities. Moderate deadwood. Snapped /hanging branches	Lower stem and crown in contact with building to north	Good	Fair	>40 yrs	Moderate	B	Removal required to facilitate development Permission for removal granted as separate application (App #: 2024/91323)
T17	Sycamore	<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	Mature	13	1	670	No	5.5	6	6.5	5.5	5.5	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical. Epicormic growths. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Tight union. Partially included bark. Minor cavities. Minor decay	Old pruning wounds. Cavities. Minor deadwood. Snapped /hanging branches	Overhangs buildings to north and east. Western aspect pruned away from overhead wires	Fair	Fair	>40 yrs	High	B	Removal required to facilitate development Permission for removal granted as separate application (App #: 2024/91323)
T18	Sycamore	<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	Mature	14	1	400	Yes	5	4	5	4	4	Limited access around base	Single stemmed. Vertical. Stubs. Ivy covered	Old pruning wounds. Cavities. Minor deadwood. Snapped /hanging branches	Ivy in crown. Hedge and Ivy prevented detailed inspection and accurate stem measurement	Fair	Fair	>40 yrs	Moderate	C	No works required


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
T19	Weeping Single-leaved Ash	<i>Fraxinus excelsior</i> 'Diversifolia Pendula'	Early-mature	5.5	1	260	No	0.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Minor cavities. Minor decay	Old pruning wounds. Cavities. Minor deadwood. Snapped /hanging branches	Cracking patio and lifting slabs. Overhangs oil tank	Fair	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Moderate	B	No works required
T20	Sycamore	<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	Mature	21	1	1070	No	4.5	9	9.5	9.5	9.5	No visual defects	Single stemmed at base, twin stemmed at 3m. Vertical. Epicormic growths. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Cup-like union collecting dirt/water	Old pruning wounds. Cavities. Moderate deadwood. Snapped /hanging branches	Overhangs road. Southern crown close to overhead wires	Good	Good	>40 yrs	High	A	No works required
G21	Hawthorn Holly Elder	<i>Crataegus sp.</i> <i>Ilex sp.</i> <i>Sambucus sp.</i>	Early-mature	2.5	10+	100 avg	Yes	0	See Plan				Boundary hedge, recently flailed. Occasional Holly and Elder, Ivy throughout. Patchy in places				Fair	Fair	>40 yrs	Low	C	No works required
T22	Plum	<i>Prunus domestica</i>	Mature	5	2	180 150	No	1	2	3.5	1.5	1	Exposed roots	Twin stemmed at 0.5m. Vertical. Epicormic growths. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Bark damage. Tight union. Cavities. Decay	Old pruning wounds. Cavities. Major deadwood. Snapped /hanging branches	Dead central stem	Poor	Poor	10 to 20 yrs	Low	C	No works required

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
T23	Plum	<i>Prunus domestica</i>	Semi-mature	2.5	1	120	Yes	1	1.5	2	1.5	2	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Bark damage. Cavities. Decay	Minor deadwood. Snapped /hanging branches		Poor	Fair	10 to 20 yrs	Low	C	No works required
T24	Plum	<i>Prunus domestica</i>	Semi-mature	3.5	1	140	No	1	2.5	2.5	2	2	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical. Epicormic growths. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Bark damage. Minor cavities. Minor decay	Old pruning wounds. Cavities. Minor deadwood. Snapped /hanging branches		Fair	Fair	>40 yrs	Low	C	No works required
T25	Pear	<i>Pyrus communis</i>	Semi-mature	4	1	170	No	1	2.5	3.5	3	2	Soil heave	Single stemmed. Significant lean to east. Epicormic growths. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Bark damage. Minor cavities. Minor decay	Old pruning wounds. Cavities. Minor deadwood. Snapped /hanging branches	Heaved at base. Significant bark damage at base	Fair	Poor	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	No works required
T26	Plum	<i>Prunus domestica</i>	Young	2.5	1	100	No	1.5	1	1.5	1	1	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Bark damage. Cavities. Decay	Small / sparse. Old pruning wounds. Cavities. Minor deadwood. Snapped /hanging branches		Poor	Fair	10 to 20 yrs	Low	C	Removal required to facilitate 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
T27	Small-leaved Lime	<i>Tilia cordata</i>	Mature	17	1	880	No	5	8	10.5	10	5	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical. Epicormic growths. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Cavities. Decay	Old pruning wounds. Cavities. Minor deadwood. Snapped /hanging branches	Rubble at base	Good	Good	>40 yrs	Moderate	A	No works required
T28	Sycamore	<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	Mature	17	1	800	No	5	6.5	8	8	9	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Bark damage. Cavities. Decay	Old pruning wounds. Cavities. Major deadwood. Snapped /hanging branches	Bark damage on western limb, likely to be fire damage	Fair	Good	>40 yrs	Moderate	B	No works required




Appendix 5:
Tree Constraints Plan
 Oldfield House Farm, Oldfield Road, Honley
 Ref: AWA6031

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



Appendix 6:
Tree Impacts Plan
 Oldfield House Farm, Oldfield Road, Honley
 Ref: AWA6031

BRITISH STANDARD 5837:2012
 SCALE: 1:500 PAPER: A2

	TREE TO BE RETAINED
	TREE TO BE REMOVED
	RECOMMENDED FOR REMOVAL REGARDLESS OF DEVELOPMENT
	RPA: ROOT PROTECTION AREA
	TREE STEM