

404 Spen Lane,  
Gomersal

**Arboricultural Impact Assessment**

April 2025

<b>Report reference</b>	2062.AIA
<b>Revision</b>	1
<b>Prepared by</b>	Dan Brown
<b>Approved by</b>	Andrew Westgarth
<b>Issue date</b>	08/04/2025

This report is valid for a period of 24 months from the issue date.

☎ 01765 600 799

✉ info@quantsenvironmental.com

🌐 quantsenvironmental.com

Quants Environmental Ltd, 65 Kirkby Road, Ripon, North Yorkshire. HG4 2HH

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1	Introduction and Background .....	3
1.2	Aims .....	3
1.3	Trees Within the Site .....	3
<b>2</b>	<b>Arboricultural Impact Assessment .....</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1	Introduction.....	4
2.2	Trees to be Removed.....	4
2.3	Below Ground Constraints .....	4
2.4	Above Ground Constraints.....	6
2.5	Construction Access and Activities .....	6
2.6	Post Development Pressures.....	6
	<b>Appendix 1. Tree Constraints Table .....</b>	<b>7</b>
	<b>Appendix 2. Tree Assessment Plan .....</b>	<b>11</b>

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 *Introduction and Background*

- 1.1.1.1 This report contains an Arboricultural Impact Assessment in support of an application for development at the site of 404 Spen Lane, Gomersal, Cleckheaton, BD19 4LS. The site is located at OS grid reference SE20722594 and extends to approximately 0.247 hectares
- 1.1.1.2 This report has been produced to support a full planning application for the demolition of existing residential building, with subsequent construction of new residential properties, vehicular access and landscaping.
- 1.1.1.3 The proposed development plan is shown in the Tree Assessment Plans (TAP) at Appendix 2.
- 1.1.1.4 A tree survey of the site in accordance with BS5837:2012 was carried out in April 2025 with the results outlined in the following report:
- 1.1.1.5 *404 Spen Lane, Gomersal , Arboricultural Survey* dated April 2025
- 1.1.1.6 The above report was produced to support the design of the proposed development. As part of this survey the relevant qualitative tree data was recorded in order to assess the condition of the existing trees, their constraints upon the prospective development and the necessary protection and construction specifications required to allow their retention as a sustainable and integral part of the completed development. Information is given on condition, age, size and indicative positioning of all the trees, both on and affecting the site. This is in accordance with the British Standard 5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations.

## 1.2 *Aims*

- 1.2.1.1 The Arboricultural Impact Assessment will provide information and advice on potential conflicts between the existing trees on site and the proposed development. The information contained in this assessment has been drawn from the current design layout.
- 1.2.1.2 Possible mitigation measures will be outlined where the proposed development comes into conflict with retained trees and vice versa.

## 1.3 *Trees Within the Site*

- 1.3.1.1 The survey results are shown in Appendix 1 (Tree Survey Results – Table 1) and Appendix 2 (Tree Assessment Plan). The trees included within this survey comprise of 30 individual trees, 5 groups of trees and 1 hedgerow.
- 11 individual trees were classified as Category A;
  - 1 individual trees were classified as Category B;
  - 17 individual trees were classified as Category C;
  - 4 tree groups were classified as Category B;
  - 4 tree groups were classified as Category C;
  - 1 hedgerow was classified as Category C;
  - 2 individual trees were classified as Category U; and
  - 1 tree group was classified as Category U.

## 2 Arboricultural Impact Assessment

### 2.1 *Introduction*

- 2.1.1.1 The Arboricultural Impact Assessment will outline the potential impact this development will have on the trees which are to be retained. The implications will be discussed in terms of below ground constraints and above ground constraints. Possible remedial actions will be discussed where the development impacts significantly on retained trees.

### 2.2 *Trees to be Removed*

- 2.2.1.1 The proposed rebuilding of the stone wall for extended visibility splays will require the removal of T4 – T8.
- 2.2.1.2 G1, T9 and T10 are proposed to be removed due to direct conflict with car parking spaces and bike shelters.
- 2.2.1.3 T1, T3 and H1 are proposed to be removed for the pedestrian access from Spen Lane.
- 2.2.1.4 T22, two trees within G3 and the entirety of G4 and G5 are proposed to be removed due to direct conflict with the proposed pedestrian footpath along the west boundary.

#### 2.2.2 *Mitigation for Tree Removal*

- 2.2.2.1 The only mitigation for tree removal is replacement planting of trees of a sufficient number to compensate for the area of canopy lost.

### 2.3 *Below Ground Constraints*

#### 2.3.1 *Excavation within RPAs*

##### *Pedestrian Access*

- 2.3.1.1 The proposed footpath along the south of the site will encroach into the RPA of third-party trees.
- 2.3.1.2 The encroachment is minimal, with excavation considered to be acceptable provided excavation is completed with hand tools only whilst under arboricultural supervision.

##### *Vehicle Access*

- 2.3.1.3 The new driveway and rebuilding of stone wall for the visibility splays are proposed within the RPA of T2 and T11.
- 2.3.1.4 Whilst the encroachment into the RPA of T2 from the proposed driveway is minimal, and considered acceptable, the relocation of the stone walls are closer to the stems of both T2 and T11 and is more likely to conflict with significant roots.
- 2.3.1.5 Whilst the proposed excavation is in proximity to the stem of T2, the proposed trenching is in a radial direction towards the stems, as opposed to cutting across the whole RPA. Therefore, this will reduce the significance of impact to the tree due to less roots likely being required to be severed.
- 2.3.1.6 Trial excavations will still need to be completed to determine the most appropriate positioning for the wall, as this will then limit the impact to the tree through utilising areas with the least significant roots present, and subsequent severance needed. Where the proposed location cannot be adjusted, then this may result in T2 and T11 needing to be removed, due to the severance of roots deemed to be unacceptable for retention.

### 2.3.2 *No Dig Construction within RPAs*

#### *Pedestrian Access/Car Parking*

2.3.2.1 The proposed public access within the site will pass through the RPAs of T2 and most third-party trees in the adjacent church yard along the west boundary. The proposed car parking spaces to the are also proposed within the RPAs of T2 and third-party trees along the west boundary.

2.3.2.2 To avoid need for excavation, no dig construction will need to be utilised, utilising specifications such as cellular webbing, or flags laid on existing ground to remove need of excavation.

#### *Bike shelter*

2.3.2.3 Bike shelters to the west of the site will conflict with RPAs of third-party trees within the churchyard.

2.3.2.4 Construction of shelters will need to avoid normal strip foundations due to the extent of excavation required within RPAs of trees, with recommendations to use specifications such as cellular webbing or block paving, with roof support posts dug by hand tools only.

### 2.3.3 *Soil Compaction Within the RPA*

2.3.3.1 Tree protection fencing should be used along the RPA's of retained trees around the perimeter of the main development and around trees which are likely to be impacted by ground works to prevent machinery access to the soft landscape within the RPA's of retained trees.

2.3.3.2 Construction methods for the footpaths through the RPA must be carried out in a roll out method, ensuring construction machinery, passes over installed protection measures.

2.3.3.3 Under no circumstances must construction machinery pass over unprotected soils within the RPA of retained trees.

2.3.3.4 Compaction of soil reduces oxygen and water movement through the soil which can lead to the suffocation and the eventual death of roots.

### 2.3.4 *Changes to Soil Condition*

2.3.4.1 It is vital that current soil condition is maintained within unsurfaced areas of RPAs of retained trees and areas of proposed tree planting. Effects on bulk density on the soil from construction activity and the quality of the soil can impact on the trees severely as roots have adapted to the current conditions.

### 2.3.5 *Underground Utilities/Service Provision*

2.3.5.1 Underground service provision will be in the form of drainage and electrical services. The layouts are currently unknown; however, it is concluded that there is sufficient space outside of RPAs to utilise, without the need for encroachment into these areas.

2.3.5.2 Where any requirement for service installation within the RPA of retained trees occurs, this must be constructed in accordance with the guidance provided in the National Joint Utilities Guidance document NJUG 4 and no service shall be positioned within 1m of the tree's stem.

### 2.3.6 *Landscaping/Hard Surface Removal within the RPA*

2.3.6.1 Proposed landscaping to replace existing hard surfaced areas is proposed within RPAs of several trees across the site. This will benefit the trees potential for root development and extend their contribution to the surrounding area

#### *Removal of Existing Hard Surfacing*

2.3.6.2 The existing hard standing within the RPAs of T2 and T13 – T15 comprises of tarmac construction, and it is assumed that due to the foundations for these areas likely to not be of a significant depth, trees will have grown roots underneath these surfaces.

2.3.6.3 Any removal of preexisting surfacing within RPAs will be required to be done by hand tools only such as pneumatic breakers or sledgehammers to avoid the need of excavators or similar machinery. The

debris will be lifted by hand. Root pruning should not be required, however, careful pruning back of roots <25mm in diameter may be feasible where under the supervision of an appointed arboriculturist.

2.3.6.4 Under no circumstances must mechanical rotavating of the soils occur.

2.3.6.5 Existing grass and vegetation must be removed by hand or by small mini digger with flat edge bucket scraping the top layers of vegetation away. The soil must then be broken up by hand only, prior to planting up.

## **2.4 Above Ground Constraints.**

### **2.4.1 Access Facilitation Pruning**

2.4.1.1 No pruning is considered necessary for access.

2.4.1.2 Should any pruning requirements be identified on site during the development, advice should be sought by a qualified arboricultural consultant and the relevant LPA should be consulted.

2.4.1.3 All pruning work must be carried out in accordance with BS3998:2010 Tree Work Recommendations and be completed by appropriately qualified, experienced and insured arboricultural contractors.

## **2.5 Construction Access and Activities**

2.5.1.1 Access to the site for the proposed development is expected to be from the new vehicle entrance once completed, utilising the existing entrance during the time of construction.

2.5.1.2 The location of site cabins and compounds is currently unknown, but it is concluded that there is sufficient space outside of RPAs to construct the compounds.

2.5.1.3 Consideration should be included within an Arboricultural Method Statement for the storage of materials as accidental spillage may cause damage to the surrounding trees. Spillage kits and neutral emergency bunding aggregate should be appropriate to the amount of material stored on site i.e. fuel oil or liquid chemicals.

2.5.1.4 All storage areas, cement mixing and washing points must be outside RPAs unless otherwise agreed with the Local Planning Authority.

## **2.6 Post Development Pressures**

2.6.1.1 The processes of construction are unlikely to have a detrimental effect upon the health of the retained trees assuming recommendations made within this Arboricultural Impact Assessment and the subsequent Method Statement are adhered to at all times by the contractor, e.g. the positioning of a suitable fence between the retained trees and construction activities prior to commencement of works and that the fence remains intact and in position throughout the duration of the project.

## Appendix 1. Tree Constraints Table

Tree / Group ref.no	Species	Height	Crown Spread (m)				Crown clearance	Stem diameter (mm)	Age class	Phys. Condition	Struct. Condition	Comments	Recommendations	ERC	Cat Grade	Radius of Nominal Circle	RPA SqM
			N	E	S	W											
T1	Wild Cherry	5	2	1	2	0.5	2	250,250	EM	G	F	Topped at 4m	None	10+	C1	4.2	56.69
T2	Common Lime	16	6	6	6	4	3	790	M	G	F	In good condition and form. Unable to inspect stem due to undergrowth. Suckers around stem base. Small volume of deadwood in crown.	None	40+	A1	9.5	282.34
T3	Holly	2.5	2	2	2	2	1	140	SM	F	F	Unable to inspect stem due to Ivy. Stem divides below 1.5m.two stems have been pruned to ground level	None	10+	C1	1.7	8.87
T4	Sycamore	16	6	6	6	4	3	790	M	G	F	In good condition and form. Small volume of deadwood in crown. Branches encroaching onto highway light	None	40+	A1	9.5	282.34
T5	Cherry Plum	3	1	2	2	2	1	170	SM	G	F	Ivy on tree. Cavity on stem.	None	10+	C1	2	13.07
T6	Apple	4.5	2	2	4	3	1	240	SM	G	F	Ivy on tree. Cavity on stem.	None	10+	C1	2.9	26.06
T7	Sycamore	16	8	7	9	5	3	570	M	G	F	Small volume of deadwood in crown. Broken branches in crown. Unbalanced crown shape. Branches encroaching onto highway light	None	20+	B1	6.8	146.98
T8	Field Elm	4	3	3	4	3	1	120	Y	F	F	Unable to inspect stem due to Ivy. Stem divides below 1.5m.	None	10+	C1	1.4	6.51
T9	Cherry plum 'Pissardii'	3	3	5	1	0.5	0	180	SM	F	F	Leaning East. Ivy on tree. Unable to inspect stem due to Ivy.	None	10+	C1	2.2	14.66
T10	Field Elm	4	4	4	1	3	1	150	Y	F	F	Crown distorted due to group pressure. Growing adjacent to wall	None	10+	C1	1.8	10.18
T11	Small-leaved Lime	19	6	7	5	5	3	590	M	G	G	Small volume of deadwood in crown.	None	40+	A2	7.1	157.48
T12	Small-leaved Lime	19	4	7	4	6	2	580	M	G	G	Small volume of deadwood in crown.	None	40+	A2	7	152.18
T13	Small-leaved Lime	19	4	7	4	7	3	620	M	G	G	Small volume of deadwood in crown.	None	40+	A2	7.4	173.90

Tree / Group ref.no	Species	Height	Crown Spread (m)				Crown clearance	Stem diameter (mm)	Age class	Phys. Condition	Struct. Condition	Comments	Recommendations	ERC	Cat Grade	Radius of Nominal Circle	RPA SqM
			N	E	S	W											
T14	Small-leaved Lime	19	2	7	3	4	2	220	M	G	G	Suppressed form due to adjacent tree. Leaning on wall	None	10+	C1	2.6	21.90
T15	Small-leaved Lime	19	4	7	4	7	2	650	M	G	F	Large volume of deadwood in crown.	None	40+	A2	7.8	191.13
T16	Small-leaved Lime	19	5	7	5	7	1	720	M	G	F	Unable to inspect stem due to undergrowth. Stem divides above 1.5m. Large volume of deadwood in crown.	None	40+	A2	8.6	234.52
T17	Small-leaved Lime	19	5	6	5	7	1	620	M	G	F	Large volume of deadwood in crown. Major deadwood in crown.	None	40+	A2	7.4	173.90
T18	Small-leaved Lime	6	4	7	3	2	1	150	M	G	F	Leaning East. Small volume of deadwood in crown.	None	10+	C1	1.8	10.18
T19	Small-leaved Lime	19	5	6	8	7	1	630	M	G	F	Large volume of deadwood in crown. Major deadwood in crown.	None	40+	A2	7.6	179.55
T20	Small-leaved Lime	19	5	6	5	7	1	650	M	G	F	Large volume of deadwood in crown. Major deadwood in crown.	None	40+	A2	7.8	191.13
T21	Small-leaved Lime	19	5	7	5	6	1	720	M	G	F	Large volume of deadwood in crown. Major deadwood in crown.	None	40+	A2	8.6	234.52
T22	Norway Maple	8	4	6	5	4	3	370	SM	G	F	Leaning South-East. Unable to inspect stem due to undergrowth.	None	10+	C1	4.4	61.93
T23	Goat Willow	3	4	3	1	1	2	120*	Y	F	F	Third party tree.	None	10+	C1	1.4	6.51
T24	Wild Cherry	6	2	1	1	1	0	350	SM	P	P	Dead. Unable to inspect stem due to Ivy.	None	<10	U	4.2	55.42
T25	Sycamore	12	1	1	3	4	5	250*	SM	F	F	Third party tree. Unable to inspect stem due to Ivy. Unbalanced crown shape.	None	10+	C1	3	28.27
T26	Sycamore	14	1	0	3	4	6	200*	SM	F	F	Third party tree. Unable to inspect stem due to Ivy. Unbalanced crown shape.	None	10+	C1	2.4	18.10
T27	Sycamore	14	2	3	3	4	6	200*	SM	F	F	Third party tree. Unable to inspect stem due to Ivy. Unbalanced crown shape.	None	10+	C1	2.4	18.10
T28	Field Elm	6	1	1	3	4	3	160*	Y	F	F	Third party tree. Unbalanced crown shape.	None	10+	C1	1.9	11.58
T29	Norway Maple	6	0.5	0.5	3	3	2	110*	Y	F	F	Third party tree. Unbalanced crown shape.	None	10+	C1	1.3	5.47
T30	Field Elm	10	5	5	3	5	1	270	Y	F	F	Third party tree. Stem divides above 1.5m.	None	10+	C1	3.2	32.98

Tree / Group ref.no	Species	Height	Crown Spread (m)				Crown clearance	Stem diameter (mm)	Age class	Phys. Condition	Struct. Condition	Comments	Recommendations	ERC	Cat Grade	Radius of Nominal Circle	RPA SqM
			N	E	S	W											
G1	Sycamore	3	1	1	1	1	0	75	Y	F	F	Several shoots sprouting from base of felled tree.	None	10+	C1	0.9	2.54
G2	Small-leaved Lime, Wild Cherry	6	3	5	2	5	1	160	EM	F	F	Two third party trees close together forming continuous canopy	None	10+	C2	1.9	11.58
G3	Wild Cherry, Norway Maple	6	4	4	4	4	0	180	EM	F	F	Unable to inspect stem due to undergrowth. Area of trees in southwest corner of garden	None	10+	C2	2.2	14.66
G4	Wild Cherry, Norway Maple	6	4	4	4	4	0	100	EM	F	F	Unable to inspect stem due to undergrowth. Area of trees in southwest corner of garden	None	10+	C2	1.2	4.52
G5	Field Elm	4	2	2	2	2	0	140	Y	P	P	Unable to inspect stem due to Ivy. Two dead trees	None	<10	U	1.7	8.87
H1	Holly	2	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0	150	EM	F	F	Sparse holly hedgerow	None	10+	C2	1.8	10.18

**Key:**

Tree/ Group Ref No. – tree/group number, to be recorded on tree survey plan where necessary.

Species – common and scientific names where possible.

Height – overall height of tree in metres.

Stem Dia – stem diameter, in millimetres at 1.5m above adjacent ground level (on sloping ground to be taken on the upslope of the tree base) or immediately above the root flare for multi-stemmed trees.

Branch spread – in meters taken at the four cardinal points to derive an accurate representation of the crown (to be recorded on the tree survey plan where necessary).

Height of cc – height of crown clearance – in meters above adjacent ground level to inform on ground clearance, crown stem ratio and shading.

Age class – young (Y), young mature (YM), mature (M), over mature (OM) and veteran (V).

Physiological condition – e.g. good (G), fair (F), poor (P) and dead (D).

Structural condition – e.g. collapsing, the presence of decay and any physical defect.

Management recommendations – including further investigations of suspected defects that require more detailed assessment and potential wildlife habitat.

ERC – estimated remaining contribution – in years e.g. less than 10, 10-20, 20-40, more than 40.

Cat grade – category grade – U or A to C, to be recorded in plan on the tree survey plan where possible.

RPA – Root protection area calculated from BS5837:2012 Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction – Recommendations in sq/m. Where indicated, dimensions of radius of circle or sides of square based around centre point of trunk calculated for design purposes.

## Appendix 2. Tree Assessment Plan

Notes

Do not scale off drawing - refer to the tree data schedule for accurate crown spread measurements.  
 Depictions of tree canopies are based on measurements taken to four cardinal compass points.  
 No liability of any kind is accepted for any omissions or inaccuracies in respect of this plan.  
 All rights reserved.



**Key**

- Trees Showing Canopy extents, category colour and tag number (with category).
- Category A Trees of high quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 40 years.
- Category B Trees of moderate quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 20 years.
- Category C Trees of low quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 10 years, or young trees with a stem diameter below 150 mm.
- Category U Trees in such a condition that they can not realistically be retained as living trees in the context of the current land use for longer than 10 years.
- Tree Groups Shown as dashed centre/boundary line. Colour represents category (see above).
- BS 5837:2012 Root Protection Area
- BS 5837:2012 Root Protection Area before adjustment due to site constraints
- Trees to be removed/have been removed
- No dig construction required within RPAs
- Excavation within RPAs to be completed by hand tools only
- Trial excavation within RPAs required
- Removal of existing hard surfacing within RPAs

Drawing Title  
**Tree Assessment Plan**

Client  
 Coral Projects

Site/Project  
 404 Spen Lane  
 Gomersal  
 Cleckheaton

Scale/Sheet A1 1-150	Date 08/04/2025		
Drawing No 2062.AIA	Rev 1	Drawn By DB	Checked By AW

**QUANTS**  
 environmental

Quants Environmental Limited  
 65 Kirkby Road, Ripon, North Yorkshire HG4 2HH.  
 Office: 01765 600799  
 Email: info@quantsenvironmental.com  
 Web: www.quantsenvironmental.com

