



ARBORICULTURAL REPORT

& Impact Assessment

to BS 5837:2012 at:

***14 Manor Road,
Farnley Tyas,
Huddersfield,
HD4 6UL***

Prepared for:
Mr Antony Buckle

Date: *July 2025*

Reference: *AWA6782*

*TMP006 – B
Template Revision 01
Auth By: APW
Date: 09/09/2024*

 Institute of
Chartered Foresters
Registered Consultant

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	9
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	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 Mr Antony Buckle 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 November 2024.
- 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 The tree positions were plotted on an Ordnance Survey map base-layer 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, Principal and Director of AWA Tree Consultants Ltd.
- 1.2.6 The tree survey data collection was carried out by Mr Ross Lane, FdSc Environmental Conservation, 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 please 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 on Manor Road in Farnley Tyas, Huddersfield.
- 2.1.2 The site comprises the rear garden of a private residential dwelling. Beyond the rear garden area to the south and east lies grassland and agricultural fields. Further private residential properties are located immediately to the west of site. Manor Road runs parallel to the front of the house to the north.
- 2.1.3 The approximate area of the survey is highlighted in the (2021 Google Earth) image below:



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 22/11/24 to check whether any trees at the site are protected by a Tree Preservation Order or are located within a Conservation Area. Trees at the site are not shown to be protected by a Tree Preservation Order. However, the site is situated within a Conservation Area, and as such all trees within the site are legally protected.
- 3.1.3 The accessed map image from Kirklees Council website is detailed below:



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

- 3.1.5 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).
- 3.1.6 It was confirmed that there are no designated ancient woodlands or veteran or ancient trees within the survey area.
- 3.1.7 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.
- 3.1.8 When appointing a tree surgeon, only properly qualified and experienced companies should be used, who have adequate Public Liability and Employer's Liability Insurance.
- 3.1.9 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 6 items of woody vegetation, comprised of 6 individual trees.
- 3.2.2 Of the surveyed trees: 6 trees are retention category 'C' (explanatory details regarding the retention categories are included at Appendix 3).
- 3.2.3 Full details of the surveyed trees, tree groups and hedges are provided in the attached tree data schedule at Appendix 4. General comments are provided below:
- 3.2.4 The central areas of the site contain nothing of arboricultural significance, with the recorded trees being located close to the east and west site boundaries.
- 3.2.5 All of the trees are semi-mature, with a mix of species and sizes. Species on site includes Pine, Cypress and Cherry.
- 3.2.6 The sites most significant tree is T2, a semi-mature Pine. Situated close to the site's eastern boundary. This tree is the most notable in size and species in the survey area, but currently offers only a low level of amenity value.
- 3.2.7 T1 Cypress is located close to the site's western boundary and is similar in stature to T2. This tree currently offers only a low level of amenity value.
- 3.2.8 T3 – T5 are multi stemmed specimens of Cypress and Cherry that display signs of historic pruning works consisting of stem and branch removal. These

trees are located along the eastern site boundary wall and offer a low level of amenity value.

- 3.2.9 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.
- 3.2.10 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.
- 3.2.11 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.

3.3 Photographs



Photo 1: T1, looking west



Photo 2: T2, looking northeast



Photo 3: T3, looking east



Photo 4: T4, looking east



Photo 5: T5, looking northeast



Photo 6: T6 adjacent tree, looking west

4. Arboricultural Impact Assessment

4.1 Proposed New Development

4.1.1 It is proposed to build a rear extension onto the existing residential property. 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, 4 trees will require removal to facilitate the development 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 that require removal to facilitate the development are T2, T3, T4 and T5.

4.2.3 The trees to be removed are all lower value, retention category 'C'. T2 is a semi-mature Pine, T3 and T5 are young to semi-mature Cypress and T4 is a semi-mature Cherry. T2 displays signs of historical pruning wounds and snapped branches in the crown. T3, T4 and T5 show signs of historic hard pruning works and have poor forms as a result. Due to the low value of the trees to be removed, the removals will have only a negligible negative arboricultural impact.

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 Potentially damaging activities are proposed in the vicinity of retained trees. The new development encroaches close to and into the edge of the RPA of T1. Construction within the RPA, can have negative impacts on tree roots. However, the encroachment is very minor, and the detailed RPA for these trees is likely to be a slightly exaggerated representation of the trees actual rooting area. As such, it is unlikely that significant roots will be within these areas and the retained tree should remain largely unaffected by the works, provided care is taken during construction.

4.3.3 The design of the new development has considered the trees crown position in relation to the development. Some shade from trees may be beneficial. In particular, deciduous trees give shade in summer but allow

access to sunlight in winter. However, the design proposals avoid excessive shading, and give adequate provision for future tree growth.

4.3.4 All the retained trees have been assessed as suitable for retention in terms of BS5837 (2012) section 5 "Proximity of structures to trees." The retained trees will not cause unreasonable inconvenience or nuisance issues, leading to associated pressures for felling or excessive pruning. The layout allows sufficient space to enable the retained trees to grow to maturity without significantly adversely affecting the amenity of the new development.

4.3.5 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 An associated Arboricultural Method Statement, detailing protective fencing specifications and construction methods close to the retained trees has been provided.

5. Signature

I trust this report provides all the required information.

.....

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

1st July 2025

**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, 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), TechArborA, QTRA Registered

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, QTRA Registered

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, MArborA, 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 professional-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

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 unsuitable for retention. 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	Crown height	N	E	S	W	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Physiological	Structural	Life Expectancy	Amenity	Category	Works
T1	Lawson Cypress	<i>Chamaecyparis lawsoniana</i>	Semi-mature	9.5	6	170 avg	No	2.3	2	2	2	2	Exposed roots. Ground level changes	Multiple stemmed at 0.5m. Old pruning wounds. Tight union. Partially included bark	Old pruning wounds	Located in Laurel hedge.	Good	Fair	10 to 20 yrs	Low	C	No works required
T2	Scots Pine	<i>Pinus sylvestris</i>	Semi-mature	11	1	310	No	2.5	3	3.5	2.5	2.5	Exposed roots. Root damage /loss. Ground level changes	Single stemmed. Vertical. Old pruning wounds	Snapped /hanging branches. Bark damage	Exposed roots with impact wounds to southwest. Branch snap-outs evident in crown with associated bark damage wounding.	Good	Good	10 to 20 yrs	Low	C	Removal required to facilitate development
T3	Cypress	<i>Cypress sp</i>	Young	4	3	100, 60, 60	No	0.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	Limited access around base	Multiple stemmed at base. Old pruning wounds	Old pruning wounds	One stem has failed/been pruned at 1.4m height.	Fair	Fair	10 to 20 yrs	Low	C	Removal required to facilitate development
T4	Cherry	<i>Prunus sp</i>	Semi-mature	5.5	6	95 avg	No	3	2.5	2.5	2	2	No visual defects	Multiple stemmed at base. Tight union. Partially included bark. Old pruning wounds	Slightly unbalanced. Old pruning wounds. Suppressed	Pruning wounds on lower stem to West at 1m height. Evidence of historic pruning in crown.	Fair	Fair	10 to 20 yrs	Low	C	Removal required to facilitate development
T5	Cypress	<i>Cypress sp</i>	Semi-mature	3.5	2	90, 100	No	0	1	2	2	1.5	Exposed roots. Root damage /loss. Ground level changes	Twin stemmed at base	Old pruning wounds	Minor root damage evident to south. Historically topped at 2m height.	Fair	Fair	10 to 20 yrs	Low	C	Removal required to facilitate development

Tree Species		Measurements					Crown (m)				Tree Condition					Value		Management				
Tree ID	Common Name	Latin Name	Maturity	Height (m)	Stems	Stem Diameter (mm)	Estimated	Crown height	N	E	S	W	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Physiological	Structural	Life Expectancy	Amenity	Category	Works
T6	Goat Willow	<i>Salix caprea</i>	Semi-mature	4.5	2	100, 100	Yes	1.5	1	1	1	1	Limited access around base	Twin stemmed	Old pruning wounds	Adjacent tree, not inspected in detail. Managed in small form	Fair	Fair	10 to 20 yrs	Low	C	No works required




Appendix 5: Tree Constraints Plan

14 Manor Road, Farnley Tyas, Huddersfield, HD4 6UL
Ref: AWA6782

BRITISH STANDARD 5837:2012
RETENTION CATEGORIES
Definitions of these categories can be found in Appendix 2 of the report.

SCALE: 1:200 PAPER: A4

	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

14 Manor Road, Farnley Tyas, Huddersfield, HD4 6UL
Ref: AWA6782

BRITISH STANDARD 5837:2012

SCALE: 1:200

PAPER: A4

	TREE/ TREE GROUP/ HEDGE TO BE RETAINED
	TREE/ TREE GROUP/ HEDGE TO BE REMOVED
	RPA: ROOT PROTECTION AREA
	TREE STEM