James Royston
Arboricultural Consultant

Tree Survey

in accordance with

BS5837:2012

Causeway Side

Huddersfield

Table of Contents

1 Summary....3
2 Introduction....4
2.1 Purpose of report....4
2.2 Limitations of report....4
2.3 Disclaimers....4
2.3 General recommendations....4
2.4 Survey conditions....4
3 Data collection methods....5
3.1 Methodology and data table key....5
3.2 Category Rating....6
3.2.1 Main Categories....6
3.2.2 Sub-categories....6
5 Legal status of surveyed trees....7
6 Contact Details....8
Appendix 1: Data Tables....9
Appendix 2: Plans....10

1 Summary

This survey includes 11 trees and/or groups of trees. Only those trees within influencing distance were included.

G1 is a group of mature trees. They were not fully inspected as they are located outside the area of interest.

Most of the trees surveyed were of medium value and in reasonable condition to be retained – they have been allocated a category B.

Tree T4 is of poor quality and is in poor condition – it's removal is recommended whether development occurs or not.

2 Introduction

2.1 Purpose of report

To undertake a tree survey in accordance with British Standard 5837:2012 'Trees in relation to construction – Recommendations' at: The Orchards, Causeway Side, Linthwaite, Huddersfield.

2.2 Limitations of report

The recommendations in this report are of a preliminary nature and do not take into account any specific development proposals. This allows the trees to be assessed independently and without bias. It also allows the same tree report to be used should the layout or design of the site be altered.

This report is based upon a visual survey undertaken on foot from ground level. In order to minimise costs no digging, drilling, climbing, or other diagnostic technique was undertaken on this occasion.

Though tree related hazards will be recorded and commented upon where observed, this report is not a tree hazard risk assessment and should not be used as such.

2.3 Disclaimers

The consultant shall not be responsible for events which happen after the date of survey due to factors which where not apparent at the time of the survey.

The plans included as part of this report are based on those provided by the client or their representatives. Whilst reasonable steps are taken to ensure plans are accurate and correct, the consultant will not be responsible for errors or omissions arising due to information provided by the client or the client's representatives.

2.3 General recommendations

For the management of risk from falling trees it is advisable to have trees regularly surveyed by a suitably qualified and experienced arborist. The frequency, level and type of survey will vary from site to site depending on a range of factors. We are happy to assist in this if required.

All tree works should be carried out to BS 3998:2010 - Recommendations for tree work by a suitably qualified, experienced and insured contractor.

2.4 Survey conditions

The survey was carried out on 24th June 2015 by James Royston.

The weather conditions; dry, visibility was unaffected.

3 Data collection methods

3.1 Methodology and data table key

Tree height is calculated in metres from ground level to the highest point of the tree using a distance measure (eg a tape measure, a laser measure or measuring wheel depending on site conditions) and a clinometer.

Stem diameter is measured and rounded down to the nearest ten millimetres at 1.5m above ground level using a specialist measuring tape. Where a tree divides into multiple stems below 1.5m it will be measured at the lowest point above the root flare. The data tables show whether a tree is single or multi-stem.

Canopy spread is measured in metres at magnetic north, south, east and west using a tape measure, a measuring wheel or a laser measure. Measurements are taken from the tree stem at ground level to the furthest extent of the crown in the direction being measured.

Height of crown clearance is estimated in metres and is an indication of the lowest significant live branches of the crown. Epicormic growth and small diameter suppressed branches would not normally be considered as significant.

Age Class is divided into young, semi-mature, early-mature, mature, over mature, and veteran. This is an indication of which stage a tree is at in its natural life cycle, allowing for an assessment of how energy and growth will be prioritised within a tree. In general, younger trees are more able to cope with disturbance or stress.

Physiological condition is an assessment of the health and vigour of the tree and will include an assessment of the size, colour and density of the foliage. Trees in good physiological condition are better able to cope with disturbance or stress.

Structural condition is an indication of the structural integrity of the tree. This is given as good, average or poor. More details will be given in the observations column of the data tables if appropriate.

The observations column will include a brief description of each tree and provide further information as relevant.

Visual importance is assessed using a combination of factors such as species, size, aesthetic quality and location. The visual importance of a tree (or group of trees) is one of the key factors in determining its category grading.

The remaining contribution is a rough estimate of the number of years a tree is expected to survive in a structurally sound condition assuming normal arboricultural management.

Occasionally it is impractical to obtain accurate measurements due to restricted access or other site conditions and the data may be estimated. Where data is estimated the figures are shown in italics in the attached data tables.

3.2 Category Rating

3.2.1 Main Categories

Category ratings are allocated based on the current quality and value of a tree in its current surroundings assuming the recommendations of this report are carried out. No consideration is given to any specific development proposal when allocating category ratings.

Category A trees are those which are of high quality and value, are in good structural and physiological condition and are expected to contribute for at least another 40 years.

Category B trees are those which would be considered as category A trees but which are of lower quality and value, poorer structural condition, and which are expected to contribute for at least 20 years.

Category C trees are those which are of low quality and value, are in poor condition, and are expected to contribute for at least 10 years.

Category U trees are those which are expected to contribute for less than 10 years due to serious defects. As is common in risk management, where there is doubt, the precautionary principle may be applied.

In certain circumstances trees may be considered of higher value due to cultural or ecological reasons. If this is the case it will be made clear in the tree data tables.

3.2.2 Sub-categories

Sub- categories of 1, 2 or 3 are included in the tree data tables and are defined as follows:

Sub-category 1 trees are those with 'mainly arboricultural value'

Sub-category 2 trees are those with 'mainly landscape value'

Sub-category 3 trees are those with 'mainly cultural or conservation value'

These subcategories do not infer any hierarchy of value. For example a category B1 tree should not necessarily be considered any more valuable than a category B3 tree.

5 Legal status of surveyed trees

In order to both reduce costs and to ensure timely completion, no check has been made by this consultant with the local planning authority.

We recommend that the local planning authority is contacted to check whether the trees on this site are protected by a Tree Preservation Order or are within a Conservation Area.

Trees may also be subject to legal protection under a range of other legislation, much of which is aimed at wildlife and habitat protection.

No work should be done to any trees until either suitable permission has been granted or it has been verified that the intended work does not require permission.

We are happy to assist in establishing whether trees on this site are protected by a Tree Preservation Order or a Conservation Area designation if required.

6 Contact Details

I hope this report provides all the required information. However, if further advice is needed then please contact me and I will be happy to help.

James Royston – Independent Arboricultural Consultant
MSc Arboriculture and Urban Forestry, BSc (Hons) Forestry

The Media Centre

7 Northumberland Street

Huddersfield

HD1 1RL

Report completed 30th June 2015

Appendix 1: Data Tables

Key:

Tree number Refers to the tree number as shown on the attached plans.

Common name Is the English name given to a species.

Scientific name Also known as the botanical name often is in Latin but can contain elements of other languages. The botanical authority who named the species is not included.

Height is tree height in metres.

Diameter is stem diameter rounded down to the nearest 10mm.

Branch spread is the distance from the base of the tree to the extremities of the crown in the four cardinal directions of the magnetic compass.

Height of crown clearance is estimated in metres and is an indication of the lowest significant live branches of the crown.

Age class is an indication of which stage a tree is at in its natural life cycle.

Physiological condition is an assessment of the health and vigour of the tree.

Structural condition is an indication of the structural integrity of the tree.

The observations column includes a brief description of each tree and provide further information as relevant.

Preliminary management recommendations includes suggestions on tree management when considering current site use and current tree condition.

Visual importance is an indication of the visual amenity value of the tree in its current setting.


Remaining contribution is a rough estimate of the number of years a tree is expected to survive in a structurally sound condition assuming normal arboricultural management.

Category grading is given as A, B, C or U with subcategories 1, 2 or 3. See Section 3.2 for further details.

Note: Occasionally it is impractical to obtain accurate measurements due to restricted access or other site conditions and the data/measurements may be estimated.

Tree Number	Common Name	Botanical Name	Height (m)	Effective Diameter (mm)	Branch spread (m)				Crown Clearance (m)	Age class	Physiological condition	Structural condition	Observations	Recommendations	Visual Amenity Value	Remaining contribution (years)	Category grading	RPA radius (m)
					North	East	South	West										
1	Mix	*Mix*	18	450	_	_	_	_	2	Early mature	Fair	Fair	A mixed group of lime, horse chestnut, and sycamore. Mostly single stem. Not fully inspected because they are mostly outside the area of interest.	No action at present	Medium	20+	B2	5.4
2	Lime	*Tilia sp*	18	470	6.4	5.2	5.0	2.6	5	Early mature	Fair	Fair	A single stem slightly leaning tree with no apparent major defects.	No action at present	Medium	20+	B2	5.6
3	Horse chestnut	*Aesculus hippocastanum*	18	620	2.2	3.3	*6.0*	*5.0*	2	Early mature	Fair	Fair	A single stem tree with a multi-stem crown containing tight unions. The tree has horse chestnut canker.	No action at present	Medium	20+	B2	7.4
4	Horse chestnut	*Aesculus hippocastanum*	15	300	1.8	2.5	1.7	1.7	3	Semi mature	Poor	Poor	A single stem tree with major die-back in the upper crown. The tree is suppressed by neighbouring batter quality trees.	Remove	Low	<10	U	3.6
5	Horse chestnut	*Aesculus hippocastanum*	18	560	2.2	1.7	5.0	3.0	3	Early mature	Fair	Fair	A single stem tree with a multi-stem crown with minor deadwood and hanging branches.	No action at present	Medium	20+	B2	6.7
6	Lime	*Tilia sp*	19	450	2.8	5.1	4.7	4.7	5	Early mature	Fair	Fair	A single stem leaning tree with minor die-back throughout.	No action at present	Medium	20+	B2	5.4
7	Horse chestnut	*Aesculus hippocastanum*	16	390	1.8	3.9	4.0	4.0	3	Semi mature	Fair	Fair	A single stem tree with a twin stem crown. No apparent major defects.	No action at present	Low	20+	C2	4.7
8	Horse chestnut	*Aesculus hippocastanum*	12	330	0.0	2.5	7.0	2.7	3	Semi mature	Fair	Fair	A single stem leaning tree with no apparent major defects.	No action at present	Low	20+	C2	4.0
9	Horse chestnut	*Aesculus hippocastanum*	14	390	2.8	3.3	7.0	3.2	4	Early mature	Fair	Fair	A single stem tree with a twin stem crown with a tight union and partially included bark. The tree has horse chestnut canker.	No action at present	Medium	20+	B2	4.7
10	Horse chestnut	*Aesculus hippocastanum*	13	290	2.5	1.2	7.0	2.1	3	Semi mature	Fair	Fair	A twin stem tree with basal bark wounds. No apparent major defects.	No action at present	Low	20+	C2	3.5
11	Mix	*Mix*	18	500	_	_	_	_	5	Mature	Fair	Fair	A group of horse chestnut and lime. No apparent major defects.	No action at present	Medium	20+	B2	6.0

Appendix 2: Plans



Note: Plans are for guidance only. These drawings should not be be used for scaling.

James Royston
Arboricultural Consultant
The Media Centre - 7 Northumberland Street - Huddersfield - HD1 1RL

Tree constraints plan at:
Causeway Side, Huddersfield

1:500	PAPER SIZE A3

Key	
	Category A Tree
	Category B Tree
	Category C Tree
	Category U Tree
	Root protection area
• NST	Not Significant Tree - not included in survey because of low value and/or insignificance to local tree-scape

N
Indicative

50m