

NYMNPA

20/12/2022

Whitefield Farm
Appleton le Street
Malton
North Yorkshire
YO17 6PG



BS 5837:2012 ARBORICULTURAL SURVEY

FOR- LINE ARCHITECTURE (YORKSHIRE) LTD

15/11/2022

Re: Stray Head Farm, Little Beck Lane, Littlebeck, Whitby

ARBORICULTURAL SURVEY

Re: Stray Head Farm, Little Beck Lane, Littlebeck, Whitby

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. Mr Ashley Line of Line Architecture (Yorkshire) Ltd, requested an independent arboricultural survey of the trees located adjacent to the site of proposed development at Stray Head Farm. This report provides arboricultural information and advice in relation to the current health and safety of the trees inspected.
- 1.2. This document has been prepared by Mr. Joseph Waite *TechArborA*, BTEC National Diploma Forestry & Arboriculture, holding a LANTRA Professional Tree Inspectors certificate, with over 16 years arboricultural consultancy and practical experience.
- 1.3. A tree condition survey was undertaken on the 11/11/2022, which collected information on the trees in line with the recommendations set out in British standards document BS 5837:2012 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations'.
- 1.4. This report is the result of a survey using Visual Tree Assessment (VTA) and appraising general condition, tree health and structural condition. The report relates only to the conditions prevailing on the date that the site was surveyed. Data is presented in a table format (Schedule)
- 1.5. Maps are included for identification and illustrative purposes. Map 1 and 2 have been plotted using a basic GPS locator. Due to the potential for inaccuracy exact tree locations should not be relied upon. If more detailed locations need to be captured, a full topographical survey should be carried out.
- 1.6. Prior to site works commencing, and in particular ground preparation, this Report needs to be passed to the site manager and used as reference during the development period

2. SCOPE OF REPORT

- 2.1. This report may include recommendations for any tree works within the site in line with the duty of care, these will be located in the 'Recommendations' column of the Schedule.
- 2.2. The Trees surveyed have been categorised in importance of retention according to British Standards, noted as A, B, C and U and sub categories 1, 2 and 3. An explanation of these categories is in appendix 2
- 2.3. The 'Arboricultural Method Statement' outlines specifically any trees or vegetation to be removed prior to development and those to be retained along with any recommended works. Also provided are details of all measures recommended for adequate tree protection including any special construction measures to be utilised in order to minimise potential damage to retained trees.

3. SITE INFORMATION

- 3.1. The site is currently a domestic dwelling with land and woodland. The proposed development is an extension using the existing footprint of outbuilding and concrete pad with no new land based development.
- 3.2. The trees within proximity to the site are the only ones noted and are situated to the W of the site of proposed redevelopment down a bank side which is currently fenced off with a small domestic wooden fence.

3.3. The soil information according to Cranfield University Soilscales maps shows that it is likely “Slowly permeable seasonally wet acid loamy and clayey soils”. This means impeded drainage flowing into stream network, with a relatively low fertility.

3.4. The site is at an approx. 90m elevation and within 5 miles of the sea to the E. It is a slightly exposed site within a valley with surrounding tree stands.

4. TREE INSPECTION DETAILS

4.1. The trees were inspected by Visual Tree Inspection from the ground.

4.2. Conditions at time of survey were clear and blustery.

ID	Common Botanical	Structure	Num. Stems	Height (m)	DBH (cm)	Crown Spread	Life Stage	Life Expect	Proposed RPA (m)	Survey Notes	Physiological Condition	Structural Condition	Cat	Recommendations
T001	Sycamore <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	Tree	1	13	55	N4.5 E5.5 W5.5 S5	Mature	40	6.5	Slight buttressing on the root stock. Height of first branch; 2m. Previous crown lifting work with some exposed cuts previous pruning stumps. Previous tear out higher in canopy leading to weak centre. Telephone line attached at 3.5 m and included.	Good	Good	B1	
T002	Common Ash <i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>	Tree	1	13.5	33	N1 E1.5 W1 S1.5	Early Mature	<10	4	Slight lean SE. Girdling possibly from previous fence wire. Crown lifted to 3.5 m. First branch at 3 m. Bird box present at 3.5 m. Some minor deadwood but fairly full canopy. Some slight signs of ash die back (week curled up tips and loss of leaf from ends during normal leaf drop in autumn)	Fair	Good	U	

T003	Common Ash <i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>	Tree	1	10	107	N3 E5 W5 S5.5	Early Mature	10	6*	Butteress roots. Hollow stem from major historic failure leaving a tree growing from snapped stem (leading to adjusted RPA measurement) Previous failure at top leading to low squat form. Height to first branch 1.5m Some epicormic stress growth noted. Excellent habitat for roasting birds. Bird box on NE limb at 3 m. Slightly weakened canopy noted from pictures taken early in season.	Fair	Poor	B3	
------	---	------	---	----	-----	---------------------	-----------------	----	----	--	------	------	----	--

*RPA size reduced from B5837 recommendations in response to Arboricultural factors such as canopy spread and height, as well as site placement.

5. DISCUSSION

- 5.1. Due to the existing pad and the small nature of the construction works, the development will likely have little to no impact on the trees surveyed. This is also due to their location meaning all works take place outside or on the edge of their ideal RPA.
- 5.2. The site location meaning the trees are located on a bank side also means access to the trees RPA and drip-lines are naturally limited.
- 5.3. Based on the above the following direction is minor in nature

6. ARBORICULTURAL METHOD STATEMENT

6.1. PREDEVELOPMENT:

- Material storage and site offices must be confined to areas outside root protection areas.
- Retain the current garden fence to prevent heavy machinery inadvertently straying onto the root protected areas and prevents accidental damage to branches

6.2. DURING DEVELOPMENT

- No construction or excavation should take place within the RPAs as shown on attached plan.
- Scaffolding should be limited to within 1m of the existing pad and any bracing should be done using pads to spread the load of the contact points.
- Only pedestrian equipment should be used within the RPA areas (the tree side of the garden fence)

- Retain fence whilst any plant machinery is on site, may only be removed upon completion of excavation or site works.
- Material storage and site offices must be confined to areas outside root protection areas.

7. ADDITIONAL NOTES

- 7.3. Potentially trees covered in this report may also be habitat for species of bird and bat. It is therefore recommended that appropriate advice should be sought with regard these matters and any other environmental concerns.
- 7.4. This report relates only to the conditions prevailing on the date that the site was surveyed
- 7.5. All terms are intended to be easily understood or otherwise explained. Glossary of terms available on request.
- 7.6. This report is prepared by a trained Arborist with best practice and British Standards in mind. The assessment was made using the Visual Tree Assessment method. There are always factors that are beyond the observation and control of the writer, however this report is finalised with all the information required to reasonably make this analysis and opinion, and is insured for professional indemnity.

Prepared by:	Mr. Joseph Waite
Date:	15/11/2022



APPENDIX 1 - IMAGES

Pic 1

Showing T001, location and proximity to existing building and concrete pad.
Also shown is the garden fence currently installed creating a barrier to the trees in question



Pic 2

Showing T002 (R) and T003



Pic 3

Showing girdling on T002



APPENDIX 2 - EXPLANATION OF BS5837:2012 TREE QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Trees unsuitable for retention

Category U

Those in such a condition that they cannot realistically be retained as living trees in the context of the current land use for longer than 10 years

(Trees that have a serious, irremediable, structural defect, that are dead or are showing signs of significant, immediate, and irreversible overall decline or significantly affected by pathogens)

Trees to be considered for retention

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

Sub Categories (Determining factors)

- 1 - Mainly arboricultural qualities
- 2 - Mainly landscape qualities
- 3 - Mainly cultural values, including conservation

APPENDIX 3 - SHOWING TREE LOCATIONS



KEY

Red - Current Pad/Building/Construction zone

Green - Proposed RPA