



# ARBORICULTURAL REPORT

to BS 5837:2012 at:

*Land at Carr Green Lane,  
Mapplewell,  
Barnsley  
S75 6DY*

Prepared for: *Richard Richardson*

Report Date: *June 2025*

Reference: *AWA6709*

0114 272 1124 / 0776 631 0880  
info@awatrees.com  
awatrees.com

Union Forge, 27 Mowbray Street, Sheffield S3 8EN  
AWA Tree Consultants Limited. Company No. 85201  
Registered in England & Wales.



TMP006-A  
Revision 02  
Auth By: APW  
Date:27/032025

## Executive Summary

This report presents the findings of a tree survey conducted in accordance with BS 5837:2012, offering independent arboricultural advice regarding the trees in the context of potential development.

The surveyed site comprises a parcel of unused land containing 7 tree features, including individual trees, tree groups, and hedges. The assessment categorised these as follows:

- 7 trees, tree groups and hedges of low value.

Retention of high and moderate-value trees is advised where possible, while lower-value trees may often be removed with appropriate mitigation.

The Tree Constraints Plan, detailing root protection areas, serves as a key reference, ensuring tree protection is integrated into development design.

# Contents

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>1. Introduction</b>  | <b>4</b>  |
| 1.1 Instructions and Brief                                      | 4         |
| 1.2 Survey Details  | 4         |
| <b>2. The Site</b>  | <b>5</b>  |
| 2.1 Location and Description                                    | 5         |
| <b>3. The Trees</b>   | <b>6</b>  |
| 3.1 Legal   | 6         |
| 3.2 Tree Survey Results   | 7         |
| 3.3 Photographs   | 9         |
| 3.4 Arboricultural Development Advice                           | 10        |
| <b>4. Signature</b>   | <b>12</b> |
| <b>Appendix 1: Authors Qualifications &amp; Experience</b>      | <b>14</b> |
| <b>Appendix 2: Survey Methodology and Limitations of Report</b> | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Appendix 3: Explanation of Tree Descriptions</b>             | <b>16</b> |
| <b>Appendix 4: Tree Data</b>                                    | <b>17</b> |
| <b>Appendix 5: Tree Constraints Plan</b>                        | <b>18</b> |

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1 Instructions and Brief

- 1.1.1 We were instructed by Richard Richardson 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 June 2025.
- 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. The tree survey data collection was carried out by Joe Thomas: MSci Biology, Award L4 Arboriculture, TechArborA, PTI (Lantra), QTRA Registered, 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 please refer to the Tree Constraints Plan at **Appendix 5**.

## 2. The Site

### 2.1 Location and Description

- 2.1.1 The site is located on Carr Green Lane in Mapplewell, Barnsley.
- 2.1.2 The site comprises an unused parcel of land. The site is bounded to the east by Carr Green Lane. To the south are commercial properties. To the west, north and east are residential properties.
- 2.1.3 The approximate area of the survey is highlighted in the (2023 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 Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council on 05/06/25 to check whether any trees at the site are protected by a Tree Preservation Order or are located within a Conservation Area. As of this date **no trees at the site are protected** by a Tree Preservation Order or are within a Conservation Area.
- 3.1.3 Due to the large potential penalties for illegally carrying out work to protected trees, before authorising any tree works a further check should be made with the Local Planning Authority to confirm if any trees are covered by a Tree Preservation Order or are within a Conservation Area. If either applies, then statutory permission is required before any works can take place (unless such work is approved as part of full planning permission).
- 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 2025), and a check for catalogued Ancient and Veteran trees using the woodland trust ancient tree inventory (ATI) (Woodland Trust 2025).
- 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. 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 7 items of woody vegetation, comprised of 2 individual trees and 5 tree groups or hedges.
- 3.2.2 Of the surveyed trees: 7 tree groups and hedges 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 significant tree cover within the site consists mainly of groups stretching along the boundaries. The majority of the trees on site are naturalised pioneer species that have established since the site was abandoned.
- 3.2.5 The central areas of the site contain little of arboricultural significance, generally consisting of young Willow.
- 3.2.6 Species diversity at the site is relatively Low. The dominant species is Willow, with several Cypress and the occasional Birch, Hawthorn and Cherry Laurel. The hedgerows are generally comprised of Cypress.
- 3.2.7 Most of the trees are semi-mature.
- 3.2.8 G1 and G2 are semi mature Lawson Cypress hedges stretching along the eastern boundary of site. These groups have been historically topped leaving pruning wounds and dead stems throughout. G2 is set within a raised planting bed at street level. G1 and G2 provide good screening for the site but are of lower overall arboricultural value.
- 3.2.9 T3 is a semi mature Willow in the northeast of site. T3 has been historically topped at one-and-a-half meters leaving pruning wounds with decay that limits its value. T3 is in fair overall condition and provides a low level of arboricultural value.
- 3.2.10 G5 is a group of semi mature Hawthorn trees in the northwest corner of site. There is rubble pile in and around the group as well as evidence of minor groundworks/level changes. G5 is in good overall condition and provides a low level of arboricultural value.
- 3.2.11 G6 is a self-set group of semi mature Birch and Willow in the west corner of site. The most significant tree with this group is T7 a semi mature Crack Willow. These trees are in good condition overall but have only a low level of arboricultural value.

- 3.2.12 The remaining trees within the site are of particularly low value and should not pose any significant constraint on the development potential of the site.
- 3.2.13 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.
- 3.2.14 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.
- 3.2.15 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: G1 and G2 from northwest



Photo 2: G2 and T3 from southwest



Photo 3: G4 and G5 from southeast



Photo 4: G5 and G6 from east



Photo 5: G6 and T7 from northwest



Photo 6: G6 and T7 from north

### **3.4 Arboricultural Development Advice**

- 3.4.1 The higher value retention category 'A' and 'B' trees and tree groups should be retained, where possible, and incorporated into any new development design.
- 3.4.2 Where suitable, those category 'C' trees, tree groups and hedges with reasonable future prospects should be retained as part of any new development. However, care should be taken to avoid misplaced tree retention. Attempts to retain too many or unsuitable trees on a site can result in excessive pressure on the trees during demolition or construction work, or post-completion demands for their removal.
- 3.4.3 If required by the development proposals, occasional lower value, retention category 'C' trees, tree groups and hedges could be removed, and replacement planting would largely mitigate their losses.
- 3.4.4 The tree Root Protection Area (RPA), detailed on the Tree Constraints Plan at Appendix 5, should be 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.
- 3.4.5 If construction of new buildings is required within the RPA of retained trees it may be possible to employ special foundation design such as mini/ micro pile and suspended beam foundations or cantilevered foundations.
- 3.4.6 Construction of hard surfaces, for drives and paths, 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 method with a porous final surface.
- 3.4.7 The design of the new development should consider tree crown positions in relation to any new dwellings. The dappled shade of a tree is more pleasant than the deep shadow of a building, and some shade from trees may be beneficial. In particular, deciduous trees give shade in summer but allow access to sunlight in winter. While either shade or sunlight might be desirable, depending on the potential use of the area affected, the design should avoid unreasonable obstruction of light and should give adequate provision for future tree growth.

### **3.5 Recommendations**

- 3.5.1 To promote a sustainable approach that aligns with Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council tree policies and planning regulations, the following next steps are recommended:
- 3.5.2 The tree survey and Tree Constraints Plan (TCP) provides critical baseline information, enabling design around tree constraints and minimises potential conflicts. The report information should be used to integrate suitable trees into the site design, ensuring that trees and buildings can coexist successfully.
- 3.5.3 As the project design progresses, a detailed Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) and Tree Impacts Plan (TIP) may be required to assess, in detail, the potential effects of the proposed development on retained trees. This assessment will also determine any necessary tree removals or pruning requirements and outline strategies to mitigate construction-related impacts.
- 3.5.4 Once design proposals are finalised and the arboricultural impacts have been fully assessed, the Local Planning Authority (LPA) may require a detailed Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) and Tree Protection Plan (TPP) as part of planning permission. These documents will detail how trees will be protected and managed during development, specify the installation and maintenance of protection measures throughout the project, and provide practical guidance to ensure contractors avoid accidental tree damage during construction.
- 3.5.5 These steps will help safeguard retained trees while facilitating site development in accordance with BS 5837:2012 and local planning requirements.

## 4. Signature

I trust this report provides all the required information.

Signed



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

**9th June 2025**

**AWA Tree Consultants Limited**

Union Forge  
27 Mowbray Street  
Sheffield  
S3 8EN

**[www.awatrees.com](http://www.awatrees.com)**



### **Our Charity Partner: Kids Plant Trees**

At AWA Tree Consultants, we are proud to partner with the local charity, Kids Plant Trees. This collaboration allows us to support a cause that reflects our commitment to trees and the environment while making a positive impact on local communities.

Kids Plant Trees is a grassroots charity dedicated to improving tree equity by planting trees in underserved areas with limited green spaces, often in communities facing higher levels of deprivation.

We are proud to support their mission to create greener, healthier environments for future generations.



# 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 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, PGCert, 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 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 unsuitable for retention.** These trees are in such a condition that any existing value would be lost within 10 years.

| Tree ID | Tree Species    |                                       | Maturity    | Measurements |       |                    |           | Crown (m)    |          |   |   | Tree Condition |   |  |                                    | Value  |               | Management |                 |         |          |                   |
|---------|-----------------|---------------------------------------|-------------|--------------|-------|--------------------|-----------|--------------|----------|---|---|----------------|---|--|------------------------------------|--|---------------|------------|-----------------|---------|----------|-------------------|
|         | Common Name     | Latin Name                            |             | Height (m)   | Stems | Stem Diameter (mm) | Estimated | Crown height | N        | E | S | W              | Roots   | Stem   | Crown                              | Comments   | Physiological | Structural | Life Expectancy | Amenity | Category | Works             |
| G1      | Leyland Cypress | X<br><i>Cupressocyparis leylandii</i> | Semi-mature | 6.5          | 10+   | 150 avg.           | No        | 0            | See plan |   |   |                | Boundary Cypress hedge. Topped at 2.5 meters with many dead stems and large wounds. Crown reformed from epicormic growth. Good screening value. Overhanging adjacent land to southwest.   |  |                                    |  | Good          | Poor       | 20 to 40 yrs    | Low     | C        | No works required |
| G2      | Leyland Cypress | X<br><i>Cupressocyparis leylandii</i> | Semi-mature | 6.5          | 10+   | 150 avg.           | No        | 0            | See plan |   |   |                | Boundary Cypress hedge. Topped at 2.5 meters with many dead stems and large wounds. Crown reformed from epicormic growth. Good screening value. Overhanging adjacent land to northeast. Lamppost within hedge on northern edge. In raise retaining wall planting area. Ground works to west. Severed roots. |  |                                    |  | Good          | Poor       | 20 to 40 yrs    | Low     | C        | No works required |
| T3      | Willow          | <i>Salix caprea</i>                   | Semi-mature | 3.5          | 6     | 90 avg.            | No        | 1            | 2        | 2 | 2 | 2              | No visual defects, Adjacent ground works  | Multiple stemmed at 0.5m, Old pruning wounds, Stubs, Tight union, Minor decay, Epicormic growths | Old pruning wounds, Minor deadwood | Topped at 1.5 meters leaving old pruning wounds with decay | Fair          | Fair       | 10 to 20 yrs    | Low     | C        | No works required |
| G4      | Cherry Laurel   | <i>Prunus laurocerasus</i>            | Semi-mature | 5.5          | 10+   | 80 avg.            | Yes       | 1            | See plan |   |   |                | Adjacent Laurel group on boundary, access prevented detailed inspection. Overhanging into site.   |  |                                    |  | Good          | Good       | 20 to 40 yrs    | Low     | C        | No works required |
| G5      | Hawthorn        | <i>Crataegus monogyna</i>             | Semi-mature | 5.5          | 10+   | 100 avg.           | Yes       | 0.5          | See plan |   |   |                | Hawthorns within mixed species scrub area which limited access and prevented detailed inspection. Rubble piles in southeast of group. Adjacent ground works. Good vitality in crowns.   |  |                                    |  | Good          | Good       | 20 to 40 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 | Crown height | N        | E | S   | W              | Roots  | Stem   | Crown  | Comments  | Physiological | Structural | Life Expectancy | Amenity | Category | Works             |
| G6      | Goat Willow  | <i>Salix caprea</i>   | Semi-mature | 6            | 10+   | 80 avg.            | Yes       | 0            | See plan |   |     |                | Dense, self-set group of semi mature Birch and Willow. Many stem less than 80 mm. Several stems at 100mm. Filling southwest corner of site. Much of group inaccessible preventing detailed inspection. |  |        |   | Good          | Good       | >40 yrs         | Low     | C        | No works required |
| T7      | Crack Willow | <i>Salix fragilis</i> | Semi-mature | 8            | 3     | 170, 140, 100      | No        | 1            | 4        | 2 | 1.5 | 2.5            | No visual defects  | Multiple stemmed at base, Vertical, Tight union, Epicormic growths | Normal | Larger self set Willow within G6. Tight unions at base. | Good          | Good       | >40 yrs         | Low     | C        | No works required |



**Appendix 5:  
Tree Constraints Plan**

Land at Carr Green Lane, Mapplewell, Barnsley  
Ref: AWA6709

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

SCALE: 1:200 PAPER: A2

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | CATEGORY A: HIGH VALUE<br>RETENTION MOST DESIRABLE |
|  | CATEGORY B: MODERATE VALUE<br>RETENTION DESIRABLE  |
|  | CATEGORY C: LOWER VALUE<br>COULD BE RETAINED       |
|  | CATEGORY U:<br>UNSUITABLE FOR RETENTION            |
|  | RPA: ROOT PROTECTION AREA                          |
|  | TREE STEM  |