



# **ARBORICULTURAL REPORT & Impact Assessment to BS 5837:2012 at:**

***9 Broom Close,  
Barnsley,  
S70 3EG***

Prepared for:  
***JK Planning and Design Service Ltd***

Date: *October 2024*

Reference: *AWA6265*

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



# Contents

<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1 Instructions and Brief	3
1.2 Survey Details	3
<b>2. The Site</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1 Location and Description	4
<b>3. The Trees</b>	<b>5</b>
3.1 Legal	5
3.2 Tree Survey Results	6
3.3 Photographs	8
<b>4. Arboricultural Impact Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
4.1 Proposed New Development	9
4.2 Direct Impacts	9
4.3 Indirect Impacts	10
4.4 Suitable Mitigation	10
4.5 Protection of the Retained Trees	10
<b>5. Signature</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Appendix 1: Authors Qualifications &amp; Experience</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Appendix 2: Survey Methodology and Limitations</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Appendix 3: Explanation of Tree Descriptions</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Appendix 4: Tree Data</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Appendix 5: Tree Constraints Plan</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Appendix 6: Tree Impacts Plan</b>	<b>18</b>

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1 Instructions and Brief

- 1.1.1 We have been instructed by JK Planning and Design Service Ltd 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 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 Miss Lucy Garbutt, MSc, BSc (Hons), Arboriculturist at AWA Tree Consultants.
- 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 Broom Close, Barnsley.
- 2.1.2 The site comprises a detached disused building with a housing estate to the north, park to the east and west, and a car park to the south.
- 2.1.3 The approximate area of the survey is highlighted in the (2022 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 07/10/24 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 2021), and a check for catalogued Ancient and Veteran trees using the woodland trust ancient tree inventory (ATI) (Woodland Trust 2021).
- 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.
- 3.1.8 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 10 items of woody vegetation, comprised of 9 individual trees and 1 tree groups or hedges.
- 3.2.2 Of the surveyed trees: 2 trees are retention category 'U' and 8 trees, 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 a mixed species semi-mature hedge group that runs along the boundary of the site. Situated within this group are a few more mature trees of a mix of species.
- 3.2.5 Poplar and Silver Birch are the most dominant species found at the site, but with several Beech and the occasional Willow.
- 3.2.6 Most of the trees are semi-mature with only occasional early mature to mature trees.
- 3.2.7 Large early-mature Poplars T1 – T3 are prominent and provide moderate amenity to the surrounding area. Despite their size and stature within the landscape, they have defects which limit their long-term prospects. T1 has some decayed stubs at the base and T3 has some exposed roots to the east where recent ground works have taken place. Within a more developed context, it is unlikely that these trees are suitable for retention, but within the current site context they can be retained. Due to these defects, these trees are only retention category 'C'.
- 3.2.8 Silver Birch T6 and T7 both have fire damage at the base, which is causing cavities and decay. The fire damage on T6 is severe, and although T7's fire damage is less severe, there is moderate dieback in the crown of T7 and T7 is leaning. Both trees have limited long term prospects and are in poor condition. Both are retention category 'U' trees and are recommended for removal regardless of any development at the site.
- 3.2.9 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.
- 3.2.10 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.
- 3.2.11 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.

3.2.12 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 – T3 from south.



Photo 2: T1 – T3 from south east



Photo 3: T4 from west.



Photo 4: Fire damage to base of T6.



Photo 5: T6 from east.



Photo 6: T7 from south west.

## 4. Arboricultural Impact Assessment

### 4.1 Proposed New Development

4.1.1 It is proposed to build two new properties with associated access, parking, landscaping and facilities. 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 and 1 tree group will require partial 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. 1 tree group also requires pruning works to facilitate the development.

4.2.2 The trees that require removal to facilitate the development are T1, T2, T3 and T8.

4.2.3 The tree group that requires partial removal to facilitate the development is G5.

4.2.4 The trees to be removed are all lower value, retention category 'C'. T1, T2 and T3 are all early-mature self-set Poplar trees in fair condition, each with defects that limit their long-term prospects. T1 is multi-stemmed with some decayed stubs at the base, T2 is heavily ivy covered preventing detailed inspection of unions and T3 has some exposed roots at the base where electrical works have historically taken place. Although the three trees have moderate amenity value, all three trees are situated unsuitably close to existing properties and highways and due to their species' characteristics, are likely to pose a risk in future if left in place. T8 is a self-set semi-mature Beech tree with little arboricultural value. Due to the low value of the trees to be removed the removals will have only a negligible negative arboricultural impact and mitigation planting will make up for the loss of amenity provided by these three trees.

4.2.5 A small section of G5 requires partial removal to facilitate the new access road. G5 is a lower value, retention category 'C' hedgerow type tree group which will tolerate the required removals with little to impact on its long-term health or amenity.

4.2.6 G5 also requires pruning works to facilitate the development. Sections of G5's crown overhang close to or within the footprint of the development, and as such G5 requires pruning back to the boundary as required to facilitate adequate clearance for the proposed development. Do not

prune beyond the boundary.

- 4.2.7 2 trees require removal regardless of the development due to their poor condition and limited long-term prospects – these are T6 and T7.

### **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. As such, no significant negative indirect impacts have been identified.
- 4.3.2 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.
- 4.3.3 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.
- 4.3.4 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 The retained trees will require protection by fencing in accordance with BS 5837: 2012, during the development phase.
- 4.5.2 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.

Signed



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

**15<sup>th</sup> October 2024**

**AWA Tree Consultants Limited  
Union Forge  
27 Mowbray Street  
Sheffield  
S3 8EN**

**[www.awatrees.com](http://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, TechArborA, 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 technician-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 ID	Tree Species		Measurements				Crown (m)				Tree Condition				Value			Management				
	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	Poplar	<i>Populus sp.</i>	Early-mature	18	1	500	Yes	4	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	Limited access around base. Decay	Single stemmed. Vertical. Epicormic growths. Old pruning wounds. Tight union. Partially included bark	Old pruning wounds. Minor dieback. Minor deadwood. Cavities	Large Poplar situated within planting border. Twin stemmed at approx 3m. Some decayed stubs at base.	Fair	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Moderate	C	Removal required to facilitate the development.
T2	Poplar	<i>Populus sp.</i>	Early-mature	18	1	450	Yes	4	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	Limited access around base.	Single stemmed. Vertical. Epicormic growths. Heavily ivy covered. Old pruning wounds. Tight union. Partially included bark	Old pruning wounds. Minor dieback. Minor deadwood. Cavities	Heavily ivy covered.	Fair	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Moderate	C	Removal required to facilitate the development.
T3	Poplar	<i>Populus sp.</i>	Early-mature	18	1	400	Yes	4	5.5	5.5	5.5	5.5	Limited access around base.	Single stemmed. Vertical. Epicormic growths. Old pruning wounds. Tight union. Partially included bark	Old pruning wounds. Minor dieback. Minor deadwood. Cavities	Plank of wood nailed to stem. Electric works approx 2.5m from T3 with some roots exposed.	Fair	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Moderate	C	Removal required to facilitate the development.
T4	Willow	<i>Salix sp.</i>	Semi-mature	6	10+	70 avg.	Yes	2	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	Limited access around base	Multiple stemmed at base. Vertical	Normal	Situated within group.	Fair	Good	>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
G5	Beech, Elder and Holly	<i>Fagus sylvatica</i> , <i>Sambucus nigra</i> , <i>Ilex aquifolium</i>	Semi-mature	2	10+	70 avg.	Yes	0	See plans.				Limited access around base	Multiple stemmed at base. Vertical	Normal	Mixed species hedgerow which wraps around site and provides decent screening.	Fair	Good	>40 yrs	Low	C	Partial removal required to facilitate the development. Pruning works required to facilitate the development - prune back to the boundary as required to provide adequate clearance for the development. Do not prune beyond the boundary.
T6	Silver Birch	<i>Betula pendula</i>	Early-mature	8	1	300	Yes	3	3.5	5	5	3.5	Limited access around base	Single stemmed. Vertical. Old pruning wounds. Epicormic growths	Old pruning wounds	Moderate fire damage at the base leaving cavities and decay.	Poor	Fair	< 10 yrs	Moderate	U	Removal recommended regardless of any development on site.
T7	Silver Birch	<i>Betula pendula</i>	Semi-mature	5	1	230	Yes	1.5	1.5	2.5	4	3	Limited access around base	Single stemmed. Slight lean. Old pruning wounds	Old pruning wounds. Moderate dieback. Minor deadwood	Moderate dieback in crown. Leaning south. Minor fire damage at base.	Poor	Fair	< 10 yrs	Low	U	Removal recommended regardless of any development on site.
T8	Beech	<i>Fagus sylvatica</i>	Semi-mature	6	2	100, 150	Yes	2.5	2	3	2	1.5	Limited access around base	Twin stemmed at 1m. Vertical	Normal		Good	Good	>40 yrs	Low	C	Removal required to facilitate the development.
T9	Silver Birch	<i>Betula pendula</i>	Early-mature	8	1	300	Yes	3	3.5	5	5	3.5	Limited access around base	Single stemmed. Vertical. Old pruning wounds. Epicormic growths	Old pruning wounds		Good	Good	>40 yrs	Moderate	C	No works required.

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
	T10	Silver Birch	<i>Betula pendula</i>	Semi-mature	3	1	70	Yes	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	Limited access around base	Single stemmed. Vertical. Old pruning wounds. Epicormic growths	Old pruning wounds		Fair	Fair	>40 yrs	Low	C









  
**AWA**  
 TREE CONSULTANTS

**Appendix 5:**  
**Tree Constraints Plan**  
 9 Broom Close, Barnsey, S70 3EG  
 Ref: AWA6265

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

SCALE: 1:200      PAPER: A3

	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

