



# **ARBORICULTURAL REPORT**

to BS 5837:2012 at:

***Lancaster House,  
Keresforth Hall Drive,  
Barnsley,  
S70 6NH***

Prepared for:  
***Gareth Graham***

Date: *May 2024*

Reference: *AWA6044*



# 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
3.4 Arboricultural Development Advice	9
<b>4. Signature</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Appendix 1: Authors Qualifications &amp; Experience</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Appendix 2: Survey Methodology and Limitations of Report</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Appendix 3: Explanation of Tree Descriptions</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Appendix 4: Tree Data</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Appendix 5: Tree Constraints Plan</b>	<b>16</b>

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1 Instructions and Brief

- 1.1.1 We were instructed by Gareth Graham 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 May 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 Lucy Garbutt, MSc, BSc (Hons) Biology, 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**.

## 2. The Site

### 2.1 Location and Description

- 2.1.1 The site is located on Keresforth Hall Drive in Barnsley.
- 2.1.2 The site comprises a detached residential property with associated garden and access. To the north, west and south are further residential properties and to the east is agricultural fields.
- 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 24/05/24 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. 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 15 items of woody vegetation, comprised of 14 individual trees and 1 tree group.
- 3.2.2 Of the surveyed trees: 1 tree is retention category 'U', 4 trees are retention category 'B' and 10 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 early-mature and mature Cherry tree individual trees planted along the driveway. There are also several other early-mature to mature trees of various species along the southern boundary of the site. Whilst the Cherry trees along the driveway are likely planted trees, the other trees on the southern boundary are likely self-set trees.
- 3.2.5 Species diversity at the site is relatively low. The dominant species is Cherry, with several Sycamore, Ash, and Monkey Puzzle. The hedgerows are generally comprised of Privet and Yew.
- 3.2.6 Most of the trees are early mature or mature trees, with only the occasional semi-mature individual.
- 3.2.7 The sites most significant trees are the retention category 'B' trees: Cherries T3, T5 and T6 and Sycamore T11. T3, T5 and T6 are all prominent, mature Cherry trees which line the drive to the east of the site. All three are in good physiological condition, with little visual defects and good long-term prospects. Sycamore T11 is in early-mature individual which has likely self-set and become established, situated on the southeast of the site. T11 has been pruned to clear the crown away from the powerlines and the road to the west of the tree and has some stubs and moderate deadwood in the western crown as a result. T11 is in good condition, with good long-term prospects and has moderate amenity value.
- 3.2.8 Monkey Puzzle trees T9 and T10 are both planted semi-mature individuals situated within the western garden area of the site. Both are in good condition, with good long-term prospects. Both are low amenity value and are retention category 'C' trees.
- 3.2.9 Ash trees T13 and T14 are early-mature and mature individual trees, respectively. Both are situated in the southern corner of the site, close to a

boundary wall and a wooden chicken hut. Both are currently in good condition, but both are starting to show signs of Ash dieback disease within the crown, with T14 having worse dieback than T13. Both have moderate amenity value, but unfortunately their prospects are likely limited by Ash Dieback disease, and as such both are retention category 'C' trees.

- 3.2.10 Many Ash trees in the wider region are being impacted by Chalara or Ash dieback disease. Once a tree is infected, the disease is usually fatal, either directly or indirectly. While the identified Ash trees may continue to provide landscape and wildlife benefits for some time, their long-term prospects are likely to be limited as a result of Ash dieback.
- 3.2.11 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.
- 3.2.12 One tree was found to have defects and requires felling regardless of any new development at the site, this is T7 (as detailed in Appendix 4).
- 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: T5 and T6 from south west.



Photo 2: T6 – T8 from north west.



Photo 3: Stem of T7 from north.



Photo 4: T10 from south.



Photo 5: T11 and T12 from north east.



Photo 6: T13 and T14 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. Whilst 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.
- 3.4.8 The retained trees may require protection by fencing in accordance with BS 5837:2012, during the development phase.
- 3.4.9 If required by the Local Planning Authority, an associated Arboricultural Method Statement, detailing protective fencing specifications and construction methods close to the retained trees can be provided.

## 4. Signature

I trust this report provides all the required information.

Signed



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

**29<sup>th</sup> May 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 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 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 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 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	Cherry	<i>Prunus avium</i>	Early-mature	10	1	390	No	2	6	6	4.5	3	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical. Stubs. Old pruning wounds. Epicormic growths. Cracking bark	Old pruning wounds. Minor dieback. Minor deadwood	Pruned away from power lines on the western side. Building materials stored at base	Good	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	No works required in current site context
T2	Cherry	<i>Prunus avium</i>	Early-mature	9	1	400	No	2	2	7	4	5	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical. Epicormic growths. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Cracking bark	Old pruning wounds. Minor dieback. Minor deadwood	Pruned away from power lines on the western side.	Good	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	No works required in current site context
T3	Cherry	<i>Prunus avium</i>	Mature	10	1	530	No	2	4	7	5	5	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical. Epicormic growths. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Cracking bark	Old pruning wounds. Minor dieback. Minor deadwood		Good	Fair	>40 yrs	Low	B	No works required in current site context
T4	Cherry	<i>Prunus avium</i>	Early-mature	9	1	440	No	2	4	7	4	6	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical. Epicormic growths. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Cracking bark	Old pruning wounds. Minor dieback. Minor deadwood		Good	Fair	>40 yrs	Low	C	No works required in current site context

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
T5	Cherry	<i>Prunus avium</i>	Mature	9	1	520	No	2	4	7	4.5	4.5	Exposed roots	Single stemmed. Vertical. Epicormic growths. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Cracking bark	Old pruning wounds. Minor dieback. Minor deadwood	Lifting soil slightly	Good	Fair	>40 yrs	Low	B	No works required in current site context
T6	Cherry	<i>Prunus avium</i>	Mature	10	1	510	No	2	5	7	3	3.5	Exposed roots	Single stemmed. Vertical. Epicormic growths. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Cracking bark	Old pruning wounds. Minor dieback. Minor deadwood	Lifting soil slightly	Good	Fair	>40 yrs	Low	B	No works required in current site context
T7	Cherry	<i>Prunus avium</i>	Early-mature	9	1	470	No	2	2	4	5	4	Exposed roots. Fungus	Single stemmed. Vertical. Old pruning wounds. Epicormic growths. Stubs. Bark damage. Minor cavities. Major decay. Cracking bark	Old pruning wounds. Moderate dieback. Minor deadwood. Cavities. Low vigour	Fungal bracket detached at base possibly <i>Phellinus pomaceus</i> . Cracked bark exposing rotten heartwood and several pruning wounds with decay.	Poor	Fair	<10 yrs	Low	U	Unsuitable to retain in current site context
T8	Cherry	<i>Prunus avium</i>	Mature	10	1	530	No	3	4.5	6	3	2.5	Exposed roots	Single stemmed. Vertical. Epicormic growths. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Minor cavities. Cracking bark	Old pruning wounds. Minor dieback. Minor deadwood	Exposed root lump at base	Good	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	No works required in current site context

Tree ID	Tree Species		Maturity	Measurements				Crown (m)				Tree Condition				Physiological	Structural	Life Expectancy	Value		Management	
	Common Name	Latin Name		Height (m)	Stems	Stem Diameter (mm)	Estimated	Crown height	N	E	S	W	Roots	Stem	Crown				Comments	Amenity		Category
T9	Monkey Puzzle Tree	<i>Araucaria araucana</i>	Semi-mature	8	1	180	No	3	2	2.5	2	1.5	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical	Old pruning wounds		Good	Good	>40 yrs	Low	C	No works required in current site context
T10	Monkey Puzzle Tree	<i>Araucaria araucana</i>	Semi-mature	14	1	400	Yes	1	3	2.5	3	3	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical. Old pruning wounds	Old pruning wounds		Good	Good	>40 yrs	Low	C	No works required in current site context
T11	Sycamore	<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	Early-mature	14	1	500	No	6	4	3.5	3	3	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical. Epicormic growths. Old pruning wounds. Stubs	Old pruning wounds. Minor dieback. Minor deadwood. Moderate deadwood	Some moderate deadwood in the crown overhanging road. Pruned away from powerlines to the west.	Good	Good	>40 yrs	Moderate	B	No works required in current site context
T12	Sycamore	<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	Semi-mature	12	1	300	No	6	2	2.5	3	2.5	Limited access around base	Single stemmed. Vertical. Epicormic growths. Old pruning wounds. Stubs	Old pruning wounds. Minor dieback. Minor deadwood		Good	Good	>40 yrs	Low	C	No works required in current site context
T13	Ash	<i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>	Early-mature	15	1	540	No	4	5	7	2	5	No visual defects	Vertical. Epicormic growths. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Single stemmed	Old pruning wounds. Minor dieback. Minor deadwood	Very minor dieback	Good	Good	20 to 40 yrs	Moderate	C	No works required in current site context
T14	Ash	<i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>	Mature	15	1	630	No	5	2	7	7	4	Exposed roots	Single stemmed. Vertical. Epicormic growths. Old pruning wounds. Stubs	Old pruning wounds. Minor dieback. Minor deadwood	Some dieback in crown	Fair	Good	20 to 40 yrs	Moderate	C	No works required in current site context

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
G15	Privet and Yew	<i>Ligustrum sp.</i> , <i>Taxus sp.</i>	Semi-mature	1.5	10+	70 avg.	Yes	0	See plan.				Yew and Privet hedgerow group mostly Privet. Planted and pruned into shape.				Good	Good	>40 yrs	Low	C	No works required in current site context



  
 TREE CONSULTANTS

**Appendix 5:**  
**Tree Constraints Plan**  
 Lancaster House, Keresforth Hall Drive, Barnsley  
 Ref: AWA6044

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 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