Rebecca Peace

Arboriculture

Mortgage Reports
Planning & Development Tree Surveys
Tree Condition Surveys
Woodland Surveys and Planning

rebeccapeace@hotmail.com | Mobile: 07810 063 688 | www.RebeccaPeaceArb.com

Arboricultural Constraints / Impact Report

Including Tree Protection Method Statement

in accordance with British Standard 5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition & construction - Recommendations

Land off Castle Lane, Penistone

Sheffield S36 6AH

Report Reference: 051225/ RP/CL
Tree Constraints Plan Reference: AA01TCP/RP/CL
Survey Conducted: December 5th, 2025

Surveyor & Author:
Rebecca Peace, *MArborA.* HND. Am Horticulture
Professional Member of the Arboricultural Association (PR9377)
LANTRA Accredited Professional Tree Inspector (PTI)
Registered QTRA User
Professional Member of the Consulting Arborists Society (CAS)

Registered User

The Consulting Arborist Society

Arboricultural Association
Professional Member

Table of Contents

No.	Section
1.0	Instruction and the purpose of the tree survey
2.0	Scope of the report – methodology and limitations
3.0	Site locations and development description
4.0	Nature of tree stock
5.0	Root Protection Areas (RPAs)
6.0	Arboricultural Constraints Assessment (AIA)
7.0	Legal constraints
8.0	Summary

Appendices

Appendix 1	a. Survey Key: Abbreviations and categories
	b. British Standards Categories and Criteria
	c. Tree Inspection/Survey Results and BS 5837:2012 and Categorisation
Appendix 2	AA TCP 01 Tree Constraints/Protection Plan for Land off Land off Castle Lane, Penistone, Sheffield S36 6AH
Appendix 3	Glossary of Terms & Abbreviations
Appendix 4	Internet and Reading References

Client:	Progress Housing Group and Barnsley MBC. **Agents:** Halsall Lloyd Partnership - Mark Jermy, Senior Partner
Report Ref and Drawing Ref: No's:	Report Reference: 051225/ RP/CL Tree Constraints Plan Reference: AA01TCP/RP/CL
Site details:	The area is an old play field off Castle Lane Penistone, Sheffield. Behind No.2 Castle Lane
Date of Site Inspection:	Survey Conducted: December 5th, 2025
Proposal:	Preliminary Stage, plans not finalised
Report Author and Surveyor:	*Rebecca Peace, MArborA. HND. Am Horticulture* ***Professional Member of the Arboricultural Association (PR9377)*** *LANTRA Accredited Professional Tree Inspector (PTI)* ***Registered QTRA User*** *Professional Member of the Consulting Arborists Society (CAS)*

1.0 Instruction and the Purpose of the Survey and Report

1.1 This report provides a covering Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) and a Tree Constraints Plan (TCP) for an area of land off Castle Lane Penistone, Sheffield.

1.2 The tree survey and arboricultural Impact report are the first stages of an arboricultural process relating to planning and the implementation of the final design. This includes the preparation of supporting basic documentation (Arboricultural Impact Assessment) and Tree Constraints Plans. This document also includes a Tree Protection Plan as this will the main arboricultural impact.

1.3 This report is principally to support any planning applications to show that all legislation, responsibilities and tree protection regulations are fully understood and will be implemented before the design and the construction of the new development.

1.4 The initial tree survey and Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) and basic Tree Protection method statement are compliant with **BS5837:2012** (Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – recommendations) as requested by Halsall Lloyd Partnership - Mark Jermy, Senior Partner

1.5 The survey extent is the land marked on Tree Constraints Plan AATCP01/GI. The tree survey and mapping are based on a full site survey with topographical mapping available. The RPA measurements are plotted and are also listed in Appendix 1 – Tree Data.

2.0 The Scope of the Survey Report - Methodology & Limitations

2.1 The tree survey process consisted of a ground-based visual inspection and is applied only to the areas proposed for development and nearby trees on neighbouring properties. Soil type was not assessed.

2.2 This report is valid for **three years** from the date of site inspection. The condition of trees can change following severe meteorological conditions, the effects of diseases and pests and other abiotic factors.

2.3 The surveyed trees are not marked on site as all are easily identifiable from plans and on site. All trees are listed in the survey data in **Appendix 1** and are plotted onto the associated plan in **Appendix 2.**

2.4 No definite details relating to the location or the installation of services either existing or as part of the new development have been supplied. Therefore, this report can only deal with this issue in a preliminary manner. Once a utilities layout is available, this will need updating with reference to NJUG Volume 4 and BS5837 guidance and the positioning of services should be approved by a suitably qualified surveyor.

3.0 Site Locations and Development Description

3.1 The site sits within an old playing field on the south side of Penistone. A house has already been built at the front of this section, known as 2 Castle Lane and there are farm buildings at the upper end of the wider area although these lie outside the field itself. The land is currently unused, but it also shows signs of long-term informal use. The proposal is for three single storey supported living bungalows to be built on the site.

4.0 Nature of Tree Stock at Land off Castle Lane Penistone.

4.1 The table of results in **Appendix 1** provides details of the condition of the trees and their suitability for retention according to BS 5837:2012. Where there are trees of particular interest merit or require reference due to their condition; these will be discussed below.

4.2 **BS5837:2012** The retention grade indicated in the Schedule refers to the advantages of retaining trees in the context of the current land use, taking into consideration a range of factors including life expectancy, cultural value and contributions to wildlife, landscape and amenity. The grades are defined as follows:

- **A** – High value – most desirable to retain in pre-development context
- **B** – Moderate value - desirable to retain in pre-development context
- **C** – Low value – could be retained in pre-development context
- **U** – Remove – unsuitable for retention in pre-development context, including where recommended for removal for the benefit of adjacent trees.

The system assesses not only tree health and condition but other factors such as their long-term impact on adjacent structures and good arboricultural management.

4.3 The land surrounding is arable and some residential. The larger trees within this survey are either on the boundary directly or third party trees belonging to residential and farming land behind.

5.0 Root Protection Areas (RPAs) in accordance with BS5837

5.1 **BS5837:2012** makes recommendations for the provision of areas around any retained trees where their roots should be protected, known as Root Protection Areas, or RPAs, expressed in metres. For any tree, BS5837: 2012 prescribes this area according to a formula using stem diameter measurements of the trees in question. The RPAs for the trees are listed in radius (**m**) from the stem of the tree within the survey data table attached to this report.

5.2 The RPAs for the trees recorded by the tree surveys have been calculated in accordance with the guidance in ***Chapter 4.6*** **of BS5837:2012**. For single stem trees, the RPA is equivalent to a circle with radius of 12 times the stem diameter.
For trees with between two to five stems, the combined stem diameter is calculated by finding the square root of the sum of the squared stem diameters.
For trees with more than five stems, the combined stem diameter is calculated by finding the square root of the sum of the mean stem diameter squared multiplied by the number of stems.

5.3 The RPAs of all trees that could affect the proposals have been recorded onto the Tree Data in **Appendix 1** for each individual site and will explain any amendments, removals or root protection methods which will need to be put into place where any development could be within the RPA.

6.0 Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA)

6.1 This Arboricultural Impact Assessment has been prepared in accordance with BS5837:2012 and considers the relationship between the existing tree stock and the proposed development of three single storey supported living bungalows at land off Castle Lane, Penistone.

6.2 The development proposals are still at a preliminary stage and, as such, this assessment focuses on identifying key arboricultural constraints, opportunities for retention and areas where flexibility in design will support successful tree integration. The assessment is informed by the tree survey data in Appendix 1 and the Tree Constraints Plan AA01TCP/RP/CL, which is attached to this report.

6.3 The trees within the site itself are limited in number and generally small to moderate in scale. T1 and T2 are elder, categorised as C grade trees with limited landscape value but reasonable vitality. These are located away from the main areas of development pressure and provide options in terms of management. They could be heavily reduced during construction and allowed to regenerate post development or alternatively removed with suitable replacement planting introduced as part of the landscape scheme.

6.4 T3, although not technically a tree, has been included due to its visual contribution. This Cotoneaster is in good condition and offers an opportunity for retention, subject to final layout and construction logistics. With appropriate protection, it could form part of the retained landscape structure.

6.5 T4 is a young ash tree of good quality and is categorised as A with a long future contribution. This tree is considered a key arboricultural asset on site. It provides effective screening from the neighbouring working farm and will become increasingly valuable as it matures. The proposed development should be designed to fully retain T4, with its Root Protection Area respected and protected throughout the construction phase.

6.6 Trees G1, G2, T5 and T6 are boundary or third-party trees associated with existing dry stone walling. These trees are well integrated into the landscape, provide effective screening and lie outside the influence of the proposed development. No direct arboricultural impacts are anticipated, provided standard site controls are adhered to. Their retention will add maturity and enclosure to the completed scheme.

6.7 The Tree Constraints Plan clearly identifies Root Protection Areas and canopy spreads and should be used to inform the final layout, access routes and construction sequencing. Where works are proposed close to retained trees, appropriate tree protection fencing and ground protection will be required in line with BS5837:2012.

6.8 Overall, the proposed development can be achieved with minimal arboricultural impact. With thoughtful layout design and appropriate protection measures, most trees can be successfully retained and integrated into the finished development, providing both visual and practical benefits

7.0 Legal Constraints

7.1 **Trees subject to statutory controls**: The site is not within a Conservation Area and there are no Tree Preservation Orders. The local authority is Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council. This information was found on Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council website. **Click here for link.**

7.2 **Statutory wildlife obligations:** The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 as amended by the Countryside and **The Habitat Regulations 2012** provides statutory protection to birds, bats and other species that inhabit trees. All tree work operations are covered by these provisions and advice from an ecologist should be obtained before undertaking any works that might constitute an offence. It was noted that within trees they were previous nesting birds in the area.

8.0 Tree Protection Method Statement

8.1 General principles

This Tree Protection Method Statement has been prepared in accordance with BS5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations. It sets out the minimum measures required to protect retained trees throughout the construction phase of the proposed development at land off Castle Lane, Penistone.

The tree protection requirements for this site are relatively simple, as the majority of retained trees are either boundary or third-party trees or are located outside the main footprint of the proposed works. Provided standard controls are implemented from the outset, no significant arboricultural conflicts are anticipated.

All tree protection measures shall be installed prior to the commencement of any site clearance, demolition, groundworks or material storage and shall remain in place for the duration of construction unless otherwise agreed in writing by the project arboricultural consultant.

8.2 Protective fencing

Protective fencing shall be erected at the positions shown on the approved Tree Constraints and Protection Plan AA01TCP/RP/CL.

Fencing shall comprise a rigid barrier in accordance with Figure 2 of BS5837:2012, consisting of welded mesh panels securely fixed to a scaffold framework or similar robust system. The fencing shall be clearly signed as a Tree Protection Area with appropriate weatherproof signage.

Once installed, the fenced areas shall be treated as a no go zone. No construction activity, storage of materials, mixing of cement, vehicle access, excavation or changes in ground levels shall take place within the protected areas.

Given the limited extent of development and the location of retained trees, fencing alignment is straightforward and can be achieved without impacting site access or construction sequencing.

8.3 Ground protection

No construction traffic is proposed within Root Protection Areas. As such, specialist ground protection is not anticipated to be required.

Should unforeseen access be required adjacent to retained trees, this must be agreed in advance with the project arboricultural consultant and appropriate temporary ground protection specified in accordance with BS5837:2012.

8.4 Excavation and services

No excavation is proposed within the Root Protection Areas of retained trees.

Should service runs or minor excavations be required in proximity to RPAs at a later stage, works shall be designed to avoid root disturbance wherever possible. Any excavation within or close to RPAs shall be undertaken using hand digging or air excavation techniques and only following consultation with the arboricultural consultant.

8.5 Tree works and supervision

Any tree works required as part of the development shall be carried out in accordance with current British Standards and best arboricultural practice. Given the scale of the site and the nature of the works, formal arboricultural supervision is not considered necessary, provided that protective fencing is installed correctly and respected throughout the construction period.

A brief site inspection by the arboricultural consultant following installation of tree protection fencing is recommended to confirm compliance.

8.6 Completion of works

Protective fencing shall remain in place until all construction works, including landscaping, are complete. Fencing shall only be removed once there is no longer any risk to retained trees.

On completion of the development, retained trees should be incorporated into the landscape scheme with ongoing management appropriate to their species, age and setting.

9.0 Summary

9.1 This report has assessed the existing tree stock at land off Castle Lane, Penistone and considered its relationship with the proposed development of three supported living bungalows.

9.2 The site contains a modest number of tree with the most significant arboricultural considerations relating to boundary and third party trees and one high quality young ash tree within the site. These trees provide screening, structure and long term landscape value and should be retained wherever possible.

9.3 The proposed development is considered achievable without significant tree loss. The young ash tree T4 is of particular importance and its retention, along with additional new planting in this area, will be key to maintaining screening from the adjacent working farm and enhancing future amenity.

9.4 Lower quality trees within the site offer flexibility, either through retention with appropriate management or removal with replacement planting, depending on the final layout and landscape proposals.

9.5 A simple and proportionate Tree Protection Method Statement has been included within this report. The recommended tree protection measures are straightforward to implement and, when installed prior to construction, will ensure that retained trees are adequately protected throughout the development process.

9.6 Provided the recommendations within this report are followed, including adherence to the Tree Constraints Plan and the Tree Protection Method Statement, the development can proceed in accordance with BS5837:2012 while maintaining and enhancing the arboricultural and landscape value of the site.

Appendices

Appendix 1 Tree Inspection/Survey Results

Table 1. SURVEY KEY: Abbreviations and categories used in the survey are as follows:

Tree Type and No	T = Tree, G = Group, S = Shrub, H= Hedge. Number of tree and corresponding number on plan.
Species.	Common name and scientific in name in *italics*.
Height	Estimated height in metres
DBH (Stem diameter)	Diameter measured in centimetres at 1.5m above ground level. MS:=Multiple stems
Root Protection Area. (RPA).	The root protection in metres as radial distance as measured from the centre of the tree stem. Where an * is present the R.P.A. cannot be achieved due to ground constraints, or it is located outside the site.
Crown spread	Measured from centre to average branch spread in metres. Four points measured North, South, East and West.
Age Class.	Young (Y). Semi Mature (SM). Early Mature (EM). Mature (M). Over Mature (OM). Veteran (V).
Physiological and Structural Condition	Good. (G Fair. (F) Poor. (P) Dead. In addition, specific diseases, defects or faults are described.
Recommendations for Work	Recommendations for tree work where observed as necessary, including further investigations of suspected defects which may require more detailed assessment. If blank no works are recommended.
Cat: Category Grading (BS5837) with estimated remaining contribution in years	U or A, B, C (See table below). Less than 10 years. <10. 10-20 years. 20 -40 years. More than 40 years. 40> *SULE = Safe Useful Life Expectancy*

Table 2. SURVEY KEY: British Standards Categories and Criteria

Category & definition	**Criteria (including subcategories where appropriate)**		
Category U **Trees in such a condition that they cannot realistically be retained as living trees in the context of current land use for <10 yrs.**	• Trees that have a serious, irremediable, structural defect, such that their early loss is expected due to collapse, including those that will become unviable after removal of other category U trees • Trees that are dead or showing signs of significant, immediate and irreversible decline • Trees infected with significant pathogens affecting health or safety, or very low-quality trees suppressing trees of better quality. *NOTE: these trees can have existing or potential conservation value making retention desirable*		
	1 Mainly arboricultural qualities	**2 Mainly landscape qualities**	**3 Mainly cultural values incl conservation**
Category A **Trees of high quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of >40 yrs**	Particularly good examples of their species, especially if rare or unusual. Those that are essential components of groups or formal or semi-formal arboricultural features	Trees, groups or woodlands of particular visual importance as arboricultural and/or landscape features.	Trees, groups or woodlands of significant conservation, historical, commemorative or other value
Category B **Trees of moderate quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of >20 yrs**	Trees that might be included in category A but are downgraded because of impaired condition such that they are unlikely to be suitable for retention for beyond 40 years; or trees lacking the special quality necessary to merit category A designation.	Trees present in numbers, usually growing as groups or woodlands such that they attract a higher collective rating that they might as individuals. Trees occurring as collectives but situated so as to make little visual contribution to the area.	Trees with material conservation or other cultural value
Category C **Trees of low quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of >10 years, or young trees with a stem diameter <150mm**	Unremarkable trees of very limited merit or such impaired condition that they do not qualify in higher categories.	Trees present in groups or woodlands, but without this conferring on them significantly greater collective landscape value; and/or trees offering low or only temporary landscape benefits.	Trees with no material conservation or other cultural value.

Appendix 1 (Cont.) Tree Inspection/Survey Results. Land off Castle Lane Penistone

Tree No.	Latin Name	Common Name	Height (m)	DBH (cm)	RPA Calculation (m)	Crown Spread NESW				Height of ground clearance (m)	Age Class	Physiological Condition	Structural Condition	Category Grading	Notes, Arb Impact Ass. With any work recommendations	Photos
T1	*Sambucus nigra*	**Elder**	4	33	3.9	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	Mature	Fair	Good	C (10-20)	Not a problematic tree. This is an elder and so this can be removed at any time	Photo
T2	*Sambucus nigra*	**Elder.**	5	30	3.6	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	Mature	Fair	Good	C (10-20)	Although attractive, there are more suitable shrubs for planting in new development landscaping .	Photo
T3	*Cotoneaster glaucophyllus*	**Large-leaved Cotoneaster**	4	32	3.8	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		Mature	Good	Good	B (20-40)	This is actually a nice shrub and if it's possible to save it, with some management this would be good for the further landscape	Photo
T4	*Fraxinus excelsior*	**Ash**	7	26	3.1	2	2	2	2	1	Semi Mature, Young	Good	Good	A (40+)	Young tree in the corner of the site, quite a good quality tree as well. And with good viable buds throughout which would enhance the future landscape	Photo
G1	*Acer pseudoplatanus*	**Sycamore**	15	48	5.7	3	3	3	3	3	Mature, Early Mature	Good	Good	C (10-20)	These are very close to third party trees, made up of self-set sycamores growing from behind a dry-stone wall. There is fencing around them so it is not entirely clear which property they belong to. Access to the bases was limited, so the diameters are approximate. As screening trees they are actually quite viable and in reasonable health, so they could be retained, though the wall behind them makes management a bit awkward.	Photo Photo
G2	*Acer pseudoplatanus*	**Sycamore**	15	44	5.2	4	4	4	4	0	Early Mature	Good	Good	B (20-40)	These are again self-set sycamores growing alongside the dry stone boundary wall. They are in surprisingly good condition. If they are to be retained, they will need a bit of crown raising to lift them off the ground and make future management easier. If retention is not wanted, then removal would be straightforward.	Photo
T5	*Acer pseudoplatanus*	**Sycamore**	11	51	6.1	5	5	5	5	1	Mature, Early Mature	Good	Good	B (20-40)	As above but it would be a good idea to keep these tree in place for biodiversity	Photo Photo
T6	*Acer pseudoplatanus*	**Sycamore**	14	48	5.7	5	5	5	5	1	Early Mature	Good	Good	B (20-40)	Third party tree over the other side of the dry-stone wall quality tree from what can be seen. No issues	Photo
T7	*Acer pseudoplatanus*	**Sycamore**	16	49	5.8	4	4	4	4	1	Early Mature	Good	Good	B (20-40)	This is off site and off area where construction will take place but noted as will be beneficial for the future landscape surrounding of the area	Photo Photo

Appendix 2. **Tree Constraints and Root Protection Plan:** AATCP01 Land off Castle Lane Penistone.

Trees G1, G2, T5 and T6 are either boundary or third-party trees. There is no justification for their removal, as they are well integrated with the existing dry stone walling and provide excellent screening. They also sit outside the Root Protection Areas of the proposed development and will therefore not be affected by the works. Overall, these trees will be a clear benefit to the development and should be retained. Fencing protection will be straight forward

T1 is an elder and **T2** is also an elder. **T3** a Cotoneaster is not technically a tree but has been included as it does offer some visual and landscape benefit to the proposed development.

Elder is not known for being the most attractive of species but in this case **T1** and **T2** are located in areas where there is no significant development pressure. One option would be to cut them back quite hard during the development phase as elder responds well to this and will readily regrow as more manageable shrub form once works are complete.

Alternatively, both trees could be removed with replacement planting carried out at a later stage, depending on the final layout and landscaping proposals.

T4 is a smaller, young ash tree which will be of benefit to the development. It is still at an early stage of growth and has the potential for a long and useful lifespan. The tree also provides valuable screening from the neighbouring farm, which is a busy working site and may generate noise at times. For this reason, the retention of T4, along with any additional new screening planting within this area, is considered particularly important.

Rebecca Peace
Arboriculture

Tree Constraints Plan AA01TCP

Land off Castle Lane. Penistone

KEY:

Tree Data is accurate on site at the time of survey.

- The **RPA** delineates the minimum rooting area required to enable tree retention and root protection boundary.
- **Tree Canopy is approximate**

RPA: Tree Canopy:

RPA of Possible Removals:

Possible Sites of New Planting:

Fencing for Tree Protection:

Surveyed trees have been assigned a category in accordance with Table 1 of ***BS 5837:2012 'Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction'***. The category is indicated by the colour of the central tree point on the plan and in Tree Data.

The categories are as follows:

Category 'A' - Tree of high quality and/or value –
Green Centre
Category 'B' - Tree of moderate quality and/or value - Blue Centre
Category 'C' - Tree of low quality and/or value –
Grey Centre
Category 'U' - Tree of significantly reduced potential or to be removed for development -
Dark Red Centre.

See covering report for full Data Key, full Method Statement and Fencing Dimensions for Tree Protection.

Scale: Approx. Scale. Measurements taken on site

Drawn: R. Peace Date: December 2025

Drawing No: AATCP01/Castle Lane

Note: Do not scale off this drawing.

Appendix 3. Glossary of Terms & Abbreviations in Tree Health

- **Compression fork/Co-dominant stem**. Can be a failure point at a fork between two branches or limbs, which, as they grow, press against each other, causing a build-up of stresses similar to the effect you would get if a wedge were hammered into the fork. Increased end-loading as the limbs grow can lead to the fork failing.
- **Cavity.** Hole in a tree resulting from decay or damage.
- **Deadwood**. Twigs or branches in the crown of the tree which have died off. This can indicate the tree's inability to transport fluid and/or nutrients to its extremities signifying that the tree is under stress or has failing systems. It can also take place naturally when a branch affects a process known as "self-pruning". This occurs when the energy needed to sustain the live branch outweighs the energy it produces.
- **Decay**. This can be minor, such as on the surface of a shallow wound, or severe, with large sections of the trees structure being decayed. It is a problem that can progress to the point where the tree collapses.
- **Epicormic growth.** This can sometimes indicate a problem within the tree's systems. Epicormic growth is produced by the tree to gain a greater ability to photosynthesize when it needs extra resources. Some trees, such as Lime, produce epicormic growth, particularly from the base, as part of their natural growth habit.
- **Included union.** A branch or a stem of a tree grows at an acute angle that leads to them growing into one another. The problem comes when the bark of a branch and bark of the main tree stem gets pushed together and becomes trapped in the branch union. This prevents the branch and stem from growing together. The result of this is that the branch is not fully attached to the main stem creating an area of weakness that can fail resulting in the branch splitting from the main stem.
- **Lean**. A lean does not necessarily mean inherent instability but when a tree's stem loses structural integrity, it can become a hazard, especially if the weakness is on the side to which the tree is leaning.
- **Loosened bark.** This indicates a problem under the surface in either the wood or the inner layers of bark (cambium). Bark can fall away from decaying wood behind it, or can start to die off due to a range of reasons (bacterial infections etc). The bark can then no longer transport fluid or nutrients around the tree.
- **Mechanical Damage.** Damage caused by non-biological means i.e. vehicle impact or damage caused by animals trying to eat bark. Damage of this kind can penetrate into the structure and is more often found on the surface of the tree.
- **Reaction wood/growth.** Where weakness or decay within a tree occurs, the tree will grow material to compensate for it. It is often seen as 'cable' like structures with patches of uneven bark which indicate irregular growth patterns. Another form of reaction growth can be seen as 'bulges' on a trees structure. Large amounts of reaction growth indicate advanced decay or weakness within the tree structure.
- **Sail Area.** The area of the tree that is affected by the wind.
- **Weak unions.** The unions between the stem (trunk) and structural limbs or branches sometimes develop weakly and as the tree ages can become unstable. This can be exacerbated when the tree is affected by other problems. Also, certain tree species are prone to developing weak unions.

Appendix 4 Internet and Reading References

General

http://www.treecall.co.uk/trees-a-the-law

http://www.forestry.gov.uk/safetreemanagement

https://www.gov.uk/guidance/developers-get-environmental-advice-on-your-planning-proposals (SSSI)

Mattheck & Breloer H. (1994). Research for Amenity Trees No.4: The Body Language of Trees, HMSO, London.

Strouts R.G. & Winter T.G. (1994).Research for Amenity Trees No.2: Diagnosis of ill health in Trees. Department of the Environment, HMSO.

Weber K., Mattheck C. (2003). Manual of Wood Decays. The Arboricultural Association

UK Government, *The Hedgerows Regulations 1997* (criteria for "important" hedgerows and consent requirements) (Countryside hedgerow protection: removing hedgerows - GOV.UK) (Countryside hedgerow protection: removing hedgerows - GOV.UK).

GOV.UK Guidance, *Countryside hedgerow protection: removing hedgerows* (Natural England/DEFRA, updated May 2024) – length, location and importance criteria for protected hedgerows (Countryside hedgerow protection: removing hedgerows - GOV.UK) (Countryside hedgerow protection: removing hedgerows - GOV.UK

Tree Protection

https://ecogrid.co.uk/popular-uses/tree-root-protection/

http://www.ground-guards.co.uk/sectors/

http://www.geosyn.co.uk/product/cellweb-tree-root-protection

Rebecca Peace

Arboriculture