



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

**9 Millstones,  
Oxspring,  
Sheffield  
S36 8WZ**

Prepared for: *White Agus Ltd*

Report Date: *November 2025*

Reference: *AWA7101*

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 – B  
Revision 03  
Auth By: APW  
Date: 29/09/2025

## Executive Summary

This report provides independent arboricultural advice in accordance with BS 5837:2012, regarding trees at the site in the context of a proposed residential development.

A total of 12 items of woody vegetation were surveyed, comprising individual trees and groups or hedges. Of these: 11 are low value (Category C), and 1 is unsuitable for retention (Category U).

The proposed development will require the removal of 2 low-value trees and tree groups. No high or moderate value trees are proposed for removal. This will result in a negligible negative arboricultural impact.

The layout of the development has been designed to minimise encroachment into Root Protection Areas (RPAs). Mitigation measures, including protective fencing and 'no-dig' construction methods, are recommended where necessary.

The scheme presents an opportunity for new tree planting as part of a landscape strategy, offering mitigation for the removals and long-term enhancement of the site's tree cover.

# 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
<b>4. Arboricultural Impact Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
4.1 Proposed New Development	10
4.2 Direct Impacts	10
4.3 Indirect Impacts	10
4.4 Suitable Mitigation	11
4.5 Protection of the Retained Trees	11
<b>5. Summary of Tree Impacts</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>6. Signature</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Appendix 1: Authors Qualifications &amp; Experience</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Appendix 2: Survey Methodology and Limitations</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Appendix 3: Explanation of Tree Descriptions</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Appendix 4: Tree Data</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Appendix 5: Tree Constraints Plan</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Appendix 6: Tree Impacts Plan</b>	<b>20</b>

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1 Instructions and Brief

- 1.1.1 We have been instructed by White Agus 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 November 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 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 Sophie Beckerman, BA (Hons), Dip. Arboriculture Level 4, 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** 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 Millstones in Oxspring, Sheffield.
- 2.1.2 The site comprises a residential property set in landscaped gardens. Further residential properties lie to the north, east and west, and the River Don forms the southern boundary.
- 2.1.3 The approximate area of the survey is highlighted in the (2025 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 12/11/25 to check whether any trees at the site are protected by a Tree Preservation Order or are located within a Conservation Area. **Trees at the site are protected by a Tree Preservation Order.**

3.1.3 The accessed map image from <https://www.barnsley.gov.uk/barnsley-maps/tree-preservation-orders-map/> is detailed below:



- 3.1.4 Before carrying out any works to protected trees the permission of the local planning authority is required. There are large potential penalties for illegally carrying out work to protected trees. Statutory permission is not required for the removal of deadwood.
- 3.1.5 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).
- 3.1.6 It was confirmed that there are no designated ancient woodlands or veteran or ancient trees within the survey area.
- 3.1.7 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.
- 3.1.8 When appointing a tree surgeon, only properly qualified and experienced companies should be used, who have adequate Public Liability and Employer's Liability Insurance.
- 3.1.9 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 12 items of woody vegetation, comprised of 7 individual trees and 5 tree groups or hedges.
- 3.2.2 Of the surveyed trees: 1 tree is retention category 'U', and 11 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 Species diversity at the site is relatively low, consisting of Cypress, Alder, Cherry Laurel, Cotoneaster, Maple, Cherry and Sycamore, with age categories from young to mature.
- 3.2.5 The significant tree cover within the site consists mainly of ornamental trees and shrub groups within the landscaped gardens. These are low value Category 'C', although they offer some screening between the site and the adjacent properties.
- 3.2.6 On the river's edge just beyond the southern boundary are 2 Alders (T2 and

T3). These have been crown raised and cut away from the garden to the north leaving stubs, some with decay. They are in good physiological health and fair structural health and offer some arboricultural interest.

- 3.2.7 All the trees at the site are of particularly low value and should not pose any significant constraint on the development potential of the site.
- 3.2.8 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.
- 3.2.9 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.
- 3.2.10 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: T2 and T3 from west



Photo 2: T5 from west



Photo 3: torn stem on T6



Photo 4: View of lawned area to east of site



Photo 5: G10 from south



Photo 6: T11 and T12 from southwest

## 4. Arboricultural Impact Assessment

### 4.1 Proposed New Development

4.1.1 It is proposed to extend the existing property on the eastern aspect. 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, 1 tree and 1 tree group will require 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.

4.2.2 The tree that requires removal to facilitate the development is Cypress T5, a species with little arboricultural value.

4.2.3 The tree group that requires removal to facilitate the development is G7, a group consisting of Thuja, Birch and Pine that have been topped and trimmed to shape, likely limiting their long-term prospects

4.2.4 The tree and tree group to be removed are both lower value, retention category 'C' trees with little value.

4.2.5 Due to the low value of the trees to be removed the removals will have only a negligible negative arboricultural impact.

### 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 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 to future occupiers, 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 dwelling or amenity space.

4.3.3 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 To ensure the successful retention of trees during the development process, all trees identified for retention must be physically protected from the outset of site preparation through to final landscaping. This protection should be in accordance with section 6.1 of BS:5837:2012 – Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction – Recommendations.
- 4.5.2 The primary method of protection will be the installation of tree protection fencing, constructed in line with the specification shown in BS 5837:2012.
- 4.5.3 This fencing must be installed prior to the commencement of any site clearance, demolition, or construction activity and remain in place for the duration of all potentially damaging operations.
- 4.5.4 The protected areas must be treated as construction exclusion zones. No materials, spoil, or equipment should be stored within these zones, and no access should be permitted.
- 4.5.5 Ground levels within the RPAs should be left unaltered, and care must be taken to avoid compaction of the soil structure, which could have long-term impacts on tree health.
- 4.5.6 If conditioned by the Local Planning Authority, an associated Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) and Tree Protection Plan (TPP) detailing protective fencing locations and specifications, construction methods close to the retained trees, and any required site monitoring, can be provided.
- 4.5.7 The AMS and TPP explain how and when the protection measures will be installed and maintained throughout the development. They are designed to be referenced for practical guidance on how to protect the retained trees at the site to ensure contractors do not accidentally damage trees during construction.

## 5. Summary of Tree Impacts

<i>Tree/ Group Ref</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>Impact Type</i>	<i>Description of Impact</i>	<i>Impact Level</i>	<i>Mitigation / Solution</i>
T5	C (Low)	Direct - Removal	Within footprint of development area	Negligible	Mitigation planting
G7	C (Low)	Direct - Removal	Crowns likely to be damaged during construction	Negligible	Mitigation planting

## 6. Signature

I trust this report provides all the required information.

Signed



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

**13<sup>th</sup> November 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**

**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, QTRA + VALID 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 25 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, L4 Dip 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 Diploma in Arboriculture. Joe joined AWA in 2022 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, 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.

**Brandon Townsend: BSc (Hons) Biology, L4 (Arb) Apprentice, QTRA Registered**

Brandon is an Arboricultural Technician at AWA, currently completing the Level 4 Arboriculture Apprenticeship at Myerscough College. He holds a BSc (Hons) in Biology from Bangor University, where he developed a strong interest in woodland ecology. Before joining AWA in April 2024, he gained practical arboricultural experience and completed his NPTC chainsaw qualification. Brandon supports a range of consultancy work including tree surveys, risk assessments, and technical reporting, and is developing skills in specialist inspection methods such as PiCUS tomography.

## 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		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	Cypress	<i>Cupressus sp.</i>	Semi-mature	3	6	200 avg	Yes	0	See plan				Cypress boundary hedge, fence immediately to west. Partially on retaining wall next to garage.				Fair	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	No works required
T2	Alder	<i>Alnus sp.</i>	Mature	15	1	450	Yes	5	4	4	4	2	Limited access around base. Exposed roots. Waterlogged	Single stemmed. Old pruning wounds. Stubs	Minor deadwood	On river edge 1.5m below garden level at base of retaining wall. Crown raised to 5m leaving long stubs with some decay. Roots exposed on river edge and partially submerged.	Good	Fair	>40 yrs	Low	C	No works required
T3	Alder	<i>Alnus sp.</i>	Early-mature	9	1	320	No	2	3	4.5	3	1	Limited access around base	Single stemmed. Slight lean. Old pruning wounds	Minor deadwood	On river bank. Limited access around base prevented detailed inspection. Crown cut back from garden to 4m above ground level.	Good	Fair	>40 yrs	Low	C	No works required
G4	Sycamore	<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	Semi-mature	2	2	300 150	Yes	1	1	2	2	1	Limited access around base	Vertical. Old pruning wounds. Stubs	Minor deadwood. Old pruning wounds	Two stems topped at 2-3m with regrowth.	Good	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	No works required
T5	Cypress	<i>Cupressus sp.</i>	Early-mature	3	1	200	Yes	0	1	1	1	1	Limited access around base	Single stemmed. Vertical	Normal	Trimmed and shaped.	Good	Good	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	Removal required to facilitate the development

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
T6	Cherry	<i>Prunus sp.</i>	Young	2.5	1	90	No	1	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Tear out. Stem wound	Normal	Stem previously torn out at 1m leaving large wound. Planting stake in contact with branches.	Good	Poor	<10 yrs	Low	U	No action required in current site context – tree unsuitable for longterm retention
G7	Thuja, Birch, Pine	<i>Thuja occidentalis</i> , <i>Betula sp.</i> , <i>Abies sp.</i>	Young	3	4	100 avg	Yes	0	See plan				Topped to 3m and trimmed to shape.				Good	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	Removal required to facilitate the development
G8	Alder	<i>Alnus glutinosa</i>	Young	2.5	2	80 80	Yes	1	See plan				Limited access around base	Stubs. Old pruning wounds	Minor deadwood	2 stems within shrubbery. topped at 2.5m.	Fair	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	No works required
T9	Cherry Laurel	<i>Prunus laurocerasus</i>	Young	2	6	80 avg	Yes	0	1	1	1	1	Limited access around base	Stubs. Old pruning wounds	Normal	Trimmed to shape.	Good	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	No works required
G10	Cotoneaster, Cherry Laurel, Cypress	<i>Cotoneaster sp.</i> , <i>Prunus sp.</i> , <i>Cupressus sp</i>	Semi-mature	3	10+	70 avg	Yes	0	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	No visual defects	Multiple stemmed at base	Normal	Shrubby group. Topped at approx 3m.	Good	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Low	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
	T11	Cherry	<i>Prunus sp.</i>	Young	3	3	120 120 80	No	1	1	1	1	1	Limited access around base	Multiple stemmed at 1m. Tight union	Old pruning wounds. Stubs	Topped at 2.5m. overhanging drive	Good	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C
T12	Maple	<i>Acer sp.</i>	Young	2	2	80 70	No	2	1	1	1	1	Limited access around base	Twin stemmed at 1m. Epicormic growths	Old pruning wounds. Stubs	Topped at 2m. overhanging drive	Good	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	No works required



Shrubs  
T12

T11

Cotoneaster

Adjacent Cotoneaster

G10

Cotoneaster

Shrubs

G1

T5

G7

Shrubs

G8

T9

T6

Shrubs

T2

Shrubs

T3

Elder

G4




**AWA**  
TREE CONSULTANTS


**Appendix 5:**  
**Tree Constraints Plan**  
9 Millstones, Oxspring, Sheffield  
Ref: AWA7101

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



  
**Appendix 6:**  
**Tree Impacts Plan**  
 9 Millstones, Oxspring, Sheffield  
 Ref: AWA7101  
 BRITISH STANDARD 5837:2012  
 SCALE: 1:200      PAPER: A3