No.3 The Harridge, Rochdale

Arboricultural Report

June 2018



acsconsulting
tree consultants

acsconsulting
tree consultants

Chapter 1	Introduction
Chapter 2	Background
Chapter 3	Tree Survey
Chapter 4	Development Implications
Chapter 5	Conclusions
Drawing(s)	
ARB/3803/Y/100	Arboricultural Plan
Appendices	
1	Tree Tables
2	Heads of Terms Method Statement

ACS Consulting is a UK industry leader in arboriculture. We offer a range of services involving trees, woodlands and forestry in the built and rural environment:

Planning
Hazard Evaluation
Management
Law

For further information contact:
Ian Murat

01565 755422

irm@acsconsulting.co.uk

Limitation

ACS Consulting (ACS) has prepared this Report for the sole use of Mr. Matthews in accordance with the Agreement under which our services were performed. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this Report or any other services provided by us. This Report may not be relied upon by any other party without the prior and express written agreement of ACS. Unless otherwise stated in this Report, the assessments made assume that the sites and facilities will continue to be used for their current purpose without significant change. The conclusions and recommendations contained in this Report are based upon information provided by others and upon the assumption that all relevant information has been provided by those parties from whom it has been requested. Information obtained from third parties has not been independently verified by ACS, unless otherwise stated in the Report.

1.0 Introduction

1.01 Purpose
The purpose of this report, in accordance with good practice, is to formally record in detail the existing tree resource present on site prior to development and to help inform the design of the site where existing trees present may potentially be incorporated into the design.

1.02
ACS Consulting is instructed by Mr. Matthews to report on trees and the constraints on development at land adjacent to No.3 The Harridge, Rochdale. The assessment and report was undertaken by Ian Murat, Registered Consultant of the Arboricultural Association.

1.03
The assessment identifies trees and discusses their suitability to be retained on the site.

The survey identifies:
- Trees that are undesirable to be retained because of structural or other defects.
- Trees that can be retained with an acceptable level of risk and the measures that are required to ensure their long term retention.

1.04
The site was visited during June 2018 and a survey of the trees was completed recording; species type, age, height, crown spread, diameter-at-breast-height, and condition. The trees were in leaf which gave a restricted view of their upper canopies, but an opinion on tree physiology and species. All the trees have been summarised in the tables in Appendix 1. The Arboricultural Plan ARB/3803/Y/100 plots the merged Root Protection Area as a heavy dashed line. Individual RPA areas are noted as a circle with a blue line.

1.05
Under the UK planning system, local authorities have a statutory duty to consider the protection and planting of trees when granting planning permission for proposed development. The potential effect of development on trees, whether statutorily protected or not, is a material consideration that is taken into account in dealing with planning applications. The report contains standard information regarding the trees and the protection requirements of those trees considered desirable to be retained as a record. The report is compliant with Table B.1 – Pre-Application.

Copyright of ACS Consulting.
All rights described in Chapter IV of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 have been generally asserted ©, June 2018

2.0 Background

2.01 The Site

The site is a triangular shaped parcel of land located next to No.3 The Harridge.



2.02 Statutory Protection/Planning Policies

The application is subject to the Planning Policies of Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council. The site is not located in a Conservation Area. The trees do not appear to be the subject of a Tree Preservation Order.

2.03 Soils

BS 5837 – 2012 requires a basic assessment of the soils on site. An examination of the British Geological Survey site suggests the superficial deposits as: Till, Devensian - Diamicton. Superficial Deposits formed up to 2 million years ago in the Quaternary Period. Local environment previously dominated by ice age conditions (U).

The Cranfield Soil and Agrifood Institute Soilscapes viewer shows soils at the site to be Slowly permeable seasonally wet acid loamy and clayey soils.

3.0 Tree Survey

3.01
I have identified trees as individuals or in groups.

The group classification is intended to identify trees that form cohesive arboricultural
features either aerodynamically, visually or culturally.

Off-site trees and groups that could influence the development potential of the site, have been noted. Their attributes have been approximated.

3.02
The trees were surveyed for species type, age, height, crown spread, diameter-at-breast-height, condition, and their suitability for retention from ground level. Heights were measured with a Hypsometer and diameters were taken, where possible, with a diameter tape to give an average stem measurement. Canopy spreads have been measured at the cardinal points or where they significantly extend in other directions.

3.03
The principal arboreal components are the mature sycamore (990 – 994) that appear as a group visually, lime (997) and, sycamores (998 – 1000).

3.04
Within the group of sycamore, only tree 990 is considered to be desirable, the others, whilst contributing to a group setting, are mediocre or considered exempt from planning control by virtue of their structural condition. The lime is a desirable specimen, well formed with good growth characteristics. The remaining trees are unremarkable trees of very limited merit that they do not qualify in higher categories.

3.05
Along the site's boundary is a group of holly and a tree that appears to be in the ownership of the neighbouring property (T1).

3.06
The trees were assessed for Potential Roost Features (PRF) in accordance with *Bat Survey for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (3rd Edition) 2016* and *BS 8596:2015 Surveying for bats in trees and woodland. Guide.* The majority of the trees are considered to be classified as Negligible/no risk (Trees with low or no potential to support bats).







4.0 Development Aspects

4.01
Development should normally seek to retain and integrate trees identified as Category A or B. Category C and U may be retained where they pose no constraint to development.

Retention of trees around the boundary will give scale and maturity, giving a mature sense of place. Layouts need to take account of secondary development pressures such as shade and dominance. Layouts should also seek to allow adequate levels of light to private amenity space and light demanding rooms during the core hours.

4.02
Mitigation is an important consideration. A carefully designed landscape including new planting to compensate for any lost trees would have the potential to reduce the adverse effects of development and in some cases create beneficial effects, through the creation of a better quality landscape.

4.03
Where trees are retained, regardless of their BS designation, development should be located outside the Root Protection Area (RPA). The RPA is a layout design tool indicating the minimum area around a tree deemed to contain sufficient roots and rooting volume to maintain the tree's viability, and where the protection of the roots and soil structure is treated as a priority.

4.04
The Arboricultural Plan ARB/3803/Y/100 plots the merged Root Protection Area as a heavy black line noted RPA. Individual RPA areas are noted as a circle with a solid blue line.

4.05
Development can be extended into the RPA under certain circumstances. Research suggests there may be an allowance of up 20% into the RPA provided there is a corresponding increase through ground contiguous to the RPA by the same or greater amount. This does not apply to veteran trees where it is recommended that no construction occurs in the RPA.

Arboricultural input should be sought when considering such features.

4.06 Tree Protection
Where trees are able to be retained, Tree Protection measures should be implemented as stated in BS 5837:2012 and placed in the positions indicated on the Arboricultural Plan. A suitably qualified arboriculturalist should be retained to monitor and report on tree related development issues to ensure the continued protection of trees. A method statement should be prepared by the Arboricultural Consultant prior to commencement at the site in accordance with BS5837 - 2012. A full scheme of protective fencing, its location, and type should be agreed with the Arboricultural Consultant at an early stage in the development of the scheme.

Definitive plans are to be produced by the Arboricultural Consultant showing the location of the haul routes, cabins and storage areas prior to commencement on site.

5.0 Conclusions

5.01
The purpose of this report, in accordance with good practice, is to formally record in detail the existing tree resource present on site prior to development and to help inform the design of the site where existing trees present may potentially be incorporated into the design.

5.02
The site is a triangular shaped parcel of land located next to No.3 The Harridge.

Retention of trees around the boundary will give scale and maturity, giving a mature sense of place. Layouts need to take account of secondary development pressures such as shade and dominance. Layouts should also seek to allow adequate levels of light to private amenity space and light demanding rooms during the core hours.

5.03
Mitigation is an important consideration. A carefully designed landscape including new planting to compensate for any lost trees would have the potential to reduce the adverse effects of development and, in some cases, create beneficial effects, through the creation of better quality landscape.

5.04
Development should seek to:

- Incorporate trees identified as desirable (category B) or highly-desirable (A).
- Retain trees identified as Category C or U where they pose little constraint on development.
- Trees located in adjacent property need to be taken into account in any development scheme.
- Locate development outwith designated RPAs of retained trees.
- Take account of shade and dominance allowing sufficient light to private amenity space and light demanding rooms during core hours.

The incorporation of desirable specimens and good spatial locations allied with tree protection measures should satisfy the Council's suite of tree protection policies and good arboricultural practice.

5.05
Detailed method statements associated with the following issues, where relevant, should be obtained to ensure the protection of trees where they are retained:

- demolition,
- ground clearance,
- earth works,
- drainage,
- fencing,
- site storage/compounds/site cabins,
- tree works,
- monitoring and reporting.

Appendix 1

Contents

Key

BS5837: 2012

Tree Tables

KEY

Age	Y – Young: Out-planted trees that have not yet established SM – Semi-mature: Established trees up to 1/3 of expected height and crown EM – Early mature: Between 1/3 and 2/3 of expected height and crown M – Mature: Between 2/3 and full expected height and crown FM – Fully mature: Full expected height and crown OM – Over mature: Crown beginning to break-up and decrease in size S – Senescent: Crown in advanced stage of break-up
Physiological Condition	Good – Very few defects a reasonable long life expectancy depending on age class Fair – Some defects giving the tree a shortened life expectancy Poor – Limited life with major problems
Structural Condition	Good – Very few defects Fair – Some defects rectifiable with minor tree surgery Poor – Significant defects rectifiable with major tree surgery or felling

Table 1 – Cascade chart for tree quality assessment

Category and definition	Criteria			Identification on Plan
Category U Those in such a condition that they cannot realistically be retained as living trees in the context of the current land use for longer than 10 years.	• 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 U category trees (i.e. where, for whatever reason, the loss of companion shelter cannot be mitigated by pruning). • Trees that are dead or are showing signs of significant, immediate, and irreversible overall decline. • Trees infected with pathogens of significance to the health and/or safety of other trees nearby, or very low quality trees suppressing adjacent trees of better quality. *NOTE Category U trees can have existing or potential conservation value which might be desirable to preserve; see 4.5.7*			RED
	1 Mainly arboricultural qualities	**2 Mainly landscape qualities**	**3 Mainly cultural values, including conservation.**	
Trees To Be Considered For Retention				
Category A **Trees of high quality** with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 40 years	Trees that are particularly good examples of their species, especially if rare or unusual, or essential components of groups, or of formal or semi-formal arboricultural features (e.g. the dormant and/or principal trees within an avenue)	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 (e.g. veteran trees or wood-pasture)	GREEN
Category B **Trees of moderate quality** with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 20 years.	Trees that might be included in category A, but are downgraded because of impaired condition (e.g. presence of significant though remediable defects, including unsympathetic past management and storm damage), such that they are unlikely to be suitable for retention for beyond 40 years; or trees lacking the special quality necessary to merit the category A designation.	Trees present in numbers, usually growing as groups or woodlands, such that they attract a higher collective rating than they might as individuals; or trees occurring as collectives but situated so as to make little visual contribution to the wider locality.	Trees with material conservation or other cultural value.	BLUE
Category C **Trees of low quality** with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 10 years, or young trees with a stem diameter below 150 mm.	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/transient landscape benefits.	Trees with no material conservation or other cultural benefits	GREY

Tree Ref No.	Species	Height	Stem Diameter	Branch Spread M				Height of Crown Clearance	Clear Branch Height	Age Class	Physiological Condition	Structural Condition	Comments/Preliminary Management Recommendations	Estimated Remaining Contribution Years	Category Grading
		M	MM	N	E	S	W	M	M						
989	Cypress	14	300	2	2	2	2	2	2	SM/ EM	Good	Good	A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
990	Sycamore	19	710	3	0.5	#6	#5	2	2	M	Good	Good	One of a group of five sycamores at the site. A tree of moderate quality and value in the landscape.	20+	B1/2
991	Sycamore	19	575	0.5	10	6	6	3	3	M	Good	Good	One of a group of five sycamores at the site. Significant crown asymmetry due to the influence of other trees. Small cavity. Individually mediocre but makes a contribution as part of a group. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
992	Sycamore	19	570	2	6	5	2	6	7	M	Good	Good	One of a group of five sycamores at the site. Tall, drawn specimen. Leans south east. Individually mediocre but makes a contribution as part of a group. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
993	Sycamore	19	665	5	6.5	0	2	5	5	M	Good	Poor	Extensive cavity on the western stem. Decay that extends up the main trunk.	-	U

Tree Ref No.	Species	Height	Stem Diameter	Branch Spread M				Height of Crown Clearance	Clear Branch Height	Age Class	Physiological Condition	Structural Condition	Comments/Preliminary Management Recommendations	Estimated Remaining Contribution Years	Category Grading
		M	MM	N	E	S	W	M	M						
994	Sycamore	15	440	3	0.5	0.5	5	2 (W)	4 (W)	M	Good	Good	Cavity on the north eastern stem. The poorest tree of a group of five sycamores at the site. Severely suppressed. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
G1	Group	5	200	2	2	2	2	0	0	EM	Good	Good	Group of holly located on the boundary/just off site. Of moderate quality and value in the landscape.	20+	B1/2
T1	Horse-chestnut	18	#500	3	3	3	3	3	3	EM/M	Good	Good	Tall, drawn specimen. Influenced by past lime – now removed and is stump sprouts. A tree of moderate quality and value in the landscape.	20+	B1/2
995	Goat Willow	12	200	3	5	5	2	3	3	EM/M	Good	Fair/Poor	Multi-stemmed with included union. Stem injuries. Crown asymmetry. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
996	Holly	12	220, 180	2	2	2	2	0	0	SM/ EM	Fair	Fair	Twin stemmed with included union. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
997	Lime	17	630	5	3	5	7	0	2	M	Good	Good	A tree of moderate quality and value in the landscape.	20+	B1/2

Tree Ref No.	Species	Height	Stem Diameter	Branch Spread M				Height of Crown Clearance	Clear Branch Height	Age Class	Physiological Condition	Structural Condition	Comments/Preliminary Management Recommendations	Estimated Remaining Contribution Years	Category Grading
		M	MM	N	E	S	W	M	M						
998	Sycamore	17	545	3	5	6	3	5	6	M	Fair	Good	Mediocre foliage density and vigour. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
999	Sycamore	15	520	2	5	0.5	2	3	3	M	Poor	Fair	Poor foliage density and vigour. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
1000	Sycamore	17	550, 550	8	8	4	3	3 (W)	3 (W)	M	Fair	Good	2 trees as one visual unit. Of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
G2	Group	5	100	2	2	2	2	0	0	Y	Good	Fair	Group of self-set holly, beech and sycamore Of moderate quality and value in the landscape.	20+	B1/2

Appendix 2

Contents

Heads of Terms Method Statement

Heads of Terms of an Arboricultural Method Statement

The purpose of this document is to serve as a live record of the Heads of Terms which are suggested for the proposed development. The Heads of Terms are in draft form and are therefore themselves subject to further discussion and/or agreement. Certain matters listed herein may alternatively be addressed satisfactorily by means of Condition. This requires detailed discussions with the LPA on the principle that conditions should always be used in the first instance as per government guidance and that contained in BS 5837 – 2012 Table B.1 Delivery of tree-related information into the planning system; this method statement fulfils the recommended criteria for arboricultural information.

The Draft Heads of Terms and obligations are as follows:-

Construction Exclusion Zone Fencing

- Timing for setting out, construction and completion of fencing generally in accordance with the phasing plan.
- Specification for fencing and or ground protection to be in accordance with BS 5837:2012.

Storage of Materials/Offices/Fuels

- Identification and reservation of land for storage of materials,
- parking of vehicles, location of offices and welfare facilities, fuels.

Removal of Hard surfacing

- Existing surface to be removed by hand working from the closest point to the tree working out.
- The upper course to be cut with a disc cutter.
- The material is to be broken with hand tools.

Services

- Location of services including sewerage, gas, water, electricity.
- Timing of excavations where they pass within or close to retained trees in accordance with phasing plan.

Review/Site Inspection

- Review to be undertaken prior to the commencement of development to address: phasing and land uses.
- Arrangements for Review (monitoring).
- Review to allow for amendment / variation by agreement.

Construction Works	Arboricultural Input
Tree works	Review with contractor
Fencing installation/laying of temporary working surface	Review and supervise installation of Construction Exclusion Zone Fencing
Excavation of hard surfaces/removal of material from site	Review protection measures and working practices
Construction of hard surfaces and delivery of building materials	Review working of practices/supervision of works/Review of tree protection measure and site storage
Installation of services	Review working of practices/supervision of works/Review of tree protection measure

Head Office

Suite 1, 9 - 11 Princess Street, Knutsford, WA16 6BY

01565 755 422

manchester@acsconsulting.co.uk

www.acsconsulting.co.uk

Ian Murat

M.Sc, F.Arbor.A, CEnv, MCIEEM, RC. Arbor.A

Registered Consultant of the Arboricultural Association.

ian.murat@acsconsulting.co.uk

Scotland Office

272 Bath Street, Glasgow, G2 4JR

0141 354 1633

glasgow@acsconsulting.co.uk

www.acsconsulting.co.uk

acsconsulting
tree consultants

Arboricultural ASSOCIATION
Fellow Member

AA Registered CONSULTANT
trees.org.uk