

# Arboricultural Impact Assessment



Land at Whitworth Road (Dunelm and Carpetright) Car  
Park, Whitworth Road, Rochdale



**Tyler  
Grange**

**1<sup>st</sup> February 2024**

TG Report No. 16546\_R01\_JJ

| Report No: | Date                          | Revision | Authors                               |
|------------|-------------------------------|----------|---------------------------------------|
| 16546_R01  | 1 <sup>st</sup> February 2024 | -        | Jack Jewell,<br>BA(Hons) MLA,<br>CMLI |

**Disclosure:**

This report, all plans, illustrations, and other associated material remains the property of Tyler Grange Group Ltd until paid for in full. Copyright and intellectual property rights remain with Tyler Grange Group Ltd.

The contents of this report are valid at the time of writing. Tyler Grange shall not be liable for any use of this report other than for the purposes for which it was produced. Owing to the dynamic nature of ecological, landscape, and arboricultural resources, if more than twelve months have elapsed since the date of this report, further advice must be taken before you rely on the contents of this report. Notwithstanding any provision of the Tyler Grange Group Ltd Terms & Conditions, Tyler Grange Group Ltd shall not be liable for any losses (howsoever incurred) arising as a result of reliance by the client or any third party on this report more than 12 months after the date of this report.



## Contents:

|                                             |   |
|---------------------------------------------|---|
| Section 1: Introduction                     | 1 |
| Section 2: Tree Survey Findings             | 2 |
| Section 3: Arboricultural Impact Assessment | 3 |

## Appendices:

|                                                                                 |  |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| Appendix 1: Tree Survey Methodology, Constraints Mapping and Report Limitations |  |
| Appendix 2: Cascade Chart for Tree Quality Assessment                           |  |
| Appendix 3: Tree Survey Schedule                                                |  |
| Appendix 4: Local Planning Policy                                               |  |

## Plans:

|                                            |  |
|--------------------------------------------|--|
| 16546/P01: Tree Constraints Plan           |  |
| 16546/P02: Tree Retention and Removal Plan |  |



## Section 1: Introduction

- 1.1 This Arboricultural Impact Assessment has been prepared by Tyler Grange Group Ltd (TG) on behalf of ERP (Accrington) Ltd c/o Glenbrook Investments Ltd (hereafter referred to as 'the applicant').
- 1.2 It sets out the findings of a BS5837 Tree Quality Survey and Arboricultural Impact Assessment in support of an application which seeks full planning permission for the construction of a drive-through cafe unit and associated site works. The scheme is proposed on part of Whitworth Road (Dunelm and Carpetright) Car Park on Whitworth Road, Rochdale, OL12 0TY (hereafter referred to as 'the site').
- 1.3 The report identifies the arboricultural impact of the proposed development in the context of local and national planning policy. The tree survey and assessment has been guided by the recommendations set out within the British Standard 5837 (2012) 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – recommendations' (hereafter 'BS5837') to accord with industry best practice.

## Site Context

- 1.4 The site extends to approximately 0.34 ha and is broadly rectangular in shape. The site comprises the northern end of Whitworth Road Car Park and encompasses 128 car parking spaces, including 8 equipped with electric vehicle charging points (EVCPs). Vegetation aligns the perimeter of the site along the north, east and western boundaries to Queen Street, Duke Street and Whitehall Street comprising lines of trees with low-level shrubs and hedge planting below.

## Proposed Development

- 1.5 The proposed development is for the construction of a Use Class E(a)/E(b) drive through café, which will be occupied by Starbucks, along with associated modifications to the vehicular and pedestrian site access, car parking layout, hard and soft landscaping, and other site works.
- 1.6 The application also proposes external works to modify the existing vehicular access from Duke Street and Whitworth Road along with modifications to the internal car parking layout and circulation to provide access, servicing and car parking facilities to support the proposed development.
- 1.7 The existing vehicular access point to Whitworth Street Car Park from Duke Street will be retained, but the access will be widened to improve visibility and provide wider footpaths to Duke Street.



## Section 2: Tree Survey Findings

### Tree Survey Summary

- 2.1 The tree survey was completed in accordance with BS5837 and the methodology as detailed at **Appendix 1**. The survey was completed in January 2024. In accordance with best practice a measured topographical survey (supplied by others) was used to inform the location of trees and their surrounding context. The distribution of the trees surveyed is illustrated on the TCP which includes plotted details of the following in accordance with BS5837:
- Tree quality gradings<sup>1</sup>;
  - Root Protection Areas (RPAs)<sup>2</sup>; and
  - Tree canopy spreads<sup>3</sup>.
- 2.2 The trees surveyed have been categorised using the 'cascade chart for tree quality assessment' (**See Appendix 2**) recommended by the BS5837. The grading system allows informed decisions to be made concerning the design and impact of the development in relation to the arboricultural value of the trees surveyed.
- 2.3 Findings for each of the trees surveyed are detailed in the Tree Survey Schedule (**See Appendix 3**). This provides a tabulated record of the trees surveyed, including; reference numbers, species composition, tree dimensions, life stage, physiological and structural condition, and the arboricultural value of each survey entry.

### Planning Policy Context

- 2.4 A summary of the applicable national and local planning policies pertinent to trees and woodlands is included at **Appendix 4** of this report. A principle local policy objective is to safeguard existing trees where possible, with Policy G6 stipulating a 2:1 tree replacement policy where tree removals are unavoidable.

### Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) and Ancient Woodland, Ancient, Notable and Veteran Trees

- 2.5 Rochdale Council have confirmed via email on 1<sup>st</sup> February 2024 that none of the surveyed trees are covered by a TPO. The site does not lie within a conservation area.
- 2.6 As shown on the magic.gov.uk website, there are no Ancient Woodlands located on nor within influence of the site. As shown on the Woodland Trust Ancient Tree Inventory, there are no Ancient, Notable or Veteran trees recorded on site. No such trees were identified during the BS5837 tree quality survey of the site.

---

<sup>1</sup>The value of arboricultural features surveyed in accordance with the methodology set-out Appendix 1.

<sup>2</sup>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. See further explanation at Appendix 1.

<sup>3</sup>Dimensions of the trees crown spread and clearance from ground level. See further explanation at Appendix 1.



## Section 3: Arboricultural Impact Assessment

- 3.1 The proposed development is for the construction of a Use Class E(a)/E(b) drive through café, which will be occupied by Starbucks, along with associated modifications to the vehicular and pedestrian site access, car parking layout, hard and soft landscaping, and other site works.
- 3.2 This assessment is informed by a composite overlay of the BS5837 tree survey information and proposed development layout as shown on the Tree Retention and Removal Plan ('TRRP') contained to the rear of this report.

### Proposed Tree Removals

- 3.3 The main consideration in terms of arboricultural impacts relates to the partial removal of understorey vegetation within H2 on the south western site boundary and within H3 on the south eastern site boundary, requiring 2no. 3m wide puncture points in order to implement proposed pedestrian connections into the site from the adjoining highways.
- 3.4 A single Category B Plane within G1 and a single Category C Rowan within G5 will be removed in order to facilitate proposed site access widening works. This include for the cutting back along the northern side of H3 to implement a new footway as part of the site's new site access arrangement.
- 3.5 No TPO trees will be removed nor impacted by the proposed development.

### Tree Canopy Works

- 3.6 As an active car park the majority of the trees have been previously crown lifted along the boundaries to around 2.5 - 3m from ground level. There is therefore adequate clearance beneath canopies to facilitate the construction stage and clearance for vehicular parking, although where isolated tips and branches are found to obstruct construction working room, these will be pruned back to provide the clearance required.
- 3.7 As denoted on the TRRP 2no cherry trees within tree group G2 will be lifted to enable 3m clearance from finished floor level of the proposed south western boundary pedestrian connection to lower branch tips in order to maintain a safe clearance below branches for pedestrians accessing the site during operation.
- 3.8 As denoted on the TRRP a Category B willow will also be crown reduced along the canopy's site-side edge by 2m in order to maintain a 4m clearance from the proposed Starbucks development.

### Construction Mitigation

- 3.9 It will be necessary to demonstrate how the above and below ground structures of retained tree cover will be protected during the site preparation and construction phases of the development in accordance with BS5837. It is therefore recommended that a full Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) is prepared to discharge an applicable and suitably worded planning Condition, should consent be granted.



## Conclusion

- 3.10 A BS5837 tree survey has been undertaken to inform the arboricultural impact of a proposed Use Class E(a)/E(b) drive through café off Whitworth Road, Rochdale.
- 3.11 There are no TPOs and no trees of high arboricultural value on nor within influence of the site with the baseline comprising a mix of low to moderate value tree stock bounding the northern, eastern and western edges of an existing active car park. The site does not lie within a Conservation Area.
- 3.12 2no trees will be removed in order to facilitate the development with portions of the existing landscape buffers to the north, east and west of the site being extended into former car parking bays as a means of providing ample space for replacement tree and shrub planting.
- 3.13 Overall, the layout demonstrates a clear design effort to avoid arboricultural impacts, safeguarding the majority of the site's boundary tree cover and strengthening the site's structural landscaping towards the development boundaries and this therefore is judged to accord on balance with local policy objectives pertinent to trees. The proposals are therefore supportable from an arboricultural perspective.



# Appendix 1: Tree Survey Methodology, Constraints Mapping and Report Limitations



# Appendix 1: Tree Survey Methodology, Constraints Mapping and Report Limitations

## Field Work

- A1.1 In accordance BS5837, the tree survey included all trees within / in influence of the site and the site boundaries that were over 75mm diameter at breast height (1.5m).
- A1.2 Measured topographical survey data (supplied by others) was used to inform tree locations their surrounding context. Any trees not identified on the topographical survey are prefixed with (\*) and their locations have been approximated using measurements during the tree survey and further informed by aerial photography where required.
- A1.3 The trees surveyed were visually inspected from ground level only. No invasive investigations or climbing inspections were necessary to confirm visual or audible signs of defect or debility and no tissue or soil samples were undertaken. For further clarification please refer to the tree survey explanatory notes in below.

## Tree Numbers

'T' prefixes have been used to identify individual trees and commence with 'T1'.

'G' prefixes have been used to identify groups of trees.

'H' prefixes have been used to identify hedgerows.

'W' prefixes have been used to identify woodlands.

## Species

Species are listed by their common name, both in the schedule and in the report text.

## Height and Stem Diameter

- A1.4 The stem diameter is measured at 1.5m above ground level and given in millimetres (mm). Tree heights are measured in metres (m) using a clinometer where access and land typography allowed. In instances where access to tree's stem and height measurements were not possible, the dimensions have been estimated by eye.

## Crown Spread and Height of Crown Clearance

- A1.5 Radial crown spread is measured in metres and is listed for each of the four cardinal points where access has been possible to obtain a measurement. Where access was not possible to measure the spread of the canopy, such distances have been estimated by eye or informed by aerial photography.
- A1.6 The measured canopy shapes have been plotted on the Tree Constraints Plan at the four cardinal points. For groups of trees, the extent of the canopy has been measured as an average across the group and plotted using the topographical survey mapping. In some instances, Tyler Grange will use aerial photography to inform the canopy spread of larger tree groups and woodlands where topographical data is limited for such features.



- A1.7 The distance between the ground level and the first significant branch or radial tree crown, whichever is the lower, has been measured in metres.

## Age Class

- A1.8 The age of each tree is defined as follows:

**Young** - within the first third of reaching full maturity;

**Semi-Mature** - within the second third of reaching full maturity;

**Early-Mature** - within the last third of reaching full maturity;

**Mature** - specimen at full maturity; and

**Veteran** – tree that, by recognised criteria, shows features of biological, cultural or aesthetic value that are characteristic of, but not exclusive to, individuals surviving beyond the typical age range for the species concerned.

## Physiological and Structural Condition

- A1.9 The physiological or structural condition of each tree is defined as either; good, fair, poor or dead. For each tree, where appropriate, notes on the structural integrity are provided on form, taper, forking habit, storm damage, decay, fungi, pests, etc.

An assessment of a tree's physiological condition is defined as:

**Good** – fully functioning biological system showing expectant vitality for the species i.e. normal bud growth, leaf size, crown density and wound closure.

**Fair** – fully functioning biological system showing below average vitality i.e. reduced bud growth, smaller leaf size, lower crown density and reduced wound closure.

**Poor** – a biological system with limited functionality showing clear physiological decline, disease or significantly below average vitality i.e. limited bud growth, small and chlorotic leaves, low crown density and limited wound closure.

**Dead** – tree observed to fully dead with no living parts.

An assessment of a tree's structural condition is defined as:

**Good** – no significant structural defects.

**Fair** – structural defects which could be alleviated through remedial tree surgery or arboricultural management practices

**Poor** – structural defects which cannot be alleviated through tree surgery or arboricultural management practices.



## Tree Quality Gradings

- A1.10 The value of trees has been assessed in accordance with the BS5837 Cascade Chart for Tree Quality Assessment (See Appendix 2). Grading subcategories (1, 2 and 3) reflect arboricultural, landscape and cultural values, respectively.

## Root Protection Areas

- A1.11 The Tree Constraints Plan shows the approximate extent of Root Protection Areas (RPAs). The RPAs have been plotted and calculated in accordance with the methodology set out in Appendices C and D of BS5837, using the tree stem diameter dimensions obtained during the site visit.
- A1.12 Plotted RPAs serve as 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.
- A1.13 Where pre-existing site conditions or other factors indicate that rooting may occur asymmetrically, a polygon of equivalent area should be produced. Modifications to the shape of the RPA should reflect a soundly based arboricultural assessment of likely root distribution observed on-site. Any deviation in the RPA from the original circular plot should take account of the following factors whilst still providing adequate protection for the root system:
- a) the morphology and disposition of the roots, when influenced by past or existing site conditions (e.g. the presence of roads, structures and underground apparatus);
  - b) topography and drainage;
  - c) the soil type and structure;
  - d) the likely tolerance of the tree to root disturbance or damage, based on factors such as species, age, condition and past management.
- A1.14 The plotted RPAs have therefore informed the design of the proposed development where possible. While developing within RPAs should be avoided, special working methods can be adopted to alleviate the RPA disturbance for cases where the development is considered necessary and unavoidable.

## Tree Canopies

- A1.15 The distribution of tree canopy cover on and within influence of the site is illustrated on the TCP. Canopies have been plotted at cardinal points for individual and groups of trees. The Tree Survey Schedule included at Appendix 5 to the rear of this report lists the vertical clearance from site ground level to significant tree branching of individual trees. This measurement informs the impacts of accessibility and development beneath tree canopies.

## Limitations

- A1.16 The comments made are based on observable factors present at the time of inspection. Although the health and stability of trees in their current context is an integral part of their suitability for retention, it must be understood that this report is not a tree risk assessment and should not be construed as such. While every attempt has been made to provide a realistic and accurate



assessment of the trees' condition at the time of inspection, it may have not been appropriate, or possible, to view all parts or all sides of every tree to fulfil the assessment criteria of a risk assessment.

- A1.17 No tree can be considered entirely safe, given the possibility that exceptionally strong winds could damage or uproot even a mechanically 'perfect' specimen. It is therefore usually accepted that hazards are only recognisable from distinct defects or from other failure-prone characteristics of the tree or the site. An assessment of the potential influence of trees upon existing buildings or other structures resulting from the effects of trees upon shrinkable load-bearing soils or the effects of incremental root or branch growth, are specifically excluded from this report.

## Un-assessable Risks

- A1.18 Any alteration to the application site or development proposals could change the current circumstances and may invalidate this report and any recommendations made.
- A1.19 The Wildlife and Countryside Act (WCA) 1981 (as amended) makes it an offence to disturb nesting birds or recklessly endanger a bat or its roost. Bats are also a European protected species and are additionally protected under the Conservation (Habitats & c) Regulations 1994 and 2010 (as amended). The survey findings, constraints, opportunities and design or mitigation recommendations included within that report must be read alongside this document.
- A1.20 A lack of recommended work does not imply that a tree does not pose an unacceptable level of risk and likewise, it should not be implied that a tree will present an acceptable level of risk following the completion of any recommended work.



## Appendix 2: Cascade Chart for Tree Quality Assessment

| TREES FOR REMOVAL                                                                                                                                                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |                                                                                                        |                                                                                                                                       |                        |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| Category and Definition                                                                                                                                                | Criteria                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |                                                                                                        |                                                                                                                                       | Identification on Plan |
| Category U<br><br>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 category U trees (i.e. where, for whatever reason, the loss of companion shelter cannot be mitigated by pruning). |                                                                                                        |                                                                                                                                       | DARK RED               |
|                                                                                                                                                                        | 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 it might be desirable to preserve)                                                                                                                                                                                     |                                                                                                        |                                                                                                                                       |                        |
| TREES TO BE CONSIDERED FOR RETENTION                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |                                                                                                        |                                                                                                                                       |                        |
| Category and Definition                                                                                                                                                | 1.Mainly Arboricultural Values                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | 2. Mainly Landscape Values                                                                             | 3. Mainly Cultural Values, including Conservation                                                                                     | Identification on Plan |
| Category A<br><br>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 those that are essential components of groups or formal or semi-formal arboricultural features (e.g. the dominant 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) | ` LIGHT GREEN          |



|                                                                                                                                                                 |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |                                                                     |                 |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| <p>Category B</p> <p>Trees of moderate quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 20 years</p>                                             | <p>Trees that might be included in category A, but are downgraded because of impaired condition (e.g. presence of significant though remedial 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</p> | <p>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</p> | <p>Trees with material conservation or other cultural benefits.</p> | <p>MID BLUE</p> |
| <p>Category C</p> <p>Trees of low quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 10 years, or young trees with a stem diameter below 150mm</p> | <p>Unremarkable trees of very limited merit or such impaired condition that they do not qualify in higher categories</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | <p>Trees present in groups or woodlands, but without this conferring on them significantly greater collective landscape value; and/or trees offering low or temporary/transient landscape benefit.</p>                                                                   | <p>Trees with no material conservation or other cultural value.</p> | <p>GREY</p>     |



# Appendix 3: Tree Survey Schedule



| Tree Number | Common Species Name                                                 | Height (m) | Trunk Diameter (mm) | Height of Crown Clearance (m) | Age Class              | Physiological Condition | Structural Condition | BS5837 Category | Notes                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
|-------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| G1          | Plane, Small Leaved Lime, Cherry, Silver Birch, Rowan, Goat Willow. | 8 - 12m    | 200 - 490           | 1.5 - 2m                      | Early Mature to Mature | Fair - Good             | Fair                 | B.2 / C.2       | Northern boundary car park edge planting, comprising a mix of early mature trees and younger infill tree cover. Lifted canopies with co-dominant upper stems. Kerb edging to site-side with car parking beyond. Collective moderate value as high canopy car park edge tree planting, with selected lower quality younger specimens. |
| G2          | 3no. Cherry, Goat Willow                                            | 8 - 12m    | av. 350             | 2 - 3m                        | Early Mature to Mature | Fair - Good             | Fair                 | B.2             | Linear stand of 3no. Cherry and mature Goat Willow. Several torn / hanging branches to western roadside canopies                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| G3          | Lime, Poplar                                                        | 6 - 12m    | to 350              | 3m                            | Early Mature to Mature | Fair - Good             | Fair                 | B.2 / C.2       | Stand of 2no. trees to south western site corner in car park edge planting bed. Ornamental high canopy tree stock, torn and hanging deadwood noted. Developed context with EV infrastructure to north of stems, hard surfacing and kerb edging to site-side RPAs. Lifted crowns over car park edge.                                  |
| G4          | Cherry, Lime, Callery Pear                                          | 6 - 12m    | to 600              | 3m                            | Early Mature to Mature | Fair - Good             | Fair                 | B.2 / C.2       | Stand of 3no. trees to south eastern site corner in car park edge planting bed / H3 hedgerow belt. Ornamental high canopy tree stock, with central larger Cherry. Urban influence with torn and hanging deadwood noted. Hard surfacing and kerb edging to site-side RPAs. Lifted crowns over car park edge.                          |
| G5          | 2no. Rowan                                                          | 6 - 8m     | to 220              | 2m                            | Early Mature           | Fair - Good             | Fair - Good          | C.2             | 2no. Street tree / car park edge Rowans. No significant issues. Crown lifted with rounded form. Growing within H3 eastern boundary shrub bed.                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| H1          | Cherry Laurel                                                       | 1.5m       | 100                 | 0.00                          | Early Mature           | Good                    | Good                 | C.2             | Northern boundary car park edge shrubs / hedging plants with no significant issues.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| H2          | Holly, Cotoneaster, Lonicera                                        | 1.5m       | 75                  | 0.00                          | Early Mature           | Good                    | Good                 | C.2             | Western boundary car park edge shrubs / hedging plants with no significant issues. Some clearance / cutting back noted for EV charging point installation.                                                                                                                                                                           |
| H3          | Cotoneaster                                                         | 1.5m       | 75                  | 0.00                          | Early Mature           | Good                    | Good                 | C.2             | Eastern boundary car park edge shrubs / hedging plants with no significant issues.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |

## Appendix 4: Planning Policy Context



# Appendix 4: Planning Policy Context

## Policy Context

### National Planning Policy

- A4.1. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was updated in December 2023 and is a material consideration in planning decisions and outlines the Government's planning policies for England, setting out how these are expected to be applied. The consideration for existing trees and woodlands in the context of planning and new development is set out within Section 12 'Achieving well-designed and beautiful places' and Section 15 'Conservation and Enhancing the Natural Environment'.
- A4.2. Section 12, paragraph 136 states that "Trees make an important contribution to the character and quality of urban environments, and can also help mitigate and adapt to climate change. Planning policies and decisions should ensure that new streets are tree-lined, that opportunities are taken to incorporate trees elsewhere in developments (such as parks and community orchards), that appropriate measures are in place to secure the long-term maintenance of newly-planted trees, and that existing trees are retained wherever possible. Applicants and local planning authorities should work with highways officers and tree officers to ensure that the right trees are planted in the right places, and solutions are found that are compatible with highways standards and the needs of different users".
- A4.3. Section 15, paragraph 180 provides a series of prerequisites to inform how planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment. This includes "recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland".
- A4.4. Section 15, paragraph 181 addresses the need to take a "strategic approach to maintaining and enhancing networks of habitats and green infrastructure and adding that plans should be made for the enhancement of natural capital at the catchment or landscape scale across local authority boundaries".
- A4.5. Section 15, paragraph 186 highlights a series of principles that local planning authorities should apply when determining planning applications, stating that "if significant harm biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused".
- A4.6. Section 15, paragraph 186 (c) also adds that "development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensatory strategy exists".
- A4.7. Considering the surveyed trees in the context of NPPF paragraph 186, it should be noted that no protected trees, Veteran trees nor Ancient Woodlands are present on or within influence of the site, nor does the site lie within a Conservation Area and as such, the policy tests within paragraph 186 c) need not be engaged.



## Local Planning Policy

### Rochdale Adopted Core Strategy (October 2016)

- A4.8. Policy G6 – Enhancing Green Infrastructure states that development must *“protect ancient woodlands and hedgerows, support new woodland and tree planting in new developments, and replace removed trees from a site at a ratio of 2:1”*.
- A4.9. Policy G7 – Increasing the Value of Biodiversity and Geodiversity states that development proposals are expected to *“Protect and enhance existing features such as peatland, ponds, wetlands, reservoirs, mill lodges, trees, hedges, wooded areas, meadows, flora and fauna”*

### Unitary Development Plan (June 2006)

- A4.10. The Unitary Development Plan from the 1996-2016 Local Plan is still in place until the Allocations Development Plan is adopted.
- A4.11. Policy NE/8 – Development Affecting Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows states that *“Development proposals will be permitted that do not adversely affect trees, woodland or hedgerows”*.
- A4.12. The policy adds that:

*“Proposals on sites containing trees and woodlands should ensure:*

- a) Suitable space and conditions for the successful retention of trees, woodland and hedgerows;*
- b) That new tree planting is of an appropriate scale and species and that the impacts on the amenity of the development and surrounding area in the longer term e.g., root spread, stability, loss of daylight, leaf fall and personal safety have been fully considered;*
- c) Suitable care and protection of trees and their environment during construction;*
- d) The nature conservation value of existing hedgerows, trees and woodland has been safeguarded where appropriate including the incidence of protected species e.g., bat roosts, and the value of ground flora e.g. bluebells;*
- e) Hedgerows which meet the criteria set out in the Hedgerow Regulations 1997 and other hedgerows which are locally distinctive and valuable for their natural or historic value are fully safeguarded;*
- f) The requirement of the Forestry Commission for a felling licence to be obtained is met where appropriate;*
- g) Suitable arrangements for future maintenance and management of trees and woodland (which may need to be secured by means of a legal agreement); and h) Replacement planting of trees in the event of death or failure during a 5 year period”.*



## Plans:

16546/P01: Tree Constraints Plan

16546/P02: Tree Retention and Removal Plan





-  Site Boundary
-  Category C - Trees of low quality and value
-  Category B - Trees of moderate quality and value
-  BS5837 Canopy Shading Extents
-  Approximate Extent of BS5837 Calculated Root Protection Areas (RPAs)
-  RPA Influenced by Existing Hard Standing



3 Jordan St, Manchester M15 4PY  
t: 0121 828 4043  
www.tylergrange.co.uk

Tree Constraints Plan

Project Land at Whitworth Road (Dunelm and Carpetright) Car Park, Whitworth Road, Rochdale

Drawing No 16546/P01 January 2024

This document should not be relied on or used in circumstances other than those for which it was prepared and for which Tyler Grange was appointed.  
Tyler Grange accepts no responsibility for this document to any other party other than the person by whom it was appointed





# Step into our world

[www.tylergrange.co.uk](http://www.tylergrange.co.uk)



**Tyler  
Grange**

Landscape | Ecology | Arboriculture