



# ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

*In accordance with BS5837:2012*  
Pre-Development Planning Application

---

|                                 |                                         |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| <b>Site Address</b>             | 206–208 Drake Street, Rochdale OL16 1PJ |
| <b>Client</b>                   | Helmrig Ltd                             |
| <b>Local Planning Authority</b> | Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council   |
| <b>Document Reference</b>       | DS-AIA-290426-AIA-01                    |
| <b>Report Date</b>              | 29 April 2026                           |
| <b>Prepared By</b>              | Andrew McLoughlin MARborA               |

---

Treestyle Consultancy Ltd | Bailrigg, Jepps Lane, Barton, Preston PR3 5AQ  
Tel: 07872064313 | [info@treestyleconsultancy.co.uk](mailto:info@treestyleconsultancy.co.uk)

## DOCUMENT CONTROL

### Associated documents to be read in conjunction with this report:

| Document                                               | Reference            | Version |
|--------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|---------|
| Arboricultural Method Statement                        | DS-AIA-290426-AMS-01 | 1       |
| Landscaping, Maintenance & Replacement Planting Scheme | DS-AIA-290426-LMP-01 | 1       |
| Tree Survey Schedule (Appendix A)                      | DS-AIA-290426-SCH-01 | 1       |
| Drawing 1 — A Plan of the Tree Constraints             | DS-AIA-290426-TCP-01 | 1       |
| Drawing 2 — Tree Protection Plan                       | DS-AIA-290426-TPP-01 | 1       |

### Version Control:

| Date       | Notes               | Author | Version |
|------------|---------------------|--------|---------|
| 29/04/2026 | Issued for planning | AM     | 01      |

### Copyright & Limitations

This report and its content are copyright © 2026 Treestyle Consultancy Ltd. All rights reserved. This report was prepared solely for the use of Helmrig Ltd and their agents. It may not be relied upon by any other party without the prior written permission of Treestyle Consultancy Ltd.

Opinions and information provided in this report are prepared using all reasonable skill, care and due diligence in compliance with BS5837:2012 and the Arboricultural Association Code of Professional Conduct.

## Executive Summary

---

Treestyle Consultancy was commissioned to complete a survey in accordance with the specifications set out in British Standard 5837:2012, Trees in relation to design, demolition & construction — Recommendations. This document is an Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) prepared to support a pre-development planning application at 206–208 Drake Street, Rochdale OL16 1PJ.

### The Tree Survey

A total of 10 trees and tree groups were surveyed within and immediately adjacent to the application site. The site is a cleared urban brownfield plot on Drake Street, Rochdale. The green infrastructure is of poor quality throughout, comprising self-seeded pioneer species of low value and limited life potential. No Category A trees were recorded. Four Category B trees (T7–T10) on neighbouring land are unaffected by the proposed development due to containment of their root systems by existing boundary walls. Six groups of Category C and Category U vegetation (G1–G6) are recommended for removal prior to development.

| Cat | No. | Description                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
|-----|-----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| A   | 0   | No Category A trees recorded on site.                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
| B   | 4   | Four trees recorded as Category B — moderate quality, 20–40 year life expectancy. T7 (Common lime), T8 (Common lime), T9 (Turkey oak) and T10 (Sycamore) on neighbouring land. No impact from development due to root containment by boundary walls. |
| C   | 5   | Five tree groups recorded as Category C — low quality, less than 10 year life expectancy. G1–G5 are self-seeded pioneer species (birch, buddleia, willow, maple) with poor form and limited life potential. All recommended for removal.             |
| U   | 1   | One group recorded as Category U — not realistically retainable. G6 (self-seeded birch, buddleia and willow) with canopies overhanging the public footpath, restricting access and presenting a public safety hazard.                                |

### The Proposal

- Pre-development site clearance and preparation at 206–208 Drake Street, Rochdale OL16 1PJ.
- Removal of all on-site vegetation (G1–G6) as identified in the tree survey schedule.
- New developments seen within Drawing 2 Tree Protection Plan, this AIA supports the pre-development planning application and establishes the arboricultural constraints baseline for the site.

## **Key Arboricultural Findings**

- No Category A trees are present on or adjacent to the site.
- Four Category B trees (T7, T8, T9, T10) are located on neighbouring land. Their root systems are effectively contained by existing boundary wall foundations and the development poses no arboricultural impact to them.
- Five groups of Category C self-seeded pioneer species (G1–G5) are recommended for removal before development commences. These are of very low quality and limited life potential.
- One Category U group (G6 — self-seeded birch, buddleia and willow) overhangs the public footpath and presents a public safety hazard independent of the proposed development. Urgent removal is recommended.
- The site offers a significant opportunity to enhance the local urban green infrastructure through a structured replacement planting scheme with appropriate species and post-planting maintenance.

## **Recommended Sequence of Operations**

- Removal of G6 (Category U) as a priority H&S measure — urgent.
- Removal of G1–G5 (Category C) prior to development commencing.
- Protection of T7–T10 boundary trees during all demolition and construction operations.
- Replacement planting scheme implemented as part of the landscaping proposals.

### **Executive Summary**

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Site Description
- 3.0 Proposed Development
- 4.0 Survey Methodology & Tree Categorisation
- 5.0 Tree Survey Results
- 6.0 Arboricultural Impact Assessment
- 7.0 Conclusions & Recommendations
- 8.0 Caveats & Limitations
- 9.0 References
- 10.0 About the Author

Drawing 1 A Plan of the Tree Constraints — DS-AIA-290426-TCP-01 (separate drawing)

Drawing 2 Tree Protection Plan — DS-AIA-290426-TPP-01 (separate drawing)

Appendix A Tree Survey Schedule

Appendix B Glossary

Appendix C BS5837:2012 Tree Categorisation Chart

Appendix D Tree Fencing Specification

Appendix E Tree Constraints Photographs

Appendix F Site Photographs

---

## 1.0 Introduction

---

### Instruction

- 1.1 I have been instructed by Helmrig Ltd to prepare an Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) in accordance with BS5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction — Recommendations, to support a pre-development planning application at 206–208 Drake Street, Rochdale OL16 1PJ.

### Scope

- 1.2 The scope of this instruction has been to:
- Record and categorise all trees on and adjacent to the application site that may be affected by the proposed development.
  - Assess the potential and actual impact of the proposed development on those trees.
  - Identify trees for retention and those requiring removal to facilitate the development.
  - Recommend measures to protect retained neighbouring trees during construction.
  - Assess compliance with national and local planning policies.
  - Provide the arboricultural constraints baseline to inform the design of the proposed development.

### Qualifications

- 1.3 My name is Andrew McLoughlin, Managing Director of Treestyle Consultancy Ltd since 2001. I hold a National Certificate in Arboriculture and a Master of Arboriculture (MArborA). I am an ISA Qualified Tree Risk Assessor (TRAQ), a Quantified Tree Risk Assessor, an Ancient and Veteran Tree Expert, and a Professional Member of the Arboricultural Association.
- 1.4 The initial arboricultural feasibility inspection was carried out on 12 March 2025. The tree survey was completed on 12 February 2026. Planning reference not yet assigned at the time of this report.

---

## 2.0 Site Description

---

- 2.1 The application site is 206–208 Drake Street, Rochdale OL16 1PJ, located within the administrative area of Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council. The site is a cleared brownfield urban plot in the town centre of Rochdale, bounded by Drake Street to the north-west, a public footpath to the north-east, and residential/commercial properties to the south and east.
- 2.2 The site has been cleared of former structures. The ground surface is mixed hard standing and rubble with self-seeded pioneer vegetation along the boundary margins. The site is characterised by poor-quality self-seeded trees and shrubs of low amenity and ecological value, comprising primarily birch, buddleia, willow and maple.
- 2.3 Four Category B trees (T7 – Common lime; T8 – Common lime; T9 – Turkey oak; T10 – Sycamore) are located on neighbouring land adjacent to the eastern boundary. Visual assessment of these trees was restricted by dense epicormic growth around the base, but all were assessed as Category B in good physiological and structural condition. An LPA protected trees search was conducted on 29 April 2026 via the Rochdale MBC online mapping portal, confirming no Tree Preservation Orders affecting trees on or adjacent to the application site. The site is not within a Conservation Area.
- 2.4 Survey conditions: 12 February 2026, dry and overcast, dormant season. Conditions were satisfactory for this assessment.

---

## 3.0 Proposed Development

---

- 3.1 This AIA has been prepared to support a pre-development planning application for the site at 206–208 Drake Street, Rochdale OL16 1PJ. The proposed development details are to be confirmed by the applicant. The primary purpose of this assessment is to establish the arboricultural constraints baseline for the site and to demonstrate that the on-site vegetation is of insufficient quality to warrant retention.
- 3.2 The key development-relevant elements of this assessment are: the removal of all on-site vegetation (G1–G6) prior to and as part of the development; the demolition of existing boundary walls and associated structures; the installation of new hard standing surfaces; and any new landscaping proposals.
- 3.3 The neighbouring Category B trees (T7–T10) are assessed as the principal arboricultural constraints on any future development design, as their Root Protection Areas extend towards the site boundary. The existing boundary wall foundations have historically contained root spread, and the residual impact on these trees from the proposed development is assessed as negligible.

## 4.0 Survey Methodology & Tree Categorisation

- 4.1 The survey was conducted as a ground-based Visual Tree Assessment (VTA) in accordance with BS5837:2012. Tree species, dimensions, age class, physiological and structural condition, life expectancy and amenity/ecological value were recorded for all trees and groups within and adjacent to the site.
- 4.2 Root Protection Areas (RPAs) were calculated in accordance with BS5837:2012 Clause 5.3:  $RPA = \pi \times (DBH/2 \times 12)^2$ . All RPAs are shown on the Tree Constraints Plan (Drawing 1, DS-AIA-290426-DWG-TCP-01).
- 4.3 Trees were assigned to quality categories A, B, C or U in accordance with BS5837:2012 Table 1. A full explanation of the category cascade chart is provided in Appendix C.

**Table 1: BS5837:2012 Category Summary — 206–208 Drake Street, Rochdale**

| Cat | Colour | Life Expectancy / Criteria                                                 |
|-----|--------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| A   | Green  | High quality — estimated remaining life expectancy $\geq 40$ years.        |
| B   | Blue   | Moderate quality — estimated remaining life expectancy $\geq 20$ years.    |
| C   | Grey   | Low quality — estimated remaining life expectancy $\geq 10$ years.         |
| U   | Red    | Cannot realistically be retained as living trees for longer than 10 years. |

■ Cat A                      ■ Cat B                      ■ Cat C                      ■ Cat U

## 5.0 Tree Survey Results

- 5.1 A total of 10 trees and tree groups were surveyed within and adjacent to the application site. Six groups of vegetation (G1–G6) are located within the site boundary. Four individual trees (T7–T10) are located on neighbouring land. No Category A trees were recorded. The tree population comprises 0 Category A, 4 Category B, 5 Category C and 1 Category U.
- 5.2 The on-site vegetation (G1–G6) is uniformly of poor quality. All groups are self-seeded pioneer species established on a poor substrate with multiple stems, poor form and limited life expectancy of less than 10 years. None of the on-site vegetation meets the threshold for retention under BS5837:2012.
- 5.3 The four neighbouring Category B trees (T7–T10) are in good physiological and structural condition with 20–40 years of estimated remaining life expectancy. Visual assessment of these trees was restricted due to dense epicormic growth around the base of each stem, consistent with the trees having been previously cut back or managed. The survey note for each tree records that minimal roots extend beyond the existing wall foundations, meaning the development poses no arboricultural impact.

**Table 2: Tree Survey Schedule — Summary (see Appendix A for full schedule)**

| Ref        | Species                                                                              | Maturity    | DBH (mm) | Ht (m) | Spread N/E/S/W | Category | Life Exp. | Work / Status                     |
|------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----------|--------|----------------|----------|-----------|-----------------------------------|
| <b>G1</b>  | Self-seeded group ( <i>Betula sp.</i> , <i>Buddleja davidii</i> , <i>Salix sp.</i> ) | Semi-mature | N/A      | 3      | 5/1/3/2        | <b>C</b> | <10 yrs   | Fell — pre-development            |
| <b>G2</b>  | Self-seeded group ( <i>Buddleja davidii</i> , <i>Salix sp.</i> )                     | Semi-mature | N/A      | 4      | 5/3/3/3        | <b>C</b> | <10 yrs   | Fell — pre-development            |
| <b>G3</b>  | Self-seeded group ( <i>Acer sp.</i> , <i>Buddleja davidii</i> , <i>Salix sp.</i> )   | Semi-mature | N/A      | 5      | 3/15/2/15      | <b>C</b> | <10 yrs   | Fell — pre-development            |
| <b>G4</b>  | Self-seeded willow group ( <i>Salix sp.</i> )                                        | Semi-mature | N/A      | 5      | 5/5/3/2        | <b>C</b> | <10 yrs   | Fell — pre-development            |
| <b>G5</b>  | Self-seeded willow group ( <i>Salix sp.</i> )                                        | Semi-mature | N/A      | 3      | 3/3/3/3        | <b>C</b> | <10 yrs   | Fell — pre-development            |
| <b>G6</b>  | Self-seeded group ( <i>Betula sp.</i> , <i>Buddleja davidii</i> , <i>Salix sp.</i> ) | Semi-mature | N/A      | 3      | 15/3/15/3      | <b>U</b> | <10 yrs   | Fell URGENT — H&S footpath        |
| <b>T7</b>  | Common Lime ( <i>Tilia europaea</i> )                                                | Mature      | 450      | 16     | 5/4/4/8        | <b>B</b> | 20–40 yrs | No action — root system contained |
| <b>T8</b>  | Common Lime ( <i>Tilia europaea</i> )                                                | Mature      | 400      | 17     | 4/7/6/4        | <b>B</b> | 20–40 yrs | No action — root system contained |
| <b>T9</b>  | Turkey Oak ( <i>Quercus cerris</i> )                                                 | Mature      | 500      | 25     | 5/7/8/6        | <b>B</b> | 20–40 yrs | No action — root system contained |
| <b>T10</b> | Sycamore ( <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i> )                                              | Mature      | 400      | 22     | 5/4/8/6        | <b>B</b> | 20–40 yrs | No action — root system contained |

■ Cat A                      ■ Cat B — neighbouring, retained                      ■ Cat C — remove pre-development                      ■ Cat U — urgent H&S removal

5.4 G6 (Category U) is of particular note. This group of self-seeded birch, buddleia and willow has canopies that overhang the public footpath along the northern boundary, restricting pedestrian access and presenting a public safety risk. Removal is recommended as an urgent priority, irrespective of the proposed development.

---

## 6.0 Arboricultural Impact Assessment

---

- 6.1 Development can have an adverse impact on trees through immediate removal to facilitate the development footprint; potential future loss from soil compaction or damage; root disturbance within the Root Protection Area; and canopy removal or damage from plant movement. Where impacts are unavoidable, the principle is to avoid harm where possible, mitigate where harm cannot be avoided, and compensate for any unavoidable loss through replacement planting.
- 6.2 In this instance, all on-site vegetation (G1–G6) is of Category C or U quality and is recommended for removal. The removal of this vegetation does not represent a significant arboricultural loss, as none of the on-site trees meet the threshold for retention under BS5837:2012. The four Category B neighbouring trees (T7–T10) are to be fully retained, with their root systems effectively protected by existing boundary wall foundations.

**Table 3: Arboricultural Impact Assessment — Summary of Effects**

| Ref        | Species                  | Cat      | RPA (m²) | Impact Type                                                                     | Mitigation                                                     | Impact Level  | Residual Impact       |
|------------|--------------------------|----------|----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------|
| <b>G1</b>  | Self-seeded group        | <b>C</b> | 0        | Removal to facilitate development footprint                                     | Fell to ground; grind stump; dispose arisings                  | Major Adverse | Negligible — Cat C    |
| <b>G2</b>  | Self-seeded group        | <b>C</b> | 0        | Removal to facilitate development footprint                                     | Fell to ground; grind stump; dispose arisings                  | Major Adverse | Negligible — Cat C    |
| <b>G3</b>  | Self-seeded group        | <b>C</b> | 0        | Removal to facilitate development footprint                                     | Fell to ground; grind stump; dispose arisings                  | Major Adverse | Negligible — Cat C    |
| <b>G4</b>  | Self-seeded willow group | <b>C</b> | 0        | Removal to facilitate development footprint                                     | Fell to ground; grind stump; dispose arisings                  | Major Adverse | Negligible — Cat C    |
| <b>G5</b>  | Self-seeded willow group | <b>C</b> | 0        | Removal to facilitate development footprint                                     | Fell to ground; grind stump; dispose arisings                  | Major Adverse | Negligible — Cat C    |
| <b>G6</b>  | Self-seeded group (U)    | <b>U</b> | 0        | URGENT removal — H&S footpath hazard                                            | Fell to ground; stump grind; dispose arisings                  | Major Adverse | H&S resolved — URGENT |
| <b>T7</b>  | Common Lime              | <b>B</b> | 91.6     | Indirect — demolition/construction near boundary; root system contained by wall | Protection fencing to boundary; arb supervision for demolition | Minor Adverse | Negligible            |
| <b>T8</b>  | Common Lime              | <b>B</b> | 72.4     | Indirect — demolition/construction near boundary; root system contained by wall | Protection fencing to boundary; arb supervision for demolition | Minor Adverse | Negligible            |
| <b>T9</b>  | Turkey Oak               | <b>B</b> | 113.1    | Indirect — demolition/construction near boundary; root system contained by wall | Protection fencing to boundary; arb supervision for demolition | Minor Adverse | Negligible            |
| <b>T10</b> | Sycamore                 | <b>B</b> | 72.4     | Indirect — demolition/construction near boundary; root system contained by wall | Protection fencing to boundary; arb supervision for demolition | Minor Adverse | Negligible            |

■ Category B — neighbouring, retained

■ Category C — removal: negligible impact

■ Category U — urgent H&S removal

---

## 7.0 Conclusions & Recommendations

---

- 7.1 This AIA has been prepared in accordance with BS5837:2012. The on-site vegetation at 206–208 Drake Street comprises six groups of self-seeded pioneer species of Category C and Category U quality. None of the on-site vegetation meets the threshold for retention under BS5837:2012, and all six groups are recommended for removal prior to or as part of the proposed development.
- 7.2 The four neighbouring Category B trees (T7–T10 — Common lime, Turkey oak and Sycamore) are in good condition and should be fully retained. In my professional opinion, the proposed development can be carried out without unacceptable harm to these retained trees, provided the protection measures set out in the accompanying AMS are fully implemented. The root systems of T7–T10 are effectively contained by the existing boundary wall foundations and the residual impact of the development on these trees is assessed as negligible.
- 7.3 G6 (Category U — self-seeded birch, buddleia and willow) poses a risk to the public by overhanging the public footpath along the northern boundary of the site. Removal of G6 is recommended as a priority H&S measure, independently of and in advance of the proposed development.
- 7.4 The removal of all on-site vegetation creates a significant opportunity to enhance the local urban green infrastructure through a structured replacement planting scheme. This is of particular importance in an urban setting where canopy cover and green infrastructure are essential for future generations. Full details are set out in the accompanying Landscaping, Maintenance and Replacement Planting Scheme (DS-AIA-290426-LMP-01).

### 7.5 Planning Policy Compliance

- 7.5.1 The proposed development must be assessed against the following planning policy framework: the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2023; the Rochdale Core Strategy (adopted October 2016), which remains the lead document of the Rochdale Borough Local Plan; the Greater Manchester Places for Everyone Plan (adopted March 2024); and the saved policies of the Rochdale Borough Unitary Development Plan (UDP, adopted June 2006).
- 7.5.2 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2023: Paragraphs 174 and 180 require that planning decisions contribute to and enhance the natural environment and that new development is appropriate in its landscape setting, protecting and enhancing trees, hedgerows and woodland. Paragraph 131 requires that good design ensures that trees and green infrastructure are integral to development proposals. The proposed enhanced replacement planting scheme directly supports these objectives.

- 
- 7.5.3 Rochdale Core Strategy (2016): The Core Strategy sets out the spatial planning framework for the borough to 2028. Policy G6 (Biodiversity) requires that development proposals protect and enhance biodiversity assets and seeks net gain in biodiversity wherever possible. Policy G7 (Green Infrastructure) requires that new development maintains, enhances and extends the borough's green infrastructure network and that the loss of green infrastructure will only be permitted where it can be replaced by equivalent or better provision. The removal of Category C and U pioneer vegetation at this urban brownfield site and its replacement with 12 native standard trees directly satisfies the requirements of Policies G6 and G7.
- 7.5.4 Places for Everyone Plan (adopted March 2024): Policy JP-G1 (Biodiversity and Geodiversity) requires development proposals to protect, maintain, restore and enhance biodiversity assets and to achieve Biodiversity Net Gain in accordance with the Environment Act 2021. Policy JP-G6 (Green Infrastructure) requires development to protect, enhance and create green infrastructure. The brownfield context of this site and the proposed enhanced planting programme is consistent with the objectives of both policies, contributing to the Greater Manchester urban greening agenda.
- 7.5.5 Rochdale Township Green Infrastructure Action Plan: The Council has prepared Green Infrastructure Action Plans for each Township. The Rochdale Township GI Action Plan identifies the importance of street trees and urban green infrastructure within the town centre context for health, wellbeing, biodiversity, climate resilience and regeneration. The proposed replacement planting scheme, with 12 native trees at an enhanced ratio, directly contributes to the stated objectives of the GI Action Plan for Rochdale Township.
- 7.5.6 Biodiversity Net Gain (Environment Act 2021): From November 2023, mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) of a minimum 10% applies to most major developments in England. The removal of Category C and U pioneer vegetation from this site has minimal biodiversity unit value under Metric 4.0. The proposed replacement planting of 12 native trees significantly exceeds the biodiversity unit contribution of the removed vegetation and demonstrates positive BNG. A full BNG assessment should be prepared by a qualified ecologist to confirm compliance with the mandatory 10% net gain requirement.
- 7.5.7 In the professional opinion of the author, the proposed scheme is compliant with NPPF 2023 paragraphs 131, 174 and 180; Core Strategy Policies G6 and G7; Places for Everyone Policies JP-G1 and JP-G6; and the objectives of the Rochdale Township Green Infrastructure Action Plan. The development should not give grounds for refusal or objection on arboricultural grounds. The proposed replacement planting scheme represents a positive net contribution to the urban green infrastructure of Rochdale town centre.

## Recommended Planning Conditions

**Table 4: Recommended Planning Conditions**

| No. | Condition                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1   | Prior to any works commencing on site, tree protection fencing shall be erected in the positions shown on the approved Tree Protection Plan (Drawing 2) and written clearance issued by the Arboricultural Consultant.                                                          |
| 2   | No development shall commence until the Arboricultural Method Statement (DS-AIA-290426-AMS-01) and Tree Protection Plan (DS-AIA-290426-DWG-TPP-01) have been approved in writing by the LPA. Development shall be carried out in full accordance with those approved documents. |
| 3   | G6 shall be removed prior to any other works commencing on site, to address the existing public safety hazard to the adjacent public footpath.                                                                                                                                  |
| 4   | Replacement planting shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Landscaping, Maintenance and Replacement Planting Scheme (DS-AIA-290426-LMP-01) in the first planting season following completion of the development.                                                 |



**Andrew McLoughlin MARborA**

Date: 29th April 2026

Consultant — Treestyle Consultancy Ltd

Tel: 07872064313 | [info@treestyleconsultancy.co.uk](mailto:info@treestyleconsultancy.co.uk)

---

## 8.0 Caveats & Limitations

---

- 8.1 This survey was carried out from ground level. No aerial inspection was undertaken. The report can only identify defects clearly visible from the ground at the time of the inspection. Visual assessment of T7–T10 was restricted by dense epicormic growth.
- 8.2 While all reasonable efforts have been made to identify the condition and quality of trees on site, the statements made do not take into account the effects of extreme weather events, vandalism, accidents or changes occurring after the survey date.
- 8.3 The comments and observations made will cease to be valid within two years of the survey date, or when site conditions change or any works to trees take place that have not been specified within this report, whichever is sooner.
- 8.4 This survey is limited to identifying arboricultural features. It does not include an ecological assessment or landscape appraisal beyond the scope of BS5837. Professional ecological and planning advice should be sought on all related matters.

---

## 9.0 References

---

British Standard BS5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction — Recommendations

British Standard BS3998:2010 Tree Work Recommendations

British Standard BS8545:2014 Trees: from nursery to independence in the landscape

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2023

National Tree Safety Group — Common Sense Risk Management of Trees, Second Edition (2024)

Rochdale Core Strategy (adopted October 2016) — the lead document of the Rochdale Borough Local Plan

Greater Manchester Places for Everyone Plan (adopted March 2024) — strategic spatial planning policies for Greater Manchester including Rochdale

Rochdale Borough Unitary Development Plan (adopted June 2006) — saved policies remain in force

Rochdale Township Green Infrastructure Action Plan (Rochdale MBC, 2013)

Biodiversity Metric 4.0 — Natural England (2023)

Environment Act 2021 — Biodiversity Net Gain requirements

---

## 10.0 About the Author

---

- 10.1 Andrew McLoughlin has been Managing Director of Treestyle Consultancy Ltd since 2001. He holds a Master of Arboriculture (MArborA), a National Certificate in Arboriculture, an ISA Tree Risk Assessment Qualification (TRAQ), and is a Quantified Tree Risk Assessor and Ancient and Veteran Tree Expert. He is a qualified LANTRA instructor and assessor and a Professional Member of the Arboricultural Association.

## Appendix A — Tree Survey Schedule

Table 5: Full Tree Survey Schedule — 206–208 Drake Street, Rochdale

| Ref       | Species                                                                              | Maturity    | DBH (mm) | Ht (m) | Spread N/E/S/W | Cat      | Life Exp . | Cond Crown/Stem/ Roots | Work / Status                             |
|-----------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----------|--------|----------------|----------|------------|------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| <b>G1</b> | Self-seeded group ( <i>Betula sp.</i> , <i>Buddleja davidii</i> , <i>Salix sp.</i> ) | Semi-mature | N/A      | 3      | 5/1/3/2        | <b>C</b> | <10        | Fair/Fair/Fair         | Fell to ground; stump grind; dispose      |
| <b>G2</b> | Self-seeded group ( <i>Buddleja davidii</i> , <i>Salix sp.</i> )                     | Semi-mature | N/A      | 4      | 5/3/3/3        | <b>C</b> | <10        | Fair/Fair/Fair         | Fell to ground; stump grind; dispose      |
| <b>G3</b> | Self-seeded group ( <i>Acer sp.</i> , <i>Buddleja davidii</i> , <i>Salix sp.</i> )   | Semi-mature | N/A      | 5      | 3/15/2/15      | <b>C</b> | <10        | Fair/Fair/Fair         | Fell to ground; stump grind; dispose      |
| <b>G4</b> | Self-seeded willow group ( <i>Salix sp.</i> )                                        | Semi-mature | N/A      | 5      | 5/5/3/2        | <b>C</b> | <10        | Fair/Fair/Fair         | Fell to ground; stump grind; dispose      |
| <b>G5</b> | Self-seeded willow group ( <i>Salix sp.</i> )                                        | Semi-mature | N/A      | 3      | 3/3/3/3        | <b>C</b> | <10        | Fair/Fair/Fair         | Fell to ground; stump grind; dispose      |
| <b>G6</b> | Self-seeded group ( <i>Betula sp.</i> , <i>Buddleja davidii</i> , <i>Salix sp.</i> ) | Semi-mature | N/A      | 3      | 15/3/15/3      | <b>U</b> | <10        | Poor/Fair/Fair         | FELL URGENT — H&S footpath hazard         |
| <b>T7</b> | Common Lime ( <i>Tilia europaea</i> )                                                | Mature      | 450      | 16     | 5/4/4/8        | <b>B</b> | 20–40      | Good/Ivy/Good          | No action — root system contained by wall |
| <b>T8</b> | Common Lime ( <i>Tilia europaea</i> )                                                | Mature      | 400      | 17     | 4/7/6/4        | <b>B</b> | 20–40      | Good/Ivy/Good          | No action — root system contained by wall |

| Ref | Species                                 | Maturity | DBH (mm) | Ht (m) | Spread N/E/S/W | Cat | Life Exp . | Cond Crown/Stem/ Roots | Work / Status                             |
|-----|-----------------------------------------|----------|----------|--------|----------------|-----|------------|------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| T9  | Turkey Oak ( <i>Quercus cerris</i> )    | Mature   | 500      | 25     | 5/7/8/6        | B   | 20–40      | Good/Good/Good         | No action — root system contained by wall |
| T10 | Sycamore ( <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i> ) | Mature   | 400      | 22     | 5/4/8/6        | B   | 20–40      | Good/Good/Good         | No action — root system contained by wall |

■ Cat B — Neighbouring — Retain

■ Cat C — Remove pre-development

■ Cat U — Urgent H&S removal

## Appendix B — Glossary

**Table 6: Glossary of Arboricultural Terms**

| Term                    | Definition                                                                                                                                                |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>ADB</b>              | Ash Dieback ( <i>Hymenoscyphus fraxineus</i> ) — a fungal disease causing progressive dieback of ash trees.                                               |
| <b>BS5837:2012</b>      | British Standard: Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction — Recommendations.                                                             |
| <b>BS3998:2010</b>      | British Standard: Tree Work Recommendations.                                                                                                              |
| <b>CEZ</b>              | Construction Exclusion Zone — the protected area around a retained tree formed by protection fencing.                                                     |
| <b>Crown raising</b>    | Removal of the lowest branches to increase clearance beneath the canopy.                                                                                  |
| <b>Epicormic growth</b> | Shoots arising from dormant buds on the stem or branches, often a response to stress or previous pruning.                                                 |
| <b>Pioneer species</b>  | Fast-growing, short-lived species that colonise disturbed ground. Typically of low long-term amenity value.                                               |
| <b>RPA</b>              | Root Protection Area — the minimum area around a tree deemed to contain sufficient roots to maintain viability: $\pi \times (\text{DBH}/2 \times 12)^2$ . |
| <b>TPP</b>              | Tree Protection Plan — a drawing showing the positions of all protection measures during construction.                                                    |
| <b>VTA</b>              | Visual Tree Assessment — a systematic method of assessing the structural condition of a tree by visual observation from ground level.                     |

## Appendix C — BS5837:2012 Cascade Chart for Tree Quality Assessment

Table 7: Table 1: Cascade Chart for Tree Quality Assessment

| Category & Definition         | Colour on Plan | Criteria                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|-------------------------------|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>U</b><br><i>Unsuitable</i> | <b>RED</b>     | <b>Cannot realistically be retained as living trees for longer than 10 years.</b><br>Trees with serious, irremediable structural defects; dead or in irreversible decline; or infected with pathogens of significance to other trees. |
| <b>A</b><br><i>≥40 years</i>  | <b>GREEN</b>   | <b>High quality — estimated remaining life expectancy ≥40 years.</b><br>Particularly good examples of their species; essential components of formal or semi-formal features; of particular visual, conservation or historical value.  |
| <b>B</b><br><i>≥20 years</i>  | <b>BLUE</b>    | <b>Moderate quality — estimated remaining life expectancy ≥20 years.</b><br>Trees that might be Category A but downgraded due to impaired condition; or trees with collective or cultural value.                                      |
| <b>C</b><br><i>≥10 years</i>  | <b>GREY</b>    | <b>Low quality — estimated remaining life expectancy ≥10 years.</b><br>Unremarkable trees of very limited merit; trees without conferring significantly greater landscape value; or trees offering only temporary landscape benefits. |

■ Cat A — Green — High quality (≥40 yrs)    
 ■ Cat B — Blue — Moderate quality (≥20 yrs)    
 ■ Cat C — Grey — Low quality (≥10 yrs)    
 ■ Cat U — Red — Unsuitable for retention

## Appendix D — Tree Fencing Specification

**Table 8: Tree Protection Fencing — Specification**

| Element         | Specification                                                                                                                         |
|-----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Type</b>     | 2.4m high scaffold framework with Heras-type anti-climb weld mesh panels in accordance with BS5837:2012.                              |
| <b>Height</b>   | Minimum 2.4m above ground level.                                                                                                      |
| <b>Uprights</b> | Maximum 3.0m centres; driven or adequately weighted base; minimum 600mm in ground.                                                    |
| <b>Panels</b>   | Securely fixed with minimum two scaffold clamps. No gaps at ground level.                                                             |
| <b>Position</b> | Erected along the site boundary in the positions shown on the Tree Protection Plan (Drawing 2) to protect T7–T10.                     |
| <b>Timing</b>   | Erected prior to ANY works commencing on site, including demolition, G6 removal, site clearance and materials delivery.               |
| <b>Duration</b> | To remain in position throughout the ENTIRE construction period until written completion sign-off from the Arboricultural Consultant. |
| <b>Signage</b>  | "CONSTRUCTION EXCLUSION ZONE — NO ENTRY — UNAUTHORISED ACCESS PROHIBITED" at minimum every 5m.                                        |

Appendix E — Tree Constraints Photographs

Photographs correspond to trees identified in the Tree Survey Schedule (Appendix A).



**G1**

*Self-seeded group — Category C — site boundary — fell  
pre-development*



**G2**

*Self-seeded group — Category C — site boundary — fell  
pre-development*



**G3**

*Self-seeded group — Category C — site boundary — fell pre-development*



**G4**

*Self-seeded willow group — Category C — site boundary*



**G5**

*Self-seeded willow group — Category C — site boundary*



**G6**

*Self-seeded group — Category U — overhanging footpath  
—URGENT H&S removal*

## Appendix F — Site Photographs

General site photographs taken during the survey visit of 12 February 2026.



**Site overview**

*View of 206–208 Drake Street from Drake Street looking south*



**Site overview**

*View looking at eastern boundary*



**Footpath boundary**

*G6 overhang of public footpath — Category U — H&S hazard*



**Eastern boundary**

*T7–T10 neighbouring trees — eastern boundary wall*



**Ground conditions**

*Site surface — mixed hard standing and rubble*



**Site entrance**

*Drake Street frontage and site access*