ACS Consulting
Suite One
9-11 Princess Street
Knutsford
Cheshire
WA16 6BY

acsconsulting

Trinity High School,
Manchester

Arboricultural Survey and Constraints Plan: Land at Trinity High School

Ref: 1808/DR.08

February 2008

ACS

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.01 A. C. S. Consulting is instructed by Trinity High School, Hulme, to advise on trees and the constraints on development at the school.

1.02 The report is undertaken by Mr Ian Murat, Director, A.C.S. Consulting, Manchester. I have been involved in Arboriculture for sixteen years, with project experience throughout Great Britain, Europe and the Middle East. I hold a Master of Science Degree in Applied Environmental Investigation and RFS Certificate in Arboriculture. I am a Chartered Environmentalist and a Registered Consultant of the Arboricultural Association, a Law Society 'Checked' Expert Witness and a Registered Expert Witness. My duties involve all aspects of Arboricultural Consulting including written and oral evidence for DETR planning enquiries, civil and criminal actions, development appraisals, hazard evaluations and the like. I am a Fellow of the Arboricultural Association.

1.03 The assessment I have undertaken 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.

1.0 INTRODUCTION (Continued)

1.04 I visited the site on 5th February 2008 and completed a survey of the trees recording; *species type, age, height, crown spread, diameter-at-breast-height, and condition.*

1.05 My report contains information regarding the trees and the protection requirements of those trees considered desirable or highly desirable to be retained.

1.06 All the trees have been summarised in the tables in Appendix 1 and are to be read in conjunction with the Arboricultural Constraints Plan No.1808_01.

Appendix 1

1.07 Contains tree tables and key.

Copyright

1.08 No part of this report may be reproduced, in any form or by any means, without permission in writing from the author.

2.0 BACKGROUND

The Site

2.01 The site is located in Hulme approximately 2 kilometres form Manchester city centre. The site is located in a high density residential and commercial area and comprises multi-storey buildings, play areas, areas of car parking and amenity areas. The application site comprises a small area of grass located adjacent to the school's Boundary Street entrance landscaped with trees.

Statutory Protection/Planning Policy

2.02 Manchester city council has one policy referring to trees.

> 16. Street Landscapes
> DC16.1 In considering development proposals for any site, the retention of existing trees and the planting of new trees within the public highway and along the public frontages of the site will be encouraged by the Council. Except where trees are shown to be in poor health or are individually of little amenity value, or where a satisfactory replanting scheme is more desirable, the Council will not normally permit development proposals which would involve the loss of significant trees and would thereby change the visual character of the street. (sic)

3.0 TREE SURVEY

3.01 I have identified sixteen trees as individuals or in groups where appropriate. The group classification is intended to identify trees that form cohesive arboricultural features either aerodynamically, visually or culturally. A Constraints Plan (1808_01) has been produced.

3.02 I have surveyed the trees 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 Trupulse 200 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.

Each tree has been assessed using the BS 5837 2005 category ratings (a copy can be found in Appendix 1). Consideration has been given to any Supplementary Planning Documents.

3.03 The trees have been summarised in Appendix 1. An indication has been given as to the desirability of each tree or group to be retained. The trees comprise semi-mature and early mature trees mainly found on the grassed area within the school grounds. To the east is a poor area of land behind fencing with no access. This parcel of land contains birch, cypress, willow as well as numerous shrubs. The trees within this area are mediocre specimens.

3.04 The trees within the grassed area form a loose group. There is little evidence of active management and as a result the trees are growing close together and the trees within these groups are competing vigorously with one another. This is normal and natural and the result is for the more vigorous, dominant trees to suppress the weaker individuals which can decline and die. Where it is desired to retain a belt or group of trees, it is appropriate to emulate this process by thinning out the weaker trees or those likely to compete unduly with the better specimens in order to obtain a smaller number of better individuals. This applies particularly where safety is a consideration, as suppressed trees are often more susceptible to fungal decay and other problems. At times, this kind of policy can create openings or gaps within a population of relatively healthy young trees, these are usually closed within a few years by growth of the remaining trees. Progressively opening the canopy also makes individual trees more resistant to storms and makes the group less susceptible to catastrophic damage which can occur if high winds create a gap in a group of trees that have grown close together for a long time. There is little scope to actively manage these groups in this way.

4.0 DEVELOPMENT ASPECTS

4.01 The application site is located within the grounds of Trinity High School, Hulme. An Arboricultural Constraints Plan (1808_01) has been produced.

Development Implications

4.02 The Constraints Plan identifies tree condition and the corresponding Root Protection Area (RPA) for those trees that are considered suitable to be retained. Development should not breach the RPA areas marked on the plan. Emphasis should be on retaining those trees categorised as "A and "B" in the schedule. "C" category tree may be retained where they pose no constraint on development. At the site there are trees that are exempt from planning control due to their poor condition, in certain circumstances these trees can be retained for wildlife. A number of trees have restricted root development due to existing hard surfaces, walls and building foundations. Root Protection Areas as defined in BS 5837:2005 are not applicable in these cases.

Planning Policies

4.03 Manchester City Council has one policy relating to trees and their retention on development sites. Providing those trees that are identified as being suitable to be retained are incorporated into the development, any proposals will accord with the policy.

Tree Protection

4.04 A method statement should be prepared by the demolition contractor and agreed with the Arboricultural Consultant and the Arboricultural Officer prior to commencement at the site. A full scheme of protective fencing, its location, and type should be agreed with the Arboricultural Consultant.

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

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

Summary

5.01 The site comprises a small grassed area and a parcel of redundant land within the grounds of Trinity High School, Hulme. The area is landscaped with groups of trees that have had very little management. An Arboricultural Constraints Plan (1808_01) has been produced.

Conclusions

5.02 The site contains a number of trees found as an informal group. The trees have had very little formal management resulting in specimens that are growing too close. The trees, overall, are considered mediocre and should be retained where they pose no significant constraint on development. The site contains trees that are exempt from planning control due to their poor condition as identified in the tables. Any development should be so located that it does not breach the Root Protection Areas noted on the plan where trees are to be retained.

5.03 Appropriately worded planning conditions should specify the requirement for detailed method statements associated with the following issues: earth works, fencing, site storage/compounds/site cabins, tree works, special engineering works, monitoring and reporting.

I. R. Murat *M.Sc., F. Arbor. A., CEnv*
Chartered Environmentalist & Registered Consultant
February 2008

Appendix 1

CONTENTS

Key

BS5837: 2005

Tree Tables

KEY

S/D	Stem Diameter (millimetres)
C S	Crown Spread Radius at Cardinal Points (metres)
C C	Height of Crown Clearance (metres)
Age	Y - Young Out planted tree that has yet to establish SM – Semi-mature, established tree up to 1/3 of total life expired EM – Early Mature, between 1/3 and 2/3 of life expired M – Mature, between 2/3 and normal age expected, still capable of growth FM – Fully Mature, expected age, growth only slowly occurring OM – Over Mature, tree beginning to decline and break up due to age, S – Senescent, tree in advanced stage of decline/canopy break up due to age.
Comments	Includes: Physiological Condition Structural Condition Preliminary Management Recommendations (as per BS 5837:2005)
E R C	Estimated Remaining Contribution (years)
Cat	Category Grading (A, B or C) (as per BS 5837:2005)

Table 1 – Cascade chart for tree quality assessment

TREES FOR REMOVAL				
Category and definition	**Criteria**			**Identification on Plan**
Category R Those in such a condition that any existing value would be lost within 10 years and which should, in the current context, be removed for reasons of sound arboricultural management.	• 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 R 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 (e.g. Dutch elm disease), or very low quality trees suppressing adjacent trees of better quality. NOTE Habitat reinstatement may be appropriate (e.g. R category tree used as a bat roost: installation of a bat box in nearby tree).			DARK RED
TREES TO BE CONSIDERED FOR RETENTION				
Category and definition	**Criteria – Subcategories**			**Identification on Plan**
	1 Mainly arboricultural values	**2 Mainly landscape values**	**3 Mainly cultural values, including conservation.**	
Category A **Those of high quality and value:** in such a condition as to be able to make a substantial contribution (a minimum of 40 years is suggested)	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 dominant and/or principal trees within an avenue)	Trees, groups or woodlands that provide a definite screening or softening effect to the locality in relation to views into or out of the site, or those of particular visual importance (e.g. avenues or other arboricultural features assessed as groups)	Trees, groups or woodlands of significant conservation, historical, commemorative or other value (e.g. veteran trees or wood-pasture)	LIGHT GREEN
Category B **Those of moderate quality and value:** those in such a condition as to make a significant contribution (a minimum of 20 years is suggested)	Trees that might be included in the high category, but are downgraded because of impaired condition (e.g. presence of remedial defects including unsympathetic past management and minor storm damage)	Trees present in numbers, usually as groups or woodlands, such that they form distinct landscape features, thereby attracting a higher collective rating than they might as individuals but which are not, individually, essential components of formal or semi-formal arboricultural features (e.g. trees of moderate quality within an avenue that includes better, A category specimens), or trees situated mainly internally to the site, therefore individually having little visual impact on the wider locality	Trees with clearly identifiable conservation or other cultural benefits	MID BLUE
Category C **Those of low quality and value:** currently in adequate condition to remain until new planting could be established (a minimum of 10 years is suggested), or young trees with a stem diameter of below 150 mm	Trees not qualifying in higher categories	Trees present in groups or woodlands, but without this conferring on them significantly greater landscape value, and/or trees offering low or only temporary screening benefit	Trees with very limited conservation or other cultural benefits	GREY
	NOTE whilst C category trees will usually not be retained where they would impose a significant constraint on development, young trees with a stem diameter of less than 150 mm should be considered for relocation.			

No.	Species	Height (m)	S/D (mm)	Crown Spread (m)				Height of CC (m)	Maturity	Comments	ERC (years)	Cat
				N	E	S	W					
1934	Sorbus	8	240	2	4	2	4	3	M	Multi-stemmed. Pronounced lean west. Damage to surface roots. Crown asymmetry. Retainable.	10 - 20	C1/2
1935	Maple	11	390	4	4	3	4	3	EM/M	Multi-stemmed. Well formed. Damage to surface roots. Reasonable foliage density and vigour. Retainable.	10 - 20	B1/2
1936	Maple	11	395	2	4	4	4	2	EM/M	Multi-stemmed. Damage to surface roots. Slight crown asymmetry. Reasonable bud and twig distribution. Retainable.	10 - 20	C1/2
1937	Beech	12	305	3	3	4	2	3	SM/EM	Twin stemmed. Crown asymmetry. Reasonable foliage density and vigour. Retainable.	10 - 20	C1/2
1938	Sorbus	8	310	3	3	3	2	3	M	Decurrent canopy form. Poor past pruning practice. Damage to surface roots. Good bud and twig distribution. Retainable.	10 - 20	C1/2
1939	Sorbus	8	220	2	2	2	2	3	EM/M	Multi-stemmed. Reasonable bud and twig distribution. Retainable.	10 - 20	C1/2
1940	Apple	5	200	0	2	2	2	2	M	Leans root exposure. Poor. Fell.	<10	R
1941	Apple	6	190	3	2	3	3	2	M	Twin stemmed tree, crown asymmetry, retainable.	10 - 20	C1/2
1942	Thorn	6	100	1	1	1	1	2	M	Twin stemmed tree, reasonable specimen, retainable.	10 - 20	C1/2
1943	Beech	12	425	4	4	4	4	3	EM	Tri-stemmed, reasonable bud and twig distribution, retainable	10 -20	C1/2
1944	Sorbus	8	220	2	2	2	2	2	EM	Tri-stemmed, reasonable bud and twig distribution, retainable	10 - 20	C1/2
1945	Sorbus	14	345	4	4	3	3	3	M	Multi-stemmed, stem injuries, reasonable wound occlusion, retainable.	10 - 20	C1/2
1946	Sorbus	12	280	3	3	3	3	3	M	Multi-stemmed tree, slight lean, good bud and twig distribution, retainable	10 - 20	C1/2

No.	Species	Height (m)	S/D (mm)	Crown Spread (m)				Height of CC (m)	Maturity	Comments	ERC (years)	Cat
				N	E	S	W					
1947	Thorn	4	100	1	1	1	1	1	SM	Twin-stemmed tree, damage from grounds maintenance, retainable.	10 - 20	C1/2
1948	Sycamore	12	220	1	1	1	1	2	SM	Self-set, single stemmed tree, retainable.	10 - 20	C1/2
1949	Sorbus	12	600	3	3	3	3	2	M	Twin-stemmed, defective stem unions, poor in form, retainable.	10 - 20	C1/2
										Within a site, with no access, are a number of trees including birch, cypress, willow, trees are mediocre specimens.	10 - 20	C1/2