ARBORICULTURAL REPORT
to BS 5837:2005
at
Wentlock Lane
Gorton Road
Manchester
Greater Manchester

Client:
United Utilities

Client Address:
Haweswater House
Lingley Mere Business Park
Lingley Green Avenue
Great Sankey
Warrington
WA5 3LP

Client Contact:
01925 773265 (Tel)

JCA Ref:
10387/RG

Contents

1. Introduction 3
1.1 Purpose of the Report 3
1.2 Terms of Reference 3
1.3 Scope of the Report 3
1.4 Survey Details 3
2. Site Description 4
2.1 Land Use 4
2.2 Topography 4
2.3 Treescape 4
2.4 Visual Amenity Value 4
2.5 Age Class Mix 4
2.6 Species Diversity 4
3. Status of the Trees 5
4. Tree Descriptions and Recommendations 5
5. Discussion 6
5.1 Tree Condition & Recommended Works 6
5.2 Potential Arboricultural Implications & Design Advice 7
6. Conclusions 9
Appendix 1: Tree Descriptions and Recommendations 11
Appendix 2: Explanation of Tree Descriptions 12
Appendix 3: General Guidelines 14
Appendix 4: Glossary of Terms & Abbreviations 15
Appendix 5: Author Qualifications 16
Appendix 6: Tree Constraints Plan 17

© JCA Limited 2011

1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose of the Report

1.1.1 A report is required at **Wentlock Lane, Gorton Road, Manchester,** to provide detailed, independent, arboricultural advice on the trees present, in the context of potential development.

1.2 Terms of Reference

1.2.1 I am instructed by United Utilities to visit the site and prepare my findings in a report.

1.2.2 For this purpose I have been supplied with a topographical survey Drawing Ref: MAN0376FA02.dwg.

1.3 Scope of the Report

1.3.1 This report is compiled in accordance with *BS 5837:2005 Trees in relation to construction.*

1.3.2 Preliminary recommendations are given with a view to the long-term management of a sustainable tree cover.

1.3.3 All trees within the site boundary with a stem diameter above 75mm are included.

1.3.4 Where applicable trees outside the site boundary, but close enough to be affected by the proposed development, are included.

1.3.5 The specific design of any proposed development is not generally taken into account at this stage.

1.4 Survey Details

1.4.1 The survey took place during the month of October 2011.

1.4.2 The survey was conducted by Robert Godwin.

1.4.3 Inspection was made at ground level. Further investigation, such as climbed inspections or decay detection surveys, may be recommended where appropriate.

1.4.4 Measurements were obtained using clinometers, specialist tapes and electronic distometers. Where this was not possible measurements were estimated.

© JCA Limited 2011

2. Site Description

2.1 Land Use

2.1.1 The site is currently occupied by a tarmac car park, with several grass verges and tree and shrub planting areas. To the west of the site there is a large office complex.

2.2 Topography

2.2.1 The site is approximately level.

2.3 Treescape

2.3.1 Surrounding the site is a residential area occasional mature garden trees and occasional mature street trees.

2.3.2 The trees on this site have a moderate impact on the local treescape.

2.4 Visual Amenity Value

2.4.1 The trees on site collectively provide a reasonable visual amenity to the surrounding area.

2.5 Age Class Mix

2.5.1 The trees surveyed ranged in age from semi-mature to early-mature. However, the trees were predominantly semi-mature.

2.6 Species Diversity

2.6.1 Species surveyed include London Plane, Sycamore, Norway Maple, Swedish Whitebeam and Fir.

© JCA Limited 2011

3. Status of the Trees

3.1 A check was made on the 11th October 2011 with: ***Manchester City Council.***

3.2 We are still awaiting the results of this investigation at this time. We will continue to pursue this matter and will inform you of the result as soon as we receive this information.

3.3 In the meantime, due to the large potential penalties for illegally carrying out work to protected trees, we recommend that ***no works be undertaken to any tree for the time being***.

4. Tree Descriptions and Recommendations

4.1 Full details of all individual trees surveyed are recorded in the tables at **Appendix 1**. A full explanation of the tables can be found at **Appendix 2**. Please refer also to the Tree Constraints Plan at **Appendix 6** for tree locations.

© JCA Limited 2011

5. Discussion

5.1 Tree Condition & Recommended Works

5.1.1 The tree survey revealed a total of 20 individual trees. Of these, 16 trees were identified as retention category 'B' and 4 trees were identified as retention category 'C'. Please refer to **Appendix 2** for retention category and definition criteria.

5.1.2 **No** trees require removal for arboricultural reasons and no tree pruning works have been recommended at this time.

5.1.3 Two trees, **T2** and **T3**, were covered in Ivy, which could potentially be concealing defects. Although these two trees appeared to be structurally sound, it would be prudent to arrange for the Ivy to be removed and for the trees to be re-inspected for any possible defects.

5.1.4 Those trees which overhang the public footpaths or public highways, detailed at **Appendix 1**, shall require future maintenance in order to maintain clearance heights for vehicular or pedestrian traffic. These heights should be 5.6m above a road and 2.5m above a footpath.

© JCA Limited 2011

5.2 Potential Arboricultural Implications & Design Advice

5.2.1 The details of the proposed development are not known at present. However, the following comments can be made about the site in terms of its tree cover in relation to a potential development.

5.2.2 During development the part of the tree most commonly under threat, and most commonly ignored, is the rooting system. When trees are damaged, particularly the roots, their long-term health and stability can be affected. Most development activity can have an impact on the future condition and safety of a tree, and therefore careful planning and management of tree protection should ensure a continued sustainable tree cover with minimal stress to existing trees.

5.2.3 In order to ensure that the retained trees on site are properly protected during the development phase, the tree rooting zones are to be considered. For the purpose of development the rooting zone of the tree is known as the Root Protection Area or RPA. The RPA of each tree or group is marked on the Tree Constraints Plan at **Appendix 6** and represents the rooting zone which, where possible, should remain undisturbed. The protection of retained trees can therefore be achieved by creating a **Construction Exclusion Zone** (**CEZ**) based on the RPAs.

5.2.4 Damage caused by any construction activity such as demolition, soil stripping, and provision of services needs to be considered at the design stage. Care should be taken to avoid damage to tree roots when existing structures such as tarmac surfaces are removed within a RPA.

5.2.5 The laying of access roads, driveways, parking areas or any other hard surfaces planned in proximity to retained trees needs to be considered. There are many solutions available to construct hard surfaces over RPAs without causing damage to trees.

5.2.6 Boundary walls or other light structures can be constructed without damage to roots through the use of piled foundations rather than the more traditional strip foundations.

5.2.7 The position of the site compound is a major consideration. It is recommended that this, which typically includes the site office, facilities, toilets, storage of materials and parking, is located away from trees and outside the RPA.

5.2.8 Consideration must be given to movement of both vehicle and pedestrian traffic. If possible traffic should be diverted away from the RPAs. If this is not possible a range of temporary surfaces are available to distribute the weight of traffic and allow the roots to receive moisture and air.

© JCA Limited 2011

5.2.9 Generally, the alteration of ground levels within the RPA is not acceptable, however, should ground levels need to be lowered in areas adjacent to trees or within the minimum distance recommended, appropriate measures should be taken to minimise the detrimental effects on the trees and their root systems. With regards to raising levels, it is necessary to maintain adequate supplies of moisture and oxygen through the soil to the tree roots. Therefore, no material should be placed within the RPA without arboricultural advice.

5.2.10 Where a landscape planting scheme is proposed, consideration must be made at the planning stage as to where this is to be implemented on site. Such locations should be protected in order to prevent soil compaction and/or contamination and should therefore form part of the Construction Exclusion Zone. JCA can provide Tree Planting Schemes where required.

© JCA Limited 2011

6. Conclusions

6.1 The trees surveyed were generally found to be in good to fair condition.

6.2 No trees have been recommended for removal for arboricultural reasons and no works were recommended.

6.3 All development work carried out in close proximity to trees should be done so in a manner sympathetic to their needs. Otherwise the condition of the trees may deteriorate in the months and years following the development, leading to a loss of amenity and potentially hazardous trees.

6.4 Care should be taken at the design stage to ensure that the retained trees are protected. The protection of retained trees can be achieved by the creation of a Construction Exclusion Zone based on the Root Protection Area of a tree. The Root Protection Area of each tree or group is marked on the Tree Constraints Plan at **Appendix 6**.

6.5 The proposed development should be accompanied by an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) detailing the specific protection measures necessary for each tree. This should specify fencing standards and positions (the creation of the Construction Exclusion Zone), acceptable construction techniques and necessary tree works.

6.6 Upon instruction JCA Ltd are able to provide a comprehensive Arboricultural Method Statement in order to ensure the continued health of trees throughout the proposed development. We are also able to provide tree planting schemes and organise tree works.

© JCA Limited 2011

Appendices

Appendix 1: Tree Descriptions and Recommendations

© JCA Limited 2011

Tree Ref.	Age Species *Latin Name*	Height (m)	Crown Height (m)	Diameter (cm)	Crown Spread N W E S	Observations	Recommendations	Physiological Condition	Structural Condition	Amenity Value	Life Expectancy (yrs)	Retention Category
T 1	Semi-mature London Plane *Platanus x hispanica*	11	2	Est. 42	6 5 6 4	Single-stemmed and vertical with a balanced crown. The crown overhangs the boundary and the footpath. No evidence of significant pruning. Dense understorey vegetation was noted.	No action required.	GOOD	FAIR	MOD	40+	B
T 2	Semi-mature London Plane *Platanus x hispanica*	11	3	Est. 32	3 4 2 3	Single-stemmed and vertical with a slightly unbalanced crown. The crown overhangs the boundary and the footpath. No evidence of significant pruning. Dense Ivy was noted	Remove ivy and inspect stem for defects.	GOOD	FAIR	MOD	40+	B
T 3	Semi-mature London Plane *Platanus x hispanica*	10	2	Est. 40	3 6 5 6	Single-stemmed and vertical with a slightly unbalanced crown. The crown overhangs the boundary and the footpath. Ivy was noted.	Remove ivy and inspect stem for defects.	GOOD	FAIR	MOD	40+	B
T 4	Semi-mature London Plane *Platanus x hispanica*	12	2	40	3 3 5 4	Single-stemmed and vertical with a slightly unbalanced crown. The crown overhangs the car park.	No action required.	GOOD	FAIR	MOD	40+	B
T 5	Semi-mature Sycamore *Acer pseudoplatanus*	9	2	Est. 30	3 1 2 3	Single-stemmed and vertical with a slightly unbalanced crown. The crown overhangs the car park. Growing amongst dense understorey vegetation and covered in dense Ivy.	No action required.	FAIR	FAIR	LOW	10-20	C
T 6	Semi-mature London Plane *Platanus x hispanica*	10	2	Est. 34	5 3 3 5	Single-stemmed and vertical with a balanced crown. Dense understorey vegetation was noted.	No action required.	GOOD	FAIR	MOD	40+	B
T 7	Early-mature Norway Maple *Acer platanoides*	11	2	50	6 6 5 4	Multi-stemmed at 2m with a balanced crown. The crown overhangs the car park. Occasional pruning wounds due to crown lifting were noted - these were generally healing well. No major visible defects were observed.	No action required.	GOOD	FAIR	MOD	40+	B
T 8	Early-mature Norway Maple *Acer platanoides*	10	2	41	3 5 4 2	Multi-stemmed at 2m with a slightly unbalanced crown. The crown overhangs the car park. Occasional pruning wounds due to crown lifting were noted - these were generally healing well. No major visible defects were observed.	No action required.	GOOD	FAIR	MOD	40+	B
T 9	Early-mature Norway Maple *Acer platanoides*	11	2	48	2.5 5 5 4	Multi-stemmed at 2m with a slightly unbalanced crown. The crown overhangs the car park. Occasional pruning wounds due to crown lifting were noted - these were generally healing well. No major visible defects were observed.	No action required.	GOOD	FAIR	MOD	40+	B

Tree Ref.	Age Species *Latin Name*	Height (m)	Crown Height (m)	Diameter (cm)	Crown Spread N W E S	Observations	Recommendations	Physiological Condition	Structural Condition	Amenity Value	Life Expectancy (yrs)	Retention Category
T 10	Early-mature Norway Maple *Acer platanoides*	10	2	40	3 4 4 5	Multi-stemmed at 3m with a slightly unbalanced crown. The crown overhangs the car park. Occasional pruning wounds due to crown lifting were noted - these were generally healing well. No major visible defects were observed.	No action required.	GOOD	FAIR	MOD	40+	B
T 11	Semi-mature Norway Maple *Acer platanoides*	8	3	37	4 4 4 4	Single-stemmed and vertical with a balanced crown. The crown overhangs the car park. Multiple pruning wounds due to crown lifting were noted - these were generally healing well.	No action required.	GOOD	FAIR	MOD	40+	B
T 12	Semi-mature Swedish Whitebeam *Sorbus intermedia*	9	2	28	3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5	Multi-stemmed at 2m with a balanced crown. The crown overhangs the adjacent building. Occasional pruning wounds due to crown lifting were noted - these were generally healing well. No major visible defects were observed.	No action required.	GOOD	FAIR	MOD	40+	B
T 13	Semi-mature Swedish Whitebeam *Sorbus intermedia*	11	2	29	5 3 5 5	Multi-stemmed at 2m with a balanced crown. The crown overhangs the adjacent building. Occasional pruning wounds due to crown lifting were noted - these were generally healing well. No major visible defects were observed.	No action required.	GOOD	FAIR	MOD	40+	B
T 14	Semi-mature Sycamore *Acer pseudoplatanus*	8	2	20	2.5 2.5 2.5 2.5	Single-stemmed and vertical with a balanced crown. The crown overhangs the car park. Occasional pruning wounds due to crown lifting were noted - these were generally healing well. No major visible defects were observed.	No action required.	GOOD	FAIR	MOD	40+	B
T 15	Semi-mature Sycamore *Acer pseudoplatanus*	8	2	20	2.5 2.5 2.5 2.5	Single-stemmed and vertical with a balanced crown. The crown overhangs the car park. Occasional pruning wounds due to crown lifting were noted - these were generally healing well. No major visible defects were observed.	No action required.	GOOD	FAIR	MOD	40+	B
T 16	Semi-mature Sycamore *Acer pseudoplatanus*	8	2	20	2.5 2.5 2.5 2.5	Single-stemmed and vertical with a balanced crown. The crown overhangs the car park. Occasional pruning wounds due to crown lifting were noted - these were generally healing well. No major visible defects were observed.	No action required.	GOOD	FAIR	MOD	40+	B
T 17	Semi-mature Sycamore *Acer pseudoplatanus*	8	2	20	2.5 2.5 2.5 2.5	Single-stemmed and vertical with a balanced crown. The crown overhangs the car park. Occasional pruning wounds due to crown lifting were noted - these were generally healing well. No major visible defects were observed.	No action required.	GOOD	FAIR	MOD	40+	B

Tree Ref.	Age Species *Latin Name*	Height (m)	Crown Height (m)	Diameter (cm)	Crown Spread N W E S	Observations	Recommendations	Physiological Condition	Structural Condition	Amenity Value	Life Expectancy (yrs)	Retention Category
T 18	Semi-mature Sycamore *Acer pseudoplatanus*	8	2	17	2 1 3 3	Single-stemmed and vertical with a slightly unbalanced crown. The crown overhangs the footpath and the car park. Occasional pruning wounds due to crown lifting were noted - these were generally healing well. No major visible defects were observed.	No action required.	POOR	FAIR	LOW	40+	C
T 19	Semi-mature Sycamore *Acer pseudoplatanus*	9	2	18	3 2.5 2 2.5	Single-stemmed and vertical with a slightly unbalanced crown. The crown overhangs the footpath and the car park. Occasional pruning wounds due to crown lifting were noted - these were generally healing well. No major visible defects were observed.	No action required.	GOOD	FAIR	LOW	40+	C
T 20	Semi-mature Fir *Abies sp.*	9	0	20	1 1 1 1	Single-stemmed and vertical with a balanced crown. No major visible defects were observed.	No action required.	GOOD	FAIR	LOW	40+	C

Appendix 2: Explanation of Tree Descriptions

A2.1 Measurements

A2.1.1 *HEIGHT* of the tree is measured from the stem base in metres. Where the ground has a significant slope the higher ground is selected.

A2.1.2 *CROWN HEIGHT* is an indication of the average height at which the crown begins.

A2.1.3 *STEM DIAMETER* is measured at 1.5 metres above (higher) ground level. Where the tree is multi-stemmed at this point; the diameter is measured close to ground level, just above the root buttress.

A2.1.4 *CROWN SPREAD* is measured from the centre of the stem base to the tips of the branches in all four cardinal points.

A2.2 Evaluations

A2.2.1 *AGE CLASS* of the tree is described as young, semi-mature, early-mature, mature, or over-mature.

A2.2.2 *PHYSIOLOGICAL CONDITION* is classed as good, fair, poor, or dead. This is an indication of the health of the tree and takes into account vigour, presence of disease and dieback.

A2.2.3 *STRUCTURAL CONDITION* is classed as good, fair or poor. This is an indication of the structural integrity of the tree and takes into account significant wounds, decay and quality of branch junctions.

A2.2.4 *LIFE EXPECTANCY* is classed as; less than 10 years, 10-20 years, 20-40 years, or more than 40 years. This is an indication of the number of years before removal of the tree is likely to be required.

© JCA Limited 2011

A2.3 Retention Categories

A2.3.1 ***A (marked green on the plan) = retention most desirable.***

These trees are of high quality and value with a good life expectancy. They may be further sub-divided as follows:

A1) Particularly good examples; perhaps rare or unusual species, or forming an essential part of arboricultural features e.g. avenues.

A2) Groups of trees having a significant landscape impact or with excellent screening properties, or those softening the effect of existing structures.

A3) Those having significant conservation or historical value e.g. veteran trees.

A2.3.2 ***B (marked in blue on the plan) = retention desirable.***

These trees are of moderate quality and value with a significant life expectancy. They may be further sub-divided as follows:

B1) Trees that might be included in the high category but because of their numbers or slightly impaired condition, are downgraded in favour of the better individuals.

B2) Groups of trees forming distinct landscape features, thereby attracting a higher collective rating than they might as individuals.

B3) Trees with clearly identifiable conservation or other cultural benefits.

A2.3.3 ***C (marked in grey on the plan) = trees which could be retained.***

These trees are of low quality and value, and are in adequate condition to remain until new planting could be established. They may be further sub-divided as follows:

C1) Trees not qualifying in higher categories.

C2) Groups of trees which do not form a distinct landscape feature.

C3) Trees with very limited conservation or other cultural benefits.

A2.3.4 ***R (marked in red on the plan) = trees for removal.***

These trees are in such a condition that any existing value would be lost within 10 years. This may be due to any of the following:

1) Failure is likely due to serious, irredeemable, structural defects.
2) Removal of other category R trees will render them exposed and unstable.
3) They are in serious, overall decline or are dead.
4) They are of low quality and suppressing adjacent trees of better quality.
5) Diseases are present which may affect the health of adjacent trees.

These trees should be removed or treated in such a way as to make them safe where they have high ecological value, such as in a woodland setting.

© JCA Limited 2011

Appendix 3: General Guidelines

A3.1 All work must be to BS 3998: 2010 - '*Recommendations for tree work'*.

A3.2 Staff carrying out the work must be qualified, experienced and ideally be Arboricultural Association approved contractors. They should be covered by adequate public liability insurance.

A3.3 This report is based upon a visual inspection. The consultant shall not be responsible for events which happen after this time due to factors which were not apparent at the time, and the acceptance of this report constitutes an agreement with the guidelines and the terms listed in this report.

A3.4 Any defects seen by a contractor or the employer that were not apparent to the consultant must be brought to the consultant's attention immediately.

A3.5 No liability can be accepted by JCA Limited in respect of the trees unless the recommendations of this report are carried out under the supervision of JCA and within JCA's timescale.

A3.6 It is advisable to have trees inspected by an arboricultural consultant regularly. In this instance it is recommended that these inspections are made every year.

© JCA Limited 2011

Appendix 4: Glossary of Terms & Abbreviations

Arboriculture	The cultivation of trees in order to produce individual specimens of the greatest ornament, for shelter or any primary purpose other than the production of timber.
Canker	Disease damaged area of a tree, usually caused by fungus or bacteria.
Co-dominant Stem	A stem which has grown in direct competition to the main stem and which has formed a substantial size influencing the appearance of the tree.
Crown Lift	The removal of the lowest branches, usually to a given height. It allows more residual light and greater clearance underneath for vehicles, etc.
Crown reduce	The reduction of a tree's height or spread while preserving its natural shape.
Crown thin	The removal of some of the density of a tree's crown**,** usually 5-25% allowing more light through its canopy and reducing wind resistance.
Deadwood	Either dead branches, or a procedure involving the removal of dead, dying and diseased branches.
Dieback	Where branches are beginning to show signs of death usually at the tips in the crown.
Epicormic shoots	Small branches that grow in uncharacteristic clusters around the base or the stem of a tree, usually as a result of bad pruning or some other stress factor.
Formative pruning	The trimming of a tree to remove weaknesses and irregularities which may lead to problems. The formative pruning operation is aimed at reducing the potential for future weaknesses or problems within the tree's crown.
Included bark	Where the bark on two adjoining branches or stems is growing tight together, forming a joint with limited physical strength.
Pollarding	A method of tree management in which the main trunk of the tree is cut at about 4m, and the resulting branches are then cropped on a regular basis.
Remedial pruning	The removal of old stubs, deadwood, epicormic growth, rubbing or crossing branches and other unwanted items from the tree's crown. Sometimes referred to as crown cleaning.
RPA	Root Protection Area – The theoretical rooting area of a tree as defined in BS5837: 2005 *Trees in relation to construction*.
Topping	Topping is a form of pruning that removes terminal growth leaving a 'stub' cut end. Topping causes serious health problems to a tree.

© JCA Limited 2011

Appendix 5: Author Qualifications

Principal Consultant and Managing Director

Jonathan Cocking F.R.E.S., Tech. Cert. (Arbor.A), PDipArb (RFS) FArborA CBiol MSB. MICFor. Jonathan is a Registered Consultant and Fellow of the Arboricultural Association and sits on its Professional Committee. He has 31 years experience in the Arboricultural profession and served for eight years as Senior Arboriculturist with a large local authority before establishing JCA in 1997. He has since developed JCA's portfolio of services and its extensive client base. Jonathan is a Chartered Biologist, a Chartered Arboriculturalist and an Expert Witness with much experience of litigation work.

Technical Coordinator

Toby Thwaites *BSc (Hons), HND (Arboriculture).* Toby joined JCA in 1998 after graduating in Ecology at the University of Huddersfield and has since graduated in Arboriculture at the University of Lancashire. A former JCA team leader and Consulting Arboriculturist, Toby was promoted to Technical Coordinator and now oversees all office and on-site activities at JCA and is on hand to offer technical support and advice.

Consulting Staff: Arboriculture

Andrew Bagshaw *FdSc (Arboriculture).* Andrew joined JCA in 2005 having gained several years experience in tree surgery and landscaping. He is trained in aerial rescue and is JCA's principal first aid person. Andrew has obtained a foundation degree in Arboriculture at the University of Lancashire, is QTRA qualified and is a JCA team leader who manages an office of Consulting Arboriculturists.

Adam Winson *BSc (Hons), ND (Arboriculture) MSc (Arboriculture and Urban Forestry).* Adam is a Professional Associate of the Institute of Chartered Foresters and an Associate Member of the Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management. Prior to joining JCA Adam worked as a tree surgeon. During his BSc in Environmental Conservation he gained the CPRE award for best dissertation. Adam has recently obtained an MSc in Arboriculture and Urban Forestry.

Robert Godwin *BA (Hons), MSc (Arboriculture and Urban Forestry), MArborA.* Robert is a Professional Member of the Arboricultural Association and a Professional Associate of the Institute of Chartered Foresters. He has a degree in Landscape Planning & Management and has several years experience as a Consulting Arboriculturist. Robert has recently obtained an MSc in Arboriculture and Urban Forestry.

Victoria Black *FdSc (Arboriculture).* Victoria has been with JCA since 2002 building her knowledge of the Arboricultural business. She has recently obtained her foundation degree in Arboriculture at the University of Lancashire.

Andrew Bussey Andrew joined JCA having spent 12 years doing tree surgery for various private companies and a Local Authority. He has various NPTC qualifications, is QTRA qualified and is currently studying for his Arboricultural Technicians Certificate.

Toby Parsons *Cert. Arb. (RFS), Tech. Cert. (Arbor.A).* Toby joined JCA after spending 6 years working as a senior climber for various Arboricultural contractors in the East Midlands and the South-West. He has gained the Level 2 Certificate in Arboriculture (RFS), an Arboricultural Technicians Certificate and is QTRA qualified.

Phil Humeniuk *FdSc (Arboriculture), MicFor.* Phil has recently joined JCA having spent 3 years working for various tree surgery companies and as a Tree Officer for a Local Authority. He obtained his foundation degree in Arboriculture at the University of Central Lancashire.

Consulting Staff: Ecology

Christopher Shaw *BSc (Hons).* Chris is our in-house Ecologist, and joined JCA in 2010 after achieving a First Class degree in Biology at the University of Leeds. Prior to joining JCA, Chris has volunteered with a number of organisations including the Yorkshire Wildlife Trust, BTCV and a local Ecological Consultancy. He is currently undertaking a 'Certificate in Ecological Consultancy Course' with Acorn Ecology. Chris is actively involved in building JCA's portfolio of ecological services.

Administrative Staff

Sue Guest Administrative Team Leader.
Sally Whitwam Administrative Assistant.
Simeon Haigh *BSc (Hons).* IT Officer.
Catherine Cocking Accounts Manager.
Yasmin Hussain Administrative Assistant.
Liz Bone Trainee Administrative Assistant
Alec Fielden *Cert. Arb. (RFS).* CAD Technician.

© JCA Limited 2011

Appendix 6: Tree Constraints Plan

© JCA Limited 2011

N

W E

S

T1 T2 T3 T4 T5 T6 T7 T8 T9 T10 T11 T12 T13 T14 T15 T16 T17 T18 T19 T20

Conc
Grass
Tarmac
SHRUBS
BUSHES
DENSE BUSHES
BENNETT STREET
BRICK WALL HT2.5m
ELEC IC
MH(UTL)
MH(SW) IL48.76
MH(SW) IL49.34
MH(FOUL) IL48.87
MH(COMB) APPROX.IL45.27
MH(SW) IL50.10
GAS METER HOUSE
UNABLE TO TRACE BEYOND THIS POINT
51.73
SPEED HUMP
(NO TRACE)
G.CH
D.CH
28/05/03
13/02/03
1.00d
20000E

Root Protection Area: RPA

THE ROOT PROTECTION AREA (RPA) INDICATES THE LIKELY ROOTING ZONE OF A TREE. THE RPA SHOULD IDEALLY REMAIN UNDISTURBED IF A TREE IS TO BE RETAINED.

THE DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS SHOULD THEREFORE BE DESIGNED TO AVOID THE RPA OF ANY TREE WHICH IS TO BE RETAINED.

IF IT IS NECESSARY FOR THE DEVELOPMENT TO ENCROACH INTO THE RPA OF A TREE WHICH IS TO BE RETAINED THEN SPECIALIST CONSTRUCTION TECHNIQUES AND MATERIALS MUST BE CONSIDERED.

Appendix 6: Tree Constraints Plan

TITLE:
Wenlock Lane, Gorton Road, Manchester.
JCA Ref: 10387/RG.

SCALE 1:200	PAPER SIZE A1
SURVEYED BY: RG	DRAWN BY: RG	APPROVED BY: TT

JCA Limited

Arboricultural & Forestry Consultants

BRITISH STANDARD 5837: 2005 4.3.1
RETENTION CATEGORIES

Detailed definitions of these catagories are at Appendix 2 of our report. N.B. These categories do not necessairly represent or correspond to recommendations for action made in this report.

	CATEGORY A: 'RETENTION MOST DESIRABLE'
	CATEGORY B: 'RETENTION DESIRABLE'
	CATEGORY C: 'TREE WHICH COULD BE RETAINED'
	CATEGORY R: 'TREE FOR REMOVAL'
•	CENTRE OF TREE/SHRUB
•	CENTRE OF TREE/SHRUB TO BE REMOVED
	ROOT PROTECTION AREA

I hope that this report provides all the necessary information, but should any further advice be needed please do not hesitate to contact the author.

Signed

R Godwin

.....

Robert Godwin MSc, MArborA.

8th November 2011

For and on behalf of ***JCA Ltd***

Registered Office:

Unit 80
Bowers Mill
Branch Road
Barkisland
Halifax
HX4 OAD

Tel. 01422 376335
Fax. 01422 376232
Email: jon@jcaac.com

www.jcaac.com

Report printed on recycled paper

© JCA Limited 2011