acsconsulting
arboricultural consultants

Proposed Development at Gladeside Court, Wythenshawe

Arboricultural Implication Study

January 2013

PLANNING AND
BUILDING CONTROL

29 JAN 2013

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

Planning

Hazard Evaluation

Management

Law

For further information contact:

Ian Murat 0141 354 1633 irm@acsconsulting.co.uk

ACS Consulting
272 Bath Street
Glasgow
G2 4JR
glasgow@acsconsulting.co.uk

CONTENTS

		Page
Chapter 1	Introduction	4
Chapter 2	Background	5
Chapter 3	Tree Survey	6
Chapter 4	Development Implications	7
Chapter 5	Conclusions	9

DRAWING(S)

2711_101	Arboricultural Layout Plan
2711_102	Tree Protection Plan

APPENDICES

1	Spread Sheets
2	Heads of Terms Arboricultural Method Statement

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.01 A. C. S. Consulting is instructed by Willow Park Housing Trust to report on trees and the implications of development at Gladeside Court, Wythenshawe. The assessment and report was undertaken by Ian Murat, Registered Consultant of the Arboricultural Association.

1.02 In accordance with Guidance on information requirements and validation for planning applications, this report fulfils the recommended national list criteria for tree survey/arboricultural information. More specifically, it contains the following:

- *A full tree survey to the requirements of BS5837 (2012) Trees In Relation To Design, Demolition and Construction – Recommendations.*
- *A plan showing tree survey information, retention categorisation and root protection areas,*
- *An assessment of the arboricultural implications of development detailing trees to be retained/removed and appropriate protection measures,*
- *An arboricultural method statement detailing the means of tree protection, implementation and phasing of works.*

1.03 The site was visited during October 2012. A survey of the trees was completed recording; *species type, age, height, crown spread, diameter-at-breast-height, and condition.*

Copyright of ACS Consulting. All rights described in Chapter IV of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 have been generally asserted ©, January 2013.

2.0 BACKGROUND

2.01 The site comprises a disused residential property set in its own self-contained grounds.

Statutory Protection/Planning Policies

2.02 The application is subject to the Planning Policies of Manchester City Council.

3.0 TREE SURVEY

3.01 I have identified fourteen individual trees and one hedgerow.

3.02 The tree data can be found at Appendix 1. There is no requirement in BS 5837 to repeat the details of the Constraints information save for confirming that the trees were surveyed for *species type, age, height, crown spread, diameter-at-breast-height, condition,* and their suitability for retention from ground level. Heights were measured with a Nikon Forestry 550 Hypsometer and diameters were taken, where possible, with a diameter tape to give an average stem measurement. Canopy spreads have been measured at the cardinal points or where they significantly extend in other directions.

Each tree has been assessed using the BS 5837 2012 category ratings (see Appendix 1). Consideration has been given to any Supplementary Planning Documents. The data collection is compliant with the advice set out at Subsection 4.4.2.5 of BS 5837:2012.

4.0 DEVELOPMENT IMPLICATIONS

4.01 The site comprises a disused detached property in self-contained grounds surrounded by residential property.

Development Implications

4.02 The proposal comprises 10 bungalows for elderly people and 2 wheelchair accessible bungalows. The buildings are either semi-detached or detached with each unit having private parking and enclosed rear gardens. All dwellings have street frontages off a new central access road linked to Gladeside Road.

Whilst it is acknowledged that all trees within the planning process are a material consideration, it is generally accepted that those trees rated as C or U are excluded from consideration regarding development implications, retained only where they pose no constraint on development.

Based on the proposals, a number of implications were noted. These have been summarised in the table below:

Impact	Reason	A	B	C
Trees lost for development	Construction – new property	0	H1	458, 459, 462, 463, 464, 466, 467, 469, 470
Retained trees that **may be** affected by disturbance	Removal of hard surfacing	457	0	0
Trees to be pruned	Satisfactory relationship with new plots and private amenity space.	0	0	0

Loss for Development

The scheme will result in the loss of nine trees. The trees are category C specimens therefore, their removal should not influence the determination of the application. One hedgerow H1 will be removed. This is to allow the boundary fencing to be constructed.

Retained Trees that May be Affected by Disturbance

One tree, 459 is located adjacent to hard surfacing. The proposal is to remove the surfacing and create a garden area. Provided the work is undertaken by hand working there are no issues for tree retention.

Trees to be Pruned

Off site trees where they grow over the boundary, are to be pruned back to it.

Policy

4.03 The over-arching policy guidance in respect of the site is that contained within Manchester's saved policy document. The application recognises that the retention of existing trees can add maturity to a new development and well-planned, designed and maintained new planting can greatly enhance its visual quality and character. The application accords with the Council's policies through the detailed consideration of BS5837: 2012. Tree surveys, protection plans and arboricultural impact assessments are provided to be considered.

Tree Protection

4.04 Plan 2711_102 – Tree Protection Plan shows the location of fencing. A Heads of Terms document can be found at Appendix 2 detailing the measures, in broad terms that will be taken to ensure Tree Protection and Compliance with current best practice.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

Summary

5.01 The scheme incorporates 10 bungalows for elderly people and 2 wheelchair accessible bungalows. The buildings are either semi-detached or detached with each unit having private parking and enclosed rear gardens. All dwellings have street frontages off a new central access road linked to Gladeside Road.
The proposed development does retain trees in positions that are sustainable in the long-term. Provision is also made for new tree planting.

Conclusions

5.02 The applicant submits an implication study that accords with Central Government advice and the requirements of the Council in respect of Best Practice. A method statement at Appendix 2 details working that allows the successful retention of trees. This is a working document and the issues raised can be addressed in detail by appropriate conditions.

I Murat M.Sc., F.Arbor.A, CEnv, MIEEM
ACS Consulting
January 2013

Appendix 1

CONTENTS

Key

BS5837: 2012

Tree Tables

acsconsulting
arboricultural consultants

KEY

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

Table 1 – Cascade chart for tree quality assessment

Category and definition	Criteria (including subcategories where appropriate)			Identification on Plan
Trees unsuitable for retention (see Note)				
Category U Those in such a condition that they cannot realistically be retained as living trees in the context of the current land use for longer than 10 years.	• Trees that have a serious, irremediable, structural defect, such that their early loss is expected due to collapse, including those that will become unviable after removal of other U category trees (i.e. where, for whatever reason, the loss of companion shelter cannot be mitigated by pruning). • Trees that are dead or are showing signs of significant, immediate, and irreversible overall decline. • Trees infected with pathogens of significance to the health and/or safety of other trees nearby, or very low quality trees suppressing adjacent trees of better quality. *NOTE Category U trees can have existing or potential conservation value which might be desirable to preserve; see 4.5.7*			RED
	1 Mainly arboricultural qualities	**2 Mainly landscape qualities**	**3 Mainly cultural values, including conservation.**	
Trees to be considered for retention				
Category A **Trees of high quality** with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 40 years	Trees that are particularly good examples of their species, especially if rare or unusual, or essential components of groups, or of formal or semi-formal arboricultural features (e.g. the dormant and/or principal trees within an avenue)	Trees, groups or woodlands of particular visual importance as arboricultural and/or landscape features.	Trees, groups or woodlands of significant conservation, historical, commemorative or other value (e.g. veteran trees or wood-pasture)	GREEN
Category B **Tress of moderate quality** with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 20 years.	Trees that might be included in category A, but are downgraded because of impaired condition (e.g. presence of significant though remediable defects, including unsympathetic past management and storm damage), such that they are unlikely to be suitable for retention for beyond 40 years; or trees lacking the special quality necessary to merit the category A designation.	Trees present in numbers, usually growing as groups or woodlands, such that they attract a higher collective rating than they might as individuals; or trees occurring as collectives but situated so as to make little visual contribution to the wider locality.	Trees with material conservation or other cultural value.	BLUE
Category C **Tress of low quality** with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 10 years, or young trees with a stem diameter below 150 mm.	Unremarkable trees of very limited merit or such impaired condition that they do not qualify in higher categories.	Trees present in groups or woodlands, but without this conferring on them significantly greater collective landscape value, and/or trees offering low or only temporary/transient landscape benefits.	Trees with no material conservation or other cultural benefits	GREY

Gladeside Court

Tree Ref No.	Species	Height M	Stem Diameter MM	Branch Spread M	Height of Crown Clearance M	Age Class	Physiological Condition	Structural Condition	Preliminary Management Recommendations/ Comments	Estimated Remaining Contribution Years	Category Grading
457	Birch	10	270	N 3 E 3 S 3 W 3	2	EM/M	Good	Good	Cut leaf birch. A tree of high quality and value in the landscape. Retain.	40+	A1/2
458	Apple	6	180, 180 & 70	N 2 E 0 S 1 W 2	1	SM/EM	Adequate	Poor	Twin stemmed. Defective stem union. Suppressed. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape. Loss to development.	10+	C1/2
459	Maple	11	330	N 4.5 E N/K S 6 W 6	1	EM	Good	Poor	Twin stemmed. Partly defective stem union. Defective branch unions. One has ripped out exposing wood. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape. Loss to development.	10+	C1/2
460	Sorbus								Dead.	<10	U
461	Ash	10	465	N 8.5 E N/K S N/K W 0 NW 8.5	3	EM/M	Good	Good	Significant tree in landscape. Crown asymmetry. Dead wood due to natural branch suppression. Storm damage. Pruning due to nuisance. A tree of moderate quality and value in the landscape. Retain.	20+	B1/2
462	Sorbus	4	100 (x10)	N 1 E 1 S 1 W 2	1	SM	Poor	Poor	A tree of low quality and value in the landscape. Loss to development.	10+	C1/2

Tree Ref No.	Species	Height M	Stem Diameter MM	Branch Spread M	Height of Crown Clearance M	Age Class	Physiological Condition	Structural Condition	Preliminary Management Recommendations/ Comments	Estimated Remaining Contribution Years	Category Grading
463	Cypress	16	<450	N 2 E 2 S 2 W 2	0	M	Good	Adequate	6 trees as one visual unit. Some trees are twin stemmed with defective unions – typical of species. A group of low quality and value in the landscape. Loss to development.	10+	C1/2
464	Sycamore	10	140, 125, 150, 130 & 145	N 3.5 E 2 S 0 W 4	1 (north)	EM	Good	Poor	Multi-stemmed at ground level. Defective stem unions. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape. Loss to development.	10+	C1/2
465	Silver Maple	16	550	N 6 E 6 S N/K W 4	0	EM/M	Good	Good	Significant specimen. Likely to attain larger dimensions. A tree of moderate quality and value in the landscape. Retain.	20+	B1/2
466	Alder	5	190	N 1 E 1 S 1 W 2	0	SM/EM	Good	Adequate	Severely suppressed. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape. Loss to development.	10+	C1/2
467	Birch	16	155	N 1 E 1 S 1 W 1	2 (south)	EM	Good	Good	Very tall slender tree growing through the canopy sycamore. Likely to become unstable following the removal of others. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape. Loss to development.	10+	C1/2

Tree Ref No.	Species	Height M	Stem Diameter MM	Branch Spread M	Height of Crown Clearance M	Age Class	Physiological Condition	Structural Condition	Preliminary Management Recommendations/ Comments	Estimated Remaining Contribution Years	Category Grading
468	Sycamore	11	320, 335 & 305	N 6.5 E 5 S 4 W	2 (east)	M	Good	Adequate	Multi-stemmed at ground level with 3 stems emanating from one point. Defective stem unions – typical of species. A tree of moderate quality and value in the landscape. Retain.	20+	B1/2
469	Alder	12	355	N 5 E 4.5 S 0 W 0	0	M	Good	Good	Significant crown asymmetry. Lean to north. Influenced in development by adjacent sycamore. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape. Loss to development.	10+	C1/2
H1	Hedge	<4	M/S	N E 2 S W	0	EM	Good	Good	Linear hawthorn hedge with privet as boundary treatment. Occasional self set sycamore. Would benefit from pruning back to shape. A hedge of moderate quality and value in the landscape. Loss to development.	20+	B1/2
470	Shrubs	<5	M/S	N 2 E 2 S 2 W 2	0	EM	Good	Adequate	Overgrown shrubs. A group of low quality and value in the landscape. Loss to development.	10+	C1/2

Appendix 2

CONTENTS

Heads of Terms of an Arboricultural Method Statement

ACSconsulting

Heads of Terms of an Arboricultural Method Statement

Gladeside Court

The purpose of this document is to serve as a live record of the Heads of Terms which are suggested for the proposed development. The Heads of Terms are in draft form and are therefore themselves subject to further discussion and/or agreement. Certain matters listed herein may alternatively be addressed satisfactorily by means of Condition. This requires detailed discussions with the LPA on the principle that conditions should always be used in the first instance as per government guidance.

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

Construction Exclusion Zone Fencing

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

Storage of Materials/Offices/Fuels

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

Services

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

Review/Site Inspection

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

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

acsconsulting
arboricultural consultants