


# BS 5837:2012

# Arboricultural Impact Assessment

**4th March 2025**

**Report No.** LTM1009.AIA.02
**Project:** 68a Kenworthy Lane
**Authored by:** Matthew Lally

Lally
TREE MANAGEMENT

www.lallytreemanagement.co.uk

# ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

## PROJECT

68a Kenworthy Lane
Northenden
Manchester
M22 4EF

## LALLY TREE MANAGEMENT LIMITED

**32 Thirlmere Road**
**Urmston**
**M41 8PP**
**[T] 07305 740120**
**[E] matt@lallytreemanagement.co.uk**
**[W] https://www.lallytreemanagement.co.uk/**

## DOCUMENT ISSUE RECORD

| Date of Inspection | Surveyor | Report Version | Issue Date | Author |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 05.01.2024 | Matthew Lally. FdSc MArborA | 02 | 04/03/2025 | Matthew Lally. FdSc MArborA |

**This report is the property of Lally Tree Management. This report may only be reproduced or disclosed to third parties with express written consent from Lally Tree Management.**
**All comments, conclusions and recommendations within this report are based on the information available to Lally Tree Management at the time of investigation. Lally Tree Management accepts no liability in cases where provided information is found to be inaccurate or misleading or if additional information exists or becomes available.**

## CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY ..... 1
1. INTRODUCTION ..... 2
1.1. Author Information ..... 2
1.2. Scope and Purpose of the Reports ..... 2
1.3. Instructions & Brief ..... 3
2. SITE VISIT & SURVEY METHODOLOGY ..... 4
2.1. Survey Details ..... 4
2.2. Creation of Existing Site Plans ..... 5
3. PLANNING POLICY ..... 7
3.1. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) ..... 7
3.2. Local Planning Policy ..... 7
4. LEGISLATION ..... 10
4.1. Statutory Considerations ..... 10
4.2. Felling Licence ..... 11
4.3. Protected Species ..... 11
5. THE SITE, ITS SURROUNDINGS & THE TREE POPULATION ..... 12
5.1. Site & Surroundings ..... 12
5.2. Tree Population ..... 12
6. ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT ..... 13
6.1. Proposed Development ..... 13
6.2. Impacts ..... 13
7. MITIGATION PROPOSALS ..... 14
7.1. Access Facilitation Pruning ..... 14
7.2. Root Pruning ..... 15
8. CAVEATS AND LIMITATIONS ..... 16
Appendix I Tree Survey Data & Site Notes
Appendix II Glossary of Terms
Appendix III Cascade Chart
Appendix IV Tree Constraints Plan & Arboricultural Implications Plan

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The proposed development site is located within a residential suburb of Northenden in Manchester. The site currently comprises a detached dwelling with a driveway to the front and lawned gardens to the front and rear.

Trees present that could be potentially affected by the development are as follows:

| Category A | Category B | Category C | Category U |
|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 6 Trees | 1 Group | 0 |

It is proposed to construct a single storey extension of the current dwelling along with associated hardstanding areas and soft landscaping. To facilitate this development, trees requiring removal or other works are as follows:

| | Tree Category. Trees Requiring Works | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Tree Work Type** | **Category A** | **Category B** | **Category C** | **Category U** |
| **Tree Removal** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Pruning Works** | 0 | 1 Tree | 1 Group | 0 |
| **Supervise Root Pruning and Excavation** | 0 | 1 Tree | 0 | 0 |

# 1. INTRODUCTION

## 1.1. Author Information

1.1.1. My name is Matthew Lally and I have been working with trees for over 18 years. I have experience in both practical elements of arboriculture and in consulting. I so far hold the following Arboricultural qualifications and technical memberships:

- FdSc Arboriculture
- LANTRA Professional Tree Inspection Certificate
- VALID – Validator
- QTRA Registered User
- Professional Member of the Consulting Arborist Society
- Professional member of the Arboricultural Association
- Associate Member of the Institute of Chartered Foresters.

1.1.2. I am the author of this report and as a Professional Member of the Arboricultural Association, the Consulting Arborist Society and an Associate Member of the Institute of Chartered Foresters, I am required to uphold ethical standards laid out by these institutions and therefore I have written this report in good faith and as objectively as possible.

## 1.2. Scope and Purpose of the Reports

1.2.1. An Arboricultural Impact Assessment is used to detail reasonably foreseeable conflicts that a development may have with regards to trees on a given site and is intended to assist the Local Planning Authority (LPA), in this case Manchester City Council, in their assessment of the proposed development. I therefore recommend that this report along with the associated Method Statement is supplied to LPA in support of the planning application to which it pertains.

1.2.2. I have aspired in this report to provide an analysis of the impacts that the proposed development is projected to have on trees located within the site based on the information that I have available to me at the time of writing. Where practicable I have included trees on land immediately adjacent to the site that may also be impacted. I also offer guidance on suitable retained tree management and mitigation recommendations for losses or other foreseen issues.

## 1.3. Instructions & Brief

1.3.1. I was commissioned to write this Arboricultural Impact Assessment by Hirala Patel. I have prepared this Arboricultural Impact Assessment in relation to the proposed development at 68a Kenworthy Lane, Northenden, M22 4EF.

1.3.2. I attach below an outline overhead photograph of the area that I assessed on 05/01/2024. (This is not necessarily the site boundary but includes trees that I deem could be impacted by the development regardless of ownership)



***Figure 1.*** Assessment boundary plan.

# 2. SITE VISIT & SURVEY METHODOLOGY

## 2.1. Survey Details

2.1.1. I visited the site and surveyed the trees in accordance with Chapter 4 of BS5837:2012. I have recorded all the recommended tree metrics in the tree schedule which can be found in appendix I.

2.1.2. British Standard 5837:2012 'Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction - Recommendations' includes guidance for considering the relationship between existing trees and how to integrate their needs into a successful development. A harmonious and sustainable relationship between any retained trees and new structure and/or hard surfaces is at the heart of the guidance.

2.1.3. When recording the trees as individual trees, groups of trees, woodlands or hedge groups I have included a prefix on the tree number. Explained as follows: Individual trees (T), groups of trees (G), hedgerows (H) or woodland groups (W).

2.1.4. I have used the term 'group' where trees form cohesive arboricultural features either aerodynamically, visually or culturally.

2.1.5. I have used the term 'hedgerow' for lines of trees or shrubs less than 5m wide at the base and which are managed or have been managed under an obvious regular pruning regime.

2.1.6. I have used the term 'woodland' where there are at least 10 trees and the individual tree canopies generally overlap and interlink, often forming a more or less continuous canopy and trees are the dominant plant form in this area.

2.1.7. I carried out the survey on Friday 5th January 2024 by means of inspection from ground level. If the inspection was restricted for any reason such as lack of access or dense climbing plants etc, then I have noted this in the site notes in appendix I.

2.1.8. In some cases, I may decide to group trees that share very similar characteristics. This method is in line with point 4.2.4 of BS 5837:2012 and I quote 'Trees forming groups should be identified and considered as groups where the arboriculturist determines that this is appropriate. It may be

appropriate to assess the quality and value of trees as a whole, rather than individuals.'

2.1.9. I assessed all the trees using: a grading A to C (A being of high quality and C being of the lowest quality) and U (trees 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). I attach in appendix III the British Standard 5837:2012 cascade chart for further details.

2.1.10. I have where appropriate recorded the canopy spread for each tree at four cardinal points in order to reproduce an accurate representation of the crown shape of the tree, this was generally not possible for tree groups, woodlands and hedges and therefore these were averaged and are represented by simplified representations on the plans. These representations can be seen in the plans that I have attached in appendix IV.

## 2.2. Creation of Existing Site Plans

2.2.1. I have shown the Root Protection Area (RPA) on the plans in appendix IV for each tree as a circle centred on the base of the stem which is based on the recommendation of the British Standard. Due to the presence of roads, structures, topography (and past tree management) the RPA is likely to be a simplified representation of the tree roots actual morphology and disposition. However, I have avoided any detailed modifications to the shape of the RPA as this would largely be based on conjecture.

2.2.2. British Standard 5837:2012 recommends the assessment of trees is made as objectively as possible, but I note that although I do my upmost to be as objective as possible, the findings and recommendations in this report will always be my opinion. The tree categorisation method identified in the British Standard is a tool I use on every Arboricultural impact Assessment as this guidance helps to make an objective judgment of the tree quality and value of the existing tree stock and keep the judgment as consistent and fair as possible.

2.2.3. Table 1 provides a summary of the documents that have been made available by the client to myself for use in this report:

**Table 1 Documents made available by client.**

| Document Type | Reference No. | Author | Date |
|---|---|---|---|
| Existing Site Layout | Existing.pdf | - | 05/11/23 |
| Proposed Site Plan | BR - 68AKLM22 Rev C | - | 2025 |

2.2.4. I note that the supplied existing site plans did not include tree positions. I have plotted the trees myself on the plans using overhead photography and using a tape measure onsite from known positions of the house & fence. I note that the positions plotted on the plan by myself are estimated and therefore any dimensions regarding tree positions in relation to the development and or protective fencing / ground protection must be checked on site. I do not accept any liability for inaccurately plotted trees.

2.2.5. The weather conditions during the survey were dry and still and therefore the quality of the tree inspections was not reduced.

2.2.6. Assessing the potential influence of trees upon load bearing soils and the potential impact to existing and proposed structures was not included in the contract brief and I have therefore not considered this in the report. I cannot be held responsible for damage arising from such action.

2.2.7. During the site visits I have inspected the trees in line with the British Standard recommendations for potentially hazardous trees and I have made appropriate recommendations where required. I note, however, that this report is not a substitute for a full tree risk assessment or management plan which are specifically designed to minimise risk and liability associated with responsibility for trees.

# 3. PLANNING POLICY

## 3.1. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

3.1.1. It is my understanding that when determining planning applications, Local Planning Authority's (LPA) should apply the following principles:

- If significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternate site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused.
- Development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused unless there are wholly exceptional reasons, and a suitable compensation strategy exists.
- Development whose primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be supported; while opportunities to incorporate biodiversity improvements in and around developments should be encouraged, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity. (paragraph 180)

3.1.2. Consideration should also be taken of paragraph 131 of the NPPF which states:

Trees make an important contribution to the character and quality of urban environments and can also help mitigate and adapt to climate change. Planning policies and decisions should ensure that new streets are tree-lined50, that opportunities are taken to incorporate trees elsewhere in developments (such as parks and community orchards), that appropriate measures are in place to secure the long-term maintenance of newly planted trees, and that existing trees are retained wherever possible. Applicants and local planning authorities should work with highways officers and tree officers to ensure that the right trees are planted in the right places, and solutions are found that are compatible with highways standards and the needs of different users. (Paragraph 131)

## 3.2. Local Planning Policy

3.2.1. The NPPF sets out Government planning policies for England and how they should be applied. The Local Planning Authorities each use this information to guide Local Planning Policies which are used as the basis for determining planning applications. The local authority in this case, Manchester City Council, refers to the following policies/guidance/plan when considering the trees and development:

3.2.2. Local Planning policy – Manchester City Council

*Policy EN 9*

*Green Infrastructure*

New development will be expected to maintain existing green infrastructure in terms of its quantity, quality and multiple function. Where the opportunity arises and in accordance with current Green Infrastructure Strategies the Council will encourage developers to enhance the quality and quantity of green infrastructure, improve the performance of its functions and create and improve linkages to and between areas of green infrastructure. Where the benefits of a proposed development are considered to outweigh the loss of an existing element of green infrastructure, the developer will be required to demonstrate how this loss will be mitigated in terms of quantity, quality, function and future management.

*3.2.3. Policy EN 15*

*Biodiversity and Geological Conservation*

The Council will seek to maintain or enhance sites of biodiversity and geological value throughout the City. Particular consideration will be given to:

- sites with international or national designations for their biodiversity value. Manchester contains one Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) (Cotteril Clough); there is a Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and an SSSI just over the border in Oldham (both on the Rochdale Canal within Oldham);
- other sites of biodiversity value, including Sites of Biological Importance (SBIs) and Local Nature Reserves (LNRs); Manchester currently has 35 SBIs (including the Rochdale and Ashton Canals) and 7 LNRs; priority habitats found within Manchester, as listed in the Manchester Biodiversity Strategy and included in the Greater Manchester Biodiversity Action Plan (GM BAP);
- protected and priority species, as listed in the Manchester Biodiversity Strategy and included in the Greater Manchester Biodiversity Action Plan (GM BAP);
- sites that are recognised for their geological importance;
- **the Council's objective to protect and conserve the City's existing trees and woodlands and the aim for a net increase in trees across the City**.

Developers will be expected to identify and implement reasonable opportunities to enhance, restore or create new biodiversity, either on-site or adjacent to the site, contributing to linkages between valuable or potentially valuable habitat areas where appropriate, with reference to:

- the Manchester Biodiversity Strategy, which provides further details of priority habitats within Manchester and opportunities for biodiversity enhancement including corridors such as the Mersey, Medlock and Irk river valleys, the canals and disused railway lines and areas of managed greenspace particularly in parks;
- the Green Infrastructure Framework for Greater Manchester, which encompasses an ecological framework that seeks to guide and inform habitat creation and repair,

# 4. LEGISLATION

## 4.1. Statutory Considerations

4.1.1. The Town and Country Planning Act (1990) (the Act) and associated Regulations empower Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) to protect trees in the interests of amenity by making Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs). The Act also affords protection for trees with a diameter at breast height over 75 mm diameter that stand within the curtilage of a Conservation Area. An application must be made to the LPA in question to carry out works upon or to remove trees that are subject to a TPO, whilst six weeks' notice of intention must be given to carry out works upon or to remove trees within a Conservation Area that are not protected by a TPO.

4.1.2. A Tree Preservation Order (TPO) is an order made by a local planning authority to protect specific trees, groups of trees or woodlands in the interests of amenity. A TPO prohibits the:

- cutting down
- topping
- lopping
- uprooting
- willful damage
- willful destruction

of trees without the LPA's written consent. If consent is given, it can be subject to conditions which have to be followed. In the Secretary of State's view, cutting roots is also a prohibited activity and requires the authority's consent. Anyone found guilty of such an offence is liable and in serious cases, may result in prosecution and incur an unlimited fine.

4.1.3. I contacted the Local Planning Authority, Manchester City Council, by email and received a reply on the 08/01/2024, this reply stated that that there are no Tree Preservation Orders or Conservation Area designations that would apply to any trees present on, or in close proximity to the assessment site and therefore no statutory constraints would apply to the development in respect of trees.

## 4.2. Felling Licence

4.2.1. Tree felling is also restricted under the Forestry Act 1967. Felling licences are Under this act, there is an exemption from the need for a felling licence for "Felling trees immediately required for the purpose of carrying out development authorised by planning permission (granted under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990) ..."

4.2.2. If full planning permission is granted, then any trees which require felling to implement the approved plans are exempt from this statutory protection. Outline planning permission does not provide an exemption to the regulations that control tree felling in the Forestry Act 1967.

## 4.3. Protected Species

4.3.1. Nesting birds are afforded statutory protection under the Wildlife & Countryside Act (1981) (as amended) and their potential presence should therefore be considered when clipping hedges, removing climbing plants and pruning and removing trees. The breeding period for woodlands runs from March to August inclusive. Hedges provide valuable nesting sites for many birds and clipping should therefore be avoided during March to July. Trees, hedges and ivy should be inspected for nests prior to pruning or removal and any work likely to destroy or disturb active nests should be avoided until the young have fledged.

4.3.2. All bat species and their roosts are protected under Schedule 5 of the Wildlife & Countryside Act (1981) (as amended) and under Schedule 2 of the Conservation of Habitats & Species Regulations 2010 (as amended). In this respect it should be noted that it is possible that unidentified bat habitat features may be located high up in tree crowns and all personnel carrying out tree works at the site should therefore be vigilant and mindful of the possibility that roosting bats may be present in trees with such features. If any bat roosts are subsequently identified, then it is essential that works are halted immediately and that a suitably qualified and experienced ecologist investigates and advises on appropriate action prior to works continuing.

4.3.3. In turn, any subsequent works carried out in relation to any protected species must be carried out under guidance from a suitably qualified and experienced ecologist and in strict accordance with the guidance provided in BS42020:2013 - Biodiversity – Code of Practice for Planning and Development and, with regard to bats, in strict accordance with BS8596:2015 - Surveying for Bats in Trees and Woodlands.

# 5. THE SITE, ITS SURROUNDINGS & THE TREE POPULATION

## 5.1. Site & Surroundings

5.1.1. The site under consideration is located in Northenden, Greater Manchester. It currently consists of a detached dwelling with lawned gardens to the front and rear. The site is set back from Kenworthy Lane and is located to the rear of 68 Kenworthy Lane with access to the south.

5.1.2. It is bordered to the north, east and west by neighbouring residential properties. Beyond the southern border is St Hilda R C Church.

## 5.2. Tree Population

5.2.1. As noted previously, a total of six individual trees and one group of trees were surveyed for the purpose of this appraisal. They range from semi-mature to early mature in age, with heights up to approximately 18 metres, maximum diametrical crown spreads up to approximately 13 metres, and stem diameters up to approximately 650 millimetres. Detailed tree dimensions and other pertinent information, such as structural defects and physiological deficiencies, are included in the Tree Schedule in Appendix I.

5.2.2. Under the UK's planning system trees are a material consideration in the planning and development process. Nonetheless, only trees of a suitable quality and value should be considered a material constraint to development. In this respect the Tree Schedule includes a column ('Cat. Grade') listing the trees' respective retention values, where they are rated either 'A', 'B', 'C' or 'U', as per BS5837:2012 Table 1 (appendix III). 'A' category trees are those considered to be of 'high quality' and, accordingly, the most suitable for retention, whilst 'B' category trees are those considered to be of 'moderate quality', and 'C' category trees are those considered to be of 'low quality' with a correlated low retention value. In turn, 'U' category trees are those that are considered to be 'unsuitable for retention'.

5.2.3. As detailed in the Tree Schedule in appendix I, seven trees were categorised as moderate quality (i.e. 'B' category), and two trees and one group were categorised as low quality (i.e. 'C' category).

# 6. ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

## 6.1. Proposed Development

6.1.1. It is proposed to construct a single storey extension along with associated hardstanding areas and soft landscaping. These proposals are encapsulated in the proposed site plan titled Proposed.pdf.

## 6.2. Impacts

6.2.1. I have overlayed the proposed site plan titled Proposed.pdf onto the existing site plan using computer aided design software and found a number of locations in which there are conflicts with existing trees. I have made this plan available in appendix IV titled Arboricultural Implications plan.

6.2.2. In order to fully assess the impact of the proposals, I have created an Impact Table below (Table 2) in which I detail each tree, showing the proximity of the associated works to the trees and if they can or cannot be retained.

6.2.3. I used the aforementioned Impact Table and Arboricultural Implications Plan in my analysis to determine whether the development will have an impact on the health of each tree. Where I have determined there is an impact, I have then decided upon any mitigation measures that could be implemented to reduce the impact the proposals will have on the treescape.

***Table 2. Impact Table***

| Tree No. | Root Protection Area identified ($m^2$) in Table 2 of BS 5837:2012 | Can the Tree/s be Successfully Retained | Retention Category |
|---|---|---|---|
| T1# | 174 | Yes | B1 |
| T2# | 152 | Yes, as outlined in section 7.2 | B1 |
| G3# | 15 | Yes, as outlined in section 7.1 | C2 |
| T4# | 191 | Yes, as outlined in section 7.1 | B1 |
| T5# | 104 | Yes | B1 |
| T6# | 65 | Yes | B1 |
| T7# | 137 | Yes | B1 |

6.2.4. I have created an Assessment Table (Table 3) to help visualise the number of trees that will or will not be impacted by the proposed development. To assess the implications of the Impact Table each tree can be categorised in the following way: -

***Table 3. Assessment Table***

| | Trees to be Retained | | Trees to be Removed | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **With No Impact** | **With detailed construction** | **Due to Condition** | **Due to Development** |
| **Category A** | - | - | - | - |
| **Category B** | T1#, T2#, T5#, T6#, T7#, | T4#, | - | - |
| **Category C** | - | G3#, | - | - |
| **Category U** | - | - | - | - |
| **TOTAL** | **5** | **2** | **0** | **0** |

6.2.5. As can be seen in table 3, no trees require removal to facilitate this proposal.

# 7. MITIGATION PROPOSALS

## 7.1. Access Facilitation Pruning

7.1.1. I note that the proposals will require the pruning of G3 on the eastern side of its crown by up to 0.7m.

7.1.2. I note that T4 will require crown lifting to a height of 4m on the development side of the crown to facilitate the build a I also note that some of the perimeter bushes will require pruning to provide access during the build.

7.1.3. I believe that if all pruning works are undertaken in line with British Standard 3998:2010 Tree Work – Recommendations then the Safe Useful Life Expectancy of the trees will not be adversely affected.

## 7.2. Root Pruning

7.2.1. The proposed construction of the extension encroaches into the RPA of T2# by approximately 3.5%. It is my opinion that this limited incursion will not have significant impact on this tree if appropriate mitigation measures are implemented as there are large areas of unsurfaced ground around this tree for the roots to exploit.

7.2.2. I would recommend that to facilitate the development and prevent damage to any tree roots within the RPAs of these trees, all excavation should be supervised by an Arboricultural Consultant and any root pruning that is required should be undertaken by the Arboricultural Consultant.

7.2.3. It is my opinion that if the following points are adhered to then the long-term health and retention of T2# will not be adversely affected:

- Excavation must be carried out using hand tools to avoid direct damage to the bark of the roots. It may be possible in some instances to use specialised equipment such as high air pressure machinery to excavate the soil with minimal disturbance to roots.
- Exposed roots will be wrapped in moist, clean hessian to prevent the roots from drying out in hot or dry weather. The hessian must be removed before backfilling.
- Roots less than 25mm diameter may be pruned back, preferably to a growing point. A sharp cutting tool such as bypass secateurs or a handsaw should be used to leave the smallest wound possible. Roots greater than 25mm in diameter should be retained wherever possible but can be pruned in this case due to the limited incursion and the large areas of unsurfaced ground for the roots to exploit.
- Root pruning should be carried out under the supervision of the Arboricultural Consultant.
- Backfilling of any excavation must be carried out by hand to avoid direct root damage or compaction, where possible. Builder sand must not be used in the backfill material.

# 8. CAVEATS AND LIMITATIONS

8.1.1. The report is for the sole use of the client and its reproduction or use by anyone else is forbidden unless written consent is given by myself (Matthew Lally).


8.1.2. This is an arboricultural report and as such no reliance should be given to comments relating to buildings, engineering, soils ecological or archaeological data. If either is commented upon within the report further professional advice should be sought.

8.1.3. This is not a Tree Risk Assessment. As such this report should not be taken to mean or imply that any of the inspected trees should be considered safe. A Tree Risk Assessment can be provided but would be subject to additional survey requirement and further fees.

8.1.4. Trees are growing dynamic structures. Whilst all reasonable effort has been made to identify defects within the trees inspected, no guarantee can be given as to the absolute safety or otherwise of any individual tree. No tree is ever absolutely safe due to the unpredictable laws and forces of nature. As a result of this, natural failure of intact trees will occur; extreme climatic conditions can cause damage to even apparently healthy trees.

8.1.5. For the purposes of this survey all dimensions of trees and their associated parts are based on estimation unless otherwise stated.

8.1.6. Trees are living organisms whose health, condition and structure can change quickly and without warning. Therefore, the contents of this report are valid for a period of one year from the date of this survey.



# Appendix I

## Tree Survey Data & Site Notes

***The recommendations in this section are based on the site survey only and are NOT recommendations to facilitate the development plans. See the Arboricultural METHOD STATEMENT for tree works required to facilitate the development.**


# BS5837:2012
# TREE SCHEDULE

Lally TREE MANAGEMENT

**DATE OF SURVEY:** 05/01/2024 **JOB REFERENCE:** LTM1009.AIA.01 **SITE ADDRESS:** 68a Kenworthy Lane, Northenden, M22 4EF

| Tree No. | Species | Stem Dia (mm) | RPA ($m^2$) | RPA Radius (m) | Height (m) | Age Class | Crown Spread (m) N | E | S | W | Crown Clearance (m) | Condition | Comments | Recommendations | Remaining Contribution | BS5837 Retention Category |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **T1#** | Sycamore | 620 | 174 | 7.44 | 18 | EM | 6 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 3N | A | Located on site boundary adjacent to Church and drive. Missing section of bark at base. Codominant stems and acute unions present. Tree appears stable. Vitality is within normal range. | **No action** | 40+ | **B1** |
| **T2#** | Sycamore | 580 | 152 | 6.96 | 18 | EM | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4W | A | A third party owned tree. No access to fully inspect. Estimated measurements. | **No action** | 40+ | **B1** |
| **G3#** | Cypress x 2 | 180 | 15 | 2.16 | 9 | SM | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 0.5N | A | A group of 2 cypress trees located on site boundary. Low arboricultural value. Trees are providing screen to adjacent properties. | **No action** | 40+ | **C2** |
| **T4#** | Sycamore | 650 | 191 | 7.8 | 18 | EM | 7 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 3W | A | A double stemmed tree from 3m. No access to the base of this tree to inspect due to dense vegetation. Estimated stem measurement. Vitality is within normal range. | **No action** | 40+ | **B1** |
| **T5#** | Sycamore | 480 | 104 | 5.76 | 11 | EM | 5 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 4N | B | Asymmetrical crown due to adjacent trees. Third party owned. No access to inspect. Estimated measurements. | **No action** | 40+ | **B1** |
| **T6#** | Sycamore | 380 | 65 | 4.56 | 14 | SM | 4 | 2.5 | 5 | 5 | 4W | A | Asymmetrical crown due to adjacent trees. Codominant stem. Vitality is within normal range. Tree appears stable. | **No action** | 40+ | **B1** |
| **T7#** | Oak | 550 | 137 | 6.6 | 16 | EM | 6 | 8 | 7 | 5 | 4E | A | A third party owned tree. Not inspected. No access, estimated measurements. | **No action** | 40+ | **B1** |

* = Average measurement ~ = Estimated measurement # = Position estimated on site



# Appendix II

## Glossary of Terms

The following terms are concurrent with best Arboricultural practice and within the guidelines set by the International Society of Arboriculture (ISA), the Arboricultural Association (AA) and the British Standards Institute (BSI).

**Age Range:**

Age is site specific and categorised:

| | |
|---|---|
| **Young (Y)** | Out-planted trees that have not yet established. |
| **Semi-Mature (SM)** | Established trees up to 1/3 of expected height and crown. |
| **Early Mature (EM)** | Between 1/3 and 2/3 of expected height and crown. |
| **Mature (M)** | Between 2/3 and full expected height and crown. |
| **Fully Mature (FM)** | Full expected height and crown. |
| **Over Mature (OM)** | Crown beginning to break-up and decrease in size. |
| **Senescent (S)** | Crown in advanced stage of break-up. |

**Height:** Height is estimated and recorded in metres.

**DBH:** Diameter at Breast Height is measured at 1.5m and recorded in metres. Where a tree becomes multi-stemmed below 1.5m the highest possible diameter is measured and indicated. Alternatively, above 1.5m the diameter of each stem or an average diameter is measured and indicated.

**Condition:** Assessment of current physiological condition and structural morphology incorporating vigour and vitality and categorised:

**A -** Tree needing little, if any attention

**B -** Tree with minor, but rectifiable defects, or in the early stages of physiological stress

**C -** Tree with significant structural and physiological flaws and/or extremely stressed

**D -** Tree that is dead, biologically/physically moribund or dangerous.

**Desirability to Retain** – As Outlined in Table 1 of BS 5837:2005 (Trees in Relation to Construction - Recommendations)

**Definition of Physiological & Morphological Terms**

**Adaptive Growth -** The process whereby wood formation is influenced both in quantity and in quality by the action of gravitational force and mechanical stresses on the cambial zone.

**Bifurcation –** Forked or divided union.

**Brown Rot -** Form of decay where cellulose is degraded, while lignin is only modified.

**Cankers-** A localised area of dead bark and cambium on a stem or branch, caused by fungal or bacterial organisms, characterised by wound wood development on the periphery. This may be annual or perennial.

**Cavity -** An open wound, characterised by the presence of extensive decay and resulting in a hollow.

**Chlorotic Leaf -** Lacking in chlorophyll, typically yellow in colour.

**Compartmentalisation -** The physiological process that creates the chemical and mechanical boundaries that act to limit the spread of disease and decay organisms.

**Crack -** Longitudinal spilt in stem or branch, involving bark and/or underlying wood. These may be vertically and horizontally orientated.

**Decay -** Process of degradation of woody tissues by fungi and bacteria through decomposition of cellulose and lignin.

**Deadwood -** Deadwood is often present within the crown or on the stems of trees. In some instances, is may be an indication of ill health, however, it may also indicate natural growth processes. If a target is present beneath the tree, deadwood may fall and cause injury or damage and should be removed, otherwise deadwood can remain intact for conservation purposes (insects, fungi, birds etc.).

**End Weight -** The concentration of foliage at the distal ends of stems and deficient in secondary branches.

**Girdling Root -** Root which circles and constricts the stem or roots causing death of phloem and/or cambial tissue.

**Hazard Beam -** An upwardly curved branch in which strong internal stresses may occur without the compensatory formation of extra wood (longitudinal splitting may occur in some cases).

**Included Bark Union -** Pattern of development at branch junctions where bark is turned inward rather than pushed out. Potential weakness due to a lack of a woody union.

**Ivy Growth -** Ivy growth may ascend into the tree's crown, increasing wind resistance, concealing potential defects and reducing the tree's photosynthetic capacity. Ivy growth is often acceptable in woodland areas as a conservation benefit.

**Live Crown Ratio -** The relative proportion of photosynthetic mass (leaf area) to overall tree height.

**Reaction Wood -** Specialised secondary xylem, which develops in response to a lean or similar mechanical stress, attempting to restore the stem to the vertical.

**Root Plate Lift -** The physical movement of the rooting plate causing soils to shift and crack. May occur during adverse weather conditions. Trees may become unstable.

**Root Protection Area -** Layout design tool indicating the minimum area around a tree deemed to contain sufficient roots and rooting volume to maintain the tree's viability, and where the protection of the roots and soil structure is treated as a priority. This area should be considered a no go area for development unless very careful mitigation measures are implemented and agreed with the LPA.

**Structural Defect -** Internal or external points of weakness, which reduce the stability of the tree.

**Suppressed -** Trees which are dominated by surrounding vegetation and whose crown development is restricted from above.

**Topping -** A highly disfiguring practice, likely to cause severe xylem dysfunction and decay in major structural parts of the wood.

**White Rot -** Form of decay where both cellulose and lignin are degraded.


**Wound -** Any injury, which induces a compartmentalisation response.

**Wound wood -** Wood with atypical anatomical features, formed in the vicinity of a wound and a term to describe the occluding tissues around a wound as opposed to the ambiguous term "callus."

**Woodland Structure -** The vertical and horizontal arrangement of trees within a group or woodland i.e. Dominant - trees with a crown above the upper layer of the canopy, Co-dominant - trees that define the general upper edge of the canopy, Intermediate - trees that have been largely overgrown by others, Suppressed - trees that have been

overgrown and occupy an understory position and grow slowly, often severely asymmetrical.


Note: The definitions described above, may not necessarily be included within the Arboricultural Survey Data.



# Appendix III

## Cascade Chart

| Trees for removal | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Category and definition** | **Criteria** | | |
| **Category U**<br>Those in such a condition that they cannot realistically be retained as living trees in the context of the current land use for longer than 10 years | ○ Trees that have a serious, irremediable, structural defect, such that their early loss is expected due to collapse, including those that will become unviable after removal of other U Category trees (i.e. where, for whatever reason, the loss of companion shelter cannot be mitigated by pruning)<br>○ Trees that are dead or are showing signs of significant, immediate, and irreversible overall decline.<br>○ 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.<br>NOTE: *Category U trees can have existing or potential conservation value which might be desirable to preserve; see section 4.7.5* | | |
| Trees to be considered for retention | | | |
| **Category and definition** | **Criteria and sub-categories** | | |
| | **1) Mainly arboricultural values** | **2) Mainly landscape values** | **3) Mainly cultural values (including conservation)** |
| **Category A**<br>**Trees of high quality**: with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 40 years | Trees that are particularly good examples of their species especially if rare or unusual, or 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 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-pastures) |
| **Category B**<br>**Those 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 area | Trees with clearly identifiable conservation or other cultural benefits |
| **Category C**<br>**Those of low quality** with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 10 years, or young trees with a stem diameter below 150mm | Unremarkable trees of very limited merit or such impaired condition that they do not qualify in the 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 no material conservation or other cultural value |



# Appendix IV

## Tree Constraints Plan & Arboricultural Implications Plan

Bushes

T6#

T7#

T5#

T4#

Bushes

G3#

68a

68b

T2#

T1#

St Hilda's

RPA

Do not scale this drawing (printed or electronic version).

Contractors must check all dimensions from site

This drawing is for use on this site only and should be used in conjunction with all relevant consultants drawings..

# LEGEND

N

Category A

Category B

Category C

Category U


Root Protection Area (RPA)

\# Position estimated on site

Lally TREE MANAGEMENT

| | |
|---|---|
| Scale: 1:200 @ A3 | Date: 02/02/2024 |
| Job: LTM1009.AIA.01 | |
| Address: 68a Kenworthy Lane, Northenden, M22 4EF | |
| Client: Hirala Patel | |
| Drawing Number: LTM1009.TCP.01 | |
| Drawn by: Matthew Lally | |

## TREE CONSTRAINTS PLAN




Do not scale this drawing (printed or electronic version).

Contractors must check all dimensions from site

This drawing is for use on this site only and should be used in conjunction with all relevant consultants drawings..

## LEGEND

N

- Category A
- Category B
- Category C
- Category U
- Root Protection Area (RPA)
- # Position estimated on site

Lally TREE MANAGEMENT

| | |
|---|---|
| Scale: 1:200 @ A3 | Date: 04/03/2025 |
| Job: LTM1009.AIA.01 | |
| Address: 68a Kenworthy Lane, Northenden, M22 4EF | |
| Client: Hirala Patel | |
| Drawing Number: LTM1009.AIP.02 | |
| Drawn by: Matthew Lally | |

# ARBORICULTURAL IMPLICATIONS PLAN