



ARBORICULTURAL REPORT **& Impact Assessment** **to BS 5837:2012 at:**

Fallowfield Retail Park
Birchfields Road
Manchester
M14 6FS

Prepared for:
FDA Landscape Ltd

Date: *October 2023*

Reference: *AWA5688*



Contents

1. Introduction.....	3
1.1 Instructions and Brief	3
1.2 Survey Details	3
2. The Site.....	4
2.1 Location and Description	4
3. The Trees.....	5
3.1 Legal	5
3.2 Tree Survey Results	6
4. Arboricultural Impact Assessment	8
4.1 Proposed New Development.....	8
4.2 Direct Impacts.....	8
4.3 Indirect Impacts	8
4.4 Suitable Mitigation	9
4.5 Protection of the Retained Trees.....	9
5. Signature	10
Appendix 1: Authors Qualifications & Experience.....	12
Appendix 2: Survey Methodology and Limitations	13
Appendix 3: Explanation of Tree Descriptions	14
Appendix 4: Tree Data	15
Appendix 5: Tree Constraints Plan.....	16
Appendix 6: Tree Impacts Plan	17

1. Introduction

1.1 Instructions and Brief

- 1.1.1 We have been instructed by FDA Landscape Ltd to visit the site and prepare our findings in a report.
- 1.1.2 The report is required in accordance with BS 5837:2012 *Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations*, to provide detailed, independent, arboricultural advice on the trees present, in the context of potential development.

1.2 Survey Details

- 1.2.1 The survey took place during January 2021.
- 1.2.2 The trees were surveyed visually from the ground using “Visual Tree Assessment” techniques and in accordance with the guiding principles of British Standard 5837:2012.
- 1.2.3 Any additional off-site trees that could impact a new development design have been included in the tree survey parameters.
- 1.2.4 We have been provided with a topographical survey with tree positions plotted. Where surveyed trees were not included on the topographical survey the tree positions were plotted using enhanced GPS technology (1-2m accuracy) and laser distance measurer.
- 1.2.5 This report has been prepared by Mr Adam Winson, Chartered Arboriculturist, MSc, BSc (Hons), MICFor, MArborA, Principal and Director of AWA Tree Consultants Ltd.
- 1.2.6 The tree survey and data collection was carried out by Mr Tom Readman Cert Arb L3, Level 4 Forestry and Arboriculture, TechArborA, Arboriculturist at AWA Tree Consultants Ltd.
- 1.2.7 Full qualifications and experience are included within **Appendix 1**. Explanatory details regarding the survey methodology are included within **Appendix 2**. A full explanation of the tree data can be found at **Appendix 3**. Full details of all the trees surveyed are found in **Appendix 4**. For tree locations please refer to the Tree Constraints Plan at **Appendix 5** and for detail of the impacts of the new development refer to the Tree Impacts Plan at **Appendix 6**.

2. The Site

2.1 Location and Description

- 2.1.1 The site is located in the Manchester suburb of Fallowfield, approximately four miles south-east of central Manchester.
- 2.1.2 The site is the southern half of Fallowfield Retail Park. It is comprised of commercial buildings to the north-west and along the eastern boundary, a tarmac car park, and a soft-landscaped border along the southern and western boundaries of the site. To the north is the northern section of the retail park, to the east is a railway line, and to the south and west are Moseley Road and Birchfields Road.
- 2.1.3 The approximate area of the survey is highlighted in the image below (Google Earth, 2016):



3. The Trees

3.1 Legal

- 3.1.1 The following advice is for guidance purposes only. Some trees are protected by legislation, and it is essential that the legal status of trees is established prior to carrying out works to them. Unauthorised work to protected trees could lead to prosecution, resulting in enforcement action such as fines or a criminal record. Tree Preservation Orders, Conservation Areas, Planning Conditions, Felling Licences or Restrictive Covenants legally protect many trees in the UK.
- 3.1.2 An online search was undertaken with Manchester City Council on 24/10/23 to check whether any trees at the site are protected by a Tree Preservation Order or are located within a Conservation Area. As of this date no trees at the site are protected by a Tree Preservation Order or are within a Conservation Area.
- 3.1.3 Due to the large potential penalties for illegally carrying out work to protected trees, before authorising any tree works a further check should be made with the Local Planning Authority to confirm if any trees are covered by a Tree Preservation Order or are within a Conservation Area. If either applies, then statutory permission is required before any works can take place (unless such work is approved as part of full planning permission).
- 3.1.4 The Multi-Agency Geographical Information for the Countryside (MAGIC) website was used to search for areas of ancient woodlands listed on the Ancient Woodland (DEFRA 2021), and a check for catalogued Ancient and Veteran trees using the woodland trust ancient tree inventory (ATI) (Woodland Trust 2021).
- 3.1.5 It was confirmed that there are no designated ancient woodlands or veteran or ancient trees within the survey area.
- 3.1.6 Trees provide a wide range of habitats for many species, some of which are legally protected such as bats, nesting birds, badgers and dormice. It is essential that appropriate care is taken to ensure that this legislation is not contravened.
- 3.1.7 When appointing a tree surgeon, only properly qualified and experienced companies should be used, who have adequate Public Liability and Employer's Liability Insurance.
- 3.1.8 All tree work should be carried out according to British Standard 3998:2010 Tree Work - Recommendations.

3.2 Tree Survey Results

- 3.2.1 The tree survey revealed 25 items of woody vegetation, comprised of 24 individual trees and 1 group of trees.
- 3.2.2 Of the surveyed trees: 5 trees are retention category 'U', 1 tree is retention category 'A', 6 trees are retention category 'B', and the remaining 13 trees and groups are retention category 'C' (explanatory details regarding the retention categories are included at Appendix 3).
- 3.2.3 Tree cover within the site consists of small, semi-mature ornamental trees including Apple, Birch, Cherry and Rowan, typically established in landscaped borders, with occasional trees established in individual tree pits. Outside the boundary of the site are larger, mature street trees comprised of Ash, Lime and Sycamore.
- 3.2.4 The central areas of the site contain little of arboricultural significance, being predominantly commercial buildings or hard standing, with only occasional small trees.
- 3.2.5 Within the retail park site are the individual trees T1 to T16, and T25. Of these trees T1, T3, T4, T15 and T25 are retention category 'U'. T1 is a small Cherry tree with a comparatively large *Ganoderma* sp. bracket at the base, causing decay, and is not suitable for long-term retention. T3, T4, T15 and T25 are dead. The remaining trees within the retail park are in better condition with reasonable prospects, however they are all small, low value individual trees with limited amenity value.
- 3.2.6 To the west of the site, outside the boundary of the retail park, are street trees T17 to T23. These are large, mature trees with reasonable prospects and are highly prominent in the wider environment, providing a good level of visual amenity. Lime T21 in particular has a high level of visual amenity, and minimal defects. There is evidence of active, regular management of these trees that is being undertaken to a high standard.
- 3.2.7 To the east of the site, behind the commercial buildings, is a railway banking with a woodland shelterbelt, G24. The shelterbelt appeared to be mainly comprised of semi-mature Ash, although occasional other semi-mature, native and naturalised pioneer species are likely among the group. Individual trees within the group are of negligible arboricultural value, and collectively the group is of limited wider landscape value, being mostly screened by existing buildings and other topography.
- 3.2.8 Many of the Ash trees in the area show symptoms consistent with Chalara or Ash dieback disease. Once a tree is infected, the disease is usually fatal, either directly or indirectly. While the identified Ash trees may continue to provide landscape and wildlife benefits for some time, their long-term

prospects are likely to be limited as a result of Ash dieback.

- 3.2.9 The retention category 'U' trees T1, T3, T4, T15 and T25 require felling regardless of any new development. Future management options for these trees includes reducing the crowns or re-pollarding back to suitable points (as detailed in Appendix 4).
- 3.2.10 Some trees were covered in dense Ivy or were inaccessible (as detailed in Appendix 4). In such cases measurements were estimated and the condition values are indicative only.
- 3.2.11 The Root Protection Area (RPA) for each tree has been plotted as a polygon centred on the base of the stem. 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, detailed modifications to the shape of the RPA would largely be based on conjecture and so have been avoided.
- 3.2.12 Some lower value tree, hedge and shrub groups do not have RPAs detailed on tree plans. The detailed extent and spread of these low value groups, in conjunction with the tree schedule, is sufficient to assess the associated potential constraints.

4. Arboricultural Impact Assessment

4.1 Proposed New Development

- 4.1.1 It is proposed to demolish some of the existing commercial units, while retaining the medical centre, and build a new Lidl food store with associated access and facilities. The development proposals have been provided by my client and inform this arboricultural impact assessment and the Tree Impacts Plan at Appendix 6.

4.2 Direct Impacts

- 4.2.1 From assessing the new development proposals, 6 trees will require removal to facilitate the development as they are situated in the footprint of the development or their retention and protection throughout the development is not suitable. 1 tree requires pruning works to facilitate the development.
- 4.2.2 The trees that require removal to facilitate the development are T5, T6, T7, T8, T13 and T16.
- 4.2.3 T5, T6, T7, T8, T13 and T16 are all situated within the footprint of the proposed car parking. All 6 of these trees are low value trees with limited life expectancy. Due to the low value of the trees to be removed the removals will have only a negligible negative arboricultural impact.
- 4.2.4 T12 required pruning works to facilitate the new parking spaces. Crown lift by 2m to provide adequate clearance for parked vehicles.
- 4.2.5 Occasionally boundary pruning of G24 may be required to facilitate development, as branches overhang into the site. This work will have negligible impact on the group overall, which will retain its screening value.
- 4.2.6 5 trees require removal regardless of the development due to their poor condition, making them unsuitable for retention. These trees are T1, T3, T4, T15 and T25.

4.3 Indirect Impacts

- 4.3.1 The tree Root Protection Area (RPA) detailed on the Tree Plans at Appendices 5 and 6, has been used as a layout design tool, to inform on the area around a tree where the protection of the roots and soil structure is treated as a priority.
- 4.3.2 Resurfacing will take place in the RPA of retained trees T2, T9, T10, T12, T14 and T17 to 23. This work is taking place within existing hard standing where it is unlikely that significant roots will be present. Retained trees within the

retail park (T2, T9, T10, T12 and T14) are situated in landscaped borders with more favourable growing conditions, which will be retained. The larger street trees (T17 to T23) are situated in tarmac, with kerb edges and landscaped borders between trees and the existing car park, and so the RPA for these trees is likely to be an exaggerated representation. As such, it is unlikely that significant roots will be within resurfacing areas and the retained tree should remain largely unaffected by the works, provided care is taken during construction.

- 4.3.3 The design of the new development has considered the trees crown position in relation to the development. Some shade from trees may be beneficial. In particular, deciduous trees give shade in summer but allow access to sunlight in winter. However, the design proposals avoid excessive shading, and give adequate provision for future tree growth.
- 4.3.4 The buildability of the proposed development has been assessed in terms of access, adequate working space and provision for the storage of materials, including topsoil, in relation to the trees.

4.4 Suitable Mitigation

- 4.4.1 The development of the site provides an excellent opportunity to undertake new tree planting throughout the site as part of a soft landscaping scheme. As such, suitable new tree planting has the potential to mitigate for the required tree removals and, in the longer term, has the potential to improve the sites tree cover.

4.5 Protection of the Retained Trees

- 4.5.1 The retained trees will require protection by fencing in accordance with BS 5837: 2012, during the development phase.
- 4.5.2 If required by the Local Planning Authority, an associated Arboricultural Method Statement, detailing protective fencing specifications and construction methods close to the retained trees can be provided.

5. Signature

I trust this report provides all the required information.

Signed



.....

Adam Winson, *Chartered Arboriculturist, MSc, BSc (Hons), MICFor, ACIEEM*

24th October 2023

**AWA Tree Consultants Limited
Union Forge
27 Mowbray Street
Sheffield
S3 8EN**

www.awatrees.com



Institute of
Chartered Foresters
Registered Consultant

Appendices

Appendix 1: Authors Qualifications and Experience

Appendix 2: Survey Methodology and Limitations

Appendix 3: Explanation of Tree Descriptions

Appendix 4: Tree Data

Appendix 5: Tree Constraints Plan

Appendix 6: Tree Impacts Plan

Appendix 1: Authors Qualifications & Experience

Adam Winson, Chartered Arboriculturist, MSc, BSc (Hons), MICFor, MArborA, ACIEEM, QTRA Registered

Adam is the company Director and Principal Consultant. He has a mix of the highest-level academic qualifications and relevant work experience. He has worked within the tree care profession for over 20 years and was awarded an MSc in Arboriculture and Urban Forestry, with distinction. Adam is a Chartered Arboriculturist and a Registered Consultant with the Institute of Chartered Foresters, a Professional Member of the Arboricultural Association and he has original research published by the UK Forestry Commission. His work ranges from individual expert tree inspections to managing trees on major infrastructure projects. His work often involves trees with preservation orders or litigation, and he has appeared as a tree expert, at planning appeal hearings up to the crown court. Adam also regularly undertakes locum Tree Officer work for several Local Planning Authorities.

James Brown, BSc (Hons) Arboriculture, MArborA, PTI (Lantra), QTRA Registered

James is a highly experienced and qualified Arboricultural Consultant. He has a BSc (Hons) in Arboriculture, attaining first class honours, as well as being awarded the Institute of Chartered Foresters student award. He is a Professional Member of the Arboricultural Association, an Associate of the Institute of Chartered Foresters, and he is working towards becoming a Chartered Arboriculturist. James joined AWA in 2016, he has many years' experience as an Arboricultural Consultant, he previously worked in Europe's largest container tree nursery and he has experience of local authority Tree Officer work.

James Godfrey, BA (Hons), FdSc Arboriculture and Tree Management, TechArborA, PTI (Lantra), QTRA Registered

James has had extensive arboricultural experience working as an arborist within the public and private sector. While working at AWA, James completed his FdSc in Arboriculture and Tree Management, graduating with a distinction and was also awarded for achieving the highest overall mark in his year. James has used his arboricultural knowledge to inform and carry out accurate tree surveys and produce detailed reports that aim to balance appropriate tree retention with the requirements of landowners.

Joe Thomas, MSci Biology, Award L4 Arboriculture, TechArborA, QTRA Registered

Joe achieved a first class degree in Biology with an integrated Masters (MSci) from the University of Sheffield. Additionally, he has a Level 4 Award in Arboriculture. Joe joined AWA after an Urban Forestry role with the Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust and Sheffield City Council, where he gained a variety of experience in different aspects of the arboriculture sector.

James Boyle, HND Level 5 Arboriculture and Urban Forestry, QTRA Registered

Jim joined AWA after having worked within the tree care profession for several years, alongside studying at college and university. During this time he gained a wealth of experience and achieved a variety of practical qualifications within the tree care industry. Jim has studied Arboriculture and Urban Forestry at Merrist Wood College in Surrey, Plumpton College in Sussex and University of Highlands and Islands in the Scottish Highlands, where he achieved a distinction in the Higher National Diploma Level 5.

Lucy Garbutt, MSc Animal Behaviour, BSc (Hons) Biology, CIEEM membership

Lucy graduated with a masters degree in Animal Behaviour from the UK's highest rated university, St Andrews of Scotland, immediately following the completion of her BSc degree in Biology from Lancaster University. Lucy has experience in botany and plant science and moved into arboriculture after previous experience of protected species and botanical surveys with a large environmental consulting company.

Sophie Beckerman, BA (Hons), Dip Arboriculture Level 4, TechArborA

Sophie has more than 10 years' experience as an arborist, working for a variety of private companies as well as undertaking tree management with Sheffield City Council Ranger Service and The Wildlife Trust. Her expertise in arboriculture is demonstrated in the practical NPTC qualifications gained, and her excellent knowledge is reflected in the L4 diploma in Arboriculture, which she completed while working. Her roles as a climbing arborist and team leader included estimating for jobs and project management, supervising tree contracting teams - ensuring that work is carried out safely and efficiently and that health and safety standards are adhered to, and risk assessments are carried out.

Mr Tom Readman Cert Arb L3, Level 4 Forestry and Arboriculture, TechArborA

Tom joined AWA from his previous role as a tree risk surveyor with Harrogate Borough Council, where he undertook tree risk surveys at a range of sites and prescribed suitable works. Tom also has extensive previous experience as a climbing arborist. Tom achieved at Distinction Star, and was recognised as the student of the year, in the Extended Diploma in Forestry and Arboriculture and is now completing a Foundation Degree in Arboriculture, while working at AWA. Tom's work focuses on tree risk surveys and accurate tree data collection for development projects to BS 5837:2012.

Appendix 2: Survey Methodology and Limitations

The survey was undertaken in accordance with British Standard 5837:2012 *Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations*. The trees were assessed objectively and without reference to any proposed site layout. The trees were surveyed from the ground using 'Visual Tree Assessment' (VTA) methodology. VTA is appropriate and is endorsed by industry guidance. It is used by arboriculturists to evaluate the structural integrity of a tree, relying on observation of trees biomechanical and physiological features. Measurements are obtained using a diameter tape, clinometer, laser distometer and loggers tape. Where this is not practical measurements are estimated. Tree groups have been identified in instances as defined in BS 5837:2012. Shrubs and insignificant trees may have been omitted from the survey.

This report represents a BS 5837:2012 tree survey and should not be accepted as a detailed tree safety inspection report; however, tree related hazards are recorded and commented upon where observed, yet no guarantee can be given as to the absolute safety or otherwise of any individual tree. All recommended tree work must be to BS 3998:2010 - *'Tree Work: Recommendations'*.

The findings and recommendations contained within this report are valid for a period of twelve months from the date of survey. The author 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 these guidelines and terms.

Appendix 3: Explanation of Tree Descriptions

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

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

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 or else a combined stem diameter is calculated.

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

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

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.

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.

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.

Retention Categories

A (marked in green on Appendix 5) = retention most desirable. These trees are of very high quality and value with a good life expectancy.

B (marked in blue on Appendix 5) = retention desirable. These trees are of good quality and value with a significant life expectancy.

C (marked in grey on Appendix 5) = trees which could be retained. These trees are of low or average quality and value, and are in adequate condition to remain until new planting could be established.

U (marked in red on Appendix 5) = trees unsuitable for retention. These trees are in such a condition that any existing value would be lost within 10 years.

	Tree Species			Measurements				Crown (m)					Tree Condition							Value		Management
Tree ID	Common Name	Latin Name	Maturity	Height (m)	Stems	Stem Diameter (mm)	Estimated	Ave Height	N	E	S	W	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Physiological	Structural	Life Expectancy	Amenity	Category	Works
T1	Cherry	Prunus 'Kanzan'	Semi-mature	4.5	1	180	No	2.5	2	2	1.5	2	Fungus/Decay. Situated in a tree pit	Single stemmed, Vertical, Tight union, Tree cage	Old pruning wounds	Ganoderma bracket at base, large relative to size of tree	Fair	Fair	<10 yrs	Low	U	Removal recommended regardless of the development.
T2	Apple	Malus sp.	Semi-mature	4.5	1	190	No	2	2.5	2.5	3	3	No visual defects	Single stemmed, Slight lean south-west, Epicormic growths, Stubs	Old pruning wounds		Good	Good	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	No works required.
T3	Dead	NA	Dead	5	1	110	No	5	1	1	1	1	Dead	Single stemmed, Slight lean north, Tight union, Partially included bark	All dead / absent		Dead	Dead	n/a	Dead	U	Removal recommended regardless of the development.
T4	Dead	NA	Dead	5.5	1	150	No	2	1	1	1	1	Dead	Single stemmed, Slight lean, Tight union, Partially included bark	All dead / absent		Dead	Dead	n/a	Dead	U	Removal recommended regardless of the development.
T5	Apple	Malus sp.	Semi-mature	4	1	140	No	2	2.5	1.5	2	2	No visual defects	Single stemmed, Vertical, Bark damage, Epicormic growths	Normal	Bark damage and epicormic at southern aspect	Good	Good	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	Removal required to facilitate the development.
T6	Rowan	Sorbus commixta	Early-mature	6	1	190	No	2.5	3	2	2	2.5	No visual defects, Tree pit	Single stemmed, at base, Epicormic growths, Tight union, Partially included bark, Bark damage, Tree cage	Minor dieback, Minor deadwood	Dead stub in centre of crown. Large epicormic with tight union at southern aspect	Fair	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	Removal required to facilitate the development.

	Tree Species			Measurements				Crown (m)				Tree Condition								Value		Management
Tree ID	Common Name	Latin Name	Maturity	Height (m)	Stems	Stem Diameter (mm)	Estimated	Ave Height	N	E	S	W	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Physiological	Structural	Life Expectancy	Amenity	Category	Works
T7	Apple	Malus sp.	Semi-mature	4.5	1	160	No	1	2	3	3	2.5	No visual defects	Single stemmed, Vertical, Epicormic growths	Minor deadwood		Good	Good	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	Removal required to facilitate the development.
T8	Hawthorn	Crataegus sp.	Semi-mature	3	1	90	No	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	2	Tree pit	Tree cage, Single stemmed, Vertical	Old pruning wounds	Ornamental variety	Good	Good	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	Removal required to facilitate the development.
T9	Birch	Betula utilis var.jacquemontii	Semi-mature	8	1	190	No	2	3	3.5	3	3	No visual defects	Single stemmed, at base, Twin stemmed, at 2m, Vertical, Tight union, Partially included bark, Old pruning wounds, Bark damage	Crossing branches	Bark damage at northern aspect. In planting bed	Good	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	No works required.
T10	Birch	Betula utilis var.jacquemontii	Semi-mature	8	1	130	No	2	2	2	2.5	2.5	No visual defects	Single stemmed, Vertical	Normal	In planting bed	Good	Good	>40 yrs	Low	C	No works required.
T11	Birch	Betula utilis var.jacquemontii	Semi-mature	8	1	140	No	2.5	3	3	2	2.5	No visual defects	Single stemmed, Vertical	Normal	In planting bed	Good	Good	>40 yrs	Low	C	No works required.

	Tree Species			Measurements				Crown (m)				Tree Condition								Value		Management
Tree ID	Common Name	Latin Name	Maturity	Height (m)	Stems	Stem Diameter (mm)	Estimated	Ave Height	N	E	S	W	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Physiological	Structural	Life Expectancy	Amenity	Category	Works
T12	Birch	Betula utilis var.jacquemontii	Semi-mature	7.5	1	130	No	1	2.5	2.5	2	2	No visual defects	Single stemmed, Vertical	Normal	In planting bed	Good	Good	>40 yrs	Low	C	Crown lifting required to facilitate the development - lift the crown to 2m to provide adequate clearance for parked vehicles.
T13	Sorbus	Sorbus sp.	Semi-mature	5.5	1	160	No	2.5	2.5	1.5	1.5	2	No visual defects	Single stemmed, Slight lean, Tight union	Normal	Fastigate form, In planting bed	Good	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	Removal required to facilitate the development.
T14	Rowan	Sorbus aucuparia	Semi-mature	7	1	220	No	3	3.5	3	3	3	No visual defects	Single stemmed, Vertical, Multiple stemmed, at 2m, Tight union, Partially included bark	Occasional pruning stubs	Fastigate form	Good	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	No works required.
T15	Apple	Malus sp.	Dead	6	1	130	No	2.5	2	2	2	2	Dead	Single stemmed, Vertical, Old pruning wounds, Stubs	All dead / absent		Dead	Dead	n/a	Dead	U	Removal recommended regardless of the development.
T16	Apple	Malus sp.	Semi-mature	4.5	1	180	No	2	2	3	3	2.5	No visual defects, Tree pit	Single stemmed, Vertical, Epicormic growths	Vehicle damage northern aspect		Fair	Good	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	Removal required to facilitate the development.

	Tree Species			Measurements				Crown (m)				Tree Condition								Value		Management
Tree ID	Common Name	Latin Name	Maturity	Height (m)	Stems	Stem Diameter (mm)	Estimated	Ave Height	N	E	S	W	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Physiological	Structural	Life Expectancy	Amenity	Category	Works
T17	Ash	Fraxinus excelsior	Mature	16	1	670	No	3.5	7	7	7	9	Tarmac to base with some root damage	Single stemmed, Vertical, Pruning wounds from crown lifting, Old pruning wounds, Epicormic growths, Bark damage	25% dead / absent, Minor dieback	Heavily crown reduced. Early Ash dieback symptoms in epicormic. Bark damage to north.	Fair	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Moderate	B	No works required.
T18	Ash	Fraxinus excelsior	Mature	16	1	560	No	5	5.5	8	7	6	Tarmac to base with some root damage	Single stemmed, Vertical, Epicormic growths, Bark damage, Old pruning wounds, Stubs	Normal	Ash dieback symptoms in epicormic. Vehicle damage on western stem	Fair	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Moderate	B	No works required.
T19	Lime	Tilia x europaea	Mature	13	1	490	No	4	5	6	6	5.5	Tarmac to base with some root damage	Single stemmed, Vertical, Old pruning wounds, Stubs, Epicormic growths	Normal, Minor deadwood	Reaction wood at base from regular management of epicormic growth	Good	Good	20 to 40 yrs	Moderate	B	No works required.
T20	Ash	Fraxinus excelsior	Mature	16	1	690	No	4	7	8.5	7	7	Tarmac to base with some root damage, Fungus	Single stemmed, Vertical, Bark damage, Epicormic growths, Old pruning wounds, Stubs	Small / sparse	Vehicle damage on western stem	Fair	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Moderate	B	No works required.
T21	Lime	Tilia x europaea	Mature	19	1	700	No	5	8	8	8.5	8	Tarmac to base with some root damage	Single stemmed, Vertical, Epicormic growths	Normal	Very minor epicormic growth	Good	Good	>40 yrs	High	A	No works required.

	Tree Species			Measurements				Crown (m)					Tree Condition							Value		Management	
Tree ID	Common Name	Latin Name	Maturity	Height (m)	Stems	Stem Diameter (mm)	Estimated	Ave Height	N	E	S	W	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Physiological	Structural	Life Expectancy	Amenity	Category	Works	
T22	Sycamore	Acer pseudoplatanus	Mature	14	1	570	No	5	6.5	7	7	7	Tarmac to base with some root damage	Single stemmed, Vertical, Epicormic growths	Normal		Good	Good	>40 yrs	Moderate	B	No works required.	
T23	Lime	Tilia x europaea	Mature	14	1	460	No	3.5	5.5	6.5	6.5	6	Tarmac to base with some root damage	Single stemmed, Vertical, Old pruning wounds, Minor cavity at 3m with minor decay, Epicormic growths, Stubs	Normal		Reaction wood at base from regular management of epicormic growth. Reasonable reaction wood around minor cavity	Good	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Moderate	B	No works required.
G24	Ash	Fraxinus excelsior	Semi-mature	10	10	200	Yes	3	See Plan				Access prevented detailed inspection. Shelter belt of semi-mature trees on railway banking. Mostly Ash with occasional other broadleaved species likely. Occasional tight unions, ivy covered stems.				Fair	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	Pruning works may be required to facilitate the development. Prune to boundary as required to provide adequate clearance for works, but do not prune beyond the boundary.	
T25	Apple	Malus sp.	Dead	4	1	90	No	2	1	1	1	1	Dead	Single stemmed, Vertical	All dead / absent		Dead	Dead	n/a	Dead	U	Removal recommended regardless of the development.	





AWA
TREE CONSULTANTS

Appendix 5:
Tree Constraints Plan

Fallowfield Retail Park, Birchfields Road, Manchester, M14 6FS
Ref: AWA5588

BRITISH STANDARD 5837:2012
RETENTION CATEGORIES
Definitions of these categories can be found in Appendix 2 of the report.

SCALE: 1:500 PAPER: A2

	CATEGORY A: HIGH VALUE RETENTION MOST DESIRABLE
	CATEGORY B: MODERATE VALUE RETENTION DESIRABLE
	CATEGORY C: LOWER VALUE COULD BE RETAINED
	CATEGORY U: UNSUITABLE FOR RETENTION
	RPA: ROOT PROTECTION AREA
	TREE STEM





AWA
TREE CONSULTANTS

Appendix 6:
Tree Impacts Plan

Fallowfield Retail Park, Birchfields Road, Manchester, M14 6FS
Ref: AWA5688

BRITISH STANDARD 5837:2012

SCALE: 1:500 PAPER: A2

	TREE TO BE RETAINED
	TREE TO BE REMOVED
	RPA: ROOT PROTECTION AREA
	TREE STEM