



ARBORICULTURAL IMPLICATIONS ASSESSMENT

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

AT

10 DEER PARK ROAD
WHALLEY RANGE

Author: C. Salisbury
Date: 01 November 2025
Ref: TRE/10DPRWR/Rev B



Mulberry

Adamson House, Towers Business Park, Wilmslow Road, Didsbury, M20 2YY

T 0161 955 3628

F 0161 955 4201

E info@mulberrytmc.co.uk

www.mulberrytmc.co.uk

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 Mulberry Tree Management were instructed by Hilltop Realty Limited to carry out an arboricultural survey of trees at their site at 10 Deer Park Road, Whalley Range.
- 1.2 This report details the arboricultural implications of developing the site, including:
 - a survey of the trees on and near the development which may impact the proposal from ground level, noting their location, species and all relevant parameters, i.e. stem diameter, height, crown spread, condition etc;
 - providing advice on the removal, retention and management of trees;
 - assessment of the potential effects of the proposal on retained trees and vice versa;
 - assessment of the requirement for tree protection for the duration of the works;
 - mitigation for any loss;
 - preparation of a tree schedule;
 - and report on the above matters.
- 1.3 The survey was carried out on 29 October 2025 by means of inspection from ground level by an Carl Salisbury. The inspection can be restricted in cases where trees were Ivy clad or surrounded by vegetation.
- 1.4 Carl Salisbury has been working and studying in the Arboricultural Industry since 1991 with 30 years practical and consultation experience both within Local Authority and the private sector. He so far hold the Higher National Diploma in Arboriculture and is a professional member of the Arboricultural Association. He is an arboriculturalist with experience of the UK and European arboricultural and landscape industries within the context of the planning system, contract tendering and service provision.
- 1.5 Under *BS5837: 2012 Trees in Relation to Construction - Recommendations*, the assessment of trees is made objectively. The tree categorisation method identifies the quality and value of the existing tree stock, allowing informed decisions to be made concerning development design layout.
- 1.6 The following documents have been made available by the client:
 - Drawing- Deerpark Road, Manchester REV B.dwg
 - Drawing- 25055 ZANDI (PL001).dwg
- 1.7 The supplied drawing included some tree positions plotted. Any dimensions regarding tree positions and protective fencing must be checked on site.

- 1.8 Weather conditions during the survey were dry and windy.
- 1.9 The survey was carried out noting the conditions of the trees at the time of inspection. As trees are part of the natural environment, conditions can naturally change; therefore the contents of this report are valid for one year only. After this period, re-inspection may be necessary.

2.0 Survey Methodology

- 2.1 The trees were surveyed (prefixed T, or G for group) and recorded in the tree schedule in appendix one. Where groups are recorded, average height and diameter at breast height (DBH) of the trees in the group are reported. Where access to the base of any trees was limited, stem size was estimated.
- 2.2 All the trees were assessed using: a grading A to C (retention) and U (removal); condition and age class as defined in appendix two.
- 2.3 Where appropriate, canopy spread for each tree was recorded at four cardinal points in order to reproduce an accurate representation of the crown shape of the tree on the tree plan in appendix three.
- 2.4 The survey included all trees within the proposal area and trees near to the proposal.

3.0 Development Proposals

- 3.1 Due to the proposed development and its associated infrastructure there are a number of locations where the proposals are in close proximity to the trees surveyed. The Site Layout Plan within appendix three identifies the trees in relation to the proposed development.
- 3.2 In order to fully assess the impact of the proposals an Impact Table has been created detailing each tree, which shows the proximity of the associated works to the tree.
- 3.3 This can then be assessed in accordance with BS 5837:2012 to determine whether the development will have a detrimental impact on the health of each tree. Once this has been determined remedial measures can be detailed to reduce the impact the proposals will have on the treescape.

3.4 Impact Table:-

Tree No.	Root Protection Area identified in Table 2 of BS 5837:2012	Distance to Proposed Hard Standing (m)	Distance to Proposed Development (m)	Can the Tree/s be Successfully Retained
T1	Not Assessed as the Tree Requires Removal Due to its Condition			
T2	62m ²	N/A	5.00	Yes
T3	41m ²	N/A	3.80	Yes
T4	375m ²	0.90	14.00	Yes as outlined in section 5.0
T5	375m ²	2.40	13.80	Yes as outlined in section 5.0
T6	22m ²	6.20	14.60	Yes
T7	203m ²	N/A	7.90	Yes as outlined in section 5.0
G1	312m ²	13.70	5.80	Yes as outlined in section 5.0

4.0 Impact Assessment

4.1 To assess the implications of the Impact Table each tree can be categorised in the following way: -

	Trees to be retained		Trees to be removed	
	With No Impact	With detailed construction	Due to Condition	Due to Development
Tree No.	T1, T2, T3 & T6	T4, T5, T7 & G1	N/A	N/A

5.0 Mitigation Proposals

5.1 Property, Bin & Bike Store Impacts

5.1.1 The impact table below shows the proposed development having a minor encroachment into the root protection area of T7 & G1. It is felt that due to the species, condition and limited extent of encroachment the proposal will not have a detrimental impact on the safe useful life expectancy of these trees.

5.1.2 Section 7.5.3 of BS 5837:2012 advises that where a slab or minor structure is to be formed within the RPA it should not exceed 20% of any existing unsurfaced ground. The table below details the amount of encroachment within the RPA.

Tree No	Total Area m2 of RPA	Total m2 of Structure within the RPA	Percentage of Structure within the RPA
T7	203	6.50	3.20%
G1	209	9.30	4.50%

5.1.3 As you can see from the table above the proposed structure does not exceed 20% of each of the RPA's.

5.1.4 In terms of trees T7 & G1 to minimise the identified impacts the proposed bin and bike store will be constructed on a slab details of how the slab foundation is to be installed are contained within the supporting Arb Method Statement.

5.1.5 The foundation design for the extension and its encroachment into G1 will be slightly deeper. This is due to the need to get a internal floor build up and carry the levels through the house at a similar level. Again details of how the foundation is to be installed are contained within the supporting Arb Method Statement.

5.1.6 In terms of the extension and the rooting environment within the foundation as requested a trial hole has been dug which identified the presence of fibrous roots only (see below images). As detailed within BS5837:2012 section 7.2.3 roots smaller than 25mm may be pruned back; furthermore section A.2.2 advises that the fine roots are short-lived, with the majority dying each winter and new ones developing in response to the needs of the tree. Taking this into account it is felt that the severance of these roots conforms with BS5837 and would be acceptable.



5.2 Car Parking

- 5.2.1 The impact table below shows the proposed car parking having a minor encroachment into the root protection area of T4 & T5. It is felt that due to the species, condition and limited extent of encroachment the proposal will not have a detrimental impact on the safe useful life expectancy of these trees.
- 5.2.2 The proposed parking has been designed to be located as much as possible on the existing area of hard standing. This allows the extent of encroachment to be minimal.
- 5.2.3 Section 7.4.2.3 of BS 5837:2012 advises that new permanent hard surfacing should not exceed 20% of any existing unsurfaced ground within the RPA. The table below details the amount of new surface proposed within the RPA of each tree.

Tree No	Total Area m2 of RPA	Total m2 of New Hard Surfacing within the RPA	Percentage of Hard Surfacing within the RPA
T4	375	24.80	6.60%
T5	375	14.20	3.80%

- 5.2.4 As you can see from the table the proposed hard surfacing does not exceed 20% of each of the RPA's, it is therefore felt that the proposed parking will not have a detrimental impact upon the existing trees.
- 5.2.5 Details of how the extended parking is to be installed to minimise the impacts are contained within the supporting Arb Method Statement

6.0 Conclusions and Arboricultural Recommendations

- 6.1 The tree categorisation method identifies the quality and value of the existing tree stock but it is not meant to be interpreted rigidly and is presented in order to form a balanced judgement on tree retention and removal.
- 6.2 A precautionary method of working near trees is detailed in the accompanying Arboricultural Method Statement.
- 6.3 Following site development, regular (annual or biannual) inspections of all retained trees should be undertaken by a qualified Arboricultural Consultant.
- 6.4 It is considered that in following the advice in this document, any negative factors affecting trees on the site will be minimised.

Appendix One

Tree Survey Schedule

TREE SURVEY SCHEDULE

Arboricultural Data Sheet:					Date of Survey:29/10/25					Surveyor: C. Salisbury				
Tree No.	Species	DBH (mm)	Height (m)	Age	Crown Spread (m)				Crown clearance	Condition rating	Comments and preliminary management recommendations	Estimated remaining contribution	Tree quality category rating	
					N	E	S	W						
T1	Dead Stem	250	3.80	EM	-	-	-	-	-	D	A standing dead stem	0-10	U	
T2	Sycamore	370	19.40	EM	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.00	B	A heavily ivy-clad co-dominant specimen	60-80	B2	
T3	Ash	300	18.80	EM	5.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	9.00	B/C	A heavily ivy-clad co-dominant specimen with poor-form displaying early signs of Ash Dieback	10-20	C2	
T4	Horse Chestnut	910	19.20	FM	8.0	7.0	5.0	7.0	2.50	B	A co-dominant specimen situated to the rear of the property	60-80	B2	
T5	Horse Chestnut	910	19.20	FM	5.0	9.0	7.0	7.0	2.50	B	A co-dominant specimen situated to the rear of the property	60-80	B2	
T6	Holly	220	7.60	EM	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	0.50	B	A suppressed specimen situated to the rear of the property	20-40	C2	
T7	Beech	670	21.80	M/F M	8.0	7.0	7.0	6.0	4.50	B	A dominant specimen adjacent to the highway	60-80	A2	
G1	3 x Lime & 1 x Sycamore	830 <	21.80	M/F M	-	-	-	-	5.00	B/C	A linear mixed species belt situated within the adjacent property damaging the boundary wall	40-60	B2	

Appendix Two

Tree Survey Key

Trees for removal				
Category and definition		Criteria		
Category U Those in such a condition that any existing value would be lost within 10 years and which should, in the current context, be removed for reasons of sound arboricultural management		Trees that have a serious, irremediable, structural defect, such that their early loss is expected due to collapse, including those that will become unviable after removal of other R category trees (i.e. where, for whatever reason, the loss of companion shelter cannot be mitigated by pruning) Trees that are dead or are showing signs of significant, immediate, and irreversible overall decline Trees infected with pathogens of significance to the health and/or safety of other trees nearby (e.g. Dutch elm disease), or very low quality trees suppressing adjacent trees of better quality Note – Habitat reinstatement may be appropriate (e.g. R category tree used as a bat roost: installation of bat box in nearby tree).		
Trees to be considered for retention				
Category and definition		Criteria - Subcategories		
		1 Arboriculture values	2 Landscape values	3 Conservation values
Category A Those of high quality and value: in such a condition as to be able to make a substantial contribution (a minimum 40 years is suggested)		Trees that are particularly good examples of their species, especially if rare or unusual, or essential components of groups, or of formal or semi-formal arboriculture features (e.g. the dominant and/or principal trees within an avenue)	Trees, groups or woodlands which provide a definite screening or softening effect to the locality in relation to views into or out of the site, or those of particular visual importance (e.g. avenues or other arboricultural features assessed as groups)	Trees, groups or woodlands of significant conservation, historical, commemorative or other value (e.g. veteran trees or wood pasture)
Category B Those of moderate quality and value: those in such a condition as to make a significant contribution (a minimum of 20 years is suggested)		Trees that might be included in the high category, but are downgraded because of impaired condition (e.g. presence of remediable defects including unsympathetic past management and minor storm damage)	Trees present in numbers, usually as groups or woodlands, such that they form distinct landscape features, thereby attracting a higher collective rating than they might as individuals but which are not, individually, essential components of formal or semi-formal arboriculture features (e.g. trees of moderate quality within avenue that includes better, A category specimens), or trees situated mainly internally to the site, therefore individually having little impact on the wider locality	Trees with clearly identifiable conservation or other cultural benefits
Category C Those of low quality and value: currently in adequate condition to remain until new planting could be established (a minimum of 10 years is suggested), or young trees with a stem diameter below 150 mm		Trees not qualifying in higher categories	Trees present in groups or woodlands, but without this conferring on them significantly greater landscape value, and/or trees offering low or only temporary screening benefit	Trees with very limited conservation or other cultural benefits
		Note - Whilst C category trees will usually not be retained where they would impose a significant constraint on development, young trees with a stem diameter of less than 150 mm should be considered for relocation		

Age Class


Y	Young	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 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

Condition

A	Good
B	Fair
C	Poor
D	Dead

Appendix Three

Plans



-  Category A Trees
-  Category B Trees
-  Category C Trees
-  Category U Trees
-  Root protection area

Mulberry TMC
Adamson House
Towers Business Park
Wilmslow Road
Didsbury
M20 2YY

Tel: 0161 955 3628
Email: info@mulberrytmc.co.uk



Site Address:
10 Deer Park Road
Whalley Range

Drawing Title:
BS5837 Plan

Drawing No:
10DPR/BS/01 Rev A

Date: 21/11/2025
Scale: 1:200@A2
Drawn by: CJ

Note: Dimensions are not to be scaled from this drawing.
All written measurements are to be checked on site by the contractor. Copyright Mulberry TMC.
Note: All rights described in Chapter IV of the Copyright Design & Patents Act 1988 have generally been asserted.

-  Category A Trees
-  Category B Trees
-  Category C Trees
-  Category U Trees
-  Root protection area

Mulberry TMC
Adamson House
Towers Business Park
Wilmslow Road
Didsbury
M20 2YY

Tel: 0161 955 3628
Email: info@mulberrytmc.co.uk



Site Address:
10 Deer Park Road
Whalley Range

Drawing Title:
AIS Plan

Drawing No:
10DPR/AIS/01 Rev A

Date: 21/11/2025 Scale: 1:200@A2 Drawn by: CJ

Note: Dimensions are not to be scaled from this drawing. All written measurements are to be checked on site by the contractor. Copyright Mulberry TMC.
Note: All rights described in Chapter IV of the Copyright Design & Patents Act 1988 have generally been asserted.

