

Tree Survey
at
1 Old Hall Lane,
Middleton,
Manchester City M24 4GZ
Greater Manchester
with reference to bats and nesting birds

2nd April 2026 V2

Dave Bentley Ecology Services (since 1984)

www.davebentleyecology.co.uk

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 A planning application has been submitted to replace the garage and concrete outhouse of 1 Old Hall Lane, Middleton, Manchester City, Greater Manchester (SD 84237 04805) with a granny annexe. Local Planning Authority (LPA) planning officers have requested a Tree Survey appropriate for planning purposes. Places for Everyone, the old UDP, and British Standards are cited on Manchester City Council's Website. Manchester's Tree and Woodland Action Plan does not appear to be a development control tool but again refers to the importance of the British Standards.

The current Tree Survey British Standard is **BS 5837:2012 (link at end)**.

1.2 Key aspects of BS 5837:2012 include:

- Tree Survey: An assessment of tree health, value, and suitability for retention.
- Tree Constraints Plan (TCP): A plan highlighting constraints imposed by trees, including the Root Protection Area (RPA).
- Tree Protection Plan (TPP): A plan demonstrating how trees will be protected on-site, usually via barriers or ground protection.
- Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS): Details of methods used to protect trees during works.

1.3 In addition some LPA Council's SPD requires attention to existing and proposed Amenity Value, including 1 Visibility; 2 Size and Form; 3 Wider Impact.

1.4 And attention to protected species etc such as nesting birds and bats.

1.5 The survey has been conducted by consultant ecologist Dave Bentley who has worked with Greater Manchester trees and woodland and other habitats since 1984.

1.6 It is not known if an existing Tree Preservation Order (TPO) covers any part of the site, as, at the time of writing, Manchester City Council does not publish a list of TPO online, although applications for such information can be made in writing. It is possible that the two Deodar Cedar in the front garden of 1 Old Hall Lane are worthy of TPO.

1.7 The proposal is to replace a modern cement rendered and pitch-roofed garage and a breezeblock timber outhouse, flat-roofed with corrugated plastic with a granny annexe.

1.8 A line of trees (SD 84237 04805) on the south side of the house gardens lying adjacent the redevelopment and the two Cedar trees in the front garden (SD 84202 04785) potentially adjacent a working area, need to be considered in this report.

2 METHODS

2.1 The site was visited on 2nd April 2026 with fine weather and visibility.

2.2 On site the girth was measured at 1.5m from ground with a tape measure, the tree height was assessed with eye, stick and a long reel tape measure, and as a double check using measured fences and walls.

2.3 Tree canopy was assessed by eye, a compass, and a tape measure used at ground level and satellite images where necessary.

2.4 Visual observations were made for previous tree work, tree vitality and tree health. Photographs were taken.

2.5 A tree numbering system was devised by adding pencil numbers to the metal fence on the south side of the site. These can be viewed from the retail site in the same ownership. In any case the individual trees are carefully mapped and are all in a row.

2.6 Only those trees considered relevant to the granny annexe application are included here in detail, although a wider survey for another project has been completed and will soon be available.

2.7 All trees and shrubs in the area of potential concern were identified to species level. A leafy twig of the Cedar and of the Cypress were taken in order to correctly identify them to species in the office.

2.8 Schedule 9 Alien Invasive shrubs were not recorded in the redevelopment area or potential working area.

2.9 The existing buildings' external features were examined by eye from ground level for the potential of usage by roosting bats and of nesting birds.

3 TREE SURVEY REQUIREMENTS

3.1 Manchester City Council's website provides Supplementary Planning Guidance via the old UDP encourages the retention of broad-leaved trees (not conifers). "UDP Development Control Policy DC16.1 also relates to trees within a development site. New developments will fit more easily into their surroundings if they incorporate existing landscapes, and there will be a presumption to retain existing trees and planting with a high amenity and ecological value. If it is not possible to retain existing trees in situ, developers will be required to include appropriate replacement within the development site or the immediate area" and "Developments should result in no net loss in overall biodiversity value and maximise opportunities to meet and exceed our target to achieve a 10% net increase in tree cover across new developments. In exceptional cases, where planting is unachievable on site, permission may be granted to plant elsewhere in the City to ensure no overall net loss in tree resources." Places for Everyone says this of trees and development " And through development as follows: 12. Where development would result in the loss of existing trees, requiring replacement on the basis of two new trees for each tree lost, or other measures that would also result in a net enhancement in the character and quality of the treescape and biodiversity value in the local area, with a preference for on-site provision; and 13. Protecting trees and woodland during the construction phase of development."

The SPG of Salford City has more detailed requirements so we shall refer to that:

Location of all existing trees (reference number to be recorded on the trees survey plan) over 75m min diameter measured at 1.5m (Diameter at Breast Height)(DBH) above ground level which are:

- Within the site;

- Overhanging the site;
- Within a distance of the boundary of the site which is less than half the height of the tree; or
- Located on land adjacent to the development site that might influence the site or might be important as part of the local landscape character.
- Trees which are less than 75mm diameter (DBH) at 1.5m above ground need not be accurately surveyed but should be indicated;

Also:

- Existing buildings/structures; Hard surfaces;
- Watercourses;
- Over-head cables;
- Under-ground services including their routes and depths;
- Ground levels throughout the site;
- Location of all existing hedges, a list of the woody species that they contain, and details of any features within the hedge, e.g. banks or supporting walls;
- Soil type(s);
- Wildlife features (e.g. birds, nests, bat roosts-see Wildlife and Countryside Act1981);
- Historical features;
- and Any other hard features.

The Tree Survey must also include the following information about the trees (that have a diameter greater than 75mm) which are indicated on the plan:

- Species (common and scientific name, where possible);
- Height;
- Diameter of the stem measured at 1.5m above ground level;
- Root Protection Area (RPA);
- Canopy spread of each tree for all four compass points;
- Age Class (e.g. young, semi-mature, mature, over-mature, etc);
- Assessment of the condition including trunk, crown, roots;
- Life expectancy (e.g. very long, long, medium, short, very short);
- A full schedule of tree works including those to be removed and those remaining that require remedial works to ensure acceptable levels of risk and management in the context of the proposed development. The **method of disposal of all arisings** should also be included along with the precautions to be taken to avoid damage to Root Protection Areas and trees to be retained;

Amenity Value assessment: In assessing the amenity value of trees, regard should be given to three criteria:

- Visibility: The extent to which the trees or woodlands can be seen from a public viewpoint (e.g. a footpath or road);
- Size and Form: Taking into account factors such as the rarity of trees, their potential growth, and their value as a screen; and
- Wider Impact: The significance of the trees in their local surroundings taking into account how suitable they are to their particular setting, as well as the presence of other trees in the vicinity.

Reasoned Justification All trees that are surveyed must be clearly tagged on site to enable their identification when considering the tree survey. Existing trees, particularly those that are mature, can offer significant amenity benefits for the local area and for local wildlife. Therefore, a detailed survey of trees on development sites is necessary to realise the importance of any trees and to prevent the loss of those trees which enhance the attractiveness and image of the city. The survey should demonstrate that development would have no impact on any protected species, in order to comply with national legislation that protects wild birds, their nests and eggs, and other wild animals including bats and their roosts.

4 TREE SURVEY OF TREES WITHIN NO 1 OLD HALL LANE

4.1 We look at the row of trees alongside where the garage and outhouse are to be removed and a new granny annexe built.

4.2 At the east end is a group of multi-stemmed Hazel bushes which appear on satellite images to be a single mass of bush. These are T1A to T1E, comprising 6 individual bushes. T1A is nearest to the redevelopment and T1E is further away.

T1E	Hazel multi-stemmed. Largest stem 17cm DBH, Height 6.5m
T1D	Hazel multi-stemmed. Largest stems 12cm and 13cm DBH, Height 6.5m
T1C	Hazel multi-stemmed. Largest stem 13cm DBH, Height 6.5m
T1B	Hazel multi-stemmed. Largest stem 13cm DBH, Height 6.5m
T1A	Hazel multi-stemmed. Largest stem 20cm and 17cm DBH, Height 6.5m
T2	Elder 4cm DBH, Height 2.6m
T3	Hazel multi-stemmed. Largest stem 11cm, Height 6m
T4	Lawsons Cypress. 40cm DBH, Height 8.5m
T5	Lawsons Cypress. 27cm DBH, Height 12.5m
T6	Wild Cherry. 30cm DBH, Height 11m

And thereafter the line of Lawsons Cypress continues westwards, terminating in a large and sprawling Goat Willow.

House front garden

4.3 Two large Deodar Cedar (alien) (potentially worthy of a Tree Preservation Order), a Cherry Laurel (alien), and smaller unidentified conifer (the front garden was not accessed).

The northern Cedar is c40cm DBH and height of 12m, and the southern Cedar is c53cm DBH with a height of 13m. The needles are around 5cm long and in whorls of many, making Deodar Cedar the only candidate. Both trees are mature, healthy, and with the crown spreading equally all around.

4.4 These tree boles are 31-32 metres from the development, with the main house in between. Vehicles can be seen on satellite images parked on the artificial lawn in front of the house showing potential compaction from such traffic has no discernible effects on these trees as yet. This suggests that temporary storage of construction materials here would have little if any negative effect, although it is necessary to provide a Root Protection Area.

4.5 In this list North relates to the garden side of the fence and South to the retail site. In reality the tree line is on a southwest to northeast line.

Tree 1E (no label) Hazel *Corylus avellana* (native)

This multi-stemmed bush with largest stem 17cm DBH, 6.5m tall, with another Hazel bush to the immediate north encouraging the bush to spread southwards.

Semi-mature. Long life expectancy. The tree appears healthy.

Canopy spread 4m north to south: North 10%, East 20%, South 50%, West 20% approx.

Comments: The bush is well clear of the redevelopment and will continue to function as a treebelt/shield. It will not grow much larger.

Tree 1D (no label) Hazel *Corylus avellana* (native)

Multi-stemmed bush with largest two stems at 12cm and 13cm DBH, 6.5m tall, with another Hazel bush to the immediate south encouraging the bush to spread northwards.

Semi-mature. Long life expectancy, appearing healthy.

Canopy spread 4m north to south: North 50%, East 20%, South 10%, West 20% approx.

Comments: The bush is well clear of the redevelopment and will continue to function as a treebelt/shield.

Tree 1C (No label) Hazel *Corylus avellana* (native)

This multi-stemmed bush has a largest stem of 13cm DBH, 6.5m tall, with another Hazel bush to the immediate north encouraging the bush to spread southwards.

Semi-mature. Long life expectancy. The tree appears healthy.

Canopy spread 4m north to south: North 10%, East 20%, South 50%, West 20% approx.

Comments: The bush is well clear of the redevelopment and will continue to function as a treebelt/shield. It will not grow much larger.

Tree 1B (No Label) Hazel *Corylus avellana* (native)

This multi-stemmed bush has a largest stem of 13cm DBH, 6.5m tall, with another Hazel bush to the immediate south encouraging the bush to spread northwards.

Semi-mature. Long life expectancy, appearing healthy.

Canopy spread 4m north to south: North 50%, East 20%, South 10%, West 20% approx.

Comments: The corner of the existing/proposed building lies 126cm from the base of the bush. One thin branch overtops the roof of the existing outhouse by 190cm. One branch has been cut on this side in the past. The removal of a single thin branch spreading over the redevelopment will have negligible impact on the tree or the function of the tree belt as a shield. It will not grow much larger.

Tree 1A (No Label) Hazel *Corylus avellana* (native)

Multi-stemmed bush with the two thickest stems with 17cm and 20cm DBH. 6.5m tall.

Semi-mature. Long life expectancy.

Canopy spread 7.4m north to south: North 20%, East 10%, South 20%, West 50% approx.

This is the nearest to the redevelopment of this group of Hazel bushes.

Comments: Tree spreading to west mainly given competition from others in group of Hazel with the corner of the existing/proposed building 165cm from the base of the bush. One thin branch overtops the roof of the existing outhouse by 220cm. The removal of a single thin branch spreading over the redevelopment will have negligible impact on the tree or the function of the tree belt as a shield. The group of Hazel is at the end of the tree line, and this bush lies between the outhouse and the corner of the retail car park. It will not grow much larger.

Tree 2 (Number 2 on fence) Elder *Sambucus nigra* (native)

Immature single-stemmed tree 4cm DBH. 2.6m tall.

Medium life expectancy, given Elder are short-lived trees

Canopy spread 70cm north to south: North 100%, East 20%, South 50%, West 20% approx.

Comments: The base of the small tree is 130cm from the existing/proposed building, to which it is adjacent. The crown spreads southwards towards the retail site car park and overhangs the fence by 50cm. Whilst close to the building this immature tree is too small to be affected by the redevelopment. The tree is part of the tree line with the building to the north and the open car park to the south. There is no need to remove this small tree species but it may be removed as part of a hedge-replanting screen proposed here.

Tree 3 (Number 3 on fence) Hazel *Corylus avellana* (native)

Multi-stemmed young bush with the thickest stem at 11cm DBH. 6m tall.

Semi-mature. Long life expectancy. The tree appears healthy.

Canopy spread 390cm north to south: North 30%, East 30%, South 25%, West 15% approx.

Comments: The base of the small tree is 126cm from the existing/proposed building, to which it is adjacent. Part of the crown spreads northwards over the existing building by 190cm. The crown overhangs the fence southwards by 50cm. The removal of a single thin branch spreading over the redevelopment will have negligible impact on the tree or the function of the tree belt as a shield. The tree is part of the tree line with the building to the north and the open car park to the south. There is no need to remove this small tree species but subject to there being no birds nests (which can be easily ascertained) it can be coppiced – coppicing means the tree will regrow from cut stumps. N.B. Not all tree species can be coppiced.

Tree 4 (Number 4 on fence) Lawson's Cypress *Chamaecyparis lawsoniana* (alien)

This mature Cypress has a 40cm DBH, with an upright fork at 1.7m from the base. 8.5m tall. As is usual in a conifer hedge the lower side branches have died off, but the tree is set apart from the other tall trees in the row so that its branches spread all around without impediment.

Long life expectancy. The tree appears healthy.

Canopy spread 649cm north to south: North 25%, East 25% South 25%, West 25% approx.

Comments: The tree is part of the tree line and at the end of the larger trees. The base of the tree is 168cm from the existing/ proposed building, to which it is adjacent. Part of the crown spreads northwards over the existing building by 127cm. The crown overhangs the fence southwards by 330cm. The trimming of flimsy branches of spreading over the redevelopment will have negligible impact on the tree or the function of the tree belt as a shield, and can be done without an impact on nesting birds. The tree is part of the tree line with the building adjacent and to the north and the open car park to the south. The architect has proposed the tree is removed so as not to potentially structurally affect the new residence – THIS MUST NOT BE REMOVED BETWEEN MARCH AND SEPTEMBER – ergo tree protection is needed until that time in order to protect nesting birds.

Tree 5 (Number 5 on fence) Lawsons Cypress *Chamaecyparis lawsoniana* (alien)

Mature tree, with upright forks at 80 from ground, a 27cm DBH of the larger stem. 12.5m tall

Long life expectancy. The tree appears healthy, and is slightly out of line thus having less dead side branches than others in the row. There is a gap between it and Tree 4 to the east, but the western side crowds against the other trees in the row.

Canopy spread 8m north to south: North 25%, East 25%, South 30%, West 20% approx.

Comments: The tree is part of the tree line. Being set further southwards from the others it does not overreach the redevelopment site and the bole is well clear of the site. The crown overhangs the fence southwards by 210cm. The tree is part of the tree line with the building to the north (but not adjacent) and the open car park to the south. The tree is well clear of the redevelopment and will continue to function as a treebelt/shield. The architect has proposed the tree is removed so as not to potentially structurally affect the new residence – THIS MUST NOT BE REMOVED BETWEEN MARCH AND SEPTEMBER – ergo tree protection is needed until that time in order to protect nesting birds.

Tree 6 (Number 6 on fence) Wild Cherry *Prunus avium* (native)

Mature tree with solid tree bole, with a c37cm DBH. 11m tall.

Long life expectancy. The tree appears healthy, and despite being within the main row of Cypress it has managed to spread its branches clear of them.

Canopy spread 9m north to south: North 30%, East 20%, South 30%, West 20% approx.

Comments: The tree is part of the tree line and has grown up between two large Lawsons Cypress. The Cherry's branches reach to a metre from the corner of the existing/proposed building. The tree is part of the tree line with the building to the north (but not adjacent) and the open car park to the south. The branches reach 3.4m on the north side, and over the car park on the south side the longest branches reach 5m over the car park. The tree is well clear of the redevelopment and will continue to function as a treebelt/shield. There is no proposal to remove this native tree.

Continuing Tree Line

Thereafter the line of trees continues southwards. There are numerous crowded Lawsons Cypress and these terminate in a large spreading Goat Willow behind the main part of the retail unit. The understory consist of Ivy, Honeysuckle, yellow-flowered *Forsythia intermedia* with a Wild Cherry sapling noted. These trees are well clear of the redevelopment and will continue to function as a treebelt/shield. Light pruning on the north side may be needed to facilitate material being carried to the redevelopment site. As long as the pruning is well clear of the trunk this will be in order (where birds nest in Cypress they nest where the branch leaves the trunk).

5 ADDITIONAL ELEMENTS OF TREE SURVEY

- Existing buildings/structures; Hard surfaces – **The redevelopment will remove an existing modern garage and an adjacent modern outhouse. The building pair is surrounded on three sides (west, north, east) by thick rubber tiling and/or artificial grass and on the south side by what appears to be a trench containing a water tank and appearing to be backfilled with wheels and tyres meaning the immediate construction area should not impact on any green area directly. The lawn in front of the house is covered in artificial grass, but should this be a working area there will need to be a Root Protection Area applied in relation to the two large Cedar trees.**

- Watercourses - **None;**
- Over-head cables - **None;**
- Under-ground services including their routes and depths – **The granny annex is in a rear garden with restricted access and cannot be a self-contained home. The outhouse has simple plumbing for a shower. The redevelopment will connect to existing drains and power supplies so additional trenches for water. Sewerage and power beyond the immediate location are not envisaged;**
- Ground levels throughout the site - **Refer to planning application;**
- Location of all existing hedges, a list of the woody species that they contain, and details of any features within the hedge, e.g. banks or supporting walls - **See provided plan below;**
- Soil type(s) **Considered to be natural loam soil over clay as prevalent in the area;**
- **Wildlife features (e.g. birds, nests, bat roosts-see Wildlife and Countryside Act1981) -**

The garage, or basically a large store, is a modern building. It sits right adjacent the main house and the pair of roll up doors face the rear living room windows across a small patio. The garage was dug into the rising land of the rear garden so that the east and south sides are well below the landform level. There is a vertical wall of soil about a half a metre or so from the garage walls. This gap contains a water tank for a shower and plumbing, and old wheels/tyres.

The tiles and ridge tiles are in good condition providing no potential entry for bats.

The barge boards and soffit boards are generally flush with the building providing no means of entry to bats or small birds, with the exception of the lower most parts were rotting and warping have open up small gaps. No evidence of bat usage was seen here (no droppings, no urine streaks, and presence of some spider webs) but there is potential enough to require a planning condition that should bats be found work should stop and a bat specialists advice be sought. Should work not proceed in 2026 a re-examination in subsequent years will be needed.

The roll top doors provide a permanent potential access point for birds or bats, but again there is no evidence of droppings or urine streaks. The building interior is well-used by the family and the building interior is too disturbed to be attractive to bats or birds.

To the east of the garage is an ever deeper cut outhouse building made from concrete block revetments walls and clear plastic corrugated roofing. This contains a shower room and again is well used by the family. There is some warped marine plywood cladding on the east face rising to about a metre ground the uphill ground level and no signs of bat access was seen. This shed has a loose doorway cover.

To the west, east and north of the garage and shed the ground is covered by artificial turf or thick rubber paving tiles, meaning none of the potential working area or building footprint on these sides is soft ground with flora.

The south side adjacent the tree line includes a line of tyres and wheels, upon which sit blue barrels and which also contain a below ground level water tank and plumbing. Although it can't be confirmed without lifting all these wheels it appears as though the land that was excavated away to build the garage, where it was not occupied by the garage, was backfilled with these wheels to provide a barrier between the walls and the soil of the tree line. This suggests that there will be little or no root damage to adjacent trees should a new building be constructed on this footprint. None of this area can be considered soft ground with flora;

NESTING BIRDS – a bird survey carried out on 2nd April at dawn revealed the following species in or near the site:

Bullfinch (Amber List), Dunnock (Amber List), Song Thrush (Amber List), Woodpigeon (Amber List), Goldfinch, Robin, Great Tit, Blue Tit, Goldcrest, Robin, Jay, Carrion Crow, Collared Dove and flyover from a gull species. A possible Mistle Thrush (Red List) was heard. Red and Amber Listed birds are of conservation concern.

Historical features – **Old Hall Lane Middleton Manchester contains no Listed buildings. A search of the Council website does not reveal a local list of Non-designated Heritage Assets. Both searches 15/04/2026.**

- and Any other hard features – **Buildings and paths, patios and walls of 1 Old Hall Lane.**

6 AMENITY VALUE ASSESSMENT

In assessing the amenity value of trees, regard should be given to three criteria:

- **Visibility:** The extent to which the trees or woodlands can be seen from a public viewpoint (e.g. a footpath or road). - **All of the trees in the treeline are visible at least in part from the roadway that leads to the motorway underpass. Whilst the buildings on Old Hall lane, and number 1 in particular, are shielded from this roadway and path, the treebelt has more of a function in shielding the residential properties for privacy and noised reduction. The Cedar trees are very noticeable on Old Hall Lane, as they greatly overtop the tall red brick garden wall.**
- **Size and Form:** Taking into account factors such as the rarity of trees, their potential growth, and their value as a screen. - **The treebelt consists of planted semi-mature Lawson's Cypress which will continue to provide a screen as long as they stand. There is no evidence of ill health in the trees so as long as the roots are not damaged then the screen of trees will remain. Lawson's Cypress are alien trees but are slower growing and easier to hard prune than Leyland Cypress and require less management. The Wild Cherry and the Hazel are native trees, most likely self-seeded, and provide diversity in the tree line as well as food for wildlife (cherries and nuts and foliage). It may be fortuitous that the smaller trees in the line are adjacent the redevelopment. The two Cedar trees in the front garden are again alien trees although they appear magnificent. There are very few records of this Cedar species in Greater Manchester.**
- **Wider Impact:** The significance of the trees in their local surroundings taking into account how suitable they are to their particular setting, as well as the presence of other trees in the vicinity - **Heaton Park is well-wooded so the tree belt has no significance beyond its use as a tree screen. The Cedar trees compliment the area very well as a suburban lane.**

7 TREE CONSTRAINTS PLAN

7.1 A Tree Constraints Plan is designed to provide advice before plans are drawn up. A Tree Constraints Plan is therefore not relevant at this stage in the planning application where the footprint is already decided upon given this is a redevelopment site. The Root Protection Area is shown on the Tree Protection Plan.

8 TREE PROTECTION PLAN

8.1 In respect of the existing building removal and replacement the Root Protection Area is already defined by the existing building footprint and the apparent trench filled with tyres and plumbing alongside. Given that the trees alongside the redevelopment cannot be removed until October to February then tree protection measures will need to be in place until end of September. The fencing

should have should have rubber feet, rather than have posts driven into the ground which might sever roots. Typically the advice is to hire in Heras fencing for the job.

8.2 British Standards requires that, to protect the Cedar trees in the front garden from working area activities such as compression from cars, vans, wagons, temporary buildings or the storage of building materials or bonfires requires, we calculate the Root Protection Area (RPA). The RPA should be calculated as an area equivalent to a circle with a radius 12 times the stem diameter. Thus we have two Cedar trees with stems diameters of 40cm and 53cm. This gives a RPA of 4.8m for the northern tree and 6.36m for the southern tree. The simplest way is to erect a single fence through the front garden using these measurements from the base of the trees. The protected area should be secured with Heras fencing and rubber feet. The British Standards document is available here and shows how this metal fence should be erected:

chrome-

extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://www.westberks.gov.uk/media/50570/CD17-2-BS3998-2010-Tree-Work-Recommendations/pdf/CD17.2_BS3998.2010_Tree_Work__Recommendations.pdf

9 ARBORICULTURAL METHOD STATEMENT

9.1 When the trees by the redevelopment are pruned the developer is advised to search the internet for the correct way to prune a tree, e.g. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PzQcyT7M0uo>

9.2 The two Lawsons Cypress T4 and T5 are to be removed due to the potential for causing damage over time or through collapse to the new granny annexe. The trees **MUST NOT BE REMOVED BETWEEN MARCH AND SEPTEMBER INCLUSIVE** due to potential and illegal damage to nesting birds. Removal is best carried out from the retail unit car park. Given the new building work may be occurring at this time the trees are best taken down piece by piece rather than felled. The branches can be chipped as used in gardens and the logs can be used for log burners or garden work. The whole may be taken to the tip. It is important that the debris does not end up fly-tipped.

9.3 Replacement hedge – Pot grown Holly are available year-round and they should be planted at 3 to 5 per metre. Choose female plants for the red berries. Holly is selected as the plants will grow to fill the gap in the treebelt, without becoming overly tall and unstable, and the evergreen nature means they provide a year-round screen, whilst the female plants provide attractive red berries.

10 ALIEN INVASIVE PLANT SPECIES

10.1 There are no alien invasive plant species in the redevelopment area, although in the wild land nearby several Schedule 9 Alien Invasive Plant Species can be found – Himalayan Balsam, Japanese Knotweed and Montbretia. However these are not pertinent to this actual planning application.

END



Two Deodar Cedar in front garden (above)



Existing garage (above)



Roof of existing outhouse with T1 group Hazels (above)



Example of area of potential bat and breeding bird access to garage (no evidence 2/4/2026)(above)



Space between garage and treeline (above)

END