

PREPARED FOR

Novus Haus project NH-NW-260725l

SITE LOCATION

5 Fairwood Road, Manchester M23 9JR

ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

October 2026

Ref: UTM/2026/015/FWR-AIA Rev A

URBAN TREE MANAGEMENT

Document Control

Item	Detail
Document reference	UTM/2026/015/FWR-AIA Rev A
Revision	A — first issue
Issue date	09/10/2026
Survey date	03/10/2026
Client	Novus Haus
Site	5 Fairwood Road, Manchester M23 9JR
LPA	Manchester City Council
Author	Carl Riva, Dip Arb ABC L6, MArborA, QTRA
Drawings issued with this report	UTM/2026/015/FWR-TCP Rev A Tree Constraints Plan; UTM/2026/015/FWR-TRP Rev A Tree Retention & Removal Plan; UTM/2026/015/FWR-TPP Rev A Tree Protection Plan (all 1:200 @ A3)
Companion document	UTM/2026/015/FWR-AMS Rev A Arboricultural Method Statement
Third-party plans relied upon	Novus Haus DWG "Location Plan_PROPOSED" (received 09/10/2026); Novus Haus Proposed Drawing Pack P1, 18/09/2026: NH-NW-260725-PL-001 Location + Block Plan, PL-002 Existing vs Proposed, Proposed Floor Plans, PL-900 Design Justification
Copyright	© Urban Tree Management NW Ltd. This report is for the client named above and the Local Planning Authority in connection with the planning application.

Contents

1. Executive Summary 4
2. Introduction 5
3. Site Context and Description 5
4. Tree Survey Methodology 6
5. Tree Categorisation 7
6. Planning Policy Framework 7
7. Statutory Tree Protection 8
8. Foundation Design 8
9. Arboricultural Impact Assessment 10
10. Justification for Tree Loss 11
11. Retained Trees 11
12. RPA Incursion Summary 13
13. Mitigation Measures 13
14. Replacement Planting 14
15. Policy Compliance 14
16. Caveats and Limitations 14
17. About the Author 15
18. Conclusion 15
19. References 15
Appendix 1 — BS 5837 Tree Survey Schedule 17
Appendix 2 — Impact Assessment Table — Urban Tree Management 5-level scale 18
Appendix 3 — Site Photographs 19

1. Executive Summary

Urban Tree Management has been instructed to provide arboricultural advice and guidance to a development proposal at 5 Fairwood Road, Manchester M23 9JR for the proposed extensions to the existing dwelling, a new low front boundary wall with gate and hedging, and an area at the end of the rear garden for a pergola.

A tree survey has been completed in accordance with the recommendations of BS 5837:2012 Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction, and a report prepared to assess the impact of the proposal on the existing tree stock.

The survey recorded a total of 9 trees and 2 groups on and adjacent to the site, 4 of which (T008, T009, T010 and T011) stand outside the site boundary:

- 3 Category B — moderate quality, 20+ years contribution (T008, T009 and T010)
- 8 Category C — low quality, 10–20 years contribution
- 0 Category U — unsuitable for retention

The development proposal will result in the loss of 2 items: T001 (eucalyptus, Category C) and G003 (leylandii and laurel hedging, Category C). T001 stands close to the rear extension, its crown already rests on the roof of the dwelling, and it has a history of stem failure with bark wounds and exposed heartwood. G003 is low-quality hedging that the client intends to remove to accommodate the rear pergola. No Category A or B tree is to be removed.

The remaining 9 trees and groups will be protected from harm during the development phase. Protection measures include protective barriers to BS 5837:2012 Figure 2 forming Construction Exclusion Zones in the rear garden and over the retained grass strip at the front; retention of the existing drive in situ, overlaid with ground protection boards, within the root protection area of the neighbouring tree of heaven (T009); hand and air-spade excavation with engineer-designed root-bridging or mini-pile/pad footings for the front wall and east gate pier within the T009 root protection area; hand-dug, micro-sited post footings with no hard base for the pergola; and hand excavation of the rear extension footing where it meets the edge of the G007 group root protection area.

The client has confirmed that the grass strip along the eastern side of the frontage will be retained as grass with no hard landscaping, and that the hedging and shrubs at the rear boundary will be removed while the small trees there are retained. The architect's pergola zone, as drawn, includes the stems of retained trees T004 and T005; the pergola must therefore be sited in the recommended location shown on the Tree Protection Plan.

Tree losses will be mitigated through a native replacement planting scheme of 3 trees at a 3:1 ratio for T001, with the loss of the G003 hedging compensated by the new hedging along the front boundary.

The proposed construction will have limited adverse impact on the retained tree stock subject to implementation of the measures set out in this AIA (UTM/2026/015/FWR-AIA Rev A) and the AMS (UTM/2026/015/FWR-AMS Rev A).

2. Introduction

2.1 I have been instructed by Novus Haus, the architect for the scheme, to prepare an Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA), Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) and supporting plans for the proposed development at 5 Fairwood Road, Manchester M23 9JR.

2.2 I visited the site and carried out the tree survey on 3 October 2026. Following the survey I set out the tree constraints to the architect so that they could be reflected in the design before the report and plans were prepared. The client's responses (removal of the eucalyptus, removal of rear hedging and shrubs with small rear-boundary trees retained, retention of the eastern grass strip as grass, and gate piers positioned away from the tree of heaven) have been taken into account, together with the revised proposed location plan received on 9 October 2026.

2.3 This assessment considers the arboricultural implications of the proposal in accordance with BS 5837:2012. It identifies trees to be removed and retained, assesses direct and indirect impacts on retained trees, and sets out the mitigation and protection required. Detailed working methods are set out in the companion AMS.

2.4 The following sections of the UTM standard structure do not apply to this scheme and are omitted: boundary or access road compaction (no access road or compacted boundary within the site); level changes, drainage ditches and ground conditions (no level changes are shown on the drawings and no ditch is present); and new access, bridge or culvert (none proposed; the existing vehicle access and dropped kerb are retained).

2.5 This report addresses arboricultural matters only. It does not constitute an ecological assessment, and no inference should be drawn from it about protected species or habitats.

3. Site Context and Description

Site address

3.1 The site is the residential property at 5 Fairwood Road, Manchester M23 9JR, within the administrative area of Manchester City Council. It is a detached two-storey brick dwelling with an integral garage, set on a regular rectangular plot on the south-eastern side of Fairwood Road, between No. 3 to the north-east and No. 7 to the south-west.

Description of site

3.2 The plot is laid out with a front garden onto Fairwood Road, the dwelling in the centre, and an enclosed rear garden. The front garden comprises a lawn to the west and a driveway to the east served by an existing dropped kerb. The driveway is a central concrete strip flanked by paving slabs set in grass, and a narrow grass strip lies between it and the boundary fence with No. 3. A paved side passage runs along the eastern side of the dwelling. A public footway and grass verge separate the front boundary from the carriageway. The rear garden is laid mainly to lawn, with hedging, shrubs and small trees along its rear and side boundaries. The ground is broadly level.

Existing trees and hedgerows

3.3 The survey recorded 9 trees and 2 groups. On site, the trees are concentrated at the rear: eucalyptus T001 and Leyland cypress T002 beside the eastern boundary close to the house; holly T004 and Leyland cypress T005 at the rear boundary; silver birch T006 on the western side of the rear garden; group G003 (leylandii and laurel), a large block wrapping around the south-east corner of the garden along the rear and eastern boundaries; and group G007 (holly and laurel) along the western boundary of the rear garden. All on-site items are Category C.

3.4 Four items stand outside the site. Common beech T008 (Category B) is in the neighbouring garden beyond the rear boundary, and its crown and root protection area extend into the rear of the site. Tree of heaven T009 (Category B) stands in the front garden of No. 3 close to the shared boundary, and its root protection area extends over the eastern grass strip, part of the driveway and the front boundary. Holly T010 (Category B) stands in the grass verge in front of No. 7, and apple T011 (Category C) stands in the verge further east. The RPAs of both have been modified to reflect the carriageway and footway, and neither is affected by the works. Full details are in the Tree Survey Schedule at Appendix 1 and on the Tree Constraints Plan.

Landscape character

3.5 Fairwood Road is a suburban residential street of detached and semi-detached houses with front gardens, grass verges and street trees. The verge holly T010 and the neighbouring tree of heaven T009 are the most visible trees from the street and contribute to the green character of the frontage. The rear-garden trees are largely screened from public view by the dwellings and contribute to private amenity and to the green rear-garden network.

4. Tree Survey Methodology

4.1 The survey was carried out in accordance with BS 5837:2012 by Carl Riva on 3 October 2026 from ground level, using visual tree assessment. No climbing, invasive or decay-detection investigation was undertaken.

4.2 For each tree I recorded species, height, stem diameter at 1.5 m (multi-stem trees measured per stem), crown spread to the four cardinal points, crown clearance, height and direction of the first significant branch, age class, physiological and structural condition, estimated remaining contribution and BS 5837:2012 category. Groups were recorded with representative dimensions.

4.3 Tree positions were recorded on a GPS-enabled survey device and overlaid on the architect's DWG location plan. The positions align with the site boundaries shown on that plan; however, GPS-derived positions carry a tolerance of approximately ±0.5–1.0 m, and tree positions should be verified on site before setting out. T008 is a third-party tree; its dimensions were estimated because access was limited.

4.4 Root Protection Areas (RPAs) have been calculated at 12 times stem diameter (BS 5837:2012, 4.6.1), using the combined diameter for multi-stem trees and groups. Where existing carriageway and footway cover a significant part of the nominal circle (T009, T010 and T011), the RPA has been modified under 4.6.2 to reflect likely root distribution, conserving the full area. The modified RPAs are shown solid on the plans with the

nominal circle dashed. No other tree has existing hard surfacing over 5% or more of its nominal circle. Group canopy outlines (G003, G007) have been traced from aerial imagery, and group RPAs are plotted as an offset of the group's stem line by the calculated RPA radius.

5. Tree Categorisation

5.1 Trees are categorised in accordance with BS 5837:2012 Table 1. Category A: high quality, at least 40 years' contribution. Category B: moderate quality, at least 20 years. Category C: low quality, at least 10 years, or young trees with a stem diameter below 150 mm. Category U: unsuitable for retention. Sub-categories 1, 2 and 3 denote arboricultural, landscape and cultural values.

Category	Items	Count
A	—	0
B	T008, T009 and T010	3
C	T001, T002, G003, T004, T005, T006, G007 and T011	8
U	—	0

6. Planning Policy Framework

6.1 The Local Planning Authority for the site is Manchester City Council. The adopted development plan comprises the Manchester Core Strategy 2012–2027, adopted on 11 July 2012, and Places for Everyone (the joint development plan for nine Greater Manchester districts), adopted on 21 March 2024. Places for Everyone replaced parts of several Core Strategy policies, including part of Policy EN15; the remaining Core Strategy provisions stay in force. A new Manchester Local Plan has reached the Regulation 19 stage, with final consultation held from 17 August to 28 September 2026 and adoption expected in 2027. It is an emerging plan and is noted here but not relied upon as adopted policy.

Key Policies / Provisions	Implications for Arboriculture in New Development
Places for Everyone Policy JP-G7: Trees and Woodland	Existing trees are to be treated as a design constraint and protected, with new planting to increase tree cover. This report identifies the trees to be retained, the protection required, and replacement planting for the trees lost.
Places for Everyone Policy JP-G2: Green Infrastructure Network	Development should protect and enhance green infrastructure. Retaining the boundary trees, the street-frontage trees (T009, T010) and the eastern grass strip, and adding new hedging, maintains the site's contribution to the local network.
Places for Everyone Policy JP-G8: A Net Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geodiversity	Development should deliver a net enhancement of biodiversity. Householder applications are exempt from statutory biodiversity net gain; the replacement trees and new native hedging nonetheless provide enhancement.
Places for Everyone Policy JP-P1: Sustainable Places	Development should be well designed and integrate with its surroundings, including landscape. The retention-led layout and new frontage hedging support this.
Manchester Core Strategy Policy EN9 (Green Infrastructure)	Development should maintain existing green infrastructure and, where possible, enhance it. Retained trees are protected under the measures in this report and the AMS.
Manchester Core Strategy Policy DM1 (Development Management)	Development is assessed against a range of considerations, including its effect on the character of the area and the landscape.

Key Policies / Provisions	Implications for Arboriculture in New Development
	The scheme retains the street-frontage trees and the eastern grass strip.
NPPF (August 2026) Policy N3 (Trees in New Development)	Trees should be integral to the design process from the outset: existing trees retained and integrated, new planting incorporated, and long-term management provided for. The constraints were set out to the architect before the design was fixed, and the design has been revised to reflect them.
NPPF (August 2026) Policies DP3 and N2	New development should include green infrastructure, with tree planting and nature-based solutions. Replacement planting and new hedging are proposed.
NPPF (August 2026) Policy N6 (irreplaceable habitats)	The loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats, including ancient and veteran trees, is to be refused. No ancient or veteran trees are present or affected.

6.2 This report has been prepared against the adopted policy basis set out above. The retention strategy, protection measures and replacement planting in Sections 9 to 14 are consistent with Places for Everyone Policy JP-G7 and NPPF Policy N3.

6.3 Under the Forestry Act 1967, a felling licence from the Forestry Commission is not required to fell trees in a garden (section 9(2)(b)), or where felling is immediately required to carry out development authorised by planning permission (section 9(4)(d)).

7. Statutory Tree Protection

7.1 No statutory designation affecting the surveyed trees was recorded at the time of survey. The status of the trees should be confirmed with Manchester City Council before any tree works are carried out, and this report should be updated if a designation is identified.

7.2 T008, T009, T010 and T011 are not within the client's ownership. Works to them, including the crown lift of T009 recommended in the survey, require the agreement of the owner (T008, T009) or the highway authority (T010). The common-law right to cut back overhanging branches to the boundary does not extend to work beyond the boundary or to work that would damage the tree.

8. Foundation Design

8.1 Foundation design is the responsibility of the structural engineer. The extensions fall outside the RPAs of all retained trees except the edge of the G007 group RPA, T001 being removed.

8.2 Standard strip or trench-fill foundations are not acceptable for the front boundary wall, the east gate pier or the north-east return wall where these fall within the RPA of T009, or for any pergola footing within the RPAs of T004, T005, T006 and T008. Where the rear extension enters the edge of the G007 RPA, the trench is to be hand-dug with roots retained, or the engineer's design adjusted to bridge them.

8.3 The following information is required from the structural engineer before work starts on these elements:

- Footing design for the front wall, gate pier and return wall within the T009 RPA (root-bridging lintel, pad or mini-pile), with locations
- Existing and proposed levels showing no excavation beyond the footing positions

- Pergola post footing design (individual hand-dug pads or ground screws), with no continuous base

8.4 Working methods for these operations are set out in the AMS.

9. Arboricultural Impact Assessment

9.1 The assessment uses Urban Tree Management's 5-level Impact Level scale. Each identified impact is assigned a level of Major, Moderate, Minor, Negligible or No Change, and identified as adverse or beneficial. The full Impact Assessment Table is reproduced at Appendix 2. Mitigation follows the standard hierarchy: Avoid, Reduce, Mitigate, Compensate. Where a residual impact remains after mitigation, it is reported as the post-mitigation Impact Level. Percentage figures are given in bands because the architect's layout is at location-plan scale.

Tree	Cat.	Source of impact	Impact Level (pre)	Impact Level (post)	Adv. / Ben.	Mitigation summary
T001	C	Removal to facilitate rear extension; crown conflicts with existing roof and proposed extension	Minor	Minor	Adverse	Removal of a Category C tree in poor structural condition; replacement planting at 3:1 (3 trees)
T002	C	Rear extension and construction activity nearby; no works within RPA	Negligible	No Change	Adverse	Protective barrier at RPA edge (CEZ); no storage or access within RPA
G003	C	Removal by client to accommodate pergola (hedging)	Minor	Minor	Adverse	Low-quality hedging; compensated by new front boundary hedging and replacement trees
T004	C	Architect's indicative pergola zone covers stem and 30–40% of RPA	Moderate	Negligible	Adverse	Pergola sited in recommended location clear of crown; RPA within CEZ; any posts within RPA hand-dug
T005	C	Architect's indicative pergola zone covers stem and 40–50% of RPA	Moderate	Negligible	Adverse	As T004
T006	C	Rear extension and construction activity nearby; no works within RPA	Negligible	No Change	Adverse	RPA within CEZ; scaffold and access kept outside RPA
G007	C	Rear extension footprint at the edge of the RPA (<5% of RPA)	Minor	Negligible	Adverse	Hand excavation of the foundation trench where it enters the RPA, roots ≥25 mm retained; remainder of RPA within CEZ
T008	B	Pergola post footings within RPA (recommended location overlaps 10–20% of RPA); third-party tree	Minor	Negligible	Adverse	Posts hand-dug and micro-sited to avoid roots ≥25 mm; no slab or hard base; no level change
T009	B	Front wall, east gate pier and NE return wall within RPA (5–10% of RPA in special engineering zone); hedge planting in retained grass strip (10–20%); existing drive retained (20–30%); crown lift to 4.0 m	Moderate	Negligible	Adverse	Engineer-designed root-bridging or mini-pile/pad footings; hand/air-spade excavation; grass strip retained as soft ground (CEZ); drive retained beneath ground protection boards; pruning to BS 3998:2010 with owner agreement
T010	B	Front boundary wall at edge of nominal RPA circle; modified RPA confined to verge, no works within it	Negligible	No Change	Adverse	Hand excavation of wall footing at the western end of the frontage
T011	C	No works within modified RPA (verge)	No Change	No Change	—	None required

10. Justification for Tree Loss

T001 — Eucalyptus (Category C)

10.1 T001 is a mature eucalyptus of 14 m height and 450 mm stem diameter, standing close to the eastern boundary beside the rear of the dwelling. The survey recorded a suppressed crown and growth form, historical stem failure, bark wounds with exposed heartwood, over-extended limbs resting on the roof of the dwelling, and a low crown. It is categorised C, with an estimated remaining contribution of 10–20 years.

10.2 The rear extension brings the building line closer to the tree. The new footprint enters the edge of its RPA, and the crown already conflicts with the existing roof and would conflict with the extension. At this proximity, the root protection area incursion and the pruning needed to give clearance are beyond what can be justified for a tree of this condition. Its structural defects and the existing contact with the dwelling would in any case require significant intervention. Removal is therefore recommended. The loss is compensated by replacement planting at 3:1.

G003 — Leyland cypress and laurel (Category C)

10.3 G003 is a semi-mature group of leylandii and laurel, three stems of 175 mm, forming a substantial block of hedging that wraps around the south-east corner of the garden, along the eastern half of the rear boundary and north along the eastern boundary towards T002. It is Category C. It stands within the area at the end of the garden that the architect has identified for a pergola, and the client has confirmed that the hedging and shrubs at the rear boundary will be removed while the small trees there are retained. G003 is low-quality, readily replaceable hedging of limited landscape contribution. Its loss is compensated by the new native hedging proposed along the front boundary.

11. Retained Trees

11.1 The key constraints for each retained tree affected by the proposal are summarised below. T011 is unaffected by the proposed works and requires no action.

T002 — Leyland cypress (Category C)

11.2 T002 stands beside the eastern boundary, south of T001. The extension falls outside its RPA. Its RPA will be enclosed within the rear Construction Exclusion Zone, with the barrier positioned to keep working space clear around the extension.

T004, T005, T006 and G007 — rear garden trees (Category C)

11.3 Holly T004, Leyland cypress T005, silver birch T006 and the holly and laurel of G007 are the small trees in the rear garden that the client wishes to retain. T006 and G007 stand on the western side of the garden, closer to the dwelling. The rear extension reaches the edge of the RPA of G007 (<5%); the foundation trench in that section is to be hand-dug, retaining roots of 25 mm or more (AMS Section 8). T006's RPA is not entered, but its crown is close enough to the extension that scaffold and access must be kept outside its RPA. The pergola zone shown on the architect's plan runs the full width of the rear boundary. It includes the stems of T004 and T005 and covers 30–40% and 40–50% of their RPAs respectively. A pergola within that full zone would conflict with the stems and

low crowns of T004 and T005. T006 and G007 stand closer to the dwelling, outside the pergola zone.

11.4 Once G003 is removed, there is space in the central and eastern part of the zone, clear of the crowns of T004, T005, T006, G007 and T008. This is shown as the recommended pergola location on the Tree Protection Plan. It overlaps <5% of the RPA of T004 and does not enter the RPAs of T005, T006 or G007. The pergola should be sited there, as a post-supported structure with hand-dug footings and no slab or continuous hard base.

T008 — Common beech (Category B, third-party)

11.5 T008 stands in the neighbouring garden beyond the rear boundary. Its RPA extends into the rear of the site, and the recommended pergola location overlaps 10–20% of it. Only individual post footings would be excavated. These are to be hand-dug and micro-sited to avoid roots of 25 mm diameter or more, with no level change, slab or compaction. The part of the RPA within the site is within the CEZ during construction.

T009 — Tree of heaven (Category B, third-party)

11.6 T009 stands in the front garden of No. 3 close to the shared boundary. Its modified RPA covers 40–50% of its area within the site, including the eastern grass strip (10–20% of the RPA), part of the existing driveway (20–30%) and the eastern end of the proposed front wall, the east gate pier and the north-east return wall (5–10% in the special engineering zone).

11.7 The client has confirmed that the eastern grass strip will remain as grass with no hard landscaping. Hedge planting in the strip is to be carried out by hand without rotavation. The existing driveway, a concrete strip with slabs set in grass, is retained without lifting, excavation or resurfacing. Because it is not a continuous hard surface, it is to be overlaid with ground protection boards within the RPA for the duration of the works. The east gate pier and the walls within the RPA require engineer-designed footings that bridge roots, set out using hand or air-spade excavation (AMS Section 8). The architect has confirmed that gate piers will be positioned away from the tree; any pier that remains within the RPA shown on the TPP is to be founded in this way.

11.8 The survey recommends a crown lift to 4.0 m to give clearance over the frontage. As T009 is a third-party tree, this requires the owner's agreement. Tree of heaven is prone to root suckering when roots are disturbed or damaged; the hand-dig methods required within its RPA also reduce this risk.

T010 — Holly (Category B, highway verge)

11.9 T010 stands in the grass verge between the carriageway and the footway. Its RPA has been modified to the verge, where rooting is most likely, with the full area conserved. No works fall within the modified RPA. The western end of the proposed front wall lies at the edge of the nominal RPA circle; as a precaution, the wall footing in that section is to be hand-excavated (AMS Section 8).

Future growth, daylight and sunlight

11.10 The retained trees are mostly small, evergreen boundary trees whose future growth can be managed by routine pruning. T008 and T009 are larger third-party trees whose crowns will continue to extend over the rear boundary and the frontage. They may require periodic crown lifting or cutting back to the boundary, which should be agreed with their

owners. Seasonal leaf, seed and fruit fall from T008 and T009 will reach the rear garden, the pergola and the driveway. T009 seeds freely and may produce suckers, so the grass strip should be kept under regular management.

11.11 The extensions are on the opposite side of the dwelling from T008 and well clear of T009 and T010, so the retained trees will not cause significant new shading of the principal rooms. T001, which currently overhangs the dwelling, is to be removed. The pergola lies beneath the edge of the T008 crown in the morning shade of the rear boundary trees, which is compatible with its proposed use as a shaded seating area.

11.12 I have not been supplied with any detailed site soil analysis. Where foundations are designed near retained or removed trees on shrinkable soils, the structural engineer should take account of the influence of the trees in accordance with the relevant guidance.

12. RPA Incursion Summary

Tree	Cat.	RPA radius (m) / area (m²)	Works within RPA (band of RPA area)	Construction method
T002	C	3.60 / 40.7	None	CEZ barrier
T004	C	3.60 / 40.7	Recommended pergola location: <5%	CEZ; any post within RPA hand-dug
T005	C	1.50 / 7.1	Recommended pergola location: None	CEZ; any post within RPA hand-dug
T006	C	1.62 / 8.2	None	CEZ; scaffold kept outside RPA
G007	C	1.80 / 10.2	Rear extension footprint at RPA edge (<5%)	Hand-dug foundation trench in that section; CEZ
T008	B	5.70 / 102.1	Pergola post footings (recommended location overlaps 10–20%)	Hand-dug, micro-sited posts; no hard base
T009	B	5.10 / 81.7 (mod.)	Front wall / gate pier footings (5–10%); hedge planting in grass strip (10–20%); existing drive retained (20–30%)	Engineer-designed root-bridging footings, hand/air-spade dig; grass retained; existing drive retained and overlaid with ground protection boards
T010	B	3.73 / 43.8 (mod.)	None within modified RPA (wall at edge of nominal circle)	Hand-dig wall footing, western end

12.1 RPA incursion by permanent hard surfacing or structures is held well below the 20% guidance threshold of BS 5837:2012 for every retained tree. In each case the works are limited to discrete or hand-dug footings, or to soft landscaping carried out by hand.

13. Mitigation Measures

- **Avoid:** the extensions are kept outside the RPAs of all retained trees except the edge of the G007 RPA; the eastern grass strip is retained as soft ground; the pergola is relocated clear of the stems and crowns of T004 and T005.
- **Reduce:** front wall and gate pier footings within the T009 RPA are engineered to bridge roots; the existing driveway is retained unaltered beneath ground protection boards; pergola footings are discrete and hand-dug.
- **Mitigate:** protective barriers form Construction Exclusion Zones before work starts; ground protection boards are laid over the existing drive within the T009 RPA; supervision and a dated photographic record are kept at the stages set out in the AMS.
- **Compensate:** 3 replacement trees for the loss of T001, and new native hedging along the front boundary in place of G003.

13.1 Services and drainage are not shown on the drawings. They are to be routed outside the RPAs of retained trees. If any run within an RPA proves unavoidable, it is to be installed by trenchless methods or hand or air-spade excavation in accordance with BS 5837:2012 and NJUG Volume 4, as set out in the AMS.

14. Replacement Planting

14.1 In line with Urban Tree Management's replacement ratios, the loss of Category C tree T001 is compensated at 3:1, giving 3 replacement trees. The loss of the G003 hedging is compensated proportionately by the new hedging along the front boundary, which the architect shows as soft landscaping and hedging up to 2.0 m high.

14.2 The replacement trees should be of UK or Irish native provenance and of a size suited to a domestic garden, for example rowan (Sorbus aucuparia), field maple (Acer campestre) or wild cherry (Prunus avium). They should be planted outside the RPAs of retained trees and well away from the dwelling, in the rear garden or the western part of the front lawn, at 10–12 cm girth to BS 8545:2014. Hedging should be predominantly native (for example hawthorn, hornbeam, field maple and holly). Planting is to be maintained for two years after planting, with failures replaced, and the scheme is to be secured by condition and agreed with the LPA.

15. Policy Compliance

Policy	Where compliance is demonstrated
PfE JP-G7 Trees and Woodland	Sections 9–14: retention of all Category B trees, protection measures, 3:1 replacement planting
PfE JP-G2 / Core Strategy EN9 Green Infrastructure	Sections 11, 13 and 14: retained frontage trees and grass strip, new hedging
PfE JP-G8 Biodiversity	Section 14: native replacement trees and hedging
NPPF N3 Trees in New Development	Section 2: constraints provided before the design was fixed and reflected in the revised layout
NPPF N6 Irreplaceable habitats	Section 6: no ancient or veteran trees affected

16. Caveats and Limitations

16.1 The survey was a ground-level visual assessment. No aerial, invasive or root investigation was undertaken. Third-party trees were inspected from within the site and the public highway; the dimensions of T008 are estimated.

16.2 Tree positions are GPS-derived and have been overlaid on the architect's DWG location plan, which is drawn on the architect's local grid. Positions carry a tolerance of approximately ±0.5–1.0 m. Distances and areas on the plans are indicative and should be checked on site before setting out. Impact percentages are given in bands for this reason.

16.3 This report relies on the architect's location plan and drawing pack listed in the Document Control table. Changes to the design may alter the findings and will require a revised report.

16.4 This report addresses arboricultural matters under BS 5837:2012 only. It is not an ecological assessment, a tree risk assessment or a structural or engineering appraisal.

16.5 Recommendations in this report are valid for one year from the date of the report unless otherwise stated. Changes to the site, tree condition or surrounding environment may

invalidate the findings before then, and re-inspection is recommended if any such changes occur.

17. About the Author

17.1 This assessment has been prepared by Carl Riva (Dip Arb ABC L6, MArborA, QTRA) of Urban Tree Management.

17.2 I confirm that I am a Professional Member of the Arboricultural Association and hold the Royal Forestry Society Certificate in Arboriculture and the ABC Level 6 Diploma in Arboriculture. I hold the LANTRA Professional Tree Inspection qualification and am qualified in Quantified Tree Risk Assessment (QTRA). I am qualified and experienced to produce BS 5837:2012 reports.

18. Conclusion

18.1 The proposal requires the removal of two Category C items: eucalyptus T001, which is in poor structural condition and in direct conflict with the dwelling and the rear extension, and hedging G003. No Category A or B tree is affected by removal.

18.2 The design has been revised to reflect the constraints I identified. The eastern grass strip within the RPA of the neighbouring tree of heaven T009 will remain soft, and the gate piers will be moved away from the tree. Subject to the pergola being sited in the recommended location, the front wall and pier footings within the T009 RPA being designed to bridge roots, and the protection set out in the AMS, the retained trees can be protected successfully. The residual impacts are Negligible or No Change for every retained tree.

18.3 It is my opinion that the proposal is acceptable in arboricultural terms and complies with the tree and green infrastructure policies of the development plan and the NPPF.

Tree inspection, report prepared, authorised, and signed by:

Carl Riva
Dip Arb ABC L6, MArborA (Professional Member, Arboricultural Association)
QTRA | LANTRA Professional Tree Inspection
Date: 09/10/2026

Urban Tree Management NW Ltd
T: 0800 222 9529
M: 07765 858090
W: www.urbantreemanagement.co.uk

19. References

- British Standards Institution (2012) BS 5837:2012 — Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction. London: BSI.
- British Standards Institution (2010) BS 3998:2010 — Tree Work: Recommendations. London: BSI.
- British Standards Institution (2014) BS 8545:2014 — Trees: from nursery to independence in the landscape. London: BSI.
- Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (2026) National Planning Policy Framework (August 2026).
- Greater Manchester Combined Authority (2024) Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document, adopted 21 March 2024.
- Manchester City Council (2012) Manchester Core Strategy 2012–2027, adopted 11 July 2012.
- National Joint Utilities Group (2007) NJUG Volume 4, Issue 2: Guidelines for the Planning, Installation and Maintenance of Utility Apparatus in Proximity to Trees.
- Forestry Act 1967.
- Mattheck, C. and Breloer, H. (1994) The Body Language of Trees. HMSO.

Appendix 1 — BS 5837 Tree Survey Schedule

ID	Species	Age	Ht (m)	Stem(s) (mm)	Calc. dia. (mm)	Spread N/E/S/W (m)	Crown clearance N/E/S/W (m)	First branch (m, dir.)	Physiological / structural	Est. contribution	Cat.	RPA r (m)	RPA (m²)	Observations	Recommendation	Status
T001	Eucalyptus (Eucalyptus sp.)	Mature	14.0	450	450	6.0/4.8/4.2/7.3	6.0/6.5/4.2/2.5	2	Fair / Fair	10 to 20 yrs	C2	5.40	91.6	Suppressed crown and growth. Historical stem failure. Bark wounds. Exposed heartwood. Over extending limbs lay in roof. Potential direct damage. Low crown.	Fell to ground level	Remove
T002	Leyland Cypress (x Cuprocyparis leylandii)	Semi-mature	7.5	300	300	1.5/1.5/1.5/1.5	0.0/0.0/0.0/0.0	N 0	Fair / Good	10 to 20 yrs	C2	3.60	40.7	Suppressed crown. Included fork.	No action	Retain
G003	Leyland cypress, laurel (x Cuprocyparis leylandii, Prunus laurocerasus)	Semi-mature	8.5	3 × 175	303	2.0/4.0/1.5/3.0	0.0/0.0/0.0/0.0	N 0	Fair / Good	10 to 20 yrs	C2	3.64	41.6	Group of leylandii and laurel.	No action	Remove
T004	Common Holly (Ilex aquifolium)	Mature	8.0	300	300	2.5/2.5/3.0/2.5	1.2/1.5/1.0/1.5	N 2	Fair / Good	10 to 20 yrs	C2	3.60	40.7	Cross rubbing branches.	No action	Retain
T005	Leyland Cypress (x Cuprocyparis leylandii)	Young	6.5	125	125	0.8/1.0/0.8/0.8	1.0/1.0/1.0/1.0	N 0	Fair / Good	10 to 20 yrs	C2	1.50	7.1		No action	Retain
T006	Silver Birch (Betula pendula)	Semi-mature	7.5	135	135	1.5/1.2/1.5/1.3	2.0/2.0/2.0/2.0	N 1	Fair / Good	10 to 20 yrs	C2	1.62	8.2	6.0 m from the property.	No action	Retain
G007	Holly, laurel (Ilex aquifolium, Prunus laurocerasus)	Young	4.2	4 × 75	150	2.5/1.0/2.5/0.6	0.0/0.0/0.0/0.0	N 0	Fair / Good	10 to 20 yrs	C2	1.80	10.2	Group of holly, laurel.	No action	Retain
T008	Common Beech (Fagus sylvatica)	Mature	9.0*	475	475	3.0/3.0/3.0/3.0	2.0/2.0/2.0/2.0	N 2	Fair / Good	20 to 40 yrs	B2	5.70	102.1	Third party tree. Limited inspection due to access.	No action	Retain
T009	Tree of Heaven (Ailanthus altissima)	Mature	13.0	425	425	5.0/5.0/4.2/5.5	4.0/4.0/1.0/1.2	W 2	Fair / Good	20 to 40 yrs	B2	5.10	81.7	Branch rip. Minor deadwood. Low crown.	Crown lift to 4.0 m (owner agreement required)	Retain
T010	Common Holly (Ilex aquifolium)	Mature	7.5	225 / 125 / 175	311	2.0/2.0/2.0/2.0	1.5/1.5/1.5/1.5	N 2	Fair / Fair	20 to 40 yrs	B2	3.73	43.8	RPA modified due to location. See photos. Included fork and bark.	No action	Retain
T011	Apple (Malus sp.)	Semi-mature	4.5	185	185	2.0/2.0/1.5/2.0	2.0/2.0/2.0/2.0	N 2	Fair / Good	10 to 20 yrs	C2	2.22	15.5		No action	Retain

* Estimated. Multi-stem RPAs use the combined diameter (BS 5837:2012, 4.6.1). The RPAs of T009, T010 and T011 are modified under 4.6.2 with the area conserved (see TCP); group RPAs (G003, G007) are plotted as an offset of the stem line. T008, T009, T010 and T011 are outside the site. Sub-category: 2 = landscape values.

Appendix 2 — Impact Assessment Table — Urban Tree Management 5-level scale

This appendix reproduces the Urban Tree Management house standard Impact Level scale used in Section 9.

Impact Level	Adverse Impact Definition	Beneficial Impact Definition	Category Considerations	Examples
Major	Significant harm leading to irreversible damage or loss of tree health, structure, or long-term sustainability.	Significant improvement to tree health, structure, or long-term sustainability.	High-value trees (Category A or B) most affected or benefited. Strict protection for harm; strategic enhancement for benefit.	Adverse: Root severance causing instability; substantial canopy loss; soil compaction beyond recovery. Beneficial: Large-scale planting (e.g. 50+ trees); comprehensive tree management plan improving soil and canopy health.
Moderate	Noticeable impact that may weaken tree vitality but can be mitigated with remedial measures.	Noticeable improvement that enhances vitality and resilience.	Applies mainly to Category B and C trees. Mitigation or enhancement strategies required.	Adverse: Minor root disturbance; partial canopy reduction; temporary soil degradation. Beneficial: Targeted pruning to improve structure; soil amelioration; improved irrigation systems.
Minor	Slight but measurable change that has minimal effect on tree health and can be managed through routine care.	Slight but measurable improvement to tree health or condition.	Benefits or affects all categories but with limited long-term effect.	Adverse: Small pruning wounds; minor soil disturbance; temporary stress due to nearby works. Beneficial: Routine maintenance; minor pruning for form; small-scale planting.
Negligible	Insignificant impact with no measurable effect on tree health or sustainability.	Insignificant improvement with no measurable effect on tree health or sustainability.	Applies broadly; minimal intervention required.	Adverse: Short-term minor vibrations; light foot traffic; non-intrusive activity near the tree. Beneficial: Cosmetic changes; minimal planting without ecological benefit.
No Change	No discernible impact on the tree's health, condition, or future sustainability.	No discernible improvement to the tree's health, condition, or future sustainability.	Trees in all categories remain unaffected.	Works conducted outside the root protection area; activities having zero interaction with the tree.

Application notes:

- Each impact identified in Section 9 is assigned an Impact Level and labelled as either adverse or beneficial.
- Pre-mitigation and post-mitigation Impact Levels are stated separately where mitigation alters the rating.
- The category considerations column anchors the rating against the BS 5837:2012 quality category of the affected tree.
- The examples column is provided as a sanity check that the level chosen is proportionate to the worked precedents.

Appendix 3 — Site Photographs

Photographs taken at the survey on 3 October 2026.



Photo 1: Frontage from the Fairwood Road footway: driveway (concrete strip with slabs in grass), front lawn, and the crown of T009 over the drive.



Photo 2: Frontage looking towards the road: driveway and eastern grass strip, with T009 beyond the boundary fence.



Photo 3: T009 tree of heaven in the front garden of No. 3, beside the eastern grass strip.



Photo 4: T010 holly in the grass verge, with the footway between the tree and the frontage.



Photo 5: East side passage looking north to the frontage, with T009 beyond.



Photo 6: East side passage looking south to T001 eucalyptus, with T002 Leyland cypress behind.



Photo 7: Rear elevation with T001 eucalyptus; its crown extends over the roof. T002 to the right.



Photo 8: Rear elevation and T001, showing limbs extending over the dwelling.



Photo 9: G003 leylandii and laurel hedging at the rear boundary.



Photo 10: Rear boundary: G003 (left) and T004 holly (right).



Photo 11: Rear boundary: T004 holly and T005 Leyland cypress.



Photo 12: Rear boundary: T004, T005 and T006 silver birch (right).



Photo 13: T006 silver birch with shrubs of G007 at its base; rear elevation beyond.



Photo 14: T006 and G007 from the rear garden.



Photo 15: G007 and T006 at the western boundary.