HPN 2012 . 0408

acsconsulting
arboricultural consultants

29 OCT 2012

Burrfields Road, Chapel-en-le-Frith

Arboricultural Survey and Constraints Report

May 2012

Client:

HEYROSE Property Group
No.1 Booths Park,
Chelford Road,
Knutsford,
Cheshire
WA16 8QZ

Consultant:

ACS Consulting
9 – 11 Princess Street
Knutsford
WA16 6BY

Report Reference: 2629/DR.12

	Name	Signature	Date
Originator	IRM	[redacted]	May 2012
Checked By	SPT		May 2012
Approved By	IRM		May 2012

Document Revision Record

Issue No	Date	Details of Revisions
1	May 2012	Original issue

LIMITATION

ACS Consulting (ACS) has prepared this Report for the sole use of Heyrose Property Group and their client in accordance with the Agreement under which our services were performed. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this Report or any other services provided by us. This Report may not be relied upon by any other party without the prior and express written agreement of ACS. Unless otherwise stated in this Report, the assessments made assume that the sites and facilities will continue to be used for their current purpose without significant change. The conclusions and recommendations contained in this Report are based upon information provided by others and upon the assumption that all relevant information has been provided by those parties from whom it has been requested. Information obtained from third parties has not been independently verified by ACS, unless otherwise stated in the Report.

CONTENTS

		Page
TITLE OF ASSESSMENT – Arboricultural Constraints Survey		
Chapter 1	Introduction	5
Chapter 2	Background	6
Chapter 3	Tree Survey	8
Chapter 4	Constraints and Opportunities	10
Chapter 5	Conclusions	12
DRAWING(S)		
2629/AC/01	Arboricultural Constraints Plan	
APPENDICES		
1	Spread Sheets	

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.01 A. C. S. Consulting is instructed by Heyrose Property Group Ltd, Knutsford, to advise on trees and the constraints on development at an industrial site in Chapel-en-le-Frith. The survey and report is undertaken by Ian Murat, a Registered Consultant of the Arboricultural Association.

1.02 The assessment identifies trees and discusses their suitability to be retained on the site.

The survey identifies:

- Trees that are undesirable to be retained because of structural or other defects.
- Trees that can be retained with an acceptable level of risk and the measures that are required to ensure their long term retention.

1.03 The site was visited during May 2012 and a survey of the trees was completed recording; *species type, age, height, crown spread, diameter-at-breast-height, and condition.*

1.04 The report contains information regarding the trees and the protection requirements of those trees considered desirable or highly desirable to be retained.

1.05 All the trees have been summarised in the tables in Appendix 1 and are to be read in conjunction with the Arboricultural Constraints Plan No. 2629/AC/01.

Copyright of ACS Consulting. All rights described in Chapter IV of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 have been generally asserted ©, May 2012.

would have some impact but the removal would be mitigated by the linear group of beech (5729).

Phase 1 Bat Survey

3.06 As part of the assessment a Phase 1 Bat survey was undertaken. The object of this survey was to establish, where possible, whether any of the trees are used by bats and, if necessary, recommend further work in order to advise on mitigation measures. Trees have been classified into the four groups: Low Potential, Medium Potential/Unknown, High Potential and Confirmed.

No/Low Potential: *Trees that have no or limited features suitable for roosting.*
Medium Potential/Unknown: *Trees that have a number of features suitable for bats. Limited or ambiguous features observed giving rise to roosting potential.*
High Potential*: Significant specimens containing many features suitable for bat roosting but no signs of bat roosting.*
Confirmed: *Signs of bat roosting or actual bats in occupation found.*

3.07 All the trees were assessed as part of the survey. A high-powered torch, extendable ladders and an endoscope were available during the inspection. Many features that give rise to concerns about tree safety are suitable for bats – cavities, cracks and splits in stems and branches, flaking bark with some attachment, very dense epicormic growth and ivy to some degree.

3.08 All the trees were considered to be of low potential. The survey was a Phase 1 Survey and therefore has a number of limitations particularly with the majority of the trees in full leaf cover. Before any work is undertaken, the trees should be re-inspected for the presence of bats. An activity survey would be inappropriate due to the time of year. The appointed contractor should also be aware and provide an appropriate Risk Assessment as part of the works. An online search via NBN web site identified a number of bat species within a 2-kilometre square of the site but no specific records for the location.

4.0 DEVELOPMENT ASPECTS

4.01 The Constraints Plan (2629/AC/01) identifies the primary and secondary developable areas in respect of trees.

Primary Developable Areas

4.02 The Constraints Plan identifies tree condition, the corresponding Root Protection Area (RPA) for those trees that are considered suitable to be retained and their potential shade cast. The principle influence on the site's development potential is from those trees located on the boundary – Trees 5716, 5717, 5718, and those located on the lawn area – 5726, 5727, 5728, 5729, 5730, 5732, 5734 and 5736.

4.03 The plan clearly shows the RPA requirements for the trees. The plan also shows predicted areas of shade cast by trees using the 45° rule of thumb.

> *The sun is 45º or more above the horizon from mid-April to mid-August, between approximately 11.00am and 3.00pm (British Summer Time). If a tree is no closer to a property than its ultimate mature height, the sun will be above the tree's canopy during those periods, and that property will receive reasonable levels of sunlight and daylight.*

The shade cast by the trees in the woodland is increased due to the significant difference in height of the woodland and the ground beyond the retaining wall. The primary developable area also takes into account dominance caused by trees which can lead to unsympathetic pruning or felling.

Opportunities

4.04 There are few additional opportunities available at the site that can increase the developable footprint. The Constraints Plan shows the secondary developable area. This can be developed where such issues as shade and dominance are not a factor such as gable walls, garages, drives/car parks and access roads.
Whilst it is acknowledged that *all* trees within the planning process are a material consideration, it is generally accepted that those trees rated as C or R are excluded from consideration regarding development implications, retained only where they pose no constraint on development.

4.05 Development should seek to retain those trees identified as of High Quality and Value (Green) and Moderate Quality and Value (Blue). Development should not breach the RPA areas marked on the plan and shade and dominance should be taken into account particularly in the location of high-light demanding rooms and private amenity space.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

Summary

5.01 The site comprises an existing manufacturing site with associated car parking and offices. The trees are located to the site's boundaries, which gives them a high amenity value. An Arboricultural Constraints Plan (2629/AC/01) has been produced.

Conclusions

5.02 The Constraints Plan identifies trees and details their RPA requirements, canopy spread and potential shade cast based on the 45° Rule of Thumb. Layouts should seek to have a sympathetic relationship with trees based on the parameters given on the Constraints Plan. The site has a number of mediocre trees that are considered to be of low quality and value. Their loss for development would have no influence on the treed character of the site or visual amenity. It is recommended that a Bat Survey is undertaken promptly as bats are emerging and there is an opportunity to detect bats flying at night.

I Murat MSc., F.Arbor.A., CEnv., MIEEM
ACS Consulting
May 2012

Appendix 1

CONTENTS

Key

BS5837: 2012

Tree Tables

acsconsulting
arboricultural consultants

KEY

Age	Y – Young: Out-planted 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 of 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
Physiological Condition	Good – Very few defects a reasonable long life expectancy depending on age class Adequate – Some defects giving the tree a shortened life expectancy Poor – Limited life with major problems
Structural Condition	Good – Very few defects Adequate – Some defects rectifiable with minor tree surgery Poor – Significant defects only rectifiable with major tree surgery or felling

Table 1 – Cascade chart for tree quality assessment

Category and definition	Criteria (including subcategories where appropriate)			Identification on Plan
Trees unsuitable for retention (see Note)				
Category U Those in such a condition that they cannot realistically be retained as living trees in the context of the current land use for longer than 10 years.	• Trees that have a serious, irremediable, structural defect, such that their early loss is expected due to collapse, including those that will become unviable after removal of other U category trees (i.e. where, for whatever reason, the loss of companion shelter cannot be mitigated by pruning). • 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, or very low quality trees suppressing adjacent trees of better quality. *NOTE Category U trees can have existing or potential conservation value which might be desirable to preserve; see 4.5.7*			RED
	1 Mainly arboricultural qualities	**2 Mainly landscape qualities**	**3 Mainly cultural values, including conservation.**	
Trees to be considered for retention				
Category A **Trees of high quality** with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 40 years	Trees that are particularly good examples of their species, especially if rare or unusual, or essential components of groups, or of formal or semi-formal arboricultural features (e.g. the dormant and/or principal trees within an avenue)	Trees, groups or woodlands of particular visual importance as arboricultural and/or landscape features.	Trees, groups or woodlands of significant conservation, historical, commemorative or other value (e.g. veteran trees or wood-pasture)	GREEN
Category B **Tress of moderate quality** with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 20 years.	Trees that might be included in category A, but are downgraded because of impaired condition (e.g. presence of significant though remediable defects, including unsympathetic past management and storm damage), such that they are unlikely to be suitable for retention for beyond 40 years; or trees lacking the special quality necessary to merit the category A designation.	Trees present in numbers, usually growing as groups or woodlands, such that they attract a higher collective rating than they might as individuals; or trees occurring as collectives but situated so as to make little visual contribution to the wider locality.	Trees with material conservation or other cultural value.	BLUE
Category C **Tress of low quality** with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 10 years, or young trees with a stem diameter below 150 mm.	Unremarkable trees of very limited merit or such impaired condition that they do not qualify in higher categories.	Trees present in groups or woodlands, but without this conferring on them significantly greater collective landscape value, and/or trees offering low or only temporary/transient landscape benefits.	Trees with no material conservation or other cultural benefits	GREY

Tree Ref No.	Species	Height M	Stem Diameter MM	Branch Spread M	Height of Crown Clearance M	Age Class	Physiological Condition	Structural Condition	Preliminary Management Recommendations/ Comments	Estimated Remaining Contribution Years	Category Grading
5715	Mixed Hardwood	10	<500	N 5 E 5 S 5 W 5	0	SM	Adequate/Poor	Adequate/ Poor	A group of self set ash, willow, sycamore. A group of low quality and value with limited visual amenity.	20+	C1/2
5716	Sycamore	15	<500	N 5 E 5 S 5 W 5	3	M	Adequate	Adequate	Linear group of sycamore, located on bank, restricted root development. A group of moderate quality and value.	40+	B1/2
5717	Sycamore	16	1200	N 6 E 6 S 3 W 6	5	M	Good	Good	Significant specimen. Restricted root development. A tree of moderate quality and value.	20+	B1/2
5718	Mixed Hardwood	15	<500	N 4 E 4 S 4 W 4	1	SM/EM	Good/ Adequate/Poor	Good/ Adequate/ Poor	A prominent broadleaved woodland, located on a raised area. A woodland of high quality and value.	40+	A1/2
5719	Laburnum			N E S W			Poor	Poor	Split, loss for condition.	<10	U

Tree Ref No.	Species	Height M	Stem Diameter MM	Branch Spread M	Height of Crown Clearance M	Age Class	Physiological Condition	Structural Condition	Preliminary Management Recommendations/ Comments	Estimated Remaining Contribution Years	Category Grading
5720	Holly	3	MS	N 0.5 E 0.5 S 0.5 W 0.5	0	SM	Good	Good	Six topiaried hollies. Low quality and value.	10+	C1/2
5721	Mixed Hardwood	8	<250	N 3 E 3 S 3 W 3	1	M	Good	Poor	Mixed group of willow, laburnum, thorn, cypress, ash. A group of low quality and value.	10+	C1/2
5722	Goat Willow	8	300, 200, 200	N 3 E 3 S 3 W 3	2	M	Good	Poor	Twin stemmed, included unions. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
5723	Lawson Cypress	10	300, 250	N 2 E 2 S 2 W 2	2	EM	Good	Adequate	Two cypress as one visual unit. Trees of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
5724	Mixed Hard and Softwood	10	<250	N 2 E 2 S 2 W 2	2	EM	Adequate	Adequate	A linear group of ash, cypress, holly, thorn, cherry, elder. A group of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
5725	Lawson Cypress	4	200	N 2 E 2 S 2 W 2	0	EM	Adequate	Adequate	A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2

Tree Ref No.	Species	Height M	Stem Diameter MM	Branch Spread M	Height of Crown Clearance M	Age Class	Physiological Condition	Structural Condition	Preliminary Management Recommendations/ Comments	Estimated Remaining Contribution Years	Category Grading
5726	Beech	15	675	N 6 E 6 S 9 W 9	1 (south)	M	Good	Good	A tree of moderate quality and value.	40+	B1/2
5727	Beech	16	600	N 3 E 6 S 6 W 5	1 (south)	M	Good	Adequate	A tree of moderate quality and value.	20+	B1/2
5728	Mixed Hard and Softwood	12	<430	N 7 E 4 S 4 W 3	1	M	Good	Good	Mixed group of cypress, larch, cherry, beech, ash. A group of high quality and value, visually prominent in the landscape.	40+	A1/2
5729	Beech	15	435 - 605	N 6 E 6 S 2 W 9	1 (west)	M	Good	Good/ Adequate	Linear group of 15 beech trees located in lawned area. A group of high quality and value.	40+	A1/2
5730	Horse Chestnut	19	1135	N 8 E 8 S 5 W 9	4	FM	Good	Good	Prominent tree, restricted root development, considered to be short-lived. A tree of moderate quality and value in the landscape but downgraded due to life expectancy.	10+	C1/2

Tree Ref No.	Species	Height M	Stem Diameter MM	Branch Spread M	Height of Crown Clearance M	Age Class	Physiological Condition	Structural Condition	Preliminary Management Recommendations/ Comments	Estimated Remaining Contribution Years	Category Grading
5731	Beech	10	425	N 4 E 5 S 5 W 5	3	EM	Good	Good	A mediocre specimen. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	20+	C1/2
5732	Beech	19	570	N 8 E 5 S 7 W 6	3	EM	Good	Adequate	Well formed specimen. A tree of high quality and value.	40+	A1/2
5733	Scots Pine	7	230	N 3 E 0.5 S 0.5 W 0.5	0	EM	Good	Good	Suppressed. A tree of low quality and value.	20+	C1/2
5734	Beech	18	660	N 7 E 9 S 5 W 9	2	M	Good	Good	Multi-stemmed, included stem unions, downgraded for defects. A tree of moderate quality and value in the landscape.	20+	B1/2
5735	Beech	15	485	N 6 E 5 S 4 W 6	3	M	Adequate	Adequate	Canker at base. A tree of low quality and value.	10+	C1/2
5736	Beech	18	410	N 4 E 4 S 4 W 4	2	M	Good	Adequate	Damage by grounds maintenance. Twin-stemmed, included stem union. A tree of moderate quality and value in the landscape.	20+	B1/2

Tree Ref No.	Species	Height M	Stem Diameter MM	Branch Spread M	Height of Crown Clearance M	Age Class	Physiological Condition	Structural Condition	Preliminary Management Recommendations/ Comments	Estimated Remaining Contribution Years	Category Grading
5737	Beech	18	550	N 6 E 6 S 7 W 6	2	M	Good	Adequate	Twin-stemmed, included stem union, crown asymmetry. A tree of low quality and value.	20+	C1/2
5738	Apple	7	300	N 3 E 4 S 4 W 4	3	M	Adequate	Adequate	A tree of low quality and value.	20+	C1/2
5739	Apple	6	250	N 1 E 3 S 3 W 4	2 (west)	M	Adequate	Adequate	Suppressed. A tree of low quality and value.	20+	C1/2
5740	Laburnum			N E S W			Poor	Poor	Split, loss for condition.	<10	U
5741	Apple	8	250	N 3 E 2 S 3 W 3	3	M	Adequate	Adequate	A tree of low quality and value.	20+	C1/2

Tree Ref No.	Species	Height M	Stem Diameter MM	Branch Spread M	Height of Crown Clearance M	Age Class	Physiological Condition	Structural Condition	Preliminary Management Recommendations/ Comments	Estimated Remaining Contribution Years	Category Grading
5742	Apple	8	250	N 4 E 3 S 3 W 4	2	M	Adequate	Adequate	A tree of low quality and value.	20+	C1/2
5743	Holly	4	150/175	N 2 E 2 S 2 W 2	2	EM	Adequate	Adequate	A tree of low quality and value.	20+	C1/2

ACS Consulting
Suite One
9-11 Princess Street
Knutsford
Cheshire
WA16 6BY

REGISTERED CONSULTANT

CHECKED

APIL EXPERT

acsconsulting
arboricultural consultants