ACS Consulting
tree consultants

Clare Lees, Chinley

Arboricultural Report

September 2018

Arboricultural Association Fellow Member

AA Registered Consultant trees.org.uk

UK Register of Expert Witnesses Registered

Contents

ACS Consulting
tree consultants

Limitation

ACS Consulting (ACS) has prepared this Report for the sole use of Mr & Mrs O'Neill 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.

Chapter 1 Introduction

1.01
ACS Consulting is instructed by Mr & Mrs O'Neill to report on trees and the implications for the proposed development of a garage at Clare Lees, Chinley. The assessment and report was undertaken by Ian Murat, Registered Consultant of the Arboricultural Association.

1.02
In accordance with guidance on information requirements and validation for planning applications, this report fulfils the recommended national list criteria for tree survey/arboricultural information. More specifically, it contains the following:

- A full tree survey to the requirements of BS5837 (2012) Trees In Relation To Design, Demolition and Construction – Recommendations.
- A plan showing tree survey information, retention categorisation and root protection areas,
- An assessment of the arboricultural implications of development detailing trees to be retained/removed and appropriate protection measures,
- An Arboricultural Method Statement detailing a set of agreed principles for tree protection, implementation and phasing of works.

1.03
The site was visited during the September 2018. A survey of the trees was completed recording; species type, age, height, crown spread, diameter-at-breast-height and, condition.

ACS Consulting
tree consultants

2.01 The Site

The application site is described in detail in the Design and Access Statement. In simple terms, the site comprises a substantial mature plot with a detached property on a wooded site in the village of Chinley.

2.02 Statutory Protection/Planning Policies

The application is subject to the Planning Policies of High Peak Borough Council. The site is located in the Chinley Conservation Area. The trees are not the subject of a Tree Preservation Order.

2.03 Soils

BS 5837 – 2012 requires a basic assessment of the soils on site. An examination of the British Geological Survey site suggests the deposits as: Till, Devensian - Diamicton. Superficial Deposits formed up to 2 million years ago in the Quaternary Period. Local environment previously dominated by ice age conditions (U).

The Cranfield Soil and Agrifood Institute Soilscapes viewer shows soils at the site to be slowly permeable seasonally wet acid loamy and clayey soils.

3.01
The tree survey has identified trees as individuals, groups and hedgerows. The group classification is intended to identify trees that form cohesive arboricultural features either aerodynamically, visually or culturally. Off-site trees and groups that could influence the development potential of the site, have been noted.

3.02
The tree data can be found at Appendix 1. There is no requirement in BS 5837 to repeat the details of the constraints information save for confirming that the trees were surveyed for species type, age, height, crown spread, diameter-at-breast-height, condition, and their suitability for retention from ground level. Heights were measured with a digital Hypsometer and diameters were taken, where possible, with a diameter tape to give an average stem measurement. Canopy spreads have been measured at the cardinal points or where they significantly extend in other directions.

Chapter 4 Development Implications

4.01
The application site is described in detail in the design and access statement. In simple terms, it is an application to erect a detached garage on the existing drive

4.02
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 U are excluded from consideration regarding development implications, retained only where they pose no constraint on development.

Based on the proposals, a number of implications were noted. These have been summarised in the table below:

Impact	Reason	A	B	C
Trees lost for development	Construction of garage	0	H1	700, 706
Retained trees that may be affected by disturbance	Construction of garage	0	0	698, 699
Trees to be pruned	Construction of garage	0	0	698, 707

Loss for Development

The proposal will result in the loss of Category C trees. In terms of Category C specimens, a detailed assessment has concluded that the trees are unremarkable trees of very limited merit or such impaired condition that they do not qualify in higher categories. Overall, they are trees offering low or only temporary/transient landscape benefits. The removal of Category C specimens should not influence the determination of the development.

The proposal will result in the loss of the beech hedge. It is a well maintained feature. However, it does not accord with the Hedgerow Regulations and its importance is as a garden feature.

The loss of the trees and the hedgerow has no visual impact on the treed character of the site from any public or private vantage point.

Retained Trees that may be Affected by Disturbance

The aim of the development has been to retain as many trees as possible to maintain the sylvan character of the site. The garage will be located on the existing driveway that serves the property. This comprises a mixed tarmac and gravel feature over a dense hard-core base that has been in situ for a significant number of years to the extent that it is now impermeable and will pose a resistance to significant root development.

The survey identified large lateral root development from the ash along the face of the terrace.
The simplified method of Root Protection Area calculation advocated in BS 5837 – 2012 is in part, redundant at this particular site. Partly due to the drive structure and partly due to the location of other trees.

The Plan (ARB/3840/Y/100) shows the simplified results as circles. It can be seen that there is significant overlap. It is my opinion that the careful removal of trees directly affected by the development and careful excavation, with appropriate ground protection measures, will ensure those trees to be retained can be successfully retained.

The Plan (ARB/3840/Y/100) shows the location of Construction Exclusion Zone fencing and ground protection measures. Detailed plans will be produced to show the precise nature of tree protection.

Pruning

Pruning is to be assessed as and when required to allow access to the work site.

Secondary Development Pressures

The proposal is for a garage. Therefore, secondary development pressures centred around shade and dominance, leaf litter, sap and falling debris are not applicable. It is my experience, these problems are not as frequent as they are thought to be and there is very little evidence that such pressures ever result in any significant diminution of the treescape. There is no published data to support the contention that trees are being excessively pruned or felled for these reasons.

4.03

The over-arching policy guidance in respect of the site is that contained within the Planning Policies of High Peak Borough Council and those of central Government.

Current proposals are of a sensitive design and choice of materials which respect and enhance the local environment in accordance with both national and local landscape related planning policy. The scheme has been carefully designed to minimise tree loss and the impact on the visual effect from the principal visual receptors of their loss. At least 70% of the visual area contains trees.

The proposed scheme conserves trees which contribute positively to the site. Where the removal of trees is required in order to enable development, replacement tree planting can be included as a condition of consent.

The development accords with the policies and guidance of the council and central Government. The development is based on best arboricultural practice that ensures trees are retained. The development is well designed and it is considered to have a symbiotic relationship with the trees.

Chapter 5 Conclusions

5.01
The application site is described in detail in the design and access statement. In simple terms, it is an application to erect a detached garage on the existing drive.

5.02
The scheme has been carefully designed to reduce tree loss. The development successfully integrates the trees. It retains specimens in locations that allow their full development retaining the treescape. The loss of trees has no impact on the treed character of the locale. The existing drive is considered to restrict root development. The protection advocated in BS5837 is not wholly applicable. Any roots are likely to be minor feeding roots rather than woody and structural roots. The Heads of Terms Method statement at Appendix 2 details the precautions that can be taken.

5.03
A Heads of Terms Method statement at Appendix 2 demonstrates the scheme is feasible. Certain matters listed therein may alternatively be addressed satisfactorily by means of a condition(s). This requires detailed discussions with the LPA on the principle that conditions should always be used in the first instance as per government guidance and that contained in BS 5837 – 2012 Table B.1 Delivery of tree-related information into the planning system; the method statement fulfils the recommended criteria for arboricultural information.

Appendix A

Contents

ACS Consulting
tree 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 Fair – Some defects giving the tree a shortened life expectancy Poor – Limited life with major problems
Structural Condition	Good – Very few defects Fair – Some defects rectifiable with minor tree surgery Poor – Significant defects rectifiable with major tree surgery or felling

Table 1 – Cascade chart for tree quality assessment

Category and definition	Criteria			Identification on Plan
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 **Trees 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 **Trees 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	Stem Diameter	Branch Spread M				Height of Crown Clearance	Clear Branch Height	Age Class	Physiological Condition	Structural Condition	Comments/Preliminary Management Recommendations	Estimated Remaining Contribution Years	Category Grading
		M	MM	N	E	S	W	M	M						
H1	Hedge	2	75	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0	0	SM/ EM	Good	Good	Well maintained beech hedge. Of moderate quality and value in the landscape.	20+	B1/2
698	Ash	16	220, 320	6	0.5	5	6	2	2 (W)	SM/ EM	Good	Fair/Poor	Twin stemmed with included union at ground level. Crown asymmetry. Tall, drawn specimen. Growing on a slope. Light ivy. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
699	Ash	16	300	3	3	3	2	9	9	SM/ EM	Good	Good	Tall, drawn spindly specimen. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
700	Elm	12	250	7	4	2	2	2 (N)	3 (N)	SM/ EM	Good	Good	Incongruous feature. Leans north. Influenced in development by adjacent ash. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
701	Ash	16	175	0	2	4	2	6	6	SM	Good	Good	Incongruous feature. Spindly specimen. Leans south/south east. 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	Clear Branch Height M	Age Class	Physiological Condition	Structural Condition	Comments/Preliminary Management Recommendations	Estimated Remaining Contribution Years	Category Grading
				N	E	S	W								
702	Ash	15	120	0	0	2	2	6	6	SM	Good	Good	Tall, drawn spindly specimen. Self-set tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
703	Ash	15	400	5	3	6	2	4	4	SM/ EM	Poor	Fair	Extensively covered in ivy. Ivy affecting the tree's ability to produce leaves. Large number of dead branches on the northern canopy. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
704	Ash	16	180	0	2	2	1	10	10	SM	Good	Fair	Leans east/north east. Ivy. Suppressed. Incongruous feature.A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
705	Group	12	<110	1	1	1	1	5	5	Y/SM	Good	Good	Group of self-set ash. Approximately 12 trees. Of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
706	Beech	10	120	4	0.5	1	4	2	2	SM	Good	Good	Self-set tree growing through a beech hedge. Incongruous feature. Suppressed by adjacent malus. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
707	Malus	10	400	5	5	6	3	2	2	FM	Fair	Good	Choked in ivy. Ivy on the stem and on all the main limbs. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2

Appendix B

Contents

Heads of Terms of an Arboricultural Method Statement

ACS Consulting
tree consultants

The purpose of this document is to serve as a live record of the Heads of Terms which are suggested for the proposed development. The Heads of Terms are in draft form and are therefore themselves subject to further discussion and/or agreement. Certain matters listed herein may alternatively be addressed satisfactorily by means of Condition. This requires detailed discussions with the LPA on the principle that conditions should always be used in the first instance as per government guidance and that contained in BS 5837 – 2012 Table B.1 Delivery of tree-related information into the planning system; this method statement fulfils the recommended criteria for arboricultural information.

The Draft Heads of Terms and obligations are as follows:-

Construction Exclusion Zone Fencing

- Timing for setting out, construction and completion of fencing generally in accordance with the phasing plan.
- Specification for fencing and or ground protection to be in accordance with BS 5837:2012.

Storage of Materials/Offices/Fuels

- Identification and reservation of land for storage of materials,
- parking of vehicles, location of offices and welfare facilities, fuels.

Services

- Location of services including sewerage, gas, water, electricity.
- Timing of excavations where they pass within or close to retained trees in accordance with phasing plan.

Review/Site Inspection

- Review to be undertaken prior to the commencement of development to address: phasing and land uses.
- Arrangements for Review (monitoring).
- Review to allow for amendment / variation by agreement.

Construction Works	Arboricultural Input
Tree works	Review with contractor
Fencing installation/laying of temporary working surface	Review and supervise installation of Construction Exclusion Zone Fencing
Excavation of hard surfaces/removal of material from site	Review protection measures and working practices
Construction of hard surfaces and delivery of building materials	Review working of practices/supervision of works/Review of tree protection measure and site storage
Installation of services	Review working of practices/supervision of works/Review of tree protection measure

Head Office

Suite 1, 9-11 Princess Street, Knutsford, WA16 6BY

01565 755 422

www.acsconsulting.co.uk

Scotland Office

272 Bath Street, Glasgow, G2 4JR

0141 354 1633

glasgow@acsconsulting.co.uk

www.acsconsulting.co.uk

Ian Murat

M.Sc, F.Arbor.A, CEnv, MCIEEM, RC. Arbor.A

Registered Consultant of the Arboricultural Association.

ian.murat@acsconsulting.co.uk

ACS Consulting

tree consultants

Arboricultural Association Fellow Member

AA Registered Consultant trees.org.uk

UK Register of Expert Witnesses Registered