ARBORICULTURAL SURVEY

Georgina Tearne MSc HND (Arboriculture) F.Arbor.A.
24th July 2009

SITE ADDRESS

141 Manchester Road
Chapel en le Frith
High Peak

PREPARED FOR:

Mrs J Bartholomew

Table of Contents

APPENDICES

1 BACKGROUND

1.1 Brief

This arboricultural report has been commissioned by;

Mrs Janet Bartholomew
Hayloft
Millbridge
Castleton
Hope Valley
Derbyshire
S33 8WR

It is required as part of a planning application for the proposed construction of a detached residential property in the grounds of:

141 Manchester Road
Chapel en le Frith
High Peak

1.2 Documents provided

To assist in the production of this report I have been provided with a copy of the existing site layout and the scheme proposals ref: 02/01 produced by Heathcote Design and Development.

1.3 Tree Status

It is understood that the trees are not subject to a Tree Preservation Order and the site is not within a Conservation Area. It is however, recommended that a check is made to clarify the status of the trees although any works approved in any planning permission would over-ride any applicable TPO or Conservation Area protection. Details of the Local Planning Authority are:

High Peak Borough Council

Tree & Woodland and Planning Services

Tel: 0845 129 7777

2 SURVEY DETAILS

2.1 Site Visit

2.1.1 Surveyor(s)

Georgina Tearne MSc, HND (Arboriculture) F.Arbor.A.

2.1.2 Date of Survey

28th May 2009

2.1.3 Other Persons Present

Mrs. J. Bartholomew.

2.1.4 Weather Conditions

Dry with an approximate temperature of 18^0C.

2.2 Inspection Methods

Data collection was carried out to BS5837:2005.

Full details of the methods used are provided in Appendix 1.

Details of the trees surveyed are presented in the spreadsheet at Appendix 2 while the positions of the trees are identified on the accompanying plans at Appendix 3 & 4.

The positions of the trees were not shown on the provided drawing and therefore they have been measured by tape on site. As such the drawings accompanying this report should not be assumed to be accurate and all measurements should be checked on site.

3 SITE OVERVIEW

3.1 Site Description

3.1.1 The proposed development site currently forms part of the grounds of a large detached property known as 141 Manchester Road. The area of the proposed development is generally unmaintained with overgrown shrubs and opportunistic plants.

3.1.2 The site is generally level across the position of the proposed dwelling although it does slope away towards the rear. Although there are no level changes of particular note consideration should be given to the root systems of trees to be retained in relation to any proposed level changes.

3.2 Tree Population

3.2.1 There are a significant number of trees located within the grounds of 141 Manchester Road, the majority of which are located across the front boundary with Manchester Road. Lime and Horse Chestnut are the most commonly encountered species although others including Sycamore, Pine, Goat Willow, Laburnum and Beech were also observed. The tree population consists mainly of mature and middle-aged individuals although some young trees were also noted.

3.2.2 Of the 28 items surveyed 10 have been identified as 'B' category while the remaining items have been categorised as a 'C' in accordance with BS5837. Many trees have been categorised as 'C' due to previous pruning which has left many with a poor form and reduced life expectancy.

3.2.3 Collectively however, the trees are considered to have a moderate to high amenity value due to their position adjacent to Manchester Road although individually many have a lower amenity value than when considered as part of the tree population as a whole.

4 TREE CONSTRAINTS

4.1 Root Protection Areas

4.1.1 The drawing at appendix 3 shows the position, canopy spreads and root protection areas (RPA) of the trees. The RPAs are calculated from the tree stem diameters following the guidance of BS5837:2005. Although the RPA attempts to identify an area of the trees' root systems which should be protected the simplistic circle (or square) does not take account of constraints such as buildings, land form and walls etc. which may have restricted or influenced root development. In this particular instance there are no significant ground constraints and therefore the circular RPAs indicated are considered to provide an accurate guide to the extent of the rooting area which should ideally be protected.

4.1.2 Following the guidance of BS5837:2005 proposals for the site should aim to incorporate those trees which are identified as 'A' and 'B'. In this instance there are a number of items identified as 'B' and if possible these should be retained.

4.1.3 When considering the layout of the site and the retention of significant trees proposals should generally be kept outside of both the RPA and the canopy spread. However, it may be possible to encroach into these areas with piled footings, access roads, footpaths and parking areas assuming existing ground levels can be maintained and the appropriate construction methods can be employed. This is particularly relevant where existing buildings and/or surfacing extends within the RPAs of the trees.

4.2 Tree Canopies

4.2.1 Four-point canopy spreads for each tree are indicated on the accompanying drawing at appendix 3. Generally the canopy spread of a tree constitutes a constraint in terms of its physical presence and its shading potential. Consideration will be given to both the current and

potential canopy spreads in relation to the proposals for the site in the following impact assessment.

5 IMPACT ASSESSMENT

5.1 Site Proposals

5.1.1 Proposals for the site include the construction of a detached residential dwelling and the provision of a new access to the existing property.

5.2 Statutory Tree Protection

5.2.1 It is understood that the trees are not the subject of a Tree Preservation Order nor is the site within a Conservation Area. It is however suggested that this is clarified with the Local Planning Authority prior to any work being carried out. It is worthy of note that tree work identified within a planning approval will over-ride any applicable Tree Preservation Order or Conservation Area legislation.

5.3 Tree Appraisal

5.3.1 In order to accommodate the development proposals it will be necessary to remove an area of shrubs and two short sections of hedging. All categorised as 'C' and of limited amenity value it is felt that there would be no objection to such proposals.

5.3.2 Although no trees need to be removed to accommodate the proposals it is suggested that one group, G19, should be felled to provide an area for material storage and vehicle access etc. This group consists of 6 Leylandii, 3 main trees with 3 much smaller specimens behind. They are of limited amenity value and it is suggested that consideration is given to their removal regardless of the site proposals. I believe that they detract from the tree population and there should be no objection to their removal to facilitate the proposed development.

5.3.3 The position of the new access for the existing property has been chosen following consideration of the tree

population across the site frontage. Between T2 and T3 is considered the position which will have the least impact on the trees overall and with appropriate construction techniques and materials it is felt that the proposed access will have a limited impact on the two adjacent trees. It is suggested that the access should be built up onto the existing ground level to avoid excavation within the RPAs and within the property the drive should be constructed using permeable surfacing. It is appreciated that some excavation will be required to enable the access to link with the main highway but it is felt that this would have little impact on the trees overall. Some pruning will be required to provide clearance over the access although this will be minimal and will have no impact on the amenity value and long-term value of the trees.

5.3.4 Consideration has been given to the canopy spreads of the trees in relation to the proposed dwelling and it is felt that there will be no future conflict in terms of light or their physical presence. The property will look out to the south and there are clear open views beyond the garden of the property. The only trees in this area are G23 – T27 which are generally mature specimens located along the boundary. Their canopies do not currently block light or views from the site and it is felt that they will not increase significantly in size and spread in the future. There are no other areas of potential conflict in relation to the canopies of the existing trees.

5.3.5 During the development phase there is the potential for damage to be caused to the trees through construction traffic, material storage etc. in addition to that highlighted above. A Tree Protection Plan (included at Appendix 4) shows the proposed position of the protective barriers intended to protect the trees. Such barriers should be retained throughout the construction phase.

5.4 Services and Other Considerations

5.4.1 Details of services have not been provided and it is important to ensure that underground services do not trench through any of the RPAs for the trees to be retained. It is suggested that it may be possible to link to the services of the existing property which would reduce the need for trenching close to the trees. Further advice can be provided in this regard should it be required.

5.5 Tree Planting

5.5.1 Although one group of trees is suggested for removal it is felt that new planting is not considered necessary in this case.

6 CONCLUSIONS

6.1 There is a significant tree population within the grounds of the proposed development site which collectively has a moderate to high amenity value.

6.2 Proposals for the site include the construction of a detached dwelling and a new access for the existing property. Although no trees need to be removed in order to accommodate the proposed development it is felt that one group of particularly poor Leylandii should be removed to provide an area for material storage and general work.

6.3 The position of the new driveway has been chosen following consideration of the trees along the site frontage. It is felt that this position will not require the removal of any trees and can be achieved with little impact on the two adjacent specimens through the use of appropriate construction techniques.

6.4 There is virtually no potential conflict with tree canopies although some light pruning may be required over the access points. However, such pruning would have virtually no impact on their appearance or long-term value.

6.5 The accompanying Tree Protection Plan shows the position of the proposed barriers to protect the trees which should remain in place throughout the construction phase.

7 GENERAL GUIDELINES, TERMS & CONDITIONS

7.1 All tree work should be carried out by qualified Arboricultural Contractors with at least £1 Million Public Liability Insurance cover.

7.2 Tree work must be carried out to BS3998 which specifies recommendations for tree work.

7.3 The acceptance of this report constitutes an agreement with the terms and guidelines listed within this report.

7.4 No liability can be accepted by the consultant in respect of the trees unless the recommendations within this report are carried out under his supervision. Nor shall the consultant be responsible for events which happen after the time of the survey due to factors which were not evident at the time.

7.5 Relationships between trees and other objects such as buildings are rarely static and can at times change quite unpredictably. It should therefore be understood that the inspection and monitoring of the condition of trees is a continuing requirement which, in this instance, is recommended on an annual basis.

I trust that this report provides all the necessary information although if further advice is needed please do not hesitate to contact me.

Signed

24/07/2009

Georgina Tearne MSc. HND (Arboriculture) F.Arbor.A.

Arboricultural Consultant

For and on behalf of: Arbolution Limited

Edge View
Blackshaw Head
Hebden Bridge
West Yorkshire
HX7 7JF

Tel/Fax: 01422 844636
Mobile: 07738 233216
Email: info@arbolution.co.uk

Registered Office: 28 Prescott Street
Halifax
HX1 2JL

Registered in England: 5512814
VAT Registration No: 870 2372 34

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1 - SURVEY METHODOLOGY

A visual assessment of each tree was made from ground level in accordance with BS 5837:2005 Trees in relation to construction - Recommendations.

The following information has been collected for each tree and is presented in the spreadsheet at Appendix 1.

1. **Height** - measured in metres using a clinometer.

2. **Stem Diameter** - measured in millimetres at 1.5m above adjacent ground level. Stems of multi-stemmed trees are measured just above the buttress flare while where multiple stems emanate from ground level a maximum individual measurement is taken.

3. **Spread** - the measurement of the branch spread from the stem of the tree to the extent of the canopy in the direction of north, south, east and west.

4. **Crown Clearance** - measured from the highest point of the adjacent ground level in metres.

5. **Age Class** - described as young (Y), middle aged (MA), mature (M), over-mature (OM), veteran (V).

6. **Physiological Condition** - classed as good, fair, poor, or dead.

7. **Structural Condition** - details of any physical defects and the presence of any decay etc.

8. **Preliminary Management Recommendations** - detail of works required including details of further investigations recommended where suspected defects require more detailed assessment and where there is the potential for wildlife habitat.

9. **Estimated Remaining Contribution** - expressed in years as; less than 10, 10-20, 20-40 and more than 40.

10. **Category Grading –** trees are categorised, in accordance with the cascade chart for tree quality assessment, into one of the following categories;

Trees for Removal

Category R

Those in such a condition that any existing value would be lost within 10 years and which should, in the current context, be removed for reasons of sound arboricultural management.

Trees to be Considered for Retention

Category A

Those of high quality and value: in such a condition as to be able to make a substantial contribution (a minimum of 40 years is suggested).

Category B

Those of moderate quality and value: those in such a condition as to make a significant contribution (a minimum of 20 years is suggested).

Category C

Those of low quality and value: currently in adequate condition to remain until new planting could be established (a minimum of 10 years is suggested), or young trees with a stem diameter below 150 mm.

In addition there are three subcategories which should also be applied identifying the form taken by the value of each tree;

1 Mainly arboricultural values
2 Mainly landscape values
3 Mainly cultural values, including conservation