acsconsulting
arboricultural consultants

Gilmour School

Arboricultural Constraints Report

March 2014

ACS Consulting is a UK industry leader in arboriculture. We offer a range of services involving trees, woodlands and forestry in the built and rural environment:

Planning

Hazard Evaluation

Management

Law

For further information contact:

Ian Murat 01565 755422 irm@acsconsulting.co.uk

ACS Consulting
Suite 1
9 – 11 Princess Street
Knutsford
WA16 6BY
Manchester@acsconsulting.co.uk

Limitation

ACS Consulting (ACS) has prepared this Report for the sole use of Mouchel Property 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.

C O N T E N T S

		Page
Chapter 1	Introduction	5
Chapter 2	Background	6
Chapter 3	Tree Survey	7
Chapter 4	Development Aspects	8
Chapter 5	Conclusions	9

DRAWING(S)

3006_101	Arboricultural Constraints Plan

APPENDICES

1	Spread Sheets

Document Revision Record

Issue No	Date	Details of Revisions
1	March 2014	Original Issue

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.01 A. C. S. Consulting is instructed by Mouchel Property to report on trees and the constraints on development at Gilmour School, Liverpool. The assessment and report was undertaken by Ian Murat, 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 March 2014 and a survey of the trees was completed recording; *species type, age, height, crown spread, diameter-at-breast-height, and condition*. The survey was undertaken in warm sunny conditions. The trees were without leaves which allowed a complete view of their upper canopies but gave little indication of the physiological 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. ***The report is an aid to developing the site with trees and not considered suitable to be submitted as part of a full application for planning permission.***

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.3006_101.

Copyright of ACS Consulting. All rights described in Chapter IV of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 have been generally asserted ©, March 2014.

2.0 BACKGROUND

The Site

2.01 The site comprises a level rectangular shaped parcel of land located in a residential area of South Liverpool.

Statutory Protection/Planning Policies

2.02 The application is subject to the saved Planning Policies of Liverpool City Council. The application will not be subject to National Planning Policy Framework. This document is only concerned with Veteran Trees which do not appear on this site. An examination of the council's online resources suggests the site is not located within a Conservation Area.

Policy HD22 applies.

HD22
1. In order to protect and integrate existing trees and landscape features within new developments, the City Council will:
i. require the retention of key ecological and natural site features, such as trees, hedges, walls and ponds;
ii. require the submission of a full independent tree survey to enable the effect of the proposal on the trees to be fully assessed;
iii. refuse planning permission for proposals which cause unacceptable tree loss, or which do not allow for the successful integration of existing trees identified for retention following consideration of the tree survey;
iv. require layouts to provide adequate spacing between existing trees and buildings, taking into account the existing and potential size of trees and their impact both above and below ground level; and
v. require retained trees and woodland to be protected and managed during construction, preventing all site works within the branch spread of any retained tree.
2. The City Council will protect existing trees and woodland areas by:
i. making tree preservation orders on trees or groups of trees, where appropriate;
ii. only allowing the removal of any protected tree in exceptional circumstances, such as where the tree is a danger to public safety or is diseased, and on condition that appropriate replacement planting takes place;
iii. ensuring the proper and beneficial management of trees and woodland areas in its ownership; and
iv. carrying out a review of existing Tree Preservation Orders.

3.0 TREE SURVEY

3.01 I have identified twenty-five individual trees and two groups. The group classification is intended to identify trees that form cohesive arboricultural features either aerodynamically, visually or culturally. A Constraints Plan (3006_101) has been produced.

3.02 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 Nikon Forestry 550 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.

Each tree has been assessed using the BS 5837 2012 category ratings (a copy can be found in Appendix 1).

3.03 The trees have been summarised in Appendix 1. An indication has been given as to the desirability of each specimen to be retained.

3.04 The trees comprise largely semi and early mature trees as structure planting to the site. The site does have a number of notable specimens considered to be of high quality and value those being beech (4084), group (4096) and lime (4099). The trees have a high visual amenity giving scale and maturity as landscape features.

4.0 DEVELOPMENT ASPECTS

4.01 The Constraints Plan (3006_101) identifies tree quality and corresponding gross Root Protection Areas (RPA).

4.02 Development should be located outside the RPA. Development should seek to retain and integrate trees identified as category A or B. Category C and U may be retained where they pose no constraint on development.

Policy

4.03 The relevant tree policy, as can be ascertained from Liverpool's web site, has been reproduced at Section 2. Due regard should be given to it.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

5.01 The site comprises a level rectangular shaped parcel of land located in a residential area of South Liverpool.

5.02 Development should seek to incorporate trees identified as moderate quality (category B) or high quality (A). An Arboricultural Constraints Plan (3006_101) has been produced.

I Murat M.Sc., F.Arbor.A, CEnv, MCIEEM
ACS Consulting
March 2014

Appendix 1

CONTENTS

Key

BS5837: 2012

Tree Tables

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	Clear Branch Height M	Age Class	Physiological Condition	Structural Condition	Preliminary Management Recommendations/ Comments	Estimated Remaining Contribution Years	Category Grading
4073	Holly	8	250	N 2 E 2 S 2 W 2	3	3	EM	Good	Good	Located in landscaped area. Restricted root development. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
4074	Elm	14	440	N 3 E 4 S 3 W 4	5	5	M	Good	Good	Multi-stemmed. Restricted root development. A tree of moderate quality and value in the landscape.	20+	B1/2
4075	Sycamore	6	120	N 3 E 3 S 3 W 3	2	2	SM	Good	Good	A tree of moderate quality and value in the landscape.	20+	B1/2
4076	Holly	8	270	N 4 E 4 S 2 W 4	2	3	M	Good	Good	A tree of moderate quality and value in the landscape.	20+	B1/2
4077	Lime	20	#700	N 6 E 6 S 6 W 8	4 (S)	5	FM	Good	Good	Dead wood up to 100mm in diameter - typical of species. Profusion of epicormic growth. Significant tree in the landscape. A tree of high quality and value in the landscape.	40+	A1/2
4078	Holly	5	150	N 2 E 2 S 2 W 2	2	3	SM/EM	Good	Good	Suppressed by adjacent lime. 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	Preliminary Management Recommendations/ Comments	Estimated Remaining Contribution Years	Category Grading
4079	Prunus	3	100	N 1 E 1 S 1 W 1	0	0	SM	Good	Good	Weeping specimen. Topped. Stake and tie still attached. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
4080	Holly	5	230	N 4 E 2 S 2 W 4	2	3	EM	Good	Good	A tree of moderate quality and value in the landscape.	20+	B1/2
4081	Holly	6	M/S	N 1 E 2 S 1 W 2	2	2	SM/EM	Poor	Adequate/ Poor	Poor distribution of leaves. Multi-stemmed. Defective stem unions. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
4082	Cherry	6	200	N 1 E 4 S 1 W 4	2	2	EM/M	Adequate/ Poor	Adequate	Twin stemmed. Defective stem union. Ooze. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
4083	Sorbus	8	310	N 4 E 4 S 4 W 4	2	2	EM	Good	Adequate/ Poor	Restricted root development. Root severance to east. Multi-stemmed. Defective stem unions – typical of species. 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	Preliminary Management Recommendations/ Comments	Estimated Remaining Contribution Years	Category Grading
4084	Beech	19	980	N 6.5 E 10 S 10 W 10	5	10	FM	Good	Good	Restricted root development due to pavement and boundary wall. Dead wood due to natural branch suppression up to 50mm in diameter. Significant specimen. Crown asymmetry following removal of tree to the north. A tree of high quality and value in the landscape.	40+	A1/2
4085	Cherry	5	75	N 1 E 1 S 1 W 1	0	0	SM	Good	Good	Group of self set trees. A group of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
4086	Holly	5	150	N 2 E 2 S 2 W 2	1	1	SM/EM	Good	Good	A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
4087	Cherry	5	235	N 2 E 3 S 3 W 5	2	2	M	Poor	Poor	Old Ganoderma brackets on wound to north east. Poor distribution of buds and twigs. Suppressed. Large pieces of dead wood.	<10	U
4088	Prunus	8	<250	N 3 E 3 S 3 W 3	1	1	EM	Good	Adequate	Group of 5 stems with sucker growth. A group 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	Preliminary Management Recommendations/ Comments	Estimated Remaining Contribution Years	Category Grading
4089	Prunus	10	390	N 3 E 4 S 4 W 4	2	2	EM	Adequate	Poor	Twin stemmed. Significant defective stem union. Fused branches. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
4090	Cherry	5	290	N 3 E 3 S 3 W 3	2	2	EM	Good	Good	Mediocre specimen. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
4091	Pear	8	300 & 325	N 2 E 3 S 4 W 4	3	3	FM/OM	Poor	Poor	Surrounded by hard surfaces. Poor distribution of buds and twigs. In decline.	<10	U
4092	Cherry	6	390	N 6 E 4 S 2 W 4	3	2	M	Adequate	Adequate	Extensive exposure of surface roots. Poor form. Stem injury with reasonable occlusion. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
4093	Pear	5	310 & 320	N 3 E 2 S 2 W 3	2	2	FM	Adequate	Adequate	Mediocre specimens. Surrounded by hard surfacing. Of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
4094	Pear	6	370	N 0 E 1 S 3 W 3	3	3	M	Adequate	Poor	Surrounded by hard surfaces. A number of large cavities. 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	Preliminary Management Recommendations/ Comments	Estimated Remaining Contribution Years	Category Grading
4095	Pear	6	265	N 2 E 1 S 2 W 3	2	2	FM	Adequate	Adequate	Surrounded by hard surfaces. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
4096	Group	<21	655, 1055 & 580	N 10 E 10 S 12 W 6	6	6	FM	Good	Good	2 sycamores and 1 plane. Minor rippling of play surfaces. Significant specimens. A group of high quality and value in the landscape.	40+	A1/2
4097	Lime	20	590	N 10 E 5 S 6 W 8	6	6	FM	Good	Good	Slight lean. Lapsed pollard. Over mature re-growth. Past pruning. A tree of moderate quality and value in the landscape.	20+	B1/2
4098	Plane	5	970	N <1 E <1 S <1 W <1	5	5	FM	Adequate	Poor	Pollarded at 5m. Recently undertaken with two years of re-growth. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
4099	Lime	19	#700	N 6 E 3 S 6 W 6	9	9	FM	Good	Good	Profusion of epicormic growth to base. Epicormic growth on stem. Restricted root development. Extensively crown lifted over telephone wires. Significant in the landscape. A tree of high quality and value in the landscape.	40+	A1/2

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

Arboricultural Association REGISTERED CONSULTANT

SWEET & MAXWELL CHECKED 2006 EXPERT WITNESS

UK REGISTER OF EXPERT WITNESSES REGISTERED

APIL EXPERT

acsconsulting
arboricultural consultants