

Gilmour School

Arboricultural Report

July 2016



Chapter 1	Introduction
-----------	--------------

Chapter 2	Background
-----------	------------

Chapter 3	Tree Survey
-----------	-------------

Chapter 4	Development Implications
-----------	--------------------------

Chapter 5	Conclusions
-----------	-------------

Drawing(s)

ARB/3006/Y/200	Arboricultural Plan
----------------	---------------------

TPP/3006/Y/201	Tree Protection Plan
----------------	----------------------

ARB/3006/Y/202	Drainage Plan
----------------	---------------

Appendices

1	Spreadsheets
---	--------------

2	Method Statement
---	------------------

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

Limitation

ACS Consulting (ACS) has prepared this Report for the sole use of Kier Business Services 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.

1.0 Introduction

1.01

A. C. S. Consulting is instructed by Kier Business Services to report on trees and the implications of development. 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 the means of tree protection, implementation and phasing of works.

1.03

The site was visited in July 2016. A survey of the trees was completed recording; species type, age, height, crown spread, diameter-at-breast-height, and condition.

Copyright of ACS Consulting. All rights described in Chapter IV of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 have been generally asserted ©, July 2016.

2.0 Background

2.01 The Site

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

2.02 Statutory Protection/Planning Policies

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.



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 was produced.

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.

Each tree has been assessed using the BS 5837 2012 category ratings (see Appendix 1). Consideration has been given to any Supplementary Planning Documents. The data collection is compliant with the advice set out at Subsection 4.4.2.5 of BS 5837:2012.

4.0 Development Implications

4.01

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

4.02

The proposal is for a single-storey extension to the existing Gilmour Infants School. The extension will provide a new kitchen as detailed in the design and access statement.

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:

Cont.....

4.0 Development Implications

Impact	Reason	A	B	C
Trees lost for development	Construction – new development	0	4080	4082, 4083
Retained trees that may be affected by disturbance	Construction – new development, services	4084	0	4085
Trees to be pruned	Construction – new development	4084	0	0

Loss for development

The development will result in the loss of 4082 and 4083 to allow the construction of the new building. The trees are unremarkable specimens of very limited merit or of such impaired condition that they do not qualify in higher categories. They are of low quality offering only temporary/transient landscape benefits. The loss of C Category specimens should not influence the determination of the application. Any losses are readily mitigated with new planting. One B Category specimen will also be removed to allow the development to be constructed.

Retained trees that may be affected by disturbance

The proposed works will result in the disturbance to one mature beech (4084) and a group of self-set cherry (4085). The building and the services are located towards the periphery of the Root Protection Area (RPA) as defined in BS 5837 – 2012.

Exploration of the site in the locations of the foundations and the proposed service runs have located beech roots varying from 20 – 55 millimetres Ø at a depth of 300 millimetres below the ground. There were also roots that refer to thorn but these were dead.

In view of the size and location of roots, the drainage and service runs have been amended to reduce the impact. The building location cannot be moved.

The original service run location was 1.2 metres from the face of the building with a manhole 1000 millimetres in size (IL – 2000mm) located at approximately 7.5 metres from the tree. The service run and manhole have now been adjusted as shown on ARB/3006/Y/202. The relocation reduces the impact on the tree.

BS 5837 – 2012 states that where construction operation(s) are to take place within the RPA it is to be demonstrated the tree(s) will remain viable and that area lost to encroachment can be compensated elsewhere, contiguous to its RPA. There is contiguous ground to the south and west. The leading edge of the car park will slightly encroach on the extremity of T1 and T2's RPA, thus the impact, if roots are recorded during excavation, is considered to be minimal and will only account for 1 – 2% of the overall root system. There is adequate compensation for root growth in contiguous ground.

The existing hard surface will be reinforced to allow its use for construction space.

Cont.....

4.0 Development Implications

Trees to be pruned for construction

One branch will be removed from the beech to allow construction access. The removal has no impact on tree physiology or visual amenity.

4.03 Policy

The over-arching policy guidance in respect of the site is that contained within Liverpool's saved policy document. The application recognises that the retention of existing trees can add scale and maturity to the proposed development. The development in arboricultural terms, accords with the council's saved policies.

The majority of the trees that are to be removed are mediocre specimens offering only temporary/transient landscape benefits. The landscaping plan will mitigate the tree loss and help to soften the development for the immediate visual receptors.

5.0 Conclusions

5.01

The development is the construction of new building housing a new kitchen with associated infrastructure. The development is described in greater detail in the Design and Access statement.

5.02

The development footprint has been adjusted to retain the beech and minimise any construction stress. The development does encroach into the RPA. However, the encroachment is only minimal and there is adequate compensation for root growth in contiguous ground.

Overall, the application has no long-term impact on the mature beech along the site's northern boundary. The development retains the majority of the screen planting along the boundary. The pruning proposed is considered negligible in terms of tree physiology and visual amenity.

5.03

A method statement is appended to demonstrate 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 1

Contents

Key

BS5837: 2012

Tree Tables

KEY

Age	<p>Y – Young: Out-planted trees that have not yet established</p> <p>SM – Semi-mature: Established trees up to 1/3 of expected height and crown</p> <p>EM – Early mature: Between 1/3 and 2/3 of expected height and crown</p> <p>M – Mature: Between 2/3 and full expected height and crown</p> <p>FM – Fully mature: Full expected height and crown</p> <p>OM – Over mature: Crown beginning to break-up and decrease in size</p> <p>S – Senescent: Crown in advanced stage of break-up</p>
Physiological Condition	<p>Good – Very few defects a reasonable long life expectancy depending on age class</p> <p>Fair – Some defects giving the tree a shortened life expectancy</p> <p>Poor – Limited life with major problems</p>
Structural Condition	<p>Good – Very few defects</p> <p>Fair – Some defects rectifiable with minor tree surgery</p> <p>Poor – Significant defects rectifiable with major tree surgery or felling</p>

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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">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. <p><i>NOTE Category U trees can have existing or potential conservation value which might be desirable to preserve; see 4.5.7</i></p>			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

Appendix 2

Contents

Method Statement

Gilmour School

Arboricultural Method Statement

July 2016



Section	Description
Section 1	General
Section 2	Description of Project
Section 3	Arboricultural Method Statement
Appendix A	General Information

Section 1

General

This Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) is prepared on behalf of Kier for the proposed extension to Gilmour Infants School. The AMS is required by Section 6.1 BS 5837:2012 Trees In Relation To Design, Demolition and Construction – Recommendations, as construction activities are occurring in the Construction Exclusion Zone and therefore cannot be addressed by a Heads of Terms document.

This document is intended to demonstrate the degree of protection to be undertaken and demonstrate the fact that, in arboricultural terms, the development is sustainable.

This AMS sets out proposed measures to minimise and mitigate construction impact on the trees and targets for the management of the site during the construction phase. It is intended that the AMS remains under review during the construction of the project. Sequencing of tree protection measures has been programmed with the contractors construction programme. The following text contains a series of considerations that Kier and their appointed contractor will follow whilst working on the project to completion.

Section 2

Description and Location of Project	
Author:	ACS Consulting, 272 Bath Street, Glasgow G2 4JR.
Project Title:	Gilmour School
Location:	£ T.B.A.
Nature of Project:	South Bank Road
Contract Period:	Proposed Extension to Kitchen

Section 3 Arboricultural Method Statement

Pre-commencement Meeting

The appointed contractor shall facilitate a pre-commencement meeting with the appointed Arboricultural Clerk of Works, the Site Manager and a representative from the Local Planning Authority.

Targets

- Appoint Arboricultural Clerk of Works.
- To agree timings of site visits and reporting.
- To agree phasing of construction works involving trees and construction programme.
- To agree emergency procedures in case of incidents involving materials that are phytotoxic.

Timing of Works

The timing of the primary works which will have an impact on trees involved for the construction of the kitchen and associated features are listed below. These timings are approximate and are influenced by a number of factors. All the tree works and fencing requirements will be undertaken prior to top soil strip and other ground works. The critical Arboricultural Operations in relation to the Construction Programme are outlined below.

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/ground protection
Excavation of top soil/ removal of material from site	Review protection measures and working practices
Installation of services	Review working of practices/supervision of works/ Review of tree protection measure

Construction Exclusion Zone Root Protection

Adequate protection of trees requires the installation of the correct fencing type at the locations shown on the Tree Protection Plan TPP/3006/Y/201.

Targets

The following applies to Terram Geocell (other systems follow a similar installation procedure).

- Heras fencing with scaffold "T" inserted through feet to prevent re-location
- Fencing installed at locations shown on the plan and marked on site.
- Location and adequacy signed off by Arboricultural Clerk of Works and LPA and advised AC.
- Tool Box Talk – make construction staff aware of the importance of areas.
- Sign to be erected advising of the areas importance.



Temporary Working Surface

A temporary working surface is required as works are being undertaken in the Construction Exclusion Zone. Therefore, it is proposed to use Plywood or Tuff Trak Mats.

Targets

- Stumps of felled trees to be ground to a depth of 200/300 millimetres below ground level.

The following applies to Plywood or Tuff Trak (other systems follow a similar installation procedure)

- Permatex 300 geotextile to be laid with a sharp sand blinding layer, Plywood or Tuff Trak laid over with surface treated to prevent slips. This surface may be retained through the contract to form a working surface.
- Location and adequacy signed off by Arboricultural Clerk of Works and LPA advised.
- Works to be monitored by Arboricultural Consultant.



Site Offices/Welfare Facilities/Compound

Site offices, welfare facilities and a compound including fueling location will be required at the site due to the length of the contract period. Site offices can be used in place of Construction Exclusion Zone fencing to protect trees. The trees to be retained are located some distance from the main works. Contamination of the Construction Exclusion Zone is considered unlikely. However, the following issues should be considered.

Targets

- Site offices/welfare facilities, if used as tree protection, to be placed on pads.
- No discharge of effluent into Construction Exclusion Zone.
- Compound to be outside of Construction Exclusion Zone.



Foundation and Service Excavations.

The foundations of the building and the services are to be located in the RPA. They are located at the edge and have been modified to reduce their impact on tree roots.

Targets

- Temporary working surface in place at the location shown on Plan ARB/3006/Y/201.
- The existing ground is to be excavated using compressed air displacement to a depth of at least 600 mm.
- Exposed roots are to be cut cleanly with a hand saw at the face of the trench.
- Exposed roots are to be covered in hessian sacking and kept moist.
- The exposed face of the excavation will be lined with a suitable liner (i.e. Reroot 3000) during the construction phase to protect the building from root regeneration.
- Location and adequacy signed off by Arboricultural Clerk of Works and LPA advised.
- Works to be monitored by Arboricultural Consultant.
- Completion to be reported to the LPA and signed off by Arboricultural Consultant.



General Precautions

The retention of trees requires a number of general precautions to be taken. Compliance is to be maintained on site by the appointed Clerk of Works and visits by the Arboricultural Consultant. The site visits are detailed at criterion 1 – Timing of Works.

Targets

- Spoil from the foundation pits or other excavations shall not be placed within the Construction Exclusion Zone. No materials, equipment, spoil or washout water may be deposited, stored or parked within the Root Protection Area/ Construction Exclusion Zone.
- On-site inspections to be undertaken by the Arboricultural Clerk of Works with the Arboricultural Consultant visiting during critical operations. The critical operations are identified. The aim of the visits is to maintain on-going liaison with all personnel involved in the site development, Liverpool City Council and its Tree Officer.
- Any defects requiring rectification shall be notified to the Contractor/Site Manager/Arboricultural Consultant and the client.
- A site logbook for tree protection measures is kept to record all stages of the development from the erection of the protective fencing, right through to the completion of the project. This will be made available to the Arboricultural Consultant and Liverpool City Council, if required, to show evidence of continuous site monitoring.

Emergency Procedure/Contacts

Adherence to the method statement, appointment of an Arboricultural Clerk of Works and the involvement, at the critical demolition and construction phases, of the Arboricultural Consultant should negate any incident. The contact page at Appendix B details those personnel who should be contacted if an incident involving a retained tree should take place.

Targets

- Spill kit available.
- On site fuels to be located away from RPA/CEZ and contained in a bunded tank at 110% capacity.
- All incidents involving trees to be reported by telephone and email.

Appendix A

Contents

General Information

Contact List

Title	Name	Address	Telephone	Email
Arboricultural Consultant	I Murat	ACS 272 Bath Street, Glasgow, G2 4JR	0141 354 1633 07595 280404	ian@acsconsulting.co.uk
Architect		Kier Services I Workplace Services I 1st Floor Exchange Station, Tithebarn Street, Liverpool L2 2QP	0151 2439938	
Arboricultural Clerk of Works	TBA			
Arboricultural Consultant (Council)	Joe Barnes Tree and Landscape Officer	Planning Liverpool City Council I Cunard Building I Pier Head I Water Street I Liverpool I L3 1DS	0151 233 3021	
Developer		EFT Group Ltd		

Tree Works Specification

Tag No.	Identity	Particular Schedule of Works Required	Cost
4080	Holly	Fell, grind stump to a depth of 300 mm.	
4082	Cherry	Fell, grind stump to a depth of 300 mm.	
4083	Sorbus	Fell, grind stump to a depth of 300 mm.	
4084	Beech	Crown reduce first branch on eastern canopy at approx. 5m going over proposed building. Reduced by up to 2m cutting back to suitable lateral branches creating wounds of no more than up to 100mm Ø.	



Site Inspection Form

Site Address	[]
Site Visit Date	[]
Persons Present	[] - Contractor Ian Murat - ACS

Tree No.	Issue	Comments	Recommendations	Action
[]	[]	[] .	[]	[]

Head Office

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

☎ 01565 755 422

✉ manchester@acsconsulting.co.uk

💻 www.acsconsulting.co.uk

Ian Murat

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

Registered Consultant of the Arboricultural Association.

✉ ian.murat@acsconsulting.co.uk

Scotland Office

272 Bath Street, Glasgow, G2 4JR

☎ 0141 354 1633

✉ glasgow@acsconsulting.co.uk

💻 www.acsconsulting.co.uk