

Jericho Lane Playing Fields

Arboricultural Report

December 2015

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 Liverpool City Council 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	7
Chapter 3	Tree Survey	8
Chapter 4	Development Aspects	9
Chapter 5	Conclusions	11
DRAWING(S)		
3285/100	Arboricultural Plan	
APPENDICES		
1	Tabulated Tree Data	
2	Tree Work Specification	

Document Revision Record

Issue No	Date	Details of Revisions
1	December 2015	Original Issue

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.01 A. C. S. Consulting is instructed by Liverpool City Council to report on trees and the constraints on development at Jericho Lane Playing Fields, 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 December 2015 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 gave a good view of their upper canopies but a poor indication of their physiological condition.

1.04 Under the UK planning system, local authorities have a statutory duty to consider the protection and planting of trees when granting planning permission for proposed development. The potential effect of development on trees, whether statutorily protected or not, is a material consideration that is taken into account in dealing with planning applications. The report contains information regarding the trees and the protection requirements of those trees considered desirable or highly desirable to be retained.

1.05 The report is compliant with Table B.1 - Pre-application. It is an aid to developing the site with trees. It may not be considered suitable to be submitted as part of a full application for planning permission by some Local Planning Authorities.

- 1.06** 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.3285/100.

Copyright of ACS Consulting. All rights described in Chapter IV of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 have been generally asserted ©, December 2015.

2.0 BACKGROUND

The Site

- 2.01** The site comprises a rectangular shaped parcel of land located in the Otterspool district of the urban conurbation of Liverpool.

Statutory Protection/Planning Policies

- 2.02** The application is subject to the saved Planning Policies of Liverpool City Council. The site is not located within a Conservation Area. The application is not the subject of the National Planning Policy Framework in terms of trees. This document is concerned with ancient woodland and Veteran Trees. These do not appear at this site.

3.0 TREE SURVEY

- 3.01** I have identified nineteen individual trees, seven groups and a copse. 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 recorded. An Arboricultural Plan (3285/100) 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 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 are generally located along the site's northern boundary with the railway line and a copse along the eastern boundary. The trees are located off-site. The southern and western boundaries with Jericho Lane and Otterspool Drive are marked by railings with privet growing through as hedging. There are number of street trees and areas of landscaping with trees along the footpaths on Jericho Lane and Otterspool Drive.

- 3.04** The trees in the street comprise largely structure planting with genera that reflect the landscaping preferences of the decade in which they were planted. Overall, the trees have a moderate to high visual amenity enhanced by the lack of other trees in the location when viewed from public vantage points. Individually, a number of 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.

4.0 DEVELOPMENT ASPECTS

- 4.01** The Arboricultural Plan (3285_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. Off-site trees should also be considered. Where trees cannot be retained, often appropriate mitigation measures can off-set the loss of the tree(s).
- 4.03** The RPA has been extended into the tarmac areas and pavements. Whilst such features can be a barrier to root development, there is the possibility that roots can develop underneath. Tree roots directly below a paved or tarmaced surface often experience conditions that are much more favourable for growth than conditions encountered by deeper roots. For example temperatures can be higher and water condenses on the underside of the hard surface, making the adjacent soil particularly suitable for root growth.

Tree Protection

- 4.04** Tree Protection measures should be implemented as stated in BS 5837:2012 and placed in the positions indicated on the Arboricultural Plan. A suitably qualified arboriculturalist should be retained to monitor and report on tree related development issues to ensure the continued protection of trees. A method statement should be prepared by the Arboricultural Consultant prior to commencement at the site in accordance with BS5837 - 2012. A full scheme of protective fencing, its location, and type should be agreed with the Arboricultural Consultant.

Definitive plans are to be produced by the Arboricultural Consultant showing the location of the haul routes, cabins and storage areas prior to commencement on site.

Management

- 4.05** The trees have been assessed for management with appropriate works identified in the Tree Tables at Appendix 1 and the Tree Works Specification at Appendix 2. A number of trees are in a very poor condition and require felling or remedial pruning to reduce the risk of failure. A number of specimens present with advanced decay symptoms and mature fruiting bodies of known decay fungi, other specimens show symptoms of advanced decline typical of significant root severance. The trees were without leaves which allowed a good view of their upper canopies but gave a poor indication of their physiological condition. The continued well-being of trees and site occupiers can be met through regular inspection dealing with issues as and when they arise.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 5.01** The site comprises a rectangular shaped parcel of land located in the Otterspool district of the urban conurbation of Liverpool. Trees that are to be lost are for management reasons or, are trees that are not considered to be suitable for long term retention and are identified in the tree tables in Appendix 1.
- 5.02** The Arboricultural Plan identifies the Root Protection Zone for trees considered suitable to be retained. This area should not be breached. Limited works may be undertaken with arboricultural supervision and detailed method statements of working.
- 5.03** Detailed method statements associated with the following issues should be obtained to ensure the protection of trees: demolition, ground clearance, earth works, drainage, fencing, site storage/compounds/site cabins, tree works, monitoring and reporting.
- 5.04** The trees require surveying on a regular basis as noted in the spreadsheets. Leaf size, colour and overall canopy density are good indicators of tree health and give early indications of physiological problems that allow for appropriate management prescriptions. A detailed survey should be undertaken within two years with brief inspections being undertaken following winds in excess of Force 7/8.

I Murat M.Sc., F.Arbor.A, CEnv, MCIEEM
ACS Consulting
December 2015

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
				N	E	S	W								
5616	Group	<10	<180	3	3	3	3	0	0	SM	Good	Good	Linear group of self set poplars along the boundary. Of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
5617	Sycamore	10	250, 300, 260	3	#4	4	5	2	2	SM/EM	Good	Fair	Tri-stemmed. Covered in ivy. Growing through fence. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
5618	Group	<14	<440	3	4	4	6	0 (W)	1 (W)	SM/EM	Good	Good/ Fair	Mixed hardwoods along the boundary. Ash and sycamore with privet, horse-chestnut. Horse-chestnuts have Pseudomonas. Forms a screen to the neighbouring property. A group of moderate quality and value in the landscape.	20+	B1/2
H1	Hawthorn	<4	<100	2	2	2	2	0	0	EM	Good	Fair	Sporadic hawthorn hedge along the boundary with occasional privet and self set sycamore. A hedge of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
5619	Copse	<15	<300	3	N/K	3	5	0 (W)	0 (W)	EM/M	Good	Good	Broadleaved copse. Side facing the pitches comprising mostly elms some of which are suffering from Dutch Elm Disease. Overall a group of moderate quality and value in the landscape. Work Remove dead, dying and diseased trees.	20+	B1/2

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
				N	E	S	W								
5619	Sycamore	15	640	5	5	5	5	2	2	M	Good	Good	In copse.	20+	B1/2
T1	Oak	14	#500	#5	#3	7.5	5	2 (S)	2 (S)	EM/M	Good	Good	Located on railway embankment. Third party tree of moderate quality and value in the landscape.	20+	B1/2
G1	Group	<18	<600	N/K	3	10		3 (S)	2 (S)	EM/M	Good	Good	Linear group of oak - red oak and holm oak located offsite on the railway embankment. Approximately 15 trees. A group of moderate quality and value in the landscape.	20+	B1/2
5620	Oak	8	300	5	5	5	5	2	2	EM	Good	Fair	Multi-stemmed. Defective stem unions. Crossing and rubbing branches. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
H2	Privet	2	M/S	<1	<1	<1	<1	0	0	M	Good	Good	Sporadic hedge growing through the iron railings along the boundary with Otterspool Road. A hedge of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
5621	Oak	9	230	3	2	3	4	2	2	EM	Good	Good	A tree of moderate quality and value in the landscape.	20+	B1/2
H3	Privet	2	M/S	<1	<1	<1	<1	0	0	M	Good	Good	Linear hedge growing through the iron railings along the boundary. 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	Clear Branch Height M	Age Class	Physiological Condition	Structural Condition	Preliminary Management Recommendations/ Comments	Estimated Remaining Contribution Years	Category Grading
				N	E	S	W								
5622	Oak	5	200	2	2	2	2	1	2	SM/EM	Good	Good	A tree of moderate quality and value in the landscape.	20+	B1/2
T2	Alder	8	150	2	2	2	2	1	1	SM/EM	Good	Fair	Multi-stemmed. Included unions. Third party tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
G2	Group	<5	<100	2	2	2	2	0	0	SM/EM	Good	Fair	Linear group of buckthorn. In third party property on the boundary however, root suckers have spread into the site. A group of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
G3	Group	<15	<500	3	3	3	3	0	0	EM-M	Good	Fair/Poor	Linear group of goat willow, sycamore, sorbus, sucker alder and poplar. Self seeded into the site. Third party trees of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
5623	Sycamore	8	280	3	2	3	3	3	3	M	Good	Good	Located in verge. A tree of moderate quality and value in the landscape.	20+	B1/2
5624	Sycamore	6	250	3	2	3	3	3	3	M	Good	Good	Located in verge. A tree of moderate quality and value in the landscape.	20+	B1/2
5625	Sycamore	5	250	4	2	4	2	3	3	EM/M	Good	Good	Located in verge. 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	Clear Branch Height M	Age Class	Physiological Condition	Structural Condition	Preliminary Management Recommendations/ Comments	Estimated Remaining Contribution Years	Category Grading
				N	E	S	W								
5626	Sycamore	4	120	1	1	1	1	3	3	SM/ EM	Fair	Fair	Leans. Located in verge. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
5627	Sycamore	8	305	6	5	5	5	3	3	EM/M	Good	Good	Located in verge. A tree of moderate quality and value in the landscape.	20+	B1/2
5628	Sycamore	6	250	3	2	3	2	3	3	EM/M	Fair	Good	Located in verge. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
5629	Sycamore	7	220	3	3	3	3	3	3	EM	Fair	Good	Located in verge. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
5630	Sycamore	8	220	5	2	3	4	3	3	EM	Fair	Fair	Located in verge. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
5631	Sycamore	10	420	4	4	3	5	2	2	EM/M	Fair	Fair	Leans. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
5632	Sycamore	14	620	5	6	6	#8	2	2	M	Good	Good	Located in verge. Significant specimen. Causing buckling of the pavement. 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	Clear Branch Height M	Age Class	Physiological Condition	Structural Condition	Preliminary Management Recommendations/ Comments	Estimated Remaining Contribution Years	Category Grading
				N	E	S	W								
5633	Group of Sorbus	6	100	2	2	2	2	2	2	SM	Good	Good	Linear group of 7 trees as an avenue formation along the promenade. Stake and ties still attached. A group of moderate quality and value in the landscape. Work Remove stakes and ties.	20+	B1/2
5633	Sorbus	1	100	1	1	1	1	1	1	SM	Poor	Poor	3 trees in a poor condition. Fell.	-	U
5634	Sorbus	<6	370, 290, 245	3	3	2	3	2	2	M	Good	Good/ Fair	3 trees as one visual unit. One tree has a large stem injury with reasonable wound occlusion. Trees of moderate quality and value in the landscape.	20+	B1/2
5635	Cherry	<5	300, 300, 200	3	3	3	3	1	1	EM/M	Fair	Fair	3 trees as one visual unit of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
5636	Group	<5	250, 350	3	3	3	2	2	2	M	Fair	Fair	2 trees as one visual unit. Hawthorn and cherry. Cherry multi-stemmed with defective stem unions. A group of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
5637	Sorbus	6	190	2	2	2	2	3	3	EM	Good	Good	Slight lean. 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
				N	E	S	W								
5638	Alder	10	270	1	3	3	3	3	2	EM	Good	Good	A tree of moderate quality and value in the landscape.	20+	B1/2
5639	Alder	11	360	5	6	5	6	3	3	EM/M	Good	Good	Well formed tree of moderate quality and value in the landscape.	20+	B1/2

Appendix 2

CONTENTS

Tree Work Specification

Our Ref: 3285/DR.15

Jericho Lane - Tree Work Specification

Tag No.	Identity	Particular Schedule of Works Required	Cost
5619	Copse	Remove dead, dying and diseased trees along site edge. Remove all arisings. Leave stump as close to the ground as possible.	
5633	Group of Sorbus	Remove stakes and ties.	
5633	Sorbus	Fell. Remove all arisings. Leave stump as close to the ground as possible.	

Arboricultural Association Standard Conditions of Contract and Specifications apply.

Works in accordance with BS3998 – 2010

Not for planning control.

Any defects are to be reported to A.C.S. Consulting - 01565 755422

No deviation from the specification without written consent.

General Risk Assessment and Method Statement to be supplied.

Bat Risk Assessment to be supplied.

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

