

**Rice Lane, Liverpool**

**Arboricultural Report**

**February 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](mailto:irm@acsconsulting.co.uk)

ACS Consulting  
Suite 1  
9 – 11 Princess Street  
Knutsford  
WA16 6BY  
[Manchester@acsconsulting.co.uk](mailto:Manchester@acsconsulting.co.uk)

#### **Limitation**

ACS Consulting (ACS) has prepared this Report for the sole use of Aldi Stores UK LTD and Mulbury Homes 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	10
DRAWING(S)		
3169_101	Arboricultural Plan	
APPENDICES		
1	Tabulated Tree Data	
2	Heads of Terms Method Statement	

### Document Revision Record

Issue No	Date	Details of Revisions
1	November 2014	Original Issue
2	February 2015	Revised Issue

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

**1.01** A. C. S. Consulting is instructed by Aldi Stores UK Ltd and Mulbury Homes to report on trees and the constraints on development at the former Walton Hospital Site, Rice Lane, 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 October 2014 (Aldi) and February 2015 (Mulbury). A survey of the trees was completed recording; *species type, age, height, crown spread, diameter-at-breast-height, and condition*. In October, the survey was undertaken in warm sunny conditions. During February, the survey was undertaken in cold dry conditions. In October, the trees were in leaf which restricted a view of their upper canopies but gave a good indication of their physiological condition, in February, they were without leaves which allowed a good view of their upper canopies.

**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.3169\_101.

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

## **2.0 BACKGROUND**

### **The Site**

- 2.01** The site comprises an irregular shaped parcel of land on the former Walton Hospital Site, Rice Lane, Liverpool. The site surrounds and is adjacent to the recently completed Clock View Hospital.

### **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 fifty-nine individual trees and sixteen groups. 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 (3169\_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).

#### **Aldi Stores**

- 3.03** Trees T1 – T20 and G1 to G4 within the red line on Plan 3169\_101 are the original trees surveyed in the November 2014 survey. Visually, from Rice Lane, the trees T1 - T13 appear as one visual unit giving scale and maturity as landscape features. The site contains one significant individual specimen (T17) that is considered desirable to retain which adds to and enhances the treed character of the locale. Equally, the area contains some trees that, due to competition from companion specimens, are mediocre in form. Their removal would detract little from the overall treescape.

#### **Mulbury Homes**

- 3.04** The trees within the Mulbury Homes application site are located to the north of the site and adjacent to internal access road as well as on a parcel of land to the south west. Overall, the trees are mediocre with only a handful of trees considered desirable to be retained. The trees within the Aldi site screen a number of trees giving them a low or moderate visual amenity.



## **4.0 DEVELOPMENT ASPECTS**

- 4.01** The Arboricultural Plan (3169\_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.

## **5.0 CONCLUSIONS**

**5.01** The site comprises an irregular shaped parcel of land located on the former Walton Hospital Site, Rice Lane, Liverpool. The site contains a number of significant specimen trees that are considered desirable to retain which add to and enhance the treed character of the locale. 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.

**I Murat M.Sc., F.Arbor.A, CEnv, MCIEEM**  
**ACS Consulting**  
**February 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>Adequate – 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>Adequate – Some defects rectifiable with minor tree surgery</p> <p>Poor – Significant defects only 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)				
<b>Category U</b>  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"><li>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).</li><li>Trees that are dead or are showing signs of significant, immediate, and irreversible overall decline.</li><li>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.</li></ul> <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				
<b>Category A</b>  <b>Trees of high quality</b> 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
<b>Category B</b>  <b>Tress of moderate quality</b> 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
<b>Category C</b>  <b>Tress of low quality</b> 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

Aldi

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
1	Goat Willow	5	#200	N 0 E 2 S 3 W 0	0	1	SM	Good	Adequate/ Poor	Severely suppressed by adjacent lime. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
2	Lime	10	490	N 4 E 5 S 5 W 5	1	2	EM/M	Good	Adequate	Multi-stemmed at 3m, defective stem unions. Stem injury with good wound occlusion. Restricted root development due to hard surfaces and ditch. A tree of moderate quality and value in the landscape.	20+	B1/2
3	Group	<12	<200	N 2 E 2 S 2 W 2	0	0	SM/EM	Good	Adequate	Small group of ash, birch and elm influencing each other in development and of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
4	Ash									Putrefied remains of Inonotus on the ground. One of principle leaders extensively decayed. Storm damage and die-back. Retainable as a wildlife feature.	-	U
5	Sorbus	8	350	N 2 E 3 S 3 W 3	0	0	M	Adequate	Adequate	Multi-stemmed, typical of species. Fire damage to north western canopy. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
6	Plane	13	500	N 5 E 3 S 5 W 5	0	0	SM/EM	Adequate	Adequate	Evidence of fire damage on the main stem – tree appears not to have suffered as has good foliage density. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2

Aldi

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
7	Birch	15	400	N 3 E 5 S 3 W 3	1	1	M	Good	Good	Suppressed by adjacent trees and of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
8	Ash	15	580	N 6 E 7 S 6 W 6	3	1	M	Adequate/ Poor	Adequate	Extensive die-back in upper canopy. No evidence of Chalara. Storm damage. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.  <b>Work</b> Crown clean.	10+	C1/2
9	Cypress	14	480	N 1 E 2 S 2 W 3	1	1	M	Good	Good	A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
10	Plane	015	310	N 5 E 2 S 3 W 5	2	2	EM	Good	Good	Suppressed by adjacent cypress. Would benefit from their removal. A tree of moderate quality and value in the landscape.	20+	B1/2
11	Cypress	15	410	N 2 E 2 S 2 W 2	1	1	M	Poor	Poor	Dysfunction on northern stem. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2

Aldi

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
12	Cypress	14	500	N 2 E 2 S 2 W 2	1	1	EM	Good	Good	Self set sycamore and elm growing through canopy. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
13	Sycamore	12	380	N 4 E 4 S 3 W 4	2	2	EM	Adequate	Adequate	Swamped by ivy. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.  <b>Work</b> Cut ivy and allow to wither.	20+	C1/2
14	Elm	11	M/S	N 3 E 3 S 3 W 3	3	3	EM	Poor	Poor	Multi-stemmed, defective stem unions. Extensive bark loss and decay.	-	U
G1	Group	<8	<100	N 2 E 2 S 2 W 2	0	0	Y/SM	Adequate	Adequate	Group of self set elm and sycamore of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
G2	Group	<8	<120	N 1 E 1 S 1 W 1	1	1	Y/SM	Good	Adequate	Group of self set ash and sycamore located in a planter and of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2



Aldi

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
15	Elm	10	280	N 2 E 2 S 3 W 3	1	1	SM/EM	Good	Good	Profusion of epicormic growth around stem – typical of species. Short lived. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
G3	Group	<10	<200	N 2 E 2 S 2 W 2	0	0	SM	Adequate	Adequate	Group of self set elm with occasional hawthorn and sycamore. A group of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
16	Cherry	8	300	N 3 E 3 S 2 W 3	2	2	EM/M	Adequate	Adequate/ Poor	Mediocre specimen of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
17	Willow	18	785	N 6 E 10 S 10 W 7	0	3	FM/OM	Adequate	Adequate	Pronounced lean east with historical root exposure and movement to the west. Storm damage. Split limbs. Pieces of dead wood – typical of species. Visually prominent. A tree of moderate quality and value in the landscape.  <b>Work</b> Crown clean and crown lift. Crown reduce eastern and southern canopies.	20+	B1/2

Aldi

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
18	Birch	10	290	N 3 E 3 S 3 W 2	1	3	EM	Good	Good	Extensive damage to north from construction. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
19	Thorn	2	100	N 1 E 1 S 1 W 1	1	1	SM	Poor	Poor	A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
20	Thorn	2	100	N 1 E 1 S 1 W 1	1	1	SM	Poor	Poor	A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
G4	Group	<8	<200	N 2 E 2 S 2 W 2	1	1	SM	Adequate	Adequate	Group of apple, sycamore and elm located in a planter. Mediocre specimens. A group of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2

# Mulbury Homes

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
G1	Group	<10	320, 370 & 195	N 7 E 4.5 S 3 W 5	1	1	EM	Good	Good	3 trees – Norway maple, London plane and cherry. The cherry is particularly poor and suppressed. The London plane is the better specimen of the three. Overall a group of moderate quality and value in the landscape.	20+	B1/2
G2	Cypress	15	<400	N 2 E 2 S 2 W 2	0	0	EM	Adequate	Poor	Demolition operations around the group. A group of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1
T3	Sycamore	15	565 & 500	N #6 E 7 S 5 W 6	2 (S)	3 (S)	M	Good	Adequate	Twin stemmed. Prominent. Surrounded by hard surfacing. A tree of moderate quality and value in the landscape.	20+	B1/2
G4	Sycamore	10	<200	N 1 E 3 S 3 W 3	0	0	SM	Good	Good	Self set group of sycamore and ash of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1
T5	Sycamore	15	#400	N #3 E #3 S 1 W #3	#2	#2	EM	Good	N/K	Appears to be a twin stemmed tree located behind a large wall in third party property. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2

# Mulbury Homes

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
T6	Sycamore	8	250	N 2 E 2 S 3 W 3.5	1	1	SM	Good	Good	Self set tree. Slight crown asymmetry due to the influence of the adjacent cherry. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1
T7	Cherry	9	265	N 4 E 6 S 4 W 5	0	0	EM	Good	Good	Located amongst rubble. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1
T8	Poplar									Dead.	-	U
T9	Poplar									Extensive tear. Exposure of wood. Large dead limbs.	-	U
T10	Poplar									Twin stemmed. Northern stem has collapsed. Southern stem is extensively fire damaged.	-	U
G11	Birch	<15	280, 320 & 440	N 4.5 E 4.5 S 4 W #5	0	0	EM/M	Good	Good	3 birch trees as one visual unit. A group of moderate quality and value in the landscape.	20+	B1/2
T12	Sorbus	8	340	N #4 E 3.5 S 3.5 W 4	1	2	EM/M	Good	Good	Well formed tree of moderate quality and value in the landscape.	20+	B1/2

# Mulbury Homes

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
T13	Sorbus	8	350	N 3 E 3 S 3 W 3	2	2	EM/M	Good	Good	Well formed tree of moderate quality and value in the landscape.	20+	B1/2
T14	Sorbus									Extensive bark stripping and fire damage.	-	U
T15	Birch	14	475	N 4.5 E 5.5 S 6 W 5	0	3	M	Good	Good	Building debris and service runs close by. Road to the north. Well formed tree. Minor damage to branches. Requires remedial tree surgery. A tree of moderate quality and value in the landscape.  <b>Work</b> Requires selective branch removal.	20+	B1/2
T16	Sorbus	5								Extensive bark stripping.	-	U
T17	Sorbus	5	330	N 3 E 3 S 3.5 W 3.5	1	2	EM/M	Good	Good	A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
T18	Sorbus	5	320	N 3.5 E 3.5 S 4 W 3.5	1	2	EM/M	Good	Good	A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2

# Mulbury Homes

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
T19	Sorbus	5	240	N 2 E 3 S 3 W 3.5	2	2	EM	Good	Good	A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
T20	Sorbus	5	220	N 1 E 3 S 3 W 3	2	2	SM/EM	Adequate	Adequate/ Poor	Limb on western canopy has split. Large amount of rubble around roots. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
T21	Cherry	9	515	N 3 E 4 S 2.5 W 3	2	4	FM	Poor	Poor	Multi-stemmed at 3m. Torn branches throughout the canopy. Poor past pruning practice. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
T22	Ash	11	570	N 4 E 5 S 5 W	2	3	M	Adequate	Adequate	Die-back in the upper canopy. Mounding of soil and demolition debris. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
T23	Ash	15	#400	N 8 E #8 S 6 W 0	2	2	M	Adequate	Good	Significant crown asymmetry due to the influence by adjacent tree. Sparse distribution of buds and twigs throughout the canopy. Large pieces of dead wood. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1

# Mulbury Homes

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
G24	Group	<10	<400	N 3 E 3 S 3 W 3	0	0	EM/M	Good	Adequate	3 hawthorns growing amongst dense bramble and goat willow. A group of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
T25	Norway Maple	10	#300	N 3 E 3 S 3 W 3	2	2	EM/M	Good	Good	Located on the boundary in third party property. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
T26	Goat Willow	12	#600	N 4 E 4 S 4 W 4	0	2	M	Good	Poor	Multi-stemmed, defective stem unions – typical of species. Located on third party property. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
G27	Group	<12	<500	N 3 E 3 S 3 W 3	2	2	M	Good	Good	Linear group of topped poplar. Multiple attachment of re-growth – typical of species. A group of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
G28	Prunus	15	#300	N #2 E #5 S #5 W #5	2	3	EM/M	Good	Good	2 trees covered in ivy. Located on third party property. A group of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
T29	Elm	14	340	N 5 E 5 S 3 W 4	0	0	EM	Good	Poor	Extensive damage from demolition.	-	U

# Mulbury Homes

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
T30	Willow	15	530	N 6.5 E 7 S 7.5 W 5	1	2	M	Good	Adequate	Storm damage and ripped branches in upper canopy. Restricted root developed. Located in a landscape feature. Dead wood due to natural branch suppression. A tree of moderate quality and value in the landscape.  <b>Work</b> Crown clean	20+	B1/2
T31	Willow	15	390	N 7 E 3 S 5 W 4	1	2	M	Adequate	Adequate	Dead wood. Crossing branches. A tree of moderate quality and value in the landscape.  <b>Work</b> Crown clean.	20+	B1/2
T32	Willow	15	535	N 8 E 8 S 8 W 1	2	3	M	Good	Good	Prominent specimen of moderate quality and value in the landscape.  <b>Work</b> Crown clean.	20+	B1/2
T33	Cypress	3	120	N 1 E 1 S 1 W 1	2	2	SM	Good	Good	Poor, suppressed specimen of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2



# Mulbury Homes

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
T34	Birch	10	240	N 3 E 3 S 2 W 3	2	2	EM	Good	Good	Slight crown asymmetry. Located in landscaped area. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
T35	Sorbus	8	340	N 4 E 4 S 3 W 4	3	3	EM/M	Good	Good	Slight lean. Soil raising. Multi-stemmed, defective stem unions – typical of species. Appears to have stabilised. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
G36	Cypress	6	170 & 160	N 2 E 2 S 2 W 2	2	2		Good	Good	2 trees located in a landscaped area of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
T37	Maple	7	#200	N 1 E 1 S 1 W 1	2	2		Poor	Poor	Poor distribution of buds and twigs. Located in shrubbery. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1
T38	Ash	10	340	N 4 E 4 S 4 W 3.5	3	3	EM	Adequate	Adequate	Torn limbs. Mediocre distribution of buds and twigs. Large pieces of dead wood at distal parts of the canopy – especially to the east. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1

# Mulbury Homes

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
T39	Apple	3	120	N 2 E 2 S 1 W 1	1	1	SM/EM	Poor	Poor	A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
T40	Apple	3	120 & 150	N 2 E 3 S 2 W 2	1	1	SM	Adequate	Adequate	Twin stemmed at ground level. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
T41	Sycamore	12	500	N 4 E 4 S 5 W 4.5	3	3	EM/M	Good	Adequate/ Poor	Twin stemmed. Defective stem union with swelling. Causing damage to the wall. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1
T42	Cherry	3	180	N 1 E 1 S 1 W 2	3	3	EM	Adequate	Adequate	Squat specimen of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1
T43	Horse-chestnut									Large branch tear and branch loss to the north. Exposed timber.	-	U
T44	Cherry & Ash	7	200	N 5 E 4 S 4 W 2	1	1	SM/EM	Good	Poor	2 trees. Ash is a tall, drawn self set specimen. Cherry is multi-stemmed with defective stem unions. Trees of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1

# Mulbury Homes

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
T45	Sorbus	9	245	N 0 E 5 S 0 W 0	4	4	EM	Adequate	Poor	Pronounced lean east. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
T46	Hawthorn	9	400	N 1 E 4 S 3 W 4	1	1	FM	Good	Adequate	Multi-stemmed, defective stem unions – typical of species. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1
G47	Cherry	<15	440, 370, 375, 340 & 415	N 8 E 7.5 S #5 W 6.5	0 (W)	3	M	Poor	Poor	5 cherries. One tree (2) has an old Ganoderma bracket. Trees 1 & 3 are twin stemmed with defective stem unions. 2 & 4 have extensive stem decay. Overall, a group to be felled due to condition.	-	U
G48	Group	<5	<100	N 2 E 2 S 2 W	0	0	SM	Adequate	Adequate	Linear group of self set elm and goat willow. Extensive tipping. A group of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
G49	Group	<15	#450, 300 & 280	N 5 E #7 S 3 W 3	0	0	EM	Good	Adequate	N to south. #450, 300 & 280.  3 trees as one visual unit. 2 sycamores and an elm. Tipping around the roots. A group of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1

# Mulbury Homes

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
T50	Ash	10	600	N 5 E 5 S 5 W 5	2	2	EM	Good	Good	Appears to be within the site located on top of wall. Tri-stemmed tree. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1
T51	Walnut	10	#400	N 4 E #4 S #2 W 4	3	3	EM	Good	Good	Located on the boundary in third party property. A tree of moderate quality and value in the landscape.	20+	B1
G52	Group	<14	<300	N 4 E 4 S 4 W 4	0	0	SM/EM	Adequate	Adequate	Mixed group of hawthorn. Cherry, sycamore, laurel and willow. A group of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
G53	Group	<8	<300	N 2 E 2 S 2 W 2	0	0	SM-M	Adequate	Adequate	Group of hawthorn, sycamore and elm. Located on a steeply sloping bank. A number of trees are poor. A group of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2

# Appendix 2

---

## CONTENTS

Method Statement

## **Heads of Terms of an Arboricultural Method Statement**

### **Rice Lane**

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.

#### **Removal of Hard surfacing**

- Existing surface to be removed by hand working from the closest point to the tree working out.
- The upper course to be cut with a disc cutter.
- The material is to be broken with hand tools.

#### **Services**

- Location of services including sewerage, 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

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

