

Ground Level Tree Assessment

Survey site:

Land off Archway Road, Huyton, Metropolitan Borough of Knowsley, Merseyside, L36 9XD

Client:

Genr8 Kajima Regeneration (Huyton) Limited

Survey date:

16th April 2025

Project:

This report is prepared to inform a planning application with the Liverpool City Council. The proposal is described as: Main 7 acre site: The demolition of the existing muni tower, annex and computer centre, as well as enabling works to the whole site Phase 1 sees a new council HQ, 130 bed hotel and affordable 75 unit residential block built, as well as some of the public realm. The outline application for later phases allows for a maximum of 500 residential units and/or commercial development.

Lathom Road, Lansdowne way & old market:

Demolition of existing, and replacement with a 150 space surface level car park, to incl. EV charging and cycle spaces, and public realm.

Cavendish:

Retain existing building, refurbish the interior, make some façade upgrades and punch some new windows through.

GLTA survey methodology and legislation can be found in the Arbtech Supplement: [PRA Methodology and Legislation - 2024.](#)

The survey results and recommendations contained within this report are valid for 18 months. An updated site visit may be required if the report is to be used any longer than 18 months after completion.

Site Location and Context					
The survey site is centred on National Grid Reference SJ 44183 90863 and has an area of approximately 2.8ha. The site comprises multiple buildings (B1-5), associated hardstanding and landscaping including grassland, ornamental shrubs, tree lines and hedgerows. The site is adjacent to Huyton Village Shopping Centre to the south, within the urban town of Huyton. The surrounding landscape is comprised of urban development including tarmacked roads subject to heavy traffic, urban buildings and residential dwellings with associated vegetated gardens. There are amenity green spaces including that associated with Lord Derby Academy situated ~400m east and Bowring Park and Golf Course situated ~800m west. There are train tracks situated ~80m south which likely enhance the area for a variety of species, including bats, amphibians and reptiles by aiding in dispersal to areas of optimal habitat within the wider landscape.					
Survey Details					
The site survey was undertaken by Katie Crawford BSc MRes ACIEEM (Natural England Protected Species Licence Numbers: [Bats] (2023-11335-CL18-BAT) [Great Crested Newts] (2023-11555-CL08-GCN)					
Date of survey	Temperature (°C)	Humidity (%)	Cloud Cover (%)	Wind (km/h)	Rain
16/04/2025	9	79	90	9	Light

PRA Survey Factor	Detailed using desk study and site survey. Any specific limitations noted within relevant section. This table may include further work you will need to commission (if any) to obtain planning permission or comply with legislation for other consent. All clients are expected to read and understand this section, or to contact the lead surveyor for advice.														
See GLTA plan in Appendix 1, location plan in Appendix 2, proposed plans in Appendix 3.															
Summary of Survey Findings (UKHab codes used)	EPSL data A search of the magic.gov.uk database for granted EPSLS within a 2km radius of the site has been completed. Displaced bats from licensed sites <2km away from the survey site will find alternative habitat either within the mitigation measures implemented as part of the licence or will relocate to other known roosts sites in close proximity to the licensed site. There are 2 EPSLs within a 2km radius of site as detailed below:														
	<table><tr><th>EPSL reference</th><th>Bat species affected</th><th>Distance from site</th><th>Impacts allowed by licence</th></tr><tr><td>2018-38343-EPS-MIT</td><td>Common pipistrelle</td><td>~1.9km northeast</td><td>Destruction of a resting place</td></tr><tr><td>2015-8047-EPS-MIT</td><td>Brown long eared bat and common pipistrelle</td><td>~1.9km northeast</td><td>Destruction of a resting place</td></tr></table>			EPSL reference	Bat species affected	Distance from site	Impacts allowed by licence	2018-38343-EPS-MIT	Common pipistrelle	~1.9km northeast	Destruction of a resting place	2015-8047-EPS-MIT	Brown long eared bat and common pipistrelle	~1.9km northeast	Destruction of a resting place
	EPSL reference	Bat species affected	Distance from site	Impacts allowed by licence											
2018-38343-EPS-MIT	Common pipistrelle	~1.9km northeast	Destruction of a resting place												
2015-8047-EPS-MIT	Brown long eared bat and common pipistrelle	~1.9km northeast	Destruction of a resting place												
Foraging and commuting habitat Habitats recorded on site are assessed to provide moderate value foraging and commuting opportunities for bats in the form of modified grassland, native hedgerows, tree lines and scattered trees across the site. These habitats are likely to provide micro-climatic conditions that support invertebrates that will in turn provide foraging opportunities for local bat populations. Most notably, the hedgerows and tree lines will act as linear landscape elements for bats to commute across the site. There are train tracks situated ~80m south which will aid in commuting and foraging of local bat populations whilst travelling between roost sites. However, there is limited linear habitat which extends off site and connects the site to this feature.															
<u>Local notable habitats</u> The site contains native hedgerow which is listed as a habitat of principal importance under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act (2006). The site also contains scattered and lines of trees which are of good quality and could be															

	of value to local wildlife populations (as detailed in subsequent sections of this table). Other habitats within the site are common and widespread and have low ecological value. Further notable habitats are present within 2km.					
Trees – Ground Level Tree Assessment						
Summary of Survey Findings	There are 93 individual trees and three lines of trees within the site boundary. Final plans have not been determined, although, it is considered that 14 individual trees and lines of trees will be lost to facilitate development.					
	Tree ID	Arb report ID	Species	Size (DBH)	GLTA Results	Photograph
	T1	NA	Beech	~38cm (medium)	No features, negligible suitability	
	T2	NA	Beech	~35cm (medium)	Light ivy cover, not considered heavy enough to be a PRF, negligible suitability	
	T3	NA	Beech	~35cm (medium)	No features, negligible suitability	
	T4	NA	Horse chestnut	~70cm (large)	Dense ivy cover around trunk, but tree not large enough to be considered to have features suitable for	

					multiple bats and considering the heavily urban context it is given PRF-I		
	T5	NA	Horse chestnut	~70cm (large)	Dense ivy cover around trunk, but tree not large enough or mature enough stems to be considered to have features suitable for multiple bats and considering the heavily urban context it is given PRF-I		

	T6	NA	Beech	~74cm (large)	No features, negligible		
	T7	T1	Ash	~33cm (medium)	No features, negligible		

	T8	T47	Rowan	~33cm (medium)	No features, negligible	
	T9	G3	Cherry	~33cm (medium)	No features, negligible	
	T10	G3	Cherry	~33cm (medium)	No features, negligible	
	T11	G3	Cherry	~31cm (medium)	No features, negligible	
	T12	G3	Cherry	~32cm (medium)	No features, negligible	
	T13	G3	Cherry	~20cm (small)	No features, negligible	

	T14	G2	Cherry	~37cm (medium)	No features, negligible		
	T15	G2	Cherry	~37cm (medium)	No features, negligible		
	T16	G1	Rowan	~27cm (small)	No features, negligible		
	T17	T3	Norway Maple	~35cm (medium)	No features, negligible		
	T18	T2	Cherry	~35cm (medium)	No features, negligible		

	T19	G6	Silver birch	~22cm (small)	No features, negligible potential		
	T20	G6	Silver birch	~27cm (small)			
	T21	G7	Maple	~21cm (small)	No features, negligible		

	T22	G6	Silver birch	~34cm (medium)	Both along footpath, split in trunk of silver birch does not lead into suitable roosting feature, both negligible		
	T23	T10	Cherry	~27cm (small)			

							
	T24	G9	Whitebeam	~20cm (small)			

	T25	G9	Whitebeam	~20cm (small)	Urban setting, no features, negligible		
	T26	G10	Silver birch	~32cm (medium)	Light ivy cover on one birch but urban and		

	T27	G10	Silver birch	~39cm (medium)	heavily lit setting, negligible suitability, birds nest observed		
--	-----	-----	--------------	-------------------	---	--	--

	T28	G10	Whitebeam	~19cm (small)	Two lines of urban trees beside a path, no features negligible potential		
	T29	G10	Whitebeam	~19cm (small)			
	T30	G10	Whitebeam	~19cm (small)			
	T31	G10	Whitebeam	~16cm (small)			
	T32	G10	Whitebeam	~28cm (small)			
	T33	G10	Whitebeam	~23cm (small)			

	T34	T30	Ash	~15cm (small)	No features, negligible suitability		
	T35	T32	Lime	~60cm (medium)	No features, negligible suitability		
	T36	T29	Sycamore	~22cm (small)	No features, negligible suitability		
	T37	T28	Poplar	~49cm (large)	No features, negligible suitability		

	T38	T21	Poplar	~35cm (medium)	No features, negligible suitability	
	T39	T33	Lime	~52cm (large)	No features, negligible suitability	
	T40	T27	Sycamore	~22cm (small)	No features, negligible suitability	
	T41	T34	Poplar	~81cm (large)	No features, negligible suitability	
	T42	T26	Rowan	~21cm (small)	No features, negligible suitability	

	T43	T31	Holly	~16cm (small)	No features, negligible suitability	
	T44	T31	Sycamore	~22cm (small)	No features, negligible suitability	
	T45	G28	Norway Maple	~35cm (medium)	No features, negligible suitability	
	T46	G28	Norway Maple	~35cm (medium)	No features, negligible suitability	
	T47	G28	Rowan	~28cm (small)	No features, negligible suitability	
	T48	25	Sycamore	~50cm (medium)	No features, negligible suitability	
	T49	T24	Oak	~90cm (large)	Small split limb, with feature approximatel y 4m high	

					and north facing, PRF-I	
	T50	T22	Sweet chestnut	~33cm (medium)	No features, negligible suitability	

						
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

	T51	T23	Beech	~75cm (medium)	Split trunk at base but does not lead to a feature, negligible potential	
--	-----	-----	-------	-----------------	--	---

						
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

	T52	G26	Norway Maple	~15cm (small)	No features, negligible suitability, light ivy cover but no mature stems and very urban setting	
	T53	T27	Whitebeam	~25cm (small)	No features, negligible suitability	
	T54	T27	Rowan	~15cm (small)	No features, negligible suitability	

	T55	T20	Hawthorn	~15cm (small)	Dense ivy cover, PRF-I	
	T56	G25	Cockspur thorn	~29cm (small)	No features, negligible suitability	
	T57	G25	Ash	~10cm (small)	No features, negligible suitability	

	T58	G2	Ash	~18cm (small)	No features, negligible suitability	
	T59	G29	Lime	~27cm (small)	No features, negligible suitability	
	T60	G29	Norway Maple	~27cm (small)	No features, negligible suitability	
	T61	G29	Norway Maple	~27cm (small)	No features, negligible suitability	

	T62	G29	Norway Maple	~23cm (small)	No features, negligible suitability	
--	-----	-----	-----------------	------------------	---	--

	T63	G29	Norway Maple	~29cm (small)	No features, negligible suitability	
	T64	T37	Norway Maple	~31cm (medium)	No features, negligible suitability	
	T65	G30	Norway Maple	~20cm (small)	Dense ivy cover, PRF-I	

	T66	T36	Norway Maple	~20cm (small)	No features, negligible suitability	
	T67	T35.	Norway Maple	~22cm (small)	Dense ivy cover around trunk, PRF-I	

	T68	T39	Whitebeam	~29cm (small)	No features, negligible suitability	
	T69	T38	Beech	~45cm (medium)	Dense ivy cover, given the urban context and species it is considered PRF-I	

	T70	G18	Beech	~43cm (medium)	No features, negligible suitability	
	T71	G8	Oak	~72cm (large)	Knothole approximatel y 2m high, visibly not leading into a feature and upwards facing, negligible potential	

	T72	G22	Cider gum	~16cm (small)	Very small and short trees with no features, negligible	
	T73	G22	Rowan	~15cm (small)		
	T74	T18	Rowan	~15cm (small)		

						
	T75	T40	Callery pear	~15cm (small)	Small tree, no features, negligible	

	T76	T41	Whitebeam	~17cm (small)	No features, negligible suitability	
	T77	T42	Whitebeam	~13cm (small)	No features, negligible suitability	

	T78	T13	White poplar	~76cm (large)	Large tree with generally smooth bark, split in trunk but does not lead to internal feature, negligible suitability	
--	-----	-----	--------------	---------------	---	---

						
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

	T79	T12	Silver birch	~22cm (small)	No features, negligible suitability	
	T80	G30	Lime	~68cm (large)	Ivy cover on trunk with stems appearing mature, PRF-I	

	T81	G30	Norway Maple	~29cm (small)	No features, negligible suitability	
	T82	G30	Norway Maple	~38cm (medium)	No features, knothole approximately 1.5m up on southern elevation but does not lead on to further crevice, negligible suitability	

	T83	G31	Norway Maple	~31cm (medium)	No features, negligible suitability	
	T84	G31	Norway Maple	~34cm (medium)	No features, negligible suitability	
	T85	G36	Hornbeam	~75cm (medium)	No features, negligible suitability	
	T86	G36	Common pear	~14cm (small)	No features, negligible suitability	
	T87	G34	Lime	~30cm (medium)	No features, negligible suitability	
	T88	G34	Lime	~30cm (medium)	No features, negligible suitability	

	T89	G13	Lime	~31cm (medium)	No features, negligible suitability	
	T90	G13	Norway Maple	~35cm (medium)	Ivy cover around trunk of tree, PRF- I	

	T91	NA	Silver birch	~42cm (medium)	Ivy cover on two birch trees but light cover and no thick stems on ivy to provide a crevice, other two birch trees have no features and negligible potential	
--	-----	----	--------------	-----------------	--	---

						
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

	T92	NA	Rowan	~20cm (small)	No features, young tree, negligible suitability	
	T93	NA	Alder	~15cm (small)	No features, young tree, negligible suitability	
	T94	NA	Alder	~15cm (small)	No features, young tree, negligible suitability	

	G1 (T141-146)	G18	Line of 10 Beech	~52cm (medium)	No features, small beech has some knotholes but do not lead into features, all negligible suitability.	
	G2 (T116-127+T140)	G16	Ash and Maple group	~31cm maximum (medium)	No features, negligible	

	G3 (T94- T108)	G14+G15	Group of 11 trees including ash, maple and silver birch	Mix of small and medium	No visible features, some light ivy cover on a couple of trees, negligible suitability	
	G4 (T179 -182)	G30	Group of 4 whitebea m trees	Medium	No features, negligible	

	G5 (T128 -139)	G17	Group of 13 trees including sycamore and beech	Mix of small and medium	No features, negligible		
	G6 (T183 -186)	G31+G36	Group of 4 wild service trees	Mix of medium and large	T185 dense ivy clad – PRF-I		

	G7 (T187 -191)	G35	Group of 5 trees including alder, cherry and field maple	Mix of small and medium	Negligible feature on T187. ~1.5m above ground facing upwards. Feature is exposed to weather and will retain water making it unsuitable.	
--	----------------------	-----	--	----------------------------------	---	---

	G8 (T109 -114)	G12	Group of 8 trees including silver birch and lime	Mix of medium and large	One large tree (T114) dense ivy clad – PRF-I	
	G9 (T147 -176)	G20+G21+G23+G 24	Group of 29 trees including holly, cherry, cabbage tree, silver birch, field maple, poplar	Mix of small, medium and large	No features, superficial crevices present on poplar and holly, negligible	


			and sycamore			
	T115	G10	Cherry		No features, knot holes present but superficial	
	T177	NA	Alder		No features, negligible	

	T178	NA	Alder		No features, negligible	
<i>Foreseen Impacts</i>	As a feature was identified on T49, the felling of this tree could result in destruction of any bat roosts present within the identified feature and could cause disturbance, death or injury to bats. However, T49 will be retained as part of the proposed plans and therefore no impacts to roosting bats within T49 are anticipated.					

<i>Recommendations</i>	If the plans change and T49 be subject to felling, a close-up inspection of the PRF identified from ground-level on T49 will be required to determine the suitability for bats (i.e. PRF-I or PRF-M). This will involve a tree climbing team or MEWP to access the features and should be carried out by a class 2 licenced ecologist. The inspection will involve a detailed inspection of all features using a torch and endoscope. Following this inspection, the features will then be re-classified based on their suitability for roosting bats. Depending on the results of the close-up inspection further surveys may be required to determine bat presence/likely-absence or a recommendation to remove the trees under a precautionary working method statement <u>T4, T5, T49, T55, T65, T67, T69, T80, T90, T185, T114</u> For other trees, as per Tables 6.3 and 7.1 of the Bat Survey Guidelines (2023) trees with PRF-I's only do not require further survey effort, however compensation for lost features should be installed prior to tree felling works, and works should be carried out under a precautionary working method statement (PWMS). The PWMS includes: • Prior to any PRF removal, suitable compensation should be provided onsite (i.e. bat boxes in appropriate locations) • Felling to be done under supervision by an ecologist • Any identified PRF-I feature(s) will be soft felled in conjunction with an experienced arborist. This will involve sections of the tree with the PRF to be cut away and lowered to the ground and inspected by a licenced ecologist • Any PRFs felled will be left in-situ on the ground within a 10m exclusion zone for 24 hours • In the unlikely event that a bat or evidence of bats is discovered during the development all work must stop and a bat licensed ecologist contacted for further advice Suggested biodiversity enhancements The installation of at least 10 bat boxes at the site will provide additional roosting habitat for bats. The bat boxes will be incorporated into the fabric of the new dwellings. They will be suitable for pipistrelles (which have been identified locally through EPSL data). Suitable bat boxes include Habibat Bat Box, Ibstock Enclosed Bat Box or similar alternative brand. Bat boxes should be positioned 3-5m above ground level facing in a south or south-westerly direction with a clear flight path to and from the entrance, away from artificial light.
Birds	
<i>Summary of Survey Findings</i>	<u>Trees:</u> A single bird's nest was identified within T27. Additionally, all on site trees provide foraging opportunities and nest-building resources for birds. <u>Barn owls:</u>

	The site does not appear to provide any suitable nesting sites for barn owls. <u>Overwintering birds:</u> Due to the small size of the site and the extent and type of the habitats recorded, the site not considered suitable to support a significant assemblage of protected and/or notable birds.
<i>Foreseen Impacts</i>	Buildings/trees The felling of trees could result in the destruction or the disturbance and subsequent abandonment of active bird nests if present during the time of works. Barn owls None foreseen. Overwintering birds None foreseen.
<i>Recommendations</i>	Tree felling or pruning should be undertaken outside the period 1st March to 31st August. If this timeframe cannot be avoided, a close inspection of the vegetation should be undertaken immediately, by a qualified ecologist, prior to the commencement of work. All active nests will need to be retained until the young have fledged. Precautions should be taken with machinery and noise levels when working close to any retained nests so as not to disturb any nearby nesting birds during construction works. At least a 3-5m buffer should be created between any machinery and active nests until the young have fledged. <u>Suggested biodiversity enhancements:</u> The installation of a minimum of five bird boxes on the new buildings will provide additional nesting habitat for birds e.g. ▪ Vivara Pro WoodStone Swift Nest Box (buildings) ▪ House Sparrow Terrace FSC Nest Box (buildings) ▪ Swallow Nest Bowl (buildings) (Or a similar alternative brand). Swift and sparrow boxes should be positioned at the eaves of a building and can be incorporated into the fabric of the building during construction.





Ground Level Tree Assessment



Ground Level Tree Assessment

Lucid
design studio

Renold Building, 32a Atrincham Street, Manchester, M1 7JR



Legal

Arbtech Consulting Limited has prepared this report for the sole use of the above-named client or their agents in accordance with our General Terms and Conditions, under which our services are performed. It is expressly stated that 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 Arbtech Consulting Limited. The conclusions and recommendations contained in this report are based upon information provided by third parties. Information obtained from third parties has not been independently verified by Arbtech Consulting Limited.

© This report is the copyright of Arbtech Consulting Limited. Any unauthorised reproduction or usage by any person other than the addressee is strictly prohibited.

Version control			
Status	Issue	Name	Date
Draft	0.1	Katie Crawford BSc MRes ACIEEM Ecologist	18/04/2025
Final	1.0	Harley Stone BSc (Hons), Consultant Ecologist	23/04/2025
Updated	2.0	Amber Williams BSc (Hons) MSc MPhil Consultant Ecologist	16/02/2026
Amended	3.0	Amber Williams BSc (Hons) MSc MPhil Consultant Ecologist	02/04/2026
Amended	4.0	Amber Williams BSc (Hons) MSc MPhil Consultant Ecologist	27/05/2026
Final	5.0	Amber Williams BSc (Hons) MSc MPhil Consultant Ecologist	27/07/2026