

ELMLEY CASTLE PARK



TREE CONDITION ASSESSMENT

Prepared for: Elmley Castle, Bricklehampton and Netherton Parish Council

On the instructions of: David Thompson

Completed by: Paul Barton

Date: 27th November 2019

Project reference: E.3299

Table of Contents:

1.	INTRODUCTION	1
2.	METHODOLOGY	2
3.	SURVEY FINDINGS	3
4.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	5
	APPENDICES	6

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. The following report was commissioned by David Thompson, Parish Councillor of Elmley Castle. It is intended to provide an assessment of the condition of the significant trees located on and around the park/playing field in Elmley Castle, near Pershore, Worcestershire.
- 1.2. I inspected and recorded all major trees in this area in order to provide a complete inventory of the tree stock being managed by the Parish Council.
- 1.3. The report is based upon data collected on a visit to the site made on Friday 15th November, 2019. I was accompanied by a student of arboriculture from Pershore College, but all observations and opinions in this report are my own.
- 1.4. Weather conditions were cold and damp, but adequate enough to visually inspect the trees.
- 1.5. While every attempt has been made to provide a realistic and accurate assessment of the trees' condition at the time of inspection, no responsibility can be accepted for damage or injury sustained as a result of the failure of any tree due to faults not apparent upon a visual, ground level inspection carried out at this season, or to faults developing subsequent to the survey. Similarly, no liability can be accepted for the condition of trees that are obscured in part or in whole (e.g. by dense ivy or other foliage), nor for any that proved inaccessible to the inspector. Certain features which might provide evidence of ongoing decay or decline (such as seasonal fungal fruiting bodies, damage to foliage, insect emergence holes etc.) may not have been in evidence; only those features that are apparent at the time of the inspection could be assessed.
- 1.6. Where significant defects have been identified some recommendations for action may be provided. It should be appreciated that any such recommendations are in outline form only and do not constitute a detailed specification of any works that may be required.
- 1.7. Any tree surgery should be carried out by qualified and skilled arborists who would be able to interpret the recommendations in order to carry out necessary works in accordance with current Best Practice as set out in BS3998:2010.
- 1.8. A tree location plan is provided at the end of this report, based upon a Google Earth (Pro) aerial image. This plan indicates the *approximate* position of some trees using the numbers of the metal tags affixed to the trunks, and uses arrows to describe the rising sequence of the numbers around the site's periphery.

2. METHODOLOGY

- 2.1. The tree assessment comprised a visual inspection carried out from ground level only, using hand tools such as probes and a sounding hammer where appropriate. The inspections were intended to identify distinct defects and other failure-prone characteristics of the trees where these features might give rise to an unacceptable level of risk. It must nevertheless be recognised that no tree is entirely safe, given the possibility that an exceptionally strong wind or other unusual circumstances could damage or uproot even a mechanically 'perfect' specimen.
- 2.2. The identification of a 'defect' associated with a tree does not tell us anything about the actual risk that it represents to person or property. In order to make a realistic risk assessment one needs to consider three distinct aspects of the situation, namely:
 - (a) The likelihood that a failure, should it occur, will actually lead to any injury or damage. (i.e. are there vulnerable buildings or other structures within the potential 'target area'? If the tree is near a road, a driveway or a footpath, what is the frequency of use? How often are people, cars, bicycles etc. actually present in the area immediately around the tree?
 - (b) The size of the defective part (or, more specifically, how much damage would it cause were it to fail);
 - (c) The likelihood that failure will actually occur (i.e. what is the realistic probability that the dead limb, decayed tree etc. will actually break in the foreseeable future)
- 2.3. With regard to point (a), when one considers the length of time that a pedestrian or a moving vehicle is actually within the area likely to be affected by a tree failure, this frequently amounts to no more than a matter of seconds. Furthermore, tree failure can occur at any time of the day or night throughout the year and for much of that time the frequency of occupation may be negligible. Although dependent upon the frequency of traffic within the 'target area', it is often the case that total time that a 'target' is present and potentially vulnerable to tree failure will be a very small proportion of the overall time during which a failure might occur. It may also be of significance that site usage rates, particularly by pedestrians, will be reduced at times of bad weather when tree failures are more likely to occur. While the risk posed by trees should never be wholly disregarded, the level of safety that a situation demands must be set within the context of its environment. A tree at some distance from any building situated in a quiet side street will require considerable less stringent safety margins than would one growing in a town centre or alongside a busy road.
- 2.4. Within the methodology used in this report attempts are made to assess each of the three aspects described above. Point (a) is defined by a "Target Status" code allocated to each tree, determined

by its location in relation to features that could prove susceptible to harm. Where a hazard has been identified in a tree, its magnitude is defined by a "Hazard Code", while the "probability of hazard failure" is also designated a code.

- 2.5. These factors are defined in more detail, along with the other parameters assessed in the appendix to this report. There are subjective elements to each of these factors, but the intention is to use them to provide an informed assessment of the priority that should be given to dealing with any given hazard.

3. SURVEY FINDINGS

- 3.1. Detailed information for all trees surveyed can be found in the tree schedule in Appendix 1, however significant factors relating to the site and 'treescape' are discussed in this section of the report.
- 3.2. The trees are all located around the periphery of the playing field. To the west, three trees flank the pedestrian entrance to the field from Main Street and the sycamore (30851) is located quite close to an adjacent cottage. On the north and south boundaries the trees are planted in linear rows along the edge of Mill Lane (north) which is a no-through road serving local houses, and an un-named road to the south. Both roads appear to be relatively quiet with a low volume of traffic.
- 3.3. To the east of the field is the cricket pavilion, storage shed and a small fenced play area containing play equipment. Trees located along the brook on this boundary are within falling distance of the rough car parking area and storage shed.
- 3.4. Where trees are within falling distance of homes, the 'target status' has been recorded as '5' for permanently occupied or vulnerable structures. Most other trees have been assigned a target status of 2 or 3; moderate to significant occupancy. I acknowledge that on certain days of the year the occupancy of the site will be high, such as on warm summer days when cricket is being played or if there is a village fete or similar event. However, most use of the site (other than for dog-walkers) will be weather dependant; people are less likely to be under or close to trees during high-wind events when trees are most likely to suffer failures of some sort.
- 3.5. The tree stock is rather even-aged, consisting mostly of semi to early mature specimens. The most significant mature tree is the silver birch near Mill Lane tagged as 30862. There is a lack of newly planted or young trees.
- 3.6. Overall, the tree stock is in good condition. Of the 55 trees surveyed, only two trees have were noted to have defects that I considered to be significant in terms of their potential for failure. These were ash 30887 and plum 30900.

3.7. The ash appears to be in decline as evidenced by the sparse bud density and deadwood in the crown. It also has a poorly formed union between the second-order stems. The adjacent tree, also an ash, forms a cohesive canopy with the tree in decline so removal of the one tree would result in an imbalanced form for the remaining tree, as well as leaving it more exposed to new wind forces due to the removal of the mutual shelter. In my opinion crown reduction pruning of the remaining tree would not mitigate this impact, so I have recommended that both ash trees (30887 and 30888) are felled. Whilst this may seem like a high impact on the visual amenity of the playing field, it is foreseeable that both ash trees could succumb to 'ash dieback' which would shorten their lives anyway, so removal of these trees and replacement with a different species makes sense for the long-term in any case.



Photo 1: ash trees 30887 (left) & 30888 (right) recommended for removal.

- 3.8. The plum tree (30900) is a small tree on west boundary of poor form with a split in the stem. The risk of harm posed by this tree is low, but it is recommended for removal as part of general good tree management.
- 3.9. Six trees displayed minor defects, but not all of these trees necessarily require remedial works.

4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- 4.1. In summary, the trees at the playing field are generally in good condition, and very few require tree surgery works in order to reduce risk to users of the site. Out of 55 trees, five are recommended for removal; two as a 'moderate' priority and two as a 'low' priority.
- 4.2. Two trees are also recommended for ivy severance in order to aid future inspections.
- 4.3. The site lies within the boundary of the Elmley Castle conservation area. Therefore, notice of any intended tree works must be given to the local planning authority (Wychavon Council), which then has a 6 week period to either allow the works or serve a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) in order to prevent the specified work. The notice can be served to the council via their own form ([link here](#)) or by a letter or email sent to planning@wychavon.gov.uk.
- 4.4. I recommend that the trees at the site are formally re-inspected by a competent professional in three years time, but that until then informal, ad hoc inspections of the trees are undertaken by parish council members or grounds people employed to maintain the area. If sudden changes in tree health are noted, such as a lack of foliage, the emergence of fungal fruiting bodies or the appearance of cracks, a competent professional arboriculturist should be contacted for advice.
- 4.5. I also recommend that new trees are planted at the site in available open spaces, in order to compensate for the trees that are recommended for removal but also to diversify the age range and species at the site. If you need further advice on suitable species to plant, please feel free to contact me.



Paul Barton

MSc, BSc (hons), MArborA, RArborA

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: TREE SURVEY SCHEDULE & METHODOLOGY

TREE SURVEY SCHEDULE

ELMLEY CASTLE PARK

PROJECT NO: E.3299

SURVEYOR: P BARTON

SURVEY DATE: 15TH NOV 2019

CLIENT: ELMLEY CASTLE, BRICKLEHAMPTON & NETHERTON
PARISH COUNCIL



Ref	Species	Height	Diameter	Age class	Form	Target Status	Condition	Notes / Defect type	Hazard magnitude (Hazard trees only)	Likelihood of failure (Hazard trees only)	Recommended action	Priority
30851	Sycamore	M	M	EM	Std	5	G	Previously reduced and pruned back from adjacent property. Crossing branches on east side of crown.			None	0
30852	Lawson cypress	M	M	EM	Col	3	G	Good form. Co-dominant stems from approximately 4m.			None	0
30853	Lawson cypress	M	M	EM	Col	3	G	The poorer specimen of the pair of Lawson cypress near the green entrance. Suppressed by adjacent tree. No significant issues observed.			None	0
30854	Norway maple	M	M	M	Sprd	2	G	Multi stemmed from 1.5m. Broad crown form. Good form and condition.			None	0
30855	Ash	M	S	Y	Std	2	G	Located within holly hedgerow. No significant issues observed.			None	0
30856	Cherry	S	S	EM	3-st	2	G	Multi stemmed from ground level. Branches overhanging bench. Minor pruning wounds.			None	0
30857	Box elder	M	M	M	Asym	3	G	Suppressed by adjacent tree and pruned back from cricket field net. Top wire of netting abrading branches. Pruning stubs near telephone cable.			None	0
30858	Box elder	M	M	M	Sprd	3	G	As per tree 30857.			None	0
30859	Silver Maple	M	M	EM	Std	5	G	Good form and condition. 5 clumps of mistletoe in the crown.			None	0
30860	Small leaved lime	M	M	EM	Sprd	2	G	Multi stemmed from 1.5m, minor internal deadwood. No significant issues observed.			None	0
30861	Norway maple	M	M	EM	Std	2	M	Included bark union at 1.5m with rib of new wood on west side. Branches touching BT pole.			None	0
30862	Silver birch	L	L	M	Sprd	2	G	Impressive mature specimen of good form. At 1m there is a circumferential bulge, possibly caused by imbedded wire or similar.			None	0
30863	Tibetan cherry	S	M	M	Std	1	M	Suppressed by adjacent willow. Prolific epicormic shoots indicates stress. Deadwood on east side of crown.			Fell tree	D

Please refer to the methodology for explanation of codes used in this schedule.

TREE SURVEY SCHEDULE

ELMLEY CASTLE PARK

PROJECT NO: E.3299

SURVEYOR: P BARTON

SURVEY DATE: 15TH NOV 2019

CLIENT: ELMLEY CASTLE, BRICKLEHAMPTON & NETHERTON
PARISH COUNCIL

Ref	Species	Height	Diameter	Age class	Form	Target Status	Condition	Notes / Defect type	Hazard magnitude (Hazard trees only)	Likelihood of failure (Hazard trees only)	Recommended action	Priority
30864	Viburnum	S	S	EM	M-st	2	G	Typical form, no issues observed.			None	0
30865	Western red cedar	M	M	EM	Col	2	G	Co-dominant stem from 5m. No significant issues observed.			None	0
30866	Western red cedar	L	L	M	2-st	2	G	Twin-stemmed from 1m. Suppressed by willow on south side.			None	0
30867	Weeping willow	L	L	M	Weep	2	G	Weeping foliage overhanging adjacent cricket nets. Some pruning stubs. Partially split limb in central crown at 8m resting on adjacent branch, appears stable.			None	0
30868	Weeping willow	M	M	EM	Asym	1	G	Dead severed ivy on stem. Crown bias toward adjacent garden.			None	0
30869	Sycamore	L	L	EM	2-st	1	G	Co-dominant stems from 1m. Asymmetrical crown shape due to presence of tree on west side now removed.			None	0
30870	Norway maple	M	M	EM	Std	2	G	Good form and condition. Minor deadwood typical of species and age. Large partially occluded pruning wound at 1.5m.			None	0
30871	Norway maple	M	M	EM	Std	2	G	Forms cohesive canopy with adjacent tree. Minor impact wounds on lower stem.			None	0
30872	Field maple	M	M	EM	Std	2	M	Bulging bark around union at 0.6m. Occluding pruning wounds.			None	0
30873	Sycamore	M	M	EM	M-st	3	G	Multi stemmed tree on streamside. Minor deadwood. Some tip dieback over stream, but no significant defects that pose a threat to the adjacent shed.			None	0
30874	Ash	M	M	EM	Slndr	3	G	Dead, severed ivy on stems. Some deadwood up to 5cm diameter. No significant issues observed. No ADB symptoms observed.			None	0
30875	Sycamore	M	M	EM	M-st	3	G	Multi stemmed streamside tree. Dead, severed ivy. Crown overhangs storage area/parking.			None	0
30876	Sycamore	M	M	EM	M-st	3	M	Dead, severed ivy on stems. Tagged stem has area of necrotic bark near base and sparse bud density above, but oriented over stream.			None	0

Please refer to the methodology for explanation of codes used in this schedule.

TREE SURVEY SCHEDULE

ELMLEY CASTLE PARK

PROJECT NO: E.3299

SURVEYOR: P BARTON

SURVEY DATE: 15TH NOV 2019

CLIENT: ELMLEY CASTLE, BRICKLEHAMPTON & NETHERTON
PARISH COUNCIL

Ref	Species	Height	Diameter	Age class	Form	Target Status	Condition	Notes / Defect type	Hazard magnitude (Hazard trees only)	Likelihood of failure (Hazard trees only)	Recommended action	Priority
30877	Sycamore	M	S	EM	Asym	2	G	Suppressed by adjacent trees on far side of stream. Old impact wound on stem at 1.5m.			None	0
30878	Sycamore	M	M	EM	Std	2	G	No significant issues observed.			None	0
30879	Sycamore	M	M	EM	Grp	1	G	Forms cohesive canopy with adjacent tree. Dead, severed ivy on stem.			None	0
30880	Sycamore	M	M	EM	Grp	1	G	Forms cohesive canopy with adjacent tree. Dead, severed ivy on stem.			None	0
30881	Sycamore	M	M	EM	Grp	2	G	Forms cohesive canopy with adjacent tree. Dead, severed ivy on stem.			None	0
30882	Beech	L	M	EM	Std	2	G	Excellent specimen with no significant issues observed.			None	0
30883	Plum	S	S	EM	M-st	2	G	Typical for species and age.			None	0
30884	Silver birch	M	S	Y	Slndr	2	G	Ivy at stem base.			Sever ivy.	1
30885	Silver birch	L	M	EM	Std	2	G	Previously failed branch in central upper crown. Ivy at base.			Sever ivy.	1
30886	Silver birch	M	S	Y	Std	2	G	Trunk forks in to two secondary stems at 5m.			None	0
30887	Ash	L	M	M	Asym	2	H	Included bark union at 1.5m. Prolific deadwood in lower crown. Sparse bud density throughout crown indicates low vitality. Tree in decline.	2	3	Fell tree	2
30888	Ash	L	M	M	Asym	2	G	There are no significant defects observed. However, the removal of the adjacent ash which forms a cohesive canopy with this tree may lead to an increased likelihood of limb failures due to the removal of the mutual shelter. Reduction pruning is not considered to be a desirable long term management approach, so removal and replacement is recommended.			Fell	2

Please refer to the methodology for explanation of codes used in this schedule.

TREE SURVEY SCHEDULE

ELMLEY CASTLE PARK

PROJECT NO: E.3299

SURVEYOR: P BARTON

SURVEY DATE: 15TH NOV 2019

CLIENT: ELMLEY CASTLE, BRICKLEHAMPTON & NETHERTON
PARISH COUNCIL

Ref	Species	Height	Diameter	Age class	Form	Target Status	Condition	Notes / Defect type	Hazard magnitude (Hazard trees only)	Likelihood of failure (Hazard trees only)	Recommended action	Priority
30889	English oak	M	M	EM	Std	2	G	Good form and condition.			None	0
30890	Ash	M	M	EM	Std	2	G	No significant issues observed.			None	0
30891	Silver maple	M	M	EM	Std	2	G	Significant limb removed at 0.5m. Mistletoe in crown.			None	0
30892	Sycamore	M	M	EM	Std	2	M	Multiple branch removal wounds near base, some occluded and some decaying. Tight union between stems from 1-2m. Severed ivy.			None	0
30893	Roble beech	M	M	EM	Std	2	G	Good specimen tree. Minor internal deadwood. No significant issues observed.			None	0
30894	Roble beech	M	M	EM	Std	2	G	Good form and condition.			None	0
30895	Norway maple	M	M	EM	Std	2	G	Excellent, well balanced crown form.			None	0
30896	Norway maple	M	M	EM	Std	2	G	Minor squirrel damage to branch junctions. Strip of delaminating bark on northeast side of lower trunk.			None	0
30897	Cypress sp.	S	S	Y	Std	2	G	One of a pair forming a cohesive canopy. Pruned back from garden and road side.			None	0
30898	Cypress sp.	S	S	Y	Std	2	G	One of a pair forming a cohesive canopy. Pruned back from garden.			None	0
30899	Cherry	S	S	Y	Std	2	G	Squat form. Dead, severed ivy on stem. Dropping low foliage over field.			None	0
30900	Plum	M	M	EM	M-st	2	H	Central stem has split apart at 1.5m. Pruned back from garden on west side. Poor, suppressed form.	2	3	Fell tree.	1
30901	Ash	M	M	EM	Asym	2	G	Pruned back from adjacent garden. Dead, severed ivy on stem. Good vitality.			None	0
30902	Sycamore	M	M	Y	2-st	2	G	Suppressed by adjacent ash. No significant issues observed.			None	0

Please refer to the methodology for explanation of codes used in this schedule.

TREE SURVEY SCHEDULE

ELMLEY CASTLE PARK

PROJECT NO: E.3299

SURVEYOR: P BARTON



SURVEY DATE: 15TH NOV 2019

CLIENT: ELMLEY CASTLE, BRICKLEHAMPTON & NETHERTON
PARISH COUNCIL

Ref	Species	Height	Diameter	Age class	Form	Target Status	Condition	Notes / Defect type	Hazard magnitude (Hazard trees only)	Likelihood of failure (Hazard trees only)	Recommended action	Priority
30903	Purple leaf plum	S	S	EM	Std	2	M	Poor form. Dead stubs and colonisation by Phellinus tuberculosis fungus.			Fell tree.	1
30904	Purple leaf plum	S	S	EM	Std	2	G	Fair form. Some dead stubs and small amount of Phellinus brackets.			None	0
30905	Plum	S	S	Y	Std	2	G	Good vitality. Slightly suppressed by adjacent trees. Basal shoots.			None	0

Please refer to the methodology for explanation of codes used in this schedule.

Height:

P	saPling:	Trees under 3.5m (<11')
S	Small;	Between 3m & 8m (10'-26')
M	Medium;	Between 7.5m & 15m (25'-50')
L	Large;	Between 14m & 23m (45'-75')
V	Very Large;	Trees over 22m (>75')

Diameter:

P	saPling:	Diameter under 7.5cm (<3")
S	Small:	Between 7.5cm & 30 cm (3" -1')
M	Medium:	Between 30cm & 75cm (1' -2'6")
L	Large:	Between 75cm & 125cm (2'6" -4')
V	Very Large:	Over 125cm (Over 4')

Maturity: - *Necessarily subjective and based on the appearance of the trees, not on their chronological age; (Note: "SULE" = Safe, Useful Expected Lifespan. May vary between species & with other circumstances.)*

P	Sapling or newly Planted tree; not fully established. (Transplantable or easily replaced.)
Y	Young: Establishing; usually with good vigour, but as yet of limited landscape value.
EM	Early-Mature; established; normally vigorous & increasing in height. Of increasing landscape value.
M	Mature; Well established trees around the middle half of their SULE and retaining good vigour. Achieving full height but their crowns still spreading.
LM	Late-mature: Fully established trees, generally retaining moderate vigour but growth slowing.
O	Old: Fully mature trees in last quarter of their SULE; vigour declining.
A	Ancient: Very old; low vigour; liable to decline. May include important Veteran Trees.

NOTE: *Where groups or areas of trees are considered collectively, the same codes are used to describe the general character of the majority of the trees, or the range of sizes found within the stand (e.g. S-L = Small to Large; Y-M = Young to Mature).*

Form: -

(A brief overview of the trees' general form & disposition.)

Std	- <u>Standard</u> : a tree of 'typical' form with a single stem and a more or less domed or rounded crown.
Uprt	- <u>Upright</u> : Trees with a pyramidal or upright form, noticeably taller than broad.
Col	- <u>Columnar</u> : Trees with a narrow, more strictly upright or fastigiate form.
Sprd	- <u>Spreading</u> : Specimens with a more spreading branch structure, with canopies as broad or broader than they are high.
2-st	- <u>Twin-stemmed</u> : Trees that fork into two main sub-stems at or near ground level.
3-st	- <u>Three-stemmed</u> : Trees that divide into three main sub-stems at or near ground level.
M-st	- <u>Multi-stemmed</u> : Trees with four or more co-dominant sub-stems arising from near ground level.
Poll	- <u>Pollarded</u> : Trees that at some stage have been lopped at some distance above ground level and now show a structure typically with numerous boughs ascending from the old pollard-point; (note that decay may arise at old pollard-points.)
Copp	- <u>Coppiced</u> : Trees that have been cut to near ground level and so caused to re-grow with several co-dominant sub-stems, forming a more or less dense 'clump'.
Scrn	- <u>Screen</u> : Trees managed to form a hedge or screen
Lean	- <u>Leaning</u> : Trees whose stems show a <i>significant</i> lean.
Asym	- <u>Asymmetric</u> : Trees with a <i>markedly</i> asymmetric or unbalanced crown
Grp	- <u>Group tree</u> : An individual whose form has been influenced by close-growing neighbours; acceptable within that grouping but potentially unsuitable as an isolated specimen.
Slndr	- <u>Slender</u> stem (Height:Diameter ratio significantly greater than 30)
Weep	- <u>Weeping</u> or strongly drooping shoots
Trm	- <u>Trimmed</u> : Trees whose present form & size has been the result of regular trimming (e.g. topiary)
Stmp	- <u>Stump</u> of tree remaining only (includes trees cut back to their <u>stock</u> , i.e. high stump, with or without branch stubs)
Dmgd	- <u>Damaged</u> : Form impaired through tree having suffered significant structural damage (e.g. top lost)
Clpsd	- <u>Collapsed</u> : A tree in a state of partial or complete collapse: major branch/stem failure and/or partly or fully uprooted
Mxd	- <u>Mixed</u> : Groups or Areas of trees with a range of forms (none extreme).

Target Status (T/S):

This is an estimate, largely based on appearances at the time of inspection, of the perceived target occupancy of the area around a tree, i.e. how probable is it that a "target" will be present should some form of failure occur, considered together with an estimate of the seriousness of the possible consequences of such a failure, i.e. the vulnerability of the potential target to harm.

Thus any substantial tree near a busy road, where a failure could cause a serious accident, would have a High target status, while a tree in an open field would have a low score, even if it were in poor condition. However a relatively fragile structure, such as a prefabricated office or temporary classroom unit, may demand a High target status, even if the frequency of occupation is only moderate.

The Target Status is essentially independent of the other parameters, being a reflection of the tree's external environment. However the score of a tree may be reduced where its youth and small size indicate that failure is highly unlikely to result in damage. In such cases the score may be increased over time, as the tree grows. By contrast there are certain site types, including school premises and certain commercial leisure venues, where there may be a heightened duty of care, which may be accounted for by assuming a Target Status that is slightly above that which would reflect the actual, objective level of target occupancy.

The examples of site types given below are representative but are not exhaustive.

- 0 - Negligible target occupancy; very low risk of harm being caused. (e.g. low-use parts of open spaces & woodland)
- 1 - Low target occupancy: (e.g. Parts of amenity areas away from main footpaths; peripheral parts of parks, playing fields etc.)
- 2 - Moderate target occupancy (e.g. intermittently occupied areas; near moderate-use foot-paths, quiet side roads and private gardens; trees near unoccupied/low-value buildings etc.)
- 3 - Significant target occupancy (e.g., Near well-used footpaths, playgrounds, access routes & secondary roads. Most car parking areas. Trees over low-occupancy buildings and structures not liable to major damage in the event of tree failure)
- 4 - High target occupancy (e.g. high-use footpaths and play areas; main access and assembly areas; near busy roads & car-parks; near high-occupancy buildings & structures liable to significant damage in the event of tree failure.)
- 5 - Permanent target occupancy (e.g. trees close to vulnerable, permanently occupied structures, or in other areas where tree failure is likely to lead to serious injury or damage, such as near fast trunk roads, in town centres etc.)

Condition:

- G Good:** No significant defects noted. **Trees classified thus are not considered further,** (although additional comments may be provided in the "Notes" column).
- M Management or Minor issues:** Minor or potential problems/defects observed, but not such that is likely to represent a significant hazard within the next three years (or within the routine inspection cycle, whichever is the shortest). Also, trees where work may be advisable to abate an immediate or foreseeable nuisance, or where preventative formative pruning would be significantly beneficial.
- H A Hazard (a feature that has some potential to cause harm)**

- If the Condition Code is either M or H the following parameter is included:

Defect Description &/or General Notes: Brief notes identifying notable characteristics including the nature and location of any hazard, defect or other significant factor.

- In cases where a Hazard has been identified (i.e. condition code = H) the Magnitude of Hazard & Probability of Hazard Failure, are both assessed, as defined below:

Hazard Magnitude:

In considering the feature giving rise to hazard, **what degree of harm is likely to arise were it to fail and find a target?**

Hazard Magnitude	Degree of likely/possible harm	<u>Approx. size of part at risk</u>
1. Minor:	Defective material small; unlikely to result in more than minor injury or easily repairable damage to objects or structures.	(<50mm)
2. Moderate:	Some possibility of injury requiring first aid; damage to objects or structures generally repairable at moderate cost.	(50-150mm)
3. Significant:	Injury requiring hospitalisation possible; buildings etc. liable to structural damage; vehicles liable to be rendered unusable.	(150 – 300mm)
4. Large:	Severe disabling or even fatal injuries; significant structural damage likely to structures and vehicles.	(300-750mm)
5. Major:	Single or multiple fatalities likely; major structural damage; vehicles crushed.	(>750mm)

Probability of Hazard Failure:

Based on the condition of tree or its defective part, on the species characteristics, on its location and exposure and other factors deemed to be significant, within what period might failure reasonably be expected to occur?

N.B. Given the large number of variables that may determine when a tree might fail (e.g. weather conditions; severity of tissue degradation; further damage occurring; alterations in environment, including increased exposure etc. etc.) it is impossible to specify the probability of failure with any accuracy. The following categories are intended to provide guidance based on the conditions & circumstances at the time of the inspection, and assuming that weather conditions will not exceed what might reasonably be considered to be the 'normal' range to be expected in the locality. The time-scales indicated are thus indicative only; they do **not** indicate periods over which the defects may be considered 'safe'!

1. **Low:** Defects effectively stable and unlikely to deteriorate in the foreseeable future (e.g. failure not probable for at least 3-5 years)
2. **Developing:** Failure foreseeable but not likely to occur soon (e.g. *within* 3-5 years).
3. **Moderate:** Failure considered to be moderately likely to occur (e.g. within 1-3 years)
4. **Probable:** Failure considered to be probable (e.g. within 1 year)
5. **Imminent:** Failure likely to occur at any time

Notes / Action:

Brief details of any action that may be recommended or suggested for any tree. All works commissioned should conform to **BS3998:2010 – Tree works-Recommendations**.

The present survey does not give an opportunity for the detailed assessment of each tree and in certain cases further investigations, such as a climbing assessment or decay mapping may be advised. A Client Inspection may also be advised where work proposed may be controversial, or where a number of alternative options may be considered

Priority:

The **Priority code** provides guidance as to the degree of urgency with any recommended operation should be attended and, in the case of identified hazards, it will be based on consideration of the Target Status, the Magnitude of Hazard and the Likelihood of Failure.

It is recommended that all works with a code of 1 or more be dealt with at the first opportunity, but where there are other limiting constraints (e.g. the availability of funds), operations should be prioritised as indicated.

Operations meriting Priority Codes 4 or 5 will normally be communicated to the client immediately (i.e. prior to the submission of a written report).

(Where the tree in question is considered to be of particularly high amenity value, and a defect threatens its well-being or survival, it may be given an upgraded priority rating even if there is no major risk of harm to person or property.)

0 (or not set) -	No action deemed necessary on the basis of this inspection
M <u>Monitor</u>	Hazard, health or other factor identified which is not deemed to require positive action at this time but to which future assessments should pay particular attention.
D <u>Discretionary:</u>	Risk to person/property below action level but work nonetheless recommended; includes problems of nuisance & those currently minor or incipient. (Note: this may include matters where timely action may be cost-effective by preventing more serious problems developing.)
1 <u>Low priority:</u>	} Remedial or Preventative work is required
2 <u>Medium priority:</u>	
3 <u>High priority:</u>	
4 <u>Urgent*:</u>	<u>Attention required without delay</u> Serious risk of significant harm: <u>attend within a MAXIMUM of 5 days</u>
5 <u>Emergency*:</u>	<u>Immediate attention required:</u> <i>Emergency call-out of contractors; road closure &/or site evacuation may be required.</i>

(* Note: Such cases would normally be notified to the relevant authority immediately and should therefore have been dealt with by the time the written report is received.).

APPENDIX 2: TREE SURVEY PLAN

Elmley Castle Park

Tree survey plan - Nov 2019



Barton Hyett Associates
Arboricultural Consultants

Legend



Tree (tag num)
all trees are tagged
but not all are
plotted on this plan



Google Earth

© 2018 Google

100 m

APPENDIX 3: REFERENCES

1. BRITISH STANDARDS INSTITUTION BS3998 (2010). Recommendations for Tree work.
2. DAVIES C., FAY N., & MYNORS C. (2000) Veteran Trees: A guide to Risk & Responsibility
English Nature
3. ELLISON M.J (2005) Quantified Tree Risk Assessment used in the management of amenity
trees. Journal of Arboriculture vol 31 no. 2 pp 57-65
4. HELLIWELL, D.R. (1990). Acceptable level of risk associated with trees. Arboricultural Journal
15, pp 179-181
5. GILMAN & LILLY (2008) I.S.A. Best Management Practices: Tree Pruning. International
Society of Arboriculture, Champaign, IL U.S.A. (www.isa-arboriculture.org)
6. LONSDALE, D (2013). Ancient and other veteran trees: further guidance on management.
The Tree Council, London
7. LONSDALE, D (1999). Principles of tree hazard assessment and management (Research for
Amenity Trees No.7) HMSO, London: The Stationery Office
8. LONSDALE, D (2000). Hazards From Trees - A General Guide. The Forestry Commission,
HMSO, London: The Stationery Office.
9. MATHENY, N. & CLARK, J (1994). A photographic Guide to the Evaluation of Hazard Trees in
Urban Areas. International Society of Arboriculture.
10. MATTHECK, C & BRELOER, H (1998). The Body Language of Trees: A Handbook for Failure
Analysis (Research for Amenity Trees 4) HMSO, London.
11. NATIONAL TREE SAFETY GROUP (2011) Common sense risk management of trees. Forestry
Commission (see <http://www.forestry.gov.uk/forestry/INFD-7T6BPP>)
12. READ H.J. (ed) (2000) Veteran Trees: A guide to good management. English Nature
13. ROBERTS et al (2006). Tree Roots in the Built Environment (Research for Amenity Trees No. 8)
The Stationery Office, London
14. SHIGO, A. L. (1986). A New Tree Biology. Shigo & Trees Associates, Durham, New
Hampshire.
15. SMILEY, MATHENY & LILLEY (2011). Tree Risk Assessment. Best Management Practice.
International Society of Arboriculture, Champaign, Illinois