



Addressing All Aspects of Arboricultural Consultancy

**HEALTH AND SAFETY
ARBORICULTURAL REPORT**

OUR REFERENCE	AC.2018.136
CLIENT	Mr Mohammad Osman of Amber Housing
SITE	St Audrey's, Church Street, Old Hatfield, Hertfordshire, AL9 5AR
SURVEY & REPORT BY	Mr I S Tom Thompson BSc. (Hons.) Arb. MSc. (eFor) MArborA
DATE	2 nd August 2018
DATE OF INSPECTION	20 th July 2018

**ARBOR CULTURAL
RIVER COTTAGE, 8A CHERRY ORCHARD GARDENS,
WEST MOLESEY, KINGSTON, SURREY, KT8 1QY
0208 979 1899
www.arbor-cultural.co.uk**



TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	i
APPENDICES.....	ii
1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Instructions	1
1.2 Summary of the Legal Situation	1
1.3 Qualifications and Experience:	2
1.4 Limitations and Use of Copyright.....	3
1.5 Disclaimer	4
2 SURVEY PROCESS AND DETAILS.....	5
2.1 The Survey Schedule	5
2.2 Survey Procedure.....	5
2.3 Trees Included	5
2.4 Description of Tree Categories	6
2.5 Tree Condition.....	7
2.6 Overall Condition.....	7
2.7 Deadwood Categorisation	7
3 FINDINGS.....	8
3.1 General Observations.....	8
3.2 Previous Works.....	9
3.3 Tree Inspection.....	9
4 CONCLUSION & RECOMMENDATIONS.....	13
4.1 Conclusion	13
4.2 Recommendations.....	15
REFERENCES and BIBLIOGRAPHY	17

APPENDICES

Appendix I QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

Appendix II PHOTOGRAPHS

Appendix III TREE SURVEY RECORDS

Attached document AC.2018.136 Tree Location Plan

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Instructions

1.1.1 Arbor Cultural Ltd was given written instruction from Mr Mohammad Osman of Amber Housing to survey and report on trees located at St Audrey's, Church Street, Old Hatfield, Hertfordshire, AL9 5AR. Arrangements were made for Connick Tree Care to survey the site on 20th July 2018.

1.1.2 The trees were inspected, and this report covers;

- The health and safety of the trees
- The most appropriate future management of the trees
- A timescale for re-inspection

1.2 Summary of the Legal Situation

1.2.1 The Occupiers' Liability Act 1957 & 1984 established that the site owner or occupier holds the liability for the safety of visitors and those on adjacent lands. Where incidents are both reasonably foreseeable and reasonably preventable the owner or occupier may be held liable for losses (physical harm to life and/or property). In order to be in a position to foresee and therefore prevent harm arising from a tree failure and discharge the Duty of Care, it is necessary to subject the tree or trees in question to 'regular inspection' by someone competent both to identify any defects present and to interpret their significance for public safety.

- 1.2.2** These circumstances include specific consideration for children; under s2(3)(a) of the OLA 1957, 'an occupier must be prepared for children to be less careful than adults'. The case of Tomlinson v Congleton Borough Council ([2003] 1 A.C. 46; [2004] UKHL 47), the 'shallow pond case', expanded on this requirement by stressing the need to consider the inequivalence of danger relative also to people of reduced mobility.
- 1.2.3** A considerable body of case law has established that, in order to be in a position to foresee and indeed to prevent harm arising from a tree failure, it is necessary to subject the tree or trees in question to 'regular inspection', with this inspection undertaken by someone competent both to identify any defects present and to interpret their significance for public safety.
- 1.2.4** An effective system of managing trees should meet the requirements set out in the Management of Health and Safety at Work Regulations 1999 and the associated ACoP (guidance is contained in HSG 65 Successful Health and Safety Management and INDG 163 Five Steps to Risk Assessment).

1.3 Qualifications and Experience:

- 1.3.1** I have based this report on my site observations and investigations and I have come to conclusions in the light of my qualifications gained and experience obtained whilst working in the field of arboriculture. I have qualifications and practical experience in arboriculture and forestry and list the details of this in Appendix I.

1.4 Limitations and Use of Copyright

- 1.4.1** All rights in this report are reserved. No part of it may be reproduced or transmitted, in any form or by any means without our written permission. Its contents and format are for the exclusive use of Amber Housing and their associates. It may not be sold, lent out or divulged to any third party not directly involved in this situation without the written consent of Connick Tree Care.
- 1.4.2** This report contains all my advice and opinions and any representation and/or statements that have or may have been made which are not specifically and expressly included in this report should not be relied upon and no responsibility is taken for the accuracy of such statements.
- 1.4.3** The Inspection was carried out on the basis of ground level, Visual Tree Assessment (VTA) examination of external features of each individual tree. Binoculars were used to assess the aerial parts. The principal objective of the survey was to identify trees, or parts of trees, which appear to be in a hazardous condition and to advise remedial action to ameliorate the risk they could represent to users of the property and adjacent areas. The report and recommendations relate to the condition of the trees and their surroundings at the time of inspection only. All measurements, proportions and assessments of age are approximate, except where stated.
- 1.4.4** Visual assessment, in accordance with accepted arboricultural practice, was based on apparent vitality (leaf cover, extension growth), presence of deadwood and die back, fractured and detached limbs, evidence of excessive basal movement and external indications of stem and basal decay likely to affect the structural condition of the tree. No decay detection equipment either invasive or non-invasive was employed.

1.4.5 The survey findings are of a preliminary nature with regard to assessment of risk of direct damage (by contact) from trees to built structures. No soil samples were taken, or trial pits were dug, therefore no risk assessment was carried out with regard to subsidence (indirect damage). No parts of the drainage or service systems were inspected on site as I am not qualified to do so.

1.4.6 If you, or your advisers, have at your disposal any information to suggest that the property is or has been suffering any tree related structural defect, I would ask that you release the information to us. All relevant data is presented within this report together with any recommendations for further analysis, as appropriate.

1.4.7 Trees are living organisms whose health and condition can change rapidly. The conclusions and recommendations in this report are only valid for one year. Any changes to the site as it stands at present will invalidate this report, e.g. building of extensions, excavation works, importing of soils, extreme weather events etc.

1.4.8 **The Local Planning Authority has not yet been contacted to establish whether any Tree Preservation Order (TPO) covers any of the trees, or to determine if the site is situated within a Conservation Area (CA). It would be necessary to determine whether either of these planning controls are in operation before commencement of any works and submitting the required notifications or obtaining the required permissions.**

1.5 Disclaimer

1.5.1 I have no connection with any of the parties involved in this situation that could influence the opinions expressed in this report.

2 SURVEY PROCESS AND DETAILS

2.1 The Survey Schedule

- Tree identification number tags attached to the trees
- Approximate tree height in metres
- Tree stem diameter, in millimetres, measured at 1.5m*
- Age class
- Observed physiological/structural condition and assessment of direct damage to built structures excluding drains
- Management recommendations
- Works priority
- Tree location shown on a plan of the site
- Information recorded in paper-based format

* If multi-stemmed then measures at ground level B.D. (Basal Diameter)
If not possible to measure, then estimated and recorded with the # symbol

2.2 Survey Procedure

2.2.1 The survey was conducted to industry Best Practice.

2.3 Trees Included

2.3.1 Only young trees and older were included in the survey data, newly planted or shrub species were not included. Anything smaller than 150mm in diameter was not surveyed.

2.3.2 Only onsite trees were included in this survey

2.4 Description of Tree Categories

Age Class:

NP	Newly Planted – A tree that is still receiving post planting maintenance and still has a stake supporting it.
Y	Young – Recently planted or establishing tree that could be transplanted without specialist equipment, i.e. up to 12-14cm stem diameter.
SM	An establishing tree which is still exhibiting strong apical dominance and has significant growth potential.
EM	A tree that is reaching its ultimate potential height and losing apical dominance, whose growth rate is slowing down but will still increase in stem diameter and crown spread and has safe life expectancy remaining
M	Mature tree with limited potential for any increase in size but with reasonable safe useful life expectancy
OM	Over mature – A senescent or moribund specimen with a limited safe useful life expectancy
V	Veteran – Trees of great age for species with important biological, aesthetic, conservation or cultural value. Trees are in a state of decline due to old age.
D	Dead tree

2.5 Tree Condition

P = Physiological	Good	No significant health problems
	Fair	Symptoms of ill health that can be remediated
	Poor	Significant ill health
	Dead	Dead Tree

S = Structural:	Good	No significant defects
	Fair	Significant defects that can be remediated
	Poor	Significant defects no remedy

2.6 Overall Condition

A	Very good condition/High amenity value
B	Satisfactory condition/Moderate amenity value
C	Poor/Declining/Low amenity value
D	Dead/Dangerous

2.7 Deadwood Categorisation

Minor Deadwood	Less than 50mm in diameter or less than 3m in length
Major Deadwood	Greater than 50mm in diameter or greater than 3m in length

3 FINDINGS

3.1 General Observations

- 3.1.1** The trees were all located in the grounds of St Audrey's on Church Street Hatfield. There were a number of them along the road frontage, immediately behind a 2m tall retaining wall, see Images 1 and 2. The structural integrity of the wall was being assessed by an appropriate professional, but the trees' condition needed to be assessed as there was a public highway adjacent to the wall, so it was a high target area.
- 3.1.2** In addition to that many of the rest of the trees were within striking distance of the various drives and pathways around the site as well as the main building and car park areas.
- 3.1.3** Ivy will not normally directly cause the death of a tree. The only time that it can do this is if it completely swamps the crown of the tree preventing the tree from being able to photosynthesize. However, it can indirectly cause problems for trees. This takes two distinct forms. The first is to mask the main stem and scaffold branches making it impossible to accurately assess the health and safety of the tree. The second is to increase the wind sail, which increases the forces exerted on the tree, thereby increasing the chance of limb or whole tree failure.
- 3.1.4** Ivy does have the benefit of providing habitat for wildlife, some of which are beneficial for the tree. Consequently, it is not always appropriate to remove all the ivy. Where there are trees in prominent locations with relatively high target areas it is sometimes appropriate to sever the ivy to reduce the sail and allow more detailed inspections in the future.

3.1.5 Due to declining condition of a number of trees, the extent of the ivy colonisation and the high target value areas around the trees it is considered necessary to sever the ivy some of trees. This ivy severance is best achieved by cutting a band of about 300mm all the way round the tree stem at a height of around 1m. The 300mm gap prevents the ivy from re-joining, and the 1m height is to prevent it reconnecting with ivy on the ground. This will cut off the water and nutrient supply to the ivy and will result in it dying back over a year or so and falling away from the tree.

3.1.6 Deadwood does also have the benefit of providing habitat for wildlife, some of which are beneficial for the tree. Consequently, it is not always appropriate to remove all of the deadwood. Where there are trees in prominent locations with relatively high target areas it is sometimes appropriate to remove deadwood. Due to declining condition of a number of trees and the high target value areas around them it is considered necessary to remove the deadwood on a number of trees.

3.2 Previous Works

3.2.1 As far as could be determined all of the tree work recommendations made two years ago, had been completed.

3.3 Tree Inspection

3.3.1 T268 is a large horse chestnut tree immediately adjacent to the main driveway and Church Street. It has minor cavities and suckering as well as fibre buckling and tight unions with included bark. The ivy has been severed on this tree. It has a severe leaf miner infestation.

3.3.2 Trees T272, T274, T279 and T302 were removed prior to 2016.

- 3.3.3** T278 is a large ash trees, that is close to the road so is recommended for the removal of deadwood.
- 3.3.4** T281, another large ash tree is recommended for at the very least the deadwood to be taken out, as it is close to the driveway and road. This tree is in terminal decline and it is only a matter of time before it dies completely. Other options are to pollard the tree or to coppice it, removing the main trunk and seeing what if anything re-emerges from the roots.
- 3.3.5** It is recommended to sever the ivy on T276 and T296 a large horse chestnut and a grey poplar respectively.
- 3.3.5** T282 and T283 are towards the front of the property on the junction between Church Lane and Church Road. They are both growing into the telephone lines and will be causing noise on these lines in high winds. Both these trees are recommended for cutting clear of the service lines.
- 3.3.6** T285 is a Lawson cypress is growing very close to the adjacent outbuilding causing conflict with the roof. The ivy and it was severed last time around and is falling away as it dies off. This tree should be cut back to give at least 2 m clearance of the roof to prevent any damage to the roof guttering of this building.
- 3.3.7** T286 is a large declining walnut tree growing adjacent to the main building. This tree has minor deadwood, damaged branches and fallen branches on the ground. There is also evidence of damage to the roots which is likely to have occurred when the main building was constructed, see Image 14. This tree is recommended for cutting back from the building by at least 2-3m to allow sufficient light into the adjacent room.

- 3.3.8** T288 is a large beech tree that is growing adjacent to the main building. This tree has twin stems and they have included bark. Over time these stems have fused together to create a strong union, see Image 15. This tree is recommended for cutting back from the building by at least 2-3m to allow sufficient light into the adjacent room.
- 3.3.9** T293 is a large Corsican pine with twin stems from around 4m. There is a tight union between the stems with included bark and a persistent crack running down from this point. This tree should be put on a frequent inspection regime to monitor the extent of this defect.
- 3.3.10** There is a girdling root on the cherry tree T303. This route is recommended for being severed.
- 3.3.11** There are two groups of trees, G1 and G2. G1 runs along the road frontage behind the retaining wall from level with the front of the building up to the rear entrance. This includes the smaller diameter trees and under storey species including numerous multi-stemmed ash trees and cherry laurels as well as some elder.
- 3.3.12** G2 is located on the other side of the rear entrance. This is comprised of mostly cherry laurel.
- 3.3.13** T282 and the group G2 are overhanging into the adjacent property. All of these trees were inspected and there were no structural concerns about their main trunk stems. Consequently, there is no requirement to cut these trees back. If the neighbours are concerned about these overhanging branches it is their common law right to cut the branches back as far as the boundary. There is no obligation on Audrey's undertake this work or pay for someone else to do it as it does not conflict with the high hedge legislation at this time.

3.3.14 Finally, the basal growth from T268 should be cut back to allow people to see the sign for St Audrey's, see Image 1.

4 CONCLUSION & RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Conclusion

- 4.1.1** 3.3.9 T278 is a large ash trees, that is close to the road so is recommended for the removal of deadwood.
- 4.1.2** T281, another large ash tree is recommended for at the very least the deadwood to be taken out, as it is close to the driveway and road. Alternatively, this tree could be pollarded or coppiced.
- 4.1.3** It is recommended to sever the ivy on T276 and T296 a large beech and a sycamore respectively.
- 4.1.4** T282 and T283 are towards the front of the property on the junction between Church Lane and Church Road. Both these trees are recommended for cutting clear of the services.
- 4.1.5** T285 is a Lawson cypress is growing very close to the adjacent outbuilding causing conflict with the roof. This tree should be cut back to give at least 2 m clearance of the roof to prevent any damage to the roof guttering of this building.
- 4.1.6** T286 is a large declining walnut tree growing adjacent to the main building. This tree is recommended for cutting back from the building by at least 2-3m to allow sufficient light into the adjacent room.
- 4.1.7** T288 is a large beech tree that is growing adjacent to the main building. This tree is recommended for cutting back from the building by at least 2-3m to allow sufficient light into the adjacent room.

- 4.1.8** There is a girdling root on the cherry tree T303. This root is recommended for being severed.
- 4.1.8** T282 and the group G2 are overhanging into the adjacent property. All of these trees were inspected and there were no structural concerns about their main trunk stems. Consequently, there is no requirement for some Audrey's to cut these trees back at this time.
- 4.1.9** Finally, the basal growth from T268 should be cut back to allow people to see the sign for St Audrey's, see Image 1.

4.2 Recommendations

4.2.1 Management recommendations given in the survey data are given on the basis of good arboricultural management and to mitigate Health and Safety risk. They are detailed in Table 1 on the next page, with further recommendations for removal of deadwood and severance of ivy in Table 2 on the page after that.

4.2.2 The works laid out are prioritised and it's recommended that they are carried out within the given time frames.

4.2.3 All recommended works should be undertaken by appropriately qualified Arboricultural Contractors, to BS3998 Recommendations for Tree Work 2010 or current Industry Best Practice, unless otherwise specified with a clear justification for the deviation from the British Standard.

4.2.4 This survey and survey results are for the sole use of the client Amber Housing and their associates

4.2.5 The survey results are based upon current site conditions. Arbor Cultural should be informed of any future change in those conditions at the earliest opportunity.

Table 1 Tree Work Recommended for the abatement of significant hazard

ID	Species	Stem Diam (mm)	Tree Works	Work Completion
T268	Horse chestnut, <i>Aesculus hippocastanum</i>	620	Remove basal growth that is obstructing view of the signage	3 Months
T276	Beech <i>Fagus sylvatica</i>	910	Sever ivy	3 Months
T278	Ash <i>Fraxinus exelsior</i>	660	Remove deadwood	3 Months
T281	Ash <i>Fraxinus exelsior</i>	300# Ave. X 6	Remove deadwood and hangers over the road. Alternatively Pollard or Coppice.	3 Months
T282	Sycamore <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	170	Cut clear of service lines	3 Months
T283	Cherry Laurel <i>Prunus laurocerasus</i>	6	Cut clear of service lines	3 Months
T285	Lawson Cypress	370	Cut clear of the adjacent building	3 Months
T286	Walnut <i>Juglans regia</i>	70	Cut clear of the adjacent building	3 Months
T288	Beech <i>Fagus sylvatica</i>	630	Cut clear of the adjacent building	6 Months
T296	Sycamore <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	540	Sever Ivy	3 Months
T303	Wild Cherry <i>Prunus avium</i>	340	Sever girdling root	6 Months

REFERENCES and BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anon, British Standard BS 5837 (2012), "Guide for Trees in Relation to Construction", British Standards Institute. London.
- Anon, British Standard BS 3998 (2010), "Recommendations for Tree Work", British Standards Institute. London.
- DOE, "Tree Preservation Orders - A guide to the law and good practice", Department of Environment, 1994.
- Forbes-Laird, J. (2010) THREATS, Tree Hazard: Risk Evaluation and Treatment System, A method for identifying, recording & managing hazards from trees <http://www.flac.uk.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/07/THREATS-GN-June-2010.pdf>, Accessed 20/06/2012.
- Harris, R.W. (1983) Arboriculture; Care of trees, shrubs and vines in the landscape. Prentice Hall, London
- Lonsdale L (1999) Principles of Tree Hazard Assessment and Management HMSO
- Mattheck, C. and Breloer, H. (1994) The body language of trees. HMSO 240 pp
- Matheny N. P. & J. R. Clarke, (1994), "A photographic guide to the Evaluation of hazard trees in urban areas, 2nd Edition, International Society of Arboriculture.
- Shigo, A.L., (1986) A new tree biology. Shigo & trees, associates, Durham, New Hampshire, USA, 595 pp
- Shigo, A.L. (1991) Modern Arboriculture. Shigo & trees, associates. Durham, New Hampshire, USA, 490pp
- Town & Country Planning Act Part VIII (1990). Issued by the Secretary of State for the Environment, HMSO.

APPENDIX I – QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

Tom Thompson BSc (Hons Arb), MSc eFor, MArborA Cert Arb

1 QUALIFICATIONS

Subjects	Level	Dates
International Society of Arboriculture Certified Arborist	Pass	May – 2012
Professional Tree Inspection Course (LANTRA)	Pass	April - 2011
BSc Hons Arboriculture	(2.1)	2008 - 2009
FdSc Arboriculture	Distinction	2004 - 2007
MSc. Environmental Forestry (MSc eFor)	Pass	2001 - 2002
BSc. Hons Env Science (Conservation Management)	(2.2)	1997 - 2000
Environmental Studies	Access Course	1996 - 1997
Forestry & Practical Environmental Skills	NVQ I & II	1996 – 1997

2. CAREER SUMMARY

Tom Thompson began his career with trees in 1994 completing various practical forestry and environmental courses with BTCV as well as undertaking various voluntary roles within this field whilst studying to gain entry to university. During the completion a degree in Environmental Science from the University of Surrey he spent six months working on sustainable forestry operations in British Columbia, Canada. He then spent one month on a forest-based work camp in Japan before commencing an MSc in Environmental Forestry at the University of Wales Bangor.

He then spent five years working in new woodland creation, firstly for ADAS in the National Forest and then for 18 months with the Forestry Commission in Cobham, Kent. During this time, he began a degree in Arboriculture through Myerscough College.

This course enabled him to make the transition from forestry to arboriculture where he spent 5 years as a tree officer, firstly at St Albans and then more recently at King's Lynn and West Norfolk. He joined Connick Tree Care in May 2012, where he worked as an Arboricultural Consultant for 2 years. He has been the Principal Arboricultural Consultant at Arbor Cultural since it was founded in June 2014.

3 AREAS OF EXPERTISE

- Tree hazard risk assessments for tree owners
- Decay assessment and mapping
- Mortgage and Insurance reports to assess the influence of trees on buildings
- Pre-development site surveys and arboricultural implication studies
- Tree management reports to prioritise maintenance programs
- Tree related insurance claims
- Diagnosis of tree disorders
- General arboricultural advice

- Woodland design for conservation

4 SELECTED CONTINUAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Tree Pruning – Ed Gilman	Barcham Nursery	June- 2012
Up by Roots – James Urban	ISA	May 2012
Tree Biomechanics – Claus Mattheck	Symbiosis	May 2012
BS 5837 2012 & Tree Regs Changes	Arboricultural Association	May 2012
BS 3998 Changes to Standard	London Tree Officers Association	May 2012
Bat Course for Arboriculturalists	AA & Bat Conservation Trust	April 2012
Tree Biomechanics (Germany)	Claus Mattheck	Oct 2011
Designing with Trees	T Kirkham & P Thurman	Sept 2011
Urban Forest–Climate Change, Shade & SUDS	Peter MacDonagh	Sept 2011
Arb Consultancy Report Writing	Consulting Arb Society	July 2011
BS5837 Seminar on new 2011 draft	Arb Association & ICF	June 2011
BS3998 Road show presenting 2010 document	Arb Association	May 2011
New Pests and Diseases Advance	David Rose	Mar 2011
Fungal Management Strategies	Barcham Nursery	Nov 2010
Perfect Roots & Tree Growth	Gary Watson	June 2010
Fungi Recognition and Response	Tree Life Training	May 2010
Visual Tree Assessment	Claus Mattheck	May 2010
Arboriculture in Planning	Arb Solution	April 2010
Trees and the Law - Charles Minors	Barcham Nursery	Oct 2009
Tree Related Subsidence	Tree Life Training	Oct 2009
CAVAT as a management tool	NATO	Sept 2009
CAVAT Training	NATO	Sept 2009
THREATS Tree Assessment	JFL Arboriculture	Aug 2009
BS 5837 (Trees in Relation to Construction)	Tree Life Training	Jul 2009
Trees and Hard Surfaces	NATO	June 2009
BS 5837 (Trees in Relation to Construction)	Richard Nicholson	May 2009
Native Woodland Plan Advisor	F C Wales	2002

5. PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS

Consulting Arborist Society Professional Member	since 2013
Arboricultural Association Professional Member	since 2008
International Society of Arboriculture Certified Arborist	since 2012
Royal Forestry Society	since 1999

APPENDIX II – IMAGES



Image 1 Trees along road frontage behind retaining wall, near to entrance



Image 2 Trees further down the retaining wall



Image 3 T268, by the entrance



Image 4 T270A, adjacent to Church Street



Image 5 T270 to T273 viewed from the grounds of St Audrey's



Image 6 Tight union with included bark on T270A



Image 7 **Tight unions with included bark on T271**



Image 8 **T272 and T273, joined at the base**



Image 9 Persistent crack and cavity on T272



Image 10 Basal cavity on T273



Image 11 T277, a stump covered with ivy but with leader snapped and hung up



Image 12 T274, growing over the top of the retaining wall



Image 13 T281 with multiple stems, some dead or decayed with Daldinia



Image 14 T286, declining walnut tree adjacent to main building (left) & root damage



Image 15 T288, with fused stems



Image 16 T288 close to the building, recommended to be cut back to clear the building by 2-3m



Image 17 T293 with tight union with included bark

APPENDIX III - TREE SURVEY RECORDS

DATE OF SURVEY - 20th July 2018

ID	Species	Hgt	Stem Diam (mm)	Canopy Radius	Crown Hgt	Life Stage	Struct Cond	Phys Cond	Observations	Tree Works	Work Completion	Re-Inspect
T268	Horse Chestnut <i>Aesculus hippocastanum</i>	16	620	10	4	OM	Fair	Good	Minor Basal cavities, Suckering Fibre buckling (torsion) Tight forks & included bark Ivy covered, Moderate deadwood, Damaged branches, Severe leaf miner.	Remove basal growth that is obstructing view of the signage.	3 Months	2 Years
T269	Yew <i>Taxus baccata</i>	11	420	4	1	SM	Good	Good	Cavities (Minor) Tight forks & included bark	No Action Required at this time (NAR)	N/A	2 Years
T270	Sycamore <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	16	220	2	0	SM	Fair	Fair	Tight forks Asymmetrical canopy	NAR	N/A	2 Years
T270 A	Horse Chestnut <i>Aesculus hippocastanum</i>	20	1030	7	5	OM	Fair	Good	Persistent crack/bulge Burrs, Tight forks & included bark, Ivy covered, Snub nose defect, Necrotic bark, Ivy around the base.	NAR	N/A	2 Years
T271	Horse Chestnut <i>Aesculus hippocastanum</i>	20	430	3	0	OM	Fair	Good	Tight forks & included bark Ivy covered, Deadwood (Min) Hung-up branches, Ivy in crown Asymmetric canopy due to suppression Leaf miner.	NAR	N/A	2 Years
T272	Ash <i>Fraxinus-exelsior</i>	20	500	5	10	OM	Poor	Fair	Tree removed between 2014 and 2016	N/A	N/A	2 Years
T273	Horse Chestnut <i>Aesculus hippocastanum</i>	20	480	5	3	EM	Fair	Good	Restricted root zone, Basal Cavities (Major), Stem Cavities (Minor), Asymmetrical Crown, Ivy covered, Deadwood (Min), ivy growing around the base.	N/A	N/A	2 Years

APPENDIX III - TREE SURVEY RECORDS

DATE OF SURVEY - 20th July 2018

ID	Species	Hgt	Stem Diam (mm)	Canopy Radius	Crown Hgt	Life Stage	Struct Cond	Phys Cond	Observations	Tree Works	Work Completion	Re-Inspect
T274	Ash Fraxinus excelsior	22	510	8	10	OM	Fair	Good	Tree removed between 2014 and 2016	N/A	N/A	2 Years
T275	Variegated Holly <i>Ilex aquafolium</i> 'Silver holly'	5	120	2	0	Yng	Fair	Good	Cavities (Major), Ivy around the base	NAR	N/A	2 Years
T276	Beech <i>Fagus sylvatica</i>	15	910	10	5	M	Good	Good	Cavities (Minor) Fibre buckling (torsion) Tight forks & included bark Ivy covered, Deadwood (Min) Ivy in crown	Sever ivy	3 Months	2 Years
T277	Box elder, <i>Acer negrundo</i>	4	100	2	3	OM	Poor	Poor	Partially failed stump, Cavities (Major), Ivy covered, Decay	NAR	N/A	2 Years
T278	Ash <i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>	17	660	6	6	OM	Fair	Fair	Restricted root zone, Basal growth, Ivy covered, Deadwood (Maj), Tight forks, Damaged branches	Remove deadwood	3 Months	2 Years
T279	Ash Fraxinus excelsior	17	580	5	10	OM	Fair	Good	Tree removed between 2014 and 2016	N/A	N/A	2 Years
T280	Ash <i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>	20	490	5	3	M	Fair	Fair	Restricted root zone, Ivy covered Deadwood (Maj), Ivy severed and falling away but re-establishing.	N/A	N/A	2 Years

APPENDIX III - TREE SURVEY RECORDS

DATE OF SURVEY - 20th July 2018

ID	Species	Hgt	Stem Diam (mm)	Canopy Radius	Crown Hgt	Life Stage	Struct Cond	Phys Cond	Observations	Tree Works	Work Completion	Re-Inspect
T281	Ash <i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>	12	300# Ave. X 6	7	4	SM	Poor	Fair	Restricted root zone, Fruiting Bodies, Cavities (Minor), Decay, Bark wounds, Ivy covered, Multi-stemmed, Deadwood (Maj), Tight forks & included bark, Ivy in crown, Slight pom pomming of the beranches characteristic of ash dieback	Remove deadwood and hangers over the road, Pollard or Coppice.	3 Months	2 Years
T282	Sycamore <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	8	170	3	4	Yng	Good	Good	Service lines conflict	Cut clear of service lines	N/A	2 Years
T283	Cherry Laurel <i>Prunus laurocerasus</i>	6	6	4	0	SM	Good	Good	Service lines conflict	Cut clear of service lines	N/A	2 Years
T284	Horse Chestnut <i>Aesculus hippocastanum</i>	9	130	3	5	SM	Fair	Good	Multi-stemmed	NAR	N/A	2 Years
T285	Lawson Cypress	9	370	3	3	SM	Fair	Good	Tight forks & included bark Very poor form. Ivy severed and falling away. Conflict with the roof of adjacent building.	Cut clear of the adjacent building	N/A	2 Years

APPENDIX III - TREE SURVEY RECORDS
DATE OF SURVEY - 20th July 2018

ID	Species	Hgt	Stem Diam (mm)	Canopy Radius	Crown Hgt	Life Stage	Struct Cond	Phys Cond	Observations	Tree Works	Work Completion	Re-Inspect
T286	Walnut <i>Juglans regia</i>	12	70	8	1	OM	Poor	Good	Damaged roots, Cavities (Minor), Ivy covered, Deadwood (Min), Cavities, Broken branches, Ivy in crown, Branch stubs, Previously cut back from the building, Brambles around the base.	Cut clear of the adjacent building	6 Months	2 Years
T287	Pear <i>Pyrus domestica</i>	7	190	4	2	OM	Fair	Fair	Tight forks & included bark Deadwood (Min)	NAR	N/A	2 Years
T288	Beech <i>Fagus sylvatica</i>	15	630	6	2	M	Good	Good	Tight forks from 1 to 4m between two stems, with fusing taking place	Cut clear of the adjacent building	6 Months	2 Years
T289	Grey poplar <i>Populus x canescens</i>	18	590	10	4	M	Fair	Fair	Asymmetrical Crown Leaning Old Pruning wounds	NAR	N/A	2 Years
T290	Grey poplar <i>Populus x canescens</i>	18	360	6	6	M	Good	Good	Asymmetrical Crown Deadwood (Min)	NAR	N/A	2 Years
T291	Sycamore <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	11	200	3	0	SM	Good	Good	No significant defects	NAR	N/A	2 Years
T292	Grey poplar <i>Populus x canescens</i>	18	360	5	10	M	Fair	Fair	Asymmetrical Crown Leaning Ivy covered	NAR	N/A	2 Years
T293	Corsican pine <i>Pinus nigra</i> Maritima	15	540	5	8	M	Fair	Good	Persistent crack/bulge Tight forks & included bark	NAR	N/A	2 Years
T294	Ash <i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>	8	210	4	2	EM	Poor	Good	Poor form, Suppressed at 3m with deviation to the east	NAR	N/A	2 Years

APPENDIX III - TREE SURVEY RECORDS
DATE OF SURVEY - 20th July 2018

ID	Species	Hgt	Stem Diam (mm)	Canopy Radius	Crown Hgt	Life Stage	Struct Cond	Phys Cond	Observations	Tree Works	Work Completion	Re-Inspect
T295	Horse Chestnut <i>Aesculus hippocastanum</i>	15	220	6	3				Asymmetrical Crown Poor form	NAR	N/A	2 Years
T296	Sycamore <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	22	540	6	0	M	Good	Good	Swept stem to the west. Ivy covered stem	Sever Ivy	3 Months	2 Years
T297	Grey poplar <i>Populus x canescens</i>	22	670	10	0	M	Good	Good	No significant defects	NAR	N/A	2 Years
T298	Sycamore, <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	18	510	4	0	EM	Good	Good	Tight forks & included bark Asymmetrical Crown, suppressed by T297	NAR	N/A	2 Years
T299	Hawthorn <i>Crataegus monogyna</i>	8	310	4	3	OM	Fair	Fair	Ivy covered Multi-stemmed	NAR	N/A	2 Years
T300	Holly <i>Ilex aquafolium</i>	17	300	8	0	OM	Good	Good	Tight forks & included bark Old Pruning wounds Branch stubs	NAR	N/A	2 Years
T301	Sycamore, <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	20	450	5	0	M	Fair	Good	Persistent crack/bulge Tight forks & included bark Asymmetrical Crown Suppressed crown (mutual) Deadwood (Min).	NAR	N/A	2 Years
T301 A	Sycamore <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	20	500	5	0	M	Fair	Good	Ivy covered stems	NAR	N/A	2 Years
T302	Sycamore <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	21	470	6	0	M	Poor	Fair	Tree removed between 2014 and 2016	N/A	N/A	2 Years
T303	Wild Cherry <i>Prunus avium</i>	18	340	4	0	M	Good	Good	Uneven ground level Girdling roots	Sever girdling root	6 Months	2 Years

APPENDIX III - TREE SURVEY RECORDS

DATE OF SURVEY - 20th July 2018

ID	Species	Hgt	Stem Diam (mm)	Canopy Radius	Crown Hgt	Life Stage	Struct Cond	Phys Cond	Observations	Tree Works	Work Completion	Re-Inspect
T304	Norway spruce <i>Picea abies</i>	18	420	4	0	M	Good	Good	No significant defects	NAR	N/A	2 Years
T305	Wild Cherry <i>Prunus avium</i>	19	310	5	0				Deadwood (Min)	NAR	N/A	2 Years
T306	Common Lime <i>Tilia x europaea</i>	21	340	8	0	EM	Good	Good	Tight forks & included bark at around 4m, with a persistent crack	NAR	N/A	2 Years
T307	Hazel, <i>Corylus avellana</i>	8	100# Ave X 30#	5	1	SM	Good	Good	Multi-stemmed	NAR	N/A	2 Years