



Tree report

Gordon House, Chapel Lane,
Everton,
Nottinghamshire.

Prepared by: Tree Generation on the 20th January 2017.

Prepared by:

Tree Generation
1 Kings Court,
Louth,
Lincolnshire.
07719 143011

Date of Inspection: 20th January 2017

Survey and Report on trees:

**Gordon House, Everton.
Nottinghamshire.**

1 Introduction

Upon the consideration of their duty of care under the Occupiers Liability Act 1985 Mr Bo Jorgensen acting on behalf of the Homeowner asked me to inspect a line of trees growing on the homeowner's property. And to provide recommendations for any remedial action I deemed necessary.

2 Conclusions and Summary

This site contains many trees of various species though I have only been asked to inspect a line of Horse Chestnut trees.

Works which have been recommended are to re-pollard which is due to the fact that these trees are now quite old and have had similar previous works carried out in them in the past. I feel that any other works would have a detrimental effect on the unions which are very often weak following pollarding works. The trees will require continued management though to retain them long term, and I would recommend that they are re-pollarded every 10 years.

Some of the trees contain deadwood, which has been recommended to remove over the road etc. As deadwood can contain "Static mass" (Stored energy) it is not always the best option to remove all of it, but just the ends which snap easily.

It should be noted that all trees have a natural failure rate. This failure has long been classed as Act of God.

It should also be noted that the trees I have commented on as needing work are mainly on the roadside and private land, and in a medium risk target area. The targets in this case are a school, road, pub entrance, phone lines, street lights, footpath, and neighbouring properties.

3 Instructions

As requested by 1985 Mr Bo Jorgensen acting on behalf of the Homeowner, I have now inspected the all of trees growing at the grounds of the location mentioned above, and am pleased to report on the following:

- (i) The condition, health and safety of the inspected trees.
- (ii) Recommendations for the future management.

4 Qualifications and experience.

I have been working professionally with trees since 1989, and so as a result of this I have always had to visually inspect trees.

I hold the LANTRA Professional tree inspectors award, and am able to draw on the extensive knowledge of a local Arboricultural Consultant and LCC tree officers when needed.

5 Report limitations

My inspection of the trees was carried out from ground level with aid of a sounding hammer, probe and binoculars: should a further inspection be required it will be highlighted in my recommendations.

Where Ivy, sucker or shrub growth are present, I was only able to view those areas visible to me.

Trees and shrubs are living organisms whose health and condition can change rapidly. The health, condition and safety of trees should be checked by a competent person on a regular basis, and would recommend downloading a copy of the latest NTSG (National Tree Safety Group) factsheets.

My conclusions and recommendations within this report are true to the best of my knowledge on the dates of inspection. The period of validity of one year may be reduced in the case of any change in conditions above or below ground close to the tree.

6 Findings

A schedule of information on the trees inspected is included with this report under the following headings:

- **Ref** – Tree number as marked on the tree and shown on the site plan.
- **Species** - Common English name.
- **Age class** – Defined as:
 1. Young, e.g. less than 1/3 expected safe useful lifespan.
 2. Early mature, e.g. >1/3 but <2/3 expected safe useful lifespan.
 3. Mature, e.g. >2/3 expected safe useful lifespan.
 4. Over mature.
 5. Veteran.

- **Height class** – Estimated total height according to the following range of sizes (Shown as S, M, L, and VL)
Small - <7 metres.
Medium – 7 to 15 metres.
Large - > 15metres, but <20metres.
Very Large – 20metres +
- **Condition** – A description of the physiological and/or structural factors which I consider represent a significant weakness, decline or imminent risk.
Structure (S) – Good. A tree free of significant defects.
Fair. A tree with significant defects, which can be remedied.
Poor. A tree with significant defects which need substantial works.
Physiological (P) – Good. A tree in overall good health. (A good ability to resist pathogens)
Fair. A tree with signs or symptoms of ill health that can be treated.
Poor. A tree in terminal decline, due to ill health.
Target (T) – proximity to an area which could cause injury or damage to persons and or property.
Insignificant (INSIG) – A defect worthy of note, but needing no further clarification at this time.
- **Recommendations** – For remedial Arboricultural works. * denotes favoured option.
- **Risk Rating**- This is based on the rating quantified by Matheney & Clark and is based on the following principles.
 1. Failure potential: 1=Low, 2=Medium, 3=High, 4=Severe
 2. Size of part: 1=<15cm, 2=15 to 45cm, 3=45 to 75cm, 4=75cm+
 3. Target: 1=Occasional use, 2=Intermittent use, 3=Frequent use, 4=Constant use.
These risks are added together to give an overall risk rating.
- **Work Priority** – Based on the assessment of risk considering three factors:
 1. Presence of a target – i.e. are persons or property at risk if the tree or part of the tree should fail.
 2. How likely is failure within 12 months?
 3. How severe is damage or injury likely to be (based on size of part and type of target use)
 - 4.

The Priority has then been defined as follows:

1. **Very High** – Works/exclusion to be carried out at the **earliest** opportunity, e.g., this category would include immediate steps to minimise risk.
2. **High** – works to be carried out within the next three months (ideally before/after leaf flush to avoid the risk of disturbing nesting birds)
3. **Medium** – Works to be carried out within six months (ideally avoiding leaf flush, and disturbing nesting birds)
4. **Low** – Works to be carried out as part of an annual programme.
5. **N/A** – No action at this time.

The above priorities recognise the practicalities of organising remedial works, e.g., an element of risk exists if any tree has a defect and it is located near a person's property, but the Law states that landowners should do what is "reasonably practical" to reduce that risk.

Other considerations when prioritising works are the impact on wildlife; it is an offence under the *Wildlife and Countryside Act* to intentionally or recklessly disturb bats or nesting birds. This would not preclude the carrying out of urgent safety works (although prior liaison with the relevant bodies would be a requirement).

It will be essential that operators carrying out works observe the requirements of the act if encountering protected wildlife. This may include temporary postponement, or seeking of a licence from Natural England.

7 Comment

The following are mentioned within the tree schedule, and are worthy of explanation:

A Crown Dieback/deadwood

The crown of most trees contains small quantities of deadwood which may warrant immediate remedial works. However, as a tree declines significant dieback can cause an indication of dysfunction. Occasionally trees will dieback in response to stress (e.g., drought, water logging, or compaction) and show recovery when the soil conditions are improved.

A number of the inspected trees contain small to medium quantities of deadwood. Deadwood makes an important contribution to the wildlife food chain, and need only to be removed where it poses a perceived risk to persons or property.

B Internal Decay

Trees may contain varying degrees of internal decay, normally following damage and colonisation by decay pathogens. This can be and often is compartmentalised and need not immediately create a critical weakness, plus it is also a major benefit to wildlife.

Occasionally "Slime Flux" will be seen to weep from wounds/cavities. This is often the product of an organism known as *Bacterial Wetwood*. The alkaline substance produced is potentially toxic to the tree, but rarely enters the trees' transport systems, and in the meantime serves to exclude more harmful pathogens.

Large wounds remain as a potential entry point for decay Pathogens for many years. When considering tree surgery work, every effort should be made to minimise wound size, e.g. by reducing the size of branch rather than removing the whole branch.

C Ivy

It is often thought that ivy kills trees – this is not strictly accurate ivy is a climber, which grows up the side of the tree, but can eventually smother the tree. It also increases the "sail area" of the crown and resistance to wind, potentially causing trees to fail earlier than they would otherwise have done.

Finally of course heavy growth of ivy can obstruct more serious stem defects.

D Hangers

Loose hanging branches are often present in the crowns of maturing trees. It is important to periodically check for, and remove any loose branches in the crowns. These are more easily identified when trees are without leaves.

8 General

Before authorising any tree works, you should confirm (via your Local Planning Authority) if the trees are the subjects of a Tree Preservation Order (TPO), or if they are within a Building Conservation Area.

If the TPO is in place then statutory approval is required **before** any works can take place. If located in a Building Conservation Area, then the local Authority must be given six weeks advance notice of intent.

When engaging the services of a tree surgeon, please, use only properly qualified and experienced companies and always check that they carry Public and Products Liability Insurance, and the relevant Employers Liability Insurance.

All tree works should be carried out in accordance with “current industry best practice”

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you require any further assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Steve Vessey

Report completed 20th January 2017

References: The Body Language of Trees – Mattheck & Breloer

Updated Field Book – C. Mattheck.

NTSG, Common Sense Risk Assessment of Trees.

Principles of Tree Hazard Assessment and Management – D. Lonsdale.

