



Unit 1 Foundry Yard, New Row
Boroughbridge YO51 9AX
T 01423 322 371
E info@barnesassociates.co.uk
W barnesassociates.co.uk
Company Number 10438116
Registered in England and Wales

Project: Risk Assessment of Trees

Site: 55a Manor Well, Hill Top, Knottingley, WF11 9AQ

On Behalf of: Hilary Southgate

Date: 23/01/2024

Reference: BA230340



DOCUMENT CONTROL

Surveyed by*	Matt Metcalfe	Report date	23/01/2024		
Prepared by*	Matt Metcalfe				
Reviewed by*	Sue Barnes				
Revision	A	Date	23/01/2024	Notes:	
	* Refer to qualifications and experience appendix				

SUMMARY OF TREE INFORMATION

I have undertaken a ground-based walkthrough risk assessment of the trees onsite to assess their general condition and their relationship with significant targets.

Most trees offer a Broadly Acceptable Risk and are assumed to be at a point where the risk is already 'As Low as Reasonably Practicable' (ALARP) when considered over the coming year. Overall, the risk offered by most of the trees are low and within the boundaries of tolerability that might ordinarily be applied by a reasonable and informed landowner and so were not recorded.

Of the trees assessed, none of the trees appeared to offer an excessive risk. However, due to poor past management of the canopies by excessive crown thinning, the lower lateral branches are end-weighted and at an elevated risk of future failure.

I also noted metalwork and electrical connections on tree stems. It is likely that the metalwork and electrical connections will become included within the tree as it grows. As the feed is likely live, the need to remove/refit or change these connections may arise and could cause harm to the tree. It is recommended that the electrical connections are removed and either placed on a small diameter utility post adjacent to the tree, or removed entirely whilst retaining and 'capping' the cable beneath the ground rather than attempting to excavate which would likely cause root loss to the tree. The above electrical works should be carried out by a qualified and experienced electrician.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ARBORICULTURAL ASSESSMENT

APPENDICES

	Page No	
1	INTRODUCTION	6
2	METHODOLOGY	7
3	SITE ASSESSMENT	9
4	CONCLUSION	13
		QUALIFICATIONS & EXPERIENCE
		TREE SCHEDULE & EXPLANATORY NOTES
		-Tree Dimensional Data
		-Tree Risk and Management Data
		SITE PLANS
		FURTHER ASSESSMENTS
		TREES & RISK
		LEGAL ASPECTS OF TREE MANAGEMENT

Limitations of use and copyright: All rights in this report are reserved. No part of it may be reproduced or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, or stored in any retrieval system of any nature, without our written permission. Its content and format are for the exclusive use of the addressee in dealing with this site. It may not be sold, lent, hired out or divulged to any third party not directly involved in this site without the written consent of © Barnes Associates Ltd 2024.

WALK THROUGH RISK ASSESSMENT

This ground-based visual assessment was carried out to assess the current risk they offer to site users. The report also includes recommendations both for current and future works required to maintain or improve the condition of trees, simplify management or to improve safety.

Its purpose is to provide initial information on the condition of trees and the risk offered by trees, based upon their condition, location, likelihood of failure and potential to impact property and people.

This assessment has been undertaken by a qualified arboriculturist.

This arboricultural assessment includes general information on tree condition and management. The report includes:

- a **visual tree assessment**, which is prepared in line with best practice.
- a **tree assessment of risk trees**, detailing significant issues with suggested works.
- a **tree schedule & survey plan** within the appendices, which details the principal management issues and trees that pose an elevated risk to the site users and neighbours. This information is split into two tables:

Tree Dimensional Data: Basic data about the size and categorisation of your trees.

Tree Risk and Management Data: Any comments or observations of note are detailed here, along with the risk assessment and, if required, any works recommended to reduce that risk.

INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 **The Terms of Reference.** This report is based upon a ground-based assessment and is based upon the Visual Tree Assessment (VTA) methodology, as devised by Mattheck (1993) in addition to Hazard Evaluation devised by Matheny & Clark (1993). Guidance is also taken from Lonsdale (1999) Principles of Tree Hazard Assessment and Management. The format of the survey follows the guidelines of British Standard 5837:2012 'Trees in relation to design, demolition & construction - Recommendations' & The ISA Tree Risk Assessment Manual (2017).
- 1.2 **Objective.** To carry out a ground based visual assessment on the condition of trees and to identify the trees which pose a threat to properties both within and adjacent to the site, site users, and anyone else that can reasonably be foreseen to be affected by identified hazards. Where such trees are located, we will propose management recommendations to enable the level of risk to be reduced to an acceptable level. Conditions or situations which may cause longer term issues, such as likely damage to structures through direct damage or the susceptibility to disease, may be mentioned in the **Summary Of Tree Information**.
- 1.3 **Surveyors:** The assessment was undertaken by Matt Metcalfe. Brief details on qualifications and experience are included in APPENDIX – CONSULTANT BRIEF QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE. This report is based on onsite observations and the provided information.
- 1.4 **The scope of this report:** This preliminary assessment is concerned with the health and risk offered by the trees, in addition, comments relating to general management requirements are included; remedial recommendations are included in the tree schedule in APPENDIX – TREE SCHEDULE & EXPLANATORY NOTES.
- 1.4.1 The statements made in this report do not take account of the effects of extremes of climate, vandalism or accident, whether physical, chemical or fire. Barnes & Associates cannot, therefore, accept any liability about these factors, nor where prescribed work is not carried out correctly and professionally in accordance with current good practice. The authority of this report ceases at any stated time limit within it, or if none stated after two years from the date of the survey, or when any site conditions change, or pruning or other works unspecified in the report are carried out to, or affecting, the subject tree(s), whichever is the sooner.
- 1.4.2 Assessment of the potential influence of trees upon buildings or other structures resulting from the effects of trees abstracting water from shrinkable load-bearing soils was not included in my instruction and is not considered here. Though issues relating to current or foreseeable direct damage related to tree growth is included as appropriate.

METHODOLOGY.

2.0 **Visual Tree Assessment (VTA)**, relies upon a tree's response to loading and adaptation to weakness to help provide details of the tree's internal condition and stability. As the stress distribution in a tree is changed in response to the presence of a defect or loading the tree attaches or lays down more wood in overloaded locations to strengthen that area. As a result, bulges or dents are formed near hollows, ribs, near cracks or in areas of increased loading. These changes in the tree's appearance or its body language can be interpreted.

2.0.1 Visually examining a tree and a tree response to its environment, an arboriculturist can gather information on the condition of its roots, trunk, main branch structure, crown, buds, and leaves to make an assessment and draw conclusions about the general condition, health, and vitality.

2.0.2 Additional, biological signs, such as undersized leaves, discoloured foliage, dead branches, large or numerous cankers, and fungal fruiting bodies, help inform the assessment which can be compared to typical growth patterns and appearance of the tree involved. If mechanical weakness is suspected, there may be a need for more detailed investigation using specialist decay detection and measuring equipment.

2.1 **Potential Risk from Trees.** Trees, unlike built structures, are a dynamic structure and offer several specific management issues that need to be considered. Reasonable risk management generally aims to provide trees that can be regarded as stable in a normal/foreseeable, storm event.

2.2 **Wind Speed.** In the UK wind speed typically expected winds range between 21.5m/s and 31m/s. General, the windiest parts of the UK are the north and west. This is because the prevailing west to south-westerly winds across the UK lead to northern and western areas being typically more exposed than the south and east.


2.2.1 There are also a lot of localised effects with most hills, mountains and coasts being windier than low-lying inland areas, with coastal areas having typically higher winds as the sea surface produces less friction than the land.

2.2.2 Based upon information published in the UK National Annex to Eurocode 1 - Actions on structures Part 1-4: General actions - Wind actions In this region, we expect to receive the following peak wind speeds:

	Metres Per Second (m/s)	Kilometres Per Hour (kph)	Miles Per Hour (mph)
Peak Wind Speed	22.5	81.00	50.33
Adjusted for altitude	22.8	82.08	51.00
Beaufort Wind Scale	Force 9 Strong Gale (21-24m/s)		

I have included further general information in APPENDIX – TREES AND RISK.

3.0.1 The wind rose below demonstrates that the wind frequency (direction) is predominantly from the west which suggests that tree adaptation is likely to be stronger against westerly winds than other cardinal points. As a result, winds from other cardinal points may lead to unforeseeable failures.



3.1 **Target evaluation.** To enable a balanced approach to the site assessment, I undertook an initial review of the associated risks onsite to identify likely levels of occupation, areas where trees are within striking range of valuable or fragile structures or higher human occupancy locations. Targets are broadly zoned in relation to occupancy rates, population, and value. These are included in the Occupancy Rates Plan, BA230340/OP in APPENDIX – SITE PLANS.

3.2 **Risk Assessment.** The risk assessment centres on the area likely to be affected by trees; this is typically considered to be the area within 0.5 times the trees height when falling branches/deadwood etc are concerned and 1.5 times the trees height when total tree failure is predicted.

3.3 The assessment follows the general principles of Risk Assessment; to reduce the risk of injury to people, property damage or disruption of services. The THREATS (Tree Hazard: Risk Evaluation and Treatment System) method has been designed to offer all those who have responsibility for evaluating and managing trees a means of assessing them for risk in a consistent fashion. THREATS also assist the user in determining the appropriate response to the

level of identified risk. The method multiplies three values together to give a threat category (shown below) which guides the inspector on an appropriate response to the risk posed. We apply our BARMY (Barnes Associates Risk Method (of) Yorkshire) amendments to THREATS; See APPENDIX - TREE SCHEDULE & EXPLANATORY NOTES for further information.

3.4 The Risk Rating helps inform priority for action with the highest risk rating with the greatest target values requiring work urgently. Where the priority of trees is recorded as being low and a low target value, works required to improve the tree's risk of harm, are expected to be undertaken as part of the normal estate management.

THREAT Category	Recommended action & Completion deadline
7 – Extreme	Evacuate/prevent access to impact site, emergency call-out of contractors
6 – Serious	Close site if practical; arrange for work to be completed within 7 days
5 – Significant	Arrange for work to be completed within four weeks maximum
4 – Moderate	Remediate within 13 weeks, reinspect after SWE meantime (inc. gales to Force 7+)
3 – Slight	Reinspect annually /after storms (Force 10+), expect to schedule work within 2 yrs
2 – Minimal	Reinspect within 3 yrs if public access, schedule work as required
1 – Insignificant	Reinspect within 5 yrs if general public access or 3 yrs if child-specific access & TS ≥20

3.5 **Tree Management.** We take a balanced approach to managing trees taking account of their contribution to biodiversity, the environment, human health, safety and quality of life. An appropriate response to tree risk takes account of the human and financial costs involved in controlling risks. It also gives due

regard to the value of trees in the widest sense, and how wholesale tree removal impoverishes our environment.

- 3.6 At the same time, we aim to provide holistic management guidelines to help both maintain and improve the condition of a tree, whilst attempting to predict management or structural problems or where trees are inappropriately located and offer a foreseeable nuisance. In doing so we hope to strike a balance between cost-effective management, timely intervention and the guidelines of current best practice.

SITE ASSESSMENT

- 3.1 **The purpose of this report.** This is an arboricultural assessment outlining the current condition and safety of the trees onsite and aims to recommend works to improve the tree's condition, pre-emptive works to simplify tree management and identify the trees offering an elevated risk of harm. Its purpose is to provide initial information on the potential risks offered by trees, their condition and to suggest either further assessment or works to improve safety and extend their safe life.
- 3.2 **Background Information.** Subject to physical access is available, to assess all the significant trees on site from ground level.
- 3.2.1 Information on the trees is recorded and their details are discussed in the tree schedule, which is included in APPENDIX – TREE SCHEDULE & EXPLANATORY NOTES.

- 3.3 **Date of Assessment.** Our tree survey was undertaken on 11th Jan 2024.
- 3.4 **Weather conditions.** The weather was overcast with fair to good visibility.
- 3.5 **Boundaries:** The outer site boundaries are well defined by hedging, walls and fencing. This helped inform my assessment of the occupancy rates, recorded on the plan, BA230340/OP in APPENDIX – SITE PLANS.
- 3.6 **Brief site description.** The site is a residential property with a large garden and shared driveway.
- 3.6.1 I have highlighted the approximate location of the site boundaries in red on the aerial photograph below, image courtesy of ©Google and third-party suppliers noted on the plan.



3.7 **Tree Population.** The trees compose of a reasonably diverse mix of large, moderate growing native and near-native trees. No rare species were observed.

3.8 **Amenity Value.** The trees filter views between the public domain and the site in addition to defining the site and land use, based on the level of visibility the trees are assumed to have a high visual amenity value.

3.9 **Legislative Protection:** Information on Wakefield Councils online resource suggests that the site is located within a Conservation Area (CA:22), therefore all tree works will require a Section 211 notice of intent completed with a period of up to six weeks lead time before works can be completed (dependant on S.211 outcome).



3.10 **Principal Targets.** The trees are located within the garden area close to the property and boundary third party land.

3.11 **Pedestrian Access.** Pedestrian access is possible around the entire site.

3.12 **Vehicle Access.** Vehicle access is restricted to maintenance vehicles only outside of the driveway.

3.13 **Condition of Trees.** The trees appear to have had poor historic management. This inspection provides an assessment of the condition of the principal trees, within the existing site along with landscape and environmental constraints. The trees have been assessed from ground level only. Information upon the trees is in the Tree Schedule in APPENDIX – TREE SCHEDULE & EXPLANATORY NOTES.

3.14 **Identification and location of the trees.** I have illustrated the location of the recorded trees on Tree Location Plan BA230340/TP in APPENDIX – SITE PLANS. Trees are shown on the plan, which is for illustrative purposes only and should not be used for directly scaling measurements.

3.15 **Visual assessment of trees.** The assessment of the trees was undertaken from ground level using Visual Tree Assessment (VTA), this is a non-invasive method of examining the health and structural condition of individual trees. The assessment provides information on the condition of the roots, trunk, main branch structure, crown, buds and leaves together providing an assessment of general tree health and vitality.

3.15.1 Basic decay detection tools such as mallets and probes were utilised to determine whether further investigation is required.


3.15.2 Other than where the height of a tree is critical to the outcome of the assessment, approximately 1 in 10 trees are measured using a clinometer and the remainder estimated against the measured trees. Where possible canopies are measured using either tape or measuring wheel, where access is restricted, they are estimated. Stem diameters are measured using a rounded-down diameter tape to avoid variations due to stem shape, otherwise where trees are in a group and/or not accessible the stem's mean stem diameters are estimated to provide a reasonable basis for ageing.


3.16 **Risk Assessment.** I have undertaken a tree survey to identify the general nature of the trees and their relationship with significant targets. The level of detail with which the trees have been assessed is informed by their relationship with targets. Based on these larger trees adjacent to higher-value targets were more closely assessed than smaller trees adjacent to a lower value target when viewed over the next year.

3.16.1 The majority of trees offer a Broadly Acceptable Risk and are assumed to be at a point where the risk is already 'As Low as Reasonably Practicable' (ALARP) when considered over the coming year. Overall, the risk offered is low and within the boundaries of tolerability that might ordinarily be applied by a reasonable and informed landowner.

3.17 **Insignificant/Minimal/Slight Risk Trees.** On-site, three trees are assessed as offering an **Insignificant/Minimal/Slight Risk** and although not posing an unacceptable risk, they are highlighted to assist with the ongoing management of the site. These trees are highlighted **Green** within my Tree Schedule in APPENDIX – TREE SCHEDULE & EXPLANATORY NOTES, and on


the site, plan located in APPENDIX – SITE PLANS.

Insignificant/Minimal/Slight Risk Tree			
T2 Sycamore			
Comments		Recommendations	
<p>Located on the boundary overhanging a horse paddock. Growing as part of a single line of trees north south. Single Stem. Metalwork in stem. High-end loading on main branches over garden area which are an elevated risk of failing due to poor historic pruning operations. Stem cavity on eastern side of the stem - appears shallow/localised. The internal canopy appears to have been excessively thinned in the past.</p>		<p>Lateral reduction on west side of lower canopy side by 1.5-2m to reduce end weight and failure potential.</p> <p>Reduce elongated limb growing towards property by 1 to 1.5m to reduce risk of future failure.</p>	
			
Priority	Within 1 year	Next inspection	18 months

Insignificant/Minimal/Slight Risk Tree			
T1 Sycamore			
Comments		Recommendations	
<p>Growing in the open within the lawn area. Root compaction visible. Subterranean electricity cable trenched through tree. Single Stem. Cables and electric sockets on Southern stem. Lighting on stem Typical shape and form for the species. Small diameter (<25 mm) deadwood in the inner canopy. Cavities visible within main branches. Wounding from branch failures visible.</p>		<p>Remove deadwood to improve safety. Re inspect in summer 2024 to comment on vitality levels, especially in the central leaders of the canopy.</p>	
			
Priority	Within 1 year	Next inspection	18 months

CONCLUSION

- 4.1 **Tree Management.** Unfortunately, many of the trees appear to be at much the same point in their life cycle and this should ideally be amended through a tree management program centred around improving immediate safety in addition to the phased establishment of replacement trees and removal of problem trees which would be beneficial to maintain tree cover. Also, improving the appearance of some areas and the broad range of benefits offered by the trees.
- 4.1.1 Ideally, a management plan should be prepared to help provide a more detailed insight into the population of the trees. To provide appropriate forthcoming works, planting opportunities and to help identify both immediate and ongoing management to help stabilise the tree population.
- 4.2.1 Trees potentially live for many generations their environment and people's attitudes can change significantly over their life spans, and management practices can change. Plans and procedures should be reviewed regularly to ensure they remain effective and current, particularly in relation to climate change issues and current best practices.
- 4.3 **Remedial Tree Works.** Several trees contain defects and require works to improve their current condition or require further investigation. These works are detailed within the schedule of the tree listed in APPENDIX – TREE SCHEDULE & EXPLANATORY NOTES.
- 4.4 **Additional and ongoing requirements.** The site will require an ongoing assessment to maintain a reasonable level of safety.

Insignificant/Minimal/Slight Risk Tree			
T3 Sycamore			
Comments	Recommendations		
<p>Located on the boundary overhanging a horse paddock. Growing as part of a single line of trees north south. Single stem. High-end loading on main branches over garden area which are at an elevated risk of failing due to poor historic pruning operations. The internal canopy appears to have been excessively thinned in the past.</p>	<p>Reduce limb growing towards property by 1.5 to 2m.</p>		
			
Priority	Within 1 year	Next inspection	18 months

- 4.5 **Limiting Site Access.** It is reasonable to assume a 'Storm' of force 10 using the Beaufort Scale (winds of 87.9kph-102.2kph (54.8-63.6 mph) on land) will occur annually and such a risk should be built into the site risk management. Recent work has shown even sound trees that would typically be regarded as safe can fail during high winds through several factors relating to wood physiology, dynamics and the relationship between the root system and the supporting soils.
- 4.5.1 Typically, trees have evolved to fail in part, i.e., twigs and branches are sacrificed/fail from a parent tree rather than the tree being lost entirely. Observations at various sites have found that twigs and branches, can break from trees at wind speeds of as little as 50kph (31mph), the upper limit of a 'strong breeze' as detailed in Beaufort Scale 6 (38.6 kph- 49.7 kph (24.1mph - 31.0mph)). Such branch failures are difficult to predict with any great level of detail and as such, I would recommend a defensive position is best adopted.
- 4.6 **Trees subject to statutory controls.** If the trees are covered by a Tree Preservation Order, located in a Conservation Area, have other legal planning constraints or are on neighbouring land; works may be restricted. The works specified are necessary for reasonable management and should be acceptable to the local authority.
- 4.7 **Implementation of works.** I would always suggest that you get at least three fixed priced quotations before deciding upon a contractor to undertake the works on your behalf.
- 4.7.1 You should ensure that any contractor employed for the above works is suitably qualified and experienced, familiar with current best practice and covered by current, public, products, and employee liability insurance, to an adequate level. I would advise that any Arboricultural work is carried out by a reputable contractor or one approved by the Arboricultural Association. (www.trees.org.uk) is advisable if you require us to suggest a contractor for your works please feel free to get in touch.
- 4.7.2 The contractor should carry out all tree works to BS3998 (2010) Tree Work – Recommendations and/or the European Tree Pruning Guide - European Arboricultural Council (English Version) and the Industry Code of Practice for Arboriculture: Tree Work at Height (Edition 1, February 2015). Works should be undertaken in strict accordance with current arboricultural best practice ensuring that any pruning works accord with current target pruning methodology. They should be fully conversant with current Arboricultural best practice and adhere to all relevant legislation including the New Road & Street Works Act 1991 for works in proximity of highways, and The Working at Heights Regulation 2005. In addition to the dangers & legislation associated with working close to Electrical Supplies.
- 4.7.3 Additionally, they should be aware of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. In addition, the amendments of 1985 and its implications to tree works. Works should be planned to avoid times when birds are nesting and be aware that a bat survey may be needed on significant tree hollows. If bats are discovered during inspection or subsequent work, Natural England must be informed immediately.
- 4.8 **Legal Duty.** Tree owners have a statutory duty of care under the Health and Safety at Work Act 1974 and the Occupiers Liability Acts of 1957 & 1984 in addition to the Management of Health and Safety Regulations 1999, to ensure that members of the public and staff are not to be put at risk because of any failure by the owner and to take all reasonable precautions to ensure their safety.

-
- 4.9 **Future considerations.** Trees are living organisms whose health and condition can change rapidly. The health, condition and safety of trees should be checked on a regular basis. In addition to professional inspection, a tree owner should inspect their trees personally on a regular basis, particularly after stormy weather or high winds.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX – CONSULTANT BRIEF QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

Mr Ian Barnes - Director

*RCArbor.A, F.Arbor.A, C.Hort, CEnv,
 Arboricultural Association Registered Consultant, Fellow Arboricultural Association, Chartered Horticulturalist, Chartered Environmentalist.
 Professional member Consulting Arborist Society.
 BSc (Hons), Arboriculture and Urban Forestry, HND Arboriculture. NDHT/Arb, Cert Arb L4 (ABC), ISA TRAQ Qualified, QTRA Licensed*

Ian has been in the Horticulture and Arboricultural industry since 1985. He has experience in commercial horticulture, Local Authority, and Highway Authority tree surveying. He has been a commercial Arboricultural climber for 15 years. He ran in partnership a tree and landscape contracting business for over 15 years. He has been a full time Arboricultural consultant since 2007. His main area of works are trees and development (BS5837) and advanced tree assessments using various advanced techniques. He is a qualified tree risk assessor and experienced in trees and subsidence claims. He is a trainer in the UK for Fakopp equipment, Sonic and Electronic tomography, and Dynaroot and Static Tree pulls. He is also director of a hi-tech arborist/ landscape equipment and training company Tree Diagnostics Ltd providing training to arborists in advanced assessments. He undertakes ground-penetrating radar (Tree Radar) scans.

Mrs Sue Barnes - Director

*CMLI, F.Arbor.A, C.Hort, CEnv, MBALI
 Chartered Landscape Architect, Fellow Arboricultural Association, Chartered Horticulturalist, Chartered Environmentalist, Registered Designer BALL.
 FdSc Arboriculture, NDHT/Arb
 Professional Member Consulting Arborist Society, Affiliate member RIBA,*

Sue has been in the Horticulture / Arboricultural industry since 1986. She has experience in amenity parks and gardens and has been a head gardener for Local Health Authority. In partnership she ran a tree contracting and landscape design and build company for 15 years and also has been a tree and landscape consultant full time since 2007. Her main area of works is detailed commercial planting design, specifications (NBS), tree planting specifications and Arboricultural management, Trees on development sites BS5837 reports and plans. Experienced in trees and subsidence and also legal and planning conditions in regard to trees and landscapes. Sue undertakes ground-penetrating radar (Tree Radar) scans along with assisting with other further investigation works on trees such as tomography scans and assists in dynamic and static tree tests.

Mr Matt Metcalfe – Lead Surveyor/Consultant/UAS Pilot

*M.Arbor.A
 Professional member of the Arboricultural Association,
 City and Guilds NPTC assessor/ Instructor
 FdSc Arboriculture, National Diploma in Arboriculture, Level 5 Certificate in Education.
 VALID tree risk validator
 GVC Commercial Drone Pilot
 IOSH Managing Safety in the Workplace*

Matt has worked in the Arboricultural Industry since 2000, Firstly, as a climbing arborist in both the public and private sector. In 2009 Matt started teaching Arboriculture at a land-based college in York and became a City and Guilds NPTC assessor. In 2013 he became a course manager and internal verifier for the level 2 work-based learning-apprenticeships where later he became a senior course manager overseeing the management of other arboricultural courses. In 2018 he became a fulltime consulting arborist and provides advanced tree assessment training, undertakes BS5837 tree surveys, Arboricultural safety audits and is a trained tree risk assessor/validator. He undertakes ground-penetrating radar (Tree Radar) scans along with other further assessments on trees such as tomography, dynamic tree testing and static tree pulls. In 2021 he undertook the A2CoC and GVC Drone licences and carries out drone surveys of trees which also includes 2D and 3D mapping of sites. Also, in 2021 mat completed IOSH Managing safety in the workplace.

Mr Trevor Grigg – Consulting Arborist

*Technical member of the Arboricultural Association,
 Cert Arb L4 (ABC)
 NC Horticulture (Arboriculture)
 Lantra Professional Tree Inspector
 QTRA Licensed*

Since 2004, Trevor has been involved in Arboriculture firstly as a climbing arborist, then as an Arboricultural Officer for a local authority. He has gained experience of working with a wide range of clients, from residential tree owners to schools, Parish Councils and Highways departments providing a variety of tasks and requests such as risk assessments, management plans and replanting schemes. Trevor joined Barnes Associates in 2021 with a view to widening his experience of trees in relation to developments and further investigations of trees using the specialist equipment available.

Mr John Evans – Consulting Arborist

*Technical member of the Arboricultural Association,
 Forestry and Arboriculture Level 3*

For the past six years, John has been a climbing arborist, firstly working freelance for utility and domestic clients, then joining Darlington Borough Council. Whilst working for the council, he continued his professional development and working below and observing Darlington's Tree Officer. John was very excited to move into a role with Barnes Associates to continue his development, learning how to use the advanced tree surveying equipment and developing into BS5837 report writing.

Mr Benjamin Stoker - Project Coordinator/ Arb Surveyor/A2CoC UAS Pilot

*Technical member of the Arboricultural Association
 Forestry and Arboriculture Level 3
 FdSc Arboriculture (ongoing)
 Lantra Basic Tree Inspector*

Ben started with Barnes Associates as a student placement whilst studying for his level 3 in Arboriculture and currently completing his foundation degree in Arboriculture. With a background originally in hospitality, his role of project coordinator has developed over the years, supporting clients and helping things run smoothly. His professional development is ongoing with studies for the FdSc in Arboriculture and progressing his career as a surveyor under mentorship from the Barnes Team.

APPENDIX – TREE SCHEDULE & EXPLANATORY NOTES

The following survey has been prepared from a visual assessment taken from ground level without any detailed investigation. Observations are based upon the body language of the trees and any visual indicators present at the time of inspection. This survey should be regarded as a preliminary overview; ongoing inspections will be required as specified individually. In most situations, the health, condition and safety of trees should be checked on a cyclic basis, alternating between early and late seasons to ensure a full picture of tree health is established. Inspections should only be carried out by a suitably qualified arborist.

Similarly, numerous potential defects may not be detectable dependent upon the timing of inspection; in particular, wood decay fungi may only produce external fructifications annually (rather than perennially), or may not provide external symptoms until an advanced state is achieved.

Reasonable risk management generally aims to provide a tree that can be regarded stable in normal/foreseeable, regularly experienced storm events i.e. force 10 storms. The level of risk offered by the tree will be significantly greater as the wind speed that the tree is exposed to increases beyond this level. Additionally, the threat from aerial parts, i.e., included unions, may remain even following works, although failures of such parts are likely to be limited to small diameter branches and to periods of extreme weather.

As an arborist, I am a tree specialist and use my knowledge, education, training and experience to examine trees, recommend measures to enhance their beauty and health, and attempt to reduce the risk of living near trees. As a client, you may choose to accept or disregard these recommendations or seek additional advice.

As an arborist I cannot detect every condition that could possibly lead to a tree or limb failure. Trees are living organisms that may fail in many ways, some of which we do not fully understand.

Conditions are often hidden within the tree and below the ground. As arborists, we cannot guarantee that a tree will be healthy or safe under all circumstances or for a specified period of time. Sometimes trees may appear "healthy," but may be structurally unsound. Likewise, remedial treatment, like any medicine, cannot be guaranteed.

Treatment, pruning and removal of trees may involve considerations beyond the Arboricultural perspective, such as property boundaries and ownership, disputes between neighbours, planning issues, sight lines, landlord-tenant matters etc. Arborists cannot take such issues into account unless complete and accurate information is given to them. Likewise, as an arborist I cannot accept any responsibility for the authorisation or non-authorisation of any recommended treatment or remedial measure.

Furthermore, certain trees are borderline cases as to whether they should remain or be removed. If conditions change a tree may need further monitoring in the future to determine its health and structure. Trees can be managed, but they cannot be controlled, and to live near a tree is to accept some degree of risk.

Mathematical abbreviations: > Greater than, < Less than.

Est: This includes any attributes that have been estimated.

Measurements/estimates: Measurements are taken with a tape, clinometer or laser. If dimensions are estimated, this will be indicated within the **Est** column.

Tag number: Numbered Tag attached to each stem, usually on the inside face of the stem at roughly 2.5 metres.

Structure: Whether the Tag Number refers to a Tree, Group, Hedge, Area, Stump, Shrub or Woodland.

Name: Tree species are detailed by their common name- Latin can be provided upon request.

Age: I record the age as an estimate of the tree's likely span for guidance only, i.e.:

Y Young	Recently established/planted tree.	M Mature	The middle one-third of its likely expected lifespan
SM Semi Mature	Fully established and growing with high vigour	OM Over Mature	The later one-third of its likely expected life span with sign of canopy retrenchment.
EM Early Mature	The first third of its likely expected lifespan	V Veteran	An aged example of the species, typically with defects & conservation value
		A Ancient	Beyond its expected Life span possible of historical interest or in a state of decline

Height: I estimate height to the nearest metre to the mean height.

Crown Height: I estimate height to the nearest half metre to the mean underside of the canopy.

Canopy (N S E W): I estimate the distance of the canopy radius to the nearest metre to provide a mean distance of separation between the stem and the outer canopy.

Condition: Is a personal assessment of the tree's growth rate in the current season, in comparison to other trees within the locality, region and an indicator of the tree likely response to site change.

Good A tree of normal vitality **Fair** A tree of lower vitality **Poor** A tree of low vitality **Dead** A dead or very low vitality tree

Life Expectancy: Is a personal assessment of the trees likely expected remaining safe life span in years, assuming the current site management continues, or the tree is protected from significant environmental change. Trees can enter into serious decline with site changes and likewise, the expected safe life can be significantly improved following changes/improvements to site management and following remedial works.

Category: Assess in line with Table 1 BS5837 – copied below.

Symbol Guide:

BSS837 Cascade chart for tree quality assessment				
Category and definition	Criteria (including subcategories where appropriate)			Identification on plan
Trees unsuitable for retention (see Note)				
Category U Those in such a condition that they cannot realistically be retained as living trees in the context of the current land use for longer than 10 years	Trees that have a serious, irremediable, structural defect, such that their early loss is expected due to collapse, including those that will become unviable after removal of other category U trees (e.g. where, for whatever reason, the loss of companion shelter cannot be mitigated by pruning) Trees that are dead or are showing signs of significant, immediate, and irreversible overall decline Trees infected with pathogens of significance to the health and/or safety of other trees nearby, or very low quality trees suppressing adjacent trees of better quality <i>NOTE Category U trees can have existing or potential conservation value, which it might be desirable to preserve; see 4.5.7.</i>			Red on Plan
Trees to be considered for retention	1 Mainly arboricultural qualities	2 Mainly landscape qualities	3 Mainly cultural values, including conservation	
Category A Trees of high quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 40 years	Trees that are particularly good examples of their species, especially if rare or unusual; or those that are essential components of groups or formal or semi-formal arboricultural features (e.g. the dominant and/or principal trees within an avenue)	Trees, groups or woodlands of particular visual importance as arboricultural and/or landscape features	Trees, groups or woodlands of significant conservation, historical, commemorative or other value (e.g. veteran trees or wood-pasture)	Green on Plan
Category B Trees of moderate quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 20 years	Trees that might be included in category A, but are downgraded because of impaired condition (e.g. presence of significant though remediable defects, including unsympathetic past management and storm damage), such that they are unlikely to be suitable for retention for beyond 40 years; or trees lacking the special quality necessary to merit the category A designation	Trees present in numbers, usually growing as groups or woodlands, such that they attract a higher collective rating than they might as individuals; or trees occurring as collectives but situated so as to make little visual contribution to the wider locality	Trees with material conservation or other cultural value	Blue on Plan
Category C Trees of low quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 10 years, or young trees with a stem diameter below 150 mm	Unremarkable trees of very limited merit or such impaired condition that they do not qualify in higher categories	Trees present in groups or woodlands, but without this conferring on them significantly greater collective landscape value; and/or trees offering low or only temporary/transient landscape benefits	Trees with no material conservation or other cultural value	Grey on Plan

NOTE Whilst C category trees will usually not be retained where they would impose a significant constraint on development, young trees with a stem diameter of less than 150 mm should be considered for relocation.

Diameter: These figures relate to a measurement of the stem at 1.5m above ground level recorded in centimetres, measured with a rounded-down diameter tape.

Comments / Observations: General comments referring to tree health, structure and condition.

Management Options: Comments detailing remedial works required to improve immediate safety or improve the management of the tree.

Tree Risk Assessment: At Barnes Associates Ltd, we are experienced in the management of the risks associated with trees and have undertaken training in all of the principal methodologies in commercial use today, including Matheny and Clarke, Quantified Tree Risk Assessment (QTRA), THREATS (Tree Hazard: Risk Evaluation and Treatment System), Tree Risk Assessment Qualification (TRAQ) and VALID Tree Risk-Benefit Management & Assessment.

Having experience in several methods, it was perhaps inevitable that we developed our own system to reflect both the benefits of the other systems and changes in current legislation and court decisions, following continual study and application of tree risk management in the real world across the wide range of environments where trees can be found and in which we find ourselves.

We typically apply our BARMY (Barnes Associates Risk Method (of) Yorkshire) - we are proudly based in Yorkshire and could not resist the inclusion of the 'Y'. We openly admit this is a method based upon the THREATS, methodology. The complete details of THREATS (Tree Hazard: Risk Evaluation and Treatment System) can be found at <https://www.flac.uk.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/07/THREATS-GN-June-2010.pdf>

Firstly, we must thank Julian Forbes-Laird (JFL), for his work and philanthropic approach to developing and gifting this risk assessment methodology to the arboricultural and forestry world, which has been and continues to be used widely.

However, following extended use and seeing several cases go through the legal system, one small element of the THREATS system became increasingly problematic for us; namely, the THREATS system included a 'None Apparent' failure score with a 0 (zero) and a Failure Score that attributed a 0 (zero) to sites with a Target Score of None. This results in a compounding multiplication risk assessment product of 0 (zero) score, as shown in the table below. Following long-term use, this felt increasingly uncomfortable and undefendable as it is difficult for us to conclude that any tree or site offers 'No Risk', unless access is strictly controlled or restricted.

Table 1 – Shows all possible outcomes using THREATS

Failure Score	Impact Score	Target Score																							
		1	1	1	1	1	1	4	4	4	4	4	4	6	6	6	6	6	6	10	10	10	10	10	10
		Small <10cm	Small <10cm	Small <10cm	Small <10cm	Small <10cm	Small <10cm	Medium 10-35cm	Medium 10-35cm	Medium 10-35cm	Medium 10-35cm	Medium 10-35cm	Medium 10-35cm	Large 35-75cm	Large 35-75cm	Large 35-75cm	Large 35-75cm	Large 35-75cm	Large 35-75cm	Very Large >75cm	Very Large >75cm	Very Large >75cm	Very Large >75cm	Very Large >75cm	Very Large >75cm
0	None Apparent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0.8	Potentially with time	0	5.6	12	16	20	32	0	22.4	48	64	80	128	0	33.6	72	96	120	192	0	56	120	160	200	320
2	Likely	0	14	30	40	50	80	0	56	120	160	200	320	0	84	180	240	300	480	0	140	300	400	500	800
8	Probable	0	56	120	160	200	320	0	224	480	640	800	1280	0	336	720	960	1200	1920	0	560	1200	1600	2000	3200
50	Imminent	0	350	750	1000	1250	2000	0	1400	3000	4000	5000	8000	0	2100	4500	6000	7500	12000	0	3500	7500	10000	12500	20000

We could not knowingly conclude that a site or tree offered no risk, and this led to the development of BARMY to help better reflect our instincts in relation to the small but still present risk offered by trees on sites even when access is very limited. Essentially, we have copied THREATS and to JFL we are eternally thankful for opening the door. However, to better reflect the site we manage and the sites we visit, we have substituted both the descriptors for the 'Target Score' from 'None' to 'Minimal' and the Failure Score from 'None Apparent' to 'Unlikely'. In undertaking these changes, we have adjusted the scores associated with these descriptions as described below and shown in the table below. We have elevated the score from 0 to 0.4 for 'Minimal'. This is simply half of THREATS 'Potentially with time' score. Additionally, we have raised the score for None from 0 to 1.5 for 'Minimal'. The results of these small changes are shown in the table below.

Table 2 – Shows all possible outcomes using BARMY

Failure Score	Impact Score	Target Score																							
		1	1	1	1	1	1	4	4	4	4	4	4	6	6	6	6	6	6	10	10	10	10	10	10
		Small <10cm	Small <10cm	Small <10cm	Small <10cm	Small <10cm	Small <10cm	Medium 10-35	Medium 10-35	Medium 10-35	Medium 10-35	Medium 10-35	Medium 10-35	Large 35-75	Large 35-75	Large 35-75	Large 35-75	Large 35-75	Large 35-75	Very Large	Very Large	Very Large	Very Large	Very Large	Very Large
0.4	Unlikely	1.5	7	15	20	25	40	1.5	7	15	20	25	40	1.5	7	15	20	25	40	1.5	7	15	20	25	40
0.8	Potentially	1.5	7	15	20	25	40	1.5	7	15	20	25	40	1.5	7	15	20	25	40	1.5	7	15	20	25	40
2	Likely	1.5	7	15	20	25	40	1.5	7	15	20	25	40	1.5	7	15	20	25	40	1.5	7	15	20	25	40
8	Probable	1.5	7	15	20	25	40	1.5	7	15	20	25	40	1.5	7	15	20	25	40	1.5	7	15	20	25	40
50	Imminent	1.5	7	15	20	25	40	1.5	7	15	20	25	40	1.5	7	15	20	25	40	1.5	7	15	20	25	40

As can be seen from the table above, no tree now offers a Zero risk, which we would suggest better reflect the sites which we find ourselves assessing for clients. The only significant differences are that Large and Very Large trees with an Imminent failure score now are recorded as offering a Moderate Risk, which after much consideration, sits a little more comfortably with both our teams and clients.

So, whenever we are assessing trees, the BARMY method will be used and has been designed to offer all those who have responsibility for evaluating and managing trees a means of assessing them for risk in a consistent fashion.

BARMY also assists the user in determining the appropriate response to the level of identified risk, and this includes both works and intermediate control measures. The method multiplies three values together to give a threat category which guides the inspector on an appropriate response to the risk posed.

Failure Score: Identified defects in relation to species/clone history, established failure criteria & time of year are considered.

Target Score: Impact radius of identified defect against potential targets (objects or persons liable to be affected by tree defect), forward visibility available to drivers (Poor Forward Visibility / Good Forward Visibility) & whether vehicles are likely to be stationary, e.g., at junctions are all considered. If targets are liable to include unsupervised children &/or the elderly or infirm the score is increased by one category.

Impact Score: Height of fall/momentum & whether e.g., lower branches would impede the agent's descent are considered.

Table 3 – Example of the BARMY calculation method and products

Failure Score		Target Score		Impact Score		BARMY - Risk Category		
Likelihood of failure	Score	Value	Score	Value	Score	Score Range	Threat Category	Priority, Recommended action & Completion deadline
Imminent	50	Very High	40	Very Large	10	4000+	7 – Extreme	Critical - Work to be carried out as soon as practically possible. i.e. <7 days or control access
Probable/Soon	8	High	25	Large	6	2001 - 3999	6 – Serious	Urgent – Work to be carried out as soon i.e within 1 month or control access
Likely, foreseeable	2	Medium	20	Medium	4	1000 - 2000	5 – Significant	High – Work to be carried out in the near future i.e. within 3 months or restrict access
Potentially with time	0.8	Low	15	Small	1	330 - 999	4 – Moderate	Moderate - Work to be carried out in the current season i.e. within 6 months or limit access
Unlikely	0.40	Very Low	7			160 - 329	3 – Slight	Low – Work to be carried out before the next inspection i.e. within 18 months
		Minimal	1.5			50 - 159	2 – Minimal	Minor - Works to be carried out if these meet management objectives and if budgets allow
						0 - 49	1 – Insignificant	Minor - Works to be carried out if these meet management objectives and if budgets allow

Unless stated otherwise, the risk assessment assumes the risk is offered over the next year.

Priority: Guidance for the time scale in which works should be completed, from the date of the report.

What3Words: What3Words is the easiest way to describe any precise location. It has divided the world into 3m squares and given each one a unique identifier made from three words. To see the trees' location via the What3Words website or App, just click on the hyperlink.

Preliminary Arboricultural Assessment - This should not be referred to as a specification of Arboricultural Works

Tree Dimensional Data

Est	Tag No.	Structure	Name	Age	Height (m)	Crown Height (m)	North (m)	South (m)	East (m)	West (m)	Condition	Life Exp	Category	Diameter (cm)	Stems	What3Words
Pos	T001	Tree	Sycamore	Mature	22	4	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	Fair	10+ Years	B	102	1	https://w3w.co/towel.blatantly.polar
Pos	T002	Tree	Sycamore	Mature	22	3	3.0	7.0	10.0	11.0	Good	20+ Years	B	109	1	https://w3w.co/deep.marathons.enrolling
Pos	T003	Tree	Sycamore	Mature	22	3	3.0	3.0	11.0	10.0	Fair	10+ Years	B	78	1	https://w3w.co/sprayer.head.guidebook



Tree Risk and Management Data



Tag No.	Structure	Name	Comments	Failure Score	Target Score	Impact Score	Risk	Recommendations	Priority	Next Inspection
T001	Tree	Sycamore	<p>Growing in the open within the lawn area. Root compaction visible. Subterranean electricity cable trenched through tree Single Stem. Cables and electric sockets on Southern stem Lighting on stem Typical shape and form for the species. Small diameter (<25 mm) deadwood in the inner canopy. Cavities visible within main branches. Wounding from branch failures visible.</p>	Likely, Foreseeable	Medium	Medium	3: Slight	<p>Remove deadwood to improve safety. Re inspect in summer 2024 to comment on vitality levels, especially in the central leaders of the canopy.</p>	1 Year	18 Months
T002	Tree	Sycamore	<p>Located on the boundary overhanging a horse paddock. Growing as part of a single line of trees north south. Single Stem. Metalwork in stem. High-end loading on main branches over garden area which are an elevated risk of failing due to poor historic pruning operations. Stem cavity on eastern side of the stem - appears shallow/localised. The internal canopy appears to have been excessively thinned in the past.</p>	Potentially with time	Medium	Large	2: Minimal	<p>Lateral reduction west side of lower canopy by 1.5-2m to reduce end weight and failure potential. Reduce elongated limb growing towards property by 1 to 1.5m to reduce risk of future failure.</p>	1 Year	18 Months
T003	Tree	Sycamore	<p>Located on the boundary overhanging a horse paddock. Growing as part of a single line of trees north south. Single stem. High-end loading on main branches over garden area which are at an elevated risk of failing due to poor historic pruning operations. The internal canopy appears to have been excessively thinned in the past.</p>	Likely, Foreseeable	High	Large	3: Slight	<p>Reduce limb growing towards property by 1.5 to 2m</p>	1 Year	18 Months



APPENDIX – SITE PLANS



NOTE: This plan should be viewed in **COLOUR**.
Please do not scale from this drawing. Copyright of Barnes & Associates. All right described in Chapter IV of the Copyright; Design & Patents Act 1988 have been generally asserted © 23/01/2024. Copyright of this plan remains with Barnes Associates until all fees are paid in full.
Base image courtesy of © Google and third-party suppliers.

Assumed Site Boundary 
Principal Access 

Constant Occupancy 
Frequent Occupancy 

Occasional Occupancy 
Rare Occupancy (Unshaded) 

Title: Occupancy Rates Plan
Drawing No: BA230340/OP
Date: 23/01/2024
Drawn By: Matt Metcalfe
Scale: Not to Scale.

APPENDIX – SITE PLANS



NOTE: This plan should be viewed in **COLOUR**. Please do not scale from this drawing. Copyright of Barnes & Associates. All right described in Chapter IV of the Copyright; Design & Patents Act 1988 have been generally asserted © 23/01/2024. Copyright of this plan remains with Barnes Associates until all fees are paid in full. **Base image courtesy of © Google and third-party suppliers.**

Insignificant Risk Tree/
Minimal Risk Tree/
Slight Risk Tree



Moderate Risk Tree



Significant Risk Tree



Serious Risk Tree



Extreme Risk Tree



Title: Tree Location Plan
Drawing No: BA230340/TP
Date: 23/01/2024
Drawn By: Matt Metcalfe
Scale: Not to Scale.

APPENDIX – LEGAL ASPECTS OF TREE MANAGEMENT

The laws relating to trees are included within both common and statute law and need to be considered when managing trees, particularly those trees on neighbouring land. **Statute Law** is written down in Acts of Parliament and encompasses areas of administrative, constitutional and criminal law. **Common Law** is about dealings between individuals and is formulated by precedent or past cases. Many aspects of Common Law fall under the branch of law known as TORT. These are not crimes but civil wrongs and are committed by one private person against another.

Trees may cause friction between neighbours which may end up as legal disputes. In an ever more litigious society, it is as well to have some idea of your legal rights and obligations. Problems caused by growing trees cover ownership, dangerous trees, protruding branches and encroaching roots.

The Principal Laws relating to trees are set out below:-

Statute Law

Town and Country Planning Act 1990

This Act contains legislation which gives powers to the Local Authority (LA) to protect single or multiple trees by way of a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). The order prevents anyone from pruning or felling the tree without permission from the LA; anyone considering felling or pruning without such permission should consider the maximum penalty of £20,000 which the courts could evoke. Without this legislation many of our mature trees would have been lost. Additionally, this act contains legislation to protect the immediate pruning and felling of trees contained within Conservation Areas.

Forestry Act 1967

This Act contains legislation which gives the Forestry Commission powers to control the quantity of trees being felled at any one time.

Anti-social Behaviour Act 2003

Part 8 of the Anti-social Behaviour Act 2003 creates new procedures to enable local authorities in England and Wales to deal with complaints about **high hedges**.

Highways Act 1980

This Act covers laws associated with roads. Section 41 states that the Highway Authority (H.A) have a duty to maintain the highway.

Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976

This Act contains legislation in sections 23 and 24 that enables the Local Authority (LA) to deal with dangerous trees on private property. An example of such a situation could be 'that a tree is dangerous to third parties and the owner refuses to make it safe; the LA can serve notice on the owner to make the tree safe, if the owner still refuses then the LA can enter on to the owners property to make the tree safe and recover the expenses incurred from the owner'.

The Occupiers Liability Act 1957/1984

This Act lays down a duty for occupiers to take reasonable steps to ensure that premises (including woodland) are reasonably safe for visitors permitted to be there. This affects managers of woodland and forest who need to make regular safety inspections of trees adjacent to car parks, footpaths, picnic areas, public areas etc.

Access to Neighbouring Lands Act 1992

Should someone need to enter onto someone else's land to carry out works to their own land but cannot do so because the owner refuses consent, they can use the legislation contained within this act to apply to a court for an access order. The courts will only grant such an order if it is satisfied that the works are necessary and that they cannot be carried out, or would be

substantially more difficult to carry out, from the owners own land. Such works include, amongst other things, the felling, removal or replacement of any hedge, tree, shrub etc which is, or is in danger of becoming, a hazard and danger.

Hedgerow Regulations 1997 (applying to native field hedgerows)

In response to the wide spread loss of our hedgerows within the countryside the government has developed these regulations in an attempt to reduce and regulate further losses. The regulations were made law in 1997 and fall under Statutory Instrument (SI) No 1160; they describe the criteria and exemptions applicable to protected hedges. The regulations are published in their entirety on the HMSO web site; however, for those of you who would prefer an easier read, the Department of Environment produce a leaflet and book explaining the regulations in a brief and easy to understand way. The leaflet is called 'The Hedgerow Regulations'.

Common Law

In addition to Statute Law the development of Case law has provided basic principles of tree management of trees which overhang boundaries or develop beyond boundaries.

If branches from a neighbour's tree overhangs your property you may cut these branches back to the property boundary [See note 1 below]. Although you do not need to obtain permission from the tree owner to carry out these works it would be neighbourly to notify them of your intentions. However, you **must** first obtain permission from the owner if you need to enter onto their property to carry out such operations. The removed branches (and any fruit) remain the property of the tree owner and should be offered back to them!

Just as branches can be pruned back to the property boundary, so can a neighbouring tree's roots. However, it is recommended that professional advice be obtained prior to such operations. [See note 1 below]. It may be possible that you can claim compensation in respect of damage caused by roots from neighbouring trees, if you have problems with such damage it is advised that you contact a solicitor for more information.

Note 1: You should take care not to promote disease or decay by poor pruning technique or unbalance a tree by severing anchor roots or by removing large limbs from one side of the tree only; should the tree subsequently fail due to your actions, you may be liable for any damages caused by your actions (seek professional advice if you are unsure). If the tree is located within a conservation area or is subject to a TPO then permission must be obtained from the Local Authority prior to any branch or root pruning operations.

Common Problems

These various laws provide guidance on tree management and helps form the basis of reasonable management principles. I have included some general information in relation to common situations, if you require any additional information please feel free to contact me.

LOSS OF LIGHT

There is no absolute right to light or to a view, therefore you would normally need to negotiate with your neighbour about managing their trees. In extreme cases it is possible to apply to a magistrate's court for an injunction to control or restrict the growth of trees however this requires specialist legal advice and only applies in limited circumstances – there is also no specific law on how tall trees are allowed to grow and cases for loss of light normally only apply to windows in buildings not gardens (see also 'high hedges' below).

THE RIGHT TO LIGHT

The "right to light" is often quoted in relation to trees cutting out light to adjacent property. Whilst there is an established right in the case of new buildings obstructing light there is no clear precedent that trees cutting out light can infringe a person's "right to light".

DANGEROUS TREES

Every tree owner has a general duty of care to ensure their trees do not pose an unacceptable risk to other people on or adjacent to their land – you will however only be liable for injury or damage caused by trees if you are found to be negligent in some way e.g., by not taking reasonable care to inspect them or undertake essential work such as removing deadwood that could easily be seen to be hazardous etc. Any work must be limited to that required to remove the immediate danger. ***The burden of proof is on the tree owner and the person doing the work to prove that it was necessary for urgent safety reasons.*** This can be very difficult after the event and professional arboricultural advice should be taken before carrying out any urgent works. It would also help if photographs were taken of the tree and the defects which create the need for the emergency work.

FALLING LEAVES, FRUIT/FLOWERS, DEBRIS

Although they can cause a lot of inconvenience, falling leaves & debris are not regarded as a 'nuisance' in the legal sense and a tree owner has no obligation to clear them – it is normally up to each landowner whether they own a tree or not to undertake their own 'property maintenance' if for example, they need to clear paths or gutters. Where leaves are making the footpaths and road slippery or unsafe Street Cleansing should be notified to ensure the paths are swept and are safe and clean.

HIGH HEDGES / CONIFERS (Leyland Cypress)

This relates to evergreen or semi evergreen hedges only, not ordinary deciduous trees. It is sometimes possible to apply for enforcement action from the Council to restrict the growth of a neighbours' hedge if it exceeds a certain height in relation to its distance from a property. There are specific criteria for doing this and also a cost.

TREE ROOTS & DAMAGE TO PROPERTY

If a tree is found to be causing damage to a neighbouring property it is classed as a legal nuisance and the tree owner would normally be liable for the associated costs of any loss or damage. In the event of any form of damage it is advised that you notify your neighbour and also contact your property insurers for further advice – they can often investigate and deal with the issue on your behalf.

TREE POSITION - GENERAL NUISANCE AND INTERFERENCE

Although trees may be considered an inconvenience to those living adjacent to them, by law they must be shown to be a substantial interference to a neighbour's comfort and convenience to be considered a 'nuisance'. As a general policy the Council will not undertake the topping, thinning or felling of trees simply to prevent the accumulation of leaves, seeds or minor debris on adjacent property, where the trees in question would not otherwise require any surgery.

UTILITY SERVICES

Instances of underground pipes being broken by the growth of tree roots are very rare, but penetration and blockage of damaged pipes is not uncommon. As a general policy the Council will not undertake the topping, thinning or felling of trees to prevent roots entering damaged pipes. Repair of the defect in the pipe is the only certain remedy that will prevent future problems. Modern materials and joints will significantly reduce pipe damage and subsequent root encroachment in the future.

TV & SATELLITE RECEPTION

TV interference can be caused by trees however there is no legal right to TV reception. We recommend you consult a television engineer to assess your aerial/signal.

TREES AND IVY

Ivy is a climbing, scrambling plant abundant as a groundcover shrub in the under storey of many rural woodlands. It has a variety of conservation benefits and forms an integral part of a woodland's habitat. In the urban environment there is the need to balance three main considerations for its retention: tree safety, conservation and aesthetics. Ivy generally causes no direct damage to trees. However, in some situations it may be considered unsightly and more importantly can create problems for efficient management by obscuring structural defects and fungal fruiting bodies. It also increases the weight of a tree's crown and the 'sail' effect during the wet windier winter months, when deciduous trees have shed their leaves. As a general policy the Council undertake the removal of ivy from trees only where it is considered necessary to aid visual tree health assessment.

INSPECTIONS

Landowners are responsible for all trees within the boundary of their property. They have a duty to maintain the trees in a safe condition. To discharge this duty an owner must ensure the trees are inspected regularly for any signs that they are unsafe. The importance of regular, detailed inspections is to minimise the likelihood of damage or injury occurring if the tree or parts of it were to fall. If the risk is high, e.g., a large old tree next to a road, the importance is much greater. An owner without specialist knowledge would be expected to employ a suitably experienced and qualified arboriculturist to inspect them every 1 to 3 years depending on the degree of risk.

TREES OBSTRUCTING THE HIGHWAY

The Highways Act 1980 requires that trees and other vegetation do not obstruct the passage of users. The Highway Authority requires a minimum clearance over any part of a footpath of 2.4 metres and over any part of a road of 5.2 metres. The Highway Authority have the powers to enforce these clearances. If the tree is protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) or growing in a Conservation Area you should consult the Borough Council's Arboricultural Officer before carrying out any work.

PLANTING OF TREES

Generally, trees can be planted anywhere on a property and there is no requirement for trees or hedges to be set back a certain distance from the boundary. However, restrictions may exist through other controls such as covenants or planning controls.

HEIGHT OF TREES

There is no maximum height beyond which tree owners must not allow their trees or hedges to grow. They can be as tall as the owner wishes, provided they do not cause damage to adjoining property unless restrictions are imposed through other controls such as covenants or planning conditions.

APPENDIX – TREES & RISK

Tree owners should take a balanced and proportionate approach to tree management

It is recognised that trees are managed for a variety of reasons and therefore that the expectation of a "suitable and sufficient risk assessment" referred to by the HSE varies with context. In general, the risk from trees has certainly reached the situation where residual risks (those that remain after management for safety) are sufficiently low that investment in additional measures is likely to be disproportionate to any safety benefit. As the HSE itself notes in *Reducing risks, protecting people*:

"Any informed discussion quickly raises ethical, social, economic and scientific considerations, for example: ... how to achieve the necessary trade-offs between benefits to society and ensuring that individuals are adequately protected; the need to avoid the imposition of unnecessary restrictions on the freedom of the individual."

Extremely low risk of harm

HSE guidance for its inspectors and local authority enforcement officers on the standard of tree risk management and the DARM research commissioned by the NTSG on behalf of landowners confirm that the overall real risk of serious harm from trees in the UK is "extremely low". Indeed, the levels of risk are so low that they are "comparable to those that people regard as insignificant or trivial in their daily lives", near the bottom of the spectrum of what the HSE considers as an acceptable risk:

"Risks falling into this region are generally regarded as insignificant and adequately controlled. We, as regulators, would not usually require further action to reduce risks unless reasonably practicable measures are available. The levels of risk characterising this region are comparable to those that people regard as insignificant or trivial in their daily lives. They are typical of the risk from activities that are inherently not very hazardous or from hazardous activities that can be, and are, readily controlled to produce very low risks."

Reasonable risk management generally aims to provide trees that can be regarded stable in a normal / foreseeable, regularly experienced storm event in relation to the situation / context of the tree. In this region, it is reasonable to assume a 'Storm' of force 10 using the Beaufort Scale (55 - 63 miles per hour) of wind speeds on land will occur annually. It should be realised that all trees do pose a risk; recent work in Germany has shown even sound trees that would typically be regarded as safe can fail during high winds through various factors relating to wood physiology, dynamics and the relationship between the root system and the supporting soils. It should be remembered that for any given tree regardless of its stability, there will always be a wind load that has the potential to break or uproot a tree regardless of its condition.

Typically, trees have evolved to fail in part, i.e. twigs and branches are sacrificed / fail from a parent tree rather than the tree being lost entirely. Observations at various sites in this country have found that twigs and branches can break from trees at wind speeds of as little as 31 miles per hour, the upper limit of a 'strong breeze' as detailed in Beaufort Scale 6 (25 - 31 miles per hour). This has led to a recommendation for certain sites with grounds open to the public to be closed when the wind speeds approaching 'Near Gale' or Force 7, as detailed by the Beaufort Scale (32-38 miles per hour). Such failures are difficult to predict with any great level of detail and a general position is best adopted. Typically, the level of risk offered by trees will be significantly greater as the force of the wind increases, the threat from aerial parts i.e., deadwood, tight unions and elongated branches may remain even following remedial works. Branch failures are likely to be limited to small diameter branches and to periods of extreme weather, though as often seen in any natural model, exceptions to the rule can be expected. Therefore, although in managing trees we are aiming to limit or reduce the risk to nearby features, unfortunately it is not possible to remove the risk offered by a tree entirely.

As an arborist, I am a tree specialist and use my knowledge, education, training and experience to examine trees, to recommend measures to enhance their beauty and health, and attempt to reduce the risk of living near trees. As a client, you may choose to accept or disregard these recommendations, or seek additional advice. As an arborist, I cannot detect every condition that could possibly lead to a tree or limb failure. Trees are living organisms that may fail in many ways, some of which we do not fully understand.

Conditions are often hidden within the tree and below the ground. As arborists, we cannot guarantee that a tree will be healthy or safe under all circumstances, or for a specified period, of time. Sometimes trees may appear "healthy," but may be structurally unsound. Likewise, remedial treatment, like any medicine, cannot be guaranteed.

Treatment, pruning and removal of trees may involve considerations beyond the arboricultural perspective, such as property boundaries and ownership, disputes between neighbours, planning issues, sight lines, landlord-tenant matters etc. Arborists cannot take such issues into account unless complete and accurate information is given to them. Likewise, as an arborist, I cannot accept any responsibility for the authorisation or non-authorisation of any recommended treatment or remedial measure. Furthermore, certain trees are borderline cases as to whether they should remain or be removed. Also, conditions change, and a tree may need further monitoring in the future to determine its health and structure.

**Even healthy trees unaffected by defects can fail in extreme weather conditions.
Trees can be managed, but they cannot be controlled, and to live near a tree is to accept some degree of risk.**

TREE SURVEYS

Health & Safety Surveys
Risk Assessments
Homebuyer (Mortgage and Insurance)
Veteran & Venerable Trees
Legal & Law (TPO & Valuations)

ADVANCED ASSESSMENTS

Decay & Defect Scans
Tree Stability Checks
Tree & Plant Health Care
Root Detection & Mapping
Aerial Inspections

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

BS5837 Tree Surveys
Impact Assessments
Method Statements
Planning Conditions
CAD Plans (2D & 3D)

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

Commercial Landscape Design
LVIA (Landscape Visual Impact Assessments)
Landscape Management
Garden Design
Green Infrastructure