

Arboricultural Assessment of 25 Hurricane drive, Rownhams, SO16 8LH

Carried out by Mal hew Rowden on behalf of Sharon
Crook, prospective buyer and correspondent for the
application for the above address.

2 Furzedown house, Furzedown road, Kings Somborne, SO20 6QL
email: rowdentreeconsultants@gmail.com
07483135349

Romsey
Tree Surgeons Ltd

Contents

1. Title page
2. Contents
3. Instruction
4. Limitations
5. Site details
6. Proposals
7. Drawings and documents
8. Legal restrictions
9. Summary
10. Findings
11. Analysis
12. Conclusion
13. Recommendations
14. References
15. Appendices 1 (tree survey schedule - separate document), 2 (tree location plan)

3. Instruction

This report is to survey one mature common ash tree on the site for the potential to cause damage and/or harm for insurance and liability, prior to the client purchasing the property. I refer to the current guidance set out within NTSG Common sense risk management of trees 2011 to enable the prospective buyer of the property to have discharged their duty of care.

The risks that I have assessed are: Likelihood of damage to property (indirect or contact), tree failure through structures, and personal harm or injury. I have been instructed by Ross Woodley from Romsey Tree Surgeons Ltd.

4. Limitations

This survey is valid for 5 years (adhering to the guidance set out in NTSG 2011). I must be kept in direct supervision of the site at all times in regards to all arboricultural matters in order for the findings in this report to remain valid.

The site was inspected using the VTA method as outlined in Malheek and Breloer 1994. No detailed decay detection has been carried out.

No soil analysis has been carried out: assumptions have been made based on data from the BGS, and the species that grow in that area.

5. Site details

The site is a 0.5Ha plot of land with one structure on it. The tree surveyed is mature common ash tree. The soil conditions are listed by the BGS as: London Clay Formation - Clay, silt and sand. Sedimentary bedrock formed between 56 and 47.8 million years ago during the Palaeogene period.

6. Legal restrictions

The tree is covered by a TPO, ref: TPO/TVBC/371.

7. Proposals

This report aims to establish whether the tree requires work within the next 5 years, 1 year, critically (as soon as reasonably practicable), or no work whatsoever. It aims to discharge the duty of care that the landowner has to ensure that their trees are as safe as reasonably practicable, and to install a cyclic formal re-inspection schedule every 3 years in line with NTSG common sense risk management of trees 2011. Based on the target area of the site, the records of this report must be kept with the resident, and the next date for a formal inspection is April 2029 if the tree is retained in any form.

Informal observations may be taken annually by visiting arboriculturists.

8. Drawings and documents

The client has not provided drawings and documents for the purposes of this assessment. I have obtained one from the British Geological Society and have annotated the tree on the map.

9. Summary

The ash tree exhibits a litany of structural defects and is in physiologically poor condition. It exhibits advanced signs and symptoms of *Hymenocypus fraxineus*, and is unlikely to retain its amenity for longer than 5 years.

10. Findings (please see appendix 1 for specific details)

Bulges and lower stem:

- i. No comments.

Main stem and branch structure:

- ii. Historic limb failures to the N aspect at 8 and 15m have occurred recently (within the last 10 years), and have exposed the heartwood of the stem to opportunistic pathogens such as *Kretzschmaria deusta*.

- iii. The canopy exhibits major deadwood throughout: far more than might be expected for a tree of this age and maturity. One piece is highly significant and poses an immediate safety concern.

Overall canopy

- iv. The canopy exhibits dieback from the Lps, lil le in the way of inner canopy or adventitious shoots, and brown lesions beneath the unions that is indicative of ash dieback disease (*Hymenocyphus fraxineus*).
- v. This disease may be regarded as highly significant when found on common ash, due to the poor immunity that these trees have to the disease. It is highly likely that all amenity will be lost within the next 5 years.

11. Analysis

- i. The tree is within the fall radius of 4 separate structures, with the potential to cause considerable damage were it to fail at the base, or lose a large structural limb. I consider the future failure of stems of this tree to be exceptionally likely, whether from the upper canopy, or at ground level. With the target area categorised as moderate usage, and the tree of a large size (where a stem or limb failure could cause significant damage and/or death), the risk posed by this tree is unacceptable when imposed on others. It must therefore be controlled, and the only way that it is viable to control that risk is to fell the tree.
- ii. A Helliwell valuation for the ash tree to be felled works out as:
 - a. Size = >200m² (8)
 - b. Duration = 2-5(1)
 - c. Importance = Some(2)
 - d. Tree cover = Some (2)
 - e. Suitability = Fairly (3)
 - f. Form = Average (1)
 - g. This equates to $(8 \times 1 \times 2 \times 2 \times 3 \times 1) \times £46.92 = £4504.32$
- viii. With the usage of the site in mind, the failure of this tree could do hundreds of thousands of pounds worth of damage to the surrounding structures or kill someone. Hence, retention is not justifiable.

12. Conclusion:

The ash tree is, regrettably, unlikely to last much longer than 5 years, and future limb failures are highly likely as the vascular system of the tree has been exposed to opportunistic pathogens (via limb failure) that will degrade it further. The appropriate course of action is to preventatively fell the tree now and to replant with a species more resistant to the pests and diseases that currently

occupy GB. The replacement tree must be a broadleaf and have a similar size at maturity to the ash it replaces.

13. Recommendations

1. T1- Fell
2. Replace with an 8-10 standard 15litre airpot tree in the same vicinity. Appropriate species may be *Fraxinus madschurica*, *Fraxinus chinensis*, *Platanus x hispanica*, or *Persica parrotia*.



Matthew Rowden ABC ProfDipArb L6, BTEC NatDipArb L3

17/04/2024

14. References

- a. BS5837:2012 - Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction
- b. TDAG 2014
- c. Cutler & Richardson 1981, Kew root survey.
- d. BS3998:2010
- e. Structural Features Related to Tree Crotch Strength by Robert W. Farrell
- f. Tree Pulling Tests of Large Shade Trees in the Genus Acer, Brian Kane and Peggi Clouston
- g. Modern Arboriculture, Alex Shigo
- h. The body language of trees, Dr Claus Mattheck
- i. Failure mode and the prediction of the strength of branch attachments, Kane et al. 2008
- j. Does included bark reduce the strength of co-dominant stems? Smiley 2003
- k. Towards a new model of branch attachment Slater D. and Harbinson C. 2010
- l. De mystifying tree forks, vices and virtues of forks in arboriculture. Slater D. 2020
- m. Determining the mechanical properties of hazel forks by testing their component parts, Slater D. 2013.
- n. Plant Biomechanics, Karl Niklas
- o. NTSG Common sense risk management of trees 2011
- p. "Analysing key factors of roots and soil contributing to tree anchorage", Ming & Defoussez 2018
- q. Arantes and Goodall 2014
- r. NTSG Common sense risk management of trees 2011.
- s. BS8454: 2014
- t. How much crown pruning is needed for a specific wind-load reduction? Frank Rinn, 2014

Appendix 1 - Tree survey schedule (separate document)

Appendix 2: Tree loca. on plan

