

Tree Safety Report (Negative/Hazardous reporting only)

Channing School

The Bank

Highgate Hill

London

N6 5HF

18 July 2023

Dean Meadows BSc (Hons) MArborA

Principal Arboricultural Consultant



Table of Contents

| Executive Summary | 2 |
|---|----|
| Particulars of Instruction | 2 |
| Author | 2 |
| Survey Methodology | 3 |
| Findings | 4 |
| Limitations | 5 |
| Caveats | 5 |
| Appendices | 6 |
| Appendix 1: Schedule of Trees | 7 |
| Appendix 2: Tree Location Plan drawing (not to scale) | 15 |
| Appendix 3: Tree work guidance | |
| Appendix 4: THREATS – Risk evaluation sum matrix | 23 |
| | 26 |
| Appendix 5: Definitions | |

Executive Summary

A tree safety inspection of all trees within the boundaries provided was undertaken. Only trees with significant hazards and/or environmental conditions that required remedial measures, or a more frequent inspection regime have been highlighted within this report. The objective of the inspection is to evaluate the risk of harm/damage arising from tree/component (e.g., branch) failure.

A total of nine individual trees and two groups have been highlighted as requiring remedial work to minimise or remove the risk of harm. Details of all trees inspected, and the specification/priority of remedial work can be found in Appendix 1 Schedule of Trees and Summary of Works.

Particulars of Instruction

Arbtech Consulting Limited (Arbtech) received written instruction to undertake a tree safety survey of all trees within the boundaries provided. This report only details trees on the basis of "negative reporting", i.e., hazardous trees.

Author

Dean Meadows is a Principal Arboricultural Consultant, the lead consultant for this project, and the author of this report. He graduated from Myerscough where he studied BSc (Hons) Arboriculture and Urban Forestry, achieving a First Class for his research project and overall degree, obtaining a Distinction in all but one module. Before this, Dean completed a National Diploma in Applied Horticulture, also at Myerscough. He is now undertaking an MSc in Arboriculture and Urban Forestry.

In 2020, Dean was named one of Pro Landscaper's 30 Under 30: The Next Generation, an award recognising exemplary young, aspiring, and ambitious professionals.

Dean has expertise in undertaking large to small-scale tree risk and condition surveys and collaborates with organizations, landowners, and Local Authorities to ensure the application of common-sense inspection and management principles to meet their duty of care efficiently and cost-effectively.

Dean holds the industry standard LANTRA Professional Tree Inspection accreditation. He is an experienced and proficient user of THREATS (Tree hazard: Risk Evaluation and Treatment System) and is a Registered User of QTRA (Quantified Tree Risk Assessment).

The advice below and appended is underwritten by our Professional Indemnity insurance for the business practice of Arboricultural Consultancy in the sum of one million Pounds Sterling in each and every claim.

Survey Methodology

For the landowner/steward of the site to be deemed as acting in accordance with their statutory Duty of Care, trees growing on their land should be inspected on a regular basis by a competent person. This regular inspection should be recorded in an auditable fashion. This survey report constitutes a single inspection which can be included in the site's inspection record.

As requested by The Client, the objective of the survey was to inspect all trees and identify and record any apparent signs of structural or physiological markers that may be associated with a raised probability of whole tree/component (e.g., branch) failure. All trees/tree groups that have been highlighted as requiring remedial work are located on a plan and observations pertaining to size, life stage (age), physiological condition and structural condition were recorded.

Identified hazards are assessed using the Tree Hazard: Risk Assessment and Treatment System (THREATS).

THREATS is a framework for systematically and consistently quantifying an informed arboricultural judgement allowing tree managers to arrive at their decision through a logical, defensible, and transparent process. Where the surveyor has noted significant conditions/defects/features on a tree during the inspection, the risk has been evaluated using the THREATS methodology.

The system consists of three parts, i) Tree Inspection Record, ii) Risk Evaluation Sum, iii) Implementation of Control Measures. All of which have multiple stages. The full details of the scoring matrix can be found in Appendix 4. Any recommendations for remedial works, if required, are prioritized using the accrued score.

The survey was made at ground level using visual observation only. Detailed examinations such as climbing inspections and decay detection (beyond the use of a sounding mallet/probing instrument) were not employed, though may form part of the survey's management recommendations. All observations were made from within the curtilage of the site or from the public realm where possible.

The probability of structural failure is impossible to predict with certainty. It can only ever be an estimation based on the surveyor's knowledge, experience, understanding, and best judgment. Trees that have been surveyed by a competent, professional arboriculturist, in line with up-to-date best practice, while making proportionate and reasonable management recommendations enable tree owners/managers to meet their duty of care.

Natural conditions will vary and change over time, so any assessment of the likelihood of failure of a tree or branch will become less reliable as more time passes. Trees are dynamic living organisms that change both physiologically and structurally over time - sometimes significantly. The observations and recommendations during



the survey can therefore only be considered valid for a period of up to two years (18 months in high-risk areas such as schools or care homes), and the subject trees should be re-inspected within a reasonable timeframe and immediately following storm-force winds at/exceeding Beaufort Wind Scale 7 (32-38mph) which may have caused partial failure and/or increase the likelihood of structural failure.

Findings

A total of nine individual trees and two groups have been highlighted as requiring remedial work to minimise or remove the risk of harm. Details of all trees inspected, and the specification/priority of remedial work can be found in Appendix 1 Schedule of Trees and Summary of Works.





Limitations

Trees were inspected by using visual observation from ground level only. Trees were not climbed or inspected below ground level. Estimations have been made about the location, physical dimensions and characteristics of inaccessible trees. Trees have been grouped where it is expedient to do so. Unless specifically stated and requested to do so we have performed no statutory protection checks, such as Conservation Areas (CA) or Tree Preservation Order (TPO). Consequently, we do not seek to offer any comparison between or infer any difference in the quality or importance of TPO trees and other trees.

Caveats

- 1. This report is nullified if any remedial works not advised within this report are undertaken on any area of the site, after the date of survey.
- 2. The report is only valid from the date of inspection and any deletion, editing or alteration of the document will void it in its entirety.
- 3. The responsibility for any work undertaken on the basis of the recommendations of this report does not form part of this contract. No responsibility is assumed by the author of this report or by Arbtech for any legal matters that may arise as a consequence.
- 4. The report is not valid in adverse or unpredictable weather conditions or for any failure due to Force Majeure.
- 5. No liability is assumed by the author or by Arbtech for any misuse, misinterpretation or misrepresentation of the information contained herein.
- 6. This report has been compiled using only the information made available to the author as of the above date of inspection.
- 7. The assessment, unless described as "detailed" was of a preliminary nature, conducted from the ground only; no soil samples were taken for analysis, and no trees were climbed or inspected below ground level (including roots).
- 8. Arbtech is not responsible for any works other than those invoiced for.
- 9. All tree work is to be undertaken in accordance with British Standard BS 3998:2010, Recommendations for tree work.
- 10. Prior to any and all specified tree works it is the duty of the landowner/steward and/or contractor to undertake a check to see if there are any statutory protections upon the land and trees.
- 11. All tree works are to be undertaken at an appropriate time and any and where necessary a suitably qualified ecologist has been consulted so as not to damage or destroy any protected species and/or habitats.



Appendices

The following documents were released to the Client as appendices in this report:

- Appendix 1: Schedule of Trees and Summary of Works
- Appendix 2: Tree Location Plan drawing
- Appendix 3: Tree work guidance
- Appendix 4: THREATS risk evaluation sum matrix
- Appendix 5: Definitions

If you require clarification of the information contained herein, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Yours Sincerely,

Dean Meadows Principal Arboricultural Consultant

Appendix 1: Schedule of Trees

| Tree/Tag No. | Species | Height (m) | Trunk Diameter (mm) | Canopy Spread (m) | Age Class | Physiological Condition | Structural Condition | Comments | Failure Part | Failure Score | Target Score | lmpact Score | Hazard Rating | Threat Category | Urgency code |
|-----------------|-----------------------|---------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|--|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| 212 | Red horse chestnut | 12m | 500mm | N2m E4m S6m W4m | Mature | Low | Poor | Tag no. 0212; graft line present at base; sounding mallet test - extensive decay within the eastern aspect of lower trunk (stringy white rot consistency); imbalanced crown; located on the southern boundary between fence line. | Stem | Likely, foreseeable | Medium | Severe | 400 | 4 - Moderate | 13W |
| 341 | Lime | 17m | 600mm# | 6m | Mature | Average | Moderate | Tag no. 0341; visibility of base restricted due to dense epicormic growth and undergrowth. | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 342 | Lime | 17m | 600mm | 6m | Mature | Average | Moderate | Tag no. 0342; visibility of base restricted due to dense epicormic growth and undergrowth. | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 1 | Holly | 10m | 400mm | 5m | Mature | Low | Moderate | Tag no. no tag; dieback/sparse crown on western aspect - possibly associated with root damage caused by the installation of the new playground; recently crown lifted - stub cuts; small dark bleed at the base – possibly associated with <i>Phytophthora</i> sp. | Whole tree | Potentially with time | High | Severe | 200 | 3 - Slight | A |



| Tree/Tag No. | Species | Height (m) | Trunk Diameter (mm) | Canopy Spread (m) | Age Class | Physiological Condition | Structural Condition | Comments | Failure Part | Failure Score | Target Score | lmpact Score | Hazard Rating | Threat Category | Urgency code |
|-----------------|----------------|---------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|--|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| 2 | Holm oak | 8m | 990mm | 8m | Mature | Average | Poor | Tag no. no tag; squat crown and small crown area; pronounced root flare; low, pendulous crown; arching branch weight; <i>Ganoderma</i> <i>applanatum/australe</i> brackets present - x1 below crown break on northern aspect and x1 eastern aspect at 0.75 m; crust fungi present on historic pruning wounds ; hollow trunk evident - cavity on northern aspect at 1 m. | Stem | Potentially with time | High | Severe | 200 | 3 - Slight | A |
| 3 | Ash | 5m | 200mm | 3m | Semi- mature | Low | Moderate | Tag no. no tag; ash dieback suspected - dieback throughout crown. | Whole tree | Potentially with time | High | Minor | 80 | 2 – Minimal | ЗҮ |
| 4 | Ash | 7m | 250mm | 4m | Semi- mature | Low | Moderate | Tag no. no tag; ash dieback suspected - dieback within northern aspect of crown; bark wounding on northern aspect of trunk - likely traffic collision damage from high-sided vehicles. | Whole tree | Potentially with time | High | Minor | 80 | 2 – Minimal | ЗҮ |
| 5 | English elm | 10m | 300mm | 3m | Semi- mature | Dead | Poor | Tag no. no tag; dead tree. | Whole tree | Probable/Soon | Medium | Moderate | 960 | 4 – Moderate | 13W |



Channing High School – Arbtech TS 01

| Tree/Tag No. | Species | Height (m) | Trunk Diameter (mm) | Canopy Spread (m) | Age Class | Physiological Condition | Structural Condition | Comments | Failure Part | Failure Score | Target Score | Impact Score | Hazard Rating | Threat Category | Urgency code |
|-----------------|--------------------|---------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|---|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| 6 | Lombardy poplar | 15m | 600mm | 3m | Mature | Dead | Poor | Tag no. no tag; dead tree; <i>Ganoderma</i> <i>applanatum/australe</i> fruiting around base. | Whole tree | Probable/Soon | Medium | Severe | 1600 | 5 - Significant | 4W |
| G1 | English elm | 8m | Max 200mm | 3m | Semi- mature | Dead | Poor | Dead trees within group | Whole tree | Probable/Soon | Medium | Minor | 640 | 4 - Moderate | A |



| Tree/Tag No. | Species | Height (m) | Trunk Diameter (mm) | Canopy Spread (m) | Age Class | Physiological Condition | Structural Condition | Comments | Failure Part | Failure Score | Target Score | lmpact Score | Hazard Rating | Threat Category | Urgency code |
|-----------------|---------|---------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|--|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| 62 | Various | 18m | Max 700mm | 3m | Mature | Average | Moderate | Linear belt of Lombardy poplar and mix of native and naturalised species naturally occurring within dense understory; The Lombardy poplars have been regularly managed at reduced dimensions – the timing of the next pruning cycle should be determined during regular inspection; unable to closely inspect many trees closely due to inaccessibility and dense vegetation – no significant structural defects or overt signs of decline were observed that require immediate management. The group should be periodically inspected annually to monitor the structural and physiological condition of the group. | Whole tree | Potentially with time | Medium | Severe | 160 | 3 - Slight | 13W |



A arbtech

Channing School – Arbtech TWS 01

| Tree No. | Species | Works | Urgency Code |
|-------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| 212 | Red horse chestnut | Fell (ground level) due to extensive structural decay within trunk | 13W |
| 341 | Lime | Remove all epicormic growth from ground level up to 2 m to allow for re-inspection to investigate any hidden defects that may be present. The tree should be re- inspected by a suitably qualified Arboriculturist immediately following clearance works. | n/a Carry out within 6 months |
| 342 | Lime | Remove all epicormic growth from ground level up to 2 m to allow for re-inspection to investigate any hidden defects that may be present. The tree should be re- inspected by a suitably qualified Arboriculturist immediately following clearance works. | n/a Carry out within 6 months |
| 1 | Holly | Continually monitor the physiological condition of the crown and the extent of dieback due to suspected decline. | A |
| 3 | Ash | Continually monitor the physiological condition of the crown and the extent of dieback due to suspected decline – possibly associated with ash dieback | ЗҮ |
| 4 | Ash | Continually monitor the physiological condition of the crown and the extent of dieback due to suspected decline – possibly associated with ash dieback | ЗҮ |
| 5 | English elm | Fell to ground level – dead tree. | 13W |

A arbtech

Channing School – Arbtech TWS 01

| Tree No. | Species | Works | Urgency Code |
|-------------|--------------------|---|-----------------|
| 6 | Lombardy poplar | Fell to ground level – dead tree with fungal brackets present. | 4W |
| G1 | English elm | Fell all dead elm trees to ground level | A |
| G2 | Various | Re-inspect annually to monitor physiological/structural condition | 13W |



| <u>Key:</u> | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Tree No. | A unique number or reference to identify trees or groups as shown on associated plans. | | | | | | |
| Tag No. | A unique number on a physical tag attached to the tree. | | | | | | |
| Species | Common and/or taxonomic name. | | | | | | |
| Age Class | Age classification: Young (Y); Semi-mature (SM); Early Mature (EM); Mature (M); Veteran (V). | | | | | | |
| Height | The height of the tree rounded to the nearest meter (m). | | | | | | |
| Crown Spread | An approximation of the extents of the crown, rounded to the nearest meter (m). | | | | | | |
| No of stems | The number of stems forming the primary structure of the tree. | | | | | | |
| Calculated stem diameter | The measured stem diameter for, a single stemmed tree taken at 1.5m above ground level unless otherwise specified; a calculated stem diameter indicative of a multi stemmed tree or group. Recorded in millimetres (mm). | | | | | | |
| Failure indicators present | List of all significant features that indicate an increased risk of failure for the tree or group. | | | | | | |
| Failure indicator most hazardous | The most significant indicator of increased failure for the tree or group. | | | | | | |
| FS | Features that may be considered defects are considered and scored in relation to species/clone history, established failure criteria and time of year. | | | | | | |
| тѕ | The impact radius of the identified defect is considered in relation to potential targets. If on a vehicular transit line, forward visibility of the driver is considered along with the potential for the vehicle to be stationary for a period. If children and/or the elderly or infirm are likely to be present, the target category score is upgraded by one category. | | | | | | |
| IS | The likely damage/harm that would result from the failed part striking the target is considered. This includes the height/momentum and size of the scored part upon impact. | | | | | | |
| Risk score | The function of the FS, TS and IS (i.e. Risk Evaluation=Failure Score X Target Score X Impact Score). | | | | | | |
| Threat cat. | Numerical category ranging between 1 (insignificant) and 7 (extreme), as set out in table 4. | | | | | | |
| Priority Code | The timescale in which the mitigation work/works is recommended to be completed within. | | | | | | |
| Mitigation | Proposed mitigation works proposed to reduce the identified risks to within an acceptable range. | | | | | | |
| Observations | Notes and general comments on the structure and condition of the tree as well as its environment (where appropriate). | | | | | | |

Arbtech Consulting Limited is registered in England and Wales: 05678552. VAT: GB903660148

Ecology – Protected Species - Licensing – Arboriculture – Biodiversity Net Gain – Land/Topographical Survey

Page | **14**



Appendix 2: Tree Location Plan drawing (not to scale)







| | To Company | Threat Categories |
|--|--|--|
| | | 10 Trees are calepointed in accorance with the Tree Hazdro Kee Evaluation and Treement System (THERTS) as published by Forbes-Laird Abornsultand, June 2010. The Call 1-2 Trees dentified as having a THEAT Calegory of |
| | | Theignificant or Minimal requiring management works within 3 years or 3-5 years respectively. Threat Cat. 3 Trees identified as having a THREAT Category of |
| | | Siight requiring management works within 1-2 years. Threat Cat. 4 Treesi identified as having a THREAT Category of Moderate' requiring management works within 13 weeks. |
| | | Threat Cat. 5-7 Trees identified as having a THREAT Category of Significant, Serious or Extreme requiring management works within 4 weeks, 7days or |
| | | Immediately respectively. THREATS Tree Report |
| | | Please rater to Arback Consulting Lut. THREATS The Report and for full details on all surveyed tress, hedgreenes and mains that progras. All these were surveyed and categorised in accordance with the Thee Hazard: Risk Evaluation and Treatment System. |
| | | It is important that the Report is fully understood and any recommended mitigation works are undertaken within the specified time scales. |
| | A COLORADO | |
| | Concil of Concil of | |
| | | CHOICE |
| | and the second s | ALC: NOT THE OWNER OF THE OWNER OWNER OF THE OWNER OWN |
| | C1.1 | and the second se |
| | | 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 |
| | And in the other states of the second se | and the second se |
| 2010 | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | NAME AND ADDRESS OF |
| Contraction of the local distance of the loc | ASA ASA | A CONTRACTOR OF |
| Contract Contract Contract | All and a second | |
| | | |
| | | - |
| | | 100 |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | C |
| | | - 14 |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | 100 Mar 10 |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | arbtech |
| | | Unit 3, Weil House Barns, Chester, CH4 0DH https://artitech.co.vik, 01244 061170 |
| | | Project: |
| | | Highgate Hill London |
| | | Client: |
| | | Channing School Drawing: |
| | | Tree Location Plan Based on: |
| | | Drawing No: Rev: |
| / Balling | | Arbtech TLP 01 Date: Scale: Drawn: |
| | | July 2022 Not to scale DM Key: |
| | | Tree No.: 1 Trurks: O Three Cat. 3 groups: 1 and answers hand to checked at a fix the memory as a bit set for the and anyon. Plant study and any disripsed cat. Affabit Catalate La result on the Antheory Catalate La result o |
| A CONTRACTOR OF A CONTRACTOR O | 1 | reason on processing and any analysis of the Arriter Contrarts (ad. Contrarts the Arriter Strapport for Interception). The analysis is not one of the Arriter Contrarts (ad. Contrarts the Arriter Strapport for Interception) and the Arriter Contrarts and any and the Arriter Contrarts (add. Add. Add. Add. Add. Add. Add. Add. |
| | | The drawing was produced in colour - a monochrome copy should not be niled upon. © Antrech Consulting List, 2018 |



Appendix 3: Tree work guidance



Tree removal

A tree should be felled in one piece only when there is no significant risk of damage to people, property or protected species (see Annex A).

Where restrictions (e.g. lack of space, buildings, other features, land ownership or use, or other trees which are to be retained) cannot be overcome, trees should be dismantled in sections.

This also applies where a tall stump is being retained but where branches are to be removed/pruned.

Extensively decayed trees can be unpredictable when they are being felled, and special precautions should therefore be taken, such as the use of a winch to guide the direction of fall.

Stump removal – stump grinding

Stump grinding should be to a minimum of 300mm deep or to extend through the base of the stump leaving the major roots disconnected if the intention is to reduce the potential for the spread of Honey fungus.

The grinding residue should be treated as arising's and removed from site.

NOTE Mechanical destruction of a stump by stump grinding is less disruptive to the site than digging out.

The hole left by stump removal, should be filled with soil or other material. The filling should be appropriate for future site usage, and for any surface treatment that is to be installed.

Where future plant growth is desired, the backfill material should be firmed in 150 mm layers by treading, avoiding excessive compaction and destruction of the soil structure.

Stump removal - digging

Stump removal by digging out should include disposal/utilization of woody material (see Clause **13**).

NOTE Whether done by hand or machine, digging out can cause severe disturbance of the site.

Where possible, when winching out a stump, a ground or other type of anchor should be used rather than a tree to be retained. If there is no alternative to using such a tree as an anchor, appropriate protective measures should be adopted.

After stump removal

The hole left by stump removal, whether by digging out or grinding, should be filled with soil or other material. The filling should be appropriate for future site usage and for any surface treatment that is to be installed.

Where future plant growth is desired, the back fill material should be firmed in 150mm layers by treading, avoiding excessive compaction and destruction of the soil structure.

Cut Ivy

Cutting of ivy is to be undertaken using hand tools such as hand saws or secateurs to prevent damage to the bark of the tree; the use of chain saws is prohibited. A 300mm high section of ivy is to be cut and removed from within 1m of ground level.

Protected Species

Conservation Status of British Bats

The general consensus in Britain and Europe is that virtually all bat species are declining and vulnerable. Our understanding of population status is poor as there is very little historical data for most bat species. Certain species, such as the horseshoe bats, are better understood and have well documented contractions in range and population size.

Given this general picture of decline in UK Government within the UK Biodiversity Action Plan has designated five species of bats as priority species (greater and lesser horseshoe bats, barbastelle, Bechstein's and pipistrelle). These plans provide an action pathway whereby the maintenance and restoration of the former populations levels are investigated.

Legal Status of British Bats

Given the above position all British bats as well as their breeding sites and resting places enjoy national and international protection.

All bat species in the UK are fully protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) through inclusion in Schedule 5. All bats are also listed on Annex IV (and some on Annex II) of the EC Habitats Directive giving further, European protection. Taken together the act and Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2012 (as amended)* make it an offence to; intentionally or deliberately kill, injure or capture (take) bats;

- Deliberately disturb bats (whether in a roost or not).
- Damage, destroy or obstruct access to bat roosts.

- Possess or transport a bat or any part of a bat, unless acquired legally.
- Sell, barter or exchange bats, or parts of bats.

The legislation although not strictly affording protection to foraging grounds does protect roost sites. Bat roosts are protected at all times of the year whether or not bats are present. Any disturbance of a roost due to development must be licensed.

*The regulations that delivered by the UK's commitments to the Habitats Directive.

Breeding birds

All nesting birds are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act (as amended) 1981, which makes it an offence to intentionally kill, injure or take any wild bird or take, damage or destroy its nest whilst in use or being built, or take or destroy its eggs. Furthermore, a number of birds enjoy further protection under that Act and are listed on Schedule 1 of the Act. These further protected birds are also protected from disturbance and it may be necessary to operate "no-go" buffer zones around such nests – typically out to 100m.

Planning policy guidance on the treatment of species identified as priorities under the biodiversity action program suggests that local authorities should take measures to protect the habitats of these species from further decline through policies in local development documents and should ensure that they are protected from the adverse effects of development, where appropriate, by using planning conditions or obligations. The conservation of these species should be promoted through the incorporation of beneficial biodiversity designs within developments



Appendix 4: THREATS – Risk evaluation sum matrix



Risk Evaluation Sum

Table A: Failure Score

| Score | Likelihood of failure | Example indicators |
|-------|-----------------------|--|
| 50 | Imminent/Immediate | Uprooting; Extreme root loss; Collapsing structure (i.e. primary failure has already occurred) |
| 8 | Probable/Soon | Altered exposure; Primary decay fungus; Severe inclusive bark/root loss; Fragile dead wood |
| 2 | Likely, foreseeable | Lapsed pollard; Overweight/subsiding limbs; Poor stem taper; Dieback |
| .8 | Potentially with time | Early development of inclusive bark; Robust dead wood |
| 0 | None apparent | No significant defects observed |

Table B: Target Score

| Score | Value | Static target examples | Target occupancy examples | | | | | |
|-------|-----------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 40 | Very High | Building 24 hour use | Constant vehicular traffic/busy playground | | | | | |
| 25 | High | Building 12 hour use, ≥11Kv power lines | Frequent vehicular traffic/constant pedestrian use | | | | | |
| 20 | Medium | Building/structure occasional use, <11Kv lines | Peak times traffic/intermittent use, PFV, e.g. commuter run | | | | | |
| 15 | Low | Garage, Summer house, Listed wall | Occasional traffic/sporadic use, GFV e.g. quiet rural road | | | | | |
| 7 | Very Low | Unlisted wall, paving, garden features | Infrequently used access/public right of way/bridleway | | | | | |
| 0 | None | Grass | Hardly ever used, e.g. remote path | | | | | |

Table C: Impact Score

| Score | Degree of harm & consequences (examples) | Agent: trees, mm, or branches, kg (NB size/weight for guidance only) | | | |
|-------|---|--|-----------|----------|--|
| 10 | Severe structural damage, vehicles crushed – passenger fatalities very probable | VL | >750mm | >500kg | |
| 6 | Moderate structural/ severe vehicle damage – fatal/disabling injuries likely | L | 350-750mm | 50-500kg | |
| 4 | Minor damage/probable disabling/hospitalising injury to pedestrians | Μ | 100-350mm | 10-50kg | |
| 1 | Fragile objects destroyed, superficial/recoverable injury to pedestrians | S | <100mm | <10kg | |

Part 3: Implementation of Control Measures

Risk Evaluation Sum: Failure Score X Target Score X Impact Score = Score Range

| Score range | Threat category | Recommended action & Completion deadline | | |
|----------------|--------------------|---|------|--|
| 4000+ | 7 Extreme | Evacuate/prevent access to impact site, emergency call-out of contractors | | |
| 2001- 3999 | 6 Serious | Close site if practical; arrange for work to be completed within 7 days | 7D | |
| 1000- 2000 | 5 Significant | Arrange for work to be completed within four weeks maximum | 4W | |
| 330-999 | 4 Moderate | Remediate within 13 weeks, reinspect after severe weather event meantime (Inc. gales to Force 7+) | 13W | |
| 160-329 | 3 Slight | Reinspect annually /after storms (Force 10+), expect to schedule work within 2 yrs. | А | |
| 50-159 | 2 Minimal | Reinspect within 3 yrs. if public access, schedule work as required | ЗY | |
| 0-49 | 1 Insignificant | Reinspect within 5 yrs. if general public access or 3 yrs. if child-specific access & TS ≥20 | 3/5Y | |

Table D: Appropriate Response

Table E: Outline of Work Required

| Control measure | Example indicators | | | | |
|-----------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Target management | Target value / vulnerability reduced by exclusion, diversion or relocation: e.g. antisocial Target value / vulnerability reduced by exclusion, diversion or relocation: e.g. antisocial planting / fence off & warn; re-route paths; relocate benches | | | | |
| Further investigation | Decay mapping to establish significance of defect: set results against failure criteria | | | | |
| Install support | Non-invasive brace to support vulnerable member / dividing union | | | | |
| Localised pruning | Reduce weight loading on vulnerable limb (including shortening dead branches to retain habitat) | | | | |
| Limb removal | Prune out dead/damaged/vulnerable growth | | | | |
| General pruning | Reduce crown by specified amount | | | | |
| Crown removal | Leave stem as a standing carcass (consider habitat piling cord wood, preferably in dappled light) | | | | |
| Tree removal | Takedown and fell to ground level (consider habitat piling & also stump grinding) | | | | |



Appendix 5: Definitions

Arboriculturist

An arboriculturist (or arboricultural consultant) is a person who has, through relevant education, training and experience, gained recognized qualifications and expertise in the field of accurately identifying risk increasing features and managing trees for risk.

Tree Safety Report

The report following a tree survey undertaken by an arboriculturist that records information about the trees on a site, as well as any risk mitigation recommendations.

Tree Location Plan

A Tree Location Plan (TLP) is plan, is typically delivered as a scalable plan and in a .PDF format. However, in some instances this may be delivered as a non-scalable hand draw (sketch) plan, prepared by an arboriculturist for the purposes of visually demonstrating the approximate locations of the surveyed trees.

Tree Survey Schedule

A list of all trees surveyed, regardless of if remedial works have been recommended. detailing a physical description of the tree as well as any features that increase the risk of the tree/feature.

Tree Works Schedule

A summary list only containing trees that have remedial works recommended. intended to be given directly to a contractor/management team.



Document Production Record

| Document number | Editor | Signature | Position | lssue number | Date |
|--------------------|--------------|-----------|---|-----------------|------------|
| Arbtech TSR 01 | Dean Meadows | | Principal Arboricultural Consultant | 1 | 18/07/2023 |

Limitations

Arbtech Consulting Ltd has prepared this Report for the sole use of the above-named Client/Agent in accordance with our terms of business, under which our services were performed. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this Report or any other services provided by us. This Report may not be relied upon by any other party without the prior and express written agreement of Arbtech Consulting Ltd. The assessments made assume that the sites and facilities will continue to be used for their current purpose without significant change. The conclusions and recommendations contained in this Report are based upon information provided by others and upon the assumption that all relevant information has been provided by those parties from whom it has been requested. Information obtained from third parties has not been independently verified by Arbtech Consulting Ltd.

Copyright

© This Report is the copyright of Arbtech Consulting Ltd. Any unauthorised reproduction or usage by any person other than the addressee is strictly prohibited.