



*Tree Risk Management Report 2024*  
*Old Barn House, High Road,*  
*Eastcote, HA5 2EW*



Ref: 101 961

Date: 18/10/2024

Russell Ball BSc. (Hons.), P.G. Dip. LM, CBiol., MSB

Technical Director: Arbol EuroConsulting Ltd.

Royal Society of Biology **Chartered Biologist**

International Society of Arboriculture **Certified Arborist**

LANTRA Approved **Professional Tree Inspector**

No. 1 Landford Close Rickmansworth WD3 1NG

Mobile: 078844 26671

Email: [russell@arboleuro.co.uk](mailto:russell@arboleuro.co.uk)

## **CONTENTS**

- 1.0** Introduction
- 2.0** Report Limitations
- 3.0** Conclusion & Recommendations
- 4.0** References

## **APPENDICES**

- 1.** Indicative Tree Location Plan (appended at end of report narrative)
- 2.** Tree Survey Schedule (appended at end of report narrative)
- 3.** **Appendix I** General Information
- 4.** **Appendix II** Outline CV and Professional Experience

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

### 1.1. Brief

We are instructed to inspect and survey trees in regard to their:

- \* Health, condition and notably risk rating: Tree Risk Assessment (TRA).
- \* Any required general tree management recommendations.

**NB** This is a *negative survey* in that only those trees with risk management issues are surveyed and recorded for any necessary remedial action. If a tree(s) has no significant visual defect(s) they are not surveyed or recorded. See Tree Survey details in section 2.1.

Trees were assessed within a time-frame of 12 months\*. Rationale: Trees are living organisms whose health and condition are (annually) subject to the influence of many factors and unpredictable change. One of these important factors is the changing seasons with their high winds, storms and snowfall.

\*To account for seasonal changes (see section 1.3) the re-inspection period is within 16 months. Correspondingly, this report is valid for 16 months.

Please refer to the appended tree survey schedule and site plan map.

### 1.2 Visual Tree Assessment (VTA)

VTA is an integral part of any TRA. VTA is an internationally recognised tree hazard assessment method developed by Prof. Claus Mattheck: Body Language of Trees – a handbook for failure analysis (HMSO, 1994). The basis of VTA is the identification of (external) symptoms which a tree produces in reaction to a weak spot or area of mechanical stress. These can then be interpreted in terms of potential hazard features within a tree.

### 1.3 VTA Assessment in a Repeat and Seasonal Context

**Repeat Context:** Trees are dynamic living organisms whose health and condition are subject to the influence of many factors and unpredictable changes. Therefore, trees should be re-assessed within a time-frame of 16 months (see related Seasonal Context below).

**Seasonal Context:** There are both advantages and disadvantages to carrying out VTA assessments in summer versus the winter:

#### Spring/Summer

Advantages: Vitality can be easily assessed and deadwood is clearly visible.

Disadvantages: Trees in full (heavy) leaf (e.g. Lime) can obscure assessment of branch/trunk defects. Pathogenic fungal bodies are not always present at this time of year.

#### Autumn/Winter

Advantages: Branch/trunk structure more readily visible from the ground and pathogenic fungi are best spotted at this time of year.

Disadvantages: Vitality is not so readily assessed and deadwood is not so identifiable.

For these reasons, spring/summer and autumn/winter VTA assessments are best alternated.

#### 1.4. Qualifications and Experience

I have based this report on my site observations and investigations, and have come to the conclusions and recommendations (in sections 2 and 3 below) in light of my experience, interpretation of site indicators and technical knowledge in arboriculture. I have experience and technical qualifications in botany and arboriculture. Please refer to the appended outline CV.

#### 2.0 TREE INSPECTION RESULTS (to be read in conjunction with the appended Tree Survey Plan & Tree Schedule)

**2.1** Across the site we surveyed approximately 15 trees covering a species range of, for example predominately ash with elm, field maple plum and crack willow. In total, three trees and 2 x groups were identified as having significant hazard features. See table below. Importantly, we are advised that the site is within a Conservation Area (CA).

#### 2.2. Recommendations for Tree Works (by way of a reminder see Tree Risk Management Strategy *Risk Rating & Work Priority* at appendix A)

Please see the table below to be read in conjunction with the appended Tree Risk Survey.

RECOMMENDED TREE WORKS	
PRIORITY 1 (EXTREME)	-
PRIORITY 2 (HIGH)	G1, T2 & T3
PRIORITY 3 (MEDIUM)	G2 & T1
PRIORITY 4 (LOW)	-
GENERAL MGT. RECS.	-

**2.2.1. Priority 1:** There were no extreme or low-risk trees.

**2.2.2 Priority 2:** As set out in the appended Tree Risk Survey sheets, works to high-risk trees (G1, T2 and T3) included removal of diseased trees and deadwood/hangers. These works should be carried out within the next 1-3 months.

**2.2.3 Priority 3:** The medium-risk tree works to G2 and T1 (dead/structurally compromised tree removal) should be carried out in the next twelve months.

**2.2.4 General Management Recommendations (GMRs):** There were no GMRs.

#### 3.0 CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

**3.1** Given the significant-sized wooded copse at Old Barn House the required Priority 2 and 3 tree works are relatively minor. We recommend that the required tree works are carried out in a timely manner (see timeframes above). **NB** If resources allow, it may be more cost effective to have all the tree works carried out in the one operation. Please note the points below in regard to risk ratings and landowner legal duty of care.

3.1.1 Regardless of the tree risk rating - extreme, high or medium - the legal duty of care remains the same for *all* these trees and the harm/damage they may cause. Importantly, it is only the *timeframe* for these trees that is the variable.

3.1.2 If trees/works are not removed/carried out within our specified time-frames then the legal duty of care transfers to the landowner. Moreover, with the

identified Tree Risk Survey hazard feature(s) any failure to act in a timely manner would likely result in full liability for the landowner.

- 3.2 This report does not seek to authorise any tree works (see General Information appendix section Aii). See CA in section 2.1.
- 3.3 We recommend that the next TRA survey is carried out (within the next 16 months) when the trees are out-of leaf. See Rationale Contexts in section 1.3.

#### 4.0 REFERENCES

- National Tree Safety Group (2024). *Common Sense Risk Management of Trees*, Forestry Commission.
- Lonsdale, David (2001) *Principles of Tree Hazard Assessment and Management* DTLR Forestry Commission
- Dunster, Julian A., E. Thomas Smiley, Nelda Matheny, and Sharon Lilly. (2017). *Tree Risk Assessment Manual* (second edition). Champaign, Illinois: International Society of Arboriculture.
- Mattheck, C. (1994). *Body Language of Trees - A Handbook for Failure Analysis*. HMSO, London.
- E. Thomas Smiley, Nelda Matheny, and Sharon Lilly. (2011). *Best Management Practices. Tree Risk Assessment*. Champaign, Illinois: International Society of Arboriculture.
- HSE. 2013. Sector Information Minute - *Management of the Risk from Falling Trees or Branches*. Health & Safety Executive, Bootle.

Russell Ball BSc. (Hons.), P.G. Dip. LM, CBiol., MRSB.

Technical Director: Arbol EuroConsulting Ltd.

Royal Society of Biology **Chartered Biologist**

International Society of Arboriculture *Certified Arborist* (ID: UI-1287A)

LANTRA Approved **Professional Tree Inspector** (Ref: HO00178227 504187)



Mobile: 078844 26671

Email: [russell@arboleuro.co.uk](mailto:russell@arboleuro.co.uk)

## Appendix A

### TRMS: RISK RATING AND WORK PRIORITY

<i>Risk Rating</i>	<i>Description</i>
<i>Extreme</i>	<i>Work to be completed immediately</i>
<i>High</i>	<i>Work to be completed within 1-3 months*</i>
<i>Medium</i>	<i>Work to be completed within 12 months **</i>
<i>Low</i>	<i>Option B: No tree works required before the next Tree Management Survey</i>

\* Where trees are subject to Tree Preservation Orders (TPO) this 1-3 month time period will allow time for a Local Planning Authority TPO application.

\*\* For Medium or Low Risk trees there is a caveat to the timing of any required pruning. This can be variable depending on the tree species. Visit this link below for more specific advice:

<https://www.trees.org.uk/Help-Advice/Help-for-Tree-Owners/Guide-to-Tree-Pruning>

**APPENDIX I**  
**GENERAL INFORMATION**  
**Sounding Hammer Use, Tree Protection, Tree Works Best Practice & Wildlife  
Legislation**

**Ai) USE OF A NYLON SOUNDING HAMMER**

This may be referred to in the assessment sheets. It is a recognised field **resonance** test and is a useful tool in aiding Visual Tree Assessment. It involves tapping around areas of suspected decayed wood (in trunks & branches) to compare with areas of wood which are not (i.e. solid). The aim is to listen for hollowing (e.g. with a dull thud) as this indicates unsound wood, internal cavities and/or delaminated (loose) bark.

**Aii) STATUTORY TREE PROTECTION**

Trees can be protected in law – via Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) or by virtue of them growing in a Conservation Area – by the Government's Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (the Act). Trees may also be protected by Planning Conditions. In all these instances, written Council (Local Planning Authority: LPA) permission/consent is required before protected trees can be pruned or felled. Contravention of the Act may carry a fine of up to £20,000 and a criminal record.

**Aiii) TREE WORKS - BEST PRACTICE**

Subject to LPA written permission/consent (if applicable - see section Aii), all tree works must conform rigorously to BS 3998 (2010) 'Recommendations for Tree Work' and as modified by research more recent. All trees to be retained should be inspected annually by an Arboriculturist to assess the significance of any future physiological, morphological or environmental changes.

**Aiv) WILDLIFE LEGISLATION**

The Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981) Chapter 69 forms the basis for the legal wildlife protection in Great Britain. Amongst other protected flora and fauna, nesting birds and all species of bat are afforded statutory protection. In brief, it is an offence to:

- Intentionally kill, injure or take a bat.
- Sell, hire, barter or exchange a bat, dead or alive.
- Be in possession or control of a bat or anything derived from them.
- Disturb a nesting bird.

It is recommended that the client and/or their agent review the Act - <http://www.jncc.gov.uk/page-3614> - for further information and guidance.

**Av) WILDLIFE HABITATS**

A cursory assessment of wildlife habitat values of trees and hedgerows on the site was carried out during the survey. No protected or exceptional habitats were identified and details were not recorded. However, trees and hedgerows of most species provide valuable nesting sites for a wide range of birds and it is likely that nesting birds will be present on the site during the period March to September. We have not been made aware of the presence of roosting bats and have not identified any obvious signs of roost sites. However, this does not mean that roost sites are absent.

**Avi) TREES AND IVY**

Whilst ivy can be a valuable wildlife habitat, for trees it can obscure structural defects (& any associated decay fungi) in trunks and branches. Ivy can also increase the wind-sail area and weight of crowns. For these reasons, ivy on trees adjacent to roads, paths, buildings and other targets should be managed (see photo below).



Failure of a live ivy-clad hawthorn tree across a road (the extra weight of ivy caused the tree failure)

*“.....in a gale a tree that is heavily laden with ivy is like a fully-rigged ship, unable to lower its sails. Over it goes!”*

Jennifer Sandy - Richard Mabey's **Flora Britannica**

Ivy removal from around a trunk base using hand-tools (only) so as not to damage the underlying bark



Trunk ivy not to be removed used with a chainsaw  
(bark damaged and sapwood exposed)



## APPENDIX II

### CV Overview

Russell Ball BSc. (Hons.), P.G. Dip. LM, CBiol., MSB.

Chartered Biologist

#### Qualifications

- BSc. (Hons.) Botany (Manchester University).
- Post Graduate Diploma: Landscape Management (Manchester University).
- Royal Society of Biology **Chartered Biologist** (since 1995).
- LANTRA Approved **Professional Tree Inspector** (Ref: HO00178227 504187)

#### Professional Memberships

- International Society of Arboriculture (ISA). President of the ISA UK/I Chapter (2010-2012).
- Arboricultural Association
- Consulting Arborist Society
- Royal Society of Biology
- Royal Horticultural Society (Chelsea Flower Show Silver-Gilt medal Winner: Rainforest Belize – 1996)

## INDIVIDUAL TREE RISK SURVEY

SITE:	OLD BARN HOUSE, HIGH ROAD, EASTCOTE, HA5 2EW					
CLIENT:	OLD BARN CONSULTING LIMITED					
BRIEF:	CARRY OUT AN ISA LEVEL 1 & 2 TREE RISK ASSESSMENT					

SURVEYOR:	R. BALL & S. WHORWOOD
ASSESSMENT DATE:	16/10/2024
VIEWING CONDITIONS:	CLOUDY
JOB REFERENCE:	101 961

PAGE: 1 OF 3
--------------

General Management Recommendations = GMRs

TREE NO.	SPECIES	AGE RANGE	HEIGHT (M)	CROWN SPREAD	DIA. (MM)	VITALITY	COMMENTS	MANAGEMENT	RISK RATING	REVIEW MONTHS
----------	---------	-----------	------------	--------------	-----------	----------	----------	------------	-------------	---------------

G1	Ash x 3 Mid tree tagged: 0430	EM	14-17	3.0	Est. Av. 400	M	All three trees – that have been topped in the past with resulting poor form - are suffering from the pathogenic (vascular wilt) fungal disease: Ash Dieback (AD). Two of the trees, have large dead scaffold limbs (leaning towards and above the neighbouring garage roof) one limb of which is colonised with the pathogenic <i>Inonotus hispidus</i> . See group photo no. 1.  <b>Target:</b> entrance road and garage roof.	Remove trees	H	-
G2	Elm x 4 No tag	D	7-9	-	-	D	Dead trunks have succumb to Dutch Elm Disease  <b>Target:</b> wooded copse area	Remove trunks	M	-
T1	Plum Tag: 0430	EM	8	1.8	180	N	'Historic' co-dominant trunk failure. Remaining trunk is leaning at approx. 40°. See photo no. 2.  <b>Target:</b> wooded copse area	Remove remaining standing trunk	M	-
T2	Ash No tag	EM	19+	5.0	420	N	Low-crown pendulous deadwood (DW) above the third-party bin store  <b>Target:</b> bin store	Remove DW	H	Within 16 months
T3	Sycamore Tag 0416	SM	10+	1.9	300	N	Dead vertical hanger above car parking bay  <b>Target:</b> parking bay	Remove dead-hanger	H	Within 16 months

## HEADINGS &amp; ABBREVIATIONS

TREE NO. REFERENCE NUMBER. REFER TO PLAN OR NUMBERED TAGS WHERE APPLICABLE

SPECIES: COMMON NAME

AGE RANGE: Y = YOUNG, SM = SEMI MATURE, EM = EARLY MATURE, M = MATURE, PM = POST MATURE

HEIGHT: OTHER THAN WHERE THE HEIGHT OF A TREE IS CRITICAL TO THE OUTCOME OF THE RISK ASSESSMENT, TREE HEIGHT IS ESTIMATED

CROWN SPREAD: MEASURED OR ESTIMATED DIAMETER OF CROWN AT THE WIDEST POINT

DIA: STEM DIAMETER - MEASURED AT A HEIGHT OF APPROXIMATELY 1.3 METRES.

VITALITY: A MEASURE OF PHYSIOLOGICAL CONDITION. D = DEAD, MD = MORIBUND, P = POOR, M = MODERATE, N = NORMAL

SITE:	OLD BARN HOUSE, HIGH ROAD, EASTCOTE, HA5 2EW					
CLIENT:	OLD BARN CONSULTING LIMITED					
BRIEF:	CARRY OUT AN ISA LEVEL 1 & 2 TREE RISK ASSESSMENT					

SURVEYOR:	R. BALL & S. WHORWOOD
ASSESSMENT DATE:	16/10/2024
VIEWING CONDITIONS:	CLOUDY
JOB REFERENCE:	101 961

PAGE: 2 OF 3
--------------

General Management Recommendations = GMRs

TREE NO.	SPECIES	AGE RANGE	HEIGHT (M)	CROWN SPREAD	DIA. (MM)	VITALITY	COMMENTS	MANAGEMENT	RISK RATING	REVIEW MONTHS

Photo no. 1 to show the ash group G1 with dead tips and sparse foliage – typical of AD  
 For comparison and reference, note the public-realm 'AD unaffected' ash group in the background



## INDIVIDUAL TREE RISK SURVEY

SITE:	OLD BARN HOUSE, HIGH ROAD, EASTCOTE, HA5 2EW
CLIENT:	OLD BARN CONSULTING LIMITED
BRIEF:	CARRY OUT AN ISA LEVEL 1 & 2 TREE RISK ASSESSMENT

SURVEYOR:	R. BALL & S. WHORWOOD
ASSESSMENT DATE:	16/10/2024
VIEWING CONDITIONS:	CLOUDY
JOB REFERENCE:	101 961

PAGE: 3 OF 3

### General Management Recommendations = GMRs

TREE NO.	SPECIES	AGE RANGE	HEIGHT (M)	CROWN SPREAD	DIA. (MM)	VITALITY	COMMENTS	MANAGEMENT	RISK RATING	REVIEW MONTHS
----------	---------	-----------	------------	--------------	-----------	----------	----------	------------	-------------	---------------

SITE:	OLD BARN HOUSE, HIGH ROAD, EASTCOTE, HA5 2EW					
CLIENT:	OLD BARN CONSULTING LIMITED					
BRIEF:	CARRY OUT AN ISA LEVEL 1 & 2 TREE RISK ASSESSMENT					

SURVEYOR:	R. BALL & S. WHORWOOD
ASSESSMENT DATE:	16/10/2024
VIEWING CONDITIONS:	CLOUDY
JOB REFERENCE:	101 961

PAGE: 4 OF 3
--------------

General Management Recommendations = GMRs

TREE NO.	SPECIES	AGE RANGE	HEIGHT (M)	CROWN SPREAD	DIA. (MM)	VITALITY	COMMENTS	MANAGEMENT	RISK RATING	REVIEW MONTHS

Photo no. 2 to show the basal trunk co-dominant failure on the plum T1  
Pen included for scale



SITE:	OLD BARN HOUSE, HIGH ROAD, EASTCOTE, HA5 2EW					
CLIENT:	OLD BARN CONSULTING LIMITED					
BRIEF:	CARRY OUT AN ISA LEVEL 1 & 2 TREE RISK ASSESSMENT					

SURVEYOR:	R. BALL & S. WHORWOOD
ASSESSMENT DATE:	16/10/2024
VIEWING CONDITIONS:	CLOUDY
JOB REFERENCE:	101 961

PAGE: 5 OF 3
--------------

General Management Recommendations = GMRs

TREE NO.	SPECIES	AGE RANGE	HEIGHT (M)	CROWN SPREAD	DIA. (MM)	VITALITY	COMMENTS	MANAGEMENT	RISK RATING	REVIEW MONTHS

