Trevor Heaps

Arboricultural Consultancy Ltd.

12 Plover Drive, Milford-on-Sea, Hampshire, SO41 0XF - Tel: 07957 763 533

Email: trevor@trevorheaps.co.uk • www. trevorheaps.co.uk

Tree Risk Assessment Report

For

ACS International School Hillingdon, 108 Vine Lane

Uxbridge, UB10 0BE

Prepared for ACS International

Prepared by Trevor Heaps BSc, MICFor, M. Arbor.A.

Date: 15th May 2024

Ref: TH 4552

Arboricultural ASSOCIATION Professional Member

Institute of Chartered Foresters Registered Consultant

Summary

This report demonstrates that the trees within the boundaries of ACS International School (Hillingdon) have been visually checked by a suitably qualified tree expert (during a walkover tree survey).

Some tree defects were noted, and remedial works have been specified (and/or specific re-inspection timescales are specified). The remedial works should be implemented as soon as is practically possible or at least within the recommended timescales.

Unless otherwise stated, recommendations are made on the basis that the trees will be re-inspected within 3 years from the date of the last inspection. However, all trees should be inspected after extreme and severe weather events, and in the event of any nearby disturbance that could adversely affect tree stability, such as mechanical excavations or loss of sheltering trees.

Contents

1.0 Introduction

1.1 I am Trevor Heaps, Director of Trevor Heaps Arboricultural Consultancy Ltd. I have experience and qualifications in the field of Arboriculture. Further information is provided in Appendix 1.

1.2 The basic principle in Law is that a tree owner has a duty to take reasonable care to protect those reasonably likely to be affected by their trees.

1.3 Subsequently, a tree owner, or those responsible for the tree(s), must take steps to ensure they are aware of foreseeable risks that may cause harm; and they should take appropriate remedial action to protect those who are reasonably likely to be affected.

1.4 Guidance issued by the Government, the Forestry Commission and the Arboricultural Association advises that a regular tree survey is undertaken by a suitably qualified tree expert. Failure to do so may leave those responsible liable to prosecution.

1.5 Contact details:

Who	Name	Organisation	Details
Arboricultural Consultant	Trevor Heaps	THAC Ltd. 12 Plover Drive, Milford-on-Sea, Hampshire, SO41 0XF	Tel: 07957 763 533 E-mail: trevor@trevorheaps.co.uk
Client		ACS International	
London Borough of Hillingdon - LPA	Tree Officer	The London Borough of Hillingdon, Civic Centre, High Street, Uxbridge, UB8 1UW	Tel: 01895 556000 E-mail: trees@hillingdon.gov.uk

2.0 Instruction

2.1 We are instructed to carry out a walkover tree survey to assess the condition of all trees within the boundaries of ACS International School (Hillingdon).

2.2 Based on the data collected during the tree survey, we are to provide a report to make recommendations to manage all identifiable, foreseeable and significant risks.

2.3 The purpose of this report is to demonstrate that the trees have been visually checked by a suitably qualified tree expert and to ensure that all reasonable measures are taken to ensure that persons and property are not at risk of harm from them.

3.0 Statutory tree protection

3.1 According to the Council's website, this site is covered by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO 7, 1967).

3.2 This means that if any tree works are required to the trees covered by the TPO, an application must be made to the LPA.

4.0 Ecological constraints

4.1 The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000) provides statutory protection to birds, bats and other species that inhabit trees.

4.2 These animals could impose significant constraints on the timing of any recommended tree works. You are therefore advised to seek advice from a suitably qualified ecologist prior to the start of any tree works.

5.0 The tree survey

5.1 The trees at ACS International School (Hillingdon) were inspected by Trevor Heaps on the 15th May 2024. There was light rain, but visibility was fair.

5.2 The trees were inspected from ground level.

5.3 The trees were inspected using the Visual Tree Assessment (VTA) methodology, developed by Mattheck & Breloer (The Body Language of Trees, 1994).

5.4 Neither root nor soil samples were taken for analysis.

6.0 The trees

6.1 The locations of all trees surveyed are shown on the site plan in Appendix 4. Further information about the trees can be found in appendices 2 & 3.

6.2 To help visualise the general condition of the trees on the site plan, they are colour coded as follows:

- **Tree coloured green – Acceptable** - These are in a normal condition with no significant defects.
- **Tree coloured amber – Be aware** - These are either located in an unsustainable position (a large species of tree close to property for example) or defects have been noted that could lead to future problems. Recommendations are made to remove the tree or the defects or reduce the defects to an acceptable level.
- **Tree coloured red – Take action** - These are hazardous to life and property and cannot be made safe by remedial works alone. These will need to be removed.
- **Tree coloured purple – N/A** – These have been removed since the last survey.

7.0 Recommendations

7.1 All recommendations are described in the tree data schedule in Appendix 3.

7.2 Any urgent works are highlighted red. These must be organised as a matter of urgency and carried out as soon as possible.

7.3 If lower priority works have been recommended, they are highlighted green, and should be carried out within the given timescales.

7.4 To help prioritise work, a risk index figure (between 0-100) has been provided. The larger the number, the more important the work will be.

7.5 If re-inspection timescales (other than every 3 years) are specified, these are highlighted yellow.

8.0 Signature

8.1 This report represents a true and factual account of all potential arboricultural issues and makes recommendations for appropriate remedial action within the boundaries of ACS International School (Hillingdon).

Signed

.....

Trevor Heaps
Chartered Arboriculturist
BSc (Hons), MArborA, MICFor.

Dated

15th May 2024

Appendix 1 - Professional résumé

I am Trevor Heaps, director of Trevor Heaps Arboricultural Consultancy Ltd. I am a Chartered Arboriculturist, a Professional Member of the Arboricultural Association (AA) and hold a First-Class Honours Degree in Arboriculture.

Professional training

- Arboriculture and Bats: Scoping Surveys for Arborists (BCT & AA) – October 2017
- Tree Science (AA) – June 2016
- OPM (Oak Processionary Moth) Training (FC) – May 2016
- Visual Tree Assessment (Arboricultural Association) - October 2015
- Trees and the Law (Dr Charles Mynors) - June 2015
- Mortgage (Home Buyers) Report Writing (LANTRA / CAS) - February 2015
- Tree Preservation Orders - effective application (LANTRA / CAS) - November 2014
- Professional Tree Inspection 3-day course (LANTRA / AA) - July 2014
- Arboricultural Consultancy Course (AA) - May 2014
- Further down the subsidence trail 1-day course (AA) - April 2013
- Getting to grips with subsidence 1-day course (AA) - November 2012

AA – Arboricultural Asscociation

BCT – Bat Conservation Trust

CAS – Consulting Arborist Society

FC – Forestry Commission

Appendix 2 - Tree data schedule

Ref	Species	Comments	Likelihood of problem occurring within 3 years	Risk Index (0-100 / low-high)	Recommendations	Priority	When to re-inspect
T1	Acer pseudoplatanus (Sycamore)	Twin-stemmed at base. Tight forks noted.	Unlikely or N/A	0			Within 3 years
T2	Aesculus hippocastanum (Horse Chestnut)	Cavity at 4m	Unlikely or N/A	0			Within 3 years
T3	Cedrus atlantica 'Glauca' (Blue Atlas Cedar)	Struck by lightning in past. Wounds at main break sealing well, but noticed (potentially) Phaeolus schweinitzii fruiting bodies. Stem sounded hollow beneath. Crown parts that overhang potential target areas are 'relatively' small	Possible	18.75	Carry out resistograph test to check level of decay and/or fence off from pedestrians. Light pruning may also be an option to reduce crown weight.	Within 1 year	Within 18 months
T4	Robinia pseudoacacia (Acacia)	30 degree lean towards access road (measured at eye level with iPhone)	Unlikely or N/A	0			Within 3 years
T4.1	Crataegus monogyna (Hawthorn)	Dead tree.	Likely	10	Remove (cut to ground level).	Within 1 year	N/A to be removed
T4.2	Acer pseudoplatanus (Sycamore)		Unlikely or N/A	0			Within 3 years
T4.3	Prunus avium (Wild Cherry)	Sparse. Die-back in crown.	Possible	7.5			Within 18 months
T5	Acer pseudoplatanus (Sycamore)	Old stem removed at base in past. Decay forming at the old wound, but does not appear to be affecting the remaining stem	Unlikely or N/A	0			Within 3 years
T6	Taxus baccata (Yew)	Tight forks, but normal for species	Unlikely or N/A	0			Within 3 years
T7	Acer pseudoplatanus (Sycamore)	Minor deadwood in crown. Located at back of linear group, and hard to assess.	Unlikely or N/A	0			Within 3 years
T8	Taxodium distichum (Swamp Cypress)	Twin-stemmed. Tight forks noted (fair union).Braced	Unlikely or N/A	0			Within 3 years

Ref	Species	Comments	Likelihood of problem occurring within 3 years	Risk Index (0-100 / low-high)	Recommendations	Priority	When to re-inspect
T8.1	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	Showing early stages of Ash die back. Large limbs overhanging courts. Appears to be a small cavity near the branch union.	Possible	7.5	Check annually for symptoms of Ash die back.	Within 1 year	Within 18 months
T9	Taxus baccata (Yew)	Sparse. Minor deadwood in crown. Large bark wound. Sealing well	Unlikely or N/A	0			Within 3 years
T10	Taxus baccata (Yew)	Sparse.	Unlikely or N/A	0			Within 3 years
T11	Betula pendula (Silver Birch)	Limb lost in past, wound sealing well but decaying behind.	Possible	7.5	Reduce crown all round by 3-4m to reduce wind loading	Within 1 year	Within 18 months
T12	Taxus baccata (Yew)	Leaning onto corner of courts, but top of tree is correcting itself. Leaning at 50 degrees (measured with iPhone at eye level).	Unlikely or N/A	0			Within 3 years
T13	Quercus robur (Common Oak)	Very large old tree located next to footpath. Several old wounds and cavities scattered throughout main limbs and scaffold branches. Hard to assess all from ground. Recent aerial inspection noted several areas of decay in scaffold limbs.	Possible	15	Crown reduce tree by 4-5m all round and/or re-direct footpath so that it no longer passes beneath the crown (as recommended in 2021)	As soon as practicable	Within 18 months
T14	Salix caprea (Goat Willow)	Collapsed and re-growing, but low target area. Coppice if area becomes more used	Unlikely or N/A	0			Within 3 years
T15	Cedrus atlantica 'Glauca' (Blue Atlas Cedar)	Collapsing limbs, but fenced off. Main upper stem is at moderate risk of failing in the future due to increased wind exposure.	Possible	10	Reduce main upper part of crown by 3-4m to reduce weight (as recommended in 2020 and 2021).	Within 1 year	Within 3 years
T16	Pyrus (Pear)	Twin-stemmed. One stem part-fallen.	Unlikely or N/A	0			Within 3 years

Ref	Species	Comments	Likelihood of problem occurring within 3 years	Risk Index (0-100 / low-high)	Recommendations	Priority	When to re-inspect
T17	Quercus robur (Common Oak)	Very large old tree located next to footpath. Old fruiting bodies at base. Large cavity at 5m, braced. Major deadwood over footpath. Resistograph test carried out early 2021.	Possible	15	Remove deadwood and crown reduce by 4-5m all round to reduce weight of crown and/or re-direct footpath so that it no longer passes beneath the crown (as recommended in 2021)	As soon as practicable	Within 18 months
T18	Tilia X europaea (Common Lime)	Lapsed pollard. Epicormics.	Unlikely or N/A	0	Remove epicormics from base of tree and re-inspect for defects.	Within 1 year	Within 18 months
T19	Sequoiadendron giganteum (Wellingtonia)	Braced	Unlikely or N/A	0			Within 3 years
T20	Cedrus deodora (Deodar Cedar)	Sparse.	Unlikely or N/A	0			Within 3 years
T20.1	Cedrus deodora (Deodar Cedar)	Twin-stemmed. Old tear-out wound noted. Sparse. Defective limb on southeastern side, tight forks and old tear out wound	Unlikely or N/A	0			Within 3 years
T20.2	Cedrus atlantica 'Glauca' (Blue Atlas Cedar)	Old tear-out wound noted. A couple of small limbs have recently snapped out and are hanging, but only over the fenced off area.	Unlikely or N/A	0			Within 3 years
T20.3	Cedrus deodora (Deodar Cedar)		Gone	0			N/A Gone
T21	Quercus ilex (Holm Oak)	Tight forks noted.	Unlikely or N/A	0			Within 3 years
T22	Taxus baccata (Yew)	Major bark wounding on stem (sealing).	Unlikely or N/A	0			Within 3 years
T22.1	Buxus sempervirens (Box)	Dying and hung up in neighbouring tree	Possible	5	Remove or coppice (unless John would prefer to monitor for recovery)	Within 3 years	Within 3 years

Ref	Species	Comments	Likelihood of problem occurring within 3 years	Risk Index (0-100 / low-high)	Recommendations	Priority	When to re-inspect
T23	Tilia X europaea (Common Lime)	Cavity from old tear out wound at 4m. Wound sealing well. Chicken of woods fungus may have colonised wound (yellow fungus on stem noted by Simon)	Unlikely or N/A	0			Within 18 months
T24	Tilia X europaea (Common Lime)	Lapsed pollard, decay and Ganoderma evident. But small crown and low target area. Maintain by regular re-pollarding (not needed at present).	Possible	5			Within 18 months
T25	Quercus ilex (Holm Oak)	Crown reduced in past. Ganoderma noted at base. Resistograph test carried out early 2021. High use area close to classrooms.	Possible	10	Crown reduce by 2-3m in height and by 4-5m from sides	Within 1 year	Within 18 months
T26	X Cupressocyparis leylandii (Leyland Cypress)	Coryneum canker noted throughout crown. Tree in slow terminal decline, but ok for now.	Possible	7.5			Within 18 months
T27	Acer pseudoplatanus (Sycamore)	Multi-stemmed at base. Has been partly braced in upper crown, but needs further bracing.	Possible	15	Brace stem on car park side to the stems at rear with 2 new braces, so all three upper stems are braced (as recommended in 2020 and 2021)	Within 3 years	Within 3 years
G27.1	X Cupressocyparis leylandii (Leyland Cypress)		Gone	0			N/A Gone
T27.2	Aesculus hippocastanum (Horse Chestnut)	Dead / dying tree	Possible	6.25	Remove.	Within 1 year	N/A to be removed
T27.3	Unknown (Unknown)	Failed sapling	Possible	6.25	Remove.	Within 3 years	N/A to be removed

Ref	Species	Comments	Likelihood of problem occurring within 3 years	Risk Index (0-100 / low-high)	Recommendations	Priority	When to re-inspect
T28	Taxus baccata (Yew)	Ivy (heavy covering). Sparse. Declining due to recent ground works (used to be surrounded by soft landscaping).	Unlikely or N/A	0			Within 3 years
T30	Taxus baccata (Yew)	Sparse. Declining due to recent ground works (used to be surrounded by soft landscaping).	Unlikely or N/A	0			Within 3 years
T30.1	Taxodium distichum (Swamp Cypress)	Large stem has failed in the past. Large stub / tear out wound remains	Possible	12.5			Within 3 years
T30.2	Prunus cerasifera 'Pissardii' (Purple-leafed Plum)	Old tear-out wound noted. Possibly infected by chicken of woods. Split limb noted on Southern Side, hung up in crown	Possible	5			Within 18 months

Appendix 3 - Tree data schedule explanatory notes

This section explains the terms used in the **Tree data schedule** (Appendix 2).

Ref: Each item of vegetation has its own unique number prefixed by a letter such that:

T1=Tree **S2**=Shrub or stump **G3**=Group **H4**=Hedge **W5**=Woodland

Species: Common names are given (with Latin names given in brackets)

VTA – Visual Tree Assessment

1 (tree coloured green) – No issues noted (at present) - These trees are considered to be in good condition / acceptable location with no significant defects noted

2 (tree coloured amber) – Be aware - These trees are either located in an unsustainable position (a large species of tree close to property for example) or defects have been noted that could lead to future problems. Recommendations may be made to remove the tree or the defects or reduce the defects to an acceptable level

3 (tree coloured red) – Take action - These trees are considered to be hazardous to life and property and cannot be made safe by remedial works alone. These trees will need to be removed

4 (tree coloured purple) – N/A – These have been removed since the last survey.

Comments: Tree form and pruning history are recorded along with an account of any significant defects

Likelihood of failure or problem occurring: The tree surveyor's opinion on how likely it is the tree or part of it will fail or cause an issue (such as direct or indirect damage) within 1 year.

Risk Index: An estimate of risk (0 = no risk to 100 = very high risk) based on a calculation made from the assumed occupancy, the size of the tree (or defect) and the assumed likelihood of a problem occurring (see above). This allows work to be prioritised.

Recommendations: These are based on any defects / problems observed and are intended to ensure that the tree is maintained in an acceptable condition.

Priority: Depending upon the threat posed by the tree, and the likelihood of a problem occurring, any recommendations made should be carried out within the prescribed timescales.

When to re-inspect: The suggested interval before the next inspection should be carried out.

Appendix 4–References

[1]OPSTD/Agriculture and Waste Recycling Sector/ Agriculture Safety Section (2015), *Management of the risk from falling trees or branches*. Available at https://www.hse.gov.uk/foi/internalops/sims/ag_food/010705.htm#(Accessed: 14 January 2020).

[2]Forestry Commission (2011), *Common sense risk management of trees, Managing trees for safety.*

[3]Arboricultural Association (2016), *Tree Surveys: A guide to good practice, Guidance Note 7.*

[4]Mattheck & Breloer (1994), *The Body Language of Trees, 1994.*

[5]Watson and Green (2011), *Fungi on Trees – an Arborists' Field Guide.*

Appendix 5 - Site Plan

Aerial photo showing the approximate locations of the tree/s (Google Earth background). See Appendices 3 & 4 for an explanation of the colours used.

T1 T2 T4 T30.2 T3 T4.1 T4.2 T30.1 T30 T4.3 T5 T27.3 T28 T6 T7 G27.1 T27 T8 T27.2 T10 T9 T8.1 T11 T12 T26 T13 T16 T18 T17 T19 T14 T15 T25 T24 T23 T20 T20.2 T20.1 T20.3 T21 T22.1 T22

Tree Survey Legend

No issues noted - These trees are currently considered to be in an acceptable location and condition with no significant defects noted

Be aware - These trees are either within (current or potential) influencing distance of property or defects have been noted that could lead to future problems.

Take action - These trees are considered to be hazardous to life and property and cannot be made safe by remedial works alone. These trees will need to be removed

N/A - Removed since last survey

Note: Trees are shown as a coloured-coded stems. Hedges and groups are depicted as colour-coded polygons