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

Yiewsley Grange, High Street, West Drayton

UB7 7QP

Prepared for Heritage Trees Ltd.

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

Date: 12th April 2025

Ref: TH 5089

AA Registered CONSULTANT trees.org.uk

Institute of Chartered Foresters

Registered Consultant

Summary

This report demonstrates that the trees within the site boundaries have been visually checked by a suitably qualified tree expert.

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

Unless otherwise stated, recommendations are made on the basis that 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 close to tree stems, or loss of sheltering trees.

Contents

1.0 Introduction

1.1 I am Trevor Heaps, Director of Trevor Heaps Arboricultural Consultancy Ltd. I hold a First-Class Honours Degree in Arboriculture; I am a Chartered Arboriculturist and a professional member of the Institute of Chartered Foresters; and I am also a Registered Consultant with the Arboricultural Association. Further information about my qualifications and experience 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		Heritage Trees Ltd.	
London Borough of Hillingdon - LPA	Tree Officer	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 tree survey to assess the condition of all trees within the site boundaries.

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 some trees within and adjacent to this site are covered by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO 303); which means that if any tree works are required (to the trees covered by the TPO), an application must be made to the Council.

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 were inspected by Colin Chambers on the 8th April 2025.

5.2 The weather was dry, clear and sunny. Visibility was good.

5.3 The trees were inspected from ground level.

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

5.5 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.

7.6 Please note, for the trees at the far end of the site (T52 & T53), it may be more cost effective to fence this area off to avoid it being accessed.

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.

Signed

.....

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

Dated

12th April 2025

Appendix 1 - Professional résumé

I am Trevor Heaps, Director of Trevor Heaps Arboricultural Consultancy Ltd. I hold a First-Class Honours Degree in Arboriculture; I am a Chartered Arboriculturist and a professional member of the Institute of Chartered Foresters; and I am also a Registered Consultant with the Arboricultural Association.

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	Ilex aquifolium (Holly)	Sparse. Ivy (light covering). Multi-stemmed.	Unlikely or N/A	0.15			Within 3 years
T2	Alnus glutinosa (Common Alder)	Smaller dead tree fallen into subject tree and locked in with ivy. Wound on limb growing into Holly, significant repair wood seen from ground level; appears stable. Ivy (light covering). Twin-stemmed.	Unlikely or N/A	0.2			Within 3 years
T3	Fagus sylvatica 'Purpurea' (Copper Beech)	Stem is slightly leaning (to the west) and suppressed. Vertical cavity at rear. Wound sealing well, but in a high-use area.	Possible	10	16th April 2024 - Carry out resistograph test to determine extent and significance of decay. 8th April 2025 - not clear whether testing was undertaken, need to check and if not then commission one.	Within 1 year	Within 3 years
T4	Taxus baccata (Yew)		Unlikely or N/A	0.1			Within 3 years
T5	Taxus baccata (Yew)		Unlikely or N/A	0.1			Within 3 years
T6	Taxus baccata (Yew)		Unlikely or N/A	0.1			Within 3 years
T7	Taxus baccata (Yew)		Unlikely or N/A	0.1			Within 3 years
T8	Ilex aquifolium (Holly)	Small historical wound at ground level, unable to look closely, appears stable. Growing through cut roof	Unlikely or N/A	0.1			Within 3 years
T9	Ilex aquifolium (Holly)		Unlikely or N/A	0.1			Within 3 years
T10	X Cupressocyparis leylandii (Leyland Cypress)	Limited view into tree crown. Has been reduced in height a number of times. Has been cut back from the boundary. Sparse. Die-back in crown.	Unlikely or N/A	0.2			Within 3 years
T11	X Cupressocyparis leylandii (Leyland Cypress)	Limited view into crown. Has been reduced in height a number of times. Has been cut back from the boundary. Sparse. Die-back in crown.	Unlikely or N/A	0.2			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
T12	X Cupressocyparis leylandii (Leyland Cypress)	Has been cut back from the boundary. Sparse. Die-back in crown.	Unlikely or N/A	0.2			Within 3 years
T13	Taxus baccata (Yew)		Unlikely or N/A	0.15			Within 3 years
T14	Taxus baccata (Yew)		Unlikely or N/A	0.15			Within 3 years
T15	Taxus baccata (Yew)		Unlikely or N/A	0.15			Within 3 years
T16	Taxus baccata (Yew)		Unlikely or N/A	0.15			Within 3 years
T17	Taxus baccata (Yew)		Unlikely or N/A	0.15			Within 3 years
T18	Taxus baccata (Yew)		Unlikely or N/A	0.15			Within 3 years
T19	Taxus baccata (Yew)		Unlikely or N/A	0.15			Within 3 years
T20	Taxus baccata (Yew)		Unlikely or N/A	0.15			Within 3 years
T21	Taxus baccata (Yew)		Unlikely or N/A	0.15			Within 3 years
T22	Taxus baccata (Yew)		Unlikely or N/A	0.15			Within 3 years
T23	Taxus baccata (Yew)		Unlikely or N/A	0.15			Within 3 years
T24	Taxus baccata (Yew)		Unlikely or N/A	0.15			Within 3 years
T25	Taxus baccata (Yew)		Unlikely or N/A	0.15			Within 3 years
T26	Taxus baccata (Yew)		Unlikely or N/A	0.15			Within 3 years
T27	Taxus baccata (Yew)		Unlikely or N/A	0.15			Within 3 years
T28	Taxus baccata (Yew)		Unlikely or N/A	0.15			Within 3 years
T29	Taxus baccata (Yew)		Unlikely or N/A	0.15			Within 3 years
T30	Taxus baccata (Yew)		Unlikely or N/A	0.15			Within 3 years
G31	Taxus baccata (Yew)		Unlikely or N/A	0.15			Within 3 years
T32	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	Brushing against school building and air conditioning unit	Possible	7.5	16th April 2024 - Cut back branches on southern side by 5-6m to give clearance for a few years 8th April 2025 - works not undertaken. Limb has fractured 7 come to rest on the adjacent building, it's still connected to the main tree 7 is still alive. Probably best to remove it, while someone is up the tree: Reduce / remove branch touching building above spot light, reduce by 2/3 metres limb overhanging yew / building with wound on upper side of limb.	As soon as practicable	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
T33	Aesculus hippocastanum (Horse Chestnut)	Cavity at base but sealing well. 8th April 2025, noted.	Unlikely or N/A	0.15			Within 3 years
T34	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	No access now into this area. Woodpecker holes noted at 10mCrown reduced in past. Sparse. Die-back in crown.	Possible	10	16th April 2024 - Crown reduce by 4-5m all round and manage as a smaller tree with regular re-pruning (about every 5-7 years). 8th April 2025 - works not undertaken, commission as soon as possible.	As soon as practicable	Within 3 years
T35	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	Two woodpecker holes noted at 10m on larger stem and a nearby canker. Twin-stemmed.	Possible	12.5	16th April 2024 - Crown reduce by 6-8m all round and manage as a smaller tree with regular re-pruning (about every 5-7 years). 8th April 2025 -works not yet undertaken, commission as soon as possible.	As soon as practicable	Within 3 years
T36	Thuja plicata (Western Red Cedar)	Standing dead stack. Should be solid for many years. 8th April 2025 - Building now constructed around dead stump limiting inspection. Come the day when it needs felling or reducing there is no means of getting an elevated platform into the back area unless fencing is taken down. May be better to undertake any works before the stump becomes unstable. The angle of this tree is being monitored by the Asst. Head, who will make contact if it is felt there is any gradual movement taking place.	Possible	5	Consider reducing height of stump or removing altogether before it becomes unstable.	Within 3 years	Within 18 months

Ref	Species	Comments	Likelihood of problem occurring within 3 years	Risk Index (0-100 / low-high)	Recommendations	Priority	When to re-inspect
S37	Pyrus communis (Common Pear)		Possible	2.5	16th April 2024 - Remove stump (if considered a hazard). 8th April 2025 – not done.	Within 3 years	N/A to be removed
T38	Pyrus communis (Common Pear)		Unlikely or N/A	0.1			Within 3 years
T39	Malus sylvestris (Crab Apple)	Twin-stemmed at base.	Unlikely or N/A	0.1			Within 3 years
T40	Prunus nobilis (Bay)	Growing close to brick wall. May cause damage in the future. Inspection limited by plastic sheeting. Multi-stemmed.	Unlikely or N/A	0.15			Within 3 years
T41	Ilex aquifolium (Holly)		Likely	10	16th April 2024 – Remove 8th April 2025 - works not yet undertaken, commission as soon as possible	As soon as practicable	N/A to be removed
T42	Pyrus (Pear)	Fallen in past but regrown	Unlikely or N/A	0.05			Within 3 years
T43	Pyrus communis (Common Pear)	Near gate. Major bark wounding on stem (sealing). Quite sparse. Minor die-back in crown.	Possible	5	Crown reduce to form smaller rounder tree	As soon as practicable	Within 3 years
T44	Malus (Apple)		Unlikely or N/A	0.1	Old pruning wounds noted.		
T45	Malus (Apple)	Two active nesting holes. Cavities noted.	Possible	5	Crown reduce by approx. 2 metres	As soon as practicable	Within 18 months
T46	Acer pseudoplatanus (Sycamore)	Suppressed due to growth from nearby trees.	Unlikely or N/A	0.15			
T47	Acer pseudoplatanus (Sycamore)	Cobra braced in the past (but not sure when installed). Leans towards playing area. Twin-stemmed. Tight forks noted.	Gone	0	8th April 2025 -Tree now removed.	N/A	N/A Gone
T48	Quercus robur (Common Oak)	No access to tree. Viewed as best as possible	Unlikely or N/A	0.25			Within 3 years
T49	Ilex aquifolium (Holly)		Gone	0	N/A Gone	N/A	N/A Gone

Ref	Species	Comments	Likelihood of problem occurring within 3 years	Risk Index (0-100 / low-high)	Recommendations	Priority	When to re-inspect
T50	Quercus robur (Common Oak)	Causing minor cracking to brick wall. Hollow at base, but crown seems normal.	Possible	12.5	16th April 2024 - Check in autumn for fruiting bodies and/or carry out resistograph test to determine extent and significance of decay. 8th April 2025 - neither appears to have been undertaken. Autumn insp. first option.	Within 1 year	Within 1 year
T51	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	Damaging brick boundary wall. 8th April 2025 - noted. Pollarded in the past.	Unlikely or N/A	0.2	Remove (if damage to wall is considered unacceptable)	Within 3 years	Within 3 years
T52	Aesculus hippocastanum (Horse Chestnut)	Large cavity noted on southern side. Old tear-out wound/s noted.	Possible	10	16th April 2024 - Carry out resistograph test to determine extent and significance of decay. 8th April 2025 - unclear whether works have been commissioned, if not, they should be as soon as possible.	As soon as practicable	Within 3 years
T53	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	Crown and scaffold branches in a very poor condition. Tear out wounds, cankers and major deadwood noted. Damaging brick boundary wall	Likely	25	16th April 2024 - Remove (if damage is considered unacceptable). Heavily reduce / pollard if tree to be retained. Can be managed as a much smaller tree with regular re-pollarding. 8th April 2025 - no works have been undertaken, works should be commissioned as soon as possible.	As soon as practicable	Within 3 years

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) – **Acceptable** - These are in a normal condition with no significant defects.

2 (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.

3 (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.

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 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 3 years.

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 occuring, 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.

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