A report on tree condition

including management work recommendations

Survey Date: 02/02/2024
Report Date: 05/02/2024
Site: Sandfield House, Downhill Lane, East Boldon, England, NE36 0AX
Client: c/o Duncan Fleck
Job Ref: 3025

Survey and report by Simon Forster BSc MArborA DipArb L4 (ABC)
Website: www.thetreefellane.co.uk
Email: simon@thetreefellane.co.uk
Phone: 01914326167
Mobile: 07896703068

Copyright © The Tree Fella NE Ltd

Contents

1 Introduction 3
2 Methodology 3
3 Conclusions 5
4 Recommendations 6
5 Appendix 1 – Key to Tree data (Appendix 2) 8
6 Appendix 2 - Tree data 10
7 Appendix 3 – Site plan 14
8 Appendix 5 – Limitations of Survey & Report 15
9 Appendix 6 – Information on Author 17
10 Appendix 7 - Bibliography 18

The document remains copyright of The Tree Fella NE Ltd, 16 Prince of Wales Close, NE34 6QT. All rights reserved. No part of this report may be copied or reproduced by any means without prior written permission from the copyright holder.

If you have received this report in error, please destroy all copies in your possession or control.

This report has been prepared for the exclusive use of the commissioning party and unless otherwise agreed in writing by The Tree Fella NE Ltd, no other party may use, make use of, or rely on the contents of this report.

No liability is accepted by The Tree Fella NE Ltd for any use of this report, other than for the purposes for which it was originally prepared and provided.

Opinions and information provided in the report are based on the author using due skill, care and diligence in the preparation of the same and no warranty is provided as to their accuracy.

Surveys are undertaken on the understanding that nothing in the final report will be omitted, amended, or misrepresented by the client or any other interested party.

This report and its contents remain the property of The Tree Fella NE Ltd until payment has been made in full.

It should be noted, and it is expressly stated that no independent verification of any of the documents or information supplied to the author by the client or 3rd parties has been carried out.

1 Introduction

1.1 I, Simon Forster, have been instructed by c/o Duncan Fleck, 'the client', to carry out a ground-based visual tree inspection of trees located within the site boundary of, 'the site', Sandfield House, Downhill Lane, East Boldon, England, NE36 0AX and to report my findings on tree condition.

1.2 This inspection consisted of a survey of all trees with a diameter of 150mm or greater at 1.5m stem height from the ground level. No offsite trees were inspected.

1.3 The findings of this report provide management work recommendations with the order of work priority given such that hazards are addressed in an appropriate timeframe.

1.4 Reference in this report is made to a historic tree survey, "the 2020 report", carried out by AJT Environmental Consultants ('*735 TreeSurvey Final R03 2020.pdf*') dated November 2020. For consistency I have adopted the tree numbering from the 2020 report. Some trees appear missing; these would appear to have been removed since the 2020 report was completed.

1.5 Management work recommendations can be found in section 6, recommendations.

2 Methodology

2.1 I, Simon Forster, holder of ABC Level 4 Diploma in Arboriculture and the LANTRA Professional Tree Inspection qualification, conducted this tree condition survey on 02/02/2024.

2.2 I carried out all tree inspections in accordance with the current best practice, Visual Tree Assessment[1], to give a systematic, consistent, and transparent evaluation method for tree inspection.

2.3 I conducted all tree inspections from ground level with the use of an acoustic-sounding hammer and probe. No invasive decay instruments were used.

2.4 The main scope of a tree condition survey is to provide a suitable and sufficient risk assessment, identifying and recording hazardous trees, to determine their level of risk, and to identify the required work management recommendations to reduce the risk of harm from these hazards to an acceptable level for the observed occupancy/land use. See Common Sense Risk Management of Trees in the bibliography for further details.

[1] Mattheck, C (2007) Field Guide for Visual Tree Assessment & Lonsdale, D (1999) Principle of Tree Hazard Assessment and Management

Copyright © The Tree Fella NE Ltd

2.5 Where required trees may be grouped. Any trees of note, falling outside the group average conditions structurally or physically, will be individually identified and included in the tree survey.

2.6 Data, in line with Appendix 1 – Tree survey key, is digitally recorded during the inspection and transferred to the report document upon return to the office.

2.7 **Tree data** regarding the trees inspected for this report can be found in Appendix 2 - Tree data.

2.8 **Tree management work recommendations** are given within Appendix 2 and are colour-coded for work priority. Urgent priority works are colour-coded in purple and immediate action is recommended to make the tree safe or guard the site; high-priority works are colour-coded in red and are recommended to be carried out within 30 days; moderate-priority works are colour-coded yellow, with a recommendation to be carried out within 90 days; and low priority works are the lowest priority and may be done if budget permits. Other works may be identified to achieve desired management objectives, with timescales given for the completion of these works. Please note, that all tree work should be carried out in accordance with *British Standard BS3998:2010 Tree Work – Recommendations*.

Copyright © The Tree Fella NE Ltd

3 Conclusions

3.1 The wind during this survey 2nd February 2024 was Beaufort scale 6 and during a brief revisit on 6th February 2024 to reinspect the cavity of T50 the winds were again scale 6; great conditions to observe the trees in and following several recent storms with scale 11 and 12 winds.

3.2 It is my opinion that there are several high-priority tree works (to be undertaken within 30 days of the tree survey) to be recommended at this site.

3.3 It is my opinion that there are several moderate-priority tree works (to be undertaken within 90 days of the tree survey) to be recommended at this site.

3.4 It is my opinion that there are several low-priority tree works (that may be carried out if budget permits) to be recommended at this site.

3.5 My recommendations are set out below.

Copyright © The Tree Fella NE Ltd

4 Recommendations

4.1 It is my opinion that there will be no significant long-term adverse impact on the amenity/habitat/heritage value of the immediate or wider landscape by following these recommendations.

Tree Removals

4.2 I recommend T1 should be removed.

4.3 I recommend T65 should be removed.

Tree Pruning

4.4 I recommend T40 crown extending northwest over road should be crown reduced by 2m.

4.5 I recommend T30-41 & T46 should have deadwood removed.

4.6 I recommend T5, T21, T36, T40 & G1 should have ivy removed from the base of the stems.

Further Investigations.

4.7 I recommend T32 & T53 should have a detailed investigation of structural integrity by use of resistograph and tomography within 12 months.

4.8 I recommend T51 should have a detailed investigation of structural integrity by use of resistograph and tomography within 12 months.

4.9 I recommend T60 & T61 should have the grass layer around buttress removed, the buttress examined and a resistograph used to check the structural integrity of the buttress as there is very little buttress taper visible suggesting soil levels may have been raised in the past.

4.10 I recommend T50 should have a detailed investigation of structural integrity by use of resistograph and tomography within 12 months.

4.11 I recommend T5, T6, T7, T9, T10, T17, T22, T27 should be reinspected in 18 months.

Other Recommendations

4.12 I recommend T17 should have the swing removed and repositioned with slacker line to prevent damage to the tree.

Copyright © The Tree Fella NE Ltd

4.13 I recommend that the homeowner considers the adoption of the VALID Tree Risk-Benefit Management strategy[2] and observes the "passive assessment" process including the use of the Obvious Tree Risk Features guide.

[2] https://www.validtreerisk.com/tree-risk-management-strategy-policy-&-plan

Copyright © The Tree Fella NE Ltd

5 Appendix 1 – Key to Tree data (Appendix 2)

Type & ID

- **Types** – **T**- individually identified tree, **G** – group of trees (similar trees of similar condition), * - a tree isolated from a group, **R** – row of trees, **H** – hedgerow, **S** – stump, **W** – woodland.
- **ID** – a unique number identifying the tree, group, isolated group tree, row, hedgerow, or woodland with a unique identification number. For individual tree identification metal tags may be located at 1.5m above ground on their stem.

Species – Common Name – scientific tree genus & species name with the common tree name after a hyphen. For groups there may be multiple species.

Age Class - estimated based on the current size and expected size of the species at that location.

- **Y** - Young - 1st quarter of expected life of species
- **EM** - Early Mature - not young but growing towards the tree's maximum expected size for species/location.
- **M** - Mature - near to or at the tree's maximum expected size for species/location
- **LM** - Late Mature - has been at the maximum expected height and spread for species/location for several years.
- **A** - Ancient - exceptionally old for species

Height - estimated to the nearest metre from the ground to the tip of the top of the leaf-bearing structure and recorded in metres to put observations and photos into context with observations and recommendations.

Crown Spread - is measured approximately, using a laser measure, from the tip of leaf bearing structure to the stem, horizontally, and recorded in metres. This is recorded for the north, east, south, and west crown, enabling crown shape to be indicated on our plan and contextualised within observations and recommendations.

Physiological Condition – the physiological condition of the tree(s), ranging from good (G), fair (F), poor (P), and dead (D).

Structural Condition – the structural condition of the tree(s), ranging from good (G), fair (F), poor (P), and very poor (VP).

Comments – observations or comments noted by the surveyor.

Management Work Recommendations - recommended tree surgery operations including further investigation of suspected defects that require more detailed assessment.

Copyright © The Tree Fella NE Ltd

Occupancy – an assessment of the target zone (where harm may be done by the tree) from high to low as assessed on the date of the tree inspection. This is informed using the area likely to be affected by a failure of whole or part tree, and the perceived likelihood of this area being occupied at the time of failure.

- High occupancy areas should be reinspected in 12 months or as stated.
- Medium occupancy areas should be reinspected in 24 months or as stated.
- Low occupancy areas should be reinspected in 5 years or as stated.

Work Types

- Hazard – hazard management work to reduce risk to a person or property from a tree with a defect or in poor condition.
- Arb – informed Arboricultural management.
- Landscape – landscape design/management for amenity.
- Conservation – wildlife/habitat/historic management.
- Woodland – woodland management.

Work Priority – A priority for management work recommendations determined from an assessment on the day, considering the occupancy and the likelihood of failure. The surveyor considers his understanding of the tree(s) physiology/anatomy, the condition of the tree(s), the reasonable foreseeability that the tree or part of the tree will fail, and the size of the failed tree or part.

The ISA risk rating matrix is applied, giving a Risk Rating for the tree.

	Consequences of Failure			
Likelihood of Failure & Impact	**Negligible**	**Minor**	**Significant**	**Severe**
Very Likely	Low	Moderate	High	Extreme
Likely	Low	Moderate	High	High
Somewhat likely	Low	Low	Moderate	Moderate
Unlikely	Low	Low	Low	Low

Taken from ISA Basic Tree Risk Assessment Form, 2017.

Based on this risk rating a recommended timescale for the work to be carried out is provided below.

- Urgent (where extreme) - immediate action is recommended to make tree(s) safe or guard the site.
- High - to be undertaken within 30 days of the tree survey.
- Moderate - to be undertaken within 90 days of the tree survey.
- Low - that may be carried out if the budget permits.

Copyright © The Tree Fella NE Ltd

6 Appendix 2 - Tree data

ID TPO Reference	Species Common Name	Age Class	Height (m)	Crown Spread (m)	Physiological Condition	Structural Condition	Comments	Management Work Recommendations	Occupancy	Work Type	Work Priority
N1	Acer platanoides Norway Maple	EM	7	3	G	G			Medium	N/A	N/A
T1-TPO149-24	Fraxinus excelsior Ash	LM	15	5	P	P	Symptoms of ash dieback (Hymenoscyphus fraxineus) with close to 75% crown dieback.	Tree should be removed by landowner as it poses risk of damage to structure.	Medium	Hazard	High
T2-TPO8-A2	Acer pseudoplatanus Sycamore	EM	14	5	G	F	Fire damage on stem and underside of branches on east aspect shows continued callus growth as occlusion continues.		Low	N/A	N/A
T3-TPO8-A2	Acer pseudoplatanus Sycamore	EM	13	4	G	F	Fire damage on stem and underside of branches on east aspect shows continued callus growth as occlusion continues.		Low	N/A	N/A
T4-TPO8-A2	Acer pseudoplatanus Sycamore	EM	12	5	G	F	Fire damage on stem and underside of branches on east aspect shows continued callus growth as occlusion continues.		Low	N/A	N/A
T5-TPO149-30	Acer pseudoplatanus Sycamore	M	14	6	G	F	Large lesion on primary limb extending to north-east showing excellent callus growth. The 2020 report mentions 'possible fungal decay' of the surface roots, but no fruiting bodies were noted. Root damage appears minor.	Maintain ivy clear of stem. Reinspect in 18 months.	Low	Hazard	Low
T6-TPO149-31	Acer pseudoplatanus Sycamore	EM	14	6	G	F	Basal decay as previously noted in 2020 report. Butress roots appear sound and acoustic hammer sounds good around full base of tree. The tree appears very stable on this windy day.	Reinspect in 18 months.	Low	Hazard	Low
T7-TPO149-32	Acer pseudoplatanus Sycamore	EM	14	6	G	F	Basal decay as previously noted in 2020 report. Butress roots appear sound and acoustic hammer sounds good around full base of tree. The tree appears very stable on this windy day.	Reinspect in 18 months.	Low	Hazard	Low
T8-TPO149-33	Acer pseudoplatanus Sycamore	EM	14	6	G	G	No observations of note.		Low	N/A	N/A
T9-TPO149-34	Acer pseudoplatanus Sycamore	EM	14	6	G	G	Basal decay as previously noted in 2020 report. Butress roots appear sound and acoustic hammer sounds good around full base of tree. The tree appears very stable on this windy day.	Reinspect in 18 months.	Low	Hazard	Low
T10-TPO149-35	Acer pseudoplatanus Sycamore	EM	14	6	G	G	Basal decay as previously noted in 2020 report. Butress roots appear sound and acoustic hammer sounds good around full base of tree. The tree appears very stable on this windy day.	Reinspect in 18 months.	Low	Hazard	Low
T11-TPO149-36	Acer pseudoplatanus Sycamore	EM	14	6	G	G	No observations of note.		Low	N/A	N/A
T12-TPO149-37	Acer pseudoplatanus Sycamore	EM	14	6	G	G	No observations of note.		Low	N/A	N/A
T13-TPO149-38	Acer pseudoplatanus Sycamore	EM	12	6	G	G	No observations of note.		Low	N/A	N/A
T14-TPO149-39	Acer pseudoplatanus Sycamore	EM	12	5	G	G	No observations of note.		Low	N/A	N/A
T15							*Removed since the 2020 report*				
T16							*Removed since the 2020 report*				
T17-TPO296-1	Fagus sylvatica Beech	M	16	11	G	G	Multiple stems from 2m. Weeping bark inclusion visible on eastern aspect of stem. Swing secured to secondary limb over lawn.	Swing should be removed and reattached to remove choking tie points from limb. Reinspect tree in 18 months to reassess development of the weeping bark inclusion.	Medium	Arb	Low
T18							*Removed since the 2020 report*				
T19							*Removed since the 2020 report*				
T20							*Removed since the 2020 report*				

Copyright © The Tree Fella NE Ltd

T21-TPO296-3	Acer pseudoplatanus Sycamore	M	14	7	G	G	Multiple stems from 2m.	Remove ivy from base of stem.	Low	Arb	Low
T22-TPO296-2	Acer pseudoplatanus Sycamore	EM	14	7	G	G	Multiple stems from 2m. Small cavity at the base on North aspect of buttress. Deadwood over low occupancy target areas.	Reinspect in 18 months.	Low	Hazard	Low
T23-TPO149-16	Acer pseudoplatanus Sycamore	M	12	5	G	G	No observations of note.		Low	N/A	N/A
T24-TPO149-14	Pyrus communis Pear	Y	2	1	G	G	Recent pruning cuts from crown lift.		Low	N/A	N/A
T25-TPO149-13	Acer pseudoplatanus Sycamore	LM	16	7	G	G	Appears well rooted on embankment but not fully accessible for inspection.	Crown reduce away from house by 2m to avoid direct damage from branches touching property.	High	Landscape	Moderate
T26							*Removed since the 2020 report*				
T27-TPO149-11	Fraxinus excelsior Ash	EM	8	2	F	F	Heavily asymmetrical. No current evidence of ash dieback (Hymenoscyphus fraxineus).	Reinspect in 18 months.	Low	Hazard	Low
T28	Acer pseudoplatanus Sycamore	EM	8	2	F	F	Forms canopy with T29. No observations of note.		Low	N/A	N/A
T29-TPO149-12	Crataegus monogyna Hawthorn	EM	8	3	G	F	Forms canopy with T28. No observations of note.		Low	N/A	N/A
T30-TPO149-9	Acer pseudoplatanus Sycamore	M		6			Deadwood over walkway.	Remove deadwood.	Low	Hazard	Low
T31-TPO149-8	Acer pseudoplatanus Sycamore	M	15	6			Deadwood over walkway.	Remove deadwood.	Low	Hazard	Low
T32-TPO149-7	Aesculus hippocastanum Horse-chestnut	M	15	7	G	P	This tree has previously been flagged for removal in the 2020 report. There is a large cavity at 2m which appears to extend will into the main stem. The tree appears healthy aside from this cavity.	Detailed investigation of structural integrity by use of a resistograph and tomograph within 12 months. Given its survival of recent storms and low occupancy I don't feel immediate removal is necessary.	Low	Hazard	High
T33-TPO149-6	Acer pseudoplatanus Sycamore	M	14	6			Deadwood over walkway.	Remove deadwood.	Low	Hazard	Low
T34-TPO149-5	Aesculus hippocastanum Horse-chestnut	M	15	7	G	G	Deadwood over walkway.	Remove deadwood.	Low	Hazard	Low
T35-TPO149-4	Aesculus hippocastanum Horse-chestnut	M	13	6			Deadwood over walkway.	Remove deadwood.	Low	Hazard	Low
T36-TPO149-3	Aesculus hippocastanum Horse-chestnut	M	14	3	P	F	Dieback in crown. Butress damage with exposed sapwood.	Remove ivy from stem to maintain clear inspection. Remove deadwood	Low	Hazard	Low
T37-TPO149-1	Acer pseudoplatanus Sycamore	M	16	5	G	F	Multi-stem from ground. Deadwood over highway.	Remove deadwood.	Medium	Hazard	Low
T38							*Removed since the 2020 report*				
T39							*Removed since the 2020 report*				
T40-TPO8-45	Acer pseudoplatanus - Sycamore	M	15	6	G	G	Limb extending laterally northwest over the road has been reduced but is gaining height again now. This limb was recommended for removal in the 2020 report because of a cavity in the limb. I feel this would result in a large stem wound if carried out today.	Crown extending from the northwest limb over road should be reduced by 2m to reduce the lever arm forces. Remove ivy from stem to improve future inspections.	Medium	Hazard	High
T41-TPO8-44	Acer pseudoplatanus - Sycamore	EM	15	6	F	G	The 2020 report states very poor condition. Despite dormant period observation did not appear to be in poor condition. Deadwood over highway.	Remove deadwood. Carry out aerial inspection to explore the 2020 observations.	Medium	Hazard	Moderate
T42	Taxus baccata - Yew	EM	6	2	G	G	No observations of note.		Low	N/A	N/A
T43	Taxus baccata - Yew	EM	6	2	G	G	No observations of note.		Low	N/A	N/A
T44	Acer pseudoplatanus - Sycamore	EM	15	5	G	G	No observations of note.		Medium	N/A	N/A
T45	Taxus baccata - Yew	EM	6	2	G	G	No observations of note.		Low	N/A	N/A
T46	Acer pseudoplatanus - Sycamore	EM	15	5	G	G	The 2020 report suggests retrenching the crown by 1m. I am unsure why this is suggested. I have noted a large deadwood stem top in the crown.	Remove deadwood branches from dead stem and reduce dead stem by 1.5m.	Medium	Hazard	Moderate
T47	Taxus baccata - Yew	EM	6	2	G	G	No observations of note.		Low	N/A	N/A
T48							*Removed since the 2020 report*				
T49-TPO8-42	Aesculus hippocastanum Horse-chestnut	Y	9	4	G	G	The 2020 report states to remove branch NE over highway. I'm taking this to mean northwest, as the highway is to the west. This branch does not appear to be an issue currently.		Medium	N/A	N/A

Copyright © The Tree Fella NE Ltd

T50-TPO8-39	Fagus sylvatica - Beech	LM	20	7	G	F	Divides into two main stems at 1m with a bark included junction visible. No observation of movement within the junction. A cavity is visible on the eastern stem where a stem has been removed. or failed. historically. The cavity appears to have compartmentalised well internally and there is a large amount of reinforcing wood being generated around the wound opening. The maximum probe depth from was 30cm, suggesting decay does not extend far below base of cavity opening and no further than the stems dead wood. There is a massive quantity of reaction wood present throughout the base of both stems and there are no signs of movement or separation of the junction. The highest value target is the main house, but I note that the stem with wound leans out over towards the lawn. Considering the comments in the 2020 report there appears to have been no worsening of the stem wound in the last 4 years. In the 2020 report there was an observation stating that black charcoal features may be Kretzschmaria deusta. During my visit I did not observe the presence of this crust fungi, although there were dark crusty sections of detritus within the cavity which I believe could be mistaken for K. deusta. I revisited the property 6th Feb 2024 to reconfirm these findings and came to the same conclusion.	Detailed investigation of structural integrity by use of a resistograph and tomograph within 12 months.	Medium	Hazard	Low
T51-TPO8-38	Aesculus hippocastanum Horse-chestnut	M	20	7	G	F	Divides into 3 stems at 1m with bark included branch junctions. No observation of movement within the junction. Vast quantities of response growth throughout the junctions. There were some indications of hollowing when sounded with acoustic hammer.	Detailed investigation of structural integrity by use of a resistograph and tomograph within 12 months.	Medium	Hazard	Moderate
T52							*Removed since the 2020 report*				
T53-TPO8-41	Aesculus hippocastanum Horse-chestnut	EM	18	4	G	F	Stem wound at 2m on EAST face from limb loss resulting in large wet cavity.	Detailed investigation of structural integrity by use of a resistograph and tomograph within 12 months.	Medium	Hazard	High
T54-TPO8-40	Fagus sylvatica Beech	EM	14	7	G	F	Divides into 2 stems at 1m with branch junction showing signs of minimal bark inclusion. Good bulging reaction wood beginning to form around union.		Medium	N/A	N/A
T55-TPO8-35	Acer pseudoplatanus Sycamore	EM	12	5	G	F	Twin stem from 2m. High previous crown lift starting to lion's tail the crown.		Medium	N/A	N/A
T56	Taxus baccata - Yew	Y	6	3	G	G	Multi-stem from low level.		Medium	N/A	N/A
T57							*Removed since the 2020 report*				
T58							*Removed since the 2020 report*				
T59-TPO8-T36	Ulmus procera 'pendula' Weeping English Elm	LM	10	5	G	F	Veteran. Woodpecker holes present in crown.		Medium	N/A	N/A
T60-TPO8-33	Acer pseudoplatanus Sycamore	EM	12	4	G	F	Small cavity at 2.5m old pruning wound. Butress also believed to be covered by soil.	Remove grass layer to provide mulching bed and identify buttress growth and condition. Use resistograph to understand structural integrity of base of stem and inform management.	Medium	Hazard	Moderate
T61-TPO8-32	Sorbus intermedia Swedish Whitebeam	M	12	6	G	F	Tree divides into two stems at 1m height. There is very little buttress reinforcement and very little reinforcement of union. There is some evidence of increment strip growth on the south face. *Previously referred to as Sorbus latifolia – confirm when in leaf.*	Remove grass layer to provide mulching bed and identify buttress growth and condition. Use resistograph to understand structural integrity of base of stem and inform management.	Medium	Hazard	Moderate
T62							*Removed since the 2020 report*				
T63							*Removed since the 2020 report*				
T64-TPO8-28	Acer pseudoplatanus - Sycamore	EM	10	3	G	G	No observations of note.		Low	N/A	N/A
T65	Sorbus aria - Common Whitebeam	M	10	3	P	P	Stem leaning on adjacent TPO sycamore.	Remove tree.	Low	Hazard	Moderate
T66-TPO8-27	Acer pseudoplatanus - Sycamore	EM	12	5	G	G	Not fully inspected as in neighbouring garden.		Medium	N/A	N/A

Copyright © The Tree Fella NE Ltd

T67-TPO149-2	Acer pseudoplatanus Sycamore	M	16	3	G	F	Recorded as part of T37 in the 2020 report but individually recorded in TPO149 as T2.		Medium	N/A	N/A
G1-TPO149-Various	Mixed	Y	8	4	G	G	Group consists of T17-23. Sycamore, ash, and hawthorn.	Remove ivy from base of stems.	Low	Arb	Low

Copyright © The Tree Fella NE Ltd

7 Appendix 3 – Site plan



Copyright © The Tree Fella NE Ltd

8 Appendix 5 – Limitations of Survey & Report

8.1 "**It is perfectly normal for trees to occasionally break without anyone or anything being to blame. The breakage is the natural price the tree must pay for achieving an energy-saving, lightweight structure**"[3]. Whilst every effort is made to ensure an accurate assessment of tree condition is made during an inspection no responsibility can be taken for resultant damage or injury occurred by a falling tree. The survey only gives a snapshot of what is visible, not obscured, or inaccessible on the day of the survey.

8.2 The **level of detail** of the tree inspection will vary depending on the target occupation and the size of the tree or group of trees. For example, zones of perceived high confluence (large trees in high target occupation areas) will be inspected in much greater detail than zones of perceived low confluence (small trees in low target occupation areas).

8.3 **Findings of this report** are only valid for 24 months from the date of the tree inspection.

8.4 **Location of trees** illustrated in Appendix 3 - Site Plan are approximate, derived from geo-reference data, ordnance survey mapping and aerial photography. The tree locations shown on the plan are sufficiently accurate to assess the risk of harm and readily identify trees requiring works.

8.5 Access to some trees on this site was difficult due to a steep incline with limited access routes which included overgrown rotten steps to the south and a structurally unsound wooden staircase to the west. Where close inspection was not achievable this is recorded in the comments of Appendix 2 – Tree data.

8.6 **Legal constraints** may limit the work that can be undertaken on-site, and the methods used. These may include, but not be limited to, those that follow.

8.6.1 Trees may be subject to **TPO (tree preservation orders)** or within a **conservation area** and therefore may be subject to legislation whereby you have an obligation to gain local planning authority consent, or at least inform the authority before any work is carried out on site. You should confirm this position prior to instructing any works. It is my understanding that most trees on site are covered by three separate TPOs confirmed by South Tyneside Council. Where known these are listed with the tree ID.

8.6.2 Prior to instruction of any works consideration should be given for **protected wildlife**, which may involve inspection and written records or reports, to prevent damage to wildlife and ensure compliance with the Wildlife and Countryside Act

[3] Professional Tree Inspection Workbook – Version 4, 2023, Lantra Awards.

Copyright © The Tree Fella NE Ltd

1981 and to protect species such as Bats that are protected under The Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019. It is my understanding your site is not within a conservation area.

8.6.3 Requirements for a **felling license** under the Forestry Act (1967) may apply to this site depending on the designation of the land where the trees are located. The Forestry Commission guidance document, '*Tree felling: getting permission*', tells you if you'll need to get permission to fell trees. It is my understanding that trees standing or growing in a garden, as yours are, are exempt from this requirement.

Copyright © The Tree Fella NE Ltd

9 Appendix 6 – Information on Author

9.1 I, Simon Forster, have over seven years of experience working within the Arboricultural industry having worked as a climbing arborist for many of these years and have a detailed knowledge of the practical profession of climbing arborist. I am a professional member of the Arboriculture Association (PR9022) and have a keen interest in all areas of arboriculture and keep up to date with research and developments tracking CPD as part of my Arboriculture Association membership.

9.2 My qualifications include.

- Upper Second-class BSc Honours Degree
- ABC Level 4 Diploma in Arboriculture
- PTI - Professional Tree Inspection (LANTRA awards)
- Quantified Tree Risk Assessment (QTRA) – Mike Ellison
- VALID Tree Risk-Benefit Management – David Evans
- Practical Arboriculture Qualifications (NPTC)

Copyright © The Tree Fella NE Ltd

10 Appendix 7 - Bibliography

- Arboricultural Association – https://www.trees.org.uk
- British Standards 3998:2010 – Tree Work – Recommendations; British Standards Institution.
- British Standards 5837:2012 – Trees in relation to design, demolition, and construction; British Standards Institution.
- Lonsdale, D (1999) Principle of Tree Hazard Assessment and Management
- Mattheck, C (2007) Field Guide for Visual Tree Assessment
- The National Tree Safety Group (2011), Common sense risk management of trees
- Shigo, A.L (1991) Modern Arboriculture
- Slater, D (2022) Guidance Note 14 – Branch Junctions: A Classification System for Arborists
- Sterry, P (2007) Collins Complete British Trees London
- Strouts, R.G (2013, 3rd Edition) Diagnosis of Ill Health in Trees
- Weber, K & Mattheck, C (2003) Manual of wood decay
- Wessolly, L (2016) Manual of Tree Statics and Tree Inspection

Copyright © The Tree Fella NE Ltd

Intentionally Blank

Copyright © The Tree Fella NE Ltd