Quantified Tree Risk Assessment

Compiled by: J Urwin

7th October 2026



Instructed by S Hunt

for
Foulden village hall
& recreation ground

refs. FPC/THA/91026

Ravencroft Tree Services Ltd.
6 Reepham Rd
Foulsham
Dereham
NR20 5SL
Tel: 01362 684291
jon@ravencrofttrees.co.uk

QTRA
Registered User

Registered in England No 4936062
Registered address: Summer Hill House, Sculthorpe road, Fakenham, NR21 9HA

Contents

1 Introduction

Instruction and brief....3

Limitations....3

Documents received....4

2 Inspection method

Consideration of risk....5

Tree plotting and identification....5

Quantified Tree Risk Assessment....5

3 Future management

Survey frequency....8

Planting....8

4 Site summary

Site visit....9

Site descriptions....9

General assessment and mitigation....9

5 Appendices

1 Tree location plan & survey schedule

Schedule key; Target ranges; QTRA summary

1 Introduction

Instruction and brief

1.1 Ravencroft Tree Services Ltd. has been instructed by S Hunt to undertake an inspection of and provide a risk assessment for trees around the grounds of Foulden village Hall & recreation ground.

1.2 This appraisal intends to evaluate any existing and potential tree hazards and specify works to mitigate risk of harm to persons or property using the Quantified Tree Risk Assessment (QTRA) system.

1.3 The assessment also takes into consideration the social, environmental and economic benefits which the trees might provide to the sites and surrounding area.

Limitations

1.4 The collection of all tree survey data was undertaken from ground level without invasive inspection of individual trees, trunks, buttresses or root flares. The disclosure of hidden defects cannot therefore be expected. As explained in the fee proposal, inspection may have been restricted where trees were ivy clad, located wholly or partly on neighbouring land or impeded by poor access due to ditches or fencing and where basal growth or other vegetation obscured lower stems and root collars. Were more detailed assessments using internal examination equipment required, recommendations would have been set out in the survey schedule. Height, spread and other dimensions were estimated unless otherwise stated.

1.5 This information is confidential to our client and their professional advisers. No liability is accepted for its contents to any other than our client.

1.6 The assessment and any recommendations relate specifically to the condition of the trees on the day that the inspection was carried out. They are necessarily invalid if works of any type are undertaken on or close to trees other than those recommended herein. This includes changes to soil levels, excavations carried out on the land subject to this survey and abnormal weather conditions generating new defects or exacerbating those already present but currently obscured.

1.7 Trees are dynamic, living organisms and failures a part of their natural processes. Even healthy trees or their parts may fail, particularly - although not exclusively - as a result of strong winds or violent storms. Occasionally, yet with ever greater frequency, extreme weather systems occur, bringing with them an unusual degree of tree damage. Clearly, Ravencroft Tree Services Ltd. cannot

be held liable for the consequences of any such events or similarly unpredictable failures.

1.8 Assessment of the potential effects of trees on buildings or other structures resulting from their abstraction of water from shrinkable load-bearing soils was not included in our instruction and is not considered here.

1.9 Some or all of these trees may be subject to conservation area or Tree Preservation Order protection. If so, prior to any works being instructed or undertaken, the district council's tree officer must be informed to establish whether all proposed works comply with all applicable regulations. Please note that the council requires 6 weeks' notice of proposed tree works within conservation areas, in accordance with section 211 of the Town and Country Planning Act (1990). Where trees are protected by a Tree Preservation Order, an application for works will be required to ensure adherence to the stipulations of this same Act. Had trees been identified by our inspection as being dead or 'dangerous' i.e. presenting an unacceptably high risk of harm, they *may* have been exempt from the Act, requiring only five days notification to the council's tree officer before commencement of works. This is not the case here.

1.10 This report is based on findings from the site survey, tree observations and any other information provided. Conclusions have been drawn from the author's professional qualifications and experience in arboriculture.

Documents received

1.11 No plans or relevant documents were received prior to the survey being undertaken. The survey has been based on boundaries set at the last one. Should there be any changes to these boundaries, an update can be made on request.

2 Inspection method

Consideration of risk

2.1 Under the Quantified Tree Risk Assessment system the ‘targets’ (people and property) onto which trees could fail are assessed and quantified, so enabling the arboriculturist to determine whether a closer inspection of any particular tree is required and to what degree of rigour.

Tree plotting and identification

2.2 Any trees recorded were mapped during inspection to a level of detail sufficient to enable distinction and position. Recorded trees’ stems were tagged where possible with a numbered aluminium tag. No tags were applied on trees inaccessible due to thick vegetation or other barriers at the stem base, nor trees belonging to a group or neighbouring property. Tag numbers form the basis of the identification system used in the survey schedule. Tree ID numbering in the schedule (T1, T2 etc.) may not reflect any previous documentation.

2.3 Trees were grouped where individual identification was neither feasible nor useful. These trees typically share a taxonomic or spatial connection. Marked trees may remain as part of the group in which they are located for the purposes of reference while being assigned a different work priority or recommendation.

Quantified Tree Risk Assessment

2.4 After the mapping of target areas the surveyor will have walked each site, not necessarily with the intention of inspecting or surveying all parts or all sides of every tree but to take a general overview looking for signs of substantial defects which might be significant relative to the targets. These would then be further investigated and their defects recorded.

2.5 The level of detail at which trees were inspected was guided by target appraisal. This involved assessing trees on approach before undertaking a closer examination in line with recognised Visual Tree Assessment principles and may have included the use of binoculars, probe and mallet. Where necessary, the tree or branch was then considered in terms of both size and probability of failure. Values derived from the assessment of these three components (target range, size and probability of failure) were combined to calculate the risk of that harm occurring. This risk of harm for all combinations of these three ranges has been calculated using Monte Carlo simulations. The QTRA

risk of harm is the mean value from each set of Monte Carlo results. For an overview of the Monte Carlo simulation method, please refer to http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Monte_Carlo_method

2.6 Target assessment was based on the average estimated occupancy of any area under trees during a typical 24 hour period throughout the next eighteen months, derived from observations made on site such as footpaths & desire lines, compaction, access, current type of use, etc.

2.7 Once the calculation for risk of harm was completed, remedial works may have been specified to reduce that risk to more tolerable levels. For the purposes of this survey, a tolerable risk of harm, where that risk is imposed on an unwitting public and is judged to be **as low as reasonably practicable** (ALARP), is accepted to range from less than one in ten thousand (< 1 in 10k) to one in one million (1 in 1M), in keeping with industry, National Tree Safety Group and HSE guidelines. Risks less than one in one million (<1 in 1M) are judged to be broadly acceptable.

2.8 These works were subsequently assigned a work priority based on their risk of harm, ensuring that the most significant risks are to be reduced first. Tree hazards that were found to present a more acceptable risk were given a lower priority. Implementation of works recommended remains at the discretion of the site manager.

Works priority ratings have been assessed as follows: -

Risk of harm	Works priority	Degree of urgency	To be completed~
>1 in 1k	**1 - Unacceptable risk of harm**	**Requiring immediate action ***	**within 7 days or as advised**
<1 in 1k to 1 in 10k	**2 - Significant risk of harm**	**Requiring swift Action**	**within 2 months**
<1 in 10k to 1 in 60k	**3 - Tolerable risk of harm**	**Important management**	**within 6 months**
<1 in 60k to 1 in 1M	**4 – Tolerable to broadly acceptable**	**General management, as budget allows ******	**Within 9 months**
<1 in 1M	**5 - Broadly acceptable**		**As recommended**

* Notification of these trees would have been given directly to the person instructing this report on the day the survey was carried out. This date can be found on the cover page.

Recommended works in priorities 1 & 2 may be deemed necessary in order to discharge the duty of care owed by tree owners to the general public and other users of their land under the Occupier's

Liability Act 1984. Recommended works in priority 3 & 4 may be required to ensure the risks are ALARP.

**These categories exist to inform of potential defects which may worsen over time. As the risks decrease to the broadly acceptable threshold of 1 in 1M they may only require demonstration that the risks are ALARP, i.e. they are at a point where the cost of mitigatory work disproportionately outweighs an insignificant risk.

2.9 The categories are a guide for what is in effect a sliding scale. For example, a risk of harm at the upper end of works priority 3 may be treated similarly to those at the lower end of works priority 2.

2.10 Contained in the schedule are also general management recommendations considered by the surveyor significant enough to be worthy of mention. Whilst of lower priority at present, if these works were completed sooner, consequently greater expenses might be avoided as the defects deteriorate. It may be considered prudent to undertake these works proactively as funds become available, so minimising the urgency and expense of remedial works. In addition to reducing risks associated with tree failure, general management of tree stocks, carried out to British Standard 3998:2010 Tree work - Recommendations, may improve the structural form of trees, increasing their aesthetic value and prolonging their use for shading, wildlife and air cooling.

3 Future management

Survey frequency

3.1 A walkover assessment of trees is recommended to be repeated every eighteen months, unless any identifiable problems or noticeable defects appear, in which case professional arboricultural advice should be sought. It may often be beneficial to inspect the trees in late summer or early autumn when most decay fungus fruit bodies are to be found.

Planting

3.2 Opportunities exist on these sites to increase diversity by planting a wider variety of trees and plants which will in turn encourage a more complete ecosystem capable of co-existence with their environment. To maintain an ongoing tree stock, we advise replacement planting if ever a tree is removed. In fact, this is a requirement for any protected trees. Whether a native species to encourage wildlife, or more unusual species to make an impact; a smaller tree as a focal point or a larger specimen as an architectural statement, we would be pleased to offer guidance on selection, planting and aftercare, this latter being the most important part of the process.

3.3 In order to ensure the continuation and sustainability of the tree population, planting and establishment works may be given precedence over - without replacing - the lowest priority tree works, when organising budgets.

4 Site summary

Site visit

4.1 Jonathan Urwin, arboriculturist for Ravencroft Tree Services Ltd., undertook the assessment of the trees for Foulden Parish Council during a visit on 7th October 2026.

Site descriptions

4.2 The village hall & recreation ground lie at the eastern end of Foulden village, on either side of Vicarage Road. The recreation ground is bound on three sides by private residences, although along most of its east boundary grows a heavily wooded private garden. Across the village hall boundaries east, south and west are agricultural fields. Both sites have public access and appear to be well maintained and popular. Trees on the recreation ground stand around its edges while at the village hall they are mainly grouped about the eastern portion of the grounds. Beyond the ditch here is an area of rough ground which appears to be usually wet. In this area are a number of standing dead trees, which all appear to have died relatively recently and suddenly. The cause for this isn't obvious but likely to be an environmental change rather than a pathogen, as the species affected are diverse. Such rapid decline and death of trees is most often caused by the demise of their root systems.

General assessment and recommendations

4.3 There is a range of ages and developmental stages of trees on these two sites consisting of naturalised species. Visually, the trees are important and can easily be viewed by the public from beyond the site boundaries. Although the structural and physiological conditions of the trees vary a little, most have been assessed as fair to good.

4.4 Possible risk of harm changes across the areas surveyed, dependant as it is on how frequently any area within failing distance of trees is occupied (target range) and how likely it is that a tree should fail (probability of failure). Vicarage road and any buildings have been identified as slightly higher target value. Other areas have been recorded by degrees in lower ranges. By their nature static targets often give rise to a proportionately higher risk of harm than moving ones, which occupy spaces for less time. In addition to occupancy levels, approximate repair costs of property may also have been considered.

4.5 Any works recommended are expected to be carried out by fully qualified arboricultural contractors to British Standard 3998:2010 Tree work – Recommendations, where applicable. The sites'

aesthetic depends on their trees' good conditions and forms, so careful works of a high standard are particularly important.

4.6 Some of the trees carry dead wood yet may not appear in the survey schedule. Clearly the cost of removing all dead wood from the trees' crowns may be prohibitive and unnecessary, therefore only instances with a higher probability of failure and / or larger pieces likely to contact a target need be considered. Deadwood removal may be undertaken at any time and from any tree to reduce risk of harm and inexpensively discharge some of the duty of care imposed by the Occupier's Liability Act. This can be done from the ground with the appropriate PPE and subject to a risk assessment. Either a pole with a hook fixed to the end or a strong nylon line with a small, weighted bag can be used. The bag with line attached can be thrown over the dead branch and both ends of the line pulled to break the branch at a point nearer to its union with live wood. This activity may be carried out at intervals and a record kept of trees cleared of the most likely deadwood to fail over a target. This record will provide proof of an effective system which may be used as part of any defence against the possibility of a claim.

4.7 Some of the trees are ivy clad. This provides valuable habitat for wildlife but can prevent full inspection, hiding defects and adding weight to a tree's structure. If care is taken to avoid damaging tree bark, the job may be relatively easily achieved with minimal expense. Ivy removal should be carried out using a handsaw only, at least six months before an inspection to allow it to die back sufficiently for the tree to be effectively inspected. Sometimes the ivy may not completely die, in which case a recommendation *may* be made in future surveys to remove it from the crown entirely.

4.8 Of the trees clear of vegetation and fully inspected, none were calculated to fall outside the level of risk generally accepted by HSE and industry standards as tolerable. Recommended works fall into the category of general management and as such may be carried out within the suggested timeframes, in priority order as budget restrictions allow.

Appendix: 1



Tree ID	Tag no.	Tree species	Life stage	EPS habitat potential	Height (m)	Stem dia. (mm)	General observations	Most likely failure	Target range	Size range	Probability of failure	Risk of harm	Recommended works	Works priority	To be completed
T3	139	Ash	Semi mature	Low	10	300	Cavity @ base W side. Possible root decay, tree leans over the road. *Grifola frondosa* at base N	Root shear	3	2	4	1 in 1M	Fell to near ground level	4	within 9 months
T1	391				18	450	Dead wood in crown over parking	Dead wood	4	P		< 1 in 1M	Remove dead wood from over the parking	5	by next survey due date
G1	N/a				to 21	380 avg.	Ivy prevents full inspection	N/a	3	N/a			Remove ivy to 2m up stem, using handsaw only, & reinspect		as part of general management
T2	140		Early mature	Low / medium	20	520	Large cavity W @ 1.2m with internal decay to 2m. Good reaction wood & secondary thickening. Dead wood in crown	Stem fracture	4	1	4	< 1 in 1M	Monitor for splits & cracks after strong winds & condition at next survey		
T4	141			Low	17	520 & 540	Twin stem tree, significant decay @ base. In terminal decline, *Cerioporus squamosus* on lower stem, dysfunctional cambium to 1m	Stem base fracture			3		Retain for habitat		
G2	N/a	Various		Low / medium	to 16	to 580	All trees in this area have died relatively recently, without apparent cause	Root shear							
T5	145	Whitebeam	Semi mature	Low	6	120 x 2	Tree is now near dead		4	3	4		Fell to near ground & plant suitable replacement		
T6	343	Cherry	Early mature		16	350, 180 & 280	Multi stem tree in decline	Dead wood	5	4	3				

There are, at the time of this survey, no trees within range of targets which are considered to present a significant risk of harm, i.e. a risk of 1:10,000 or greater

All works recommended are expected to be carried out by fully qualified arboricultural contractors to British Standard 3998:2010 Tree work - Recommendations

Next survey due date;- April 2028

PROJECT
Foulden village hall

TITLE
Tree location plan

SCALE
Not to scale, drawn @ A4

DATE SURVEYED
7th October 2026

DRAWN BY
J.U.

PROJECT NUMBER
FPC/TLP/91026

DRAWING NUMBER
002

RAVENCROFT TREE SERVICES LIMITED.

6 Reepham Road, Foulsham
Dereham, Norfolk NR20 5SL
Tel/Fax: 01362 684291
Email: jon@ravencrofttrees.co.uk

Ravencroft Tree Services Ltd. is registered at Summer Hill House, Fakenham, NR21 9HA No.4936062
The original of this drawing was produced in colour, monochrome copies may be unreliable
This plan is not to be scaled from - all dimensions to be checked
https://ravencrofttrees.co.uk/consultancy/terms-and-conditions/

Appendix: 2



Survey schedule

Tree ID	Tag no.	Tree species	Life stage	EPS habitat potential	Height (m)	Stem dia. (mm)	General observations	Most likely failure	Target range	Size range	Probability of failure	Risk of harm	Recommended works	Works priority	To be completed
T8	N/a	Unknown	Early mature	Low / medium	17	450 est.	Standing dead tree with very heavy ivy cover, within reach of mown path	Root shear	5	1	3	< 1 in 1M	Fell to near ground	5	by next survey due date
T7	147	Sycamore	Semi mature	Low	16	580	Included bark in primary union @ 2.5m, possible inactive lesions below that	Primary union shear	3	P	5		Monitor for splits after strong wind & at next survey		as part of general management
G3	N/a	Elm			8	250	These trees standing dead, in bramble at field edge	Root shear	4	2	4		Retain for habitat		

There are, at the time of this survey, no trees within range of targets which are considered to present a significant risk of harm, i.e. a risk of 1:10,000 or greater

All works recommended are expected to be carried out by fully qualified arboricultural contractors to British Standard 3998:2010 Tree work - Recommendations

Next survey due date;- April 2028

PROJECT
Foulden recreation ground

TITLE
Tree location plan

SCALE
Not to scale, drawn @ A4

DATE SURVEYED
7th October 2026

DRAWN BY
J.U.

PROJECT NUMBER
FPC/TLP/91026

DRAWING NUMBER
002

RAVENCROFT TREE SERVICES LIMITED.

6 Reepham Road, Foulsham
Dereham, Norfolk NR20 5SL
Tel/Fax: 01362 684291
Email: jon@ravencrofttrees.co.uk

Ravencroft Tree Services Ltd. is registered at Summer Hill House, Fakenham, NR21 9HA No.4936062
The original of this drawing was produced in colour, monochrome copies may be unreliable
This plan is not to be scaled from - all dimensions to be checked
https://ravencrofttrees.co.uk/consultancy/terms-and-conditions/

Survey schedule key

The survey schedule details the data taken of trees with significant defects. Below is an example with an explanation of its components.

Probability of failure within 12 months

Range	Ratio	Range	Ratio
1	1/1-1/10	4	1/1k->10k
2	1/10->1/100	5	1/10K->100k
3	1/100->1/1000	6	1/100k-1/1m

Size of part

1	>450mm Ø
2	450-260mm Ø
3	250-110mm Ø
4	100-25mm Ø
P	Applies to property

Alphanumeric reference

Defines the relative stage of a tree's development within the environment as follows: overall Life Expectancy (LE)
Young - <10% LE
Semi Mature – 11-30% LE
Early mature – 31 – 60%
Mature – 61-100% LE;
Over Mature - >100% LE.

The likelihood that any part of the tree is used by European protected species

The risk of harm presented is the mean value from each set of Monte Carlo results. – see 2.5 of the main text

An explanation of work priorities is given in the main text

Tree ID	Tag no.	Tree species	Life stage	EPS habitat potential	Height (m)	Stem dia. (mm)	General observations	Most likely failure	Target range	Size range	Probability of failure	Risk of harm	Recommended works	Works priority	To be completed
G2	17	Elm	Semi mature	Low	13	N/A	Heavy ivy cover, standing dead trees along boundary	Root shear	3	P	4	1 in 300k	Fell to near ground level	**4**	within 9 months
T4	238	Ash	Mature	Medium	21	1100	Old pruning wounds in crown, ivy up stem	Branch shear	3	1	5	< 1 in 1M	Remove ivy using handsaw only. Monitor for splits & cracks after high winds	**5**	as part of general management

Stem diameter is measured at 1.3m from ground level or at the narrowest point below an irregularity or low fork

Comments may include details of any identified structural defects, notes on form and location.

This does not preclude other defects or failures but forms the base upon which the risk of harm calculation is based

An overview for these figures is outlined in sub section 2.5 of the main report. 'P' denotes property as target

Recommendations include any work specifications necessary to reduce the calculated risk of harm to a tolerable/broadly acceptable level

Timed from receipt of this schedule

Target ranges

Target range	Property value	Pedestrian frequency	Vehicle frequency per day	Value (probability of occupation or fraction of £2M - value of statistical life)
1	Very high £2M - >£200k	**Occupation:** constant - 2.5hrs/day **Pedestrians & cyclists:** 720/hr - 73/hr	26,000-2700 vehicles @ 110kph (68mph)	1/1 - >1/10
			32,000-3300 vehicles @ 80kph (50mph)	
			47,000-4800 vehicles @ 50kph (32mph)	
2	High £200k - >£20k	**Occupation:** 2.4hrs/day - 15mins/day **Pedestrians & cyclists:** 72/hr - 8/hr	26,00-270 vehicles @ 110kph (68mph)	1/10 - >1/100
			32,00-330 vehicles @ 80kph (50mph)	
			47,00-480 vehicles @ 50kph (32mph)	
3	Moderate high £20k - >£2000	**Occupation:** 14/day - 2mins/day **Pedestrians & cyclists:** 7/hr - 2/hr	260-27 vehicles @ 110kph (68mph)	1/100 - >1/1,000
			320-33 vehicles @ 80kph (50mph)	
			470-48 vehicles @ 50kph (32mph)	
4	Moderate £2000 - >£200	**Occupation:** 1min/day - 2mins/week **Pedestrians & cyclists:** 1/hr - 3/day	26-4 vehicles @ 110kph (68mph)	1/1,000 - > 1/10,000
			32-4 vehicles @ 80kph (50mph)	
			47-6 vehicles @ 50kph (32mph)	
5	Low £200 - >£20	**Occupation:** 1min/week - 1min/month **Pedestrians & cyclists:** 2day - 2/week	3-1 vehicles @ 110kph (68mph)	1/10,000 - >1/100,000
			3-1 vehicles @ 80kph (50mph)	
			5-1 vehicles @ 50kph (32mph)	
6	Very low £20 - £1	**Occupation:** <1min/month **Pedestrians & cyclists:** 1/week - 6/year	None	1/100,000 - 1/1,000,000

Vehicle, pedestrian & property targets are categorised by their frequency of use or their monetary value. The probability of a vehicle or pedestrian occupying a target area in, for example, target range 4 is between the upper and lower limits of >1/1,000 and 1/10,000. Using the value of statistical life (VOSL) of £2,000,000 the property repair or replacement value for target range 4 is £2,000 - £200

Quantified Tree Risk Assessment

A Non-technical Summary

Tree safety management is about limiting the risk of harm from tree failure while maintaining the benefits conferred by trees. Although it may seem counter-intuitive, the condition of trees should not necessarily be the first consideration. Instead, tree managers should first take account of the usage of the land on and around which the trees stand, and this in turn will inform the process of assessing the trees.

The Quantified Tree Risk Assessment (QTRA) method applies established and accepted risk management principles to tree safety management. Firstly, the targets (people and property) onto which trees could fail are assessed and quantified, thus enabling tree managers to determine whether they need to assess trees and to what degree of rigour an assessment or inspection of the trees is required. Where necessary, a tree or branch is then considered in terms of both its size (potential impact) and probability of failure. Values derived from the assessment of these three components (target, size and probability of failure) are combined to calculate a risk of harm within the coming year. The year is simply a convenient time-frame over which to measure the risk and does not in itself infer that the risk should be re-assessed annually; rather the frequency of re-assessment should be informed by the level of risk and the characteristics of the tree population and land-use.

The quantification of risk is not the only consideration when managing tree safety. The financial cost of reducing the risk and the potential loss of the many benefits from trees should be accounted for when making risk management decisions. By quantifying the risks we can more readily assess this balance.

The method moves the management of tree safety away from labelling trees as either ‘safe’ or ‘unsafe’ and requiring definitive statements of tree safety from either tree surveyors or tree managers. Instead, QTRA quantifies the risk of harm from tree failure in a way that enables tree managers to account for the various costs and benefits of risk reduction and operate to pre-determined risk thresholds. Using a traffic light system of colour coding the risk from trees, we have simplified the decision making process for tree owners and tree managers. For more information on the QTRA method and the decision making process, download the QTRA Practice Note, which is available in eight languages and seventeen country-specific versions.

Green	**Broadly Acceptable**	Do nothing.
Yellow	**Tolerable**	Do nothing, unless you expect the risk to increase significantly before the next assessment. The benefits conferred by the tree will usually outweigh the risk.
Amber	**Tolerable**	Reduce the risk unless there is broad stakeholder agreement to retain it.
Red	**Unacceptable**	Reduce the risk.

Quantified Tree Risk Assessment Ltd.
9 Lowe Street
Macclesfield
Cheshire
SK11 7NJ
United Kingdom

www.qtra.co.uk

Tree ID	Tag No.	Issue	Action	Timescale
T3	139	Cavity@base W Side, possible root decay, tree leans over road	Fell to near ground level	By June 2027
G2	17	Heavy Ivy cover standing dead trees along boundary	Fell to near ground level	By June 2027
T1	391	Dead wood in crown over parking area	Remove dead wood	By next survey
T8		Standing dead tree with very heavy ivy cover within reach of mown path	Fell to near ground	By next survey
G1		Ivy prevents full inspection	Remove ivy to 2m up stem - with handsaw	
T5	145	Tree is now near dead	Fell to near ground and plant suitable replacement	
T6	343	Multi stem tree in decline	Fell to near ground and plant suitable replacement	
T4	238	Old pruning wounds in crown, ivy up stem	Remove ivy to 2m up stem - with handsaw	