

Arboricultural Assessment of Jellicoe House, Hedge End, SO30 2AF

Carried out by Matthew Rowden on behalf of HRG Tree Surgeons for Mike Netley, contracts manager and correspondent for the above address.

2 Furzedown house, Furzedown road, Kings Somborne, SO20 6QL
email: rowdentreeconsultants@gmail.com
07483135349



Contents

1. Title page
2. Contents
3. Instruction
4. Limitations
5. Site details
6. Proposals
7. Drawings and documents
8. Legal restrictions
9. Summary
10. Findings
11. Conclusion
12. Recommendations
13. References
14. Appendices 1 (tree survey schedule - separate document), 2 (tree location plan).

3. Instruction

This report is to survey all trees on the site (>75mm DBH) for the potential to cause damage and/or harm for insurance and liability. I refer to the current guidance set out within NTSG Common sense risk management of trees 2011 to enable the occupier of the property to have discharged their duty of care.

The risks that I have assessed are: Likelihood of damage to property (indirect or contact), tree failure through structures, and personal harm or injury. I have been instructed by Mike Netley from HRG Tree Surgeons, on behalf of Scandor Landscapes who represent the management company, Glidefern Property Management Ltd.

4. Limitations

This survey is valid for 5 years (adhering to the guidance set out in NTSG 2011). I must be kept in direct supervision of the site at all times in regards to all arboricultural matters in order for the findings in this report to remain valid.

The site was inspected using the VTA method as outlined in Mattheck and Breloer 1994. No detailed decay detection has been carried out.

No soil analysis has been carried out: assumptions have been made based on data from the BGS, and the species that grow in that area.

5. Site details

The site is a 3Ha plot of land with one main structure on it. The car park is to the S aspect of the structure and is overhung by offsite trees. The area is densely wooded to the South, East and West aspects of the structure, with a large proportion of big trees around the site. The trees surveyed are trees within the boundaries of the site and those that overhang the car park that could constitute a safety concern.

6. Legal restrictions

None of the trees on the footprint of the site are covered, but the trees overhanging the car park to the South West aspect are covered by a blanket TPO, ref 114:E.

7. Proposals

This report aims to establish whether the trees require work within the next 5 years, 1 year, critically (as soon as reasonably practicable), or no work whatsoever. It aims to discharge the duty of care that the landowner has to ensure that their trees are as safe as reasonably practicable, and to instil a cyclic formal re-inspection schedule every 5 years in line with NTSG common sense risk management of trees 2011. Based on the target area of the site, the records of this report must be kept with the site manager, and the next date for a formal inspection is May 2029.

Informal observations may be taken annually by site managers, visiting arboriculturists, and onsite staff.

8. Drawings and documents

The client has not provided drawings and documents for the purposes of this assessment. I have obtained one from Ordnance survey and have annotated the trees on the map.

9. Summary

The majority of the trees on the site are young, newly planted specimens that fall into the category of young or early mature. They do not constitute a safety concern, and remedial work is only necessary to bring these trees up to a standard where high sided vehicle access is possible. The majority of the recommendations are crown lifting, with two trees recommended for felling due to their structural defects that will cause issues in the future.

There are significant threats posed by the offsite trees to the SW aspect with dead wood over the carpark, and 1 tree that has lost one of its three stems and constitutes a critical safety concern.

10. Findings (please see appendix 1 for specific details)

Trees for removal:

- i. Trees 10 and 12 require felling.

- ii. Tree 10 is an offsite poplar tree that has lost one of its three main stems at ground level, with the root plate having heaved. This has entailed around a 50% loss in anchorage of the remaining stem, with a strong canopy bias over the car park.
- iii. The species is, by its nature, brittle and susceptible to wind throw. The target area of the site makes its retention not viable, and the priority to be critical (action as soon as feasibly possible). Within the densely wooded area, a replacement is not necessary.
- iv. T12 is a dead birch tree that is only within the young category. It overhangs the carpark area and will inevitably fail, causing damage to the cars or the people that use it. No replacement is necessary

Trees requiring pruning

- v. Trees 5, 6, 11, G13, G14, & WG15 require crown lifting over the car park area to allow adequate clearance for high sided vehicles.

Trees requiring deadwood/ hanging limb removal

- vi. Trees 2, 11 and WG15 require deadwood or hanging limb removal.
- vii. Deadwood can have a considerably weakened tensile and compressive strength (over 70%), and can fail in light winds. The pieces of deadwood in these trees are big enough for dead limb failure to pose a significant risk.

11. Conclusion:

The majority of trees on the site are low value trees that are still newly established. The main threats are presented by offsite trees contained within WG15 that are council owned. It is the responsibility of the tree owner/duty holders to ensure that these trees are maintained adequately, not the managers of Jellicoe House. The onsite trees do not present much, if any, significant risk (bar tree 12).

However, tree 10 does present an immediate and critical risk, and its felling is essential to maintain the safety of the site: it is an offsite tree and therefore my clients are not the duty holders.

12. Recommendations

1. Follow the recommendations paragraph within appendix 1.
2. Formal re-inspection by May 2029 of all trees. Annual informal inspections by your arboricultural contractor are advised to monitor the condition of the trees (any loss of canopy, vitality, or structural damage). The records of this inspection and the annual informal inspections (these may be verbal) are to be kept within the site office. The responsibility of storing these records rests with the estate manager.



Matthew Rowden *ABC ProfDipArb L6, BTEC NatDipArb L3*

14. References

- a. Cutler & Richardson 1981, Kew root survey.
- b. BS3998:2010
- c. Structural Features Related to Tree Crotch Strength by Robert W. Farrell
- d. Tree Pulling Tests of Large Shade Trees in the Genus Acer, Brian Kane and Peggi Clouston
- e. Modern Arboriculture, Alex Shigo
- f. The body language of trees, Dr Claus Mattheck
- g. Failure mode and the prediction of the strength of branch attachments, Kane et al. 2008
- h. Does included bark reduce the strength of co-dominant stems? Smiley 2003
- i. Towards a new model of branch attachment Slater D. and Harbinson C. 2010
- j. De mystifying tree forks, vices and virtues of forks in arboriculture. Slater D. 2020
- k. Determining the mechanical properties of hazel forks by testing their component parts, Slater D. 2013.
- l. Plant Biomechanics, Karl Niklas
- a. NTSG Common sense risk management of trees 2011.
- b. BS8454: 2014

Appendix 1 - Tree survey schedule (separate document)

Appendix 2: Tree location plan (separate document)