

**ROOTS &  
SHOOTS**

Professional Tree Inspector



The Stables, Hargate Hill Lane, Charlesworth, SK135HG

Rootsandshootsmanchester.com

Tree condition survey

Location of trees

7 Vineyard Leymoor Road, Golcar, Huddersfield, HD7 4RN

On instructions of:

Helena Carlton

7 Vineyard Leymoor Road, Golcar, Huddersfield, HD7 4RN

Date of site visit: 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2026

Report Date: 24th March 2026

(Roots and Shoots Tree Surveys Limited)

Jason Isherwood HND, M Arbor A, PTI, TRAQ, Bond Solon Expert Witness.

## Contents

Instruction	3
Survey Methodology	4
Tree Survey Summary	5
Site Survey Location	7
Work Schedule of Trees	8
Recommendations Summary	8
Tree Survey Risk Report	14
Site Photos	17
Implementation of Works	22
Statutory Wildlife Obligations	22
Trees Subject to Statutory controls	22
Disclaimers	24
Appendix 1 – Tree Risk Rating Plans (TRAQ)	25
Appendix 2 Tree risk -v- tree Management best practices	27
Appendix 3 Reasons for survey and any works listed	28
Appendix 4 Bibliography	33
Appendix 5 TRAQ Risk Categorisation – Glossary and Methodology	35

## **Instruction**

Roots and Shoots Tree Surveys Limited, acting on instruction from Helena Carlton, 7 Vineyard Leymoor Road, Golcar, Huddersfield, HD7 4RN commissioned Roots and Shoots Tree Surveys Limited (Jason Isherwood) to undertake a ground-level tree condition.

The findings are presented in this report and include a schedule of the tree/group recorded, a risk-based schedule of recommended works (using the ISA TRAQ framework), and a site plan showing the approximate location and reference of each tree. The full schedules and plans are contained in the appendices.

1. This report is based on my site observations and the information provided, and I have come to conclusions in the light of my experience. I have 13 years of experience in arboriculture and 29 years in horticulture. I have a HND Horticulture, several CS certs, LANTRA Professional Tree Inspector and International Society of Arboriculture TRAQ Tree Risk Assessment Qualification supported by the ISA Credentialing Council. I am an associate member of the Institute of Chartered Foresters, and I am also a professional member of the Arboricultural Association M Arbor A. I am a Bond Solon-trained Expert Witness, holding the Cardiff University Expert Witness Certificate.
2. The advice in this report is underwritten by our professional indemnity insurance to the sum of one million pounds sterling in every claim which covers Jason Isherwood's Tree Consultancy (Roots and Shoots Tree Surveys Limited).

## Survey Methodology

3. Initially, a site map locating each tree/group and making observations concerning physiological, structural, and overall condition is constructed. This plan of the map is for illustrative purposes only and it should not be used for directly scaling measurements. On larger sites a separate map is sent to enlarge the area and make the trees more visible.
4. The limit of the survey is from ground level only and is based on visual observation only; the only tools used are a probe, a Thor sounding hammer, Digital rangefinder (SLRF600), and binoculars. Any defects in the tree are listed along with recommendations of remedial work. Each recommended tree work item is accompanied by an appropriate target timescale. This timescale is not a guarantee of safety regarding any part of the tree failing. Whether a tree is sound or weak, in windy conditions the sail effect can exceed the viable strength and flex of the tree to the point of failure.
5. Method: The survey was undertaken on a full recording basis within the defined inspection zone. All trees within the defined survey zones were inspected from ground level. Trees are listed in the schedule where, at the time of inspection, they met the agreed intervention thresholds and therefore require works, monitoring, access controls and/or asset protection measures.
6. Scope Statement: Except were listed as action trees/groups, no actionable defects were observed that would justify intervention at this time. This does not imply the absence of minor defects or future change. Recommendations are proportionate to site risk, current tree condition and target occupancy.
7. QA and Duty of Care: Survey coverage is evidenced by route mapping and time-stamped notes; a sample of “no-action” areas was subject to internal QA. Re-inspection intervals and trigger events are set out in the tree survey risk report.

8. The method of risk assessment is called TRAQ (Tree Risk Assessment Qualification), an industry-standard system supported by the International Society of Arboriculture. The methodology is as follows:
9. Make observations and record any parts of the tree that have the potential of failure and could impact any of the targets.
10. Establish the likelihood of failure within a certain timeframe of a tree or parts of a tree as either, Imminent, probable, possible, or improbable.
11. Establish what type of targets there are: static, movable or mobile targets and approximate the occupancy rate of the targets as either, Constant, Occasional, Frequent, or Rare.
12. Establish the likelihood within a certain timeframe of a tree failure impacting a target. This is done using the ISA Matrix 1, Likelihood matrix, using likelihood of failure and likelihood of impact.
13. Assess the consequences of failure which are, Severe, Significant, Minor, Negligible.
14. Finally, we use Matrix 2, Risk rating matrix using likelihood of failure and impact combined with consequences of failure to establish a risk rating of Extreme, High, Moderate, Low.

### **How to read the Work Schedule**

Inspect Period refers to the recommended re-inspection interval. Timescale refers to the target date by which the recommended work should be completed.

### **Tree Survey Summary**

15. On the 23rd March 2026, the survey was carried out at 7 Vineyard Leymoor Road, Golcar, Huddersfield, HD74RN. The inspection focus for this instruction was all of the established trees onsite that were sufficient size to pose a risk if a defect were noted.

16. The following require intervention:

- High risk – 1 tree

17. The work is listed on the table under recommendations.
18. A full table listing of the trees/groups recorded can be found in the details of tree inspection under Appendix 1. A colour code symbol is included for ease of cross reference.
19. To ensure that trees onsite are monitored and assessed properly it is necessary that they are assessed for risk on a set cycle of inspection. It is normal for most trees in this context to have an annual (12-month) inspection cycle or it can be 18 months depending on the site, with extra inspections after high winds.
20. Report images sometimes have red arrows indicating where dead wood is or other faults and failures. This is only a guide and does not mean that all the dead wood, faults or failures are highlighted with red arrows.

## Site Location



7RAS/TC/2026/100 7 Vineyard Leymoor Road, Golcar, Huddersfield, HD74RN

## **Work Schedule of Trees**

To maintain clarity in the recommended works programme, the works are presented in descending order of priority. The programmed timeframes are urgent, within three months, within six months, and within one year. On the site plan these categories are colour coded as follows: urgent or dead is shown in black, within three months in red, within six months in amber, and within one year in green. Where target value, occupancy, or vulnerability is higher, the recommended timeframe may be shortened to reflect the increased level of risk.

## **Recommendations summary**

23. This section orders the work involved in two priorities namely the degree of work involved and the risk ranking of each tree/group. Where clarity is needed these works can be listed as Necessary for tree risk mitigation, Necessary for asset protection, Optional but advisable, and Optional. However, the burden of proof will be weighted on the risk rating of High, Moderate and Low, and on the condition of either good, fair or poor.

## **Tree Summary**

### **T001 – Sycamore (*Acer pseudoplatanus*)**

T001 is an early mature sycamore approximately 13m in height with an average crown radius of 6m and a stem diameter of 70cm. The tree is located in close proximity to a dwelling, with the principal target being the adjacent house and its constantly occupied curtilage. The tree is in Fair overall condition, but it exhibits a combination of basal defects, restricted rooting conditions, stem lean, and asymmetric crown loading which are materially relevant to structural stability and risk management.

## **Condition Summary**

The tree shows a range of defects and indicators of dysfunction concentrated at the base and lower stem. The rooting environment is significantly restricted by a surrounding wall on three sides

for approximately 270 degrees of the lower root plate, with the wall standing close to the trunk at between approximately 0.4m and 1.4m. There is significant displacement of the garden wall, recorded as BRE Category 5 damage, indicating substantial and prolonged root pressure within a confined rooting environment.

At the base of the tree there is visible stress response growth, suggesting adaptive growth in response to mechanical stress and/or dysfunction. Several wounds are present around the basal stem, some of which are not fully occluded, although partial occlusion is occurring. Probe testing at the base penetrated to approximately 300mm and was accompanied by the release of discoloured sap, which is consistent with dysfunctional or decayed internal tissue. Acoustic sounding produced a hollow resonance, indicating likely internal voiding and/or loss of sound wood within the lower stem.

Additional observations include woodlice at the base, two embedded copper nails within one wound area, and several historic pruning wounds, including two that remain unoccluded and exhibit signs of associated decay adjacent to the main stem. The trunk exhibits a lean toward the south-east, and the crown is asymmetrically weighted toward the dwelling. Ivy is present on the stem and partially obscures the bark surface, although it is not the principal defect. A bird's nest was also noted within the crown.

Taken cumulatively, these features indicate a tree with a compromised basal condition and a credible reduction in structural reliability in the part of the tree most relevant to whole-tree stability.

### **Site Hazards and Constraints**

The tree stands in a constrained domestic setting immediately adjacent to a residential structure. The main target is the dwelling, with an occupancy level properly regarded as constant. This significantly increases the importance of any structural defect because the likelihood of occupation within the potential failure zone is high.

The site is further constrained by the close proximity of boundary walling around much of the stem base, which has restricted normal root flare development and appears to have influenced both root architecture and future inspection access. The crown is biased toward the dwelling and the stem lean is in a similar direction, increasing concern regarding the consequences of failure should basal instability progress.

The recorded bird's nest is also a material site constraint, requiring works to be timed and implemented in accordance with wildlife legislation and subject to checks for active nesting before operations commence.

### **Risk Context**

From a risk assessment perspective, the relevant concern is not simply the presence of defects, but the interaction between observable structural weaknesses, target occupancy, and likely consequences.

There is a credible likelihood of failure associated with the base and lower stem given the combination of restricted rooting, pronounced wall displacement, stress response growth, basal wounds, probable internal decay, hollow acoustic response, lean, and asymmetric loading toward the principal target. While the observations do not on their own quantify the precise residual wall thickness, they do establish a reasonable arboricultural basis for concern regarding the structural integrity of the lower stem and root buttress region.

The likelihood of impact is elevated because the target is a dwelling and associated domestic space with constant occupancy. The foreseeable consequences of whole-tree or basal stem failure include significant property damage and a realistic risk of serious harm.

In that context, a Moderate risk rating is reasonable and proportionate. The tree does not necessarily exhibit features requiring classification as an immediate emergency at the time of inspection, but it does present a level of risk that, in this setting, is not reasonably ignored or left to routine monitoring alone.

## **Recommendations**

Recommended management: remove T001.

This recommendation is based on the cumulative significance of the defects observed rather than on any one feature in isolation. The principal concern relates to the structural integrity of the basal stem and lower supporting structure, in combination with a high-value target and constant occupancy.

Removal is considered proportionate because:

- the most significant defects are located at the base of the tree, where failure would be critical;
- there is evidence consistent with decay, hollowing, and compromised structural wood;
- the rooting environment is restricted and abnormal;
- the tree leans and is asymmetrically weighted toward the dwelling; and
- lesser interventions, such as crown pruning, would not satisfactorily address the underlying uncertainty regarding basal stability.

On the evidence available, retention would require acceptance of a residual risk that is difficult to justify in this location. Removal therefore represents the most reliable and proportionate mitigation measure.

## **Immediate / Priority Works**

The tree should be scheduled for removal within 6 months. This timeframe is appropriate to the current observed condition and risk context, provided no further deterioration becomes evident before works are undertaken.

Before works proceed, the crown should be checked for active nesting birds. If an active nest is present, works must be delayed or otherwise managed in accordance with applicable wildlife legislation and ecological advice as necessary.

Pending removal, the tree should be kept under observation for any signs of progression, including fresh cracking, soil or root plate movement, increased lean, bark separation, or sudden deterioration in crown condition. Should such symptoms arise, the urgency of works should be reviewed immediately.

### **Professional Opinion**

In my professional opinion, the recommendation to remove T001 is objective, proportionate, and defensible. It is not based on an overly precautionary approach, nor on the existence of minor defects alone, but on a combination of factors that collectively indicate a materially elevated structural concern in a high-occupancy setting.

A risk-based approach in keeping with TRAQ principles requires consideration of the likelihood of failure, the likelihood of impact, and the severity of foreseeable consequences. In this case, the defect profile at the base of the tree, together with the presence of a constantly occupied dwelling within the likely impact zone, makes continued retention difficult to justify without exposing the client to an avoidable level of risk.

Although the tree is not assessed as requiring immediate emergency action on the day of inspection, removal within a defined short-term period is, in my view, the most appropriate and proportionate management response. This recommendation is therefore consistent with good arboricultural practice and with a reasoned, balanced approach to tree risk management.

## Replacement approach

Replant with trees of an appropriate mature size for the location, properly spaced to allow full crown development and avoid future suppression. The following are suitable candidates for high amenity value in constrained/edge-of-footpath settings, offering varied architecture, flower and colour:

- *Amelanchier alnifolia* 'Obelisk'
- *Cercis canadensis* 'Purple Leaf'
- *Cornus kousa* 'Miss Satomi'
- *Euonymus europaeus* 'Red Cascade'
- *Liquidambar styraciflua* 'Gum Ball'
- *Salix exigua*
- *Sorbus pseudovilmorinii* / *Sorbus vilmorinii*


These species are well suited to delivering an immediate and enduring improvement to public amenity: they read as intentional specimen planting, provide strong seasonal character, and—crucially—can be matched to space constraints so the long-term management burden is reduced rather than increased.

# Tree Survey Report

Client: Helena Carlton

Site: 7 Vineyard

Overall Condition	No. trees
Fair	1
Total	1

Ref.	Species	Description	Measurements	Survey Notes	Overall Condition	Risk Rating	Inspect Period	Recommendations	Photo
T001	Sycamore ( <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i> )	Target # - dwelling. - Occupancy - Constant(4).	Height (m): 13 Crown Radius (m): 6 DBH (cm): 70 Life Stage: Early Mature	<p>The tree is surrounded on three sides by a wall that is 52 centimetres high.</p> <p>There is significant wall displacement BRE cat5, but it is a garden wall.</p> <p>The wall is 70 centimetres to the south east, 40 centimetres to the north east and 140 centimetres to the north west from the trunk of the tree. This root plate is restricted for the first 52 centimetres for 270 degrees of root plate spread.</p> <p>There is stress response growth at the base of the tree.</p> <p>Ivy is growing up the trunk of the tree.</p> <p>Probe test penetrated thirty centimetres a lot of discoloured sap poured out. Acoustic test revealed a hollow resonance.</p> <p>Several wounds at the base of the tree have not yet healed over but are starting to heal over.</p> <p>Woodlice present at the base</p>	Fair	Moderate	1 Year	Tree risk mitigation: remove the tree. Timescale: 23-Sep-2026 (6 Months)	

of the tree.  
Two copper nails present at the base of the tree inside one of the wounds that was covered over with soil.  
There are several historic pruning wounds two of which have not healed and are showing signs of rot next to the main trunk.  
The trunk is leaning to the south east.  
The crown is asymmetrically weighted towards the dwelling house.  
There is a bird's nest in the crown of the tree

## Site Images

Species	Photo	Photo
Sycamore ( <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i> )		

Sycamore  
(*Acer  
pseudoplatanus*)



Sycamore  
(*Acer  
pseudoplatanus*)



Sycamore  
(*Acer  
pseudoplatanus*)



Sycamore  
(*Acer  
pseudoplatanus*)



## **Implementation of works.**

25. All tree works should be carried out to BS3998/2010. The work should conform to the work at height regulations 2005. It is advisable to select a contractor who is approved by the Arboricultural Association. [www.trees.org.uk/contractors.htm](http://www.trees.org.uk/contractors.htm)

## **Statutory wildlife obligations**

26. 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. All tree work operations are covered by these provisions and advice from an ecologist must be obtained before undertaking any works that might constitute an offence.

## **Trees subject to statutory controls**

27. If the tree is covered by a tree preservation order or located in a conservation area, it will be necessary to consult the council before any pruning works other than certain exemptions where tree work can be carried out. The works specified above are necessary for reasonable management and should be acceptable to the council. However, tree owners should appreciate that they may take an alternative point of view and have the option to refuse consent.

## **Disclaimers**

28. There have not been any checks done with reference to any statutory controls that may apply, for example, Tree Preservation orders, conservation areas or any other planning conditions.

29. The survey technique employed is conducted strictly from ground level and relies solely on observational methods. The only tools used during the survey include a probe, a Thor sounding hammer, and a Digital Range Finder (SLRF600). All data collected and recorded are specific to the time of the survey. It is important to note that tree conditions may change over time due to factors such as disease, wind, or excavation activities for construction. In cases of high winds, a follow-up inspection should be requested to assess any potential risks. Additionally, any change in land use may alter the risk assessment. For these reasons, it is recommended that a regular inspection schedule be established and agreed upon to ensure the site remains up to date and any potential risks are promptly identified.

30. All content within this report is copyrighted by Jason Isherwood's Tree Consultancy (Roots and Shoots Tree Surveys Limited), unless otherwise used under license. Reproduction of this report is prohibited unless explicitly authorized in writing.

31. This report has been prepared exclusively for the use of the client named herein. It does not constitute advice to any other party, by any means. No third party may rely on this report without a written agreement. Jason Isherwood's Tree Consultancy (Roots and Shoots Tree Surveys Limited) accepts no liability for any damages or losses incurred from relying on the observations recorded in this report.

32. Any edits, deletions, or alterations to this report will render it null and void. The report will also be considered void in the event of extreme weather or any failures arising from unforeseen circumstances. The author accepts no liability for any issues arising from misinterpretation, misreading, or misrepresentation of the report's contents. Jason Isherwood's Tree Consultancy (Roots and Shoots Tree Surveys Limited) is solely responsible for the contents of the report that have been invoiced; we are not liable for any work carried out based on the report.

Appendix 1 – Work Schedule of Trees



## Appendix 2

### Tree risk mitigation -v- Tree Management best practices

20. Tree risk mitigation refers to the process of identifying, assessing, and managing potential risks associated with trees, especially in urban, suburban, or developed environments. This process aims to reduce the likelihood of tree failure or damage to property, people, or infrastructure by addressing hazards such as weak or decayed branches, unstable roots, or poor tree structure.
21. The goal of tree risk mitigation is to implement corrective actions, such as pruning, cabling, removal of hazardous trees, or other preventive measures, to minimize the potential impact of tree-related incidents. Proper risk mitigation ensures that trees continue to provide their ecological, aesthetic, and social benefits while reducing the dangers they may pose.
22. Tree management best practices refer to a set of guidelines, strategies, and techniques designed to promote the health, safety, and longevity of trees. These practices ensure that trees are maintained in a way that supports both their natural growth and their role in the environment.

#### **Key aspects of tree management best practices include:**

23. Pruning and Maintenance: Regular pruning to remove dead, diseased, or damaged branches, as well as to shape the tree for healthy growth and structural integrity.
24. Planting and Selection: Choosing the right tree species for the location, considering factors such as soil type, climate, space, and the tree's potential for growth.

25. Watering and Fertilization: Ensuring proper irrigation, especially during drought periods, and providing nutrients for optimal tree growth.
26. Pest and Disease Management: Monitoring for pests and diseases and taking preventive measures or applying treatments when necessary.
27. Soil Care: Maintaining healthy soil conditions through proper mulching, aeration, and avoiding soil compaction around tree roots.
28. Tree Risk Assessment: Identifying and mitigating risks associated with weakened or hazardous trees, especially in urban environments.
29. Environmental Considerations: Promoting biodiversity by protecting native species and ensuring trees provide ecological benefits, like supporting wildlife or improving air quality.
30. By following tree management best practices, tree owners and care professionals help ensure trees are safe, healthy, and beneficial to the community and environment over the long term.

## **Appendix 3**

### **Reason for Survey and Rationale for Works**

#### **Domestic Setting and Proportionate Risk Management**

**31.** This survey was commissioned to assess the condition, physiological state, structural condition and management requirements of the trees within the curtilage of a private residential property. The purpose of the inspection was to identify material defects, relevant site constraints, foreseeable targets and any arboricultural works reasonably required in the interests of sound tree management and proportionate risk control.

**32.** The survey is not intended to promote unnecessary intervention, nor to understate defects where present. Its purpose is to provide an objective arboricultural assessment of the trees as found on the date of inspection, having regard to their condition, the nature of the site, the occupancy of potential target areas and the likely consequences of failure should defects progress unmanaged.

**33.** In a domestic setting, the principal targets commonly include the dwelling, garages and outbuildings, boundary walls and fences, parked vehicles, garden areas, pedestrian routes, neighbouring land and, where relevant, the adjoining highway or footway. Whilst occupancy within a private garden is generally lower and less continuous than at a school, commercial site or public open space, it is nevertheless entirely foreseeable that residents, visitors, neighbours and contractors may be present within the potential failure zone of retained trees.

**34.** The assessment of management need has therefore been based not on the mere presence of defects, as many trees contain minor defects without requiring significant intervention, but on the relationship between the observed condition of each tree, the likelihood of failure of the part affected, the likelihood of impact on identified targets, and the probable consequences if failure were to occur.

## **Duty of Care and Negligence**

**35.** Under common law principles, a landowner or occupier is expected to take such steps as are reasonable in the circumstances to avoid foreseeable harm arising from trees under their control.

That duty is not one of absolute safety, but one of reasonable and informed management.

**36.** In practical terms, liability is more likely to arise where there has been a failure to respond appropriately to defects that were either known or ought reasonably to have been identified on competent inspection. Conversely, the existence of a reasoned inspection record and implementation of recommendations within an appropriate timescale are relevant indicators that the owner has acted prudently.

**37.** Arboricultural management must therefore distinguish between:

- minor or commonly occurring defects that can reasonably be monitored or addressed through routine maintenance; and
- defects of a type, position or severity that materially alter the risk profile of the tree and justify more specific intervention.

**38.** The recommendations in this report have been framed on that basis. They are not advanced on a zero-risk premise, but based on what would constitute a reasonable arboricultural response to the condition observed and the targets present.

## **Statutory and Legal Responsibilities**

**39.** In addition to common law duties, landowners and occupiers should remain mindful of their obligations under the Occupiers' Liability Act 1957 and, where relevant, the Occupiers' Liability Act 1984. These provisions do not require all tree-related risk to be eliminated, but they do require that such care as is reasonable in the circumstances is exercised in relation to lawful visitors and, in more limited situations, others who may come into the vicinity of the property.

**40.** For tree management purposes, the relevant test is one of reasonableness and proportionality. Trees are dynamic biological structures and cannot be made entirely risk-free. The appropriate question is whether the owner has acted as a prudent landowner would act, having regard to the condition of the tree, the nature and frequency of occupation around it, and the significance of any defects identified.

**41.** A competent inspection and a reasoned schedule of recommended works form part of that process. They do not of themselves determine whether works are exempt from statutory controls, nor do they displace the need to consider tree protection legislation where applicable, but they do provide the arboricultural basis on which management decisions may properly be made.

### **Site Context and Management Requirement**

**42.** Trees within domestic curtilage should be managed according to the level of foreseeable risk they present in that setting. In many cases, intermittent garden use and lower target frequency mean that minor defects can be managed through inspection and routine pruning. In other cases, however, the proximity of buildings, hard structures, access points or neighbouring land may materially increase the significance of defects that might be tolerable in a lower-use location.

**43.** The management recommendations arising from this survey are therefore site-specific. They have been informed by the condition of the trees inspected, the distribution of targets, and whether the defects observed are likely to remain tolerable with monitoring alone or whether they justify active intervention to maintain risk within reasonable bounds.

**44.** This is an evidence-led exercise. Recommendations have not been made simply because a tree is large, close to a structure, or exhibits characteristics commonly associated with age or normal adaptive growth. Equally, where defects affect the stem base, principal scaffold unions, root plate or other structurally significant parts, and where meaningful targets are present, the threshold for intervention is necessarily lower because the consequences of failure are correspondingly greater.

**45.** In that regard, the purpose of recommended works is to address identified management need at a stage when intervention remains planned and proportionate, rather than to defer action until deterioration becomes more advanced or visible symptoms become acute.

### **Priority and Reason for Recommended Works**

**46.** No recommendation within this report should be interpreted as arbitrary or convenience based. Each item of work has been identified because, in my professional opinion, it is justified by the condition observed, the position of the tree, the target context and the likely development of the defect if left unmanaged.

**47.** Where routine works such as deadwood removal, clearance pruning, climber management or periodic re-inspection are recommended, this reflects a judgement that the defects concerned are presently manageable within normal maintenance parameters and do not, at this stage, warrant more extensive intervention.

**48.** Where removal of an individual tree, or of a compromised stem or structural part, is recommended, that recommendation should be understood as arising from one or more of the following circumstances:

- the defect is in a structurally important part of the tree.
- the likelihood of improvement through retention is low.
- the defect cannot be meaningfully mitigated by lesser pruning works.
- the target occupancy is sufficient to make continued retention increasingly difficult to justify;  
or
- the foreseeable consequences of failure are disproportionate to the amenity value of retaining the tree in its current condition.

**49.** The rationale for such works is therefore not that the tree stock is unsafe in any absolute sense, but that the identified defects justify measured intervention to maintain an acceptable balance between retention, amenity and foreseeable risk.

**50.** In my opinion, this is consistent with accepted arboricultural risk management principles. It recognises that some defects can reasonably be tolerated and monitored, but that others require action within a defined timeframe if the retained tree stock is to remain compatible with the continued residential use of the site.

**51.** Following completion of the recommended works, the retained trees should remain broadly appropriate for the site, with residual risk reduced to a level that is, on present evidence, reasonable for a domestic property subject to ongoing review and further inspection.

**52.** A re-inspection interval of 12 months, or earlier following severe weather, visible change, ground disturbance, complaint, or other material event, is considered appropriate for this site unless otherwise stated for an individual tree.

### **Professional Context Statement**

This appendix sets out the arboricultural basis for the recommendations made. It is intended to explain why the proposed works are considered necessary, or alternatively why more extensive intervention is not presently justified, by reference to condition, defect significance, target context and proportionality.

The recommendations are not made based on a blanket preference for removal, nor on the assumption that all observable defects are intolerable. Equally, they do not minimise those defects which, by virtue of their position, extent or associated target context, materially influence the risk profile of the tree. The approach taken is one of balanced professional judgement.

In my professional opinion, the recommendations are reasonable, evidence-based and proportionate to the site conditions, the trees inspected and the level of foreseeable risk arising in a domestic residential setting.

## Appendix 4

### Bibliography

Mattheck, C. (2015) The Body Language of trees. KS Druck GmbH Kronau

Shigo, A.L. (2020) Modern Arboriculture. Sheridan Books

Lonsdale, D. (2022) Principles of Tree Hazard Assessment and Management. Arboricultural Association

Strouts, R.G. and Winter, T.G. (2019) Diagnosis of ill health in trees. Arboricultural Association

Brickell, C. and Joyce, D (1996) The Royal Horticultural Society Pruning and Training. Dorking Kindersley

Rogers, K. and Kirkham, T. (2019) Trees Broadleaf and conifer models (all variations covered) Owners' Workshop Manual. Haynes Publishing

Boddy, L. (2021) Fungi and Trees Their Complex Relationships. Arboricultural Association

Humphries, D. and Wright, C. (2021) Fungi on Trees A photographic reference. Arboricultural Association

Greenwood, P. and Halstead, A. (1997) The Royal Horticultural Society Pests and Diseases The complete guide to Preventing, Identifying and treating Plant Problems. Dorking Kindersley

Cutler, D.F. and Richardson, I.B.K. (1989) Tree Roots and Buildings. Longman Scientific and Technical

Watson, B. (2006) Trees Their Use, Management, Cultivation and Biology. The Crowood Press Ltd

Roberts, J. Jackson, N. and Smith, M. (2006) Tree Roots in the Built Environment. Arboricultural Association

Draper, D. B. and Richards, P. A. (2009) Dictionary for Managing Trees in Urban Environments.

Csiro publishing

33RAS/TC/2026/100 7 Vineyard Leymoor Road, Golcar, Huddersfield, HD74RN

Dunster, J.A. Smiley, E.T, Matheny, N. and Lilly, S. (2017) Tree Risk Assessment Manual.  
International Society of Arboriculture

Watson, G. (2013) Tree Pests and Diseases, An Arborists' Field Guide. Arboricultural Association

Watson, G. and Green, T. (2011) Fungi on Trees, An Arborists Field Guide. Arboricultural Association

## **Appendix 5: TRAQ Risk Categorisation – Glossary and Methodology**

This appendix provides definitions and context for the Tree Risk Assessment Qualification (TRAQ) framework developed by the International Society of Arboriculture (ISA). These definitions underpin the qualitative methodology used in this report for assessing tree-related risk.

The TRAQ system combines assessments of the Likelihood of Failure, Likelihood of Impact, Consequences of Failure, and the resultant Risk Rating, using standardised matrices. The following glossary sets out key terms used in this process.

### **1. Likelihood of Failure (LOF)**

This describes the probability that a tree or tree part will fail within the time frame of concern, typically 12 months, unless otherwise stated.

- **Imminent**

Failure is expected at any moment; signs of instability or structural compromise are actively visible.

- **Probable**

Failure is expected under normal environmental conditions within the specified timeframe.

- **Possible**

Failure could occur under abnormal or loading conditions but is not expected under typical environmental influences.

- **Improbable**

Failure is unlikely even in the event of storms or other external pressures; the tree or part appears structurally sound.

### **2. Likelihood of Impact (LOI)**

This reflects the probability that a person, vehicle, structure, or other target will be present in the potential impact zone at the time of failure.

- **High**

Target is continuously or frequently present (e.g., residential homes, busy roads, schools).

- **Medium**

Target is present regularly but not continuously (e.g., car parks, playgrounds, commercial premises).

- **Low**

Target is occasionally present (e.g., lightly used paths, occasional car access).

- **Very Low**

Target is rarely or unpredictably present (e.g., open space with no formal access).

### 3. Likelihood of Failure and Impact (LOFI)

This term combines the likelihood of failure and likelihood of impact to estimate how probable it is that a failure would result in contact with a target.

#### LOFI Matrix

Likelihood of Failure ↓	Very Low (LOI)	Low (LOI)	Medium (LOI)	High (LOI)
<b>Imminent</b>	Somewhat Likely	Likely	Very Likely	Very Likely
<b>Probable</b>	Unlikely	Somewhat Likely	Likely	Very Likely
<b>Possible</b>	Unlikely	Unlikely	Somewhat Likely	Likely
<b>Improbable</b>	Unlikely	Unlikely	Unlikely	Somewhat Likely

#### LOFI Definitions:

- **Very Likely**

Failure and impact are expected under normal conditions, high probability of occurrence.

- **Likely**

The event is more probable than not under foreseeable conditions.

- **Somewhat Likely**

There is a reasonable possibility of the combined event occurring.

- **Unlikely**

The event is improbable based on both structural and target-use factors.

#### **4. Consequences of Failure**

This relates to the **severity of outcomes** if the failure and impact occur. Considerations include potential injury, damage to property, interruption to utilities, or other liabilities.

- **Severe**

Death or serious injury is possible; or significant property damage; may include disruption to critical services.

- **Significant**

Moderate injuries or property damage could result; risk to users or vehicles, but not life-threatening.

- **Minor**

Cosmetic or easily repairable damage; potential for minor injury.

- **Negligible**

Very limited damage; no expected injury; disruption is minimal.

#### **5. Risk Rating (Overall Risk Level)**

The final risk level is derived by combining the Likelihood of Failure and Impact with the Consequences of Failure, as per the matrix below.

#### **Risk Rating Matrix**

LOFI ↓	Negligible Minor		Significant Severe	
<b>Very Likely</b>	Low	Moderate	High	Extreme
<b>Likely</b>	Low	Moderate	High	High
<b>Somewhat Likely</b>	Low	Low	Moderate	High
<b>Unlikely</b>	Low	Low	Low	Moderate

### Risk Rating Definitions:

- **Extreme Risk**

Failure is imminent or very likely with severe consequences. Immediate action required. Access may need to be restricted, and removal or substantial intervention may be necessary.

- **High Risk**

Failure is likely and could result in significant or severe outcomes. Remedial action should be prioritised.

- **Moderate Risk**

Failure and impact are possible with minor to significant consequences. Mitigation should be considered based on risk tolerance.

- **Low Risk**

Risk is acceptable under current management practices. Monitor or review as appropriate.

### 6. Notes for Report Inclusion and Application

- TRAQ is a structured, qualitative assessment system grounded in field observation, arboricultural expertise, and the use of standardised risk matrices.

- The risk assessment timeframe is typically up to one year, but can be adjusted depending on the growth rate, health condition, or species-specific behaviour of the tree.
- Risk tolerance levels may vary depending on land use context, client objectives, duty of care, and applicable legislation or guidance (e.g., NTSG, BS 3998).
- The TRAQ process is intended to guide reasonable, proportionate decision-making, not to eliminate risk entirely.
- All tree risk assessments in this report are made in good faith, based on observable factors at the time of inspection. Hidden defects or future changes (e.g., decay progression, storms, root disturbance) may alter the risk profile and warrant reinspection.
- Limitations of access and site use patterns have been considered where relevant, and any assumptions regarding target occupancy are stated within the body of this report.