



Tree condition survey

Location of trees

9 Church Lane south, Crosland, Netherton, HD47DB

On instructions of:

9 Church Lane south, Crosland, Netherton, HD47DB

Date of site visit: 18th March 2026

Report Date: 18th 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	3
Tree Survey Summary	5
Site Survey Location	7
Work Schedule of Trees	8
Recommendations Summary	8
Tree Survey Risk Report	15
Site Photos	17
Implementation of Works	18
Statutory Wildlife Obligations	18
Trees Subject to Statutory controls	18
Disclaimers	19
Appendix 1 – Tree Risk Rating Plans (TRAQ)	21
Appendix 2 Tree risk -v- tree Management best practices	22
Appendix 3 Reasons for survey and any works listed	24
Appendix 4 Bibliography	29
Appendix 5 TRAQ Risk Categorisation – Glossary and Methodology	31

Instruction

Roots and Shoots Tree Surveys Limited, acting on instruction from Trevor Ashton, 9 Church Lane South, Crosland, Netherton, HD47DB 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 18th March 2026, the survey was carried out at 9 Church Lane South, Crosland, Netherton, HD47DB. 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 (both trunks)
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



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*)

A mature sycamore located at 9 Church Lane, positioned on a steep slope adjacent to a busy meeting road, with nearby targets including a dwelling, footpath, carriageway and street lighting. The tree is recorded as approximately 21m in height with an approximate 6.5m crown radius. The stem is formed from two co-dominant trunks dividing at less than 1m above ground level. The report records the tree in Poor overall condition, with a High risk rating, and recommends removal within 3 months.

Condition Summary

The tree is in poor physiological and structural condition. Of principal concern is the presence of significant basal dysfunction and decay, evidenced by a combination of an open wound at the stem base, extensive internal rot, deep probe penetration, and hollow acoustic response. In my

opinion, the most important defect is not in the outer crown but at the lower stem / basal region, where loss of structural integrity has the greatest bearing on the risk of stem base or whole-tree failure.

The tree's structural form also contributes to concern. It comprises two main stems arising low on the trunk, which increases mechanical loading at the basal union. Given the tree's position on a slope and its proximity to frequently occupied targets, the existing defects materially reduce confidence in its safe long-term retention.

Key Defects and Supporting Evidence

The following defects are recorded in the survey data and together form the basis of the risk assessment:

1. Extensive basal decay

- The report records an open wound on the roadside aspect of the trunk.
- Rot within that wound is described as extensive.
- This is a significant structural defect because decay at the base affects the tree's primary load-bearing zone.

2. Deep probe penetration

- A probe test penetrated 24cm into the trunk.
- This suggests a substantial area of softened, decayed or compromised woody tissue rather than a superficial surface defect.

3. Hollow acoustic response

- An acoustic test revealed hollow resonance in parts of the trunk.
- While not a full decay mapping exercise, this finding is consistent with internal dysfunction and corroborates the probe test and visible wound/rot observations.

4. Low bifurcation / co-dominant stem structure

- The tree is described as having two trunks dividing at less than 1 metre from the base.
- This growth form can increase loading and stress concentration at the lower stem, particularly where decay is already present.

5. Steep slope location

- The tree stands on a steep slope next to a busy road.
- This site characteristic is relevant because it may increase exposure and potential consequences should basal instability progress to failure.

6. Historic crown lifting

- The report notes a historic crown lift to approximately 8m, said to exceed that normally expected under BS 3998.
- While not the principal defect, this management history is relevant context and may have altered the tree's loading profile and live crown ratio.

Site Hazards and Constraints

This tree occupies a constrained and sensitive position. The report identifies the following targets:

- Dwelling
- Footpath
- Road
- Street lighting
- Constant occupancy context

The tree is noted as being approximately 7m from the roadside and 18m from the dwelling.

Because of the combination of adjacent infrastructure and regular public/private occupancy, the consequences of failure are potentially significant. The steep slope and roadside position also constrain safe retention options and increase the need for a clear, proportionate management decision.

Any works would need to be undertaken with due regard to:

- proximity to the highway and pedestrians,
- traffic and site management during operations,
- potential statutory protection,
- nesting birds and other wildlife constraints where relevant,
- safe dismantling in a confined roadside environment.

Risk Context

In arboricultural risk terms, this is not simply a tree with minor defects in a low-use setting. It is a mature roadside tree with identified basal decay defects in a high-target environment.

The principal risk is failure at or near the base, rather than minor branch drop. Where decay affects the lower stem, the consequence can be partial or total collapse of the tree. In this case, the likely strike zone includes a public highway, footway, nearby property and street apparatus. For that reason, the risk context is elevated even without requiring immediate evidence of active movement.

The report's assigned rating of High risk is, in my opinion, justified by:

- the nature and position of the defects,
- the corroborating inspection evidence,
- the tree's form,

- the steep slope location, and
- the constant and varied target occupancy beneath and adjacent to the tree.

Recommendations

The recommendation recorded in the survey report is to remove the tree, and on the information provided I consider that recommendation to be reasonable, proportionate and arboriculturally justified.

The defect profile is centred on the basal stem, which is the most critical part of the tree structurally. This is not a case where risk can be reliably and satisfactorily managed by routine crown pruning alone. Crown reduction may lessen sail area to a limited extent, but it would not resolve the fundamental concern of extensive decay affecting the stem base. In that context, retention would leave a material residual risk.

Accordingly, the recommended management response is:

- Removal of T001
- Works to be carried out by a competent arboricultural contractor
- Operations to be undertaken with appropriate traffic/pedestrian management if required
- Stump treatment or retention to be determined by site objectives and any replanting proposal
- Replacement planting should be considered, if appropriate to the site and subject to any statutory requirements

Where statutory controls apply, removal should be subject to:

- confirmation of whether the tree is covered by a Tree Preservation Order, and/or
- whether the site lies within a Conservation Area,
before works commence.

Immediate / Priority Works

Priority action:

Arrange for the tree to be removed within 3 months, in accordance with the timescale already identified in the report.

Interim precautionary measures pending works:

Until removal is undertaken, it would be prudent to:

- keep the tree under observation for any signs of rapid deterioration,
- note any fresh cracking, heave, separation, bark movement, or change around the basal wound,
- avoid unnecessary occupation directly within the potential fall zone where practicable.

If any worsening symptoms are observed before scheduled works, the timescale should be brought forward and made urgent.

Professional Opinion

Based on the inspection findings recorded in the report, it is my professional opinion that this sycamore has significant basal structural defects sufficient to justify its classification as being in poor condition and presenting a high risk in its present setting.

The most persuasive evidence is the combination of:

- open basal wound,
- extensive associated rot,
- 24cm probe penetration,
- hollow acoustic response, and
- co-dominant low stem structure in a steep roadside location with multiple high-value targets.

Taken together, these observations indicate a materially reduced level of structural reliability at the base of the tree. In a low-occupancy setting, continued monitoring or further diagnostic testing might sometimes be considered. However, in this case, given the target profile and the nature of the defects, I consider removal to be the most appropriate and defensible risk management recommendation.

In summary, the recommendation to remove is, in my view, sound, proportionate, and capable of withstanding professional scrutiny, provided all necessary statutory checks and good-practice work controls are followed.

Tree Survey Report

Client:	Trevor Ashton
---------	---------------

Site:	9 Church Lane
-------	---------------

Overall Condition	No. trees
Poor	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. Target # - footpath. Target # - road. Target # - street lights. - Occupancy - Constant(4).	Height (m): 21 Crown Radius (m): 6.5 DBH (cm): 62 and 59 Life Stage: Mature	The tree is situated on a steep slope next to a busy meeting road. The tree is 7 metres from the roadside and 18 metres from the dwelling house. The DBH is 62 centimetres and 59 centimetres. There has been epicormic growth that has recently pruned. The tree is made up of two trunks dividing less than one metre at the base. Probe test penetrated 24 centimetres into the trunk. Acoustic test revealed a hollow resonance on parts of the trunk. There is an open wound on the roadside and the rot within the wound is extensive. There is a historic crown lift of 8 metres that exceed the height expected in British Standard 3998. The basal rot increases the risk of failure of the tree.	Poor	High	1 Year	Tree risk mitigation: remove the tree. Timescale: 18-Jun-2026 (3 Months)	

Site Images

Ref.	Species	Photo	Photo
T001	Sycamore (<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>)		

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

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, structural integrity and management requirements of the tree population within the curtilage of a private domestic property. The purpose of the inspection was to identify any significant defects, foreseeable hazards and appropriate management measures necessary to assist the owner in discharging their duty of care, whilst also recognising the amenity, environmental and landscape value of the trees.

32. The inspection found that the overall tree stock presents a low level of risk, with the majority of specimens recorded in Good to Fair condition. The principal targets within a domestic setting include the dwelling itself, garden areas, neighbouring land, boundary structures, parked vehicles, pedestrian access routes and, where relevant, the adjacent highway or footway. Although occupancy at a domestic property is less intense and less concentrated than in a school or other public-use setting, it remains foreseeable that residents, visitors, contractors and adjoining owners may be exposed to harm should tree failure occur. On the evidence available at the time of inspection, however, the current condition of the trees does not indicate a credible likelihood of catastrophic failure.

Duty of Care and Negligence

33. Under the general principles of common law duty of care, a landowner or occupier is required to take such reasonable steps as are appropriate in the circumstances to avoid acts or omissions which may foreseeably cause harm to persons or damage to property arising from trees on their land.

34. In the context of domestic tree ownership, liability in negligence may arise where a tree, or part of a tree, fails and causes injury or damage, if such harm was reasonably foreseeable and the

owner failed to take reasonable management steps in response to defects that ought properly to have been identified and acted upon.

35. In this case, the survey findings support a managed-risk approach rather than an urgent or emergency response. The defects identified, including such matters as minor deadwood, localised bark loss, climber infestation, or irregular rooting characteristics, are not uncommon in arboricultural practice and are generally addressed through planned maintenance works and periodic re-inspection rather than immediate intervention.

Statutory and Legal Responsibilities

36. In addition to common law duties, occupiers and landowners should be mindful of their responsibilities under the Occupiers' Liability Act 1957 and, to a more limited extent, the Occupiers' Liability Act 1984. These provisions require an occupier to take such care as is reasonable in the circumstances to ensure that lawful visitors, and in certain circumstances even trespassers, are reasonably safe when entering or approaching the property.

37. In practical terms, this does not impose an obligation to eliminate all risk associated with trees. Trees are living biological structures and can never be rendered entirely risk-free. The legal requirement is one of reasonableness, namely that the owner should act as a prudent landowner would, having regard to the site, the tree condition, the level of occupancy, and the nature of any observed defects.

38. A competent tree inspection, together with the implementation of reasonable recommendations arising from that inspection, forms an important part of demonstrating that duty of care has been recognised and acted upon. This is particularly relevant should the condition or management of a tree later come under scrutiny following damage, complaint or local authority review.

Site Context and Management Requirement

39. Trees within a domestic setting should be managed in a manner proportionate to the level of foreseeable risk presented by the site. Unlike schools, public parks or highways land, the

occupancy of a private garden is generally intermittent and variable. Nevertheless, domestic properties still contain identifiable targets, including buildings, residents, family members, guests, service providers, neighbouring property and boundary features.

40. Arboricultural risk management in such settings should therefore follow a proportionate and evidence-based approach. It is well established that some level of risk associated with retained trees is both inherent and tolerable, provided that known or foreseeable defects are monitored and addressed within a reasonable timeframe.

41. The present findings indicate that the identified risks can be effectively controlled through planned maintenance works and periodic inspection, rather than by reactive or extensive intervention. A documented inspection record and a reasoned schedule of works provide evidence of prudent tree management and support the owner's position should the retained trees be queried by a Tree Officer, neighbour, insurer or other third party.

Priority and Reason for Recommended Works

42. No trees surveyed were assessed as presenting an immediate or high risk at the time of inspection. On that basis, urgent emergency works are not considered necessary.

43. The recommended works should instead be undertaken within a reasonable maintenance timescale in order to prevent defect progression, maintain adequate clearances where required, and retain the tree stock within broadly acceptable risk tolerances for a domestic property.

44. Typical works in this context may include:

- removal of deadwood where it overhangs areas of regular domestic use, access routes or neighbouring land.
- selective pruning to maintain suitable clearance from buildings, structures, fences, garden features or overhead utilities where relevant.

- removal of an individual tree where its form, condition or structural characteristics indicate a developing longer-term defect that is not presently an emergency but is unlikely to improve with retention.
- removal of a compromised stem where localised bark loss, dysfunction or reduced vitality suggests a declining structural contribution.
- management of invasive climber growth where it materially increases sail effect, obscures inspection of the stem and scaffold structure, or contributes to progressive decline.

45. The rationale for such works is not that the trees are presently unsafe in an absolute sense, but that proportionate arboricultural intervention is justified in order to preserve reasonable safety margins, reduce foreseeable risk, and maintain the retained trees in a condition compatible with continued occupation of the property.

46. Following completion of the recommended works, the tree population is expected to remain compatible with the use of the site, with residual risk maintained at a low and broadly acceptable level, subject to ongoing review.

47. A 12-month re-inspection cycle, or earlier inspection following severe weather, visible change, ground disturbance, or reports of concern, is considered appropriate for this domestic site and accords with recognised arboricultural risk management principles.

Professional Context Statement

This appendix sets out the legal and practical rationale supporting a proactive but proportionate approach to tree management within a private residential setting. The survey findings do not justify urgent intervention or disproportionate removal. Rather, they support a programme of structured maintenance and ongoing monitoring as part of responsible domestic land management.

With such measures in place, the trees should be capable of continuing to provide meaningful amenity, screening, ecological and landscape benefits, whilst remaining within acceptable risk thresholds for a domestic property. In my professional opinion, the recommendations made are

reasonable, proportionate and consistent with the standard of care expected of a prudent householder managing trees on private land.

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

- 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)
Imminent	Somewhat Likely	Likely	Very Likely	Very Likely
Probable	Unlikely	Somewhat Likely	Likely	Very Likely
Possible	Unlikely	Unlikely	Somewhat Likely	Likely
Improbable	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	
Very Likely	Low	Moderate	High	Extreme
Likely	Low	Moderate	High	High
Somewhat Likely	Low	Low	Moderate	High
Unlikely	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.