



PREPARED FOR
Alben Landscape

SITE LOCATION
Dewsbury District Hospital - WF13 4HS

TREE CONDITION & **RISK SURVEY**

July 2026

TREESTYLE CONSULTANCY

Dewsbury and District Hospital, Halifax Road, Dewsbury, West Yorkshire, WF13 4HS

An assessment of tree health and safety across the hospital grounds, car parking areas and site frontage.

Date of Assessment: 8 July 2026

Site: Dewsbury and District Hospital, Halifax Road, Dewsbury, West Yorkshire, WF13 4HS

Client: Mid Yorkshire Teaching NHS Trust

Instructed by: Alben Landscape Ltd

Author: Andrew McLoughlin, Treestyle Consultancy Ltd, info@treestyleconsultancy.co.uk

Index

- 1.0 Instructions
- 2.0 Report Limitations
- 3.0 Introduction
- 4.0 Findings
- 5.0 Analysis
- 6.0 Conclusions
- 7.0 Recommendations
- 8.0 Disclaimers
- 9.0 Appendices
- 10.0 Bibliography
- 11.0 References
- 12.0 Useful Web Links
- 13.0 Photographs
- 14.0 Glossary

1.0 Instructions

- 1.1 Treestyle Consultancy Ltd was instructed by Alben Landscape Ltd, on behalf of Mid Yorkshire Teaching NHS Trust, to visit Dewsbury and District Hospital, Halifax Road, Dewsbury, West Yorkshire, WF13 4HS to assess all trees within the grounds.
- 1.2 The purpose of the report is to assess the risk posed by trees to people and infrastructure:
 - a) The tree owner seeks to ensure it reasonably meets its duty of care by demonstrating a defensible, proactive tree management regime.
 - b) To visually inspect trees growing within the site.
 - c) To identify trees that pose an unacceptable risk and recommend remedial works to reduce risk to acceptable levels.
 - d) To provide a report to assist in the planning and management of the trees.
- 1.3 It was agreed that a basic level of inspection be applied to the trees to aid the preparation of this report, including tree and risk assessment, report findings and mitigation recommendations where required.
- 1.4 A suitable management plan with recommendations has been prepared in accordance with current arboricultural best practice BS3998:2010.

2.0 Report Limitations

- 2.1 The inspection identifies defects and other failure prone characteristics of a tree where these might reasonably be anticipated to cause an unacceptable risk. It should be recognised that no tree is entirely safe, given the possibility that an exceptionally strong wind or other unusual circumstance could damage or uproot even a mechanically sound specimen.
- 2.2 While every attempt has been made to provide a realistic and accurate assessment of the trees' condition at the time of inspection, no responsibility can be accepted for damage or injury sustained as a result of the failure of any tree due to faults not apparent during a visual, ground level inspection carried out at this season, or to faults developing after the survey.
- 2.3 No liability can be accepted for the condition of any tree that was obscured in part or in whole, for example by structures or dense vegetation, or that proved inaccessible at the time of inspection. Certain features which might provide evidence of ongoing decay or decline, such as seasonal fungal fruiting bodies, damage to foliage or insect emergence holes, may not have been in evidence at the time of survey; only those features apparent at the time of inspection can be assessed.

- 2.4 Underground services were not confirmed around the trees surveyed. The potential influence of trees upon buildings or other structures, resulting from the effects of trees upon shrinkable load bearing soils or the impact of incremental root growth, is specifically excluded from this report.
- 2.5 The report reflects the trees as found on the day surveyed. Changes to ground levels, soil conditions, surrounding tree cover or land use, or any ground works within the root zone of any tree, may invalidate the content of this report. No root zone excavation was undertaken.

3.0 Introduction

- 3.1 The author of this report is Andrew McLoughlin, Managing Director and Principal Arboricultural Consultant of Treestyle Consultancy Ltd since 2001. He holds a National Certificate in Arboriculture and a MArborA in Arboriculture, has been a qualified arboriculturist since 1998, and holds the ISA Tree Risk Assessment Qualification and Quantified Tree Risk Assessment accreditation, together with Ancient and Veteran Tree Expert status. He is a professional member of the Arboricultural Association, Membership No. AS2370, and a member of the Consulting Arborist Society.
- 3.2 The report is based upon data collected on site on 8 July 2026 by Andrew McLoughlin, Principal Arboricultural Consultant at Treestyle Consultancy Ltd.
- 3.3 The tree survey was instructed by Alben Landscape Ltd on behalf of Mid Yorkshire Teaching NHS Trust.
- 3.4 The instruction reflects concerns regarding the safety of trees within the hospital grounds due to their proximity to staff, patients, visitors and infrastructure, including car parking, the public highway, ambulance access routes and areas used for recreation.
- 3.5 The methodology for the preparation of this report is as follows:
- Communication with the client and site contact to establish an understanding of site history and management concerns.
 - A Visual Tree Assessment carried out with the aid of a nylon mallet where appropriate.
 - Assessment of each tree's life expectancy and amenity value.
 - A tree risk assessment.
 - Recommendation of mitigating measures and actions where necessary.
- 3.6 Trees were assessed at a basic Level 2 Visual Tree Assessment standard wherever access allowed. Trees affected by dense ivy, epicormic growth or restricted access received a more limited assessment; these instances are identified within Section 5.0 Analysis. Tree positions were recorded using a handheld GPS unit; GPS accuracy is typically within 1 to 3 metres and positions should be treated as approximate.

- 3.7 The tree stock across the site provides substantial visual amenity, screening and wildlife habitat value, and contributes positively to the hospital's wider setting. High occupancy target areas include staff and visitor car parking, the public highway frontage on Halifax Road, ambulance access routes and areas used for outdoor recreation. Where trees and people coincide, there will always be an element of residual risk; the purpose of this assessment is to reduce that risk to a level that is reasonably acceptable, rather than to eliminate it entirely.

N.B. Target areas are places where a tree or tree part could fall and land on a vehicle, structure or a person, causing damage, injury or disruption.

4.0 Findings

4.1 Below are the main findings across the site:

- 64 individual trees, 46 groups, one area of woodland (W12) and one hedgerow (H17).
- Overall condition: 84 survey units were assessed as Good, 19 as Fair, 8 as Poor and 1 as Dangerous.
- Common Lime, Bird Cherry and Swedish Whitebeam are the predominant species recorded, alongside Sycamore, Silver Birch, Common Ash, Lombardy Poplar and Common Horse Chestnut, with good overall species diversity but more limited age diversity, the majority of the stock being classed as mature.
- Trees provide outstanding visual amenity and wildlife habitat value throughout the hospital grounds and car parking areas.
- High occupancy targets are present throughout, most notably car parking areas, the public highway, ambulance access routes and areas of recreation; occupancy beneath the canopy itself is generally lower, though these areas remain sensitive targets given the hospital setting.
- Evidence of drought stress and apical dieback was recorded across a number of individual trees and groups, most likely linked to recent dry conditions.
- Alder leaf beetle infestation and early symptoms consistent with horse chestnut leaf miner were noted on affected species.
- Ash dieback (*Hymenoscyphus fraxineus*) was identified at early stages on several younger ash specimens.
- Post planting maintenance has been neglected in places, with stakes and ties left in position beyond the recommended period.

4.2 The Visual Tree Assessment

During the site visit, the following observations were noted:

- Low canopies over car parking, footpaths, the public highway and ambulance access routes.
- Trees with mechanically weak structures, including multiple stems, bark inclusion and codominant unions.
- Apical dieback and deadwood are associated with drought stress.
- Early stage ash dieback on younger ash specimens.
- Alder leaf beetle infestation and early horse chestnut leaf miner symptoms.
- Dense ivy and epicormic growth are limiting visual assessment of several stems.
- Two small dead trees requiring felling and replacement planting.
- Neglected post planting maintenance, including retained stakes and ties.

5.0 Analysis

- 5.1 Based on the Visual Tree Assessment, interpretation and risk assessment undertaken, there is a low probability of a tree or tree part falling and causing injury across the majority of the site.

Mechanically Weak Structures

- 5.2 A number of trees present mechanically weak structures resulting from multiple stems, bark inclusion or codominant unions. Research indicates that such unions can be up to 42% weaker than conventional stem or branch unions (D. Slater, 2016). Whilst failure has not yet occurred in the majority of cases, increasing age and size will increase the probability of failure over time. This feature is present within T4, T6, T7, T13, T24, T27, T37, T59, T61, T64, T72, T75, T76, T104, G2, G3, G25 and H17.
- 5.2.1 T27 sycamore and G25 crack willow present the most significant mechanical concerns on site, both showing poor form with cracked or included bark and now exposed to increased wind loading following the removal of neighbouring dead trees. G25 was assessed as Dangerous, and both trees are within a high occupancy target area close to residential and hospital infrastructure, warranting pollarding and felling, respectively as a priority.
- 5.2.2 T64 common horse chestnut has a leaning, V-shaped union on its largest stem, extending over the road; reduction of this stem, together with pruning away from overhead light, is recommended.
- 5.2.3 T72 and T76 common lime, both part of the lime avenue adjoining the nursery building, have codominant leaning stems with associated cavities; pollarding and continued monitoring are recommended, respectively, given the elevated occupancy of the adjacent area.
- 5.2.4 Smaller specimens with a mechanically weak form, such as T5, T6 and T7 bird cherry, are located over low occupancy targets and are considered to be at an acceptable level of risk at this time; their form should nonetheless be monitored as they mature.

Drought Stress, Apical Dieback and Deadwood

- 5.3 Apical dieback, deadwood and general signs of drought stress were recorded across a number of trees and groups, consistent with recent dry conditions. This was most apparent within G1, G12, G22, G36, G93, G95, G109, T21, T45, T50, T52 and T108.
- 5.3.1 T21 Swedish whitebeam presents the most advanced drought related decline among the individual trees recorded, with a stressed canopy and limited remaining life potential. No target dependent action is currently required, though re inspection at the next scheduled visit is recommended.

- 5.3.2 Prolonged periods without rainfall reduce the water available to tree roots, and this is expected to remain a recurring management issue as the climate continues to change. Species already under stress, together with newly planted specimens, are likely to be the most vulnerable and should be prioritised for monitoring and, where practicable, watering during dry periods.

Ash Dieback

- 5.4 Ash dieback (*Hymenoscyphus fraxineus*) was identified at early to secondary stages on T45, T50 and T52 common ash, and is likely to be a contributing factor to the decline of the ash and elm within G93. T46 common ash, by contrast, showed no indication of the disease and remains in good health, illustrating the variable rate of decline across the ash population on site.
- 5.4.1 The disease has the potential to progressively reduce life expectancy and increase the risk of deadwood shedding, particularly over the public highway and car parking areas adjoining G93. Ongoing monitoring of the ash population is recommended, with felling reserved for specimens presenting an unacceptable level of risk to defined targets.

Pest and Disease

- 5.5 Alder leaf beetle infestation was noted within G18. This is not currently considered a significant structural concern, though continued monitoring for canopy decline is recommended.
- 5.5.1 Early symptoms consistent with horse chestnut leaf miner were recorded on T63 and T64, both common horse chestnut. This pest primarily affects foliar health and amenity rather than structural integrity, but should be factored into future condition monitoring of the wider species group, including T59, T63 and T64.

Restricted Visual Assessment

- 5.6 Dense ivy cover restricted the visual assessment of G11, G28, T53, T68 and T69, while dense vegetation and epicormic growth similarly limited inspection of the lime avenue T67 to T76 and the cherry groups G82 and G83.
- 5.6.1 Where a full assessment could not be completed, this has been noted, and re-inspection following ivy or epicormic removal is recommended for G28, T53, T68 and T69.
- 5.6.2 Management of ivy and epicormic growth is considered a priority, not only for tree health but to allow a complete Visual Tree Assessment to be undertaken at the next inspection, particularly given the concentration of high occupancy targets, including the nursery building, adjoining the affected lime avenue.

Low Canopies and Infrastructure Constraints

- 5.7 Low canopies were recorded restricting car parking, footpaths, the public highway and, most significantly, ambulance access at G82 and G83. Crown raising is recommended across a number of individual trees and groups, including G2, G3, G29, G34, G35, G58, G66, G79, G85, G103, G111 and G114, together with T15, T30, T33, T43, T57, T60, T98, T99, T104 and T107, to restore appropriate clearance and safeguard access for emergency vehicles.
- 5.7.1 G58, a row of seven lime trees, and G82 and G83, groups of cherry restricting ambulance access, are considered a priority given the operational implications for the hospital site; crown raising to 5.0m and to between 3.0m and 4.0m respectively is recommended.

Trees Recommended for Felling

- 5.8 T112 and G113 comprise small dead specimens recommended for felling and replanting. G1 includes one small tree in decline, recommended for felling and replanting within the group. G87 and G93 present ash, sycamore and elm growing through boundary fencing, several in decline due to drought stress or ash dieback, and are recommended for felling. T27 sycamore is recommended for felling by the next inspection given its poor form and exposure to wind throw. G25 crack willow is recommended for pollarding rather than felling, retaining the specimen's screening and wildlife value while addressing the identified risk.

Post Planting Management

- 5.9 G36, a row of three planted cherry and birch, continues to be constrained by planting stakes and ties which should have been removed two to three years after planting; their retention is restricting stem development and contributing to the drought stress observed in the birch within the group. Removal of stakes and ties, together with the wider post planting management recommendations set out at Section 7.4, is recommended across all recently planted stock on site.

Proportionality

- 5.10 The recommendations within the Tree Schedule at Appendix B address the identified hazards and are considered reasonable, pragmatic and proportionate to the risk presented. Absolute tree safety is in practice unachievable; however, the works recommended will remove the identified unacceptable and high risks to car parking, infrastructure, the public highway, ambulance access and areas of recreation across the site.

6.0 Conclusions

- 6.1 The tree stock at Dewsbury and District Hospital is a significant asset to the site, providing amenity, screening and wildlife value across the grounds and car parking areas, and contributing positively to the environment experienced by patients, staff and visitors. Ownership of this tree population carries a responsibility not only for safety but for its long term management and renewal. Generally, the likelihood of a tree or part of a tree falling is considered low before the next inspection.

The summary of the areas of concern is as follows:

- G25 crack willow is in Dangerous condition and requires pollarding as a priority within three months.
- A limited number of trees present mechanically weak structures through multiple stems, bark inclusion or codominant unions, most notably T27, T37, T64, T72 and T76.
- Drought stress and apical dieback were recorded across several trees and groups and should be monitored, particularly during future dry periods.
- Ash dieback is present at an early stage on a small number of specimens and should continue to be monitored.
- Alder leaf beetle and early horse chestnut leaf miner symptoms were recorded.
- Dense ivy and epicormic growth are restricting the visual assessment of a number of trees, particularly within the lime avenue adjoining the nursery building.
- Low canopies are restricting car parking, footpaths, the public highway and, at G82 and G83, ambulance access.
- Post planting maintenance, including the removal of stakes and ties, has been neglected in places.
- Two small dead trees and a small number of declining specimens require felling and replacement planting.

7.0 Recommendations

7.1 It is recommended that all trees included in this survey be re inspected on a rolling cycle appropriate to their condition, generally not exceeding 12 months, allowing the inspector to view the trees across the different seasons of their annual cycle. The tree work set out in the Tree Schedule at Appendix B should be completed within the priority timescales stated. In general, the recommendations are as follows:

- Management of trees through regular inspection.
- Regular walks of the site following storms and prolonged periods of heavy rain, to check for failures or potential hazards.
- Priority pollarding of G25 crack willow and felling of T27 sycamore, G87 and G93.
- Crown raising works to restore clearance over car parking, footpaths, the public highway and ambulance access, prioritising G82 and G83.
- Removal of ivy and epicormic growth to allow completion of a full Visual Tree Assessment, particularly within the lime avenue T67 to T76.
- Continued monitoring of ash dieback, alder leaf beetle and horse chestnut leaf miner.
- Post planting management as set out at Section 7.4.

7.2 Priority Works Summary

7.2.1 One tree, G25, is recommended for priority pollarding within three months on account of its Dangerous condition rating. The remaining priority and routine works are set out in full within the Tree Schedule at Appendix B, ranging from within one month through to twelve months, in accordance with the following timescales:

- Emergency: Immediate, do not delay.
- 1 Month: Within one calendar month of the report date.
- 3 Months: Within three months of the report date.
- 12 Months: Routine, within the next annual programme.
- Monitor: No action, re inspect at the next scheduled inspection.

7.3 Ecological Considerations

7.3.1 Before commencing felling works, particularly at G87, G93, T27, T112 and G113, a check for active bird nests should be undertaken by a suitably qualified person immediately prior to work commencing where works fall within the active nesting season. The active nesting season is broadly taken as March to August inclusive.

7.3.2 Where felling cannot be scheduled outside this period, a pre commencement nest check should be carried out on each tree immediately before work begins.

7.4 Post Planting Management

7.4.1 Post planting maintenance should be carried out across all recently planted stock, particularly G36, comprising:

- Removal of planting ties and stakes two to three years after planting.
- Formative pruning once stakes are removed.
- Removal of competing grass around the base of newly planted trees to reduce the potential for mower and strimmer damage.
- Regular application of woodchip mulch around tree bases to suppress grass competition, improve soil health, retain moisture and reduce compaction and drought stress.
- Watering during periods of prolonged drought, particularly during the establishment period.

7.4.2 Tree planting is essential both to offset the loss of the small number of trees recommended for felling and to future proof the site's green infrastructure for generations to come.

7.5 Pest and Disease Monitoring

7.5.1 Continued monitoring of ash dieback across the ash population, particularly T45, T50, T52 and G93, is recommended.

7.5.2 The alder within G18 and the horse chestnut within T59, T63 and T64 should be monitored for further decline associated with alder leaf beetle and horse chestnut leaf miner respectively.

7.6 Zoning

- 7.6.1 Given the scale of the hospital site and the frequency with which it is used by staff, patients, visitors and ambulance crews, it is recommended that a system of zoned inspection be adopted, consistent with Health and Safety Executive guidance on the management of trees on land frequented by the public. This should include a recorded system of inspection, prioritisation of zones, and a record of who, when and where inspections were carried out.
 - 7.6.2 Zoning allows the frequency of inspection to be prioritised according to occupancy and use, for example weekly, monthly or six monthly, and helps determine the urgency of any tree work required. Zone mapping can be produced and amended as site use or development changes.
 - 7.6.3 Given the changing environment and range of target areas across the site, it is recommended that high occupancy zones, including car parking, ambulance access routes and the public highway frontage, receive a Level 1 walkover inspection at more frequent intervals than lower occupancy areas such as boundary planting and woodland, and that all zones receive an inspection following any significant storm event.
 - 7.6.4 A record of all inspections and findings should be maintained, including the date of inspection, any works identified, and confirmation of completion.
 - 7.6.5 The zoning and inspection timescales set out above are provided as guidance rather than a precise specification. What is important is that inspections are undertaken, recorded and acted upon consistently.
-

Tree inspection, report prepared, authorised and signed by:

Andrew McLoughlin

MARborA (Professional Member, Arboricultural Association, No. AS2370)

Date: July 2026

Treestyle Consultancy Ltd

Bailrigg Jepps Lane, Barton, Preston PR3 5AQ

T: | E: info@treestyleconsultancy.co.uk | W: www.treestyleconsultancy.co.uk

8.0 Disclaimers

- 8.1 This survey was carried out from ground level. No aerial inspection was undertaken; this report can therefore only identify defects clearly visible from the ground. A Visual Tree Assessment is a Level 2 arboricultural survey, generally involving a 360 degree visual inspection of the buttress, stem and crown. While every effort has been made to provide a realistic and accurate assessment of the trees' condition at the time of inspection, it may not have been possible to view all parts or all sides of every tree.
- 8.2 No tree is entirely safe given the possibility that exceptionally strong winds could damage or uproot even a mechanically sound specimen. Hazards are therefore only recognisable from distinct defects or other failure prone characteristics of the tree or the site.
- 8.3 Underground services were not confirmed around any of the trees surveyed. The potential influence of trees upon buildings or other structures, resulting from the effects of trees upon shrinkable load bearing soils or the impact of incremental root growth, is specifically excluded from this report.
- 8.4 The report reflects the tree stock as found on the day surveyed. Changes to ground levels, soil conditions, surrounding tree cover or land use, or any ground works within the root zone of any tree, may invalidate the content of this report. No root zone excavation was undertaken.
- 8.5 A change of circumstance resulting from unusual weather conditions may invalidate the content of this report. Trees should be reassessed following a strong gale, 39 to 46 mph, Beaufort Scale 8.
- 8.6 The content of this report is valid for a period of 12 months from the date of survey. Any works recommended beyond this period are based on expectation rather than a currently identified defect. The condition of the trees should be re inspected by a qualified arboricultural consultant within three years of the date this report was written.
- 8.7 This report has been produced for the sole use of Mid Yorkshire Teaching NHS Trust and addresses arboricultural matters only. It should not be relied upon for structural engineering, ecological or planning purposes without appropriate supplementary professional advice.

9.0 Appendices

- 9.1 Appendix A: Tree Mapping is provided as a separate document, prepared by Alben Landscapes Ltd using Pear Technology mapping software, showing the location of all trees, groups, woodland and hedgerow referenced within this report.
- 9.2 Appendix B: Tree Schedule is provided as a separate document, listing each tree survey unit referenced within this report together with its species, dimensions, condition, recommended works and priority timescale.
- 9.3 Appendix C: Site Photographs are provided as a separate document, referenced within Section 13.0 of this report.

10.0 Bibliography

Mitchell, A. Collins Field Guide to the Trees of Britain and Northern Europe.

Brown, G. and Kirkham, T. Pruning of Trees, Shrubs and Conifers. Second Edition.

Lonsdale, D. Principles of Tree Hazard Assessment and Management. The Stationery Office.

11.0 References

British Standards Institution (2010) BS 3998:2010 Tree Work: Recommendations. London: BSI.

British Standards Institution (2012) BS 5837:2012 Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction. London: BSI.

International Society of Arboriculture (2013) Best Management Practices: Tree Risk Assessment.

National Tree Safety Group. Common Sense Risk Management of Trees.

Occupiers Liability Acts 1957 and 1984.

Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).

Forestry Act 1967.

Forestry Commission (2019) Chalara Management Plan. Edinburgh: FC.

Slater, D. (2016) research on the comparative strength of codominant stem unions.

12.0 Useful Web Links

Ash dieback: <https://treecouncil.org.uk/science-and-research/ash-dieback/public-guidance/>

Ash dieback: <https://www.forestresearch.gov.uk/tools-and-resources/fthr/pest-and-disease-resources/ash-dieback-hymenoscyphus-fraxineus/>

Common Sense Risk Management of Trees: <http://ntsgroup.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/FCMS025.pdf>

Horse chestnut leaf miner: <https://www.forestresearch.gov.uk/tools-and-resources/pest-and-disease-resources/horse-chestnut-leaf-miner/>

Alder leaf beetle: <https://www.forestresearch.gov.uk/tools-and-resources/pest-and-disease-resources/alder-leaf-beetle/>

Tree planting funding: <https://treecouncil.org.uk/take-action/grants-for-trees/>

13.0 Glossary

DBH	Diameter at Breast Height. The diameter of the tree trunk taken at 1.3 metres above ground level. Multi stem trees have their stems measured separately.
VTA	Visual Tree Assessment. A system of tree inspection devised by Claus Mattheck using visual signs to read the body language of trees and aid diagnosis of potential defects.
Y	Young. A tree which has not yet established a significant rooting or branching structure.
EM	Early Mature. A tree which has established a significant rooting structure and internal scaffold structure, still developing significantly in height and spread.
M	Mature. A tree which has established a significant root plate and is over 50% of the way through its usual life expectancy.
OM	Over Mature. A tree which has fully established and will no longer continue to increase significantly in size, and may show signs of decline.
Codominant stem with included bark	Two stems on a tree suggesting a weakened union, where bark becomes trapped within the union.
Minor Deadwood	Deadwood under 50mm in diameter.
Major Deadwood	Deadwood equal to or greater than 50mm in diameter.
Risk	The combination of the likelihood of an event and the severity of the potential consequences; in the context of trees, the likelihood of a tree failure affecting a target combined with the severity of the associated consequences.
Abiotic	Damage caused by a physical rather than biological process.
Biotic	Relating to or resulting from a living organism.