Warnham Parish Council

Tree Inspection

Area 2 Cricket Ground

July 2022

1.1 Instruction:

This report, commissioned by Warnham Parish Council and is related to a tree inspection for Area 2 the Cricket Ground at Warnham Village. The survey was carried out on the 10.7.24 with the report completed on the 15.7.24

1.2 Brief:

To inspect trees in the areas indicated for the purpose of safety, identifying trees that could present a possible risk to person(s) and property, and to recommend remedial works.

1.3 Maps:

Maps supplied in this report are not to scale and are used to zone areas and for the approximate location of the trees that have been surveyed. The map accompanying this survey identifies trees on the Cricket Ground and Village Hall area only.

2.0 Rationale of inspection:

This survey focuses on trees that could present risks to individuals or property, based on frequency of use and likelihood for harm. The Cricket Ground areas adjacent to the village hall, playground, local housing, school and public footpath are all considered high risk. The inner area of the cricket ground is low risk.

2.1 Survey methodology

This survey was conducted as a visual ground-based survey only. No aerial inspection was carried out and no decay detection equipment was used, other than a probe to assess cavities or rot. Where further inspection is considered appropriate, a recommendation will be included in this report. Where remedial work is required as a result of this survey, a priority list has been included as categories: Urgent, High, Medium and Low. Urgent priority should be carried out immediately (or as soon as is practical); High priority should be carried out within a period of 2 months, Medium within 4 months and Low within 6 months, from receipt date of this survey.

Please note that the tree numbers within this survey do correspond with the Tree Survey conducted in 2023. Where tree numbers are missing, this indicates the tree(s) have been felled.

2.2 Limitations:

Trees, being living organisms, are subject to change and best practice dictates that they should be inspected on a regular basis (subject to recommendations) for reasons of safety. Although every effort has been made to detect defects that could result in harm (during the date of survey), no guarantee can be given to the absolute safety of any individual tree. For example, storm conditions can cause damage to apparently healthy trees, resulting in new hazards. The recommendations stated within this report are in the context of the current condition of the trees (at the time of inspection) and the current usage of the areas; any further change in use or condition of any area indicated or following any named storm event (as defined by the UK Met office), should result in a further re-inspection, by a suitably qualified person(s), to identify any new hazards arising.

It is not known to the author if the trees on the Cricket Ground are covered by Tree Preservation Orders. It is not known if any of the trees surveyed contain the presence of protected species such as bats (it is illegal to carry out remedial work on trees containing bats or bat roosts, without permission). A bat survey was not carried out as part of this survey. This survey furthermore does not suggest that the trees requiring remedial work are in anyway 'safe' to climb, in order for contractors to carry-out aerial tree work. Contractors are recommended to carry out their own visual hazard inspection and complete a written risk assessment prior to commencing any remedial works. The author will therefore not accept any liability, for failure to comply with relevant permissions, damage to protected wildlife or habitat(s) or to the health and safety of contractors and/or the general public or property, caused during recommended remedial works. The author will also not accept any liability for injury to persons, or damage to property, caused by trees within the surveyed areas, due to the recommendations in this report not being adhered to, or during or following any named storm event (as defined by the UK Met Office). It is ultimately the responsibility of the owner/occupier of land, as directed by the Occupiers Liability Act 1957 as amended 1984, to take reasonable steps to ensure a 'duty of care' to others. Where doubt exists, expert advice should be sought.

The area of this survey is the same as the previously agreed area, as sent to Warnham Parish Council on the 2.8.2021, no trees outside the boundary of this area (as indicated by the map) were surveyed. The large oak tree in the grounds of the Village Hall has not been included in this survey as it requires monitoring with specialist decay detection equipment and is under the care and management of Haraway Tree Services LTD. Three trees on the boundary with the Glebe have not been surveyed (please see Map 2). This is due to the Parish Councillors concluding that these trees were not under council ownership as they are on the new development side of the fence.

3.0 Guidelines

This survey was carried out following current best practice guidance, namely the National Tree Safety Group guidelines in *Common Sense Risk Management of Trees* (2010). It is recommended that any remedial works carried out following this survey should adhere to all relevant current legislation, regulations and follow British Standards for Tree Work BS3998. Any Forestry Commission, Local Authority, Highways or protected species 'permissions of work', should be sought before work commences (where applicable). During remedial work, all health and safety legislation should be adhered to by contractors.

4.0 Brief overview of survey findings

There is limited remedial work required, from this survey with only six trees requiring remedial work. One tree T78 has a pathogen at its base and would benefit from a follow up more detailed inspection with a decay detection device such a Picus tomograph. The next 'formal' tree inspection of this area should be carried out by August 2025 (as directed by WPC).

Inspection Findings

Area 2

Tree No.	Species	Ht (m)	Age	DBH (cm)	Condition	Recommendations	Priority	Date work Completed
T50	Sycamore	14	SM	46	Average condition for age. There is an included union @1.5m.	No work required.		
T51	Lime	8	Y	34	This tree within the playground is in typical condition for the species, with numerous tight unions.	No work required.		
T52	Field maple	4	Y	8	This tree continues to establish well.	No work required.		
T53	Walnut	3.5	Y	6	This tree continues to establish well.	No work required.		
T54	Walnut	3.5	Y	6	This tree continues to establish well.	No work required.		
T55	Oak	14	SM	30	This tree is in average condition for its age. Minor deadwood.	No work required.		
T56	Oak	14	SM	69	This tree is in fair condition for its age. Since the previous survey the crown growth continues to improve. There is a broken limb hanging down.	Remove broken limb (this can be carried out with a pole saw).	**Low**	
T57	Oak	16	SM	62	This tree is in overall good condition, although there is some very minor dieback in the upper crown.	No work required.		
T58	Horse chestnut	18	M	68	This tree is in fair condition although there is some significant bark sluffing on the lower limb over the hedge and within the upper crown. There is some dieback on the stem over the road and some exudations on the stem @ 2.5m and 4m. There is little change from previous survey.	Monitor crown dieback in follow-up survey.		

Tree No.	Species	Ht (m)	Age	DBH (cm)	Condition	Recommendations	Priority	Date work Completed
T60	Sycamore	22	M	82	This is a large tree adjacent to the school, path and carpark. It is in fair condition although there is a tight union at 5m. There has been some work carried out on the path which may have damaged roots.	Monitor crown and union in follow up surveys.		
T61	Oak	18	M	68	This tree adjacent to the path and carpark and is on the bank of a ditch. It is in a fair condition for its age. There is a small cavity at the base and a tight union @ 4m.	No work required.		
T62	Sycamore	20	M	76	This tree adjacent to the school, path and carpark and is on the bank of a ditch. It is in average condition. The tree has a tight union @ 4m.	No work required.		
T63	Hornbeam	9	Y	28	Average condition.	No work required.		
T65	Ash	18	M	64	This tree has a co-dominant stem @2.5m. There is some continued dieback in the crown (minor deadwood), but it does not appear to be suffering from Ash Dieback Disease.	No work required.		
T66	Norway maple	10	SM	26	Average condition.	No work required.		
T67	Oak	10	SM	32	Average condition, although suppressed by adjacent trees.	No work required.		
T68	Oak	12	SM	38	Average condition, for age	No work required.		

Tree No.	Species	Ht (m)	Age	DBH (cm)	Condition	Recommendations	Priority	Date work Completed
T69	Whitebeam	7	Y	18	Since the last survey this tree has declined significantly and has spare crown growth.	Monitor.		
T71	Oak	20	OM	120	This is a large tree to the rear of the Glebe. It is co-dominant @3m. There is minor deadwood in the crown and extended limbs towards the property.	Monitor unions in follow up surveys.		
T72	Oak	16	M	60	Average condition, for age, with minor deadwood within the crown.	No work required.		
T73	Oak	22	M	80	Average condition, for age. One piece of major dead wood over seat.	Remove dead wood (this was recommended in the last survey)	**Low**	
T74	Oak	14	SM	44	Average condition, for age. There is some bark damage to the base.	No work required.		
T75	Oak	24	OM	132	This is a very large tree on the boundary of the cricket ground. Previous remedial work of reducing extended limbs over the adjacent property, does not seem to have been fully carried out.	Ownership of this tree needs to be fully established as it appears outside the boundary fence. Carry out remedial work if ownership is WPC.	**Low**	
T76	Ash	16	SM	40	This tree is was showing signs of Ash Dieback Disease in the previous survey, but appears to have stabilised although the regrowth is congested.	Monitor disease progression.		
T77	Oak	9	Y	18	This tree is establishing well.	No work required.		

Tree No.	Species	Ht (m)	Age	DBH (cm)	Condition	Recommendations	Priority	Date work Completed
T78	Oak	22	OM	120	This is a large tree adjacent to the footpath and new development. There has been some past disturbance to the northern root area of this tree. One bracket of *Ganoderma resinaceum* fungus was observed in 2023, located at the base on the eastern side. This has increased with several brackets at the base and up the buttress area to 0.3m. There is some bark congestion on a lower limb parallel with the path and a limb over adjacent garden has a small crack 3m from the stem (this limb has been reduced in length as recommended by the previous survey).	This tree would benefit from a Picus investigation to ascertain decay progression within the buttress area.	**Medium**	
T79	Oak	22	M	76	This is a large tree adjacent to the footpath. There has been some past disturbance to the rear of the tree. The 2021 survey noted dieback. Since this time the dieback has decreased and the crown growth has stabilised.	Monitor crown dieback.		
T80	Oak	20	M	60	This is a large tree adjacent to the footpath. There has been some past disturbance to the rear of the tree. The 2021 survey noted dieback. Since this time the dieback has decreased and the crown growth has stabilised.	Monitor crown dieback.		

Tree No.	Species	Ht (m)	Age	DBH (cm)	Condition	Recommendations	Priority	Date work Completed
T81	Oak	22	OM	100	This is a large tree adjacent to the footpath. There has been some past disturbance to the rear of the tree. . The 2021 survey noted dieback. Since this time the dieback has decreased and the crown growth has stabilised. There is exudation on the stem at 3m on the western side. A large lower limb towards adjacent property has a wound and cavity near to the branch union although the wound wood has developed well.	Monitor crown dieback.		
T82	Field maple	6	V	100	A very old tree. The tree is hollow. Regrowth has developed well.	None required.		
T83	Sycamore	18	M	Multi stem x5	This tree adjacent to the footpath is in a fair condition. There are multiple tight unions at the base and a small cavity on the western side. The tree still has crown dieback of 20%, this has not progressed since the last survey.	Monitor unions in follow up surveys.		
T84	Sycamore	18	M	45	This tree adjacent to the footpath is in fair condition. There is some minor dieback. There is deadwood in the crown, but this is over the ditch and hedge. The tree has crown dieback of 15%, this has not progressed since the last survey.	No work required.	.	

Tree No.	Species	Ht (m)	Age	DBH (cm)	Condition	Recommendations	Priority	Date work Completed
T85	Sycamore	18	M	Co-dominant	This tree adjacent to the footpath is in a fair condition. There is a tight union at 1m. The tree has crown dieback of 15%, this has not progressed since the last survey.	Monitor union in follow up surveys.		
T86	Oak	18	OM	110	This tree is adjacent to the path and has been reduced in the past. It was noted in 2019 that the tree continued to decline. This decline appears to have stabilised. There was evidence of Spindle shank fungus (*Collybia fusipes*) at the base and this could be the agent of the crown dieback. This fungus was not present during this survey. There is a cavity on the limb over the path but no signs of structural issues and a tight union (no cracks) on the two main crown stems and a Limb over the carpark with a cavity at the stem union.	This tree would benefit from a sympathetic crown reduction to rebalance the crown.	**Low**	
T87	Red oak	15	SM	44	This tree adjacent to the path is in average condition. Crown condition continues to improve since the last survey. There are several lower limbs drooping over the adjacent path.	Benefit from a light crown raise.	**Low**	
T88	Field maple	10	M	50	This tree is in average condition. It is weighted towards the road and has two limbs with tight unions. There appears to have been some trenching work carried out adjacent to this tree.	Monitor tight unions in follow up surveys.		

Tree No.	Species	Ht (m)	Age	DBH (cm)	Condition	Recommendations	Priority	Date work Completed
T89	Field maple	10	M	Multi stem x5	This tree is in average condition. There is a cavity on the northern side at 1m and a tight union at 0.5m. There appears to have been some trenching work carried out adjacent to this tree	Monitor the tight union and cavity in follow up surveys.		
T90	Oak	12	SM	32	This tree is located within the playground of the Village Hall. It is developing well and is of good form and condition. There appears to have been some trenching work carried out adjacent to this tree	No work required.		

Glossary of terms and explanation of abbreviations

U= Urgent (As soon as is possible)

H= High Priority (Within 2 month of survey date)

M= Medium Priority (Within 4 months of survey date)

L= Low Priority (Within 6 months of survey date)

Non safety Work: This work could be organised at any point that is convenient for the Parish Council and could be carried out 'in house'.

Monitor

Indicates that a given tree may have structural or physiological conditions that warrant monitoring as part of follow up surveys (as indicated), but which were not considered to be a hazard to persons or property (requiring remedial work) at the time this survey was conducted.

DBH = Diameter at Breast Height (1.3m) in centimetres (cm), Ht =Height in metres, Age (approximate, dependant on species) (Y) young, (SM) semi-mature, (M) Mature, (OM) Over-mature, (V) Veteran. All measurements within this report are approximate

The Author

Qualifications

Higher National Diploma in Forestry, Arboricultural Association Technicians Certificate in Arboriculture, City and Guilds Craftsman in Tree Surgery. City and Guilds (NPTC) Chainsaw Assessor. Certificate in Further Education teaching, Certificate in Level 3 practical instructor, IOSH certificate managing health and safety.

Experience

Twenty five years within the Land-based sector, focusing on Forestry and Arboriculture practice and training. Positions currently held: Forestry and Arboriculture Consultant, Chainsaw Instructor and City and Guilds Assessor. Positions previously held include; Tree surgeon, Countryside Ranger, Forester, National Trust Head Forester, Lecturer in arboriculture and forestry.

Copyright

The author asserts copyright and intellectual ownership over this document. This document cannot therefore be copied or shared or displayed in a digital format without the prior permission of the author.

15.7.2024 JP Cornford