

Room 2, 8 Astley House
Cromwell Business Park
Banbury Road
Chipping Norton
Oxon
OX7 5SR

T: 01608 692705

E: info@treefrontiers.com



Norway Maple (T1), Hill & Moor Parish Council

Tree Condition Report

Site: Hill & Moor Parish Council
Postcode: WR10 2PG
Client: Hill & Moor Parish Council

Document Ref: 1185214-950-RPT-TCA
Revision No D1
Status: For Client Review
Date: 11th August 2026
Author: Nicholas Bolton
Qualifications: BA Hons BSc Hons MArborA MICFor RCarborA
Position: Director

Environmentally Focussed Tree Management Solutions



Room2, 8 Astley House, Cromwell Business Park, Banbury Road, Chipping Norton, Oxfordshire OX7 5SR
T: 01608 692 705

E: info@treefrontiers.com



DOCUMENT CONTROL

Plans and Schedules to be read in conjunction with this report:

Type	Reference	Version
Tree Schedule	1185214-950-INF-SCH	1
Tree Location Plan	1185214-950-DRW-TLP	1

Version Control

Date	Notes	Author	Version
11.08.2026	Initial draft for client review	NB	D1

Survey Date: 6th August 2026

Timeframe of Assessment: 28 months (+/- 1 month)

Next inspection due: November 2028 – January 2029

Copyright & Limitations

This report and its content are copyright © 2026 Tree Frontiers Ltd (TFL). All rights reserved.

This report may not be distributed or commercially exploited until a final version has been issued and payment in full has been received by TFL.

Any unauthorised redistribution or reproduction of part or all the contents of this report will constitute an infringement of copyright.

This report was prepared by TFL solely for use by Hill & Moor Parish Council and its agents. This report is not addressed to and may not be relied upon by any other party other than Hill & Moor Parish Council and its agents for any purpose without the prior written permission of TFL.

TFL, its partners, employees, associates and affiliated companies accept no responsibility or liability for reliance upon or use of this report other than by Hill & Moor Parish Council and its agents for the purposes for which it was originally commissioned and prepared.

TFL holds Professional Indemnity Insurance in connection with the preparation of this report. Details of the current policy, including the insurer and level of cover, are available from TFL upon request.

Opinions and information provided in the report are prepared using all reasonable skill, care and due diligence in compliance with the industry best practice guidance (the National Tree Safety Group's Common Sense Risk Management of Trees and BS3998:2010 Tree Work - Recommendations), and The Arboricultural Association and Institute of Chartered Foresters Codes of Professional Conduct.

Contents

1.	Introduction	3
2.	Site	3
3.	Extent and Methodology of Tree Survey	3
4.	Risk Management and Threshold	5
5.	Timeframe of Assessment	6
6.	Tree Survey and Observations	6
7.	Statutory Considerations	7
8.	About the Author	9
9.	References & Bibliography	9
10.	Appendix 1: Tree Risk Assessment Methodology	11
11.	Appendix 2 - Ash Dieback (<i>Hymenoscyphus fraxineus</i>)	15

FOR REVIEW

1. INTRODUCTION

Instruction

- 1.1 I have been instructed by Hill & Moor Parish Council to undertake a condition survey of the trees within or on the boundary of land owned by the council.

Scope

- 1.2 The scope of this instruction was:
- To undertake a survey of all trees within or on the boundary of the site, and;
 - Prepare a report with recommendations for mitigating any identified tree related hazards.

2. SITE

- 2.1 Hill & Moor Parish Council land ('the Site') is located in Lower Moor in Worcestershire (see Plate 1).



Plate 1: Indicative Site location (Source: Google Earth)

3. EXTENT AND METHODOLOGY OF TREE SURVEY

Surveyor

- 3.1 The survey was carried out on 6th August 2026 by Nick Bolton, director and arboricultural consultant to Tree Frontiers. I am also the author of this report.

- 3.2 A summary of my experience and qualifications is provided in Section 8 of the report.

Survey Approach

- 3.3 The assessment was carried out as a walk-over survey, following the guidance issued by the National Tree Safety Group in their publication, *Common Sense Risk Management of Trees*. This approach enables a rapid inspection of trees from accessible viewpoints, allowing for the identification of any that may require further investigation or remedial safety management. Trees were visually assessed in relation to their overall condition and setting, with particular attention paid to features that might require closer scrutiny of the base, trunk, and crown.
- 3.4 To aid the inspection, tools such as a steel probe, binoculars, and a nylon-headed mallet were employed where accessible. These instruments helped to examine features from ground level, such as cavities, dead or delaminating bark, or to detect the presence of internal decay through acoustic resonance testing.

Assessment Technique

- 3.5 The methodology adopted was the Visual Tree Assessment (VTA) protocol developed by Mattheck and Breloer (1994). This is a ground-based system which does not employ advanced techniques or modern technology unless specifically noted within the report. Where such technologies have been utilised, this has been explicitly stated.

Limitations of Inspection

- 3.6 No excavation or other invasive methods were used during the survey. The soil at the base of each tree remained undisturbed, and root collars were only exposed where they were already visible. Furthermore, no soil samples or other tests were conducted, nor were any samples taken from the trees, roots, or leaves for laboratory analysis.
- 3.7 All trees were assessed during a single site visit. Consequently, there was no opportunity to observe the trees' responses to differing weather conditions or wind strengths. The condition assessment was based solely on observations made at the time of inspection.

Temporal Nature of Findings

- 3.8 The information presented in this survey reflects the state of the trees at the moment of assessment. Any subsequent changes to the site or local environment may affect the trees, and such events are outside the scope of this report.

Inventory Basis and Recommendations

- 3.9 This survey was conducted using a negative reporting approach, whereby all trees with a stem diameter greater than 75mm at 1.5 metres above ground level were inspected. Trees identified as having features warranting intervention have been specifically recorded, along with recommended remedial actions and suggested timescales for their resolution, as determined by the risk assessment methodology.
- 3.10 Additionally, certain trees that did not require immediate intervention were also documented where I considered it important for the site management team to be aware of their characteristics or circumstances. These trees have been noted to ensure relevant information

is available for ongoing management and monitoring, even though no remedial action is currently advised.

Nature of Trees and Risk

- 3.11 Trees are living, self-optimising mechanical structures that adapt and respond to their environment. They can suffer wounds or infections from external factors, and their growth is characterised by an efficient use of materials to ensure stress is evenly distributed across their surfaces. Despite this, even trees in perfect mechanical condition may be susceptible to damage or failure in the event of extreme weather or other exceptional circumstances.
- 3.12 Any tree may pose a hazard as a result of decay or structural weakness, with the level of risk influenced by its size and proximity to potential targets. It is important to note that no tree can be guaranteed to be entirely safe, and even healthy specimens may experience damage under normal conditions.

Photographic Evidence and Professional Scope

- 3.13 Unless otherwise indicated, all photographs included in this report and schedule were taken by me during the site visit.
- 3.14 While I have experience with landscape, ecological, and legal matters, formal qualifications in these fields are not held. Therefore, any comments relating to these topics are provided solely in a general context, and professional advice should be sought where necessary.

4. RISK MANAGEMENT AND THRESHOLD

- 4.1 This assessment has been undertaken having regard to current published guidance on tree risk management, principally the National Tree Safety Group's Common Sense Risk Management of Trees and Forestry Commission guidance, which the courts have identified as the most directly relevant references when considering a duty holder's civil liability (see *Witley Parish Council v Cavanagh* (2018) and *Hoyle v Hampshire County Council* (2022)). The HSE's Sector Information Minute on the management of the risk from falling trees (SIM 01/2007/05) reflects the "as low as reasonably practicable" (ALARP) principle applied under health and safety legislation, and has also been considered. However, both judgments above note that the SIM is primarily directed at the standard required to avoid criminal prosecution rather than civil liability, and it has therefore been applied here alongside, rather than in place of, the NTSG and Forestry Commission guidance.
- 4.2 This survey and its recommendations follow a risk-based approach to tree management. This means that recommended works are directed at hazards and defects identified as presenting a foreseeable risk to people or property. Wider tree health, amenity or longer-term management objectives fall outside the scope of this instruction and, where relevant, should be addressed separately.
- 4.3 The intention is to ensure that any risk rating that might be ascribed to trees is defined as "low" (or its quantitative equivalent), after remedial works have been completed. A more detailed description of the risk ratings is presented with the schedule of trees, and the risk assessment methodology is presented in Appendix 1.

- 4.4 Not every hazard rated “Low” carries the same basis for that rating. Some Low-rated hazards are unlikely to fail at all within the assessment period, in which case no works are required and the hazard is simply retained for review at the next scheduled inspection. Others are rated Low only because current occupancy of the area is limited, even though failure of the tree or a part of it is itself assessed as likely (Likelihood of Failure: Imminent or Probable – see Appendix 1). For these, the schedule may identify either intervention or a shorter monitoring interval, and the rating should be reviewed if occupancy of the area changes (for example, through new access, events, or nearby works).
- 4.5 This approach accords with current best practice guidance as defined by the National Tree Safety Group and Forestry Commission, and is consistent with HSE guidance on managing the risk from falling trees.

5. TIMEFRAME OF ASSESSMENT

- 5.1 The assessment of trees at the site has been conducted on the basis of a 28-month timeframe. This period defines the window during which the potential for any identified hazard to result in failure has been assessed.
- 5.2 For each hazard identified during the survey, any recommended actions are detailed within the accompanying schedule. Each action is assigned a specific timeframe for completion, which may be shorter than, but will not exceed, the 28-month assessment period.
- 5.3 The rationale behind adopting this 28-month timeframe is to ensure that subsequent inspections take place at a different point in the year compared to the current survey. This approach enables the assessment of varying aspects of tree condition that may be more apparent at different seasons. Consequently, the next inspection should be carried out within 28 months (+/- 1 month) from the date of this survey, so the recommended inspection window for the next survey is between November 2028 and January 2029.
- 5.4 Notwithstanding the 28-month timeframe of assessment set out above, all ash trees (*Fraxinus excelsior*) within or on the boundary of the site must be reassessed on a fixed 12-month cycle, irrespective of the general assessment timeframe or any zoning or management plan otherwise applicable to the wider site. Reassessment should be undertaken annually in summer (June to September) while trees are in leaf, when symptoms of ash dieback (*Hymenoscyphus fraxineus*) are most readily identifiable (see Appendix 2). This reflects the potential for rapid deterioration associated with ash dieback, which can compromise structural integrity within as little as two growing seasons.

6. TREE SURVEY AND OBSERVATIONS

- 6.1 A detailed schedule of all recorded trees is included as part of this report, accompanied by a location plan and a photographic record.
- 6.2 The schedule provides a hyperlink to Google Maps, allowing the reader to locate the approximate position of each individual tree with ease. The following information is recorded for each tree:
- **Tree Details:** Species, measured height, stem diameter, and estimated age class.

- **Location and Potential Targets:** Identification of the tree's position and any potential targets, including an indication of typical occupancy levels.
- **Observed Hazards:** Noted hazards associated with each tree.
- **Likelihood of failure of the identified hazard:** Imminent, Probable, Possible or Improbable.
- **Risk Rating:** An assessment of the risk posed by each tree.
- **Recommended Actions:** Suggestions for works either intended to reduce the identified risk or as part of good arboricultural practice.
- **Timeframe for Works:** The recommended period within which any suggested works should be completed.

7. STATUTORY CONSIDERATIONS

Felling Licences: Requirements and Exceptions

- 7.1 Under the Forestry Act 1967 (as amended), anyone wishing to fell trees in England must obtain a felling licence from the Forestry Commission unless an exemption applies. It is an offence to fell trees without the appropriate licence or other valid permission, and penalties can include both fines and a requirement to replant the trees.
- 7.2 A felling licence is required for the felling of more than 5 cubic metres of timber in any calendar quarter, unless no more than 2 cubic metres are sold. For smaller quantities, or where the timber is not sold, a licence may not be necessary. The regulations apply regardless of whether the trees are on private or public land.
- 7.3 There are several key exemptions where a felling licence is not required, including:
 - The felling of trees in a garden, orchard, churchyard, or designated public open space.
 - Trees with a diameter less than 8 cm (measured at 1.3 m above ground level), or less than 10 cm if thinning to benefit the growth of other trees.
 - Felling required by a statutory obligation (such as safety works on highways or to comply with a notice from the local authority).
 - Works authorised by other types of consent, such as planning permission.
- 7.4 Anyone proposing to fell trees should check with the Forestry Commission to determine whether a licence is required, and to ensure that none of the exemptions apply. In addition, it is important to note that felling licences do not override other statutory protections, such as Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) or Conservation Area controls, for which separate consent may be necessary.

Trees

- 7.5 Part VII of The Town and Country Planning Act (1990) (the Act) provides protection to trees in specified circumstances, through the use of Tree Preservation Orders (TPO), or by a tree being located within a Conservation Area.
- 7.6 The Town and Country Planning (Tree Preservation Order) (England) Regulations 2012 prohibits any works to trees that are subject to a TPO without the written consent of the local planning authority. There are exemptions to the regulations relating to planning and the conditions of

the trees. No works can be undertaken on a protected tree until the authority has granted consent in writing.

- 7.7 Section 198 of the Act also provides protection to trees that are located within a Conservation Area. Prior to any works being undertaken on such trees the local planning authority must be informed. Once notice has been given, the authority has up to six weeks to consider whether it wishes to object to the works. After this period and in the absence of any response from the authority, works can be undertaken.
- 7.8 The Site is located within Worcestershire, and Wychavon is the LPA.
- 7.9 A search has been undertaken on the LPA website to determine if any trees are subject to a TPO or if any trees are located in a conservation area. The searches have indicated that the Site is not within a Conservation Area, and no trees are subject to a TPO.
- 7.10 Any contractor or property staff undertaking the works recommended in this report should undertake their own checks prior to commencing works.

Wildlife

- 7.11 The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, as amended by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000, provides statutory protection to wild birds and other species that may nest, roost, or shelter in trees. Prior to undertaking any tree pruning or removal, it is essential to check for the presence of nesting birds, bat roosts, badgers, and hibernating animals such as hedgehogs. Deliberate or reckless disturbance of these species may constitute an offence under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) and the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000).
- 7.12 Tree works are generally least disruptive to bats and birds when carried out during the autumn months, specifically between September and November.

Bats

- 7.13 All bat species are strictly protected under the following legislation:
- Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (Schedule 5)
 - Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019 (Schedule 2)
 - Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000
- 7.14 These laws prohibit the deliberate killing, injuring, or capturing of bats, the deliberate disturbance of bats whether roosting or not, and the damage, destruction, or obstruction of access to bat roosts. A bat roost is defined as any structure or location used by bats for shelter, protection, or breeding, regardless of whether bats are present at the time of inspection. If proposed works risk disturbing or destroying a bat roost, Natural England must be notified in advance and given sufficient time to provide guidance on whether and how the works may proceed. This will require an ecologist to submit the necessary information.

Birds

- 7.15 All wild birds, their nests, and eggs are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. It is an offence to intentionally damage or destroy an active nest. The nesting season typically runs from March to August, but checks should be carried out year-round. If active nests are found, works must be postponed until fledging is complete.

Timing of Works

- 7.16 To minimise ecological impact, tree works should ideally be scheduled for late autumn to early winter (September to November), avoiding peak activity periods for nesting birds, roosting bats, and hibernating mammals.

8. ABOUT THE AUTHOR

- 8.1 This report has been prepared by Nick Bolton, Director of Tree Frontiers Ltd and an arboricultural consultant to the company.
- 8.2 I have over 20 years' experience in the arboricultural sector and a first-class honours degree in arboriculture from Myerscough College, accredited by the University of Lancaster. I am a chartered member of the Institute of Chartered Foresters and a Registered Consultant of the Arboricultural Association.
- 8.3 I am qualified as a tree risk assessor for the International Society of Arboriculture's Tree Risk Assessment Qualification (TRAQ) as well as the VALID tree risk assessment methodology.

9. REFERENCES & BIBLIOGRAPHY

- 9.1 This report has referenced or made use of the following external reference sources:
- Dunster, J (2017) *Tree Risk Assessment Manual*. International Society of Arboriculture
 - Lonsdale, D (2001) *Principles of Tree Hazard Assessment*. HMSO
 - Mattheck, C., & Breloer, H. (1994, sixth impression 2001) *The body language of trees*. HMSO
 - Humphries, D & Wright, C (2020) *Fungi on trees: A photographic reference*. The Arboricultural Association
 - Bolton, N (2020) [*Tree Risk Management – A Guide to Landowner's Responsibilities*](#). Royal Forestry Society Quarterly Journal of Forestry
 - The National Tree Safety Group (2024) [*Common Sense Risk Management of Trees*](#). Forestry Commission, Edinburgh
 - The Tree Council (2019) [*Ash Dieback: an Action Plan Toolkit*](#).
 - Forestry Commission (2019) [*Operations Note 46a: The management of individual ash trees affected by ash dieback*](#).
 - [*Management of the risk from falling trees SIM 01/2007/05 HSE. 2003*](#).
 - The Town and Country Planning Act (1990)

- The Town and Country Planning (Tree Preservation Order) (England) Regulations (2012)
- Wychavon District Council (2026) [*Conservation Area Search*](#)
- Gov.uk (2024) [*Tree Preservation Orders and trees in conservation areas*](#)

FOR REVIEW

10. APPENDIX 1: TREE RISK ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

In order for risk to exist, there needs to be a hazard. A hazard is defined as something that has the potential to cause harm. In relation to trees, any part of a tree that could fail has the potential to be a hazard. Therefore, all trees are potentially hazardous.

Definitions as given in the Management of Health and Safety at Work Regulations (1999) and Approved Code of Practice (1992) are used throughout this document.

- A hazard is something with the potential to cause harm.
- Risk is the likelihood of potential harm from that hazard being realised. The extent of the risk will depend on:
 - (i) the likelihood of that harm occurring;
 - (ii) the potential severity of that harm, i.e. of any resultant injury or adverse health effect; and
 - (iii) the target (person, property or infrastructure) which might be affected by the hazard.

The International Society of Arboricultural has devised a programme for tree risk assessment which has achieved international recognition. The programme culminates in the Tree Risk Assessment Qualification (TRAQ), and ensures that the assessor is competent in Tree Biology and Mechanics, Tree Inspection and Assessment, Data Analysis and Risk Categorisation, and Risk Reporting.

The TRAQ system of assessing tree related risk uses two matrices to consider the likelihood of failure, the likelihood of a failed part impacting a target and the severity of that impact. The resulting output of the matrices provides an assessed risk rating (Extreme, High, Moderate & Low), but the management of that risk is retained with the landowner or risk management.

Every person or organisation will have a different attitude to risk and therefore the risk threshold will differ. The Risk Assessment does not seek to set a threshold but instead to provide a reference point for the risk manager to base any decision upon.

In order to assist in determining the level of risk associated with a hazard, the risk assessor needs to follow several stages:

1. Assessment of the potential target: The assessor must consider everything, whether inanimate or animate, which could be impacted by a hazard. Having considered what each target is, the assessor must then provide an occupancy rating based on the criteria in Table 1.

Table 1: Occupancy Rates

<u>Occupancy Rates</u>	
Constant	A target is present at all times, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week
Frequent	A target is occupied for a large portion of the day or week
Occasional	The target zone is occupied by people or targets infrequently or irregularly
Rare	The target zone is not commonly occupied by people

2. Having considered the potential target/s, the risk assessor must then consider the likelihood of each specified hazard failing. Table 2 provides details of the likely failure definitions.

Table 2: Likelihood of failure

<u>Likelihood of Failure</u>	
Imminent	Failure has started or is most likely to occur in the near future, even if there is no significant wind or increased load
Probable	Failure may be expected under normal weather conditions within the specified time period
Possible	Failure may be expected in extreme weather conditions, but is unlikely during normal weather conditions within the specified period
Improbable	The tree or part is not likely to fail during normal weather conditions and may not fail in many severe weather conditions, within the specified period.

3. Once the likelihood of failure has been determined, the assessor must then consider the likelihood of the hazard impacting on the target (on the assumption that the hazard has failed). Table 3 provide a summary of the likelihood of impact definitions.

Table 3: Likelihood of impact

<u>Likelihood of Impact</u>	
High	Failed tree or tree part is likely to impact the target. This is the case when there is a constant target, there are no protection factors and the direction of fall is towards the target.
Medium	The failed tree or part could impact the target but is not expected to do so
Low	There is a slight chance that the failed tree or part will impact the target
Very Low	The likelihood of the felled tree or tree part impacting the target is remote .

4. Having assessed the potential for failure and the potential of a hazard impacting the target, the assessor needs to consider the consequence of the hazard impacting the target. Table 4 provides details of the consequence definitions.

Table 4: Consequence of failure

Consequence of Failure	
Severe	Serious personal injury or death, damage to high-value property or disruption of important activities
Significant	Personal injury, property damage of moderate to high-value or considerable disruption
Minor	Very minor personal injury, property damage of low to moderate-value, or small disruptions to traffic
Negligible	No personal injury, low value property damage, or disruption that can be mitigated or repaired.

Once all of the likely or potential outcomes have been considered, the risk assessor is able to reach a conclusion as to the risk rating, using the matrices provided in Table 5 and Table 6.

Table 5: Likelihood of Failure vs Likelihood of Impact

		Likelihood of Impact			
		Very low	Low	Medium	High
Likelihood of failure	Imminent	Unlikely	Somewhat Likely	Likely	Very Likely
	Probable	Unlikely	Unlikely	Somewhat Likely	Likely
	Possible	Unlikely	Unlikely	Unlikely	Somewhat Likely
	Improbable	Unlikely	Unlikely	Unlikely	Unlikely

Table 6: Risk Rating

		Severity of Impact			
		Negligible	Minor	Significant	Severe
Results of Table 5	Very Likely	Low	Moderate	High	Extreme
	Likely	Low	Moderate	High	High
	Somewhat Likely	Low	Low	Moderate	Moderate
	Unlikely	Low	Low	Low	Low

The Action Threshold arising from the Risk Rating are presented in and also provided with the schedule of recorded trees.

Table 7: Action Thresholds

Extreme	Hazards that are in the process of failing, are highly likely to strike a target and cause severe harm or injury.	Works should be completed as a matter of urgency, ideally within a matter of days or as detailed by the assessor
High	Hazards that are highly likely to fail over the timeframe and which could cause severe harm or injury	Works should be completed as soon as possible, as a matter of urgency, usually within a matter of weeks or as detailed by the assessor
Moderate	Hazards that could foreseeably fail in the defined timeframe, but which are unlikely to result in a high level of harm or injury.	Works should be completed as soon as practicably possible and/or within the timeframe recommended by the assessor
Low – Foreseeable failure	Hazards assessed as likely to fail within the assessment period (Likelihood of Failure: Imminent/Probable), but which currently rate Low because occupancy or consequence is limited, rather than because failure itself is unlikely.	A shorter, documented monitoring interval applies (see schedule), and the rating should be reviewed if occupancy of the target area changes. Works are advisable where practicable, reflecting that failure is considered reasonably foreseeable.
Low – Monitor	Hazards assessed as unlikely to fail within the assessment period (Likelihood of Failure: Possible/Improbable). No feature indicates the hazard is foreseeably likely to occur.	No works are required. The hazard is retained for review at the next scheduled inspection; any suggested works are advisory only and would not alter the risk rating.

11. APPENDIX 2 - ASH DIEBACK (*HYMENOSCYPHUS FRAXINEUS*)

Guidance for tree owners

Ash dieback is a fungal disease that now affects the great majority of ash trees (*Fraxinus excelsior*) across Britain. It causes progressive loss of the crown and, in a proportion of trees, eventual death. First confirmed in the UK in 2012, the disease is now well established nationally, and it is likely that any ash tree assessed in this report will be affected to some degree, whether or not symptoms are yet visible.

This is a widespread and long-term issue rather than an emergency, and current national guidance is consistent: infection alone is not a reason to fell a tree. This note explains what ash dieback means in practice and what, as the tree owner, you need to do.

What this means for your tree(s)

Outcomes vary considerably between trees, and it is not possible to predict the future of a specific tree with certainty. However, some general patterns are well established:

- **Not all ash trees will die.** A small proportion (estimated at around 1–5%) show genetic tolerance and may survive and continue to reproduce.
- **Location matters.** Trees in open settings (eg hedgerows, parks and gardens) tend to decline more slowly than those in dense woodland, and some persist for many years with only mild symptoms.
- **Age and history matter.** Younger trees, and those recently cut back or coppiced, tend to decline fastest. Mature and veteran trees often tolerate the disease for longer.
- **Decline can still be rapid.** In some cases, particularly where secondary decay organisms such as honey fungus become established at the base, a tree's structural condition can deteriorate within as little as two growing seasons.

Because of this, dead, dying and declining ash trees should still be retained wherever it is safe to do so. They continue to provide habitat and landscape value, and retaining healthier-looking trees increases the chance that naturally tolerant individuals survive to the next generation.

Signs to look out for

- Wilting, blackened or sparse leaves, or dieback of twigs and small branches, most visible from June to September
- Diamond-shaped lesions where side shoots join branches
- Dense clusters of small shoots (epicormic growth) below areas of dieback
- Dark or weeping lesions, or areas of missing bark, at the base of the trunk. These can indicate hidden decay and reduced stability, even where the crown looks reasonably healthy

Not every unhealthy-looking ash tree has ash dieback. Drought, waterlogging, root damage and other pests or diseases can produce similar symptoms. If you are unsure, call Tree Frontiers and we will provide further advice.

Your responsibilities

As the owner of land on which a tree stands, you have a legal duty of care for the reasonable safety of anyone who might be affected by it. This does not mean removing all risk. National guidance (from the National Tree Safety Group) is built around a simple, proportionate principle, noting that trees provide real benefits and carry a genuinely low overall risk to public safety. Any action should be balanced against that risk rather than an automatic response.

In practice, this means:

- **Low-risk trees** — for example, in a hedge or field with no public access — should normally be left to decline naturally, with periodic monitoring.
- **Higher-risk trees** — close to roads, footpaths, parking areas, gardens or buildings — need closer and more frequent attention, and any necessary safety work should be proportionate to the risk rather than pre-emptive removal.

When to inspect

- Carry out a visual check of your ash trees at least once a year, ideally while they are in leaf (June to September), when symptoms are easiest to identify
- Take photographs at each inspection so change can be tracked from one year to the next

When to intervene or seek professional advice

Contact Tree Frontiers if any of the following apply:

- A tree near people, vehicles or property shows crown dieback beyond around half of its original extent, or possible basal decay
- You notice sudden leaning, new cracking, significant deadwood, or a recently fallen limb
- You are unsure whether symptoms are due to ash dieback, or unsure what action, if any, is needed

Inspect	Intervene	Ask for help
At least once a year, in leaf (June–September); more often near roads, footpaths or buildings.	If deadwood, crown loss over 50%, leaning, cracking or basal decay is present, or a target is nearby.	Whenever you are unsure

This note provides general background on ash dieback and does not replace the site-specific assessment, condition rating and recommendations for the tree(s) covered in the main body of this report.