



TREE SURVEY & RISK ASSESSMENT

Flers Court, Warminster

For & on behalf of: ELM Group

Robert C. Yates

December 2025

CONTENTS :

- 1. Instruction & Remit**
- 2. Caveats**
- 3. Survey Methodology**
- 4. Re-Inspection Procedure**
- 5. Findings & General Recommendations**
- 6. Statutory Obligations**

Appendices:

- 1. Schedule of trees**
- 2. Site/Tree Location Plan**

1.0 Instruction & Remit

We are instructed by Mr Lloyd Taylor (Area Manager for ELM Group), to carry out a survey and risk assessment of all trees on the site of Flers Court, Warminster.

The main objective of this survey is to comply with the school's legal 'duty of care' obligations and adopted health & safety policies.

2.0 Caveats

All trees have been inspected from ground level only. Should further, more detailed inspection be deemed appropriate, this will be mentioned in the recommendations section of the appended schedule of works.

Trees are dynamic living organisms, whose health and condition can be subject to rapid changes, depending upon a number of internal and external factors. The conclusions and recommendations contained in this report are based on the trees at the time of inspection. It should be noted that even completely sound, healthy trees, can fail, given sufficiently severe weather conditions.

3.0 Survey Methodology

- 3.1 All trees have been assessed for general condition and health & safety issues, using the recognised system known as VTA (Visual Tree Assessment) as popularised by eminent arboriculturists such as Dr. David Lonsdale (Ref. Principles of Tree Hazard Assessment & Management 1999) and Mattheck & Breloer (Ref. The Body Language of Trees 1999).
- 3.2 The primary identification system used, is based on numbered tags affixed to all significant individual trees. In addition, the approximate location of the trees is marked on the plan at Appendix 2.
- 3.3 Management recommendations have been given for each tree (or group) based on the relevant risk zone and the probability of failure, and these recommended works have been prioritised as High, Medium or Low, as follows:

High Priority : Carry out works within 3 months

Medium Priority : Carry out works within 6 months

Low Priority : Works not immediately relevant to health & safety, but should ideally be undertaken for reasons of sound arboricultural practice or to avoid an increase in the probability of failure – 18 months is suggested as a maximum

- 3.4 The survey was carried out on 10th December 2025, by Robert C Yates (principal partner & consultant). The weather at the time of survey was fine and bright with very good visibility.

Robert Yates holds the formal qualification, *Tech.Cert.Arbor.A* and the LANTRA Certificate in Professional Tree Inspection. He has over 35 years' combined industry experience, and is a member of the Consulting Arborist Society, the Arboricultural Association and the Royal Forestry Society.

4.0 Re-Inspection Procedure

The recommended period between formal risk assessments i.e. by a professional arboriculturist is **three years**.

All trees should be included in routine risk assessments carried out by a suitably competent member of the permanent site staff – a risk assessment should always be undertaken immediately following severe weather events i.e. high winds, heavy rain or snow falls. If in doubt regarding the safety of a particular tree, always consult a qualified arboriculturist.

5.0 Findings & General Recommendations

- 5.1 The main survey area lies to the West side of the retirement bungalows at Flers Court, and comprises predominantly Sycamore as the dominant canopy tree, which Holly as the secondary species. Minority species include False Acacia, Field Maple, Ash and Oak, whilst the understorey consists of Cherry Laurel, Elder, Hazel, young Holly and Elm, and a small number of ornamental shrubs. The largely unmanaged Laurel, in particular, would benefit from a reduction in height e.g. to 2.5 metres.

- 5.2 For detailed and specific recommendations see Appendix 1.

- 5.3 The photos below relate to the works specified at Appendix 1, for tree no.144 (Fig.1). This tree has been recommended for removal, due to the presence of a known wood decay fungus *Kretzschmaria deusta* (Fig.2); this will eventually lead to a brittle form failure in the stem base or structural roots, thus having serious safety implications, given the proximity of adjacent properties.



Fig.1 Overview of tree No.144



Fig.2 Close-up view of stem base

6.0 Statutory Obligations

- Works to trees which are covered by Tree Preservation Orders [TPOs] or are within a Conservation Area [CA] require permission or consent from your Local Planning Authority [LPA]. *We understand that the entire site falls within a Conservation Area, and thus a formal 'Notice of Intent' to the local planning authority is necessary in order to comply with the legislation (Removal of dead wood is exempt from this requirement).*
- It is a criminal offence under normal circumstances to disturb or destroy - whether intentional or unintentional - the nesting sites of wild birds or the roost sites of bats, under the 'Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981, the 'Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000' and the 'Conservation of Habitats & Species Regulations 2017'. *We strongly recommend that prior to commencement of any significant tree works, a thorough aerial inspection is carried out by a suitably competent arborist in order to check for signs of bat activity or occupied nest sites.*

APPENDIX 1 : Schedule of trees at Flers Court – December 2025 (Page 1 of 3)

Tree ID.	Species (Common Name)	Age Class	Height (m)	Stem dia. (cm)	Physiological Condition	Structural Condition	Observations / Comments	Recommendations	Work Priority
119	False Acacia	mature	22	45	good	Good/fair	Previously reduced crown	No works required	n/a
120	False Acacia	mature	16	65	good	Good/fair	Previously reduced crown, Ivy clad stem	Sever Ivy at base	LOW
121	Holly	mature	8.5	3x 35	good	good	Three stems from base	No works required	n/a
122	Sycamore	mature	25	45	good	good	Previously reduced crown	No works required	n/a
123	Sycamore	mature	25	45	good	Good/fair	Co-dominant stems from 7m	No works required	n/a
124	Ash	m/aged	11	30	good	good	Ivy clad stem	Sever Ivy at base	LOW
125	Sycamore	mature	25	40	good	Good/fair	Drawn & slender form, excessively crown lifted in past, Ivy clad stem	Sever Ivy at base	LOW
126	Sycamore	mature	25	50	good	good	Previously reduced crown, Ivy clad stem, basal epicormic shoots, cavity at 1m in former sub-stem (non-invasive to main stem)	Sever Ivy at base	LOW
127	Field Maple	m/aged	8	20	good	good	Ivy clad stem	Sever Ivy at base	LOW
128	Sycamore	mature	23	35	good	good	Previously reduced crown	No works required	n/a
129	Sycamore	mature	26	45	good	good	Crown suppressed to East, Ivy clad stem	Sever Ivy at base	LOW

Tree Survey & Risk Assessment – Flers Court, Warminster – December 2025

Tree ID.	Species (Common Name)	Age Class	Height (m)	Stem dia. (cm)	Physiological Condition	Structural Condition	Observations / Comments	Recommendations	Work Priority
130	Sycamore	mature	26	40	good	Good/fair	Co-dominant stems from 9m, Ivy clad stem	Sever Ivy at base	LOW
131	Sycamore	mature	26	45	good	Good/fair	Crown suppressed to East, Ivy clad stem	Sever Ivy at base	LOW
132	Sycamore	mature	26	45	good	good	Previously reduced crown, Ivy clad stem	Sever Ivy at base	LOW
133	Holly	mature	7	3x 25	good	good	Three stems from base	No works required	n/a
134	Oak	young	8.5	10	good	good	No comments	No works required	n/a
135	Field Maple	m/aged	10	30	good	good	No comments	No works required	n/a
136	Sycamore	mature	30	65	good	Good/fair	Co-dominant stems from 7m	No works required	n/a
137	Holly	mature	11	40	good	good	No comments	No works required	n/a
138	Sycamore	mature	30	55	good	good	Previously reduced crown	No works required	n/a
139	Crataegus spp.	m/aged	6	20	good	fair	Pronounced lean but stable	No works required	n/a
140	Sycamore	mature	25	50	good	good	Previously reduced crown, numerous surrounding young self-set Sycamore	No works required	n/a
141	Holly	mature	7	25	good	good	No comments	No works required	n/a
142	Holly	mature	8	m/s	fair	Good/fair	Multiple stems from base, one stem to East has advanced terminal dieback	Remove one stem with dieback	LOW

Tree Survey & Risk Assessment – Flers Court, Warminster – December 2025

Tree ID.	Species (Common Name)	Age Class	Height (m)	Stem dia. (cm)	Physiological Condition	Structural Condition	Observations / Comments	Recommendations	Work Priority
143	Sycamore	mature	27	45	good	Good/fair	Previously reduced crown	No works required	n/a
144	Sycamore	mature	28	70	good	poor	<i>K.deusta</i> fungal fruit bodies at base to East with associated internal wood decay (possibly into roots), located within falling distance of adjacent properties to West – HIGH RISK of basal failure	REMOVE TO GROUND LEVEL (spot marked with orange paint)	HIGH
145	Sycamore	young	11	15	good	good	No comments	No works required	n/a
146	Field Maple	m/aged	10	30	good	good	Co-dominant stems from 1m	No works required	n/a
147	Sycamore	mature	30	55	good	Good/fair	Excessively crown lifted in past	No works required	n/a
148	Sycamore	mature	23	55	good	Good/fair	Co-dominant stems from 9m, basal epicormic shoots	Remove epicormic shoots up to 3m	LOW
149	Sycamore	mature	25	75	good	good	Heavily reduced crown (recent), basal epicormic shoots	Remove epicormic shoots up to 2m	LOW
150	Willow Leaved Pear	mature	3	10	good	good	Maintained crown	No works required	n/a
151	Cherry	mature	3	30	good	good	Previously reduced crown	No works required	n/a
152	Cherry	mature	8.5	50	good	good	Previously reduced crown, exposed surface roots	No works required	n/a

APPENDIX 2: Tree Location Plan for Flers Court, Warminster (Not to Scale)

