

Jessop Road Norwich

Tree Survey

Prepared on behalf of

Imogen Mole Norwich City Council

Table of Contents

1.	.0	Qualifications	and	Experience

- 2.0 Scope and Limitations of Report
- 3.0 Site Details
- 4.0 General Observations
- 5.0 Recommended Tree works

1.0 Qualifications and Experience

- 1.1 My name is Giles Mercer and I am a Consultant practising through arbconsultants Limited, which is an Arboricultural Consultancy Practice based at Myerscough College in Lancashire. The Practice specialises in Arboriculture, Forestry, Urban Forestry, Biological Sciences and Project Management.
- 1.2 I am a Consultant specialising in tree failure, hazard evaluation, risk assessment related to trees, planning and development where trees are involved and insurance claims where tree failure is involved and/or building damage occurs which may be attributed to the activity of trees.
- 1.3 I have a 1st class honours degree in Arboriculture awarded by Myerscough College in conjunction with the University of Central Lancashire, the Arboricultural Association Technicians Certificate (Theory), the Royal Forestry Society Certificate in Arboriculture and am a licensed user of the QTRA (Quantified Tree Risk Assessment) system.
- 1.4 I have 10 years experience in the Arboricultural Industry ranging from contracting through to Senior Consulting level with Europe's largest specialist Arboricultural Consultancy.
- 1.5 I am a professional member of both the Arboricultural Association and the International Society of Arboriculture.

1.0 Scope and limitations of report

2.7 This report has been commissioned by Norwich City Council and the scope of the report reflects their instructions. The brief was to appraise specified trees in relation to the potential risk that they may pose to users of and visitors to the site.

- 2.2 The scope of the report includes a visual inspection of a number of significant trees within the area of Jessop Road.
- 2.3 Each tree is identified using its accepted common name and assigned a unique reference number.
- 2.4 The dimensions of the tree are recorded and notes taken relating to the maturity, vitality, safety.
- 2.5 Recommendation are made in respect of the management of the trees both in terms of their health / managing the risk they pose and also to avoid conflicts i.e. by reducing trees away from building and street furniture before they pose a problem.
- 2.6 This report refers to the condition of the trees and an assessment of the site on the day that the evaluation was undertaken, the trees were not climbed but assessed from ground level.
- 2.7 Data provided by the testing / measuring equipment has been verified according to the equipment manufacturer's instructions.
- 2.8 No analysis of soil samples was undertaken and no data of the soil structure is known and therefore no advice can be given on the likelihood of tree related subsidence events.
- 2.9 Any legal descriptions or information given to the Arbconsultants Ltd are understood to be accurate.
- 2.10 No responsibility is assumed by Arbconsultants Ltd for legal matters that may arise from this report, and the consultant shall not be required to give testimony or to attend court unless subsequent contractual arrangements are made.
- 2.11 Any alteration or deletion from this report will invalidate it as a whole.
- 2.12 This report is valid for six months from the date of the inspection. It is recommended that trees within falling distance of a highway or regularly populated area are

a oconsultants

inspected annually and after any extreme weather event e.g. winds in excess of 50mph.

- 2.13 The report is valid only for typical weather conditions. Healthy trees or parts of healthy trees may fail in unusually high or unpredictable winds or violent storms and as the consequences of such weather phenomena are unforeseeable Arbconsultants cannot be held liable for any such failures.
- 2.14 The responsibility for any work undertaken on the surveyed trees rests with the land manager. It is advised that before any work is undertaken the Local Authority is consulted with regard to the existence of statutory controls for example Tree Preservation Orders; Conservation Area's etc.

3.0 Site Details

3.1 Jessop Road is Suburban tree line Avenue, with vehicular access through the site. The area is heavily used and as such the risk of harm should catastrophic failure occur is high.

ļ

3.7 The trees were inspected on in March 2006 the weather was mixed with snow showers throughout the period of the inspection.

4.0 Observations

4.1 Observations on the surveyed trees and all recommended works are detailed at Appendix 2 of this report.

5.0 Recommended Tree Works

All tree work should be cross referenced with the tree reference, the attached tree 5.1 data tables and the tree plan which plots all specified trees. Any significant defects found during the course of the work should be reported to the land manager. Under no circumstances is any tree work to be instigated without the express consent of the Local Planning Authority. All tree workers shall have the relevant NPTC qualifications and shall submit completed risk assessments to the land manager prior to commencement of tree-work. Specifically it has been noted that a number of trees have Meripilus giganteus (Giant polypore) This fungus is associated with root rot and death of infected trees mainly Beech (Fagus sylvatica) Meripilus produces a white rot affecting the cellulose content of cells initially and then selectively degrading the pectin producing a soft rot. Once the fruiting bodies become visible the tree is already likely to be a health and safety hazard as it will be prone to windfall. Control by physical and chemical methods alone is inadequate and therefore trees that are showing signs of this decay fungus should be removed at the earliest possible opportunity. The root systems of infected trees can become entirely colonized by Meripilus, serving as an inoculum source for adjacent trees and providing massive inoculum levels in replant situations. If trees could be colonized by an effective competitor of Meripilus, the extent of root colonization by the pathogen can be reduced, thus decreasing the threat to adjacent trees and/or subsequent plantings. The association of Mycorrhizae and tree roots form a complex mutually beneficial relationship. The Mycorrhizae increase the surface area of the roots by as much as 300%. This increases the surface area for the absorption of water. In addition, the Mycorrhizae actively and selectively absorb minerals (especially phosphate ions) that the tree needs and transfers them to the plant, while excluding minerals that the plant does not need (sodium ions). Mycorrhizae also secrete growth factors that stimulate root growth and branching, as well as antibiotics that protect the root from pathologic bacteria and pathologic fungi. Therefore to achieve a sustainable non chemical best practice solution it is recommended that conditions within the rhyzosphere of uninfected trees are created which will prohibit the promulgation of pathogenic fungi throughout the site. To control the spread of the pathogens in a sustainable and environmentally friendly method as possible, trees that are infected should be felled and the stumps ground out at as a first step. Once the stumps have been removed as many structural

consultants

roots as possible should be removed using an Airspade. Further to this the soil around the rhyzosphere of each retained tree should be de-compacted and inoculated with a mix of Endo and Ecto Mycorrhizae. Finally each tree should be top dressed with a sanitised mulch mix.

Pruning' and in accordance with the current relevant British Standard, BS3889: 1989 'Recommendations for Tree Work'. All pruned sections shall be lowered to the ground in a controlled manner such that no damage is done to other trees or vegetation and structures beneath. The implementation of tree works must have regard to the presence of any nesting Birds or Bats and their roosts, which are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. With regard to the aforementioned Act it was noted that a number of trees have cavities that would be suitable as roosts for bats therefore we would recommend that a bat survey is carried out before any tree works commence.

Arbconsultants Ltd. The Rural Business Centre, Myerscough College, Bilsborrow, Preston PR3 ORY Tel: 01995 642321 Email: <u>a.mercer@arbconsultants.co.uk</u> Web: www.arbconsultants.co.uk

Appendix 1

Tree Hazard Evaluation Form



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2				
Map/Location					
Owner	Norwich City Council				
Date	23rd March 2008				
Date of last	Not available				
inspection	Not available				
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer				

	HAZARD RATING								
1.0	1.0	3.0	5.0						
Failure	Size of	Target	Hazard						
Potential	Part	Rating	Rating						
lmmedi	ate action r	needed							
Needs further inspection									
	Dead Tree								

TREE CHARACTERISTICS

Occupancy

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crow	n Spread	Crown Clear	Special Value
2201	Beech	М	Minor Asym	Dom	1	630	18		16		n/a
								•			
Observ	rations Live crown	ratio -	90%								
Crown	raised / pollarded an	d reduc	ed histo	rically							
TREE	HEALTH										
Foliage	e colour	Nor	mal	Chlc	orotic	Nec	rotic				
-	e density	Nor		Spa							
-	on growth	Goo	od	X Ave		Poo	r				
	lwood devlopment	God	od	<u> </u>	rage	Poo	r	None			
Vitality	·-	God	od	X Ave	-	Fair		Poor			
Leaf siz		Nor	mal	Smo							
Epicorn	nic growth	Yes		No							
Diebac	=	Yes		X No							
Growth	n obstructions	x Yes		No		Street	light an	d house			
Pests/	Diseases	Yes		X No							
SITE C	CONDITIONS										
Site ch	aracter	X Don	nestic	Indu	strial	POS	:	Natural	Woods	Gro	ın
	ape type	Law		X Roa		Bord		Open	Garden	Agri	•
Irrigati		Non		Goo		X Ade		Poor	Excessive		-
_	sturbance	Yes	-	x No	-		4				
	line paved	0%			25%	25-	50%	50-75%	x 75-100%	Othe	er
•	line soil	0%		x 10-1	25%	25-	50%	50-75%	75-100%	Othe	er
-	line grade lowered	x 0%		_	25%	25-	50%	50-75%	75-100%	Othe	er
Soil pro			inage	Sha	llow	X Con	npact	X Drought	Saline	Alka	line
		Acid	lic	X Volu	ıme	Dise		Failure	Slope	Cont	aminated
Obstru	ctions	X Ligh	ts		age	LOS	;	Utilities	Veg	X Othe	er
Exposu	re to wind	Оре	en	x Prot	ected	Gro	ир	Prone	_	<u> </u>	
Prevail	ing wind direction	South v	vesterly								
TARG	ET										
Target	s under tree	X Buil	ding	x Parl	king	X Roa	d	X Pedestrian	Recreation	Lanc	Iscape
		X Har	dscape	Utili	ty	Play	/ing	Other			
	rget be moved	Yes		X No							
Restrict	· usage?	Yes		x No							

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT)				
Suspect Root Rot Fruiting body present Exposed roots Undermined Root pruned Buttress wounded Restricted root area Potential for root failure Lean Soil heave Roots broken Compounding factors	Yes Yes Severe Severe X Yes Yes Severe Natural Yes Yes Yes	X No X Moderate Moderate No X No Moderate X Moderate Unnatural X No X No	% Root area affe	ected 30% Utility ound None Angle	
TREE REFERENCES (CROW	/N.I.\				
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	(N)				
DEFECT	D.	at Floor	T	Conffold	Dal
DEFECT	Ro	oot Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Poor taper					
Bow, sweep Co-dominants / forks					1
Multiple attachments					
Included bark					
Excessive end weight					
Cracks / Splits					
Hangers					
Girdling					
Wounds / Seam					
Decay					
Cavity					
Fungal Fruiting Bodies Bleeding / Sap Flow					
Loose / Cracked Bark		+			
Birds / Bats / Bees					1
Deadwood / Stubs					
Borers / Ants etc					
Cankers / Galls					
Previous failure					
HAZARD RATING					
Part most likely to fail	Whole tre	ee Scaffold	X Branch	Other	
Inspection frequency	─	2 - yearly	<u> </u>	Other	
inspection frequency	X Annual	z - yeuny	3 - Teurly	Olliei	
1.0 + 1.0 + 3.0 Failure Size of Potential Part Ratio	et Hazard	Failure Potention Size of part Target Rating	l Low 15cm Occasional		75cm 4 Severe > 75cm 4 Constant
HAZARD ABATEMEN	т				
Prune Inspect Further Remove tree Move target	X Yes Root Yes Yes	No Decay No No	Reduce away from lig Aerial Replace Tree Other	ght and building. Crown lift o Monitor Other Yes	over road.
COMMENTS					



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

HAZARD RATING								
1.0	2.0	3.0	6.0					
Failure	Size of	Target	Hazard					
Potential	Part	Rating	Rating					
lmmedi	ate action r	needed						
Needs further inspection								
Dead Tree								

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crown Spread	Crown Clear	Special Value
2202	Beech	Μ	Minor Asym	Dom	1	740	18	26		n/a

	Asym	1				.,, =
Observations Live crow	n ratio - 90%					
Crown raised and reduced h	nistorically					
TREE HEALTH						
Foliage colour	Normal	Chlorotic	Necrotic			
Foliage density	Normal	Sparse				
Extension growth	Good	X Average	Poor			
Woundwood devlopment	Good	X Average	Poor	None		
Vitality class	Good	X Average	Fair	Poor		
Leaf size	Normal	Small				
Epicormic growth	Yes	No				
Dieback	Yes	X No				
Growth obstructions	X Yes	No	Pavement			
Pests/ Diseases	Yes	x No				
SITE CONDITIONS						
Site character	▼ Domestic	Industrial	POS	Natural	Woods	Group
	X Domestic	Н	Border	Open	Garden	Agric
Landscape type Irrigation	None	X Roadside Good	X Adequate	Poor	Excessive	Agric
Site disturbance	⊢	No	Installation of		LXCessive	
% drip line paved	X Yes	10-25%	25-50%	50-75%	x 75-100%	Other
% drip line soil	0%	Н.,	25-50%	50-75%	X 75-100%	Other
% dripline grade lowered	x 0%	10-25% 10-25%	25-50%	50-75%	75-100%	Other
Soil problems	X Drainage	Shallow	X Compact	X Drought	Saline	Alkaline
John problems	Acidic	X Volume	Disease	Failure	Slope	Contaminated
Obstructions	Lights	Signage	LOS	Utilities	Veg	X Other
Exposure to wind	Open	x Protected	Group	Prone		
Prevailing wind direction	South westerl					
anning mind direction	333 #331611	<i>'</i>				
TARGET						

Targets under tree	Ĥ	Building Hardscape	_	Parking Utility		Road Playing	Pedestrian Other	Recreatio	n	Landscape
Can target be moved		Yes	х	No	-	•	-			
Restrict usage?		Yes	х	No						
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	X	Frequent	Constant	Other		

IKEE DEFECTS (KOOT)					
Suspect Root Rot Fruiting body present Exposed roots Undermined Root pruned Buttress wounded Restricted root area Potential for root failure Lean Soil heave Roots broken Compounding factors	Yes Yes Yes Severe X Yes X Severe Severe Natural Yes Yes	X No X No X Moderate Moderate No No Moderate X Moderate Unnatural X No X No	Low Low X % Root area affer Approx age of wo Low Low Corrected Decay in plane of Soil cracking	oted 30% Utiliti	es installation 0-5 Years x No x No
TREE DEFECTS (CROWI	N)				
DEFECT	D	. El	Towns	Conffedd	Danie de
DEFECT	Roo	t Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Poor taper					
Bow, sweep					
Co-dominants / forks			Yes (2.5m)		
Multiple attachments				Yes	
Included bark					
Excessive end weight					
Cracks / Splits					
Hangers					Yes
Girdling					
Wounds / Seam					
Decay					
Cavity				Yes (8m)	
Fungal Fruiting Bodies					
Bleeding / Sap Flow					
Loose / Cracked Bark					
Birds / Bats / Bees					
Deadwood / Stubs					
Borers / Ants etc					
Cankers / Galls					
Previous failure					
HAZARD RATING					
Part most likely to fail	Whole tree	Scaffold	★ Branch	Other	
Part most likely to fail	H				
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other	
1.0 + 2.0 + 3.0 Failure Size of Target	+ 6.0	Failure Potential	1 15cm		75cm 4 > 75cm
Potential Part Rating	Rating	Target Rating	1 Occasional	2 Intermittent 3 Free	quent 4 Constant
HAZARD ABATEMENT					
_	<u> </u>	<u> </u>			
Prune	X Yes	No	Crown Clean	, —	
Inspect Further	Root	Decay	Aerial	Monitor Other	
Remove tree	Yes	x No	Replace Tree	Yes	No
Move target	Yes	x No	Other		
J -					
COMMENTS					



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

	HAZARD RATING										
3.0	3.0	3.0	9.0								
Failure	Size of	Target	Hazard								
Potential	Rating	Rating									
lmmedi	ate action r	needed									
Needs	ection										
	Dead Tree										

TREE CHARACTERISTICS

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crown Spread	Crown Clear	Special Value
2203	Beech	Μ	Major Asym	Dom	1	950	24	20		n/a

2203	Beech	М	Major Asym	Do	om 1	9.	50	24		2	0		n/a
Observ Crown	rations Live crown												
TREE	HEALTH												
Foliage	colour		ormal		Chlorotic		Necro	tic					
-	density	\mathbf{H}	ormal		Sparse		I veci e						
_	on growth	\mathbf{H}	ood		Average		Poor						
	wood devlopment	\mathbf{H}	ood		Average		Poor			None			
Vitality		\mathbf{H}	ood	_	Average		Fair			Poor			
Leaf siz		\mathbf{H}	ormal		Small	<u> </u>]			1,			
	nic growth	Ye	s		No								
Diebac		Ye	s	х	No								
Growth	obstructions	X Ye	s		No	Pa	vemen	nt					
Pests/	Diseases	Ye	s	х	No								
SITE C	SITE CONDITIONS												
Site cho	ıracter	x Do	mestic		Industrial		POS			Natural	Woods	Gro	up
Landsc	ape type	La	wn	х	Roadside		Borde	r		Open	Garden	Agri	с
Irrigatio	on	No	one		Good	х	Adequ	ıate		Poor	Excessive		
Site dis	turbance	Ye	s	х	No				-		<u> </u>		
% drip	line paved	0%	6		10-25%		25-50	%		50-75%	x 75-100%	Othe	er
% drip	line soil	0%	6	x	10-25%		25-50	%		50-75%	75-100%	Othe	er
% drip	ine grade lowered	x 0%	6		10-25%		25-50	%		50-75%	75-100%	Othe	er
Soil pro	blems	x Dr	ainage		Shallow	X	Comp	act	X	Drought	Saline	Alko	line
		Ac	idic	X	Volume		Diseas	e		Failure	Slope	Con	raminated
Obstru	ctions	X Lig	jhts		Signage		LOS			Utilities	Veg	X Othe	er
Exposu	re to wind	Or	oen	x	Protected		Group	•		Prone			
Prevail	ng wind direction	South	westerly										
TARG	ET												
			I	1		_	7			1 '		_	
Taraets	under tree	▼ Bu	ildina	~	Parkina	Iv	Road		V	Pedestrian	Recreation	Lanc	Iscape

Utility

x No

X Hardscape Yes

Yes

Can target be moved

Restrict usage? Occupancy

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT	Γ)				
Suspect Root Rot	Yes	x No			
Fruiting body present	Yes	x No		<u></u>	
Exposed roots	Severe	X Moderate	Low	None	
Undermined	Severe	Moderate	Low	X None	
Root pruned	x Yes	No	% Root area aft	fected 30% Utiliti	es installation
Buttress wounded	Yes	x No	Approx age of	wound	
Restricted root area	X Severe	Moderate	Low	None	
Potential for root failure	X Severe	Moderate	Low		
Lean	Natural	Unnatural	Corrected	Angle	
Soil heave	Yes	x No	Decay in plane	of lean Yes	x No
Roots broken	Yes	x No	Soil cracking	Yes	x No
Compounding factors	Yes	x No	-		
TREE DEFECTS (CROV	VN)				
		_	-		
DEFECT	Ro	ot Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Poor taper					
Bow, sweep Co-dominants / forks					
Multiple attachments					
Included bark					
Excessive end weight					
Cracks / Splits					
Hangers					
Girdling Wounds / Seam					
Decay			Bottle butt		
Cavity			200	Yes (x2)	
Fungal Fruiting Bodies				·	
Bleeding / Sap Flow					
Loose / Cracked Bark				\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	.
Birds / Bats / Bees				Nest	Nest
Deadwood / Stubs Borers / Ants etc					
Cankers / Galls					
Previous failure					
	•	-		-	
HAZARD RATING					
Part most likely to fail	Whole tree	e X Scaffold	Branch	Other	
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other and after	weather events
			_		_
3.0 + 3.0 + 3.	0 → 9.0	Failure Potentia	l low	2 Medium 3 High	h Severe
Failure Size of Targ		Size of part	1 15cm	2 15-45cm 3 45-3	75cm 4 > 75cm
Potential Part Rati	ng Rating	Target Rating	1 Occasiona	Intermittent 3 Free	quent 4 Constant
HAZARD ABATEMEN	i T				
Prune	X Yes	No		uvity. Reduce tree by 15% and	monitor.
Inspect Further	Root	X Decay	X Aerial	Monitor Other	
Remove tree	? Yes	No	Replace Tree	Yes	No
Move target	Yes	X No	Other		
COMMENTS					
This tree will require signfie	cant pruning in o	order to reduce	the level of risk it p	ooses. Consideration could	d be given to
removal and replacement.					



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

HAZARD RATING										
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0							
Failure Potential	Size of	Target Rating	Hazard Rating							
lmmedi										
Needs	pection									
	Dead Tree									

	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crown Spread	Crown Clear	Special Value
2204 B	Beech	М	Minor Asym	Dom	1	1000	25	18		n/a

2204	Beech	М	Minor Asym	Don	n 1	10	000	25		1	8			n/a
Observat Crown cle	ions Live crown	n ratio -	90%											
TREE HI	EALTH													
Foliage c	olour	No	rmal		Chlorotic		Necro	tic						
Foliage d	ensity	No	rmal	s	parse									
Extension	growth	Go	od	x A	verage		Poor							
Woundwo	ood devlopment	Go	od	x A	verage		Poor			None				
Vitality cl	ass	Go	od	x A	verage		Fair			Poor				
Leaf size		No	rmal	s	mall					•				
Epicormic	growth	Ye	;	Ν	lo									
Dieback		Ye	;	x	lo									
Growth o	bstructions	x Ye	s	Ν	lo	Pav	vemer	nt						
Pests/ Dis	seases	Ye	;	χN	lo									
SITE CONDITIONS														
Site chard	acter	X Do	mestic	In	ndustrial		POS			Natural		Woods	Gı	oup
Landscap	e type	Lav	√n	x R	oadside		Borde	r		Open		Garden	-	ıric
Irrigation		No	ne		Good	x	Adequ	uate		Poor		Excessive		
Site distu	bance	x Ye	;	N	lo			mac b	y tre	ee		1		
% drip lir	ne paved	0%		1	0-25%		25-50)%		50-75%	х	75-100%	Ot	her
% drip lir	ne soil	0%		x 1	0-25%		25-50)%		50-75%		75-100%	O1	her
% driplin	e grade lowered	x 0%		1	0-25%		25-50)%		50-75%		75-100%	01	her
Soil prob	lems	x Dro	ainage	s	hallow	х	Comp	act	х	Drought		Saline	All	caline
		Aci	dic	x \vee	olume '		Diseas	se		Failure		Slope	Co	ntaminated
Obstruction	ons	Lig	hts	s	ignage		LOS		х	Utilities		Veg	X Ot	her
Exposure	to wind	Op	en	x P	rotected		Group)		Prone		•		
Prevailing	wind direction	South	westerly	-						4				
TARGE	Γ													
												_		
Targets u	nder tree	X Bui	lding	x P	arking	x	Road		x	Pedestrian		Recreation	La	ndscape

Targets under tree	Ĥ	Building Hardscape	_	Parking Utility	X Road Playing	x	Pedestrian Other	Recreation	Landscape
Can target be moved		Yes	х	No		·	_		
Restrict usage?		Yes	х	No					
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	X Frequent		Constant	Other	

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT)					
		_				
Suspect Root Rot		Yes	X No			
Fruiting body present		Yes	x No			
Exposed roots		Severe	X Moderate	Low	None	
Undermined		Severe	Moderate	Low	None	
Root pruned	x	Yes	No	% Root area affe	_	ties installation
Buttress wounded	<u> </u>	Yes	⊢ ⊢	Approx age of w		nes maranan
Restricted root area		Severe	<u> </u>			
					None	
Potential for root failure		Severe	X Moderate		٦	
Lean		Natural	Unnatural	Corrected	Angle	
Soil heave		Yes	X No	Decay in plane of	f lean Ye	s X No
Roots broken		Yes	X No	Soil cracking	Ye	s X No
		_				
Compounding factors		Yes	X No			
		_				
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	N)					
DEFECT		Roc	ot Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Poor taper						
Bow, sweep						
Co-dominants / forks					Yes	
Multiple attachments						
Included bark					Yes	
Excessive end weight						
Cracks / Splits						
Hangers						
Girdling			Yes			
Wounds / Seam			Yes			
Decay						
Cavity Fungal Fruiting Bodies						
Bleeding / Sap Flow						
Loose / Cracked Bark						
Birds / Bats / Bees						
Deadwood / Stubs						
Borers / Ants etc						
Cankers / Galls						
Previous failure						
HAZARD RATING						
Part most likely to fail		Whole tree	Scaffold	X Branch	Other	
Inspection frequency	x	Annual	2 - yearly		Other	
		1	,			
1.0 . 1.0 . 4.0		6.0	Failure Potentia	al 1 Low	2 Medium 3 Hiç	gh 4 Severe
+ 1.0 + 4.0	— →			<u> </u>		
Failure Size of Targe Potential Part Rating		Hazard Rating	Size of part	1 15cm		-75cm 4 > 75cm
roteina ran kann	ð	Kullig	Target Rating	1 Occasional	2 Intermittent 3 Free	equent 4 Constant
	_					
HAZARD ABATEMEN	Γ					
Prune	x	Yes	No	Reduce away from ph	one lines	
Inspect Further		Root	Decay	Aerial	Monitor Other	
Remove tree		Yes	x No	Replace Tree	Yes	No
Move target		Yes	X No	Other	<u> </u>	
9 -	<u> </u>	1	ث	Ш _		
COMMENTS						



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

HAZARD RATING										
1.0	1.0	2.0	4.0							
Failure Potential	Size of Part	Target Rating	Hazard Rating							
lmmedi	needed									
Needs	ection									
	Dead Tree									

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crown Spread	Crown Clear	Special Value
2205	Maple	Y	Gen Sym	Dom	1	245	9	8		n/a

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crow	n Spread	Crown Clear	Special Value	
2205	Maple	Y	Gen Sym	Dom	1	245	9		8		n/a	
	•		•	•	•			•		•		
Observ	vations Live crown	n ratio -	90%									
Crown	raised historically.											
TREE	HEALTH											
		<u> </u>				<u></u>						
-	e colour	Nor		_	orotic	Nec	rotic					
-	e density	Nor		Spa								
	on growth	X Goo		Н.	rage	Poo						
	lwood devlopment	Goo		X Ave	-	Poo		None Poor				
Vitality Leaf si:		God		X Ave	-	Fair		Poor				
		Yes	mai	No	111							
Diebac	nic growth	Yes		Н.								
	n obstructions	-		X No		Pavem	ont					
		X Yes		_		Tuveill	CIII					
1 0313/	Pests/ Diseases Yes No											
SITE (CONDITIONS											
Site ch	aracter	X Don	nestic	Indu	ıstrial	Про:	3	Natural	Woods	Gro	un	
	ape type	Law		_	dside	Bor		Open	Garden	Agri		
Irrigati		Non		Goo		X Ade		Poor	Excessive	— °		
	sturbance	Yes		x No								
% drip	line paved	0%			25%	25-	50%	50-75%	x 75-100%	Othe	er	
	line soil	0%		x 10-:	25%	25-	50%	50-75%	75-100%	Othe	er	
	line grade lowered	x 0%		-	25%	25-	50%	50-75%	75-100%	Othe	er	
Soil pr	=		inage	Sha	llow	X Con	npact	X Drought	Saline	Alko	line	
		Acid	lic	X Volu	ıme		ease	Failure	Slope	Cont	raminated	
Obstru	ctions	Ligh	ts	Sign	nage	LOS	5	Utilities	Veg	X Othe	er	
Exposu	re to wind	Оре	en	X Prot	ected	Gro	oup	Prone				
Prevail	ing wind direction	South v	vesterly									
TARG	ET											
Taraet	s under tree	X Build	ding	x Parl	king	X Roo	d	X Pedestrian	Recreation	Land	Iscape	
901		-	dscape	Utili		Play		Other		Ш	- 1	
Can ta	rget be moved	Yes	-	x No	•	— Т						
D4!		H_{V}		H.								

Targets under tree	x	Building	х	Parking	х	Road	x	Pedestrian		Recreation	Landscape	
3		Hardscape		Utility		Playing		Other	<u> </u>	4	 ⊣ .	
Can target be moved		Yes	х	No				1				
Restrict usage?		Yes	х	No								
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	X	Frequent		Constant		Other		

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT)					
Suspect Root Rot Fruiting body present Exposed roots Undermined Root pruned Buttress wounded Restricted root area Potential for root failure Lean Soil heave	Yes Yes Severe Severe Yes Yes Severe Severe Natural Yes	X No No No Moderate Moderate X No X No X Moderate X Moderate Unnatural X No	Low Low X % Root area affe Approx age of well Low Low Corrected Decay in plane of	ound None Angle	s X No
Roots broken	Yes		Soil cracking	Ye	
ROOIS DIOREII	Tes	X No	Son cracking		s X No
Compounding factors	Yes	X No			
TREE DEFECTS (CROWN	<u>1)</u>				
DEFECT	D_aal	Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
	KOOI	riale	Trunk	Scamola	pidilidi
Poor taper					
Bow, sweep				V	
Co-dominants / forks				Yes	
Multiple attachments					
Included bark					
Excessive end weight					
Cracks / Splits					
Hangers	Ye				
Girdling					
Wounds / Seam	Ye	es			
Decay					
Cavity					
Fungal Fruiting Bodies					
Bleeding / Sap Flow					
Loose / Cracked Bark					
Birds / Bats / Bees Deadwood / Stubs					
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
Borers / Ants etc Cankers / Galls					
Previous failure					
HAZARD RATING					
Part most likely to fail	Whole tree	Scaffold	X Branch	Other	
Inspection frequency	H	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other	
inspection frequency	X Annual	z - yeuny	J - reurly		
1.0 + 1.0 + 2.0	4.0	Failure Potential	1 Low	2 Medium 3 His	gh 4 Severe
Failure Size of Target Potential Part Rating	Hazard Rating	Size of part Target Rating	1 15cm 1 Occasional		-75cm 4 > 75cm 4 Constant
HAZARD ABATEMENT					
Prune Inspect Further Remove tree Move target	Yes Root Yes Yes	X No Decay X No	Aerial Replace Tree Other	Monitor Other	No
COMMENTS					



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

HAZARD RATING										
1.0	6.0									
Failure Potential	Target Rating	Hazard Rating								
Immedi	ate action r	needed								
Needs further inspection										
Dead Tree										

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crown Spread	Crown Clear	Special Value
2206	Beech	М	Gen Sym	Dom	1	1010	26	20		n/a

Chlorotic Necrotic	2206	Beech	М	Gen Sym	Dor	m 1	10	010	26		2	20		n/a	
Foliage colour Foliage density Extension growth Woundwood devlopment Vitality class Leaf size Epicormic growth Dieback Growth obstructions Pests/ Diseases Site character Landscape type Irrigation None Ves Wolf drip line paved % drip line soil % drip line soil % drip line grade lowered Soil problems Normal Small Small Fair Poor None Pavement Poor None None None None None None None None															
Foliage density Extension growth Woundwood devlopment Vitality class Leaf size Leaf size Leaf size Normal Dieback Growth obstructions Pests/ Diseases Ves Ves No Site character Landscape type Irrigation Site disturbance % drip line paved % drip line paved % drip line soil % drip line grade lowered Soil problems Signage Normal Small Poor Poor None Pavement Poor None Poor None Pavement Poor None Pavement Poor Den Garden Agric Fair Poor None Pavement Poor Sire disturbance Yes X No Sire disturbance % drip line paved % drip line soil % dripline grade lowered Soil problems X Drainage X Drainage X Signage X Volume Disease Failure Siope Contaminated Prove Veg X Other Signage LoS Utilities Veg X Other	TREE	TREE HEALTH													
Extension growth Woundwood devlopment Vitality class Leaf size Normal Small Epicornic growth Dieback Growth obstructions Yes Yes No Pests/ Diseases Site character Landscape type Irrigation Site disturbance Yes Woods Woods Woods Group Lawn None Good X Average Poor None Pavement Poor Pavement POS Natural Woods Group Garden Agric Agric Irrigation Site disturbance Yes X No Yes X No Yes X No Site disturbance Yes Yes X No Yes X No Yes X No Site disturbance Yes X No Yes X No Yes X No Site disturbance Yes X No Yes X No Yes X No Site disturbance Yes X No Yes X No Yes X No Site disturbance Yes X No Yes X No Yes X No Yes X No Other Other Other Other Other Soil problems Disease Disease Failure Poor None Stope Contaminated Open Alkaline Alkaline Contaminated Open Disease Failure Poor None South westerly	Foliage	colour	No	ormal		Chlorotic		Necrot	ic						
Woundwood devlopment Vitality class Leaf size Fair Foor Foor None Poor None Poor Fair Poor Poor None Poor Fair Poor Poor None Poor Fair Poor Poor None Poor	Foliage	density	No	ormal	S	Sparse		_							
Vitality class Leaf size Epicormic growth Dieback Yes	Extension	on growth	Go	ood	X	Average		Poor			-				
Leaf size Epicormic growth Dieback Yes X No Growth obstructions Pests/ Diseases Site character Landscape type Irrigation Site disturbance % drip line paved % drip line soil % drip line grade lowered Soil problems X Domestic Lawn X Roadside Border Dopen South westerly POS Natural POS Natural POS Natural Woods Group Agric Forup	Wound	wood devlopment	Go	ood	X	Average		Poor			None				
Epicormic growth Dieback Growth obstructions Pests/ Diseases Yes X No No Pavement Pavement Pos Natural Voods Group Lawn X Roadside Irrigation Site disturbance Warp drip line paved Warp line soil Warp dripline grade lowered Soil problems Dieback Yes X No No No Pavement POS Natural POS Open Garden Agric Foor Excessive Noo X Adequate Poor Excessive Stream X 75-100% Other Other O	Vitality	class	Go	ood	X	Average		Fair			Poor				
Dieback Growth obstructions Pests/ Diseases SITE CONDITIONS Site character Landscape type Irrigation Site disturbance % drip line paved % drip line soil % dripline grade lowered % dripline grade lowered Soil problems Disease No Pavement Pos Natural Pos Natural Pos Natural Pos Natural Pos Natural Pos Natural Pos Sorder Open Garden Agric Excessive Site disturbance Yes X No 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% X 75-100% Other Other Soil problems X Drainage Shallow X Compact X Drought Saline Acidic X Volume Disease Failure Slope Contaminated Obstructions Exposure to wind Provedling wind direction South westerly	Leaf siz	e	No	ormal	S	Small					•				
Growth obstructions Pests/ Diseases X Yes X No SITE CONDITIONS Site character Landscape type Lawn X Roadside Irrigation None Good X Adequate Poor Excessive Site disturbance % drip line paved % drip line soil % dripline grade lowered Soil problems X Domestic Industrial A Roadside Border Dopen Garden Agric Foor Excessive Site disturbance Yes X No 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% X 75-100% Other X Domestic Industrial POS Natural Woods Group Foor Garden Agric Foor Excessive Site disturbance Yes X No 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% Other Soil problems X Drainage Shallow X Compact X Drought Saline Alkaline Acidic X Volume Disease Failure Slope Contaminated Obstructions Exposure to wind Provediling wind direction South westerly	Epicorn	ic growth	Ye	es .	١	No									
Site character Landscape type Irrigation Site disturbance % drip line paved % drip line soil % dripline grade lowered Soil problems Acidic Site character Lawn X Roadside Border POS Natural POS Open Garden Agric Food X Adequate Poor Excessive Sto-75% X 75-100% Other 75-100% Other Acidic X Volume Disease Failure South westerly South westerly	Diebac	k	Ye	es .	χ	1 0									
Site character Landscape type Lawn None Site disturbance % drip line soil % dripline grade lowered Soil problems Drainage Shallow Shallow Signage Los Woods Group Agric Pos Natural Open Garden Agric Failure Solope Agric South westerly None South westerly Pos Natural Open Soroup Agric Soroup Soroup Soroup Agric Soroup Soroup Soroup Agric Soroup Agric Soroup Soroup Agric Soroup Soroup Soroup Soroup Soroup Soroup Soroup South westerly	Growth	obstructions	x Ye	es .	١	1 0	Pa	vemen	t						
Site character Landscape type Irrigation Site disturbance % drip line paved % drip line soil % dripline grade lowered Soil problems Open Acidic Domestic Lawn X Roadside Border Open Garden Excessive Adequate Poor Excessive Stallow X Adequate Poor Soil problems Domestic Industrial POS Natural Open Garden Agric Foor Excessive Soil problems None Ves X No 10-25% 25-50% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% Other Soil problems Soil problems Acidic X Volume Disease Failure Slope Contaminated Dome X Protected Group Prone South westerly	Pests/ I	Diseases	Ye	es	χ	٧o									
Landscape type Irigation	SITE C	CONDITIONS													
Landscape type Irrigation None Site disturbance Yes No 10-25% drip line soil % dripline grade lowered Soil problems Acidic A															
Irrigation None Good X Adequate Poor Excessive Adequate Poor Fool Other Other Alkaline Alkaline Alkaline Contaminated Obstructions Excessive A poor To-100% Other Disease Failure Slope Contaminated Other Alkaline Contaminated Other Alkaline Contaminated Order Alkaline Open Acidic Alkaline Contaminated Order Alkaline Contaminated Order Alkaline Open Alkaline Contaminated Order Alkaline Open Al	Site cho	ıracter	X Do	mestic	lı	ndustrial		POS			Natural	Woods	Gro	υр	
Site disturbance % drip line paved % drip line soil % dripline grade lowered % dripline grade lowered Soil problems Obstructions Exposure to wind Yes X No 10-25% 25-50% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% Other 50-75% 75-100% Other 50-75% 75-100% Other	Landsco	ape type	La	wn	x	Roadside		Border			Open	Garden	Agri	c	
% drip line paved % drip line soil % dripline soil % dripline grade lowered % dripline grade lowered Soil problems Drainage Acidic X Volume Signage Protected South westerly Double 10-25% South westerly Double 25-50% South westerly Double 30-75% South westerly South westerly Double 30-75% South westerly South westerly Double 30-75% South westerly South westerly South westerly South westerly South westerly Other Totalov T	Irrigation	on	No	one		Good	х	Adequ	ate		Poor	Excessive			
% drip line soil % dripline grade lowered % of problems Drainage Acidic Disease Disease Signage Provailing wind direction South westerly South westerly Disease Droup South westerly	Site dis	turbance	Ye	·s	χ	No	-				•	<u> </u>			
% dripline grade lowered Soil problems O% Drainage Acidic Acidic X Volume Disease Exposure to wind Prevailing wind direction O% 10-25% Shallow X Compact X Drought Saline Alkaline Contaminated Con	% drip	line paved	0%	6	1	10-25%		25-50	%		50-75%	x 75-100%	Othe	er	
Soil problems X Drainage Shallow X Compact X Drought Saline Alkaline Acidic X Volume Disease Failure Slope Contaminated Obstructions Exposure to wind Open X Protected Group Prone South westerly Saline Alkaline Contaminated Utilities Veg X Other Prone	% drip	line soil	0%	6	x 1	10-25%		25-50	%		50-75%	75-100%	Othe	er	
Obstructions Lights Signage Exposure to wind Prevailing wind direction Acidic X Volume Signage LOS Utilities Prone Failure Utilities Veg X Other Prone South westerly	% drip	ine grade lowered	x 0%	6	l	10-25%		25-50	%		50-75%	75-100%	Othe	er	
Obstructions Lights Signage LOS Utilities Veg X Other	Soil pro	blems	x Dr	ainage	S	Shallow	х	Compo	act	х	Drought	Saline	Alko	ıline	
Exposure to wind Open Prevailing wind direction South westerly Protected Group Prone			Ac	idic	x	/olume		Disease	е		Failure	Slope	Con	taminated	
Prevailing wind direction South westerly	Obstruc	ctions	Lig	ghts	S	Signage		LOS			Utilities	Veg	X Othe	er	
	Exposu	e to wind	Op	pen	X	Protected		Group			Prone				
TARGET	Prevail	ng wind direction	South	westerly			-	•			•				
	TARG	TARGET													
Taxgate under troo								1_			 1				

Targets under tree	<u> </u>	Building Hardscape	Ĥ	Parking Utility	-	Road Playing	x	Pedestrian Other	Recreation	Landscape
Can target be moved		Yes	х	No				=		
Restrict usage?		Yes	х	No						
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	x	Frequent		Constant	Other	

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT)					
Suspect Root Rot	Yes	X No			
Fruiting body present	Yes	x No		_	
Exposed roots	Severe	X Moderate	Low	None	
Undermined	Severe	Moderate		None	
Root pruned	Yes	X No	% Root area affe		
Buttress wounded	Yes	x No	Approx age of w	ound	
Restricted root area	X Severe	Moderate	Low	None	
Potential for root failure	Severe	X Moderate	Low	_	
Lean	Natural	Unnatural	Corrected	Angle	_
Soil heave	Yes	x No	Decay in plane o	f lean Yes	x No
Roots broken	Yes	x No	Soil cracking	Yes	x No
Compounding factors	Yes	X No	-		
TREE DEFECTS (CROW)	NIN				
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	N)				
DEFECT	Po	ot Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Poor taper	KOC	or Flare	Trunk	Scarrola	branch
Bow, sweep					
Co-dominants / forks				Yes	
Multiple attachments					
Included bark				Yes	
Excessive end weight					
Cracks / Splits					
Hangers Girdling	- 				
Wounds / Seam					
Decay					
Cavity					
Fungal Fruiting Bodies					
Bleeding / Sap Flow					
Loose / Cracked Bark Birds / Bats / Bees					
Deadwood / Stubs					
Borers / Ants etc					
Cankers / Galls					
Previous failure					
HAZARD RATING					
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>		¬₋.	
Part most likely to fail	Whole tree	—	X Branch	Other	
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other	
10 10 40	4.0	Cailona Dagangial			h 4 8
1.0 + 1.0 + 4.0	→ 6.0	Failure Potential		2 Medium 3 Hig	
Failure Size of Target Potential Part Rating		Size of part	1 15cm		75cm 4 > 75cm
•		Target Rating	1 Occasional	2 Intermittent 3 Fre	quent 4 Constant
HAZARD ABATEMENT					
HAZAKO ADATEMENI					
Prune	Yes	X No			
Inspect Further	Root	Decay	X Aerial	Monitor Other	
Remove tree	Yes	⊢ '	Replace Tree	Yes	No
Move target	Yes		Other	1 es	∟ ,'``
move luigei		X No			
COMMENTS					
Roots are creating a trip ha	zard.				
Rust area on bark.					



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

HAZARD RATING										
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0							
Failure Potential	Target Rating	Hazard Rating								
Potential Part Rating Rating Immediate action needed										
Needs further inspection										
Dead Tree										

TREE CHARACTERISTICS

Special Crown No. Age Tree ID DBH Height Species Form Crown Spread Class Class Stems Clear Value Gen 2207 Dom Beech М 1 840 25 18 n/a Sym **Observations** Live crown ratio - 80% Crown raised and pollarded historically. Multiple pruning events. TREE HEALTH Necrotic Foliage colour Normal Chlorotic Foliage density Normal Sparse Extension growth Good Average Poor X Woundwood devlopment Good Poor X Average None Good Vitality class X Average Fair Normal Leaf size Small Epicormic growth Yes Νo Dieback Yes Νo X Growth obstructions Yes Νo Pavement / Utility Lines Pests/ Diseases **X** No Yes **SITE CONDITIONS** Industrial POS Site character Domestic Natural Woods Group Landscape type Lawn Roadside Border Open Garden Agric X Irrigation None Good Adequate Poor Excessive Site disturbance Yes Νo X 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% Other % drip line paved 0% 75-100% % drip line soil 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% Other **x** 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% Other % dripline grade lowered **X** Drainage Soil problems Shallow Compact Drought Saline Alkaline X Acidic Volume Disease Failure Slope Contaminated X LOS Utilities **X** Other Obstructions Lights Signage Veg X Exposure to wind Open Group Protected Prone Prevailing wind direction South westerly **TARGET**

Targets under tree	Ĥ	Building Hardscape	_	Parking Utility	_	Road Playing	x	Pedestrian Other	Recreation	Landscape	
Can target be moved		Yes	X	No		='		="			
Restrict usage?		Yes	х	No							
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	х	Frequent		Constant	Other		

Suspect Root Rot Fruiting body present Exposed roots Severe Woderine Soil racking Woderine Woderine Soil racking Woderine Soil racking Woderine Woderine Soil racking Woderine Woderin	TREE DEFECTS (ROOT)				
DEFECT Root Flare Trunk Scaffold Branch	Fruiting body present Exposed roots Undermined Root pruned Buttress wounded Restricted root area Potential for root failure Lean Soil heave Roots broken Compounding factors	Yes Severe Yes Yes X Severe Severe Natural Yes Yes Yes	X No X Moderate Moderate X No X No Moderate X Moderate Unnatural X No No	% Root area affer Approx age of when Low Low Corrected Decay in plane of	None coted ound None Angle Flean Yes	
Poor taper Bow, sweep	TREE DEFECTS (CROW	/N)				
Poor taper Bow, sweep						
Bow, sweep Co-dominants / forks Wildlife attractions State of part Society	DEFECT	Roo	ot Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Co-deminants / forks Multiple artechments Included bark Excessive end weight Cracks / Spilts Hangers Girdling Wounds / Seam Decay Cavity Fungal Fruiting Bodies Bleeding / Sap Flow Loose / Cracked Bark Birds / Bart / Seas Decay Cavity Fungal Fruiting Bodies Bleeding / Sap Flow Loose / Cracked Bark Birds / Bart / Seas Decay Cavity Fungal Fruiting Bodies Bleeding / Sap Flow Loose / Cracked Bark Birds / Bart / Seas Decay Cavity Fungal Fruiting Bodies Bleeding / Sap Flow Loose / Cracked Bark Birds / Bart / Seas Decay Cavity Fungal Fruiting Bodies Bleeding / Sap Flow Loose / Cracked Bark Birds / Bart / Seas Decay Cavity Fungal Fruiting Bodies Bleeding / Sap Flow Loose / Cracked Bark Birds / Bart / Seas Decay Decay Cavity Fungal Fruiting Bodies Bleeding / Sap Flow Loose / Cracked Bark Birds / Bart / Seas Decay Decay Decay Decay Modium 3 High Severe 15-45cm 3 45-75cm 4 2 75cm 75cm 75cm Praterial Part Faring Target Rating Target Rating Target Rating Target Rating Target Rating Decay	Poor taper					
Nutriple attachments Included bark Excessive and weight Cracks / Splits Hangers Girdling Wounds / Seam Decay Covity Fungal Fruiting Bodies Bleeding / Sap Flow Loose / Cracked Bark Birds / Bats / Bees Decadwood / Stubs Bores / Anth etc Cankers / Galls Previous failure HAZARD RATING Part most likely to fail Inspection frequency I.0 + 1.0 + 4.0						
Included bark Excessive end weight Caracks / Splits Hongers Girdling Wounds / Seam Decay Cavity Cavity Flying Bodies Bleeding / Sap Flow Loose / Cracked Bark Blinds / Barts / Bees Deadwood / Stubs Borers / Ants etc Cankers / Calls Previous failure HAZARD RATING Part most likely to fail Inspection frequency Annual 1.0						
Excessive end weight Crack / Splits Hangers Girdling Wounds / Seam Decay Cavity Fungal Fruiting Bodies Bleeding / Sap Flow Loose / Cracked Bark Birds / Bars / Bars / Bars Decay Socret / Ants atc Cankers / Auts atc Cankers / Auts atc Cankers / Auts atc Cankers / Calls Previous failure HAZARD RATING Part most likely to fail Inspection frequency Whole tree Scaffold X Branch Folium Previous failure 1 Low 2 Medium 3 High 4 Severe Annual 2 - yearly 5 - Yearly Other 1 Scaffold Target Rating HAZARD ABATEMENT Prune Inspect Further Remove tree Not Yes X No Reduce away from phone lines Inspect Tree Nother Comments Remove tree Nove target COMMENTS						
Cracks Splits Hangers Girdling Wounds Seam Decay Covity Fungal Fruiting Bodies Bleeding Sap Flow Couse Cracked Bark Birds Bast Bees Decay Covity Subs Bleeding Sap Flow Conserved Fact Cankers Galls Decay Covity Street Conkers Galls Decay Covity Size of part Size of part Size of part Target Rating						
Fidure Founds Fidure Fidure Fidure Founds Fidure Fidur						
Girdling Wounds / Seam Decay Cavity Fungal Fruiting Bodies Bleeding / Sap Flow Loose / Cracked Bark Birds / Bats / Bess Deadwood / Strubs Borers / Ants etc Cankers / Galls Previous failure HAZARD RATING Part most likely to fail Inspection frequency 1.0 Failure Potential Size of part Forming Front Forming F	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
Wounds / Seam Decay Deca						
Decay Cavity Fungal Fruiting Bodies Bleeding / Sap Flow Loose / Cracked Bark Birds / Bats / Beas Deadwood / Stubs Borers / Ants etc Cankers / Galls Previous failure HAZARD RATING Part most likely to fail Inspection frequency I.0 + 1.0 + 4.0						
Cavity Fungal Fulling Bodies Bleeding / Sap Flow Loose / Cracked Bark Birds / Bars / Bees Boding / Sap Flow Birds / Bars / Bees Boding / Sap Flow Birds / Bars / Bars / Bars / Sart set Borers / Ants et Borers / Ants et Borers / Galls Branch Borers / Galls Branch	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
Bleding / Sop Flow Loose / Cracked Bark Birds / Bars / Bees Deadwood / Stubs Borers / Ants etc Cankers / Galls Previous failure HAZARD RATING Part most likely to fail Inspection frequency Inspection frequency Inspection frequency Inspection frequency Inspect Further Inspect Furth	· ·					
Loose / Cracked Bark Birds / Bars / Bees Deadwood / Stubs Borers / Ants etc Cankers / Galls Previous failure HAZARD RATING Part most likely to fail Inspection frequency I.0 Fellure Potential Size of part Target Rating Prune Inspect Further Remove tree Move target Move target Loose / Cracked Bark Birds / Bars / Bees Deadwood / Stubs Borers / Ants etc Cankers / Galls Previous failure Whole tree Scaffold X Branch Scaffold X Branch Scaffold Scaffold Yes Scaffold						
Birds / Bats / Bees Deadwood / Stubs Borers / Ants etc Cankers / Galls Previous failure HAZARD RATING Part most likely to fail Inspection frequency 1.0	Bleeding / Sap Flow					
Deadwood / Stubs	Loose / Cracked Bark					
Borers / Ants etc Cankers / Galls Previous failure HAZARD RATING Part most likely to fail Inspection frequency 1.0 + 1.0 + 4.0	, ,					
Cankers / Galls Previous failure HAZARD RATING Part most likely to fail Inspection frequency 1.0	Deadwood / Stubs					
Previous failure HAZARD RATING Part most likely to fail Inspection frequency 1.0						
HAZARD RATING Part most likely to fail Inspection frequency Insp						
Part most likely to fail Inspection frequency No No No No No No No N	Previous failure					<u> </u>
Inspection frequency 1.0	HAZARD RATING					
1.0 + 1.0 + 4.0 - 6.0 Failure Potential Size of part Target Rating Tar	Part most likely to fail	Whole tree	Scaffold	X Branch	Other	
Failure Size of Part Rating Rating Size of part Target Rating Size of part Target Rating Target Rating Target Rating Size of part	Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other	
Prune Inspect Further Remove tree Move target X Yes Root X Decay Aerial Monitor No Replace Tree Yes X No Other Other Other Other Other	Failure Size of Targe	et Hazard	Size of part	1 15cm	2 15-45cm 3 45-	75cm 4 > 75cm
Inspect Further Remove tree Move target Root X Decay Aerial Monitor Other Yes No Replace Tree Yes No Other	HAZARD ABATEMEN	т				
Inspect Further Remove tree Move target Root X Decay Aerial Monitor Other Yes No Replace Tree Yes No Other						
Remove tree Move target Yes X No Replace Tree Yes No Other COMMENTS		X Yes	No		one lines	
Move target Yes X No Other COMMENTS	Inspect Further	Root	X Decay		Monitor Other	_
COMMENTS	Remove tree	Yes	x No	Replace Tree	Yes	No
COMMENTS	Move target	Yes	x No	Other		<u> </u>
	COMMENTS	<u>—</u>				
		presence of inte	ernal dysfunctic	onal wood.		



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
	Jessop Rodd, 1401 widi 14K2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last	Nist and State
inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

HAZARD RATING										
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0							
Failure Potential	Size of	Target Rating	Hazard Rating							
lmmedi	Immediate action needed									
Needs	pection									
	Dead Tree									

TREE CHARACTERISTICS

Restrict usage? Occupancy

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crown Spread	Crown Clear	Special Value
2208	Beech	EM	Gen Sym	Dom	1	230	13	6		n/a

Tree ID	Species	Class	Form	Class	Stems	DBH	Height		Crow	n Spread		Clear	Value
2208	Beech	EM	Gen Sym	Dom	1	230	13			6			n/a
			000/										
Observ		n ratio -	90%										
Crown	raised historically												
TREE	HEALTH												
Foliage	, colour	Nor	mal	Сыс	orotic	Ne	crotic						
	density	Nor		Spa			crone						
	on growth	God		Н .	rage	Poo	\r						
	wood devlopment	God		Ĥ.	rage	Poo			None				
Vitality	· ·	God		Ĥ.	rage	Fair			Poor				
Leaf siz		Nor		X Ave	-			Щ	1 001				
	nic growth	Yes		No	""								
Diebac	=	Yes		Н.									
	obstructions	H_{ν}		X No		Pavem	ent						
	Diseases	X Yes		x No		Taveni							
1 0313/	Discuses			X 1.0									
SITE C	CONDITIONS												
									Ī				
Site cho		X Don	nestic	\vdash	ıstrial	PO			Natural	Wo	ods	Gro	
	ape type	Law	'n	X Roa	dside		der		Open	Ga	rden	Agr	ic
Irrigati		Non	ie	God	od	X Ade	equate		Poor	Exc	essive		
Site dis	turbance	Yes		X No		_			Ī				
% drip	line paved	0%		10-	25%	25-	50%		50-75%	x 75-	100%	Oth	er
% drip	line soil	0%		x 10-	25%	25-	50%		50-75%	75-	100%	Oth	er
% drip	line grade lowered	x 0%		10-	25%	25-	50%		50-75%	75-	100%	Oth	er
Soil pro	oblems	x Dra	inage	Sha	llow	X Cor	npact	X	Drought	Sali	ne	Alko	ıline
		Acid	dic	x Volu	ıme	Dise	ease		Failure	Slo	ре	Con	taminated
Obstru	ctions	Ligh	nts	Sigr	nage	LOS	5		Utilities	Veç	9	X Oth	er
Exposu	re to wind	Оре	en	x Prot	ected	Gro	oup		Prone				
Prevail	ing wind direction	South v	westerly										
TARG	ET												
Targets	under tree	X Buil		x Parl	•	X Roo			Pedestrian	Rec	reation	Land	dscape
		X Har	dscape	Utili	ty	Pla	ying		Other				
Can ta	rget be moved	Yes		X No									

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT	')				
Suspect Root Rot	Yes	x No			
Fruiting body present	Yes	X No		_	
Exposed roots	Severe	X Moderate	Low	None	
Undermined	Severe	Moderate	Low	None	
Root pruned	Yes	x No	% Root area affe	ected	
Buttress wounded	Yes	x No	Approx age of w	ound	
Restricted root area	Severe	X Moderate	Low	None	
Potential for root failure	Severe	X Moderate	Low	_	
Lean	Natural	Unnatural	Corrected	Angle	
Soil heave	Yes	X No	Decay in plane o	f lean Yes	X No
Roots broken	Yes	X No	Soil cracking	Yes	
			_		<u> </u>
Compounding factors	x Yes	No	Mower damage	to surface roots	
THE DEFECTS (CHAN	/NI)				
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	/N)				
	_			C (C)	
DEFECT	Ro	ot Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Poor taper Bow, sweep					
Co-dominants / forks					
Multiple attachments					
Included bark					
Excessive end weight					
Cracks / Splits					
Hangers					
Girdling		V			
Wounds / Seam Decay		Yes			
Cavity					
Fungal Fruiting Bodies					
Bleeding / Sap Flow					
Loose / Cracked Bark		Yes			
Birds / Bats / Bees					
Deadwood / Stubs					
Borers / Ants etc Cankers / Galls					
Previous failure					
Trevious ranore	<u>.</u>	<u> </u>		ļ	<u>Į</u>
HAZARD RATING					
Part most likely to fail	Whole tree	Scaffold	X Branch	Other	
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other	
inspection frequency	X / ***********************************		s really		
1.0 . 1.0 . 4.0	0 _ 6.0	Failure Potentia	1 Low	2 Medium 3 Hig	h Severe
++	→	Size of part	1 15cm		75cm 4 > 75cm
Failure Size of Targ Potential Part Ratin		Target Rating	1 Occasional		quent 4 Constant
HAZARD ABATEMEN	т				
D					
Prune	Yes	X No		¬	
Inspect Further	Root	Decay	Aerial	Monitor	<u> </u>
Remove tree	Yes	X No	Replace Tree	Yes	No
Move target	Yes	X No	Other		
COMMENTS					
	manta Daniel J		u la anula na anna (* 1719 - 1	المادين والمقيرا	
Mower damage to surface	1001s. Basal da	mage with mino	r park necrosis (like	iy io be mechanical dar	nagej.



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

HAZARD RATING										
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0							
Failure	Size of	Target	Hazard							
Potential	Part	Rating	Rating							
Immedi	Immediate action needed									
Needs	Needs further inspection									
	Dead Tree									

TREE CHARACTERISTICS

Restrict usage? Occupancy

Gen D D D D D D D D D D D D D D D D D D D	
2209 Lime Y Sym Dom 1 200 13 8	n/a

	•	Class		Class	Stems					•	Clear	Value
2209	Lime	Υ	Gen Sym	Dom	1	200	13			8		n/a
Observ Crown	rations Live crowr raised historically	ı ratio -	90%									
TREE	HEALTH											
Foliage	e colour	Noi	rmal	Chlo	orotic	Ne	ecrotic					
Foliage	edensity	Noi	rmal	Spo	irse							
_	on growth	Go	od	X Ave	rage	Po	or					
	lwood devlopment	Go	od	X Ave		Po	or		None			
Vitality	class	Go	od	X Ave		Fa	ir		Poor			
Leaf siz		Noi	rmal	Smo								
Epicorn	nic growth	Yes	;	No								
Diebac		Yes	;	x No								
Growth	obstructions	x Yes	;	No		Paver	nent					
Pests/	Diseases	Yes	i	x No								
SITE (SITE CONDITIONS											
Site cho	aracter	X Dor	nestic		ıstrial	PC)S		Natural	Woods	Gro	лb
Landsc	ape type	Lav	vn	X Roa	dside		rder		Open	Garden	Agri	С
Irrigati	on	Nor	ne	God	od	X Ac	lequate		Poor	Excessive		
Site dis	turbance	Yes	;	x No				_				
% drip	line paved	0%	•	10-	25%		5-50%		50-75%	x 75-100%	Othe	er
% drip	line soil	0%		x 10-	25%	25	5-50%		50-75%	75-100%	Othe	er .
% drip	line grade lowered	x 0%	•	10-	25%	25	5-50%		50-75%	75-100%	Othe	er .
Soil pro	oblems	x Dro	inage	Sha	llow	X Co	mpact	x	Drought	Saline	Alka	line
		Aci	dic	X Volu	ume	Dis	sease		Failure	Slope	Cont	taminated
Obstru	ctions	Ligh	nts	Sigr	nage	LC	S		Utilities	Veg	X Othe	er:
Exposu	re to wind	Ор	en	X Prof	tected	Gı	oup		Prone			
Prevail	ing wind direction	South	westerly									
TARG	ET											
Target	s under tree	X Buil	ding	X Par	king	x Ro	ad	х	Pedestrian	Recreation	Lanc	dscape
-		_	rdscape	Utili		-	aying	-	Other	Ш		
Can ta	rget be moved	Yes		x No								

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT	Γ)				
Suspect Root Rot	Yes	x No			
Fruiting body present	Yes	X No			
Exposed roots	Severe	X Moderate	Low	None	
Undermined	Severe	Moderate	Low	None	
Root pruned	Yes	X No	% Root area affe	_	
Buttress wounded	Yes	H	Approx age of w		
Restricted root area	Severe	 	Low		
	—	X Moderate	\vdash	None	
Potential for root failure	Severe	X Moderate	Low	٦	
Lean	Natural	Unnatural	Corrected	Angle	
Soil heave	Yes	X No	Decay in plane of	F lean Yes	x No
Roots broken	Yes	x No	Soil cracking	Yes	x No
Compounding factors	Yes	x No			
	<u></u>	<u> </u>			
TREE DEFECTS (CROV	VN)				
•	•				
DEFECT	Roo	ot Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Poor taper					
Bow, sweep					
Co-dominants / forks					
Multiple attachments					
Included bark					
Excessive end weight					
Cracks / Splits					
Hangers					
Girdling					
Wounds / Seam					
Decay					
Cavity					
Fungal Fruiting Bodies					
Bleeding / Sap Flow Loose / Cracked Bark					
Birds / Bats / Bees					
Deadwood / Stubs					
Borers / Ants etc					
Cankers / Galls					
Previous failure					
	•	•		•	•
HAZARD RATING					
Part most likely to fail	Whole tree	Scaffold	X Branch	Other	
Inspection frequency	⊢ ⊢	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other	
inspection frequency	Annual	2 - yeurry	3 - Tearly	Officer	
10 10 1		5 tl . B			
1.0 + 1.0 + 4.0	0 → 6.0	Failure Potentia		2 Medium 3 Hig	
Failure Size of Targ		Size of part	1 15cm		75cm 4 > 75cm
Potential Part Ratio	ng Rating	Target Rating	1 Occasional	2 Intermittent 3 Free	quent 4 Constant
HAZARD ABATEMEN	T				
Prune	Yes	x No			
Inspect Further	Root	Decay	Aerial	Monitor Other	
Remove tree	Yes	X No	Replace Tree	Yes	No
Move target	Yes		Other		
ore larger		X No			
COMMENTS					
			.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Remove root ball matting f	rom base ot tree	e - potential trip	nazard and restric	itng growth.	



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

HAZARD RATING							
3.0	2.0	4.0	9.0				
Failure Potential	Size of Part	Target Rating	Hazard Rating				
lmmedi	ate action r	needed					
Needs further inspection							
	Dead Tree						

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crown Spread	Crown Clear	Special Value
2210	Elm	М	Major Asym	Dom	1	495	20	17		n/a

ZZTO	/*/	Asym	70111	1 4/3	20			17		II/ U
Observations Live crow	n ratio - 9	0%								
Crown raised and reduced h	nistorically									
TREE HEALTH										
Foliage colour	Norm	al	Chlorotic	Ne	ecrotic					
Foliage density	Norm	al	Sparse							
Extension growth	Good	×	Average	Po	or					
Woundwood devlopment	X Good		Average		or		None			
Vitality class	Good		Average	Fo	ir		Poor			
Leaf size	Norm	al	Small	<u></u>						
Epicormic growth	Yes		No	-						
Dieback	Yes	х	No							
Growth obstructions	x Yes		No	Paver	nent / U	Itility	lines			
Pests/ Diseases	Yes	х	No							
SITE CONDITIONS										
	_	_	7				Ī		_	
Site character	X Dome		Industrial				Natural	Woods	Gro	
Landscape type	Lawn	х	Roadside		rder		Open	Garden	Agr	ic
Irrigation	None	_	Good		lequate		Poor	Excessive		
Site disturbance	x Yes	<u> </u>	No	_	armac ı	ınder		_		
% drip line paved	0%		10-25%		5-50%		50-75%	x 75-100%	Oth	
% drip line soil	0%	х		<u> </u>	5-50%		50-75%	75-100%	Oth	
% dripline grade lowered	x 0%		10-25%	25	5-50%		50-75%	75-100%	Oth	er
Soil problems	X Drain	age	Shallow	x Co	mpact	X	Drought	Saline	Alko	aline
	Acidio	x	Volume	Di	sease		Failure	Slope	Con	taminated
Obstructions	Lights		Signage	LC	S	X	Utilities	Veg	X Oth	er
Exposure to wind	Open	х	Protected	d G	oup		Prone			
Prevailing wind direction	South we	esterly								
TARGET										
			_							

Targets under tree	Ĥ	Building Hardscape	_	Parking Utility	X Road Playing	x	Pedestrian Other	Recreation	Landscape
Can target be moved		Yes	х	No		·	_		
Restrict usage?		Yes	х	No					
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	X Frequent		Constant	Other	

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT	')				
Suspect Root Rot Fruiting body present Exposed roots Undermined Root pruned Buttress wounded Restricted root area Potential for root failure Lean Soil heave Roots broken Compounding factors	Yes Yes Severe Yes Yes Severe Severe Natural Yes Yes Yes	X No X No X Moderate Moderate X No X Moderate X Moderate Unnatural X No X No X No	Low Low X % Root area affe Approx age of wellow Low Corrected Decay in plane of Soil cracking	ound None	
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	/N)				
DEFECT	Re	oot Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Poor taper					
Bow, sweep					
Co-dominants / forks					
Multiple attachments Included bark					
Excessive end weight					
Cracks / Splits					
Hangers					
Girdling					
Wounds / Seam		Yes	Yes	Yes	
Decay					
Cavity					
Fungal Fruiting Bodies					
Bleeding / Sap Flow					
Loose / Cracked Bark					
Birds / Bats / Bees					
Deadwood / Stubs					Yes
Borers / Ants etc					
Cankers / Galls					Vaa
Previous failure				ļ	Yes
HAZARD RATING					
Part most likely to fail	Whole tre	ee Scaffold	X Branch	Other	
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other	
Failure Size of Potential Part Ratio	et Hazard	Failure Potentia Size of part Target Rating	1 Low 1 15cm 1 Occasional		h
HAZARD ABATEMEN	Т				
Prune Inspect Further Remove tree Move target	X Yes Root Yes Yes	No Decay	Reduce and balance of Aerial X Replace Tree	rown. Deadwood. Monitor	No
COMMENTS Coalescing column of decay		x No			
g or acca,	,	2 P. 91.0111	J		



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
	Jessop Rodd, 1401 widi 14K2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last	Nist and State
inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

X Hardscape Yes

Yes

Can target be moved

Restrict usage? Occupancy

x No

HAZARD RATING								
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0					
Failure Potential	Size of	Target Rating	Hazard Rating					
lmmedi	Immediate action needed							
Needs further inspection								
	Dead Tree							

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crown Spread	Crown Clear	Special Value
2211	Beech	М	Gen Sym	Dom	1	820	21	18		n/a

2211	Beech	M	Sym	Dom	n 1	82	20 2	1		18		n/a
			•		•		•					
Observ	rations Live crow	n ratio	- 90%									
Crown	raised and reduced h	istorico	ılly									
TREE	HEALTH											
Foliage	colour	Пи	lormal	CI	hlorotic		Necrotic					
	edensity	N	lormal	Sı	parse		J					
Extensi	on growth	G	ood	x A	verage		Poor					
Wound	wood devlopment	G	Good	X A	verage		Poor		None			
Vitality	class	G	Good	X A	verage		Fair		Poor			
Leaf siz	ze	N	lormal	Sr	mall		•		⊣			
Epicorn	nic growth	Y	es	N	o							
Diebac	k	Y	es	x N	o							
Growth	obstructions	X	es	N	o	Pav	ement /	Utility	/ lines			
Pests/	Diseases	Y	es	X N	o							
SITE C	CONDITIONS											
									_			
Site cho	aracter	x D	omestic	In	dustrial		POS		Natural	Woods	Gro	ир
Landsc	ape type	Lo	awn	x Ro	oadside		Border		Open	Garden	Agri	ic
Irrigati	on	-	lone	G	ood	X	Adequate	, <u> </u>	Poor	Excessive		
Site dis	turbance	x Y	es	N	o	Ne	w tarma	c up to	stem			
% drip	line paved	0	%	10	0-25%		25-50%		50-75%	x 75-100%	Oth	er
% drip	line soil	0	%	x 10	0-25%		25-50%		50-75%	75-100%	Oth	er
% drip	line grade lowered	x 0	%	10	0-25%		25-50%		50-75%	75-100%	Oth	er
Soil pro	oblems	x D	rainage	Sł	hallow	X	Compact	х	Drought	Saline	Alko	ıline
		A	cidic	x V	olume		Disease		Failure	Slope	Con	taminated
Obstru	ctions	Li	ghts		ignage		LOS	х		Veg	X Oth	er
Exposu	re to wind		pen	X Pr	rotected		Group		Prone			
Prevail	ing wind direction	South	n westerly									
TARG	ET											
Taract	under tree		uilding		arking		Road	Γ	Pedestrian	Recreation		dscape
ruigei	under tree		ardscape	x Po	_	X	Playing	X	Other	Recreation	L	ascape

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT)				
Suspect Root Rot Fruiting body present Exposed roots Undermined Root pruned Buttress wounded Restricted root area Potential for root failure Lean Soil heave Roots broken Compounding factors	Yes Yes Severe Yes Yes Severe Yes Severe Natural Yes Yes Yes	X No N	Low Low % Root area affe Approx age of w Low Low Corrected Decay in plane or Soil cracking	ound None Angle	
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	/N)				
DEFECT	Ro	ot Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Poor taper					
Bow, sweep					
Co-dominants / forks					
Multiple attachments					
Included bark					
Excessive end weight					
Cracks / Splits					
Hangers Girdling					
Wounds / Seam		Yes			
Decay		103			
Cavity					
Fungal Fruiting Bodies					
Bleeding / Sap Flow					
Loose / Cracked Bark					
Birds / Bats / Bees					
Deadwood / Stubs					Yes
Borers / Ants etc					
Cankers / Galls					
Previous failure					
HAZARD RATING					
Part most likely to fail	Whole tree	Scaffold	x Branch	Other	
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other	
Failure Size of Potential Part Ratio	et Hazard	Failure Potential Size of part Target Rating	1 Low 1 15cm 1 Occasional		h
HAZARD ABATEMEN	т				
Prune Inspect Further Remove tree Move target	Yes Root Yes Yes	No	Crown lift and deadw Aerial Replace Tree Other	Monitor Other	No
COMMENTS Some root damage. Tarmad					
	- 56 .3 3.5111 30				



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

HAZARD RATING										
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0							
Failure Potential	Size of	Target Rating	Hazard Rating							
lmmedi										
Needs	pection									
	Dead Tree									

TREE CHARACTERISTICS

Can target be moved

Restrict usage? Occupancy

Yes Yes

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crown Spread	Crown Clear	Special Value
2212	Beech	М	Gen Sym	Dom	1	770	18	20		n/a

2212	Beech	М	Gen Sym	Dom	1	77	0 18			20		n/a
01			0001		_		_		-			
Observ			90%									
Crown	raised and pollarded	ın past.										
TREE	HEALTH											
Foliage	e colour	Nor	mal	Ch	lorotic		Necrotic					
-	e density	Nor	mal	Sp	arse	ш						
	on growth	God	od	X Av	erage		Poor					
	lwood devlopment	God	od	X Av	erage		Poor		None			
Vitality	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	God	od		erage	-	Fair		Poor			
Leaf siz		Nor	mal	Sm	ıall				4			
Epicorn	nic growth	Yes		No	,							
Diebac	:k	Yes		x No	,							
Growth	n obstructions	x Yes		No	,	Pave	ement / U	tility	lines			
Pests/	Diseases	Yes		x No	,							
SITE (CONDITIONS											
3111	CONDITIONS											
Site cho	aracter	X Don	nestic	Ind	lustrial	П	POS		Natural	Woods	Gro	up
Landsc	ape type	Law	'n	x Ro	adside		Border		Open	Garden	Agri	
Irrigati		Non	ie		ood	x	Adequate		Poor	Excessive	<u></u>	
-	sturbance	x Yes		No)		/ tarmac u	p to	stem			
% drip	line paved	0%		10	-25%	$\overline{}$	25-50%		50-75%	x 75-100%	Oth	er
% drip	line soil	0%		x 10	-25%		25-50%		50-75%	75-100%	Oth	er
% drip	line grade lowered	x 0%		10	-25%		25-50%		50-75%	75-100%	Oth	er
Soil pro	oblems	x Dra	inage	She	allow	x	Compact	х	Drought	Saline	Alko	lline
		Acio	dic	x Vo	lume		Disease		Failure	Slope	Con	taminated
Obstru	ctions	Ligh	ıts	Sig	jnage		LOS	х	Utilities	Veg	X Oth	er
Exposu	re to wind	Оре	en	x Pro	otected		Group		Prone			
Prevail	ing wind direction	South v	vesterly						_			
TARG	ET											
Target	s under tree	X Build	ding	x Pa	rking	x	Road	x	Pedestrian	Recreation	Land	dscape
		X Har	dscape	X Uti	lity	F	Playing		Other		-	

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT	Γ)				
Suspect Root Rot	Yes	X No			
Fruiting body present	Yes	x No			
Exposed roots	Seve	re X Moderate	Low	None	
Undermined	Seve	re Moderate	Low	X None	
Root pruned	Yes	x No	% Root area	offected	
Buttress wounded	Yes	x No	Approx age o	of wound	
Restricted root area	Seve	—		None	
Potential for root failure	Seve		<u> </u>		
Lean	Natu		Corrected	Angle	
Soil heave	Yes		Decay in plan		'es 🗶 No
Roots broken	Yes	X No	Soil cracking		res X No
KOOIS DIOKEII	ies	X	3011 Crucking	Ш'	es X
Compounding factors	Yes	X No			
TREE DEFECTS (CROV	WN)				
	,				
DEFECT		Root Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Poor taper					
Bow, sweep					
Co-dominants / forks					
Multiple attachments					
Included bark					
Excessive end weight Cracks / Splits					
Hangers				Yes	
Girdling				103	
Wounds / Seam		Yes			
Decay					
Cavity				Yes	
Fungal Fruiting Bodies					
Bleeding / Sap Flow					
Loose / Cracked Bark					
Birds / Bats / Bees					Vaa
Deadwood / Stubs Borers / Ants etc	-+				Yes
Cankers / Galls					
Previous failure					
					
HAZARD RATING					
Desired Bloken fell					
Part most likely to fail	⊢	le tree Scaffold	X Branch	Other	
Inspection frequency	X	al 2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other	
1.0 + 1.0 + 4.	0 _ 6.0	O Failure Potentia	al Low	2 Medium 3	ligh 4 Severe
Failure Size of Targ	get Haza	Size of part	1 15cm	2 15-45cm 3 4	45-75cm 4 > 75cm
Potential Part Rati	ing Ratii	Target Rating	1 Occasion	nal 2 Intermittent 3 F	requent 4 Constant
HAZARD ABATEMEN	IT				
Prune	Yes	No	Crown clean and	raise. Remove other vegetation	n from crown
Inspect Further	X Yes Root	Decay	X Aerial	Monitor Other	
•	<u> </u>				
Remove tree	Yes	X No	Replace Tree	Yes	No
Move target	Yes	X No	Other		
COMMENTS					
Holly, Cypess and Sorbus			in scaffold. Cross	sing branches. Significant	deadwood.
Obstructing phone lines. To	ırmac up to	root plate.			



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

HAZARD RATING										
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0							
Failure	Size of	Target	Hazard							
Potential	Rating	Rating								
Immedi	ate action r	needed								
Needs	ection									
	Dead Tree									

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crown Spread	Crown Clear	Special Value
2213	Beech	М	Gen Sym	Dom	1	680	18	16		Bird box

2213	Beech	٨	Λ Sym	Do	om	1	68	80	18			16			Bird box
Observ	Observations Live crown ratio - 90%														
Crown	raised and pollarded			x in	tree.										
	•	•													
TREE	HEALTH														
Foliage	colour		Normal		Chloro	tic		Necrot	ic						
Foliage	density		Normal		Sparse	•		1							
Extension	on growth		Good	х	Averaç	ge		Poor							
Wound	wood devlopment		Good	х	Averaç	ge		Poor			None				
Vitality	class		Good	х	Averaç	ge		Fair			Poor				
Leaf siz	e		Normal		Small		-	_			•				
Epicorm	nic growth		Yes		No										
Diebac	k		Yes	х	No										
Growth	obstructions	X	Yes		No		Pav	vemen	t						
Pests/ I	Diseases		Yes	x	No										
SITE C	CONDITIONS														
					_			_			_		_		
Site cho	aracter	X	Domestic		Industr	ial		POS			Natural		Woods	Gro	oup
Landsco	ape type		Lawn	x	Roadsi	de		Border			Open		Garden	Agr	ic
Irrigatio	on		None		Good		x	Adequ	ate		Poor		Excessive		
Site dis	turbance	X	Yes		No		Ne	w tarn	nac u	o to	stem	_	•		
% drip	line paved		0%		10-25	%		25-50°	%		50-75%	X	75-100%	Oth	er
% drip	line soil		0%	X	10-25	%		25-50°	%		50-75%		75-100%	Oth	er
% drip	line grade lowered	x	0%		10-25	%		25-50°	%		50-75%		75-100%	Oth	er
Soil pro	blems	x	Drainage		Shallov	~	x	Compo	act	x	Drought		Saline	Alk	aline
			Acidic	X	Volume	Э		Disease	е		Failure		Slope	Cor	taminated
Obstruc	ctions		Lights		Signaç	je		LOS			Utilities		Veg	X Oth	er
Exposu	re to wind		Open	X	Protect	ted		Group			Prone				
Prevail	ing wind direction	Sou	th westerly												
TARG	ET														
			Ī		1			1			1	_	7		
fargets	under tree	<u> </u>	Building Hardscape	X	Parking Utility	g	Х	Road Playing	יי	X	Pedestrian Other		Recreation	Lan	dscape

Targets under tree	х	Building	х	Parking	x	Road	x	Pedestrian	Recreation	Landscape
	х	Hardscape		Utility		Playing		Other	•	-
Can target be moved		Yes	х	No				•		
Restrict usage?		Yes	х	No						
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	X	Frequent		Constant	Other	

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT)				
Suspect Root Rot Fruiting body present Exposed roots Undermined Root pruned Buttress wounded Restricted root area Potential for root failure Lean Soil heave Roots broken	Yes Yes Severe Severe Yes Yes Severe Severe Natural Yes Yes	X No X No X Moderate Moderate X No X No X Moderate Unnatural X No X No	Low Low % Root area affe Approx age of w Low Low Corrected Decay in plane of Soil cracking	octed ound None Angle f lean	Yes X No Yes X No
Compounding factors	Yes	x No			
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	N)				
DEFECT	Do	A Flows	Tours	Couffe la	Dunn ah
DEFECT	Roo	ot Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Poor taper					
Bow, sweep Co-dominants / forks	+	+		+	+
Multiple attachments	+	-			
Included bark					
Excessive end weight					
Cracks / Splits					
Hangers					Yes
Girdling					
Wounds / Seam					
Decay					
Cavity					
Fungal Fruiting Bodies					
Bleeding / Sap Flow					
Loose / Cracked Bark					
Birds / Bats / Bees					.,
Deadwood / Stubs					Yes
Borers / Ants etc Cankers / Galls					
Previous failure	<u> </u>				
Frevious railore					
HAZARD RATING					
Part most likely to fail	Whole tree	Scaffold	X Branch	Other	
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other	
positori troquoticj					
1.0 + 1.0 + 4.0 Failure Potential Part Rating	t Hazard	Failure Potential Size of part Target Rating	1 Low 1 5cm 1 Occasional	2 15-45cm 3	4 Severe 4 5-75cm 4 Constant 4 Constant 4 Constant 4 Constant 4 Constant Constan
HAZARD ABATEMENT	<u> </u>				
Prune	x Yes	No	Crown clean and crow	vn lift	
Inspect Further	Root	Decay	Aerial	Monitor Othe	r
Remove tree	Yes	x No	Replace Tree	Yes	No
Move target	Yes	x No		vement lifted - Trip Hazar	d
-				<u> </u>	
COMMENTS					



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

HAZARD RATING										
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0							
Failure	Size of	Target	Hazard							
Potential	Part	Rating	Rating							
Immedi	Immediate action needed									
Needs	ection									
	Dead Tree									

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crown Spread	Crown Clear	Special Value
2214	Horse Chestnut	Y	Gen Sym	Dom	2	360	11	12		

Tree ID	Species	Class	Form	Class	Stems	DBH	Height		Crown	Spread	Clear	Value			
2214	Horse Chestnut	Υ	Gen Sym	Dom	2	360	11		1	2					
Observ	ations Twin stem	a d f a	1 4												
		illed ITOII	1 1.0111.												
Crown	raised in past.														
TREE	HEALTH														
F-1:			1												
Foliage		Norn			orotic	140	ecrotic								
	density	\vdash		Spo											
	on growth	Goo		X Ave			oor		N.I.						
	wood devlopment	Goo		$oldsymbol{oldsymbol{eta}}$	rage	x Pc		-	None						
Vitality		Goo		X Ave		Fair Poor									
Leaf size Normal				Smo	111										
Epicormic growth Yes				X No											
Diebacl		Yes		X No											
	obstructions	x Yes		No		Pave	ment								
Pests/ L	Diseases	Yes		X No											
SITE C	ONDITIONS														
Site cho	ıracter	X Dom	estic		ıstrial	PC	OS		Natural	Woods	Gro	ηþ			
Landsco	ipe type	Lawr	1	x Roa	dside	Вс	order		Open	Garden	Agri	с			
Irrigatio	on	None	•	God	od	x Ad	dequate		Poor	Excessive					
Site dis	turbance	X Yes		No		New	tarmac u	p to	stem						
% drip	line paved	0%		10-	25%	2.5	5-50%		50-75%	x 75-100%	Othe	er			
% drip	line soil	0%		x 10-	25%	2.5	5-50%		50-75%	75-100%	Othe	er			
% dripl	ine grade lowered	x 0%		10-	25%	23	5-50%		50-75%	75-100%	Othe	er			
Soil pro	blems	X Drain	nage	Sha	llow	x C	ompact	х	Drought	Saline	Alko	line			
		Acid	ic	x Volu	Jme	Di	sease		Failure	Slope	Cont	aminated			
Obstruc	tions	Light	s	Sigr	nage	LC	os		Utilities	Veg	X Othe	er			
Exposui	e to wind	Оре	n	X Prof	tected	G	roup		Prone						
Prevaili	ng wind direction	South w	esterly												
TARG	ET														
Taracta	under tree	X Build	ina	X Parl	kina	x Ro	ad		Pedestrian	Recreation		Iscape			
rangers	onder nec	X Hard		X Pari	-		aying	$\stackrel{\sim}{-}$	Other	Recreation					

Targets under tree	х	Building	x	Parking	x	Road	x	Pedestrian	Recreation	Landscape	
	х	Hardscape		Utility		Playing		Other	•	 -	
Can target be moved		Yes	х	No		•		•			
Restrict usage?		Yes	х	No							
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	X	Frequent		Constant	Other		

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT))				
Suspect Root Rot Fruiting body present Exposed roots Undermined Root pruned Buttress wounded Restricted root area Potential for root failure Lean Soil heave Roots broken	Yes Yes Severe Severe Yes Yes Severe Severe Natural Yes Yes	X No X No X Moderate Moderate X No X No X Moderate X Moderate Unnatural X No X No	Low Low % Root area affe Approx age of well Low Low Corrected Decay in plane of Soil cracking	ound None Angle	<u> </u>
Compounding factors	Yes	X No	Jon Cracking	<u></u>	, <u>A</u> ,
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	N)				
DEFECT	Roc	t Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Poor taper					
Bow, sweep					
Co-dominants / forks					
Multiple attachments					
Included bark					
Excessive end weight					
Cracks / Splits					
Hangers					
Girdling				-	
Wounds / Seam					
Decay					
Cavity Fungal Fruiting Bodies	+	+		-	1
Bleeding / Sap Flow	 	+			
Loose / Cracked Bark		+			
Birds / Bats / Bees	+	+			1
Deadwood / Stubs	<u> </u>	+			
Borers / Ants etc					
Cankers / Galls					
Previous failure					
HAZARD RATING					
Part most likely to fail	Whole tree	Scaffold	X Branch	Other	
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other	
1.0 . 1.0 . 4.0	[]	Failure Potential		2 Medium 3 High	gh 4 Severe
++	-→				_
Failure Size of Targe Potential Part Rating		Size of part Target Rating	1 15cm 1 Occasional		-75cm 4 > 75cm equent 4 Constant
HAZARD ABATEMENT	г				
_	<u> </u>	<u> </u>			
Prune	X Yes	No	Crown lift]	
Inspect Further	Root	Decay	Aerial	Monitor Other	
Remove tree	Yes	X No	Replace Tree	Yes	No
Move target	Yes	x No	Other		
COMMENTS					
Root graft.		<u></u>			



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

HAZARD RATING									
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0						
Failure Potential	Size of Part	Target Rating	Hazard Rating						
Immedi	ate action r	needed							
Needs	Needs further inspection								
	Dead Tree								

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crow	n Spread	Crown Clear	Special Value
2215	Chestnut	EM	Gen Sym	Dom	1	320	10		12		
Observ	vations										
TREE	HEALTH										
Foliage Extensi Wound Vitality Leaf siz Epicorr	ze nic growth	Nori Nori Goo Goo Nori Yes	mal od od od	Spa X Ave X Ave	rage rage rage	Poo Poo Fair	r	None Poor			
Diebad		Yes		X No							
	n obstructions Diseases	X Yes		X No		Pavem	ent / St	reet Lamp			
SITE	CONDITIONS										
Irrigati Site dis % drip % drip % drip Soil pro Obstru Exposu	ape type on sturbance line paved line soil line grade lowered oblems ctions re to wind ing wind direction	Law Non Yes 0% 0% X 0% X Drai Acid X Ligh Ope	e inage lic ts	X Roa Goc X No 10- X 10- Sha X Volu Sigr X Prof	25% 25% 25% 25% Illow ume	25- 25- x Con	der equate 50% 50% 50% apact ease	Natural Open Poor 50-75% 50-75% X Drought Failure Utilities Prone	Woods Garden Excessive	Othe Othe Alka	er er er line aminated
	s under tree rget be moved	x Build x Hard Yes	ding dscape	X Park	-	X Roo		x Pedestrian X Other	Recreation	Lanc	Iscape
	usage?	Yes		x No							

Targets under tree	<u> </u>	Building Hardscape	Ĥ	Parking Utility		Road Playing	 Pedestrian Other	Recreation	Landscape
Can target be moved		Yes	X	No		="	_		
Restrict usage?		Yes	х	No					
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	x	Frequent	Constant	Other	

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT	")				
Suspect Root Rot Fruiting body present Exposed roots Undermined Root pruned Buttress wounded Restricted root area Potential for root failure Lean Soil heave Roots broken Compounding factors	Yes Yes Severe Severe Yes Yes Severe Natural Yes Yes Yes	X No X Moderate Moderate X No X Mo X Moderate X Moderate X Moderate X Moderate X Moderate X No No X No	Low Low % Root area affe Approx age of w Low Low Corrected Decay in plane of Soil cracking	ound None Angle	
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	/N)				
DEFECT	Roc	ot Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Poor taper					
Bow, sweep					
Co-dominants / forks					
Multiple attachments					
Included bark					
Excessive end weight					
Cracks / Splits					
Hangers Circling					
Girdling Wounds / Seam					
Decay					
Cavity					
Fungal Fruiting Bodies					
Bleeding / Sap Flow					
Loose / Cracked Bark					
Birds / Bats / Bees					
Deadwood / Stubs					
Borers / Ants etc					
Cankers / Galls					
Previous failure					
HAZARD RATING					
Part most likely to fail	Whole tree	Scaffold	X Branch	Other	
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other	
Failure Size of Potential Part Ratio	et Hazard	Failure Potential Size of part Target Rating	1 Low 1 15cm 1 Occasional		h
HAZARD ABATEMEN	т				
Prune	Yes	No		away from street lamp	
Inspect Further	Root	Decay	Aerial	Monitor Other	
Remove tree	Yes	X No	Replace Tree	Yes	No
Move target	Yes	X No	Other		
COMMENTS Mower damage to roots. H	orse Chestnut Sc	ale. Root graft	Obstructing street !	ight	
Moner adminge to 10015. IT	orac chesinoi ac	aic. Rooi giulli	Change and all ear I	·A····	



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2				
Map/Location					
Owner	Norwich City Council				
Date	23rd March 2008				
Date of last inspection	Not available				
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer				

HAZARD RATING									
2.0	1.0	4.0	7.0						
Failure	Size of	Target	Hazard						
Potential	Part	Rating	Rating						
Immedi	ate action r	needed							
Needs further inspection									
	Dead Tree								

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crown Spread	Crown Clear	Special Value
2216	Maple	EM	Gen Sym	Dom	1	320	13	9		

2210	Maple	E/V	\ Sym	DC	om	ı	34	20 13			9			
Observ	vations Crown rais	sed in	past.											
TREE	HEALTH													
Foliage	a colour		Vormal		Chlorotic	. Г		Necrotic						
	e density	\vdash	Vormal		Sparse	Ĺ		recrone						
_	on growth	\vdash	Good		Average	. Г		Poor						
	lwood devlopment	\vdash	Good		Average	-		Poor		None				
Vitality	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	\vdash	Good		Average	- F		Fair	H	Poor				
Leaf siz		\mathbf{H}	Normal	<u> </u>	Small	L				٦. ٥٥.				
	nic growth	\vdash	'es		No	-								
Diebac	=	Y	'es	_	No	_								
	obstructions	X Yes No Pavement / Street Lamp												
	Diseases	$\stackrel{\sim}{-}$	'es	х	No	-		/						
,						_								
SITE C	CONDITIONS													
					Ī	_		Ī		-	_	7		
Site cho		Ĥ	Oomestic		Industria			POS		Natural		Woods	Gro	•
	ape type	\vdash	awn	X	Roadside	-		Border	-	Open		Garden	Agr	ic
Irrigati		□	Vone		Good		X	Adequate		Poor		Excessive		
	turbance	\vdash	'es		No	-		Ī	_	=		7	_	
-	line paved	\blacksquare)%		10-25%	-		25-50%		50-75%	х	75-100%	Oth	
-	line soil	0	0%	X	10-25%			25-50%		50-75%	-	75-100%	Oth	er
-	line grade lowered	x 0)%		10-25%	L		25-50%		50-75%		75-100%	Oth	er
Soil pro	oblems	X	Prainage		Shallow		X	Compact	х	Drought		Saline	Alko	aline
		\vdash	Acidic	X	Volume	L		Disease		Failure	-	Slope	Con	taminated
Obstru		X L		_	Signage	-		LOS		Utilities		Veg	X Oth	er
-	re to wind		Open	X	Protecte	d		Group		Prone				
Prevail	ing wind direction	Sout	h westerly											
TARG	EI													

Targets under tree	Ĥ	Building Hardscape	_	Parking Utility		Road Playing	Pedestrian Other	Recreatio	n	Landscape
Can target be moved		Yes	х	No	-	•	-			
Restrict usage?		Yes	х	No						
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	X	Frequent	Constant	Other		

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT)				
Suspect Root Rot Fruiting body present Exposed roots Undermined Root pruned Buttress wounded Restricted root area Potential for root failure Lean Soil heave Roots broken Compounding factors	Yes Yes Severe Severe Yes X Yes Severe Severe Natural Yes Yes Yes	X No N	Low Low % Root area afformation Approx age of well- Low Low Corrected Decay in plane of Soil cracking	vound None Angle	-
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	/N)				
DEFECT	Ro	ot Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Poor taper					
Bow, sweep					
Co-dominants / forks					
Multiple attachments					
Included bark					
Excessive end weight					
Cracks / Splits					
Hangers Girdling					
Wounds / Seam		Yes			
Decay		103			
Cavity					
Fungal Fruiting Bodies					
Bleeding / Sap Flow					
Loose / Cracked Bark					
Birds / Bats / Bees					
Deadwood / Stubs					
Borers / Ants etc					
Cankers / Galls					
Previous failure					
HAZARD RATING					
Part most likely to fail	Whole tree	Scaffold	X Branch	Other	
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other	
Failure Potential Part A.C. Targe Part Ratin	et Hazard	Failure Potential Size of part Target Rating	1 Low 1 15cm 1 Occasional		gh 4 Severe -75cm 4 > 75cm equent 4 Constant
HAZARD ABATEMEN	Т				
Prune Inspect Further Remove tree	Yes Root Yes	X No Decay	Aerial Replace Tree	Monitor Other	No
Move target	Yes	X No	Other		
COMMENTS	0.00				
Signficant basal damage fr	om 0-30cm.				



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2				
Map/Location					
Owner	Norwich City Council				
Date	23rd March 2008				
Date of last inspection	Not available				
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer				

Good

Good

Normal

Yes

Yes

Yes

Yes

HAZARD RATING											
1.0	4.0	6.0									
Failure Potential	Failure Size of Target										
lmmedi	ate action r	needed									
Needs	further insp	ection									
	Dead Tree										

TREE CHARACTERISTICS

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crown Spread	Crown Clear	Special Value
221 <i>7</i>	Maple	EM	Gen Sym	Dom	1	300	12	9		
Observ	ations									
	ations HEALTH									
TREE	HEALTH	Nor	mal	Chlo	protic	Nec	rotic			
TREE l	HEALTH	Nori Nori		Chlo Spa		Nec	rotic			

Poor

Fair

None

Average

Average

Small

Νo

Νo

Νo

SITE CONDITIONS

Woundwood devlopment

Vitality class

Epicormic growth

Growth obstructions

Pests/ Diseases

Leaf size

Dieback

х	Domestic		Industrial		POS		Natural		Woods		Group
	Lawn	х	Roadside		Border		Open		Garden		Agric
	None		Good	х	Adequate		Poor		Excessive		•
	Yes	х	No		- -						
	0%		10-25%		25-50%		50-75%	х	75-100%		Other
	0%	х	10-25%		25-50%		50-75%		75-100%		Other
X	0%		10-25%		25-50%		50-75%		75-100%		Other
x	Drainage		Shallow	x	Compact	X	Drought		Saline		Alkaline
	Acidic	х	Volume		Disease		Failure		Slope		Contaminated
x	Lights		Signage		LOS		Utilities		Veg		Other
	Open	х	Protected		Group		Prone	•	-		•
Sou	th westerly		-		<u>.</u>		<u>.</u>				
	X X X	Lawn None Yes 0% 0% X 0% Drainage Acidic X Lights Open	Lawn X None Yes X 0% 0%	Lawn X Roadside	Lawn X Roadside Good X	Lawn	Lawn X Roadside Border	Lawn	Lawn	Lawn X Roadside Border Open Garden	Lawn

TARGET

Targets under tree	<u> </u>	Building Hardscape	_	Parking Utility		Road Playing	Pedestrian Other	Recreation	Landscape	
Can target be moved		Yes	х	No		_	_			
Restrict usage?		Yes	х	No						
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	X	Frequent	Constant	Other		

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT)								
Suspect Root Rot Fruiting body present Exposed roots Undermined Root pruned Buttress wounded Restricted root area Potential for root failure Lean Soil heave Roots broken	Yes Yes Severe Severe Yes Severe Severe Natural Yes Yes	Yes X No Severe X Moderate Low None Severe Moderate Low X None Yes X No % Root area affected Yes X No Approx age of wound Severe X Moderate Low None Severe X Moderate Low None Natural Unnatural Corrected Angle Yes X No Decay in plane of lean Yes X No Soil cracking		None cted ound None Angle	Yes X No Yes No			
Compounding factors	Yes	X No						
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	N)							
DEFECT	Root	Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch			
Poor taper								
Bow, sweep								
Co-dominants / forks								
Multiple attachments Included bark								
Excessive end weight								
Cracks / Splits								
Hangers								
Girdling								
Wounds / Seam	Y	'es						
Decay								
Cavity								
Fungal Fruiting Bodies								
Bleeding / Sap Flow								
Loose / Cracked Bark								
Birds / Bats / Bees								
Deadwood / Stubs								
Borers / Ants etc								
Cankers / Galls Previous failure	+	+						
Trevious fullore	<u> </u>	<u> </u>		<u> </u>				
HAZARD RATING								
Part most likely to fail	Whole tree	Scaffold	¥ Branch	Other				
•	H							
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other				
1.0 + 1.0 + 4.0	→ 6.0	Failure Potential	⊢		High 4 Severe			
Failure Size of Target Potential Part Rating	Hazard Rating	Size of part Target Rating	1 15cm 1 Occasional		45-75cm			
HAZARD ABATEMENT								
D		П .,	C					
Prune	X Yes	No	Crown clean],, ,,				
Inspect Further	Root	Decay		Monitor Othe				
Remove tree	Yes	X No	Replace Tree	Yes	No			
Move target	Yes	X No	Other					
COMMENTS								
Crossing branches in crown.		<u></u>						



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
	Jessop Rodd, 1401 widi 14K2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last	Nist and State
inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

	HAZARD RATING											
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0									
Failure Potential	Failure Size of Target											
lmmedi	ate action r	needed										
Needs	further insp	ection										
	Dead Tree											

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crov	vn Spread	Crown Clear	Special Value				
2218	Beech	М	Gen Sym	Dom	1	760	0 25		19						
	Observations Crown raised and pollarded in the past.														
Crown r	aised and pollarded	in the p	ast.												
TREE H	HEALTH														
	12/(2111														
Foliage	colour	Nor	mal	Chlo	orotic	\square	Vecrotic								
Foliage		Nor	mal	Spo	ırse										
-	on growth	God	od	⊢ ⊢ '	rage	P	oor								
	wood devlopment	God	od		rage	P	oor	None							
Vitality	· ·	God	od	<u> </u>	rage	F	air	Poor							
Leaf size		Nor	mal	Smo	-			Ш							
Epicormi	ic growth	Yes		x No											
Dieback	•	Yes		X No											
Growth	obstructions	X Yes		No		Pave	ement								
Pests/D	Diseases	Yes		x No											
SITE C	ONDITIONS														
Site cha	racter	X Don	nestic	□ Indi	ıstrial	Пр	os	Natural	Woods	Gro	un				
	ipe type	Law			dside	_	Sorder	Open	Garden	Agri					
Irrigatio		Non		God		\mathbf{H}	Adequate	Poor	Excessive						
-	urbance	X Yes		No			tarmac b								
	line paved	0%		—	25%	$\overline{}$	25-50%	50-75%	x 75-100%	Othe	er				
% drip	· ·	0%			25%	-	25-50%	50-75%	75-100%	Othe					
•	ine grade lowered	0%			25%	\mathbf{H}	25-50%	50-75%	75-100%	Othe					
Soil pro	=	X Dra	inage	$\stackrel{\sim}{\vdash}$	llow	¥	Compact	X Drought	Saline	Alka	line				
•		Acid	dic	x Volu	Jme		Disease	Failure	Slope	Cont	aminated				
Obstruc	tions	X Ligh	ıts	<u> </u>	nage		OS	Utilities	Veg	Othe	er				
	e to wind	Оре		X Prof	tected		Group	Prone		ш					
-	ng wind direction	South v	vesterly						-						
			•												
TARG	ET														
_				<u> </u>				<u> </u>		<u> </u>					
Targets	under tree	X Build	Ū	X Par		X R		X Pedestrian	Recreation	Lanc	Iscape				
_		<u> </u>	dscape	Utili	ty	P	laying	Other							
	get be moved	Yes		X No											
Restrict	=	Yes		X No				<u></u>	□ - ·						
Occupa	ncy	Rar	е	Inte	rmittent	I x F	requent	Constant	Other						

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT))				
Suspect Root Rot	Yes	x No			
Fruiting body present	Yes	x No		_	
Exposed roots	Severe	X Moderate	Low	None	
Undermined	Severe	Moderate	Low	None	
Root pruned	Yes	x No	% Root area aff	ected	
Buttress wounded	Yes	x No	Approx age of \	wound	
Restricted root area	Severe	X Moderate	Low	None	
Potential for root failure	Severe	X Moderate	Low	_	
Lean	Natural	Unnatural	Corrected	Angle	
Soil heave	Yes	x No	Decay in plane o	of lean Yes	x No
Roots broken	Yes	x No	Soil cracking	Yes	x No
Compounding factors	Yes	X No			
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	N)				
DEFECT	Ro	ot Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Poor taper					
Bow, sweep				.,	
Co-dominants / forks				Yes	
Multiple attachments Included bark				Yes Yes	
Excessive end weight		+		res	
Cracks / Splits					
Hangers					
Girdling					
Wounds / Seam		Yes	Yes		
Decay					
Cavity					
Fungal Fruiting Bodies					
Bleeding / Sap Flow Loose / Cracked Bark					
Loose / Cracked Bark Birds / Bats / Bees		+			
Deadwood / Stubs					Yes
Borers / Ants etc					
Cankers / Galls					
Previous failure					
	-	-		•	-
HAZARD RATING					
				_	
Part most likely to fail	Whole tree	Scaffold	X Branch	Other	
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other	
1.0 _ 1.0 _ 4.0	6.0	Failure Potentia	l low	2 Medium 3 Hig	h Severe
Failure Size of Targe	t Hazard	Size of part	1 15cm	2 15-45cm 3 45-	-75cm 4 > 75cm
Potential Part Rating	Rating	Target Rating	1 Occasional	2 Intermittent 3 Fre	quent 4 Constant
			<u>—</u>	<u> </u>	<u>—</u>
HAZARD ABATEMENT	Γ				
Prune	X Yes	No	Crown clean and ren	nove lowest limb towards hous	se.
Inspect Further	Root	Decay	Aerial	Monitor Other	
Remove tree	Yes	X No	Replace Tree	Yes	No
Move target	Yes	X No	Other		
ŭ			<u> </u>		
COMMENTS					
Signficant ribbing to stem. A	Ninor root dama	age. Girdling ro	oots. Included unions	s in crown. Significant de	adwood.
New tarmac by base and le				<u> </u>	



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

	HAZARD RATING											
1.0	4.0	6.0										
Failure	Size of	Target	Hazard									
Potential	Potential Part Rating											
Immedi	ate action r	needed										
Needs	further insp	ection										
	Dead Tree											

TREE	CHARACTERISTIC	S										
											_	
Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height		Crowr	spread	Crown Clear	Special Value
2219	Chestnut (Carnea)	Y	Gen Sym	Dom	1	110	5			4		
Observ												
Crown	raised in past											
TDEE	HEALTH											
INEE	HEALIN											
Foliage	e colour	No	ormal	Ch	orotic		lecrotic					
_	edensity	No	ormal	Sp	arse							
-	on growth	G	ood	x Av	erage	P	oor					
Wound	lwood devlopment	G	ood	x Av		P	oor		None			
Vitality	class	G	ood	x Av		F	air		Poor			
Leaf siz	ze	No	ormal	Sm	all				4			
Epicorn	nic growth	Ye	es .	x No								
Diebac	k	Ye	es .	x No								
Growth	obstructions	X	es .	No		Pave	ement					
Pests/	Diseases	Ye	es .	x No								
SITE (CONDITIONS											
						_			1			
Site cho		-	omestic	ш.	ustrial	\vdash	OS		Natural	Woods	Gro	•
	ape type	\blacksquare	wn	X Ro			order		Open	Garden	Agri	c
Irrigati		\mathbf{H}	one	Go		X	dequate		Poor	Excessive		
	turbance	Ye		X No					1		_	
-	line paved	0%	-		-25%	-	25-50%		50-75%	x 75-100%	Oth	
•	line soil	0%			-25%	\mathbf{H}	25-50%		50-75%	75-100%	Oth	
-	line grade lowered	0%	6	<u> </u>	-25%	\vdash	25-50%		50-75%	75-100%	Oth	
Soil pro	oblems	$\stackrel{\sim}{\vdash}$	ainage		allow		Compact	X	Drought	Saline	Alko	
		Ac	idic	x Vo	lume	D	Disease		Failure	Slope	Con	taminated

TARGET

Obstructions

Exposure to wind

Prevailing wind direction

Targets under tree	x	Building	х	Parking	х	Road	х	Pedestrian		Recreation	Landscape	
3		Hardscape		Utility		Playing		Other	<u> </u>	4	 	
Can target be moved		Yes	х	No				1				
Restrict usage?		Yes	х	No								
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	X	Frequent		Constant		Other		

LOS

Group

Signage

X Protected

Lights

Open

South westerly

Utilities

Prone

Veg

Other

IKEE DEFECTS (KOOT)					
Suspect Root Rot Fruiting body present Exposed roots Undermined Root pruned Buttress wounded Restricted root area Potential for root failure Lean	Yes Yes Severe Yes Yes Severe Severe Natural	X No X No X Moderate Moderate X No X Moderate X Moderate Unnatural	Low Low X % Root area affer Approx age of wo	cted	
		—		·	<u> </u>
Soil heave	Yes	X No	Decay in plane of	lean Y	es X No
Roots broken	Yes	X No	Soil cracking	Y	es X No
Compounding factors	Yes	X No	_		
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	N)				
DEFECT	Roo	t Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Poor taper	ROC		HOTH	Jeanfold	- STWINGII
·					
Bow, sweep Co-dominants / forks					
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,					
Multiple attachments					
Included bark					
Excessive end weight					
Cracks / Splits					
Hangers					
Girdling					
Wounds / Seam					
Decay					
Cavity					
Fungal Fruiting Bodies					
Bleeding / Sap Flow					
Loose / Cracked Bark					
Birds / Bats / Bees					
Deadwood / Stubs					
Borers / Ants etc					
Cankers / Galls					
Previous failure					
HAZARD RATING					
Part most likely to fail	Whole tree	Scaffold	X Branch	Other	
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other	
1.0 _ 1.0 _ 4.0	6.0	Failure Potentia	1 Low	2 Medium 3 H	igh 4 Severe
Failure Size of Target Potential Part Rating	Hazard Rating	Size of part Target Rating	1 15cm 1 Occasional		5-75cm 4 > 75cm requent 4 Constant
HAZARD ABATEMENT				ت ت	
Prune	Yes	X No			
Inspect Further	Root	Decay	Aerial	Monitor Other	
Remove tree	Yes	H	Replace Tree	Yes	No
Move target	Yes	x No	Other	163	
COMMENTS					



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

HAZARD RATING											
3.0	2.0	4.0	9.0								
Failure Potential	Size of	Target Rating	Hazard Rating								
lmmedi	ate action r										
Needs	further insp	ection									
	Dead Tree										

TREE CHARACTERISTICS

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crown Spread	Crown Clear	Special Value
2220	Horse Chestnut	Y	Gen Sym	Dom	1	200	8	6		
Observ	rations									

TREE HEALTH			
Vitality class Leaf size Epicormic growth Good X Average Small X No	None Poor		
Dieback Growth obstructions Pests/ Diseases Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes No No Pavement / Phone SITE CONDITIONS	lines		
Site character Landscape type Irrigation Site disturbance X Domestic Lawn Lawn None Site character X Domestic Lawn Roadside Roadside Border X Adequate X No	Natural Open Poor	Woods Garden Excessive	Group Agric Other
% drip line soil 0% x 10-25% 25-50% % dripline grade lowered 0% x 10-25% 25-50% Soil problems x Drainage Shallow x Compact x Acidic x Volume Disease Image	50-75% 50-75% Drought Failure Utilities	75-100% 75-100% Saline Slope	Other Other Alkaline Contaminated Other

Exposure to wind Open **X** Protected Group South westerly Prevailing wind direction

TARGET

Targets under tree	<u> </u>	Building Hardscape	_	Parking Utility	\vdash	Road Playing	x	Pedestrian Other	Recreation	Landscape
Can target be moved		Yes	х	No		_'		=		
Restrict usage?		Yes	х	No						
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	X	Frequent		Constant	Other	

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT)					
Suspect Root Rot Fruiting body present Exposed roots Undermined Root pruned Buttress wounded Restricted root area Potential for root failure Lean Soil heave Roots broken Compounding factors	Yes Yes Yes Severe Yes Yes Severe Severe Natural Yes Yes Yes	X No No No No No No No No X Moderate X Moderate Unnatural X No X No	Low Low % Root area affer Approx age of which Low Low Low Corrected Decay in plane of Soil cracking	Yound None Angle	
TREE DEFECTS (CROWI	N)				
•	•				
DEFECT	Roo	t Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Poor taper					
Bow, sweep					
Co-dominants / forks					
Multiple attachments					
Included bark					
Excessive end weight					
Cracks / Splits					
Hangers					
Girdling	,	V			
Wounds / Seam Decay		Yes			
Cavity					
Fungal Fruiting Bodies					
Bleeding / Sap Flow					
Loose / Cracked Bark					
Birds / Bats / Bees					
Deadwood / Stubs					
Borers / Ants etc					
Cankers / Galls					
Previous failure					
HAZARD RATING					
Part most likely to fail	Whole tree	Scaffold	X Branch	Other	
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other	
Failure Potential Part Rating	+ 9.0 Hazard Rating	Failure Potential Size of part Target Rating	1 Low 1 15cm 1 Occasional		gh
HAZARD ABATEMENT					
Prune Inspect Further Remove tree	X Yes Root Yes	No Decay	Fell to ground level a Aerial Replace Tree Other	nd remove stump Monitor Other X	No
COMMENTS Extensive basal damage. Tre	Yes ee resistograph	X No			



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

HAZARD RATING												
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0									
Failure	Size of	Target	Hazard									
Potential	Rating	Rating										
Immedi	ate action r	needed										
Needs	further insp	ection										
	Dead Tree											

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height		Crown	Spread	Crown Clear	Special Value	
2221	Beech	М	Gen Sym	Dom	1	730	24		1	7			
Observ	rations												
Root do	amage, crossing brand	ches, obst	ructing	street li	ght. Ne	w Tarn	nac. Tren	chec	l within app	orox 2m. Dead	wood.		
TREE	REE HEALTH												
				<u> </u>									
Foliage		Norr	nal	Chlo	orotic	Ne	ecrotic						
	density	Norr		Spa									
	on growth	Goo	d	X Ave		Po	or		Ī				
	wood devlopment	Goo	d	X Ave		Po	or		None				
Vitality		Goo	d	X Ave	rage	Fa	ir		Poor				
Leaf siz	e	Norr	nal	Smc	ıll								
Epicorm	nic growth	Yes		X No									
Diebac	k	Yes		X No									
Growth	obstructions	X Yes		No		Paver	ment						
Pests/ I	Diseases	Yes		x No									
SITE C	CONDITIONS												
Site cho	aractor.	X Dom	ostic	□ lndu	ıstrial	ПРС	ns		Natural	Woods	Gro	ın	
	ape type	Lawi		X Roa			rder		Open	Garden	Agri	•	
Irrigatio		None		God			lequate		Poor	Excessive		-	
-	turbance	Yes	-	Н.	Ju	X	requare		1 001	LACESSIVE			
	line paved	0%			25%		5-50%		50-75%	x 75-100%	Othe	ar.	
-	line soil	0%		x 10-1		\vdash	5-50%		50-75%	75-100%	Othe		
-	ine grade lowered	0%			25%		5-50%		50-75%	75-100%	Othe		
Soil pro	=	\vdash	nage	<u> </u>	llow	Н.	mpact		Drought	Saline	Alka		
Joil pro	Diellis	<u> </u>	-			Ĥ	•	X			\vdash		
Obstruc	rtions	Acid X Light		X Volu	nage	LO	sease NS	\vdash	Failure Utilities	Slope Veg	Othe	aminated	
					-	-				Yeg		:1	
-	re to wind ing wind direction	Ope South v		X Prot	ecieu	Ш	roup	Ш	Prone				
rrevalli	ing with difection	South w	esieriy										
TARG	ET												
Taraeta	under tree	X Build	lina	X Parl	kina	x Ro	ad		Pedestrian	Recreation	Larc	scape	
9013			.5	ഥ∷	. 9	ഥ™					—		

Targets under tree	х	Building	X	Parking	х	Road	x	Pedestrian		Recreation	Landscape
	x	Hardscape		Utility		Playing	x	Other	Str	eet light	 -
Can target be moved		Yes	X	No		<u>.</u>		•			
Restrict usage?		Yes	x	No							
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	X	Frequent		Constant		Other	

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT)				
Suspect Root Rot Fruiting body present Exposed roots Undermined Root pruned Buttress wounded Restricted root area Potential for root failure Lean Soil heave Roots broken Compounding factors	Yes Yes Severe X Yes Yes Severe Naturo Yes X Yes	Moderate No X No X Moderate X Moderate	% Root area af Approx age of Low Low Low Corrected Decay in plane Soil cracking	wound None Angle of lean	es X No es X No
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	/NI\				
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	(N)				
DEFECT		Doot Elevo	Two le	Conffold	Dunnah
		Root Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Poor taper					
Bow, sweep Co-dominants / forks					
Multiple attachments					
Included bark					
Excessive end weight					
Cracks / Splits					
Hangers					
Girdling					
Wounds / Seam		Yes			
Decay					
Cavity					
Fungal Fruiting Bodies					
Bleeding / Sap Flow Loose / Cracked Bark					
Loose / Cracked Bark Birds / Bats / Bees					
Deadwood / Stubs					Yes
Borers / Ants etc					163
Cankers / Galls					
Previous failure					
		•		•	•
HAZARD RATING					
		<u> </u>		¬ ₋.	
Part most likely to fail	Whole	tree Scaffold	X Branch	Other	
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other	
1.0 + 1.0 + 4.0 Failure Potential Part Ratio	et Hazara	Size of part	al 1 Low 1 5cm 1 Occasiona	2 15-45cm 3 4.	igh
HAZARD ABATEMEN	т				
Prune Inspect Further Remove tree Move target	X Yes Root Yes Yes	No Decay No No	Deadwood. Crown of Aerial Replace Tree Other	clean and crown lift. Monitor Other Yes	X No
COMMENTS					



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

HAZARD RATING								
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0					
Failure Potential	Size of Part	Target Rating	Hazard Rating					
lmmedi	ate action r	needed						
Needs	Needs further inspection							
	Dead Tree							

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crow	n Spread	Crown Clear	Special Value
2222	Horse Chestnut	Y	Gen Sym	Dom	1	90	5		3		
Observ	rations										
TREE	HEALTH										
Extension Wound Vitality Leaf siz Epicorn Diebac Growth Pests/	e density on growth wood devlopment class ze nic growth k n obstructions Diseases	Norn Norn Goo Goo Norn Yes Yes Yes	mal od od od	Spa X Ave	rage rage rage	Poo Poo Fair	r	None Poor			
SITE C	CONDITIONS										
Irrigation Site dis drip drip drip drip Soil pro	ape type on turbance line paved line soil line grade lowered oblems	Lawii Non Yes 0% 0% 0% X Drai Acid	e inage lic	X Roa Goo X No 10-1 X 10-1 X 10-1 X Volume	25% 25% 25% Ilow ume	25- 25- X Con	der equate 50% 50% 50% inpact	Natural Open Poor 50-75% 50-75% 50-75% X Drought Failure	Woods Garden Excessive X 75-100% 75-100% Saline Slope		er er er line aminated
•	ctions re to wind ing wind direction	Light Ope		X Prot	ected	Gro		Utilities Prone	Veg	Othe	er
TARG	ET										
	s under tree	X Build	ding dscape	x Park	•	X Roa		X Pedestrian Other	Recreation	Lanc	lscape
	rget be moved usage?	Yes Yes		x No No		— —-		_			

Targets under tree	Ĥ	Building Hardscape	<u> </u>	Parking Utility		Road Playing	х	Pedestrian Other	Recreation	Landscape	
Can target be moved		Yes	X	No		="		-			
Restrict usage?		Yes	х	No							
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	x	Frequent		Constant	Other		

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT)				
Suspect Root Rot Fruiting body present Exposed roots Undermined Root pruned Buttress wounded Restricted root area Potential for root failure Lean Soil heave Roots broken Compounding factors	Yes Yes Severe Severe Yes Yes Severe Natural Yes Yes Yes	X No X Moderate Moderate X No X Moderate X No X Moderate X Moderate X Moderate X No X No X No	Low Low X % Root area affer Approx age of w Low Low Low Decay in plane of Soil cracking	ound None Angle	
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	/N)				
DEFECT	Rod	ot Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Poor taper					
Bow, sweep					
Co-dominants / forks					
Multiple attachments					
Included bark					
Excessive end weight					
Cracks / Splits					
Hangers Girdling					
Wounds / Seam					
Decay					
Cavity					
Fungal Fruiting Bodies					
Bleeding / Sap Flow					
Loose / Cracked Bark					
Birds / Bats / Bees					
Deadwood / Stubs					
Borers / Ants etc					
Cankers / Galls					
Previous failure					
HAZARD RATING				_	
Part most likely to fail	X Whole tree	Scaffold	Branch	Other	
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other	
Failure Size of Potential Part Rating	et Hazard	Failure Potential Size of part Target Rating	1 Low 1 15cm 1 Occasional		h
HAZARD ABATEMEN	Т				
Prune Inspect Further Remove tree	X Yes Root X Yes	No Decay No	Fell to ground level at Aerial Replace Tree Other	Monitor Other	No
COMMENTS	Yes	X No			
Remove cage. Severe graft	incompatibility.	roor tree. Fell	ana replant.		



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

HAZARD RATING							
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0				
Failure	Size of	Target	Hazard				
Potential	Part	Rating	Rating				
Immedi	needed						
Needs	further insp	ection					
	Dead Tree						

ree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crow	n Spread	Crown Clear	Specia Value
2223	Beech	EM	Gen Sym	Dom	1	490	16		16		
\\											
Observation	ns mpacted. Root d	lamaae N	lew tar	mac to l	hasa M	inor de	adwood	N Rust spot			
cverery co	inpacica. Roof c	idilidge. i	icw iai	iliac io i	Dusc. 74	illor ac	aawooc	a. Kosi spoi.			
REE HEA	LTH										
ماده مماد		Nori	l		orotic	□ _{Naa}	rotic				
oliage colo		Nori				Nec	TOTIC				
oliage den xtension gr		Goo		Spa		Poo					
•				-	rage	_		Na			
	d devlopment	Goo		<u> </u>	rage	Poo		None Poor			
itality clas	S	Goo			rage	Fair		Poor			
eaf size	.1	Nori	nal	Sma	ıll						
picormic gi	rowin	Yes		X No							
)ieback		Yes		X No		D	/ .				
Growth obs		X Yes		No 		Pavem	ent / ov	erhead lines			
Pests/ Disec	ases	Yes		X No							
SITE CON	DITIONS										
Site charact	or	Dom	estic	Indu	strial	POS	:	Natural	Woods	Gro	un.
		X Dom		X Roa		Bord		Open	Garden	Agri	-
andscape 1	уре	-						Poor	—	Agri	C
rrigation		Non	е	Goo	oa	X Ade	quate	Poor	Excessive		
ite disturbo		Yes 0%		X No	25%		50%	50-75%	x 75-100%	Othe	
6 drip line		————		—	25% 25%		50%	50-75%	X 75-100%	—	
6 drip line		0%							—	Othe	
-	grade lowered	0%		₽ `	25%		50%	50-75%	75-100%	Othe	
Soil problen	ns	X Drai	•	Shal		X Con		X Drought	Saline	Alko	
Na		Acid		X Volu		Dise		Failure	Slope	\vdash	taminated
Obstructions		Ligh		$H_{\scriptscriptstyle \perp}$	age	LOS		X Utilities	Veg	Othe	er
xposure to		Ope		لتنا	ected	Gro	υp	Prone			
revailing w	ind direction	South w	esterly								
TARGET											
·										<u> </u>	
argets und	er tree	X Build	iing	x Park	king	X Roa	a	X Pedestrian	Recreation	Land	dscape
		X Hard	dscape	X Utili		Play		Other			

Targets under tree	Ĥ	Building Hardscape	Ĥ	Parking Utility		Road Playing	Pedestrian Other	Recreation	Landscape
Can target be moved		Yes	х	No		•	="		
Restrict usage?		Yes	х	No					
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	X	Frequent	Constant	Other	

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT)				
Suspect Root Rot Fruiting body present Exposed roots Undermined Root pruned Buttress wounded Restricted root area Potential for root failure Lean Soil heave Roots broken Compounding factors	Yes Yes Yes Severe Yes Yes X Severe Severe Natural Yes X Yes X Yes	X No X No X Moderate Moderate X No X No Moderate X Moderate X Moderate X Moderate Unnatural X No No	Low Low X % Root area affe Approx age of w. Low Low Corrected Decay in plane of Soil cracking New tarmac laid	ound None Angle	
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	(N)				
DEFECT	Ro	ot Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Poor taper					
Bow, sweep					
Co-dominants / forks Multiple attachments					
Included bark					+
Excessive end weight					
Cracks / Splits					
Hangers					
Girdling					1
Wounds / Seam		Yes			
Decay					
Cavity					
Fungal Fruiting Bodies					
Bleeding / Sap Flow					
Loose / Cracked Bark Birds / Bats / Bees					
Deadwood / Stubs					Yes
Borers / Ants etc					163
Cankers / Galls					+
Previous failure					
	•	<u> </u>		!	+
HAZARD RATING					
Part most likely to fail	Whole tree	e Scaffold	X Branch	Other	
Inspection frequency	Н	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other	
inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearry	3 - Tearry	Officer	
Failure Potential Part 4.0	t Hazard	Failure Potential Size of part Target Rating	Low 1 1 1 1 5cm 1 Occasional		A Severe
HAZARD ABATEMEN	Γ				
Prune Inspect Further Remove tree Move target	X Yes Root Yes Yes	No	Crown lift. Decompact Aerial Replace Tree Other	Monitor Other	X No
COMMENTS					
Severely compacted. Root of	damage. New t	armac to base.	Minor deadwood. R	ust spot.	



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

	HAZARD RATING												
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0										
Failure Potential	Size of	Target Rating	Hazard Rating										
lmmedi	ate action r												
Needs	Needs further inspection												

TREE CHARACTERISTICS

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crown Spread	Crown Clear	Special Value
2224	Beech	Μ	Gen Sym	Dom	1	790	24	20		

Observations
Severely compacted. Significant root damage. Girdling roots. Significant deadwood and hanger in crown.
Coalescing column of decay in crown.

ı	K	E	=	Н	E	A	L	ı	r	1

		_		_		_					
Foliage colour		Normal		Chlorotic		Necrotic					
Foliage density		Normal		Sparse		_					
Extension growth		Good	х	Average		Poor					
Woundwood devlopment		Good	х	Average		Poor		None			
Vitality class		Good		Average	х	Fair		Poor			
Leaf size		Normal		Small		•		•			
Epicormic growth		Yes	х	No							
Dieback		Yes	х	No							
Growth obstructions	Х	Yes		No	Pav	rement / ov	erh	ead lines			
Pests/ Diseases		Yes	х	No		·					
		<u>-</u> '									
SITE CONDITIONS											
Site character	х	Domestic		Industrial		POS		Natural		Woods	Group
Landscape type		Lawn	х	Roadside		Border		Open		Garden	Agric
Irrigation		None		Good	х	Adequate		Poor		Excessive	_
Site disturbance	х	Yes		No		•	-	_			
% drip line paved		0%		10-25%		25-50%		50-75%	х	75-100%	Other
% drip line soil		0%	х	10-25%		25-50%		50-75%		75-100%	Other
% dripline grade lowered		0%	х	10-25%		25-50%		50-75%		75-100%	Other
Soil problems	х	Drainage		Shallow	х	Compact	х	Drought		Saline	Alkaline
		Acidic	х	Volume		Disease		Failure		Slope	Contaminated
Obstructions		Lights		Signage		LOS	х	Utilities		Veg	Other
Exposure to wind		Open	х	Protected		Group		Prone		1	1
Prevailing wind direction	Sou	ı ıth westerly		•				_			

TARGET

Targets under tree	Ĥ	Building Hardscape	_	Parking Utility	X Road Playing	x	Pedestrian Other	Recreation	Landscape
Can target be moved		Yes	х	No		·	_		
Restrict usage?		Yes	х	No					
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	X Frequent		Constant	Other	

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT)					
Suspect Root Rot Fruiting body present Exposed roots Undermined Root pruned Buttress wounded Restricted root area Potential for root failure Lean Soil heave Roots broken Compounding factors	Yes Yes Yes Severe Yes Yes X Severe Severe Natural Yes Yes Yes Yes	X No X No Moderate Moderate X No X No Moderate X Moderate Unnatural X No No No	Low Low X % Root area affe Approx age of well Low Low Corrected Decay in plane of Soil cracking	ound None Angle	 ^
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	N)				
·					
DEFECT	Roc	ot Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Poor taper					
Bow, sweep					
Co-dominants / forks					
Multiple attachments Included bark					
Excessive end weight					
Cracks / Splits					
Hangers					Yes
Girdling		Yes			
Wounds / Seam		Yes			
Decay				V	
Cavity Fungal Fruiting Bodies				Yes	
Bleeding / Sap Flow					
Loose / Cracked Bark					
Birds / Bats / Bees					
Deadwood / Stubs					Yes
Borers / Ants etc					
Cankers / Galls					
Previous failure					<u> </u>
HAZARD RATING					
				-	
Part most likely to fail	Whole tree	Scaffold	X Branch	Other	
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other	
1.0 + 1.0 + 4.0	→ 6.0	Failure Potential	1 Low 1.5cm	2 Medium 3 Hig 2 15-45cm 3 45-	h 4 Severe 75cm 4 > 75cm
Failure Size of Target Potential Part Rating		Target Rating	1 Occasional		quent 4 Constant
HAZARD ABATEMENT					
_	<u> </u>				
Prune	X Yes	No D		ood. Reduce away from hou	se and phone lines.
Inspect Further	Root	X Decay		Monitor Other	<u> </u>
Remove tree	Yes	X No	Replace Tree	Yes	X No
Move target	Yes	X No	Other		
COMMENTS		- 1"	01 17		
Severely compacted. Signific		ge. Girdling ro	ots. Significant dead	lwood and hanger in cr	own.
Coalescing column of decay	in crown				

Climbed inspection - Forms a cup at union.



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

	HAZARD RATING												
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0										
Failure	Size of	Target	Hazard										
Potential	Part	Rating	Rating										
Immedi	ate action r	needed											
Needs	Needs further inspection												
	Dead Tree												

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crown Spread	Crown Clear	Special Value
2225	Beech	EM	Gen Sym	Dom	1	320	15	9		n/a

	opou.or	Class		Class	Stems	55		5.5		Clear	Value
2225	Beech	EM	Gen Sym	Dom	1	320	15		9		n/a
	rations Live crown	ratio -	90%								
Crown	raised historically										
TREE	HEALTH										
Foliage	e colour	Nor	mal	Chlo	orotic	Ne	ecrotic				
•	e density	Nor		Spa		<u></u>	.c. o.i.c				
-	on growth	God		X Ave		Po	or				
	lwood devlopment	God	od		rage	x Po	or	None			
Vitality	· ·	God	od	X Ave	-	Fa	ir	Poor			
Leaf siz		Nor	mal	Smc							
Epicorn	nic growth	Yes		No							
Diebac	:k	Yes		X No							
Growth	n obstructions	x Yes		No		Paver	nent				
Pests/	Diseases	Yes		X No							
CITE /	CONDITIONS										
211E	CONDITIONS										
Site cho	aractor	Don	nestic	Indu	ıstrial	PC	1 5	Natural	Woods	Gro	un.
	ape type	X Don		X Roa		_	rder	Open	Garden	Agri	•
Irrigati		Non		God			lequate	Poor	Excessive		
_	sturbance	Yes		x No	, u		icquaic		Excessive		
	line paved	0%			25%	25	5-50%	50-75%	x 75-100%	Othe	er
	line soil	0%		x 10-	25%	25	5-50%	50-75%	75-100%	Othe	er
-	line grade lowered	x 0%			25%	25	5-50%	50-75%	75-100%	Othe	er
Soil pro		-	inage	Sha	llow	x Co	mpact	X Drought	Saline	Alko	line
		Acio	lic	x Volu	ıme	Dis	sease	Failure	Slope	Con	aminated
Obstru	ctions	X Ligh	ts	Sigr	nage	LC	S	Utilities	Veg	X Othe	er
Exposu	re to wind	Оре	en	x Prot	ected	Gr	oup	Prone			
Prevail	ing wind direction	South v	vesterly					<u> </u>			
TARG	ET										
Target	s under tree	X Build	ding	X Parl	king	x Ro	ad	X Pedestrian	Recreation	Land	Iscape
		X Har	dscape	Utili	ty	Plo	aying	Other	-	•	

Targets under tree	х	Building	x	Parking	x	Road	x	Pedestrian	Recreation	Landscape	
	х	Hardscape		Utility		Playing		Other	 <u>-</u> '	-	
Can target be moved		Yes	х	No		•		•			
Restrict usage?		Yes	х	No							
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	X	Frequent		Constant	Other		

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT)				
Suspect Root Rot Fruiting body present Exposed roots Undermined Root pruned Buttress wounded Restricted root area Potential for root failure Lean Soil heave Roots broken Compounding factors	Yes Yes Yes Severe Yes X Yes X Severe Severe Natural Yes Yes Yes	X No X No No Moderate Moderate X No No Moderate X Moderate Unnatural X No X No	Low Low % Root area affer Approx age of w Low Low Corrected Decay in plane or Soil cracking	Yound None Angle	
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	/N)				
•	•				
DEFECT	Ro	ot Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Poor taper					
Bow, sweep					
Co-dominants / forks					
Multiple attachments					
Included bark					
Excessive end weight Cracks / Splits					
Hangers					
Girdling					
Wounds / Seam		Yes			
Decay					
Cavity					
Fungal Fruiting Bodies					
Bleeding / Sap Flow Loose / Cracked Bark					
Loose / Cracked Bark Birds / Bats / Bees					
Deadwood / Stubs					
Borers / Ants etc					
Cankers / Galls					
Previous failure				Yes	
HAZARD RATING					
Part most likely to fail	Whole tre	e Scaffold	y Branch	Other	
	⊢ ⊢				
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other	
1.0 + 1.0 + 4.0 Failure Potential Part Targ	et Hazard g Rating	Failure Potentia Size of part Target Rating	Low 1 15cm 1 Occasional		9h
HALAKU ADAIEMEN	<u> </u>				
Prune Inspect Further Remove tree Move target	X Yes Root Yes Yes	No	Crown clean Aerial Replace Tree Other	Monitor Other	No
COMMENTS Signficant basal damage. E	ividones of his		reo Crown New term	mac by trop	
ərgimicani basar damage, t	vidence of histo	oric railore, spa	ise Ciowii, iyew tari	nuc by nee.	



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

	HAZARD	RATING	
1.0	2.0	3.0	6.0
Failure	Size of	Target	Hazard
Potential	Part	Rating	Rating
lmmedi	ate action r	needed	
Needs	ection		
	Dead Tree		

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crown Spread	Crown Clear	Special Value
2226	Beech	Μ	Minor Asym	Dom	1	630	18	20		n/a

2226	Beech	М	Minor Asym	Do	m 1	6	30	18			20			n/a
Observa Crown ro	tions Live crown													
TREE H	EALTH													
Foliage		\vdash	ormal ormal	-	Chlorotic Sparse		Necroti	ic						
Extension	•	\vdash	ood	-	Average		Poor							
	ood devlopment		ood	<u> </u>	Average	-	Poor			None				
Vitality o	•	G	ood		Average		Fair			Poor				
Leaf size		No	ormal		Small	<u></u>	1			1				
Epicormi	c growth	Ye	s	1	No									
Dieback		Ye	s	x	No									
Growth	obstructions	x Ye	s	1	No	Pa	vement	t						
Pests/ Di	iseases	Ye	s	x	No									
SITE CO	ONDITIONS													
Site char	acter	X Do	mestic		ndustrial		POS			Natural		Woods	Gı	oup
Landsca	oe type	La	wn	x	Roadside		Border			Open		Garden	-	ıric
Irrigation		No	ne		Good	х	Adeque	ate		Poor		Excessive		
Site distu	ırbance	Ye	s	x	No		1			4		1		
% drip li	ine paved	0%	6		10-25%		25-50%	%		50-75%	x	75-100%	Ot	her
% drip li	ne soil	0%	6	x	10-25%		25-50%	%		50-75%		75-100%	Ot	her
% driplin	ne grade lowered	x 0%	6		10-25%		25-50%	%		50-75%		75-100%	01	her
Soil prob	olems	X Dr	ainage		Shallow	x	Compa	ct	х	Drought		Saline	All	caline
		Ac	idic	X \	Volume		Disease	•		Failure		Slope	Co	ntaminated
Obstruct	ions	Lig	ıhts	Š	Signage		LOS			Utilities		Veg	X Ot	her
Exposure	to wind	Op	oen	X	Protected		Group			Prone				
Prevailin	g wind direction	South	westerly											
TARGE	:T													
Targets	under tree	X Bu	ilding	x	Parking	x	Road		x	Pedestrian		Recreation	La	ndscape

Targets under tree	<u> </u>	Building Hardscape	Ĥ	Parking Utility		Road Playing	_	Pedestrian Other	Recreation	Landscape
Can target be moved		Yes	х	No		•				
Restrict usage?		Yes	х	No						
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	x	Frequent		Constant	Other	

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT	')				
Suspect Root Rot Fruiting body present Exposed roots Undermined Root pruned Buttress wounded Restricted root area Potential for root failure Lean Soil heave Roots broken	Yes Yes Yes Severe Severe X Yes Yes X Severe Severe Natural Yes Yes	X No X No X Moderate Moderate No X No Moderate Unnatural X No X No	Low Low % Root area affor Approx age of w Low Low Corrected Decay in plane of Soil cracking	ected 20% vound None Angle	<u> </u>
Compounding factors	Yes	X No			
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	/N)	_ _			
DEFECT	Ro	ot Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Poor taper					
Bow, sweep					
Co-dominants / forks					
Multiple attachments Included bark					
Excessive end weight					
Cracks / Splits					
Hangers					
Girdling					
Wounds / Seam		Yes	Yes		
Decay			ś		
Cavity			Ś		
Fungal Fruiting Bodies					
Bleeding / Sap Flow					
Loose / Cracked Bark					
Birds / Bats / Bees Deadwood / Stubs					Yes
Borers / Ants etc		+			res
Cankers / Galls					
Previous failure					
					<u>.L</u>
HAZARD RATING					
Part most likely to fail	Whole tre	e Scaffold	X Branch	Other	
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other	
inspection frequency	X		Joe really		
Failure Size of Potential Part Ratio	et Hazard	Failure Potentia Size of part Target Rating	1 Low 1 15cm Occasional		A Severe
HAZARD ABATEMEN	Т				
D		□ ,.	.		
Prune	X Yes	No	Deadwood	¬	
Inspect Further	Root	X Decay	Aerial	Monitor Other	<u> </u>
Remove tree	Yes	X No	Replace Tree	Yes	No
Move target	Yes	X No	Other		
COMMENTS Poot damage near navement	ont Dib and acco	olling to hala D	adwood is assur-		
Root damage near paveme	eni, kib ana swe	ening to pole. De	eaawooa in crown.		



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
	Jessop Rodd, 1401 widi 14K2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last	Nist and State
inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

	HAZARD	RATING	
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0
Failure Potential	Size of Part	Target Rating	Hazard Rating
lmmedi	ate action r	needed	
Needs	further insp	ection	
	Dead Tree		

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crown Spread	Crown Clear	Special Value
2227	Beech	Μ	Gen Sym	Dom	1	610	18	18		n/a

2227	Beech	Μ	Gen Sym	Do	om	1	6	10	18		1	8		n/a
Observ Crown	rations Live crown raised and pollarded													
TREE	HEALTH													
Foliage	colour		Normal		Chloro	tic		Necrot	ic					
-	density	\vdash	Normal		Sparse									
	on growth	\vdash	Good	¥	Averaç	1		Poor						
	wood devlopment	\square	Good	_	Averaç			Poor			None			
Vitality	•	\Box	Good	_	Averaç			Fair			Poor			
Leaf siz		\square	Normal	Ĥ	Small	´		ı			Į			
	nic growth	\square	Yes		No									
Diebac	•	,	Yes	x	No	•								
Growth	obstructions	X	Yes		No	•	Pav	vemen	t					
Pests/ I	Diseases		Yes	x	No	•								
SITE C	CONDITIONS													
Site cho	aracter	x	Domestic		Industri	ial		POS			Natural	Woods	Gro	oup
Landsco	ape type	П	Lawn	x	Roadsi	de		Border			Open	Garden	Agı	ic
Irrigatio			None		Good		х	Adequ	ate		Poor	Excessive		
Site dis	turbance		Yes	х	No	ı		1			1			
% drip	line paved		0%		10-25	%		25-509	%		50-75%	x 75-100%	Oth	er
% drip	line soil		0%	х	10-25	%		25-509	%		50-75%	75-100%	Oth	er
% drip	ine grade lowered	x	0%		10-25	%		25-509	%		50-75%	75-100%	Oth	er
Soil pro	blems	x	Drainage		Shallov	v	х	Compo	ıct	х	Drought	Saline	Alk	aline
			Acidic	х	Volume	,		Disease	е		Failure	Slope	Cor	ntaminated
Obstruc	ctions	x	Lights		Signag	e		LOS			Utilities	Veg	X Oth	er
Exposu	re to wind		Open	х	Protect	ed		Group			Prone			
Prevail	ng wind direction	Sout	th westerly								-			
TARG	ET													
Tarasta	under tree		Ruildina	Г.,	Darkin	,	· ·	Pogd			Padastrian	Pacragitor	. Dian	decana

Targets under tree	X	Building	х	Parking	х	Road	х	Pedestrian	Recreatio	n [Landscape	
	х	Hardscape		Utility		Playing		Other			-	
Can target be moved		Yes	х	No		-		•				
Restrict usage?		Yes	х	No								
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	x	Frequent		Constant	Other			

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT))				
Suspect Root Rot Fruiting body present Exposed roots Undermined Root pruned Buttress wounded Restricted root area Potential for root failure Lean Soil heave Roots broken Compounding factors TREE DEFECTS (CROW	Yes Yes Severe Severe X Yes Yes X Severe Natural Yes Yes Yes	X No No No No Moderate No No Moderate Moderate Moderate Unnatural X No No	Low Low % Root area aff Approx age of v Low Low Corrected Decay in plane of Soil cracking	vound None Angle	s X No
	/				
DEFECT	Ro	ot Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Poor taper	KO	or riule	HOHK	Scarroid	Didilcii
Bow, sweep					
Co-dominants / forks					+
,					+
Multiple attachments					
Included bark					_
Excessive end weight					
Cracks / Splits					
Hangers					Yes
Girdling					
Wounds / Seam					
Decay					
Cavity					
Fungal Fruiting Bodies					
Bleeding / Sap Flow					
Loose / Cracked Bark					
Birds / Bats / Bees					
Deadwood / Stubs					Yes
Borers / Ants etc					103
Cankers / Galls					+
Previous failure					+
TTEVIOUS TUIIOTE					
HAZARD RATING					
Part most likely to fail	Whole tree	Scaffold	Branch	Other	
•			5 - Yearly		
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Tearly	Other and after	weather events
Failure Size of Potential Part Rating	t Hazard	Failure Potentia Size of part Target Rating	Low 1 15cm Coccasional	\blacksquare	gh
HAZARD ABATEMENT	<u> </u>				
Prune Inspect Further Remove tree	X Yes Root Yes	No Decay No	Crown Clean Aerial Replace Tree	Monitor Other	No
Move target	Yes	X No	Other		
COMMENTS					



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
	Jessop Rodd, 1401 widi 14K2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last	Nist and State
inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

HAZARD RATING												
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0									
Failure Potential	Size of	Target Rating	Hazard Rating									
lmmedi	ate action r											
Needs	further insp	pection										

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crown Spread	Crown Clear	Special Value
2228	Beech	М	Gen Sym	Dom	1	600	17	18		n/a

2228	Beech	<i>N</i>	۸ Sym	D.	om	1	60	00	17			18			n/a
Observ															
Crown r	aised and pollarded	histo	rically												
TREE I	HEALTH														
Foliage	colour	П	Normal		Chlo	rotic		Necro	tic						
Foliage			Normal		Spar	se		J							
_	n growth		Good	×	Aver			Poor							
	wood devlopment		Good	X	Aver			Poor			None				
Vitality	•		Good		Aver	-		Fair			Poor				
Leaf siz			Normal		Sma			1			4				
Epicorm	ic growth		Yes		No										
Dieback			Yes	х	No										
Growth	obstructions	х	Yes		Νo		Pav	vemer	nt						
Pests/ D	Piseases		Yes	х	No										
					_										
SITE C	ONDITIONS														
Site cha	racter	×	Domestic		Indus	strial		POS			Natural		Woods	Пс	roup
	pe type	$\stackrel{\frown}{\vdash}$	Lawn	x	-	dside		Borde	r		Open		Garden		gric
Irrigatio			None	<u> </u>	Goo	d	×	Adequ	Jate		Poor		Excessive	Ш`	•
•	urbance	\vdash	Yes	х	No			1		<u> </u>	1	<u> </u>	1		
% drip	line paved		0%		10-2	25%		25-50)%		50-75%	х	75-100%	0	ther
% drip			0%	x	10-2	25%		25-50)%		50-75%		75-100%	0	ther
% dripl	ne grade lowered	х	0%		10-2			25-50)%		50-75%		75-100%	0	ther
Soil pro	blems	х	Drainage		Shal	low	х	Comp	act	х	Drought		Saline	Al	kaline
			Acidic	х	Volu	me		Diseas	se		Failure		Slope	Co	ontaminated
Obstruc	tions		Lights		Sign	age		LOS		х	Utilities		Veg	x o	ther
Exposur	e to wind		Open	х	Prote	ected		Group)		Prone		-		
Prevaili	ng wind direction	Sou	th wester	ly							-				
TARG	ARGET														

Targets under tree	х	Building	x	Parking	x	Road	x	Pedestrian	Recreation	Landscape	
	х	Hardscape	х	Utility		Playing		Other	•	•	
Can target be moved		Yes	х	No		•		•			
Restrict usage?		Yes	х	No							
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	X	Frequent		Constant	Other		

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT)				
Suspect Root Rot Fruiting body present Exposed roots Undermined Root pruned Buttress wounded Restricted root area Potential for root failure Lean Soil heave Roots broken Compounding factors	Yes Yes Severe Severe X Yes Yes Severe Severe Natural Yes Yes Yes	X No X No X Moderate Moderate No X No X Moderate Unnatural X No X No	Low Low % Root area affer Approx age of w Low Low Corrected Decay in plane of Soil cracking	ected Trench by ound None Angle	<u> </u>
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	(N)				
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	,				
DEFECT	Ro	ot Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Poor taper					
Bow, sweep					
Co-dominants / forks					
Multiple attachments					
Included bark					
Excessive end weight					
Cracks / Splits					
Hangers					
Girdling					
Wounds / Seam					
Decay				Yes	
Cavity Fungal Fruiting Bodies				res	
Bleeding / Sap Flow					
Loose / Cracked Bark			Yes		
Birds / Bats / Bees					Yes
Deadwood / Stubs					Yes
Borers / Ants etc					
Cankers / Galls					
Previous failure					
HAZARD RATING					
Part most likely to fail	Whole tree	Scaffold	X Branch	Other	
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other	
Failure Size of Potential Part Rating	et Hazard	Failure Potential Size of part Target Rating	1 Low 1 15cm 1 Occasional		4 Severe 75cm 4 > 75cm quent 4 Constant
HAZARD ABATEMEN	T		· —		.—
Prune	x Yes	No	Crown raise and clea	<u>n</u>	
Inspect Further	Root	X Decay	Aerial	Monitor Other	
Remove tree	Yes	X No	Replace Tree	Yes	No
Move target	Yes	X No	Other		ш
- · - · - · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			ш <u> </u>		
COMMENTS Root damage. Basal brak n	ecrosis. Nestina	bird. Cavity in	scaffold. Minor dea	dwood.	



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last	Not available
inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

	HAZARD	RATING	
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0
Failure	Size of	Target	Hazard
Potential	Part	Rating	Rating
Immedi	ate action r	needed	
Needs	further insp	ection	
	Dead Tree		

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crown Spread	Crown Clear	Special Value
2229	Beech	М	Gen Sym	Dom	1	700	19	18		n/a

Tree ID	Species	Class	101111	Class	Stems	ווטט	Heighi	Clow	ii spredd	Clear	Value
2229	Beech	М	Gen Sym	Dom	1	700	19		18		n/a
	rations Live crown	ratio -	90%								
TREE	HEALTH										
Foliage	e colour	Nor	mal	Chlc	orotic	Nec	crotic				
•	e density	Nor		Spa			00				
	on growth	X God			rage	Poo	or				
	lwood devlopment	God		X Ave	-	Poc		None			
Vitality	· ·	God	od	X Ave	_	Fair		Poor			
Leaf siz		Nor	mal	Smo							
	nic growth	Yes		No							
Diebac	k	Yes		x No							
Growth	obstructions	x Yes		No		Pavem	ent / St	reet light			
Pests/	Diseases	Yes		X No			•				
SITE (CONDITIONS										
Site cho	aracter	X Don	nestic	Indu	strial	РО	S	Natural	Woods	Gro	up
	ape type	Law		X Roa	dside	Bor	der	Open	Garden	Agri	ic
Irrigati		Non	е	Goo	od	X Ade	equate	Poor	Excessive		
	turbance	Yes		x No							
% drip	line paved	0%			25%	25-	50%	50-75%	x 75-100%	Othe	er .
% drip	line soil	0%		x 10-	25%	25-	50%	50-75%	75-100%	Othe	ər
% drip	line grade lowered	x 0%		10-:	25%	25-	50%	50-75%	75-100%	Othe	er .
Soil pro	oblems	x Dra	inage	Sha	llow	X Cor	npact	X Drought	Saline	Alko	ıline
		Acio	lic	X Volu	ıme	Dise	ease	Failure	Slope	Con	taminated
Obstru	ctions	Ligh	ts	Sign	age	LOS	5	Utilities	Veg	X Othe	er
Exposu	re to wind	Оре	en	x Prot	ected	Gro	oup	Prone		<u>-</u> -	
Prevail	ing wind direction	South v	vesterly					_			
TARG	ET										
Target	s under tree	X Build		X Parl		X Roc	ıd ying	X Pedestrian Other	Recreation	Land	dscape

Targets under tree	Ĥ	Building Hardscape	_	Parking Utility		Road Playing	Pedestrian Other	Recreatio	n	Landscape
Can target be moved		Yes	х	No	-	•	-			
Restrict usage?		Yes	х	No						
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	X	Frequent	Constant	Other		

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT)				
Suspect Root Rot	Yes	x No			
Fruiting body present	Yes	x No		_	
Exposed roots	Severe	X Moderate	Low	None	
Undermined	Severe	Moderate	Low	None	
Root pruned	x Yes	No	% Root area affe	ected Trenched (30%)
Buttress wounded	Yes	x No	Approx age of w	ound	
Restricted root area	Severe	X Moderate	Low	None	
Potential for root failure	Severe	X Moderate	Low	_	
Lean	Natural	Unnatural	Corrected	Angle	
Soil heave	Yes	Н.	Decay in plane of	J '	x No
Roots broken	Yes		Soil cracking	Yes	<u> </u>
KOOIS DIOKEII	163	X No	3011 Crucking		X No
Commonwelling foretone	Yes	No.			
Compounding factors	1 63	x No			
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	/NI\				
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	IN)				
DEFECT	Ro	ot Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Poor taper		O. Field	HOMK	Jeanola	Brandi
Bow, sweep					
Co-dominants / forks					
Multiple attachments					
Included bark					
Excessive end weight					
Cracks / Splits					
Hangers					
Girdling					
Wounds / Seam			2		
Decay			ś ś		
Cavity Fungal Fruiting Bodies		+	•		
Bleeding / Sap Flow			Yes		
Loose / Cracked Bark			Yes		
Birds / Bats / Bees					
Deadwood / Stubs					
Borers / Ants etc					
Cankers / Galls					
Previous failure					
HAZARD RATING					
				-	
Part most likely to fail	Whole tre	e Scaffold	X Branch	Other	
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other	
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>			. 🗔
1.0 + 1.0 + 4.0	→ 6.0	Failure Potentia	<u> </u>	2 Medium 3 High	<u> </u>
Failure Size of Targe		Size of part	1 15cm		75cm 4 > 75cm
Potential Part Ratin	g Rating	Target Rating	1 Occasional	2 Intermittent 3 Free	quent 4 Constant
HAZARD ABATEMEN	Т				
Prune	Yes	No	Crown clean and raise	e.	
Inspect Further	Root	Decay		Monitor Other	
Remove tree	Yes	H., '	Replace Tree	Yes	No
		<u> </u>		L les	L
Move target	Yes	X No	Other		
COMMENTS					
Outside Church - high usage	e. Root damage	e. Beech bark di	sease. Possible swel	ling to bole. Minor dead	dwood.



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

HAZARD RATING							
2.0	3.0	4.0	9.0				
Failure	Size of	Target	Hazard				
Potential	Part	Rating	Rating				
lmmedi	ate action r	needed					
Needs	Needs further inspection						
	Dead Tree						

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crown Spread	Crown Clear	Special Value
2230	Beech	М	Gen Sym	Dom	1	590	17	16		n/a
Observ	Observations Live grown ratio 200/									

2230 Bee	ech	M	Sym	Don	n 1	59	70 17			16			n/a
					•								
Observations	Live crown i	ratio -	90%										
Crown raised and	pollarded h	istoric	ally										
TREE HEALTH													
Foliage colour	[No	rmal	C	hlorotic	П	Necrotic						
Foliage density	Ī	No	rmal	SI	parse								
Extension growth		Go	od	X A	verage		Poor						
Woundwood device	opment	Go	ood	X A	verage		Poor		None				
Vitality class		Go	ood	X A	verage		Fair		Poor				
Leaf size		No	rmal	Sı	mall				-				
Epicormic growth		Ye	s	N	o								
Dieback		Ye	s	x N	o								
Growth obstruction	ıs	X Ye	s	N	o	Pav	ement						
Pests/ Diseases		Ye	s	x N	o								
SITE CONDITIC)NS												
Site character	Γ	x Do	mestic	In	dustrial	П	POS		Natural		Woods	Gr	oup
Landscape type	•	Lav	wn	x Ro	oadside		Border		Open		Garden	Ag	ric
Irrigation		No	ne	G	ood	х	Adequate		Poor		Excessive		
Site disturbance	Ī	X Ye	S	N	o	-		hed	builders sar	nd b	y base		
% drip line paved	ľ	0%	, 0	10	0-25%	$\overline{}$	25-50%		50-75%		75-100%	Otl	ner
% drip line soil	ļ	0%	, D	x 10	0-25%		25-50%		50-75%		75-100%	Otl	ner
% dripline grade l	owered	x 0%	, D	10	0-25%		25-50%		50-75%		<i>75</i> -100%	Otl	ner
Soil problems		X Dro	ainage	Sł	hallow	x	Compact	X	Drought		Saline	Alk	aline
		Aci	dic	x	olume		Disease		Failure		Slope	Со	ntaminated
Obstructions		Lig	hts	Si	ignage		LOS		Utilities		Veg	X Ot	ner
Exposure to wind		Op	en	X Pı	rotected		Group		Prone		-		
Prevailing wind dir	ection	South	westerly						= 				
	_												
TARGET													

Targets under tree	x	Building	x	Parking	х	Road	х	Pedestrian	Recreation	Landscape
	X	Hardscape		Utility		Playing		Other	-	•
Can target be moved		Yes	X	No		-"		•		
Restrict usage?		Yes	X	No				_	_	
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	X	Frequent		Constant	Other	

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT)						
Suspect Root Rot	Yes	x No				
Fruiting body present	Yes	x No				
Exposed roots	Severe	X Moderate	Low	None		
Undermined	Severe	Moderate	Low X	None		
Root pruned	X Yes	No	% Root area affe	cted Possibly tre	enched	
Buttress wounded	Yes	x No	Approx age of w			
Restricted root area	Severe	X Moderate	Low	None		
Potential for root failure	Severe	x Moderate	Low	1		
Lean	Natural	Unnatural	Corrected	Angle		
Soil heave	Yes	Н.	Decay in plane of	<u> </u>	X No	
Roots broken	Yes	HH	Soil cracking	Yes	X No	
ROOIS DIOREII	1 63	X No	3011 Crucking	1es	X	
Common dia a faratana	Yes	L. N.				
Compounding factors	Tes	X No				
TREE DEFECTS (CROWI	M)					
TREE DEFECTS (CROW)	•/					
DEFECT	Rog	ot Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch	
Poor taper	Koc	rriule	HOHK	Scarrola	Didilcii	
Bow, sweep						
Co-dominants / forks						
Multiple attachments						
Included bark						
Excessive end weight						
Cracks / Splits			Yes			
Hangers						
Girdling Wounds / Seam						
Decay	- 					
Cavity	- 					
Fungal Fruiting Bodies						
Bleeding / Sap Flow						
Loose / Cracked Bark			Yes	Yes		
Birds / Bats / Bees						
Deadwood / Stubs					Yes	
Borers / Ants etc						
Cankers / Galls						
Previous failure						
LIAZADO DATINO						
HAZARD RATING						
De a constituit de fett				امرا		
Part most likely to fail	Whole tree	H	X Branch	Other		
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other		
		5 H				
2.0 + 3.0 + 4.0	- → 	Failure Potentia	-	2 Medium 3 High	<u> </u>	
Failure Size of Target	Hazard Rating	Size of part	1 15cm		75cm 4 > 75cm	
Potential Part Rating	Kalling	Target Rating	1 Occasional	2 Intermittent 3 Free	quent 4 Constant	
HAZARD ABATEMENT						
_						
Prune	x Yes	No	Deadwood	, —		
Inspect Further	Root	X Decay		Monitor Other		
Remove tree	Yes	x No	Replace Tree	Yes	No	
Move target	Yes	X No	Other			
						
COMMENTS						
Multiple pruning woounds lea	Multiple pruning woounds leading to possible coalescing column of decay in scaffold.Bark necrosis in scaffold,					
Beech Bark Disease. Severely compacted. Swollen base. Damaged roots. Deadwood.						



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

	HAZARD	RATING				
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0			
Failure	Size of	Target	Hazard			
Potential	Part	Rating	Rating			
Immedi	ate action r	needed				
Needs further inspection						
	Dead Tree					

TREE CHARACTERISTICS

Occupancy

		1.					l				Special
Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crow	n Spread	Crown Clear	Value
			Minor								Value
2231	Horse Chestnut	Y	Asym	Dom	1	270	10		9		n/a
			7.07					<u> </u>			
Observ	rations Live crow	n ratio -	85%								
Crown											
<u></u>											
TREE	HEALTH										
Foliage	e colour	Nor	mal	Chlo	orotic	Nec	rotic				
Foliage	edensity	Nor	mal	Spa	rse						
Extension	on growth	God	od	X Ave	rage	Poo	r				
Wound	lwood devlopment	God	od	X Ave	rage	Poo	r	None			
Vitality	class	God	od	X Ave	rage	Fair		Poor			
Leaf siz	ze	Nor	mal	Smc	ıll						
Epicorm	nic growth	Yes		No							
Diebac	k	Yes		X No							
Growth	obstructions	x Yes		No		Pavement / Utility lines					
Pests/ I	Diseases	Yes		X No							
SITE C	CONDITIONS										
		_								_	
Site cho		X Dom	nestic		strial	POS		Natural	Woods	Gro	•
	ape type	Law	n	X Roa	dside	Boro		Open	Garden	Agri	c
Irrigatio	on	Non	е	God	od	X Ade	quate	Poor	Excessive		
	turbance	Yes		X No							
% drip	line paved	0%			25%	25-	50%	50-75%	x 75-100%	Oth	er
% drip	line soil	0%		x 10-	25%	25-	50%	50-75%	75-100%	Oth	er
-	line grade lowered	x 0%		10-	25%		50%	50-75%	75-100%	Oth	er
Soil pro	oblems	X Drai	inage	Sha	llow	x Con	pact	X Drought	Saline	Alko	lline
		Acio	lic	X Volu	ıme	Dise	ease	Failure	Slope	Con	taminated
Obstruc	ctions	Ligh	ts	Sigr	nage	LOS	;	X Utilities	Veg	X Oth	er
Exposu	re to wind	Оре	en	X Prot	ected	Gro	up	Prone			
Prevaili	ing wind direction	South v	vesterly								
TARG	ET										
_								<u> </u>			
Targets	s under tree	X Build	-	X Parl	-	X Roa		X Pedestrian	Recreation	Land	dscape
_	_	$\stackrel{\sim}{\vdash}$	dscape	X Utili	ty	Play	/ing	Other			
	rget be moved	Yes		X No							
Pactrict	neade5	Yas		w No							

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT)					
Suspect Root Rot	Yes	x No			
Fruiting body present	Yes	x No			
Exposed roots	Severe	X Moderate	Low	None	
Undermined	Severe	Moderate	Low	None	
Root pruned	Yes	x No	% Root area affe	-cted	
Buttress wounded	x Yes	No	Approx age of w	ound	1-5 years
Restricted root area	x Severe	Moderate	Low	None	•
Potential for root failure	Severe	X Moderate	Low	-	
Lean	Natural	Unnatural	Corrected	Angle	
Soil heave	Yes	X No	Decay in plane of		X No
Roots broken	Yes		Soil cracking	Yes	<u> </u>
KOOIS DIOKEII	103	X No	Jon cracking		X
Compounding factors	Yes	No.			
Compounding raciors	Tes	x No			
TREE DEFECTS (CROWN	J)				
TREE DETECTS (CROW)	4/				
DEFECT	Rod	ot Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Poor taper					
Bow, sweep					
Co-dominants / forks				Yes	
Multiple attachments					
Included bark					
Excessive end weight					
Cracks / Splits					
Hangers Girdling					
Wounds / Seam	_				
Decay	- 		Yes		
Cavity					
Fungal Fruiting Bodies					
Bleeding / Sap Flow			Yes		
Loose / Cracked Bark			Yes		
Birds / Bats / Bees					
Deadwood / Stubs					
Borers / Ants etc	-				
Cankers / Galls	-				
Previous failure					
HAZARD RATING					
HAZAKO KATINO					
Part most likely to fail	Whole tree	Scaffold	X Branch	Other	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other	
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearry	5 - Tearly	Oliner	
1.0 . 1.0 . 4.0	_ 6.0	Failure Potentia	I Low	2 Medium 3 Hig	h 4 Severe
1.0 + 1.0 + 4.0	- →		-		_
Failure Size of Target Potential Part Rating	Hazard Rating	Size of part	1 15cm		75cm 4 > 75cm
•		Target Rating	1 Occasional	2 Intermittent 3 Free	quent 4 Constant
UAZADO ADATEMENT					
HAZARD ABATEMENT					
Prune	Yes	No	Fell or monitor regulal	lelv.	
		$H_{\underline{}}$			
Inspect Further	Root	X Decay		Monitor Other	□
Remove tree	Yes	X No	Replace Tree	X Yes	No
Move target	Yes	X No	Other		
COMMENTS					
Signficant basal damage fro	m 0-30cm. Ear	ly stages pf Ble	eeding Canker. Sevr	ely compacted soil. Incl	uded union.
Obstructing phone lines.		·			



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
	Jessop Rodd, 1401 widi 14K2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last	Nist and State
inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

HAZARD RATING									
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0						
Failure Potential	Size of Part	Target Rating	Hazard Rating						
Immedi	needed								
Needs	ection								

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crown Spread	Crown Clear	Special Value
2232	Beech	М	Gen Sym	Dom	1	550	1 <i>7</i>	16		n/a

											7 0.00
2232	Beech	М	Gen Sym	Dom	1	550	1 <i>7</i>		16		n/a
Observ	rations Live crown	ratio -	90%								
	raised and pollarded										
0.0	. a.ooa a.oa pona. aoa		,.								
TREE	HEALTH										
Foliage	e colour	Nor	mal	Chlo	orotic	Nec	rotic				
	edensity	Nor	mal	Spa	rse	ш					
	on growth	God	od	X Ave	rage	Poo	r				
	lwood devlopment	God	od		rage	Poo	r	None			
Vitality	· ·	God	od		rage	Fair		Poor			
Leaf siz		Nor	mal	Smc	ıll	ш					
Epicorn	nic growth	Yes		No							
Diebac	k	Yes		x No							
Growth	obstructions	x Yes		No		Pavem	ent				
Pests/	Diseases	Yes		x No							
SITE (CONDITIONS										
3111	301131110113										
Site cho	aracter	X Don	nestic	Indu	ıstrial	POS	5	Natural	Woods	Grou	p
	ape type	Law	'n	X Roa	dside	Bord	der	Open	Garden	Agric	
Irrigati		Non	ie	God	od	X Ade	quate	Poor	Excessive		
-	turbance	Yes		x No		تت					
% drip	line paved	0%			25%	25-	50%	50-75%	x 75-100%	Othe	r
% drip	line soil	0%		x 10-	25%	25-	50%	50-75%	75-100%	Othe	r
% drip	line grade lowered	x 0%		10-	25%	25-	50%	50-75%	75-100%	Othe	r
Soil pro	oblems	x Dra	inage	Sha	llow	X Con	pact	X Drought	Saline	Alkal	ine
		Acio	dic	X Volu	ıme	Dise	ase	Failure	Slope	Conto	aminated
Obstru	ctions	Ligh	ıts	Sigr	nage	LOS	i	Utilities	Veg	X Othe	r
Exposu	re to wind	Оре	en	x Prot	ected	Gro	υр	Prone			
Prevail	ing wind direction	South v	westerly						•		
TARG	ET										
_											
rargets	s under tree	x Build		X Parl		X Roa		X Pedestrian Other	Recreation	Land	scape
				Ш	,		.9	ت			

Targets under tree	х	Building	x	Parking	х	Road	x	Pedestrian	Recreation	Landscape
	x	Hardscape		Utility		Playing		Other	 -	-
Can target be moved		Yes	х	No		•		•		
Restrict usage?		Yes	х	No						
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	x	Frequent		Constant	Other	

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT)				
Suspect Root Rot Fruiting body present Exposed roots Undermined Root pruned Buttress wounded Restricted root area Potential for root failure Lean Soil heave Roots broken Compounding factors	Yes Yes Severe Yes Yes Severe Natural Yes Yes Yes	X No X No X Moderate Moderate X No X Moderate X Moderate Unnatural X No X No	Low Low % Root area affer Approx age of w Low Low Corrected Decay in plane of Soil cracking Mower damage t	Angle f lean Yes	
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	'N)				
DEFECT	Ro	oot Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Poor taper					
Bow, sweep					
Co-dominants / forks					
Multiple attachments					
Included bark					
Excessive end weight					
Cracks / Splits Hangers					
Girdling	-				
Wounds / Seam		Yes			
Decay		103			
Cavity	- 			Yes	
Fungal Fruiting Bodies					
Bleeding / Sap Flow					
Loose / Cracked Bark			Yes		
Birds / Bats / Bees					
Deadwood / Stubs					
Borers / Ants etc					
Cankers / Galls					
Previous failure					
HAZARD RATING					
Part most likely to fail	Whole tre	ee Scaffold	X Branch	Other	
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other	
1.0 + 1.0 + 4.0 Failure Size of Potential Part Rating	et Hazard	Failure Potentia Size of part Target Rating	Low 1 15cm 1 Occasional		4 Severe 75cm 4 > 75cm quent 4 Constant
HAZARD ABATEMENT	<u>r</u>				
Druno	Var.	□ _{N-a}	Crown aloga	un raico	
Prune	Yes	No	Crown clean and crow		
Inspect Further	Root	X Decay	Aerial	Monitor Other	<u> </u>
Remove tree	Yes	X No	Replace Tree	Yes	No
Move target	Yes	X No	Other		
COMMENTS Cavity at pollard point. Roc	ot damage. Ba	sal damage. Bar	k necrosis. Rubbing	branches. Compacted.	



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last	Not available
inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

X Hardscape

Yes

Yes

Rare

Can target be moved

Restrict usage?

Occupancy

Utility

Nο

Νo

HAZARD RATING									
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0						
Failure	Size of	Target	Hazard						
Potential	Part	Rating	Rating						
Immedi	ate action r	needed							
Needs further inspection									
	Dead Tree								

TREE CHARACTERISTICS

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crown Spread	Crown Clear	Special Value
2233	Beech	*	Minor Asym	Dom	1	1020	24	23		n/a

2233	Beech	М	Minor Asym	Doi	m 1	10	20 2	24		2	23			n/a
Observ														
Crown	raised and pollarded	nistoric	ally.											
TREE	HEALTH													
Foliage	colour	□ _{N∘}	rmal	П	Chlorotic		Necrotic	2						
_	density	\vdash	rmal	_	Sparse		1							
_	on growth	Go	ood	-	Average		Poor							
	wood devlopment	Go	ood	_	Average		Poor	ſ		None				
Vitality		Go	ood	-	Average		Fair	Ì		Poor				
Leaf siz		No	rmal		Small		1	L		ı				
Epicorn	nic growth	Ye	s	1	No									
Diebac	k	Ye	s	x	No									
Growth	obstructions	X Ye	s	1	No	Pav	vement							
Pests/	Diseases	Ye	s	x	No									
CITE (CONDITIONS													
SIIE	ONDITIONS													
Site cho	aracter	x Do	mestic	ı	ndustrial		POS	[Natural	\square_{\vee}	Voods	Gro	qu
	ape type	Lav		x	Roadside		Border	l		Open		arden	Agr	•
Irrigatio		No	ne		Good	x	Adequa	ıte		Poor	E	xcessive		
Site dis	turbance	Ye	s	x	No I		J .	ļ						
% drip	line paved	0%	, o		10-25%		25-50%	6		50-75%	x 7	5-100%	Oth	er
% drip	line soil	0%	ó	x	10-25%		25-50%	6		50-75%	7	5-100%	Oth	er
% drip	line grade lowered	x 0%	ó	-	10-25%		25-50%	6		50-75%	7	5-100%	Oth	er
Soil pro	blems	x Dro	ainage		Shallow	х	Compac	ct	х	Drought	S	aline	Alko	ıline
		X Aci	idic	x	Volume		Disease			Failure	S	lope	Con	taminated
Obstru	ctions	Lig	hts		Signage		LOS			Utilities		eg	X Oth	er
Exposu	re to wind	Op	en	X	Protected		Group			Prone				
Prevail	ing wind direction	South	westerly		·		_	_						
TARG	ET													
Targets	under tree	X Bui	lding	x	Parking	x	Road		х	Pedestrian	R	ecreation	Land	dscape

Other

Playing

Intermittent X Frequent

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT)	ı				
Suspect Root Rot	Yes	X No			
Fruiting body present	Yes	X No			
Exposed roots	Severe	X Moderate	Low	None	
Undermined	Severe	Moderate	Low	None	
Root pruned	Yes	X No	% Root area affe	ected	
Buttress wounded	Yes	x No	Approx age of w	ound	
Restricted root area	Severe	X Moderate	Low	None	
Potential for root failure	Severe	X Moderate	Low	-	
Lean	Natural	Unnatural	Corrected	Angle	
Soil heave	Yes	x No	Decay in plane of	f lean	Yes X No
Roots broken	Yes	x No	Soil cracking		Yes X No
		<u></u>			<u> </u>
Compounding factors	Yes	x No			
	<u></u>	<u> </u>			
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	N)				
DEFECT	Ro	ot Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Poor taper					
Bow, sweep					
Co-dominants / forks Multiple attachments				+	
Included bark	_			+	
Excessive end weight					
Cracks / Splits					
Hangers					
Girdling		Yes			
Wounds / Seam Decay			Yes ?		
Cavity			•		
Fungal Fruiting Bodies	_			+	
Bleeding / Sap Flow					
Loose / Cracked Bark					
Birds / Bats / Bees					
Deadwood / Stubs					
Borers / Ants etc Cankers / Galls		+		+	
Previous failure		+			
				<u> </u>	
HAZARD RATING					
				-	
Part most likely to fail	Whole tree	Scaffold	X Branch	Other	
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other	
			_		
1.0 + 1.0 + 4.0	- → 6.0	Failure Potentia	l low	2 Medium 3	High 4 Severe
Failure Size of Target		Size of part	1 15cm	2 15-45cm 3	
Potential Part Rating	Rating	Target Rating	1 Occasional	2 Intermittent 3	Frequent 4 Constant
	_				
HAZARD ABATEMENT	1				
Prune	x Yes	No	Deadwood	, ,	
Inspect Further	Root	X Decay	Aerial		ner
Remove tree	Yes	X No	Replace Tree	Yes	No No
Move target	Yes	X No	Other		
COMMENTS					
COMMENTS Described by the state of the stat		C	and the second	ar Cianton - 111 ·	Dander I
Possible battery acid leakag	je onto root pl	ate. Seveerely	compacted. Bottle b	υττ. Signticant ribbii	ng. Deadwood.
Girdling roots.					



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

HAZARD RATING									
3.0	2.0	4.0	9.0						
Failure	Size of	Target	Hazard						
Potential	Part	Rating	Rating						
Immedi	ate action r	needed							
Needs further inspection									
	Dead Tree								

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crown Spread	Crown Clear	Special Value
2234	Beech	М	Geny Sym	Dom	1	630	23	18		n/a

2234	Beech	М	Sym	Dor	n 1	6	30	23		18				n/a
Observ	rations Live crow	n ratio	- 90%											
	Raised historically													
TREE	HEALTH													
Foliage	colour	N	ormal		Chlorotic		Necrotic	:						
	density	N	ormal	s	parse		_							
Extensi	on growth	G	ood	x	verage		Poor							
Wound	wood devlopment	X G	ood		verage		Poor			None				
Vitality	class	G	ood	X	verage		Fair	-		Poor				
Leaf siz	e	N	ormal	s	imall					•				
Epicorn	nic growth	Y	es	\ 	40									
Diebac	k	Y	es	χ	40									
Growth	obstructions	x Y	es	١	10	Pavement / Street light								
Pests/	Diseases	Y	es	χ	40									
SITE C	CONDITIONS													
Site cho	aracter	X D	omestic	∏lr	ndustrial		POS	Γ		Natural	Wood	ds	Grou	Jρ
Landsc	ape type		awn	x R	oadside!		Border	-		Open	Garde	en	Agri	
Irrigatio	on .	N	one		Good	x	Adequa	ıte		Poor	Excess	sive		
Site dis	turbance	Y	es	χ	40		_	_		J I				
% drip	line paved	0,	%		0-25%		25-50%	6		50-75%	x 75-10	00%	Othe	er
% drip	line soil	0	%	x 1	0-25%		25-50%	6		50-75%	75-10	00%	Othe	er
% drip	line grade lowered	x 0°	%	1	0-25%		25-50%	6		50-75%	75-10	00%	Othe	er
Soil pro	blems	x D	rainage	s	ihallow	х	Compa	ct	х	Drought	Saline	•	Alka	line
		A	cidic	χV	olume/		Disease			Failure	Slope		Cont	aminated
Obstru	ctions	Li	ghts	s	ignage		LOS		х	Utilities	Veg		X Othe	er
Exposu	re to wind	0	pen	x P	rotected		Group			Prone				
Prevail	ing wind direction	South	westerly				_			•				
TARG	ET					_								
							1_	Г		 l				
Targets	under tree	X Bu	uilding	I x IP	arking	X	Road		X	Pedestrian	Recre	ation	Land	scape

Targets under tree	х	Building	x	Parking	x	Road	X	Pedestrian	Recreation		Landscape
	х	Hardscape		Utility		Playing	X	Other	Str	et	Light
Can target be moved		Yes	х	No							
Restrict usage?		Yes	х	No							
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	X	Frequent		Constant	Other		

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT))				
Suspect Root Rot Fruiting body present Exposed roots Undermined Root pruned Buttress wounded Restricted root area Potential for root failure Lean Soil heave	Yes Yes Severe Severe Yes Yes Severe Natural Yes	X No X No X Moderate Moderate X No No X Moderate X Moderate Unnatural X No	Low Low % Root area affe Approx age of w Low Low Corrected Decay in plane or	ound 1-5 None Angle	years (Mowers)
Roots broken	Yes	X No	Soil cracking	Yes	X No
Compounding factors	Yes	X No			
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	N)				
DEFECT	D -	at Elem	Toronto	C. effected	Daniel
DEFECT	Ro	ot Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Poor taper Bow, sweep					
Co-dominants / forks				Yes	
Multiple attachments				163	
Included bark				Yes	
Excessive end weight					
Cracks / Splits					
Hangers					
Girdling		Yes			
Wounds / Seam		Yes			
Decay					
Cavity					
Fungal Fruiting Bodies					
Bleeding / Sap Flow Loose / Cracked Bark					
Birds / Bats / Bees					
Deadwood / Stubs					
Borers / Ants etc					
Cankers / Galls					
Previous failure					
HAZARD RATING					
Part most likely to fail	Whole tre	e Scaffold	X Branch	Other	
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other	
Failure Potential Part 4.0 Targe Rating	t Hazard	Failure Potential Size of part Target Rating	1 Low 1 15cm 1 Occasional		4 Severe
HAZARD ABATEMENT	Γ				
Prune	¥ Yes	No	Reduce away from st	reet light Deadwood	
	$\stackrel{\frown}{\vdash}$	—			
Inspect Further	Root	Decay	Aerial	Monitor Other	NI-
Remove tree	Yes	X No	Replace Tree	Yes	No
Move target	Yes	X No	Other		
COMMENTS Girsling roots. Compacted s	il. Root damag	e from mowers.	Included union in sco	affold.	



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

	HAZARD	RATING						
3.0	3.0	4.0	10.0					
Failure Potential	Size of Part	Target Rating	Hazard Rating					
Immedi	ate action r	needed						
Needs further inspection								
Dead Tree								

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crown Spread	Crown Clear	Special Value
2235	Beech	Μ	Gen Sym	Dom	1	700	23	19		n/a

2235	Beech	М	Gen Sym	Dom	1	700	23		19			n/a
			000/									
Observ												
Crown	raised and polladed h	istorical	ly									
TREE	HEALTH											
Foliage	colour	Nor	mal	Chlo	orotic	Пи	lecrotic					
_	density	Nor	mal	Spc	ırse							
_	on growth	God	od	X Ave	rage	P	oor					
Wound	wood devlopment	God	od	X Ave	rage	P	oor		None			
Vitality	class	God	od	X Ave	rage	Fo	air		Poor			
Leaf siz	e	Nor	mal	Smo	all				=			
Epicorn	nic growth	Yes		No								
Diebac	k	Yes		X No								
Growth	obstructions	x Yes		No		Pave	ment					
Pests/	Diseases	Yes		X No								
SITE C	CONDITIONS											
Site cho	ıracter	X Dom	nestic	Indu	ıstrial	P	OS		Natural	Woods	Gro	υр
Landsc	ape type	Law	n	X Roo	dside	В	order		Open	Garden	Agri	c
Irrigatio	on	Non	е	God	od	x A	dequate		Poor	Excessive		
Site dis	turbance	x Yes		No		Const	truction d	istur	bance			
% drip	line paved	0%		10-	25%	2.	5-50%		50-75%	x 75-100%	Oth	er
% drip	line soil	0%		x 10-	25%	2.	5-50%		50-75%	75-100%	Oth	er
% drip	ine grade lowered	x 0%		10-	25%	2.	5-50%		50-75%	75-100%	Oth	er
Soil pro	blems	X Drai	inage	Sha	llow	x C	Compact	X	Drought	Saline	Alko	ıline
		Acio	lic	X Vol	Jme	D	isease		Failure	Slope	Con	taminated
Obstru	ctions	Ligh	ts	Sign	nage	LC	OS	X	Utilities	Veg	X Oth	er
Exposu	re to wind	Оре	en	X Prof	tected	G	Proup		Prone			
Prevail	ng wind direction	South v	vesterly									
TARG	ET											
Targets	under tree	X Build	ding	X Par	king	X R	oad	x	Pedestrian	Recreation	Land	dscape

Targets under tree	Ĥ	Building Hardscape	<u> </u>	Parking Utility		Road Playing	х	Pedestrian Other	Recreation	Landscape	
Can target be moved		Yes	X	No		="		-			
Restrict usage?		Yes	х	No							
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	x	Frequent		Constant	Other		

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT)				
Suspect Root Rot	Yes	X No			
Fruiting body present	Yes	x No		-	
Exposed roots	Severe	X Moderate	Low	None	
Undermined	Severe	Moderate	Low	None	
Root pruned	Yes	x No	% Root area affe	ected	
Buttress wounded	Yes	x No	Approx age of w	ound	
Restricted root area	Severe	X Moderate	Low	None	
Potential for root failure	Severe	X Moderate	Low	_	
Lean	Natural	Unnatural	Corrected	Angle	
Soil heave	Yes	⊢	Decay in plane of		x No
Roots broken	Yes		Soil cracking	Yes	 -
ROOIS DIOREII	163	X No	3011 Crucking		X No
Compounding factors	Yes	No	Soil levels appea	r to be raised	
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	(N)				
(()	/				
DEFECT	Ro	ot Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Poor taper		0111010	············		
Bow, sweep					
Co-dominants / forks					
Multiple attachments					
Included bark					
Excessive end weight					
Cracks / Splits					
Hangers					
Girdling					
Wounds / Seam					
Decay Cavity				Yes	
Fungal Fruiting Bodies				163	
Bleeding / Sap Flow					
Loose / Cracked Bark					
Birds / Bats / Bees					
Deadwood / Stubs					Yes
Borers / Ants etc					
Cankers / Galls					
Previous failure					
HAZARD RATING					
Part most likely to fail	Whole tree	Scaffold	Branch	Other	
Inspection frequency	⊢ ⊢	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other	
inspection frequency	Annual	2 - yearry	3 - reuny		
3.0 + 3.0 + 4.0 Failure Size of Targe	et Hazard	Failure Potential	1 15cm		75cm 4 > 75cm
Potential Part Rating	g Rating	Target Rating	1 Occasional	2 Intermittent 3 Free	quent 4 Constant
HAZARD ABATEMEN	Т				
Prune	Yes	No	Crown lift and deadw	vood	
		H_		_	
Inspect Further	Root	X Decay		Monitor Other	
Remove tree	Yes	X No	Replace Tree	Yes	No
Move target	Yes	X No	Other		
COMMENTS Cavities at base of sscaffold	d (pollard point	e) Minor doad	wood Construction	listurhance of root are	Lavals raised
Cavilles at base of sscatton	a (pondra pom	sp. minor deady	TOOL. CONSTRUCTION O	nsionbunce of 1001 afea	. LEVEIS IUISEU.



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
	Jessop Rodd, 1401 widi 14K2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last	Nist and State
inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

	HAZARD	RATING						
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0					
Failure Potential	Size of	Target Rating	Hazard Rating					
lmmedi	ate action r							
Needs further inspection								
	Dead Tree							

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crown Spread	Crown Clear	Special Value
2236	Beech	М	Gen Sym	Dom	1	590	18	15		n/a

2236	Beech	М	Gen Sym	Don	m 1	59	70 18		1	5		n/a
Observ												
Crown	raised and pollarded	in pas	st.									
TREE	HEALTH											
Foliage	e colour	Пи	lormal		Chlorotic		Necrotic					
-	e density	\square_{N}	lormal	s	parse							
	on growth		Good	X A	verage		Poor					
Wound	lwood devlopment	G	Good	x A	verage		Poor		None			
Vitality	class	G	∂ood	x A	verage		Fair		Poor			
Leaf si	ze	N	lormal	s	mall				-			
Epicorn	nic growth	Y	es	Z	10							
Diebac	k	Y	es	X	10							
Growth	obstructions	X	es	Z	10	Pav	ement					
Pests/	Diseases	Y	es	X	10							
SITE (CONDITIONS											
<u> </u>												
Site che	aracter	x D	omestic	In	ndustrial		POS		Natural	Woods	Gro	up
Landsc	ape type	Lo	awn	x R	oadside		Border		Open	Garden	Agri	c
Irrigati	on	N	lone	C	Good	х	Adequate		Poor	Excessive		
Site dis	sturbance	x Y	es	Ζ	10	Cor	struction c	listur	bance - leve	els changed		
% drip	line paved	0	%	1	0-25%		25-50%		50-75%	x 75-100%	Oth	er
% drip	line soil	0	%	x 1	0-25%		25-50%		50-75%	75-100%	Oth	er
% drip	line grade lowered	x 0	1%	1	0-25%		25-50%		50-75%	75-100%	Oth	er
Soil pro	oblems	x D	rainage	S	hallow	x	Compact	X	Drought	Saline	Alko	ıline
		A	cidic	×	olume/		Disease		Failure	Slope	Con	taminated
Obstru	ctions	Li	ights	S	ignage		LOS	X	Utilities	Veg	X Oth	er
Exposu	re to wind		Open	x P	rotected		Group		Prone			
Prevail	ing wind direction	South	n westerly									
TARG	ET											
Target	s under tree	X B	uilding	x P	arking	х	Road	X	Pedestrian	Recreation	Land	dscape

Targets under tree	x	Building	х	Parking	x	Road	x	Pedestrian	Recreation	Landscape	
	х	Hardscape	x	Utility		Playing		Other	 -	 _	
Can target be moved		Yes	х	No		•		•			
Restrict usage?		Yes	х	No							
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	X	Frequent		Constant	Other		

TREE DEFECTS (ROO)	i)				
Suspect Root Rot Fruiting body present Exposed roots Undermined Root pruned Buttress wounded Restricted root area Potential for root failure Lean Soil heave Roots broken Compounding factors	Yes Yes Yes Severe X Yes Yes Severe Severe Natural Yes Yes Yes	X No X No X Moderate Moderate No X No X Moderate X Moderate Unnatural X No X No	Low Low % Root area af Approx age of Low Low Corrected Decay in plane Soil cracking	wound None Angle of lean	Yes X No Yes X No
TREE DEFECTS (CROV		X			
·					
DEFECT	Ro	ot Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Poor taper					
Bow, sweep					
Co-dominants / forks					
Multiple attachments					
Included bark					
Excessive end weight					
Cracks / Splits					
Hangers					
Girdling					
Wounds / Seam					
Decay					
Cavity Fungal Fruiting Bodies					
Bleeding / Sap Flow		+			
Loose / Cracked Bark					
Birds / Bats / Bees					
Deadwood / Stubs					Yes
Borers / Ants etc					- 100
Cankers / Galls					
Previous failure					
		•		•	
HAZARD RATING					
Design of the last of the		Scaffold			
Part most likely to fail	Whole tree	<u> </u>	X Branch	Other	
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other	
Failure Potential Part A. Size of Part Ratio	get Hazard	Failure Potentia Size of part Target Rating	Low 1 15cm 1 Occasiona	2 15-45cm 3	High 4 Severe 45-75cm 4 > 75cm Constant
HAZARD ABATEMEN	ίΤ				
Prune	Yes	x No			
Inspect Further	Root	Decay	X Aerial	Monitor X Othe	r Root plate
Remove tree	Yes	X No	Replace Tree	Yes	No
Move target	Yes	x No	Other	<u> </u>	
COMMENTS					
Root plate disturbance by				oot damage.	
Require additional root pla	ate investigation	using airspade.			



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
	Jessop Rodd, 1401 widi 14K2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last	Nist and State
inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

	HAZARD	RATING	
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0
Failure Potential	Size of	Target Rating	Hazard Rating
lmmedi	ate action r		
Needs	further insp	pection	
	Dead Tree		

rispecioi	Cilis Kup	/ei / G	iies Mei	CEI						Dedd Hee		
TREE CHARACT	ERISTICS	;	_		_		_					
Tree ID Speci	es	Age Class	Form	Crowr Class		DBH	Height		Crown	Spread	Crown Clear	Specia Value
2237 Beed	ch	М	Gen Sym	Dom	1	960	24		2	21		
Observations L Crown raised and p	ive crown i		90%									
crown raisea ana p	onaraca n	, pasii										
-												
TREE HEALTH												
Foliage colour	Γ	Nor	mal	Ch	llorotic	Ne	ecrotic					
Foliage density	ŀ	Nor		\vdash	arse	Ш'```	.c. one					
Extension growth	ŀ	Goo		H '	erage	Po	or					
Woundwood devlo	oment	Goo	d	X AV	-	Po			None			
Vitality class		Goo		X Av		Fa		\vdash	Poor			
Leaf size	ŀ	Nori	mal		nall			ш				
Epicormic growth	ŀ	Yes		No								
Dieback	Ī	Yes		X No)							
Growth obstructions	•	x Yes		No)	Paver	nent					
Pests/ Diseases	ŀ	Yes		X No)							
	.											
SITE CONDITIO	NS											
Site character	Г	X Dom	estic	Inc	dustrial	РС)S		Vatural	Woods	Gro	au
Landscape type	ŀ	Law		— ——	adside		rder	\vdash	Open	Garden	Agr	•
Irrigation	}	Non		-	ood		lequate	\vdash	Poor	Excessive		
Site disturbance	ŀ	X Yes		No				ш		els changed		
% drip line paved	ŀ	0%		\vdash)-25%	$\overline{}$	-50%	$\overline{}$	50-75%	x 75-100%	Oth	er
% drip line soil	ŀ	0%		_)-25%	_	-50%	_	50-75%	75-100%	Oth	er
% dripline grade lo	wered	x 0%)-25%	25	-50%		50-75%	75-100%	Oth	er
Soil problems	ţ		nage	Sh	allow	x Co	mpact	x	Drought	Saline	Alko	aline
•	ţ	Acid	ic	x vo	olume	<u> </u>	sease	-	ailure	Slope	Con	taminated
Obstructions	ţ	Ligh	ts		gnage	LC		\Box	Jtilities	Veg	X Oth	er
_	<u> </u> -	$\dashv_{_}$		⊢.`		Н.		Н.	_		لت	

TARGET

Exposure to wind

Prevailing wind direction

Targets under tree	Ĥ	Building Hardscape	_	Parking Utility		Road Playing	Pedestrian Other	Recreation	Landscape	
Can target be moved		Yes	х	No						
Restrict usage?		Yes	х	No						
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	X	Frequent	Constant	Other		

Group

X Protected

Open

South westerly

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT)				
Suspect Root Rot Fruiting body present Exposed roots Undermined Root pruned Buttress wounded Restricted root area Potential for root failure Lean Soil heave Roots broken Compounding factors	Yes Yes Yes Severe X Yes Yes Severe Severe Natural Yes Yes Yes	X No X No X Moderate Moderate No X No X Moderate Unnatural X No X No	Low Low % Root area af Approx age of Low Low Corrected Decay in plane Soil cracking	wound None Angle	Yes X No X No
TREE DEFECTS (CROV		X			
	,				
DEFECT	Ro	ot Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Poor taper					
Bow, sweep					
Co-dominants / forks					
Multiple attachments					
Included bark					
Excessive end weight					
Cracks / Splits					
Hangers					
Girdling					
Wounds / Seam					
Decay					
Cavity					
Fungal Fruiting Bodies					
Bleeding / Sap Flow					
Loose / Cracked Bark					
Birds / Bats / Bees Deadwood / Stubs					
Borers / Ants etc		+			-+
Cankers / Galls		+			
Previous failure					
Trevious failure					
HAZARD RATING					
Part most likely to fail	Whole tree	e Scaffold	X Branch	Other	
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other	
	<u></u>	<u> </u>			
1.0 , 1.0 , 4.0	0 6.0	Failure Potentia	I Low	2 Medium 3	High 4 Severe
Failure Size of Targ	get Hazard	Size of part	1 15cm	2 15-45cm 3	45-75cm 4 > 75cm
Potential Part Ratio		Target Rating	1 Occasiona		
		ranger kaning	1 Occusione	2	Trequent 4 constant
HAZARD ABATEMEN	iT				
Prune	Yes	x No			
Inspect Further	Root	Decay	Aerial	X Monitor X Ot	her Root plate
Remove tree	Yes	x No	Replace Tree	Ye	s No
Move target	Yes	x No	Other		—
Č					
COMMENTS					
Construction disturbance - I	evels changed				
		ado			
Requires rootplate investig	anon using Airsp	Juue.			



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

	HAZARD	RATING	
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0
Failure Potential	Size of Part	Target Rating	Hazard Rating
lmmedi	ate action r	needed	
Needs	further insp	ection	
	Dead Tree		

TREE	CHARACTERISTIC	CS												
Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height		Crowi	n Spre	ead		own ear	Special Value
2238	Beech	М	Gen Sym	Dom	1	790	0 24			21				
Observ	ations													
TREE	HEALTH													
Foliage	colour	Nor	mal	Chlo	orotic		Vecrotic							
Foliage	density	Nor	mal	Spa	rse									
	on growth	God	od	X Ave	rage	P	oor							
Wound	wood devlopment	God	od	Ave	rage	x P	oor		None					
Vitality	class	God	od	X Ave	rage	F	air		Poor					
Leaf siz	e	Nor	mal	Smc	ıll				4					
Epicorm	nic growth	Yes		X No		-								
Diebac	k	Yes		X No										
Growth	obstructions	x Yes		No		Pave	ement							
Pests/ [Diseases	Yes		x No										
SITE C	CONDITIONS													
Ct. I				<u> </u>			.05		1		l		ام	
Site cho		$\stackrel{\frown}{\vdash}$	nestic	Н.	strial	-	os		Natural	-	Woods		Grou	•
	ape type	Law		Ĥ	dside	\vdash	Sorder		Open	-	Garden		Agric	:
Irrigatio		Non	е	God	od		dequate	<u> </u>	Poor		Excessive			
	turbance	X Yes		No 10	25%	$\overline{}$	tarmac u 25-50%	01 0	stem 50-75%	<u></u>	75-100%		Othe	_
=	line paved	0%		Н.,		\vdash	25-50%		50-75%	X	75-100% 75-100%		Othe	
•	line soil	Н.,,			25% 25%	-			50-75%		75-100% 75-100%		Othe	
=	ine grade lowered	X 0%		Sha		H,	25-50%		1	-	Saline		Alkal	
Soil pro	Diens	X Drai	inage Iic	Н		Ĥ	Compact Disease	X	Drought Failure	<u> </u>	Slope	-	•	aminated
Obstruc	rtions	Ligh		Ľ		-	OS		Utilities	\vdash	1		Othe	
	re to wind	Ope			ected	\vdash	Group		Prone		Veg	X	One	1
•	ng wind direction	ш.	vesterly	لث	ccica	Ш'	J. 00p	<u> </u>]. Tolic					

TARGET

Targets under tree	x	Building	х	Parking	х	Road	x	Pedestrian	Recreation	Landscape
	х	Hardscape		Utility		Playing		Other		
Can target be moved		Yes	х	No		<u>-</u> '		_		
Restrict usage?		Yes	х	No						
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	х	Frequent		Constant	Other	

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT)					
Suspect Root Rot	Yes	X No			
Fruiting body present	Yes	x No			
Exposed roots	Severe	X Moderate	Low	None	
Undermined	Severe	Moderate	Low	None	
Root pruned	x Yes	No	% Root area affe	ected Possible	
Buttress wounded	Yes	x No	Approx age of w	ound	
Restricted root area	Severe	X Moderate	Low	None	
Potential for root failure	Severe	X Moderate	Low	-1	
Lean	Natural	Unnatural	Corrected	Angle	
Soil heave	Yes	X No	Decay in plane of		X No
Roots broken	Yes	X No	Soil cracking	Yes	
			5 5 1 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5		
Compounding factors	Yes	X No			
compositating raciors	L				
TREE DEFECTS (CROWI	N)				
	/				
DEFECT	Roc	ot Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Poor taper					
Bow, sweep					
Co-dominants / forks					
Multiple attachments					
Included bark					
Excessive end weight Cracks / Splits					
Hangers	- 				
Girdling	- 				
Wounds / Seam					
Decay			Yes		
Cavity			Yes		
Fungal Fruiting Bodies					
Bleeding / Sap Flow					
Loose / Cracked Bark					
Birds / Bats / Bees Deadwood / Stubs	-				Yes
Borers / Ants etc					res
Cankers / Galls	_				
Previous failure					
	•			•	•
HAZARD RATING					
Part most likely to fail	Whole tree	Scaffold	X Branch	Other	
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other	
	<u> </u>	<u></u>	<u> </u>		
1.0 _ 1.0 _ 4.0	6.0	Failure Potential	l Low	2 Medium 3 Hig	h Severe
Failure Size of Target	Hazard	Size of part	1 15cm	2 15-45cm 3 45-	75cm 4 > 75cm
Potential Part Rating	Rating	Target Rating	1 Occasional	2 Intermittent 3 Fre	quent 4 Constant
			—		
HAZARD ABATEMENT					
Prune	Yes	x No	Crown lift		
Inspect Further	X Root	X Decay	Aerial	Monitor X Other	Root plate
Remove tree	Yes	x No	Replace Tree	Yes	No
Move target	Yes	x No	Other		—
-		<u> </u>			
COMMENTS					
Start of cavity in stem. Swell	ing. Root dama	ge. Constructio	n disturbance. Level	s changed. Minor dead	wood in crown.
Requires additional root plat	te investigation	using airspade	···		



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

	HAZARD	RATING							
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0						
Failure	Size of	Target	Hazard						
Potential	Part	Rating	Rating						
Immedi	ate action r	needed							
Needs	Needs further inspection								
	Dead Tree								

TREE CHARACTERISTICS

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crown Spread	Crown Clear	Special Value
2239	Beech	М	Gen Sym	Dom	1	880	26	24		

2239	Beech	M	Sym	Dom	1	880) 26			24			
Observe	ntiana Crayen rai	امما مما	ام سمال مص	- al !:- 4	h a .a a.a.								
Observe	ations Crown rai	isea ana	poliara	ea in t	ne past.								
TREE H	HEALTH												
Foliage	colour	Nor	mal	Ch	lorotic		Vecrotic						
Foliage		Nor	mal	Sp	arse								
_	n growth	God	od	x Av	erage	P	oor						
Wound	wood devlopment	God	od	x Av	erage	P	oor		None				
Vitality	class	God	od	x Av	erage	F	air		Poor				
Leaf size	е	Nor	mal	Sm	all				4				
Epicormi	ic growth	Yes		X No	,								
Dieback		Yes		x No	,								
Growth	obstructions	x Yes		No	,	Pave	ement						
Pests/ D	Diseases	Yes		X No	•								
SITE C	ONDITIONS												
Site cha	ractor	Don Don	nestic	lne	lustrial	Пь	OS	_	Natural		Woods		Group
Landsca		X Don		\mathbf{H}	adside	\mathbf{H}	order		Open	-	Garden		Agric
Irrigatio		Nor		-	ood	$\overline{}$	dequate		Poor	-	Excessive		Agric
Site dist		Yes		X No		^	aequale	<u> </u>	1 001	<u> </u>	LXCessive		
	line paved	0%		 	-25%		25-50%		50-75%	x	75-100%		Other
% drip		0%		x 10		$\overline{}$	25-50%		50-75%	 ^	75-100%		Other
•	ne grade lowered	x 0%		\vdash	-25%	-	25-50%		50-75%		75-100%		Other
Soil pro	-		inage		allow	Н	Compact	x	Drought	-	Saline		Alkaline
ос р. с		Acid	_	x Vo	lume	Ĥ	Disease	 	Failure	-	Slope		Contaminated
Obstruc	tions	X Ligh		-	nage	-	OS		Utilities		Veg	x	Other
	e to wind	Op			otected	Н	Group	\vdash	Prone	<u> </u>	1 ~	_^	
-	ng wind direction		vesterly	ٔ ک			•	Ь	1				
TADC	ET												

TARGET

Targets under tree	x	Building	х	Parking	х	Road	х	Pedestrian	Recreation	Landscape
	X	Hardscape		Utility		Playing	X	Other		
Can target be moved		Yes	х	No		•		•		
Restrict usage?		Yes	х	No						
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	x	Frequent		Constant	Other	

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT)				
Suspect Root Rot	Yes	x No			
Fruiting body present	Yes	X No			
Exposed roots	Severe	X Moderate	Low	None	
Undermined	Severe	Moderate	Low	None	
Root pruned	Yes	x No	% Root area aff	<u>``</u>	
Buttress wounded	Yes		Approx age of v		
Restricted root area	Severe		Low Low	None	
		X Moderate	<u> </u>	None	
Potential for root failure	Severe	X Moderate	Low	¬	
Lean	Natural	Unnatural	Corrected	Angle	
Soil heave	Yes	X No	Decay in plane o	of lean Yes	<u> </u>
Roots broken	Yes	X No	Soil cracking	Yes	x No
Compounding factors	Yes	x No			
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	/N)				
DEFECT	Roo	ot Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Poor taper					
Bow, sweep					
Co-dominants / forks					
Multiple attachments					
Included bark					Crossing
Excessive end weight Cracks / Splits					
Hangers					
Girdling					
Wounds / Seam					
Decay					
Cavity					
Fungal Fruiting Bodies					
Bleeding / Sap Flow					
Loose / Cracked Bark					
Birds / Bats / Bees					.,
Deadwood / Stubs					Yes
Borers / Ants etc Cankers / Galls					
Previous failure	-+				
Trevious failure					
HAZARD RATING					
HAZARD KATING					
D				٦٠٠	
Part most likely to fail	Whole tree		X Branch	Other	
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other	
			_		
1.0 + 1.0 + 4.0	6.0	Failure Potentia	l Low	2 Medium 3 Hig	gh 4 Severe
Failure Size of Targe		Size of part	1 15cm	2 15-45cm 3 45	-75cm 4 > 75cm
Potential Part Ratin	g Rating	Target Rating	1 Occasional	2 Intermittent 3 Fre	quent 4 Constant
					
HAZARD ABATEMEN	T				
Prune	X Yes	No	Reduce endweight or	n crossing branch. Crown lift	
Inspect Further	X Root	Decay	Aerial	Monitor X Other	Rootplate
Remove tree	Yes	H., '	Replace Tree	Yes	No
	—		Other	163	LJ'**
Move target	Yes	X No	Omer		
COMMENTS					
COMMENTS					
Consturction disturbance. Le			ssing branch in scaf	told. Minor deadwood.	
Requires root plate investig	ation using air s	pade.			



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

	HAZARD RATING										
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0								
Failure Potential	Size of Part	Target Rating	Hazard Rating								
lmmedi	ate action r	needed									
Needs	Needs further inspection										
	Dead Tree										

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crown Spread	Crown Clear	Special Value
2240	Beech	М	Gen Sym	Dom	1	910	20	20		

2240 Beech	,	M Sym	1 1)/	om 1	9	10 20			20			
Observations Crown	n raised	and pollar	ded l	nistorical	ly.							
TREE HEALTH												
Foliage colour		Normal		Chlorotic		Necrotic						
Foliage density		Normal	-	Sparse		1_						
Extension growth	.	Good	X	Average		Poor	_	1				
Woundwood devlopmen	⁺	Good		Average		Poor		None				
Vitality class		Good	X	Average	<u> </u>	Fair		Poor				
Leaf size		Normal Yes	-	Small No								
Epicormic growth Dieback	-	Yes	X	No								
Growth obstructions	- V	Yes	X	No	Par	vement / S	Street	Lamp				
Pests / Diseases	X	Yes	-		- 10	veilleili / C	Jireei	Lamp				
Tests/ Diseuses		163	X	No								
SITE CONDITIONS												
Site character	х	Domestic		Industrial		POS		Natural		Woods		Group
Landscape type		Lawn	х	Roadside		Border		Open		Garden		Agric
Irrigation		None		Good	x	Adequate		Poor		Excessive		
Site disturbance		Yes	x	No		_		_				
% drip line paved		0%		10-25%		25-50%		50-75%	x	75-100%		Other
% drip line soil		0%	X	10-25%		25-50%		50-75%		75-100%		Other
% dripline grade lowere	d x	0%		10-25%		25-50%		50-75%		75-100%		Other
Soil problems	x	Drainage		Shallow	x	Compact	х	Drought		Saline		Alkaline
		Acidic	x	Volume		Disease		Failure		Slope		Contaminated
Obstructions	x	Lights		Signage		LOS		Utilities		Veg	x	Other
Exposure to wind		Open	X	Protected		Group		Prone				
Prevailing wind direction	Soi	uth westerl	ly									
TARGET												

Targets under tree	<u> </u>	Building Hardscape	Ĥ	Parking Utility		Road Playing	_	Pedestrian Other	Recreation	Landscape
Can target be moved		Yes	х	No		•				
Restrict usage?		Yes	х	No						
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	x	Frequent		Constant	Other	

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT))				
Suspect Root Rot	Yes	X No			
Fruiting body present	Yes	x No		_	
Exposed roots	Severe	X Moderate	Low	None	
Undermined	Severe	Moderate	Low X	None	
Root pruned	Yes	x No	% Root area affe	cted	
Buttress wounded	Yes	x No	Approx age of wa	ound	
Restricted root area	Severe	X Moderate	Low	None	
Potential for root failure	Severe	X Moderate	Low	4	
Lean	Natural	Unnatural	Corrected	Angle	
Soil heave	Yes	X No	Decay in plane of	J .	x No
Roots broken	Yes	HH	Soil cracking	Yes	X No
KOOIS DIOKEII		X No	Jon cracking		X ''`
Compounding factors	Yes	x No			
Compounding raciors		X III			
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	N)				
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	14)				
DEFECT	Rog	ot Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Poor taper					
Bow, sweep					
Co-dominants / forks					
Multiple attachments				Yes	
Included bark					
Excessive end weight					
Cracks / Splits Hangers					
Girdling					
Wounds / Seam					
Decay					
Cavity				Yes	
Fungal Fruiting Bodies					
Bleeding / Sap Flow					
Loose / Cracked Bark					
Birds / Bats / Bees					
Deadwood / Stubs					Yes
Borers / Ants etc Cankers / Galls					
Previous failure					
TTC VIOUS TURIOTC				<u>l</u>	
HAZARD RATING					
Part most likely to fail	Whole tree	Scaffold	X Branch	Other	
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other	
				<u></u>	
1.0 , 1.0 , 4.0	6.0	Failure Potential	1 Low	2 Medium 3 High	Severe
Failure Size of Target	t Hazard	Size of part	1 15cm	2 15-45cm 3 45-3	75cm 4 > 75cm
Potential Part Rating		Target Rating	1 Occasional	2 Intermittent 3 Free	quent 4 Constant
HAZARD ABATEMENT	Γ				
Prune	x Yes	No	reduce away from stre	eetlight	
Inspect Further	X Root	Decay	X Aerial X	Monitor X Other	Rootplate
Remove tree	Yes	X No	Replace Tree	Yes	No
Move target	Yes	X No	Other		
		ت ک			
COMMENTS					
Root damage. Cavities to 2	x scaffold limb	s. Included and	grafted leaders. Ob	ostructing street light.	
Construction disturbance. Re					
			9	•	



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

	HAZARD RATING										
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0								
Failure Potential	Size of Part	Target Rating	Hazard Rating								
lmmedi	ate action r	needed									
Needs	Needs further inspection										
	Dead Tree										

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crown Spread	Crown Clear	Special Value
2241	Beech	М	Gen Sym	Dom	1	780	24	18		

2241	Beech	М	Sym	Doi	m 1	7	80 2	24		18			
Observ	vations Crown rai	sed and	l pollard	ed hi	istorically.								
TREE	HEALTH												
Eoliga	e colour	Пы	rmal	<u></u>	Chlorotic		Necrotic						
-			rmal	-	Sparse		Necronc						
	e density	\vdash	ood	Н.	•		Poor						
	on growth Iwood devlopment		ood	Ĥ.	Average		Poor		None				
	•	-	ood	Ĥ.	Average Average		Fair	-	Poor				
Vitality Leaf size		\mathbf{H}	rmal	-	Average Small		Fair	<u> </u>	Poor				
		Ye		\mathbf{H}									
	nic growth	Ye		Ĥ	No No								
Diebac		\vdash		Ĥ	No								
	n obstructions	Ye		Ĥ	√o								
Pests/	Diseases	Ye	S	X	1 0								
SITE (CONDITIONS												
							_		_				
Site ch	aracter	x Do	mestic	lı	ndustrial		POS		Natural		Woods	Gro	up
Landsc	ape type	Lav	wn	X	Roadside		Border		Open		Garden	Agr	c
Irrigati	on	No	ne		Good	x	Adequat	е	Poor		Excessive		
Site dis	sturbance	Ye	s	χ	No		_		<u> </u>		_		
% drip	line paved	0%	, o	1	10-25%		25-50%		50-75%	х	75-100%	Oth	er
% drip	line soil	0%	, 0	x 1	10-25%		25-50%		50-75%		75-100%	Oth	er
% drip	line grade lowered	x 0%	, 0	1	10-25%		25-50%		50-75%		75-100%	Oth	er
Soil pro	oblems	x Dro	ainage	5	Shallow	х	Compac	×	Drought		Saline	Alko	lline
		Aci	idic	x	/olume		Disease		Failure		Slope	Con	taminated
Obstru	ctions	X Lig	hts	5	Signage		LOS		Utilities		Veg	Oth	er
Exposu	re to wind	_	en	x	Protected		Group		Prone		-		
•	ing wind direction		westerly				_	<u> </u>		_			
	-												
TARG	ET												

Targets under tree	<u> </u>	Building Hardscape	Ĥ	Parking Utility		Road Playing	_	Pedestrian Other	Recreation	Landscape
Can target be moved		Yes	х	No		•				
Restrict usage?		Yes	х	No						
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	x	Frequent		Constant	Other	

IREE DEFECTS (ROOT)						
Suspect Root Rot Fruiting body present Exposed roots Undermined Root pruned Buttress wounded Restricted root area Potential for root failure Lean Soil heave Roots broken Compounding factors	Yes Yes Severe Severe X Yes Severe Severe Natural Yes Yes Yes	X No X No No No Moderate No No X Moderate X Moderate Unnatural X No No X No	Low Low % Root area aff Approx age of Low Low Corrected Decay in plane Soil cracking	wound None Angle	Possible Yes Yes	0-5 x No x No
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	 N)					
DEFEAT		. =1		C	<i>cc</i>	
DEFECT	Ко	ot Flare	Trunk	Sca	ffold	Branch
Poor taper						
Bow, sweep						
Co-dominants / forks				Y	'es	
Multiple attachments						
Included bark				Y	'es	
Excessive end weight				<u> </u>		
Cracks / Splits						
, :						
Hangers						
Girdling						
Wounds / Seam		Yes	Yes			
Decay						
Cavity						
Fungal Fruiting Bodies						
Bleeding / Sap Flow						
'.						
Birds / Bats / Bees						
Deadwood / Stubs						
Borers / Ants etc						
Cankers / Galls						
Previous failure						
L		<u> </u>				
HAZARD RATING						
		_				
Part most likely to fail	Whole tree	e Scaffold	X Branch	Other		
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other		
					-	
1.0 . 1.0 . 4.0	_ 6.0	Failure Potential	1 Low	2 Medium	3 High	4 Severe
++	- →	Size of part	1 15cm	2 15-45cr		75cm 4 > 75cm
Failure Size of Target Potential Part Rating	Hazard Rating	-	<u> </u>			<u> </u>
rolellidi run kuling	Kunig	Target Rating	1 Occasiona	l 2 Intermitt	ent 3 Freq	uent 4 Constant
HAZARD ABATEMENT	•					
Pruno	Vaa	na Na				
Prune	Yes	X No		_		
Inspect Further	X Root	Decay	Aerial	X Monitor	X Other	Rootplate
Remove tree	Yes	x No	Replace Tree	_	Yes	No
Move target	Yes		Other		—	ш
Move larger	1 es	X No				
COMMENTS						
		manatar de la constantidad de la c		atlala as to V		
Root damage. Minor damag				sible cavity).		
Construction disturbance, Lev	vels changed. I	ncluded unions in	n scaffold.			

Requires additioanl root plate investigation using airspade.



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

	HAZARD RATING												
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0										
Failure Potential	Target Rating	Hazard Rating											
lmmedi	ate action r	needed											
Needs	Needs further inspection												

		1 4 5 5	Ī	Crown	No.	1					Crown	Special
Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Class	Stems	DBH	Height		Crow	n Spread	Clear	Value
2242	Maple	EM	Gen Sym	Dom	1	195	13			8		
Observat	ions											
TREE HI	EALTH											
Foliage c	olour	Nor	mal	Chl	orotic	Ne	crotic					
Foliage d	ensity	Nor	mal	Sp	arse	<u> </u>						
Extension	growth	God	od	X Av	erage	Pod	or					
Woundwa	ood devlopment	God	od	X Av	erage	Poo	or		None			
Vitality cl	ass	God	od	X Av	erage	Fai	r		Poor			
Leaf size		Nor	mal	Sm	all				•			
Epicormic	growth	Yes		x No								
Dieback		Yes		x No								
Growth o	bstructions	x Yes		No		Paver	nent / St	reet	t Light			
Pests/ Dis	eases	x Yes		No		Horse	Chestnut	t Sco	ale			
SITE CO	NDITIONS											
Site chard	ıcter	X Don	nestic	Ind	ustrial	РО	s		Natural	Woods	Gro	up
Landscap	e type	Law	'n	x Ro	adside	Bor	der		Open	Garden	Agri	c
Irrigation		Non	e	-	od	X Ad	equate		Poor	Excessive		
Site distur	bance	Yes		x No					1			
% drip lir	e paved	0%		\vdash	-25%	25	-50%		50-75%	x 75-100%	Othe	er
% drip lir	· ·	0%		x 10	-25%	25	-50%		50-75%	75-100%	Othe	er
·=	e grade lowered	0%		\vdash	-25%	25	-50%		50-75%	75-100%	Othe	er
70 unpiin		x Dra	inage	Sho	allow	X Coi	mpact	х	Drought	Saline	Alko	line
	01113					-		-	1			
Soil probl	C5	Acid	lic	x Vo	lume	Dis	ease		Failure	Slope	Con	aminated
				Ĥ	lume Inage	Dis-		x	Failure Utilities	Slope Veg	Cont	

TARGET

Prevailing wind direction

Targets under tree	х	Building	х	Parking	х	Road	х	Pedestrian	Recreation	Landscape	
-	х	Hardscape		Utility		Playing		Other	 4	-	
Can target be moved		Yes	х	No		-					
Restrict usage?		Yes	х	No							
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	X	Frequent		Constant	Other		

South westerly

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT)					
Suspect Root Rot Fruiting body present	Yes Yes	X No				
Exposed roots	Severe	X Moderate	Low	None		
Undermined	Severe	Moderate	Low	-		
Root pruned	Yes	Н.	% Root area affe	<u> </u>		
Buttress wounded	⊢ ,,	X No	Approx age of w	_		0-5 yrs
	\rightarrow	<u> </u>		_		0-3 yis
Restricted root area	Severe	X Moderate	Low	None		
Potential for root failure	Severe	X Moderate	Low	¬		
Lean	Natural	Unnatural	Corrected	Angle		
Soil heave	Yes	X No	Decay in plane o	f lean	Yes	X No
Roots broken	Yes	X No	Soil cracking		Yes	X No
Compounding factors	Yes	X No				_
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	(N)					
DEFECT	Ro	ot Flare	Trunk	Scaffo	old	Branch
Poor taper						
Bow, sweep						
Co-dominants / forks						
Multiple attachments						
Included bark Excessive end weight						
Cracks / Splits						
Hangers						
Girdling						
Wounds / Seam		Yes				
Decay		Yes				
Cavity		Yes				
Fungal Fruiting Bodies						
Bleeding / Sap Flow						
Loose / Cracked Bark		Yes				
Birds / Bats / Bees Deadwood / Stubs						
Borers / Ants etc						
Cankers / Galls						
Previous failure						
HAZARD RATING						
Part most likely to fail	Whole tree	Scaffold	X Branch	Other		
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other		
1.0 + 1.0 + 4.0 Failure Size of Potential Part Ratin	et Hazard	Failure Potential Size of part Target Rating	1 Low 1 15cm 1 Occasional	2 Medium 2 15-45cm 2 Intermittent	3 High 3 45-7 3 Frequ	—
HAZARD ABATEMEN	т	. a. go kag			<u> </u>	
Prune	X Yes	No	Reduce away from st	reet liaht		
Inspect Further	Root	H_		Monitor	Other	
Remove tree	Yes		Replace Tree	7 -	Yes	No
Move target	Yes	X No	Other			L
		ت ت				
COMMENTS						
Extensive basal damage. H	orse Chestnut S	cale. Obstructing	g street light. Resiste	ograph		



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

HAZARD RATING												
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0									
Failure	Size of	Target	Hazard									
Potential	Part	Rating	Rating									
Immedi	Immediate action needed											
Needs	ection											
	Dead Tree											

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height		Crow	n Spread	Crown Clear	Specia Value
2243	Beech	М	Gen Sym	Dom	1	860	25			21		
Observo	ations											
TREE H	IEALTH											
- oliage	colour	Nori	mal	Chlo	orotic	Ne	crotic					
Foliage		Nori		Spo								
-	n growth	Goo		X Ave		Poo	or					
	vood devlopment	Goo		X Ave		Poo			None			
/itality o		Goo		X Ave		Fai			Poor			
eaf size		Nori		Smo								
	c growth	Yes		X No								
Dieback	-	Yes		X No								
	obstructions	X Yes		No		Pavem	nent					
Pests/ D		Yes		X No								
SITE C	ONDITIONS											
Site chai	racter	X Dom	estic	Indu	ustrial	РО	S		Natural	Woods	Gro	up
Landsca	pe type	Law	n	X Roa	dside	Bor	der		Open	Garden	Agr	c
rrigatio	n	Non	е	God	od	X Add	equate		Poor	Excessive		
Site dist	urbance	Yes		X No					-			
% drip l	ine paved	0%		10-	25%	25-	-50%		50-75%	x 75-100%	Oth	er
% drip l	ine soil	0%		x 10-	25%	25-	-50%		50-75%	75-100%	Oth	er
% dripli	ne grade lowered	0%		x 10-	25%	25-	-50%		50-75%	75-100%	Oth	er
Soil prol	olems	X Drai	nage	Sha	llow	X Cor	mpact	x	Drought	Saline	Alko	ıline
		Acid	ic	x Volu	Jme	Disc	ease		Failure	Slope	Con	taminated
Obstruct	ions	Ligh	ts	Sigr	nage	LO	S		Utilities	Veg	Oth	er
Exposure	e to wind	Оре	en	X Prot	rected	Gro	oup		Prone			
Droveti.		C	ابر مقمم،						•			

TARGET

Prevailing wind direction

South westerly

Targets under tree	х	Building	х	Parking	x	Road	x	Pedestrian	Recreation	Landscape	•
	x	Hardscape		Utility		Playing		Other	-	 _	
Can target be moved		Yes	х	No		•		•			
Restrict usage?		Yes	х	No							
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	X	Frequent		Constant	Other		

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT)				
Suspect Root Rot	Yes	x No			
Fruiting body present	Yes	x No			
Exposed roots	Severe	X Moderate	Low	None	
Undermined	Severe	Moderate	Low	None	
Root pruned	X Yes	No	% Root area affe	acted Possible	
Buttress wounded	Yes	x No	Approx age of w		
Restricted root area	Severe	X Moderate	Low	None	
Potential for root failure	Severe	H	Low	Trone	
	Natural	X Moderate Unnatural	Corrected	T _{Americ}	
Lean		⊢		Angle	
Soil heave	Yes	X No	Decay in plane of		<u> </u>
Roots broken	Yes	X No	Soil cracking	Yes	X No
C		N-			
Compounding factors	Yes	X No			
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	/NI)				
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	14)				
DEFECT	Roe	ot Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Poor taper			···•····		214
Bow, sweep					
Co-dominants / forks					
Multiple attachments					
Included bark					
Excessive end weight					
Cracks / Splits					
Hangers					
Girdling Wounds / Seam					
Decay			Ś		
Cavity			Ś		
Fungal Fruiting Bodies			·		
Bleeding / Sap Flow				Yes	
Loose / Cracked Bark					
Birds / Bats / Bees					
Deadwood / Stubs					Yes
Borers / Ants etc					
Cankers / Galls					
Previous failure					
HAZARD RATING					
HAZAKU KATING					
D				٦٠٠	
Part most likely to fail	Whole tree	\vdash	X Branch	Other	
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other	
			. —		
1.0 + 1.0 + 4.0	0 → 6.0	Failure Potentia	<u> </u>	2 Medium 3 High	—
Failure Size of Targe		Size of part	1 15cm	2 15-45cm 3 45-	75cm 4 > 75cm
Potential Part Ratin	g Rating	Target Rating	1 Occasional	2 Intermittent 3 Free	quent 4 Constant
	_				
HAZARD ABATEMEN	Γ				
_					
Prune	x Yes	No	Crown lift and deadw	ood	
Inspect Further	X Root	Decay	X Aerial	Monitor X Other	Rootplate
Remove tree	Yes	x No	Replace Tree	Yes	No
Move target	Yes	X No	Other		<u> </u>
					
COMMENTS					
Construction disturbance. le	vels changed. V	Veeping from so	caffold unions. Some	swelling to stem.	
Requies additional root pla	te investigation	using airspade.			



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

HAZARD RATING											
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0								
Failure	Size of	Target	Hazard								
Potential	Rating	Rating									
Immedi	ate action r	needed									
Needs further inspection											

TREE CHARACTERISTICS

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crown Spread	Crown Clear	Special Value
2244	Beech	М	Gen Sym	Dom	1	880	23	20		

2244	реесп	//	` Sym	Do	m l ı	0	80 23			20			
Observat	tions Pollarded	histo	rically										
TREE H	EALTH												
Foliage c	olour		Normal		Chlorotic		Necrotic						
Foliage d			Normal		Sparse		J						
Extension		\Box	Good	x	Average		Poor						
Woundw	ood devlopment		Good	x	Average		Poor		None				
Vitality cl	lass		Good	x	Average		Fair		Poor				
Leaf size			Normal		Small		4		-1				
Epicormic	growth		Yes	x	No								
Dieback			Yes	x	No								
Growth o	bstructions	X	Yes		No	Pa	vement /	Stree	t light				
Pests/ Dis	seases		Yes	x	No								
SITE CC	ONDITIONS												
C*. I				Ш.			l _{POS}	_	1		1		
Site char		-	Domestic	ш	Industrial			-	Natural	-	Woods	Gro	•
Landscap	7.7	\vdash	Lawn	-	Roadside		Border	-	Open	-	Garden	Agr	С
Irrigation		\vdash	None	-	Good	X	Adequate		Poor	<u> </u>	Excessive		
Site distu		\vdash	Yes 0%	Ĥ	No 10-25%	_	25-50%		50-75%		75-100%	Oth	
% drip lin	=	\vdash	0% 0%				25-50%		50-75%	Х	75-100% 75-100%	Oth	
% drip lin		\vdash	0%		10-25% 10-25%		25-50%	-	50-75%	-	75-100% 75-100%	Oth	
•	e grade lowered	Н.			Shallow	-	1_	-	-		Saline	Alko	
Soil prob	iems	Ĥ	Drainage	\vdash		Х		X	Drought		-		
المعاملات المعاملات		\vdash	Acidic	$\stackrel{f \sim}{-}$	Volume		Disease LOS	H-	Failure Utilities	-	Slope		taminated
Obstruction		-	Lights Open	-	Signage Protected			Х	Prone		Veg	Oth	≓ I
Exposure		ш	•	-	гтогестеа		Group		rrone				
rievailin	g wind direction	3001	th westerly										

TARGET

Targets under tree	Ĥ	Building Hardscape	^	Parking Utility		Road Playing	x	Pedestrian Other	Recreation	Landscape	
Can target be moved		Yes	х	No		<u>-</u> '					
Restrict usage?		Yes	x	No							
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	x	Frequent		Constant	Other		

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT)					
Suspect Root Rot	Yes	X No			
Fruiting body present	Yes	x No		_	
Exposed roots	Severe	X Moderate	Low	None	
Undermined	Severe	Moderate	Low	None	
Root pruned	X Yes	No	% Root area affe	cted Possible	
Buttress wounded	Yes	x No	Approx age of w	ound	
Restricted root area	Severe	X Moderate	Low	None	
Potential for root failure	Severe	X Moderate	Low	4	
Lean	Natural	Unnatural	Corrected	Angle	
Soil heave	Yes	X No	Decay in plane of	J	X No
Roots broken	Yes	X No	Soil cracking	Yes	
			oon or downing		
Compounding factors	Yes	X No			
compositating raciors			-		
TREE DEFECTS (CROWI	N)				
THE DETECTS (CHOTTE	•/				
DEFECT	Rod	ot Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Poor taper					
Bow, sweep					
Co-dominants / forks					
Multiple attachments					
Included bark					
Excessive end weight					
Cracks / Splits Hangers					
Girdling					
Wounds / Seam					
Decay					
Cavity					
Fungal Fruiting Bodies					
Bleeding / Sap Flow					
Loose / Cracked Bark					
Birds / Bats / Bees Deadwood / Stubs					
Borers / Ants etc					
Cankers / Galls					
Previous failure					
HAZARD RATING					
Part most likely to fail	Whole tree	Scaffold	X Branch	Other	
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other	
. ,				<u> </u>	
1.0 . 1.0 . 4.0	_ 6.0	Failure Potential	1 Low	2 Medium 3 Hig	h Severe
Failure Size of Target	Hazard	Size of part	1 15cm		75cm 4 > 75cm
Potential Part Rating	Rating	Target Rating	1 Occasional	2 Intermittent 3 Fre	
		99			
HAZARD ABATEMENT	ı				
Prune	X Yes	No	Reducew away from s	treet light	
Inspect Further	<u> </u>	Decay	Aerial],, ,,	Root plate
Remove tree		No	Replace Tree	·	No
	Yes	<u> </u>	Other	X	
Move target		X No			
COMMENTS					
Obstructing street light and r	road sian Cons	truction disturb	ance - levels shanas	d	
				u.	
Requires additonal root plat	e investigation	osing an spade	·•		



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

HAZARD RATING											
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0								
Failure	Size of	Target	Hazard								
Potential	Rating	Rating									
Immedi	ate action r	needed									
Needs	ection										
	Dead Tree										

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crow	n Spread	Crown Clear	Special Value
2245	Beech	М	Gen Sym	Dom	1	610	16		17		
Observ											
Pollard	led historically.										
TREE I	HEALTH										
Foliage	colour	Nori	mal	Chlo	orotic	Nec	rotic				
Foliage		Nor		Spa			· One				
	on growth	Goo		—	rage	Poo	r				
	wood devlopment	Goo			rage	Poo		None			
Vitality	· ·	Goo			rage	Fair		Poor			
Leaf siz		Nori		Sma	•	Ш. «					
	ic growth	Yes		x No							
Dieback	=	Yes		X No							
	obstructions	x Yes		No		Pavem	ent				
Pests/ D		Yes		x No							
SITE C	ONDITIONS										
Site cha	ıracter	X Dom	estic		strial	POS	5	Natural	Woods	Gro	-
Landsca	ipe type	Law	n	X Roa	dside	Bord	der	Open	Garden	Agri	С
Irrigatio	on	Non	е	Goo	od	X Ade	quate	Poor	Excessive		
	turbance	Yes		X No							
	line paved	0%		10-2	25%	25-	50%	50-75%	x 75-100%	Othe	er
% drip		0%			25%		50%	50-75%	75-100%	Othe	er
-	ine grade lowered	0%		x 10-2	25%		50%	50-75%	75-100%	Othe	er
Soil pro	blems	X Drai	inage	Shal		X Con		X Drought	Saline	Alka	line
		Acid		x Volu		Dise	ase	Failure	Slope	Cont	aminated
Obstruc		X Light	ts	_	age	LOS		Utilities	Veg	Othe	er
-	e to wind	Оре		X Prot	ected	Gro	ир	Prone			
Prevaili	ng wind direction	South v	vesterly								
TARG	ET										
Targets	under tree	X Build	ding dscape	X Park	-	X Roa		X Pedestrian Other	Recreation Street light	Lanc	Iscape
Can tar	get be moved	Yes	,	x No				ت	J		
	-	—									

Targets under tree	х	Building	х	Parking	х	Road	x	Pedestrian	Recreation	Landscape
	х	Hardscape		Utility		Playing	х	Other	Street light	_
Can target be moved		Yes	х	No		-				
Restrict usage?		Yes	х	No						
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	x	Frequent		Constant	Other	

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT)					
Suspect Root Rot	Yes	X No			
Fruiting body present	Yes	X No		_	
Exposed roots	Severe	X Moderate	Low	None	
Undermined	Severe	Moderate	Low	None	
Root pruned	X Yes	No	% Root area affe	cted Possible	
Buttress wounded	Yes	x No	Approx age of w	ound	
Restricted root area	Severe	X Moderate	Low	None	
Potential for root failure	Severe	X Moderate	Low	4	
Lean	Natural	Unnatural	Corrected	Angle	
Soil heave	Yes	X No	Decay in plane of	J .	x No
Roots broken	X Yes	No	Soil cracking	Yes	<u> </u>
ROOTS BTOKET	X 163		Jon cracking		A
Compounding factors	Yes	X No			
Compositating ractors		_X_N°			
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	N)				
TREE DEFECTS (CROW)	•/				
DEFECT	Roc	ot Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Poor taper	, KOX	or r raic	HOIK	Scarroia	Branen
Bow, sweep					
Co-dominants / forks					
Multiple attachments					
Included bark					
Excessive end weight					
Cracks / Splits					
Hangers					
Girdling Wounds / Seam					
Decay					
Cavity				Yes	
Fungal Fruiting Bodies				103	
Bleeding / Sap Flow					
Loose / Cracked Bark					
Birds / Bats / Bees					
Deadwood / Stubs					
Borers / Ants etc					
Cankers / Galls					
Previous failure					
LIAZADO DATINO					
HAZARD RATING					
D				ام.	
Part most likely to fail	Whole tree	—	X Branch	Other	
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other	
1.0 + 1.0 + 4.0	→ 6.0	Failure Potential	<u> </u>	2 Medium 3 Hig	_
Failure Size of Target	Hazard	Size of part	1 15cm		75cm 4 > 75cm
Potential Part Rating	Rating	Target Rating	1 Occasional	2 Intermittent 3 Free	quent 4 Constant
HAZARD ABATEMENT					
		_			
Prune	Yes	x No		, 	
Inspect Further	X Root	Decay	X Aerial	Monitor X Other	Rootplate
Remove tree	Yes	X No	Replace Tree	Yes	X No
Move target	Yes	x No	Other	_ 	<u> </u>
COMMENTS					
Cavities to two scaffold limb	s. Root damage	e. Construction of	disturbance - levels o	changed.	
Requires additional troot pla	ıte investigation	n using air spad	le.		



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

Normal

	HAZARD RATING												
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0										
Failure Potential	Size of Part	Target Rating	Hazard Rating										
lmmedi	ate action r	needed											
Needs	ection												
	Dead Tree												

TREE CHARACTERISTICS

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crown Spread	Crown Clear	Special Value
2246	Liriodendron?	Y	Minor Asym	Dom	1	72	3	2		
Observations										
TREE HEALTH										

Foliage density	Normal		Sparse		_	
Extension growth	Good	x	Average		Poor	 _
Woundwood devlopment	Good		Average	х	Poor	None
Vitality class	Good	X	Average		Fair	Poor
Leaf size	Normal		Small			
Epicormic growth	Yes	x	No			
Dieback	Yes	X	No			

Necrotic

Chlorotic

SITE CONDITIONS

Growth obstructions
Pests/ Diseases

Foliage colour

Site character	х	Domestic		Industrial		POS		Natural		Woods		Group
Landscape type		Lawn	х	Roadside		Border		Open		Garden		Agric
Irrigation		None		Good	х	Adequate		Poor		Excessive		•
Site disturbance		Yes	х	No				-		-		
% drip line paved		0%		10-25%		25-50%		50-75%	х	75-100%		Other
% drip line soil		0%	x	10-25%		25-50%		50-75%		75-100%		Other
% dripline grade lowered		0%	x	10-25%		25-50%		50-75%		75-100%		Other
Soil problems	х	Drainage		Shallow	х	Compact	х	Drought		Saline		Alkaline
		Acidic	x	Volume		Disease		Failure		Slope		Contaminated
Obstructions		Lights		Signage		LOS		Utilities		Veg		Other
Exposure to wind		Open	x	Protected		Group		Prone		-		•
Prevailing wind direction	South westerly											

TARGET

Targets under tree	<u> </u>	Building Hardscape	^	Parking Utility		Road Playing	Pedestrian Other	Recreation	Landscape	
Can target be moved		Yes	х	No		<u>-</u> '	<u>-</u>			
Restrict usage?		Yes	x	No						
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	X	Frequent	Constant	Other		

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT)						
Suspect Root Rot Fruiting body present Exposed roots Undermined Root pruned Buttress wounded Restricted root area Potential for root failure Lean Soil heave Roots broken Compounding factors	Yes Yes Yes Severe Yes Yes Severe Severe Natural Yes Yes Yes	X No X No X Moderate Moderate X No X Moderate X Moderate Unnatural X No X No	Low Low % Root area affe Approx age of w Low Low Corrected Decay in plane of Soil cracking	ected round None	Yes Yes	X No X No
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	N)					
DEFECT	D. a	A Elama	Turnele	S a mfd	in la	Dunn ah
DEFECT	Koo	t Flare	Trunk	Scaff	rola	Branch
Poor taper						
Bow, sweep						
Co-dominants / forks						
Multiple attachments						
Included bark						
Excessive end weight						
Cracks / Splits						
Hangers						
Girdling						
Wounds / Seam	,	Yes				
Decay						
Cavity						
Fungal Fruiting Bodies						
Bleeding / Sap Flow						
Loose / Cracked Bark						
Birds / Bats / Bees						
Deadwood / Stubs						
Borers / Ants etc						
Cankers / Galls						
Previous failure						
HAZARD RATING						
_				7		
Part most likely to fail	X Whole tree	Scaffold	Branch	Other		
Inspection frequency	★ Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other		
1.0 _ 1.0 _ 4.0	6.0	Failure Potential	1 Low	2 Medium	3 High	4 Severe
Failure Size of Target	Hazard	Size of part	1 15cm	2 15-45cm	3 45-7	75cm 4 > 75cm
Potential Part Rating		Target Rating	1 Occasional	2 Intermitter		uent 4 Constant
HAZARD ABATEMENT	•					
D	\square	—	E. II.	. 1		
Prune	X Yes	No	Fell to ground level a	- i	_	
Inspect Further	Root	Decay	Aerial	Monitor	Other	
Remove tree	x Yes	No	Replace Tree		X Yes	No
Move target	Yes	x No	Other	L		
3 -		ت	Ш _			
COMMENTS						
Extensive basal damage.						



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last	Not available
inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

	HAZARD	RATING	
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0
Failure Potential	Size of	Target Rating	Hazard Rating
lmmedi	ate action r		
Needs	pection		

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crown Spread	Crown Clear	Special Value
2247	Beech	М	Gen Sym	Dom	1	655	17	10		

Tree ID	Species	Class	Form	Class	Stems	DBH	Height		Crown	Spread	Clear	Value
2247	Beech	М	Gen Sym	Dom	1	655	17		1	0		
Obsor	vations											
	ed historically											
i oliai a	ea historically											
TREE	HEALTH											
Foliage	colour	Norr	nal	Chlo	orotic	Ne	crotic					
•	edensity	Norr	nal	Spa	rse	ш						
-	on growth	Goo	d	X Ave	rage	Po	or					
	lwood devlopment	Goo	d	X Ave	-	Po		N	one			
Vitality	•	Goo	d	X Ave		Fa	ir	P	oor			
Leaf siz		Norr	nal	Smo				ш.				
Epicorn	nic growth	Yes		X No								
Diebac	k	Yes		x No								
Growth	obstructions	X Yes		No		Paver	nent					
Pests/	Diseases	Yes		x No								
•												
SITE C	CONDITIONS											
Site cho	aracter	X Dom	estic		strial	PC	S	N	atural	Woods	Gro	ıρ
Landsc	ape type	Lawı	1	X Roa	dside	Во	rder)pen	Garden	Agri	C
Irrigati	on	None	•	God	od	X Ad	equate	Po	oor	Excessive		
Site dis	turbance	Yes		X No								
% drip	line paved	0%		10-	25%	25	-50%	5	0-75%	x 75-100%	Othe	er
-	line soil	0%		x 10-3	25%	25	-50%	5	0-75%	75-100%	Othe	er
% drip	line grade lowered	0%		x 10-3	25%	25	-50%	\vdash	0-75%	75-100%	Othe	er
Soil pro	oblems	X Drai	nage	Sha	llow	x Co	mpact	x D	rought	Saline	Alka	line
		Acid	ic	X Volu	ıme	Dis	ease		ailure	Slope	Cont	aminated
Obstru	ctions	Light	s	~	age	LC	S	x U	tilities	Veg	Othe	er
Exposu	re to wind	Оре	n	X Prot	ected	Gr	oup	Pi	rone			
Prevail	ing wind direction	South w	esterly									
TARG	ET											
Tarast	s under tree	X Build	lina	x Parl	vina	x Ro	ad	D.	edestrian	Recreation		scape
rurger	onder nee		-	الشا	-	-		<u> </u>	edesirian Other	Keereanon	L	Scupe
		X Hard	lscape	X Utili	ıy	P10	ying	\Box	inei			

Targets under tree	Ĥ	Building Hardscape	^	Parking Utility		Road Playing	x	Pedestrian Other	Recreation	Landscape	
Can target be moved		Yes	х	No		<u>-</u> '					
Restrict usage?		Yes	x	No							
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	x	Frequent		Constant	Other		

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT)					
Suspect Root Rot	x Yes	No			
Fruiting body present	Yes	X No			
Exposed roots	Severe	X Moderate	Low	None	
Undermined	Severe	Moderate	Low X	None	
Root pruned	Yes	X No	% Root area affe	cted	
Buttress wounded	Yes	x No	Approx age of w		
Restricted root area	X Severe	Moderate	Low	None	
Potential for root failure	Severe	X Moderate	Low	1	
Lean	Natural	Unnatural	Corrected	Angle	
Soil heave	Yes	H.,	Decay in plane of	J	s No
Roots broken	Н.,	X No No	Soil cracking	Yes	 ^
ROOIS DIOREII	X Yes		3011 Crucking	165	X No
Campa a undina de faratava	Yes	No.			
Compounding factors	Tes	X No			
TREE DEFECTS (CROWN	۸N				
TREE DEFECTS (CROWI	<u>*)</u>				
DEFECT	Por	ot Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Poor taper	Koc	riule	HOHK	Scarroid	branch
Bow, sweep					
Co-dominants / forks					
Multiple attachments					
Included bark					
Excessive end weight					
Cracks / Splits					
Hangers					
Girdling Wounds / Seam	-				
Decay	_				
Cavity	_				
Fungal Fruiting Bodies	_				
Bleeding / Sap Flow					
Loose / Cracked Bark					
Birds / Bats / Bees					
Deadwood / Stubs					
Borers / Ants etc					
Cankers / Galls				V	
Previous failure				Yes	
HAZARD RATING					
				٦	
Part most likely to fail	Whole tree	—	X Branch	Other	
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other	
1.0 , 1.0 , 4.0	6.0	Failure Potential	1 Low	2 Medium 3 Hig	h Severe
Failure Size of Target	Hazard	Size of part	1 15cm	2 15-45cm 3 45-	-75cm 4 > 75cm
Potential Part Rating	Rating	Target Rating	1 Occasional	2 Intermittent 3 Fre	quent 4 Constant
HAZARD ABATEMENT			<u>—</u>		—
HATANY AVAILMENT					
Prune	Yes	No	Decompact		
	 			Monitor - Oaks	Dootelete
Inspect Further	X Root	Decay	X Aerial	Monitor X Other	Rootplate
Remove tree	Yes	X No	Replace Tree	Yes	X No
Move target	Yes	X No	Other		
COMMENTS					
Severely compacted. Centre	of tree lost hos	storically. Root	damage.		
Requires additional rrotplate	investigation ι	using airspade.			



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

HAZARD RATING							
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0				
Failure Potential	Size of	Target Rating	Hazard Rating				
lmmedi	ate action r						
Needs further inspection							
	Dead Tree						

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crow	n Spread	Crown Clear	Special Value
2248	Beech	М	Gen Sym	Dom	1	850	25		20		
Observ	rations										
	raised and pollarded	historica	lly.								
TREE	HEALTH										
Foliage	e colour	Nori	mal	Chlc	orotic	Nec	rotic				
	e density	Nori		Spa		Ш					
	on growth	Goo		⊢ ⊢ '	rage	Poo	r				
	lwood devlopment	Goo		<u> </u>	rage	Poo		None			
Vitality		Goo			rage	X Fair		Poor			
Leaf siz		Nori		Smc	_			Ш			
	nic growth	Yes		x No							
Diebac	=	Yes		X No							
	n obstructions	x Yes		No		Pavem	ent				
	Diseases	Yes		x No							
SITE (CONDITIONS										
Site cho	aracter	X Dom	estic	Indu	strial	POS	5	Natural	Woods	Gro	gu
	ape type	Law	n	X Roa	dside	Bor	der	Open	Garden	Agri	
Irrigati		Non	e	Goo	od	X Ade	quate	Poor	Excessive		
_	turbance	X Yes		No		لثا	•				
	line paved	0%		10-:	25%	25-	50%	50-75%	x 75-100%	Othe	er
-	line soil	0%		x 10-:	25%	25-	50%	50-75%	75-100%	Othe	er
-	line grade lowered	0%		_	25%	25-	50%	50-75%	75-100%	Othe	er
Soil pro	oblems	X Drai	inage	Sha	llow	X Con	npact	X Drought	Saline	Alka	line
		Acid	lic	X Volu	ıme	Dise	ease	Failure	Slope	Cont	aminated
Obstru	ctions	Ligh	ts		age	LOS	5	X Utilities	Veg	Othe	er
Exposu	re to wind	Оре	en	X Prot	ected	Gro	oup	Prone			
Prevail	ing wind direction	South v	vesterly								
TARG	ET										
Target	s under tree	X Build	ding dscape	x Parl	Ū	X Roo		X Pedestrian Other	Recreation	Lanc	lscape
Can ta	rget be moved	Yes		X No	•						
	usage?	Yes		X No							
	9	H_{2}^{-1}		\mathbf{H}	•	<u></u>		П а			

Targets under tree	х	Building	x	Parking	x	Road	x	Pedestrian	Recreation	Landscape	
	х	Hardscape	х	Utility		Playing		Other	•	•	
Can target be moved		Yes	х	No		•		•			
Restrict usage?		Yes	х	No							
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	X	Frequent		Constant	Other		

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT)				
Suspect Root Rot Fruiting body present Exposed roots Undermined Root pruned Buttress wounded Restricted root area Potential for root failure Lean Soil heave Roots broken Compounding factors	x Yes Yes X Severe Severe Yes Yes X Severe Natural Yes X Yes	No X No Moderate Moderate X No X No Moderate X Moderate X Moderate Unnatural X No No	Low Low % Root area af Approx age of Low Low Corrected Decay in plane Soil cracking	wound None Angle	<u> </u>
TREE DEFECTS (CROW		L X I™			
	·				
DEFECT	Ro	ot Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Poor taper					
Bow, sweep					
Co-dominants / forks				Yes	
Multiple attachments					
Included bark				Yes	
Excessive end weight					
Cracks / Splits					
Hangers					
Girdling					
Wounds / Seam			Yes		1
Decay					
Cavity				Yes	
Fungal Fruiting Bodies					
Bleeding / Sap Flow					+
Loose / Cracked Bark					+
Birds / Bats / Bees					
Deadwood / Stubs					Yes
Borers / Ants etc	- 				163
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					+
Cankers / Galls					
Previous failure					
HAZARD RATING					
Part most likely to fail	Whole tree	e Scaffold	X Branch	Other	
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other	
1.0 . 1.0 . 4.0	0 _ 6.0	Failure Potentia	I Low	2 Medium 3 Hig	gh 4 Severe
++	 →	Size of part	1 15cm		75cm 4 > 75cm
Failure Size of Target Potential Part Ratin					<u> </u>
roleima run kum	g Kumg	Target Rating	1 Occasiona	al 2 Intermittent 3 Fre	equent 4 Constant
HAZARD ABATEMEN	T				
Prune	Yes	x No			
	_ 	 1	,		n I i
Inspect Further	X Root	Decay	<u> </u>	X Monitor X Other	Root plate
Remove tree	Yes	x No	Replace Tree	Yes	x No
Move target	Yes	x No	Other		
COMMENTS					
	sluded Denres	cion to stam ? -	caffold limbs inclin	dad Trip hazard on a m	omont
Twin stemmed from 7.5m in			carroia iimps inclu	ueu. IIIp nazara on pav	emem.
large pruning wounds behir	nd which are co	lumns of decay.			

Requires additional root plate investigation using airspade.



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

HAZARD RATING							
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0				
Failure Potential	Size of Part	Target Rating	Hazard Rating				
Immedi	ate action r	needed					
Needs	further insp	ection					
	Dead Tree						

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crow	n Spread	Crown Clear	Specia Value
2249	Beech	М	Gen Sym	Dom	1	970	23		20		
	raised and pollarded	historica	lly.								
REE	HEALTH										
oliage	colour	Nori	mal	Chlo	rotic	Ned	rotic				
	density	Nori	mal	Spa	rse						
	on growth	Goo	d	X Ave	rage	Poo	r				
	wood devlopment	Goo	d		rage	Poo	or	None			
/itality	· ·	Goo	d		rage	Fair	•	Poor			
eaf siz		Nori	mal	Smo	ıll						
picorm	nic growth	Yes		x No							
Diebacl	=	Yes		X No							
Growth	obstructions	X Yes		No		Pavem	ent				
ests/[Diseases	Yes		x No							
SITE C	CONDITIONS										
Site cho	aracter	X Dom	estic	Indu	strial	PO	S	Natural	Woods	Gro	ηþ
andsco	ape type	Law	n	X Roa	dside	Bor	der	Open	Garden	Agri	с
rrigatio	on	Non	e	God	od	X Ade	equate	Poor	Excessive		
Site dist	turbance	Yes		X No					<u> </u>		
% drip	line paved	0%			25%	25-	50%	50-75%	x 75-100%	Othe	er
∕₀ drip	line soil	0%		x 10-3	25%	25-	50%	50-75%	75-100%	Othe	er
∕₀ dripl	ine grade lowered	0%		x 10-1	25%	25-	50%	50-75%	75-100%	Othe	er
Soil pro	blems	X Drai	nage	Sha	llow	X Cor	npact	X Drought	Saline	Alka	line
		Acid	ic	X Volu	ıme		ease	Failure	Slope	Cont	aminated
Obstruc	ctions	Ligh	ts	Sign	age	LOS	5	X Utilities	Veg	Othe	er
xposur	re to wind	Оре	en	x Prot	ected	Gro	oup	Prone	_ 		
revaili	ng wind direction	South v	esterly								
ARG	ET										
Targets	under tree	X Build	ding	X Parl	king	X Roo	ıd	X Pedestrian	Recreation	Lanc	Iscape
		X Hard	dscape	X Utili	ty	Pla	ying	Other		- <u></u>	
Can tar	get be moved	Yes		X No							
estrict	usage?	Yes		x No							
Occupa	incy	Pare		Inter	rmittent	Fro.	quent	Constant	Other		

Targets under tree	х	Building	х	Parking	х	Road	x	Pedestrian	Recreation	Landscape
	х	Hardscape	х	Utility		Playing		Other	•	•
Can target be moved		Yes	х	No		•		•		
Restrict usage?		Yes	x	No						
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	X	Frequent		Constant	Other	

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT)					
Suspect Root Rot	X Yes	No			
Fruiting body present	Yes	X No		_	
Exposed roots	Severe	X Moderate	Low	None	
Undermined	Severe	Moderate	Low	None	
Root pruned	Yes	x No	% Root area affe	cted	
Buttress wounded	Yes	x No	Approx age of w	ound	
Restricted root area	X Severe	Moderate	Low	None	
Potential for root failure	Severe	X Moderate	Low	_	
Lean	Natural	Unnatural	Corrected	Angle	
Soil heave	Yes	X No	Decay in plane of	lean Yes	X No
Roots broken	x Yes	No	Soil cracking	Yes	x No
Compounding factors	Yes	X No			
TREE DEFECTS (CROWN	1)				
DEFECT	Roc	ot Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Poor taper					
Bow, sweep Co-dominants / forks					
Multiple attachments					
Included bark					
Excessive end weight					
Cracks / Splits					
Hangers					
Girdling Wounds / Seam				Yes	
Decay				103	
Cavity					
Fungal Fruiting Bodies					
Bleeding / Sap Flow					
Loose / Cracked Bark					
Birds / Bats / Bees Deadwood / Stubs					
Borers / Ants etc					
Cankers / Galls					
Previous failure					
		•			
HAZARD RATING					
Part most likely to fail	Whole tree	Scaffold	X Branch	Other	
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other	
1.0 + 1.0 + 4.0	6.0	Failure Potential	1 Low	2 Medium 3 High	h Severe
Failure Size of Target	Hazard	Size of part	1 15cm	2 15-45cm 3 45-	75cm 4 > 75cm
Potential Part Rating	Rating	Target Rating	1 Occasional	2 Intermittent 3 Free	quent 4 Constant
					
HAZARD ABATEMENT					
Prune	x Yes	No	Decompact	_	
Inspect Further	X Root	Decay	X Aerial	Monitor X Other	Rootplate
Remove tree	Yes	x No	Replace Tree	Yes	X No
Move target	Yes	X No	Other		
COMMENTS					
Severely compacted. Swoller	n base. Root do	amage. Lifitng p	pavement (trip hazaı	rd). Wound at base of	main leader.
Outside school. Requires add	litional rootpla	te investigation	using air spade.		



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

HAZARD RATING								
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0					
Failure Potential	Size of	Target Rating	Hazard Rating					
lmmedi								
Needs	pection							

	CHARACIERISTI										
				ı	1	I	1				
Tree ID	Species	Age	Form	Crown	No.	DBH	Height	Crow	vn Spread	Crown	Specio
		Class		Class	Stems					Clear	Value
2250	Beech	М	Gen	Dom	1	905	24		18		
			Sym								
Observ	rations										
	raised and pollarded	l historica	llv								
CIOWII	raisea ana ponaraea	rinsiorica	пу.								
TREE	HEALTH										
Foliage	colour	Nor	mal	Chlc	orotic	□ _{Ne}	crotic				
	density	Nor		Spa		Ш.,,					
_	on growth	Goo		— I '	rage	Po	or				
	wood devlopment	Goo		<u> </u>	rage	Po		None			
Vitality	•	Good		<u> </u>	rage	x Fa		Poor			
Leaf siz		Nor		Smc	-						
	nic growth	Yes	iiui	-	""						
Diebac	=	Yes		$\stackrel{\sim}{\vdash}$							
	n obstructions	Щ,		X No		Paver					
		x Yes		-		raver	nenr				
rests/ i	Diseases	Yes		X No							
SITE C	CONDITIONS										
Site cho	aracter	X Dom	estic	Indu	strial	PC	os	Natural	Woods	Gro	up
Landsco	ape type	Law	n	X Roa	dside	Во	rder	Open	Garden	Agri	c
rrigatio		Non	е	God	od	X Ad	lequate	Poor	Excessive		
	turbance	x Yes		No				—			
% drip	line paved	0%		10-:	25%	25	-50%	50-75%	x 75-100%	Othe	er
	line soil	0%		x 10-:	25%	25	-50%	50-75%	75-100%	Othe	er
-	line grade lowered	0%		-	25%	25	-50%	50-75%	75-100%	Othe	er
Soil pro	=	X Drai	inage	Sha	llow	x Co	mpact	X Drought	Saline	Alko	ıline
		Acid		X Volu	ıme	-	sease	Failure	Slope	Con	taminated
Obstruc	ctions	Ligh			nage	LC		X Utilities	Veg	Othe	
	re to wind	Оре		-	ected	\mathbf{H}	oup	Prone	щ [°]	Ш	
	ing wind direction	South v		لتئا		Ш .	•				
	3 2 2 2 2		,								
TARG	ET										
-				<u> </u>					<u></u>	<u> </u>	
argets	under tree	X Build		X Parl	-	X Ro		X Pedestrian	Recreation	Land	dscape
_		<u> </u>	dscape	X Utili	ty	Plo	aying	Other			
	rget be moved	Yes		X No							
	usage?	Yes		X No							
Occupo	ncv	Rare	•	Inte	rmittent	I ▼ Fre	eauent	Constant	Other		

Targets under tree	Building Hardscape	Ĥ	Parking Utility		Road Playing	Pedestrian Other	Recre	ation	Landscape
Can target be moved	Yes	х	No						
Restrict usage?	Yes	х	No						
Occupancy	Rare		Intermittent	X	Frequent	Constant	Other		

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT)	1				
Suspect Root Rot	Yes	No			
Fruiting body present	Yes	X No		-	
Exposed roots	X Severe	Moderate	Low	None	
Undermined	Severe	Moderate		None	
Root pruned	Yes	X No	% Root area affe		
Buttress wounded	x Yes	No	Approx age of w	ound	0-5 years
Restricted root area	X Severe	Moderate	Low	None	
Potential for root failure	Severe	X Moderate	Low	-	
Lean	Natural	Unnatural	Corrected	Angle	
Soil heave	Yes	x No	Decay in plane of	f lean Ye	es X No
Roots broken	X Yes	No	Soil cracking	Υe	es X No
Compounding factors	Yes	X No			
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	N)				
DEFECT	Roo	t Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Poor taper					
Bow, sweep				Yes	
Co-dominants / forks Multiple attachments				res	
Included bark				Yes	
Excessive end weight				1.00	
Cracks / Splits					
Hangers					
Girdling					
Wounds / Seam					
Decay Cavity				Yes	
Fungal Fruiting Bodies				res	
Bleeding / Sap Flow					
Loose / Cracked Bark					
Birds / Bats / Bees					
Deadwood / Stubs					
Borers / Ants etc					
Cankers / Galls					
Previous failure					
HAZARD RATING					
Part most likely to fail	Whole tree	Scaffold	X Branch	Other	
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other	
1.0 + 1.0 + 4.0	→ 6.0	Failure Potential	1 Low		gh Severe
Failure Size of Target Potential Part Rating	Hazard Rating	Size of part Target Rating	1 15cm 1 Occasional		5-75cm 4 > 75cm equent 4 Constant
HAZARD ABATEMENT	•				
Prune	Yes	x No		, <u> </u>	
Inspect Further	X Root	X Decay		Monitor X Other	Root plate
Remove tree	Yes	x No	Replace Tree	Yes	X No
Move target	Yes	X No	Other		
COMMENTS					
Suspect meripilus. Bakr necro	osis on roots. Se	verely compact	ed. Cavity in scaffo	ld. Damage to root flo	are. Signficant
		, 1	,	<u> </u>	

inclusion to scaffold. Deep ribbing. Requires additional root plate investigation using airspade. Requires additional root plate investigation using airspade.



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

	HAZARD RATING											
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0									
Failure Potential	Size of Part	Target Rating	Hazard Rating									
lmmedi	ate action r	needed										
Needs	further insp	ection										
	Dead Tree											

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crow	n Spread	Crown Clear	Specia Value
2251	Beech	М	Gen Sym	Dom	1	1010	24		18		
Obsorv	rations										
	raised and pollarded	historica	ıllv								
CIOWII	raisea ana ponaraea	illisionico	ıııy.								
TDEE	HEALTH										
IKEE	HEALIH										
oliage	colour	Nor	mal	Chlo	orotic	Ne	crotic				
-	edensity	Nor	mal	Spa	ırse						
-	on growth	God	od	X Ave	rage	Pod	or				
	wood devlopment	God	od		rage	Poo	or	None			
/itality	•	God	od	<u> </u>	rage	x Fai	r	Poor			
eaf siz		Nor	mal	Smc	-	لتير		—			
	nic growth	Yes		x No							
Diebac	=	Yes		X No							
	obstructions	x Yes		No		Paven	nent / St	reet light			
	Diseases	Yes		x No			, ,				
SITE C	CONDITIONS										
Site cho	aracter	X Don	nestic	Indu	ıstrial	РС	S	Natural	Woods	Gro	au
	ape type	Law	'n	X Roa	dside	Boi	der	Open	Garden	Agri	•
rrigatio		Non	e	God		X Ad	eauate	Poor	Excessive	ш °	
	turbance	X Yes	-	No.			- 4				
	line paved	0%			25%	25	-50%	50-75%	x 75-100%	Othe	er
-	line soil	0%			25%		-50%	50-75%	75-100%	Othe	
-	line grade lowered	0%			25%		-50%	50-75%	75-100%	Othe	
-	oblems		inage	L A	llow	x Co		x Drought	Saline	Alko	
on pre	, Dicinis	Acid		H.,			ease	Failure	Slope		aminated
Obstruc	ctions	X Ligh			nage	LO		Utilities	Veg	Othe	
	re to wind	Ope		H_{-}	tected	\vdash	oup	Prone			-1
-	ing wind direction		vesterly	لتنا	ecieu		оор	Trone			
i c vuili	ing wind difection	300111 V	· calcily								
ΓARG	ET										
Ган			alta a		letin a:		al	D1- · ·	D	<u> </u>	Janus -
argets	under tree	X Build		X Parl	•	X Roo		X Pedestrian	Recreation	Land	Iscape
_	. 1	<u> </u>	dscape	X Utili	ty	Plo	ying	Other			
	rget be moved	Yes		X No							
	usage?	Yes		X No							
Occupo	ancy	Rare	е	Inte	rmittent	x Fre	quent	Constant	Other		

IREE DEFECTS (ROOT)					
Suspect Root Rot Fruiting body present Exposed roots Undermined Root pruned Buttress wounded Restricted root area Potential for root failure Lean Soil heave Roots broken	X Yes Yes Yes X Severe Yes Yes X Severe Severe Natural Yes X Yes	No X No Moderate Moderate X No X No Moderate X Moderate X Moderate Unnatural X No No	Low Low % Root area aff Approx age of Low Low Corrected Decay in plane Soil cracking	wound None Angle	Yes Yes	X No No
Compounding factors	Yes	X No				
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	/N)					
DEFECT	Ro	ot Flare	Trunk	Scaffold		Branch
Poor taper						
Bow, sweep						
Co-dominants / forks						
Multiple attachments						
Included bark						
Excessive end weight						
Cracks / Splits						
Hangers						
Girdling						
Wounds / Seam			Yes			
Decay			163			
Cavity						
Fungal Fruiting Bodies						
Bleeding / Sap Flow						
Loose / Cracked Bark						
Birds / Bats / Bees						
Deadwood / Stubs						
Borers / Ants etc						
Cankers / Galls						
Previous failure						
HAZARD RATING						
Part most likely to fail	Whole tree	e Scaffold	X Branch	Other		
Inspection frequency	⊢⊢	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other		
inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearry	J - Tedity	Olliei		
1.0 _ 1.0 _ 4.0	6.0	Failure Potentia	I Low	2 Medium	3 High	4 Severe
Failure Size of Targe	et Hazard	Size of part	1 15cm	2 15-45cm	3 45-75cm	4 > 75cm
Potential Part Rating		Target Rating	1 Occasiona	l 2 Intermittent	3 Frequent	4 Constant
		ranger kaning	Occusiona		3 requein	Constant
	_					
HAZARD ABATEMEN	Γ					
Prune	Yes	X No				
Inspect Further	X Root	Decay	Aerial	X Monitor X	Other	Root plate
		⊢ ⊢ `				¬
Remove tree	Yes	X No	Replace Tree		Yes	K No
Move target	Yes	X No	Other			
COMMENTS						
Signficant ribbing to stem. S	Severely compo	acted. Suspect m	eripilus infection. R	Root damaae.		
Obstructing street light.			-			
Change and a light.						

Requires additional root plate investigation using airspade.



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

HAZARD RATING												
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0									
Failure Potential	Size of	Target Rating	Hazard Rating									
lmmedi	ate action r											
Needs	further insp	pection										
	Dead Tree											

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crow	n Spread	Crown Clear	Special Value
2252	Beech	М	Gen Sym	Dom	1	1075	25		19		
Observ											
Crown	raised and pollarded	historica	lly.								
TREE	HEALTH										
Foliage	e colour	Nor	mal	Chlo	orotic	Nec	crotic				
	edensity	Nori	mal	Spa	rse						
	on growth	Goo	od	H '	rage	Poo	or				
	lwood devlopment	Goo	od	X Ave		Poo	or	None			
Vitality	-	Goo	od	X Ave		Fai	r	Poor			
Leaf siz		Nori	mal	Smo							
	nic growth	Yes		x No							
Diebacl	•	Yes		X No							
Growth	obstructions	x Yes		No		Pavem	ent and	l phone lines			
Pests/[Diseases	Yes		X No				•			
SITE C	CONDITIONS										
Site cho	aracter	X Dom	nestic	Indu	strial	РО	S	Natural	Woods	Gro	ηþ
Landsco	ape type	Law	n	x Roa	dside	Bor	der	Open	Garden	Agri	с
Irrigatio	on	Non	е	Goo	od	X Add	equate	Poor	Excessive		
Site dis	turbance	Yes		x No					<u> </u>		
% drip	line paved	0%		10-	25%	25-	-50%	50-75%	x 75-100%	Othe	er
% drip	line soil	0%		x 10-:	25%	25-	-50%	50-75%	75-100%	Othe	er
% dripl	line grade lowered	0%		x 10-:	25%	25-	-50%	50-75%	75-100%	Othe	er
Soil pro	oblems	X Drai	inage	Sha	llow	X Cor	mpact	X Drought	Saline	Alka	line
		Acid	lic	X Volu	ıme	Disc	ease	Failure	Slope	Cont	aminated
Obstruc	ctions	Ligh	ts	Sign	age	LO:	S	X Utilities	Veg	Othe	er
Exposui	re to wind	Оре	en	X Prot	ected	Gro	oup	Prone		<u>-</u>	
Prevaili	ing wind direction	South v	vesterly	,							
TARG	ET										
Targets	s under tree	X Build		X Parl		X Roo		X Pedestrian	Recreation	Lanc	Iscape
_		$\stackrel{\sim}{\vdash}$	dscape	X Utili	ty	Pla	ying	Other			
	rget be moved	Yes		X No							
	usage?	Yes		X No							
Occupo	ancy	Rare	•	Inte	rmittent	x Fre	quent	Constant	Other		

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT)				
Suspect Root Rot	X Yes	No			
Fruiting body present	Yes	x No			
Exposed roots	Severe	X Moderate	Low	None	
Undermined	Severe	Moderate	Low	None	
Root pruned	Yes	X No	% Root area affe	cted	
Buttress wounded	Yes	x No	Approx age of w	ound	
Restricted root area	X Severe	Moderate	Low	None	
Potential for root failure	Severe	X Moderate	Low	<u> </u>	
Lean	Natural	Unnatural	Corrected	Angle	
Soil heave	Yes	X No	Decay in plane of	J	X No
Roots broken	X Yes	No	Soil cracking	Yes	
ROOIS DIORCII	X 100		Jon cracking		A
Compounding factors	Yes	x No			
compounding racions	Ш				
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	/N)				
	•				
DEFECT	Roo	ot Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Poor taper					
Bow, sweep					
Co-dominants / forks					
Multiple attachments					
Included bark Excessive end weight					
Cracks / Splits					
Hangers					
Girdling					
Wounds / Seam			Yes		
Decay					
Cavity					
Fungal Fruiting Bodies					
Bleeding / Sap Flow					
Loose / Cracked Bark					V
Birds / Bats / Bees Deadwood / Stubs					Yes
Borers / Ants etc					
Cankers / Galls					
Previous failure					
HAZARD RATING					
				_	
Part most likely to fail	Whole tree	Scaffold	X Branch	Other	
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other	
1.0 + 1.0 + 4.0	6.0	Failure Potentia	l low	2 Medium 3 Hig	h 4 Severe
Failure Size of Targe	et Hazard	Size of part	1 15cm	2 15-45cm 3 45-	75cm 4 > 75cm
Potential Part Ratin	g Rating	Target Rating	1 Occasional	2 Intermittent 3 Free	quent 4 Constant
					-
HAZARD ABATEMEN	Τ				
Prune	x Yes	No	Decompact	_	
Inspect Further	X Root	X Decay	X Aerial	Monitor X Other	Rootplate
Remove tree	Yes	x No	Replace Tree	Yes	x No
Move target	Yes	X No	Other	_	
COMMENTS					
Severely compacted. Root of	damage. Phone	lines. Ribbing to	o stem. Cavity in sca	ffold. Nesting bird.	
Outside school. Requires ad	lditional rootpla	te investigation	using air spade.		



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

Acidic

Lights

Open

South westerly

	HAZARD RATING											
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0									
Failure Potential	Size of Part	Target Rating	Hazard Rating									
lmmedi	ate action r	needed										
Needs	further insp	ection										
	Dead Tree											

TREE CHARACTERISTICS

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Cro	own Spread	Crown Clear	Specio Value
2253	Birch	Y	Gen Sym	Dom	1	95	4		3		
Observat	ions										
TREE HI	EALTH										
Foliage c	olour	Nor	mal	Chl	orotic	Ne	crotic				
Foliage d	ensity	Nor	mal	Spo	arse						
xtension	growth	God	od	X Ave	erage	Pod	or				
Woundwo	ood devlopment	God	od	X Ave	erage	Poo	or	None			
Vitality cl	ass	God	od	Ave	erage	X Fai	r	Poor			
Leaf size		Nor	mal	Sm	all						
Epicormic	growth	Yes		x No							
Dieback		Yes		x No							
Growth o	bstructions	x Yes		No		Pavem	ent				
Pests/ Dis	seases	Yes		X No							
SITE CO	NDITIONS										
Site chard		X Don	nestic		ustrial	PO		Natural	Woods	Gro	•
Landscap	e type	Law		X Roo			der	Open	Garden	Agri	С
rrigation		Nor	ie	Go		X Add	equate	Poor	Excessive		
Site distu		X Yes		No							
-	ne paved	0%			-25%	_	-50%	50-75%	x 75-100%	-	
% drip lir		0%		x 10.			-50%	50-75%	75-100%		
% drinling	e grade lowered	0%		x 10.	-25%	25-	-50%	50-75%	75-100%	Othe	er
Soil prob		\vdash			allow	\vdash		X Drought	Saline	Alko	

TARGET

Obstructions

Exposure to wind

Prevailing wind direction

Targets under tree	x	Building	х	Parking	x	Road	x	Pedestrian	Recreation	Landscape	
	x	Hardscape	x	Utility		Playing		Other	 -	 <u>.</u>	
Can target be moved		Yes	х	No							
Restrict usage?		Yes	х	No							
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	X	Frequent		Constant	Other		

Disease

LOS

Group

Failure

Utilities

Prone

Slope

Contaminated

Other

Volume

Signage

X Protected

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT))					
Suspect Poet Pot	Yes	No				
Suspect Root Rot	X Yes					
Fruiting body present	— П	X No Moderate	П Г	٦,,,,,		
Exposed roots Undermined	Severe		Low	None		
	Severe	Moderate	Low	_1		
Root pruned	Yes	X No	% Root area affe	_		
Buttress wounded	X Yes	No No	Approx age of w		0	-5 years
Restricted root area	X Severe	Moderate	Low	None		
Potential for root failure	Severe	X Moderate	Low	7		
Lean	Natural	Unnatural	Corrected	Angle		
Soil heave	Yes	X No	Decay in plane of	f lean	Yes	X No
Roots broken	X Yes	No	Soil cracking		Yes	X No
Compounding factors	Yes	X No				
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	N)					
·	·					
DEFECT	Roc	ot Flare	Trunk	Scaff	old	Branch
Poor taper				1		
Bow, sweep Co-dominants / forks						
Multiple attachments	+	+				
Included bark						
Excessive end weight						
Cracks / Splits						
Hangers						
Girdling						
Wounds / Seam		Yes				
Decay Cavity				1		
Fungal Fruiting Bodies						
Bleeding / Sap Flow						
Loose / Cracked Bark						
Birds / Bats / Bees						
Deadwood / Stubs						
Borers / Ants etc						
Cankers / Galls				1		
Previous failure						
HAZARD RATING						
Part most likely to fail	Whole tree	Scaffold	★ Branch	Other		
Inspection frequency	Н	2 - yearly	Branch 5 - Yearly	Other		
inspection frequency	X Annual	z - yedny	3 - Tedity			
1.0 + 1.0 + 4.0	→ 6.0	Failure Potential		2 Medium	3 High	4 Severe
Failure Size of Targe Potential Part Rating		Size of part Target Rating	1 15cm 1 Occasional	2 15-45cm 2 Intermitter	3 45-750 3 Freque	
HAZARD ABATEMENT	<u> </u>					
Prune	Yes	x No				
Inspect Further	Root	Decay	Aerial x	Monitor	Other	
Remove tree	Yes	x No	Replace Tree	-	Yes	x No
Move target	Yes	X No	Other	L		
COMMENTS						
Extensive basal damage - s	trimmer					



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

HAZARD RATING										
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0							
Failure Potential	Size of	Target Rating	Hazard Rating							
lmmedi										
Needs	pection									
	Dead Tree									

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crow	n Spread	Crown Clear	Specia Value	
2254	Beech	М	Gen Sym	Dom	1	1110	26		20			
Observ	bservations											
	raised and pollarded	historica	lly.									
TREE	HEALTH											
: oliage	colour	Nor	mal	Chlo	orotic	Nec	rotic					
oliage	edensity	Nor	mal	Spa	rse							
xtensio	on growth	Goo	od	X Ave	rage	Poo	r					
Nound	wood devlopment	Goo	od	X Ave	rage	Poo	r	None				
/itality	class	Goo	od	Ave	rage	x Fair		Poor				
eaf siz	ze	Nor	mal	Smo	ıll			-				
picorm	nic growth	Yes		X No								
)iebac	k	Yes		X No								
3rowth	obstructions	x Yes		No		Pavem	ent					
Pests/ [Diseases	Yes		x No								
SITE C	CONDITIONS											
Site cho	aracter	X Dom	estic	Indu	strial	POS	5	Natural	Woods	Gro	ıρ	
.andsco	ape type	Law	n	X Roa	dside	Boro	der	Open	Garden	Agri	С	
rrigatio		Non	е	God	od	X Ade	quate	Poor	Excessive			
ite dis	turbance	X Yes		No								
∕₀ drip	line paved	0%		10-	25%	25-	50%	50-75%	x 75-100%	Othe	er	
√ drip	line soil	0%		x 10-:	25%	25-	50%	50-75%	75-100%	Othe	er	
√ dripl	line grade lowered	0%		x 10-1	25%	25-	50%	50-75%	75-100%	Othe	er	
oil pro	oblems	X Drai	inage	Sha	llow	X Com	pact	X Drought	Saline	Alka	line	
		Acid	lic	X Volu	ıme	Dise	ase	Failure	Slope	Cont	aminated	
Obstruc	ctions	Ligh	ts	Sign	age	LOS		X Utilities	Veg	Othe	er	
xposui	re to wind	Оре	en	x Prot	ected	Gro	υр	Prone				
revaili	ing wind direction	South v	vesterly									
ΓARG	ET											
araets	s under tree	X Build	ding	X Parl	cing	X Roa		X Pedestrian	Recreation	Lanc	lscape	
J. 9013			dscape	X Utili	•	Play		Other		Щ		
an tar	rget be moved	Yes		X No	• /	٠٠٠ ^{, ١٥} ,	. 9					
	usage?	Yes		X No								
	Jaget	H_{i}^{i}		\mathbf{H}	•	<u></u>		<u> Па</u> .				

Targets under tree	Ĥ	Building Hardscape	Ĥ	Parking Utility	-	Road Playing	_	Pedestrian Other	F	Recreation	andscape
Can target be moved		Yes	х	No							
Restrict usage?		Yes	х	No							
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	X	Frequent		Constant		Other	

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT)						
Suspect Root Rot Fruiting body present Exposed roots Undermined Root pruned Buttress wounded Restricted root area Potential for root failure Lean Soil heave Roots broken Compounding factors	x Yes Yes Yes X Severe Severe Yes Yes X Severe Severe Natural Yes Yes Yes	No X No Moderate Moderate X No Moderate X No Moderate X Moderate Unnatural X No No No	Low Low % Root area affe Approx age of w Low Low Corrected Decay in plane of Soil cracking	ound None	Yes Yes	X No
compounding racions	Щ					
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	N)					
DEFECT	Roo	t Flare	Trunk	Scaff	old	Branch
Poor taper						
Bow, sweep						
Co-dominants / forks						
Multiple attachments						
Included bark						
Excessive end weight						
Cracks / Splits						
Hangers						
Girdling						
Wounds / Seam						
Decay						
Cavity				Ye	s	
Fungal Fruiting Bodies				1	•	
Bleeding / Sap Flow				1		
Loose / Cracked Bark				+		
Birds / Bats / Bees						
Deadwood / Stubs				+		
Borers / Ants etc						
Cankers / Galls						
Previous failure				1		
HAZARD RATING						
				٦		
Part most likely to fail	Whole tree	Scaffold	X Branch	Other		
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other		
1.0 _ 1.0 _ 4.0	6.0	Failure Potential	1 Low	2 Medium	3 High	4 Severe
Failure Size of Target	t Hazard	Size of part	1 15cm	2 15-45cm	3 45-7	75cm 4 > 75cm
Potential Part Rating		Target Rating	1 Occasional	2 Intermitten		uent 4 Constant
HAZARD ABATEMENT	Γ					
Pruno	Yes	N/o				
Prune		X No	<u> </u>	٦.,	−	
Inspect Further	Root	Decay		Monitor	Other	
Remove tree	Yes	x No	Replace Tree		Yes	X No
Move target	Yes	x No	Other	_	-	-
COMMENTS						
Root damage. Cavity at bas	se of pollards. C	Outside school				
	, ,					



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last	Not available
inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

HAZARD RATING									
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0						
Failure	Size of	Target	Hazard						
Potential	Potential Part Rating								
lmmedi	ate action r	needed							
Needs	ection								
	Dead Tree								

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crow	n Spread	Crown Clear	Specia Value
2255	Beech	М	Gen Sym	Dom	1	715	25		17		
	rations raised and pollarded	historica	lly.								
REE	HEALTH										
Foliage Extension Wound Vitality Leaf siz		Norr Norr Goo Goo Norr Yes	mal d d	Spa X Ave X Ave	rage rage rage	Pool Pool X Fair	or	None Poor			
Diebacl	=	Yes		X No							
Growth	obstructions	x Yes		No		Pavem	ent				
SITE C	CONDITIONS										
Site cho	aracter	X Dom	estic		strial	PO	S	Natural	Woods	Gro	ηþ
andsco	ape type	Law	n	X Roa	dside	Bor	der	Open	Garden	Agri	с
rigatio	on	Non	е	God	od	X Add	equate	Poor	Excessive		
	turbance	X Yes		No							
	line paved	0%			25%		50%	50-75%	x 75-100%	Othe	
-	line soil	0%		<u> </u>	25%		50%	50-75%	75-100%	Othe	
-	line grade lowered	0%		<u> </u>	25%		50%	50-75%	75-100%	Othe	
oil pro	blems	X Drai		Sha		X Cor		X Drought	Saline	Alka	
		Acid		X Volu		\vdash	ease	Failure	Slope		aminated
Obstruc		Ligh		lacksquare	age	LO		X Utilities	Veg	Othe	er
-	re to wind	Оре		X Prot	ected	Gro	oup	Prone			
revaili	ing wind direction	South v	esterly								
ΓARG	ET										
argets	under tree	X Build	ding dscape	x Park	-	x Roo	ıd ying	X Pedestrian Other	Recreation	Lanc	Iscape
Can tar	get be moved	Yes		x No							
	usage?	Yes		X No							
Occupa	-	Pare		Inte	rmittent	Fre Ere	quent	Constant	Other		

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT))						
Suspect Root Rot	X Yes	No					
Fruiting body present	Yes	X No					
Exposed roots	X Severe	Moderate	Low	None			
Undermined	Severe	Moderate	Low	None			
Root pruned	Yes	x No	% Root area affe	ected			
Buttress wounded	Yes	x No	Approx age of w	vound			
Restricted root area	X Severe	Moderate	Low	None			
Potential for root failure	Severe	X Moderate	Low				
Lean	Natural	Unnatural	Corrected	Angle			
Soil heave	Yes	X No	Decay in plane o	J	x No		
Roots broken	Н.	No	Soil cracking	Yes	<u> </u>		
ROOIS DIOREII	X Yes		3011 Crucking	10.	X No		
Compounding factors	Yes	No.					
Compounding factors	Tes	x No					
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	'NI'						
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	14)						
DEFECT	Ro	ot Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch		
Poor taper							
Bow, sweep							
Co-dominants / forks							
Multiple attachments							
Included bark							
Excessive end weight							
Cracks / Splits							
Hangers							
Girdling Wounds / Seam			Yes				
Decay			163				
Cavity							
Fungal Fruiting Bodies							
Bleeding / Sap Flow							
Loose / Cracked Bark							
Birds / Bats / Bees							
Deadwood / Stubs							
Borers / Ants etc							
Cankers / Galls							
Previous failure							
HAZARD RATING							
David mand libratures facil	Whole tree	Scaffold	★ Branch	Other			
Part most likely to fail	Н	—					
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other			
1.0 + 1.0 + 4.0	→ 6.0	Failure Potentia	l low	2 Medium 3 Hig	h Severe		
Failure Size of Target		Size of part	1 15cm		-75cm 4 > 75cm		
Potential Part Rating	g Rating	Target Rating	1 Occasional	2 Intermittent 3 Fre	quent 4 Constant		
HAZARD ABATEMENT	Γ						
Prune	Yes	No	Decompact				
	 ^ 	—		Manitar Dal			
Inspect Further	Root	Decay		Monitor Other	N		
Remove tree	Yes	X No	Replace Tree	Yes	X No		
Move target	Yes	X No	Other				
COMMENTS	COMMENTS						
Deep flutes to stem. Interfer	ing with phone	lines. Depressio	n around tree sugge	est level change. Minor	deadwood		



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

HAZARD RATING									
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0						
Failure Potential	Size of Part	Target Rating	Hazard Rating						
Immedi	ate action r	needed							
Needs	ection								

	CHARACIERISIIC										
Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crov	vn Spread	Crown Clear	Specia Value
2256	Beech	М	Gen Sym	Dom	1	950	26		19		
N											
Observ			11								
crown	raised and pollarded	historica	illy.								
TRFF	HEALTH										
	IIEAEIII										
- oliage	colour	Nor	mal	Chlo	orotic	Ne	ecrotic				
- oliage	edensity	Nor	mal	Spa	irse						
-	on growth	God	od	X Ave	rage	Po	oor				
	wood devlopment	God	od		rage	Pc	oor	None			
/itality	•	God			rage	Fo		Poor			
.eaf siz		Nor		Smc	-						
	nic growth	Yes			•••						
Diebac	=	Yes		–							
		Ш.		<u> </u>		D		l lt			
	obstructions	x Yes		No		Paver	ment and	phone lines			
Pests/ Diseases Yes				X No							
SITE C	CONDITIONS										
Site cho	aracter	X Dom	nestic	Indu	ıstrial	PC	os	Natural	Woods	Gro	υp
_andsc	ape type	Law	'n	X Roa	dside	Вс	order	Open	Garden	Agri	с
rrigatio		Non	e	God	od	x Ac	dequate	Poor	Excessive		
	turbance	Yes		x No			•				
	line paved	0%			25%	24	5-50%	50-75%	x 75-100%	Othe	۵r
-	line soil	0%			25%		5-50%	50-75%	75-100%	Othe	
-		0%		$\stackrel{\sim}{\vdash}$	25%		5-50%	50-75%	75-100%	Othe	
-	line grade lowered	\vdash		<u> </u>					—	-	
ooil pro	blems		inage	H	llow		ompact	X Drought	Saline	Alka	
		Acio	lic	X Volu	Jme	\vdash	sease	Failure	Slope	Cont	aminated
Obstruc		Ligh	ts	Sigr	nage	\vdash)S	X Utilities	Veg	Othe	er
xposu	re to wind	Оре	en	X Prot	ected	G	roup	Prone			
revaili	ing wind direction	South v	vesterly								
ΓARG	ET										
Targets	under tree	X Build		X Parl	•	X Ro		X Pedestrian	Recreation	Lanc	Iscape
		X Har	dscape	X Utili	ty	Ple	aying	Other			
Can taı	rget be moved	Yes		X No							
Restrict	usage?	Yes		X No							
Оссирс	ancy	Rare	е		rmittent	x Fr	equent	Constant	Other		

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT)					
Suspect Root Rot Fruiting body present Exposed roots Undermined Root pruned Buttress wounded Restricted root area Potential for root failure Lean Soil heave Roots broken Compounding factors	Yes Yes Severe Severe Yes Yes Severe Yes X Severe Natural Yes Yes Yes	X No X No X Moderate Moderate X No X No Moderate X No Moderate X Moderate X Moderate Unnatural X No No	Low Low X % Root area affe Approx age of w Low Low Corrected Decay in plane of Soil cracking	ound None Angle	
TREE DEECTS (CROW	NI\				
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	N)				
DEFECT	Po	ot Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Poor taper	KO	or Flare	ITOIIK	Scarrola	branch
Bow, sweep					
Co-dominants / forks					
Multiple attachments					
Included bark					
Excessive end weight					
Cracks / Splits					
Hangers					
Girdling					
Wounds / Seam					
Decay					
Cavity				Yes	
Fungal Fruiting Bodies Bleeding / Sap Flow					
Loose / Cracked Bark					
Birds / Bats / Bees					
Deadwood / Stubs					
Borers / Ants etc					
Cankers / Galls					
Previous failure					
HAZARD RATING				_	
Part most likely to fail	Whole tree	Scaffold	X Branch	Other	
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other	
Failure Size of Potential Part Rating	Hazard	Failure Potential Size of part Target Rating	1 Low 1 15cm 1 Occasional	2 Medium 3 Higl 2 15-45cm 3 45- 2 Intermittent 3 Free	75cm 4 > 75cm
HAZARD ABATEMENT	<u> </u>				
Druno	V	□N ₂	Poduce	iono linos / desidure /	un life
Prune	X Yes	No		one lines / deadwood / crov	WII IIII
Inspect Further	Root	Decay	X Aerial	Monitor Other	<u> </u>
Remove tree	Yes	x No	Replace Tree	Yes	X No
Move target	Yes	X No	Other		
COMMENTS Root damage. Lifiting paven	nent causing trip	o hazard.Cavity	in scaffold. Phone I	ines. Minor deadwood.	



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

	HAZARD	RATING	
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0
Failure Potential	Size of	Target Rating	Hazard Rating
lmmedi	ate action r		
Needs	pection		

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crown Spread	Crown Clear	Special Value
2257	Beech	m	Gen Sym	Dom	1	795	25	19		

2257	Beech	m	Gen Sym	Do	om	1	79	95 2	25			19			
Observ	rations Pollarded	histor	ically.												
TREE	HEALTH														
Ealtana	laur	\Box	lormal		Chlore			Necrotic							
Foliage	density	_	lormal		Sparse			Necronc							
-	·	\vdash	Good	-	4 '			Poor							
	on growth	\mathbf{H}		_	Avera			Poor	Г		N				
	wood devlopment	-	Good Good	×	Avera				ŀ		None				
Vitality		\mathbf{H}			Avera	ge	Х	Fair	L		Poor				
Leaf siz		-	lormal ,		Small										
	nic growth	_	es ,	X	No										
Diebac		-	es ,	X	No		_								
	obstructions	—	'es		No		Pav	ement							
Pests/	Diseases	Y	es	X	No										
SITE C	CONDITIONS														
Site cho	aracter	x	Oomestic		Industi	rial		POS			Natural		Woods	Gro	ир
Landsc	ape type	L	awn	х	Roads	ide		Border			Open		Garden	Agr	ic
Irrigation	on	١	lone		Good		х	Adequat	te		Poor		Excessive		
Site dis	turbance	x Y	'es		No				-				•		
% drip	line paved	0	1%		10-25	%		25-50%	. [50-75%	X	75-100%	Oth	er
% drip	line soil	0	1%	х	10-25	%		25-50%	. [50-75%		75-100%	Oth	er
% drip	line grade lowered	0	1%	х	10-25	%		25-50%	. [50-75%		75-100%	Oth	er
Soil pro	blems	x	rainage		Shallo	w	х	Compac	,	х	Drought		Saline	Alko	aline
		Α	cidic	х	Volum	е		Disease	Ī		Failure		Slope	Con	taminated
Obstruc	ctions		ights		Signa	ge		LOS	ľ		Utilities		Veg	Oth	er
Exposu	re to wind		Open	х	Protec	ted		Group	ľ		Prone		4		
	ing wind direction	South	h westerly						L		1				
	-	-	,												
TARG	ET														

Targets under tree	Ĥ	Building Hardscape	Ĥ	Parking Utility		Road Playing	x	Pedestrian Other	Recreation	Landscape
Can target be moved		Yes	х	No		_				
Restrict usage?		Yes	х	No						
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	X	Frequent		Constant	Other	

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT)				
Suspect Root Rot	X Yes	No			
Fruiting body present	Yes	X No		<u></u>	
Exposed roots	Severe	Moderate	Low	None	
Undermined	Severe	Moderate	Low	None	
Root pruned	Yes	X No	% Root area affe	ected	
Buttress wounded	Yes	No	Approx age of w	vound	
Restricted root area	X Severe	Moderate	Low	None	
Potential for root failure	Severe	X Moderate	Low		
Lean	Natural	Unnatural	Corrected	Angle	
Soil heave	Yes	X No	Decay in plane o	f lean Yes	X No
Roots broken	X Yes	No	Soil cracking	Yes	
				ш	
Compounding factors	Yes	X No			
compounding racions	Ш				
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	N)				
	/				
DEFECT	Ro	ot Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Poor taper					
Bow, sweep					
Co-dominants / forks					
Multiple attachments					
Included bark					
Excessive end weight Cracks / Splits		+			
Hangers					
Girdling					
Wounds / Seam		Yes			
Decay					
Cavity				Yes	
Fungal Fruiting Bodies					
Bleeding / Sap Flow					
Loose / Cracked Bark					
Birds / Bats / Bees Deadwood / Stubs					Yes
Borers / Ants etc	-+				res
Cankers / Galls					
Previous failure					
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>		1	
HAZARD RATING					
Part most likely to fail	Whole tree	Scaffold	X Branch	Other	
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other	
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>		-	
1.0 1.0 4.0	6.0	Failure Potentia	I Low	2 Medium 3 Hig	h Severe
Failure Size of Targe	t Hazard	Size of part	1 15cm	2 15-45cm 3 45-	75cm 4 > 75cm
Potential Part Rating		Target Rating	1 Occasional	2 Intermittent 3 Free	quent 4 Constant
					_
HAZARD ABATEMENT	Г				
Prune	Yes	No	Remove hally and av	press from crown. Deadwood.	Decompact
	X Yes Root			Monitor Other	
Inspect Further		Decay	X Aerial	- H	NI-
Remove tree	Yes	X No	Replace Tree	Yes	X No
Move target	Yes	X No	Other		
COMMENTS					
Small cavity to leader. Mind	or deadwood. S	Signgifcant root	damage. Severely	compacted. Holly and C	Cypress tree
growing in crown. Unusual p	atterning to ba	ırk (caused by c	old fencing?)		



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

	HAZARD	RATING									
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0								
Failure	Size of	Target	Hazard								
Potential	Part	Rating	Rating								
Immedi	ate action r	needed									
Needs	ection										
	Needs further inspection Dead Tree										

			1	1			ı	1					
Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crow	n Spread	Crown Clear	Special Value		
2258	Beech	М	Gen Sym	Dom	1	850	26		22				
Foliage Foliage Extensic Wound Vitality Leaf siz Epicorm	HEALTH colour density on growth wood devlopment class ce nic growth	historica Norr Goo Goo Norr Yes Yes	nal nal d	Spa X Ave X Ave X Ave Sma X No X No	rage rage rage	Nec Poo Poo Fair	r	None Poor					
Growth obstructions Pests / Diseases Yes Yes No Pavement Pavement SITE CONDITIONS													
Site cho	aracter ape type	X Dom		Indu X Roa Goo		POS Boro	der	Natural Open Poor	Woods Garden Excessive	Gro Agri			
% drip % drip	turbance line paved line soil line grade lowered oblems	<u> </u>	nage	x 10-2 x 10-2 Shal	25% llow	25 25 X Con	50% 50% 50% npact	50-75% 50-75% 50-75% Drought	75-100% 75-100% 75-100% Saline	Othe Othe Othe	er er line		
-	ctions re to wind ing wind direction	Light Ope	ts	X Prot	age	e LOS Utilities Veg Other							
TARG	ET												
Targets	under tree	X Build	ding dscape	X Park	•	X Roa		X Pedestrian Other	Recreation	Lanc	Iscape		
	get be moved usage?	Yes Yes	-	x No x No			-						

Targets under tree		Building		Parking		Road	_		Recreation	Landscape	
	X	Hardscape	Х	Utility		Playing		Other			
Can target be moved		Yes	х	No							
Restrict usage?		Yes	х	No							
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	x	Frequent		Constant	Other		

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT))					
Suspect Root Rot Fruiting body present Exposed roots Undermined Root pruned Buttress wounded Restricted root area Potential for root failure Lean Soil heave Roots broken Compounding factors	X Yes Yes Severe Severe Yes X Severe Severe Natural Yes X Yes Yes	No X No No Moderate Moderate X No No Moderate X Moderate X Moderate X Moderate Unnatural X No No	Low Low % Root area affer Approx age of w Low Low Low Decay in plane or Soil cracking	ected vound None Angle	Yes Yes	0-5 yrs x No x No
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	N)					
DEFECT	Ro	ot Flare	Trunk	Scaffold		Branch
Poor taper						
Bow, sweep						
Co-dominants / forks						
Multiple attachments						
Included bark						
Excessive end weight						
Cracks / Splits						
Hangers						
Girdling		· ·				
Wounds / Seam		Yes	Yes			
Decay				,,		
Cavity				Yes		
Fungal Fruiting Bodies						
Bleeding / Sap Flow						
Loose / Cracked Bark			Yes			
Birds / Bats / Bees						V
Deadwood / Stubs						Yes
Borers / Ants etc Cankers / Galls						
Previous failure						
rievious failule						
HAZARD RATING						
Dave most likely to fail	Whole tree	Scaffold	★ Branch	Other		
Part most likely to fail	Н			╡ —		
Inspection frequency	Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other		
1.0 + 1.0 + 4.0 Failure Potential Size of Part Rating	t Hazard	Failure Potential Size of part Target Rating	1 Low 1 15cm 1 Occasional	2 Medium 2 15-45cm 2 Intermittent	3 High 3 45-750 3 Freque	<u> </u>
HAZARD ABATEMENT	Γ					
Prune	X Yes	No	Deadwood			
Inspect Further	Root	H_{ζ}	_	Monitor	Other	
•				, H		No.
Remove tree	Yes	X No	Replace Tree		Yes	X No
Move target	Yes	X No	Other			
COMMENTS Wound to stem. Bark necros	is Cavity in sec	iffold Post dan	ngge Deadwood F	lush cuts		
TOURS TO STELLIN DULK HECTOS	is curily ill scu	o.a. Rooi dall	lage. Dedawood. F	10311 C013.		



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

HAZARD RATING											
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0								
Failure Potential	Size of	Target Rating	Hazard Rating								
lmmedi	ate action r										
Needs	further insp	pection									
	Dead Tree										

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crown Spread	Crown Clear	Special Value
2259	Beech	Μ	Gen Sym	Dom	1	725	1 <i>7</i>	16		

2259	Beech	M	Sym	Do	om	1	72	25 17			16			
			<u>I</u>					<u> </u>						
Observ	ations Crown rai	sed ar	nd pollard	ed h	nistorica	ılly								
TREE	HEALTH													
Foliage	colour		Normal		Chlorotic	· [Necrotic						
-	density	\square	Normal		Sparse	L								
_	on growth		Good	x	Average	. [Poor						
	wood devlopment		Good	\vdash	Average			Poor		None				
Vitality	· ·		Good		Average		х	Fair		Poor				
Leaf siz	e		Normal		Small	J=			-	4				
Epicorm	nic growth	Y	es (es	х	No	_								
Diebac	k	Y	es es	х	No	-								
Growth	obstructions	x Y	es es		No	Ī	Pav	ement						
Pests/ [Diseases	x Y	es es		No	Ī	Bee	ch bark d	diseas	e				
					•									
SITE C	ONDITIONS													
					ı	-			_	,		,		
Site cho		X	Domestic		Industria	_		POS		Natural		Woods	G	roup
	ape type	L	.awn	X	Roadside	e		Border		Open		Garden	A	gric
Irrigatio	on	^	Vone		Good	L	X	Adequate		Poor		Excessive		
Site dis	turbance	X	l'es		No	-				,		,		
% drip	line paved		0%		10-25%			25-50%		50-75%	X	75-100%		ther
% drip	line soil		0%	X	10-25%			25-50%		50-75%		75-100%		ther
% dripl	ine grade lowered	C	0%	х	10-25%	L		25-50%		50-75%		75-100%		ther
Soil pro	blems	X	Orainage		Shallow		X	Compact	х	Drought		Saline	A	lkaline
			Acidic	x	Volume			Disease		Failure		Slope	С	ontaminated
Obstruc	ctions	L	ights		Signage	<u> </u>		LOS		Utilities		Veg		ther
Exposu	e to wind		Open	x	Protected	d		Group		Prone				
Prevaili	ng wind direction	Sout	h westerly		-					_				
TARG	ET													

Targets under tree	х	Building	х	Parking	х	Road	х	Pedestrian	Recreation	Landscape	
	x	Hardscape		Utility		Playing		Other		-	
Can target be moved		Yes	х	No		-		_			
Restrict usage?		Yes	х	No							
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	x	Frequent		Constant	Other		

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT)				
Suspect Root Rot	x Yes	No			
Fruiting body present	Yes	x No		_	
Exposed roots	Severe	Moderate	Low	None	
Undermined	Severe	Moderate	Low	None	
Root pruned	Yes	x No	% Root area affe	ected	
Buttress wounded	Yes	x No	Approx age of w	ound	
Restricted root area	x Severe	Moderate	Low	None	
Potential for root failure	Severe	X Moderate	Low	=	
Lean	Natural	Unnatural	Corrected	Angle	
Soil heave	Yes	X No	Decay in plane o	J	x No
Roots broken		No	Soil cracking	Yes	<u> </u>
KOOI3 DIOKEII	X Yes		3011 Crucking		X No
Common unding foretors	Yes	No.			
Compounding factors	Tes	x No	-		
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	/NI)				
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	111)				
DEFECT	Ro	oot Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Poor taper					
Bow, sweep					
Co-dominants / forks					
Multiple attachments					
Included bark					
Excessive end weight					
Cracks / Splits					
Hangers					
Girdling					
Wounds / Seam					
Decay Cavity		+			
Fungal Fruiting Bodies					
Bleeding / Sap Flow			Yes		
Loose / Cracked Bark					
Birds / Bats / Bees					
Deadwood / Stubs					
Borers / Ants etc					
Cankers / Galls					
Previous failure				Yes	
HAZARD RATING					
HAZAKO KATINO					
Part most likely to fail	Whole tre	e Scaffold	X Branch	Other	
Inspection frequency	Н	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other	
inspection frequency	Annual	2 - yearry	J - Tearly	Olliei	
1.0 . 1.0 . 4.0	6.0	Failure Potentia	ı Jaw	2 Medium 3 Higi	h 4 Severe
+ +	→ 0.0		<u> </u>		
Failure Size of Targe Potential Part Rating		Size of part	1 15cm		75cm 4 > 75cm
, stemmer i an i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	9	Target Rating	1 Occasional	2 Intermittent 3 Free	quent 4 Constant
HAZARD ABATEMENT	г				
Prune	x Yes	No	Crown lift	- —	
Inspect Further	Root	X Decay	X Aerial X	Monitor Other	
Remove tree	Yes	x No	Replace Tree	Yes	X No
Move target	Yes	X No	Other	_ 	<u>-</u>
			<u> </u>		
COMMENTS					
Beech Bark Disease. Leader	blown out hist	orically. Ribbing	to stem.		



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

0%

0%

0%

X Drainage

Acidic

Lights

Open

South westerly

10-25%

10-25%

10-25%

Shallow

Volume

Signage

Protected

X

25-50%

25-50%

25-50%

Compact

Disease

LOS

Group

50-75%

50-75%

50-75%

Drought

Failure

Utilities

Prone

X

X

75-100%

75-100%

75-100%

Saline

Slope

Veg

Other

Other

Other

Other

Alkaline

Contaminated

HAZARD RATING											
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0								
Failure Potential	Size of Part	Target Rating	Hazard Rating								
lmmedi	ate action r	needed									
Needs further inspection											
Dead Tree											

TREE CHARACTERISTICS

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crov	wn Spread	Crown Clear	Specia Value
2260	Horse Chestnut	Υ	Gen Sym	Dom	1	230	7		6		
Observ	ations										
TREE I	HEALTH										
Foliage	colour	Nor	I	Chi	orotic	Nec	ratio				
Foliage		Nor		Spc		Nec	TOTIC				
_	on growth	God		X Ave		Poo	r				
	wood devlopment	God	-	X Ave		Poo		None			
Vitality	· ·	God	-		rage	X Fair		Poor			
Leaf siz		Nor	-	Smo	•	_ X	ļ	1 001			
	ic growth	Yes	iliai	X No	411						
Dieback	•	Yes		X No							
	obstructions	x Yes		No		Pavem	ent				
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		Yes		X No			<u> </u>				
Pests/ D											
			!								
	ONDITIONS										
SITE C	ONDITIONS	X Don	nestic		ustrial	POS	3	Natural	Woods	Grou	υp
SITE C	ONDITIONS	X Don Law				POS Boro		Natural Open	Woods Garden	Gro. Agri	
SITE C	ONDITIONS racter upe type		n	Indu	dside	_	der		<u> </u>	—	

TARGET

% drip line paved

% dripline grade lowered

Prevailing wind direction

% drip line soil

Soil problems

Obstructions

Exposure to wind

		-		-		-		•	_	_	
Targets under tree	X	Building	x	Parking	X	Road	X	Pedestrian	Recreation	Landscape	
	X	Hardscape		Utility		Playing		Other	 -	_	
Can target be moved		Yes	х	No				•			
Restrict usage?		Yes	х	No							
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	X	Frequent		Constant	Other		

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT)						
Suspect Root Rot Fruiting body present Exposed roots Undermined Root pruned Buttress wounded Restricted root area Potential for root failure Lean Soil heave Roots broken	Yes Yes Severe Yes Yes Yes Severe Actual Yes Yes Yes	X No X No Moderate Moderate X No X No X Moderate Unnatural X No X No	Low Low X % Root area affe Approx age of well Low Low Corrected Decay in plane of Soil cracking	cted ound None	Yes Yes	X No
Compounding factors	Yes	X No				
TREE DEFECTS (CROW						
DEFECT	Roo	t Flare	Trunk	Scaff	old	Branch
Poor taper						
Bow, sweep						
Co-dominants / forks						
Multiple attachments						
Included bark						
Excessive end weight						
Cracks / Splits						
Hangers						
					+	
Girdling						
Wounds / Seam						
Decay						
Cavity						
Fungal Fruiting Bodies						
Bleeding / Sap Flow						
Loose / Cracked Bark						
Birds / Bats / Bees						
Deadwood / Stubs						
Borers / Ants etc						
Cankers / Galls						
Previous failure						
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>		1		
HAZARD RATING						
Danie manak Blasta a C. B	Whole tree	Scaffold	D L	Other		
Part most likely to fail	—		X Branch	-		
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other		
1.0 + 1.0 + 4.0	→ 6.0	Failure Potential	1 Low	2 Medium	3 High	4 Severe
Failure Size of Target		Size of part	1 15cm	2 15-45cm	3 45-7	5cm 4 > 75cm
Potential Part Rating	Rating	Target Rating	1 Occasional	2 Intermitter	requ	uent 4 Constant
HAZARD ABATEMENT	<u> </u>					
D		<u> </u>				
Prune	Yes	x No		, -		
Inspect Further	Root	Decay	Aerial	Monitor	Other	
Remove tree	Yes	x No	Replace Tree	Γ	Yes	X No
Move target	Yes	X No	Other	L		—
	ш [.] "					
COMMENTS						
COMMENTS						
None						



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

HAZARD RATING									
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0						
Failure Potential	Size of Part	Target Rating	Hazard Rating						
lmmedi	ate action r	needed							
Needs	further insp	ection							
	Dead Tree								

TREE CHARACTERISTICS

	Value	Clear	Crown Spread	Height	DBH	No. Stems	Crown Class	Form	Age Class	Species	Tree ID
2262 Lime Y Gen Sym Dom 1 195 10 5			5	10	195	1	Dom		Y	Lime	2262

ZZOZ LIIIIE	'	Sym		OIII			75 10			<u> </u>			
Observations													
TREE HEALTH													
Foliage colour	Пи	ormal		Chloi	otic		Necrotic						
Foliage density	N	ormal		Spar			<u>l</u>						
Extension growth	G	ood	x	Aver	age		Poor						
Woundwood devlopment	G	ood	-	Aver			Poor		None				
Vitality class	G	ood		Aver		х	Fair		Poor				
Leaf size	N	ormal		Smal	I	-	1		4				
Epicormic growth	Y	es	х	No									
Dieback	Y	es		Νo									
Growth obstructions	x Y	es		No		Pav	/ement						
Pests/ Diseases	Y	es	x	Nο									
SITE CONDITIONS													
Site character	x D	omestic		Indus	trial		POS		Natural		Woods	Gro	oup
Landscape type	Lo	awn	x	Road	lside		Border		Open		Garden	Agr	ic
Irrigation	N	one		Good	d	X	Adequate		Poor		Excessive		
Site disturbance	Y	es	X	Nο			-		<u>-</u>				
% drip line paved	0'	%		10-2	5%		25-50%		50-75%	X	75-100%	Oth	er
% drip line soil	0'	%	X	10-2	5%		25-50%		50-75%		75-100%	Oth	er
% dripline grade lowered	0'	%	X	10-2	5%		25-50%		50-75%		75-100%	Oth	er
Soil problems	x D	rainage		Shall	ow	X	Compact	x	Drought		Saline	Alk	aline
	A	cidic	X	Volu	me		Disease		Failure		Slope	Cor	taminated
Obstructions	Li	ghts		Signo	age		LOS		Utilities		Veg	Oth	er
Exposure to wind		pen	х	Prote	ected		Group		Prone		= -		
Prevailing wind direction	South	westerly		_				-					

Targets under tree	х	Building	х	Parking	x	Road	x	Pedestrian	Recreation	Landscape	
	x	Hardscape		Utility		Playing		Other		 -	
Can target be moved		Yes	х	No		•		•			
Restrict usage?		Yes	х	No							
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	X	Frequent		Constant	Other		

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT)					
Suspect Root Rot Fruiting body present Exposed roots Undermined Root pruned Buttress wounded Restricted root area Potential for root failure Lean Soil heave Roots broken	Yes Yes Severe Severe Yes Yes Severe Natural Yes Yes	X No X No Moderate Moderate X No X No X Moderate Unnatural X No X No	X Low Low X % Root area affe Approx age of w Low Low Corrected Decay in plane of Soil cracking	ound None	Yes Yes	X No X No
Compounding factors	Yes	X No				
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	N)					
DEFECT	Roo	t Flare	Trunk	Scaf	fold	Branch
Poor taper						
Bow, sweep				+		
Co-dominants / forks Multiple attachments						
Included bark				+		
Excessive end weight						
Cracks / Splits				+		
Hangers				1		
Girdling						
Wounds / Seam				1		
Decay						
Cavity						
Fungal Fruiting Bodies						
Bleeding / Sap Flow						
Loose / Cracked Bark						
Birds / Bats / Bees						
Deadwood / Stubs						
Borers / Ants etc				<u> </u>		
Cankers / Galls				1		
Previous failure						
HAZARD RATING						
				٦		
Part most likely to fail	Whole tree	Scaffold	X Branch	Other		
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other		
1.0 + 1.0 + 4.0	6.0	Failure Potential	1 Low	2 Medium	3 High	4 Severe
Failure Size of Targe Potential Part Rating		Size of part Target Rating	1 15cm 1 Occasional	2 15-45cm 2 Intermitte	3 45-7 nt 3 Frequent	_
HAZARD ABATEMEN	r					
Prune	x Yes	No	Remove root mat	- , -		
Inspect Further	Root	Decay	Aerial	Monitor	Other	
Remove tree	Yes	X No	Replace Tree		Yes	X No
Move target	Yes	x No	Other	•		
COMMENTS	_					



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2						
Map/Location							
Owner	Norwich City Council						
Date	23rd March 2008						
Date of last inspection	Not available						
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer						

HAZARD RATING									
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0						
Failure	Size of	Target	Hazard						
Potential	Part	Rating	Rating						
Immedi	ate action r	needed							
Needs further inspection									
	Dead Tree								

TREE CHARACTERISTICS

Occupancy

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crown Spread	Crown Clear	Special Value
2263	Beech	М	Gen Sym	Dom	1	850	24	20		

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height		Crown Spread	Crown Clear	Specia
2263	Beech	М	Gen Sym	Dom	1	850	24		20		
hcom	rations										
		historica	II.,								
HWOIL	raised and pollarded	HISTOTICA	ııy.								
TREE	HEALTH										
		<u> </u>		—		<u> </u>					
	colour	Nori			rotic	N	ecrotic				
_	e density	Nori		Spa		<u> </u>					
	on growth	Goo		<u> </u>	rage		oor				
	wood devlopment	Goo		<u> </u>	rage	\vdash	oor	None			
/itality		Goo			rage 	Fo	air	Poor			
eaf siz		Nori	mal	Smo	ıll						
-	nic growth	Yes		X No							
)iebac		Yes		X No							
	obstructions	X Yes		No		Pave	ment				
ests/ I	Diseases	Yes		X No							
SITE C	CONDITIONS										
Site cho	aracter	X Dom	estic	Indu	strial	Про	OS	Natura	l Woods	Gro	au
	ape type	Law			dside		order	Open	Garden	Agri	
rigatio		Non		Goo			dequate	Poor	Excessive	ш °	
	turbance	Yes		X No							
	line paved	0%		<u> </u>	25%		5-50%	50-75	% X 75-100%	Oth	er
	line soil	0%			25%	—	5-50%	50-75	<u> </u>	Oth	
-	line grade lowered	0%			25%	—	5-50%	50-759		Oth	
-	oblems	\vdash	nage	Sha			ompact	X Drough	<u> </u>	Alko	
. p. c		Acid	-	X Volu			isease	Failure	 1	-	taminated
Obstruc	ctions	Ligh			ıage	-	OS	Utilities	├	Oth	
	re to wind	Оре		x Prot			roup	Prone			
•	ing wind direction		 vesterly								
			20.0117								
ARG	ET		_								_
argets	under tree	X Build	•	X Parl	•	Ĥ.	oad	X Pedest	rian Recreation	Land	dscape
		X Hard	dscape	Utili	ty	PI	laying	Other			
	rget be moved	Yes		x No							
Restrict	usage?	Yes		X No							

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT)				
Suspect Root Rot	Yes	X No			
Fruiting body present	Yes	X No		_	
Exposed roots	Severe	X Moderate	Low	None	
Undermined	Severe	Moderate	Low	None	
Root pruned	Yes	X No	% Root area affe	ected	
Buttress wounded	Yes	x No	Approx age of w	vound	
Restricted root area	Severe	X Moderate	Low	None	
Potential for root failure	Severe	X Moderate	Low	<u> </u>	
Lean	Natural	Unnatural	Corrected	Angle	
Soil heave	Yes	Н	Decay in plane o		x No
Roots broken	Н.,	X No	Soil cracking	Yes	<u> </u>
KOOIS DIOKEII	X Yes		3011 Crucking	165	X No
		П .,			
Compounding factors	Yes	X No			
Ther before (chaw	/B I \				
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	N)				
DEFECT	Ro	ot Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Poor taper					
Bow, sweep Co-dominants / forks					
Multiple attachments					
Included bark					
Excessive end weight					
Cracks / Splits					
Hangers					
Girdling					
Wounds / Seam		Yes			
Decay					
Cavity					
Fungal Fruiting Bodies					
Bleeding / Sap Flow					
Loose / Cracked Bark					
Birds / Bats / Bees Deadwood / Stubs					
Borers / Ants etc					
Cankers / Galls					
Previous failure					
	I .			- I	
HAZARD RATING					
Part most likely to fail	Whole tree	e Scaffold	X Branch	Other	
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other	
. ,				<u> </u>	
1.0 _ 1.0 _ 4.0	6.0	Failure Potentia	1 Low	2 Medium 3 Hig	h Severe
++	-→	Size of part	1 15cm		-75cm 4 > 75cm
Failure Size of Targe Potential Part Rating		Target Rating	1 Occasional		quent 4 Constant
		rarger kaning	Occasional	2 Intermittent 3 Fre	queni 4 Constant
LIAZADO ADATEMENI	-				
HAZARD ABATEMEN					
Davis	Πv				
Prune	Yes	x No		¬	
Inspect Further	Root	Decay		Monitor Other	
Remove tree	Yes	X No	Replace Tree	Yes	X No
Move target	Yes	x No	Other		
COMMENTS					
Severely compacted. Root of	damage. Possib	le column of de	cay as a result of m	ultiple pruning wounds.	



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

X Drainage

Acidic

Lights

Open

South westerly

HAZARD RATING										
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0							
Failure	Size of	Target	Hazard							
Potential	Rating	Rating								
Immedi	needed									
Needs	ection									
	Dead Tree									

TREE CHARACTERISTICS

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crow	n Spre	ad	Crown Clear	Specia Value
2264	Maple	Y	Gen Sym	Dom	1	195	9		5			
Observati	ons											
TREE HE	ALTH											
Foliage co	lour	Nori	mal	Chlo	orotic	N	ecrotic					
Foliage de		Nor	mal	Spa	rse							
Extension (Goo	d	X Ave	rage	Po	oor					
Woundwo	od devlopment	Goo	d	X Ave	rage	Po	oor	None				
Vitality clo	155	Goo	d		rage	x Fo	air	Poor				
Leaf size		Nori	mal	Smc	ıll			-				
Epicormic (growth	Yes		X No								
Dieback		Yes		x No								
Growth ob	ostructions	x Yes		No		Pave	ment					
Pests/ Dise	eases	Yes		X No								
SITE CO	NDITIONS											
Site chara	cter	X Dom	estic	Indu	ıstrial	PC	OS	Natural		Woods	Gro	ηþ
Landscape	type	Law	n	X Roa	dside	Во	order	Open		Garden	Agri	с
rrigation		Non	e	God		X A	dequate	Poor		Excessive		
Site disturl	oance	X Yes		No								
% drip line	e paved	0%		10-	25%	2.	5-50%	50-75%	х	75-100%	Othe	er
% drip line	e soil	0%		x 10-	25%	2.	5-50%	50-75%		75-100%	Othe	er

TARGET

Soil problems

Obstructions

Exposure to wind

Prevailing wind direction

		-		-		-		•	_	_	
Targets under tree	X	Building	x	Parking	X	Road	X	Pedestrian	Recreation	Landscape	
	X	Hardscape		Utility		Playing		Other	 -	_	
Can target be moved		Yes	х	No				•			
Restrict usage?		Yes	х	No							
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	X	Frequent		Constant	Other		

Compact

Disease

LOS

Group

Drought

Failure

Utilities

Prone

Saline

Slope

Veg

Alkaline

Other

Contaminated

Shallow

Volume

Signage

X Protected

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT)					
Suspect Root Rot Fruiting body present Exposed roots Undermined Root pruned Buttress wounded Restricted root area Potential for root failure	Yes Yes Severe Severe Yes Yes Severe Severe	X No X No Moderate Moderate X No No No Moderate X Moderate X Moderate	Low Low % Root area affe Approx age of w Low Low	ound None		
Lean	Natural	Unnatural	Corrected	Angle		
Soil heave	Yes	X No	Decay in plane of	_ f lean	Yes	X No
Roots broken	Yes	X No	Soil cracking		Yes	¥ No
Room Stoken			oon cracking			
Compounding factors	Yes	x No				
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	(N)					
DEFECT	Roo	ot Flare	Trunk	Scaffe	old	Branch
Poor taper						
Bow, sweep						
Co-dominants / forks						
Multiple attachments						
Included bark						
Excessive end weight						
Cracks / Splits						
Hangers						
Girdling						
Wounds / Seam		Yes	Yes			
Decay						,
Cavity						
Fungal Fruiting Bodies						
Bleeding / Sap Flow						
Loose / Cracked Bark						
Birds / Bats / Bees						,
Deadwood / Stubs						,
Borers / Ants etc						
Cankers / Galls						
Previous failure						
HAZARD RATING						
Dave most likely to fait	Whole tree	Conft-1-1	Rranah -	Other		
Part most likely to fail	⊢ ⊢1	_	X Branch	Other		
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other		
1.0 + 1.0 + 4.0 Failure Size of Targe	-→	Failure Potentia	1 Low	2 Medium 2 15-45cm	3 High 3 45-750	4 Severe 4 > 75cm
Failure Size of Targe Potential Part Ratin		Target Rating	1 Occasional	2 Intermittent		
HAZARD ABATEMEN	T					
Prune	x Yes	No	Remove holly and cyp	oress from crown	Deadwood De	compact.
		\vdash				copacii
Inspect Further	Root	Decay	Aerial	Monitor	Other	
Remove tree	Yes	X No	Replace Tree	L	Yes	X No
Move target	Yes	x No	Other			
COMMENTS						
Wounds to stem at 0-10cm	and at 1m. Roo	t damaae.				
condit to stom at o roam	31 1111 KOO					



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

HAZARD RATING										
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0							
Failure	Size of	Target	Hazard							
Potential	Rating	Rating								
Immedi	needed									
Needs	ection									
	Dead Tree									

2265 Beech M Gen Sym Dom 1 960 20 23	Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crown Spread	Crown Clear	Special Value
	2265	Beech	М		Dom	1	960	20	23		

ZZOS Deech	"	Sym		"" '	'	00 2	٠		25			
Observations Crown ra	ised and	pollard	ed h	istorical	ly.							
TREE HEALTH												
IKEE HEALIH												
Foliage colour	No	rmal		Chlorotic		Necrotic						
Foliage density	No	rmal		Sparse		_						
Extension growth	Go	od	x	Average		Poor						
Woundwood devlopment	Go	od	-	Average		Poor		None				
Vitality class	Go	od		Average	×	Fair	-	Poor				
Leaf size	No	rmal		Small		_	<u> </u>	-				
Epicormic growth	Yes	;	х	No								
Dieback	Yes	;		No								
Growth obstructions	X Yes	;	-	No	Pa	vement	/ Phone	e lines				
Pests/ Diseases	Yes	;	х	No		•						
,												
SITE CONDITIONS												
						_		_		_		
Site character	X Doi	mestic		Industrial		POS		Natural		Woods	Gro	опр
Landscape type	Lav	vn	x	Roadside		Border		Open		Garden	Agr	ic
Irrigation	No	ne		Good	x	Adequat	е	Poor		Excessive		
Site disturbance	Yes	5	X	No		_		_		_		
% drip line paved	0%)		10-25%		25-50%		50-75%	x	75-100%	Oth	er
% drip line soil	0%)	х	10-25%		25-50%		50-75%		75-100%	Oth	er
% dripline grade lowered	0%)	х	10-25%		25-50%		50-75%		75-100%	Oth	er
Soil problems	x Dro	ainage		Shallow	х	Compact	х	Drought		Saline	Alko	aline
	Aci	dic	х	Volume		Disease		Failure		Slope	Con	taminated
Obstructions	Ligi	hts		Signage		LOS	х	Utilities		Veg	Oth	er
Exposure to wind	Ор	en	х	Protected		Group		Prone		-		
Prevailing wind direction	South	westerly			-		-	_				
TARGET												

Targets under tree	Ĥ	Building Hardscape	Ĥ	Parking Utility	X Road Playing	x	Pedestrian Other	Recreation	Landscape
Can target be moved		Yes	x	No			-		
Restrict usage?		Yes	х	No					
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	X Frequent		Constant	Other	

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT)						
Const David Davi						
Suspect Root Rot	Yes	X No				
Fruiting body present	Yes	X No		٦.,		
Exposed roots	Severe	Moderate	X Low	None		
Undermined	Severe	Moderate	Low			0/1
Root pruned	X Yes	No	% Root area affe		enched (30°	%)
Buttress wounded	Yes	X No	Approx age of w	ound		
Restricted root area	Severe	X Moderate	Low	None		
Potential for root failure	Severe	X Moderate	Low	_		
Lean	Natural	Unnatural	Corrected	Angle		
Soil heave	Yes	X No	Decay in plane o	f lean	Yes	x No
Roots broken	Yes	X No	Soil cracking		Yes	X No
Compounding factors	Yes	X No				
TREE DEFECTS (CROWI	N)					
·						
DEFECT	Roo	ot Flare	Trunk	Scaffol	d	Branch
Poor taper						
Bow, sweep						
Co-dominants / forks Multiple attachments						
Included bark						
Excessive end weight						
Cracks / Splits						
Hangers						
Girdling						
Wounds / Seam						
Decay						
Cavity Fungal Fruiting Bodies						
Bleeding / Sap Flow						
Loose / Cracked Bark						
Birds / Bats / Bees						
Deadwood / Stubs						Yes
Borers / Ants etc						
Cankers / Galls						
Previous failure				1		
HAZARD RATING						
Part most likely to fail	Whole tree	Scaffold	X Branch	Other		
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other		
1.0 + 1.0 + 4.0	→ 6.0	Failure Potentia	<u> </u>	2 Medium	3 High	4 Severe
Failure Size of Target Potential Part Rating	Hazard Rating	Size of part Target Rating	1 15cm 1 Occasional	2 15-45cm 2 Intermittent	3 45-75c 3 Frequen	
HAZARD ABATEMENT	ı					
Prune	X Yes	No	Reduce away from pl	none lines		
Inspect Further	Root	Decay	Aerial	Monitor	Other	
Remove tree	Yes	H., '	Replace Tree	J	Yes	X No
Move target	Yes	X No	Other	<u> </u>	1. ~ .	
	ш'"	 '``				
COMMENTS						
Root damage. Trenched. Mir	opr deadwood	I. Telephone lin	es.			



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

HAZARD RATING										
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0							
Failure	Size of	Target	Hazard							
Potential	Rating	Rating								
Immedi	needed									
Needs	ection									

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crow	n Spread	Crown Clear	Specio Value
2266	Beech	М	Gen Sym	Dom	1	825	23		20		
	ations										
irown i	raised and pollarded	historica	lly.								
TREE	HEALTH										
oliage	colour	Nor	mal	Chlo	orotic	Ne	crotic				
oliage	density	Nor	mal	Spa	rse						
	on growth	Goo	od	X Ave	rage	Poo	or				
	wood devlopment	Goo	od	X Ave	rage	Poo	or	None			
'itality	class	Goo	od		rage	x Fai	r	Poor			
eaf siz		Nor	mal	Smc	ıll			—			
picorm	ic growth	Yes		x No							
iebacl	k	Yes		X No							
rowth	obstructions	x Yes		No		Paver	ent				
ests/[Diseases	Yes		x No							
SITE C	CONDITIONS										
ite cho	ıracter	X Dom	nestic	Indu	strial	РО	S	Natural	Woods	Gro	up
andsco	ape type	Law	n	X Roa	dside	Bor	der	Open	Garden	Agri	c
rigatio	on	Non	е	God	od	X Ad	equate	Poor	Excessive		
ite dist	turbance	Yes		X No					<u> </u>		
₀́ drip	line paved	0%		10-	25%	25-	-50%	50-75%	x 75-100%	Othe	er
6 drip	line soil	0%		x 10-3	25%	25-	-50%	50-75%	75-100%	Othe	er
% dripl	ine grade lowered	0%		x 10-3	25%	25-	-50%	50-75%	75-100%	Othe	er
oil pro	blems	X Drai	inage	Sha		X Coi	mpact	X Drought	Saline	Alka	ıline
		Acid		X Volu	ıme	Dis	ease	Failure	Slope	Cont	taminated
Obstruc		X Ligh	ts		age	LO	S	Utilities	Veg	Othe	er
•	re to wind	Оре	en	X Prot	ected	Gro	oup	Prone			
revaili	ng wind direction	South v	vesterly								
ARG	ET										
araets	under tree	X Build	ding	x Parl	king	X Roo	ad	X Pedestrian	Recreation	Lanc	dscape
9013		<u> </u>	dscape	Utili			ying	X Other	Street light		
an tar	get be moved	Yes		x No	•	```لب	, 3	٠	2		
	usage?	Yes		X No							
Jeenne	_	H _D	_		mittent	Fro Ero	quant	Constant	Other		

Targets under tree	х	Building	х	Parking	х	Road	х	Pedestrian	Recreation	Landscape
	х	Hardscape		Utility		Playing	х	Other	Street light	_
Can target be moved		Yes	х	No		-				
Restrict usage?		Yes	х	No						
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	x	Frequent		Constant	Other	

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT)	1				
Suspect Root Rot	Yes	X No			
Fruiting body present	Yes	x No	<u> </u>	٦	
Exposed roots	Severe	Moderate	X Low	None	
Undermined	Severe	Moderate	Low X	⊒	
Root pruned	Yes	X No	% Root area affe		
Buttress wounded	Yes	X No	Approx age of w	ound	
Restricted root area	Severe	X Moderate	Low	None	
Potential for root failure	Severe	X Moderate	Low	=	
Lean	Natural	Unnatural	Corrected	Angle	_
Soil heave	Yes	x No	Decay in plane of	: lean Yes	x No
Roots broken	Yes	X No	Soil cracking	Yes	x No
Compounding factors	Yes	X No			
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	N)				
,	•				
DEFECT	Roc	ot Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Poor taper					
Bow, sweep					
Co-dominants / forks					
Multiple attachments					
Included bark Excessive end weight					
Cracks / Splits					
Hangers					
Girdling					
Wounds / Seam					
Decay					
Cavity				Yes	
Fungal Fruiting Bodies					
Bleeding / Sap Flow					
Loose / Cracked Bark					
Birds / Bats / Bees Deadwood / Stubs					Yes
Borers / Ants etc					res
Cankers / Galls					
Previous failure					
				•	•
HAZARD RATING					
Part most likely to fail	Whole tree	Scaffold	X Branch	Other	
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other	
moposition moderately					
1.0 1.0 4.0	 6.0	Failure Potentia	I Low	2 Medium 3 Hig	h Severe
Failure Size of Target	Hazard	Size of part	1 15cm	2 15-45cm 3 45-	-75cm 4 > 75cm
Potential Part Rating	Rating	Target Rating	1 Occasional	2 Intermittent 3 Free	quent 4 Constant
HAZARD ABATEMENT	•				
Prune	Yes	No	Reduce away from str	eet light. Deadwood	
	X Yes Root	Decay	X Aerial	Monitor Other	
Inspect Further		H.,	Replace Tree	-	W No
Remove tree	Yes	X No		Yes	X No
Move target	Yes	X No	Other		
COMMENTS					
Cavity to leader. Root dame	age. Deadwood	d.			
,	J				



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

	HAZARD	RATING	
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0
Failure	Size of	Target	Hazard
Potential	Part	Rating	Rating
Immedi	ate action r	needed	
Needs	ection		
	Dead Tree		

TREE	CHARACTERISTIC	S											
Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height		Crow	n Spread	Crown Clear	Special Value	
2267	Beech	М	Gen Sym	Dom	1	870	24	20					
Observ	rations												
TREE	HEALTH												
Foliage	colour	Nor	mal	Chlo	orotic	N	ecrotic						
-	density	Nor	mal	Spa	rse	Ш							
	on growth	God	od	X Ave	rage	Po	oor						
	wood devlopment	God	od	-	rage	Po	oor		None				
Vitality	· ·	God	od		rage								
, Leaf siz		Nor	mal	Smc	ıll				1				
Epicorm	nic growth	Yes		x No									
Diebac	k	Yes		x No									
Growth	obstructions	x Yes		No		Pave	ment / Ph	one	lines				
Pests/ [Diseases	Yes		X No			,						
SITE C	CONDITIONS												
Site cho	aracter	X Don	nestic	Indu	strial	PC	os		Natural	Woods	Gro	nb	
Landsco	ape type	Law	n	x Roa	dside	Вс	order		Open	Garden	Agri	с	
rrigatio	on	Non	е	God	od	x Ad	dequate		Poor	Excessive			
Site dis	turbance	Yes		x No					_	<u> </u>			
% drip	line paved	0%		10-	25%	23	5-50%		50-75%	x 75-100%	Oth	er	
% drip	line soil	0%		x 10-	25%	2.5	5-50%		50-75%	75-100%	Oth	er	
% dripl	line grade lowered	0%		x 10-	25%	2.5	5-50%		50-75%	75-100%	Oth	er	
Soil pro	blems	X Dra	inage	Sha	llow	x Co	ompact	х	Drought	Saline	Alko	line	
		Acio	lic	X Volu	ıme	Di	sease		Failure	Slope	Con	raminated	
Obstruc	ctions	Ligh	ts	Sign	age	LC	os	х	Utilities	Veg	Oth	er	
Exposu	re to wind	Оре	en	X Prot	ected	G	roup		Prone				
Prevaili	ing wind direction	South v	vesterly						_				

Targets under tree	х	Building	x	Parking	x	Road	x	Pedestrian	Recreation	Landscape	
	х	Hardscape	x	Utility		Playing		Other	-	_	
Can target be moved		Yes	х	No		•		•			
Restrict usage?		Yes	х	No							
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	X	Frequent		Constant	Other		

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT)					
	<u> </u>				
Suspect Root Rot	Yes	X No			
Fruiting body present	Yes	X No		7	
Exposed roots	Severe	X Moderate	Low	None	
Undermined	Severe	Moderate	Low	_	
Root pruned	Yes	X No	% Root area affe		
Buttress wounded	Yes	x No	Approx age of w	ound	
Restricted root area	Severe	X Moderate	Low	None	
Potential for root failure	Severe	X Moderate	Low	_	
Lean	Natural	Unnatural	Corrected	Angle	
Soil heave	Yes	X No	Decay in plane of	F lean Yes	X No
Roots broken	x Yes	No	Soil cracking	Yes	
Compounding factors	Yes	X No			_
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	N)				
·	·				
DEFECT	Roc	t Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Poor taper					
Bow, sweep				Van	
Co-dominants / forks Multiple attachments				Yes	
Included bark				Yes	
Excessive end weight					
Cracks / Splits					
Hangers					
Girdling					
Wounds / Seam					
Decay				Yes	
Cavity Fungal Fruiting Bodies				res	
Bleeding / Sap Flow					
Loose / Cracked Bark					
Birds / Bats / Bees					
Deadwood / Stubs					Yes
Borers / Ants etc					
Cankers / Galls					
Previous failure					
HAZARD RATING					
Part most likely to fail	Whole tree	Scaffold	X Branch	Other	
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other	
1.0 + 1.0 + 4.0	→ 6.0	Failure Potentia		2 Medium 3 Hig	
Failure Size of Target Potential Part Rating		Size of part Target Rating	1 15cm 1 Occasional		75cm
HAZARD ABATEMENI	ſ				
Prune	X Yes	No	Crown lift. Deadwood	I. Reduce away from phone I	ines.
Inspect Further	Root	Decay	X Aerial	Monitor Other	
Remove tree	Yes	H., '	Replace Tree	Yes	X No
Move target	Yes	X No	Other	163	_ _ '```
more ranger	LL1'53	_ _			
COMMENTS					
Included union. Root damage	e. Cavity in lea	der. Obsturcting	n phone lines Dead	wood.	
	J. Janny in icut		9 P.10110 III1031 Dedu		



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

	HAZARD	RATING	
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0
Failure Potential	Size of	Target Rating	Hazard Rating
lmmedi	ate action r		
Needs	further insp	pection	
	Dead Tree		

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height		Crow	n Spred	ıd	Crown Clear	Specia Value
2268	Beech	М	Gen Sym	Dom	1	960	25			21			
Observ	ations												
TREE I	HEALTH												
Foliage	colour	Nor	mal	Chlo	orotic	Ned	crotic						
	density	Nori	mal	Spa	rse								
_	on growth	Goo	d	X Ave	rage	Poo	or						
	wood devlopment	Goo	d	X Ave		Poo	or		None				
/itality	•	Goo	d		rage	X Fair	r		Poor				
.eaf siz		Nor	nal	Smc	ıll				ı				
picorm	ic growth	Yes		x No									
Dieback	=	Yes		X No									
Growth	obstructions	X Yes		No		Pavem	ent / Ph	one	lines				
Pests/ [Diseases	Yes		X No			•						
SITE C	ONDITIONS												
Site cha	racter	X Dom	estic	Indu	ıstrial	PO	S		Natural		Woods	Gro	ηþ
andscc	ipe type	Law	n	X Roa	dside	Bor	der		Open		Garden	Agri	С
rrigatio	on	Non	е	God	od	X Ade	equate		Poor		Excessive		
Site dist	turbance	X Yes		No					-				
% drip	line paved	0%		10-	25%	25-	50%		50-75%	x	75-100%	Othe	er
% drip	line soil	0%		x 10-	25%	25-	50%		50-75%		75-100%	Othe	er
% dripl	ine grade lowered	0%		x 10-	25%	25-	50%		50-75%		75-100%	Othe	er
Soil pro	blems	X Drai	nage	Sha	llow	X Cor	npact	x	Drought	П	Saline	Alka	line
		Acid	ic	x Volu	ıme		ease		Failure	П	Slope	Cont	aminated
	tions	Ligh	ts		nage	LOS	S	х	Utilities		Veg	Othe	er
Obstruc	.110113	19			•						-		
Obstruc Exposur	e to wind	Оре		x Prot		Gro	oup		Prone		-	ш.	

Targets under tree	х	Building	х	Parking	x	Road	х	Pedestrian	Recreation	Landscape	;
	х	Hardscape	x	Utility		Playing		Other	- '	 _	
Can target be moved		Yes	х	No		•					
Restrict usage?		Yes	х	No							
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	X	Frequent		Constant	Other		

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT))					
Suspect Root Rot Fruiting body present Exposed roots Undermined Root pruned Buttress wounded Restricted root area Potential for root failure Lean Soil heave Roots broken Compounding factors	Yes Yes Severe Severe Yes Yes Severe Severe Natural Yes Yes	X No X No X Moderate Moderate X No No X Moderate X Moderate Unnatural X No X No	Low Low % Root area affe Approx age of w Low Low Corrected Decay in plane of Soil cracking	ound None	Yes Yes	X No X No
compounding raciors		X				
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	N)					
DEFECT	Roo	t Flare	Trunk	Scaff	old	Branch
Poor taper						
Bow, sweep						
Co-dominants / forks						
Multiple attachments						
Included bark						
Excessive end weight						
Cracks / Splits						
Hangers						
Girdling						
Wounds / Seam						
Decay						
Cavity						
Fungal Fruiting Bodies						
Bleeding / Sap Flow						
Loose / Cracked Bark						
Birds / Bats / Bees						
Deadwood / Stubs						
Borers / Ants etc						
Cankers / Galls						
Previous failure						
HAZARD RATING						
Part most likely to fail	Whole tree	Scaffold	X Branch	Other		
Inspection frequency	⊢⊢	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other		
inspection frequency	Annual	2 - yearry	3 - Tearly	Oillei		
1.0 + 1.0 + 4.0	→ 6.0	Failure Potential	1 Low	2 Medium	3 High	4 Severe
Failure Size of Target		Size of part	1 15cm	2 15-45cm	3 45-7	75cm 4 > 75cm
Potential Part Rating	Rating	Target Rating	1 Occasional	2 Intermitter	nt 3 Freq	uent 4 Constant
			<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u></u>	
HAZARD ABATEMENT	Г					
D	\square		Dardon ()	15.		
Prune	X Yes	No	Reduce away from ph	T		
Inspect Further	Root	Decay	X Aerial	Monitor	Other	
Remove tree	Yes	x No	Replace Tree		Yes	x No
Move target	Yes	X No	Other	L		—
v						
COMMENTS						
	a constant Description	I a				
Phone lines. Multiple pruning	, wounds. Root d	ıamage.				



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

Building

X Hardscape

Yes

Yes

Rare

Parking

Utility

Νo

Νo

Intermittent

Road

x Frequent

Playing

Pedestrian

Other

Recreation

Landscape

Targets under tree

Restrict usage?

Occupancy

Can target be moved

	HAZARD	RATING	
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0
Failure	Size of	Target	Hazard
Potential	Part	Rating	Rating
lmmedi	ate action r	needed	
Needs	further insp	ection	
	Dead Tree		_

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crown Spread	Crown Clear	Special Value
2269	Beech	М	Gen Sym	Dom	1	835	23	19		

2269	Beech	M	Sym	Do	om	1	83	35	23			19			
			•		•			•							
Observ	ations Crown rai	sed a	nd pollard	ed h	nistor	ically									
TREE	HEALTH														
Foliage	colour		Normal		Chlor	otic		Necrotic	:						
Foliage	density		Vormal		Spars	se		1							
	on growth		Good	х	Aver	age		Poor							
Wound	wood devlopment		Good	х	Aver	age		Poor			None				
Vitality	class		Good		Aver	age	х	Fair	ľ		Poor				
Leaf siz	е		Normal		Small			4							
Epicorm	ic growth		Yes	х	No										
Dieback	(Yes	х	No										
Growth	obstructions	X	Yes		No		Pav	vement							
Pests/ [Diseases		Yes	х	No										
SITE C	ONDITIONS														
								7	r		Ī		٦		
Site cho		X	Domestic		Indus			POS	ļ		Natural		Woods	-	oup
Landsco	ipe type		-awn	X	Road	side		Border	ļ		Open		Garden	Ag	ric
Irrigatio	on	1	Vone		Good	I	X	Adequa	te		Poor		Excessive		
Site dist	urbance	X	Yes		No			-			1		,		
% drip	line paved		0%		10-2	5%		25-50%	ó		50-75%	x	75-100%	Otl	ner
% drip	line soil		0%	X	10-2	5%		25-50%	ó		50-75%		75-100%	Otl	ner
% dripl	ine grade lowered		0%	x	10-2	5%		25-50%	ó		50-75%		75-100%	Otl	ner
Soil pro	blems	x	Orainage		Shall	ow	x	Compa	t	X	Drought		Saline	Alk	aline
			Acidic	x	Volun	ne		Disease			Failure		Slope	Co	ntaminated
Obstruc	tions		_ights		Signo	ige		LOS			Utilities		Veg	Otl	ner
Exposur	e to wind		Open	x	Prote	cted		Group			Prone				
Prevaili	ng wind direction	Sout	h westerly					-			• 				
TARG	FT														

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT	·)				
Suspect Root Rot	Yes	X No			
Fruiting body present	Yes	x No		=	
Exposed roots	Severe	Moderate	Low	None	
Undermined	Severe	Moderate	Low		
Root pruned	Yes	x No	% Root area affe		
Buttress wounded	Yes	No	Approx age of w	ound	
Restricted root area	Severe	X Moderate	Low	None	
Potential for root failure	Severe	X Moderate	Low	_	
Lean	Natural	Unnatural	Corrected	Angle	
Soil heave	Yes	X No	Decay in plane of	F lean Yes	X No
Roots broken	Yes	X No	Soil cracking	Yes	X No
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>			
Compounding factors	Yes	X No			
					
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	/N)				
DEFECT	Ro	ot Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Poor taper					
Bow, sweep					
Co-dominants / forks Multiple attachments					
Included bark					
Excessive end weight					
Cracks / Splits					
Hangers					
Girdling					
Wounds / Seam					
Decay				V2	
Cavity Fungal Fruiting Bodies		+		Yes x 3	
Bleeding / Sap Flow					
Loose / Cracked Bark			Yes		
Birds / Bats / Bees					
Deadwood / Stubs					Yes
Borers / Ants etc					
Cankers / Galls					
Previous failure					
HAZARD RATING					
Part most likely to fail	Whole tree	Scaffold	★ Branch	Other	
Inspection frequency		2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other	
inspection frequency	Annual	2 - yeurry	3 - Teurly	Olliei	
1.0 + 1.0 + 4.0	→ 6.0	Failure Potentia	_	2 Medium 3 High	⊢
Failure Size of Targo Potential Part Ratin		Size of part Target Rating	1 15cm 1 Occasional	2 15-45cm 3 45- 2 Intermittent 3 Free	75cm 4 > 75cm quent 4 Constant
HAZARD ABATEMEN	т				
Prune	Yes	No	Crown lift and deadw	rood	
	X Yes Root	—	Aerial	- —	
Inspect Further	\vdash	Decay		- ¹	N _a
Remove tree	Yes	X No	Replace Tree	Yes	X No
Move target	Yes	X No	Other		
COMMENTS					
Root damage. Cavities to 3	leaders from o	ld pruning wou	nds. Minor bark necr	osis. Deadwood	



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

Good

Good

Normal

Yes

Yes

Yes

	HAZARD	RATING	
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0
Failure Potential	Size of Part	Target Rating	Hazard Rating
lmmedi	ate action r	needed	
Needs	further insp	pection	
	Dead Tree		

TREE CHARACTERISTICS

2270 Elm M Gen Sym Dom 1 465 18 18 Observations	Observations TREE HEALTH	Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Crown Spread	Crown Clear	Specia Value
Observations	TREE HEALTH	2270	Elm	М		Dom	1	465	18	18		
TREE HEALTH												
	Foliage density Normal Sparse	Foliage	colour	Nor			protic	Nec	rotic			

Poor

Pavement

None

Average

Average

Small

Νo

Νo

Νo

SITE CONDITIONS

Woundwood devlopment

Vitality class

Epicormic growth

Growth obstructions

Pests/ Diseases

Leaf size

Dieback

Site character	х	Domestic		Industrial		POS		Natural		Woods	Group
Landscape type		Lawn	x	Roadside		Border		Open		Garden	Agric
Irrigation		None		Good	х	Adequate		Poor		Excessive	•
Site disturbance		Yes	X	No		•				· 	_
% drip line paved		0%		10-25%		25-50%		50-75%	Х	75-100%	Other
% drip line soil		0%	х	10-25%		25-50%		50-75%		75-100%	Other
% dripline grade lowered		0%	х	10-25%		25-50%		50-75%		75-100%	Other
Soil problems	х	Drainage		Shallow	X	Compact	x	Drought		Saline	Alkaline
		Acidic	X	Volume		Disease		Failure		Slope	Contaminated
Obstructions		Lights		Signage		LOS		Utilities		Veg	Other
Exposure to wind		Open	X	Protected		Group		Prone			•
Prevailing wind direction	Sou	th westerly				•		-			

Targets under tree	х	Building	х	Parking	x	Road	x	Pedestrian	Recreation	Landscape	•
	x	Hardscape		Utility		Playing		Other	-	 _	
Can target be moved		Yes	х	No		•		•			
Restrict usage?		Yes	х	No							
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	X	Frequent		Constant	Other		

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT)					
Suspect Root Rot Fruiting body present Exposed roots Undermined Root pruned Buttress wounded Restricted root area Potential for root failure Lean Soil heave Roots broken Compounding factors	Yes Yes Severe Severe Yes Yes Severe Severe Natural Yes Yes Yes	X No X No Moderate Moderate X No X No X Moderate X Moderate Unnatural X No X No	X Low Low X % Root area affect Approx age of wo Low Low Corrected Decay in plane of Soil cracking	None Angle	<u> </u>
compositioning record					
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	N)				
				C (C)	
DEFECT	Roo	t Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Poor taper					
Bow, sweep					
Co-dominants / forks					
Multiple attachments					
Included bark					
Excessive end weight					
Cracks / Splits					
Hangers					
Girdling					
Wounds / Seam			Yes (Fibre buckle)		
Decay			Tes (Tible bockle)		
Cavity					
-					
Fungal Fruiting Bodies					
Bleeding / Sap Flow					
Loose / Cracked Bark					
Birds / Bats / Bees					
Deadwood / Stubs					Yes
Borers / Ants etc					
Cankers / Galls					
Previous failure					
	•	•		•	•
HAZARD RATING					
David was at library to facil	Whole tree	Scaffold	¥ Branch	Other	
Part most likely to fail		—			
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other	
1.0 _ 1.0 _ 4.0	6.0	Failure Potentia	ıl 1 Low	2 Medium 3 Hig	gh 4 Severe
Failure Size of Target	Hazard	Size of part	1 15cm	2 15-45cm 3 45	-75cm 4 > 75cm
Potential Part Rating		Target Rating	1 Occasional		equent 4 Constant
					
HAZARD ABATEMENT	- !				
		_			
Prune	x Yes	No	Deadwood and crown	lift	
Inspect Further	Root	Decay	Aerial X	Monitor Other	
Remove tree	Yes	H., '	Replace Tree	Yes	X No
					<u> </u>
Move target	Yes	X No	Other		
COMMENTS					
Deadwood. Root damage. F	ibre bucklina (h	istoric). Monito	or.		
		,			



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

HAZARD RATING								
1.0	1.0	6.0						
Failure Potential	Size of	Target Rating	Hazard Rating					
lmmedi	ate action r							
Needs further inspection								
	Dead Tree							

TREE CHARACTERISTICS

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height	Cro	own Spread	Crown Clear	Specia Value
2271	Beech	М	Gen Sym	Dom	1	900	26		19		
TREE HE	ALTH										
		Nor	mal	Chlo	orotic	Nec	rotic				
Foliage col Foliage de	our nsity	Nor Nor		Spa	rse						
Foliage col Foliage de	our nsity	_	mal		rse	Nec Poor					
Foliage col Foliage de Extension ç	our nsity	Nor	mal od	Spa	rse rage		r	None			
Foliage col Foliage de Extension ç Woundwoo	our nsity growth od devlopment	Nor	mal od	Spa X Ave	rse rage	Pooi	r r	None Poor			
Foliage col Foliage de Extension ç Woundwoo Vitality cla	our nsity growth od devlopment	Nor God God	mal od od	Spa X Ave	rse rage rage rage	Poor	r r				
Foliage col Foliage de Extension ç Woundwoo Vitality cla Leaf size	our nsity growth od devlopment ss	Nor Goo Goo	mal od od	X Ave	rse rage rage rage	Poor	r r				
Foliage col Foliage de Extension ç Woundwoo Vitality cla Leaf size Epicormic ç	our nsity growth od devlopment ss	North	mal od od	X Avei X Avei Sma X No	rse rage rage rage	Poor	r r				
Foliage col Foliage de Extension ç	our nsity growth od devlopment ss	Nor Goo Goo Nor Yes	mal od od	X Avel Avel Avel Sma	rse rage rage rage	Poor	r				

SITE CONDITIONS

								_			
Site character	х	Domestic		Industrial		POS		Natural		Woods	Group
Landscape type		Lawn	x	Roadside		Border		Open		Garden	Agric
Irrigation		None		Good	х	Adequate		Poor		Excessive	•
Site disturbance		Yes	X	No							
% drip line paved		0%		10-25%		25-50%		50-75%	X	75-100%	Other
% drip line soil		0%	х	10-25%		25-50%		50-75%		75-100%	Other
% dripline grade lowered		0%	х	10-25%		25-50%		50-75%		75-100%	Other
Soil problems	х	Drainage		Shallow	x	Compact	x	Drought		Saline	Alkaline
		Acidic	x	Volume		Disease		Failure		Slope	Contaminated
Obstructions	х	Lights		Signage		LOS		Utilities		Veg	Other
Exposure to wind		Open	x	Protected		Group		Prone			•
Prevailing wind direction	Sou	th westerly						•			

Targets under tree	Ĥ	Building Hardscape	х	Parking Utility		Road Playing	Pedestrian Other	Recreation Street light	Landscape
Can target be moved		Yes	х	No					
Restrict usage?		Yes	х	No					
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	X	Frequent	Constant	Other	

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT	')				
Suspect Root Rot	Yes	X No			
Fruiting body present	Yes	x No		_	
Exposed roots	Severe	Moderate	X Low	None	
Undermined	Severe	Moderate	Low	None	
Root pruned	Yes	x No	% Root area affe	ected	
Buttress wounded	Yes	x No	Approx age of w	ound	
Restricted root area	Severe	X Moderate	Low	None	
Potential for root failure	Severe	X Moderate	Low	-	
Lean	Natural	Unnatural	Corrected	Angle	
Soil heave	Yes	<u>⊢</u>			la Ne
	\vdash	X No	Decay in plane of		X No
Roots broken	Yes	X No	Soil cracking	Yes	X No
Compounding factors	Yes	x No			
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	/N)				
DEFECT	R	oot Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Poor taper					
Bow, sweep					
Co-dominants / forks					
Multiple attachments					
Included bark					
Excessive end weight					
Cracks / Splits					V
Hangers Girdling		Yes			Yes
Wounds / Seam		res	Yes	Yes	
Decay			163	163	
Cavity					
Fungal Fruiting Bodies					
Bleeding / Sap Flow					
Loose / Cracked Bark					
Birds / Bats / Bees					
Deadwood / Stubs					Yes
Borers / Ants etc					
Cankers / Galls					
Previous failure					
HAZARD RATING					
	_	_		=	
Part most likely to fail	Whole tre	ee Scaffold	X Branch	Other	
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other	
	<u> </u>		<u> </u>		
1.0 . 1.0 . 4.0	0 6.0	Failure Potentic	ıl 1 Low	2 Medium 3 High	1 Severe
Failure Size of Targ	et Hazard	Size of part	1 15cm	2 15-45cm 3 45-3	75cm 4 > 75cm
Potential Part Ratin		Target Rating	1 Occasional	2 Intermittent 3 Fred	<u> </u>
		. a. goag	1 O doddional	Z mierimiem G i i s	4 00
HAZARD ABATEMEN	т				
HALAKU ADA I EMEN	<u> </u>				
	 .,	<u> </u>		lef.	
Prune	X Yes	No	Crown clean and crov		
Inspect Further	Root	Decay	Aerial X	Monitor Other	
Remove tree	Yes	x No	Replace Tree	Yes	x No
Move target	Yes	X No	Other	<u> </u>	
			<u> </u>		
COMMENTS					
Large seam (3m long). Prun	ing wound to s	scaffold. Hanger	in crown. Ribs to ste	m. Root damage. Girdli	ng root.

Monitor.



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

HAZARD RATING									
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0						
Failure	Size of	Target	Hazard						
Potential	Part	Rating	Rating						
lmmedi	Immediate action needed								
Needs further inspection									
	Dead Tree								

Tree ID	Species	Age Class	Form	Crown Class	No. Stems	DBH	Height		Crov	vn Spred	ıd	Crown Clear	Specia Value
2272	Horse Chestnut	Υ	Gen Sym	Dom	1	300	10			9			
Observo	itions												
TREE H	IEALTH												
oliage	colour	Nor	mal	Chlo	orotic	Nec	rotic						
oliage		Nor	mal	Spa									
	n growth	God		X Ave		Poo	r						
	vood devlopment	God			rage	Poo			None				
itality o	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	God		<u> </u>	rage	Fair			Poor				
eaf size		Nor		Smo	_				1. 00.				
	c growth	Yes		X No									
Dieback	-	Yes		X No	•								
	obstructions	x Yes		No		Pavem	ent / Ph	one	lines				
Pests/ D		x Yes		No			ng canke						
SITE C	ONDITIONS												
Site cha	racter	X Don	nestic	Indu	ıstrial	POS	S		Natural		Woods	Gro	up
andsca	pe type	Law	n 'n	X Roa	dside	Boro	der		Open		Garden	Agri	с
rrigatio	n	Non	ne	God	od	X Ade	equate		Poor		Excessive		
Site dist	ırbance	Yes		X No				-	•				
∕₀ drip l	ine paved	0%			25%	25-	50%		50-75%	x	75-100%	Othe	er
√ drip l	ine soil	0%		x 10-3	25%	25-	50%		50-75%		75-100%	Othe	er
∕₀ dripli	ne grade lowered	0%		x 10-1	25%	25-	50%		50-75%		75-100%	Othe	er
oil prol	olems	x Dra	inage	-	llow	X Con	npact	х	Drought		Saline	Alko	line
		Acid		X Volu	ıme	_	ease		Failure		Slope	Con	aminated
				$oldsymbol{oldsymbol{ o}}$					1	\vdash			
Obstruct	ions	Ligh	nts	Sign	nage	LOS	5	X	Utilities	l l'	Veg	Othe	er

Targets under tree	х	Building	x	Parking	х	Road	x	Pedestrian	Recreation	Landscape	
	х	Hardscape	x	Utility		Playing		Other	 - -	-	
Can target be moved		Yes	х	No		•		•			
Restrict usage?		Yes	х	No							
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	x	Frequent		Constant	Other		

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT))				
Suspect Root Rot Fruiting body present Exposed roots Undermined Root pruned Buttress wounded Restricted root area Potential for root failure Lean Soil heave Roots broken Compounding factors TREE DEFECTS (CROW	Yes Yes Severe Severe Yes Yes Severe Natural Yes Yes Yes	X No X No X Moderate Moderate X No X Moderate X Moderate Unnatural X No X No	Low Low % Root area affer Approx age of w Low Low Corrected Decay in plane of Soil cracking	ected ound None	X No No
INCLUDED CONTRACTOR	,				
DEFECT	Poo	t Flare	Trunk	Scaffold	Branch
Poor taper	Koc	riule	HOHK	Scarroid	Branch
Bow, sweep					
Co-dominants / forks					
Multiple attachments					
Included bark					
Excessive end weight					
Cracks / Splits					
Hangers					
Girdling					
Wounds / Seam		Yes			
Decay					
Cavity					
Fungal Fruiting Bodies					
Bleeding / Sap Flow			Yes		
Loose / Cracked Bark					
Birds / Bats / Bees					
Deadwood / Stubs					
Borers / Ants etc					
Cankers / Galls					
Previous failure					
HAZARD RATING					
Dave more librature fait	Whole tree	Scaffold	Rranah -	Other	
Part most likely to fail	—		X Branch		
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other	
1.0 + 1.0 + 4.0 Failure Size of Targe	-→	Failure Potential	1 Low 15cm	2 Medium 3 High 2 15-45cm 3 45-	1 4 Severe 75cm 4 > 75cm
Potential Part Rating		Target Rating	1 Occasional	2 Intermittent 3 Free	quent 4 Constant
		99			
HAZARD ABATEMENT	Γ				
Prune	Yes	No	Prune away from pho	ne lines.	
		-		_	
Inspect Further	Root	X Decay		Monitor Other	<u> </u>
Remove tree	Yes	X No	Replace Tree	Yes	X No
Move target	Yes	x No	Other		
COMMENTS	<u>-</u>				
Significant basal damage. E	Bleeding canker.	Interfering wit	h phone lines.		



Site/Address	Jessop Road, Norwich NR2
Map/Location	
Owner	Norwich City Council
Date	23rd March 2008
Date of last inspection	Not available
Inspector	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer

HAZARD RATING									
1.0	1.0	4.0	6.0						
Failure	Size of	Target	Hazard						
Potential	rential Part Rating								
lmmedi	ate action r	needed							
Needs	pection								
	Dead Tree								

nspecii	Oli									Ne	eas turtner insp	ection	
nspecto	or	Chris Raper / Giles Mercer						Dead Tree					
.n.= -	611 A P A 6-	-DIG=: 6:	_										
KEE (CHARACTI	ERISTIC	5										
1					Cro	wn No.			I			Crown	Specia
Tree ID	Specie	es		ge ass Form	Cro		DBH	Height		Crow	n Spread	Crown	Value
2273	273 Horse Chestnut			Gen	ν-	m 1	150) 17			5		
22/3	norse Cn	estnut		Sym	Do	m I	130) 17					
Observ	rations												
REE I	HEALTH												
oliage	colour			Normal		Chlorotic		ecrotic					
	density			Normal		Sparse							
	on growth			Good	x	Average	P	oor					
Wound ¹	wood devlop	ment		Good	x	Average	P	oor		None			
/itality	class			Good		Average	x F	air		Poor			
eaf siz				Normal		Small							
picorm	nic growth			Yes	x	No							
Dieback				Yes	x	No							
Growth	obstructions		х	Yes		No	Pave	ment					
Pests/ [Diseases			Yes	x	No							
				•									
SITE C	CONDITION	15											
Site cha	aracter		х	Domestic		Industrial	P	OS		Natural	Woods	Gro	υр
.andscc	ape type			Lawn	х	Roadside	В	order	(Open	Garden	Agri	c
rrigatio	on			None		Good	x A	dequate		Poor	Excessive		
ite dist	turbance		х	Yes		No					<u></u>		
∕₀ drip	line paved			0%		10-25%	2	5-50%		50-75%	x 75-100%	Oth	er
	line soil			0%	x	10-25%	2	5-50%		50-75%	75-100%	Oth	er
% dripl	line grade lo	wered		0%	x	10-25%	2	5-50%		50-75%	75-100%	Oth	er
Soil pro			х	Drainage		Shallow	x	ompact	x	Drought	Saline	Alko	ıline
				Acidic	x	Volume	D	isease		Failure	Slope	Con	taminated
Obstruc	ctions			Lights		Signage	Lo	OS		Utilities	Veg	Oth	er
xposur	re to wind			Open	x	Protected	G	roup		Prone		—	
	ing wind dire	ction	Sou	ıth westerl									
ΓARG	ET												
				D :1 1:		D 1:			<u> </u>	D 1 . •			
argets	under tree			Building	-	Parking	X R			Pedestrian	Recreation	Land	dscape
			X	Hardscape		Utility	I P	laying		Other			

Targets under tree	х	Building	х	Parking	x	Road	x	Pedestrian	Recreation	Landscape	•
	x	Hardscape		Utility		Playing		Other	-	 	
Can target be moved		Yes	х	No		•		•			
Restrict usage?		Yes	х	No							
Occupancy		Rare		Intermittent	X	Frequent		Constant	Other		

TREE DEFECTS (ROOT)					
Suspect Root Rot Fruiting body present Exposed roots Undermined Root pruned Buttress wounded Restricted root area Potential for root failure Lean Soil heave Roots broken	Yes Yes Yes Severe Yes Yes Severe Severe Natural Yes Yes	X No X Moderate Moderate X No No X Moderate X Moderate X Moderate Unnatural X No X No	Low Low % Root area affe Approx age of w Low Low Corrected Decay in plane o Soil cracking	ected	Yes Yes	X No
Compounding factors	Yes	X No				
TREE DEFECTS (CROW	'N)					
DEFECT	Roo	t Flare	Trunk	Scaff	old	Branch
Poor taper						
Bow, sweep						
Co-dominants / forks						
Multiple attachments						
Included bark						
Excessive end weight						
Cracks / Splits						
Hangers						
Girdling						
Wounds / Seam						
Decay						
Cavity						
Fungal Fruiting Bodies						
Bleeding / Sap Flow						
Loose / Cracked Bark						
Birds / Bats / Bees						
Deadwood / Stubs						
Borers / Ants etc						
Cankers / Galls						
Previous failure						
HAZARD RATING						
				٦		
Part most likely to fail	Whole tree	Scaffold	X Branch	Other		
Inspection frequency	X Annual	2 - yearly	5 - Yearly	Other		
1.0 _ 1.0 _ 4.0	6.0	Failure Potential	1 Low	2 Medium	3 High	4 Severe
Failure Size of Targe	t Hazard	Size of part	1 15cm	2 15-45cm	3 45-750	cm 4 > 75cm
Potential Part Rating		Target Rating	1 Occasional	2 Intermitten	Freque	nt 4 Constant
HAZARD ABATEMENT	<u>r</u>					
D		П _{М-}				
Prune	Yes	X No		٦	_	
Inspect Further	Root	Decay		Monitor	Other	
Remove tree	Yes	X No	Replace Tree	L	Yes	x No
Move target	Yes	X No	Other			
COMMENTS						
Showing some signs of graf	t incompatibility	- monitor				