## Meeting of the

## ESTATES COMMITTEE

Will be held at the Springfield Centre,

## Springfield Boulevard, Springfield

on

## Tuesday 11 June 2024 at 6.30pm

## AGENDA

## Committee Members:

| Cllr L Adura | Cllr J Howard |
| :--- | :--- |
| Cllr B Barton | Cllr K Kavarana |
| Cllr V Dixon | Cllr K Kent |
| Cllr R Golding (Chair) | Cllr D Pafford |
| Cllr B Greenwood | Cllr M Petchey |

## AGENDA

## 1. To Receive:

Apologies for Absence
Declarations of Interest
Members of the Public Present
2. Appointment of Vice Chairperson

The Committee is invited to consider if there is a requirement to elect a Vice Chairperson, and if so, appoint a Vice Chairperson to May 2025.
3. Appointment of Lead Members

Committee is invited to consider if there is a requirement to appoint any Lead Member(s), and if so, appoint and define their role/s to May 2025.
4. Minutes of the Meeting held on the 9 April 2024
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Committee is invited to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 9 April 2024, previously circulated and therefore taken as read.
5. Public Involvement - Deputations, Petitions and Questions

Members of the public may make representations in respect of the business on the agenda.
6. Fishermead Sports Ground Working Group

Nothing to report, Committee is invited to note the next Working Group meeting will be held later this month, date to be confirmed.
7. Community Hub, Working Group Update and Recommendations

Committee is invited to receive an update from the Working Group, including any recommendations.

Committee is further invited to consider the inclusion of a new defibrillator and public access cabinet for the Community Hub project (part funding available from Department of Health \& Social Care, cost to CPCC £750).
8. Kernow Crescent Play Park Annual Inspection Report - E01/24
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Committee is invited to receive, note, and action the independent annual Inspection report of Kernow Crescent play area as carried out by Seagrave Inspection Services Ltd.
9. Woodland Management Plan, Tree Survey Report - E02/24

Committee is invited to receive, note, and action the tree survey report of land managed by the Community Council as carried out by MPL Tree Consultancy Ltd.
10. Annual Estates Equipment Report - E03/24

The Committee is invited to receive and consider the Annual Estates Equipment Report, including the recommendation contained therein.
11. Springfield Centre Disabled Parking Bay Provision

If available, the Committee is invited to receive, and if appropriate, agree the parking bay technical specification as proposed by Stuart Thomas Associated Ltd.
12. Allotments Tenancy Termination Procedure - E04/24

Page 53
Committee is invited to receive and note a report on the procedure used for communicating with allotment tenants whose plots are not being maintained, including where necessary the termination of the tenancy.
13. Date of Next Meeting

Tuesday 9 July 2024 at 6.30pm

## BY ORDER OF THE COUNCIL

## Dominic Warner

D Warner<br>Clerk to Council<br>4 June 2024

# Minutes of the meeting of the Estates Committee held on Tuesday $9^{\text {th }}$ April 2024 at 6.30pm at the Springfield Centre, Springfield Boulevard, Springfield 

This meeting was open to the public

| 115/23 | Members Present |
| :---: | :---: |
| 116/23 | Apologies for Absence None |
| 117/23 | Declarations of Interest None |
| 118/23 | Members of the Public Present None |
| 119/23 | Minutes of the Meeting held on the $\mathbf{1 2}^{\text {th }}$ March 2024 The minutes of the meeting, having previously been circulated, were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair. |
| 120/23 | Public Involvement - Deputations, Petitions and Questions None |
| 121/23 | New arrangements for the procurement and use of energy (electric \& gas) at Council buildings. Report E9/23 <br> Committee received a report from the Estates Manager on the progression of this matter, resolving to recommend to Council that it renews its existing arrangement for the procurement of energy through the LASER framework for another 4-years to 2028. |

122/23 Terms of Reference
Committee reviewed its Terms of Reference prior to the Annual Meeting of Council in May. With changes made to reflect references to the Environment Officer being replaced with Estates Manager, and with points $7,8 \& 9$ removed, and points $15 \& 16$ updated, the Committee resolved to recommend the updated Terms of Reference for acceptance at the annual meeting of Council.

123/23 Fishermead Sports Ground Working Group
Committee received and considered the Working Group draft Terms of Reference and Vision Statement, resolving to recommend them to Council for acceptance. Committee received and noted the minutes of the inaugural Working Group meeting.

124/23 Community Hub, Room-by-Room Requirement Review Working Group Update and Recommendations
Committee received an update from the Working Group, including:

- details of the previously unidentified concrete layer underneath the existing car park which requires removal at additional cost
- receipt and associated payment arrangements for the latest Steele and Bray invoice
- anticipated receipt of MKCC CIF grant
- old pub patio area needs to be demolished and rebuilt (at additional cost) as not suitable for use in new Hub scheme

125/23 Kernow Crescent Play Park
Committee noted that it had not been possible to obtain a contractor quotation for the required remedial work and that the landscape team would complete the work in the coming month.

126/23 Springfield Centre Disabled Parking Bay Provision
Committee reviewed the parking bay technical specification fee proposal from Stuart Thomas Associates. Committee agreed that the technical specification was required to progress the project and resolved to accept it.

127/23 Date of Next Meeting
Tuesday $14^{\text {th }}$ May 2024 at 6.30 pm

REPORT TO: Estates Committee<br>DATE: 11 June 2024<br>REPORT ON: Kernow Crescent Play Area Annual Inspection<br>REPORT BY: Estates Manager \& Estates Officer<br>REPORT NO: E01/24

## Purpose of report

To update members on the condition of Kernow Crescent play area, its recent annual inspection, and remedial works carried out in the last year, and to be carried out this year.

## Last years works.

Since last year's annual inspection, we have removed the low retaining wall at the rear of the play area, and graded back the soil and re-grassed this new bank. This has removed a large hazard, that was also unsightly. The wet pour surface in the ping-pong area has repeatedly been flagged as a trip hazard, this has now been removed and the area resurfaced with self-binding gravel, which is safer and looks better too. We had a broken and dangerous springy removed, and the hole made good, and a number of patchy surfaces repaired around the site. The trampoline bed also broke, and despite our best efforts to source a replacement bed, we eventually took the decision to back fill the hole with soil. This continues to settle, and we will continue to fill it until we can re-grass this small patch too. We have also carried out a number of small repairs to individual pieces of equipment throughout the year, as they are flagged in our weekly inspections

## Weekly inspections.

Now John has retired, we have had Sophie Gibbens (Estates Officer) trained up to do the weekly inspections, which she is carrying out, and reporting any faults to the Estates Manager for action.

## Annual inspection.

Attached to this report is the annual inspection itself (Campbell Park C.C. A.I.2024.pdf), and below is a table of the faults found, their risk rating and what has/will be done to rectify the issue.

Any items identified in the report and not in this table are items for us to monitor and rectify as necessary, which is being done.

| Rating | Issue | Rectified |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 8 | Uneven footpath (tarmac)- trip hazard | we are looking in to long term solutions for this |
| 10 | stumps in gravel area | we will be grinding these out this year |
| $4 / 5$ | damaged fencing | we regularly bend this back in to shape, and <br> monitor |
| 4 | paint chips on benches | we are monitoring this for sharp edges |
| 12 | Pendulum swing, shackles and seat | new seat and shackles have been ordered and <br> will be fitted ASAP. This will correct seat height <br> and replace bushes at the same time |
| 12 | swing chains | we will replace these at 40\% wear as <br> recommended |
| 7 | soil too low in former trampoline | we are regularly re filling this to remove the <br> hazard |
| $8-13$ | shakes in wooden poles - ship and tower <br> multiplay | sanded and monitored regularly, the exposed <br> screws and loose fittings in this section have <br> been rectified |
| 13 | swing seat in junior area missing a strap | seat replaced last month |



## Annual Inspection Report



| Client: | Campbell Park Community Council |
| ---: | :--- |
| Address: | 1 Pencarrow Place Fishermead Milton Keynes MK6 <br> 2AS |
| Date: | 7th May 2024 |
| Inspector: | Peter Briggs |

Assessed site risk at time of inspection
High Risk (13)


## GENERAL COMMENTS

Monitor area and review all fixings for security. The concept of the Operational/Annual/Post Installation is to assist the customer in providing a programme of works as recommended with any findings or EN failures. Consider a robust maintenance and inspection schedule. Guidance should be given that the installation process has been followed as per the manufactures/suppliers instructions.

The following notes form an important part of the inspection report - The equipment has been assessed to the relevant British version of the European Standard namely BSEN1176 for Playground Equipment, BSEN14974 for Wheeled Sports, BSEN15312 for Multi Use Games Areas and BSEN16630 for permanently installed Outdoor Fitness Gym Equipment. The standards mentioned are minimum standards and are not a legal requirement, where in the opinion of the Inspector compliance failure is noted then there is a risk assessed accordingly. Risk assessment is a legal requirement and should the need arise a court or a Health and Safety Inspector will ask to see the assessment, the level of risk has to be acceptable.

Seagrave Inspection Services Ltd risk assessment is based on Peter Heseltine and Bob Cooks Third Edition Assessing Risk on Children's Playgrounds, this is not a definitive list of terms of all equipment, however; the book principles will be applied, other factors such as accident statistics, Inspectors experience are also relevant.

Inspections are non-dismantling, for equipment that disappears into enclosed fixings dismantling inspection will be advised accordingly. Equipment over 2.5 metre heights are excluded from Seagrave Inspection Services Ltd, for wear parts above this height an advisory note will be provided if felt necessary.

Structural loadings should be provided by the manufacturer for all types of above mentioned equipment.
Guidance should be sought from the supplier for certification that the depth or type of surfacing used meets EN1177 for HIC requirements.

This report indicates the assessed level of risk at the time of visiting and not a given or implied guarantee to the installation process or product warranty. No dismantling of equipment took place or any other general maintenance. This report also does not confirm the playground will remain free from possible product conflict for the period until the next audit. Refer to the owner of the play area for any routine or operational inspections and the manufacturers recommended schedules for ongoing maintenance/inspection requirements before and after this audit.

There are three levels of inspection; Routine, Operational and Annual. The Annual Inspection checks the Operational and the Operational checks the Routine Inspections. A risk assessment is also provided where considered necessary and categorised on a score rating as follows;

| Risk rating | Action |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{1 - 3} \quad$ Very Low Risk | Monitor |  |
| 4-7 $\quad$ Low Risk | Monitor and take reasonable action if required |  |
| $\mathbf{8 - 1 2}$ | Medium Risk | Take action to reduce if possible |
| $\mathbf{1 3 - 2 0}$ | High Risk | Take action ASAP to implement control measures |
| $\mathbf{2 1 +} \quad$ Unacceptable Risk | Remove or immobilise immediately |  |

## ANCILLARY ITEMS

Ancillary items such as; seats, litter bins, gates, planting form part of the inspection along with comments relating to the facilities in close proximity to roadways, water courses, electrical substations, overhead cables and any structure considered a hazard i.e. general safety of the area.

| Item | Classification | Comments and <br> Recommendations |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Access | Monitor | None |
| Pathways | Average | See report |
| Fencing | Average | See report |
| Gate(s) | Present: No | Consider ownership signage use |
| Sign(s) | Average | See report |
| Seat(s) | Acceptable | Monitor |
| Litter Bin(s) | Average | Monitor area |
| Cleanliness | Trees <br> Grass <br> Monitor area | Monitor nearby trees <br> Acceptable |
| Planting | Monitor use |  |



As above finding.
Recommendation:
$\frac{\text { Recomme comment. }}{\text { As above }}$


Distorted fence rail(s).
Recommendation:


## Damaged bow top fencing <br> Recommendation: <br> $\frac{\text { Recommendation }}{\text { Monitor this condition }}$

## Findings at the time of inspection with risk number



Worn paintwork to benches evident.
Recommendation:
Repaint as necessary.


Old tree stump evident in seating area. Possible trip/slip hazard.

Recommendation:
$\frac{\text { Recommendation }}{\text { Remove stump(s). }}$


Trip hazard to various seating areas.
Recommendation:
$\frac{\text { Recommendation: }}{\text { Improve to flush condition. }}$


> Tarmac subsidence evident around site.
> Recommendation:
> Monitor to repair as necessary.

## Findings at the time of inspection with risk number



No faults found during the inspection.
Recommendation:
$\frac{\text { Recommendation: }}{\text { No action required, }}$ monitor this area.



## Findings at the time of inspection with risk number







Exposed screw fixings evident in places.
Recommendation:
Remove this condition and refer back to manufacturer for comment if necessary.


Weathered wooden items.
Recommendation:
$\frac{\text { Recommendation }}{\text { Consider to re-stain }}$ areas.

## Findings at the time of inspection with risk number

Loose rope fixing in split post.
Recommendation:
Repair as required asap.


## Recommendation:

## Recommendation:

## Findings at the time of inspection with risk number



Some areas of timber appear to show evidence of splits/ decay in places.

Recommendation:
$\frac{\text { Recommendation: }}{\text { Repair/replace areas as required asap. }}$






Damaged surrounding surface and steps.
Recommendation:
$\frac{\text { Recommendation. }}{\text { Repair as necessary asap. }}$


## Findings at the time of inspection with risk number



Rust/corrosion evident in some areas.

## Recommendation:

Monitor to rub down and repaint as required.


Gaps in matting.
Recommendation:

Rubber bonded fibre breaking up.
Recommendation:
$\frac{\text { Recommendation }}{\text { Repair/replace as necessary. }}$


> Signage missing on some items.
> Recommendation:
> Replace as required.


## Findings at the time of inspection with risk number



No faults found during the inspection.
Recommendation:
No action required, monitor this item.


| Item | Triple Seat Spring Seesaw |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Supplier |  |  |  |  |  |
| Surface | Unknown |  |  |  |  |
| Risk Rating Overall Pour | Very Low | Low | Medium | High | Unacceptable |
|  |  | 5 |  |  |  |



| Item |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Supplier | Europlay |  |  |  |  |
| Surface | Wet Pour |  |  |  |  |
| Risk Rating Overall | Very Low | Low | Medium | High | Unacceptable |
|  |  | 6 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Findings at the time of inspection with risk number




|  | Recommendation: |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Recommendation: |




## Inspection Scope for RPII Annual Inspectors

This document outlines the RPII scope for inspections undertaken by the Inspectors listed as Annual Inspectors on the RPII Register of Inspectors when undertaking Indoor Annual, Outdoor Annual, Outdoor Operational and Outdoor Routine inspections.

Inspections are undertaken with reference to the standards listed in this preamble only; where no date for the standard is given it will be the standard that is current at the time of inspection except where overlap periods are granted by the standards committee when standards are updated. The information contained in reports is provided to assist the owner/operator in fulfilling their responsibilities as detailed in the relevant standard. Other standards referenced within the listed standards do not form part of the inspection, unless they are also explicitly listed here.

The following standards are relevant to all installations of equipment that are publicly accessible to users; this includes public parks, pay and play parks, schools, nurseries, public houses, holiday parks, indoor play centres, farm parks etc. All equipment used or employed in publicly accessible areas should meet with the requirements of the relevant standards (listed below):

BS EN 1176 Parts 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, $10 \& 11$ Playground equipment intended for permanent installation outdoors \& indoors.

BS EN 1176 Part 7 - 'Guidance on Installation, Inspection, Maintenance and Operation' (this document gives guidance to the owners/operators of the facility on the installation, inspection, maintenance and operation of playground equipment, excluding ancillary items).

In the United Kingdom the National Foreword forms an important part to the understanding and implementation of the recommendations set out in this document. It clarifies the application of the document within the UK as best practice guidance, as the document has been used since its initial publication. Therefore, in the UK this standard (BS EN 1176 - Part 7) contains no requirements and needs to be read and implemented as guidance, with the use of the term 'shall' therefore becoming a recommendation, as in the term 'should'.

Domestic play equipment falls outside of the scope of BS EN 1176 and has its own standards (BS EN 71 series - Safety of Toys). Where domestic equipment can be identified this will be acknowledged in the report but any comments concerning compliance will follow the requirements and recommendations of BS EN 1176.

When water play items, including spray parks, are inspected any comments concerning compliance within the inspection will refer to EN 1176. We have not assessed these against the requirements of EN 17232 (Water play equipment and features).

Other equipment that is not clearly identified as unsupervised or domestic (natural play, self-build equipment etc.) will be assessed for compliance with the relevant standard listed below:

BS EN 15312 Free access multi-sports equipment
BS EN 14974 Skateparks
BS EN 16630 Permanently installed outdoor fitness equipment
BS EN 16899 Parkour equipment (plus RPII/API guidance notes)
Annual and Post Installation inspections will take into consideration compliance with these current standards, and defects related to wear and vandalism. Items not listed in the report have not been included in the inspection. The inspection will cover the playground equipment and the active area (that area which is obviously part of the playground), nominally up to three metres around, the fence line if closer, or other areas as agreed.

Operational inspections only take into consideration defects related to cleanliness, equipment ground clearances, ground surface finishes, exposed foundations, sharp edges, missing parts, excessive wear (of moving parts) structural integrity, wear and vandalism.
Routine visual inspections relate only to the most obvious defects such as broken or missing parts, litter, vandalism and issues created by severe weather conditions (the intention is to identify hazards created by storm damage).

All inspections are non-dismantling, non-destructive and do not include any structural, toxicology or impact assessments defined in the standard; however, the inspector will undertake a manual test for stability and if equipment fails under manual load, or any other hazard is identified as an unacceptable risk, the owner/ operator will be notified as soon as practicably possible.

The inspector will access all reasonably accessible equipment and will assess all reasonably accessible parts above the standing surface. Where it is not possible to access parts of the equipment without employing an alternative means of access the report will record the action required by the owner/operator to ensure the continued safe use of the equipment.

Ancillary equipment will be assessed using the inspector's knowledge and experience of the standards named in this document. (Note: Ancillary items are not included in the specific equipment-type parts of the EN 1176 series; hence they are not assessed for compliance with EN 1176 series and are subject to a general safety assessment).

The owner/operator is responsible for the overall safety of the equipment and area.
The inspector will not undertake any of the following works unless specifically agreed in writing at the time of order:

Checking the depth and underlying structural integrity of any surface areas and/or carrying out any testing of the impact attenuating properties of any surfaces; the identification of any corrosion, rot or other deterioration in any apparatus or equipment other than by an external inspection; the inspection of any equipment (or part thereof) that is beneath the playing surface (loose-fill materials may be moved to expose foundations); tightening any bolts, hinges or other fixing devices on any apparatus or equipment; assessing or inspecting any electrical installations contained on any site and/or apparatus and/or equipment; assessing or inspecting any water supplies and/or water features and/or any associated computerised systems (including carrying out any programming); where planting or trees are mentioned in the report no assessments of toxicity, suitability or condition are undertaken - the owner/operator should have suitable inspections provided by a competent person.

The owner/operator should have a 'design risk assessment' provided by the manufacturer/designer of the area for the equipment and location in which the facility is installed.

The operator is responsible for managing risks of their provision and is required by law to carry out a 'suitable and sufficient assessment' of the risks associated with a site or activity. This inspection shall be considered as contributing to the operator's discharge of this responsibility.

The details contained within the report are a snapshot of the condition at the time of inspection only and subsequent events may affect the condition of the facility. Suggested remedial actions are based on the knowledge and experience of the inspector and/or that of the inspection company. The owner/operator should always seek the advice of the manufacturer or a competent person when undertaking repairs and/or modifications to equipment.

## Table 1

The operator is responsible for following the guidance of the relevant standards. The standards give guidance on the installation, inspection, maintenance and operation of the various types of facilities. The inspection guidance is listed in Table 1, with an indication of which parts will be included in an RPII Annual or Post-Installation Inspection. The relevant standards also contain additional parts which the operator should follow.

| Inspection Recommendations of relevant standards Refer to relevant standards for full text | Annual Main | RPII Annual/ Post Installation Inspection |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6.1 d) Overall levels of safety of equipment (see note 1) | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ [1] |
| 6.1 d) Overall levels of safety of foundations (see note 1) | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark[1]$ |
| 6.1 d) Overall levels of safety of playing surfaces (see note 2) | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark[2]$ |
| 6.1 d) Compliance with the relevant parts of the standard and or risk assessment (see note 3) | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark[3]$ |
| 6.1 d) Effects of weather | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| 6.1 d) Presence of rot, decay or corrosion (see note 1) | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark[1]$ |
| 6.1 d) Assessment of repairs made or added or replaced components (see note 4) | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark[4]$ |
| 6.1 d) Excavation or dismantling/additional measures | $\checkmark$ | $\times$ |
| 6.2.1 Assessment of glass reinforced plastics (see note 5) | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark[5]$ |
| 6.2.1 Inspection of one post equipment (see note 1) | $\checkmark$ | -[1] |
| 6.2.4 Undertaking the Operators inspection protocol | $\checkmark$ | $x$ |

NB: The clause numbers in table 1 are taken from BS EN 1176 - Part 7:2020. The content is equally applicable to all other relevant standards listed herein. Playgrounds contain a range of equipment from different manufacturers and installed over a number of years; operators should implement any guidance provided by the manufacturer. Item specific detail is not readily available to RPII Playground Inspectors, whose report contributes to the operator's overall Annual Main Inspection as detailed in the relevant [1] A manual test only is undertaken for stability. Wear and instability are only detectable where readily apparent without dismantling or destruction and without the use of tools, excavation or specialist equipment. Rot and corrosion are tested or with a hammer and/or steel rod. Decay in timber may exist which can only be found with specialist equipment.
[2] Only the visible condition and dimensional compliance of surface extent is considered. Neither testing of impact attenuating properties nor measurement of the thickness of bound surfaces are undertaken on RPII annual inspections.
[3] The inspection assesses compliance where this can be tested on site using manual methods without dismantling, destruction and without the use of tools or specialist equipment.
[4] The operator should use manufacturer's recommended parts, or equivalent. We are unable to verify if such parts have been used, and any subsequent change in quality or performance.
[5] Visible glass fibres will be noted in reports. The operator is responsible for repairs or replacement.

## REPORT TO: <br> DATE: <br> REPORT ON: Tree condition survey <br> REPORT BY: Estates Manager \& Estates Officer <br> REPORT NO: E02/24

## Purpose of report

To update members on the tree condition survey received April 2024 and work arising from it.

## Tree report

Attached to this report is the inspection itself (Tree Survey Campbell Park CC Ref HS002490 March 2024.pdf), and below is a table of the issues found, their risk rating and what has/will be done to rectify the issue. Under the advice of the consultant, the most dangerous trees have been dealt with, with the remaining high-risk trees to be done shortly. While public safety is our highest priority in these matters, we have to be mindful of the public perception of felling trees, especially in bird nesting season.

## Work arising

Below is a table of the issues in the report, and our planned work to remedy the problem. We have decided which trees we can safely work on ourselves, and which will need our specialist contractor to carry out the proposed work. Our contractor is looking at the issues in his list at present and will go ahead when appropriate.

| Site | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tag } \\ & \text { No } \end{aligned}$ | Species |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No } \\ \text { Stems } \end{gathered}$ | Size | Age | Comments | Recommendations | Completed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Woolstone Pond | 3893 | Crack <br> willow | Salix fragilis | Single | Large | Young Mature | Tall, slender tree with new wind exposure from northeast (neighbouring willow previously topped to form a pollard). <br> Seam of decay from north and south, from ground up to 2 m . | Top at 6 m to similar height of neighbouring willow. Sever ivy. | Contractor to quote |
| Woolstone Pond | 3894 | Ash | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fraxinus } \\ & \text { excelsior } \end{aligned}$ | Triple | Medium | Young Mature | Triple stem ash with notable stem coming from the east (overhanging footpath). Stem shows incremental growth \& point of high loading at 5 m . | Remove stem near to ground level. | Planned winter '24 |
| Woolstone Sports Ground | 3896 | English elm | Ulmus procera | Single | Small | Young | Dead standing tree, within striking distance of highway. | Remove the tree. | Planned winter '24 |


| Fishermead Sports Ground | 3897 | Grey <br> poplar | Populus $x$ canescens | Single | Medium | Young Mature | Codominant stems from <br> 1.5 m . Bias lean to south towards road \& buildings. Hornet moth (Sesia apiformis) exit holes at base. Minor crown dieback on branch endings. | Remove the tree. | Planned winter '24 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fishermead Sports Ground | 3898 | Field maple | Acer campestre | Single | Small | Young | Dead standing stem, beginning to fracture. | Remove tree to ground level. | Planned winter '24 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Fishermead } \\ & \text { Sports } \\ & \text { Ground } \end{aligned}$ | G3899 | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \times \text { Field } \\ & \text { maple } \end{aligned}$ | $2 \times$ Acer campestre | Double | Medium | Young Mature | Two closely grown trees forming cohesive crown. In contact with adjacent building. | Reduce lateral growth away from building by 1-3m, pruning to secondary growth to reduce likelihood of building damage. | Contractor to quote |
| Fishermead Sports Ground | 3900 | Crack willow | Salix fragilis | Single | Medium | Young Mature | Heavily biased north. <br> Significant stem decay on tension side (south). | Top at $3 m-4 m$, retaining the standing stem for habitat value. | Done 05/24 |
| Fishermead Sports Ground | 3901 | White willow | Salix alba | Single | Medium | Young Mature | Codominant stems from 1.5 m . Tree is failing at the primary fork. Large secondary failure at $3 m$ (east). | Remove east limb back to source. Top remaining tree at 5 m . | Contractor to quote |
| Oldbrook Green | 3902 | Bird cherry | Prunus padus | Single | Medium | Young Mature | Stem partially failed at 3 m . | Top below fracture to allow tree to regenerate. | Done 05/24 |
| Oldbrook Green | G3903 |  | $2 \times$ Betula pendula | Double | Medium | Young Mature | Standing dead trees within striking distance of footpath. | Remove the trees. | Planned winter '24 |
| Oldbrook Green | G3904 | $2 x$ Silver birch | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \times \text { Betula } \\ & \text { pendula } \end{aligned}$ | Double | Medium | Young Mature | Standing dead trees within striking distance of park bench. | Remove the trees. | Planned winter '24 |
| Oldbrook Green | G3905 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \times \text { Betula } \\ & \text { pendula } \end{aligned}$ | Double | Medium | Young Mature | Standing dead trees within striking distance of footpath. | Remove the trees. | Planned winter '24 |
| Oldbrook Green | 3906 | $\quad$ Hybrid black poplar | Populus $x$ canadensis | Single | Medium | Young Mature | Severe hornet moth (Sesia apiformis) infestation. <br> Minor crown dieback. Within striking distance of third party property. | Remove to ground level. | To be done asap |
| Oldbrook Green | 3907 | Field maple | Acer campestre | Single | Medium | Young Mature | Conflicting with lamp column. | Prune to give 1m2 m clearance of lamp column. | Planned winter '24 |
| Oldbrook Green | 3908 | Silver birch | Betula pendula | Single | Medium | Young Mature | Moribund. Within striking distance of main road. <br> Smaller dead standing birch, 4 m southwest. | Remove trees to ground level. | To be done asap |
| Oldbrook Green | 3909 | Sycamore | Acer pseudoplatanus | Single | Medium | Young Mature | Sooty bark disease <br> (Cryptostroma corticale). <br> Crown dieback. | Remove to ground level to reduce risk of failure and the fungus spreading to other sycamore trees. Contactor to wear appropriate PPE (e.g. FFP3 mask). | To be done asap |


| Oldbrook Green | 3910 | Sycamore | Acer pseudoplatanus | Single | Medium | Young Mature | Sooty bark disease. Crown dieback. | Remove to ground level to reduce risk of failure and the fungus spreading to other sycamore trees. Contactor to wear appropriate PPE (e.g. FFP3 mask). | To be done asap |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Oldbrook Green | 3911 | Sycamore | Acer pseudoplatanus | Single | Medium | Young Mature | Sooty bark disease. Crown dieback. | Remove to ground level to reduce risk of failure and the fungus spreading to other sycamore trees. Contactor to wear appropriate PPE (e.g. FFP3 mask). | To be done asap |
| Oldbrook Green | 3912 | Sycamore | Acer pseudoplatanus | Single | Medium | Young Mature | Sooty bark disease. Crown dieback. | Remove to ground level to reduce risk of failure and the fungus spreading to other sycamore trees. Contactor to wear appropriate PPE (e.g. FFP3 mask). | To be done asap |
| Oldbrook Green | 3913 | Sycamore | $\begin{gathered} \text { Acer } \\ \text { pseudoplatanus } \end{gathered}$ | Single | Medium | Young Mature | Sooty bark disease. Crown dieback. | Remove to ground level to reduce risk of failure and the fungus spreading to other sycamore trees. Contactor to wear appropriate PPE (e.g. FFP3 mask). | To be done asap |
| Oldbrook Green | 3914 | Ash | Fraxinus excelsior | Single | Medium | Young Mature | Fungal fruiting body of Inonotus hispidus on main stem at 1.6 m and 3 m (southeast). Within striking distance of main road. Increased likelihood of stem failure. | Remove the tree. | To be done asap |
| Oldbrook Green | 3915 | Sycamore | Acer pseudoplatanus | Single | Medium | Young Mature | Sooty bark disease. Crown dieback. | Remove to ground level to reduce risk of failure and the fungus spreading to other sycamore trees. Contactor to wear appropriate PPE (e.g. FFP3 mask). | To be done asap |
| Oldbrook Green | 3916 | Sycamore | Acer pseudoplatanus | Single | Medium | Young Mature | Sooty bark disease. Crown dieback. | Remove to ground level to reduce risk of failure and the fungus spreading to other sycamore trees. Contactor to wear appropriate PPE (e.g. FFP3 mask). | To be done asap |
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## 1. Introduction

1.1 This report was commissioned by Mr Chris Hindson, the Estates Manager for Campbell Park Community Council (CPCC).
1.2 The scope of the report is limited to a ground level visual inspection of the trees managed by CPCC.
1.3 The sites include:

- Woolstone Pond
- Woolstone Sports Ground
- Woolstone Allotments
- Fishermead Sports Ground
- Oldbrook Green
- Willen Allotments
1.4 My brief was to:
1.4.1 Visually inspect the physiological and structural condition of the trees.
1.4.2 Record attributes for all trees that currently require remedial works.
1.4.3 Make recommendations on the immediate and future management of the trees. This is based on my assessment and these guidelines, and on my personal experience as a professional arboriculturist.
1.5 The assessment was undertaken in the spirit of the guidance provided by the National Tree Safety Group, in that due consideration has been given to the landscape and ecological benefits trees provide when making recommendations for the management of risk to persons and property.


## 2. Limitations

2.1 Due to the changing nature of trees and other site circumstances, this report and any recommendations made are limited to a three (3) year period (unless otherwise stated). Any alteration to the subject site or any development could change the current circumstances and may invalidate this report and any recommendations made.
2.2 This report and recommendations relate to the condition of the tree(s) and their surroundings at the time of assessment only.
2.3 A lack of recommended work does not imply that a tree is safe, and likewise it should not be implied that a tree will be made safe following the completion of any recommended work.
2.4 This report is only for the use of the client. Reproduction and / or use by anyone other than the client is prohibited unless written consent is provided by the author.
2.5 This is a tree condition assessment, it should in no way be considered, or used as a subsidence / heave risk assessment.

## 3. Investigations

3.1 The survey was carried out on the $25^{\text {th }}$ of March 2024, during which time the weather was overcast, but with adequate visibility.
3.2 During the survey I was accompanied by Mr Andrew Saunders, who is currently training towards a recognised qualification in tree surveying and consultancy. Detailed investigations were not carried out. Dimensions were estimated unless otherwise indicated. I had full access to the site, and I was able to gain a clear view of the trees (unless otherwise stated).
3.3 The process used to methodically assess these trees is widely recognised and known as a Visual Tree Assessment (VTA). The VTA was devised by Mattheck (1993) as an addition to Hazard Evaluation by Matheny \& Clark (1993). Guidance is also taken from Lonsdale (1999) Principles of Tree Hazard Assessment and Management, and from VALID Tree Risk-Benefit Management \& Assessment.
3.4 I evaluated the significance of weight considerations for the listed factors and their respective levels of importance using the above methodology:
3.4.1 history of failure of the tree and others nearby;
3.4.2 prevailing ground conditions that could affect stability;
3.4.3 recent changes or disturbance to nearby ground conditions and shelter;
3.4.4 exposure to weather, such as high winds, drought periods, heavy rain/ snow;
3.4.5 predisposition of the species to failure;
3.4.6 health of the tree, such as vitality, structural features or defects that could increase the likelihood of failure; giving indication to their significance.
3.5 Prior to undertaking any recommended works to the tree(s), it is critical to engage with the Local Planning Authority (LPA) as the tree(s) might be protected under a Tree Preservation or be situated within a designated Conservation Area (CA). If this is the situation, obtaining the necessary consent from the LPA will be a prerequisite before commencing any tree works.
3.6 The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 as amended by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000, protects with certain exceptions all birds and their nests. It is an offence to destroy such nests or take or injure such birds during tree works operations.
3.7 If a tree is a bat-roost, a licence to work on the tree must first be obtained from the relevant Statutory Nature Conservation Organization (in England: Natural England 08456014523 .) Acting without a licence is likely to be justifiable only in acute emergencies threatening human life and where all other legally available option such as footpath diversion, fencing and warning signs cannot be applied.
3.8 Tree work should be undertaken to BS3998: 2010 'Tree Work - Recommendations’ (where applicable) by a competent, experienced, and insured arboricultural contractor.

## 4. Site Occupancy

4.1 The occupancy of the sites has been considered in the context of tree risk/ benefit.
4.2 Whilst trees can fail in calm weather; the likelihood of failure is significantly increased during adverse weather, such as high winds and heavy rainfall.

|  |  | Site Occupancy |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

## 5. Risk Assessment

5.1 When determining the need for remedial action to minimize the risk of failure, a priority level is assigned. This level serves to assess the risk posed by the individual tree, considering its condition and position. Each urgency category is accompanied by a designated target timeframe, which should be regarded as the maximum period within which the risk needs to be mitigated.

The urgency categories are:
1 High priority - requires immediate action to fulfil liability under duty of care. Risk to be reduced within a maximum of three months.

2 - requires action as soon as reasonably practicable to fulfil duty of care obligations. Risk to be reduced within a maximum twelve months.

3 Low priority - requires action for good tree management. Works to be completed within a maximum of three years.
5.2 The target timeframes for completing tree works are considered S.M.A.R.T (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-bound) goals. They serve as maximum timeframes for carrying out the necessary works rather than predicting the precise moment a tree may become unsafe.
5.3 It is impossible to accurately pinpoint the exact day when a tree might fail due to various factors, including environmental conditions, decay progression and structural changes. Therefore, the timeframes set for tree works allow for proactive management while acknowledging that tree safety assessment remains an ongoing and dynamic process.
Appendix 1: Tree Survey Schedule

| Site | Easting | Northing | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tag } \\ & \text { No } \end{aligned}$ | Species |  | No Stems | Size | Age | Vitality | Condition | Comments | Recommendations | Priority |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Woolstone | 487306 | 239243 | 3893 | Crack willow | Salix fragilis | Single | Large | Young | Normal | Poor | Tall, slender tree with new wind exposure from northeast (neighbouring willow previously topped to form a pollard). Seam of south, from ground up to 2 m . | Top at 6 m to similar height of neighbouring willow. Sever ivy. | 1 |
| Woolstone Pond | 487331 | 239244 | 3894 | Ash | Fraxinus excelsior | Triple | Medium | Young Mature | Normal | Fair | Triple stem ash with notable stem coming from the east (overhanging incremental growth \& point of high loading at 5 m . | Remove stem near to ground level. | 2 |
| Woolstone Sports Ground | 487433 | 239247 | 3895 | Horse chestnut | Aesculus hippocastanum | Single | Medium | Young Mature | Normal | Good | Triple stem at 2 m . Bark cracking on centre stem. Suspected historic bleeding canker damage, currently insignificant. | No action currently required, however the tree's condition should be reviewed during the next survey. | n/a |
| Woolstone Sports Ground | 487369 | 239076 | 3896 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { English } \\ & \text { elm } \end{aligned}$ | Ulmus procera | Single | Small | Young | Low | Dead | Dead standing tree, within striking distance of highway. | Remove the tree. | 2 |
| Woolstone Allotments | No remedial works required in this area. The trees are currently in an acceptable condition. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fishermead Sports Ground Ground | 486214 | 238724 | 3897 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Grey } \\ & \text { poplar } \end{aligned}$ | Populus $x$ canescens | Single | Medium | Young Mature | Slightly Reduced | Poor | Codominant stems from 1.5 m . Bias lean to south towards road \& buildings. Hornet moth (Sesia apiformis) exit holes at base. Minor crown dieback on branch endings. | Remove the tree. | 2 |
| Fishermead Sports Ground | 486207 | 238732 | 3898 | Field maple | Acer campestre | Single | Small | Young | Low | Dead | Dead standing stem, beginning to fracture | Remove tree to ground level. | 2 |
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| Site | Easting | Northing | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tag } \\ & \text { No } \end{aligned}$ | Species |  | No Stems | Size | Age | Vitality | Condition | Comments | Recommendations | Priority |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fishermead Sports Ground | 486207 | 238737 | G3899 | $\begin{gathered} 2 \times \text { Field } \\ \text { maple } \end{gathered}$ | $2 \times$ Acer campestre | Double | Medium | Young Mature | Normal | Good | Two closely grown trees forming cohesive crown. In contact with adjacent building. | Reduce lateral growth away from building by $1-3 \mathrm{~m}$, pruning to secondary growth to reduce likelihood of building damage. | 3 |
| Fishermead Sports Ground | 486191 | 238758 | 3900 | Crack willow | Salix fragilis | Single | Medium | Young <br> Mature | Slightly <br> Reduced | Poor | Heavily biased north. Significant stem decay on tension side (south). | Top at $3 \mathrm{~m}-4 \mathrm{~m}$, retaining the standing stem for habitat value. | 1 |
| Fishermead Sports Ground | 486373 | 238684 | 3901 | White willow | Salix alba | Single | Medium | Young <br> Mature | Normal | Dangerous | Codominant stems from 1.5 m . Tree is failing at the primary fork. Large secondary failure at $3 m$ (east). | Remove east limb back to source. Top remaining tree at 5 m . | 1 |
| Oldbrook Green | 485277 | 237894 | 3902 | Bird cherry | Prunus padus | Single | Medium | Young <br> Mature | Slightly Reduced | Poor | Stem partially failed at 3m. | Top below fracture to allow tree to regenerate. | 1 |
| Oldbrook Green | 485366 | 237961 | G3903 | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \times \text { Silver } \\ & \text { birch } \end{aligned}$ | $2 \times$ Betula pendula | Double | Medium | Young <br> Mature | Low | Dead | Standing dead trees within striking distance of footpath. | Remove the trees. | 2 |
| Oldbrook Green | 485367 | 237969 | G3904 | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \times \text { Silver } \\ & \text { birch } \end{aligned}$ | $2 \times$ Betula pendula | Double | Medium | Young <br> Mature | Low | Dead | Standing dead trees within striking distance of park bench. | Remove the trees. | 2 |
| Oldbrook Green | 485370 | 237976 | G3905 | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \times \text { Silver } \\ & \text { birch } \end{aligned}$ | $2 \times$ Betula pendula | Double | Medium | Young <br> Mature | Low | Dead | Standing dead trees within striking distance of footpath. | Remove the trees. | 2 |
| Oldbrook Green | 485425 | 238024 | 3906 | Hybrid black poplar | Populus x canadensis | Single | Medium | Young <br> Mature | Low | Poor | Severe hornet moth (Sesia apiformis) infestation. Minor crown dieback. Within striking distance of third party property. | Remove to ground level. | 1 |
| Oldbrook Green | 485473 | 237969 | 3907 | Field maple | Acer campestre | Single | Medium | Young <br> Mature | Normal | Good | Conflicting with lamp column. | Prune to give $1 \mathrm{~m}-2 \mathrm{~m}$ clearance of lamp column. | 3 |
| Oldbrook Green | 485552 | 237897 | 3908 | Silver birch | Betula pendula | Single | Medium | Young Mature | Low | Poor | Moribund. Within striking distance of main road. Smaller dead standing birch, 4 m southwest. | Remove trees to ground level. | 1 |
|  |  |  |  |  | rough Hall Bus | s Centre |  | onsultan Braunst pltree.co pltree.co | Daventry, | thamptonsh | NN11 7JG |  |  |
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Appendix 2: Survey Key

|  | Survey Key |
| :---: | :---: |
| Tag/ Tree No. | The unique reference number assigned to the tree, or asset tag number added to tree during the survey for ease of identification |
| Species | Common and botanical names have been given |
| No. Stems | The number of stems (trunks) the tree has |
| Size | A description of the tree's overall size: specific to the species |
| Age | Young - a tree yet to have reached $1 / 3$ of its expected mature height. Generally growing vigorously and have high apical dominance |
|  | Young-mature - a tree that has reached between $1 / 3$ and $2 / 3$ of its expected mature height |
|  | Mature - a tree close to its full height and crown size, these dimensions being determined by species and site factors. |
|  | Over-mature - senescence; a tree that has entered a period of overall decline |
|  | Veteran - a tree that has characteristics, which have been achieved by age or condition; of which are significantly important in regard to, habitat importance to a local area |
|  | Ancient - a tree that has past beyond maturity that is old, aged, in comparison to other same species |
| Vitality | A visual assessment of the tree's health, foliage density, foliage colour, ability to lay down repair wood in damaged or localised areas of high loadin comparison to similar trees of the same age class and species. This provides an insight into a tree's physiological and overall health |
| Conditions | Good - a tree in optimal condition |
|  | Fair - management works may be necessary, or comments made on a condition that needs to be reviewed: either during the next inspection or via a detailed assessment |
|  | Poor - a suboptimal tree which has poor form, or is in a declining condition |
|  | Dangerous - a tree with a significant defect, which could affect people or property |
|  | Dead - an insufficient amount of functional foliage to support the tree's system |
| Comments | Details of defects or features that could increase the likelihood of failure, and/ or general observations of the tree |
| Recommendations | Recommended remedial action to reduce the likelihood of failure, or advice for good tree management. |
|  | MPL Tree Consultancy Ltd <br> Bragborough Hall Business Centre, Welton Road, Braunston, Daventry, Northamptonshire, NN11 7JG Info@mpltree.co.uk www.mpltree.co.uk |
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Appendix 3: Site Plans
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## Appendix 5: Experience

## Experience:

I have twenty-eight (28) years' experience working in arboriculture. Since 1996 I have developed a pragmatic approach to tree management through hands on experience and in an advisory capacity, allowing insight to the various stages of working with trees. I am a professional member of the Consulting Arborists Society (CAS) and technician member of the Arboricultural Association. I am accredited by LANTRA as a Professional Tree Inspector.

## Formal qualifications relevant to this report:

ABC Level 4 Diploma in Arboriculture, Tree Life Training Ltd, September 2011- July 2012.
In 2013 I successfully completed training and assessment in the 'Professional Tree Inspection’ course, awarded by 'LANTRA', which is the leading accreditation scheme in the UK for tree inspection (refreshed 27.11.18)

## Continuing professional development relevant to this report:

On the $12^{\text {th }} \& 13^{\text {th }}$ June 2018 I attended The Science and Art of Visual Tree Assessment lecture with Prof. Dr Claus Mattheck

On the $19^{\text {th }} \& 20^{\text {th }}$ September 2018 I attended an advanced tree inspection training course with Dr Frank Rinn, RinnTech.

On the $14^{\text {th }}$ and $15^{\text {th }}$ June 2021, I received training in the VALID tree evaluation methodology with David Evans.
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Principles of Tree Hazard Assessment and Management. David Lonsdale. 1999
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REPORT TO: Estates Committee<br>DATE: 11 June 2024<br>REPORT ON: Landscape Equipment Update<br>REPORT BY: Estates Manager \& Estates Officer<br>REPORT NO: E03/24

## Purpose of report

To update the committee on the status of equipment in use, offloaded and required for the coming year by the Landscape team.

## Recommendation

The committee is invited to consider the trade in of one of the Hustler zero turn mowers, and purchase of a replacement (Ferris 2600260 " deck) at a cost to the council of $£ 15,100$. This would be funded from a combination of the landscape equipment budget and the landscape equipment earmarking. The recommendation would be that now is the right time to do this.

The committee is also invited to consider the purchase of a flail mower attachment for the tractor, this is a different kind of mower, better suited to thicker scrub and long grass, than the rotary mower deck purchased last year. This will improve the management of the wildflower/biodiversity areas we have, and allow us to tackle some of the rougher, overgrown areas in a more timely and effective way. There are a few suitable models available to us, that all come in at around the $£ 5,000$ mark. This would be funded from the landscape equipment budget from the current financial year.

The above purchases would ideally leave us several thousand pounds in the landscape equipment budget for any incidental purchases and allow us to add to the existing battery equipment we are using.

## Current Large Equipment

The tractor has done 550 hrs as of the end of May, and last year cost us $£ 1827$ to maintain. This machine is in good condition and running well. Last year we purchased a mower deck for the tractor, this combined with some changes to our shrub management processes means the tractor will be out doing more summer work this year. This machine was anticipated to last us 5-10 years from purchase, and I don't foresee this changing despite the higher workload. This is a key piece of equipment for all our work, and we don't want to end up stuck with an unreliable tractor. We will continue to monitor its condition, value, and associated costs, as well as the marketplace to ensure we swap this for a new replacement at the optimum time.

The mower deck (new last year) and hedge cutter are in good order and should remain so for well beyond our ownership of the tractor.

The Hustler zero turn mowers have done 1500 hrs and 1250 hrs respectively as of the end of May, and last year cost us $£ 6133$ to maintain (the pair). These are starting to show their
age, and we are looking to trade one in for a new model, with the other being replaced next year. We have demo'd several models on site through the year and have settled on a Ferris $2600 Z$ with a 60 " deck (same size as existing Hustlers) with a Briggs \& Stratton diesel engine. Out of the models we looked at, this provided the best combination of cut quality and comfort, with the ability to mow at greater speeds. It would be supplied by RT Machinery, who we have a good working relationship with, and will be able to provide quicker support for the mower than we have experienced to this point with PA Turney and the Hustlers.

The chipper has done 200 hrs as of the end of May, and last year cost us nothing to maintain, as we traded for a brand-new model last Summer. This is a key piece of equipment, especially for our Winter programme, so it is imperative we manage this tool well, and keep on top of the correct service regime. The landscape team have started to take on some of the basic maintenance of the equipment, which has led to reduced costs and down time across all equipment.

## Vehicles

We have three vehicles for use specifically by the Landscape team, an Iveco Panel van, an Iveco tipper, and a Ford Ranger pickup. These are all given a full service annually, and do relatively low annual mileages, as such they are not expected to need replacing imminently. However, they do have to work hard, and often run cold, so at some point the balance between ongoing maintenance costs and trade in value will mean it will be time to swap them. I expect the pickup will be the first to need replacing (potentially two to three years, but we hope for more), and the tipper will be last. I would expect road vehicles in this environment to replaced roughly every ten years, although I've allowed for the pickup to have a shorter life span (this has a large diesel engine, and the short journeys it mostly does will take a heavier toll on this) The tipper, might last us 15 years, as it does less work. Once we have replaced both mowers (anticipated by this time next year), we will be in a position to build up our earmarked reserves to ensure we have funds available to make these changes when it either offers the best value to do so, or it becomes unavoidable. With our team and equipment as it stands, the mix of vehicles we have is pretty much ideal, I would however, look seriously at electric alternatives when the time comes, to save cost (fuel and servicing) and as these are better suited to our usage (lots of short journeys) than diesel engines.

## Small Equipment

As of last year, we have started to purchase some battery hand tools to complement our two-stroke equipment, and this has worked well, the battery equipment (apart from being more environmentally friendly, in line with our climate emergency commitments) is lighter, quieter, and less fatiguing to use - better for users and residents alike. It is also taking the strain off some of our older two-stroke machines, which should in turn help them last longer.

We will continue to evaluate new battery equipment as it becomes available, to ensure we are striking the best balance we can between operational needs, our environmental commitments, and best value for our residents.

# REPORT TO: Estates Committee <br> DATE: 11 June 2024 <br> REPORT ON: Allotment Procedures (warnings and evictions) <br> REPORT BY: Estates Manager \& Allotments Administrator <br> REPORT NO: E04/24 

## Purpose of report

To update members on the procedures in place for warning and evicting allotment tenants who are in breach of the terms and conditions.

## Warnings

When tenants are found to be in breach of the terms and conditions, they are issued a first warning. This gives them 14 days to rectify the breach or contact us to explain the problem. It may be that there are circumstances that mean it has been impossible for the tenant to put in the work necessary to maintain the plot, If the tenant has a plan, and brings the plot up to standard within an agreed time frame, the matter will be closed. If the tenant does not contact us or bring their plot up to the required standard within 14 days, they will receive a second warning, stating that they have a further 14 days to rectify the issues, and failure to do so will result in them being evicted from the plot, and potentially refused a plot in the future.

## Eviction notice

If no improvement is noted in our inspections, and no contact is received after the second warning period, the tenant will receive an eviction notice. They then have 30 days to remove any personal belongings and produce from the plot, and hand back the key (if they are at our Willen site), during this time we reserve the right to do any maintenance necessary to the plot in order to get it back to a lettable condition.

