Woodland Condition Self-assessment Form

Please read the guidance before starting! Additional space for notes at the end of the document.

| Woodland name/coordinates/address: Compartment ID: | | Do you know if the site is currently managed? If yes , how (e.g. signs of coppicing, thinning)? You can use of the area. | | | | |
|--|-------|---|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | |
| Borough: | Date: | | | | | |
| Surveyor(s): | | | | | | |
| What is the main use of the space? Nature conservation / ommunity woodland / cemetery / | | Is it a young woodland? Approx. 90% of the trees have less than 8cm of diameter at chest level, and less than 5 metres high. Plantations included. Yes / No If yes, jump to 2.1 | | | | |

| 1. Trees | | | | 2. Native shrub | | | |
|--|--|-------|-------------|--|--|-------|-------------|
| Assessment | Criteria | Score | Tick box | Assessment | Criteria | Score | Tick box |
| 1.1 Canopy cover | No gaps in the canopy, no light reaching the ground (>90% of | 0 | | 2.1 Native shrub composition | No shrub layer present (jump to 3) | 0 | |
| | canopy) Canopy very open (max 20%) or no canopy | 0 | | | The <u>only</u> species is bramble (jump to 3) | 1 | |
| | Very close canopy (75-90%); little amount of light arriving to the ground) | 1 | | | <u>All</u> shrubs of same species (not including bramble) 2-4 species of shrubs | 2 | |
| | Some gaps in the canopy, (25-75%); light scattered on the ground | 3 | | | 5 or more species | 4 | |
| 1.2 Dominant (most common) tree species | Canopy of a mix of more than 4 dominant species (tick & jump to 1.3) | 3 | | 2.2 Native shrub density 2.3 Native shrub age variation | Dense covering of shrubs over most or all of woodland | 1 | |
| | Canopy of mostly 3-4 dominant species | 2 | | | Scattered throughout Even combination | 3 | |
| | Canopy of mostly 1-2 dominant species | 1 | | | of dense covering of shrubs in places, with scattered shrubs elsewhere | 4 | |
| 1.3 Age variation of dominant trees | <u>All</u> trees evenly aged (similar size: e.g. only old trees present). No saplings | 0 | | | <u>All</u> shrubs even aged (similar size within a species) | 2 | |
| | Most trees evenly aged. No saplings | 1 | | | Most shrubs are evenly aged | 3 | |
| | <u>Most</u> trees evenly aged. At least <u>some</u> saplings | 3 | | | Age variable (different | | |
| | <u>Even mix</u> of ages; <u>some</u> saplings | 4 | | | sizes within a species) | 4 | |
| | <u>Even mix</u> of ages; <u>plentiful</u> saplings | 5 | | | Total sc | ore | |
| Totals | score (sum all the numbe | ers) | | | | | |

| 3. G | round layer | 4. Problem species | | | | | | |
|---|---|--------------------|--|--|--|--|-------------|--|
| Assessment | Criteria | Score | Tick box | Assessment | Criteria | Score | Tick box | |
| 3.1 Bare ground (<u>not</u> including designated/official | No vegetation covering the ground, <u>all</u> bare ground | 0 | | 4.1 Invasive plant Species including shrubs & ground vegetation | None (jump to 4.3) | 4 | | |
| | <u>No</u> bare ground, all covered by vegetation (jump to 3.3) | 1 | | | Present in <u>less than 5%</u> of the total area | 2 | | |
| paths) | <u>Small</u> areas of bare ground, scattered between the vegetation | 4 | | (see species guidance) | Present in <u>5-10%</u> of the total area | 1 | | |
| | on the ground layer Other | 1 | | 4.2 | Present but no control measures in place | 0 | | |
| 3.2 | None | 4 | | Management of invasive plant | Present but management inadequate, not under | ο | | |
| Erosion and compaction (<u>not</u> including | Small areas (e.g. some paths have been slightly widened; dogs frequenting one specific area) | 1 | | species | Present, management adequate, but not under control | 1 | | |
| designated/official paths) | Large areas | 0 | | | Present, but management in place, and under control | 2 | | |
| 3.3 | Dominated by grasses, nettles or cow parsley | ο | | 4.3 | None (jump to 5) | 4 | | |
| Ground cover vegetation | (jump to section 4) Dominated by ivy, | 1 | | Competitive plant species that tend | Present in <u>more than</u> <u>20%</u> of the total area | ο | | |
| (herbs, wildflowers, br bulbs, bramble from the floor till 0.5m) Do th sp br gr gu M br gr gu th th sp | bracken or bramble (jump to section 4) | | | to dominate and exclude other species | Present in <u>less than 10%</u> of the total area | 2 | | |
| | Dominated by <u>more</u> <u>than 2</u> typical woodland species, other than ivy, bramble, nettles and | | | | including shrubs & ground vegetation | Present in <u>10-20%</u> of the total area | 1 | |
| | grasses (see species guidance) | | | 4.4 | Present but no control measures in place | о | | |
| | Mix of bracken, ivy, bramble, cow parsley & at least <u>more than</u> <u>1</u> typical woodland species (see species guidance) | 2 | Management of competitive plan species | competitive plant | Present and management in place, but not under control | 1 | | |
| | | | | | Present and management in place, and under control | 2 | | |
| 3.4 | No AWI species | 0 | | | Total so | ore | | |
| Ancient Woodland Indicator species Only if the woodland is listed; to be completed between mid- March & mid-May | Infrequent patches of 1-3 AWI species | 1 | | | | | | |
| | <u>Frequent</u> patches of 1-3 AWI species | 2 | | | t are Invasive and/or probl k the areas in the map, and sible. | | nd | |
| | <u>Infrequent</u> patches of 4 AWI species, or large areas of 1-3 AWI species | 3 | | | | | | |
| | <u>Frequent</u> patches of 4 or more AWI species | 4 | | | | | | |
| | Total sc | ore | | | | | | |
| | - | | 1 | ı L | | | | |

| 5. Wildlife features | | | | 6. Access and interpretation | | | | |
|---|---|----------|-------------|--|--|-------|-------------|--|
| Assessment | Criteria | Score | Tick box | Assessment | Criteria | Score | Tick box | |
| 5.1 | No ivy on trees (jump to 5.2) | 0 | | 6.1 | All in operational order (jump to 6.2) | 1 | | |
| Ivy on trees (you can tick more | <u>Scattered</u> amounts of ivy on trees <u>throughout</u> <u>woodland</u> | 2 | | Access – entrances and gates / kissing gates / stiles | Operational but neglected, broken | -1 | | |
| than 1) | Large amounts of ivy | | | gates / stiles | Not operational | -2 | | |
| | on trees that are close to public right of way or properties | -1 | | 6.2 | Designated paths in good condition, at least some of them usable by wheelchairs | 5 | | |
| 5.2 | <u>No</u> dead wood except small twigs | 0 | | Access – paths acknowledging path surfaces should be as natural/ naturalistic as possible, while | Designated paths in good condition | 4 | | |
| Dead wood content on the ground | <u>Few</u> >10cm of diameter branches or trunks | 2 | | | Most designated paths in good condition, but difficult to use when | 2 | | |
| | <u>Abundant</u> branches & trunks of all sizes, and/ or some <u>standing</u> dead wood present | 3 | | maximising access to those with restricted mobility. | muddy Designated paths mix of good and poor condition | 2 | | |
| | <u>Abundant</u> fallen branches & trunks of all sizes, <u>and several</u> | 4 | | If several access/ paths present, mark the option in the worst condition 6.3 Interpretation – Signage 6.4 | Most of designated paths in poor condition but usable | 1 | | |
| | standing dead wood present | | | | All designated paths in poor condition and difficult to use | -1 | | |
| 5.3 Other features | Insect banks (bare sloped soil, often sandy, sunny) | 3 | | | Presence of abundant non-designated paths between the vegetation | -2 | | |
| <u>Can tick more than</u> one | Woodpecker nesting holes present | 3 | | | Not seen/not present (jump to 7) | 0 | | |
| | Badger sett – active | 3 | | | Signage missing or badly damaged, unusable, or inappropriate | -1 | | |
| | At least one pond, in good condition | 3 | | | Signage out of date or unprecise but useable | 0 | | |
| | At least one pond, in poor condition | 2 | | | Signage usable but old/ partly damaged, ideally it is replaced soon | 1 | | |
| | Presence of at least a few veteran trees | 4 | | | All usable, precise and safe, but more needed | 2 | | |
| | Ditches with water | 3 | | | All usable, precise and safe | 3 | | |
| | Watercourse in <u>good</u> condition Watercourse in <u>poor</u> | 2 | | | Clear provision for people with limited mobility | 1 | | |
| ~ | condition Total sc | 1 ore | | Inclusive accessibility (infrastructure/ | Clear provision for people with limited mobility & evidence | | | |
| | | | signage) | (e.g. signboard) of compliance with standards (e.g. Fieldfare Trust) | 2 | | | |
| | | | | Total score | | | | |

| 7. Use of site | | | | | |
|---|---|----|--|--|--|
| Assessment | Criteria | | | | |
| 7.1 | Unsociable behaviour (including infrastructure damage) | ο | | | |
| Site activities tick all that apply | Fly tipping (including garden waste) | -1 | | | |
| tick all that apply | Significant levels of dogs running off path off lead | 0 | | | |
| | Regular light littering | 0 | | | |
| | Presence of dog waste (on ground and/or in trees) | -1 | | | |
| | Mismanagement or general misuse (inappropriate and unauthorised planting, ivy clearance from tree trunks, tree works etc or localised wildlife damaging activities) | 0 | | | |
| | Responsible site usage (people walking on path, dogs under control, no littering) | 2 | | | |
| | Evidence of positive outdoor usage (general usage for exercise, enjoyment of open space, children's play etc) | 3 | | | |
| | Evidence of positive local management (by council, site manager, volunteers). For instance dead hedging, fencing of sensitive areas, restoration projects. | 4 | | | |
| Total score | | | | | |

Is there any evidence of tree diseases or pests present? E.g. ash die back, Dutch elm disease, oak processionary moth. If yes, what is the frequency (frequent; occasional; rare) and could you locate it in the map of the woodland?

Is there any conflict of interest regarding the use of the site? E.g. some people using motorcycles.

Other notes:

This project is funded by the Trees Call to Action Fund. The fund was developed by Defra in partnership with the Forestry Commission and is being delivered by the Heritage Fund.

This has been produced on behalf of the London Urban Forest Partnership by London Wildlife Trust, The Conservation Volunteers and Trees for Cities © 2024







