

Tree Condition Report

Location of property:

St Mary's Church,
A59, Gisburn
BB7 4HB

Arboricultural report for:

Ribble Valley Borough Council

Date of site survey:

11/12/2025

Date of report:

17/12/2025

Job Ref: 2060

Survey undertaken by:

Gary Marsden
FDSc Arb, M.Arbor.A.




The content and format of this report are for the exclusive use of the client. It may not be sold, lent, hired out or divulged to any third party not directly involved in this subject matter without our written consent.

I hope that this report provides all the necessary information, but should any further advice be needed please do not hesitate to contact me.

Any enquiries regarding this report should be addressed to:

GM Tree Consultants Ltd
16, Farfield Drive,
Lower Darwen,
Darwen,
Lancashire,
England,
BB3 0RJ.



Gary Marsden FDS Sc Arb M.Arbor.A
Professional Member - Arboricultural Association (AA)
Professional Member - Consulting Arborist Society (CAS)



Contents

Introduction	4
Limitations.....	5
Site visit and observations.....	6
Condition assessment	8
Recommendations.....	11
Other Considerations	11
APPENDIX 'A'	14
APPENDIX 'B'	15
Back cover	16

Introduction

1. Qualifications and experience.

- 1.1. I have based this report on my site observations and any provided information, and I have come to conclusions in the light of my 25+ years' experience in the arboricultural industry. I have professional indemnity and public liability insurance at the required level to undertake such work.

2. Instruction.

- 2.1. I am instructed by David Hewitt on behalf of Ribble Valley Borough Council (referred to as the 'client' from here on) to inspect the significant trees located within the site boundary at St Mary's Church, Gisburn and to provide a report to fulfil the following criteria:

- A schedule of the relevant tree to include basic data, tree location and a condition assessment.
- A tree risk assessment based on relevant targets, defects, and likelihood of failure.
- A schedule of any subsequent work that may be required.

3. Relevant background information.

- 3.1. Prior to the tree inspection, my client advised me that a survey of the trees is needed to assess their condition and make any recommendations with regards to managing the trees.

4. Documents and information provided.

- 4.1. My client provided me with copies of the following documents or information:

- Their email of instruction outlining the situation.
- Their email commissioning this report and agreeing to the T&C and cost.

5. Scope of this report.

- 5.1. This report is only concerned with the prominent trees within or around the proximity of the site. It takes no account of any trees outside this remit or any building structural issues. It includes a preliminary assessment based on the site visit and any documents and information provided, listed in section 3 and 4 above.

- 5.2. The survey is based upon information that was available at the time of the inspection. Further inspections are necessary over time to give a fuller picture of the health of trees.

6. Mapping.

- 6.1. I have not been provided with a topographical survey of the site. A digital ordnance survey map has been purchased, and I have plotted the trees by the combined / individual use of land features, manual measurements, laser measurements and GPS. It is estimated that the accuracy is within 1-2m.

6.2. Site plans showing all the tree locations and any relevant details can be found in Appendix 'B'.

7. Tree health.

7.1. This arboricultural report is based on the following primary technical references:

- British Standards Institution (2010) BS 3998 Recommendations for tree work
- Lonsdale, D. 1999. *Principles of Tree Hazard Assessment and Management*. The Stationary Office, London.
- Lonsdale, D. 2000. *Hazards from trees. A general guide*. Forestry Commission, Edinburgh.
- Matheny, N. P., and Clark, J.R. *A photographic guide to the evaluation of hazard trees in urban areas. 2nd Edition*. International Society of Arboriculture.
- Mattheck, C, and Breloer, H. *The body language of trees – A handbook for failure analysis*. The Stationary Office, London.
- Schwarze, F.W.M.R., Engels, J. and Mattheck, C. *Fungal strategies of wood decay in trees*. Springer, Berlin.
- Strouts, R.G. and Winter, T.G. 1994. *Diagnosis of ill-health in trees*. The Stationary Office, London.
- The National Tree Safety Group. 2011. *Common sense risk management of trees. Guidance on trees and public safety on the UK for owners, managers, and advisers*. Forestry Commission, Edinburgh.

Limitations

8. Survey.

8.1. The inspection was carried out from ground level only and relates only to arboricultural aspects. All visual observations and recommendations relate to the condition of the trees on the day of the survey. The trees have been assessed with the aid of a Nylon mallet for detecting changes in resonance which may indicate that further investigation is required. Where appropriate the use of advanced decay detection methods is used, primarily a digital resistograph. Any unusual weather conditions, changes in soil, soil levels and changes to surroundings may result in a dramatic change in the trees health.

9. Time limit.

9.1. Due to the changing nature of trees and other site circumstances, this report and any recommendations made are limited to a 24-month period. Any alteration to the site and any development proposals could change the current circumstances and may invalidate this report and any recommendations made.

10. Tree health.

10.1. Trees are dynamic structures that can never be guaranteed 100% safe: even in good condition they can suffer damage under average conditions. Regular inspections can help to identify potential problems before they become acute.

11. Justification of works.

- 11.1. Where management action / tree surgery is recommended, this is based on maximizing the tree's safe useful life expectancy (SULE), given its current situation or the safety of persons and surrounding targets. A lack of recommended work does not imply that a tree is safe and likewise it should not be implied that a tree would be made safe following the completion of any recommended work.

12. Buildings.

- 12.1. This report does not consider the structural condition of existing buildings, nor the impact of existing trees on their foundations. If there are concerns over such matters the advice of a structural engineer should be sought.

Site visit and observations

13. Site visit.

- 13.1. I carried out an unaccompanied site survey on 11/12/2025. All my visual observations were undertaken from within the clients' boundaries or publicly accessible areas from ground level, and I estimated all dimensions unless otherwise indicated. The weather at the time of inspection was clear, still, and dry, with good visibility. I have taken various photographs of the site for reference and are kept on file; photos are added into the report only if they are needed to highlight a specific issue.

14. Brief site description.

- 14.1. The site is on the northern side of the road and surrounded by residential developments. The site consists of a churchyard that is currently unoccupied and centrally set within the site boundary. Utility services were observed on site; these are phone lines. No visual inspections of any services were made below ground level. There is no known history on this site either personal or from a third party.

15. Identification and location of the trees.

- 15.1. I have illustrated the locations of the significant trees on the map included in Appendix 'B'. This plan is for illustrative purposes only and it should not be used for directly scaling measurements. All the relevant information on it is contained within this report and the provided documents.
- 15.2. Each tree has had a metal numbered tag stapled to the stem to aid in the identification of the trees due to the number of trees surveyed and the proximity of each tree, identification should be clarified by checking the corresponding tag number with the tree data recorded.

16. Systematic method of assessment.

- 16.1. I visually inspected the significant trees and recorded the information in the table in section 18.
- 16.2. I stress that my inspection was of a preliminary visual tree assessment (VTA) nature and did not involve any climbing or detailed investigation beyond what was visible from accessible points at ground level.

- 16.3. The methodology employed in the assessment of trees undertaken by GM Tree Consultants Ltd takes into consideration the following points (but not in any order of importance) by firstly carrying out a Visual Tree Assessment (VTA), this includes:
- A distance visual assessment of the tree considering the overall shape, form, foliage colour appropriate for the time of year and any other elements that do not appear normal for that species.
 - The exposure to the weather. This can be due to it being a solitary tree or that surrounding tree cover could have been removed exposing it to 'new wind forces' acting on the canopy.
 - The prevailing ground conditions. For example: soil erosion, ponding, soil characteristics and the impact on the tree, presence / lack of vegetation.
 - Any information as to the tree's history or history of the surrounding trees / landscape. For example: previously failed limbs, surrounding tree removal / failure, excavations, fruiting bodies seen.
 - Knowledge of previous documented information of issues with a species. For example: tight union failure on Beech, poor compartmentalisation of Willow.
 - The health and visual defects of the tree. For example: cavities, the trees 'body language', dieback, foliage irregularities, fungal brackets, and deadwood.
- 16.4. From this information an assessment is made of the likelihood of the part/s most likely to fail in relation to the target / occupancy value within the trees failure area and recommendations are then made, these can include the following but is not exhaustive:
- Recommendations for further visual monitoring.
 - Investigation with more advanced decay detection equipment such as: Resistograph, Picus, Thermal imaging.
 - Remedial pruning / limb removal.
 - Whole tree removal.
 - Pruning for aesthetical reasons.
 - Removal of significant deadwood.
 - Or no work may be needed.
- 16.5. The primary reasoning behind this method of assessment is to identify a foreseeable failure, make an informed decision and act on it within a specified time and know that the response is reasonable in relation to the target area and the financial resources available.
17. Resistograph .
- 17.1. Testing with a nylon hammer indicated that all stem/s appeared to have no internal defects and there were no significant visual defects on the stem <3m, buttress and roots, these findings negated the need for further detailed investigation with the resistograph.

Condition assessment

18. Tree dimensions.

18.1. A detailed on-site assessment of the trees can be found in the inserted survey sheets in appendix 'B'.

19. Tree assessment summary.

19.1. The tree data and any identified works are shown in the tree schedule any recommended works should be carried out within the identified timeframes, giving priority to any tree highlighted as a safety concern.

19.2. The trees on site are in overall good condition with no significant issues regarding health and safety, remedial pruning recommendations have been made, and one tree is recommended for removal.

19.3. There are some deadwood and hanging branches that need removing, these are detailed in the schedule and photos added for identification.

19.4. Some of the trees are encroaching the neighbour's boundary lines but there is no encroachment towards properties or access points and as such no boundary clearance pruning is recommended.

20. Photos.

20.1. Below are photographs of some relevant trees to aid in identification of any notable defects or required tree management actions. Other works may be needed on the trees, please see the tree schedule for a full list of recommended works.


T201 – prune to clear phone lines



T207 – prune failed branches



T206 – remove deadwood over road



T208 – remove hung up branches



T217 – remove tree



20.2. I have taken additional photographs of the site for reference, and these are kept on file; these can be used to compare the condition of trees in future re-surveys; photos are added into the report only if they are needed to highlight a specific issue.

20.3. A copy of all photos taken on site can be sent as a link to an online cloud folder, please ask for a link to be emailed to you, if required.

21. Target led tree risk assessment.

21.1. Each tree was assessed for defects / dysfunction that could lead to part of or whole tree failure / breakage. With this an assessment is made as to where the tree / part of tree would land if that defect failure occurred and what the likelihood and consequence would be if this happened.

22. Appropriate Response.

22.1. From the risk assessment, recommendations are made to reduce the risk of harm to an acceptable level and within an appropriate timescale, this could be pruning works, further advanced investigations, more monitoring at specified intervals or ultimately removal of the tree, this list is not exhaustive and is adaptable to each individual situation.

22.2. REASONING: “Proactive intervention rather than reactive to failure”

Recommendations

23. Present requirements.

- 23.1. Any works required to establish acceptable levels of risk for the site and to maintain the tree in line with good arboricultural management are listed and should be carried out within the time scale indicated.
- 23.2. These lists of works are designed to highlight dangerous situations and are necessary for safety reasons or to establish high levels of arboricultural management to the existing tree.
- 23.3. All works listed in the tree survey schedule 'Recommendations' column must be carried out within the recommended timescale.

24. Re-survey.

- 24.1. It is important to follow up with any recommended re-surveys / follow-up inspections of trees detailed in this report, failure to schedule a resurvey could lead to a potential issue being overlooked and a tree failure averted.
- 24.2. There are several reasons why a re-survey is recommended, these could be (list not exhaustive):
- Ongoing future tree management.
 - Monitoring of potential health and safety concerns.
 - Carry out a climbing assessment of the upper canopy to assess a potential defect.
 - Carry out advanced decay detection such as resistograph testing.
 - The tree wasn't in leaf at the time of inspection and a further assessment is need when in leaf, normally during the summer.
 - To determine the health / vitality of the tree.
 - Determine the potential presence of a disease such as 'Ash Dieback'.
 - Analyse a potential fungal bracket when fully developed, normally during autumn / winter season.
 - Ensure recommended works have been undertaken and to the correct standard by a contractor.

Other Considerations

25. Ash Dieback.

- 25.1. There is no Ash trees located on or around the perimeter of the site address.

26. Tree Preservation Order (TPO) and Conservation Area (CA).

- 26.1. A tree preservation order, referred to as a 'TPO', is an order made by a local planning authority ('LPA') in respect of trees or woodlands.
- 26.2. The principal effect of a TPO is to prohibit the: Cutting down, uprooting, topping, lopping, wilful damage, or wilful destruction of trees without the LPAs consent. The cutting of roots is potentially damaging and so, in the Secretary of State's view, requires the LPAs consent.
- 26.3. Anyone who, in contravention of a TPO, wilfully damages a tree in a way that is likely to destroy it is guilty of an offence. Anyone found guilty of this offence is liable, if convicted in the

Magistrates Court, to a fine of up to £20,000. In serious cases a person may be committed for trial in the Crown Court and, if convicted, is liable to an unlimited fine.

- 26.4. Conservation Areas are areas of special architectural or historical interest with a character or appearance that is desirable to preserve or enhance. Trees may often contribute to the special character of the area.
- 26.5. All trees in a Conservation Area are subject to controls which enable the LPA to protect the special character of the area created by the trees. If trees have a specific Tree Preservation Order (TPO) on them, then the normal Tree Preservation Order controls apply.
- 26.6. You must give the LPA 6 weeks' notice, in writing, of your intention to do any work to trees in a Conservation Area. You must not carry out any work during the six-week period, which starts from the date of receipt of your notification by the council, unless you receive written permission to do so.
- 26.7. Work which is not exempt and is carried out without formal notification or within the six-week period without the written consent of the council is illegal. The LPA may prosecute offenders and fines of up to £20,000 for each tree may be imposed by the Magistrates Court in the event of offenders being convicted of an offence. If proceedings are instituted in the Crown Court fines are unlimited. There is a duty to replace any tree removed without permission.
- 26.8. *At the time of writing this report it has not been confirmed if there is a Tree Preservation Order in place on the trees in question or if this site is in a Conservation Area. It is strongly advised that prior to undertaking work to tree/s an up-to-date check is carried out to establish if a TPO / CA is in force on the tree/s and consent granted prior to any work commencing if required.***

27. Local authority details.

- 27.1. For reference the contact details are listed below for the relevant councils planning department and / or the arboricultural (tree) officer.

Ribble Valley Borough Council
Council Offices,
Church Walk,
Clitheroe,
Lancashire,
BB7 2RA
Tel: 01200 425111,
E-mail: webmaster@ribblevalley.gov.uk

28. Correspondence with local arboricultural / planning officer.

- 28.1. There is no significant correspondence that needs documenting into this report.

29. Tree works.

29.1. The management options noted in the survey data should be followed so to keep a maintained tree stock on and around this development site, particularly giving clearance from properties and over any adopted roads or footpaths.

30. Implementation of works.

30.1. All tree works should be carried out to BS 3998 Recommendations for Tree Work as modified by more recent research. It is advisable to select a contractor from the local authority list and preferably one approved by the Arboricultural Association. Their Register of Contractors is available free from:

Arboricultural Association The Malthouse, Stroud Green, Standish, Stonehouse, Gloucestershire GL10 3DL, UK	Tel: +44 (0)1242 522152 Email: admin@trees.org.uk Website: http://www.trees.org.uk/ARB-Approved-Contractor-Directory
--	--

31. Local Arboricultural Contractors.

31.1. If requested, I can provide a list of reputable arboricultural contractors that have carried out work on previous projects.

32. Safety.

32.1. Tree works can be a hazardous profession, so it is important that all operatives have the necessary and relevant training, health and safety policy and valid forms of insurance.

33. Statutory wildlife obligations.

33.1. The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 as amended by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000, provide statutory protection to birds, bats and other species that inhabit trees. All tree work operations are covered by these provisions and advice from an ecologist must be obtained before undertaking any works that might constitute an offence.

34. Future considerations.

34.1. Any remaining trees should be inspected on a regular basis by a qualified arboricultural consultant and should not exceed a 5-year interval.


APPENDIX 'A'

- Site Location aerial photo taken from Google Maps showing site location. 



APPENDIX 'B'

- Tree location plan with corresponding tree numbers to aid identification.
- Inserted tree schedule showing all surveyed trees with comments and recommendations.






Job Ref:	2060		Survey Date: 11 December 2025				Surveyor: Gary Marsden		Site Address: St Marys Church Gisburn		VTA site survey			EMIRIE CONSULTANTS				
Type	Ref.	Species	Number of stems	Stem diameter @ 1.5m (cm)	Height	Spread	Life Stage	Physiological Condition	Structural Condition	Life Expectancy	Survey Notes	Fungus	Pests and Diseases	Description	Is RISK 'ALARP' As Low As Reasonably Practicable	Recommendations	Timescale for recommended works	Re-inspect within
Tree	T201	Cherry (<i>Prunus sp.</i> 'Cherry')	1	20	6	N:2 E:2 S:2 W:2	Semi Mature	Good	Fair	20+ Years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stem decay. Canopy encroaching phone wires. 	No significant visible fungus present at the time of inspection.	No significant visible Pests or Diseases present at the time of inspection.	Owned by the client. Target # - Garage Target # - graveslones / statue	YES	Prune to clear utilities by 2 m.	11-Dec-2026 (1 Year)	1 Year
Tree	T202	Hawthorn (<i>Crataegus sp.</i>)	4	20	6	N:3 E:3 S:3 W:3	Semi Mature	Good	Good	20+ Years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suppressed canopy. Unbalanced canopy. Seasonal leaf drop has occurred (normal). 	No significant visible fungus present at the time of inspection.	No significant visible Pests or Diseases present at the time of inspection.	Owned by the client. Target # - graveslones / statue	YES	No work required at time of inspection.	No Action	1 Year
Tree	T203	Hawthorn (<i>Crataegus sp.</i>)	4	20	5	N:3 E:3 S:3 W:3	Semi Mature	Good	Good	20+ Years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suppressed canopy. Unbalanced canopy. Seasonal leaf drop has occurred (normal). 	No significant visible fungus present at the time of inspection.	No significant visible Pests or Diseases present at the time of inspection.	Owned by the client. Target # - graveslones / statue	YES	No work required at time of inspection.	No Action	1 Year
Tree	T204	Common box (<i>Buxus sempervirens</i>)	1	20	5	N:3 E:3 S:3 W:3	Mature	Good	Good	40+ Years	The tree has no significant visual defects.	No significant visible fungus present at the time of inspection.	No significant visible Pests or Diseases present at the time of inspection.	Owned by the client. Target # - graveslones / statue	YES	No work required at time of inspection.	No Action	1 Year
Tree	T205	English yew (<i>Taxus baccata</i>)	2	20	6	N:4 E:4 S:4 W:4	Semi Mature	Good	Under	40+ Years	The tree has no significant visual defects.	No significant visible fungus present at the time of inspection.	No significant visible Pests or Diseases present at the time of inspection.	Owned by the client. Target # - graveslones / statue	YES	No work required at time of inspection.	No Action	1 Year
Tree	T206	Sycamore (<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>)	1	100	25	N:3 E:3 S:3 W:3	Mature	Good	Good	40+ Years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Moderate deadwood 25-100 mm diameter. Seasonal leaf drop has occurred (normal). 	No significant visible fungus present at the time of inspection.	No significant visible Pests or Diseases present at the time of inspection.	Owned by the client. Target # - Parking / driveway	YES	No work required at time of inspection.	No Action	1 Year
Tree	T207	Oak (<i>Quercus sp.</i>)	1	40	16	N:4 E:4 S:4 W:4	Semi Mature	Good	Good	40+ Years	The tree has no significant visual defects. Seasonal leaf drop has occurred (normal).	No significant visible fungus present at the time of inspection.	No significant visible Pests or Diseases present at the time of inspection.	Owned by the client. Target # - graveslones / statue Target # - Parking / driveway	YES	No work required at time of inspection.	No Action	1 Year

Job Ref:	2060		Survey Date: 11 December 2025				Surveyor:		Gary Marsden		Site Address:		St Marys Church Gisburn		VTA site survey		GMITREE CONSULTANTS	
Type	Ref.	Species	Number of stems	Stem diameter @ 1.5m (cm)	Height	Spread	Life Stage	Physiological Condition	Structural Condition	Life Expectancy	Survey Notes	Fungus	Pests and Diseases	Description	Is RISK 'ALARP' As Low As Reasonably Practicable	Recommendations	Timescale for recommended works	Re-inspect within
Tree	T207	Cypress (<i>Cupressus</i> sp.)	10	20	7	N:3 E:3 S:3 W:3	Mature	Good	Fair	20+ Years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multi stemmed at base. Multi stemmed leaders. Failed co-dominant stem. 	No significant visible fungus present at the time of inspection.	No significant visible Pests or Diseases present at the time of inspection.	Owned by the client. Target #- gravestones / statue Target #- Road	YES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limb - Remove (see photo). Option to remove at clients discretion. 	11-Jun-2028 (6 Months)	1 Year
Tree	T208	Sycamore (<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>)	1	100	25	N:3 E:3 S:3 W:3	Mature	Good	Good	40+ Years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seasonal leaf drop has occurred (normal). Hanging limbs in upper canopy x2. 	No significant visible fungus present at the time of inspection.	No significant visible Pests or Diseases present at the time of inspection.	Owned by the client. Target #- gravestones / statue Target #- Road Target #- Footpath - highway	YES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Make safe storm damage - see photo. 	11-Mar-2026 (3 Months)	1 Year
Tree	T209	Cherry (<i>Prunus</i> sp. 'Cherry')	1	40	5	N:5 E:5 S:5 W:5	Semi Mature	Good	Fair	40+ Years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seasonal leaf drop has occurred (normal). Suppressed canopy. Unbalanced canopy. 	No significant visible fungus present at the time of inspection.	No significant visible Pests or Diseases present at the time of inspection.	Owned by the client. Target #- gravestones / statue Target #- Road Target #- Footpath - highway	YES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No work required at time of inspection. 	No Action	1 Year
Tree	T210	Cherry (<i>Prunus</i> sp. 'Cherry')	1	40	10	N:4 E:4 S:4 W:4	Semi Mature	Good	Good	40+ Years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The tree has no significant visual defects. Seasonal leaf drop has occurred (normal). 	No significant visible fungus present at the time of inspection.	No significant visible Pests or Diseases present at the time of inspection.	Owned by the client. Target #- Road Target #- Footpath - highway	YES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No work required at time of inspection. 	No Action	1 Year
Tree	T211	Buckthorn (<i>Rhamnus cathartica</i>)	1	40	10	N:4 E:4 S:4 W:4	Semi Mature	Good	Good	40+ Years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The tree has no significant visual defects. Seasonal leaf drop has occurred (normal). 	No significant visible fungus present at the time of inspection.	No significant visible Pests or Diseases present at the time of inspection.	Owned by the client. Target #- Road Target #- Footpath - highway	YES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No work required at time of inspection. 	No Action	1 Year
Tree	T212	Cherry (<i>Prunus</i> sp. 'Cherry')	1	20	5	N:4 E:4 S:4 W:4	Young	Good	Good	40+ Years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The tree has no significant visual defects. Seasonal leaf drop has occurred (normal). 	No significant visible fungus present at the time of inspection.	No significant visible Pests or Diseases present at the time of inspection.	Owned by the client. Target #- Road Target #- Footpath - highway	YES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No work required at time of inspection. 	No Action	1 Year
Tree	T213	Cherry plum (<i>Prunus cerasifera</i>)	1	40	10	N:4 E:4 S:4 W:4	Semi Mature	Good	Good	40+ Years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The tree has no significant visual defects. Seasonal leaf drop has occurred (normal). 	No significant visible fungus present at the time of inspection.	No significant visible Pests or Diseases present at the time of inspection.	Owned by the client. Target #- Road Target #- Footpath - highway	YES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No work required at time of inspection. 	No Action	1 Year

Job Ref:	2060		Survey Date:		11 December 2025				Surveyor:		Gary Marsden		Site Address:		St Marys Church Glabrum			VTA site survey			GM TREE CONSULTANTS	
	Type	Ref.	Species	Number of stems	Stem diameter @ 1.5m (cm)	Height	Spread	Life Stage	Physiological Condition	Structural Condition	Life Expectancy	Survey Notes	Fungus	Pests and Diseases	Description	Is RISK 'ALARP' As Low As Reasonably Practicable	Recommendations	Timescale for recommended works	Re-inspect within			
Tree	T214	Cherry (<i>Prunus</i> sp. 'Cherry')	3	40	8	N:4 E:4 S:4 W:4	Semi Mature	Good	Good	20+ Years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The tree has no significant visual defects. Seasonal leaf drop has occurred (normal). 	No significant visible fungus present at the time of inspection.	No significant visible Pests or Diseases present at the time of inspection.	Owned by the client. Target # - Road Target # - Footpath - highway	YES	No work required at time of inspection.	No Action	1 Year				
Tree	T215	Weeping willow (<i>Salix</i> <i>babyonicea</i>)	1	40	4	N:3 E:3 S:3 W:3	Semi Mature	Good	Good	40+ Years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The tree has no significant visual defects. Seasonal leaf drop has occurred (normal). 	No significant visible fungus present at the time of inspection.	No significant visible Pests or Diseases present at the time of inspection.	Owned by the client. Target # - Road Target # - Footpath - highway	YES	No work required at time of inspection.	No Action	1 Year				
Tree	T216	Cherry (<i>Prunus</i> sp. 'Cherry')	1	40	5	N:4 E:4 S:4 W:4	Semi Mature	Good	Good	40+ Years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The tree has no significant visual defects. Seasonal leaf drop has occurred (normal). 	No significant visible fungus present at the time of inspection.	No significant visible Pests or Diseases present at the time of inspection.	Owned by the client. Target # - Road Target # - Footpath - highway	YES	No work required at time of inspection.	No Action	1 Year				
Tree	T217	Cherry (<i>Prunus</i> sp. 'Cherry')	1	50	6	N:4 E:4 S:4 W:4	Mature	Good	Poor	<10 years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stem decay. Failed co-dominant stem. Seasonal leaf drop has occurred (normal). 	No significant visible fungus present at the time of inspection.	No significant visible Pests or Diseases present at the time of inspection.	Owned by the client. Target # - Road Target # - Footpath - highway	YES	Remove tree to ground level for arboricultural management reasons.	11-Jun-2026 (6 Months)	1 Year				
Tree	T218	Cherry (<i>Prunus</i> sp. 'Cherry')	1	40	4	N:4 E:4 S:4 W:4	Mature	Good	Fair	10+ Years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seasonal leaf drop has occurred (normal). Pruning history - Topped. 	No significant visible fungus present at the time of inspection.	No significant visible Pests or Diseases present at the time of inspection.	Owned by the client. Target # - Road Target # - Footpath - highway	YES	No work required at time of inspection.	No Action	1 Year				
Tree	T219	Cherry (<i>Prunus</i> sp. 'Cherry')	1	30	6	N:3 E:3 S:3 W:3	Semi Mature	Good	Good	40+ Years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The tree has no significant visual defects. Seasonal leaf drop has occurred (normal). 	No significant visible fungus present at the time of inspection.	No significant visible Pests or Diseases present at the time of inspection.	Owned by the client. Target # - Road Target # - Footpath - highway	YES	No work required at time of inspection.	No Action	1 Year				
Tree	T220	Silver birch (<i>Betula</i> <i>pendula</i>)	1	60	20	N:5 E:5 S:5 W:5	Mature	Good	Good	40+ Years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The tree has no significant visual defects. Seasonal leaf drop has occurred (normal). 	No significant visible fungus present at the time of inspection.	No significant visible Pests or Diseases present at the time of inspection.	Owned by the client. Target # - Road Target # - Footpath - highway	YES	No work required at time of inspection.	No Action	1 Year				

Job Ref:	2060		Survey Date:	11 December 2025				Surveyor:	Gary Marsden		Site Address:	St Marys Church Glaburn			VTA site survey				
Type	Ref.	Species	Number of stems	Stem diameter @ 1.5m (cm)	Height	Spread	Life Stage	Physiological Condition	Structural Condition	Life Expectancy	Survey Notes	Fungus	Pests and Diseases	Description	Is RISK 'ALARP' As Low As Reasonably Practicable	Recommendations	Timescale for recommended works	Re-inspect within	
Tree	T221	Apple (Malus sp.)	1	20	4	N:2 E:2 S:2 W:2	Semi Mature	Good	Good	40+ Years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The tree has no significant visual defects. Seasonal leaf drop has occurred (normal). 	No significant visible fungus present at the time of inspection	No significant visible Pests or Diseases present at the time of inspection	Owned by the client. Target # - Road Target # - Footpath - highway	YES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No work required in terms of inspection 	100 Action	1 Year	
Tree	T222	Common holly (Ilex aquifolium)	3	20	4	N:2 E:2 S:2 W:2	Semi Mature	Good	Good	40+ Years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seasonal leaf drop has occurred (normal). Pruning history - Topped. 	No significant visible fungus present at the time of inspection	No significant visible Pests or Diseases present at the time of inspection	Owned by the client. Target # - Road Target # - Footpath - highway	YES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No work required in terms of inspection 	100 Action	1 Year	

BS 5837 Surveys

**Arboricultural Impact
Assessments**

**Arboricultural Method
Statements**

Site Supervision

Visual Tree Assessments

QTRA Assessments

Expert Witness Reports

**L.O.L.E.R Thorough
Equipment Inspections**

Mortgage Reports

TPO applications and advice

