Tree Condition Report

Location of property:

4 + 6 Brooklands,
Chipping,
Preston,
PR32QU

Arboricultural report for:

Mary Hall + Steve Axell

Date of site survey:

16/03/2026

Date of report:

25/03/2026

Job Ref: 2294

Survey undertaken by:
Gary Marsden
FDSc Arb, M.Arbor.A.

GMTREE CONSULTANTS



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.

Tel: 077 61 66 73 84
Email: gary@gmtreeconsultants.co.uk
Web: www.gmtreeconsultants.co.uk
Registered in England and Wales – CRN: 07548009

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

Contents

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 Mary Hall (No. 4) and Steve Axell (No. 6), (referred to as the 'client' from here on) to inspect the significant trees located within the site boundaries at No. 4 + 6 Brooklands, Chipping, Preston, PR32QU 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.
- Complete an application form to work on protected trees and submit this to the relevant local authority with the report as supplementary evidence.

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 16/03/2026. 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. An assessment was carried out using a Resistograph to help determine the internal qualities of a tree as visual indicators prompted further investigation. 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. Brooklands is in Chipping. The site is on the eastern side of the road and surrounded by similar residential developments and Chipping Brook to the east of the trees. The site consists of two residential properties that is currently occupied and centrally set within the site boundaries. No significant utility services were observed on site. 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.

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. This inspection was of a preliminary visual tree assessment (VTA) nature that was visible from accessible points at ground level and included detailed investigation with the use of a resistograph to assess the internal function of the stem / buttress / roots area.

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. Where there is external visual indication of possible dysfunction or concern over its condition within a section of stem / branch, a drill test using a Resi-PD400 has been carried out to gain more information as to the quality of the internal structural wood.

17.2. The IML-RESI PowerDrill® (Resi-PD400) measures the drilling resistance and feed force of the wood to supply the user with data to make a clear statement about the condition of the wood.

17.3. With a fine drilling needle, the measuring device penetrates the wood in a minimally invasive way and records both the drilling resistance and the feed force in relation to the penetration depth. When the bit enters a void or decay, the measurement curve will lose resistance and be seen as a flat or decreasing line in the graph clearly defining a loss in wood structure.

17.4. Each measurement graph will have an Assessment box which shows conditions and the depth (cm) of which that condition applies, this correlates to the colour above and below the graph, these graphs are inserted in Appendix 'B'.

Colour codes on Resi-PD400 assessment graph	
Bark	Cavity
Structural wood	Split
Partial decay	Abnormal density
Decay	Drill exited tree
Extensive decay	Drill retraction

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. Trees have been identified that require tree works due to safety reasons, this includes tree removal and / or pruning works, the trees are identified in the tree schedule and located via the tree maps included in this report.

19.3. Tree 1 has an unbalanced canopy it is recommended that a crown reduction of 3 m is undertaken to prevent end loading of canopy towards the summer house.

19.4. Tree 2 has been reduced to a monolith prior to this survey, the stem is covered in ivy so any defects can't be seen, the resistograph showed adequate structural wood at 1m above ground. No work needed at the time of inspection.

19.5. Tree 3 has a previously removed stem to the west that has now decayed, at present this has not affected the main remaining stem. There is an unidentifiable fungal bracket evident at the base of the tree that is not identifiable due to degradation. The tree will need reassessing again within 12 months when in full leaf to fully assess the vigour and vitality of the tree. No work needed at the time of inspection.

19.6. Tree 4 has no significant defects found. Tree does have three codominant leaders but no significant risk of failure.

19.7. Tree 5 is located on the boundary line with the properties at number 4 and 6. Part of the main internal stem structure has branch decay that extends into the upper 5m of branch structure. The main branches do have helical twist growth with evidence of bacterial cancer, but the tree is coping with these associated stresses. At the time of inspection this tree can be managed by carrying out a canopy reduction of 3m all over to reduce and loading on the unions and stem, this will retain the aesthetics of the site in the short term. In the long term (10+ years), it is foreseen that this tree will need removing.

19.8. Tree 6 has an open wound on the stem at 2m, but the wound is gradually occluding. There is no sign of significant spread of decay into the main stem from resistograph test and with hammer resonance test. There are no visible issues with the upper canopy.

19.9. Tree 7 has significant decay within the main stem, and this then extends into the upper branch structure that spans towards the stream and the summer house on the other side of the stream, there is a high potential for failure due to the heavy end loading and weight imposed on the weakened branch union and stem. Whole tree removal is recommended due to internal decay at base of the tree and extending into the main limb.

19.10. Tree 8 is a tall slender grown tree with a high upper canopy. There is no significant defects on this tree and no work required at the time of inspection

19.11. Tree nine is located on the boundary line with the properties at number 6 and 8. No significant visual defects found with the tree and no work needed at the time of inspection.

19.12. Resistograph testing has been carried out on all 9 trees. At the time of testing on the in screen digital display only T7 showed significant internal disfunction that warranted removal. Due to an unknown technical issue with the device the transmission of the collected data to my PC was lost, so no printable graphs could be produced for this report.

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.

T1

T2

T3

T4

T5

T5

T6

T7

T7

T7

T8



T9

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'.
- Analise 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. <u>At the time of writing this report</u> it has been confirmed by the client that there is a Tree Preservation Order / Conservation Area in force on some or all the trees in question. It is strongly advised that prior to undertaking any work on the tree/s written consent is granted from the local authority via an application or through the planning process.

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.

Mary Hall + Steve Axell
4+6 Brooklands, Chipping, Preston

2294 - VTA - March 2026

Page size: A3

1 : 400

0 5 m 10 m

N

GMTREE CONSULTANTS

Arboricultural ASSOCIATION Professional Member



Mary Hall + Steve Axell
4+6 Brooklands, Chipping, Preston

2294 - VTA - March 2026

Page size: A3

1 : 400

0 5 m 10 m

N

GMTREE CONSULTANTS

Arboricultural ASSOCIATION Professional Member

Job Ref:	2294	Survey Date:	16 March 2026	Surveyor:	Gary Marsden	Site Address:	4 and 6 Brooklands, Chipping, Preston	VTA site survey	GMTREE 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 recomended works	Re-inspect within
Tree	T001	Horse chestnut *(Aesculus hippocastanum)*	1	60	18	N:6 E:6 S:6 W:6	Mature	Good	Good	20+ Years	_ Restricted rooting volume. _ Tree growing on edge of watercourse. _ Dense ivy clad on stem. _ Included bark of main branches. _ Occluded pruning wounds on main branches. _ Minor deadwood <25 mm diameter. _ Unbalanced canopy. _ Grown as part of a group of trees. _ Bud burst has started.	No significant visible fungus present at the time of inspection.	No significant visible Pests or Disease present at the time of inspection.	Owned by the client. Target # - Garden Target # - Conservatory Target # - shed / greenhouse / outbuilding	YES	_ Reduce crown by 3m in length.	16-Sep-2026 (6 Months)	18 Months
Tree	T002	Horse chestnut *(Aesculus hippocastanum)*	1	60	5	N:0.5 E:0.5 S:0.5 W:0.5	Mature	Dead	Fair	<10 years	_ Tree canopy removed. _ Monolith. _ Dense ivy clad on stem.	No significant visible fungus present at the time of inspection.	No significant visible Pests or Disease present at the time of inspection.	Owned by the client. Target # - Garden Target # - Conservatory	YES	_ No work required at time of inspection.	No Action	18 Months

Job Ref:	2294	Survey Date:	16 March 2026	Surveyor:	Gary Marsden	Site Address:	4 and 6 Brooklands, Chipping, Preston	VTA site survey	GMTREE 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 recomended works	Re-inspect within
Tree	T003	Horse chestnut *(Aesculus hippocastanum)*	1	60	18	N:6 E:6 S:6 W:6	Mature	Good	Fair	20+ Years	_ Restricted rooting volume. _ Tree growing on edge of watercourse. _ Detailed inspection undertaken - 1 resitograph tests taken on the stem. _ Fungal fruiting body at base of tree. _ Multi stemmed at base. _ Stem decay. _ Failed co-dominant stem. _ Occluded pruning wounds on main branches. _ Tight union of branches within canopy. _ Minor deadwood <25 mm diameter. _ Pruning history - Crown reduction. _ Bud burst has started.	Fungus Present - identification not possible due degraded bracket	No significant visible Pests or Disease present at the time of inspection.	Owned by the client. Target # - Garden Target # - Conservatory Target # - shed / greenhouse / outbuilding	YES	_ Reduce crown by 3m in length.	16-Sep-2026 (6 Months)	18 Months
Tree	T004	Horse chestnut *(Aesculus hippocastanum)*	1	60	18	N:6 E:6 S:6 W:6	Mature	Good	Good	20+ Years	_ Restricted rooting volume. _ Tree growing on edge of watercourse. _ Stem has co-dominant fork. _ Multi stemmed leaders. _ Minor deadwood <25 mm diameter. _ Bud burst has started.	No significant visible fungus present at the time of inspection.	No significant visible Pests or Disease present at the time of inspection.	Owned by the client. Target # - Garden Target # - Conservatory Target # - shed / greenhouse / outbuilding Target # - Dwelling	YES	_ No work required at time of inspection.	No Action	18 Months

Job Ref:	2294	Survey Date:	16 March 2026	Surveyor:	Gary Marsden	Site Address:	4 and 6 Brooklands, Chipping, Preston	VTA site survey	GMTREE 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 recomended works	Re-inspect within
Tree	T005	Horse chestnut *(Aesculus hippocastanum)*	1	80	18	N:8 E:8 S:8 W:8	Mature	Good	Fair	10+ Years	_ Restricted rooting volume. _ Tree growing on edge of watercourse. _ Detailed inspection undertaken - resitograph tests taken on the stem. _ Decay at base of tree. _ Stem has co-dominant fork. _ Multi stemmed leaders. _ Stem decay. _ Stems have included bark. _ Stems have a tight union. _ Bacterial canker on stem. _ Fungal fruiting body on stem <5 m AGL. _ Bark damage on main branch structure. _ Decay on main branch structure. _ Occluded pruning wounds on main branches. _ Minor deadwood <25 mm diameter. _ Bud burst has started.	No significant visible fungus present at the time of inspection.	No significant visible Pests or Disease present at the time of inspection.	Owned by the client. Target # - Garden Target # - Conservatory Target # - shed / greenhouse / outbuilding	YES	_ Reduce crown by 3m in length.	16-Sep-2026 (6 Months)	18 Months
Tree	T006	Horse chestnut *(Aesculus hippocastanum)*	1	60	16	N:6 E:6 S:6 W:6	Mature	Good	Good	20+ Years	_ Restricted rooting volume. _ Tree growing on edge of watercourse. _ Failed co-dominant stem. _ Minor deadwood <25 mm diameter. _ Suppressed canopy. _ Unbalanced canopy. _ Grown as part of a group of trees. _ Bud burst has started.	No significant visible fungus present at the time of inspection.	No significant visible Pests or Disease present at the time of inspection.	Owned by the client. Target # - Garden Target # - Conservatory Target # - shed / greenhouse / outbuilding Target # - Dwelling	YES	_ No work required at time of inspection.	No Action	18 Months

Job Ref:	2294	Survey Date:	16 March 2026	Surveyor:	Gary Marsden	Site Address:	4 and 6 Brooklands, Chipping, Preston	VTA site survey	GMTREE 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 recomended works	Re-inspect within
Tree	T007	Horse chestnut *(Aesculus hippocastanum)*	1	60	18	N:6 E:6 S:6 W:6	Mature	Good	Decaying	<10 years	_ Restricted rooting volume. _ Tree growing on edge of watercourse. _ Detailed inspection undertaken - resitograph tests taken on the stem. _ Decay at base of tree. _ Stem has co-dominant fork. _ Multi stemmed leaders. _ Stem decay. _ Heavy branch loading. _ Included bark of main branches. _ Occluded pruning wounds on main branches. _ Bud burst has started.	No significant visible fungus present at the time of inspection.	No significant visible Pests or Disease present at the time of inspection.	Owned by the client. Target # - Garden Target # - Conservatory Target # - shed / greenhouse / outbuilding Target # - Dwelling	YES	_ Remove to ground level.	16-Sep-2026 (6 Months)	18 Months
Tree	T008	Horse chestnut *(Aesculus hippocastanum)*	1	40	18	N:4 E:4 S:4 W:4	Mature	Good	Good	20+ Years	_ Restricted rooting volume. _ Tree growing on edge of watercourse. _ The tree has no significant visual defects. _ Bud burst has started.	No significant visible fungus present at the time of inspection.	No significant visible Pests or Disease present at the time of inspection.	Owned by the client. Target # - Garden Target # - Conservatory Target # - shed / greenhouse / outbuilding Target # - Dwelling	YES	_ No work required at time of inspection.	No Action	18 Months

Job Ref:	2294	Survey Date:	16 March 2026	Surveyor:	Gary Marsden	Site Address:	4 and 6 Brooklands, Chipping, Preston	VTA site survey	GMTREE 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 recomended works	Re-inspect within
Tree	T009	Horse chestnut *(Aesculus hippocastanum)*	1	40	18	N:4 E:4 S:4 W:4	Mature	Good	Good	20+ Years	_ Restricted rooting volume. _ Tree growing on edge of watercourse. _ The tree has no significant visual defects. _ Bud burst has started.	No significant visible fungus present at the time of inspection.	No significant visible Pests or Disease present at the time of inspection.	Owned by the client. Target # - Garden Target # - Conservatory Target # - shed / greenhouse / outbuilding Target # - Dwelling	YES	_ No work required at time of inspection.	No Action	18 Months

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