



Tree Risk Management Appraisal

of Trees within the Identified Boundaries at



**Stonehouse, Blackburn Road, Ribchester, Lancashire,
PR3 3ZP**

Prepared by:

Bowland 
Tree Consultancy Ltd

July 2026

**TREE RISK MANAGEMENT APPRAISAL
STONEHOUSE, BLACKBURN ROAD, RIBCHESTER**

CONTENTS

1. CIVIL LAW REGARDING TREE OWNERSHIP AND DUTY OF CARE
2. QTRA METHODOLOGY OVERVIEW AND APPLICATION IN MANAGEMENT DECISIONS
3. PROTECTED SPECIES AND STATUTORY RESTRICTIONS
4. SUMMARY OF SURVEY FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
5. GENERAL TREE MANAGEMENT COMMENTS
6. TREE RISK MANAGEMENT STRATEGY RECOMMENDATIONS
7. TREE SURVEY SCHEDULE
8. TREE SURVEY PLAN
9. QTRA PRACTICE NOTE

6 Cross Street
Preston
Lancashire
PR1 3LT

T: 01772 437150

E: info@bowlandtreeconsultancy.co.uk

14 Castlegate
Penrith
Cumbria
CA11 7HZ

T: 01768 744450

Bowland 
Tree Consultancy Ltd

**TREE RISK MANAGEMENT APPRAISAL
STONEHOUSE, BLACKBURN ROAD, RIBCHESTER**

PROJECT DETAILS

Project No.: BTC3601

Site: Stonehouse, Blackburn Road, Ribchester, Lancashire, PR3 3ZP

Survey Type: Individual Tree Survey

Tree(s) Considered: Trees within site boundaries as identified by client

Report Time Frame: 12 months from date of issue

Next Inspection Date: ≈18 months from date of issue

Client: Susie Owen

Survey Date: 17 June 2026

Surveyor: Dan Brown BSc (Hons) MArborA

Report Prepared by: Dan Brown BSc (Hons) MArborA

Report Checked by: Joseph Lambert BSc(Hons) FdSc MArborA MICFor

Date of Issue: 06 July 2026

Version No: 1

1. CIVIL LAW REGARDING TREE OWNERSHIP AND DUTY OF CARE

- 1.1 Under civil law the owner of the land on which a tree stands, together with any party who has control over the tree's management, has a duty of care to take reasonable steps to prevent or minimise the risk of personal injury and/or damage to property from any tree located within the curtilage of the land in question.
- 1.2 In turn, it is accepted that these steps should normally include commissioning a qualified and experienced arboriculturist to survey the tree in order to identify and appraise any risk of harm to persons or damage to property that it may present and, where unacceptable risks are identified, taking suitable remedial action to negate or reduce those risks accordingly.

2. QTRA METHODOLOGY OVERVIEW AND APPLICATION IN MANAGEMENT DECISIONS

- 2.1 A survey was carried out in order to consider the general structural stability of the identified trees at the site and the associated risk of harm posed to persons and/or property and, from this information, to make management recommendations to reduce any risks identified to be unacceptable to a level that is considered to be either tolerable or broadly acceptable (see Table 1, below).
- 2.2 The Quantified Tree Risk Assessment (QTRA) methodology utilised for the tree survey (see appended QTRA Practice Note for more details) quantifies the three components of tree failure risk, which are:
 - i. *Target* (something with potential to be harmed and/or damaged by the mechanical failure of tree parts);
 - ii. *Impact Potential*; and
 - iii. *Probability of Failure* (within the coming year).
- 2.3 The product of the three component values is the annualised 'Risk of Harm', which is a combined measure of the likelihood and the consequence of tree failure considered in terms of the loss within the coming year, and is expressed as a probability. In applying the 'Tolerability of Risk Framework' (ToR) the QTRA methodology divides the 'Risk of Harm' into three threshold values, being:
 1. *Unacceptable* (i.e. $>1/1,000$), which is unacceptable and will not ordinarily be tolerated;
 2. *Tolerable* (i.e. between $1/1,000,000$ and $1/1,000$, where the Risk of Harm will be tolerable if it is As Low As Reasonably Practicable (ALARP); but a Risk of Harm $1/10,000$ or greater will not ordinarily be Tolerable where it is imposed on others, such as the public. In the Tolerable range management decisions are informed by consideration of the benefits and costs of risk control, including benefits provided by trees that would be lost to risk control measures; and
 3. *Broadly Acceptable* ($<1/1,000,000$), which is already ALARP.
- 2.4 The QTRA advisory thresholds, (see Table 1, below) are proposed as a reasonable approach to balancing safety from falling trees with the costs of risk reduction. This approach takes account of the principles of ALARP and ToR, but does not dictate how these principles should be applied. While the thresholds can be the foundation of a robust policy for tree risk management, tree managers should make decisions based on their own situation, values and resources.

Table 1: QTRA Advisory Risk Thresholds:

Threshold	Description	Action
Risk of harm of $1/1,000$ or greater	Unacceptable - Risks will not ordinarily be tolerated	Control the risk
Risk of harm between $1/1,000$ and $1/10,000$	Unacceptable (where imposed on others) - Risks will not ordinarily be tolerated	- Control the risk - Review the risk
	Tolerable (by agreement) Risks may be tolerated if those exposed to the risk accept it, or the tree has exceptional value	- Control the risk unless there is broad stakeholder agreement to tolerate it, or the tree has exceptional value - Review the risk
Risk of harm between $1/10,000$ and $1/1,000,000$	Tolerable (where imposed on others) - Risks are tolerable if ALARP	- Assess costs and benefits of risk control - Control the risk only where a significant benefit might be achieved at reasonable cost - Review the risk
Risk of harm less than $1/1,000,000$	Broadly Acceptable - Risk is already ALARP	- No action currently required - Review the risk

- 2.5 As detailed in Table 1, a Risk of Harm less than $1/1,000,000$ is Broadly Acceptable and already ALARP (i.e. 'as low as reasonably practicable'). A Risk of Harm $1/1,000$ or greater is unacceptable and will not

ordinarily be tolerated. Between these two thresholds, the Risk of Harm is in the Tolerable region of the ToR Framework and will be tolerable if it is ALARP, but a Risk of Harm 1/10,000 or greater will not ordinarily be Tolerable where it is imposed on others, such as the public. Here, management decisions are informed by consideration of the benefits and costs of risk control, including benefits provided by trees that would be lost to risk control measures.

- 2.6 In respect of the above the assessor (i.e. Bowland Tree Consultancy Ltd) may consider the costs of risk control when providing options for management if specifically asked to do so, but the tree owner/manager, who owns the risk and therefore exercises control over the costs, must consider the balance and make the final management decision(s).

3. PROTECTED SPECIES AND STATUTORY RESTRICTIONS

Tree Preservation Orders and Conservation Area Designations

- 3.1 The Town & Country Planning Act (1990) (the Act) and associated Regulations empower Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) to protect trees in the interests of amenity by making Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs). The Act also affords protection for trees of over 75mm diameter that stand within the curtilage of a Conservation Area (CA). Subject to certain exemptions, an application must be made to the LPA in question to carry out works upon or to remove trees that are subject to a TPO, whilst six weeks' notice of intention must be given to carry out works upon or to remove trees within a CA that are not protected by a TPO.
- 3.2 According to the LPA's website, checked 25 June 2026, the site stands within a CA. As such, other than for limited exceptions, it is essential that an applicable section 211 notice is submitted to the planning department of the local council, in this case Ribble Valley Borough Council, prior to scheduling or undertaking any tree works.

Protected Species

- 3.3 Nesting birds are afforded statutory protection under the Wildlife & Countryside Act (1981) (as amended) and their potential presence should therefore be considered when clipping hedges, removing climbing plants and pruning and removing trees. The breeding period for woodlands runs from March to August inclusive. Hedges provide valuable nesting sites for many birds and clipping should therefore be avoided during March to July. Trees, hedges and ivy should be inspected for nests prior to pruning or removal and any work likely to destroy or disturb active nests should be avoided until the young have fledged.
- 3.4 All bat species and their roosts are protected under Schedule 5 of the Wildlife & Countryside Act (1981) (as amended) and under Schedule 2 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended). In this respect, it should be noted that it is possible that unidentified bat habitat features may be located high in tree crowns and all personnel carrying out tree works at the site should therefore be vigilant and mindful of the possibility that roosting bats may be present in trees with such features. If any bat roosts are identified, then it is essential that works are halted immediately and that a suitably qualified and experienced ecologist investigates and advises on appropriate actions prior to works continuing.
- 3.5 In turn, any subsequent works carried out in relation to any protected species must be carried out under guidance from a suitably qualified and experienced ecologist and in strict accordance with applicable industry guidance (i.e. BS8596:2015 - Surveying for Bats in Trees and Woodlands).

Felling Licences

- 3.6 Subject to certain exemptions the Forestry Act (1967) requires that a 'Felling Licence' be obtained to remove growing trees amounting to more than five cubic metres of timber in a calendar quarter, providing no more than two cubic metres are sold. Felling Licences are administered by the Forestry Commission and contravention of the associated controls can incur substantial penalties. A felling licence is, however, not required for trees standing within the curtilage of a private residential garden, orchard, churchyard or in public open spaces such as land registered under the Commons Act 1899, village greens, public parks and public gardens.

4. SUMMARY OF SURVEY FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- 4.1 An 'Individual Tree Survey' (see 'Schedule of Operations' appended to agreed project quote) was carried out on 17 June 2026 at the site under consideration. In turn, the ownership boundaries, and the trees to be considered within the survey, were identified by the instructing client Susie Owens on plans supplied via e-mail.
- 4.2 The survey identified four individual trees (prefixed 'T'), as detailed in the appended Tree Survey Schedule (TSS) and Tree Survey Plan (TSP). Collected tree survey data and pertinent recorded features can be found for each tree in the appended Tree Survey Schedule (TSS).
- 4.3 The site under consideration is a dwelling located on Blackburn Road within the village of Ribchester. The surveyed area consists of a dwelling off Ribchester Road, bordered by other dwellings around the perimeter with farm land in the distance to the north and east and the village of Ribchester to the south and west. The majority of trees are located along the south boundary, adjacent to Blackburn Road.
- 4.4 As a component of this appraisal various targets were identified to be within falling distances of the surveyed trees, including, but not restricted to, vehicles and occupants travelling along the high usage Ribchester Road, and using the various driveways to access residential properties, pedestrians using the footpath adjacent to Ribchester Road, and various items of property including the property itself, various neighbouring properties, parked vehicles, street furniture, and boundary features such as fences and walls.
- 4.5 In regards to the survey it was noted that various trees had inspection impediments, such as stems within dense hedgerows or within wider vegetation, or dense coverings of climbing plants such as Ivy. In turn, it is not considered reasonable to justify the cost of removal, and the subsequent loss of habitat benefits, of such impediments unless an obvious tree risk feature or physiological issue is observed and further detailed inspection is deemed necessary by the surveyor
- 4.6 In turn, as highlighted with the colour green in the appended Tree Survey Schedule, and in Table 2 (below), the risk assessment established that all the surveyed trees have calculated QTRA risk indices that fall within the broadly acceptable risk threshold range of less than 1,000,000 (please refer to Table 1, on the previous page, with regard to advisory tree risk thresholds). However, as also detailed in Table Two, various recommendations have also been made for a range of general non-risk management related works reasons (as denoted with the suffix (M)), to mitigate risk to a fixed structure (as denoted with the suffix (S)) or, where applicable, to enable applicable trees to be inspected in further detail for risk assessment purposes (as denoted with the suffix (I)). Additionally, recommendations have also been made to prevent currently tolerable risks moving into the unacceptable risk threshold upon further deterioration of tree condition.

Table 2: Tree Work Recommendations:

No.	Species	Management Works Recommended*	Responsible Professional	Work Priority
T1	Sycamore	1. Prune applicable branches within tree canopy to attain 1.5m clearance from adjacent dwelling (S). 2. Prune tree to remove deadwood >35mm diameter whilst completing above pruning works due to identified increased risk of failure.	1. Tree contractor 2. Tree contractor	1. Moderate 2. Low
T2	Wild Cherry	1. Prune canopy to reduce height and sides by up to 2m to reduce static and dynamic loading on potential weak unions resultant of historic pruning works (M). 2. Sever ivy and remove all ivy from tree to facilitate future ongoing cyclical inspections (I).	1. Tree contractor 2. Tree contractor	1. Low 2. Low
T3	Double Cherry Plum	1. Prune first significant branch to west back by 2m to secondary branch union at approximately 2.5m height to reduce dynamic and static loading on bark included primary branch union (M). 2. Prune tree canopy over adjacent public footpath to attain 2.5m height clearance (M).	1. Tree contractor 2. Tree contractor	1. Low 2. Low

Table continued overleaf

Table 2: Tree Work Recommendations (continued):

No.	Species	Management Works Recommended*	Responsible Professional	Work Priority
T4	Smooth Japanese Maple	1. Prune canopy over adjacent public footpath to attain 2.5m height clearance (M).	1. Tree contractor	1. Low

*Note: it shall be the client's responsibility to arrange contact with the applicable council's planning department to check for any statutory tree protection, and obtain any necessary permissions if required, prior to scheduling or carrying out any tree works

5. GENERAL TREE MANAGEMENT COMMENTS

- 5.1 During the course of the survey, it was noted that the canopies of a number of the trees border Blackburn Road and the associated footway. In this respect it is generally accepted that the minimum clearances should be approximately 2.5 metres over a footpath and 5.05 metres over a road carriageway which, in turn, should give sufficient clearance for a person with a raised umbrella to walk unimpeded along a footpath and for a double-decker bus to travel along a road without striking any overhanging branches. Furthermore, adequate clearance should be maintained to visibility splays from junctions and accesses and also to road signs and street lights.
- 5.2 Additionally, it was noted that the canopies of various trees overhang access driveways. As such, it is recommended that general periodic maintenance pruning should be undertaken as and when necessary to ensure adequate canopy clearances are maintained to roads, footways and internal accesses and any overhead utilities such as overhead telephone lines.

6. TREE RISK MANAGEMENT STRATEGY RECOMMENDATIONS

- 6.1 In consideration of the high usage of the adjacent Blackburn Road, and the proximity of the trees to various items of property, and the associated identified targets such as parked and moving vehicles and pedestrians and residential properties and parked cars, it is subsequently recommended that all of the trees be re-inspected on a cyclical programme of roughly every 18 months, so that they can be alternately viewed whilst both in and out of leaf in order to monitor both their structural and physiological condition and, consequently, for the site occupiers to meet their duty of care. In this respect it is therefore recommended that the trees be re-inspected Winter 2027.
- 6.2 Additionally, it is strongly recommended that the client undertakes a walkover check of trees around the site following any inclement weather events, and observes the trees during their day to day activities and routines. This is recommended to identify any obvious risk features, such as broken, split or hanging branches, root-plate heave, the apparition of fungal fruiting bodies etc. that could have occurred following inclement weather, and, if subsequently identified as necessary, to then seek appropriate advice from a tree contractor or tree consultant.

DISCLAIMER

Survey Limitations: Unless otherwise stated all trees are viewed from ground level using non-invasive techniques. The disclosure of hidden crown and stem defects, in particular where they may be above a reachable height, or where trees are ivy clad or in areas of ground vegetation, cannot therefore be expected. All obvious defects, however, are reported. Where the QTRA Risk Index is calculated as Tolerable or Broadly Acceptable, but the tree(s) have not been adequately inspected (e.g. due to the presence of ivy and/or ground vegetation which impeded the inspection), then it is essential to follow the recommendations made in the Management Recommendations column and to have the applicable tree(s) re-inspected as recommended.

Detailed tree safety appraisals are only carried out under specific written instructions. Comments upon evident tree safety relate to the condition of said tree at the time of the survey only. The level of detail of the survey is as per the brief detailed on the Tree Survey Schedule and as per the specifics set out in the associated fee estimate for the project.

Unless otherwise stated all trees should be re-inspected annually in order to appraise their on-going mechanical integrity and physiological condition. It should, however, be recognised that tree condition is subject to change, for example due to the effects of disease, decay, high winds, development works, etc. Changes in land use or site conditions (e.g. development that increases access frequency) and the occurrence of severe weather incidents are also significant considerations with regards tree structural integrity and trees should therefore be re-assessed in the context of such changes and/or incidents and inspected at intervals relative to identified and varying site conditions and associated risks.

Where trees are located wholly or partially on neighbouring private third-party land then said land is not accessed and our inspection is therefore restricted to what can reasonably be seen from within the site. Any subsequent comments and judgments made in respect of such trees are based on these restrictions and are our preliminary opinion only. Recommendations for works to neighbouring third-party trees are only made where a potentially unacceptable risk to persons and/or property has been identified during our survey. Where significant structural defects of third-party trees are identified and associated management works are considered essential to negate any risk of harm and/or damage then we will first attempt to inform the site occupier of the issues and, if not possible, then inform the relevant Council. Where a more detailed assessment is considered necessary then appropriate recommendations are set out in the Tree Survey Schedule.

The potential influence of trees upon existing or proposed buildings or other structures, resulting from the effects of their roots abstracting water from shrinkable load-bearing soils, is not considered herein.

Copyright & Non-Disclosure Notice: The content and layout of this report are subject to copyright owned by Bowland Tree Consultancy Ltd, save to the extent that copyright has been legally assigned to us by another party or is used by Bowland Tree Consultancy Ltd under license. The report remains the property of Bowland Tree Consultancy Ltd until such time as payment in full for the services conducted as per the contract of Bowland Tree Consultancy Ltd's appointment has been compensated. The report may not be copied or used without our prior written agreement for any purpose other than those indicated. Unauthorised reproduction or usage of the report by any person is prohibited.

Third Parties: Any disclosure of this document to a third party is subject to this disclaimer. The report was prepared by Bowland Tree Consultancy Ltd at the instruction of and for use by our client, as named. This report does not in any way constitute advice to any third party who is able to access it by any means. Bowland Tree Consultancy Ltd excludes to the fullest extent lawfully permitted all liability whatsoever for any loss or damage arising from reliance on the contents of this report.

Statutory Tree Protection: It is the client's responsibility to check for the presence of any statutory tree protection measures, such as the site's location within a Conservation Area and/or the presence of any Tree Preservation Orders, directly with the applicable Council's planning department prior to scheduling or carrying out any tree works. In turn, it is also the client's responsibility to check for the need for a felling licence with the Forestry Commission prior to scheduling or carrying out any tree works. Bowland Tree Consultancy Ltd cannot be held responsible for any decisions made by the client to prune or remove trees where any such statutory protection exists.

Liability: This report was prepared for the sole use of 'The Client' and, where applicable, the client's 'Agent', in accordance with the agreement under which the services were instructed. No warranty, express or implied, is made as to the advice in this report or any other service provided by Bowland Tree Consultancy Ltd. This report may not be relied upon by any other party except the client or any third party for whom the report is intended without the prior written permission of Bowland Tree Consultancy Ltd. The content of this report is, at least in part, based upon information provided by secondary data sources and on the assumption that all relevant information has been provided by those parties from whom it has been requested. Information obtained from any third party has not been independently verified by Bowland Tree Consultancy Ltd, unless otherwise stated in the report.

Validity: The findings and recommendations contained within this report are, providing its recommendations are observed and the site conditions are retained as per the date(s) of the survey, valid for a period of twelve months from the last survey date. This period of validity may be reduced should there be any changes in factors affecting both the surrounding environment and/or built structures in relative proximity to the trees. The condition of trees should be re-appraised directly, through a site survey, following major weather events such as storms, changes undertaken to the site's conditions, inclusive of demolition and/or ground works, or the removal of existing site vegetation, including trees.

Site:	Stonehouse, Blackburn Road, Ribchester, Lancashire, PR3 3ZP
Client:	Susie Owen
Brief:	Carry out an individual tree survey within area specified by client, report on projected risk posed to persons and property, and make management recommendations where appropriate

Surveyor:	Dan Brown BSc (Hons) Mahora
Survey Date:	17 June 2026
Viewing Conditions:	Clear
Job Reference:	BTC3601

No.	Species	Age	Height (m)	Stem Diam. (mm)	Crown Spread (m)	Vitality	Comments	Management Recommendations	Risk Assessment Description (Part/Target)	Target	Size	P.O.F	Reduced Mass %	Risk Index	Work Priority
T1	Sycamore	M	24	890	20	G	- No change from previous survey, except for the canopy beginning to encroach towards the chimney stack of the residential property to the west of the tree <i>Comments from 2020 survey:</i> - Located adjacent to boundary wall and stone paved area within rear garden of residential property. - Stem trifurcates at a height of approximately 5m with evidently cupped union and some debris and small amount of ivy growing from within. - Minor staining to north-east, likely water overflow from within. - Number of fully and partially occluded pruning wounds up to approximately 150mm diameter in lower canopy and primary branches from works to raise and maintain canopy clearances to adjacent properties and road. - Primary branch arising to north sub divides approximately 2m from main stem with two branches of approximately 180mm and 300mm diameter in contact a distance of approximately 500mm from this union. - Small amount of deadwood throughout canopy up to approximately 50mm diameter.	- Tree contractor to prune applicable branches within tree canopy to attain 1.5m clearance from adjacent dwelling (S). - Tree contractor to prune tree to remove deadwood >35mm diameter whilst completing above pruning works due to identified increased risk of failure.	P = Deadwood up to approximately 50mm. T = Vehicles and occupants using adjacent Blackburn Road.	2	4	3	25%	<1M	M

HEADINGS & ABBREVIATIONS

NO.
SPECIES:
AGE:
HEIGHT:
DIAMETER:
CROWN SPREAD:
VITALITY:
MANAGEMENT:
TARGET RANGE:
RISK ASSESSMENT DESCRIPTION:
SIZE RANGE:
P.O.F:
REDUCED MASS %:
RISK INDEX:
WORK PRIORITY:

TREE/GROUP REFERENCE NUMBER. REFER TO PLAN OR NUMBERED TAGS WHERE APPLICABLE
 COMMON NAME
 Y = YOUNG, SM = SEMI MATURE, EM = EARLY MATURE, M = MATURE, PM = POST MATURE
 APPROXIMATELY 80% OF TREES ARE MEASURED USING AN ELECTRONIC CLIMOMETER AND THE REMAINDER ESTIMATED AGAINST THE MEASURED TREES
 STEM DIAMETER MEASURED OR ESTIMATED AT A HEIGHT OF APPROXIMATELY 1.3 METRES
 MEASURED OR ESTIMATED DIAMETER OF CROWN(S) AT THE WIDEST POINT
 A MEASURE OF PHYSIOLOGICAL CONDITION WHEREBY D = DEAD, MD = MODERATELY DEAD, P = POOR, M = MODERATE, G = GOOD
 SUFFIXES: (M) = FOR GENERAL ARBORICULTURAL OR SILVICULTURAL MANAGEMENT, (S) = TO REMOVE OR REDUCE THE RISK OF DIRECT DAMAGE TO A FIXED STRUCTURE BY MEANS OF CIRCUMFERENTIAL ROOT, STEM OR BRANCH GROWTH, (I) = TO ENABLE THE TREE(S) TO BE INSPECTED
 FURTHER FOR RISK ASSESSMENT PURPOSES
 HIGHEST VALUE TARGET THAT THE MOST SIGNIFICANT PART LIKELY TO FAIL COULD STRIKE, RANGES 1-6, 1 = HIGH, 6 = LOW VALUE/OCCUPANCY
 DESCRIPTION OF PART IDENTIFIED AS MOST LIKELY TO FAIL AND ASSOCIATED TARGET, ASSESSED IN ACCORDANCE WITH OTRA SYSTEM
 SIZE CATEGORY OF MOST SIGNIFICANT PART CONSIDERED LIKELY TO FAIL, - RANGES 1-4 WHEREBY 1 = LARGE, 4 = SMALL, P = PROPERTY
 PROBABILITY OF FAILURE WITHIN 12 MONTHS, RANGES 1-7, 1 = HIGH, 7 = LOW
 WHERE THE MASS OF A TREE OR BRANCH IS REDUCED BY DEGRADATION THE RISK INDEX IS MULTIPLIED TO REFLECT THE PERCENTAGE OF MASS REDUCTION
 E.G. RISK INDEX 20 = RISK OF SIGNIFICANT HARM 1 IN 20,000, AN ADDITIONAL FIGURE IN BRACKETS MAY BE SUFFIXED TO REPRESENTING THE RATE OF MULTIPLY OCCUPANTS OR AN EQUIVALENT MONETARY VALUE, - SEE OTRA PRACTICE NOTE FOR MORE INFORMATION REGARDING COLOURS USED TO SIGNIFY RISK INDEX
 H (HIGH) = TREE WORKS TO BE GIVEN IMMEDIATE CONSIDERATION, M (MODERATE) = TREE WORKS TO BE CARRIED OUT WITHIN 12 MONTHS OF SURVEY DURING MAY BE SPECIFIED IN MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS), L (LOW) = TREE WORKS THAT ARE NOT CONSIDERED ESSENTIAL FOR RISK MANAGEMENT PURPOSES, BUT ARE RECOMMENDED IN ACCORDANCE WITH PRUDENT ARBORICULTURAL MANAGEMENT (TO BE REVIEWED IN 12 MONTHS, OR SPECIFIED TIME, IF APPLICABLE), N/A = NOT APPLICABLE

Site:	Stonehouse, Blackburn Road, Ribchester, Lancashire, PR3 3ZP
Client:	Susie Owen
Brief:	Carry out an individual tree survey within area specified by client, report on projected risk posed to persons and property, and make management recommendations where appropriate

Surveyor:	Dan Brown BSc (Hons) M Arbor
Survey Date:	17 June 2026
Viewing Conditions:	Clear
Job Reference:	BTC3601

No.	Species	Age	Height (m)	Stem Diam. (mm)	Crown Spread (m)	Vitality	Comments	Management Recommendations	Risk Assessment (Part Target)	Target	Size	P.O.F	Reduced Mass %	Risk Index	Work Priority
T2	Wild Cherry	M	9	610	9	G	- Located 1.5m from boundary wall. - Historically pruned back to primary branches, with significant regrowth present indicating good response. - Branches are long and slender, to be expected from such significant pruning works, with branches likely to continue to grow in this form in future, with increasing loading on potential weak unions - Suppression by the adjacent sycamore is resulting in a significant canopy bias to east. - Overhead telephone lines are growing through the canopy to the north, with the canopy not in contact with the wires - Approximately 1m height clearance from adjacent property to north. - Dense ivy restricting inspection of stem.	- Tree contractor to prune canopy to reduce height and sides by up to 2m to reduce static and dynamic loading on potential weak unions resultant of historic pruning works (M). - Tree contractor to sever ivy and remove all ivy from tree to facilitate future ongoing cyclical inspections (I).	P = Branches up to 50mm diameter. T = Persons using driveway.	4	4	6	N/A	<1M	L
T3	Double Cherry Plum	M	7.5	150	7	G	- Located adjacent to boundary wall, leaving approximately 2m height clearance of adjacent footpath to south of tree - Westerly primary branch which arises from the stem at approximately 1m height has bark included union typically found of the species, however, also hyper extends considerably further away from the natural canopy form, and will continue to grow outwards, putting increasing pressure on the structurally weak branch union.	- Tree contractor to prune first significant branch to west back by 2m to secondary branch union at approximately 2.5m height to reduce dynamic and static loading on bark included primary branch union (M). - Tree contractor to prune tree canopy over adjacent public footpath to attain 2.5m height clearance (M).	P = Branch failure up to 120mm diameter. T = Persons using footpath.	4	3	3	N/A	<1M	L
T4	Smooth Japanese Maple	M	7.5	3x280 2x140 (ms)	8	G	- Multistemmed tree with stems arising from unions at approximately 0.5m height, with minor bark inclusions present - Located adjacent to boundary wall, leaving approximately 2m height clearance of adjacent footpath to south of tree	Tree contractor to prune tree canopy over adjacent public footpath to attain 2.5m height clearance (M).	P = Stem failure up to 120mm diameter. T = Persons using footpath.	4	3	6	N/A	<1M	L