Fallen&Found Arboriculture®

Independent Arboricultural Consultancy

Professional Tree Inspection and Arboricultural Assessment

Project Name:	BProfessional Tree Inspection and Arboricultural Assessment T1 Common Ash	Document Reference:	Q0627/Budd/PTI/2026_V2
Location:	134 Warren Road, Worthing, West Sussex	Date:	06/07/2026
Prepared By:	Mr Oliver Lower	Revision:	0.1

© 2026 Fallen&Found Arboriculture Ltd

All rights to the contents of this report are reserved. No part of this report may be reproduced, transmitted, modified, or stored in any form or by any means, including electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written consent of the author. This report, its contents, and its format have been prepared exclusively for the use of **Mr & Mr Budd** for the purpose of addressing matters relating to the specified site. The report shall not be disclosed, loaned, hired, sold, or relied upon by any third party not directly involved with the specified site without the express written permission of Fallen&Found Arboriculture Ltd. No duty of care is accepted to any third party. The findings, conclusions, and recommendations contained within this report are based on site conditions observed at the time of inspection only. They do not take account of extreme weather events, subsequent alterations to the rooting environment, accidental damage, vandalism, or works undertaken that are not carried out in accordance with recognised industry standards and best practice. Fallen&Found Arboriculture Ltd accepts no liability arising from such circumstances. Unless otherwise stated, the validity of this report shall expire twelve months from the date of the site inspection, or immediately upon any material change to site conditions or the subject tree(s), whether as a result of third-party activity, development works, or natural processes occurring after the inspection date.

Quality Control			
Author	**Oliver Lower**	**Checked by**	**Stephanie Smith (03/11/2026)**

Executive Summary

I was instructed by **Mrs Louisa Budd** to undertake a ground-based professional tree inspection of one mature Common Ash (*Fraxinus excelsior*), identified as **T1**, growing within the rear garden of **134 Warren Road, Worthing, West Sussex, BN14 9RB**. The tree is located close to the western boundary of the rear garden and approximately 750mm from a single-storey rear extension associated with the dwelling.

The inspection was undertaken from ground level on Saturday, 4 July 2026. Access to the tree was good and the majority of the above-ground structure was visible from multiple aspects. The tree has moderate local amenity value within the rear garden setting; however, its wider public amenity contribution is limited due to its rear-garden position, restricted visibility from Warren Road and limited visibility from surrounding properties.

T1 is protected under Tree Preservation Order No.1 of 2007 as an Ash tree within Group G1. A previous application to fell and replace the tree was refused by Worthing Borough Council in 2021. That previous refusal is noted as background information only; the findings and recommendations of this report are based on the current observable condition of the tree at the time of inspection.

The tree appears to have been historically managed as a pollard, with subsequent regrowth now extending well beyond a typical pollard management cycle. The inspection identified several significant biomechanical features, including a basal compression-type feature extending from ground level to approximately 1.3m above ground level, multiple compression fork-type unions within the primary branch structure, and decayed former pruning points associated with the old pollard framework. These features affect the main load-bearing structure of the tree rather than being confined to minor branches.

Apical dieback, wilting of outer shoots and areas of sparse foliar density were also observed throughout parts of the canopy. These symptoms are consistent with a reduction in crown vitality and, when considered alongside the tree's structural condition, reduce confidence in the realistic long-term retention of T1 in its present form.

A brief desktop consideration of soil and indirect-damage risk has also been included. No soil sampling, trial pit, foundation inspection or geotechnical investigation was undertaken; therefore, any comment on subsidence potential is indicative only. On the basis of the available information, the site should not be treated as having a confirmed high shrink–swell clay risk without further specialist investigation. However, given the tree's close proximity to the rear extension and below-ground services, a precautionary low to moderate indirect-damage risk has been identified.

Taking the observations collectively, retention of T1 through routine pruning or crown reduction is not considered sufficient to address the principal structural concerns. Removal of T1 is therefore recommended on arboricultural safety grounds, subject to the necessary written consent being obtained from the Local Planning Authority. Replacement planting is recommended within the rear garden to mitigate the loss of canopy cover and local amenity, using an appropriately selected small to medium-sized tree species planted in a position with suitable rooting volume and adequate clearance from built structures, boundaries and below-ground services.

Contents

Executive Summary 2
1. Introduction 4
1.1. Instruction 4
1.2. Scope 4
1.3. Document disclosure 4
1.4. Ecological constraints 4
1.5. Qualifications and experience 4
1.6. Background information 5
1.7. Legal protection of trees 5
1.8. Survey methodology 5
2. Location 7
2.1. Site visit 7
2.2. Site location 7
2.3. Site description 7
3. Inspection & observations 8
3.1. Tree dimensions 8
3.2. Initial Observations 8
3.3. Roots and root buttresses 8
3.4. Stem 8
3.5. Branch attachments and branches 8
3.6. Leaves and shoots 9
4. Conclusion 10
5. Recommendations 12
6. Considerations 14
7. Additional information 15
7.1. Limitations of the report 15
9. Appendix A 17
References 22

1. Introduction

1.1. Instruction

I have been instructed by you (**Mrs Louisa Budd**) to conduct a ground based professional inspection of a single Common Ash (*Fraxinus excelsior*) tree growing within the rear garden of your property at **134, Warren Road, Worthing, West Sussex, BN149RB.**

1.2. Scope

1.2.1. The purpose of this tree inspection is to assess the tree regarding its health and condition and to identify any immediate and non-immediate risks posed by the tree to public and personal safety. Risk level will be assessed depending on the hazard, probability of failure, the target area, and public occupancy. Consideration will also be given to the probability of direct damage to above-ground structures at the site.

1.2.2. All my tree observations are of a preliminary nature without any investigations using invasive or diagnostic equipment. All data and findings will be assessed to form relevant conclusions on which subsequent recommendations will be made. The assessment and conclusions contained within the report are in the interest of health and safety and the continued management of the tree/s. All observable significant biomechanical features will be photographed and discussed within the body of the report.

1.3. Document disclosure

1.3.1. I have not been supplied with any other supplementary documentation regarding the subject tree/s, neither has there been any other third-party input or detailed schematic used for the purposes of this report.

1.4. Ecological constraints

1.4.1. Any works on or around any of the trees or hedges contained within or located outside of the site should bear in mind The Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 as amended the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000. All wild Birds are protected by the Wildlife and Countryside Act - 1981, Conservation - Natural Habitats -Regulations 1994 and Countryside Rights of Way Act – 2000. This makes it an offence to intentionally kill, injure, take, possess, or trade in any wild animal listed and prohibits interference with places used for shelter or protection, or intentionally disturb animals occupying such places. The Bird Breeding season extends from the 1st of March to the 31st of July, as a result, all disturbing activities should be avoided during these times.

1.4.2. All species of Bat and their breeding sites or resting places (roosts) are protected under Regulation 41 of The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 and Section 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. It is an offence for anyone intentionally to kill, injure or handle a Bat, to possess a Bat (whether live or dead), disturb a roosting Bat, or sell or offer a Bat for sale without a licence. It is also an offence to damage, destroy or obstruct access to any place used by Bats for shelter, whether they are present or not. These issues are outside of my area of experience and separate advice from a suitably qualified ecologist should be sought in the instance that any of these constraints apply to this site.

1.5. Qualifications and experience

1.5.1. The conclusions and recommendations contained in this report are formed from my own site observations and the provided information. The opinions expressed within it are based on my arboricultural experience. My qualifications and experience in arboriculture are included in **Section 5** at the end of this document.

1.6. Background information

1.6.1. Concerns have been raised regarding the tree's biological and biomechanical condition. The subject tree is located in close proximity to the dwellings rear extension, property boundary and neighbouring properties. You have also voiced concerns regarding the tree's proximity to a mains sewer which passes close to or beneath the subject tree.

1.7. Legal protection of trees

1.7.1. The subject tree, referred to as **T1** for the purpose of this report, is a Common Ash (*Fraxinus excelsior*) located at **134 Warren Road, Worthing, West Sussex, BN14 9RB**. Information supplied for this report indicates that the tree is subject to statutory protection under Tree Preservation Order No.1 of 2007 as an Ash tree within Group G1 and has previously been considered by the Local Planning Authority in relation to an application to fell and replace the tree. The previous refusal is noted as relevant background information only; the recommendations within this report are based upon the present ground-based inspection and the current observable biological and biomechanical condition of the tree.

1.7.2. **TPO Title:** Tree Preservation Order No.1 of 2007

1.7.3. **TPO Number:** 1 of 2007

1.7.4. **Protected tree reference:** 1 no. Ash within Group G1 of Tree Preservation Order No.1 of 2007 (identified as T1 in this report)

1.7.5. **Relevant LPA application history:** Application AWDM/0484/21 sought consent to fell and replace the protected Ash tree within Group G1 of Tree Preservation Order No.1 of 2007 and was refused by Worthing Borough Council on 14 May 2021.

1.7.6. The presence of statutory protection means that no works should be undertaken to the tree without the necessary consent from the Local Planning Authority, unless an exemption applies. Any future application should be supported by clear arboricultural evidence and should refer to the current condition of the tree, including the biomechanical features recorded during this inspection, rather than relying solely on the historic application history.

1.8. Survey methodology

1.8.1. The survey will be conducted using the Visual Tree Assessment (VTA) techniques which were devised by Prof. Dr Claus Mattheck & Ass. Jur Mrs Helge Breloer at the Karlsruhe Research Centre, Germany in 1994. Assessment and recommendations given or made have been done so using my own expertise and judgement given the situation and application. A pair of binoculars will be used to further inspect the tree crowns, stems, and branch attachments where applicable. Component parts of tree structure will be recorded using a compass to give aspect and a laser measure to indicate height. The recorded data and any pertinent observations will be categorised in order of importance. This will be calculated by assessing the potential risk posed by any observed hazards. The location of the tree/s, the potential hazard posed, and the density of public use in that area will be considered when categorising any recommendations. In this report, a hazard is any part of a tree which displays outward signs that there is a significant possibility that it may fail. The risk is then assessed by combining the information about its significance and the likelihood of its failure.

1.8.2. Risk level will be assessed depending on the hazard, probability of failure, the target area, and public occupancy. Recommendations will be made to reduce risks to be as low as is reasonably practicable, whilst pertaining to the retention of trees where possible. Trees with biomechanical features, dead wood, fallen trees, and decaying structures will be retained where practicable or where it is safe to do so. The purpose of the survey is to identify hazards which pose an unacceptable risk to the residents and the public frequenting the site.

Inspection Instruments			
Height	Haglöfs ECII Clinometer	**Assessment tools**	Thorex sounding mallet. 1m inspection pin. Binoculars
Distance	Laser Measure		
DBH (Diameter @ 1.5m agl)	10m Diameter tape		

2. Location

2.1. Site visit

2.1.1. I undertook a site visit on the morning of **Saturday, 4th July 2026**, for the purpose of carrying out a ground-based professional tree inspection of the subject tree. Weather conditions at the time of inspection were bright and sunny, with light wind conditions. Access to the tree was good, and the majority of the above-ground structure was visible from multiple aspects, allowing a suitable visual assessment to be undertaken from ground level.

Conditions (Avg)	Result
Temperature	20°C
Cloud Cover	10%
Precipitation	0%
Humidity	50%
Wind Speed (Beaufort)	F1



Red circled area is indicative of tree location.

2.2. Site location

2.2.1. The subject tree is growing within the rear garden of **134, Warren Road, Worthing, West Sussex, BN149RB** close to the western fenced boundary and rear extension.

2.3. Site description

2.3.1. The site comprises a residential property at **134 Warren Road, Worthing, West Sussex, BN14 9RB**. The subject tree, identified as **T1** for the purpose of this report, is located within the rear garden, which is primarily laid to lawn. T1 is growing close to the western boundary of the rear garden and in close proximity to a single-storey rear extension associated with the dwelling. The immediate setting therefore comprises domestic garden space, boundary features and built structure, with the tree occupying a confined boundary position adjacent to the extension. In wider amenity terms, the tree's contribution to the public street scene is limited, as it is set to the rear of the property and is only partially, if at all, appreciable from Warren Road. Its visual influence is therefore principally private or semi-private in nature, being most relevant to the subject property and a small number of immediately neighbouring properties. During the site inspection, visibility of the tree from surrounding receptors appeared restricted, with only two other properties having clear or partial views toward the tree. On this basis, whilst T1 has local value as a mature garden tree and contributes to canopy cover within the rear garden setting, its wider public amenity value is considered limited when compared with a tree occupying a more prominent roadside or open public position.

3. Inspection & observations

3.1. Tree dimensions

Species: Common Ash (*Fraxinus excelsior*)
Number of trees: 1
Height: 13.5m
Number of Stems: 1
Average Stem Diameter @ 1.5m agl: 725mm
Crown radius average spread: 7m
Height of crown clearance: 5m, average above ground level
Age class: Mature
Vitality: Normal
Distance from built structures: 750mm, rear dwelling extension.
Amenity value: Moderate local amenity value; limited wider public visibility
Above ground targets: Boundaries; dwellings; occupants; adjacent properties.

3.2. Initial Observations

3.2.1. The subject tree is located in close proximity to the rear extension of the main dwelling. It has a broad, generally balanced canopy and appears to have been subject to historic crown-raising works, primarily over the dwelling and extension. The tree also appears to be an overstood pollard, with the current regrowth extending well beyond a typical pollarding cycle. Overall canopy vitality is considered to be normal; however, apical dieback is present within numerous outer shoots, resulting in a reduced and uneven foliar density throughout parts of the crown[1].

3.3. Roots and root buttresses

3.3.1. During my inspection, I observed a profusion of surface roots and fine fibrous roots growing close to, and in places above, the soil surface within the restricted area between the boundary fence and the rear extension[2]. The main stem exhibits normal basal flare and root buttress formation, consistent with the species and the tree's mature age class.

3.4. Stem

3.4.1. I observed a large, linear compression-type biomechanical feature at the base of the tree, characteristic of a compression fork-type bifurcation. This feature originates at ground level and extends to approximately 1.3m above ground level. It is visible on both the eastern and western aspects of the main stem. Reaction wood ribs have formed around the feature on the eastern side of the stem, while fresh incremental bark strips are visible on the western side within the central part of the feature[3].

3.5. Branch attachments and branches

3.5.1. I observed additional compression fork-type unions where significant primary limbs originate from the main stem and project outward toward the north, over the garden, and west, over an adjacent property driveway. The first of these unions is present on the north-western aspect of the tree at approximately 1.7m above ground level. The union measures approximately 970mm in length, extending upward between the primary limb and parent stem, and is visible from both sides of the attachment[4].

[1] Appendix A, Photos 1 & 2
[2] Appendix A, Photo 3
[3] Appendix A, Photos 4 & 5
[4] Appendix A, Photos 6 & 7

3.5.2. A second prominent compression fork is present on the eastern aspect of the main stem at approximately 1.6m above ground level. This feature extends for a further 600mm and exhibits fresh incremental bark growth along its length[5].

3.5.3. As previously noted, the subject tree appears to have been historically managed as a pollard, with growth having been removed at an approximate height of 2.6m above ground level. At this height, I observed two areas of biomechanical interest associated with decayed former pruning points. From ground level, decayed stubs were visible; these had deteriorated to the point where practical removal from the tree's structure had occurred. Using a step ladder, I was able to view and photograph both areas from above. The first area of decay is located at approximately 2.6m above ground level on the upper side of a primary limb projecting vertically toward the north-east. The decayed area measured approximately 260mm in height and 250mm in width, with decay descending into the primary limb to an approximate depth of 150mm[6]. This depth was assessed using a metal inspection pin and tape measure. Wood fibres extracted during the inspection were dry, brown and crumbled easily between finger and thumb. The second area of decay was observed using the same method and is located at approximately 2.8m above ground level on the eastern side of the tree structure. This decayed area measured approximately 150mm in height and 150mm in width, with decay extending to an approximate depth of 100mm[7]. Callus formation is present around the perimeter of both decayed zones.

3.5.4. I observed a large, linear compression fork between two bifurcating, potentially inosculating limbs at approximately 2.9m above ground level. This union projects south-east over the main dwelling. The feature measures approximately 1m in length, is visible from both sides of the union, and exhibits abnormal callus formation along its length[8].

3.6. Leaves and shoots

3.6.1. Apical dieback and wilting of the outermost shoots are visible throughout the canopy, with brown and browning leaves present at various points. These symptoms are consistent with a reduction in crown vitality and contribute to the sparse foliar appearance noted during the inspection[9].

[5] Appendix A, Photo 8
[6] Appendix A, Photo 9
[7] Appendix A, Photo 10
[8] Appendix A, Photo 11
[9] Appendix A, Photo 2

4. Conclusion

4.1. T1 is a mature Common Ash (*Fraxinus excelsior*) located within the rear garden of 134 Warren Road, Worthing. The tree is positioned close to the western boundary and approximately 750mm from the rear dwelling extension. The surrounding target area includes the dwelling, extension, boundary features, occupants and adjacent properties. Although T1 contributes to local canopy cover within the rear garden setting, its wider public amenity value is limited by its rear-garden position and restricted visibility from Warren Road.

4.2. The proximity of T1 to the rear extension and below-ground services has also been considered in broad terms from a desktop perspective. No soil sampling, trial pit, foundation inspection or geotechnical investigation was undertaken as part of this report; therefore, any comment on subsidence potential must be treated as indicative only. Published national mapping indicates that this part of Worthing lies within the Brighton and Worthing geological district, where Chalk, superficial coastal-plain deposits and locally variable soils occur. In general terms, shrink–swell subsidence risk is principally associated with clay-rich soils, where seasonal wetting and drying can result in volume change, particularly where trees are growing close to buildings. On the basis of the available desktop information alone, the site should not be treated as having a confirmed high shrink–swell clay risk without further site-specific investigation. However, given the tree's close proximity to the extension and the presence of services within the rooting environment, a precautionary low to moderate indirect-damage risk is considered appropriate, pending confirmation by a suitably qualified structural engineer, drainage specialist or geotechnical consultant if building movement or service damage is suspected.

4.3. The profusion of surface roots and fine fibrous roots observed close to, and in places above, the soil surface provides further evidence that the tree is actively exploiting the upper soil horizon within a restricted rooting environment. This may reflect limited rooting volume, localised compaction, reduced deeper soil aeration, physical obstruction, or the concentration of available moisture and nutrients close to the surface. This observation does not, in itself, confirm a subsidence mechanism or below-ground service damage; however, it is relevant when considering the tree's proximity to the rear extension, boundary and below-ground services. The precise extent and cause of any rooting constraint could only be confirmed by suitable below-ground investigation.

4.4. The tree appears to have been historically managed as a pollard, with subsequent regrowth now extending well beyond a typical pollard management cycle. This has resulted in a mature, spreading crown supported by a framework of older pruning points and primary unions. While overall canopy vitality was assessed as normal at the time of inspection, apical dieback, wilting of outer shoots and areas of reduced foliar density were visible throughout the canopy. These symptoms are consistent with colonisation by Ash Dieback (*Hymenoscyphus fraxineus*) and are likely to reduce the tree's realistic long-term retention potential.

4.5. The most significant observations relate to the tree's biomechanical condition. A large linear compression-type feature is present at the base of the tree, extending from ground level to approximately 1.3m above ground level and visible on both the eastern and western aspects of the main stem. Reaction wood ribs and fresh incremental bark strips demonstrate adaptive growth around this area; however, the feature remains structurally significant because it is associated with the lower main stem and basal framework of the tree. Modern tree biomechanics literature identifies features of this type as having the potential to form, or to have already formed, an internal shear-type fracture (Mattheck, 2015) within the tree's structure.

4.6. Further compression fork-type unions were observed within the primary branch structure, including unions at approximately 1.6m, 1.7m and 2.9m above ground level. These features are not confined to minor branches but are associated with significant primary limbs extending over the garden, an adjacent property driveway and the main dwelling. The union at approximately 2.9m above ground level is of particular relevance because it projects south-east over the dwelling, measures approximately 1m in length and exhibits abnormal callus formation along the union.

4.7. Decay was also recorded at historic pruning points associated with the former pollard framework. Two areas of decay were observed at approximately 2.6m and 2.8m above ground level, with measured decay depths of approximately 150mm and 100mm respectively. The extracted wood fibres were dry, brown and friable, and callus formation was present around the margins of both decayed zones. These findings indicate that parts of the old pollard framework contain compromised wood integrity at locations where significant loading is carried by the upper crown structure.

4.8. Taken collectively, the observed defects reduce confidence in the long-term retention of T1 in its current form. The tree contains multiple biomechanical features affecting the basal stem, primary unions and former pruning points, rather than a single isolated defect that could be addressed through minor pruning. The presence of nearby built structures and regularly occupied domestic target areas increases the significance of these defects when assessing foreseeable risk.

4.9. In my opinion, retention of T1 through routine pruning or crown reduction would not adequately address the principal structural concerns, as the most significant defects are associated with the main stem, primary branch attachments and historic pollard framework. Any management option short of removal would leave substantial reliance on structurally compromised unions and decayed former pruning points in close proximity to the dwelling and neighbouring targets. On this basis, removal of T1 can be justified on arboricultural grounds, subject to the necessary consent being obtained from the Local Planning Authority due to the tree's protected status.

5. Recommendations

5.1. **Recommended works:** Fell T1 to as near ground level as is reasonably practicable and remove arisings from site, unless otherwise agreed with the client. The recommendation is made on arboricultural safety grounds, having regard to the cumulative biomechanical defects recorded within the basal stem, primary branch unions and historic pollard framework, together with the tree's proximity to the dwelling, rear extension, boundary features and neighbouring targets.

5.2. **Statutory consent:** T1 is protected under Tree Preservation Order No.1 of 2007 as an Ash tree within Group G1. No works should be undertaken until written consent has been obtained from the Local Planning Authority, unless a statutory exemption applies. Any application should be supported by this report, the photographic evidence and the recorded inspection findings so that the current biological and biomechanical condition of the tree is clearly set out.

5.3. **Timescale:** Subject to receipt of the necessary LPA consent, the works should be undertaken within 3 months of consent being granted, or sooner if there is any noticeable deterioration in the tree's condition, evidence of movement at the recorded unions, storm damage, or change in the occupancy of the target area.

5.4. **Tree work standard:** All works should be undertaken by a competent, suitably qualified and fully insured arboricultural contractor working in accordance with BS 3998:2010 *Tree work – Recommendations*. The contractor should prepare suitable risk assessments and method statements prior to work commencing and should ensure that the rear extension, boundary features, neighbouring property and below-ground services are appropriately protected during operations.

5.5. **Ecological constraints:** Prior to felling, the contractor should carry out a pre-commencement visual check for nesting birds, roosting bats and other protected species or protected-species features. If any evidence of protected species is identified, works should cease and advice should be sought from a suitably qualified ecologist before operations continue.

5.6. **Biosecurity:** Given the observed symptoms consistent with Ash Dieback and the presence of decayed wood, appropriate biosecurity measures should be implemented during and after the works. Tools and equipment should be cleaned where practicable, and arisings should be managed responsibly so as to minimise the risk of spreading pests, pathogens or decay organisms.

5.7. **Stump and rooting area:** Stump treatment or grinding should be agreed with the client and considered in relation to the proximity of the rear extension, boundary features and known or suspected below-ground services. Any stump grinding or below-ground disturbance should be undertaken carefully and only once the location of relevant services has been checked.

5.8. **Replacement planting:** Replacement planting is recommended to mitigate the loss of canopy cover and local amenity arising from the removal of T1. A minimum of one new tree should be planted within the rear garden, in a position that provides suitable future rooting volume and adequate clearance from the rear extension, boundaries, drainage runs and other below-ground services. The final planting location and species should be agreed with the client and, where required, the Local Planning Authority as part of the TPO consent process.

5.9. **Suggested replacement species:** A small to medium-sized native or climate-resilient ornamental tree would be appropriate for the rear garden setting. Suitable options may include Field Maple (*Acer campestre*), Rowan (*Sorbus aucuparia*), Hawthorn (*Crataegus monogyna*), Crab Apple (*Malus* spp.), Amelanchier (*Amelanchier* spp.) or Hornbeam (*Carpinus betulus*) where sufficient space is available. Final species selection should consider mature size, soil conditions, available rooting volume, light levels, proximity to structures and the client's landscape objectives.

5.10. **Planting specification:** Replacement planting should be undertaken during the next suitable planting season, typically between November and March, using good-quality nursery stock. Planting and establishment should follow the principles of BS 8545:2014 *Trees: from nursery to independence in the landscape*, including appropriate pit preparation, staking or underground guying where required, mulching, watering and protection from damage.

5.11. **Aftercare:** The replacement tree should be subject to a minimum 3-year establishment and aftercare programme, including regular watering during dry periods, weed control around the base, inspection and adjustment of stakes or ties, formative pruning where required and replacement if the tree fails to establish.

6. Considerations

6.1. All tree works should be undertaken by a competent, suitably qualified, and fully insured arboricultural contractor, operating in accordance with BS 3998:2010 – Tree Work – Recommendations. The contractor should prepare and implement appropriate risk assessments and method statements prior to the commencement of works, with due regard to current health and safety legislation, industry best practice, and site-specific constraints.

6.2. A Responsibility remains with the landowner and any appointed contractor to ensure that the legal status of the subject trees is fully established prior to the commencement of any works. Where trees are protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) or are located within a Conservation Area, any proposed works will require formal consent or notification to the Local Planning Authority (LPA) in accordance with the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and associated regulations.

6.3. No works should be undertaken to any protected tree unless the required permission has been granted in writing by the LPA, or the statutory notification period has expired without objection, as applicable. Failure to obtain the appropriate consent may constitute a criminal offence and could result in enforcement action.

6.4. Where recommended works are progressed on the basis of this report, it is advised that the scope and specification of works submitted to the LPA are consistent with the findings and recommendations contained herein, in order to ensure clarity of intent and facilitate effective decision-making.

6.5. The presence or absence of statutory tree protection should be reconfirmed immediately prior to works commencing, as tree protection status may change independently of this report. This report does not constitute consent to carry out works to protected trees.

6.6. All tree works should take account of relevant ecological legislation, including the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. In particular, nesting birds and roosting bats are afforded legal protection. Should evidence of protected species be identified during works, operations should cease immediately and advice sought from a suitably qualified ecologist before works proceed further.

6.7. Where replacement planting is undertaken, this should be carried out in accordance with BS 8545:2014 (as amended) *Trees: from nursery to independence in the landscape*, with appropriate establishment and aftercare measures provided to support successful establishment. In the absence of statutory tree protection, replacement planting is identified as a matter of best practice rather than legal requirement, intended to mitigate amenity loss and support longer-term canopy cover and landscape function.

6.8. All contractors should implement appropriate biosecurity measures to minimise the risk of spreading pests, pathogens, or decay organisms during tree works. The Arboricultural Association's *Application of Biosecurity in Arboriculture* (Guidance Note 2) provides guidance on the responsibilities of tree work contractors and should be followed as a minimum standard. Tools, machinery, and equipment should be cleaned and, where appropriate, disinfected before and after use, particularly where contact is made with decayed or infected wood. Arisings should be managed responsibly and disposed of in accordance with current waste and biosecurity guidance.

7. Additional information

7.1. Limitations of the report

7.1.1. Trees are living, dynamic structures that exist within a constantly changing environment and are subject to pests, diseases, extreme weather events, and alterations to their rooting environment. This report reflects the condition of the tree(s) at the time of inspection only. Accordingly, the findings, conclusions, and recommendations contained herein are based solely on observations made during the survey and may change over time. Re-inspection may be required following severe weather events, significant site alteration, construction activity, or where there is an obvious change in tree condition or appearance. Notwithstanding the above, this report is regarded as valid for a period of twelve months from the date of issue (**Tuesday, 03 November 2026**).

7.1.2. The survey and its conclusions are based on a ground-based visual inspection only and do not benefit from invasive investigation, climbing inspection, laboratory analysis, or third-party technical reports unless otherwise stated. The opinions expressed within this report are professional judgements formed using the author's arboricultural experience and recognised tree assessment methodologies.

7.1.3. This report relates exclusively to the arboricultural condition and management of the tree(s) and does not address ecological, archaeological, geotechnical, structural engineering, drainage, or other specialist disciplines that may be present on site.

7.1.4. There has been no instruction to assess the risk of indirect damage to surrounding or adjacent structures, services, or infrastructure. Accordingly, no consideration has been given to the potential for subsidence, heave, shrinkage, or changes in ground moisture regimes arising from tree retention, management, or removal. Specialist advice should be sought where such matters are of concern.

7.1.5. Only visible parts of the tree(s) were inspected. Areas obscured by dense vegetation, ivy cover, or restricted access may limit the ability to fully assess structural condition. Where visibility was restricted, this has been noted and, where appropriate, recommendations have been made to facilitate further inspection. Defects identified from ground level may require further investigation, including climbing inspection or internal assessment, to determine their extent and significance.

7.1.6. Trees exhibiting external characteristics suggestive of internal dysfunction or decay may require further assessment using specialist investigative equipment (for example, decay detection devices). Any such investigations fall outside the scope of this survey unless explicitly stated.

7.1.7. No soil excavation, root exposure, or below-ground inspection was undertaken as part of this survey. Observations relating to soil condition, compaction, or drainage are therefore based on surface indicators only.

7.1.8. Where observations or comments are made regarding non-arboricultural matters—such as built structures, construction practices, or soil conditions—these are provided as general observations only. Such comments are made from an arboricultural perspective and should not be relied upon as specialist advice. Confirmation should be sought from appropriately qualified professionals.

7.1.9. Cladoptosis (sudden branch drop) is a natural phenomenon that remains difficult to predict and may occur in otherwise healthy trees, often during or following prolonged periods of hot, calm weather. There are typically no reliable visual indicators of imminent branch failure associated with this process. While inspections are undertaken with this phenomenon in mind, no responsibility can be accepted for the occurrence of sudden branch drop.

7.1.10. This report has been prepared for the Client named within and for the stated purpose only. It should not be relied upon by any other party without the author's prior written consent. Any reliance placed upon this report beyond its stated scope is entirely at the reader's own risk.

9. Appendix A

Photo Ref	Photograph	Description / Observations
Photo 1		The subject tree (centre photo) taken from within the rear garden of the property looking SW.
Photo 2		The subject tree with characteristic sparse foliage due to the presence of *Hymenoscyphus fraxineus*

Photo 3		Shallow roots growing close to the surface of the soil close to the extension adjacent.
Photo 4		Basal compression fork type bifurcation with reaction wood ribs. Photos taken of eastern aspect of tree.
Photo 5		A photo of the same basal bifurcation displaying fresh bark incremental growth and bark plates which are lifting.

Photo 6		
Photo 7		
Photo 8		

Photo 9		
Photo 10		
Photo 11		

This report was constructed and written by

[redacted]

Oliver Lower *ND Arb L3, Dip Arb L4, Dip Arb L6*

Founder & Principal Arboricultural Consultant

I have 27 years' experience in the arboricultural industry, having worked in both the UK and New Zealand during that time, and have attained the following accreditations: a Level 4 Diploma (ABC) and Level 6 Diploma (ABC) in Arboriculture, as well as a LANTRA Professional Tree Inspection qualification. I provide consultancy services to several local government authorities and a wide range of private, commercial and domestic clients. I am a professional member of the International Society of Arboriculture and the Consulting Arborist Society. A comprehensive list of my qualifications, experience and training can be found on LinkedIn using this link: https://www.linkedin.com/in/oliver-lower-527a7377/

Qualifications:

Professional Tree Inspection (LANTRA)

National Diploma Arboriculture L3

Level 4 Diploma Arboriculture (ABC)

Level 6 Diploma Arboriculture (ABC)

Member No: 384093

References

Strouts, R.G. & Winter, T.G. (1994). *Diagnosis of Ill-Health in Trees*. 2nd ed. Arboricultural Association, Stonehouse.

Mattheck, C. & Breloer, H. (1994). *The Body Language of Trees*. HMSO, London.

Mattheck, C. (2007). *Updated Field Guide for Visual Tree Assessment*. Karlsruhe Research Centre.

British Standards Institution (2010). *BS 3998:2010 – Tree Work – Recommendations*. BSI, London.

British Standards Institution (2014, as amended). *BS 8545 – Trees: from nursery to independence in the landscape – Recommendations*. BSI, London.

Weber, K. & Mattheck, C. (2003). *Manual of Wood Decays in Trees*. Karlsruhe Research Centre.

Lonsdale, D. (1999). *Principles of Tree Hazard Assessment and Management*. HMSO, London.

Arboricultural Association (2013). *Application of Biosecurity in Arboriculture*. Guidance Note 2.

Lemmon v Webb [1895] AC 1 (HL).