

## Report Introduction

- ✚ This survey has been instructed by Carolyn Connor, to determine the condition of selected trees within the grounds of the property, The Orchard.
- ✚ The site was visited during week beginning September 15<sup>th</sup>, 2025. The trees were assessed visually from ground level in line with the report supplied. Trees were in full leaf.
- ✚ Provision will need to be made for any further investigations as recommended in the report, for example internal inspection of trees with signs of decay or fungal growth.
- ✚ The trees on the site are subject to a general re-inspection schedule three years, this will depend on age, position and other risk factors, unless detailed otherwise. At which point a requirement for further monitoring or assessment can be judged. Retained trees will require reasonably frequent monitoring after any possible disturbance. For example, storms, building or drainage work.
- ✚ No assessment has been made of the soil conditions or implications of soil conditions. Root extent is not determined in this survey. We would urge that soil type is ascertained in positions of risk, and tree related implications are assessed such as foundation type/depth in accordance with N.H.B.C. guidelines. This is important when tree root systems are under hard surfaces or have high footfall such as public access, schools etc. More obvious visual soil issues may be brought out in this report as a reason for further investigation, such as fungus, signs of root disturbance or root damage.



Normally, trees have the capacity to exploit existing damage to service lines and are not generally responsible for initial damage. No information is available to assess any tree implications of service lines; we would urge this information is assessed for tree significance.

The survey boundaries have been taken from a visual point; boundary clarification may be required at various locations. Unclear boundaries may leave trees un-surveyed with the real possibility of unknown risk, but not applicable in this instance.

Any trees which are not classed as 'nursery' size have not been tagged but reported on if any issues are identified.

This visual report is carried out from ground level, the client has not expressed a wish for any tree to be climbed to ascertain any possible disability, which may only be evident from an aerial inspection.

This report is for the sole use of our client. The report is an Arboricultural Safety Report as seen from a ground survey. It does not cover buildings, street, services, or soil implications.

It is important to note; trees are a growing dynamic structure. While reasonable efforts have been taken to identify defects, no guarantee can be given to the *absolute* safety of *any* individual tree. *No tree can be defined as safe due to unpredictable laws and forces of nature.* As a result, trees can fail due to other reasons, such as wind, rain and soil implications such as water logging, even healthy trees.

This report does not rely on ecological or archaeological data.



## **Generally:**

The object of the survey is to ascertain any dangers to both the owner and visitors while entering and being within the confines of, or within the range of trees covered by this report.

The trees in question are Sycamore, the age range is classified as young, some trees are stunted due to crown reduction and root severing.

During our ground inspection, some trees were identified as having small cavities and dead wood along with extension die back. There are issues with these trees, in the main root damage. The ground in the area appears to have had some disturbance from recent building work. Some roots have been damaged and are exposed; then covered with new soil and gravel. These should be monitored for future issues as root damage can lead to tree failure.

Where it is highlighted in this report as, small amounts of natural die-back or small amounts of extension die-back are natural, this does not always require removal, if an area is kept as a 'wooded or natural area', the die-back may be left to fall away naturally. If the area is used by any persons, the correct assessment should be made to prevent possible injury.

## Important:

While inspecting these trees, it was evident that the trees were in place when the house was built. The creation of the garden area was made up from higher level ground. This has been lowered, leaving the row of trees in a raised bed. It is prudent to assume that the tree root system was compromised for the building of such a retaining wall. This has been assumed using the crown spread of the more mature of the trees as a guide.

*Walls*, it was noted that the trees are also set up close to a boundary wall. This wall has a small drop on the other side, this in turn will have a weakened point of pressure due to the continuing root formation by the trees. Investigation showed that roots were up against this wall and damage is inevitable.

*Included bark*, trees with included bark, should always be highlighted as a future high risk, depending on the severity. In this instance, **T2** has included bark running from just above the soil line and running two thirds of the tree.

*Root Constriction*, there is a real presumption that root constriction will become more evident as time goes by due to the positioning of such trees within a confined raised area.

*Ivy*, this has previously been growing heavily throughout all trees leaving them with top growth only. This has been removed to some degree and has also caused small amounts of bark damage, i.e. heavy cuts to the cambium layer.

*Decay*, and dead wood, this is evident within the crown of the larger trees.

## Tree Report

The Orchard, Huyton, L36.

### Hazard Rating:

**Severe:** Urgently required. – time scale may be indicated

**Moderate:** within the next twelve months

**Low:** Within the next eighteen months or No Work

Running from left to right, when standing in the garden viewing the trees.

### **T1: Sycamore – *Acer Pseudoplatanus***

**Age Range:** Not yet reached mature size/age

This is a small tree which has become stunted and deformed due to growing up into the crown of **T2**. The symmetry is poor leaving the tree with no amenity value.

**Work Required:** Removal, the tree will never be able to recover while in this position.

**Hazard Rating:** **Severe**

### **T2: Sycamore – *Acer Pseudoplatanus***

**Age Range:** Not yet reached mature size/age

This is a co-dominant tree, again growing into the crown of **T3**. The symmetry is poor leaving the tree with no amenity value. Both trunks are growing into each other leading to included bark and future risks. There was dead wood within the crown. The tree has obvious signs of previous poor work being carried out leaving 'pegs' and 'tears' along the bark.

**Work Required:** Removal

**Hazard Rating:** **Severe**

**T3: Sycamore – *Acer Pseudoplatanus***

**Age Range:** Not yet reached semi mature due to position and root damage/constriction

This is a co-dominant tree, although this is the better specimen of the group, it should be highlighted that it is up against the wall and has been subjected to the same poor treatment as the others within this group. I.e. root damage and root constriction.

The tree has bad work carried out in the recent past, again of a poor standard leaving 'pegs' and bark tears.

**Work Required:** Removal

**Hazard Rating:** Moderate

**T4: Sycamore – *Acer Pseudoplatanus***

**Age Range:** Not yet reached semi mature due to position and root damage/constriction

This is a multi-stemmed tree, although again this is a better specimen within the group, it should be highlighted that it is up against the front retaining wall and has been subjected to the same poor treatment as the others within this group, i.e. root damage and root constriction. It is clear to see that this tree has had major root removal to install the small front retaining wall. The symbiotic nature of the root system could, if this tree fails, also cause the other close tree to become unstable. This conclusion is only arrived at by judging the distance and nature of root growth.

The tree has bad work carried out in the recent past, again of a poor standard leaving 'pegs' and bark tears.

**Work Required:** Removal

**Hazard Rating:** Severe

**T5: Sycamore – *Acer Pseudoplatanus***

**Age Range:** Not yet reached mature size/age

This is a small tree which has become stunted and deformed due to growing up into the crown of T4 leaving it with a severe lean. The symmetry is poor leaving the tree with no amenity value.

**Work Required:** Removal, the tree will never be able to recover while in this position.

**Hazard Rating:** Severe

**Fungus:** We have attempted to assess for any fungal growth surrounding the stems of trees within this report. Certain types of fungal growth can indicate underlying issues and help determine a way forward with maintenance of trees. Due the area being covered with stone chippings, we were unable to identify any fungal growth. It should be noted that some types of fungus can only be seen in certain conditions. The absence of such fungus should not be relied upon to reach any positive conclusion regarding safety of trees.