

Lyn and Mark Dunlavey 1 Tivy Dale Drive, Cawthorne, Barnsley S75 4EN

24th April 2025

Ref: AWA6577

Arboricultural Report at:

1 Tivy Dale Drive, Cawthorne, Barnsley \$75 4EN

Introduction

As instructed, we have visited the above site and inspected, from ground level, the trees at the site primarily with regard to the structural integrity of the existing detached residential property at the site.

The survey took place in April 2025 by James Brown, BSc (Hons) Arboriculture, MArborA, and Lucy Garbutt MSc, PGCert, BSc (Hons) Biology, PTI (Lantra), TechArborA, Arboriculturists at AWA Tree Consultants Ltd.

Full details of the surveyed trees have been provided in the attached tree data schedule and the tree positions have been identified on the attached tree plan.

We have been informed by our client that there is damage to the property and that the trees at the site may be implicated in the damage.

We have been provided with an associated structural engineer's report (Ref: FC:2025/09) produced by Freeman Consultancy.

We are arboriculturists and not structural engineers, so we can only advise on the trees considered to be a potential or future contributing factor in any property damage. Any doubt as to the structural condition of the property would require the advice of a structural engineer.





Legal

An online search was undertaken with Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council on the 24th of April 2025 to check whether any trees at the site are located within a Conservation Area or are protected by a Tree Preservation Order. The site is situated within a Conservation Area and part of the site is protected by a woodland Tree Preservation Order.

The accessed map images from barnsley.gov.uk are detailed below:



Before carrying out any works to protected trees the permission of the local planning authority is required. There are large potential penalties for illegally carrying out work to protected trees. Statutory permission is not required for the removal of deadwood.

The Trees

The tree survey revealed 33 items of significant woody vegetation, comprised of 28 individual trees and 5 tree groups.

G1 to T30 are within site boundaries while T31, T32 and G33 are adjacent and not under site ownership.



T14, T22 and T28 are mature, T4, T5, T6, T9 to T13, T17, T23 and T25 are early mature, G1, T2, G3, T7, T8, T15, T16, G18, G19, T21, T24, T26, T27 and T29 to G33 are semi mature, and T20 is young.

Lime T14 is of high value, Norway Maples T5 and T23, Limes T6, T9, T11, T12, T13, T21 and T22, Robinia T10, Oak T28 and Spruce T29 are of moderate value and the other trees and tree groups at the site are of lower value.

G1, T2 and T5 to G33 are in good or fair condition and G3 and T4 are in poor condition.

Trial Pits

Trial pits have been dug at the site to inspect the soil conditions and the tree roots; the trial pit positions have been identified on the attached tree plan.

The soil within the trial pits appears clayey and roots are visible within all of the trial pits; most of the roots are very minor, less than 10mm in diameter, but with very occasional roots over 10mm in diameter, but less than 20mm in diameter.

The Damage

Obvious cracks are visible to the property, both horizontal and vertical, and to both the interior and exterior. The damage to the property is detailed in the associated structural engineer's report (Ref: FC:2025/09) produced by Freeman Consultancy.

The low brick boundary wall along the northern boundary of the site to the immediate north of T2 to T8 is leaning to the north and several bricks are loose or dislodged.

Associated Structural Engineer's Report

The associated structural engineer's report (Ref: FC:2025/09) produced by Freeman Consultancy observes that the damage to the property is consistent with slight settlement or subsidence of the foundations and that its likely cause is considered to be due to the close proximity of mature trees against the north boundary, resulting in a degree of clay contraction and rehydration.

The report summarises that the internal and external damage represents slight foundation movement, that they suspect that the property had relatively shallow foundations sat onto a clay or cohesive subsoil, that the close proximity of the mature trees against the north boundary in particular is likely to influence ground conditions and suspects T5, T6 and T9 as being of most influence, and that the damage has not severely impaired the stability of the property but is such that this may affect insurance cover and future saleability.



The report recommends that ground investigations are undertaken to expose the foundation and subsoil, recommends considering the removal of trees T5, T6 and T9 and the low hedging immediately adjacent to the property against the north and east elevations, recommends to expose pipework close to the property to check its adequacy and that any damage should be suitably repaired and recommends a period of monitoring should then be undertaken followed by repairs.

Discussion

G1 to T9, T31, T32 and G33 are considered to be within influencing distance of the property.

Roots of T6 are visible at the soil surface, extending out towards the property, roots are visible within the dug trial pits at the site, and it is likely that the roots of T5, T6, T9, T28, T29, T31 and T32 currently extend out to the footings of the property.

While it is unlikely the roots of G1 to T4, T7, T8, T10 and T23 currently extend out to the footings of the property, they may extend out to the footings of the property in future.

The two common types of tree related damage are direct and indirect. Direct damage is the result of tree stem or root activity, physically moving structures near to where they grow or as a result of falling branches and limbs. Indirect damage is a result of vegetation related clay shrinkage subsidence, whereby moisture is abstracted from the soil causing soil shrinkage and foundation movement.

In my opinion, the observed damage to the property is consistent with indirect damage as a result of vegetation related clay shrinkage subsidence, whereby moisture is abstracted from the soil causing soil shrinkage and foundation movement.

Despite the lack of further investigative evidence, it is reasonable to assume the G1 to T9 are the principal factor to the property damage. Future risk of further damage is foreseeable; it is foreseeable the property damage will get worse as the trees grow, unless managed.

In my opinion the observed damage to the low brick boundary wall along the northern boundary of the site is consistent with direct damage as a result of G1 to T9 stem or root activity, physically moving the wall.

Management Options

I am of the opinion that the safe removal of the trees identified as G1 to T9 and treating or grinding the stumps to prevent regrowth, will help to avoid the risk of future damage to the property from the surveyed trees.



Pruning the tree crowns, according to British Standard 3998: 2010 – recommendations for tree work, would not have a significant impact on tree root growth and so it is not considered justified in this instance, as a response to the damage.

G3 and T4 are in poor condition and would be recommended for removal regardless of the structural damage to the property.

The site is situated within a Conservation Area and part of the site is protected by a woodland Tree Preservation Order. Before carrying out any works to protected trees the permission of the local planning authority is required.

When appointing a tree surgeon, please use only properly qualified and experienced companies and check that they carry adequate Public Liability and Employer's Liability Insurance.

All tree work should be carried out in accordance with British Standard 3998: 2010 – tree work: recommendations.

Conclusion

We have visited the above site and inspected, from ground level, the trees primarily with regard to the structural integrity of the existing detached residential property at the site.

There is obvious crack damage to the property, consistent with vegetation related subsidence damage.

The observed damage to the low brick boundary wall is consistent with direct damage from the trees.

The removal of G1 to T9 and treating or grinding the stumps to prevent regrowth, will help to avoid the risk of future damage to the property from the surveyed trees.

Yours sincerely,

J. Brown

James Brown, BSc (Hons) Arboriculture, MArborA, PTI (Lantra), QTRA Registered



AWA Qualifications and Experience

Adam Winson, Chartered Arboriculturist, MSc, BSc (Hons), MICFor, MArborA, ACIEEM, QTRA Registered

Adam is the company Director and Principal Consultant. He has a mix of the highest-level academic qualifications and relevant work experience. He has worked within the tree care profession for over 20 years and was awarded an MSc in Arboriculture and Urban Forestry, with distinction. Adam is a Chartered Arboriculturist and a Registered Consultant with the Institute of Chartered Foresters, a Professional Member of the Arboricultural Association and he has original research published by the UK Forestry Commission. His work ranges from individual expert tree inspections to managing trees on major infrastructure projects. His work often involves trees with preservation orders or litigation, and he has appeared as a tree expert, at planning appeal hearings up to the crown court. Adam also regularly undertakes locum Tree Officer work for several Local Planning Authorities.

James Brown, BSc (Hons) Arboriculture, MArborA, PTI (Lantra), QTRA Registered

James is a highly experienced and qualified Arboricultural Consultant. He has a BSc (Hons) in Arboriculture, attaining first class honours, as well as being awarded the Institute of Chartered Foresters student award. He is a Professional Member of the Arboricultural Association, an Associate of the Institute of Chartered Foresters, and he is working towards becoming a Chartered Arboriculturist. James joined AWA in 2016, he has many years' experience as an Arboricultural Consultant, he previously worked in Europe's largest container tree nursery and he has experience of local authority Tree Officer work.

James Godfrey, BA (Hons), FdSc Arboriculture and Tree Management, TechArborA, PTI (Lantra), QTRA Registered James has had extensive arboricultural experience working as an arborist within the public and private sector. While working at AWA, James completed his FdSc in Arboriculture and Tree Management, graduating with a distinction and was also awarded for achieving the highest overall mark in his year. James has used his arboricultural knowledge to inform and carry out accurate tree surveys and produce detailed reports that aim to balance appropriate tree retention with the requirements of landowners.

Joe Thomas, MSci Biology, Award L4 Arboriculture, TechArborA, PTI (Lantra), QTRA Registered

Joe achieved a first class degree in Biology with an integrated Masters (MSci) from the University of Sheffield. Additionally, he has a Level 4 Award in Arboriculture. Joe joined AWA after an Urban Forestry role with the Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust and Sheffield City Council, where he gained a variety of experience in different aspects of the arboriculture sector.

Lucy Garbutt, MSc, PGCert, BSc (Hons) Biology, PTI (Lantra), TechArborA, QTRA Registered

Lucy graduated with a masters degree in Animal Behaviour from the UK's highest rated university, St Andrews of Scotland, immediately following the completion of her BSc degree in Biology from Lancaster University. Lucy has experience in botany and plant science and moved into arboriculture after previous experience of protected species and botanical surveys with a large environmental consulting company.

Sophie Beckerman, BA (Hons), Dip Arboriculture Level 4, PTI (Lantra), TechArborA, QTRA Registered

Sophie has more than 10 years' experience as an arborist, working for a variety of private companies as well as undertaking tree management with Sheffield City Council Ranger Service and The Wildlife Trust. Her expertise in arboriculture is demonstrated in the practical NPTC qualifications gained, and her excellent knowledge is reflected in the L4 diploma in Arboriculture, which she completed while working. Her roles as a climbing arborist and team leader included estimating for jobs and project management, supervising tree contracting teams ensuring that work is carried out safely and efficiently and that health and safety standards are adhered to, and risk assessments are carried out.

Ross Lane, FdSc Environmental Conservation, Diploma Arboriculture, MArborA, PTI (Lantra), QTRA Registered

Ross has a diverse background spanning horticulture, arboriculture, and ecology. Ross has extensive experience conducting surveys throughout the UK and has worked on projects of all sizes, including major infrastructure projects such as HS2. In his previous role as a Tree Inspector at Derbyshire County Council, projects involved managing the county wide tree stock in relation to the ash dieback response and contributing to ambitious County Council targets of planting a million trees. Possessing technician-level membership with the Arboricultural Association, coupled with a comprehensive range of qualifications from tree risk assessment to habitat management, underscores Ross' dedication in professional arboriculture.

	Tree S	pecies		M	leasui	remen	ıts			Tre	e Condition			
Tree ID	Common Name	Latin Name	Maturity	Height (m)	Stems	Stem Dia (mm)	Spread Radius (m)	Distance to Property (m)	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Overall	Works
G1	Elder, Amelanchier, Berberis, Ash, Blackthorn, Cherry, Hawthorn, Rowan, Sycamore	Sambucus sp. Amelanchier sp. Berberis sp. Fraxinus sp. Prunus sp. Crataegus sp. Sorbus sp. Acer sp.	Semi- mature	3.5	10	70	See plan	4.5	No visual defects	Multiple stemmed at base. Vertical. Ivy covered. Old pruning wounds. Partially included bark. Tight union. Minor cavities	Old pruning wounds. Cavities. Minor dieback. Minor deadwood	Mixed species linear group. Occasional ivy covered stem and dead standing stem. Some Ash within the group have dieback.	Good	Removal required
T2	Yew	Taxus baccata	Semi- mature	4	6	80	2	8.5	Limited access around base	Multiple stemmed at 1m. Vertical. Old pruning wounds. Tight union	Old pruning wounds. Minor deadwood	Pruned into shape.	Good	Removal required
G3	Elm	Ulmus procera	Semi- mature	9	6	120	See plan	8	Limited access around base	Multiple stemmed at 1m. Vertical. Old pruning wounds. Tight union	Old pruning wounds. Minor deadwood. Moderate deadwood	Linear group of dead elms likely from dutch elm disease. lvy covered .	Poor	Removal required
Т4	Laburnum	Laburnum anagyroides	Early- mature	6	4	180, 130, 190, 150	2	8.5	No visual defects	Multiple stemmed at 0.5m. Slight lean. Bark damage. Ivy covered. Old pruning wounds. Partially included bark. Tight union. Minor cavities. Moderate decay. Bark loss. Stubs	Old pruning wounds. Cavities. Moderate dieback. Minor deadwood	Slight lean south east. Previously heavily pruned. Very poor condition with dieback, cavities and decay.	Poor	Removal required
T5	Norway Maple	Acer platanoides	Early- mature	17	1	450	4	10	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical	Minor deadwood	Telegraph pole with overhead cables through western crown. Low roadside wall leans away from site and is falling to bits.	Good	Removal required



	Tree S	Species		N	leasu	remen	ıts			Tre	e Condition			
Tree ID	Common Name	Latin Name	Maturity	Height (m)	Stems	Stem Dia (mm)	Spread Radius (m)	Distance to Property (m)	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Overall	Works
Т6	Lime	Tilia x europaea	Early- mature	18	1	580	5.5	8.5	Exposed roots. Root damage /loss	Single stemmed. Vertical. Ivy covered. Epicormic growths	Minor deadwood. Tight unions. Included bark	Large exposed roots with significant bark damage with minor decay. Telephone line through western crown. Undergrowth prevented detailed inspection of base.	Good	Removal required
Т7	Cherry	Prunus sp.	Semi- mature	5	2	150, 180	2.5	11	Root damage /loss. Exposed roots	Twin stemmed at 1m. Vertical. Old pruning wounds	Minor deadwood. Old pruning wounds. Major dieback. Snapouts	Adjacent street light to north east of crown. Undergrowth prevented detailed inspection. Previously heavily pruned.	Fair	Removal required
Т8	Beech	Fagus sylvatica	Semi- mature	10	2	100, 120	2	13	No visual defects	Twin stemmed at 0.5m. Vertical. Tight union. Old pruning wounds	Old pruning wounds. Minor deadwood	Adjacent streetlight through northern crown. Lower crown managed from south and north. Crown in contact with streetlight. Undergrowth prevented detailed inspection.	Fair	Removal required
Т9	Lime	Tilia x europaea	Early- mature	19	1	580	5.5	14.5	Exposed roots. Decay. Root damage /loss	Single stemmed. Vertical. Old pruning wounds. Epicormic growths	Old pruning wounds. Minor deadwood	Tight union and included bark to stem and crown. Undergrowth prevented detailed inspection.	Good	Removal required
T10	Robinia	Robinia pseudoacacia	Early- mature	20	1	420	7	16.5	Exposed roots. Root damage /loss	Single stemmed. Slight lean. Moderate decay. Moderate cavity. Old pruning wounds. Bark damage	Minor deadwood. Moderate deadwood. Snapouts	Slight lean south east. Long cavity to southern side of stem with moderate decay but with good reaction growth. Undergrowth prevented detailed inspection.	Fair	No action required



	Tree S	pecies		M	leasui	remen	its			Tre	e Condition			
Tree ID	Common Name	Latin Name	Maturity	Height (m)	Stems	Stem Dia (mm)	Spread Radius (m)	Distance to Property (m)	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Overall	Works
T11	Lime	Tilia x europaea	Early- mature	18	1	420	4.5	19	Exposed roots. Bark damage	Single stemmed. Slight lean. Old pruning wounds. Epicormic growths. Tight union. Partially included bark	Minor deadwood. Old pruning wounds. Tight union. Included bark	Slight lean east. Stored garden waste to south.	Good	No action required
T12	Lime	Tilia x europaea	Early- mature	20	1	480	4.5	26	Bark damage. Exposed roots. Girdled roots	Single stemmed. Slight lean. Ivy covered	Old pruning wounds. Tight union. Included bark. Minor deadwood	Slight lean south east.	Good	No action required
T13	Lime	Tilia x europaea	Early- mature	20	5	300, 150, 450, 260, 430	5	33	Exposed roots. Girdled roots. Bark damage	Multiple stemmed at 1m. Vertical. Old pruning wounds. Tight union. Partially included bark	Minor deadwood. Old pruning wounds. Tight union. Included bark	Multiple stemmed at 1m. Maybe historically pruned. Crown hangs low over footpath and road to north west.	Good	No action required
T14	Lime	Tilia x europaea	Mature	20	1	700	7	40	Bark damage. Girdled roots. Exposed roots	Single stemmed. Vertical. Epicormic growths. Old pruning wounds	Old pruning wounds. Tight union. Included bark. Minor deadwood	Black staining to stem.	Good	No action required
T15	Ash	Fraxinus excelsior	Semi- mature	10	1	190	5	42	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Significant lean. Epicormic growths	Old pruning wounds. Minor deadwood	Growing from base of bus stop with significant lean east. Adjacent street line to south of crown	Good	No action required
T16	Hawthorn	Crataegus monogyna	Semi- mature	9	6	80	2	43	No visual defects	Multiple stemmed at base. Vertical. Tight union. Partially included bark. Old pruning wounds	Minor deadwood. Old pruning wounds	Growing at base of bus stop. Crown in contact with bus stop to west. Adjacent street line to east. Crown in contact with streetlight. Lower crown managed over footpath	Fair	No action required

	Tree S	pecies		M	leasui	remen	ts			Tre	e Condition			
Tree ID	Common Name	Latin Name	Maturity	Height (m)	Stems	Stem Dia (mm)	Spread Radius (m)	Distance to Property (m)	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Overall	Works
T17	Sycamore	Acer pseudoplatanus	Early- mature	21	1	600	6	36	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical. Ivy covered. Tight union. Partially included bark. Bark damage. Bark loss. Minor decay. Epicormic growths	Minor dieback. Minor deadwood. Minor snapouts. Ivy covered	Two co dominant stems at 1.5m with included bark and bark loss and minor decay. Telephone wire to south east of crown. Undergrowth prevented detailed inspection of the roots, heavy ivy prevented detailed inspection of stem and crown.	Fair	No action required
G18	Hawthorn	Crataegus monogyna	Semi- mature	1.5	10	70	See plan	27.5	No visual defects	Multiple stemmed. Partially included bark. Tight union. Old pruning wounds. Epicormic growths. Bark damage. Minor cavities. Minor decay. Fused stems	Minor deadwood. Old pruning wounds	Managed Hawthorn hedge.	Good	No action required
G19	Beech	Fagus sylvatica	Semi- mature	15	10	120	See plan	24	No visual defects	Multiple stemmed. Partially included bark. Tight union. Old pruning wounds. Epicormic growths. Bark damage. Minor cavities. Minor decay. Fused stems	Minor deadwood. Old pruning wounds	Linear group of semi mature beech. Likey once managed now unmanaged row of stems. Retaining wall to immediate south east. Likely once planted as a hedge, now is unmanaged and overgrown.	Good	No action required
T20	Beech	Fagus sylvatica	Young	5	1	120	2	22	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Slight lean. Ivy covered	Minor deadwood	Slight lean south. Retaining wall to immediate south. Insigificant tree. Likely once planted as part of hedge G19.	Good	No action required



	Tree S	pecies		M	easu	remen	its			Tre	e Condition			
Tree ID	Common Name	Latin Name	Maturity	Height (m)	Stems	Stem Dia (mm)	Spread Radius (m)	Distance to Property (m)	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Overall	Works
T21	Lime	Tilia x europaea	Semi- mature	22	5	250, 250, 150, 250, 200	4	22	No visual defects	Multiple stemmed at base. Vertical. Epicormic growths. Partially included bark. Tight union. Old pruning wounds	Minor deadwood. Minor snapouts. Included bark. Tight union. Old pruning wounds	Multiple stemmed. Dense epicormic growths at base prevented detailed inspection. Retaining wall to immediate south. Ivy and undergrowth prevented detailed inspection of the roots. Crown in good condition, with no signs of fungus at base. Growing on top of wall.	Good	No action required
T22	Lime	Tilia x europaea	Mature	22	1	700	4.5	16	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical. Epicormic growths. Old pruning wounds. Tight union. Partially included bark	Minor deadwood. Old pruning wounds	Single stemmed but with large epicormic growths at base, which prevented detailed inspection. Ivy undergrowth prevented detailed inspection of roots. Retaining wall to immediate south. Historically pollarded at 6-7m.	Good	No action required
T23	Norway Maple	Acer platanoides	Early- mature	14	2	290, 230	4	19	No visual defects	Twin stemmed at 1m. Vertical. Tight union. Partially included bark	Minor deadwood. Old pruning wounds	Co-dominant stems at 1m.	Good	No action required
T24	Prunus	Prunus sp.	Semi- mature	6	2	80, 90	2	20	No visual defects	Twin stemmed at 1m. Vertical. Major decay. Major cavity	Minor deadwood	Very long decayed bark wound and cavity to northern side of stem.	Fair	No action required



	Tree S	pecies		M	leasui	remen	nts			Tre	e Condition			
Tree ID	Common Name	Latin Name	Maturity	Height (m)	Stems	Stem Dia (mm)	Spread Radius (m)	Distance to Property (m)	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Overall	Works
T25	Ash	Fraxinus excelsior	Early- mature	20	1	550	5	22	Limited access around base. Exposed roots	Single stemmed. Slight lean. lvy covered. Minor cavities. Major decay	Old pruning wounds. Ivy covered. Minor snapouts	Large pruning wounds with decay at base to east, likely was multiple stemmed previously. Situated within planting pit. lvy and undergrowth prevented detailed inspection at base. Crown in good condition with no obvious signs of Ash Dieback but likely to get it in future.	Fair	No action required
T26	Hawthorn	Crataegus monogyna	Semi- mature	7	2	120, 180	3	21	No visual defects	Twin stemmed at base. Vertical. Ivy covered. Partially included bark. Tight union	Minor dieback. Minor deadwood. Old pruning wounds	Situated next to Ash T25 in planting pit. In good condition. Insignificant tree.	Good	No action required
T27	Dogwood	Cornus sp.	Semi- mature	4.5	6	60	3	17.5	No visual defects	Multiple stemmed at base. Vertical. Stubs. Tight union. Partially included bark. Bark damage. Old pruning wounds	Old pruning wounds. Minor deadwood	Insignificant tree.	Fair	No action required
T28	Oak	Quercus robur	Mature	21	1	850	7	17.5	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical. Old pruning wounds. Fungus. Bark damage	Minor deadwood. Moderate deadwood. Old pruning wounds. Minor snapouts	Metalwork embedded in stem. Large Ganoderma australe fungal bracket to north eastern side at base of stem. Likely historic pruning works undertaken such as crown reduction. Crown in good condition, but stem sounds hollow when using a sounding hammer.	Fair	No action required



	Tree S	pecies		M	leasu	remen	its			Tre	e Condition			
Tree ID	Common Name	Latin Name	Maturity	Height (m)	Stems	Stem Dia (mm)	Spread Radius (m)	Distance to Property (m)	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Overall	Works
T29	Spruce	Picea sp.	Semi- mature	16	1	270	4	10	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical. lvy covered	Minor deadwood		Good	No action required
T30	Goat Willow	Salix caprea	Semi- mature	9	1	130	2	10.5	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Significant lean	Minor deadwood	Significant lean north west. Crown in contact with fence.	Good	No action required
T31	Ashleaf Maple	Acer negundo	Semi- mature	7.5	1	150	3	3	Limited access around base	Single stemmed. Vertical	Minor deadwood. Old pruning wounds	Adjacent tree preventing access. Crown overhangs site by 3m.	Good	No action required
T32	Cherry	Prunus 'Amanogawa'	Semi- mature	8	1	200	2	1.5	Limited access around base	Single stemmed. Vertical. Tight union. Partially included bark	Old pruning wounds. Minor deadwood	Adjacent tree preventing access. Upright form.	Good	No action required
G33	Cypress	Cupressus sp.	Semi- mature	2.5	10	70	See plans.	5.5	No visual defects	Multiple stemmed. Partially included bark. Tight union. Old pruning wounds. Epicormic growths. Bark damage. Minor cavities. Minor decay. Fused stems	Minor deadwood. Old pruning wounds	Managed Cypress hedge on boundary.	Good	No action required



 \bigoplus^{\bigoplus}



 \bigoplus

+