

Site Gilling Court, Belsize Grove NW3 4XD

> Prepared for BW Residential

Prepared by Kai Chung, MO BSc Hort & Arb

04th April 2025

Preliminary Tree Condition Survey PTCS-34239

Artemis Tree Services Ltd

West Hyde Nursery, Old Uxbridge Road, West Hyde, Rickmansworth, Herts WD3 9XY **T:** 01895 821623 **E:** office@artemistreeservices.com **W:** www.artemistreeservices.com



Table of Contents

1.	Brief	Brief 1									
2.	Report limitations										
3.	Methodology of Survey										
4.	Documents provided 1										
5.	Introduction 2										
6.	Findings and Recommendations 2										
7.	Re-inspection frequency 2										
8.	Trees Subject to Statutory Controls 2										
9.	Arboricultural Standards 3										
Арр	endix 1.	Tree schedule									
Арр	ppendix 2. Tree location plan										
Арр	ppendix 3. Document record										



1. Brief

- 1.1 Artemis Tree Services Itd has been instructed by Sam Forth of BW Residential to undertake a Preliminary Tree Condition Survey of trees at Gilling Court, Belsize Grove, NW3 4XD.
- 1.2 The tree condition survey is primarily concerned with the structural and physiological condition and safety of the trees surveyed.
- 1.3 Recommended management actions are provided for any issues identified by the tree survey.

2. **Report limitations**

- 2.1 Climbing inspections have not been carried out as part of the preliminary survey. If the preliminary inspection identifies a need for further investigation of specific trees (such as decay detection or aerial inspection), this will be detailed within our recommendations.
- 2.2 Conclusions and recommendations relate to the condition of the site and tree at the time of the inspection only. Comments valid for a period of 1-year from the date of this report. Within this period, trees should be inspected for damage following storms or other severe weather events.
- 2.3 Trees are dynamic, living organisms and can never be entirely free of risk. The forces of nature dictate a failure rate, even among intact trees with no apparent defects. The recommendations in this report cannot guarantee the elimination of all risk.
- 2.4 The survey and report does not include risk assessment of trees in relation to subsidence.
- 2.5 The tree survey includes trees located within the marked area only, as instructed by the client (See map below). I did not have access to third-party property.

3. Methodology of Survey

- 3.1 I carried out the tree condition survey from ground level using the Visual Tree Assessment method (Mattheck,c and Breloer,H, 1994), using basic inspection tools (mallet, probe, and binoculars).
- 3.2 For the purposes of this report, tree heights and stem diameter measurements are estimated with the aid of a laser distance measurement device.

4. Documents provided

4.1 A tree location plan has been included in Appendix 2 of this report.



5. Introduction

5.1 Qualifications

5.1.1 I hold an BSc (Hons) Horticulture, Arboriculture, and Landscape Management from THEi Hong Kong and Level 2 Certificate in Arboriculture from Myerscough.

5.2 Site visit

5.2.1 I visited the site on the 4th of April 2025 to undertake the Walk-Over Tree Survey. The weather of the day is clear and sunny.

5.3 Site Description

5.3.1 Gilling Court is a small residential complex with an area of around 1 acre. It has a communal garden NE to the complex, shared with a the neighbouring Holmefield Court. There is also a row of terraced houses NW to the complex.

6. Findings and Recommendations

6.1 Appendix 1 contains the findings and recommendations for the trees surveyed. A key for the table information can be found at the end of the survey schedule.

6.2 Summary of recommended work

Pri	ority		No. of Trees/Groups
	U	Within 2 weeks	-
	А	Within 3 months	-
	В	Within 1 year	3x
	С	Within 2 years	6x

7. **Re-inspection frequency**

- 7.1 I recommend that all trees recorded in this report are re-inspected every two years unless specified otherwise within the tree survey schedule, appendix 1.
- 7.2 In the period between programmed surveys, trees should be inspected for damage following storms or other severe weather events.

8. Trees Subject to Statutory Controls

8.1 Artemis Tree Services Itd have not been instructed to establish the presence of Tree Preservation Orders (TPO) or Conservation Areas Designation at this stage. If Artemis Tree Services Ltd is employed to undertake recommended works; all necessary checks will be made on the clients' behalf.



9. Arboricultural Standards

9.1 All tree works recommended in this report should be carried out in accordance with: *British Standard BS 3998:2010. Tree Work – Recommendations* and undertaken by a suitably qualified contracting company (preferably approved by the Arboricultural Association).



Tree tag no.	Species	Height (m)	Stem diameter (cm)	Crown Spread (m)	Age class	Physiological condition	Structural condition	Observations	Recommended management actions	Priority	Re-inspect (months)
T1	Ash (Fraxinus excelsior)	16	53	7	EM	F	G	Previously crown reduced with around 2 to 2.5m regrowth. Some epicormic growth on limbs indicates potential stresses. Area of missing bark at base of stem to E, no audible hollowing when tapped with mallet.	Reduce back to previous pruning point by removing approximately 2 to 2.5m from all over, to control overall size as part of continued maintenance.	В	24
T2	Horse chestnut (Aesculus hippocastanum)	15	82	8	М	G	G	Some epicormic growth on stem, typical of species. Previously crown reduced with approximately 1.5 to 2m regrowth. Potential cavity formation at 10m to NW, good wound wood production around area of cavity.	Reduce back to previous pruning point by removing approximately 1.5 to 2m from all over, to control overall size as part of continued maintenance. Climber to inspect cavities for decay and recommend further management if necessary.	С	24
ТЗ	Horse chestnut (Aesculus hippocastanum)	15	73	6	Μ	G	F	Previously pollarded/ reduced with approximately 3m regrowth. Branches to NW in contact with building. Historic loss of 1x main limb at 4m with large area of missing bark on stub. Some epicormic growth on stems, typical of species.	Reduce back to previous pruning point by removing approximately 2.5 to 3m from all over, to control overall size as part of continued maintenance. Remove dead stub at 4m to SE back to appropriate pruning/ growth point.	В	24



Tree tag no.	Species	Height (m)	Stem diameter (cm)	Crown Spread (m)	Age class	Physiological condition	Structural condition	Observations	Recommended management actions	Priority	Re-inspect (months)
Τ4	Holly (<i>Ilex</i> aquifolium)	5	20	2	Y	G	F	Small tree along NW boundary. Base of stem obscured by ivy and brambles. Approximately 40deg lean towards building complex to SE. Height of tree reduced previously with around 1m regrowth.	Remove brambles and ivy at base of stem to allow proper inspection on base of stem in the future.	С	24
Τ5	Lime (<i>Tilia cordata</i>)	14	56	7	EM	G	G	Previously pollarded with approximately 1.5 to 2m regrowth. Some epicormic on stem, typical of species. No significant defects noted.	Repollard back to previous as part of continued maintenance by removing approximately 1.5 to 2m.	С	24
Т6	Lime (<i>Tilia cordata</i>)	13	42	4	Y	G	G	Previously pollarded with approximately 1.5 to 2m regrowth. Some epicormic on stem, typical of species. No significant defects noted.	Repollard back to previous as part of continued maintenance by removing approximately 1.5 to 2m.	С	24
Τ7	Lime (<i>Tilia cordata</i>)	12	43	6	Y	G	G	Previously pollarded with approximately 1.5 to 2m regrowth. Some epicormic on stem, typical of species. No significant defects noted.	Repollard back to previous as part of continued maintenance by removing approximately 1.5 to 2m.	C	24



Tree tag no.	Species	Height (m)	Stem diameter (cm)	Crown Spread (m)	Age class	Physiological condition	Structural condition	Observations	Recommended management actions	Priority	Re-inspect (months)
Τ8	Horse chestnut (<i>Aesculus</i> <i>hippocastanum</i>)	14	90	10	Μ	G	F	Previously crown reduced with around 1.5 to 2m regrowth. Some epicormic growth, typical of species. Multiple stemmed at 4m, no signs of developing included unions.	Reduce back to previous pruning point by removing approximately 1.5 to 2m from all over, to control overall size as part of continued maintenance. Climber to inspect area of codominant stems and recommend further management if necessary.	С	24
T9	Cherry (<i>Prunus</i> avium)	10	36	5	Y	G	F	Codominant stem at 1.7m, no signs of developing included union. Approximately 15deg lean towards public footpath and road to E, self- corrected at 2.5m. Base of stem to E obscured by boundary wall. Historic damage of buttress roots to W. Previously crown reduced with approximately 2.5 to 3m regrowth on height.	Reduce back to previous pruning point by removing approximately 2.5 to 3m from height and 1m from sides, to control overall size as part of continued maintenance and to reduce likelihood of failure over public footpath and road.	В	24



Key for column information

Height – Approximate tree height in metres **Stem Diameter** – Approximate stem diameter in centimetres measured at 1.5m above ground level.

Age Class – Relative to species, as below

NP-Newly Planted (trees within 3-years of being planted)

Y-Young (first third of life, height and growth)

EM-Early Mature (second third of life, height and growth)

M-Mature (last third of life, ultimate height yet still increasing in girth)

OM-Over Mature/ancient (older than last third of life and tree starting to decline/retrench in height and girth starting to reduce. An old example of that species)

V-Veteran (trees of interest biologically, aesthetically, or culturally in their ancient stage of life relative to others of same species)

Physiological condition

Good - Tree in a healthy condition with no significant problems

Fair - Tree generally in good health with some problems that can be remediated

Poor - Tree in poor health with significant problems that can't be remediated

Dead - Tree without sufficient live material to sustain life

Structural condition

Good - Tree in a safe condition with no significant defects

Fair - Tree in a safe condition at present but with defects or with significant defects that can be remediated

Poor - Tree with significant defects that can't be remediated

Priority - Advised time frame for management recommendations to be undertaken from publication date of this report (for tree work only)

Pric	ority	
	U	Within 2 weeks (urgent) Where possible, the hazard should be fenced off until work can be carried out.
	А	Within 3 months
	В	Within 1 year
	С	Within 2 years

Re-inspect – Advised re-inspection frequency

Deadwood classification

Minor deadwood – Below 40mm in diameter or less than 1m in length Major deadwood – Over 40mm in diameter and 1m in length



<u>Gilling Court – Tree Location Plan</u>





Document record

Document	Editor	Publication date						
WOS-34239	Kai Chung, MO	08/04/2025						
Checked by Oliver Coleman (FdSc Arb, DipHE Arb Level 5) 08/04/2025								