



Email:

Tel:

Mob:

09 July 2026

Tree condition report

This report has been prepared for Phillip Hopkin it relates to the 2 Common Oak (*Quercus robur*) tree (T1 and T2) to the rear of the house at 60 Waun Daniel, Rhos. I was contacted to discuss pruning T2 initially. But on further investigation it became clear that T1 was a safety risk to the homeowners and neighbouring properties. As a result, I've been asked to prepare this report to support the request for the removal of both T1 and T2 to ground level. The evidence to support this report are on page 3 of this document.

Observations were made on 24/06/2026 and the conditions for survey were dry and overcast but calm with very good visibility. No invasive survey techniques were used, only visual techniques from ground level. With references and knowledge in line with current best practice and literature such as the manual of wood decay, the body language of trees, updated field guide for visual tree assessment by Claus Mattheck.

It would seem over the years the soil levels have changed a few times. With history of a culvert also running along side the trees. It is likely that these terrain factors have contributed to the stresses of the tree, and the addition of honey fungus has further progressed the decline.

T1 is a large, mature tree that forks at approx. 18inches above ground level. The fork is broad with no areas of included bark or compression in the union. The tree is lacking obvious root space for the size of the tree. With multiple small developments/constructions in close proximity to the tree such as a garage and fence. Though the garage was built some time ago, the roots may have still been disturbed during the construction.

There is a large area of dysfunction on the tension side of both stems of T1. Even with it being a common oak, the extent of decay is still a concern especially with the colonisation of Honey fungus. The extent of this decay even without invasive techniques is of high concern. Honey fungus breaks down the structural wood and lignin within the roots and butt area of the tree. It leads to root decay and potentially windthrow. It also has a detrimental effect on the vascular system of the tree preventing the passing of nutrients, which causes canopy dieback.

There looks to be older dysfunction below the union at the base. There is Extensive decay/dysfunction at the base of the union. Resulting honey fungus has colonised the wounds and beyond. There is a lot of rhizomorphs or "bootlaces" present in and around the wounds. Wounds run up both stems, approx 3m up north stem, 2.5m up south stem. The tree has attempted to put on ribbing growth to reduce the spread of decay (wall 4 codit).

The Canopy is starting to decline with evidence of dieback and smaller dead branches appearing. There is one large dead/decaying branch on the east side of the canopy with decaying fungus likely turkey tail present. The leaf coverage is quite extensive, however the majority of this would look to be epicormic growth. The epicormic growth is present on the main stems and it extends along the limbs. The leaf colour isn't as green as it should be, nor as green as the neighbouring trees. The leaves are slightly more yellow and underdeveloped in some cases.

T2 is a much smaller single stem tree, which has had a lot of previous extensive pruning which has resulted in a lot of epicormic growth. It would seem the main leader has been removed at some point (not in accordance with BS3998:2010 recommendations for tree work), with a large 6inch wound in the centre of the remaining canopy. The tree is also in the shade of the larger T1.

The canopy is overextended to the South side of the tree, the unions of the limbs look stable however they are very long and tip heavy. I have concerns that these may fail if they are left too long, either through hazard beam fractures or cupboard door type failures. There are some smaller dead branches in the canopy which is likely an early sign of dieback resulting from subterranean stresses. These stresses are likely similar to the ones relating to T1.

At the base of T2 there is a cavity which is quite extensive (upwards of 50% of the overall diameter of the tree). This is also on the tension side of the tree. There are areas of bark flaking from buttress roots which will be contributing to the demise of the vascular system of the tree. Though I couldn't immediately see signs of Honey fungus, it's likely that it is present on this tree too as it is in such close proximity to T1. This colonisation is what's likely lead to the bark flaking from the buttress areas.

Conclusion

I would recommend that T1 is to be removed in its entirety. This is due to the number of targets beneath the canopy of the tree and in proximity to the stems should they fail due to the extensive dysfunction in the main union of the tree. The tree is obviously in decline with more deadwood in the canopy than in previous years, some of which is over 100mm in diameter. The amount of epicormic growth throughout the tree would lead me to believe that the tree is under serious stress. And the vitality of the leaves also leads me to believe the tree is under stress as they aren't as green as they should be. I believe that the Honey fungus present in the main union is certainly contributing to the decline of the tree as is the nature of the decay mechanism of this fungi.

My initial thought was that T2 could be retained. However, after considering the removal of T1 this would compromise T2 greatly. The resulting instability and exposure to any adverse weather conditions would almost certainly lead to failure of the overextended limbs or potential windthrow due to the poor rooting conditions/area.

Whilst every effort is made to ensure an accurate assessment of the trees condition during a survey no responsibility can be taken for resultant damage or injury occurred by a failing tree. The survey only gives a snap shot of what is visible, no invasive techniques were used, purely non-invasive visual techniques. Please note that the findings of this report are only valid for 24 months from the date of the tree inspection. This report does not constitute to a full tree safety policy for the site.

With thanks, gyda Diolch

Our Tree Company, Ein Cwmni Coed Ltd.

Evidence of T1







Evidence of T2



