TREE INSPECTION REPORT

Property: 21 Kensington Grove, Wrexham
Tree: Fagus sylvatica (Common Beech)
Date of Inspection: 10/02/2026

Prepared by: *Nathan Dunn,*

1. Executive Summary

This report presents the findings of a detailed arboricultural inspection of a mature Beech tree located within the rear garden of 21 Kensington Grove, Wrexham. The purpose of this assessment is to evaluate the tree's condition, structural integrity, amenity value, and suitability.

The inspection concludes that although the tree is of notable size, its amenity value is limited due to restricted public visibility and contextual factors. Structural and physiological observations indicate *the potential partial destruction of its root system*, which further reduces its long-term retention value.

2. Report Author Details

Name: *Mr Nathan Dunn*
Qualifications: *Lvl 3 Forestry and Arboriculture,*
Experience: Over 10 years in arboriculture, arboricultural surveying, and tree risk assessment.
Statement of Independence: This report is prepared impartially and solely for the purpose stated.

Inspection Date: *10/02/2026*

3. Instructions and Scope

The homeowner of 21 Kensington Grove commissioned this report to:

- Assess the Beech tree's structural and physiological condition
- Evaluate its amenity value

Limitations:

- Ground-level visual inspection only
- No climbing inspection or decay detection unless otherwise stated
- Observations reflect conditions on the inspection date

Methodology:

- Visual Tree Assessment (VTA)
- BS5837:2012 principles

4. Site Description

The property is a residential dwelling situated on Kensington Grove, Wrexham. The Beech tree is positioned within the rear garden, set back from the public highway. Surrounding land use is domestic, with similar-sized properties and ornamental garden trees, as well as other mature specimens in adjoining gardens.

Visibility from public viewpoints is partially obscured by built structures, boundary fencing, and neighbouring vegetation. The tree is not part of a group or woodland setting.

5. Tree Identification

Species: Fagus sylvatica (Common Beech)
Height: Approximately 18–20 m

Crown Spread:

- East–West: approx. 14 m
- North–South: approx. 15 m

Age Class: Mature
TPO Reference: *Unknown*

6. Detailed Arboricultural Assessment

6.1 Structural Condition

Observations include:

- The tree forks into two at 6ft and a large cavity from a previous wound is visible, it retains water, and is approximately 1/4 of the tree's DBH. On the opposite side of the cavity an included union runs down the back of the tree, its approximately 0.5m in length and there is no evidence of fusing at any point. There is also evidence of a previous wound on the right hand stem (if your back is to the house) this appears to also retain water. I was unable to ascertain the depth or the severity of the wound.
- As you look at the tree, it is clear that the tree has either been built up into a planting bed by 0.5m, which would cause damage to the root flare and could cause root collar rot. Or potentially the digging out of at least a third of the root system on the house side of the tree. As the majority of the trees weight is towards the SSW (opposite side to the potential root damage) it could severely weaken the tree. There is also a wall on the South side of the tree, due to the lean in the wall it is evident that the tree is damaging the footings.

6.2 Physiological Condition

- Bud distribution appears to be normal for a mature Beech
- There is no presence of epicormic growth or major deadwood.
- There is slight sign of stress from the bark below the open cavity on the “front” (house side) of the tree, it is lifting and blistering, but I was unable to prize it off and I didn't want to further the damage.

6.3 Risk Assessment

A qualitative risk assessment was undertaken using VTA principles.

1. Likelihood of Failure

Structural Factors

- **Major cavity at 6 ft**, approx. **25% of DBH**, water-holding.
    - Water retention increases decay progression and reduces residual wall strength.
- **Included union** on the opposite side of the cavity, **0.5 m long**, with **no evidence of fusion**.
    - Included unions in mature Beech are a known structural weakness.

- **Previous wound on right-hand stem**, also water-holding, depth unknown.
- **Possible root system compromise**:
    - Either **0.5 m of soil fill** over the root flare (risk of root collar rot), **or**
    - **Loss of up to one-third of the root system** on the house side.
- **Crown bias to SSW**, opposite the suspected root loss.
    - This creates a lever arm increasing bending stress on the weakened side.

Physiological Factors

- Bud distribution normal; no epicormic growth; no major deadwood.
- Slight bark lifting/blistering below the cavity suggests **localised stress or dysfunction**.

Likelihood Rating

High

The combination of a significant cavity, included union, potential root loss, and crown weight distribution creates multiple interacting structural weaknesses. For a mature Beech, these defects materially increase the probability of partial or whole-stem failure.

2. Likelihood of Impacting a Target

Site Context

- Tree is in a **rear garden** of a residential property.
- Not adjacent to a public highway.
- Targets likely include:
    - The house
    - Garden structures
    - Occupants using the garden
    - Neighbouring gardens

Exposure

- Residential gardens have **intermittent but predictable occupancy**.
- The house is a **static, high-value target**.
- Crown spread (14–15 m) suggests **multiple potential impact zones**.

Likelihood of Impact Rating

Medium

The tree is not over a public space with constant occupancy, but the presence of a dwelling and regular garden use elevates the exposure.

3. Consequences of Failure

Given the tree's size (18–20 m) and mass, consequences of failure would be:

- **Severe** for property (structural damage likely)
- **Severe** for people (risk of serious injury or fatality)
- **Moderate–severe** for neighbouring properties depending on fall direction

Consequence Rating

High

4. Overall Qualitative Risk Rating

Using a standard qualitative matrix:

Likelihood of Failure	Likelihood of Impact	Consequence	Overall Risk
High	**Medium**	**High**	**High / Unacceptable**

Overall Risk: HIGH (approaching unacceptable)

This level of risk typically warrants **active intervention**, not simple monitoring.

5. Amenity Value Assessment

Positive Amenity Factors

- Mature Beech of 18–20 m has **high intrinsic amenity value**.
- Provides **screening**, **shade**, and **biodiversity value**.
- Contributes to the character of the rear garden and neighbouring views.

Negative Amenity Factors

- Visibility from public viewpoints is **limited**.
- Structural defects significantly reduce long-term retention potential.
- Risk profile may outweigh amenity benefits.

Amenity Value Rating

Moderate

High intrinsic value, but limited public visibility and declining structural viability reduce its overall amenity score.

7. Amenity Value Assessment

7.1 Public Visibility

- The tree is partially screened from the public highway.
- Visibility is limited to short sections of pavement and is further reduced during leaf-off periods.
- The tree does not form part of a significant landscape feature.

7.2 Contribution to Landscape Character

- The tree stands as part of a line of mature trees.
- It does not form part of a skyline or prominent vista.

7.3 Form and Condition

- The tree has an asymmetrical shape and is heavily leaning towards the neighbours garden in the SSW.

9. Supporting Evidence

Cavity at 6ft, with water inside.





Included union at rear of tree, behind the open cavity





Evidence of bark stress, and blistering, and the second mostly healed over pruning wound



Evidence of potential root damage due to digging out, or the pilling up of solid and rubble to potentially cause root flare rot.



Taken from against the house, again evidence of height difference between the grass and the base of the tree, well within what you would give as a root protection area.

10. Conclusions

The Beech tree at 21 Kensington Grove is a mature specimen of notable size; however, its amenity value is limited due to restricted public visibility, I do not think a heavy reduction would mitigate the danger the potential low down failure would cause. Due to the damage all being 6ft, and potentially below, and all within an area that collectively makes more than a 3rd of the diameter of the tree.