

Arboricultural Consultancy for Aviva

Note⁽¹⁾: This report is intended for use between the client, Environmental Services and any parties detailed within the report. It is based on the understanding at the time of visiting the property that Engineers are satisfied that damage is attributable to clay shrinkage subsidence exacerbated by vegetation.

1. Case Details

Insured	Haverstock Hill Limited	Address	96 Haverstock Hill, London, NW3 2BD		
Client	Subsidence Management Services	Contact	Emily Bogie	Claim No.	IFS-AVI-SUB-14-0052426
ES Ref	NL/0110140922/TP-REV3	Consultant	Andrew Cayley Bsc (Hons) Arb, M.Arbor.A	Contact No.	0330 380 1036
Report Date	02/10/2015 Revised: 16/10/2015, 08/06/2016 & 24/10/2016				

Scope of Report: To survey the property and determine significant vegetation contributing to subsidence damage, make recommendation for remedial action and assess initial mitigation and recovery prospects. The survey does not make an assessment for decay or hazard evaluation.

REV2 is a revision of our previously revised report following a site meeting between all parties involved in the ongoing subsidence claim; it was agreed that the following report will attempt to address all the concerns raised by the Local Authority at the time of our meeting.

REV3 is a further revision to include the results of internal site investigations (ITP/BH4) which were undertaken in September 2016

2. Property and Damage Description

The insured structure is a 4 storey semi-detached house. The property occupies a level site with no adverse topographical features.

Damage relates to the right-hand flank of the insured dwelling (internally). Please refer to the engineers report(s) for a full description of the claim history and damage.

3. Technical Reports (Revised)

In preparing our revised report we have had the benefit of the following technical investigations:

Foundation Detail / Borehole Log	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Soil Analysis	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Root Analysis	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Drain Report	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Level Monitoring	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Engineers initial / addendum report	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

4. Action Plan

Mitigation	
Insured Involved?	Yes
Local Authority involved?	No
Other third party Mitigation involved?	Yes
Recovery	
Is there a potential recovery action?	Yes

Tree Works	
Local Authority	Camden London Borough
TPO / Conservation Area / Planning Protection Searches	Insured: TPO Adjacent & Adjoining properties: TPO
Additional Comments	
Awaiting Further Instructions.	
A potential recovery action has been identified.	

5. Technical Synopsis (Revised)

This report is based upon our understanding at the time of visiting the property that Subsidence Management Services' engineers are satisfied that damage is due to clay shrinkage subsidence exacerbated by vegetation.

We are aware that the insured property has been subject to previous episodes of movement/damaged investigated by independent engineers and each time confirmed to be the result of clay shrinkage subsidence exacerbated by the influence of vegetation.

An application to fell the Elm (T3 of this report) and a Sycamore (at No. 94 Haverstock Hill) was submitted to London Borough of Camden by OCA (UK) Ltd on the 11th July 2007 (OCA REF: 36550/2452270/Hill).

Arboricultural Consultancy for Aviva

The conclusion reached, following independent investigations undertaken by Cunningham Lindsay / OCA (UK) LTD to support the above TPO application were as follows:

'It is the view of Chartered Engineers appointed to investigate damage that the insured property has suffered differential movement and subsequent damage consistent with vegetation related clay shrinkage subsidence'.

The above claim was resolved by Shire Stabiliser Installation (certificate of structural adequacy being issued 24th July 2009), however tree removal works were not progressed and subsequently damage returned in 2011.

The 2011 application concerned two Sycamores at 94 Haverstock Hill (reference: 2011/1491/T); permission was given for the removal of one tree only (this work being undertaken).

Movement / damage returned in 2014 and Innovation Group were instructed to advise on the causal vegetation and to deliver management proposals which will provide on-going and long term stability, thereby allowing repairs to be undertaken.

Site investigations were undertaken in 2014 (Drain survey and the excavation of x2 TP/BH's) and a further limited investigation in 2015 (x1 BH and a further comprehensive drain survey to all drain runs in April 2015).

The results of the above site investigations indicate that the foundations to the front of the property extend to a depth of 500mm below ground level in TP/BH1 and 1200mm in TP/BH2.

Further site investigations were undertaken in September 2016 (at the request of the Local Authority); these confirmed that internal foundations (rear right corner of the bedroom) extend to a depth of 300mm below ground level.

All foundations are noted to bear onto subsoil described within the borehole log as containing clay, thereby indicating the potential for the observed damage to be the result of clay shrinkage subsidence exacerbated by the influence of vegetation.

The above view is echoed by previous investigations.

NHBC 4.2 (2010) classifies the supporting subsoil within all four trial pits / boreholes, as being of medium - high plasticity i.e. capable of significant volumetric change potential in response to moisture content.

Site investigations have been undertaken by accredited independent soil testing laboratories in accordance with BS5930:1999 "Code of Practice for Site Investigations".

Desiccation of the underlying clay strata (in November 2014, March 2015 and September 2016) is demonstrated by an abnormal soil moisture content profile (BRE 412).

Atterberg testing for soils recovered in both TP/BH1 and TP/BH2 (SubsNet ref: C18151G7214) show the soil moisture content to be below to plastic limit for the full depth of testing 500mm – 1800mm) below ground level.

Moisture content comparison with plastic limit is a reliable indicator of desiccation, whilst moisture depletion at the depths identified are beyond that to which ambient soil drying can be influential and thereby indicate a vegetative influence in the movement / damage.

Soil suction testing (within TP/BH1 and TP/BH2) (2014)) indicates the presence of Very Severe, desiccation in accordance with BRE digest 412 from 500mm to 1800mm below ground level.

BRE Digest 412; Desiccation in Clay Soils states that '*soil sample suctions, since they will reflect any changes in in-situ pore water pressures due to desiccation, provide the most fundamental indicator of desiccation of all of the techniques'.*

Further site investigations (BH3) undertaken in March 2015 (SubsNet Ref: C18151G9987) confirmed similar soil conditions as found in TP/BH1 and TP/BH2 i.e a medium – high shrinkable clay substrate.

Desiccation / on-set desiccation of the underlying clay strata (in March 2015) is demonstrated by an abnormal soil moisture content profile (BRE 412).

Atterberg testing for soils recovered in BH3 show the soil moisture content to be at/close (within 3% max) of plastic limit for the full depth of testing 1200mm – 3200mm) below ground level.

Soil suction testing (within BH3) indicates the presence of moderate - severe, desiccation in accordance with BRE digest 412 from 1200mm to 3700mm below ground level.

Arboricultural Consultancy for Aviva

The time of testing (winter 2015) is likely to explain the reduced soil desiccation noted when compared to TP/BH1 & TP/BH2; April being the point in the season where soil rehydration reaches its peak; winter rainfall has likely masked any previous evidence of severe desiccation.

Further soil suction testing (undertaken within ITP/BH4 (2016)) indicates the presence of Very Severe, desiccation in accordance with BRE digest 412 from 500mm to 4000mm below ground level.

A survey of the drainage system at the property has been undertaken (in both 2014 and 2016) and some minor defects noted; however, Engineers have confirmed that they do not consider damaged or leaking drains to be a material cause of the current subsidence damage and soils analysis confirms this position.

Atterberg / Suction tests (2014 - 2016) demonstrate that the load bearing capacity of the soil has not been compromised by excessive water content due to leaking drains and is therefore capable of bearing the imposed load.

It should be noted that runs G and H (which lie under the main property (bathroom/lounge/kitchen) are free from defects; as such, the evidence available does not support the possibility that damage is a result of damaged or leaking drains.

In addition, level monitoring has confirmed soil recovery over the winter period; soil recovery serves to confirm that defective drainage is not a material cause of the subsidence.

In the opinion of expert engineers, defective drainage can be eliminated as a material factor in this instance; vegetation is therefore deemed to retain the capacity to be causal to the current movement / damage.

Site Investigations (2014) revealed the presence of functionally active *Ulmus* roots in TP/BH1 to a depth of 1500mm and 1900mm in TP/BH2; this depth is in excess of foundations which extend to a depth of 500mm in TP/BH1 and 1200mm in TP/BH2.

Functionally active *Acer spp* and *Ulmus spp* roots were also recovered in BH3 (2015) down to a depth of 3000mm below ground level.

Further (internal) site Investigations (ITP/BH4 (2016)) revealed the presence of numerous functionally active *Ulmus spp* roots to a depth of 3500mm and functionally active *Acer spp* roots to 2500mm; this depth is well in excess of internal foundations which extend to a depth of 300mm.

Our survey of the site identified T2 (Acer) and T3 (Elm), which, given their position relative to the damage it is our opinion that the roots identified emanate from these trees; there is no alternative, plausible source of the functionally active *Acer spp* and *Ulmus spp* roots other than T2 (Acer) and T3 (Elm).

Sample trial pits are generally small in size and the recovery of roots from such a small excavation leads us to conclude that these will not be isolated examples; there is significant potential for further root proliferation below the insured structure.

Please note: given its size and proximity to the insured property, T5 (Pear) was also considered to be causal (albeit in a limited / secondary capacity) and as such, this tree was removed.

Level monitoring has however, confirmed a persistent pattern of seasonal movement, which confirms the ongoing influence of retained vegetation.

The above assertion is supported by the results of level monitoring which has been undertaken since October 2014 with readings available through to September 2016.

Where vegetation is involved it produces a characteristic 'seasonal' pattern of foundation movement (subsidence through the summer, recovery through the winter); no other cause produces a similar pattern.

If it is occurring soil drying by vegetation must be involved, unless the foundations are less than 300mm in depth, which in this case they are not.

The results of this monitoring have confirmed soil recovery over the winter period; soil recovery serves to confirm that defective drainage is not a material cause of the subsidence.

The pattern of movement exhibited in this instance is clear and consistent with the known influence of vegetation; the peak amplitude of movement would appear to relate to stations 3, 4 and 9.

The above pattern of movement is not associated with any other cause of movement and serves to discount both defective drains and the assertions made by the Local Authority regarding underground streams softening the supporting subsoil (refer to ITP/BH4 which confirms the supporting subsoil to have adequate bearing capacity).

Arboricultural Consultancy for Aviva

If defective drains and excessive water content due to underground streams can be discounted (as the above site investigation confirm) then that only leaves one other likely cause of the movement, vegetation (and in particular trees).

Given the above, vegetation is clearly judged to be causal to the current movement/damage.

In assessing the extent of damage and the potential drying influence of the vegetation on site, T2 (Acer) and T3 (Elm) are deemed to be the dominant features and accordingly we have identified them as the principal cause of the subsidence.

Considering engineers conclusions, results of site investigations and our observations on site, vegetation management is considered appropriate with a view to restoring stability.

Please refer to Section 6 for management prescriptions.

In order to mitigate the current damage and allow soils beneath the property to recover to a position such that an effective engineering repair solution can be implemented we recommend a program of removals as listed by this report.

Whilst we have given consideration to pruning as a means of mitigating the vegetative influence of the above, this has been discounted.

Pruning is generally ineffective as the severity required to impact on the tree's water use often results in trees which no longer fulfil their visual amenity function.

Research (Hortlink 212 Project) has shown that any pruning must be extensive (well in excess of that advised within BS3998: Tree Works) and repeated every 2 years to have a sustained impact.

Whilst Certain species, can tolerate this approach (as is the case here) guarantees that the 2-year repeat pruning cycle will be adhered to cannot be provided, thereby rendering the long-term efficacy of this approach in doubt.

In accordance with the Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (Adopted 11th July 2011), the above pruning parameters are likely to be considered as 'unsympathetic' and as such the Council would generally resist this work.

Additionally, any application to reduce trees which have developed a natural shape and form will be resisted.

Given the above and in line with FSA Case study 59/10, and the terms of the insurance policy a long lasting remedy is required to stabilise the building, pruning (within likely acceptable parameters) is highly unlikely to offer the long-term solution required.

Removal of the above vegetation will therefore offer the most certain and reliable arboricultural solution likely to restore long-term stability.

The Local Authority consider the above trees to have a high level of visual amenity within the streetscape and to make a positive contribution to the character of this part of the Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area; this is not disputed.

However, the above trees are the principal and effective cause of the subsidence damage affecting 96 Haverstock Hill and this is affecting the resident's ability to enjoy the full use of their property free from damage/distress.

This view is supported by the recovery of moisture deficient clay subsoil from below confirmed foundations depths (even after winter soil rehydration) and functionally active *Acer spp* & *Ulmus spp* roots being recovered from within TP/BH1, TP/BH2, BH3 and ITP/BH4.

T2 (Acer) and T3 (Elm) are the only plausible source of these roots, whilst Level Monitoring has demonstrated a clear 'seasonal' pattern of movement which is consistent with the known influence of vegetation.

Given that foundations extend to a depth where the effects of seasonal climatic variations due to the weather cease to be of influence, it is our opinion that the movement demonstrated clearly confirms the role of vegetation, in this instance.

Estimated costs of repair to the building are £125,000 if an engineered solution is required (not including relocation costs and professional fees to bring the case to the lands tribunal).

Granting permission will limit these costs; for the avoidance of doubt, in the event of a further refusal our client will seek to secure compensation for the additional costs incurred through a section 202(E) claim.

It is the expert opinion of both the case engineer and arboriculturalist that on the balance of probabilities the supporting information clearly demonstrates the influence of the trees identified above.

Arboricultural Consultancy for Aviva

The level of pruning work required to impact of the trees water demands are such that the Local Authority are unlikely to sanction these works; with these predisposing factors, the retention of the above trees is considered unsuitable.

We consider the impact on the wider public amenity from the proposed tree works is mitigated by the presence of further trees within the immediate area and the scope for replacement planting.

Replacement planting of appropriate species could be carried out, the following trees being deemed suitable for this site / location: *Acer ginnala*, *Acer griseum*, *Catalpa bignonioides* 'Aurea', *Gleditsia triacanthos* 'Ruby Lace' or *Koelreuteria paniculata*.

We consider the impact on the wider public amenity from the proposed tree works is mitigated by the presence of further trees within the wider street scene and the scope for replacement planting.

It is our view that, in this case, the benefits of removing T2 (Acer) and T3 (Elm) far outweigh any harm to the amenity of the area.

Other than felling the trees, underpinning does offer a solution to the damage, but at a significant additional financial cost (which would be recovered from the Local Authority); a root barrier is not feasible due to onsite constraints.

We respectfully request that the Local Authority grants consent for the works detailed below.

Is vegetation likely to be a contributory factor in the current damage?	Yes
Is vegetation management likely to contribute to the future stability of the property?	Yes
Is replacement planting considered appropriate?	See Above
Would DNA profiling be of assistance in this case?	No

6.0 Recommendations (Revised)

6.1 Table 1 - Current Claim Requirements

These recommendations may be subject to review following additional site investigations

Tree No.	Species	Age Cat	Approx. Height (m)	Distance to Building (m)	Ownership	Action	Requirement
T2	Acer	1	17	8	F - Commercial Third Party	Remove	Remove and treat stump to inhibit regrowth.
T3	Elm	1	15	10.5 (to front elevation; 5.5m to front steps)	C - Insured	Remove	Remove and treat stump to inhibit regrowth.

Age Cat: 1 = Younger than property; 2 = Similar age to the property; 3 = Significantly older than property

6.2 Table 2 - Future Risk Recommendations

Tree No.	Species	Age Cat	Approx. Height (m)	Distance to Building (m)	Ownership	Action	Requirement
SG1	Mixed species group including Cordyline and Fern.	1	1	1	C - Insured	Action to avoid future risk	Do not allow to exceed current dimensions by way of regular pruning.
T1	Lime	1	16	10	A - Third Party 98 Haverstock Hill London NW3 2BD	Action to avoid future risk	Crown reduce by 3m - 4m all around and maintain at reduced dimensions by way of regular re-pruning (3-years max).
T4	Lime	1	11.5	16	A - Third Party 98 Haverstock Hill London NW3 2BD	Action to avoid future risk	Do not allow to exceed current dimensions by way of regular pruning.
T5	Pear	1	9	1	F - Commercial Third Party	No Action	No Works Removed by time of site visit (03/06/2016)


Arboricultural Consultancy for Aviva

TG1	Mixed species group	1	17	15	A - Third Party 100 Haverstock Hill London NW3 2BD	Action to avoid future risk	Reduce Beech to 14m in height and maintain at reduced dimensions. Do not allow Lime to exceed 12m max height current dimensions by way of regular pruning.
Age Cat: 1 = Younger than property; 2 = Similar age to the property; 3 = Significantly older than property							

* Estimated

Third party property addresses should be treated as indicative only, should precise detail be required then Environmental Services can undertake Land Registry Searches

7. Site Plan (Revised)




Please note that this plan is not to scale. OS Licence No. 100043218

Arboricultural Consultancy for Aviva

8. Photographs



T2 - Acer



T3 - Elm



T4 - Lime



SG1 - Mixed species group

Arboricultural Consultancy for Aviva



T5 - Pear

Arboricultural Consultancy for Aviva

Date: 08/06/2016

Property: 96 Haverstock Hill, London, NW3 2BD

9. Tree Works Reserve - Does not include recommendations for future risk.

Insured Property Tree Works	£1130
Third Party Tree Works	£2250
Provisional Sum	£0

- The above prices are based on works being performed as separate operations.
- The above is a reserve estimate only.
- Ownerships are assumed to be correct and as per Section 6.
- A fixed charge is made for Tree Preservation Order/Conservation Area searches unless charged by the Local Authority in which case it is cost plus 25%.
- Should treeworks be prevented due to statutory protection then we will automatically proceed to seek consent for the works and Appeal to the Secretary of State if appropriate.
- All prices will be subject to V.A.T., which will be charged at the rate applying when the invoice is raised.
- Trees are removed as near as possible to ground level, stump and associated roots are not removed or included in the price.
- Where chemical application is made to stumps it cannot always be guaranteed that this will prevent future re-growth. Should this occur we would be pleased to provide advice to the insured on the best course of action available to them at that time. Where there is a risk to other trees of the same species due to root fusion, chemical control may not be appropriate.

10. Limitations

This report is an appraisal of vegetation influence on the property and is made on the understanding that that engineers suspect or have confirmed that vegetation is contributing to clay shrinkage subsidence, which is impacting upon the building. Recommendations for remedial tree works and future management are made to meet the primary objective of assisting in the restoration of stability to the property. In achieving this, it should be appreciated that recommendations may in some cases be contrary to best Arboricultural practice for tree pruning/management and is a necessary compromise between competing objectives.

Following tree surgery we recommended that the building be monitored to establish the effectiveness of the works in restoring stability.

The influence of trees on soils and building is dynamic and vegetation in close proximity to vulnerable structure should be inspected annually.

The statutory tree protection status as notified by the Local Authority was correct at the time of reporting. It should be noted however that this may be subject to change and we therefore advise that further checks with the Local Authority MUST be carried out prior to implementation of any tree works. Failure to do so can result in fines in excess of £20,000.

Our flagging of a possible recovery action is based on a broad approach that assume all third parties with vegetation contributing to the current claim have the potential for a recovery action (including domestic third parties). This way opportunities do not "fall through the net"; it is understood that domestic third parties with no prior knowledge may be difficult to recover against but that decision will be fully determined by the client.

A legal Duty of Care requires that all works specified in this report should be performed by qualified, arboricultural contractors who have been competency tested to determine their suitability for such works in line with Health & Safety Executive Guidelines. Additionally all works should be carried out according to British Standard 3998:2010 "Tree Work. Recommendations".