Property Risk Inspection
LIMITED

ARBORICULTURAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

Risk Address: 23 Shepherds Hill, London, N6 5QJ

For:

Client: Sedgwick International UK
Insurer: [redacted]

Client Ref: 8714923.
Insurer Ref: [redacted]

Policy holder: [redacted]

PRI Ref: 249980

Arborist: Tom Swinburn

QC: Margaret MacQueen

Survey Date: 20/01/2023

QC Date: 23/01/2023

CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION AND BRIEF 3
2.0 LIMITATIONS 3
3.0 DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS 4
4.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 5
5.0 STATUTORY CONTROLS 5
6.0 APPENDIX 1: TREE TABLES 6
7.0 APPENDIX 2: SITE PLAN 9
8.0 APPENDIX 3: SITE PHOTOGRAPHS 10
9.0 APPENDIX 4: ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT & CO2e POLICY 17

1.0 INTRODUCTION AND BRIEF

1.1 Property Risk Inspection has been instructed on behalf of the building insurers of the insured property. We have been advised that the insured property has suffered differential movement and damage that is considered to have been caused by trees growing adjacent to the property influencing soils beneath its foundations.

1.2 We have been instructed to undertake a survey of the vegetation growing adjacent to the insured property in order to provide our opinion as to whether, based on the available information, any of this vegetation is likely to be influencing soil moisture levels beneath the foundations of the property, and if so, to provide recommendations as to what tree management could be implemented to effectively prevent damage continuing.

1.3 The vegetation growing adjacent to the risk address has been surveyed from the ground. All distances are measured to the nearest point of the risk address unless otherwise stated.

2.0 LIMITATIONS

2.1 Recommendations with respect to tree management are associated with the risk address as stated on the front cover of this report and following consultation with investigating engineers. The survey of trees and any other vegetation is associated with impacts on the risk address subject of this report. Matters of tree health, structural condition, and/or the safety of vegetation under third party control are specifically excluded. Third party land owners are strongly advised to seek their own professional advice as it relates to the health and stability of trees under their control.

2.2 Recommendations do not take account of any necessary permission (statutory or otherwise) that must be obtained before proceeding with any tree works.

2.3 Recommendations do not take account of any requirements for survey or mitigation relating to European or other protected species, e.g. bird nesting or bats. Land owners must obtain their own professional advice in respect of any protected species.

3.0 DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

3.1 Soils, soil water and vegetation

All vegetation requires water to live, and this water is substantially accessed from the soil within which the plants' roots grow.

If the soil is classified as a clay soil, then it will hold very much more water than sands, gravels and loam soils. As plants abstract water from the clay soil, the soil volume will "shrink" and "swell" during the summer as water is first removed and then added by summer rainfall. In years in which rainfall during the summer is less than the total amount of water taken from the soil by plants, shrinkage will occur. This shrinkage may remove support from building foundations, leading to cracking in the fabric of the building.

3.2 Vegetation management

The control of trees, shrubs, and climbers, by removal or pruning as appropriate, are proven techniques that can control total soil water loss thereby minimising soil shrinkage and allowing repairs to proceed.

If vegetation management works are carried out promptly, then repairs can usually proceed very quickly and the duration and distress associated with the disruption that tree related subsidence brings can be minimised.

3.3 Third party liaison and statutory controls

Tree roots do not respect physical or property boundaries and can travel for many metres beyond the above ground "dripline" of the canopy of the vegetation.

The purpose of this report is to ascertain which vegetation is the most likely substantial and/or effective contributory cause of the damage witnessed to allow for liaison with third parties or with local administrative Councils as necessary.

3.4 Evidential framework

The engineer has determined on a preliminary basis the damage to the property, its location and the likely mechanism of movement, and has concluded that the building failure is related to differential subsidence damage caused as a result of the action of vegetation. Where a factual geotechnical report has been completed, this will describe the below ground foundation design, soil and geotechnical conditions, as well as any root identification where available.

4.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Recommendations

On the basis of our findings, we have considered a practical vegetation management specification.

This specification will assist in reducing the impact of the adjacent vegetation on soil moisture levels, thereby potentially stabilising foundations of the affected area of the building.

Where felling has been proposed, this will be on the basis that the vegetation in question would not respond well to a severe reduction in leaf area that would inevitably lead to decay, the development of potential hazards, and an annual or other on-going management commitment and cost.

If pruning is recommended, the specification will be designed to allow continual ease of re-pruning with a reasonable prospect of a reduction in soil water use.

4.2 Recommended vegetation management to address the current subsidence:

Tree No:	Species	Works Required
T2	Sycamore	Fell and treat stump with eco plugs(broadleaved).
T5	Willow (Goat)	Fell and treat stump with eco plugs (broadleaved).
T8	Sycamore	Fell and treat stump with eco plugs (broadleaved).

5.0 STATUTORY CONTROLS

Haringey London Borough Council has confirmed that none of the implicated vegetation is subject to a Tree Preservation Order. However, there are Conservation Area controls.

6.0 APPENDIX 1: TREE TABLES

Tree No	Common Name	Age Class	Condition	Height (m)	Crown Spread (m)	Stem diam. (mm)	Dist to bldg. (m)	Roots Implicated	Pruning history	Recommendation	Tree work constraints	Notes	Owner address	Owner
H1	Mixed species hedge	Mature	Good	6	2	80*	4.5	N	Subject to past management.	No work required.		Laurel and Pittosporum	21 Shepherds Hill London N6 5QJ	P3P
S1	Photinia	Young	Good	6*	3.0	100	5.5	N	No significant past tree works.	No work required.		Checked and agreed 20.1.23	23 Shepherds Hill London N6 5QJ	PH
SG1	Mixed species shrubs	Mature	Good	4	4	50	10	N	Subject to past management.	No work required.		Cherry Laurel, Viburnum, and Elder.	23 Shepherds Hill London N6 5QJ	PH
ST2	Ash	N/A	DD	0*	0	180	2	N	Felled as per recommendations.	No work required.		Checked and amended 20.1.23	23 Shepherds Hill London N6 5QJ	PH
ST1	Ash	N/A	DD	0	0	140	2	N	Felled as per recommendations.	No work required.		Checked and amended 20.1.23	23 Shepherds Hill London N6 5QJ	PH
T1	Chestnut	Mature	Fair	18*	10	810	11.5	N	Subject to past management.	No work required.		Checked and agreed 20.1.23	23 Shepherds Hill London N6 5QJ	PH

Tree No	Common Name	Age Class	Condition	Height (m)	Crown Spread (m)	Stem diam. (mm)	Dist to bldg. (m)	Roots Implicated	Pruning history	Recommendation	Tree work constraints	Notes	Owner address	Owner
T2	Sycamore	Mature	Good	22*	11.0	820	9	Y	Subject to past reduction management (within last 3years).	Fell and treat stump.	Access through side/rear gate.	Checked and agreed 20.1.23	23 Shepherds Hill London N6 5QJ	PH
T3	Pine	Mature	DD	27*	10	700	17	N	No significant past tree works.	No work required.	Access through side/rear gate. Unsafe tree - not easily climbed.	Majority of tree is dead. Should be removed for H&S. Checked and amended 20.1.23	23 Shepherds Hill London N6 5QJ	PH
T4	Cedar	Mature	Fair	25*	9.0	650	17	N	No significant past tree works.	No work required.		Large amount of deadwood present in crown. Checked 20.1.23	23 Shepherds Hill London N6 5QJ	PH
T5	Willow (Goat)	Mature	Fair	8*	5.0	600*	6.4	N	Subject to past management.	Fell and treat stump with eco plugs (broadleaved).	Access through side/rear gate.	Checked and amended 20.1.23	21 Shepherds Hill London N6 5QJ	P3P
T8	Sycamore	Mature	Good	18*	6	650*	10.5*	Y	Subject to past reduction management (within last3years).	Fell and treat stump with eco plugs (broadleaved).	Access through side/rear gate.	Checked and amended 20.1.23	25 Shepherds Hill London N6 5QJ	P3P

Tree No	Common Name	Age Class	Condition	Height (m)	Crown Spread (m)	Stem diam. (mm)	Dist to bldg. (m)	Roots Implicated	Pruning history	Recommendation	Tree work constraints	Notes	Owner address	Owner
T9	Yew	Mature	Good	8	6	200	13	N	No significant past tree works.	No work required.			23 Shepherds Hill London N6 5QJ	PH
T10	Ash	Semi-Mature	Good	10	4	180	10.8	N	No significant past tree works.	No work required.			23 Shepherds Hill London N6 5QJ	PH
T11	Lime	Semi-Mature	Good	5	1.0	100	7	N	No significant past tree works.	No work required.			23 Shepherds Hill London N6 5QJ	PH
T12	Sycamore	Semi-Mature	Good	4	2	100	7	N	Subject to past management.	No work required.		Previously coppiced stump.	25 Shepherds Hill London N6 5QJ	P3P

* Value is estimated

7.0 APPENDIX 2: SITE PLAN



Location: 23 Shepherds Hill, London, N6 5QJ

Job Ref: 249980

Survey Date: 20/01/2023 – NTS

By Property Risk Inspection - Insurance Services

8.0 APPENDIX 3: SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

	
T1 – Chestnut (January 2020)	T2 - Sycamore (January 2020)
	
TG1 - Red robin (January 2020)	T3 - Sycamore (January 2020)

T3 - Cedar (January 2020)	T3 - Cedar (January 2020)
	
T4 - Cedar (January 2020)	T5 - False Acacia (January 2020)



ST2 - Ash (January 2020)



ST1 - Ash (January 2020)

T1 - Chestnut

T1 - Chestnut

S1 - Photinia

T2 - Sycamore

T2 - Sycamore

T2 - Sycamore

T3 - Pine

T3 - Pine

T3 - Pine

T4 - Cedar

T4 - Cedar

T8 - Sycamore

T8 - Sycamore

T5 - Willow (Goat)

T5 - Willow (Goat)

T5 - Willow (Goat)

ST2 - Ash

ST2 - Ash

ST1 - Ash

ST2 - Ash

T9 - Yew

T10 - Ash

SG1 - Mixed species shrubs

H1 - Mixed species hedge



H1 - Mixed species hedge

T11 - Lime

T11 - Lime

T12 - Sycamore

Front	

9.0 APPENDIX 4: ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT & CO2e POLICY

Tree removal as a remedy for subsidence of low-rise buildings

When subsidence occurs to a residential home which has foundations within clay soils one common cause of movement is the presence of trees, hedges and other vegetation removing moisture from the clay causing a shrinkage of the soil and downward movement of foundations.

There are a variety of ways in which subsidence of low-rise buildings can be mitigated and this report details the vegetation options that can be implemented and that should effectively deal with the cause of movements.

It is acknowledged that removal of trees has impacts on visual amenities for owners and the wider community and that trees play an important role in our towns, cities, and the countryside in a variety of positive ways.

Trees are not recommended for removal without a clear understanding of all these impacts and increasingly of the importance of due consideration relating to the climate crisis, of global climate change and of potential negative impacts in the UK and abroad.

The subsidence event must be remedied to secure the property, its energy efficiency and weather tightness, to maintain its saleability and suitability for mortgage or re-mortgage finance if sold and as a requirement of the insurers commitment under the terms of the policy.

In considering a vegetation remedy the insurer, their advisors and arboricultural specialists are seeking to minimise impacts to the policyholder, to remedy the cause of movement quickly and effectively, and allow subsequent repairs to commence without risk of recurrence of damage. To simply leave the property exposed to intermittent periods of repair based on dry periods would also be hugely disruptive to homeowners and costly in repeat super-structural repairs, vehicle movements, materials and other claim costs in CO2e production and would not comply with a Net Zero agenda.

If vegetation management is not possible or was unsuccessful other remedies that might be attempted whether property underpinning, extensive root barriers or other soil and ground stabilisation have their own issues and impacts. Not least of these is the cost to the environment in CO2e generation from creation of cement and cement substitutes, of steel and other metals production, from costs in plastics and then the material transport, insertion, and excavation effort with heavy machinery.

A single tree removal on a site has a relatively modest annual impact on the CO2e budget loss for a site subject to subsidence of around 25kg CO2e per tree per annum. The cost in total of materials and fuel in tree removal are significantly less than 100kg CO2e.

Heavy engineering and ground stabilisation solutions can range in impacts from around 3000kg CO2e to 10,000kg CO2e in carbon cost and are often difficult to effectively mitigate relative to tree management.

However, this is not simply a “site” consideration and insurers and their advisors through PRI are committed to replace every tree lost on a subsidence scheme in sustainable forests and reforestation projects across the globe with thousands of trees already planted and through carbon reduction investments that stop CO2e being generated to have immediate positive impacts whilst new trees grow.

It’s always sad to see a tree lost but we ensure that the loss is mitigated and replaced with new trees, and this avoids heavy engineering solutions far more costly to the planet. You can learn more about our work in tree planting, climate change and carbon capture by visiting our web site at: www.propertyrisk.co.uk.

Property Risk Inspection LIMITED

SME Climate Hub COMMITTED 2022

Ecologi

Property Risk Inspection

LIMITED

Insurance Services

2 The Courtyards

Phoenix Square

Wyncolls Road

Colchester

Essex CO4 9PE

01206 752539

insurance@propertyriskinspection.co.uk

www.propertyriskinspection.co.uk