

Arboricultural Consultancy for Aviva

Note: 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	Mr Peter White	Address	21 Cotham Grove, Bristol, BS6 6AN		
Client	Subsidence Management Services	Contact	Ben John	Claim No.	IFS-AVI-SUB-23-0106370
ES Ref	SA-253304	Consultant	Giles Mercer	Contact No.	0330 380 1036
Report Date	26/06/2023				

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.

2. Property and Damage Description

The insured structure is a four storey tenement building in multiple occupation; the property occupies a site that slopes gently downhill from front to rear.

We understand that the current damage is indicative of downward and rotational movement to the rear right hand corner of the property relative to the remainder of the building; all observations are referenced standing looking at the front of the property.

3. Technical Reports

No technical investigations are available at the time of reporting, therefore assumptions outlined in Note above apply: recommendations may be subject to change following evaluation of any investigations that may be forthcoming.

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

Treworks	
Local Authority	
TPO / Conservation Area / Planning Protection Searches	Awaiting Searches from LA
Additional Comments	
Awaiting Further Instructions.	
A potential recovery action has been identified.	
Engineers should consider focusing investigations to strengthen factual evidence for disclosure to third party tree owners.	

Arboricultural Consultancy for Aviva

5. Technical Synopsis

This report is based upon our understanding at the time of visiting the property that Subsidence Management Services have concluded, on a preliminary basis, that the current damage is due to differential foundation movement exacerbated by moisture abstraction from vegetation growing adjacent to the property's foundations.

We have therefore been instructed to assess the potential for vegetation to be influencing soil moisture levels beneath the foundations of the property and, if deemed appropriate provide management proposals which will return long-term stability and allow effective repairs to be undertaken.

The potential drying influence of the vegetation on site, has been considered based on an assessment of overall size, species profile and the proximity of vegetation relative to the advised area of damage.

Based on our observations on site, it is our opinion that the footings of the subject property are within the normally accepted influencing distance of vegetation on site, thereby indicating the potential for the advised damage to be the result of clay shrinkage subsidence exacerbated by the moisture abstracting influence of vegetation.

With due regards to species profile, size and proximity, the mixed species group (TG1) is considered the dominant feature proximate to the focal area(s) of movement and accordingly, where vegetation is confirmed as being causal, we have identified it as the primary cause of the current subsidence damage.

The size and proximity of the above vegetation is consistent with the advised location(s) of damage and it is our opinion, on balance of probability, that roots from the above vegetation will be in proximity to the footings of the insured property.

Note: additional minor vegetation has been noted on site and, depending on trial-pit location may be identified within future site investigations; however, unless specifically identified within this report, these plants are not deemed material to the current claim nor pose a significant future risk.

Given the above and considering the suspected mechanism of movement, in order to mitigate the current damage thereby allowing soils beneath the property to recover to a position such that an effective engineering repair solution can be implemented, we recommend a program of vegetation management as detailed by this report.

Please refer to Section 6 for management prescriptions.

Preliminary recommendations contained within this report are prescribed on the basis that site investigations confirm vegetation to be causal; management advice is designed to offer the most reliable arboricultural solution likely to restore long-term stability and also facilitate liaison with third-party owners and/or Local Authorities where necessary.

Consequently, we have advocated the complete removal of the mixed species group (TG1) as it will offer the most certain arboricultural solution likely to restore long-term stability.

Replacement planting is considered appropriate with regards mitigating the impact of the works suggested; however, species selection should be appropriate for the chosen site and consideration must be given to the ultimate size of the replacement species and any future management requirements.

We recommend the role of vegetation and the efficacy of management recommendations be qualified by means of monitoring.

Please note that the footing of the insured property fall within the anticipated rooting distance of additional vegetation which we believe presents a foreseeable risk of future damage and accordingly we have made recommendations in respect of this.

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

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?	Yes
Would DNA profiling be of assistance in this case?	No

Arboricultural Consultancy for Aviva

6.0 Recommendations

6.1 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
TG1	Mixed Species Group: includes apple, Ionicera, holly and prunus.	1	6.5	2	A - Third Party	Remove	Remove close to ground level and treat stumps to inhibit regrowth.
Age Cat: 1 = Younger than property; 2 = Similar age to the property; 3 = Significantly older than property							

* Estimated

6.2 Future Risk Recommendations


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
SG1	Mixed species shrubs: includes fatsia, elder, sycamore saplings and lilac.	1	3.1	2.5	E - Boundary Veg (ownership to be confirmed)	Action to avoid future risk	Maintain at, or below current dimensions by way of regular pruning.
T1	Cedar	1	16	9.6	A - Third Party	Action to avoid future risk	Maintain at broadly current dimensions by way of regular pruning.
T2	Lime	1	7	4	C - Insured	Action to avoid future risk	Maintain at, or below 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



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

Arboricultural Consultancy for Aviva

8. Photographs



TG1 - Mixed species group



TG1 - Mixed species group



SG1 - Mixed species shrubs



T2 - Lime

Arboricultural Consultancy for Aviva



T1 - Cedar



Front

Arboricultural Consultancy for Aviva

Date: 26/06/2023

Property: 21 Cotham Grove, Bristol, BS6 6AN

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

Insured Property Tree Works	£0.00
Third Party Tree Works	£900.00
Provisional Sum	£0.00

- 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 tree works 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 regrowth. 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".


GEOTECHNICAL

for Subsidence Management Services

21 Cotham Grove, Bristol, BS6 6AN

Client: Subsidence Management Services
Client Contact: Ben John
Client Ref: IFS-AVI-SUB-23-0106370
Policy Holder: Mr Peter A White
Report Date: 5 June 2023
Our Ref: C72838G32803

Site Plan





	Borehole		Foul Water Drain		Foul Manhole		Foul Rodding Point		Foul Vent Pipe
	Trial Pit / Borehole		Surface Water Drain		Rain Water Manhole		Surface Rodding Point		Rain Water Gully
	Trial Pit		Combined Drain		Combined Manhole				

TP/BH1 Foundation Detail and Borehole Log

Foundation Detail

Extension foundation comprised of blockwork wall to 470mm bgl, bearing on concrete to an estimated depth of 700mm bgl, with a total projection of 140mm from the elevation. Underside of foundation (USF) was estimated by pushing a probe, approximately 110mm back from the face of the foundation, at an angle with no apparent contact with the face of the foundation beyond the estimated depth.



Site Observations

HEALTH AND SAFETY:

Negative signal obtained in Power, Radio and Genny mode on the Cable Avoidance Tool (CAT) (TP/BH1).

BOREHOLE:

At 1.19m bgl borehole terminated due to Hand Auger and Mackintosh Probe (MP) refusal, thought to be sandstone layer in TP/BH1.

SOILS:

At 0.95m bgl becoming very stiff in TP/BH1.

ROOTS:

At 0.7m to 1.19m bgl rare roots of live appearance encountered and sampled in TP/BH1.

SOIL ANALYSIS

for Subsidence Management Services

21 Cotham Grove, Bristol, BS6 6AN

Client: Subsidence Management Services
Claim Number: 4502117016
Policy Holder: Mr Peter A White
Report Date: 22/06/2023
Our Ref: L26084

Compiled By:

Name	Position	Signature
Saira Dougan	Laboratory Technician	

Checked By:

Name	Position	Signature
Bob Walker	Laboratory Manager	

Date samples received: 31-May-23
Water Content Test Date: 08-Jun-23
Atterberg Limits Test Date: 20-Jun-23



9265

[Notes relating to soils testing](#)

Unless otherwise stated, all soil testing was undertaken by Environmental Services at unit 10H Maybrook Business Park, B76 1AL for SubsNetUK of Unit 4 Linnet Court, Cawledge Business Park, Alnwick, NE66 2GD

Soil samples have been prepared in accordance with BS1377:Part 1: 2016 Section 7

Descriptions of soil samples within the laboratory have been undertaken generally in accordance with BS5930:2015. Descriptions of soil samples fall outside of the scope of UKAS accreditation and may have been shortened to remove tertiary components for ease of reference.

The graphical representation of 40% of the LL and the numerical representation of the modified plasticity index (mod. PI) fall outside of the scope of UKAS accreditation.

Following the issue of this soil analysis report, samples will be retained for at least 28 days should additional testing, or referencing, be required. It should be noted that any tests undertaken on soils retained subsequent to the issue of this report may not give an accurate indication of the in-situ conditions of the sample.

This Soil Analysis Report may not be reproduced, in part or in full, without written approval of the laboratory.

The results contained herein relate only to items tested and no others. Additionally as the laboratory is not responsible for the sampling process it takes no responsibility for the condition of the samples and all samples are tested "as received".

Where samples of the same test type are not tested on the same day, or the testing spans multiple days, the test date states the day of the final test or the test date of the final sample.

All information above the laboratory reference on the cover page of this report are as provided by the customer and the laboratory is not responsible for any errors or omissions therein.

Water Content Tests are undertaken in accordance with ISO 17892:Part 1:2014

The Liquid Limit test is undertaken in accordance with BS1377:Part 2:1990 Section 4.4 using an 80g cone with a 30° tip. Sieve percentages reported in blue denote that the sample has been sieved otherwise it has been prepared from its natural state. Sieve percentage reported in BOLD denote that the sample has been oven-dried prior to testing.

Unless otherwise specified herein, the one-point cone penetrometer method has been used with increasing water content. Atterberg results depicted in green have not been tested and are duplicates of the preceding sample, included for reference only.


The Plastic Limit test and the determination of the Plasticity Index is undertaken in accordance with BS1377:Part 2:1990. Where a plastic limit has been denoted with an asterisk (*) then it has been derived from the liquid limit and has not been tested.

If you would like to provide feedback on this report or any laboratory services or performance, please complete the form below. All appropriate feedback will be used in the continual improvement of laboratory services.


[Laboratory feedback form](#)

Samples from BH1

Lab Ref	Depth (m)	WC (%)	LL (%)	PL (%)	PI (%)	.425 mm (%)	mod. PI (%)	Av. Suc. (kPa)	Description
1	0.8	24.7	55	24	31	91	28		Soft to firm grey-brown silty CLAY with rare gravel. Gravel is fine and medium.



Plasticity Chart for Casagrande Classification



Deviating Samples

The table below details any samples deviating from laboratory procedure or deviating in condition to an extent whereby the validity of results may be affected. A test denoted "I" is likely to have had testing abandoned but where a test result has been provided a non-standard procedure may have been used, details of which will be provided upon request.

LAB REF	CONDITION	WC	ATT	SUC	OED
1					

Key

- D Delay in sample receipt
- C Contaminated sample
- B Sample not bagged correctly
- S Sample too sandy (unsuitable for testing)
- G Sample too gravelly (unsuitable for testing)
- V Sample too soft (unsuitable for preparation)
- L Sample too silty
- I Insufficient sample
- O Too much organic content (unsuitable for testing)
- N Non-standard procedure used
- H Sample depth too shallow
- X Testing result too similar to above sample

References

The following provides a brief interpretation of the test results by comparison of the results to published classifications. The Atterberg Limit test may be used to classify the plasticity of soils; the plasticity classes defined in BS5930:2015 "Code of Practice for Site Investigations" are as follows.

- CL (ML) CLAY and CLAY/SILT of Low plasticity
- CI (MI) CLAY and CLAY/SILT of Intermediate plasticity
- CH (MH) CLAY and CLAY/SILT of High plasticity
- CV (MV) CLAY and CLAY/SILT of Very High plasticity
- CE (ME) CLAY and CLAY/SILT of Extremely High plasticity
- O The letter O is added to prefixes to symbolise a significant proportion of organic matter.
- NP Non-plastic

The Plasticity Index (PI) Result obtained from the Atterberg Limit tests may also be used to classify the potential for volume change of fine soils, in accordance with the National House Building Council's standards - Chapter 4.2 (2003) "Building Near Trees", as summarised below.

- | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Modified PI < 10 | Non Classified. |
| Modified PI = 10 to <20 | Low volume change potential. |
| Modified PI = 20 to <40 | Medium volume change potential. |
| Modified PI = 40 or greater | High volume change potential. |

The 2003 edition of Chapter 4.2 also permits use of the Plasticity Index without modification. The classifications for this are grouped by soil type (soils with similar visual soils description and using unmodified Plasticity Indices).

ROOT IDENTIFICATION

for Subsidence Management Services

21 Cotham Grove, Bristol, BS6 6AN

Client: Subsidence Management Services
Client Contact: Ben John
Claim Number: 4502117016
Client Reference: IFS-AVI-SUB-23-0106370
Policy Holder: Mr Peter A White
Report Date: 1 June 2023
Our Ref: R52843



Intec
Parc Menai, Bangor,
Gwynedd, North Wales
LL57 4FG
Tel: 01248 672652

Sub Sample	Species Identified	Root Diameter	Starch
TP/BH1:			
0.7-1.19m	Pomoideae gp.	1	4 mm Moderate

Comments:

1 - Plus 3 others also identified as Pomoideae gp.

Pomoideae gp include apple, cotoneaster, hawthorn, pear, pyracantha, quince, rowan, snowy mespil and whitebeam.

Signed: R. Shaw

Unless we are otherwise instructed in writing, the above sample material will normally be disposed of 6 years after the date of this report.

Drainage Investigation Report

For Subsidence Management Services

Client Aviva

Risk Address: 21 Cotham Grove, Bristol, BS6 6AN


Visit Date: 31st May 2023

Client Reference: IFS-AVI-SUB-23-0106370



















Our Reference: C72838 D25363

Report Date: 10/06/2023

Report Content: Front Page
Site Plan
Drain Overview



Key

	Tree		Building		Combined Drains		Unsurveyed Drains
	Shrubs		Water Supply		Foul Drains		Storm Drains
	Bushes		Launch Pit		WC		Excavation
	Boundary		Stop Valve		Exploratory Hole		Area of Concern
			Soak-Away		Bore Hole		

Notes:

Address:

21 Cotham Grove, Bristol, BS6 6AN

Following the receipt of your instruction, we attended site to carry out a CCTV survey.

Upon arrival, we could see no drainage runs within the area of concern. There was a SVP on the opposite side of the building which is taking all foul waste effluent from the rooms and a look-see CCTV survey showed this to run into a manhole and down the opposite side of the building.

Therefore, no further works are recommended.

	From	To	Result	Notes
Water Main Test	ESV	ISV	PASS	No drop in 10 minutes