Tree Care Company

ARBORICULTURAL CONTRACTORS & CONSULTANTS

Tree report to inform Mortgage/Insurance Proposal
102 Dodworth Road, Barnsley

Report reference: MS-1025-1
Client: Mrs Naressi

March 2013

Consulting Arborist Society.com
PROFESSIONAL MEMBER

ConsultingArboristSociety.com
Professional Member
A.M.I.U.G
Mortgage, Insurance & Homebuyers Tree Reports

Introduction

1. Tree Care Company were instructed by Mrs Naressi to inspect a line of mature Lime trees located at the above address. Following a site inspection a report has been written to evaluate the condition of the trees and the potential risk of direct or indirect damage occurring to surrounding built structures.

Limitations of the Report

2. Climate conditions including storm, drought and temperature-related factors can cause damage and failure in apparently healthy trees. It should be remembered that all trees do pose a risk, whilst every effort has been made to detect any major defects in inspected trees, no guarantee can be given as to their safety.

3. Any observations made by the author with regard to the condition of built structures are from a lay person's view.

Site Visit

4. A visual inspection of the trees and their surroundings was completed on 15th March 2013. The recorded information has been formulated into a schedule and attached in appendix 1. This report should be read in conjunction with the site plan attached in appendix 2. The survey was undertaken by Mike Shackleton who has over 12 years experience within the Arboricultural Industry. He has a Higher National Diploma in Arboriculture, a City and Guilds Level 2 awarded in Arboriculture and is a Professional member of the Arboricultural Association. He is a member of the Consulting Arborist Society (CAS) and has completed its Home Buyers Tree Report course. As part of his continuing professional development he regularly attends seminars and training events on issues relating to Arboriculture, particularly with trees in relation to construction.

5. The weather at the time of inspection was wet with no visibility constraints.

6. The site visit was unaccompanied with the exception of a brief conversation with Mrs Naressi.

Provided Documents

7. A report completed by Marishal Thompson in April 2012 (MI/280312109/JG) was provided which relates to Subsidence issues at a neighbouring property, 32 Derby Street.

Site Description

8. The property consists of a large detached building which currently houses Puccini's restaurant. A large tarmac car park is situated to the East of the main building. A raised garden area is located to the South of the building. The trees included in the survey are sited along the Southern boundary of the property, within the car park and garden area. A boundary wall (approximately 1.5-2.0m in height) separates the trees from the neighbouring highway. There is alteration in levels between the raised garden and the highway of approximately 0.5m.

Soil Assessment

9. No soil assessments have been completed on this occasion. From assessing the information included within the Marishal Thompson report, it is suggested that a shrinkable clay is present around the rear garage of 32 Derby Street. It could therefore be assumed that the above property could potentially be built on ground containing shrinkable clay.

Trees Appraisal

10. The survey included 8 early-mature Limes trees and a number of smaller ornamental species. Collectively the trees could be described as being in good health.

11. A list of prescribed work has been included with the tree schedule located in the appendices.

12. The majority of the Lime trees have recently been pruned. This work has included crown lifting operations which has left a number of poor pruning stubs. It has been recommended that these stubs are removed.

13. The trees also contain an amount of dead wood. In the event of high winds such material would be liable to fracture and possibly fail. As the trees are located within a car park it would be advisable to also have the dead wood removed.

14. Some of the trees crowns are encroaching over neighbouring property. It is likely local residents have complained about the possible nuisance the trees cause. It may be prudent to have the offending branches shortened so they do not overhang surrounding property. It has also been recommended that lower branches are raised over the highway to gain 5.2m of clearance.

15. It would appear that T6, T7 and T8 have been 'Topped' or heavily reduced in the past. Subsequently their crowns have redeveloped. No obvious structural weaknesses where present around the newly formed unions.

16. T7 also appears to display an area of necrotic bark or delamination between the sapwood and outer bark. This possibly could be the result of fire damage.

At present the wound is only believed to be cosmetic but should be inspected on a regular basis to determine if any deterioration has occurred.

Direct/Indirect Damage Assessment

17. Tree related damage to a building can be caused in two ways, indirectly or directly. Indirect damage arises from water uptake by roots on shrinkable soil. A shrinkable soil is one that changes volume with variations of water content. Where such a soil has dried sufficiently the ground may contract in volume and subside. Any structure not robust enough to accommodate this movement may be damaged. Direct damage is where there is physical contact between the tree and structures arising from normal growth of roots or aerial parts. If tree related damage is occurring, often effective early removal will stabilise the situation at little cost.

    For subsidence to occur the following three factors must be apparent:

    - The soil which the property is built on must be of a shrinkable nature (clay soils)
    - Trees of a substantial size need to be present within the local vicinity and require enough moisture to alter the soils located beneath the foundations
    - The foundations need to be of inadequate size to allow tree roots to grow below

18. As mentioned previously, no soil assessments have been undertaken but from reviewing the provided documentation it could be reasonable to presume a shrinkable clay could be present within the superficial layers below the property.

19. The property is not believed to be within the immediate 'zone of influence' of the trees included in the survey. It should be considered that the presence of manmade root barriers to the South will probably have caused unsymmetrical rooting development, forcing roots to spread in a more Northern direction.

20. No details of the properties foundations have been provided on this occasion. No visible signs of structural movement were present on the day of inspection.

21. The Lime trees have been planted in close proximity to the neighbouring retaining wall/boundary wall. The wall adjacent to T7 and T8 shows some signs of movement that could be associated with development of either tree rooting systems. At present the damage is not believed to be significant but it is recommended that it is assessed by a suitable qualified structural engineer.

22. A number of trees are located within the influencing distance of surrounding properties garages.

23. With reference to the Marishal Thompson report regarding structural damage at 32 Derby Street, it has been noted that the trees located at the above address are not believed to be contributing to the damage sustained to the properties garage but could potentially alter the moisture content of the soil in the future. The report recommends that trees within 20m should not 'exceed current dimensions'.

24. The trees located within 20m of the damaged garage are situated within the raised garden area of the restaurant. An alteration in soil levels of approximately 0.5-0.7m is present between the garden area and highway. The area between the damaged garage and the trees consists of non-porous manmade structures which would be unfavourable in comparison to the lawned garden area.



Figure 1 – Highlights the approximate soil level.

25. The majority of a tree's roots are situated within the first 600mm of soil. The wall is estimated to predate the trees and therefore would have acted as a root barrier during their formative years. From evaluating the site it is anticipated that the combination of the wall, alterations in topography and variance in land use would alter root disposition to have formed within the garden area.

26. Restricting the trees growth would require significant crown reduction work. Initially such drastic work could possibly lower the moisture intake of the trees but would have an adverse effect once the trees recover from the primary shock. In effect dramatic pruning would exacerbate the trees moisture requirements.

Conclusion

27. No evidence of vegetation related subsidence is present to the above property.

28. Although minor remedial pruning works have been recommended, the trees could be classed as being in good condition and vitality.

29. Currently there is insufficient evidence to suggest the trees located within the above address have or may contribute to the vegetation related subsidence at 32 Derby Street.

30. The recommended tree work included within this report should be carried out by a suitably qualified, experienced and insured contractor. The contractor

should carry out the work in accordance with the recommendations contained in the BS 3998: 2010 '*Tree Work Recommendations*'.

31. It is understood that the mature trees are protected by a Tree Preservation Order. Statutory permission is required before any tree work recommended within this report can take place.

32. At the present time the author sees no Arboricultural reasons to prevent insurance or mortgage to this property.

Yours Sincerely

Mike Shackleton H.N.D Arb, m.arbor.a

Appendix 1- Explanation of Survey Details & Tree Schedule

Tree Id	Each tree/group has been given a unique number, which coincides with drawing 1 located in appendix 2. Where specifically instructed small durable numbered metal tags will be applied to each tree/group surveyed.
Species & Botanical n	Where identifiable the full botanical name has been given. Where a cultivar, variety or species cannot be accurately given the genus name only will be given.
Age	Is described as young, semi-mature, mature, early mature or over mature.
Height (m)	This is measured approximately to the nearest 1m. If height issues are critical, measurements can be collected accurately using optical instruments.
Stem Dia (mm)	The diameter of the given tree at 1.3m above soil level, (on sloping ground taken on the up-slope side of the tree base). Where the tree is multi-stemmed measurements will be taken below the junction where possible.
Crown Spread	Indicates the crown radius from the base of tree in four compass directions, recorded to the nearest metre.
Distance from Property	The distance between the vegetation's stem/s to the nearest section of the property.
NHBC Water Demands	As advocated in the NHBC Standards Chapter 4.2 2008. Each species has been allocated a water demand described as Low, Medium and High.
NHBC Zone of Influence	The distance in metres which a species is possible of inflicting direct, in-direct damage to a structure.
Comments	Narrative comment on general condition, significant defects and overall appearance (e.g. the presence of any decay).
Work Priority:	
1.	Work that should be completed immediately to minimise the risk of injury or property damage.
2.	Work of a high priority that should be undertaken within the first twelve months after the date of the published report.
3.	Work of a low priority usually recommended for aesthetics or good Arboricultural practice, rather than risk management.

Tree ID	Species, Botanical Name	Age Class	Estimated Height (m)	D.B.H (cm)	Crown Spread (m)	Distance from Property (m)	NHBC Water Demands	Zone of Influence (m)	Comments	Action	Priority
T1	Common Lime, *Tilia X europea*	Early-mature	16	53	5	27	Moderate	11	Epicormic growth at base. Poor previous pruning stubs, ivy beginning to climb stem and major dead wood.	Crown clean & Crown lift over highway to 5.2m.	2
T2	Common Lime, *Tilia X europea*	Early-mature	16	46	5	23	Moderate	11	Well formed tree with poor previous pruning wounds and major dead wood present.	Crown clean & Crown lift over highway to 5.2m.	2
T3	Common Lime, *Tilia X europea*	Early-mature	16	26	2	20	Moderate	11	Crown spread dictated by neighbouring trees causing unbalanced crown. Poor previous pruning stubs.	Remove stubs.	2
T4	Common Lime, *Tilia X europea*	Early-mature	18	47	5	17	Moderate	11	Unbalanced crown with visible major dead wood. Crown overhangs neighbouring property and low limb present over car park.	Crown clean & Crown lift over highway to 5.2m and remove limb over car park.	2

Tree ID	Species, Botanical Name	Age Class	Estimated Height (m)	D.B.H (cm)	Crown Spread (m)	Distance from Property (m)	NHBC Water Demands	Zone of Influence (m)	Comments	Action	Priority
T5	Common Lime, *Tilia X europea*	Early-mature	18	35	4	17	Moderate	11	Crown overhangs neighbouring property and major dead wood present.	Crown clean & Crown lift over highway to 5.2m and remove limb over car park.	2
T6	Common Lime, *Tilia X europea*	Early-mature	17	46	5	16	Moderate	11	History of extensive pruning or 'topping'. Major dead wood present.	Crown clean & Crown lift over highway to 5.2m.	2
T7	Common Lime, *Tilia X europea*	Early-mature	18	46	4	14	Moderate	11	History of extensive pruning or 'topping'. Major dead wood present. Necrotic bark or delamination.	Crown clean and re-inspect on a biannual basis.	2
T8	Common Lime, *Tilia X europea*	Early-mature	19	57	5	14	Moderate	11	History of extensive pruning or 'topping'. Major dead wood present and small pockets of decay forming in pruning wounds.	Crown clean &	2

Tree ID	Species, Botanical Name	Age Class	Estimated Height (m)	D.B.H (cm)	Crown Spread (m)	Distance from Property (m)	NHBC Water Demands	Zone of Influence (m)	Comments	Action	Priority
G9	Group containing Birch, Sorbus & Cherry	Semi-mature	>10	>20	N/A	>10	Moderate-Low	>7	Group of small ornamental trees with no visible defects. Growing in close proximity to neighbouring wall.	Client wishes for the Birch to be removed.	2

Appendix 2 Site Plan

