

Arboricultural Report for

Mortgage & Insurance

10 Malvern Grove
Manchester
M20 1HT



CLIENT:	Mrs Fereshteh McConville
CLIENT REF:	PO-01132
MWA REF:	MR220908-679
MWA CONSULTANT:	Monica Gillespie Bsc (Hons) Msc, MArborA, Cbiol MRSB Tech Cert (Arbor A)
REPORT DATE:	20/09/2022

1.0 Introduction and Scope

- 1.1 This report has been commissioned by the prospective purchasers of the subject property, 10 Malvern Grove, Manchester, M20 1HT. The survey was carried out on 20/9/2022.
- 1.2 The scope of the survey is limited to a visual assessment of the trees. The trees were not climbed and assessed from ground level only.
- 1.3 The brief is to appraise risk with respect to potential direct/indirect damage to the building and surrounding above ground infrastructure from trees/shrubs. Assessment of 3rd party trees may be limited by lack of direct access to the property and relevant vegetation.
- 1.4 The report provides details of tree/vegetation data, a location plan and recommendations to inform potential lenders, insurers, prospective purchasers or current owners of the subject property.
- 1.5 This report is not a Tree Risk Management Report or a Hazard Analysis Report and should not be used as such.
- 1.6 The report refers to the condition of the trees and an assessment of the site on the day that the survey was undertaken.
- 1.7 Our survey of the trees is of a preliminary nature. The assessment of tree health/condition is based on the industry standard method of Visual Tree Assessment (VTA) and no invasive or destructive tests have been undertaken. The report is valid only for typical weather conditions. Healthy trees or parts of healthy trees may fail in normal weather conditions although the risk is significantly increased in storm conditions and as the consequences of such weather phenomena are unforeseeable, MWA Arboriculture Ltd cannot be held liable for any such failures.
- 1.8 Trees are dynamic structures that can never be guaranteed to be 100% safe; even those in good condition can suffer damage or failure under average conditions. Regular inspections by suitably qualified professionals will help to identify potential problems before they become acute. Any alteration to the subject site or any development could change the current circumstances and may invalidate this report.
- 1.9 A lack of recommended work does not imply that a tree is safe and likewise it should not be implied that a tree will be made safe following the completion of any recommended work.
- 1.10 Any legal description or other information given to MWA Arboriculture Ltd is assumed to be accurate.

- 1.11 We have not been made aware of any current structural problems with the property. We understand there have been no insurance claims made in relation to structural movements, subsidence, other defects or damage. If any information to suggest that the property has/is suffering from any structural defects is available, we would ask that this is released to us for consideration.
- 1.12 We have not carried out any ground investigations or retrieved soil / root samples for testing.
- 1.13 Any alteration or deletion from this report shall invalidate it as a whole.
- 1.14 The potential for trees to damage buildings and light structures (patios, retaining walls etc.) can be broadly categorised into two actions:

Direct damage:

This includes damage caused by falling branches or whole trees, the physical displacement of built structures/hard surfacing by tree roots, branches and main stems. Direct damage also includes the blocking of drains by tree roots.

Indirect damage:

This is usually associated with the abstraction of moisture by tree roots from cohesive plastic clay soils below the foundations. This process may result in shrinkage of the soil and differential foundation movement resulting in cracks in the building. The presence of a shrinkable clay soil is required for this type of damage to occur.

Clay shrinkage subsidence damage related to moisture abstraction by trees and other vegetation is not predictable and there are numerous variables which may contribute to the occurrence of subsidence related to vegetation influence including the size, distance and soil drying potential of trees and shrubs, soil properties, foundation depths and weather. This report aims to identify risk where significant vegetation is present however this does not mean that damage is inevitable where an enhanced risk from vegetation is present.

This report should not be relied upon as a definitive assessment of current and or future subsidence risk but should be interpreted and utilised as a guide for current owners, purchasers, mortgage lenders and buildings insurers based on the factual information available.

2.0 Property Description

- 2.1 The property comprises a semi-detached 2 storey house built Circa 1970 with a garage and porch which may be later additions to the original structure.
- 2.2 External areas comprise gardens to the front and rear.
- 2.3 The site is generally level with no adverse topographical features.

3.0 Supporting Documents

- 3.1 No technical reports relating to the structural condition of the property, information on foundation depths or subsoil characteristics have been provided.

4.0 Geology / Soils

- 4.1 Reference has been made to the British Geological Survey maps for an indicative guide to underlying soil characteristics. The on line 1:50 000 scale map records the bedrock geology as Wilmslow sandstone Formation. Superficial deposits are recorded as Glaciofluvial sheet deposits, Devensian Sand and Gravel. Historical boreholes in the general area identify the potential presence of superficial deposits of Sand and Gravel of varying depths overlaying sandy clay. This is most likely boulder Clay.
- 4.2 The National Soil Resources Institute's Natural Perils Directory identifies this area as being dominated by soils with a moderate clay related ground movement potential. In hot, dry periods, or in areas with large trees / vegetation, soil shrinkage is may occur.
- 4.3 Site specific soil characteristics and index properties (shrink/swell potential) can only be determined by sample testing in a laboratory.

5.0 Services

- 5.1 No information relating to the services has been provided. No information or reports relating to the condition of the drains has been made available. Manhole covers have not been lifted or any other inspection of the drains made.

6.0 Appraisal

- 6.1 The property curtilage contains only minor trees/vegetation, with only TG1 falling under the control of the property. Remaining significant nearby trees are all third party owned and beyond the control of the subject property, and as such are recorded for advisory purposes only.

There is a large mature street tree located to the front of the property, Lime (T1). To the rear are 3 Lombardy Poplars (T2-T4) located in the rear gardens of adjacent properties. The inspection of these trees was limited to what could be viewed from the subject property. Trees T5, T6 and T7 (Holly, Cherry and Cypress) are located in the 10a Malvern Grove.

Any shrubs or trees not recorded are considered not to be a risk to the building, its occupants or visitors.

- 6.2 In terms of the risk of direct damage from whole or part tree failure this is currently assessed as low. No indications of poor health or disease were observed, or significant defects noted which may compromise the structural stability of the trees. On this basis no remedial works to address safety issues are considered necessary at this time. However, these are large mature trees and the owners of the trees should ensure that they are regularly inspected and maintained.
- 6.3 No excavations to confirm soil characteristics have been carried out. The online 1:50,000 British Geological Survey map shows the property to be on a bedrock geology of Wilmslow sandstone. Superficial deposits are recorded as Glaciofluvial sheet deposits, Devensian Sand and Gravel which may include a clay component capable of undergoing volumetric change with changes in soil moisture content and as such moisture abstraction by tree roots may affect soil volumes below the foundations where a significant clay component is present, potentially resulting in building movement (subsidence). This can only be properly determined by site investigations and the testing of soil samples.
- 6.4 Reference to the National Soil Resources Institute's Natural Perils Directory identifies this area as being dominated by soils with a moderate clay related ground movement potential. Given the likely presence of sand and gravel clay related soil shrinkage is unlikely to be extensive in the area and as such the risk of subsidence associated with soil drying by tree/vegetation roots is not considered significant.
- 6.5 Without site specific information on subsoil soil characteristics (site investigations would be needed to determine this) and foundation depth and design however, a definitive appraisal of tree related subsidence risk cannot be given other than to identify where a risk may or may not be present.

- 6.6 Based on the above and the information currently available to us, the potential for root induced subsidence damage is considered to be low and, on this basis, no remedial works are considered necessary beyond that of normal routine maintenance. As the trees will have had the potential to exert an indirect influence on the property for many years, were the property vulnerable to root induced clay shrinkage subsidence we would expected this to have happened by now. We are not aware of any previous subsidence claims or damage which suggests the risk to be low. The large poplars T2, T3 and T4 and the lime T1 are all within influencing distance of the building, however, are beyond the control of the subject property
- 6.7 Trees are dynamic structures and should be subject to regular inspection by a competent person to assess their physiological condition and structural stability. Regular inspection of the trees should be made and promptly should any signs of ill health, disease or damage be observed.
- 6.8 Based on the current information available to us and our own site appraisal, in our opinion there are no major arboricultural issues to be addressed at this time.

7.0
Table 1
Tree Details

Age Range		Y - Young SM – Semi-mature EM - Early Mature M - Mature						
Tree No.	Species	Height (m)	Dia. (mm)	Approx. Crown Spread (m)	Dist. to structure (m)	Condition	Age Range	Ownership
T1	Lime	22	900*	14	7.4	Good	Mature	Local Authority
Observations & Management History		No recent management noted.						
Recommendation		Local Authority owned tree, beyond the control of the subject property						
T2	Lombardy Poplar	25 *	1200 *	8	7.5	Good	Mature	Third Party
Observations & Management History		No recent management noted.						
Recommendation		Third Party owned trees, beyond the control of the subject property						
T3	Lombardy Poplar	25 *	1000 *	7	8	Good	Mature	Third Party
Observations & Management History		No recent management noted.						
Recommendation		Third Party owned trees, beyond the control of the subject property						
T4	Lombardy Poplar	25 *	1000 *	7	10	Good	Mature	Third Party
Observations & Management History		No recent management noted.						
Recommendation		Third Party owned trees, beyond the control of the subject property						
T5	Holly	5 *	200 *	3	4	Good	Semi-Mature	Third Party
Observations & Management History		Recently reduced/pruned.						
Recommendation		Third Party owned trees, beyond the control of the subject property						

Tree No.	Species	Height (m)	Dia. (mm)	Approx. Crown Spread (m)	Dist. to structure (m)	Condition	Age Range	Ownership
T6	Cherry	6 *	300 Ms *	8	8	Good	Semi-Mature	Third Party
Observations & Management History		Recently reduced/pruned.						
Recommendation		Third Party owned trees, beyond the control of the subject property						
T7	Cypress	7 *	300 *	7	10	Good	Semi-Mature	Third Party
Observations & Management History		Recently reduced/pruned.						
Recommendation		Third Party owned trees, beyond the control of the subject property						
TG1	Mixed coniferous group	2 *	50*	3	6	Poor	Young	Subject Property
Observations & Management History		No recent management noted.						
Recommendation		Maintain close to existing dimensions by regular pruning						

* Estimated value

8.0 Site Plan



Plan Indicative only

9.0 Photographic record



View of T1



View of T2 – T4 from Malvern Grove



View of T2 and TG1 from rear garden.



View of T6 and T5



View of T7

10.0 Disclaimers

- 10.1 The information and opinions expressed in this report is offered in the interests of sound arboricultural management and should not be interpreted as a recommendation to proceed with the purchase of the property or for mortgage lenders to advance a mortgage charge on the property or for insurers to offer cover for the subject property.
- 10.2 MWA Arboriculture Ltd are employed as Arboricultural Consultants and are not qualified to offer formal advice relating to structural or geotechnical matters. If the opinion offered within this report does not allow you to evaluate the risks for your purposes, we advise that you employ the services of a Chartered Engineer, geotechnical specialist or other appropriate specialist.
- 10.3 If it is intended to undertake any recommended tree works, before any work is undertaken a check should be made with the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to ascertain if the trees are subject to a tree preservation order (TPO), if the property is located within a conservation area (CA) or Trust scheme, or subject to planning conditions. If either applies LPA consent is required before any work can be undertaken.