



TREE PRESERVATION ORDER: TPO C760 2008 Poplar


TREE T1 Poplar of MWA Arboricultural Report

Works - REMOVE

Reason: The above tree is considered to be responsible for root induced clay shrinkage subsidence damage to 94 Greencroft Gardens, NW6 3PH.

Investigations in to the damage have been conducted and the following information/evidence obtained:

1. Engineering opinion is that damage is due to clay shrinkage subsidence. Details of the damage are included in the Crawford Technical report submitted.
2. Foundations are bearing on to clay.
3. The clay subsoil has a high volume change potential (NHBC Guidelines) susceptible to undergoing volumetric change in relation to changes in soil moisture.
4. Roots were observed to a depth of 2000mm bgl in TP/BH2 (rear) and recovered samples have been positively identified (using anatomical analysis) as Poplar, the origin of which will be confirming its influence on the soils below the foundations.
5. Level monitoring for the period 14.05.19 to 06.01.20 has recorded a pattern of movement indicative of the effects of seasonal soil drying by the subject Poplar below foundation level. The uplift phase of the building can only be attributable to an expanding clay soil from a desiccated (shrunken) state due to the soil drying effects of the implicated trees.
6. A drainage investigation has not been undertaken. The drainage is remote from the area of current damage and trial pit/ borehole investigations did not reveal any suggestion that leakage from drainage is adversely affecting the property. Drains can be further discounted by reference to level monitoring data.
7. No tree works have been carried during the period of the claim or in the recent past in relation to the damage to the front of the building.
8. No recent structural alterations or building works have been carried out. The property has not been underpinned.
9. A root barrier has been considered as an alternative to tree removal. This is not a viable option due to the lack of access for the machinery to excavate a deep trench.
10. The evidence confirms that on the balance of probabilities the subject tree is a material cause of the subsidence damage.





11. Superstructure repairs and decorations are currently estimated to be [REDACTED] should the tree works be undertaken. Costs in the event the tree works do not proceed are currently estimated to be [REDACTED]
12. Replacement planting of standard size trees will be funded by insurers subject to planting location – to be agreed with the LA.

SUBSIDENCE CHECK LIST

- A description of the property, including a description of the damage and the crack pattern, the date that the damage first occurred/was noted, details of any previous underpinning or building work, the geological strata for the site identified from the geological map.
Technical Report and Site Investigation Report provided
- Details of vegetation in the vicinity and its management since discovery of the damage. Include a plan showing the vegetation and affected building.
MWA Arboricultural Report provided
- Measurement of the extent and distribution of vertical movement using level monitoring. Where level monitoring is not possible, state why and provide crack monitoring data. Data provided must be sufficient to show a pattern of movement consistent with the presence of the implicated tree(s)
Level Monitoring provided
- A profile of a trial/bore hole dug to identify foundation type and depth and soil characteristics.
Site Investigation Report provided
- The sub-soil characteristics including soil type (particularly that on which the foundations rest), liquid limit, plastic limit and plasticity index
Site Investigation Report provided
- The location and identification of roots found. Where identification is inconclusive, DNA testing should be carried out.
Site Investigation Report provided
- Proposals and estimated costs of options to repair the damage.
Addendum Technical Report provided

