

Engineers Addendum Report

This Report sets out in concise terms the nature of the evidence collected and the consultant's conclusions and recommendations

Policyholder, Property & Event Details

Policyholder Name		Date of discovery	17/06/2022
Risk Address	29 Edis Street London NW1 8LE	Our Ref	
		Date of relevant construction	01/01/1880
Location of damage	Rear two storey projection/outrigger	Property Type	Multi storey mid-terrace house
Nature of Damage	Cracking to walls and ceilings	Indicated mechanism of movement	Downward and rotational movement towards the rear
Crack Widths	Category 2 and would be classified as slight.	BRE Classification	Category 2
Occupiers' Observations	N/A	Previous Relevant movement	None
Comments	N/A		

Investigation Evidence

Examination by Building Professional	☒ Yes	Robbie Taylor		MCI0B
Trial Hole/Bore Hole Excavations	☒ Yes	C69655G31763	Date of related SI	10/03/2023
CCTV Drainage survey	☒ Yes	The drains are not implicated in the damage	Date of Drain survey	28/06/2024
Soil Laboratory Testing	☒ Yes	Shrinkable soils ☒ Yes	Desiccated soils ☒ Yes	Date of related SI 03/04/2023
Root Analysis	☒ Yes	Leguminosae spp. Roots (Mimosa) encountered to 1.2m	Date of related SI	09/03/2023
Arboriculture Assessment	☒ Yes	SA-252416. T2 (Mimosa) & T3 (Acer) implicated	Date of related SI	09/03/2023
Heave Risk after tree removal	☒ No	Assessed By	Robbie Taylor	
Building Monitoring	☒ Yes	Crack Width ☒ Yes	Level/Distortion ☒ Yes	Date of related SI 08/04/2024
Monitoring to date confirms	4mm of seasonal downward movement, corresponding with 1.5mm of seasonal crack opening over summer 2023.			
Supporting Comments	The monitoring undertaken to date clearly shows seasonal movement of the building which can only be caused by the excessive moisture extracting influence from nearby vegetation on the high plasticity clay soils encountered under foundations.			

Repair Scope

If prompt vegetation removal	Only Superstructure repairs required	Initial likely cost of repairs	
If NO vegetation is removed	Underpinning will be required to the rear elevations and party walls	Potential additional costs	
Supporting Comments	If the Local Authority fail to allow the mitigation of the root nuisance caused by the third party owned Mimosa, we will have no other option but to stabilise by underpinning which will result in a recovery action of these costs against the Local Authority.		

Conclusions & Recommendations

The subject property is a 4 bedroom mid terraced townhouse arranged over 5 floors of standard solid wall construction under a pitched and a slate tiled roof. The main property was built circa 1880 with a rear flat roofed outrigger added to the rear circa 1900's which projects into a small courtyard area. Set on a front to rear downward slope, the basement opens to the rear courtyard with the ground floor opening to the front street. The damage was first noticed at the end of 2022 which consisted of cracking to the walls and ceilings within the rear projection area.

The site investigation has confirmed that the cause of the subsidence is clay shrinkage. The foundations of the rear outrigger were measured at 700mm deep and bear on a stiff, very high plasticity clay soil with adequate bearing capacity. The clay soil is desiccated at 1.2m and again from 2.2m to 3.6m. Roots with abundant starch were encountered to a depth of 1.2m. The roots were identified as emanating from a Mimosa tree, which we are aware to be the third party owned, local authority protected tree located to the rear right of the risk address.

Drainage Investigations have revealed a defect to run E which is a 100mm foul water drain accepting waste from the risk address only. This defect is not considered causal or contributory (due to the seasonal movement observed) but we will be repairing this as a matter of course. For the avoidance of doubt, this drainage defect has not caused subsidence or any property damage.

Given the above factual evidence we conclude that the Third Party owned Mimosa tree, subject to a Tree Preservation Order (placed 23/11/2023) is the cause of the damage and we require its removal to arrest the current episode of subsidence. Should the application to remove be refused, we will have no other alternative other than to stabilise the building by other means by way of mass concrete underpinning, and pursue a compensation from the council for this excessive cost outlay.