# ADDENDUM TECHNICAL REPORT

#### Crawford Reference: SU1300377



Prepared for

RSA - Towergate Towergate Underwriting Let Property Floor 2, The Octagon Middleborough, Colchester CO1 1TG

Claim Reference 201209009178

#### SUBSIDENCE CLAIM

DATE 4 February 2014

# Crawford and Company

SPECIALIST PROPERTY SERVICES - SUBSIDENCE DIVISION

Cartwright House, Tottle Road, Riverside Business Park, Nottingham, NG2 1RT Tel: 0115 943 8260 Fax: 0121 200 0309 E Mail subsidence@crawco.co.uk



## INTRODUCTION

We have been instructed by insurers to investigate a claim for subsidence at the above property. The area of damage, timescale and circumstances are outlined in our initial Technical Report. This report should be read in conjunction with that report.

To establish the cause of damage, further investigations have been undertaken and these are described below.

#### **INVESTIGATIONS**

The following investigations were undertaken to identify the cause of movement.

# **TRIAL HOLES**

A trial hole was excavated to expose the foundations - see site plan for location and the diagram below for details. Trial Hole 1 revealed a concrete strip footing founded at a depth of 0.77 m below ground level which bears onto very compact dark brown gravelly silty sand with brick and concrete fragments and clinker (made ground).

Root activity of live appearance was noted to the underside of the foundations.



Foundation Details

No.	Borehole Depth	Footing (a)	Underside (b)	Thickness (c)
TH1	3.00 m.	300 mm.	770 mm.	400 mm.

#### AUGERED BOREHOLES

A 50mm diameter hand auger was sunk - see site plan for location(s). Borehole 1 revealed that the subsoil changed to a firm mid brown grey clay veined silty clay at 1.25m below ground level becoming stiff at 2.3m below ground level, with roots to a depth of 2.2 m below ground level. The borehole remained dry and open upon completion.

#### SOIL SAMPLES

Soil samples were retrieved from the bore, wrapped in clingfilm before being bagged and deposited with a testing laboratory the same day. The laboratory have instructions to test the samples to determine if there is evidence of root induced desiccation.

# ROOTS

Roots were retrieved from the trial hole and have been submitted to a botanist for identification.

# DRAINS

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. As such, a drainage investigation was not warranted.

## DISCUSSION

The results of the site investigations confirm that the cause of subsidence is root-induced clay shrinkage. The clay is plastic and thus will shrink and swell with changes in moisture content. Roots have extracted moisture below the depth of the footings, thus causing differential foundation movement to occur. This is supported by the following investigation results :-

• Atterberg limit testing indicates that the soil has a very high plasticity and hence will shrink and swell with changes in moisture content.

• Suction tests indicate slight to moderate desiccation between a depth of 1.5 m and 3.0 m coincident with the depth of root activity.

• Roots were found to a depth of 2.2 m and were identified as the species Fraxinus which are Ash. Starch was present which indicates that the roots were alive at the time of retrieval.

• Crack monitoring to date indicates seasonal cyclical movement with opening of the cracks in the summer months (as the clay shrinks) and closure in the winter months (as the clay swells).

#### RECOMMENDATION

The cause of the movement needs to be dealt with first. From the results of the site investigation, we are satisfied that your neighbour's vegetation can be removed. Arborsist have advised that their survey of the site identified the Ash (T6) and in the absence of any other significant Ash trees in the vicinity they believe that this is the most likely source of the recovered roots. Whilst no roots were recovered from the Sycamore (T1), the Birch (T2) the Lime (T3) and the Laburnum (T5), given their

size, species profile and position relative to the observed damage it is their opinion that these represent the most significant vegetative influence and the primary cause of the observed damage and accordingly they have made recommendations in respect of this. The ash, although implicated by the root identification, is considered to be a secondary influence.

Based on our analysis, we are satisfied there is no adverse heave risk to the property.

Our Mitigation Unit will liaise with your neighbour in this respect.

Following completion of the tree management works, we will undertake a suitable period of monitoring to confirm stability has been achieved before undertaking repairs to the property.

# HISTORY & TIMESCALE

Date of Construction	1957
Purchased	1957
Policy Inception Date	
Damage First Noticed	March 2012
Claim Notified to Insurer	
Date of our Inspection	
Issue of Report	
Anticipated Completion of Claim	Summer 2014
Anticipated Duration of Works	3 Weeks
Anticipated Completion of Works	Summer 2014

Yours faithfully,



Matt Deller BSc (Hons) MCIOB Dip CII Specialist Property Services - Subsidence Division Crawford & Company Adjusters (UK) Ltd subsidence@crawco.co.uk

4 February 2014