

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	Mr Michael Epstein	Date of discovery	10/08/2022
Risk Address	10 Nicholas Way Northwood, HA6 2TS	Our Ref	IFS-AVI-SUB-22-0101616
Location of damage	Cracking to the right hand front and damage internally to kitchen area	Property Type	
Nature of Damage	Cracking with a downward movement normally associated with an episode of subsidence	Indicated mechanism of movement	Downward/rotational aspect of damage and damage to kitchen floor and exterior cracking.
Crack Widths	3 and would be classified as moderate.	BRE Classification	Category 3
Occupiers' Observations	CRACKS SEEM TO BE COMING FROM THE EDGE OF UPSTAIRS AND DOWNSTAIRS WINDOW. KITCHEN BACK DOOR HAS TROUBLE OPENING.	Previous Relevant movement	NA
Comments	The damage is what we would expect when a property is suffering from subsidence and a valid claim was accepted by the insurer.		

Investigation Evidence

Examination by Building Professional	Yes	Ian Domigan	PhD MFor Sci BSc Me CPEng (Structural) IntEng CERT CII	
Trial Hole/Bore Hole Excavations	Yes	TPBH2		Date of related SI 16/09/2022
CCTV Drainage survey	Yes	The drains are implicated in the damage		Date of Drain survey 08/09/2022
Soil Laboratory Testing	Yes	Shrinkable soils	Yes	Date of related SI 12/09/2022
Root Analysis	Yes	Quercus roots to 2500mm		Date of related SI 13/09/2022
Arboriculture Assessment	Yes	H3 and T1 to be removed as per arb report		Date of related SI 16/09/2022
Heave Risk after tree removal	No	Assesed By	Ian Domigan	ian.domigan@innovation.group
Building Monitoring	Yes	Crack Width		Date of related SI 24/01/2023
Monitoring to date confirms		Monitoring only just started as informed tree has a TPO		
Supporting Comments		The vegetation needs to be removed as per the arborist report		

Repair Scope

If prompt vegetation removal	Only Superstructure repairs required	Initial likely cost of repairs	£ 7,284.96
If NO vegetation is removed	Underpin of front and side of property	Potential additional costs	£ 35,000.00
Supporting Comments	There may be the possibility of using a root barrier but this would need technical input.		

Conclusions & Recommendations

The vegetation needs to be removed as detailed in the arborist report. This is well backed up by soil conditions and roots that were found and identified in the trial pit bore hole. Even though there was drainage damage noted the soil conditions being desiccated would indicate that the vegetation is the primary cause of the subsidence.

Report Prepared By

Ian Domigan

PhD MFor Sci BSc Me CPEng (Structural) IntEng CERT CII