# ADDENDUM TECHNICAL REPORT

#### Crawford Reference: SU1000736

Mr A Seabright The Old Rectory Little Gransden Sandy Bedfordshire SG19 3DU



prepared for

Chubb Insurance Company of Europe SA 106 Fenchurch Street, London, EC3M 5NB

Claim Reference 32626481/DK

#### SUBSIDENCE CLAIM

DATE 4 May 2010

### **Crawford and Company**

#### NATIONAL SUBSIDENCE UNIT

30 St Paul's Square, Birmingham, B3 1QZ

Tel: 0870 400 0475 Fax: 0870 400 0476 E Mail subsidence@crawford-thg.com

### Site Plan

## This plan is Not to Scale

This is an Aerial Photograph of the property and the immediate surrounding area. The positions of utilities etc are only indicative and contractors must satisfy themselves regarding actual location before commencing works.



| Key:       |                     |            |                    |  |                   |  |  |
|------------|---------------------|------------|--------------------|--|-------------------|--|--|
|            | Tree: Deciduous     |            | Tree: Conifer      | 0  | Shrub             |  |  |
|            | Hedge               | $\bigcirc$ | Area of Damage     | $\left  \begin{array}{c} \phi \end{array} \right $ | Bore Hole         |  |  |
|            | Trial Hole          | •          | Trial & Bore Hole  | 1  | Level Monitoring  |  |  |
|            | Rain Water Manhole  | •          | Rain Water Gulley  | 0  | Rain Water Pipe   |  |  |
|            | Waste Water Manhole | •          | Waste Water Gulley | 0  | Toilet Pipe       |  |  |
|            | Rain Water Drain    |            | Waste Water Drain  |  | Electricity Cable |  |  |
|            | Water Supply Pipe   |            | Gas Supply Pipe    | 0  | Incoming Gas Pipe |  |  |
| <b>P</b> 3 | Incoming Water      | 4          | Incoming Electrics |  |                   |  |  |



#### **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. The trial pit revealed that the walls of the house at the left flank are built off a 170mm thick concrete strip foundation bearing at a depth of 270mm below ground level in soft to firm brown slightly sandy clay. Roots up to 2mm in diameter were observed at the underside of the foundation.



Foundation Details

| No. | Borehole Depth | Footing (a) | Underside (b) | Thickness (c) |
|-----|----------------|-------------|---------------|---------------|
| TH1 | 3.50 m.        | 0 mm.       | 270 mm.       | 170 mm.       |

#### AUGERED BOREHOLES

A 50mm diameter hand auger was sunk through the base of the trial pit. The borehole revealed firm to stiff brown slightly sandy CLAY to a depth of 1.5 metres below ground level before becoming slightly clayey SAND. Roots were identified in soil samples retrieved to the full depth of the borehole. The bore remained dry and open on 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 had instructions to test the samples to determine if there was evidence of root induced desiccation. The results of these tests have confirmed that the clay band was deficient in moisture at the time the samples were retrieved with a peak in desiccation noted at a depth of 1 to 1.5 metres below ground level.

#### ROOTS

Roots were retrieved from the trial hole and were submitted to a botanist for identification. Analysis has shown that the roots emanated from a tree of the Cedrus species (ie Cedar).

#### DRAINS

No drainage investigations were undertaken as no evidence of any surplus moisture was identified in our trial pit.

#### DISCUSSION

The results of our investigation lead us to conclude that the cause of recent movement in the building has been shrinkage of the clay component in the upper layer of soil promoted by the moisture demands of the large Cedar tree growing near-by.

The Investigations also suggest however that there is limited potential for significant movement to occur through this cause as the clay gives way to sand at relatively shallow depth. Sand is a non-plastic material whose volume cannot be influenced by the moisture demands of trees or other vegetation.

#### RECOMMENDATION

If further movement in the building is to be prevented, effective management of the Cedar tree is required so as to negate its impact on the moisture content of the soil below the foundations.

Felling of the tree represents the best means of achieving this. However, there may be alternatives and we propose seeking further advice on how this might be achieved from an Arboriculturist.

Our further report will follow once we are in receipt of their recommendations.

4 May 2010

# Simon Chesher

Simon Chesher BSc MRICS ACILA Crawford & Company Adjusters (UK) Ltd National Building Services Direct Dial: 0208 253 9416 Direct Fax: 0870 400 0476 subsidence@crawco.co.uk