London Leak Specialist

Company no. 17437507 · 020 7123 8560 · londonleakspecialist.co.uk

Leak Detection Report

> Sample report from a real job, redacted for publication. Client and address are withheld. Location: Leytonstone, E11, London Borough of Waltham Forest.

Client	Withheld
Property address	Withheld (Leytonstone, E11)
Inspection date	2026-11-02

LEAK DETECTION REPORT

Reason for Attendance

Investigation into reported water ingress affecting the neighbouring property's kitchen, with the suspected source being the tenant's bathroom shower area.

1. Background and Reported Issues

We were instructed to attend the property following reports from the neighbouring occupants that water was continuing to penetrate their kitchen from the adjoining property.

The suspected source of the water ingress was the shower area within the tenant's bathroom, which is positioned above or adjacent to the affected area in the neighbouring property.

We were informed that remedial works had previously been carried out to the shower installation. These works reportedly included:

- Replacement of the shower tray.
- Removal and replacement of approximately half of the wall tiles, extending upwards from the shower tray to around halfway up the wall towards the ceiling.
- Renewal of the mastic sealant and grouting.
- Reinstallation and sealing of the shower tray, with the intention of making the installation watertight.

Despite these repairs, the neighbouring occupants continued to report water ingress into their kitchen. We therefore attended to carry out further investigations and establish whether there was evidence of an active leak within the tenant's property.

2. Visual Inspection of the Shower Area

A visual inspection was carried out around the shower installation, including the shower tray, surrounding tiled walls, grout lines, and mastic sealant.

We also inspected beneath the shower tray, where the surrounding floor area and accessible surfaces remained noticeably damp.

However, at the time of our inspection, there was no visible evidence of an active water leak beneath the shower tray.

The continued dampness may be consistent with residual moisture retained within the floor structure following the previous leak and remedial works.

One possible explanation is that moisture remained trapped beneath the shower tray or within the surrounding floor structure when the previous repairs were completed. If the affected materials were not given sufficient time to dry before the shower tray was reinstalled, residual moisture could continue to migrate through the building fabric.

This remains a possibility rather than a confirmed finding. Further drying and monitoring may be required to establish whether the dampness is residual or whether another source of moisture is present.

3. Hot and Cold Water Pressure Testing

Pressure tests were carried out on both the hot and cold water supply systems to assess whether there was evidence of leakage from the associated pipework.

Test results:

- Hot water system: Maintained a stable pressure of 1.5 bar throughout a 30-minute test.
- Cold water system: Maintained a stable pressure of 1.5 bar throughout a 30-minute test.

No measurable pressure loss was observed during either test.

These results indicate that there was no detectable pressure loss from the tested hot and cold water systems during the testing periods.

However, a satisfactory pressure test does not necessarily exclude every possible intermittent leak or leakage from waste pipework, shower seals, or other components that are not subjected to the pressure test.

4. Shower Sealant and Water Run Test

A controlled water test was carried out on the mastic sealant surrounding the shower area.

Water was directed around the relevant sealed sections for approximately 15 minutes to simulate normal shower use and assess whether water was escaping through the sealant or surrounding joints.

During this test:

- No visible water leakage was observed.
- No dripping was identified beneath the shower tray during the test.
- No immediate evidence of water escaping through the tested sealant joints was identified.

Based on the test results, no active leakage was identified from the tested sections of the shower sealant during the inspection.

It should be noted that this test does not conclusively rule out intermittent leakage or water penetration through concealed joints and areas that were not directly accessible.

5. Endoscope Camera Inspection

An endoscope camera was used to inspect accessible concealed areas within the property to investigate potential sources of leakage.

The inspection included:

- The area beneath the shower tray.
- Accessible areas beneath the floorboards behind the washing machine.
- Accessible areas beneath the floorboards around the incoming mains water supply.

Although the incoming mains water pipework was located several metres away from the suspected shower-related area, it was included in the investigation to check for any alternative source of leakage.

No visible evidence of an active leak was identified within the accessible areas inspected using the endoscope camera.

The inspection was limited to areas that could be accessed using the equipment. Concealed pipework and building materials outside the camera's field of view could not be fully assessed.

6. Tracer Gas Testing

Further investigations were undertaken using tracer gas testing on the hot and cold water systems.

Both systems were tested separately to investigate whether there was any detectable leakage from the associated pipework.

Testing duration and results:

- Hot water system: Tested for approximately one hour. No pressure drop or meaningful change indicating leakage was observed.
- Cold water system: Tested for approximately one hour. No pressure drop or meaningful change indicating leakage was observed.

Both systems maintained their pressure throughout the testing periods.

No detectable evidence of leakage was identified from the tested hot or cold water pipework during the tracer gas investigation.

These findings provide further evidence against an active leak originating from the tested water supply pipework. However, the results cannot exclude leakage from untested waste pipes, concealed shower connections, or other areas outside the scope of the tests.

7. Inspection of the Neighbouring Property

We also inspected the neighbouring property to assess the reported water ingress affecting the kitchen.

The occupants continued to report that water was entering the kitchen despite the remedial works previously undertaken to the shower installation.

We observed that the occupants had been using heaters to help warm and dry the affected kitchen area.

The continued reports of water ingress indicate that the affected building materials may not yet have fully dried. However, the precise source and route of any continuing moisture could not be confirmed during this visit.

Water retained within wall cavities, plasterwork, flooring, or other concealed building materials can take a considerable period to dry. Depending on the construction and extent of saturation, residual moisture may continue to migrate through the building fabric after the original source of water has been repaired.

8. Findings and Assessment

Following the investigation, the following findings were established:

1. The shower installation had previously undergone substantial remedial works, including replacement of the shower tray and renewal of sections of tiling, grout, and mastic sealant.

2. The area beneath the shower tray remained noticeably damp; however, no visible active leakage was identified during the inspection.

3. Both the hot and cold water systems maintained a stable pressure of 1.5 bar throughout their respective 30-minute pressure tests.

4. The controlled 15-minute shower sealant test did not produce any visible evidence of leakage from the tested areas.

5. Endoscope inspections of accessible concealed areas beneath the shower tray, behind the washing machine, and around the incoming mains water supply did not reveal visible evidence of an active leak.

6. Tracer gas testing of the hot and cold water systems, carried out for approximately one hour per system, did not identify any detectable evidence of leakage.

7. The neighbouring occupants continued to report water ingress, although no active source of leakage could be established during our investigation.

Conclusion

Based on the tests and inspections carried out, no active leak was identified within the accessible areas of the tenant’s property or from the tested hot and cold water supply pipework at the time of attendance.

The persistent dampness beneath the shower tray, together with the history of the previous leak and subsequent remedial works, suggests that residual moisture retained within the floor structure or adjoining building fabric may be contributing to the continuing dampness observed in the neighbouring kitchen.

One possible explanation is that moisture remained trapped beneath the shower tray or within the adjoining structure following the previous leak, particularly if the affected materials were not fully dried before the shower tray was reinstalled.

At the time of attendance, there was no evidence to support an active leak.

9. Recommendations

We recommend the following actions:

1. Allow the affected areas to dry.

Continue ventilating and appropriately heating the affected kitchen and surrounding areas to encourage the evaporation of residual moisture. A professional drying assessment may be appropriate if the building materials remain saturated.

2. Monitor the affected areas.

The neighbouring occupants should monitor the kitchen ceiling and walls for any changes in staining, dampness, bubbling paint, or fresh water droplets. Where possible, record whether any new moisture appears during or immediately after the shower is used.

3. Final Statement

The investigation was undertaken to identify whether an active leak from the tenant's bathroom shower or associated water supply pipework was responsible for the reported water ingress into the neighbouring kitchen.

The hot and cold water pressure tests, tracer gas tests, controlled shower sealant test, and endoscope inspections did not identify evidence of an active leak within the areas tested.

The continued dampness beneath the shower tray and the history of previous water ingress suggest that residual moisture within the building fabric may be contributing to the ongoing problem. However, this remains a provisional assessment and cannot be confirmed without further drying, monitoring, or access to the concealed areas.

At the time of inspection, no active leak was detected. If the water ingress continues, further investigation of the shower waste system and concealed building structure is recommended before concluding that the original leak has been fully resolved.

Photographs



Waste trap and flexible waste pipe beneath the shower tray, viewed with the endoscope camera.



The shower enclosure and tray.



Tile joints and sealant in the shower enclosure, tested with water.



Pressure gauge on the water supply test.



Endoscope monitor during the inspection of concealed areas.



Pressure regulator on the test gas set-up.

London Leak Specialist · Company no. 17437507 · 020 7123 8560 · londonleakspecialist.co.uk. Photographs are watermarked and may not be reused.