

Report Title	Statement of Justification for Demolition	Ref.	MPI.22.382.RP02
---------------------	---	-------------	------------------------

Revision	Date	Remarks
*	15.03.2024	First issue

Project/Site	163 Sumatra Road, London, NW6 1PN
CDS's Client	Magnet Investments Ltd
Prepared by	Roy M Lyle <i>CEng MStructE MSAICE</i>
Reviewed by	Simon R Smith <i>CEng FStructE FICE DipEM FFB</i>

Contents	
1	Overview
2	Initial site visit
3	Follow up after initial site visit
4	Conclusion

1. Overview

Contractors Design (CDS) Ltd, we first contacted by Annie Foster on 17.10.2022 and have since been appointed by Magnet Investments Ltd to carry out the permanent and temporary structural design services at 163 Sumatra Road, London, NW6 1PN

2. Initial site visit

An initial site inspection was carried out on 31.10.2022 by Simon Smith, of this office with Peter Fishenden and Annie Foster in attendance.





Front scaffold with No.165 seen on the left, note this scaffolding is fully sheeted and was restrained by a structure that had since been removed, leaving it inadequately restrained and dangerous.



Front Scaffold with No. 161 on the right, note this scaffolding is fully sheeted and was restrained by a structure that had since been removed, leaving it inadequately restrained and dangerous.

	
<p>Random placement of RMD slimshores between front façade and party walls.</p>	<p>Unorthodox timber framing, which was founded on shallow footings not allowing for further excavation to take place without wholesale alteration.</p>

	
<p>Fireplaces were found not to have been underpinned and randomly propped. Timber A frames were not supported at depth allowing for further excavation to take place.</p>	<p>Large multivolume space left with only the roof remaining and random permanent steel installed, a complete lack of lateral restraint to party walls. The roof was propped by scaffold which in turn was not laterally restrained.</p>



Scaffolding was found to lack baseplates and was placed on timber boards which had since begun to rot.





The remains of the front façade being restrained by a raking slimshore with shallow founding conditions, which would not permit the proposed excavation to take place.



Unorthodox timber framing in place which was not founded at depth, which would allow for the proposed excavation to take place. Further raking RMD slimshores were not founded at depth



Unorthodox timber framing in place which was not founded at depth, which would allow for the proposed excavation to take place

	
<p>Rear sheeted scaffold, with No.161 to the left. Scaffold is carrying the roof and originally restrained by an internal structure which is now almost completely removed.</p>	<p>Rear sheeted scaffold, with No.165 to the right. Scaffold is carrying the roof and originally restrained by an internal structure which is now almost completely removed.</p>

3. Follow up after initial site visit

On the 02.11.2022 the following items were raised by Simon Smith, in an email, following his site visit:

- The existing building is in a parlous condition.
- The remains of the building did not appear adequate enough to support the front scaffolding that was in place.

It was noted an internal birdcage should be erected to serve the following key roles:

1. Provides safe access & support to the existing upper floors & roof;
2. Provides additional lateral restraint to the front scaffold as long as both are tied to each other;
3. Provides additional lateral support to both Party Walls provided all levels are butted-up tight to both wall faces.

It was noted that once installed, the front scaffold should be inspected and any necessary remedial works undertaken, and that rear access scaffolds are also likely to be required to permit safe, piecemeal removal of the remaining sections of masonry walls.

Further it was noted that demolition should progress in a sequential top-down manner.

As each level is removed, temporary flying shores will need to be installed to provide lateral support to both Party Walls (these flying shore details were later issued as MPI.22.382.DWG01)

MPI.22.382.DWG01, which detailed the flying shores, was first issued on 29.11.2022 and contained a sequence of works, namely:

- 1) Obtain relevant approval/permissions for complete demolition of existing building (eg Local Authority Planning; Revised Party Walls etc)
- 2) Erect internal birdcage scaffold tied into existing external scaffold.
- 3) Establish movement monitoring of adjacent properties
- 4) Conduct condition surveys of neighbouring properties.
- 5) Undertake chimney surveys.
- 6) Commence careful removal of existing structure installing party wall shoring as illustrated herein in a systematic top-down manner.
- 7) Once demolition complete, check status of underpinning.

MPI.22.382.DWG02, which detailed the internal birdcage scaffold was first issued on 30.11.2022 and contained a sequence of works, namely:

- 1) Appoint approved scaffolding contractor
- 2) Prepare ground floor
- 3) Base out birdcage
- 4) Erect birdcage scaffold with boarded lifts to facilitate access to existing remaining floors
- 5) Tie-in front scaffold.
- 6) Inspect front scaffold - remediate as necessary
- 7) Commence demolition of existing structure installing temporary party wall shoring as per CDS drawing 01 striking

4. Conclusion

The rear and front scaffold were fully sheeted, and reliant on an internal structure which at the time of the site visit now largely no longer existed. This left the scaffolding effectively laterally unrestrained and dangerous, with further complications due to the fact that large parts of the roof structure was reliant of the scaffold for vertical support.

There was seemingly no logic to the way in which the temporary works had been installed. Further it appeared that the founding conditions of the temporary works were shallow, which would not allow for the proposed bulk excavation to take place without whole scale alternations to the temporary works taking place.

Random items of permanent works had been installed, again with seemingly no logic on a sequence that was being followed.

What remained of the roof , front and rear façades and floors were in our opinion inadequately supported and unsafe. Further these items had been altered beyond the point of reasonable and safe refurbishment and incorporation into a new structure.

With all things considered a decision on the best way forward was made to make the structure safe, initially with a bird cage scaffold, and then installing temporary lateral restraint to the party walls and then completely removing what little remained of the structure.