

From: LizBrown@campbellreith.com
Sent: 23 October 2015 14:52
To: Pawel Rogalewicz
Cc: 'Guy Shani'; Ampoma, Nanayaa; 'Treatment Architecture Ltd.'; camdenaudit@campbellreith.com
Subject: Re: 156 Goldhurst Terrace

Dear Mr Rogalewicz

Thank you for your email and revised Basement Construction Method Statement (Rev 3).

Taking your points in turn

Query item 3/section 5.2

Your original BIA omitted any mention of propping in the scope of works. The sequence of works was given as follows:

1. Excavate front to allow for conveyor to be inserted.
2. Form lightwell with cantilevered retaining walls
3. Slowly work from the front to the rear inserting 1200 long cantilevered retaining walls sequentially

Having raised that as a concern both in respect of health and safety and ground movement, we acknowledge that the scope of works in the revised document now refers to temporary propping.

You note in your email that there was no water found in the borehole or standpipe. Reference to p10 of the Ground and Water Ltd Ground Investigation Report indicates that a water level of 2.11m bgl was recorded. This suggests the presence of perched water on top of the London Clay. If this was allowed to run into underpin excavations, it could soften the clay and cause instability in the Made Ground.

Query item 1

With respect to the discrepancies in the report, we note that references to Pandora Road and the Claygate Beds have been removed. However, Rev 3 of the BIA still states that no groundwater was encountered (page 5).

Query item 2

It is noted that the ground movement assessment is presented in Appendix F. App F contains only a calculation of slab uplift. There is a ground movement assessment in Appendix C. Having reviewed it, we do not agree with the differential movement that has been estimated across the width of the building. At the edge closest to the underpinning, the total movement is the sum of the movement due to installation and the movement due to excavation. You note that the anticipated damage may be categorised as 0 to 2. We believe that on the basis of your ground movement estimates, the Category is 2. As noted before, the sketch at the top of the calculations is confusing as the damage assessment should be for the neighbouring properties and not the building being underpinned.

With respect to the calculation of slab uplift, there is a calculation presented in Appendix C and Appendix F. They are different and difficult to follow. For whichever one is correct, can you clearly annotate the spreadsheet to show how the figures are derived and what they represent. Can you also check the units?

Regards
Elizabeth Brown
Partner

CampbellReith
consulting engineers

Friars Bridge Court,
41-45 Blackfriars Road,

London
SE1 8NZ

Tel +44 (0)20 7340 1700
www.campbellreith.com

From: "Pawel Rogalewicz" <pawel@croftse.co.uk>
To: <LizBrown@campbellreith.com>, <Nanayaa.Ampoma@camden.gov.uk>
Cc: "Guy Shani" <guy@shani.co.uk>, "Treatment Architecture Ltd." <thetreatment@mac.com>
Date: 21/10/2015 17:29
Subject: 156 Goldhurst Terrace

Dear Ms. Brown,

Please find below the answers to your queries;

5.2. The proposed basement will generally be excavated in sequenced panels cantilever L-retaining walls. It should be demonstrated that ground m damage can be restricted to acceptable limits without the use of tempora the construction methodology should describe how 'hit and miss' underpin with the floor slab left in place, how a safe environment for man ent potentially water bearing soils and how water will be excluded from the e

3	Stability	Construction methodology to be expanded include water exclusion from excavation, he 'hit and miss' underpinning will be achieved while ground floor remains in place and ho a safe working environment will be provide in potentially water bearing soils.
---	-----------	--

The propping to the retaining walls is necessary during the construction and any site would be close down by Health & Safety officer if these were not present. Our method statement clearly describes the process, even shows the photos from the sites showing how soil/pins are being propped. It is not therefore applicable to demonstrate acceptable ground movement and building damage without use of props. We added more photos from sites showing how the pins are being put in and how the instructions from the method statement are being utilized.

The method statement describes the process of placing the pins. The pin numbers on the basement plan were altered to make it cleared how the pins will be placed in.

The Basement impact assessment is clear that there was no water found neither in the borehole nor the water stand pipe. Additionally we completed few basement in the direct proximity (for example 166 Goldhurst Terrace) and no water was found during construction. There is no water bearing soil, therefore there is no need to show how it will be excluded from the excavation. Method statement describes how to deal with no significant dewatering.

1	BIA requirements	There are numerous contradictions in the BSMS.
---	------------------	--

Minor errors; (incorrect property name in section 1 & comment on claygate beds) removed from the report.

2	Stability	Ground movement and building damage assessment not clear and cannot be v
---	-----------	--

The ground movement and building damage assessment was altered and can be found in appendix F. The expected building damage is within the acceptable by CPG4 values. Heave calculations were added to the assessment as well as a heave protection was added to the structural sections.

Kind regards,

Pawel Rogalewicz

Senior Structural Engineer
MSc BEng



CROFT
STRUCTURAL
ENGINEERS

Clock Shop Mews, Rear of 60 Saxon Rd, SE25 5EH

t: 020 8684 4744

e: pawel@croftse.co.uk

w: www.croftse.co.uk

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.[attachment "15-10-21 156 Goldhurst Terrace CMS rev 3.pdf" deleted by Liz Brown/CRH]

If you have received this e-mail in error please immediately notify the sender by email and delete it and any attachments from your system.

This email has been sent from CampbellReith, which is the trading name of Campbell Reith Hill LLP, a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales, company number, OC300082. Registered address: Friars Bridge Court, 41-45 Blackfriars Road, London, SE1 8NZ. No employee or agent is authorised to conclude any contract on behalf of Campbell Reith Hill LLP with any other party by email unless it is an attachment on headed paper. Opinions, conclusions and other information in any email or attachments which do not relate to the official business of Campbell Reith Hill LLP are neither given or endorsed by it. Please note that email traffic and content is not secure.

As this e-mail has been transmitted over a public network the accuracy, completeness and virus status of the transmitted information is not secure and cannot be guaranteed. If you have received this message in error please notify the system manager. If you are not the intended recipient you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake and delete this e-mail from your system. If you are not the intended recipient you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. If you are not the intended recipient you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake and delete this e-mail from your system. If you are not the intended recipient you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake and delete this e-mail from your system.

This message has been scanned for malware by Websense. www.websense.com