

Gundy and Ducker Ltd,
3 Garrick Street,
London,
WC2E 9BF

Jan 20th 2016

For the attention of Mr C Ducker

Dear Sirs,

54 Shirlock Road, NW3 2HS

With reference to the Basement Impact Assessment submitted for 54 Shirlock Road, we reply with answers to Campbell Reiths queries in their Audit dated November 2015.

With reference to the Audit check list.

A works programme is presented by Croft.

Croft Drawing SL10 does show short piled foundations beneath the underpins. The piles are to prevent uplift and aid stability, the main construction is underpinning and the method statement and ground movements have been calculated for underpinning.

The Hydrology screening in the Ashton Bennett Report takes preference. The level of run off may change slightly and this has been accommodated by the use of SUDS as detailed in the Croft report. Croft have stated that the garden basement may reduce the impermeable areas which is advantageous. Croft and Ashton Bennett are in agreement that the proposed basement will not result in changes to surface water being received by adjacent properties or downstream watercourses.

There will be no extra run off and therefore there is no requirement to seek discussions with Thames Water.

The discrepancy is that Croft have mentioned that if infrastructure fails then a pump would be required to ensure the basement does not flood. This is agreed.

A Supplementary Report on an independent retaining wall check is not included. Croft have stated that the retaining wall design has been checked by Ashton Bennett Report when they in fact mean the geological assessment of land stability, which is dealt with in the Ashton Bennett report.

A CCTV has been undertaken of the drains and a leak has been detected which will be addressed during construction.

Further ground investigation is proposed before construction to ensure the exact ground bearing strength and depth for piles/underpinning as mentioned in the Ashton Bennett report. The proposed bearing pressure varies by 10kN/m² between Croft and Ashton Bennett and this will be revised following further ground investigation.

The building defects survey by Croft indicated there were no structural defects to either no 54 or adjacent properties. There are a couple of minor non structural cracks noted in no 54.

The foundations of the party walls are 2.50m bgl or 500mm below the cellar floor level.

The Ground Movement calculations appended predict a very slight movement Damage Category according to CIRIA C580.

Kind Regards,

Frances A Bennett