

pawlik + wiedmer

Kate Phillips
Regeneration and Planning
London Borough of Camden
2nd Floor, 5 Pancras Square
c/o Town Hall, Judd Street
London WC1H 9JE

10th February 2016

501 // 3 Aldred Road – BIA Audit Queries

Dear Kate,

We are writing in response to the Campbell Reith - Basement Impact Assessment Audit - Revision D2. They have asked for additional clarifications and information. We have spoken to the author of the Audit to establish what is required. We hope that the responses below in addition to the additional information provided below will do so.

Query 5

Retaining Wall – Section 4.23, 5.11

Price & Myers have corrected the small numerical error in the retaining wall calculation. The correction is shown in red in the revised P&M document attached which also states that the design is still 'OK' i.e. safe. (*24077_Calc RW1 RevA_Retaining Wall_20160201*)

Propping – Section 4.23, 5.12

The Construction sequence and indicative propping arrangement is already shown in P&M Sk10-11 provided as part of the BIA Screening report (July 2015) with additional information regarding the front area in P&M SK 12 provided in response to CR Audit revision D1 (December 2015) audit items 4 and 8 are noted and agreed as closed out.

The propping arrangements are hard to define at planning stage as a contractor has yet to be appointed and may have a preferred method of carrying out the work. The design team would expect to indicate where temporary propping is required – as we have done – but we would not expect to have to do further design of the propping at this early stage. The works design will ultimately be undertaken by the contractor. Their design will then be reviewed by the engineer prior to works commencing on site to ensure it is adequate.

Query 6

P&M have carried out a Quantative GMA and Building Damage Assessment to CIRIA C580 as requested by CR Audit Revision D2 (see attached). It is noted that this is an inherently conservative calculation and assumes a full depth of soil (i.e. no existing undercrofts) and excavation depth to formation level. Even with this worst case the outcome for this site is damage category 1 – very slight. The actual conditions (see query 9) will mean the actual movements should be lower than these estimates. (*24077_Ground movements and building damage assessment*)

Query 9

Following enquiries with adjacent owners we note the presence of basements or undercrofts to both neighboring properties as illustrated in the attached sketch (501_SK_002). We understand No 4 has the same undercroft as No3, a shallow basement with head height of approximately 2m. No 2 has a full depth basement under the full footprint of the building with a front light well onto the street. The presence of these basements should reduce CR's concern regarding deepening the existing foundations affecting how the building behaves and will reduce the differential ground movement and strains in item 6 above. (501_SK_002_Adjoining Basements)

We trust that these responses answer the Auditors outstanding queries 5, 6 & 9. However if there are any further queries please do not hesitate to contact us.

Yours Faithfully



Nicholas Pawlik

Enc:

- *24077_Calc RW1 RevA_Retaining Wall_20160201*
- *24077_Ground movements and building damage assessment*
- *501_SK_002_Adjoining Basements*