

Hazelton, Laura

Subject: FW: RADA 16-18 Chenies St

You can [sign up](#) to our new and improved planning e-alerts to let you know about new planning applications, decisions and appeals.

From: Stanley Haines [mailto:stanley.haines@hainesphillips.co.uk]
Sent: 10 March 2016 16:58
To: Hazelton, Laura
Cc: Linda Garforth; Tim Williams; Phil Hudson
Subject: Re: RADA 16-18 Chenies St

Dear Laura

Further to your email of 3rd March our Engineers, Price and Myers, have now responded directly to Campbell Reith as below and we trust that this addresses their concerns but we await their response.

Regards

Stanley.

From: Phil Hudson <PHudson@pricemyers.com>

Date: Thursday, 10 March 2016 16:42

To: "AoifeGleeson@campbellreith.com" <AoifeGleeson@campbellreith.com>

Cc: "LizBrown@campbellreith.com" <LizBrown@campbellreith.com>, Martin Cooper <Martin@gea-ltd.co.uk>, Stanley Haines <stanley.haines@hainesphillips.co.uk>, Linda Garforth <LindaGarforth@rada.ac.uk>, Steve Branch <Steve@gea-ltd.co.uk>

Subject: FW: RADA, 16-18 Chenies Street - BIA and support documents

Dear Aiofe

Forgive me for contacting you directly on this. The clock is running on this matter and I need to understand what the problems are with the BIA and supporting documentation. I was under the impression that we had resolved the remaining issues in January so I am surprised we are still debating the report contents. Having read the document with Martin Cooper of GEA I think the Non-Technical summary provides the simplest assessment of any remaining problems. In particular clauses 1.8, 1.10, 1.11, 1.12 plus 1.13. In reading the following please refer to my sketches sk105, CM100 & CM110 (attached). My thoughts on your points are as follows:

1.8 – The only building I have any doubt on with regard to a basement is Rosetti Court which is separated from number 16 by an open yard. We have had a trial pit dug at the base of the Rosetti Court flank wall which shows an existing and rather large footing below the proposed excavation level. The details of this trial pit are in the BIA. I cannot confirm it but I suspect these footings are the remains of the old Dallas Building which was left as a ruin after World War 2. By inspection we can conclude that our proposed works will not undermine Rosetti Court, whether the latter has a basement or not. I really cannot envisage how the works to number 16 will have any impact on Rosetti Court.

1.10, 1.12 & 1.13 – I think it is worth separating these into number 16 & 18 issues.

Number 16 – I wonder if there is some misunderstanding developing. Sketch CM100 is taken from our CMS. The reduced level will be about 2.8m below street level BUT the area in question is already quite low. The actual level reduction is a great deal less than this and varies between 600-900mm. Since we don't have a comprehensive trial pit coverage in this "difficult-to-get-to" part of the site we adopted a prudent approach for the CMS and allowed for some underpinning of the rear wall of the theatre space plus some underpinning to the party walls excluding Rosetti Court. The actual unloading in the second issue of the GMA in this area is 900mm of soil plus a brick wall and some timber floors. It is not 55kN/m² as quoted in clause 4.19 of your second audit. I think you took this figure from the November SI report clause 8.1.3, an assessment which was based on an early and incomplete understanding of level changes at the rear of number 16. GEA's most recent GMA issue 2 (2nd Feb) provides a more accurate assessment and demonstrates that we don't have any issues with the work to the rear of number 16. I really don't understand what you require in terms of further GMA work, sequencing analysis and consideration of temporary propping. I think we have done more than enough analysis and no temporary propping is necessary.

Number 18 – This is a partially new single basement built into a private road. It is remote from any other building not owned by our clients, notably the 8m separation from the University of Law building shown on sketch sk105. The road itself will be subject to drainage and services introduction plus resurfacing. A contig bored pile wall adjacent to such a road doesn't demand temporary propping and it will be reinstated in the normal course of work towards the end of the project.

1.11 – I envisage that the piles will be 9m long with a 6m embedment. The piles will probably be 450mm diameter at 600mm centres. Do you really need an indicative pile calculation for these piles used in a contig retaining wall? It will be just indicative since it will be subject to detailed design by a piling contractor when the time comes. If we feel the piles need to be 600mm for added robustness then we will make them bigger.

Phil Hudson

Partner

PRICE & MYERS

T: +44 (0)20 7631 5128

M: +44 (0)7971 202729

37 Alfred Place

London WC1E 7DP

www.pricemyers.com

Stanley Haines
HAINES PHILLIPS ARCHITECTS
Tankerton Works
12 Argyle Walk
London WC1H 8HA

t 020 7833 9324

f 020 7837 2864

e stanley.haines@hainesphillips.co.uk