

**12/12A Park Village West, London NW1 4AE**

**Response to Campbell Reith BIA Audit  
Comments. Project 12066-05 D1**

● **London**

1 – 5 Offord St London N1 1DH  
Telephone 020 7700 6666

**Norwich**

2 Woolgate Court  
St Benedicts Street  
Norwich NR2 4AP  
Telephone 01603 628 074

**Cambridge**

47 – 51 Norfolk Street  
Cambridge CB1 2LD  
Telephone 01223 656 058

[design@conisbee.co.uk](mailto:design@conisbee.co.uk)  
[www.conisbee.co.uk](http://www.conisbee.co.uk)

**Ref:** 140627/M Tulloch BEng MEng

**Approved By:** Chris Boydell CEng., BSc, MICE MStructE

**Date:** 27 May 2016

**Version:** 1

**Directors**

Alan Conisbee BA BAI CEng MStructE  
Chris Boydell BSc CEng MStructE MICE  
Tim Attwood BSc CEng MStructE  
Bob Stagg BSc (Hons) CEng FStructE MICE  
Tom Beaven BEng (Hons) CEng MStructE  
Allan Dunsmore BEng (Hons) CEng MStructE MICE  
Richard Dobson MEng CEng MStructE  
Paul Hartfree IEng MICE MCIHT FGS

**Associates**

David Richards BEng (Hons) CEng MStructE ACGI  
Gary Johns  
Terry Girdler BSc (Hons) Eng MSc CEng FICE MStructE  
Conservation accredited engineer (CARE)  
Ben Heath BEng CEng MStructE  
Keith Hirst BEng CEng MStructE  
Tom Lefever BEng (Hons) CEng C.WEM MICE MCIWEM

Conisbee is a trading name of  
Alan Conisbee and Associates Limited  
Registered in England No. 3958459



2010/586



## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 This document responds to the comments and clarifications sought by Campbell Reith with respect to their audit of the Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) and other documents that were submitted to LB Camden as part of the planning submission 2015/7005/P to form a partial basement beneath this property.
- 1.2 The specific documents under consideration were the Ground Investigation and the BIA prepared by Geotechnical Environmental Associates (GEA) and the Construction Method Statement (CMS) prepared by Conisbee.

## **2.0 BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 Conisbee were asked to advise on some minor modifications to the property which included forming a small basement space beneath part the Coach House, accessed from existing vaults under the courtyard, to create a laundry.
- 2.2 During an inspection visit in August 2014 it was noted that the Coach House had undergone subsidence leading to crack damage. This had gone unnoticed by the client as the finishes within the Coach house are largely stretched fabric and the external cracking was in areas infrequently accessed.
- 2.3 The causation is root action within the clay subsoil due to trees in the adjoining garden of No 13 Park Village West which have been allowed to grow in an unmanaged way.
- 2.4 Conisbee advised that no work should be undertaken to the Coach House until the foundations are stabilised and after discussion with the clients advisers it was decided to utilise the full space beneath the Coach House as part of the remedial solution, which the client has chosen to undertake at their own cost without making an insurance claim against their neighbour.

## **3.0 RESPONSE TO COMMENTS AND QUERIES IN BIA AUDIT**

- 3.1 Reference is made to the clarifications sought in the Audit Query tracker in appendix 2.
- 3.2 Conisbee have amended their CMS to reflect the comments here where appropriate.
- 3.3 Q1 - The Authors of the CMS have been confirmed see front of CMS.

- 3.4 Q2 - The Ground investigation identifies that there is perched water in the made ground above the London Clay or in sandy lenses within it. Consequently water strikes, seepages and stand pipe monitoring have identified water at various levels, which is quite common and the Hydrostatic pressure has been acknowledged in the design. Several trial pits and bore holes have been formed and the majority were dry. The SI acknowledges that conditions may vary within the site and it is part of GEA's duty of care and normal caveats to mention this. We do not consider any further investigations are necessary at this stage.
- 3.5 Q3 - The SI and BIA are a single document and the original version offered options without reference to the underpinning solution outlined in the CMS. The BIA has been revised to coordinate with the CMS. As the majority of the proposed construction is directly under the external walls piling is not a particularly practical solution in this instance as it will be more complex and will encroach significantly into the available space.
- 3.6 Q4 - Conisbee have designed many similar underpinning solutions, in similar ground conditions (largely impermeable London Clay) and do not envisage any difficulty for a competent contractor to manage occasional perched ground water here, if encountered.
- 3.7 Q5 – GEA have undertaken a ground movement analysis and building damage assessment which confirms that the damage category is 'very slight' at worst, thus acceptable. These documents now form part of the revised BIA.

Megan Tulloch:



Chris Boydell:

