T E C H N I K E R

Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) – Addendum

Project: Gloucester Lodge Job No: 15060 Date: 21.09.2016

Introduction

This is a complementary design note to the BIA stages 1 and 2 report produced by Techniker titled Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) Screening and Scoping' reference: 15060/01/04, dated 12 august 2016. In particular, this report addressed stages 3 and 4 of the BIA, namely Site investigations and Impact assessment.

Some of the items originally identified as requiring additional investigation have now been clarified in light of the recent site investigations, the results of which are appended to this note.

Site investigations

As described in the documents submitted to LBC, a site investigation was carried out to determine ground conditions, groundwater levels and potential environmental hazards on site.

This work was undertaken by GRM on 18-19 August 2016 and the results were supplied to Techniker in a report which is appended to this note.

The investigatory works and their results can be summarised as follows:

- 6no. hand-dug trial holes were excavated inside the property as well as externally in the courtyard.
- A single percussive borehole was formed in the forecourt.
- Ground conditions are shown to be a shallow layer of made ground over London Clay which becomes stiffer with an increase in depth.
- No groundwater was encountered during the works.
- Monitoring suggests pore water at 1m above the bottom of the well.
- Minimum allowable bearing pressure of 110kN/m² at 2.5m below ground level can be assumed in the design of the foundations.
- Spread foundations are considered suitable for the ground conditions.
- The ground has high volume change potential.

T E C H N I K E R

The investigations have clarified a number of items which had been nominated in the scoping section of the BIA report referenced above. In particular:

- Question 1b under Subterranean flow;

Will the proposed basement extend beneath the water table surface?

No. No groundwater was encountered during the investigative works. Groundwater monitoring regime indicates pore water at a metre head from the bottom of the well, which is far below the proposed basement formation level.

- Question 5 under Slope stability;

Is the London Clay the shallowest strata at the site?

No. London Clay is overlain by a relatively shallow layer (circa 1m thick) Made ground.

Impact assessment

The effects of the proposed basement construction are outlined in this section. The following paragraphs specifically address the construction impact on the following:

- Subterranean flow
- Stability
- Surface flow and flooding

Subterranean flow

The basement construction is to extend circa 4m below ground level measured from the courtyard or the Gloucester Gate Mews level.

The site investigation has revealed the founding strata as London Clay with no groundwater present (refer to Appendix 1). The formation level would fall within the London Clay layer which is overlain by a shallow (circa1m thick) layer of Made Ground. The London Clay stratum has been verified to be at least 11.5m deep.

The proposed basement will be waterproofed to Grade 3 standard in accordance with BS 8102:2009.

As such, the works are not expected to adversely affect groundwater flow and the water environment in general.

Stability

The soil is understood to be highly shrinkable (volume change potential) and the proposed basement construction works are expected to be affected by this. In particular, the excavation is expected to result in ground heave.

The works would be designed to minimise ground movement during and after construction. The outline construction methodology is appended to this report (Appendix 2).

The excavation and the construction of the basement walls will be carried out in a 'hit and miss' sequence with all faces of the excavation fully propped during the works and until the permanent structure has been installed and cured.

The site investigation report recommends that spread foundations be adopted for the proposed scheme. As such, a reinforced concrete raft, cast monolithically with the basement walls, is proposed. The raft will be designed to sustain ground heave resulting from the excavation.

By employing such construction methods and minimising ground movement, the potential risk of damaging the adjacent structures can be minimised and as shown in the Ground Movement Assessment (GMA) appended to the BIA report dated 12 August 2016, such damage is expected to be within the Category 1 damage on the Burland scale.

The site investigation report (Appendix 1) recommends a minimum allowable bearing pressure at 2.5m below ground level at 110kN/m². This is in line with the assumption made in the GMA for the safe bearing pressure of 150kN/m² at the depth of 4m below ground level. Furthermore, the groundwater had been conservatively assumed at the depth of 1m below ground. It was confirmed during the site investigations that no groundwater was present. The preliminary design calculations supplied in the GMA supplementary document predict the maximum anticipated lateral ground movement to be in the order of 5mm.

A movement monitoring regime would be adhered to during and after construction. The strategy is outlined in Appendix 3.

On the basis of the above, the works are not expected to adversely affect the stability of the ground or the adjacent structures and their foundations.

Surface flow and flooding

The proposal involves forming an undercroft to the courtyard between the main residence and the mews buildings. In addition to this, a glass extension to the main residence is proposed in the courtyard to replace the structure which had previously been there.

The remodelling of the mews buildings would involve extending the roof and incorporating a single-storey basement under the development, while retaining the façade.

The existing courtyard is paved, with two strips of planting to the north and the south adjacent to the garden walls on each side.

The proposed scheme does not materially increase the area of hardstanding and as such is not expected to increase the surface water runoff. The new arrangement in the courtyard would also incorporate soft landscaping over the courtyard slab.

A dedicated foul and surface water drainage system would be incorporated in the proposed scheme which would connect to the existing network.

Furthermore, the proposed basement will be waterproofed to Grade 3 standard in accordance with BS 8102:2009. The waterproofing strategy which would be designed and detailed by a specialist- is likely to incorporated a drained cavity system as well as another form of tanking by either using waterproof concrete or employing an internal / external waterproof membrane.

It is, therefore, believed that the proposed works would not pose any risk of flooding to the development or its surroundings.

TECHNIKER

Signatures

This report is produced by the following qualified signatories, in line with the requirements set out in the LBC documents CGHSS and DP27.

Names: Fardad Ghaffari

Role: Associate

Company: Techniker

Qualifications: MSc CEng MIStructE

Signature:

Frankfi

Name: Matthew Wells Role: Director Company: Techniker Qualifications: RIBA CEng FICE FIStructE Signature:

Name: Christopher Jerram

Role: Director

Company: GRM Development Solutions Ltd

Qualifications: FGS CGeol

Signature:

Jure

TECHNIKER

Appendices

Appendix 1 – Site investigation report (GRM)	
Appendix 2 – Outline construction methodology	
Appendix 3 – Movement monitoring strategy	

Appendix 1 – Site Investigation Report



GRM Development Solutions Ltd Laurus House First Avenue Centrum 100 Burton upon Trent Staffordshire DE14 2WH

 Tel:
 01283 551 249

 Web:
 www.grm-uk.com

Our Ref: P7589/LR/001 Date: 13th September 2016

Mr Matthew Wells Techniker Consulting Structural Engineers 13-19 Vine Hill London EC1R 5DW

Dear Matthew,

Re: 12 Gloucester Gate, Foundation Inspection

Scope of Works

Further to your instruction, GRM have attended the above site to conduct a number of foundation inspection pits in order to determine the thickness of the existing foundations and to determine the nature of the bearing stratum.

GRM are given to understand that development proposals include the excavation of a substantial basement beneath the existing house, court yard and extending beneath the garages located in the north of the site.

A meeting was held between the Client, the Property Owner and one of GRMs Senior Engineers on the 17th August 2016 and the site works were undertaken between the 18th and 19th August 2016.

The works comprised six trial holes excavated internal to the existing site structures and a single cable percussive borehole external to the structures situated within the centre of the driveway.

Site Description

The site is located within Central London, to the east of Regents Park, located off the Outer Circle Road, near Camden Town. The approximate centre of the site can be centred on National Grid Reference (NGR) TQ 285 834. The site is approximately 570m².

The site comprises of a mature front garden situated at the western end of the site, a large multistorey residential dwelling, with a central courtyard covered with block paving and a garage located off Gloucester Gate Mews at the eastern portion of the site. In addition, the presence of mature trees and hedges was noted.

A Site Location and Boundary Plan is appended to this Letter Report.





Trial Pits

A total of six manually excavated trial holes were excavated as part of the investigation. Two of the pits (HD1 & HD2) were situated within the existing court yard and adjacent to the southern and northern walls respectively, HD3 and HD5 were located within a building to the east of the court yard and adjacent to the northern wall, HD4 was situated within the double garage and adjacent to the southern wall and HD6 was excavated within a storeroom and adjacent to the southern wall.

On completion of each excavation an inspection was undertaken by the Client and subsequent reinstatement was undertaken to the satisfaction of the owner.

The Exploratory Hole Location Plan together with the associated trial hole logs and photographs are appended to this Letter Report.

A summary of the findings is presented below:

Hand Excavated Pit 1 (HD1)

Encountered 1030mm of topsoil overlying a sandstone footing, the sandstone footing had a maximum thickness of 150mm. London Clay was encountered at 1.03m begl.

Hand Excavated Pit 2 (HD2)

Encountered 620mm of topsoil over London Clay overlying a sandstone footing, the sandstone footing recorded a maximum thickness of 400mm. London Clay was encountered at 0.62m begl.

Hand Excavated Pit 3 (HD3)

The footing for the wall at the above location was bearing on to 250mm of concrete with two courses of bricks stepping out at the base of the wall. London Clay was encountered at 0.30m begl.

Hand Excavated Pit 4 (HD4)

Encountered 150mm thick unreinforced concrete floor slab comprising, 30mm of screed, over 70mm of concrete with 50mm of sub base. The floor slab was underlain by 470mm of London Clay sitting on a sandstone pad with a maximum thickness of 110mm.

Hand Excavated Pit 5 (HD5)

Not fully excavated due to a drain obstructing progression.

Hand Excavated Pit 6 (HD6)

Encountered a 50mm thick concrete slab sitting on a 50-60mm wide brick footing this was underlain by 630mm of London Clay

Cable Percussive Borehole

The single cable percussive borehole (BH1) was drilled to a depth of 15m begl for the purposes of establishing the depth of the groundwater and acquiring samples for geotechnical testing.

An initial 0.1m thick horizon of tarmacadam was observed to overlie a clayey gravel sub-base to a depth of 0.25m begl. This was underlain by Made Ground recorded to be firm to stiff (medium to high strength), gravelly, slightly sandy clay containing brick fragments to a depth of 1m begl.

The Made Ground was underlain by London Clay comprising firm to stiff (medium to high strength), light brown, laminated clay containing occasional sand pockets grading into weathered mudstone to a depth of 11.5m begl.



Standard Penetration Test (SPT) N values showed a general increase with depth and ranged from 8 to 25 (firm to very stiff); however, the N value of 25 at 8m begl is considered likely to be due to the presence of a sandstone boulder recorded during the drilling. In general, the SPTs suggest stiff (high strength) strata, or better, below 4m.

Groundwater Conditions

Groundwater was not encountered during the drilling works. Subsequent monitoring by the data logger, installed within the CP borehole, records that groundwater, assumed to be pore water has filled the base of the well to an approximate head of 1m. Accordingly, groundwater is not considered to pose a risk to the proposed basement development and allowances for dewatering are unlikely to be required.

Geotechnical Testing

Geotechnical soils testing has been undertaken as part of the ground investigation comprising the following:

- Two samples of the London Clay underwent Atterberg Limits (PI) classification.
- Two samples of the London Clay underwent pH and water soluble sulphate testing.

Geotechnical tests were selected to provide the parameters necessary for the budgetary design of the development including foundations and infrastructure. The geotechnical test results are appended to this Letter Report.

Geotechnical Results

Two samples of the London Clay were sampled and tested for their volume change potential (VCP). The results indicate a high volume change potential. Therefore, a high VCP should be adopted for foundation design. Accordingly, a minimum construction depth of 1m begl should be adopted for foundations within cohesive strata.

It should be noted that the effect of potentially locally desiccated clay (within the court yard – due to the influence of trees) has not been assessed during this investigation and it is assumed that the designer will take this in to account during the design process and make appropriate allowances.

Buried Concrete

Two samples of the London Clay were tested for water soluble sulphate and pH.

Based on the recorded water soluble sulphate and pH levels in the soils below the site and assuming mobile groundwater conditions, in accordance with requirements of BRE Special Digest 1 (2005), 'Concrete in Aggressive Ground', the Design Sulphate Class for buried concrete at the site should be assumed as DS-4 and the ACEC Class as AC-3s.

The results of the water soluble sulphate and pH testing are appended to this report.

Foundations

Foundations must not be founded in Made Ground, buried topsoil or soft natural strata, all of which should be fully penetrated by all new foundations.

The shallow natural cohesive strata noted during the investigation are considered suitable in their current condition for the proposed structure to found on.



It is anticipated that the depth of excavation to accommodate the basement will be approximately 2.5m begl placing it within the firm (medium strength) London Clay.

Construction of the basement is considered likely to require excavation of the natural cohesive soils to circa 2.5m begl. The natural cohesive soils noted during the investigation at this depth are considered suitable in their current condition for the proposed structures to found on.

The cohesive soils encountered, at anticipated foundation depths, were generally at least firm. It is anticipated that a nett allowable bearing pressure of at least 110kN/m² should be available for conventional strip / trench fill or reinforced raft footings.

Once the development plan and levels have been finalised, consideration should be given to the most appropriate foundation solution, taking into account removal of existing structures, stability of the strata and proximity to boundaries/services/roads/existing structures

Trees and hedges were observed within influencing distance to the proposed building, therefore deepening of foundations in accordance with a recognised standard, such as NHBC Chapter 4.2, are considered to be required as foundations are likely to bear onto, or cut into, the observed cohesive strata. Accordingly, an arboricultural survey is recommended to better determine the depth of influence of the trees.

Floor Slabs

The basement will have a ground bearing floor slab.

Shallow strata are likely to become heavily disturbed by construction activities (especially during inclement weather) and care must be taken not to make them unsuitable as a bearing stratum as this could result in an increased requirement for a suspended slab

The basement will need to be fully-tanked and waterproofed to BS8102:2009 Grade 2 specification (the use of a geosynthetic clay liner is not permitted); such a construction method will be sufficient to mitigate against any potential gas risk. The basement walls will need to act as retaining walls.

Summary Summary

It is considered that the site is suitable for the proposed development, assuming compliance with all the recommendations contained within this letter report.

We trust that the above is sufficient for your current purposes, however if you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact us.

Yours Sincerely,

Keith Mottram Senior Geotechnical Engineer

Enc:

- Site Location and Boundary Plan
- Exploratory Hole Location Plan
- Trial Pit Logs and Associated Photographs
- Geotechnical Results













Hole Location Plan





DO NOT SCALE NOTES: HD1 Hand Dug Pit GP geoenvironmental -**GRM Development Solutions Ltd** Laurus House, First Ave, Centrum 100, Burton-on-Trent, Staffordshire Tel: 01283 551 249 Fax: 01283 211 968 CLIENT: **Techniker Consulting** PROJECT: 12 Gloucester Lodge, London TITLE: Hand Dug Pit 2 Location and Photographs SCALE@SIZE : SSUE: NTS DATE: DESIGN/DRAWN by : August 2016 AW PROJECT No: DRAWING No: P7589 003 © GRM Development Solutions Ltd

© Crown Copyright. AL 100014100









DO NOT NOTES:	SCALE				
HD1 Hand	Dug Pit				
GRM					
Deve	elopment Solution pronmental - civil - structu				
GRM Developme	ent Solutions Ltd				
Laurus House, First Ave, Centrum 100, Burton-on-Trent, Staffordshire					
Tel: 01283 551 249 Fax: 01283 211 968					
CLIENT:					
Techniker Consulting					
PROJECT:					
12 Gloucester Lodge, London					
TITLE:					
Hand Dug Pit 1 Location and Photographs					
SCALE@SIZE : NTS	ISSUE:				
DESIGN/DRAWN by : AW	DATE: August 2016				
PROJECT No:					
F1009	005				





Hole Location Plan





NOT	ES:	DO NOT	SCALE	
	HD1	Hand	Dug Pit	
		GRI	elopment Solutions	
GRM Development Solutions Ltd Laurus House, First Ave, Centrum 100, Burton-on-Trent, Staffordshire Tel: 01283 551 249 Fax: 01283 211 968 mail@grm-uk.com				
LIENT:	Тес	hniker	Consulting	
ROJECT: 12	Glou	cester	Lodge, London	
TLE: Ha	and D	ug Pit 3 Photog	3 Location and graphs	
CALE@S	NTS		ISSUE:	
ESIGN/D	RAWN by : AW		DATE: August 2016	
ROJECT	^{№:} P758	9	DRAWING No:	
© G	RM De © Crowr	velopm Copyrigh	ent Solutions Ltd at. AL 100014100	





Hole Location Plan









Hole Location Plan





DO NOT NOTES:	SCALE			
HD1 Hand	Dug Pit			
Did not excava obstruction in a client instructions	te due to drain accordance with s.			
GRM Development Solutions Ltd Laurus House, First Ave, Centrum 100, Burton-on-Trent, Staffordshire Te: 01283 551 249 Fax: 01283 211 968 mail@grm-uk.com				
Techniker Consulting				
PROJECT: 12 Gloucester Lodge, London				
™™E: Hand Dug Pit 5 Location and Photographs				
SCALE@SIZE : NTS	ISSUE:			
DESIGN/DRAWN by : AW	DATE: August 2016			
PROJECT No: P7589	DRAWING No:			
© GRM Development Solutions Ltd				

© Crown Copyright. AL 100014100



Hole Location Plan





NOTES				
NOTES.	DO NOT SCA	LE		
HD1	Hand Dug	Pit		
	GRIV	Solutions structure		
GRM Development Solutions Ltd				
Burton-on-Trent, Staffordshire Tel: 01283 551 249 Fax: 01283 211 968				
Tel: 01		283 211 968		
Tel: 01 <u>mail@gr</u> CLIENT:	<u>m-uk.com</u> <u>www</u>	283 211 968 v.grm-uk.com		
Tel: 01 mail@gn CLIENT: Tec	m-uk.com www chniker Con	283 211 968 v.grm-uk.com sulting		
Tel: 01 mail@gn CLIENT: PROJECT: 12 Glou	m-uk.com www	283 211 968 v.grm-uk.com sulting ge. London		
Tel: 01 mail@gn CLIENT: Tec PROJECT: 12 Glou	m-uk.com www chniker Con ucester Lode	283 211 968 v.grm-uk.com sulting ge, London		
Tel: 01 mail@gr CLIENT: Tec PROJECT: 12 Glou TITLE: Hand [n-uk.com www. chniker Con ucester Lode	283 211 968 v.grm-uk.com sulting ge, London cation and		
Tel: 01 mail@gr CLIENT: Tec PROJECT: 12 Glou TITLE: Hand D	n-uk.com www chniker Con icester Lode Dug Pit 6 Lo Photograp	283 211 968 v.grm-uk.com sulting ge, London cation and hs		
Tel: 01 mail@gr CLIENT: Tec PROJECT: 12 Glou TITLE: Hand E SCALE@SIZE : NTS	chniker Con Icester Lode Dug Pit 6 Lo Photograp	283 211 968 v.grm-uk.com sulting ge, London cation and hs		
Tel: 01 mail@gr CLIENT: Tec PROJECT: 12 Glou TITLE: Hand E SCALE@SIZE : NTS DESIGN/DRAWN by AW	m-uk.com www chniker Con ucester Lodg Dug Pit 6 Lo Photograp	283 211 968 V.grm-uk.com sulting ge, London cation and hs		
Tel: 01 mail@gr CLIENT: Tec PROJECT: 12 Glou TITLE: Hand E SCALE@SIZE : NTS DESIGN/DRAWN by AW PROJECT No: P758	chniker Con Icester Lod Dug Pit 6 Lo Photograp	283 211 968 v.grm-uk.com sulting ge, London cation and hs ugust 2016 NG №: 012		







GRM Development Solutions

Laurus House First Avenue Centrum 100 Burton Upon Trent Staffs DE14 2WH

	Α	nalytical	Test Report:	L16/	/1926/	/GRM/	00:
--	---	-----------	--------------	------	--------	-------	-----

Your Project Reference:	12 Gloucester Gate, London	Samples Received on:	25.08.2016
Your Order Number:	P7589	Testing Instruction Received:	25.08.2016
Report Issue Number:	1	Sample Tested:	25.08 to 08.09.2016
Samples Analysed:	2 Soils	Report issued:	08.09.2016

Signed

James Gane Manager - Data Logistics Nicholls Colton Analytical

Notes:				
General				
Please refer to Methodologies tab for details pertaining to the analytical methods undertaken.				
Samples will be retained for 14 days after issue of this report unless otherwise requested.				
With the exception of Sulphate and Sulpur, which are crushed over the 2mm test sieve, concentrations are reported as a percentage mass of the dry soil passing the 10mm BS test sieve. As received samples have been corrected for moisture content but not stone content.				
Samples were supplied by customer.				
Deviant Samples				
Samples were received in suitable containers	Yes			
A date and time of sampling was provided	Yes			
Some sample handling times were exceeded prior to analysis of determinants	Yes			
Where samples do not meet one or more of the above criteria they will be classed as deviant, this means d	ata may not be representative of the sample at the time of sampling and it is possible that results			

Where samples do not meet one or more of the above criteria they will be classed as deviant, this means data may not be representative of the sample at the time of sampling and it is possible th provided may be compromised.

Accreditation Key

UKAS = UKAS Accreditation, MCERTS = MCERTS Accreditation, u = Unaccredited





L16/1926/GRM/001

Project Reference - 12 Gloucester Gate, London

Analytical Test Results - BRE Suite

NCA Reference			16-27005	16-27006
Client Sample Reference			BH1	BH1
Client Sample Location			BH1	BH1
Depth (m)			1.20-1.65	3.00
Date of Sampling			19.08.2016	19.08.2016
Time of Sampling			Not provided	Not provided
Sample Matrix			Clay	Clay
Determinant	Units	Accreditation		
Water soluble sulphate	(mg/l)	u	290	3200
Acid Soluble Sulphate	(%)	u	0.12	1.09
Total Sulphur	(%)	u	0.04	0.32
pH Value	pH Units	MCERTS	8.3	7.8





L16/1926/GRM/001

Project Reference - 12 Gloucester Gate, London

Sample Descriptions

NCA Reference	Client Sample Reference	Sample Depth (m)	Description	% Passing 2mm BS test sieve
16-27005	BH1	1.20-1.65	Brown slightly sandy slightly gravelly clay.	98
16-27006	BH1	3.00	Brown clay.	100





L16/1926/GRM/001

Project Reference - 12 Gloucester Gate, London

Analysis Methodologies

Matrix	Determinant	Sample condition for analysis	Test Method used
Soil	рН	As Received	In house method statement - MS - CL - pH (Soil) using a 1:3 soil to water extraction
Soil	Sulphate	Air Dried	In house method statement - MS - CL - Anions (Aquakem)
Soil	Acid Sulphate	Air Dried	In house method statement - MS - CL - BRE
Soil	Total Sulphur	Air Dried	In house method statement - MS - CL - BRE





Nicholls Colton Analytical 7-11 Harding Street, Leicester, LE1 4DH Tel: 0116 253 6333. Fax: 0116 251 4709 e-mail: testing@nicholls-colton.co.uk website: www.nicholls-colton.co.uk

TEST REPORT

BS 1377 PLASTICITY INDEX AND MOISTURE CONTENT

12 Gloucester Gate, London

Report no. L16/1926/GRM/002				
Order reference: P7589	Date of receipt: 25/08/2016	Date of testing: 30/08 to 01/09/2016	Date of issue: 08/09/2016	

NCA Sample reference	Client sample reference	Sample type	Depth (m)	Sample description	Fines passing 425µm (%)	Liquid limit (%)	Plastic limit (%)	Plasticity index (%)	Moisture content (%)
16-27007	BH1	Disturbed	3.0	Brown clay.	100	77	31	46	35
16-27397	BH1	Disturbed	2.0	Brown slightly silty clay.	100	74	25	49	33

NOTES:

1. Sample preparation was in accordance with BS 1377 : Part 1 : 1990.

2. Plasticity index testing was in accordance with BS 1377 : Part 2 : 1990 Clauses 3, 4.4 (one-point) & 5.

3. Moisture content testing was in accordance with BS 1377 : Part 2 : 1990 Clause 3.2.3.1 .

4. The material was prepared from its natural state.

5. Some information required by BS 1377 : Part 1 : 1990 Clause 9 is not included in the report. The information will be provided if requested.

..... J. Gane,

Manager – Data Logistics Nicholls Colton Analytical

GRM Development Solutions Ltd Laurus House First Avenue Centrum 100 Burton Upon Trent Staffordshire DE14 2WH



Cable-Percussion Borehole

Borehole No.

BH 1

Sheet 1 of 2 Ground Level (mAOD)

Site Name:

12 Gloucester Lodge, London

	Clie	ent:	Techr	iica Cons	sulting				GF	RM Proje	ct Ref:	P7589	Coordina	tes E
	Water	Sample	e and li	n Situ Tes	sting	Depth	n Level							
Well	Strikes	Depth (m)	Туре	Results		(m)	(m)	Le	gend		Stra	tum Descripti	on	
		0.20 0.20 0.50 1.00 1.20 - 1.65	D ES ES D S D	N=6 (1,	1/1,1,2,2)	0.10 0.25 1.00				Tarmac MADE C Medium Gravel is (sub bas MADE C Stiff to fi to cours and bric MADE C Stiff to fi occasion cobbles.	GROUND dense orang s medium sul se) GROUND rm gravelly s e angular to s k fragments. GROUND rm light brow nal grey redu . Grading into	e brown slightl prounded to rou lightly sandy C subrouded sand n laminated CL ction spots and weathered mu	y clayey GRAVEL. unded quartzite. LAY. Gravel is fine dstone, quartzite LAY. With I occasional chalk dstone.	
		2.00 2.00 2.00 - 2.45	D S D	N=8 (1,	1/2,2,2,2)						N CLAY			2
		3.00 3.00 3.00 - 3.45	D S D	N=7 (6,	4/1,2,2,2)									3
		4.00 4.00 4.00 - 4.45	D S D	N=10 (1	,2/2,2,3,3)					Occasion	nal orange b	prown sand p	ockets.	4
		5.00 5.00 5.00 - 5.45	D S D	N=15 (2	,3/3,4,4,4)					- - - - - - - -				5
		6.00 6.00 - 6.45 6.50	D D S	N=15 (2	,2/3,4,4,4)									6
		7.00	D											7
		8.00 8.00 - 8.45 9.00	S D D	N=25 (10	0,5/6,6,6,7)					Sandstol	ne boulder a	<u>at 8.0</u> m.	ot	
		Dave									Cont	Chiselling Detail	s	
Groum	Equipm	Mike ent: Da	ando 25	00	Logę	yer:	AVV			Depth Top	Duration		Remarks	
No Gr	ound Wa	ter encountere	ed.						┝		 	asing Diameter by F	Depth	
General Remarks: Data Logger installed in hole after completion.							Depth Base	Diameter		Remarks				
Hol	e Starte	d: 18/08/20	16		Hole Comp	olete:	18/08/2016			Versi	on:	DRAFT	Scale:	1:50

GRM Protocolina and and
geoenvironmental - Ch

Cable-Percussion Borehole

Borehole No.

BH 1

Sheet 2 of 2 Ground Level (mAOD)

Site Name:

12 Gloucester Lodge, London

View Description Fridad Statum Description Weal Sealer 0.00 - 0.46 D Description Image: Sealer Statum Statum Statum Description Image: Sealer Image: Se				Taska					~			07500	Coordinate	es _
West Depth (m) Sint beam in Situ Testing Depth (m) Depth (m) Level (m) Level (m) Depth (m) Stratum Description 1 900-45 5 N=15 (3.30.3.4.5) 1 <th></th> <th>CIIE</th> <td>ent:</td> <td>Techr</td> <td>lica Consulting</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>G</td> <td>KIM Proje</td> <td>CTRET: F</td> <td>7589</td> <td></td> <td>E N</td>		CIIE	ent:	Techr	lica Consulting				G	KIM Proje	CTRET: F	7589		E N
Stitles Depth (m) Type Results (m)	Well	Water	Sample	and I	n Situ Testing	Depth	Level	le	aend		Stra	tum Descriptio	n	
Image: Subscript of the subscrit of the subscript of the subscript of the subscript o		Strikes	Depth (m)	Туре	Results	(m)	(m)							
0.50 S N=16 (3,3) (3,4,6) Image: Signal (1,4,4,4,7) Image: Signal (1,4,4,4,4,7) Image: Signal (1,4,4,4,4,7) Image: Signal (1,4,4,4,4,7) Image: Signal (1,4,4,4,4,4,4,4,4,4,4,4,4,4,4,4,4,4,4,4			9.00 - 9.45	D				=		Becomin	g very firm	<u>with d</u> epth.		-
Orice O N O (000000000000000000000000000000000000			9.50	s	N=15 (3 3/3 3 4 5)			=		·				-
10.00 D N=22 (4.44.4, 7, 7) 11.50 Very still light prev slightly gravelity CLAY Companing a throne in tachene. Gravel is fire subconded to hole of the subconded 11 12.00 D N=22 (4.44.4, 7, 7) 11.50 Very still light prev slightly gravelity CLAY Companing a throne in tachene. Gravel is fire subconded 11 12.00 D N=22 (2.344, 6, 7) 15.45 Very still light prev slightly gravelity CLAY Companing a throne in tachene. Gravel is fire subconded 13 14.00 D D N=21 (2.344, 6, 7) 15.45 End of Boerdole at 18.4be 16 15.00 D D N=21 (2.344, 6, 7) 15.45 End of Boerdole at 18.4be 16 Crew: Dave Mileo D N=21 (2.344, 6, 7) 15.45 End of Boerdole at 18.4be 16 Crew: Dave Mileo D N=21 (2.344, 6, 7) 15.45 End of Boerdole at 18.4be 16 Crew: Dave Mileo D N=21 (2.344, 6, 7) 15.45 End of Boerdole at 18.4be 16 Crew: Dave Mileo D N=21 (2.344, 6, 7) 15.45 End of Boerdole at 18.4be 16 Crew: Dave Mileo D N End of Boerdole at 18.4be 16 Total Logger in the Alexa in the Alexa in theter in theter End of Boerdole at 18.4be <td< th=""><th></th><th></th><th>5.00</th><th></th><th>14-10 (0,0/0,0,4,0)</th><th></th><th></th><th>_</th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th></td<>			5.00		14-10 (0,0/0,0,4,0)			_						
1000 D 1100 Da			40.00					_		•				-
100 S N=22 (4,4(4,7,7)) 11.50 11.50 11.50 11.50 12.00 D 13.00 D 14.00 D 15.00 15.00 15.00 S 16.00 S 17.00 S 18.00 S 19.00 S 10.00 S 10.00 S 11.50 S			10.00	D				_		· ·				10 -
11.00 11.00 N=22 (4,4/4,4,7,7) 11.50 Interview I								_						
1100 11000 11000 11000 11000 11000 11000 110000 110000 110000 110000 110000 110000 1100000 1100000000000000000000000000000000000								_						
11.00 11.00 <td< th=""><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th>-</th></td<>														-
Income Income<			11.00 11.00 - 11.45	S	N=22 (4,4/4,4,7,7)			_						11 -
11.50 11.51 11.51								_						-
12.00 D 12.00 D 13.00 D 13.00 D 13.00 D 13.00 13.00 D 13.00 13.00 D 14.00 D 14.00 D 14.00 D 14.00 D 15.00 16.00 17.00 17.00 17.00 17.00 18.00 18.00 18.00 18.00 18.00 18.00 18.00 18.00						11.50		•	• • • •	Very stif	f light grey sl	ightly gravelly C	LAY. Containing	
12.00 D 12.00 D 13.00 D 14.00 D 14.00 D 14.00 D 14.00 D 15.00 15.00 15.00 15.00 15.00 15.00 15.00 15.00 15.00 15.00 15.00 15.00 15.00 15.45 End of Borehole at 15.50 15.00 16.								<u>.</u>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	a lithore	elic structure.	Gravel is fine su	brounded	-
13.00 D 13.00 D 13.00 D 14.00 D 15.00 D 14.00 D 15.00 15.00 S D 15.45 End of Boentale at 15.46m 15.00 15.00 S D 15.45 End of Boentale at 15.46m 15.00 15.00 S D 15.45 End of Boentale at 15.46m 16 - - - - 16.00 S D N=21 (2.34.4.6.7) 15.45 End of Boentale at 15.46m 16 - - - - - 17.00 - - - - 18.00 - - - - - 19.00 - - - - - 19.00 - - - - - 19.00 - - - - - 19.00 - - - - - 19.00 - - - - - 19.00 - - - - - 19.00 - - - - - 19.00 - - -			12.00	D					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	LONDO	N CLAY			12 -
13.00 D 14.00 D 15.00 14.00 D 14.00 14.00 14.00 14.00 14.00 15.00 16.00 15.00 16.00 <th></th> <th> -</th>														-
13.00 D 13.00 D 13.00 D 14.00 D 14.00 D 14.00 D 15.00 15.00 S D N=21 (2,3/4,4,6,7) 15.45 15.00 15.00 S D N=21 (2,3/4,4,6,7) 15.45 End of Borehole at 15.45m 16 16 - - 17.00 S D 18.00 - - 19.00 - - 19.00 - - 19.00 - - 19.00 - - 19.00 - - 10.00 - - 10.00 - - 10.00 - - 11.00 - - 11.00 - - 11.00 - - 10.00 - - 10.00 - - 10.00 - - 10.00 - - 10.00 - - 10.00 - - 10.00 - - 10.00 - - 10.00 - - <								· <u>·</u>	·····					
13.00 D 13.00 D 14.00 D 14.00 D 15.00 15.00 D N=21 (2,3/4,4,6,7) 15.45 15.00 15.00 D N=21 (2,3/4,4,6,7) 15.45 15.00 15.00 15.45 D N=21 (2,3/4,4,6,7) 16 15.00 15.45 D End of Borehole at 15.45m 16 16 16 16 16 17 16 16 16 16 18 Dave Logger: AW Depth Top Duration Remarks Crew: Dave Logger: AW Depth Top Duration Remarks Sciound Water encountered. Casing Dameter to Depth Remarks Depth Base Demeter Remarks Data Logger installed in hole after completion. Hole Startlet: 18/09/2016 Version: DRAFT Scale: 15.00														-
14.00 D 15.00 D 15.00 15.00 15.00 15.00 15.00 15.00 15.00 15.00 15.00 15.00 15.00 15.00 15.00 15.45 15.45 End of Borehole at 15.45m 16 16 17 16 18 16 18 16 19 Duration Remarks 18 0 Ground Water encountered. Case Durater by logeth General Remarks: Duration Data Logger installed in hole after completion. 1808/2016 Hole Startes: 1908/2016			13.00	D				<u> </u>		2				13 -
14.00 D 15.00 D 15.00 S 16.7 S 17.7 S 18.7 S 19.7 S								<u> </u>						-
14.00 D 14.00 D 14.00 D 15.00 15.00 D 15.00 15.00 15.00 15.00 15.00 15.00 15.45 End of Boreholde at 15.45m 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 17 15.45 End of Boreholde at 15.45m 16 18 18 16 16 19 18 16 16 19 18 16 16 10 18 18 16 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 19 18 18 18 19 18 18 18 19 18 18 18 19 18 18 18 19 18 18 18 19 18 18 18 19 18 18 18 19 18 18 18 19 18 18 18 19 18 18 18 19 18 18 18								<u>.</u>						-
14.00 D 15.00 D 15.00 D 15.00 S 16 S 17 S 18 S 18 S 18 S 19 S 18 S 18 S 19 S 19 S		1						<u>.</u>	<u> </u>					-
15.00 D N=21 (2,3/4,4,6,7) 15.45 End of Borehole at 15.45m 15 15.00 15.00 S N=21 (2,3/4,4,6,7) 15.45 End of Borehole at 15.45m 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 17 7 16 16 16 18 Crew: Dave Logger: AW Depth Top Duration Equipment: Dando 2500 Casing Diameter by Depth Remarks Casing Diameter by Depth General Remarks: Depth Base Diameter Remarks Casing Diameter by Depth Data Logger installed in hole after completion. Hole Started: 18/08/2016 Version: DRAFT Scale: 1:50		1	14.00					<u>.</u>						-
15.00 D N=21 (2.3/4,4,6,7) 15.45 End of Borehole at 15.45m 15 15.00 15.00 15.45 End of Borehole at 15.45m 16 16 16 16 16 17 17 16 18 Crew: Dave Logger: AW Equipment: Dando 2500 Groundwater Remarks: End of Borehole at 15.45m No Ground Water encountered. Casing Diameter by Depth Remarks Octional Remarks: Depth Bale Diameter Remarks Data Logger installed in hole after completion. Hole Started: 18/08/2016 Version: DRAFT Scale: 1:50			14.00	D										14 -
15.00 15.00-15.45 D D N=21 (2,3/4,4,6,7) 15.45 End of Borehole at 15.45m 15 End of Borehole at 15.45m 15.45 End of Borehole at 15.45m 16 16 16 16 16 17 18 18 18 Crew: Dave Mike Logger: AW Output to the ling Details Equipment: Dano 2500 End of Borehole at 15.45m 18 General Remarks: Casing Dameter by Depth Remarks Data Logger installed in hole after completion. Hole Complete: 1800/2016 Version:: DRAFT Scale: 15:00														=
15.00 15.00-15.45 D D N=21 (2,3/4,4,6,7) 15.45 End of Berehole at 15.45m 15 End of Berehole at 15.45m 15.45 End of Berehole at 15.45m 16 16 Crew: Dave Mike Logger: AW Depth Top Duration Remarks Rogereral Remarks: Dando 2500 Casing Dameter by Depth Remarks Casing Dameter by Depth Remarks No Ground Water encountered. Depth Top Duration Remarks Depth Base Diameter Remarks Data Logger installed in hole after completion. Hole Complete: 18/08/2016 Version: DRAFT Scale: 1:50								<u>.</u>	·					-
15.00 D N=21 (2,3/4,4,6,7) 15.45 End of Borehole at 15.45m 16 15.00 15.00 15.45 D N=21 (2,3/4,4,6,7) 15.45 End of Borehole at 15.45m 16 16 16 15.45 15.45 End of Borehole at 15.45m 16 17 16 16 17 17 17 18 18 18 18 18 18 Crew: Dave Mike Logger: AW Depth Top Duration Remarks Goundwater Remarks: No Ground Water encountered. Casing Diameter by Depth Remarks Data Logger installed in hole after completion. Depth Base Diameter Remarks Data Logger installed in hole after completion. 18/08/2016 Version: DRAET Scale: 1:50								. <u>.</u>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					-
15.00 - 15.45 D 15.45 End of Borehole at 15.45m 16 15.45 End of Borehole at 15.45m 16 16 16 11 15.45 End of Borehole at 15.45m 16 16 17 15.45 16 16 17 17 17 17 18 Crew: Dave Mike Logger: AW Depth Top Duration Remarks 18 Casing Dameter by Depth Casing Dameter by Depth Casing Dameter by Depth 18 General Remarks: Data Logger installed in hole after completion. Depth Base Diameter Remarks Data Logger installed in hole after completion. Hole Complete: 18/08/2016 Version: DRAET Scale: 1:50			15.00 15.00	D S	N=21 (2 3/4 4 6 7)			. <u>.</u>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					15 -
15.45 Image: Second			15.00 - 15.45	D										-
Image: Crew: Dave Mike Logger: AW Depth Top Duration Remarks Requipment: Dando 2500 Casing Diameter by Depth Remarks General Remarks: Casing Diameter by Depth Remarks Data Logger installed in hole after completion. Hole Complete: 18/08/2016 Version: DRAFT Scale: 1:50	`					15.45		•			End o	f Borehole at 15.45r	ı	1 -
Image: Crew: Dave Mike Logger: AW Chiseling Details Image: Crew: Dave Mike Logger: AW Depth Top Duration Remarks: Dando 2500 Chiseling Details Image: Crew: Cre														-
Image: Crew: Dave Mike Logger: AW Depth Top Duration Remarks Requipment: Dando 2500 Image: Chiselling Details Image: Chiselling Details Image: Chiselling Details General Remarks: Data Logger installed in hole after completion. Image: Chiselling Details Image: Chiselling Details Hole Started: 18/08/2016 Hole Complete: 18/08/2016 Version: DRAFT Scale: 1:50														16 -
Image: Crew: Dave Mike Logger: AW Chiselling Details Equipment: Dando 2500 Depth Top Duration Remarks So Ground Water encountered. Casing Diameter by Depth Casing Diameter by Depth General Remarks: Depth Base Diameter Remarks Data Logger installed in hole after completion. Hole Complete: 18/08/2016 Version: DRAFT Scale: 1:50														-
Image: Crew: Dave Mike Logger: AW Chiselling Details Equipment: Dando 2500 Depth Top Duration Remarks Goround Water encountered. Casing Diameter by Depth Casing Diameter by Depth General Remarks: Depth Base Diameter Remarks Data Logger installed in hole after completion. Depth Base Diameter Remarks														
Image: Crew: Dave Mike Logger: AW Image: Chiselling Details Crew: Dave Mike Logger: AW Depth Top Duration Remarks: Dando 2500 Remarks: Image: Chiselling Details Goround Water encountered. Casing Diameter by Depth Casing Diameter by Depth General Remarks: Depth Top Diameter Remarks Data Logger installed in hole after completion. Depth Base Diameter Remarks Hole Started: 18/08/2016 Hole Complete: 18/08/2016 Version: DRAFT Scale: 1:50														
Crew: Dave Mike Logger: AW Chiselling Details Equipment: Dando 2500 Depth Top Duration Remarks Groundwater Remarks: No Ground Water encountered. Casing Diameter by Depth Casing Diameter by Depth General Remarks: Depth Base Diameter Remarks Data Logger installed in hole after completion. Hole Complete: 18/08/2016 Version: DRAFT Scale: 1:50														17 -
Image: Crew: Dave Mike Logger: AW Image: Chiseling Details Image: Chiseling Details Equipment: Dando 2500 Image: Dando 2500 Image: Chiseling Details Image: Chiseling Details Groundwater Remarks: No Ground Water encountered. Image: Chiseling Details Image: Chiseling Details No Ground Water encountered. Image: Chiseling Details Image: Chiseling Details Image: Chiseling Details General Remarks: Data Logger installed in hole after completion. Image: Diameter by Depth Image: Chiseling Details Data Logger installed in hole after completion. Image: Diameter by Depth Image: Chiseling Details Image: Chiseling Details Hole Started: 18/08/2016 Hole Complete: 18/08/2016 Version: DRAET Scale: 1:50														-
Crew: Dave Mike Logger: AW Chiselling Details Equipment: Dando 2500 Depth Top Duration Remarks Groundwater Remarks: No Ground Water encountered. Casing Diameter by Depth Casing Diameter by Depth General Remarks: Depth Base Diameter Remarks Data Logger installed in hole after completion. Hole Complete: 18/08/2016 Version: DRAFT Scale: 1:50														
Crew: Dave Mike Logger: AW Chiselling Details Equipment: Dando 2500 Depth Top Duration Remarks Groundwater Remarks: No Ground Water encountered. Casing Diameter by Depth General Remarks: Data Logger installed in hole after completion. Depth Base Diameter Remarks Data Logger installed in hole after completion. Hole Complete: 18/08/2016 Version: DRAET Scale: 1:50														-
Crew: Dave Mike Logger: AW Chiselling Details Equipment: Dando 2500 Depth Top Duration Remarks Groundwater Remarks: No Ground Water encountered. Casing Diameter by Depth Image: Casing Diameter by Depth General Remarks: Depth Base Diameter Remarks Data Logger installed in hole after completion. Depth Base Diameter Remarks Hole Started: 18/08/2016 Hole Complete: 18/08/2016 Version: DRAET Scale: 1:50														18 -
Crew: Dave Mike Logger: AW Equipment: Dando 2500 Groundwater Remarks: No Ground Water encountered. General Remarks: Data Logger installed in hole after completion. Hole Started: 18/08/2016 Hole Complete: 18/08/2016			Dave									Chicelling Details		10
Equipment: Dando 2500 Groundwater Remarks: Casing Diameter by Depth No Ground Water encountered. Casing Diameter by Depth General Remarks: Depth Base Diameter Remarks Data Logger installed in hole after completion. Mole Complete: 18/08/2016 Version: DRAFT Scale: 1:50	(Crew:	Mike		Log	iger:	AW			Depth Top	Duration		Remarks	
Groundwater Remarks: Image: Casing Diameter by Depth No Ground Water encountered. Casing Diameter by Depth General Remarks: Depth Base Diameter Data Logger installed in hole after completion. Depth Base Diameter Hole Started: 18/08/2016 Hole Complete: 18/08/2016		Equipm	nent: Da	ndo 25	600									
General Remarks: Depth Base Diameter Remarks Data Logger installed in hole after completion. Hole Started: 18/08/2016 Hole Complete: 18/08/2016 Version: DRAFT Scale: 1:50	Grour	ndwater	Remarks:	hd										
General Remarks. Data Logger installed in hole after completion. Hole Started: 18/08/2016 Hole Complete: 18/08/2016 Version: DRAFT Scale: 1:50	Conce			.					<u> </u>	Depth Base	C Diameter	asing Diameter by De	pth Remarks	
Hole Started: 18/08/2016 Hole Complete: 18/08/2016 Version: DRAFT Scale: 1:50	Data L	General Remarks: Data Logger installed in hole after completion.												
	Hol	le Starte	d: 18/08/20 ²	16	Hole Com	plete: 1	8/08/2016			Versi	on:	DRAFT	Scale:	1:50

Appendix 2 – Outline Construction Methodology

Basement Construction Methodology

Project: Gloucester Lodge Job No: 15060 Date: 21.09.2016

Basement design

In light of the findings from the site investigation report the basement will be designed as a rigid box with propped cantilevered side walls and a reinforced concrete raft slab at formation level. A reinforced concrete floor slab will restrain the tops of the basement walls.

Depending on the party wall agreement, a traditional underpin or special foundations approach may be taken. In either case, the following principles will be adhered to in the construction of the basement. In the traditional method, mass concrete pins will be installed under the Party Wall foundations prior to casting the reinforced concrete basement walls to the front of the pins. The lateral strength and stiffness will be provided by the RC basement walls as not to load the unreinforced pins. If a special foundations agreement were to be pursued, reinforced concrete pins would be cast in sequence directly under the Party Wall foundations.

A traditional method of underpinning will be employed to form the basement walls with the wall segments formed in a 'hit and miss' sequence. Walls can then be formed either in a single or two lifts, depending on the groundworks contractor's preference. It is likely that the excavation progress with perimeter trenches to allow the walls and bases be cast in advance of the basement raft. The raft would then be cast at a later date with its rebar lapping with the reinforcement from the wall bases, once the walls are complete.

All faces of the excavation will remain propped during construction. This involves the use of trench sheeting with props across the excavated faces.

The wall panels will be interlinked by employing full strength couplers to ensure full rebar continuity. All wall panels supporting masonry walls above will be dry packed (75mm) with a sand and cement mix to ensure full load transfer.

ΤΕСΗΝΙΚΕΡ

Once the wall panels have been cast, they will be restrained at the top and close to them bottom (approximately 1m above base) using cross props and waling beams at regular intervals (3-4m centres). The basement raft will then be cast to provide lateral restraint at the base, followed by the ground floor RC slab to restrain the top of the walls.

The props will then be removed, once the ground floor slab has reached adequate strength.

By employing this staged installation and removal of the stiff lateral system, lateral stability of the surrounding ground, the existing buildings and adjacent structures and their foundations can be ensured, until the rigid box construction is complete.

The results from the site investigation reveal that no groundwater is present on site and it is not anticipated that the basement construction would require dewatering.

A detailed method statement and temporary works design will be expected from the contractor, which will be reviewed to ensure adequate support has been provided and appropriate measures taken to minimise ground movement and potential damage to the neighbouring properties, prior to the works commencing on site.

As outlined in the Ground Movement Assessment (GMA) appended to the BIA report dated 12 August 2916, the basement rigid box structure has been designed for the following loading conditions:

- Lateral pressures from the retained earth
- Nominal surcharge to due imposed loads from adjacent structures and foundations
- Hydrostatic pressure from a rise (accidental) in water table to a depth of 1m below ground level
- Short-term and long-term ground heave

The basement construction will be waterproofed to Grade 3 standard in accordance with BS 8102:2009 requirements, employing a drained cavity system combined with a secondary means of waterproofing. Any groundwater captured by the system would be directed to a suitable number of sumps in the basement and discharged into the below ground drainage network.

Appendix 3 – Movement Monitoring Strategy

T E C H N I K E R

Gloucester Lodge

Movement Monitoring Strategy Ref: 15060/07/01

> Techniker Ltd Consulting Structural Engineers 13-19 Vine Hill London EC1R 5DW 020 7360 4300 techniker.co.uk

Document verification

Project name	Gloucester Lodge
Document title	Movement Monitoring Strategy
Project number	15060
Ref	07

Revision	Date	Description	
01	20 September 2016		
	Prepared by	Checked by	Approved by
Name	AA	FG	FG
Signature	1 min	J. Gluff-	Filluff

Revision	Date	Description	
02			
	Prepared by	Checked by	Approved by
Name			
Signature			

Revision	Date	Description	
03			
	Prepared by	Checked by	Approved by
Name			
Signature			

Revision	Date	Description	
04			
	Prepared by	Checked by	Approved by
Name			
Signature			

Copyright: no part of this document may be reproduced by any means without prior permission of Techniker Limited.

Contents

1.	Introduction	4
1.1.	Introduction	4
1.2.	Existing Structure	4
2.	Movement Monitoring Strategy	5
2.1.	Monitoring requirements	5
2.2.	Methodology	6
2.3.	Frequency of monitoring	6
2.4.	Remedial measures	7
2.5.	Reporting	7
2.6.	Report Requirements	7
3.	Appendix A – Proposed Monitoring Positions	8

1. Introduction

1.1. Introduction

A single storey basement extension to an existing residential building is to be constructed and is situated adjacent to Gloucester Gate Mews, London. The building neighbours the Mews to the east and existing buildings to the remaining sides as can be seen in the aerial view in Figure 1 below.

This design note provides an assessment of the ground movement and damage classification onto the existing adjacent structures. The calculations of the structural behaviour of proposed basement structure in the temporary and permanent conditions are also presented.



Fig. 1 Aerial view of Gloucester Lodge, dashed line represents extent of basement extension

1.2. Existing Structure

The existing buildings date to the late 19th century and are a Victorian house style of construction with traditional load bearing masonry with timber floors. The buildings have a lower ground level and vary in height between two to four storeys. Partially above the proposed basement the existing building is two storeys in height.

Monitoring is required to demonstrate that the proposed construction works do not adversely affect the existing and adjacent structures.

Prior to commencing construction of the basement, further survey information is required. This can be divided into two components.

- i) Establishment of a monitoring regime to monitor movement of the existing party walls during the works. The monitoring requirements are detailed in this movement monitoring strategy.
- ii) Surveys to confirm the existing ground levels.

2. Movement Monitoring Strategy

2.1. Monitoring requirements

Monitoring of the existing buildings will be carried out during the works to assess any movements which may occur. This will be carried out by a third party specialist surveyor and will comprise the following items:

- Three dimensional position monitoring at the locations shown on the mark ups found in Appendix A.
- Targets for monitoring will be securely fixed to the existing structure to achieve a design life of 2 years minimum.
- Monitoring will be undertaken to achieve an accuracy of +/- 0.6mm for measurement of displacements.
- Monitoring will be every 4 weeks prior to commencement of the works on site.
- During construction, weekly monitoring of vertical movements at the locations indicated the mark ups in this report along each existing wall using a precision level to an accuracy of +/0.6mm during the structural works.
- Fortnightly monitoring will be required from completion of the structural works to handover of the project.
- The results of the monitoring will be forwarded to all parties within 24 hours along with key plans and a summary of movements since previous reading and start of works.
- A traffic light warning system will be established to deal with any excessive movement. The set out trigger levels are defined as follows:

	Amber	Red
Overall horizontal and vertical movement	4.0 mm	8.0 mm
Rate of horizontal and vertical movement	1.0 mm/week	2.0 mm/week
Crack changes (incl. occurrence of new cracks)	1.0 mm	2.0 mm

A condition survey of the existing masonry walls will be carried out with cracks mapped onto elevation drawings. Any cracks greater than 1.0 mm in width will have tell-tales attached and monitored on a weekly basis.

The surveyor should submit proposals to the structural engineer to include:

- Proposed methodology for undertaking the survey work
- Proposed equipment
- Details of the proposed targets and fixing methods
- o Proposed control stations and method of checking their stability

2.2. Methodology

Corner crack gauges will be used to determine relative movement between the elements. The crack gauges can be reliably read to +/- 1.0 mm.

2.3. Frequency of monitoring

The minimum period of monitoring to form an accurate picture is six months.

2.4. Remedial measures

From the measurements of the existing fabric the initial assumptions made in determining the threshold for instability can be checked. Having confirmed the point at which failure would occur, safe amber and red values can be determined for the monitoring. Depending on whether the movement is stabilising the need to remove the initial cause of the movement can be determined. The opening-up will determine whether repairs are required to existing connections and interfaces.

2.5. Reporting

- Provide a written report in pdf format for each monitoring visit.
- Results should be presented in both tabular and graphical format.
 - The tabular data should be presented as differences in Eastings and Northings and deflection out of plane from the base readings.
 - ii) The graphical format should show the variation in movement over time.

2.6. Report Requirements

Each report should include the following items

- The time of day the measurements were taken
- o Date
- Temperature and weather conditions
- Any damage noted to any of the targets
- Diagrams locating the individual targets

Reports should be issued within 5 working days of the survey work being undertaken.

3. Appendix A – Proposed Monitoring Positions





1		
01 PAINTED PLASTER	-	General Notes 1. Dimensions are in millimetres unless stated otherwise
02 PAINTED BRICKWORK		2. Levels are in metres AOD unless
03 BRICK		3. Dimensions govern.
04 METAL		Do not scale off drawing.
05 TILED ROOF	-	 All dimensions to be verified on site before proceeding.
		 All discrepancies to be notified in writing to Make Limited.
(07) TIMBER		© Make Limited 2015
(08) GLASS		
	-	
	-	
		01 12.08.16 Planning submission KG
	0	Rev Date Reason For Issue
		PLANNING
	8	DRAWING STATUS
		make /
		32 Cleveland Street
		tei +44 (0) 20 7636 5151
		info@makearchitects.com
		Client
		Mr, M Namaki 56 Cumberland Terrace
	1	Kevnlan
20		
0		555 North
romens		
		Project
0-		Gloucester Lodge
20 BE	Ĩ	
FOUNDATION		Existing
		Elevation 02
VCTION		
		Scale Paper Size Date
		Project No. Draw No. Rev No.
		1202 PD1101 01
2	_	







