

62 Avenue Road, London NW8

Alan Baxter (ABA) and Southern Testing (ST) responses to Campbell Reith (CR) Audit of Basement Impact Assessment (Campbell Reith reference 12466-12 Rev.D1 November 2016)

1.0 Introduction

Alan Baxter (ABA) and Southern Testing (ST) have prepared a Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) for the construction of a new basement at 62 Avenue Road. This has been submitted to London Borough of Camden (LBC) as part of the planning application for the redevelopment of the site (planning application reference 2016/4931/P).

The BIA has since been reviewed by Campbell Reith (CR) and they have set out their comments in the report 'Basement Impact Assessment Audit – Project No. 12466-12 Rev. D1 dated November 2016.

These notes provide Alan Baxter and Southern Testing's responses to the queries raised by Campbell Reith. The query numbers are as per the audit query tracker. These notes should be read in conjunction with the Basement Impact Assessment Rev. A.

2.0 Responses to queries

Query No.1:

CR query:

BIA author credentials not in accordance with CPG4 requirements

ABA/ST response:

We confirm that the BIA has been co-written by Dave Probert MEng, Simon Bennett MEng MICE MIStructE and John Race BSC(Hons) MSC CGeol FGS, as noted in section 1.0 of the BIA. The report has been reviewed by all three authors. For the avoidance of doubt, a statement has been added to section 1.0 of the BIA Rev. A.

Query No.2:

CR query:

Suitable maps/plans

ABA/ST response:

As Arup GSD and Camden SFRA maps are of public domain and already in possession of Campbell Reith, copies of these had not been included in order to limit to size of the document uploaded on the Camden's Planning website. We have discussed this with J. Jensen of Campbell Reith and understand no further action is required.

Query No.3:

CR query:

Presence/absence of basement to No.64 Avenue Road as outlined in Audit paragraph 4.10 (*Note: We assume the intended reference in the Audit Query Tracker is not paragraph 4.10 but 4.11 of the Audit Report*).

ABA/ST response:

Section 5.0 of the BIA is correct and No.64 Avenue Road does not have a basement. The confusion arises from the fact that the reference to the neighbouring buildings in the calculations had been swapped around. This has been now rectified and the BIA has been updated accordingly.

Query No.4:**CR query:**

Retaining wall calculations not given in Appendix E and stiffness parameters not given for retaining wall design

ABA/ST response:

We have discussed this with J. Jensen of Campbell Reith and pointed out that the calculations for the retaining wall were included at the end of Appendix E. For the avoidance of doubt, the calculations for ground movement and for the retaining wall are now given as separate appendixes (Appendix E1 and Appendix E2 of the BIA).

Query No.5:**CR query:**

Basement heave.

ABA/ST response:

Based on the result of the site investigations and the size and depth of the proposed basement, Southern Testing have advised that the anticipated ground movement due to heave of the London clay can be conservatively quantified as 50-60mm. Of this upwards movement, approximately 50-60% will occur during the construction of the basement. Therefore the residual heave to be considered in the long term will be approximately 25-30mm. In order to address the potential issues associated with heave, 250mm thick CORDEK Cellcore boards CC2030 (or equivalent) have been specified, which will provide a 150mm equivalent void. This is well in excess of the anticipated heave movement and therefore deemed to be sufficient. Sections 10.0 and 11.3 of the BIA have been updated to clarify the above.

Query No.6:**CR query:**

Ground Movement Assessment – Mitigation measures

ABA/ST response:

These were largely described in section 11.7 of the BIA. However, for the avoidance of doubt, a specific paragraph on mitigation measures has been included in the BIA (section 11.8). Section 11.11 has also been updated accordingly.

Query No.7:**CR query:**

Non-technical Summaries

ABA/ST response:

Conclusions were provided within at the end of each stage of the BIA. However, for the sake of clarity, non-technical summaries have now been included as specific sections at the end of each stage. (section 8.1, 9.5, 10.1 and 11.13).

Query No.8:

CR query:

Works programme and CMP

ABA/ST response:

To be confirmed by the Contractor at a later stage. No further action required at this stage.

Query No.9:

CR query:

Monitoring proposals

ABA/ST response:

To be confirmed by the Contractor as part of their detailed CMP. No further action required at this stage.

Prepared by David Probert MEng, Jon Race BSc(Hons) MSc CGeol FGS
Reviewed by Simon Bennet MEng MICE MIStructE
Issued 25 November 2016

This document is for the sole use of the person or organisation for whom it has been prepared under the terms of an invitation or appointment by such person or organisation. Unless and to the extent allowed for under the terms of such invitation or appointment this document should not be copied or used or relied upon in whole or in part by third parties for any purpose whatsoever. If this document has been issued as a report under the terms of an appointment by such person or organisation, it is valid only at the time of its production. Alan Baxter Ltd does not accept liability for any loss or damage arising from unauthorised use of this report.

If this document has been issued as a 'draft', it is issued solely for the purpose of client and/or team comment and must not be used for any other purpose without the written permission of Alan Baxter Ltd.

Alan Baxter Ltd is a limited company registered in England and Wales, number 06600598.
Registered office: 75 Cowcross Street, London, EC1M 6EL.

© **Copyright** subsists in this document.