

Andrew Hardy of Jenkins Potter to Umiak Feb 26<sup>th</sup> 2016

One further point, having re-examined the proposals for 51 Calthorpe Street

The front wall underpinning is not included in the GMA.

At the location of the front wall of No 51, it will not be possible to install piles and a section of underpinning and reinforced concrete infill panel is proposed. This will increase the predicted ground movements in this area but is not addressed in the ground movement analysis of the BIA.

To clarify, the section of underpinning is noted in the BIA (sections 8.131, 8.151, 8.169 to 8.171 & 8.186). It is, however, not referenced in the ground movement analysis.

As further clarification, the ground movement associated with the section of underpinning and infill wall will be greater than that from the piled wall. It is very difficult to predict how much ground movement will occur due to the underpinning but, in my opinion, it should at least be noted that there is a risk of additional ground movement in this area

Regards,

Andrew Hardy  
Managing Director

E: [a.hardy@jenkinspotter.co.uk](mailto:a.hardy@jenkinspotter.co.uk)

Andrew Hardy of Jenkins Potter to Umiak Feb 26<sup>th</sup> 2016

I note Campbell Reith's comments on my report of feb 10<sup>TH</sup>. My responses to their comments are noted in [blue](#) below.

I also note that CR have summarised some points of my report, and it is my **original** wording that should be read in conjunction with their comments To facilitate this, a second typing of my original report follows, that includes the unaltered C.R. comments in italics, and then my further J.P. responses in blue.

[Campbell Reith respond to Andrew Hardy of Jenkins Potter's report \(feb 10<sup>th</sup>\) on Create BIA](#)

*Hi Kate Rob has thoroughly reviewed the comments sent over and I include below in full his assessment and responses. I have highlighted in red the key points. In summary, we stand by our original assessment that an appropriate form of construction is being proposed and that damage impact predictions of Category 0 to 1 are in line with our expectations. We do not feel the structural stability of 45 Calthorpe Street is at risk. If you have further questions, please do not hesitate to call. Regards Graham Kite* <sup>CampbellReith</sup> *Friars Bridge Court, 41-45 Blackfriars Road, London SE1 8NZ Tel +44 (0)20 7340 1700*  
[www.campbellreith.com](http://www.campbellreith.com)

1) C.R. *Hi Graham My review of the following documents that formed the objection is as follows. I believe that the Jenkins Potter letter report was reviewing an old version of the BIA hence many of the points raised are no longer valid.*

J.P. I reviewed the latest version BIA that is posted on the Planning Portal (Rev B dated August 2016) – if there is an up-dated version then this should be posted to the portal.

2) C.R. *The Jenkins Potter report indicates that they have carried out their own GMA and concluded a damage category of 2, however this has not been submitted to us.*

J.P. It is for the applicant to submit a valid GMA.

3) C.R. *The applicant's GMA was not perfect as it neglected to include the effects of vertical movements, however given the use of top down construction I concluded that the effect of vertical movement would be small and that their calculated damage category of 1 was acceptable.*

J.P. Pages P14 & 15 of Volume 5 of the BIA calculate the predicted damage to be in the slight category. That is to say category 2. If the applicant's BIA is incorrect then they should submit a revised version that is correct.

4) C.R. *D Hargreaves report executive summary. The summary raises the following activities as having potential to cause structural damage to number 49 Calthorpe Street.*

- *Structure bourne vibration*
- *Ground bourne vibration*
- *Ground movement close to flank wall*
- *Piling operation close to flank wall.*

*It is agreed that the above could cause structural damage to the neighbour properties, however the proposal has taken steps to minimise the quantity or impact of these. Piling is proposed as being bored piling, which should produce minimal amounts of ground or structure borne vibration. An adequate GMA assessment has been produced to indicate that the risk of damage due to ground movements are low, and a top down construction method has been proposed which is generally recognised as being effective in minimising ground movements.*

J.P. CR have stated that “It is accepted that there are errors in the ground movement assessment” which I would not consider to be an adequate GMA.

Jenkins Potter letter report dated 10th February 2017

Here follows the J.P original wording of the above report.

The Campbell Reith comments are in italics and the J.P responses are in blue.

We also append the key pages of the BIA that are under discussion.

BIA Volume 5 pages 14,15,16.