

Campbell Reith August BIA Audit Feedback

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 01 September 2017 07:31
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: 12466-57 <2014/5939/P> 41 Howitt Road

Hi Gavin

Please find below comments on the re-submission of the BIA supporting documents for 41 Howitt Road. In order to minimise time / cost, we are issuing as email comments (as previously) but please let me know if you require this more formally.

We have reviewed the supplementary information received:

- Drawings (3no) 1343-CS01/02/03 (DDA)
- 1343-Howitt Road Visual Inspection Report (DDA)
- CG28201 GMA Rev 1 June 2017 (CGL)
- Response to CR Comments, July 2017

In summary, the majority of our queries have been specifically addressed and answered in accordance with the requirements, and are therefore satisfactory. The following have not been addressed:

Query 8 - identification of sensitive utilities infrastructure within the zone of influence of the proposed basement. The response states 'no services believed to be within the zone of influence - to be confirmed prior to commencement of any works'. Normally these are required to be identified within the BIA and then any impacts assessed if applicable ie assessment of potential impacts in conjunction with discussion with the asset owner. We are satisfied that the GMA addresses neighbouring buildings and that, although not specifically addressed, movements to the highway are likely to be limited in a similar way, to very small movements that are likely to be tolerated by flexible services. Potential issues would be if sensitive assets like brick arch sewers or high pressure gas mains were present.

Query 11(b) - structural monitoring strategy. General advice has been provided, but the query requested 'suitable trigger values and contingency actions' linked to the predicted ground movements to be proposed. The GMA makes comment on limiting movements to ensure a maximum of Category 1 damage is achieved. This is considered achievable, however how the monitoring strategy is to be adopted to ensure this would normally be provided in more detail.

For any BIA submitted to us as a fresh application, we would be requesting the above queries to be closed out rather than conditioned.

In more detail, the following queries / responses are noted:

Query 1 - damage to neighbours. CGL's assessment indicates Category 2 damage initially, that can be mitigated to Category 1. This is considered achievable and is accepted, in conjunction with the temporary works sequence and propping.

Query 2 - review by suitably qualified engineer. Accepted.

Query 3 - transitional underpins. Accepted that these will not be used.

Query 4 - SUDS drainage. Not clear from drawings, but DDA's statement that 'impermeable site area will not increase' is taken as fact, and on that basis SUDS will not be required.

Query 5 - n/a, previously resolved.

Query 6 - rear drainage. Accepted, as query 4.

Query 7 - potential for shrink / swell movements. CGL's assessment is accepted, that foundation depths / locations are generally beyond potential influence depths. Where potential movements are identified, suitable mitigation is presented e.g. compressible 'anti-heave' measures.

Query 8 - utilities. As above, not addressed.

Query 9 - n/a, previously resolved.

Query 10 - n/a, previously resolved.

Query 11(a) - Temporary works. Information now provided in sufficient detail to understand scheme and demonstrate stability will be maintained, assuming correct workmanship.

Query 11(b) - structural monitoring. As above, not addressed in detail.

Query 12 - n/a, previously resolved.

Query 13 - transitional underpinning. CGL's assessment is accepted, that these will no longer be required.

Query 14 - historic building damage. DDA's survey is accepted, that category of existing (pre-basement) building damage has not changed over the past several years.

Query 15 - n/a, previously resolved.

Query 16 - n/a, previously resolved.

If you require anything further, please let me know. I am assuming that the Query 8 and 11 responses will require review at some point. We have spent less than half of the advised maximum fee so far, FYI.

Regards

Graham Kite

