PRICE & MYERS

56 Croftdown Road 25293

Response to Campbell Reith Audit Query Tracker

Prepared by: Tim Pattinson MEng Checked by: David Derby BSc ACGI CEng MICE FIStructE Job Number: 25293

Query Number: Query Number:

3 Structural calculations - Retaining wall and Underpins See Appendix A – Head of water at 2/3 basement depth added

Construction methodology and temporary works sequencing and propping See Appendix B – Updated construction sequence with an additional section through the light well added

Monitoring of structures

See Appendix C – Monitoring positions and trigger limits set

5 Flood risk assessment 5

See Appendix D – York Rise Zone: flood risk assessment

Appendices

Appendix A: P&M retaining underpinned wall calculations Ver2

Appendix B: P&M drawings CS02 RevA and CS03

Appendix C: P&M movement monitoring plan

Appendix D: York Rise Zone: Flood risk assessment

** STRUCTURAL ENGINEERING & GEOMETRICS CONSTAINABILITY © CIVIL ENGINEERING

Appendix A

Structural Calculations for Retaining Underpin Walls

*** STRUCTURAL ENGINEERING & GEOMETRICS CONSTAINABILITY © CIVIL ENGINEERING

Actual span/effective depth ratio $ratio_{act} = (h_{stem} + d_{stem}/2) / d_{stem} = 7.17$

PASS - Span to depth ratio is acceptable

Axial load check

Limiting axial load $N_{limit} = 0.1 \times f_k \times t_{wall} = 211.2 \text{ kN/m}$

Factored axial load on wall $N_{wall} = ([t_{wall} \times h_{stem} \times \gamma_{wall} + W_{dead}] \times \gamma_{f_d}) + (W_{live} \times \gamma_{f_d}) = 19.6$ kN/m

Applied axial load may be ignored - calculations valid

TEDDS calculation version 1.2.01.06

RETAINING WALL ANALYSIS (BS 8002:1994)

Wall details

Height of retaining wall stem **blue as a controlled to the 12700** mm Thickness of wall stem $t_{wall} = 330$ mm Length of toe $I_{\text{toe}} = 1000 \text{ mm}$ Length of heel $l_{\text{heel}} = 0$ mm Overall length of base $\log_{100} = 1$ lbase $= \log_{100} + 1$ lheel + twall = **1330** mm Thickness of base **thase** = 300 mm Depth of downstand $d_{ds} = 0$ mm Position of downstand $l_{ds} = 0$ mm Thickness of downstand $t_{ds} = 300$ mm Height of retaining wall **has a compared to the hold of the hold of the hold of the hold of hydrogen + t**base + d_{ds} = **3000** mm Depth of cover in front of wall $d_{cover} = 0$ mm Depth of unplanned excavation $d_{exc} = 200$ mm Height of ground water behind wall **heater = 2000** mm Density of wall construction $\gamma_{\text{wall}} = 23.6 \text{ kN/m}^3$ Density of base construction
 $\gamma_{\text{base}} = 23.6 \text{ kN/m}^3$ Angle of rear face of wall $\alpha = 90.0$ deg Angle of soil surface behind wall $\beta = 0.0$ deg Effective height at virtual back of wall $h_{eff} = h_{wall} + h_{hel} \times \tan(\beta) = 3000$ mm

Retained material details

Mobilisation factor M = 1.5 Moist density of retained material $\gamma_m = 21.0 \text{ kN/m}^3$

Retaining wall type **Cantilever propped at base** Height of saturated fill above base $h_{sat} = max(h_{water} - t_{base} - d_{ds}, 0 \text{ mm}) = 1700 \text{ mm}$

Horizontal forces on wall

Calculate propping force

Overturning moments

Restoring moments

Check bearing pressure

Total vertical reaction $R = W_{total} = 99.4 \text{ kN/m}$

Bearing pressure at heel $p_{\text{heel}} = (R / l_{\text{base}}) \cdot (6 \times R \times e / l_{\text{base}}^2) = 8.1 \text{ kN/m}^2$

Wall stem $w_{wall} = h_{stem} \times t_{wall} \times \gamma_{wall} = 21 \text{ kN/m}$ Wall base $W_{base} = I_{base} \times I_{base} \times \gamma_{base} = 9.4 \text{ kN/m}$ Applied vertical load $W_v = W_{dead} + W_{live} = 69$ kN/m Total vertical load $W_{total} = W_{wall} + W_{base} + W_{v} = 99.4 \text{ kN/m}$

Surcharge Surcharge $F_{\text{sur}} = K_a \times \cos(90 - \alpha + \delta) \times \text{Surcharge} \times h_{\text{eff}} = 12 \text{ kN/m}$ Moist backfill above water table $F_{m_a a} = 0.5 \times K_a \times cos(90 - α + δ) \times γ_m \times (h_{eff} - h_{water})^2 =$ **4.2** kN/m Moist backfill below water table $F_{m_b} = K_a \times \cos(90 - \alpha + \delta) \times \gamma_m \times (h_{eff} - h_{water}) \times h_{water} = 16.8 \text{ kN/m}$ Saturated backfill $F_s = 0.5 \times K_a \times \cos(90 - \alpha + \delta) \times (\gamma_s - \gamma_{water}) \times h_{water}^2 = 10.5 \text{ kN/m}$ Water $\frac{1}{2}$ **Water** = 0.5 \times hwater² \times $\frac{1}{2}$ **19.6** kN/m Total horizontal load $F_{total} = F_{suf} + F_{mA} + F_{mB} + F_s + F_{water} = 63.1 \text{ kN/m}$

Passive resistance of soil in front of wall $F_p = 0.5 \times K_p \times \cos(\delta_b) \times (d_{\text{cover}} + t_{\text{base}} + d_{\text{ds}} - d_{\text{exc}})^2 \times \gamma_{\text{mb}} = 0.4 \text{ kN/m}$ Propping force $F_{prop} = max(F_{total} - F_p - (W_{total} - W_{live}) \times tan(\delta_b), 0 \text{ kN/m})$ Fprop = **34.0** kN/m

Surcharge Surcharge $M_{\text{sur}} = F_{\text{sur}} \times (h_{\text{eff}} - 2 \times d_{\text{ds}}) / 2 = 18 \text{ kNm/m}$ Moist backfill above water table $M_m a = F_m a \times (h_{eff} + 2 \times h_{water} - 3 \times d_{ds}) / 3 = 9.8$ kNm/m Moist backfill below water table $M_m b = F_m b \times (h_{water} \cdot 2 \times d_{ds}) / 2 = 16.8$ kNm/m Saturated backfill $M_s = F_s \times (h_{water} - 3 \times d_{ds}) / 3 = 7$ kNm/m Water $M_{\text{water}} = F_{\text{water}} \times (h_{\text{water}} - 3 \times d_{\text{ds}}) / 3 = 13.1 \text{ kNm/m}$ Total overturning moment $M_{ot} = M_{sur} + M_{m a} + M_{m b} + M_{s} + M_{water} = 64.7$ kNm/m

Wall stem $M_{wall} = W_{wall} \times (l_{toe} + t_{wall}/2) = 24.5 \text{ kNm/m}$ Wall base $M_{base} = W_{base} \times I_{base} / 2 = 6.3 \text{ kNm/m}$ Design vertical load $M_v = W_v \times I_{load} = 80.4 \text{ kNm/m}$ Total restoring moment **and all restoring moment** $M_{\text{rest}} = M_{\text{wall}} + M_{\text{base}} + M_{\text{v}} = 111.1 \text{ kNm/m}$

Total moment for bearing $M_{total} = M_{rest} - M_{ot} = 46.5 \text{ kNm/m}$ Distance to reaction $x_{\text{bar}} = M_{\text{total}} / R = 467$ mm Eccentricity of reaction $e = abs((l_{base} / 2) - x_{bar}) = 198$ mm **Reaction acts within middle third of base** Bearing pressure at toe $p_{\text{toe}} = (R / I_{\text{base}}) + (6 \times R \times e / I_{\text{base}}^2) = 141.4 \text{ kN/m}^2$

PASS - Maximum bearing pressure is less than allowable bearing pressure

Minimum area of tension reinforcement Reinforcement provided; **16 mm dia.bars @ 200 mm centres** Area of reinforcement provided

 $A_{s_stem_min} = k \times b \times t_{wall} = 429 \text{ mm}^2/\text{m}$

Area of tension reinforcement required; As_stem_req = Max(As_stem_des, As_stem_min) = **980** mm² /m

 A_s stem prov = 1005 mm²/m

PASS - Reinforcement provided at the retaining wall stem is adequate

Check shear resistance at wall stem

From BS8110:Part 1:1997 – Table 3.8

Design concrete shear stress v_{c_stem} = 0.584 N/mm²

Design shear stress $v_{\text{stem}} = V_{\text{stem}} / (b \times d_{\text{stem}}) = 0.066 \text{ N/mm}^2$

Allowable shear stress $v_{\text{adm}} = \min(0.8 \times \sqrt{(t_{\text{cu}} / 1 \text{ N/mm}^2)}, 5) \times 1 \text{ N/mm}^2 = 5.000 \text{ N/mm}^2$

PASS - Design shear stress is less than maximum shear stress

vstem < vc_stem - No shear reinforcement required

Toe bars - 16 mm dia. ω 100 mm centres - (2011 mm²/m) Stem bars - 16 mm dia. ω 200 mm centres - (1005 mm²/m)

Toe reinforcement

TEDDS calculation version 1.2.01.06

RETAINING WALL ANALYSIS (BS 8002:1994)

Wall details

Height of retaining wall stem **h**stem = **1500** mm Thickness of wall stem $t_{wall} = 330$ mm Length of toe $I_{\text{toe}} = 500 \text{ mm}$ Length of heel $l_{\text{heel}} = 0$ mm Overall length of base \qquad \qquad Thickness of base
 $\frac{1}{2}$ thas = 300 mm Depth of downstand $d_{ds} = 0$ mm Position of downstand
 $l_{ds} = 530$ mm Thickness of downstand $t_{ds} = 300$ mm Height of retaining wall **has a compared to the hold of retaining wall** $h_{wall} = h_{stem} + t_{base} + d_{ds} = 1800$ mm Depth of cover in front of wall $d_{cover} = 0$ mm Depth of unplanned excavation dexc = **200** mm Height of ground water behind wall
 $h_{water} = 1200$ mm Density of wall construction $\gamma_{wall} = 23.6 \text{ kN/m}^3$ Density of base construction
 $\gamma_{\text{base}} = 23.6 \text{ kN/m}^3$ Angle of rear face of wall $\alpha = 90.0$ deg Angle of soil surface behind wall $\beta = 0.0$ deg Effective height at virtual back of wall $h_{eff} = h_{wall} + I_{heel} \times tan(\beta) = 1800$ mm

Retained material details

Mobilisation factor M = 1.5 Moist density of retained material $\gamma_m = 21.0 \text{ kN/m}^3$

Retaining wall type **Cantilever propped at base**

Height of saturated fill above base $h_{sat} = max(h_{water} - t_{base} - d_{ds}, 0 \text{ mm}) = 900 \text{ mm}$

Vertical forces on wall

Check bearing pressure

Total vertical reaction $R = W_{total} = 83.6 \text{ kN/m}$

Design vertical load $M_v = W_v \times I_{load} = 43.9 \text{ kNm/m}$ Total restoring moment **Music and Article 2018** Mrest = M_{wall} + M_{base} + M_v = 54.1 kNm/m

Total moment for bearing $M_{total} = M_{rest} - M_{ot} = 37.5 \text{ kNm/m}$ Distance to reaction $x_{bar} = M_{total} / R = 449$ mm Eccentricity of reaction $e = abs((l_{base} / 2) - x_{bar}) = 34$ mm **Reaction acts within middle third of base** Bearing pressure at toe $p_{\text{toe}} = (R / l_{\text{base}})$ - $(6 \times R \times e / l_{\text{base}}^2)$ = **75.7** kN/m²

Bearing pressure at heel $p_{\text{hee}} = (R / I_{\text{base}}) + (6 \times R \times e / I_{\text{base}}^2) = 125.6 \text{ kN/m}^2$

PASS - Maximum bearing pressure is less than allowable bearing pressure

Minimum area of tension reinforcement Reinforcement provided; **12 mm dia.bars @ 200 mm centres** Area of reinforcement provided

 $A_{s_stem_min} = k \times b \times t_{wall} = 429 \text{ mm}^2/\text{m}$

Area of tension reinforcement required; As_stem_req = Max(As_stem_des, As_stem_min) = **429** mm² /m

 A_s stem prov = 565 mm²/m

PASS - Reinforcement provided at the retaining wall stem is adequate

Check shear resistance at wall stem

From BS8110:Part 1:1997 – Table 3.8

Design concrete shear stress v_{c_stem} = **0.480** N/mm²

Design shear stress $v_{\text{stem}} = V_{\text{stem}} / (b \times d_{\text{stem}}) = 0.070 \text{ N/mm}^2$

Allowable shear stress $v_{\text{adm}} = \min(0.8 \times \sqrt{(t_{\text{cu}} / 1 \text{ N/mm}^2)}, 5) \times 1 \text{ N/mm}^2 = 5.000 \text{ N/mm}^2$

PASS - Design shear stress is less than maximum shear stress

vstem < vc_stem - No shear reinforcement required

Toe bars - 12 mm dia. ω 200 mm centres - (565 mm²/m) Stem bars - 12 mm dia. ω 200 mm centres - (565 mm²/m)

Appendix B

Drawings CS02 RevA and CS03

*** STRUCTURAL ENGINEERING & GEOMETRICS CONSTAINABILITY © CIVIL ENGINEERING

PRICE&MYERS * & * ©

Consulting Engineers

JOBNO 25293 Page Sk 2 Rev A Date $JUNE$ 16 Eng HAD Chd JOB 56 CROFTDOWN ROAD

PRICE&MYERS * & & ©

Job No 24922 Page SK 3

Rev

Appendix C

Movement Monitoring Plan

*** STRUCTURAL ENGINEERING & GEOMETRICS CONSTAINABILITY © CIVIL ENGINEERING

56 Croftdown Road - Movement monitoring plan

Monitoring overview

Masonry structures in London are likely to show some seasonal movement in addition to small daily movement. Combining these could easily cause 2mm to 3mm of movement vertically and 3mm to 5mm movement horizontally.

A number of base readings will be taken at different times of different days before excavation works starts on site (three base readings per survey point). A minimum of two datum points will be chosen apart from each other and outside of the site and cross-checked against each other.

Movement monitoring readings will have an individual tolerance of +/- 1.5mm.

Locations

The attached pages demonstrate the extent of movement monitoring targets on the Party Walls and front/rear elevations.

Monitoring frequencies

Targets will be monitored on a weekly basis

Trigger levels and actions

Trigger levels will include an allowance of 2mm for effects of tolerances, seasonal and daily movement.

Amber trigger level: 7mm – Action: submit proposals to ensure red trigger levels are not exceeded

Red trigger level: 12mm – Action: stop works and make safe. Inform all parties immediately and increase frequency of monitoring. Submit proposals for procedures as may be considered necessary. Work should not recommence until these have been agreed.

Note: the red trigger level is subject to review and revision by the project team at amber where the available data evaluation should lead to a clearer understanding of the actual behaviour of the structure(s)

Additional actions if the amber level is exceeded:

- Check whether trigger level is being, or about to be exceeded by neighbouring targets and a view will be taken whether any target has 'slipped' or apparently moved independently of the structure.
- The survey measurements will be retaken if necessary for any further clarity needed which may include an early morning survey round and a late afternoon survey round or equivalent to assess movement due to daily temperature changes. This many also include a check on datum levels.
- The movement of the structure will be assessed together with the degree of differential movement and distortion with the causes determined as far as possible. The internal

condition of the structure will be checked as far as practicable to check for any unusual changes. If the distortion or differential movement is relatively small and there is no significant alteration to the internally observed condition the red trigger level may be increased or a new red trigger level for differential movement will be introduced by the project team. No change to red trigger levels will take place without agreement.

• Possible construction/demolition/temporary works measures to reduce further movements will be examined with a view to them being implemented if further movement takes place.

Lower ground level monitoring target locations

AREAS OF DEMOLITIONS INDICATED IN RED.

Revision:
A 01.06.16 Add general info.

: Movement monitoring

target locations

Front and rear elevation monitoring target locations

Appendix D

York Rise Zone: Flood Risk Assessment

*** STRUCTURAL ENGINEERING & GEOMETRICS CONSTAINABILITY © CIVIL ENGINEERING

Consulting Engineers

37 Alfred Place London WC1E 7DP 020 7631 5128 mail@pricemyers.com www.pricemyers.com

Sarah Watkins Geotechnical & Environmental Associates Widbury Barn Widbury Hill Ware, SG12 7QE

7 th December 2017

Ref: 25293/2/DLin

Dear Sarah,

Re:56 Croftdown Road, London, NW5 1EN – Flood Risk Assessment

Following your request for a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) for the above site, please find below our findings.

1 Flood Risk from Watercourses (Fluvial/Tidal)

The EA's indicative floodplain map shows that there is very low risk of tidal and/or fluvial flooding at this site location. The map shows that the site lies within Flood Zone 1, so the risk is less than a 1 in 1000 year event and is considered low.

LONDON NOTTINGHAM OXFORD

Price & Myers LLP is a Limited Liability Partnership registered in England and Wales No. OC303989 Registered Office 37 Alfred Place London WC1E 7DP

2 Flood Risk from Surface Water

The Government's surface water flood map shows that the majority of the site is at risk of flooding from surface water. Only the front side of the site is not at risk of flooding from surface water. The proposed works involve the construction of a new lightwell at the front side of the building. The existing steps will be repositioned to provide access from the new lightwell to Croftdown Road. However, the surface water flood map shows that there are no overland flow paths from Croftdown Road to the site which to transfer flood water to the lightwell.

The local topography shows that the lowest levels on Croftdown Road are at its junction with York Rise. The topography then drops steeply to the south alongside York Rise. Therefore, any overland flows on Croftdown Road from any source, including surface water, sewers and burst water mains, will flow to the road's junction with York Rise and from there will flow to the south without ponding the site's front garden and lightwell. Any overland flows on Croftdown Road will flow within the road's channel to the east of the site.

After considering all the above, the flood risk from surface water and overland flows is considered low.

3 Flood Risk from Groundwater

There are currently no reported incidents of flooding from groundwater to the existing basement. A site investigation report for the site was not available at the time of writing this report. The British Geological Survey maps show that there are no superficial deposits in this area and that the London Clay underlies the site. Therefore the local geology does not form a groundwater reservoir at this location and the impermeable nature of the London clay will prevent large volumes of groundwater from moving in any direction in this area. While the existing basement will be lowered and a new lightwell will be constructed, these works will not increase the flood risk from groundwater, as these works will take place in the same ground conditions that the existing basement was constructed. Engineering techniques such as waterproofing and cavity drainage will be provided to recuse further the risk from groundwater. Therefore, the flood risk from groundwater is considered low.

4 Flood Risk from Sewers & Infrastructure Failure

As section 2 states the local topography will direct any overland flows from any source, including sewers and burst water mains, to the junction of Croftdown Road with York Rise, and from there the water will flow to the south in low lying areas.

The Government's map below show that the site is at risk of flooding from reservoirs. The map shows that flood water from the Highgate ponds will flow to an eastern direction, where the topography falls, flooding the site and areas lying lower than the reservoirs' ground levels.

The EA and DEFRA "Guide to risk assessment for reservoir safety management – Report SC090001/R1" document states that reservoir owners are responsible for the operation, maintenance, monitoring and the preparation of risk assessments. These activities aim to reduce the risk of reservoir failure. These activities are enforced by the enforcement authority which is the EA in England. While the Government's map shows that the site is at risk of flooding from reservoir failure, the chances of this happening are extremely low, considering that there is an effective management and monitoring plan in place to safeguard the safety of such structures.

5 Climate Change

The site is not near the tidal or fluvial floodplain. Therefore, elevated flood water levels due to climate change will not affect the existing building.

6 Proposed Run-off

In principle, the proposed building modifications, including the basement, will not generate any run-off rate, as the proposed works will take place within a building which is served by an existing drainage system. Furthermore, the proposed lightwell will be constructed within an existing hardstanding area. The proposed lightwell occupies an area of approximately $6m^2$. Therefore, it will generate a peak run-off rate of 0.17 l/sec (calculated based on the modified rational method, $Q = 2.78 \times 0.0006 \times 104 = 3.76$ l/sec, where "A" is the catchment area in hectares and "i" is the rainfall intensity in mm/hr). Therefore, the run-off rate is negligible. The proposed works will not affect the existing surface water drainage system, which will be maintained.

The lightwell will be constructed on the proposed basement slab which will be formed on the London clay. Therefore, no infiltration systems can be used for surface water drainage. Attenuation techniques cannot apply, as the peak run-off rate is too low to be attenuated further. Surface water from the lightwell will be pumped to the below ground drainage network. A nonreturn valve will be fitted to the pump to reduce the flood risk from surcharged sewers.

7 Conclusion Conclusion Conclusion

Available information for the local area shows that the site is not at risk of tidal and/or fluvial flooding. While part of the site is at risk of flooding from surface water, the proposed works will not increase the flood risk to the basement level. The local topography confirms that overland flows from any source will not enter the new lightwell. The local geology indicates that the risk of flooding from groundwater is low. There is a risk of flooding from reservoirs, however effective maintenance, inspection and monitoring of such structures ensure that the chances of reservoir failure are extremely low. Furthermore, climate change will not increase the flood risk on site.

The proposed development will not increase the impermeable areas on site and subsequently the run-off rates and volumes to the public sewers.

Yours sincerely, For Price & Myers LLP

Dimitris Linardatos BEng MSc CEng MICE FIHE dlinardatos@pricemyers.com