

IIT PEARS BUILDING PROJECT
DETAILED BASEMENT CONSTRUCTION PLAN
TECHNICAL MEETING
MINUTES OF MEETING



| | |
|---------------------|--|
| Project | Pears Building |
| Date | Tuesday - 02.05.2017 |
| Time | 10:00 – 12:00hrs |
| Meeting Ref. | Basement – Technical Meeting |
| Location | ASquared Offices – 1 Westminster Bridge Road, London SE1 7XW |

| Present | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Dr Michael de Freitas (Mdf) | First Steps Ltd |
| Michael Eldred (ME) | Eldred Geotechnics Ltd |
| Ian Stephenson (IS) | Stephenson Davenport Structural Associates Limited (SDStructures) |
| Gareth Harper (GH) | Campbell Reith |
| Phill Cracknell (PC) | Willmott Dixon - Construction |
| Roy Conway (RC) | Willmott Dixon - Construction |
| Stuart Wagstaff (SW) | Soil Consultants (SC) |
| Tony Suckling (TS) | ASquared |
| Angelo Fasano (AF) | ASquared |
| Najib Sheeka (NS) | Heyne Tillet Steel (HTS) |
| Apologies | |
| None | |

| Previous Minutes |
|---|
| Comment to be added to item 14 : SW mentioned that Soil Consultants didn't find evidence of slip planes in the boreholes on Hamsstead Green, to which Mdf stated these things were not planes as such but undulating sub-horizontal surfaces and there were likely to be many of them, none very extensive. |

| ITEM | Description | Action By | Target Date |
|------|---|---------------------------------------|-------------|
| 1 | <p>MEETING DISCUSSION</p> <p>AF & TS demonstrated their model on screen identifying a number of various thickness's of stratum with their corresponding properties namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Their undrained strength (KPa) – all undisturbed London Clay 90+7z - Their unit weight – all generally 20(kN/m³) - Their permeability, k (m/s) <p>NOTE: This information can be found within Tables 4.2 & 4.3 of ASquare's (A²) Ground Movements Assessment Report.</p> <p>It was also stated that conducting Standard Penetration Tests (SPT) provided good information on the geotechnical engineering properties of the soil but so also did taking undisturbed samples.</p> | Note | |
| 2 | Reference was also made that the upper 2m comprised of made ground over laid on 1m of head deposits on top of various sub layers of London Clay. Such information was obtained from the ground investigation which also indicated sloping surfaces to certain layers of London Clay. With a 13° angle of shearing resistance used for of the upper layers as agreed with LBH Wembley. | Note | |
| 3 | <p>In addition A² demonstrated how the estimated 'conservative' loads (provided by HTS) associated with the church tower and school had been incorporated into the model.</p> <p>It was agreed that the actual configuration of the foundations and the actual loads should where possible be ascertained.</p> <p>Mdf suggested some research be carried out on other structures designed by Teulon (namely St Mary's Parish Church Ealing W5 5RH) to assist in uncovering his basis of design.</p> <p>There was also comment on the limited outstand / absence of outstand of the church tower foundations in the TP's which highlights the need to undertake a verticality check of the tower and possibly eccentric loadings of the foundations.</p> | Note Note HTS WD | |

IIT PEARS BUILDING PROJECT
DETAILED BASEMENT CONSTRUCTION PLAN
TECHNICAL MEETING
MINUTES OF MEETING



| ITEM | Description | Action By | Target Date |
|------|--|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| 4 | MdF drew attention to the ARUP Report dated June 1969 and in particular the reference made to potential slip circles. It was emphasised that this should not be ignored in the re-modelling exercise and should rotation exists this is a further complication that needs to be taken into account. It was noted that ARUP were particularly concerned with potential slip circles in a north-south direction i.e. not towards the church or school. | A ² | |
| 5 | Whilst it was acknowledged that to comply with the Section 106 Agreement, the use of conservative figures should be adopted, it was agreed that more realistic view ie (Serviceability Limit State (SLS)) figures should be taken into consideration. In this regard; it was agreed that before re-running the model joint agreement should be sought from all parties incl. Camden. | Note A ² /RFC | |
| 6 | MdF stated that we need to be confident that the model is providing us with a factual account of what is actually occurring underground and where possible such should be tested by proving on site. | A ² | |
| 7 | The layout showing the proposed additional site investigations was tabled (copy attached) and MdF requested the reasoning behind each of the boreholes be added. Soil Consultants to review the layout and add such information. | Note SC | 08.05.17 |
| 8 | SW stated that the key objective of undertaking further ground investigation was to uncover the following: a) Further information in closer proximity to the church. b) Gain a better understanding of groundwater levels and flow patterns c) Evidence of deep slips. |)) Note)) | |
| 9 | MdF clarified that BH202 was being suggested by him to assist in detecting the depth of the existing church tower foundations. In this regard he proposed contact be made with a Geophysicist to ascertain what is feasible in terms of detection. Note: KF Geotechnical Report dated 6 th Sep'06 indicates a foundation depth of 1.02m on trial pit Nr.16. Further enquiries to be made thro. KF to validate findings. | Note SC SC | 08.05.17 08.05.17 |
| 10 | MdF stated he was under the impression that 'a dam' was built behind the crypt wall to allow construction of the tower diverting water around the sides of the church. | Note | |
| 11 | To measure both groundwater levels and the presence of deep slips SW explained that a number of 20m boreholes (ie 5 No.) were to be sunk incorporating inclinometers and piezometers (albeit BH203 will probably need to be changed to 5m deep due to the proximity of the London Underground) and BH207 to possibly be moved further east. | Note | |
| 12 | Site Investigation Report – MdF stated once the additional investigation works has been carried out we need to explain in a coherent way what has been found. | SC | |
| 13 | TS stated that the intent was to produce more detailed slices from the new model and carryout a number of 'what ifs'. A ² are to provide a proposal of what they intend to show at a further meeting prior to the next iteration of the model being run. It was also stated that the model geological boundaries would be extended further North and West. | Note A ² | |
| 14 | Mdf questioned how the model responded to rainfall, furthermore it was recommended contact be made with a specialist in Hampstead Heath to obtain historic recordings. IS to provide contact details. | Note IS | 08.05.17 |

**IIT PEARS BUILDING PROJECT
 DETAILED BASEMENT CONSTRUCTION PLAN
 TECHNICAL MEETING
 MINUTES OF MEETING**



| ITEM | Description | Action By | Target Date |
|------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------|
| 15 | It was also commented that it would be worthy to investigate the presence of a drain/culvert running beneath the Royal Free Hospital. | WD | 12.05.17 |
| 16 | In conclusion; it was agreed that focus should be made on the following actions: a) Undertake additional on site ground investigations; gather data and share findings, including exploring depth and configuration of church tower foundations. b) Discuss with Camden/Campbell Reith the need to adopt more realistic parameters and/or SLS figures. c) Ensure model is truly reflecting actual underground conditions and where possible test and prove on site. | SC TS/SW/ NS/PC TS | |
| 17 | It was agreed that the next Technical Meeting would be held 16 th May '17 at Willmott Dixon's Offices in Islington (details below), principally to agree the revised Site Investigation Layout and the various responses to the number of questions raised. | Note | |

| Date and Time of Next Meeting |
|---|
| Date: 16 th May '17 Time: 10:00am Location: 44A Pentonville Road, London N1 9HF |

DRAFT

Additional Site Investigations

