

Phillip Cracknell
Willmott Dixon Construction Limited,
Willmott Dixon House
80 Wilbury Way
Hitchin
Herts
SG4 0TP



By email - phillip.cracknell@willmottdixon.co.uk

20 December 2017
Ref: 1415-01-ns

Pears Building Extension to the Royal Free Hospital, London Review of Appendix 3 to Birketts' Response to DBCP for Application 2014/6485/P

Dear Phil,

As requested HTS have undertaken an initial high level review of Appendix 3 and 3a to Birketts' response to the Detailed Basement Construction Plan for the proposed extension to the Royal Free Hospital, known as the Pears Building. This Appendix 3 and 3a 2 of the response comprises a report by SD Structures. It was provided to HTS on 12 December 2017 and this high-level review was requested on 18th December 2017.

Noting the limited time to respond, we have concentrated on responding to the comments in the conclusions and executive summary of the reports.

1. We disagree that the design remains uncoordinated and far from complete and in our opinion, is the exact opposite. As the Basement Engineer and Lead consultant for the production of the DBCP, we can confirm the design is coordinated and we have completed our role as Basement Engineers.
2. The level of calculations submitted is what we would consider appropriate for the DBCP. What is being asked is a full set of building control calculations which is not required for the DBCP.
3. Appointments – these have been submitted and confirm the role of each consultant and in our case, confirm that we are the Basement Engineers and will be retained throughout the project. We are unclear on why external parties would need anything further.
4. Having a tall piling rig near a boundary wall is not unusual within London, the fact the neighbour is a school makes little difference. There are well established methods for ensuring safety of all parties when piling.
5. The comments regarding the CMP and traffic congestion are the author's personal opinion, which we disagree with.
6. We disagree that the monitoring strategy is incorrect. Noting the predicted worst-case movements to the neighbouring properties, we believe the monitoring proposed to be appropriate.
7. I believe A-Squared have written separately to respond to the comments made regarding their work to date.
8. Similar I believe Campbell Reigh are writing separately as the conclusions suggest that CR have not completed their role as independent checking engineer correctly.

As a personal comment on the reports, we ultimately disagree with the conclusions in SD Structures reports and would say the language used is exceptionally biased and to the point of scaremongering.

Najib Sheeka

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Najib Sheeka'.

MEng CEng MIStructE
nsheeka@hts.uk.com