

**Hazelton, Laura**

---

**Subject:** FW: 24 Heath Drive 2018/0914/P & 2018/0981/L

---

**From:** Keith Gabriel <keithg@gabrielgeo.co.uk>  
**Sent:** 12 June 2018 18:32  
**To:** 'GrahamKite@campbellreith.com' <GrahamKite@campbellreith.com>  
**Cc:**  
**Subject:** RE: 24 Heath Drive 2018/0914/P & 2018/0981/L

Graham

Further to our phone call yesterday concerning the secant bored pile wall to be used for part of the proposed basement, I write to confirm and expand upon the matters discussed.

A secant bored pile wall (BPW) is only proposed where the swimming pool extends to the rear of the existing house (No.24) whereas No.23 does not extend as far back as No.24. That reason was considered sufficient to demonstrate that no damage category assessment was required for No.23 in relation to the secant BPW.

In addition, I note that the vertical ground movements alongside the secant BPW and the swimming pool underpins will be more favourable than alongside the other underpins. Paragraph 10.6.3 in the BIA (R2.3) notes that the proposed basement will, at its closest point, be approximately 3.70m from the neighbouring property to the north (No.23) as shown on Form SD's Proposed Basement Plan (Drg No.162637/L(17)02/P3, now at Rev.P4). In contrast, the proposed basement will be only 0.8m from No.25 and the predicted settlements are significantly greater on that side of the basement (because the excavations for the swimming pool will result in beneficial net heave displacements on No.23's side of the basement). That is why the two Damage Category Assessments were undertaken for No.25.

I trust this provides the clarification which you were seeking.

Best wishes

Keith

**Keith Gabriel**  
UK Registered Ground Engineering Adviser  
**Gabriel GeoConsulting Ltd**

