

To: Mr. Adam Arya
Marek Wojciechowski Architects.

By Email : Adam@mw-a.co.uk

Date: 26th July 2018

**Re: No.'s 13-15 John's Mews, London, WC1N 2PA.
Response to Basement Impact Assessment Audit**

Dear Adam,

This letter outlines the BMCEUK response to the basement impact assessment audit carried out by Campbell Reith on behalf of London Borough of Camden. The audit report was issued on 9th July 2018 (Document number 12727-12 Revision D3).

The tracker below reproduces the comments made in Section 3.0 of the report, and includes responses where necessary.

Query Tracker:

It should be noted that only the points which have comments attached have been reproduced. Others are omitted.

Table 1: Audit Checklist (Reproduced from Section 3.0 of Campbell Reith Audit)

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment	Response
Is data required by Cl.233 of the GSD presented?	No	Outline Construction Plan; listed structures within the vicinity should be identified.	An outline construction plan is illustrated in the drawings and explained in the BIA. The revised BIA identifies the Grade II listed buildings on John Street, and addresses the potential impacts on their rear garden walls.
Is a conceptual model presented?	Yes	However, due to the variable thickness of Made Ground, this may need to be reconsidered to ensure a reasonably conservative approach to the proposed works.	The depth of made ground has been modelled based on BH1B, and more conservative parameters have been used in the revised BIA.
Is a geotechnical interpretation presented?	Yes	However, this is not considered to be consistent with site investigation data presented or reasonably	The interpretation is consistent with the investigations (particularly BH1B which is only borehole taken below basement

		conservative.	level). More conservative parameters have been used in the revised BIA.
Does the geotechnical interpretation include information on retaining wall design?	No	These should be provided, including bearing capacity requirements for the underpins and permanent piled basement slab. Discrepancies between structural calculations and GMA.	The retaining wall design is given in the structural design. The drawings also show that it is propped at two levels below EGL. The underpins will not support the building weight in the construction or permanent phases (explained in BIA). The bearing capacity of the made ground is by inspection adequate to support the weight of existing foundation and underpin during construction.
Is an Impact Assessment provided?	Yes	However, damage assessment should consider all structures within the zone of influence including the party wall.	The party walls (sides & rear) will be supported on the piles via a frame at ground level during construction and the load will be transferred from the underpins into the piles via the base slab before the upper frame is removed. Due to this constant stiff support, the potential for settlement of the party walls is negligible. Therefore, it is deemed that we have assessed all structures susceptible to movement in the vicinity of the excavation.
Are estimates of ground movement and structural impact presented	Yes	However, damage assessment should consider all structures within the zone of influence, the proposed construction method and reasonably conservative geotechnical parameters.	Refer to above comments
Is the Impact Assessment appropriate to the matters identified by screen and scoping?	No	Impact assessment should consider revised GMA once geotechnical parameters and temporary works are finalised.	Refer to above comments

Has the need for mitigation been considered and are appropriate mitigation methods incorporated in the scheme?	No	This should be reconsidered once GMA is revised to include conservative geotechnical parameters.	The construction method is deemed to be an adequate mitigation measure to prevent settlement of party walls and surrounding ground. It is proposed that the building load will be supported on the piles via a frame at ground level during construction and the load will be transferred from the underpins into the piles via the base slab before the upper frame is removed.
Has the need for monitoring during construction been considered?	Yes	Although monitoring of adjoining properties is mentioned in the BIA, it has not been demonstrated how the movement will be limited to within the trigger values noted.	The construction method noted above will achieve these values.
Has the scheme demonstrated that the structural stability of the building and neighbouring properties and infrastructure will be maintained?	No	Structural calculations should be submitted for review however these are not consistent with the proposal discussed in the GMA. The BIA must demonstrate that the risk to neighbouring properties is no higher than Category 1 (Very Slight).	These are now consistent. BIA demonstrates maximum Category 1 (Very Slight).
Has the scheme avoided cumulative impacts upon structural stability or the water environment in the local area?	No	The BIA must demonstrate that the risk to neighbouring properties is no higher than Category 1 (Very Slight).	The BIA demonstrates maximum Category 1 (Very Slight).
Does report state that damage to surrounding buildings will be no worse than Burland Category 1?	Yes	However GMA / damage assessment should be revised and should consider all structures within the zone of influence, the proposed construction method and reasonably conservative geotechnical parameters.	Refer to above comments



BARRETT **MAHONY**
CONSULTING ENGINEERS
CIVIL & STRUCTURAL

Should you have any queries, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Paul Stephenson', written over a horizontal line.

Paul Stephenson
BE(Hons), MIEI, CEng
Chartered Engineer
for Barrett Mahony Consulting Engineers