
From: Graham Kite ([REDACTED])
Sent: 19 October 2018 13:06
To: Francis Williams
Cc: Constantinescu, Nora-Andreea; ([REDACTED])
([REDACTED])
Subject: 12727-95: 1 Spencer Rise_2018/2442/P

Hi Francis

To confirm our earlier discussion:

1. We could not locate the vertical movement calculations in Appendix G. As our previous comments, the vertical movements appear to be very low whereas the horizontal movements appear to be in line with expectations for a retaining wall of that nature. Could you review this and pass forward your calculations please.
2. We do require you to consider settlement of the foundations within your GMA. With this in mind, it would be worth reviewing the actual bearing pressures / bearing capacity and the resultant settlements, and how this affects the GMA.
3. We understand that structural engineer has undertaken a visual inspection of the site and surrounding buildings which did not identify any existing structural defects or evidence of ongoing movement.
4. We understand that the structural engineer has confirmed that no utilities, other than connections serving the site itself, are within the zone of influence of the works.
5. Geotechnical parameters - the approach to confirming this will be dependent on your bearing pressures / required bearing capacity (as item 2). If we are comfortable that bearing pressures and settlements are likely to be modest, based on assumed 'reasonably conservative' parameters, then your suggestion of having this confirmed prior to construction by trial excavation and hand vane may be acceptable. If not, further investigation with insitu testing will be required as part of the BIA process.
6. Our original comments still stand in regard to groundwater -additional monitoring prior to construction is welcomed and consideration of stability issues during underpinning should be made (we couldn't find reference to the dewatering in the structural report, not in the sequence described in Section 7).
7. Noted that monitoring proposals are updated.

Regards

Graham Kite

CampbellReith
consulting engineers

Friars Bridge Court,
41-45 Blackfriars Road,
London
SE1 8NZ

Tel +44 (0)20 7340 1700
www.campbellreith.com

From: "Francis Williams" <francis.williams@groundandwater.co.uk>

To: GrahamKite@campbellreith.com
Date: 15/10/2018 13:33
Subject: Re: FW: 1 Spencer Rise_2018/2442/P

On 26 September 2018 at 12:46, Francis Williams <francis.williams@groundandwater.co.uk> wrote:
Graham,

Please find our responses in relation to your audit comments.

Any comments/queries then please let me know.

Kind Regards

Fran

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Francis Williams** <francis.williams@groundandwater.co.uk>
Date: 17 September 2018 at 14:00
Subject: Re: FW: 1 Spencer Rise_2018/2442/P
To: Victoria Thong <victoriathong@edwardwilliamsarchitects.com>
Cc: TREVOR VINCENT <trevor-vincent@sky.com>, "alice.tettmar@groundandwater.co.uk" <alice.tettmar@groundandwater.co.uk>, Emma McBurney <Emma@mbaplanning.com>

Victoria,

Further to the audit response ref. the proposed basement application 2018/2442/P we have the following comments. Comments from Ground and Water are in RED, Vincent and Rymill comments in blue.

1. Whilst the the estimated horizontal ground movements appear reasonable, considering the depth of the proposal / form of construction., the estimated vertical movements appear very low (table presented on page 31 / figure 25) - the calculations should be provided for review please. **Calculation sheets are provided in Appendix G of our report. Have these been reviewed with respect to this query?**

2. In addition to 1), the vertical movements appear to be inconsistent with statements made on page 27, indicating potential settlement of up to 25mm and likely settlement of 0 to <10mm, considering the assessed allowable bearing capacity and the variability of proposed bearing pressures. The assessed settlements that will impact neighbouring structures should be clearly stated and be consistently applied through the ground movement and damage assessments. **Please note that the GMA movement calculation and settlements of the underpin are not relative. The GMA relates to the movement behind the retaining walls during construction. The settlement parameters provided relate to movement underneath the underpins on changes in loading regime. Based on experience it is highly likely that the changes in effective stress at depth, on development, will actually be minimal. We can add test indicating such in a revised report. The structural engineers report has also been updated to take this into account, please see attached.**

3. Its noted that a number of the neighbours refer to existing settlement issues and structural damage. The BIA should confirm if existing structural damage has been assessed and whether additional mitigation will be required. **A section discussing this is now within the revised structural report attached.**

4. The GMA should assess impacts to the retaining wall at the rear of the property, the highway to the front of the property, and any underground services / utilities. Its noted that neighbours report drainage and water utilities apparently along the terrace / under the property. **A section discussion this is now within the revised structural report attached.**

5. Its noted that the description of soils are more consistent with Head Deposits than London Clay, that there are no descriptions of stiffness and that no insitu testing has been undertaken. Review of the ground conditions (and any impacts resulting from this) should be undertaken and a statement of how they intend to confirm geotechnical parameters prior to construction should be made. **Should it be required, we are happy to amend our report to suggest we undertake Hand Shear Vanes at underpin formation level to verify the geotechnical parameters adopted. Please let me know this this will suffice.**

6. Considering the proposed form of construction (underpinning) and the description of soils presented, longer term monitoring of the standpipes should be considered along with a definitive assessment of whether the water levels observed are indicative of groundwater levels or a response to drainage of surface waters. Whilst the temporary works proposals are generally accepted, encountering water during underpinning has a potential stability impact unless effectively managed, and therefore assessment and mitigation proposals should be provided. **We will add a section in a revised report to dip the existing groundwater monitoring well prior to the commencement of construction, for an up to date groundwater level. A section in the structural report has been included to provide details of the proposed dewatering, should groundwater be encountered.**

7. Frequency of proposed movement monitoring survey works is presented as weekly in the construction sequence but as fortnightly on the structural drawings, which should be consistently presented (weekly is considered more appropriate). *Amended in attached report.*

Should you have any queries regarding the above then please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Kind Regards

--

Francis Williams Mgeol (Hons.)

Cgeol CEnv AGS FGS MSoBRA

Director

Ground and Water Limited

www.groundandwater.co.uk

Skype: groundandwater

Based at:

Head Office

2 The Long Barn

Norton Farm, Selborne Road

Alton

Hampshire GU34 3NB

T: 0333 600 1221

Regional Offices:

London

235 Ivydale Road

London

SE15 3DY

T: 0333 600 1221

M: 07887 751593

Brighton

41 Summerdale Road

Hove

BN3 8LG

T: 0333 600 1221

M: 07979 754715

Please consider the environment before printing an email .

You can follow us on Twitter: [GroundandWater](https://twitter.com/groundandwater) or on our blog www.groundandwater.wordpress.com

--

Francis Williams Mgeol (Hons.)

Cgeol CEnv AGS FGS MSoBRA

Director

Ground and Water Limited

Mob:07979 754715

www.groundandwater.co.uk

Skype: groundandwater