Addendum to BIA Submission

in connection with proposed redevelopment at

55 Fitzroy Park Camden N6 6JA

for

The Turner Stokes Family and the Springer Family

LBH4480biaa Ver. 1.1

December 2018



	DOCUMENT CONTROL									
	Report Ref: LBH4480a									
Version	Authorised									
			Darcy Kitson-Boyce MEng (Hons) GMICE FGS FRGS	Seamus Lefroy-Brooks BSc(hons) MSc CEng MICE CGeol FGS CEnv MIEnvSc FRGS SILC RoGEP UK Registered Ground Engineering Adviser NQMS SQP DoWCoP QP						
1.1	12 th Dec 2018	Issued for Planning								

LBH WEMBLEY ENGINEERING

12 Little Balmer

Buckingham Industrial Park

Buckingham

MK18 1TF

Tel: 01280 812310 email: enquiry@lbhgeo.co.uk website: www.lbhgeo.co.uk

LBH Wembley (2003) Limited. Unit 12 Little Balmer, Buckingham Industrial Park, Buckingham, MK18 1TF. Registered in England No. 4922494



Contents

Co	ntents		3
Fo	reword-	Guidance Notes	4
1.	Introdu	ction	5
	1.1	Background	5
	1.2	CRH Audit Checklist	5
2.	Additio	nal Information	11
	2.1	Arup Map Extracts	11
	2.2	Retaining Walls	13
	2.3	Groundwater Monitoring	14
	2.4	Proposed Retaining Structure facing the pond	15
	2.5	Utilities	15
	2.6	Structural monitoring	15
3.	Audit C	uery Tracker	16
AF	PENDIX		17
	OUTLIN	IE RETAINING WALL DESIGN	17
1.1 Background 1.2 CRH Audit Checklist 2. Addit=Information 2.1 Arup Map Extracts 2.2 Retaining Walls 2.3 Groundwater Monitoring 2.4 Proposed Retaining Structure facing the pond 2.5 Utilities 2.6 Structural monitoring 3. Audit Urry Tracker OUTLINE RETAINING WALL DESIGN UTILITES Vielee			

LBH WEMBLEY

Foreword-Guidance Notes

GENERAL

This report has been prepared for a specific client and to meet a specific brief. The preparation of this report may have been affected by limitations of scope, resources or time scale required by the client. Should any part of this report be relied on by a third party, that party does so wholly at its own risk and LBH Wembley Engineering disclaims any liability to such parties.

The observations and conclusions described in this report are based solely upon the agreed scope of work. LBH Wembley Engineering has not performed any observations, investigations, studies or testing not specifically set out in the agreed scope of work and cannot accept any liability for the existence of any condition, the discovery of which would require performance of services beyond the agreed scope of work.

VALIDITY

Should the purpose for which the report is used, or the proposed use of the site change, this report may no longer be valid and any further use of or reliance upon the report in those circumstances shall be at the client's sole and own risk. The passage of time may result in changes in site conditions, regulatory or other legal provisions, technology or economic conditions which could render the report inaccurate or unreliable. The information and conclusions contained in this report should therefore not be relied upon in the future and any such reliance on the report in the future shall again be at the client's own and sole risk.

THIRD PARTY INFORMATION

The report may present an opinion based upon information received from third parties. However, no liability can be accepted for any inaccuracies or omissions in that information.

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

It is proposed to redevelop this property through removal of the existing large house and replacement of this by five new smaller homes.

A Basement Impact Assessment has been prepared to support a full planning application to the London Borough of Camden and in this case has comprised a Geotechnical Assessment in conjunction with a separate Hydrological & Hydrogeological Impact Assessment Report (both dated July 2018).

Following an audit of the submission by Campbell Reith Hill (CRH), dated 23rd November 2018, this document has been prepared to address the issues raised and to provide the additional information requested.

The following comments were set out in the audit report.

Yes Item **CRH Comment LBH Response** /No However, the qualifications of See CPG Table Section 4.7. There is the individuals concerned Are BIA Author(s) no requirement to provide with the production of the Yes qualifications other than for the BIA credentials Structural and Civil authors who have undertaken the satisfactory? **Engineering Design** assessments. Statement is not known. Groundwater monitoring data is required to accurately characterise the groundwater table level in the area. CI.233 of the Arup report concerns the information required for a BIA The design of the SUDS screening. requires further justification. Is data required by These comments do not relate to CI.233 of the GSD No Outline design of all screening and are hence not in order. presented? temporary and permanent None of this information is required by sheet pile walls (or other CI.233 retaining walls) which directly affect the neighbouring properties, public roads and the man-made pond is required.

1.2 CRH Audit Checklist

Does the description of the proposed development include all aspects of temporary and permanent works which might impact upon geology, hydrogeology and hydrology?	No	The construction of an embankment next to the pond to facilitate the incorporation of access paths requires further description. Refer to section 4 of this audit report. The impact of the numerous changes proposed to the surface water drainage system on the existing pipe network needs further assessment	The embankment construction is further described in this document. (section 2.4) The BIA is concerned with any potential impacts upon geology, hydrogeology and hydrology. An addendum surface water drainage statement accompanies this report.
Are suitable plan/maps included?	No	Relevant Arup GSD map extracts have not been included.	Map extracts are included in this document. (section 2.1)
Do the plans/maps show the whole of the relevant area of study and do they show it in sufficient detail?	No	Insufficient information supplied to allow changes to surface water treatment to be assessed.	An addendum surface water drainage statement accompanies this report.
Land Stability Screening: Have appropriate data sources been consulted? Is justification provided for 'No' answers? Refer Geo Assessme LBH Wem July 2018. Yes The stabili embankme proposed loadings s assessed.		Refer Geotechnical Assessment prepared by LBH Wembley, dated July 2018. The stability of the embankment slopes under proposed surcharge loadings should also be assessed.	The embankment is to carry a footpath beside the pond. The structural stability of the embankment, while important to the integrity of the pond, is unrelated to the buildings and is not really a matter for basement impact assessment.
Hydrogeology Screening: Have appropriate data sources been consulted? Is justification provided for 'No' answers?	Yes	Refer to Hydrological & Hydrogeological Impact Assessment, dated July 2018. However more information is required to verify the statements. Refer section 4 of this audit report.	Further information on the groundwater is included in this document. (section 2.3)
Hydrology Screening: Have appropriate data sources been consulted? Is justification provided for 'No' answers?	Yes	Refer to pages 26-37 of Hydrological & Hydrogeological Impact Assessment, dated July 2018	

Is a conceptual model present?	Yes	It is assumed that there is no groundwater; however this is contradicted by the provision of a groundwater contour plan and discussion of groundwater flow. A more conservative approach would be to assume the presence of perched groundwater.	No. There is no contradiction. The auditor has possibly confused the initial screening exercise with the subsequent site investigation findings?
Land Stability Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	Yes	Refer to pages 20-21 of the Geotechnical Assessment, dated July 2018.	
Hydrogeology Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	Yes	Refer to Hydrological & Hydrogeological Impact Assessment, dated July 2018 and Geotechnical Assessment prepared, dated July 2018.	
Hydrology Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	Yes	Refer to Hydrological & Hydrogeological Impact Assessment, dated July 2018 and Geotechnical Assessment prepared by LBH Wembley, dated July 2018.	
Is factual ground investigation data provided?	Yes	Refer to Site Investigation Report by Concept Site Investigations, dated September 2018.	
Is monitoring data presented?	No	Refer to section 4 of the audit report.	Yes. Groundwater monitoring was reported in section 5.3 of the hydrological report. Additional data is provided in this document. (section 2.3)
Is the ground investigation informed by a desk study?	Yes	Refer to Hydrological & Hydrogeological Impact Assessment, dated July 2018.	
Has a site walkover been undertaken?	Yes		

Is the presence/absence of adjacent or nearby basements confirmed?	Yes	Refer to page no. 22 of Geotechnical Assessment, dated July 2018	
Does the geotechnical interpretation include information on retaining wall design?	Yes	Refer to Geotechnical Assessment, dated July 2018	
Are reports on other investigations required by screening and scoping presented?	Yes	Arboricltural Impact Assessment, Heritage Assessment, Construction Management Plan etc are presented.	
Are the baseline conditions described, based on the GSD?	Yes	However groundwater level monitoring data is absent	Groundwater monitoring was reported in section 5.3 of the hydrological report. Additional data is provided in this document.(section 2.3)
Do the baseline conditions consider adjacent or nearby basements?	Yes		
Is an Impact Assessment provided?	Yes		
Are estimates of ground movement and structural impact presented?	No	The outline design of the retaining walls (including temporary structures) is required with confirmation that ground movements will not adversely impact surrounding roads and the pond. A slope stability assessment is required for the embankment slopes, which include surcharges due to construction traffic, where relevant.	Confirmation regarding the relevant retaining structures is included in this document. An outline design of the retaining walls is appended to this document. The structural stability of the embankment, while important to the integrity of the pond, is unrelated to the buildings. The ability of the embankment to carry any construction traffic will be a matter for the temporary works engineer but is not relevant to the BIA and is probably not a material planning issue.

Is the Impact Assessment appropriate to the matters identified by screen and scoping?	No	The outline design of all retaining walls (including temporary structures) is required. Mitigation measures to prevent any adverse movements are required, if applicable.	An outline design of the retaining walls is appended to this document.
Has the need for mitigation been considered and are appropriate mitigation methods incorporated in the scheme?	Yes	However, appropriate mitigation to be confirmed once further assessment completed as described in section 4 of this audit.	
Has the need for monitoring during construction been considered?	No		Structural monitoring is not deemed to be required given the lack of buildings at risk. The issue is addressed in this document. (section 2.6)
Have the residual (after mitigation) impacts been clearly identified?	No	Contradictory statements have been presented regarding the groundwater level in the site. Monitoring data is required to assess the potential impact. Further assessment is required to verify the impact of the development on surface water flows off-site, to ensure the network has sufficient capacity.	No. There is no contradiction. The auditor has possibly confused the initial screening exercise with the subsequent site investigation findings. Groundwater monitoring was reported in section 5.3 of the hydrological report. Additional data is provided in this document. The BIA is concerned with any potential impacts upon geology, hydrogeology and hydrology. The sewer network capacity is not usually a matter for Basement Impact Assessment. An addendum surface water drainage statement accompanies this report and includes further explanation of the off- site surface water flows. The surface water drainage design will be subject to the approval of the council's drainage officer/ SAB.

Has the scheme demonstrated that the structural stability of the building and neighbouring properties and infrastructure will be maintained?	No	The structural stability of the buildings and the retaining walls have to be demonstrated.	Yes. 1.The existing building is to be demolished. 2.The neighbouring properties have been assessed as being too remote to be affected. 3.The existing retaining wall supporting Fitzroy Park will remain so the stability of no infrastructure is in question.
Has the scheme avoided adversely affecting drainage and run-off or causing other damage to the water environment?	No		Yes. The Hydrological & Hydrogeological Assessment has concluded that the drainage and run- off will be improved by the development. An addendum surface water drainage statement accompanies this report.
Has the scheme avoided cumulative impacts upon structural stability or the water environment in the local area?	No	Surrounding properties sufficiently remote that no cumulative impacts to stability are anticipated, however, the cumulative impact of the various changes to surface water flow requires further detail.	An addendum surface water drainage statement accompanies this report.
Does the report state that damage to surrounding buildings will be no worse than Burland Category 1?	No	However, it is accepted that the surrounding structures are away from the zone of influence of the proposed excavation and foundations.	Yes. The assessment has demonstrated that the development does not pose any risk of damage to neighbouring properties. (section section 8 of the geotechnical assessment)
Are non-technical summaries provided?	Yes	Refer to Page 16 of the Geotechnical Assessment prepared by, dated July 2018.	

2. Additional Information

2.1 Arup Map Extracts

The relevant Map extracts from the Camden Geological, Hydrogeological and Hydrological Study are presented below.



Camden 1920 Geological Map (Figure 2, CGHHS, 2010) (London Clay is shown to underlie the site)



Slope Angle Map (Figure 16, CGHHS, 2010)



Camden Flood Map (Figure 15, CGHHS, 2010) (No historical flooding recorded)

LBH WEMBLEY ENGINEERING



Camden Aquifer Designation Map (Figure 8, CGHHS, 2010) (Site is located above Unproductive Strata, at the edge of a Secondary A Aquifer)

2.2 Retaining Walls

An outline retaining wall design has been supplied by the structural engineer and is appended to this document.

2.3 Groundwater Monitoring

		22 nd Septer	ber 2018		
Borehole ID	Recorded Level of top of London Clay (m OD)	Recorded depth to Groundwater	Groundwater Level (m OD)	Recorded depth to Groundwater	Groundwater Level (m OD)
BH1	75.80	1.98	77.82	1.05	78.75
BH2	75.7	4.12	75.58	3.42	76.28
BH6	74.60	0.48	79.12	0.56	79.04
BH7	80.60	1.92	80.18	1.12	80.98
BH8	<78.80	0.66	80.14	0.75	80.05
BH12	78.6	2.11	78.09	1.42	78.78
BH13	77.2	2.87	76.83	2.36	77.34
BH18	77.9	1.51	78.49	3.00	77.00
BH20	80.5	2.80	78.10	1.25	79.65
BH21	79.2	1.15	79.25	1.24	79.16

The results of the groundwater monitoring are presented below:

The monitoring data suggests the configuration of the water table is consistent with the assertion that groundwater is flowing across the impermeable surface of the London Clay, as shown on the plan below.



LBH WEMBLEY

2.4 Proposed Retaining Structure facing the pond

Any construction work undertaken near the pond will be undertaken using non-polluting methods, using no wet concrete, paints or chemicals. Although the embankment carrying the footpath will present a grassed slope it is proposed to provide internal reinforcement to this structure by means of either geotextiles or stone-filled gabions.

2.5 Utilities

The drainage pipe underneath Millfield Lane referred to in the audit report is not believed to exist, It is something that was suggested by the corporation of London at a site inspection on 1st May 2018. A series of utilities plans are appended.

2.6 Structural monitoring

The existing building is to be demolished. The neighbouring properties have been assessed as being too remote to be affected by the proposed basement works. The existing retaining wall supporting Fitzroy Park will remain (see diagrammatic section below) so the stability of no infrastructure is in question. Structural monitoring is hence no required.



3. Audit Query Tracker

Audit Query No.	CRH Query	LBH Response / Action	Status
1	Groundwater monitoring data has to be provided.	Groundwater monitoring data is now provided. (section 2.3)	Addressed
2	Require outline design of temporary and permanent retaining walls to assess their suitability.	Outline design of the retaining walls are now provided. (appended)	Addressed
3	Assessment or calculations showing the overall difference in the inflow and outflow with respect to the site, before and after construction has to be presented.	An addendum surface water drainage statement accompanies this report.	Addressed
4	A detailed utility survey for the area is required, along with details regarding the existing drainage pipe running underneath Millfield Lane.	See attached. No drainage pipe is believed to be present underneath Millfield Lane.	Addressed
5	The slope stability analysis of the design of the MSE wall is required to confirm the stability of the embankments constructed south of the man-made pond.	The embankment construction is further described in this document. (section 2.4)	Addressed

APPENDIX

OUTLINE RETAINING WALL DESIGN

UTILITIES



	Cov		NNEDV	Date	03/12/2018	Project No.	Sheet No
	Consulting Engineers		Eng	тк	16-254	1	
	3rd Floor	Great West	House,		CT.		
	Tel.	+44(0)203393	1174	CONTRA	Fitzrov Parl	k	
	website:	www.coyleke	ennedy.com		1 11210 9 1 411	ii ii	
	email:	mail@coylek	ennedy.com				
Retaining wall design	- Plots 1 2	and 3.					
Retaining wall design	at the froi	nt of the ab	ove propertie	25			
Soil Parameters	Filled ma	aterial - Phi	= 25°				
Use ko - soil at rest = 1	1 - sin phi	= 0.57					
Water Accidentia Ultimate li	l limit sta mit state	te	- take wa - take wa	ater at full ater at 2/3	height height (con	servative)	
Surcharge Loads		20 kN/n	n ²				
wall designed as a pro	pped can	tilever					
Height of wall = 2.7m			2		Structure	Over	
Retaining wall	Fill Mater	rial	2,/00mm				
Land drain 🦯							

	COYLE KEN	NEDY	Date	03/12/2018	Project No.	Sheet No.
	Consulting Eng	gineers	Eng	тк	16-254	2
	3rd Floor Great West H	Checked				
	Brentford. TW8 9DF		CONTRA	СТ		
	Tel: +44(0)203 393 11	74		Fitzroy Parl	κ.	
	website: www.coylekenn	edy.com				
	email: mail@coyleken	nedy.com				
Retaining wall design	- Plots 1 2 and 3.					
Loads						
soil load on wall = 2	0 x 2.7 x 0.57 =	30.8kN/n	n ²			
water Load						
ALS =	10 x 2.7 =	27kN/m ²				
ULS =	10 x 1.8 =	18kN/m²				
Surcharge Load = 20 x	0.57 =	11.4kN/n	n ²			







	Соу	LE KEN	NEDY	Date	03/12/2018	Project No.	Sheet No.
	Consi	ulting Eng	gineers	Eng	тк	16-254	6
	3rd Floor Great West House,			Checked		-	
	Brentford	1. TW8 9DF		CONTRA	СТ	l	
	Tel:	+44(0)203 393 11	74		Fitzroy Parl	k	
	website:	www.coylekenn	edy.com				
	email:	mail@coyleken	nedy.com				
Retaining wall design	- Plots 1 2	and 3.					
Design paramenter	S						
	BM (kNr	n)	SF (kN)				
ULS		63	137				
ALS		47	103				
SLS		44	96				
Therefore design for	the follow BM SF	ing 63 kNm 137kN					
See calcs in the follow	wind shee	ts					
Reinforcement sumn	nary						
vertical re Horizonta	einforceme Il distributi	ent B 15 @ 15 ion steel (25%	0mm crs of vertical)) = 335mm	² per m - B1	L0 @ 200m	m crs

		COYL	E KENI	NEDY	7	Date	04/12/2018	Project No.	Sheet No.
		Consul	ting Eng	ineer	S	Eng	тк	16-254	7
		3rd Floor (reat West Ho	111001	5	Checked		_	7
		Brentford '	TW8 9DF	use,		CONTRA	СТ		
		Tel: +	44(0)203 393 11	74		Fitzrov Pa	urk		
		Fax:	-44(0)203 004 12	.34		1 1121091 0			
		website:	ww.coylekenne	edy.com		Retaining	wall	Bending	
		email:	mail@coyleken	nedy.com		Ũ		5	
R.C. Beam Design - BS EN	N 1992-1-1								
Location									
Strength of Reinforcement	t	Hot rolled Mil	d Steel=		2:	50 N/mm ²			
		Tingii Ticiu St			5	N/mm			
Trme of steel usinfectment									
Type of steel remocement	Beam	Compression	Reinft. H	16					
		Tension Reinf	t. H	16					
		Link size		Н <mark>0</mark>					
DIMENSIONS		Spacer	Proodt	20	Donth	Longth	falz	(Culindar)	
DIVIENSIONS	Beam size	=	1000	1	300	2700	40	N/mm ²	
	Cover	=	50mm	L	Cove	er used in Design	n = 50 mm		
	Max. Moment	along Subframe	2		63.	00 kNm	Elastic	1	
	Min. Percentag	ge of Reinforcer	nent =		0.	18 %			
	wiax i creemag	ge of Reinforcen	ient –			- 70			
Bar Arrangement						No. Bars	Туре]	
-					A1	0	0	0	
					A2	0	0	1330	
				Tot	tal	0.00	10	1339	mmť
	Cal d =	222	mm						
	1 4 4 5	• • •	1. d F						
Effective	lepth to Ten	ision Reinft.	used in the L	Design		222.0mm			
			Redistribut	ion:		0%			
Design formu	ula for rectangu	lar beams		% I	Red	15	5% 20%	25%	30%
	K _{bal} =	= 0.	208	κ_{bal}		0.1	6/ 0.152 K -	0.137	0.12
	K < K' then no	compression is	required				K _{bal} –	0.208	
	Z =	$= d\{0.5+(0.25-H)\}$	K/1.134)} =		215.6m	im			
			0.95d =		211m	im		#VALUE!	
	z is greater tha	n 0.95d then ch	oose z=0.95d					#VALUE!	
	Z =	=	21	l1mm					
	X =	=	~	28mm					
	M/0.87fy z	=		John	6	87 mm ²	0.23	%	
						0			
Percentage of	f Reinforcemer	nt =						0.45	%
Provide 4 T	16 for Tension	Reinft. As pr	ovided =					804.2	mm ²
The area of o	compression re	einf. required						U	mm ²
7.4.2 Check for de	eflection								
Additional T	ension reinft if	f req.		2.66	H16	534	1.8 mm^2		
0 =	= 0.362	2							
$\rho_0 =$	0.632	2				St	ructural system	K	
Tb. NA. 5 K =		4				Simply supporte	ed beam, one- or tw	wo-way 1,0	
Actual $I/d = 1/d$ ratio =	- 16.2	b 4 Equation 7 14	a Annlies			spanning simply End span of con-	supported slab	ne-way 1.3	
l/d ratio =	: 16.00	т Буцанон 7.10)	a applies			continuous slab	or two-way spann	ing slab	
σ_s Modification =	1.5	5 MPa				Interior span of	beam or one-way	or two-way 1,5	
A111.1.1/1 d		0				spanning slab	on columne without	it beams 1.9	-
Allowable I/d ratio =	= 24.00 = 16	0 6				(flat slab) (based	l on longer span)	1,2	
Allowable I/o	d ratio is > the	actual then o.k	in deflection			Cantilever		0,4	

		COYL	E KENNED	Y	Date	0	4/12/2018	Project No.	Sheet No.
		Consul	lting Engineer	S	Eng		ТК	16-254	8
		3rd Floor C	Great West House,		Checked			-	
		Brentford.	TW8 9DF		CONTR	ACT			
		Tel: +	-44(0)203 393 1174		Fitzroy F	Park			
		Fax:	+44(0)203 004 1234						
		website: email:	www.coylekennedy.com mail@coylekennedy.con	ı	Retainin	g wall		Shear	
Location									
Strength of Reinforce	ment	Hot rolled Mi High Yield St	ld Steel= eel=	25 50	50 N/mm ² 00 N/mm ²				
Strength of concrete		fck =		4	0 N/mm ²				
DIMENSIONS	Beam	Links	H Breadth	0 Depth					
	Beam size	=	1000mm	300					
	Cover	=	50mm						
	Max Shear alo	ong Subframe	UIIIII	13	7 kN				
						1220.1			
	Area of Tensio	n Keinft.				1339.1 1339 mr	n ²		
	No of Layers		1. No.			1557			
<u> </u>	Depth to centro	oid of Tension Ste	eel, d =		222mm				
Shear stress in beams			Shear Enhancement =	1		$V_{Ed} =$	137	1	
6.2.2 (6.2 a)	$V_{Rd\ c} = \Big[C_{Rd\ c} k \big($	$100\rho f_{ck})^{\frac{1}{3}} b_w$	<i>d</i> =	150.04	kN				
(6.2 b)	$V_{Rd\ c} = \left(0.035\ k^{\frac{3}{2}}\right)$	$\frac{3}{2} f_{ck}^{\frac{1}{2}} b_w d$	=	133.73	kN				
	k = 1.949 $\rho = 0.006$		$\mathbf{V}_{\mathrm{Rd,c}} =$	150.04	kN				
1			No Shear Ro	einforcemer	nt Required				

	COYLE	KEN	NEDY	Date	04/12/2018	Project No.	Sheet No.
	Consulti	ng Eng	gineers	Eng	ТК	16-254	9
	3rd Floor Gre	at West Ho	ouse,	Checked			
	Brentford. TV	V8 9DF		CONTRAC	Г		
	Tel: +44	(0)203 393 1	174	Fitzroy Park	C		
	Fax: +44 website: ww	w.covlekenr	234 nedv.com	Retaining w	all	Crack Width	
	email: ma	ail@coyleker	nnedy.com	9			
	Crack Widths BS EN 1992-1-1 § 7.3.4						
	Maxiumum allowable crack width =	0.3	mm				
	Quasi-permanent Moment =	44	kNm				
Tb 3.1	fck =	40	MPa				
	Es =	200000	GPa				
Tb 3.1	fctm =	3.51	MPa				
NCCI	Ecm =	35220	GPa				
IStructE EC2 Tb. 7.11	Creep coefficent =	1.2					
	Ec,eff =	16009	MPa				
7.3.4(2)	kt =	0.4					
7.3.4(3)	k1 =	0.8					
7.3.4(3)	k2 =	0.5					
Tb. NA 1	k3 =	3.4					
Tb. NA 1	k4 =	0.425					
	dc(x) =	71.06	mm				
	$\sigma_{\rm S}$ —	166	MPa				
	$\alpha_e =$	5.68					
	d =	222.0mm					
	As =	1339	mm ²				
7.3.2(3)	$A_{c,eff} =$	76312.33	mm ²				
Eqn. 7.10	$\rho_{p,eff}\!=\!$	0.02					
Eqn. 7.11	$S_{r,max} =$	325	mm				
Eqn. 7.9	ε_{sm} - ε_{cm} =	0.00050					
Eqn. 7.8	$w_k =$	0.16	mm				
		Section Ok					



The position of the apparatus shown on this plan is given without obligation and warranty, and the accuracy cannot be guaranteed. Service pipes are not shown but their presence should be anticipated. No liability of any kind whatsoever is accepted by Thames Water for any error or omission. The actual position of mains and services must be verified and established on site before any works are undertaken.

Thames Water Utilities Ltd, Property Searches, PO Box 3189, Slough SL1 4W, DX 151280 Slough 13 T 0845 070 9148 E searches@thameswater.co.uk | www.thameswater-propertysearches.co.uk NB. Levels quoted in metres Ordnance Newlyn Datum. The value -9999.00 indicates that no survey information is available

Manhole Reference	Manhole Cover Level	Manhole Invert Level			
9502	71.82	69.55			
9501	69.87	68.07			
9601	77.66	74.13			
9702	80.8	76.56			
881A	n/a	n/a			
8801	83.85	78.6			
88AJ	n/a	n/a			
88AI	n/a	n/a			
88AH	n/a	n/a			
88AG	n/a	n/a			
69AF	n/a	n/a			
991C	n/a	n/a			
991B	n/a	n/a			
9901	102.02	100.37			
The position of the apparatus shown on this plan is given without obligation and warranty, and the accuracy cannot be guaranteed. Service pipes are not shown but their presence should be anticipated. No liability of any kind whatsoever is accepted by Thames Water for any error or omission. The actual position of mains and services must be verified and established on site before any works are undertaken.					



The position of the apparatus shown on this plan is given without obligation and warranty, and the accuracy cannot be guaranteed. Service pipes are not shown but their presence should be anticipated. No liability of any kind whatsoever is accepted by Thames Water for any error or omission. The actual position of mains and services must be verified and established on site before any works are undertaken.

Based on the Ordnance Survey Map with the Sanction of the controller of H.M. Stationery Office, License no. 100019345 Crown Copyright Reserved.





The position of the apparatus shown on this plan is given without obligation and warranty, and the accuracy cannot be guaranteed. Service pipes are not shown but their presence should be anticipated. No liability of any kind whatsoever is accepted by Thames Water for any error or omission. The actual position of mains and services must be verified before any works are undertaken. Crown copyright Reserved

Scale:	1:2863	Comments:
Width:	800m	
Printed By:	Vkumar1	
Print Date:	13/10/2016	
Map Centre:	527787,186962	
Grid Reference:	TQ2786NE	





This plan shows those pipes owned by National Grid Gas plc in their role as a

Licensed Gas Transporter (GT). Gas pipes owned by other GTs, or otherwise privately owned, may be present in this area. Information with regard to such pipes should be obtained from the relevant owners. The information shown on this plan is given without warranty, the accuracy thereof cannot be guaranteed. Service pipes, valves, syphons, stub connections, etc. are not shown but their presence should be anticipated. No liability of any kind whatsoever is accepted by National Grid Gas plc or their agents, servants or contractors for any error or omission. Safe digging practices, in accordance with HS(G)47, must be used to verify and establish the actual position of

mains, pipes, services and other apparatus on site before any mechanical plant is used. It is your responsibility to ensure that this information is provided to all persons (either direct labour or contractors) working for you on or near gas apparatus. The information included on this plan should not be referred to beyond a period of 28 days from the date of issue. Further information on all DR4s can be determined by calling the DR4 hotline on 01455 892426 (9am-5pm) A DR4 is where a potential error has been identified within the asset record and a process is currently underway to investigate and resolve the error as appropriate.

MAPS Viewer Version 5.7.0.0

Local Machine

This plan is reproduced from or based on the OS map by National Grid Gas plc, with the sanction of the controller of HM Stationery Office. Crown Copyright Reserved.

Maps by email Plant Information Reply



WARNING: IF PLANNED WORKS FALL INSIDE HATCHED AREA IT IS ESSENTIAL BEFORE PROCEEDING THAT YOU CONTACT THE NATIONAL NOTICE HANDLING CENTRE. PLEASE SEND E-MAIL TO: nnhc@openreach.co.uk



