From: GrahamKite@campbellreith.com
Sent: 26 February 2019 16:43
To: Constantinescu, Nora-Andreea
Cc: camdenaudit@campbellreith.com
Subject: Fw: 12727-95: 1 Sprencer Rise

FYI Nora as discussed
----- Forwarded by Graham Kite/CRH on 26/02/2019 16:38 -----

From: Graham Kite/CRH
To: "Francis Williams" <francis.williams@groundandwater.co.uk>
Cc: "TREVOR VINCENT" <trevor-vincent@sky.com>, Camden Audit/CRH@campbellreith
Date: 22/02/2019 08:41
Subject: 12727-95: 1 Sprencer Rise

Hi Francis

We are completing the audit of your updated documents, for issue next week. As I believe you are aware, comments have been received from a consulting engineer on behalf of the neighbours and it would be advisable to review their report, if you haven't already. FYI I believe a second report has been commissioned although we haven't been issued with it yet, and LBC have asked us to review that next week

Based on the review so far we have a few comments for your to consider:

Re BH1 - the description of soils from 3.20m to 6.40m, can you clarify whether sand is present or not? ie described as a silty Clay, but sand is then referenced as fine grained. As previously noted, WS1 and WS2 are described as silty sandy Clay, and the summary text indicates silty sandy clay to 7.25m.

Re BH1 - do you have an opinion on the low SPT result at 6m? We note you have highlighted that 'the soft spot at 6m should not be overstressed, and you also reference assessment of movements based on soft to firm clays. A statement confirming that proposed foundation loads will not overstress the soils, or lead to excessive settlement should be made. Do the settlement calcs presented account for this low ISPT result?

Re Heave - the range of anticipated heave, up to 87mm, would be higher than normally anticipated. It would be worth checking this. As the proposed basement utilises underpins, rather than an embedded wall, consideration of heave effects in the GMA should be discussed and mitigated for ie not just protection for the structure itself, but potential impacts to neighbours.

Re damage to neighbours - given the structural inspection has noted existing damage to neighbours, are their likely to be further impacts resulting from the underpinning of the party walls? ie at 1C, its noted that the junction between the main house and the closet wing up has cracks / damage to Category 2; are the walls to the closet wing that are not underpinned likely to continue to move seasonally? And if so, will the stiffened junction at the Party Wall result in long term impacts? Does further mitigation need to be considered, such as transition pins?

If you wish to discuss the above, I am out of the office today but will be available on Monday.

Regards

Graham Kite

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