
From: Alice Tettmar <alice.tettmar@groundandwater.co.uk>
Sent: 29 March 2019 17:49
To: Victoria Thong
Cc: TREVOR VINCENT; Francis Williams; Emma McBurney;
1sr@edwardwilliamsarchitects.com; Constantinescu, Nora-Andreea
Subject: 1 Spencer Rise - Updated BIA
Attachments: GWPR2459 1 Spencer Drive, Camden Ground Investigation Report V5.01 FULL
FINAL-compressed.pdf

Good afternoon all,

Please find attached the updated GI and BIA for works at 1 Spencer Rise, Camden and my comments in response to Graham's (dated 13th March 2019)

- please ensure logs / report text are consistent. **This has been done and can be seen throughout the report and the borehole logs in Appendix D.**
- please include a statement re the low SPT result and how this is assessed / accommodated by the design. **This has been included in Section 7.2.1.**

- re the heave predicted, given the width of the property, a heave profile that exhibits 50mm (or 87mm) at the centre of dig and 0mm (or 1mm, as I think your table on p28 shows) at the Party Walls seems unlikely. We'd expect that magnitude of heave to impact adjoining shallow foundations in some way, whereas if you were utilising an embedded wall you may argue that the effects would be negligible. It may be more useful to discuss what heave may occur in the short term (which you mention in the report) in the context of the proposed temporary works methodology and how any long term heave will be accommodated by the permanent works.

We have analysed the short term and long term heave based the existing loads of the structure and proposed loads of the basement slab. The structural engineer has advised that the use of Cellcore below the base of the slab will reduce any movements at the centre of slab. A conservative approach based on a basement slab weight 12.50kN/m2 has been used. The full analysis can be seen in Section 7.2.2.

- based on the structural conditions observed (ie Cat 2 cracking) and the consideration of ongoing seasonal movements to walls that are not underpinned, a statement about impact is needed here. Trevor's comments are noted - however, if without mitigation there will be an impact then some form of mitigation should be proposed (how that mitigation is subsequently implemented under the Party Wall Award is for the PW Surveyors to decide).

We have included that consideration could be given to the use of transition pins at basement and ground level to mitigate any additional seasonal movements at the party walls.

If you have any queries or comments, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Kind regards,

Alice Tettmar BSc. (Hons.)

*Geotechnical and
Geo-Environmental Engineer*

Ground & Water Limited