

---

**From:** GrahamKite@campbellreith.com  
**Sent:** 25 March 2019 16:02  
**To:** Francis Williams  
**Cc:** camdenaudit@campbellreith.com; Constantinescu, Nora-Andreea  
**Subject:** Re: 12727-95: 1 Sprencer Rise

Hi Francis

There have been no further comments received from the neighbouring residents.

In the last few minutes I have just finished a discussion with the Planning Officer (Nora, CC'd). I understand from Nora that the application needs to be determined. Could you confirm to Nora when you will be issuing your responses please?

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](http://www.campbellreith.com)

---

From: "Francis Williams" <francis.williams@groundandwater.co.uk>  
To: GrahamKite@campbellreith.com  
Cc: camdenaudit@campbellreith.com  
Date: 25/03/2019 15:47  
Subject: Re: 12727-95: 1 Sprencer Rise

---

Graham,

I have the two points at the end of your e-mail to reply to, but otherwise, are we awaiting further submissions from the residents?

Fran

On Wed, 13 Mar 2019 at 11:40, <[GrahamKite@campbellreith.com](mailto:GrahamKite@campbellreith.com)> wrote:  
Hi Francis

We have not received any further information from LBC yet - once we have it, I'll make sure you see a copy.

Re the discussion in the preceding emails:

- please ensure logs / report text are consistent.
- please include a statement re the low SPT result and how this is assessed / accommodated by the design.

- 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.

- 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).

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](http://www.campbellreith.com)

From: "Francis Williams" <[francis.williams@groundandwater.co.uk](mailto:francis.williams@groundandwater.co.uk)>  
To: [GrahamKite@campbellreith.com](mailto:GrahamKite@campbellreith.com)  
Cc: [camdenaudit@campbellreith.com](mailto:camdenaudit@campbellreith.com)  
Date: 11/03/2019 15:12  
Subject: Re: 12727-95: 1 Sprencer Rise

---

Graham,

Thanks for the comments. Please find attached our response in red.

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

In our cover letter to the client we highlighted the general points made by all comments on the application, not just Mr De Freitas. There was overlap on a no. of points so bulked the queries over groundwater and impact on neighbouring properties together. So the specific points raised by Mr De Freitas have been reviewed and answered in our revised report. When you get any new reports then please let us know and we can review.

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.

The BH1 log has a slight typo and should include sand. Based on review of the deposits the London Clay Formation in this area does have slight sandier/siltier areas/bands. Based on our experience this is not unusual, as sand/silt bands do occur. So the description in BH1 should be similar to that of WS1/WS2. We are obviously happy to amend this error.

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?

Yes, the low SPT is accounted for in design. We can add a confirmatory statement to the report if required. The lower SPT is associated with a slight more sandy horizon, with perhaps a bit of perched water which may have been obscured by drilling.

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.

Please note that this is the upper limit of the range provided, with the lower limit being ~50mm. The heave will not occur outside the perimeter of the basement, given analysis has indicate that the net change in effective stress where the underpin/loaded edges are is about zero. So it is only the central core where heave may occur, which will not affect neighbours. Again, a confirmatory statement can be added.

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?

Trevor's comments on the above were as follows:

"My opinion is that transition pins do not work, and in any case neighbours always resist having them constructed on their property. Party wall surveyors avoid them like the plague!  
.....Some properties have been partly underpinned under their insurance, this has been done without consideration to transition pins. " Again, some confirmatory statements could be added in the report.

Please let me know your thoughts.

Kind Regards

--

**Francis Williams** Mgeol (Hons.)

Cgeol CEnv AGS FGS MSoBRA

*Director*

Ground and Water Limited

Mob:07979 754715

[www.groundandwater.co.uk](http://www.groundandwater.co.uk)

Skype: groundandwater

Based at:

Head Office

2 The Long Barn

Norton Farm, Selborne Road

Alton