

BIA – Audit Query Tracker

Query No	Subject	Query	Status	Date closed out
1	BIA	Authors qualifications.	Closed	2/1/2019
2	BIA	Superseded references of CPG, CIRIA & BS.	Closed	2/1/2019
3	BIA	The different screening and scoping sections should be made consistent to each other or incorporated into one report. Scoping for surface flow and flooding should be included in the BIA.	Open	
4	BIA	It is incorrectly mentioned (in the SA) that the site is located in London Clay. The SA has not been updated, as such it is not considered into the assessment. Both the screening and scoping sections for surface waters should be incorporated into the BIA.	Open	
5	BIA	Contradictory information is presented about the proposed floor slab type. Both the updated version of the BIA and BIA-S now refer to a ground bearing slab.	Closed	02/10/2019
6	BIA	The latest version of the GI report should be referred to in the BIA-S report.	Closed	2/1/2019
7	BIA	Consistency is required across the BIA documents with regard to proposed excavation depths.	Closed	2/1/2019
8	BIA	The BIA-S report should be aligned to CPG with respect to acceptable damage levels.	Closed	2/1/2019
9	BIA	The “Type of Works” information presented in the revised BIA-S report and the SMS report should be amended to reflect the subject site and the proposed development. The BIA-S and the SMS have been updated.	Closed	30/09/2019
10	BIA	Information about ‘front lightwells’ and the distance to the nearest public highway presented in the revised BIA-S report should be clarified/amended. The BIA-S has been updated.	Closed	02/10/2019
11	BIA	Incorrect references presented in the SMS report as discussed in Section 4 of this audit. The SMS has been updated.	Closed	02/10/2019

BIA – Audit Query Tracker

12	Hydrology	Contradictory information about SuDS measures are presented in the revised BIA-S report. The updated BIA-S states that no SuDS to be incorporated in the scheme. However, this should be confirmed at a detailed design stage.	Closed	02/10/19
13	Stability & Hydrology	A desktop utilities survey is required. See paragraph 4.8. of the F1 version of the CR audit report.	Open	
14	Stability	The answer to question 4 of the slope stability screening and paragraph 2.5 of the GI report should be amended.	Closed	2/1/2019
15	Stability	The calculation methodology of bearing capacity and the 'Limit Bearing Capacity' term should be clarified. The adopted values should be justified. Updated	Closed	02/10/19
16	Stability	The calculation methodology of heave and settlement should be clarified. Updated	Closed	02/10/19
17	Stability	The GMA should assess the potential impact on all neighbouring structures and utilities, and include existing/proposed development loads, horizontal movements, long-term movements, and movements due to wall installation. See comments below.	Open	
18	Stability	Mitigation measures should be included in the GMA as required. The GMA should discuss mitigation measures for potential collapse of the sandy layers. The structural proposal should be updated also.	Open	
19	Stability	A monitoring methodology informed by the GMA results should be provided.	Open	
20	Stability	The BIA-S retaining wall calculations should take into account the GI report's proposed ground parameters.	Closed	2/1/2019
21	Stability	The risk of ground movement and any potential damage discussed in the revised BIA-S report should be assessed on the basis of the site-specific GMA results.	Open	
22	Stability	The ground movement trigger levels suggested in the SMS report should be updated based on the outcome of the revised GMA.	Open	

BIA – Audit Query Tracker

23	Stability	Monitoring points should be added along Holly Walk pavement and highway, and along the northern boundary garden wall.	Open	
----	-----------	---	------	--

Comments on query n. 17

Vertical movements from PDisp have been coupled with horizontal ground movements estimated to occur at the back of the wall according to CIRIA C760 to estimate category of damage for neighbouring buildings. It is noted that CIRIA C760 provides estimation of damage category assuming the propagation of horizontal and vertical ground movements at the back of the wall, at ground surface. However, vertical ground movements presented in the BIA have been calculated by using the software PDsip which is normally used to calculate settlement at basement level and not at surface. In addition PDisp does not provide a reliable estimation of ground movements propagation at the back of the wall, such that calculation of the deflection, necessary to estimate the category of damage, is not possible.

The GMA should allow for a worst case scenario where unwanted ground movements can occur in the short term due to construction operations/underpin installation.

Estimation of ground movements occurring at any underground utilities and infrastructures within the zone of influence of the basement should be presented as specified in paragraph 4.25-4.26 of the F1 CR audit report.