CGL_09528B – The Network Building: LBC Comment Tracker – Scheme RM02 (Laboratory Scheme)

Card Geotechnics Limited

Comment Ref	Date Received	LBC Comment Subject	LBC BIA Query	CGL Comment	Response Date	Status
1	15/04/2021	Stability	Additional information (similar case studies) shall be provided to support the suggested by the GMA reduction of the anticipated ground movements due to wall installation or a sensitivity analysis be undertaken using CIRIA C760 curves.	A brief review of pile installation case studies in which CGL has been directly involved is presented with this comment tracker. For confidentiality reasons, the projects have been anonymised and the data presented is limited. In this worksheet, installation movements are evaluated for four basement development projects with similar ground conditions in central London. Monitored installations movements for these projects have been found to record displacements consistent with 0.02% of installed pile lengths, which is in turn consistent with much of the data reported within CIRIA C760. Consequently, the assumption made in the Preliminary Basement Impact Assessment Report with regards to installation movements being 0.02% of the pile lengths is considered reasonable and moderately conservative.		Open
2	15/04/2021	Stability	The excavation formation level under the raft shall accommodate the need for heave boards as specified in the structural drawings, any blinding or other structural layers etc. Inconsistencies encountered with regard to the assumed excavation formation level (20.86mOD in the GMA vs 20.50mOD in the AKTII Stage 2 report, Appendix A of the BIA) may affect the outcome of the GMA and Damage Assessment and shall be clarified.	The proposed B1 raft surface level is to be formed at +22.36mOD. Provided that the raft is proposed to be 1.5m thick, this results in a formation level of 20.86mOD. An additional 1m excavation has been assumed for the core area which results in a formation level of +19.86mOD. This is in line with relevant structural drawings presented in Appendix A of the revised report. An additional excavation of 100mm to account for heave boards and blinding would result in an excavation unload increase of some 2kPa. Given the order of magnitude of the excavation unloads (more than 120kPa) used in the model, this		Open

Comment Ref	Date Received	LBC Comment Subject	LBC BIA Query	CGL Comment	Response Date	Status
				additional unload of 2kPa is understood to have negligible effect on the outputs of the GMA and as such, the current GMA results provided are considered to be valid.		
3	15/04/2021	Stability	The Structural Report and Drawings (AKTII, Appendix A of the BIA) indicate the proposal is about an eight-storey building plus basement. This contradicts the BIA (Section 2.3). It shall be checked whether the structural loads assumed in the BIA are correct.	Loads considered in the GMA correspond to the proposed new eight-storey building, with a lowered single basement across the entire footprint of the site. Typo has been rectified in the revised report.		Open
4	15/04/2021	Stability	In Appendix 5 of the AKTII report (Appendix A of the BIA) contradictory information to the BIA assumptions is presented with regard to description of the RM02 proposal, design groundwater level, Young's Modulus values, geological boundaries elevations, number of props, male pile toe levels (15m or -15m OD). These shall be clarified/amended.	Relevant structural drawings have been included in Appendix A.		Open