

**MAUND GEO-CONSULTING**

CR Ref	Comment	Response
4.3	...It is understood that the height between the proposed base of the ground floor slab and the Finished Floor Level (FFL) of the basement is 2.5m and the Ground Movement Assessment (GMA) assumes a total excavation of 3.0m. However, the exact FFL and the thickness of the proposed slab, to correctly estimate the excavation depth, are not presented in the architects' drawings and are required.	The depth of the excavation is 3.35m as indicated on Drawing 21-021-02B 'Typical dig depths'
4.4	...Figure 16 from the ARUP GSD is not referenced within the BIA to support responses to land stability screening questions. As the site appears to gently slope (4.5°), there may be the risk that localised areas with slopes with an angle bigger than 7° may be present nearby the site	Figure 16 is now referenced in MGC BIA Table 7.2. As already stated in report there are no slopes observed greater than 7° near the site.
4.8	<p>... However, parameters for the Made Ground are not presented and are required....</p> <p>...The Geotechnical Report indicates an effective angle of shearing resistance of 22° for the London Clay, whereas the retaining wall calculations use a value of 24.2°. This should be clarified, and the calculations revised, if necessary</p>	<p>The made ground comprises a ceramic tile and reinforced concrete slab, which lies directly on the London Clay. Geotechnical parameters are not appropriate for this material, which will be removed during the basement excavation.</p> <p>Revised to 22° for Croft retaining wall calcs.</p>
4.10	... However, the full input and output of the software is not provided and is required	Provided as Appendix E in MGC BIA.

**MAUND GEO-CONSULTING**

CR Ref	Comment	Response
4.11	...and imposed loads acting on the underpins. However, the latter seem to not be included in the analysis and this should be clarified	The loads are included which range from 35 to 65 kN/m for the long-term condition. Croft Drawing SL06 provided in MGC BIA Appendix A
4.12	Excavation movements calculated in PDisp refer to heave movements occurring within the excavation rather than settlement at the back of the wall as a result of the wall's deflection. In addition, the maximum deflection showed in Figure 11.1 of the Geotechnical Report seems to be based on the full extent of the sum of vertical movements rather than on the actual length of the building wall. The GMA should be updated and all the walls which are within the zone of influence of the basement analysed.	For the excavation phase the ground movement has been determined for the heave emanating outwards from the excavation to the adjacent properties. This includes the impact on all party walls as confirmed in the PDIP output, although the impact is principally for Property 33G Mill Lane as other boundaries are either with a garden, parking area or footway/highway.
4.13	The result of the preliminary damage assessment confirms that damage to neighbouring properties will be within Category 1 of the Burland Scale. However, the GMA required revision as per the paragraph above	There is no change to the Burland Scale. All the relevant impacts have all been assessed.