
From: GrahamKite@campbellreith.com
Sent: 30 June 2022 17:21
To: Malcolm Brady
Cc: camdenaudit@campbellreith.com; Nora-Andreea Constantinescu
Subject: Re: MBP-8255:13693-27 <2021/1527/P> 31 Elsworthy Road

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc. Please note there have been reports of emails purporting to be about Covid 19 being used as cover for scams so extra vigilance is required.

Hi Malcolm

In answer to your proposed text:

- looking at the geometry of the neighbouring buildings, they have extensions that project beyond the main house. Consequently, piling potentially has an impact upon these extensions, depending upon the depth / type etc. We are not limiting you to underpinning / or cast insitu walls in an underpinning style sequence, all we are saying is that if you propose to pile, then the GMA must include assessment for any piling proposed. This would also include any impacts to the highway / underlying utilities at the front. The GMA currently excludes movements from piling, so if you wish to leave options in place for the three types of wall you have given options for (CFA, sheet pile, King Post) then the GMA will need updating.

- based on the current GMA, the trigger levels you have proposed would be accepted.

Regards

Graham Kite

CampbellReith
consulting engineers

15 Bermondsey Square
London
SE1 3UN

Tel +44 (0)20 7340 1700
www.campbellreith.com

BELOW GROUND LEVEL

The proposed basement will be an entirely new construction using reinforced and unreinforced concrete. Beneath the existing walls will be underpinned following traditional techniques and hit-&-miss sequences. In the garden the new wall will use a similar technique (the ground will be stable enough when excavated & banked to accommodate this method) but not constructed by other methods, such as:

- CFA piles serving as both temporary and permanent construction
- Steel sheet piles pressed into place serving as temporary and permanent construction (when the clutches are engaged)
- Within an open excavation supported by a king-post system

All of these options will serve the proposed design but will carry different implications for plant required, lead-in and programme and cost and neither steel sheet piling, nor CFA piling will be stiff enough to control the anticipated movement of soil sufficiently to limit the damage levels of 0 or 1 predicted by the GMA (which is based on insitu construction of walls) cannot be adopted for the party walls

And these trigger limits?
altered as necessary.

- The proposed monitoring points will be agreed with the contractor
- The Green/Amber trigger level will be 4mm
- The Amber/Red trigger level will be 7mm

The monitoring regime and frequency proposed is:

From: "Malcolm Brady" <[REDACTED]>
To: "GrahamKite@campbellreith.com" <GrahamKite@campbellreith.com>, "Nora-Andreea Constantinescu" <Nora-Andreea.Constantinescu@camden.gov.uk>
Cc: "camdenaudit@campbellreith.com" <camdenaudit@campbellreith.com>
Date: 06/29/2022 11:49 AM
Subject: MBP-8255:13693-27 <2021/1527/P> 31 Elsworthy Road

Graham,
Can you respond to me on the email below? I'd rather agree before we submit yet another revision of the report.
I also spoke with SCL and they don't make any reference or recommendation for the movement monitoring trigger levels so we're not sure what you are referring to: could you clarify that as well?
Thanks, & Regards, M.

MBP

Malcolm Brady BEng CEng MStructE
Principal, for Michael Barclay Partnership LLP
MBP LLP is EXEMPT from CIS VAT Reverse charges as we provide Consulting Engineering Services;
We continue to charge standard rated VAT and pay direct to HMRC.
E: Malcolm.Brady@campbellreith.com

A: 1 Lancaster Place, London, WC2E 7ED

W: mbp-uk.com@mbplon

Principals: Julian Birch Malcolm Brady Tony Hayes

Senior Associates: Jonathan Coleman Louise Quick

Associates: Martin Fenn Konstantinos Gouziou Sina Heidarzadeh Sarah Martin Natalie Martono Paul Melton Luiza Pettersson

Privacy Policy

We have made some changes to our Privacy Policy in line with GDPR. These include:

- Clarity on what data we have, how we use it, why we need it and who has access to it.
- Updates to the choices you have over how we use your data.
- Details of who to contact if you have any concerns.

To view our Privacy Policy please click [here](#) or contact Malcolm Brady at Malcolm.Brady@mbp-uk.com.

This email and any attachments to it may contain privileged and/or confidential information. If you have received it in error, please notify the sender immediately and destroy any copies.

From: Malcolm Brady

Sent: 17 June 2022 16:01

To: 'GrahamKite@campbellreith.com' <GrahamKite@campbellreith.com>; Nora-Andreea Constantinescu <Nora-Andreea.Constantinescu@camden.gov.uk>

Cc: camdenaudit@campbellreith.com

Subject: MBP-8255:13693-27 <2021/1527/P> 31 Elsworthy Road
Graham,

Will this wording be acceptable?

BELOW GROUND LEVEL

The proposed basement will be an entirely new construction using reinforced and unreinforced concrete. Beneath the main house the existing walls will be underpinned following traditional techniques and hit-&-miss sequences. In the garden the new walls can be built using a similar technique (the ground will be stable enough when excavated & benked to accommodate this method) but may, alternatively, be constructed by other methods, such as:

- CFA piles serving as both temporary and permanent construction
- Steel sheet piles pressed into place serving as temporary and permanent construction (when the clutches are welded)
- Within an open excavation supported by a king-post system

All of these options will serve the proposed design but will carry different implications for plant required, lead-in and construction programme and cost and neither steel sheet piling, nor CFA piling will be stiff enough to control the anticipated movement of the retained soil sufficiently to limit the damage levels of 0 or 1 predicted by the GMA (which is based on insitu construction of reinforced concrete), so cannot be adopted for the party walls.

And these trigger limits?

- The proposed monitoring points will be agreed with the contractor
- The Green/Amber trigger level will be 4mm
- The Amber/Red trigger level will be 7mm

The monitoring regime and frequency proposed is:

Thanks, & Regards, M.

MBP

Malcolm Brady BEng CEng MStructE

Principal, for Michael Barclay Partnership LLP

MBP LLP is EXEMPT from CIS VAT Reverse charges as we provide Consulting Engineering Services;

We continue to charge standard rated VAT and pay direct to HMRC.

E: Malcolm.Brady@mbp-uk.com

W: mbp-uk.com@mbplon

Principals: Julian Birch Malcolm Brady Tony Hayes

Senior Associates: Jonathan Coleman Louise Quick

Associates: Martin Fenn Konstantinos Gouziou Sina Heidarzadeh Sarah Martin Natalie Martono Paul Melton Luiza Pettersson

Privacy Policy

We have made some changes to our Privacy Policy in line with GDPR. These include:

- Clarity on what data we have, how we use it, why we need it and who has access to it.
- Updates to the choices you have over how we use your data.
- Details of who to contact if you have any concerns.

To view our Privacy Policy please click [here](#) or contact Malcolm Brady at Malcolm.Brady@mbp-uk.com.

This email and any attachments to it may contain privileged and/or confidential information. If you have received it in error, please notify the sender immediately and destroy any copies.

From: GrahamKite@campbellreith.com <GrahamKite@campbellreith.com>

Sent: 17 June 2022 15:25

To: Nora-Andreea Constantinescu <Nora-Andreea.Constantinescu@camden.gov.uk>

Cc: camdenaudit@campbellreith.com; Malcolm Brady

Subject: 13693-27 <2021/1527/P> 31 Elsworthy Road
Hi Nora

Many thanks for your email and the additional submissions for this BIA Audit. We do have some comments (and I have CC'd Malcolm from MBP so he can review and respond). Just to note that additional fees will apply to this audit, charged at the TOR rates, for the additional review undertaken and for any future reviews of submitted documents.

For reference below, please see my email of 20/04/22 - some of the comments are still relevant, as follows:

Q4 / Q5 - Piling

Piling has been removed from the drawings, as requested. Piling is still referenced in the CMS Sections 5 and 8 - whilst it is not the recommended option, the text reads:

"Beneath the main house the existing walls will be underpinned following traditional techniques and hit-&-miss sequences. In the garden the new walls can be built using a similar technique (the ground will be stable enough when excavated & banked to accommodate this method) but may, alternatively, be constructed by other methods, such as:

- *CFA piles serving as both temporary and permanent construction*
- *Steel sheet piles pressed in to place serving as temporary and permanent construction (when the clutches are welded)*
- *Within an open excavation supported by a king-post system*

*All of these options will serve the proposed design but will carry different implications for plant required, lead-in and construction programme and cost and **the choice will be negotiated with the intended contractor.**"*

As previously stated (email below), the BIA should reflect what is actually proposed - it is not the intention that the BIA suggest one method of construction but then allow the contractor to opt for another, which by the BIA's own conclusions would create additional impacts.

Q4 / Q5 - Underpinning

As previously stated (email below), the GMA refers to a single stage of underpinning whereas the CMS Section 5 and drawings refers to two stage underpinning. The two reports should be consistent and the GMA relevant to what is actually proposed. Please note the comments in the email below in regard to single stage / two stage underpinning and consideration of movements / load transfer etc considering the ground conditions.

Its noted that contour plots have been provided as requested, which are consistent with the values presented in the GMA.

Q6 - Monitoring

This query remains unanswered and the previous comments still apply (as below). Just to note, the trigger values within the GMA are consistent with the analyses and would be accepted if adopted by the CMS.

Regards

Graham

From: Graham Kite/CRH

To: "Nora-Andreea Constantinescu" <Nora-Andreea.Constantinescu@camden.gov.uk>

Cc: "camdenaudit@campbellreith.com" <camdenaudit@campbellreith.com>, "KatharineBarker@campbellreith.com" <KatharineBarker@campbellreith.com>

Date: 04/20/2022 05:39 PM

Subject: RE: 13693-27: 31 ELSWORTHY ROAD 2021/1527/P

Hi Nora

The comments from the structural engineer MBP relayed by you in your email of 28th March have been reviewed and **our comments are as follows below.**

Just to note that, the remaining queries that are open (Q4, Q5 and Q6) are not onerous to resolve and we would assume that any further responses from the Applicant's team would close out the Audit. We have now reviewed 2no written submissions and these additional comments via email. If further iterations of comments are received and

require response, additional fees would apply.

MBP Responses to Q4 and Q5 (our response in red)

The CMS considers, as required by policy, options for the basement construction, including piling, insitu construction and construction in open excavation and the impact of each. The report concludes that piling will not be adopted on account of the movement and the recommendations of the GMA. The point of these documents is to demonstrate that full consideration has been given to the proposed works not to prescribe one solution even if that is the conclusion and our report does discount piling and notes that the GMA is based on there not being piling.

(Acknowledged that the CMS states that piling is not recommended. However, the CMS does state that piling is an option and the drawings all show piled front and rear retaining walls. Given that, if planning consent is granted it will be conditioned to be in accordance with the BIA, it is therefore important for the BIA and related documents to reflect what is actually proposed. Therefore, if piling is no longer proposed, it should be removed from the CMS and drawings.)

The C760 contours are an output option on XDISP software, which we don't use. We have, however, assessed the movements along the relevant walls using the C760 charts and transferred these onto movement profiles along the walls. So the relevant and required information has been provided for specific walls, in a line profile rather than as contours. Therefore I cannot see how providing a contour plot will add any further information of use, other than for presentational reasons.

(The geometry of the proposed development and the consequential movement contours will influence the strains generated along the walls. Inclusion of the contours allows straightforward checking of the stated movements along the structural walls of concern. The Terms of Reference for BIA Audits states that our role is to ensure that "...the conclusions <of the BIA> have been arrived at based on all necessary and reasonable evidence and considerations, in a reliable, transparent manner...".)

Camden's policies do not specify that C760 contours are to be submitted (Agreed, but required as stated above)

The GMA is based on a single lift of pin but that does not preclude casting in two sections: if the contractor opts for the latter then they will have to ensure the parameters of the GMA are met by their temporary works.

(As above: given that, if planning consent is granted it will be conditioned to be in accordance with the BIA, it is therefore important for the BIA and related documents to reflect what is actually proposed. Therefore, it is important to clarify whether the underpinning is to be undertaken in one or 2 stages; if one stage is required to meet the movement tolerance's then the option of 2 stages should be removed; if 2 stages are proposed as an option, appropriate ground movement assessment should be presented. As a note, based on the presented ground conditions (deep soft Made Ground / Superficial Deposits) underpinning undertaken in 2 stages would be anticipated to generate movements in excess of those currently predicted, noting the load transfer in the temporary case to soils with a lower bearing capacity than the final formation level).

Camden's policies do not specify that C760 contours are to be submitted (Agreed, but required as stated above)

In response to Q6 (our response in red)

The GMA doesn't prescribe trigger levels but suggests limits of movement and refers back to our CMS for those triggers

(The CMS indicates generic, site wide trigger values, rather than wall specific trigger values. This is an acceptable approach but on this basis the trigger values in the CMS and the limiting movement values in the GMA will need to be consistent. For instance, the GMA currently indicates that limiting movements of 5mm to 8mm will be required to maintain damage to neighbouring walls to within Category 1, and specifically assigns limiting vertical and horizontal limiting movements to each neighbouring wall. The CMS trigger values are currently in excess of these limiting values and therefore are not accepted and require review. If site wide trigger values are proposed, then these will need to be lower than the smallest limiting values indicated by the GMA; otherwise, wall specific triggers could be presented, to be consistent with the GMA.)

Our Structural Engineer has asked if there is a checklist to formally log the responses back to CR ?

(Comments can be added to the Query Tracker presented in Appendix 2, if required)

Regards