

31st May 2012

Booth King Partnership Ltd
Tollgate House
9c Bridge Street
Ramsbottom
BL0 9AB

FAO – Ian Leaper

Dear Ian,

RE: GRS0112-1458 Proposed Specialist Unit, Former Gardeners Arms, Broad Green Road, Liverpool – Addendum Letter Report.

This letter report presents and discusses the completed ground gas monitoring results for the above site and should be read in conjunction with GRS0112-1458 Ground Engineering Interpretative Report issued on the 11th May 2012.

The gas monitoring results from the final monitoring visit undertaken on the 29th May 2012 and the five previous monitoring results shows that a very slight percentage (0.1%) methane gas has been detected (WS3). Concentrations of oxygen were shown to be generally in the range of normal with the exception of WS3 during the first and last visit where depleted oxygen levels were recorded. Slightly raised levels of carbon dioxide were also detected throughout the monitoring period. No hydrogen sulphate or carbon monoxide was detected in any of the installations. The maximum flow rate recorded was 5.6 l/h.

It should be noted that after the fourth monitoring visit the monitoring installation in WS1 was found to be damaged to the point that no further readings were possible.

A Preliminary Risk Assessment of the ground gas regime at the site was carried out in the Ground Engineering Interpretative Report (GRS, May 2012). The risk assessment categorised the site as 'Characteristic Situation 2' (Low Risk) for which specialised ground gas protection measures are required. As the monitoring period is now complete, a further risk assessment has been carried out using all of the monitoring data. Below is a table summarising the results from the whole of the monitoring period.

As the exact design structure is not available at the time of writing of this report GRS cannot score the ground gas protection measures. Reference should therefore be made to the below table 3 extract from BS8485 during the construction design phase.

If you have any further questions or queries, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Yours Sincerely



Dominic David BSc (Hons)
Associate

Table 3 Solutions scores

| PROTECTION ELEMENT/SYSTEM | SCORE | COMMENTS |
|---|------------------------------|--|
| a) Venting/dilution (see Annex A) | | |
| Passive sub floor ventilation (venting layer can be a clear void or formed using gravel, geocomposites, polystyrene void formers, etc.) ^{A)} | Very good performance 2.5 | Ventilation performance in accordance with Annex A. |
| | Good performance 1 | If passive ventilation is poor this is generally unacceptable and some form of active system will be required. |
| Subfloor ventilation with active abstraction/pressurization (venting layer can be a clear void or formed using gravel, geocomposites, polystyrene void formers, etc.) ^{A)} | 2.5 | There have to be robust management systems in place to ensure the continued maintenance of any ventilation system. Active ventilation can always be designed to meet good performance. Mechanically assisted systems come in two main forms: extraction and positive pressurization. |
| Ventilated car park (basement or undercroft) | 4 | Assumes car park is vented to deal with car exhaust fumes, designed to Building Regulations Document F [5] and IStructE guidance [6]. |
| b) Barriers | | |
| Floor slabs | | |
| Block and beam floor slab | 0 | It is good practice to install ventilation in all foundation systems to effect pressure relief as a minimum. Breaches in floor slabs such as joints have to be effectively sealed against gas ingress in order to maintain these performances. |
| Reinforced concrete ground bearing floor slab | 0.5 | |
| Reinforced concrete ground bearing foundation raft with limited service penetrations that are cast into slab | 1.5 | |
| Reinforced concrete cast in situ suspended slab with minimal service penetrations and water bars around all slab penetrations and at joints | 1.5 | |
| Fully tanked basement | 2 | |
| c) Membranes | | |
| Taped and sealed membrane to reasonable levels of workmanship/in line with current good practice with validation ^{B), C)} | 0.5 | The performance of membranes is heavily dependent on the quality and design of the installation, resistance to damage after installation, and the integrity of joints. |
| Proprietary gas resistant membrane to reasonable levels of workmanship/in line with current good practice under independent inspection (CQA) ^{B), C)} | 1 | |
| Proprietary gas resistant membrane installed to reasonable levels of workmanship/in line with current good practice under CQA with integrity testing and independent validation | 2 | |
| d) Monitoring and detection (not applicable to non-managed property, or in isolation) | | |
| Intermittent monitoring using hand held equipment | 0.5 | Where fitted, permanent monitoring systems ought to be installed in the underfloor venting/dilution system in the first instance but can also be provided within the occupied space as a fail safe. |
| Permanent monitoring and alarm system ^{A)} | 2 | |
| | 1 | |
| e) Pathway intervention | | |
| Pathway intervention | — | This can consist of site protection measures for off-site or on-site sources (See Annex A). |
| NOTE In practice the choice of materials might well rely on factors such as construction method and the risk of damage after installation. It is important to ensure that the chosen combination gives an appropriate level of protection | | |
| ^{A)} It is possible to test ventilation systems by installing monitoring probes for post installation validation. | | |
| ^{B)} If a 1 200 g DPM material is to function as a gas barrier it should be installed according to BRE 212 [8]/BRE 414 [9], being taped and sealed to all penetrations. | | |
| ^{C)} Polymeric Materials >1 200 g can be used to improve confidence in the barrier. Remember that their gas resistance is little more than the standard 1 200 g (proportional to thickness) but their physical properties mean that they are more robust and resistant to site damage. | | |

