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ABSTRACT

Geospatial monitoring of historic buildings has a valuable meaning for their restoration and preservation measures. The preparation and accomplishment of such monitoring have their features and cannot be standardized. Therefore, in each particular case, monitoring is carried out for specific requirements and conditions. The paper presents the results of geospatial monitoring for a part of the UNESCO object Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra. The primary subject of geospatial monitoring is a retaining wall known as the Debosquette Wall. The wall was built in the XVIII century and underwent restoration in 2014. A geospatial monitoring system has been established to prevent undesirable damage and displacements. Assigning the necessary observation accuracy for such a complex object is difficult. In the paper, the modern approach to observation accuracy calculation has been suggested and studied. The approach is based on the application of structural mechanics principles. The structural analysis of the Debosquette Wall has been accomplished. The output of the analysis was applied to calculate the required observation accuracy. The geospatial network and monitoring scheme were developed based on the calculated accuracy. The monitoring proceeded for half a year in 2012-2013, was interrupted for one year, and kept on in 2015. The primary stress was made on the horizontal displacements in that these displacements are the primary threats to the wall stability. The in-depth analysis of the monitoring results has been accomplished. It was found that the displacements have stayed within the allowable values. The developed monitoring approach is recommended for similar projects.
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INTRODUCTION

Geospatial monitoring has become an essential part of most engineering projects. The role and goal of geospatial monitoring depend on the studied structure. Particular attention should be paid to monitoring tasks for historic buildings, especially at the restoration stage. Numerous studies have investigated various monitoring methods depending on the displacements to be measured (vertical, horizontal, or spatial). These methods include different types of leveling, traverses, GNSS, laser scanning, photogrammetry, InSAR, sensors, and their combinations [1-13]. The application of these methods has its pros and cons. However, a number of recent studies have shown that any of these methods can be successfully applied to monitor historic buildings [14-25]. In general, geospatial monitoring of engineering structures contains well-known stages, namely design, target setup, geodetic network creation, observations, data processing, and analysis. This list of stages is well-described in a bunch of papers, reports, and textbooks, e.g., [26,27]. In the case of historic building monitoring, the first stage requires special attention. The design stage supposes the development of recommendations for observation accuracy, network geometry, and observation scheme. Historic buildings stand out in their complex geometry, different and even unknown construction materials, and adverse construction conditions (poorly understood geology, unaccounted loads, etc.). Such conditions lead to an issue of correct accuracy assignment for observations. The traditional approach for accuracy assignment was worked out for typical structures with preliminary known geometry, construction scheme, materials, and loads. Obviously, this case is not applicable to historic buildings. The conditions get complicated in the case of monitoring such complex structures as retaining walls. Retaining walls are used to protect the surrounding structures from possible hill collapse and serve to support the structures placed on the hill. Mostly, retaining walls are considered a kind of anti-landslide structure. Typically, the same methods and approaches are applied for monitoring retaining walls as in a general case. Different studies of monitoring methods for retaining walls have been considered in [28-36]. In our case, the main challenge is monitoring the historic retaining wall. The main theoretical issue that has to be solved is the correct observation accuracy assignment. This task has not been addressed yet in the considered publications. The correct accuracy also serves for the analysis of monitoring results, being that by comparing the allowable accuracy with measured displacements, we may infer the significance of the displacements. Therefore, the paper aimed at the theoretical study of accuracy assignment for monitoring historical retaining walls and practical implementation of the obtained accuracy for monitoring results analysis. The rest of the paper contains a description of the study object, theoretical background for the suggested accuracy assignment approach, a description of monitoring workflow, results of accuracy calculation by the suggested approach, and, finally, the analysis of monitoring results.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Monitoring object

Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra is one of the astonishing structures of Kyiv city and a world-renowned center of Orthodox Christianity. The Lavra is a complex of various historical structures, including churches, towers, caves, overpasses, and retaining walls. In total, more than fifty structures (Figure 1).
The history of the Lavra commenced in 1051 when the first complex of cave monasteries was built. The complex developed over many centuries until XIX C. In 1990, the Lavra complex was listed by UNESCO. The main buildings of the Lavra ensemble are the Dormition Cathedral, the Trinity Gate Church, the Great Bell Tower, the Church of All Saints, the Refectory Church, the monastery fortified walls with towers, the cave complexes of St. Anthony (Near) and St. Theodosy (Far) with surface churches, the Exaltation of the Cross and the Nativity of the Virgin and the Church of the Saviour on Berestove [38]. Among the fortified walls, the Debosquette Wall is of great interest [39] (Figure 2).

The wall was built in XVIII C. The total length of the wall exceeds 100 m (Figure 3). Initially, the wall was intended to reinforce the southeast hill of the Near Caves territories. In 1816, two made of bricks rotundas were built at the top of the Debosquette Wall [40].
Since its construction as a fortified structure, the primary purpose of the wall has changed. Today, the primary role of the Debosquette Wall is the anti-landslide structure. Therefore, by its functionality, the Debosquette Wall can be treated as a retaining wall that bears the load from a hill, structures emplaced on the hill and prevents them from collapsing. In 2011, the Ukrainian government decided to reconstruct and restore the Debosquette Wall. According to the reconstruction project, complex geospatial monitoring of the wall was envisaged. The goal of the monitoring was to establish the possible displacements of the wall during and right after the restoration works with appropriate accuracy.

**Method for monitoring accuracy assignment**

Insofar as the monitoring must be accomplished with necessary accuracy, the correct assignment of the accuracy is of great importance. On the other hand, any historical structure is unique, and there is no general approach to monitoring accuracy determination. This is why, before geospatial monitoring works, the appropriate method for accuracy determination has to be developed. It is worth mentioning that the primary attention has to be paid to horizontal displacements for retaining walls. Vertical displacements are typically insignificant. Thus, the method considered below is intended for the accuracy of horizontal displacement determination.

Let us consider the suggested approach for accuracy determination. The right way is the application of structural mechanics principles and approaches. The method presented below further develops the concept suggested in [41,42]. We may consider the wall a vertical cantilever beam clamped at one side and free on another. Under this premise, the deflection will have a maximum value at the top of the wall. Different loads affect the retaining wall. One may find a detailed description of the loads and their relationships in [43]. For our case, we may use the simple model where the main forces are given in Figure 4.

![Horizontal sketch of the Debosquette Wall](image)
Fig. 4 – Forces acting on a retaining wall

A cantilever retaining wall in Figure 4 must resist both overturning and sliding. In structural mechanics, the normative loads are multiplied by the reliability coefficient. On average, the value of the reliability coefficient can be accepted equals 1.2. In other words, it means that standard loads can exceed the normative loads by 20%. The loads' effect can be presented throughout the overturning moment $M_O$, which tends to overturn the wall, and sliding force $F_S$, which tends to move the wall. In terms of the moment, force, and reliability coefficient, we may write down the conditions for allowable deviations in the overturning moment and sliding force. In general, the inequalities

$$M_O \leq M_R, F_S \leq F_R,$$

establish the stability conditions, where $M_R, F_R$ are resisting moment and resisting force. On the other hand, by applying the reliability coefficient, we get

$$\Delta M_O^{\text{max}} \leq 0.2 M_O, \Delta F_S^{\text{max}} \leq 0.2 F_S$$

Therefore, the values $\Delta M_O^{\text{max}}$ and $\Delta F_S^{\text{max}}$ can be treated as additional unpredictable loads that lead to the structure displacement. If we convert the additional loads to displacements $\delta$, we may calculate the necessary accuracy $m$ by using the expression

$$m \leq 0.2\delta.$$ 

The value $m$ in (3) ensures the observation accuracy for which we can reliably determine the displacements invoked by the additional loads. Thus, the determined displacements will not be distorted by observation accuracy. To calculate the displacement $\delta$, the expressions for the cantilever beam can be used with sufficient accuracy. For the case of distributed force $q$, given
Young’s modulus $E$ and the moment of inertia of the wall’s cross-section $I$, we have [43,44] for the maximum displacement:

$$\delta = \frac{qL^4}{8EI}$$

(4)

for the displacement at any point:

$$\delta(l) = \frac{ql^2(6L^2-4Ll+l^2)}{24EI}$$

(5)

for a slope at any point:

$$\theta(l) = -\frac{q(3L^2-3Ll+l^2)}{6EI}$$

(6)

For the case of moment, we have a maximum displacement:

$$\delta = \frac{Ma(2L-a)}{2EI}$$

(7)

for the displacement at any point:

$$\delta(l) = \begin{cases} \frac{-Ml^2}{2EI}, & l \leq a \\ \frac{-Ma^2}{EI}(l - \frac{a}{2}), & l > a \end{cases}$$

(8)

for a slope at any point:

$$\theta(l) = \begin{cases} \frac{Ml}{EI}, & l \leq a, \\ \frac{Ma^2}{EI}, & l > a, \end{cases}$$

(9)

where $a$ is a lever arm distance for the moment.

The figures obtained by the expressions (2), (3), (4), (6), (7), and (9) will be provided in the next section.

**Accuracy calculation**

In the previous section, the method for monitoring accuracy assignment has been suggested. The method allows assigning the accuracy for horizontal displacement determination. Using the necessary initial parameters, one is able to calculate the overturning moment and sliding force for the particular wall. Based on these values, we may calculate the allowable displacement. Let us find out how the suggested method works for the Debosquette Wall. The main initial parameters for calculation are outlined in Table 1. The backfill soil type is stiff clay.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moment of inertia</td>
<td>1125 m$^4$</td>
<td>Soil unit weight</td>
<td>13 kN/m$^3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young’s modulus</td>
<td>50 MPa</td>
<td>Soil friction angle</td>
<td>30 deg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall height</td>
<td>15 m</td>
<td>Wall material strength</td>
<td>20 MPa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using these data, the overturning moment and sliding force and their allowable deviations were calculated:

\[ M_0 = 3130 \text{kN} \cdot \text{m}, \quad F_S = 655 \frac{\text{kN}}{\text{m}}, \]

\[ \Delta M_0^{\text{max}} = 626 \text{kN} \cdot \text{m}, \quad \Delta F_S^{\text{max}} = 131 \frac{\text{kN}}{\text{m}}. \]

Now, it is possible to use the expressions (4), (6), (7), and (9) to calculate the displacements due to the overturning moment and sliding force. The displacement and slope graphs for the overturning moment and sliding force are presented in Figure 5 and Figure 6, as well as the moment diagrams for both cases.

![Fig. 5 – Overturning moment effect](image)

![Fig. 6 – Sliding force effect](image)

We may apply the superposition method to calculate the final displacement, which gives a preliminary result for a displacement of 15.44 mm. For monitoring accuracy calculation, this approximation provides reasonable output. Therefore, the observation accuracy will

\[ m = 0.2 \times 15.44 = 3.1 \text{mm}. \]

This value was used as reference accuracy for developing the observation scheme and measurement equipment choice. The chosen equipment for measurements is capable of ensuring the determined accuracy. The estimated value of the total displacement \( \delta \) was applied for measurement result analysis.
Monitoring scheme

Geospatial monitoring has been accomplished separately for vertical and horizontal displacements. To these aims, two different monitoring networks were created. For the horizontal monitoring network, the Kyiv city coordinate system was adopted. GNSS observations referenced the point of beginning for the horizontal network to the city coordinate system. In what follows, the initial coordinates were accepted unchanged. All points of the horizontal monitoring network were permanently mounted by tube pillars with screw holes for precise centering of total stations and targets. The scheme of the horizontal network is given in Figure 7. The distances and angles were measured by Leica TCR 1201+ R400 total station, which has an angle measurement error ±1 sec, and distance measurement error ±1 mm + 1.5 ppm. The distances and angles were measured with six repetitions. The network was checked with control measurements for each observation epoch to control network point displacements. Deformation targets were mounted onto the wall along three levels (see Figures 8 and 9). The bottom-level targets (Rp1 – Rp23) were used both for vertical and horizontal displacement determination. In total, sixty-three targets were mounted.

Fig. 7 – Scheme of the horizontal monitoring network

Fig. 8 – Scheme of the deformation targets (southern facade)
The vertical monitoring network was referenced to the benchmarks of the city height system using standard leveling procedures. The scheme of the vertical monitoring network is given in Figure 10.

Points of beginning for the vertical network were placed outside the region of possible deformations. Levelling lines were run in forward and inverse directions. The precise level DL-101C (levelling error for one kilometer of a double run is ± 0.4 mm) and coded invar level rods were used. Lines of sight were in a range of 25 m.

The results of monitoring will be presented in the next section. But one remark has to be provided. It was determined that vertical displacements were insignificant during the monitoring period. The maximum value was detected for target Rp 23 and equals -3 mm. That is why only horizontal displacements will be considered and analyzed in what follows.
RESULTS

Monitoring results

The monitoring was carried out according to the schemes considered in the previous section. The observation accuracy corresponded to the value calculated before. The dataset for monitoring the Debosquette Wall spans the period from 05.11.2012 until 13.05.2015. During that time interval, twenty observations were accomplished. As it was mentioned, the main concern was horizontal displacements. Below, the horizontal displacements for different deformation targets are presented.

Fig. 11 – Horizontal displacements for deformation targets Rp1 – Rp25

Fig. 12 – Main characteristics of the deformation process for targets Rp1 – Rp25
In Figure 11, the mean displacement for each observation epoch is given aside from the horizontal displacements. Figure 12 shows each deformation target's mean, maximum, and final displacement. The same content is given in Figure 13 – Figure 16 but for different deformation targets.
The results presented in Figure 11 – Figure 16 yielded some interesting findings. Firstly, the largest displacements have reached the targets in the bottom of the Deboisquette Wall, namely 7 mm for the targets Rp1, Rp4, Rp10, Rp15, Rp16; 8 mm for the targets Rp8, Rp17, and 9 mm for the targets Rp7, Rp12. Just a few targets in the middle and at the top of the retaining wall had significant horizontal displacements, specifically 7 mm for the targets Π2, Π7, М1, М6, М10, М18, and 8 mm for the targets Π4, М11. Secondly, none of the displacements reached the critical value.
of 15 mm. Thirdly, the last observation epochs have shown that the displacements tend to increase after the reconstruction. That is especially clear in Figure 11 and Figure 13. The latter inference makes indispensable further monitoring both for vertical and horizontal displacements.

CONCLUSION

Current research appears to validate the view that the geospatial monitoring of historic structures is a unique process. Performing geospatial monitoring needs a neat approach and correct estimation of the task and solutions. The paper considered the particular case of the geospatial monitoring of historic retaining walls before and after their reconstruction. The crucial point of such monitoring is a correct observation accuracy assignment. It was suggested to assign the proper accuracy using principles of structural mechanics. The aim of this approach is twofold: to determine the necessary observation accuracy and to obtain the correct criterion for monitoring data analysis. The appropriate monitoring workflow was suggested and implemented based on the calculated accuracy. Thanks to the correct choice of monitoring accuracy, the high reliability of the measurements was ensured. The results of monitoring have confirmed the relative stability of the studied historic structure. However, the displacements tend to increase, which requires monitoring to keep on. Future studies will have to further the fusion of structural mechanics and applied geodesy for monitoring tasks.
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