CampbellReith consulting engineers

70 Margaret Road, London, NW5 2NP

Basement Impact Assessment Audit

For London Borough of Camden

> Project No. 14006-25

Date September 2023

Campbell Reith Hill LLP 15 Bermondsey Square London SE1 3UN

T: +44 (0)20 7340 1700 E: london@campbellreith.com W: www.campbellreith.com



DOCUMENT HISTORY AND STATUS

| Revision | Date | Purpose/ Status | File Ref | Author | Check | Review |
|----------|-------------------|--------------------|---|--------|-------|--------|
| D1 | September 2023 | Draft | MEkb14006-25-050923 - 70 Lady Margaret Road D1.docx | ME | КВ | КВ |

This document has been prepared in accordance with the scope of Campbell Reith Hill LLP's (CampbellReith) appointment with its client and is subject to the terms of the appointment. It is addressed to and for the sole use and reliance of CampbellReith's client. CampbellReith accepts no liability for any use of this document other than by its client and only for the purposes, stated in the document, for which it was prepared and provided. No person other than the client may copy (in whole or in part) use or rely on the contents of this document, without the prior written permission of Campbell Reith Hill LLP. Any advice, opinions, or recommendations within this document should be read and relied upon only in the context of the document as a whole. The contents of this document are not to be construed as providing legal, business or tax advice or opinion.

© Campbell Reith Hill LLP 2023

Document Details

| Last Saved | 05/09/2023 15:12 | |
|--------------------|---|--|
| Author | M Elias, BEng MSc GMICE | |
| Project Partner | E M Brown, BSc MSc CGeol FGS | |
| Project Number | 14006-25 | |
| Project Name | 70 Margaret Road, London, NW5 2NP | |
| Revision D1 | | |
| Planning Reference | 2023/2415/P | |
| File Ref | MEkb14006-25-050923 - 70 Lady Margaret Road D1.docx | |



CONTENTS

| 1.0 | NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY | . 4 |
|-----|---|-----|
| 2.0 | INTRODUCTION | 5 |
| 3.0 | BASEMENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT AUDIT CHECK LIST | 7 |
| 4.0 | DISCUSSION | 11 |
| 5.0 | CONCLUSIONS | 14 |

APPENDICES

| Appendix 1 | Consultation Responses | 15 |
|------------|------------------------------------|----|
| Appendix 2 | Audit Query Tracker | 16 |
| Appendix 3 | Supplementary Supporting Documents | 18 |



1.0 NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY

- 1.1 CampbellReith was instructed by London Borough of Camden, (LBC) to carry out an audit on the Basement Impact Assessment submitted as part of the Planning Submission documentation for 70 Margaret Road, London, NW5 2NP (planning reference 2023/2415/P). The basement is considered to fall within Category B as defined by the Terms of Reference.
- 1.2 The Audit reviewed the Basement Impact Assessment for potential impact on land stability and local ground and surface water conditions arising from basement development in accordance with LBC's policies and technical procedures.
- 1.3 CampbellReith was able to access LBC's Planning Portal and gain access to the latest revision of submitted documentation and reviewed it against an agreed audit check list.
- 1.4 The proposed development comprises the demolition of the existing three-storey rear extension, construction of a new three-storey rear extension with a single-storey basement.
- 1.5 The individuals concerned in the production of the GEA BIA have suitable qualifications in accordance with LBC guidance. The qualifications of the Symmetrys BIA authors have not been provided.
- 1.6 Screening and Scoping assessments are presented, supported by desk study information.
- A SuDS Strategy has been presented as mitigation for the proposed increase in hardstanding. It is accepted that the development will not impact the hydrology of the area. The proposed drainage strategy is subject to approval by LBC and Thames Water.
- 1.8 A ground investigation was undertaken and indicates the basement will be founded in London Clay Formation.
- 1.9 Clarification of the number of monitoring visits is required. The impact on the hydrogeology of the area should be confirmed.
- 1.10 The proposed geotechnical parameters require further clarification. Geotechnical parameters adopted in the structural calculations do not match those provided in the BIA and require further clarification.
- 1.11 A Ground Movement Assessment (GMA) has been undertaken with predicted impacts to neighbouring structures. The damage assessment indicates neighbouring properties will not exceed Category 1 (very slight) of the Burland scale. The damage category for the structures analysed should be clarified.
- 1.12 The BIA indicated that a movement monitoring scheme will be adopted as part of party wall negotiations to ensure movements are within the predicted range of the GMA.
- 1.13 As trees are proposed to be removed, consideration of the impact of their removal on neighbouring structures should be provided.
- 1.14 Queries and requested for information are discussed in Section 4 and summaries in Appendix2. Until the clarifications requested are presented, the BIA does not meet the requirements of Camden Planning Guidance Basements.



2.0 INTRODUCTION

- 2.1 CampbellReith was instructed by London Borough of Camden (LBC) on 04 August 2023 to carry out a Category B audit on the Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) submitted as part of the Planning Submission documentation for 70 Margaret Road, London, NW5 2NP and Planning Reference 2023/2415/P.
- 2.2 The audit was carried out in accordance with the Terms of Reference set by LBC. It reviewed the Basement Impact Assessment for potential impact on land stability and local ground and surface water conditions arising from basement development.
- 2.3 A BIA is required for all planning applications with basements in Camden in general accordance with policies and technical procedures contained within
 - Camden Local Plan 2017 Policy A5 Basements.
 - Camden Planning Guidance (CPG): Basements. January 2021.
 - Guidance for Subterranean Development (GSD). Issue 01. November 2010. Ove Arup & Partners.
 - Neighbourhood Plan: Kentish Town
- 2.4 The BIA should demonstrate that schemes:
 - a) maintain the structural stability of the building and neighbouring properties;
 - b) avoid adversely affecting drainage and run off or causing other damage to the water environment;
 - c) avoid cumulative impacts upon structural stability or the water environment in the local area;

and evaluate the impacts of the proposed basement considering the issues of hydrology, hydrogeology and land stability via the process described by the GSD and to make recommendations for the detailed design.

- 2.5 LBC's Audit Instruction described the planning proposal as "*Excavation of new basement level;* demolition of existing rear extensions and erection of replacement three storey rear extensions; fenestration alterations; reinstatement of original eaves line; installation of front and rear rooflights; front and rear landscaping alterations; and associated external works including installation of refuse and cycle storage."
- 2.6 The Audit Instruction confirmed 70 Margaret Road did not involve, nor was a neighbour to, listed buildings.
- 2.7 CampbellReith accessed LBC's Planning Portal on 19 August 2023 and gained access to the following relevant documents for audit purposes:
 - Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) by Symmetrys Structural/Civil Engineers, Ref. 22276-SYM-XX-XX-RPT-S-0001, dated 31 May 2023.



- Desk Study, Ground Investigation & Basement Impact Assessment report by GEA Geotechnical & Environmental Associates Limited, Ref. J23059, dated 24 May 2023.
- BS5837 Arboricultural Report & Impact Assessment by Crown Tree Consultancy, Ref. 011413, dated 27 February 2023.
- Existing and Proposed Architectural drawings by Novak Hiles Architects, dated March 2023.



3.0 BASEMENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT AUDIT CHECK LIST

| Item | Yes/No/NA | Comment |
|--|-----------|---|
| Are BIA Author(s) credentials satisfactory? | No | The author qualifications have not been provided for the Symmetrys BIA. The author qualifications are provided for the GEA BIA and are accepted. |
| Is data required by CI.233 of the GSD presented? | No | Utility data not provided. |
| Does the description of the proposed development include all aspects of temporary and permanent works which might impact upon geology, hydrogeology and hydrology? | Yes | |
| Are suitable plan/maps included? | Yes | |
| Do the plans/maps show the whole of the relevant area of study and do they show it in sufficient detail? | Yes | Arup maps are used for reference. |
| Land Stability Screening: Have appropriate data sources been consulted? Is justification provided for 'No' answers? | Yes | Section 8.2 of the Symmetrys BIA and Section 3.1.2 of the GEA BIA. |
| Hydrogeology Screening: Have appropriate data sources been consulted? Is justification provided for 'No' answers? | Yes | Section 8.1 of the Symmetrys BIA and Section 3.1.2 of the GEA BIA. |
| Hydrology Screening: Have appropriate data sources been consulted? Is justification provided for 'No' answers? | Yes | Section 8.3 of the Symmetrys BIA and Section 3.1.3 of the GEA BIA. The response to Q5 should be 'yes' however this is considered in the scoping. |
| Is a conceptual model presented? | Yes | Section 7.0 of the GEA BIA. |



| Item | Yes/No/NA | Comment | |
|--|-----------|---|--|
| Land Stability Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome? | Yes | Section 9.0 of the Symmetrys BIA and Section 4.0 of the G BIA. | |
| Hydrogeology Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome? | Yes | Section 9.0 of the Symmetrys BIA and Section 4.0 of the GEA BIA. | |
| Hydrology Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome? | Yes | Section 9.0 of the Symmetrys BIA and Section 4.0 of the GEA BIA. | |
| Is factual ground investigation data provided? | Yes | Appendix A of the Desk Study, Ground Investigation and Basement Impact Assessment Report. | |
| Is monitoring data presented? | Unknown | Clarification required due to conflicting information in Sections 4.2 and 5.3 of the GEA BIA. | |
| Is the ground investigation informed by a desk study? | Yes | Section 2.0 of the GEA BIA. | |
| Has a site walkover been undertaken? | Yes | | |
| Is the presence/absence of adjacent or nearby basements confirmed. | Yes | Section 7.0 of the Symmetrys BIA. | |
| Is a geotechnical interpretation presented? | Yes | Section 8.0 of the GEA BIA. However, Clarifications have been requested. | |
| Does the geotechnical interpretation include information on retaining wall design? | Yes | Section 8.0 of the GEA BIA. | |
| Are reports on other investigations required by screening and scoping presented? | Yes | Arboricultural Assessment, Structural Calculations, SuDs Layout, Surface Water Calculations. | |



| Item | Yes/No/NA | Comment |
|--|-----------|---|
| Are the baseline conditions described, based on the GSD? | Yes | |
| Do the base line conditions consider adjacent or nearby basements? | Yes | |
| Is an Impact Assessment provided? | Yes | Section 14 of the GEA BIA. No Impact Assessment is provided in the Symmetrys BIA. |
| Are estimates of ground movement and structural impact presented? | Yes | Sections 11.0 & 12.0 of the GEA BIA. |
| Is the Impact Assessment appropriate to the matters identified by screening and scoping? | No | The impact of removing trees should be considered. |
| Has the need for mitigation been considered and are appropriate mitigation methods incorporated in the scheme? | Yes | |
| Has the need for monitoring during construction been considered? | Yes | Section 12.2 of the GEA BIA. |
| Have the residual (after mitigation) impacts been clearly identified? | Yes | |
| Has the scheme demonstrated that the structural stability of the building and neighbouring properties and infrastructure will be maintained? | No | |
| Has the scheme avoided adversely affecting drainage and run- off or causing other damage to the water environment? | No | Clarification of groundwater monitoring is required. |



ItemYes/No/NACommentHas the scheme avoided cumulative impacts upon structural
stability or the water environment in the local area?YesDoes report state that damage to surrounding buildings will be
no worse than Burland Category 1?YesAre non-technical summaries provided?YesYesSection 15 of the GEA BIA.



4.0 DISCUSSION

- 4.1 A Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) has been carried out by Symmetrys Structural/Civil Engineers however the qualifications of this document are not provided. The Symmetrys BIA is informed and supported by Geotechnical & Environmental Associates (GEA) who produced a Desk Study, Ground Investigation & Basement Impact Assessment report. The individuals concerned in the production of the GEA document have suitable qualifications.
- 4.2 The site is bound by Lady Margaret Road at the front of the property in the northwest. 68C Lady Margaret Road adjoins the property on the southwest side and 70A Lady Margaret Road is located in close proximity to the northeast. The site is currently occupied by a four-storey building with a small single storey cellar towards the front of the building. The building has a three-storey rear extension that was added to the original building. Whilst there is an existing cellar beneath the front section of the main building, no basement is present beneath the three-storey rear extension.
- 4.3 The proposed development comprises the demolition of the existing rear extension and the construction of a new three-storey rear extension with a single-storey basement underneath part of the proposed extension. The proposed basement will be formed using underpinning techniques and cast in-situ reinforced concrete retaining walls in a 'hit and miss' sequence and will extend to c. 3m below ground level (bgl). Temporary props will support the basement during construction, while in the permanent case, a reinforced concrete ground floor slab will provide support to the basement wall.
- 4.4 Screening and scoping assessments are presented in both the Symmetrys and GEA BIA reports, informed by desktop study information. Most relevant figures/maps and other guidance documents are referenced within the BIA to support responses to screening questions.
- 4.5 The Symmetrys BIA does not include any impact assessment following the scoping stage. The impact assessments are provided in the GEA BIA along with ground movement and damage category assessment.
- 4.6 Discrepancies are noted in the screening responses to questions regarding the extent of hardstanding in the assessments of surface water flow and subterranean groundwater flow, however both the Symmetrys and GEA BIAs identify an increase in hardstanding but a decrease of impermeable surfaces at the site. This is achieved through the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDs) permeable surfacing and a green roof. A SuDs layout plan and calculations are provided in Appendix D of the Symmetrys BIA and are subject to Thames Water and LBC's approval.
- 4.7 The BIA states that the site has a very low flooding risk from sewers, reservoirs, and other artificial sources, groundwater and fluvial/tidal watercourses.
- 4.8 It can be confirmed that the proposals will not have a significant impact on the hydrology of the area.



- 4.9 A ground investigation was undertaken by GEA. Site works comprised a single borehole to 9.5m depth, and three hand excavated trial pits to a maximum depth of 1.45m. The investigation encountered a moderate thickness of Made Ground to a maximum depth of 0.80m, overlying London Clay to depth. The GEA BIA notes that the geological map for the area shows the site to be in an area marked as previously worked ground, however deep Made Ground was not identified in the ground investigation.
- 4.10 Groundwater was not encountered in the borehole during the ground investigation. Section 5.3 of the GEA BIA indicates groundwater seepages were present at the base of trial pit No. 2 and at a depth of 0.50m in trial pit No. 3. The GEA report suggests that the seepages might result from water accumulating against the building's foundations and recommendations for accommodating this ingress using sump pumping is identified.
- 4.11 A groundwater standpipe was installed in the borehole to 5m depth. Section 4.2 of the GEA BIA states that no monitoring has been undertaken to date, Section 5.3 states that one monitoring visit was undertaken and the standpipe found to be dry and Section 8.1 states that monitoring should be carried out. Confirmation of the monitoring undertaken on site is required and the impact on the hydrogeology of the area should be confirmed.
- 4.12 An allowable bearing capacity of 150kPa is identified for the basement bearing stratum at 3m depth. The BIA should provide details on how this value was determined based on the soil strength data presented in the ground investigation in Appendix A of the GEA BIA.
- 4.13 Structural retaining wall calculations are provided in Appendix B of the Symmetrys BIA. However, the geotechnical parameters (soil unit weights and friction angles) adopted in these calculations do not match those detailed in Section 8.1.1 of the GEA BIA. Clarification is requested and the geotechnical parameters should be consistent throughout both reports.
- 4.14 The Symmetrys BIA outlines a suggested construction sequence for the basement, provided in Appendix A. First partial demolition of ground floor existing extension will take place, with plans to retain and underpin the party wall and part of the main house structure adjacent to the proposed basement. The basement retaining wall directly adjacent to the party wall will be formed in a 'hit and miss' sequence, with the rest of the basement formed in open cut, with the underpins supporting the party wall and existing building. The construction sequence confirms temporary propping in the short term, once the ground floor slab has been constructed and has sufficiently cured the temporary propping to the liner walls will be removed.
- 4.15 Inconsistency within the Symmetrys BIA is noted; Section 10 states that the basement floor slab will be suspended whilst sections 6.1 and 6.2 state that a ground bearing floor slab will be adopted.



- 4.16 A Ground Movement Assessment (GMA) and a damage assessment are provided in the GEA BIA to demonstrate that ground movements and consequential damage to neighbouring properties will comply with LBC's policy requirements. Nearby sensitive structures comprise No 68 and 70A Margaret Road. The GEA BIA states that a contiguous piled wall was installed along the boundary between 70 and 70A Margaret Road to facilitate the construction of No 70A, as it is located at 3.50m below the ground level of No 70. Since the proposed basement will extend to a depth of 3m bgl. As the proposed basement will be above the foundation level of 70A Margaret Road, it will not be affected, and it has been excluded from the GMA.
- 4.17 Section 11.2.1 of the GEA BIA report states that a 32kPa load will be applied at basement level due to the proposed development. Appendix B of the Symmetrys BIA provides the anticipated loadings for the proposed development.
- 4.18 The GMA and damage assessments analyses were carried out using the Oasys programmes PDisp and XDisp. PDisp was used to model vertical movements due to basement excavation (unloading) and XDisp was used to estimate movements due to underpinning and an associated damage category.
- 4.19 In Section 11.1.1 the GEA BIA recognises that X-Disp uses soil movement relationships that have been derived for embedded retaining walls and that there is limited published data for ground movements due to underpinning. The analysis therefore uses bespoke curves that produce a minimum of 5mm vertical and horizontal movement for a 3m retained height.
- 4.20 Section 13 of the GEA BIA indicates damage to neighbouring buildings will not exceed Category 0 (Negligible) however Section 12.1 suggests that three of the structures analysed are Category 1 (Very Slight). While this is still within the requirements of LBC, these structures should be identified and the damage categories clarified.
- 4.21 The BIA indicates that a monitoring strategy will be developed at a later stage and will be subject to discussions and party wall agreements with the owners of the adjacent properties and structures. Contingency measures will be implemented if movements of the adjacent structures exceed the predefined trigger levels.
- 4.22 The Arboricultural Impact Assessment indicates that trees are going to be removed. If there is the potential for soils with shrink-swell potential to be present close to the surface, the BIA should confirm whether the neighbouring properties will be impacted by the tree removal (i.e. due to potential for change in moisture content of the soil to cause shrink / swell movements) and, if so, an assessment should be provided along with recommendations for mitigation measures, if required.
- 4.23 Utility data is not provided and is requested.



5.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 5.1 The individuals concerned in the production of the GEA Basement Impact (BIA) have suitable qualifications in accordance with LBC guidance. The qualifications of the Symmetrys BIA authors have not been provided.
- 5.2 Screening and Scoping assessments are presented, supported by desk study information.
- 5.3 The site is at low risk from flooding, and the proposed development will result in an increase in hardstanding areas. However, a SuDS Strategy has been presented as mitigation. It is accepted that the development will not impact the hydrology of the area. The proposed drainage strategy is subject to approval by LBC and Thames Water.
- 5.4 A ground investigation was undertaken and indicates the basement will be founded in London Clay Formation.
- 5.5 Groundwater was not encountered during the ground investigation. Clarification of the number of subsequent monitoring visits is required. The impact on the hydrogeology of the area should be confirmed.
- 5.6 The London Clay is identified as an unproductive aquifer. It is accepted that the development will not have a significant impact on the hydrogeology of the area.
- 5.7 The proposed geotechnical parameters require further clarification. Geotechnical parameters adopted in the structural calculations do not match those provided in the BIA and require further clarification.
- 5.8 A Ground Movement Assessment (GMA) has been undertaken with predicted impacts to neighbouring structures. The damage assessment indicates neighbouring properties will not exceed Category 1 (very slight) of the Burland scale. The damage category for the structures analysed should be clarified.
- 5.9 The BIA indicated that a movement monitoring scheme will be adopted as part of party wall negotiations to ensure movements are within the predicted range of the GMA.
- 5.10 As trees are proposed to be removed, consideration of the impact of their removal on neighbouring structures should be provided.
- 5.11 Queries and requested for information are discussed in Section 4 and summaries in Appendix2. Until the clarifications requested are presented, the BIA does not meet the requirements ofCamden Planning Guidance Basements.



Appendix 1

Consultation Responses

None



Appendix 2

Audit Query Tracker



Audit Query Tracker

| Query No | Subject | Query | Status | Date closed out |
|----------|----------------|--|------------------|-----------------|
| 1 | Hydrogeology | Please confirm the number of standpipe monitoring visits undertaken and consider the results in the hydrogeology impact assessment. | See Section 4.11 | |
| 2 | Land Stability | Clarification of how the geotechnical parameters have been derived. | See Section 4.12 | |
| 3 | Land Stability | The geotechnical parameters presented in the GEA BIA should be adopted in the structural calculations. | See Section 4.13 | |
| 4 | Land Stability | Clarification of the damage categories is required. | See Section 4.20 | |
| 5 | Land Stability | Further assessment of the impact of removing trees on neighbouring structures is required. | See Section 4.22 | |
| 6 | BIA Format | Utility data not provided and requested. | See Section 4.23 | |



Appendix 3

Supplementary Supporting Documents

None

Appendix

London

15 Bermondsey Square London SE1 3UN

T: +44 (0)20 7340 1700 E: london@campbellreith.com

Bristol

Unit 5.03, HERE, 470 Bath Road, Bristol BS4 3AP

T: +44 (0)117 916 1066 E: bristol@campbellreith.com

Birmingham

Chantry House High Street, Coleshill Birmingham B46 3BP

T: +44 (0)1675 467 484 E: birmingham@campbellreith.com

Manchester

No. 1 Marsden Street Manchester M2 1HW

T: +44 (0)161 819 3060 E: manchester@campbellreith.com

Campbell Reith Hill LLP. Registered in England & Wales. Limited Liability Partnership No OC300082 A list of Members is available at our Registered Office at: 15 Bermondsey Square, London, SE1 3UN VAT No 974 8892 43