

Basement Impact Assessment

1. The calculation of the risk of damage to neighbouring properties on the Burland scale has assumed that there is currently no subsidence damage at the neighbouring properties. **This is incorrect.** The calculation of the Burland values must consider the cumulative effect of the existing subsidence damage plus the effect of the proposed works, as it is the cumulative effect that will determine what damage the neighbours have to rectify. Given that the proposed works are already at the upper limit of the Burland value of 1 (see figure 20 (incorrectly labelled as figure 19 in the index)), it is expected that when factoring in the existing subsidence damage the Burland value will be at least greater than 1 and accordingly planning permission must be refused in accordance with the Camden Local Plan A5(n).
2. Groundwater Flow screening: The answer to question 4 in Table 3.1 should be yes. Paved areas are being changed to open cell paving and lawns (see 7.62 in the Planning Statement).
3. Land Stability screening: The answer to questions 3 and 4 in Table 3.2 should be yes. The neighbouring land has a significant slope.
4. Surface Flow and Flooding screening: The answer to questions 2, 3 and 4 in Table 3.3 should be yes. Paved areas are being changed to open cell paving and lawns (see 7.62 in the Planning Statement).
5. With reference to 8.1:

“Roots were encountered in all the three windowless sampler boreholes at depths ranging between 1.00m and 5.00m bgl. If roots are encountered during the construction phase foundations must not be placed within any live root penetrated or desiccated cohesive soils or those with a volume change potential. Should the foundation excavations reveal such materials, the excavations must be extended to greater depth in order to bypass these unsuitable soils.

The likelihood of encountering roots appears to be high given the presence of roots within all of the boreholes. Therefore, it is unclear how the proposed pile wall and raft can be arranged such as to avoid live root penetrated or desiccated cohesive soils. The likelihood of needing to excavate below 3.5 metres appears to be high which would invalidate the current Basement Impact Assessment.

6. In 10.2 the author wrote:

“The proposed development considered the excavation of 3.50m of Made Ground, corresponding to an unloading of the soils at formation level evaluated as circa 65kPa, adopting for the removed soils an average unit weight of 18kN/m³.”

This appears to be wrong because as per the borehole data, below 1.6 metres there is no made ground (see Table 5.2).

7. Contrary to paragraph 6.141 of the Camden Local Plan, there does not appear to be a minimum of 1 metre of soil above the basement development where this extends beyond the footprint of the building, and it has not been accounted for in the models for the ground movement calculations.
8. Contrary to paragraph 6.146 of the Camden Local Plan, the light wells at the rear of the proposed development are too close to the boundary of the neighbouring property, especially given the proposed development encroaches onto the land of the neighbouring property.
9. It is unclear what the dimensions of the engineered foundation design are, even the author of the Basement Impact Assessment does not know, yet this is critical to assessing the impact on the neighbouring properties. Clearly there is an engineered foundation design because there is costing for one in the Financial Viability Report which we are led to believe is accurate.
10. The planning drawings (GA Section AA and GA Section BB) show the depth of the basement is around 4 metres. Whereas the Basement Impact Assessment appears to excavate only to a depth of 3.5 metres, but with piles down to 15 metres below ground level. This is inconsistent. Unless and until the applicant can provide consistency, the application must be rejected because it cannot be properly reviewed.
11. The planning application is based on some drawings at revision P01, but others at revision P02. The Basement Impact Assessment only uses revision P01 drawings. See for example drawings for GA Section AA and GA Section BB. This is inconsistent.
12. The author of the Basement Impact Assessment states:

“Cross sections of the proposed development were not available to Soils Limited at the time of writing this BIA”

yet the cross sections are included in Appendix E. This is inconsistent.
13. The proposed development is around 10 metres above ground, but with proposed foundations of 15 metres below ground level, yet this is all for only two semi-detached houses. This does not sound like a sustainable use of materials. It is clear that the footprint for building accommodation on the proposed site is insufficient which has resulted in a proposal that is irrational and distorted.