

## 194 GOLDHURST TERRACE BASEMENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT

COMMENTS BY GAIL WALDMAN Dip Arch Poly RIBA Retired

19.19.24

Ralston: please ask insurers if this can be divulged:

The BIA also wrongly assumes that 196 Goldhurst Terrace is in good structural condition. It is not. (2.34, 5.3.1)

Neighbours must be given the opportunity to review the impact of the proposed works once boreholes have been done if planning permission were to be granted before on site boreholes and monitoring for a full season has been done. This cannot be left to any Party Wall process which may or may not apply in this case. Any Planning permission must be so conditioned.

Water enters the basement of 196 Goldhurst Terrace regularly. There is a self-activating pump in the basement. From the information in the Basement Impact Assessment this is perched water trapped above the underlying clay and/or water from the 'historic stream' 180m from the site. In either or both cases, that water would be diverted around the proposed basement which would be founded at least 3.5m below ground. This has not been acknowledged or modelled. It is noted that utilities excavations very nearby have encountered flooding, the implication from the submitted documents being it was perched water. (Appendix 1)

The BIA wrongly assumes the depth of the foundations of 196 Goldhurst Terrace to be 0.75m below front garden level (BIA 8.1.1 fifth bullet) and Appendix 1 Query 9 assumed depth is incorrect.

The BIA only takes into consideration the garage and the main part of the house at 169 Goldhurst Terrace where in any case the assumed depth of the foundations is wrong. The foundations of the small single storey rear extension and of the substantial sheds along the boundary as well as the party garden wall are not considered but must be. Note that wall is not accessible on the 169 side but any rebuilding must be fair-faced on both sides. No section is provided.

The proposal to use a 'trigger system' to validate the BIA is fraught with risk. Dealing with an emergency is left to the main contractor and at their risk. Neighbours would have no recourse to ensuring emergency action is taken or recouping any cost arising for them. The 'trigger' system is a get-around the initial Campbell Reith requirement that a depth of 5.5m should be tested for establishing the potential level of damage to neighbouring properties on the Burland Scale which Camden requires to be 1 or none. The applicant has adopted a depth of only 3.5m the results of which do not meet Camden's policy requirement of Burland Scale 1. At 8.23 the applicant states:

*"A Ground Movement Assessment has concluded that ground movements caused by the excavation and construction of the proposed development **may be Category 1.**"*

So, to repeat, a trigger system, fraught with risk, is simply a ruse to achieve Burland Scale 1. Camden should reject Campbell Reith's sign-off of the Basement Impact Assessment if only on this point alone.

It should be noted by Camden that the Party Wall Act may not apply to neighbours so a rigorous protection of damage to neighbouring properties must be taken.

In summary, Campbell Reith should not have signed off, for instance, the following:

- Is factual ground investigation data provided?
- Is monitoring data provided?
- Is the presence/absence of adjoining or nearby basements confirmed?
- Is the Impact Assessment appropriate to the matters identified?
- Have the residual (after mitigation) impacts been clearly identified?

- Has the scheme demonstrated that the structural stability of the building and neighbouring properties will be maintained?
- Has the scheme avoided cumulative impacts on structural stability ...in the local area?
- Does the Report state that damage to surrounding buildings will be worse than Burland Scale category 1?

It is also noted the GHA Trees' drawing does still not show the small trees in the rear garden of 196 Goldhurst Terrace.