

4.0 Screening

4.1.1. A screening process has been undertaken and the findings are described below.

Question	Response	Details
1a. Is the site located directly above an aquifer?	NO	Evidence – From the BGS maps, the site is not on a known aquifer.
1b. Will the proposed basement extend beneath the water table surface?	NO	Evidence – The proposed lightwell alteration depth is as existing lightwell depth.
2. Is the site within 100m of a watercourse, well (used / disused) or potential spring line?	YES	<p>Evidence - From EA maps the site is not within 100m of a watercourse, or over a groundwater source protection zone.</p> <p>From “The Lost Rivers of London” the site is approximately 50m from a disused watercourse.</p> <p>Evaluation from BIA for number 16 Alma Street (basement excavation 0.5m below existing basement level): <i>Distance from the watercourse is large enough to not pose any significant risk. The area and depth of structure extending into the ground is unlikely to adversely affect ground water flows. No further assessment is required.</i></p> <p>Proposal to number 19 to alter existing lightwell is not excavating below existing levels and is unlikely to affect ground water flows.</p>
3. Is the site within the catchment of the pond chains on Hampstead Heath?	NO	<p>Evidence - the site is not within pond catchment areas.</p> <p>Sourced from Appendix 2 Hampstead Heath Ponds Project, Assessment of Design Flood 2013. 4.3 Catchment Boundaries maps</p>
4. Will the proposed basement development result in a change in the proportion of hard surfaced / paved areas?	NO	Evidence – hard surfaced / paved areas as existing
5. As part of site drainage, will more surface water (e.g. rainfall and run-off) than at present be discharged to the ground (e.g. via soakaways and/or SUDS)?	NO	Evidence – no change from existing
6. Is the lowest point of the proposed excavation (allowing for any drainage and foundation space under the basement floor) close to, or lower than, the mean water level in any local pond (not just the pond chains on Hampstead Heath) or spring line?	NO	Evidence – Lightwell lowest point as existing lightwell

4.2 Slope Stability

Question	Response	Details
1. Does the existing site include slopes, natural or man-made greater than 7 degrees (approximately 1 in 8)?	NO	Evidence - There is a change in level between the pavement at the front of the property and the garden at the rear, but this change in level is formed by structure, rather than any sloping ground.
2. Will the proposed re-profiling of landscaping at the site change slopes at the property boundary to more than 7 degrees (approximately 1 in 8)?	NO	Evidence – Proposed levels as existing
3. Does the development neighbour land, including railway cuttings and the like, with a slope greater than 7 degrees (approximately 1 in 8)?	NO	Evidence - There are no significant slopes or cuttings in the neighbouring land.
4. Is the site within a wider hillside setting in which the general slope is greater than 7 degrees (approximately 1 in 8)?	NO	Evidence - There are no significant slopes or cuttings in the neighbouring land.
5. Is the London Clay the shallowest strata at the site?	YES	<p>Evidence - From local boreholes the London Clay is likely to be the shallowest strata.</p> <p>Evaluation from BIA for number 16 Alma Street (basement excavation 0.5m below existing basement level): <i>The area and nominal depth of structure extending into the ground is unlikely to pose any significant risk of instability. No further assessment is required.</i></p> <p>Proposal to number 19 to alter existing lightwell is not excavating below existing levels and is unlikely to pose any significant risk of instability.</p>
6. Will any trees be felled as part of the development and/or are any works proposed within any tree protection zones where trees are to be retained?	NO	Evidence – No trees on proposed site
7. Is there a history of seasonal shrink-swell subsidence in the local area and/or evidence of such effects at the site?	NO	Evidence - No evidence of shrink-swell subsidence on site.
8. Is the site within 100m of a watercourse or a potential spring line?	YES	<p>Evidence - From EA maps the site is not within 100m of a watercourse or a potential spring line, or over a groundwater source protection zone.</p> <p>From “The Lost Rivers of London” the site is approximately 50m from a disused watercourse.</p> <p>Evaluation from BIA for number 16 Alma Street (basement excavation 0.5m below existing basement level): <i>The area and depth of structure extending into the ground is unlikely to adversely affect</i></p>

		<p><i>stability. Distance from the watercourse is large enough to not pose any significant risk. No further assessment is required.</i></p> <p>Proposal to number 19 to alter existing lightwell is not excavating below existing levels and is unlikely to affect stability.</p>
9. Is the site within an area of previously worked ground?	NO	Evidence - There is no history of ground improvements or worked ground.
10. Is the site within an aquifer. If so, will the proposed basement extend beneath the water table such that dewatering may be required during construction?	NO	<p>Evidence – The site is not located within an aquifer.</p> <p>Proposed excavation for altered existing lightwell will not extend below water table.</p>
11. Is the site within 50m of the Hampstead Heath Ponds?	NO	Evidence - Site is approximately 1600m from the ponds.
12. Is the site within 5m of a highway or pedestrian right of way?	YES	Evidence – The front of the site has an existing lightwell adjacent to Alma Street.
13. Will the proposed basement significantly increase the differential depth of foundations relative to neighbouring properties?	NO	Evidence – There is an existing lightwell, the proposal is to widen the existing, retaining the existing levels, not digging down
14. Is the site over (or within the exclusion zone of) any tunnels, e.g. railway lines?	NO	Evidence - From site observations the site is not close to any above surface infrastructure. Proximity to any underground tunnels not ascertained.

4.3 Surface Water and Flooding

Question	Response	Details
1. Is the site within the catchment of the ponds chains on Hampstead Heath?	NO	<p>Evidence - the site is not within pond catchment areas.</p> <p>Sourced from Appendix 2 Hampstead Heath Ponds Project, Assessment of Design Flood 2013. 4.3 Catchment Boundaries maps</p>
2. As part of the proposed site drainage, will surface water flows (e.g. volume of rainfall and peak run-off) be materially changed from the existing route?	NO	Evidence – No material change from existing route. Existing surface water flows into combined sewer chamber withing existing lightwell. Proposed lightwell will be as existing.
3. Will the proposed basement development result in a change in the proportion of hard surfaced / paved external areas?	NO	Evidence - No change in proportion of hard surfaced / paved external areas.
4. Will the proposed basement result in changes to the profile of the inflows (instantaneous and long-term) of surface water being received by adjacent properties or downstream watercourses?	NO	Evidence – No changes to the profile of the inflows
5. Will the proposed basement result in changes to the quality of surface water being received by	NO	Evidence – No changes to the quality of surface water being received by adjacent properties or downstream watercourses

adjacent properties or downstream watercourses?		
6. Is the site in an area identified to have surface water flood risk according to either the Local Flood Risk Management Strategy or the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment or is it at risk from flooding, for example because the proposed basement is below the static water level of nearby surface water feature.	NO	Evidence - Site not in an area at risk of surface water flooding. Existing gulley at front lightwell for surface water drainage to combined sewer. Existing drainage routes to remain unchanged. Lightwell level is as existing.

4.4 Non-Technical Summary of Screening Process



Non-technical summaries must be understandable by lay people (planning and other non-engineering professionals) to enable them to understand the potential issues / risks / impacts / benefits of the proposed development.

4.4.1 The screening process identifies the following issues to be carried forward to scoping for further assessment:

- The site is within 5m of a highway. Consult with Council's Highways Team if and 'Approval in Principle' is required.

4.4.2 The other potential concerns considered within the screening process have been demonstrated to be not applicable or not significant when applied to the proposed development.

- From "The Lost Rivers of London" the site is approximately 50m from a disused watercourse. However, previous BIA undertaken at number 16 Alma Street (3 doors down) it was deemed the distance from the watercourse is large enough not to pose any significant risk, and no further assessment is required: *"The area and depth of structure extending into the ground is unlikely to adversely affect stability. Distance from the watercourse is large enough to not pose any significant risk. No further assessment is required."*
"The area and nominal depth of structure extending into the ground is unlikely to pose any significant risk of instability. No further assessment is required."
- The proposal at number 19 is *not* excavating below any existing levels at the site. Distance from the watercourse is large enough to not pose any significant risk. The area and depth of the lightwell extending into the ground will not affect existing ground water flows. The area and depth of structure extending into the ground is unlikely to adversely affect stability as it does not extend below the existing lightwell levels.
- London Clay is likely to be the shallowest strata at the site. Given the small area and nominal depth of structure extending into the ground (to match existing depth of lightwell), it is unlikely to pose any significant risk of instability.
- Proposed widening of existing lightwell subject to structural design by Structural Engineers, and Building Control approval.