

# ADDENDUM REPORT

Garden House, Vale of Health, Hampstead

Client: Mr A Vlachos

June 2012

Job no: 34891

26 High Street  
Hadleigh  
Suffolk  
IP7 5AP

Tel: 01473 825300

# REPORT

## Garden House, Vale of Heath, Hampstead

Document prepared by:- David Clarke BSc C.ENG MICE MCIHT  
on behalf of Richard Jackson Ltd

Signature:- 

Date:- 25/6/12

Document approved by:- Matthew Axton M.Geol FGS  
on behalf of Richard Jackson Ltd

Signature:- 

Date:- 25-6-12

### Revision Status

Issue	Date	Description	Author	Approved

This document has been prepared for the sole use of Mr A Vlachos, and is copyright and its contents should not be relied upon by others without the written authority of Richard Jackson Ltd. If any unauthorised third party makes use of this report they do so at their own risk and Richard Jackson Ltd owe them no duty of care or skill.

As with the previous report all information provided by others is taken as being in good faith as being accurate, but Richard Jackson Ltd cannot, and does not, accept any liability for the detailed accuracy, errors or omissions in such information.

**CONTENTS:-**

1. INTRODUCTION .....	3
2 SUBTERRANEAN (GROUNDWATER) FLOW-.....	3
3 SLOPE STABILITY.....	5
4 SURFACE FLOW AND FLOODING.....	7
.	

## 1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. Richard Jackson Ltd received instruction from Mr Alex Vlachos To prepare an addendum report in support of a Planning Application that had been made for works to be carried out in connection at the Garden House, Vale of Health, Hampstead.
- 1.2. As noted above this report is an addendum report to the report prepared under reference 34891, in April 2012 which assesses the engineering implications of the proposals and gives consideration to the potential impact on neighbouring properties and how the works may be implemented.
- 1.3. This report should therefore be read in conjunction with the previous report as the text of that report is not repeated here.
- 1.4. This addendum report has been prepared to assist the London Borough of Camden in that it gives specific consideration to the screening flow charts as presented as figures 1, 2 and 3 on pages 17, 19 and 21 of the Camden Planning Guidance documents "Basements and Lightwells – CPG4".

## 2. SUBTERRANEAN (GROUNDWATER) FLOW – FIGURE 1 PAGE 17 CPG4

- 2.1. The questions that form the flow chart are set out below, along with the appropriate response, cross referenced to the previously prepared report of April 2012.
- 2.2. **Question 1a: "Is the site located directly above an aquifer?"**
- 2.3. The site is located above the Claygate member beds, reference paragraphs 4.9 and 4.10 of April 2012 report, the Claygate member beds are classified as a secondary A aquifer, this being equivalent to the former minor aquifer. An aquifer of this nature is suggested as being capable of supporting water supplies at local rather than strategic level and in some cases provide base flows to rivers. The proposed works by their nature will have no impact on the aquifer and will not affect any of the criteria associated with such an aquifer in terms of flow and water quality.
- 2.4. **Question 1b: "Will the proposed basement extend beneath the water table surface?"**
- 2.5. The proposed construction will extend below the water table, the water table being approximately 0.6m below the existing ground level, as identified in the April 2012 .report. (The existing constructions of the Garden House also currently extending below the water table). The fact

that the works will not impact on the groundwater, its flow or the neighbouring properties as a consequence of being constructed below the water table is set out in paragraphs 5.7 to 5.15 of the April 2012 report, and also the reports previously prepared by INGealtoir, and RPS, which are included within the Appendix to the April 2012 report.

- 2.6. **Question 2: “Is the site within 100m of a watercourse well (used/disused) or potential spring line”?**
- 2.7. The site is not within any of the features listed in Question 2.
- 2.8. **Question 3: “Is the site within the catchment of the pond chains on Hampstead Heath?”**
- 2.9. The site is within the catchment of the pond located to the immediate south of the property and is also within the Hampstead Heath extension chain catchment zone. The proposed works will, however, have no effect on the catchments zones referred to above, as set out in paragraph 5.5. of the April 2012 report and the RPS report enclosed in the Appendix to that report.
- 2.10. **Question 4: “Will the proposed basement development result in a change in the proportion of hard surfaced paved areas?”**
- 2.11. The proposed work will not increase the area of hard surfacing above that which currently exists.
- 2.12. **Question 5: “As part of the 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?”**
- 2.13. The surface water drainage will remain unaltered as a result of the proposed works, and as noted above in the response to Question 4 the area of hard paving, and hence run off from the site will remain as currently exists.
- 2.14. **Question 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?”**
- 2.15. Yes. The proposed underside of the basement construction will be approximately 1m below the surface water level of the adjacent pond to the south of the proposed development. The proposed works will, however, have no effect on the adjacent pond as set out in the response provided to the questions above, included in paragraph 5.15

of the April 2012 report and the RPS report contained within the appendices to the April 2012 report.

### **3. SLOPE STABILITY – FIGURE 2 PAGE 19 OF CPG4**

3.1. **Questions 1: “Does the existing site include slope, natural or manmade greater than 7° (approximately 1 in 8)?”**

3.2. No. The existing slope is approximately at 7° (1 in 8)

3.3. **Question 2: “Will proposed re-profiling of landscaping at the site change slopes at the property value to more than 7° (approximately 1 in 8)?”**

3.4. There is no proposed re-profiling of landscaping at the site.

3.5. **Question 3: “Does the development neighbour land, including railway cuttings and the like with a slope greater than 7° (approximately 1 in 8)?”**

3.6. The site is not known to neighbour any such land.

3.7. **Question 5: “Is the London Clay the shallow strata at the site?”**

3.8. The site is underlain by Alluvium/Claygate member beds with boreholes installed on the site penetrating to 12m below ground level and not encountering London clay. Refer to the report by Lister Geotechnical Consultants contained within the Appendices of the April 2012 report.

3.9. **Question 6: “Will any trees be felled as part of the proposed development and/or are any works proposed within any tree protection zones where trees are to be retained?”**

3.10. It is understood that no trees are proposed to be felled as part of the proposed works, or works carried out within tree protection zones.

3.11. **Question 7: “Is there a history of shrinkage/swell subsidence in the local area and/or evidence of such effects on the site?”**

3.12. There are no records of there being any such issues within the locality of the proposed development.

3.13. **Question 8: “Is the site within 100m of watercourse or potential spring line?”**

3.14. As referred to above the site does not lie within 100m of a watercourse of potential spring line.

- 3.15. **Question 9: “Is the site within an area of previously worked ground?”**
- 3.16. Other than made ground associated with the construction of the existing property, which is minor in nature and associated with its construction make up, the site does not lie within such an area.
- 3.17. **Question 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.”**
- 3.18. The site does lie within an aquifer, see above, and there will be no dewatering outside the proposed area of excavation, refer to paragraphs 5.7 to 5.14 of the April 2012 report where full consideration is given to the construction process.
- 3.19. **Question 11: “Is the site within 50m of the Hampstead Heath Ponds?”**
- 3.20. The site is located within 50m of the pond to the south, the effects of the proposals on this pond are set out in the responses given above.
- 3.21. **Question 12: “Is the site within 5m of a highway or pedestrian right of way?”**
- 3.22. The site does not lie within 5m of any such feature.
- 3.23. **Question 13: “Will the proposed basement significantly increase the differential depth of the foundation relative to neighbouring properties?”**
- 3.24. There will be an increase in the differential depth of foundation, but given the proximity of the proposed works to the neighbouring properties i.e. the boundary walls, the increase is not considered significant and is reviewed within paragraphs 5.1 to 5.14 of the April 2012 report and within those considerations it identified that the proposed works can be constructed such that they will have no detrimental effect on neighbouring properties.
- 3.25. **Question 14: “Is the site over (or within the exclusion zone of) any tunnels e.g. railway lines?”**
- 3.26. The site is not located within any such exclusion zone.

**4. SURFACE FLOW AND FLOODING – FIGURE 3 PAGE 21  
CPG4**

4.1. **Question 1: “Is the site within the catchment of the pond chains on Hampstead Heath?”**

4.2. The site is within the catchment of the pond chains on Hampstead Heath, refer to the response given in question 3 of Figure 1 above.

4.3. **Question 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?”**

4.4. There will be no change to the surface water flows from the site both in terms of magnitude and route of discharge.

4.5. **Question 3: “Will the proposed basement development result in a change in the proportion of hard surface/paved external areas?”**

4.6. The existing hard surface/paved external areas will remain unaltered.

4.7. **Question 4: “Will the proposed basement result in changes of the profile of inflows (instantaneous and long term) of surface water being received by adjacent properties or downstream watercourses?”**

4.8. There will be no change to the surface water inflows, either instantaneous or long term or routes of disposal, etc. The existing conditions will be maintained.

4.9. **Question 5: “Will the proposed basement result in changes to the quality of surface water being received by adjacent properties or downstream watercourses?”**

4.10. There will be no change in the existing conditions as a result of the proposed works.

4.11. **Question 6: “Is the site an area known to be at risk from surface water flooding such as South Hampstead, West Hampstead, Gospel Oak and Kings Cross, or is at risk from flooding from for example because of a proposed basement below static water?”**

4.12. The site is not at risk from surface water flooding.

-----