APPENDIX A: CPG4 SCREENING FLOW CHART RESPONSES

SLOPE STABILITY SCREENING FLOWCHART (FIGURE 2.)

Ref.	*CPG4 Question*	*Supporting information*	*Response*
Q1.	Does the existing site include slopes, natural or manmade, greater than 7°? (approximately 1 in 8)	Site walk over, topographical surveys and Figure 16 of The Camden Geological, Hydrogeological and Hydrological Study indicates slopes are less than 7°	No
Q2.	Will the proposed re-profiling of landscaping at site change slopes at the property boundary to more than 7°? (approximately 1 in 8)	There are currently no existing slopes on or adjacent to site. The proposed levels are to be as existing.	No
Q3.	Does the development neighbour land, including railway cuttings and the like, with a slope greater than 7°? (approximately 1 in 8)	Site walk over and OS maps shows that the neighbouring land does not slope greater than 7°	No
Q4.	Is the site within a wider hillside setting in which the general slope is greater than 7°? (approximately 1 in 8)	Site walk over, topographical surveys and OS maps indicate that the site is not within a wider hillside setting in which the general slope is greater than 7°	No
Q5.	Is the London Clay the shallowest strata at the site?	The ground is expected to comprise a shallow depth of made ground over weathered brown clay overlying London Clay to considerable depth.	**Yes**
Q6.	Will any tree/s 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?	It is not proposed to fell any tree/s nor are there any tree protection zones where trees are to be retained	No

Q7.	Is there history of seasonal shrink-swell subsidence in the local area, and/or evidence of such effects at the site?	The clay ground has a medium to high volume change potential. However, there are no evidence of seasonal shrink-swell subsidence to the existing house.	No
Q8.	Is the site within 100m of a watercourse or a potential spring line?	Site walk over and Figure 12 of The Camden Geological, Hydrogeological and Hydrological Study indicates that the site is not within 100m of a watercourse or potential spring line	No
Q9.	Is the site within an area of previously worked ground?	It is understood that the site is not within an area of previously worked ground	No
Q10.	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. The clay ground is considered to be unproductive stratum.	No
Q11.	Is the site within 50m of the Hampstead Heath Ponds?	OS maps and Figure 13 of The Camden Geological, Hydrogeological and Hydrological Study indicate that the site is not within 50m of the Hampstead Heath Ponds	No
Q12.	Is the site within 5m of a highway or pedestrian right of way?	The site is adjacent to St John's Wood Park and Queens Grove.	**Yes**
Q13.	Will the proposed basement significantly increase the differential depth of foundations relative to neighbouring properties?	The site investigation has identified that the existing property is founded on shallow corbel footings. The neighbouring properties are likely to be of similar construction.	**Yes**
Q14.	Is the site over (or within exclusion zone of) any tunnels, e.g. railway lines?	OS maps and site walkover indicate that the site is not over (or within exclusion zone of) any tunnels , e.g. railway lines.	No

CPG4 SLOPE STABILITY SCOPING STUDY

1. The slope stability screening process has identified the following questions as obtaining a 'Yes' response:

   Q5. Is the London Clay the shallowest strata at the site?

   Q12. Is the site within 5m of a highway or pedestrian right of way?

   Q13. Will the proposed basement significantly increase the differential depth of foundations relative to neighbouring properties?

2. Slope stability is not a factor due to the adoption of a contiguous piled retaining wall to support the excavation.

   With respect to the 'yes' responses noted within 1. above we would note that;

   With respect to Q5. a contiguous piled wall will prevent slip circles forming within the London Clay and hence there will be no slope instability.

   With respect to Q12, a contiguous bored piled will maintain the existing stability of the ground and prevent ground movement likely to cause damage to existing infrastructure.

   With respect to Q13, adjoining properties are independent of the proposed development and therefore a contiguous piled wall will limit ground movement and maintain the stability of the adjoining properties.

3. The method of construction and structural proposals have been selected with due consideration to the known ground conditions and hydrology of the site and surrounding area and to ensure the structural integrity of the existing building, neighbouring properties and surrounding land is maintained during and post construction. The detailed proposals, set out in Sinclair Johnston and Partners report in support of planning dated October 2011, demonstrate that the works will not have an adverse impact on existing and adjoining structures. The method and form of construction proposed is tried and tested and adopted on many other developments in Camden and other London boroughs.

4. Due to the size and depth of basement proposed and with the due regard as given above a full basement impact assessment for slope stability is not considered necessary.