

**98A Priory Road
London NW6 3NT**

**Basement Impact Assessment
Audit**

For
London Borough of Camden

Project Number: 12066-35
Rev: D1

September 2015

Campbell Reith Hill LLP
Friars Bridge Court
41-45 Blackfriars Road
London
SE1 8NZ

T: +44 (0)20 7340 1700
F: +44 (0)20 7340 1777
E: london@campbellreith.com
W: www.campbellreith.com

Document History and Status

Revision	Date	Purpose/Status	File Ref	Author	Check	Review
D1	September 2015	Comment	RMjw12066-35-040915-D1.doc	R Morley	R Morley	A Marlow

This document has been prepared in accordance with the scope of Campbell Reith Hill LLP’s (CampbellReith) appointment with its client and is subject to the terms of the appointment. It is addressed to and for the sole use and reliance of CampbellReith’s client. CampbellReith accepts no liability for any use of this document other than by its client and only for the purposes, stated in the document, for which it was prepared and provided. No person other than the client may copy (in whole or in part) use or rely on the contents of this document, without the prior written permission of Campbell Reith Hill LLP. Any advice, opinions, or recommendations within this document should be read and relied upon only in the context of the document as a whole. The contents of this document are not to be construed as providing legal, business or tax advice or opinion.

© Campbell Reith Hill LLP 2015

Document Details

Last saved	04/09/2015 13:00
Path	RMjw12066-35-040915-D1.doc
Author	R Morley
Project Partner	E M Brown, BSc MSc CGeol FGS
Project Number	12066-35
Project Name	98A Priory Road, London, NW6 3NT
Planning Reference	2015/1302/P

Contents

1.0 Non-technical summary 1
2.0 Introduction 3
3.0 Basement Impact Assessment Audit Check List 5
4.0 Discussion 9
5.0 Conclusions 12

Appendices

- Appendix 1: Residents' Consultation Comments
- Appendix 2: Audit Query Tracker
- Appendix 3: Supplementary Supporting Documents

1.0 NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY

- 1.1. CampbellReith was instructed by London Borough of Camden (LBC) to carry out an audit on the Basement Impact Assessment submitted as part of the Planning Submission documentation for 98A Priory Road, London NW6 3NT (planning reference 2015/1302/P). The basement is considered to fall within Category B as defined by the Terms of Reference.
- 1.2. The Audit reviewed the Basement Impact Assessment for potential impact on land stability and local ground and surface water conditions arising from basement development in accordance with LBC's policies and technical procedures.
- 1.3. CampbellReith was able to access LBC's Planning Portal and gain access to the latest revision of submitted documentation and review it against an agreed audit check list.
- 1.4. It has been confirmed that the development site does not involve a listed building, nor is it in the neighbourhood of listed buildings.
- 1.5. The BIA has confirmed that the proposed basement will be located within the London Clay and that the surrounding slopes are stable.
- 1.6. Despite the basement being founded in the London Clay it is noted that the construction of the basement could alter the groundwater flow and that there is a risk of ground water coming to the surface. This impact is not discussed in conjunction with a consideration of the presence of any other nearby basements.
- 1.7. The proposed basement will be excavated and constructed utilising a tunnelling technique, this in combination with the potential requirement of dewatering of the excavation leads to concerns as to the stability of the surrounding ground during the construction phase.
- 1.8. In conjunction with the tunnelling technique used to construct the basement the existing ground floor slab is proposed to be retained and supported on new steelwork and concrete lintels spanning between the new underpinning. The existing construction of the floor slab is not confirmed, and there are concerns regarding its suitability and capacity to withstand the extensive temporary propping that would be required until its permanent support can be provided.
- 1.9. It is accepted that the risk of surface water flooding the buildings is low, despite nearby streets having been flooded in 2002. Numerous mitigation measures have been suggested including the use of SUDS.

- 1.10. It is recommended that a ground water drainage system be installed in order to reduce the risk of ground water reaching the surface or affecting neighbouring basements, however no such system is detailed in the design.
- 1.11. The ground movement assessment provided indicates that damage to the adjacent properties will be category 2 or less. However, the ground movement assessment is deemed to be incorrect and is to be resubmitted.
- 1.12. It is recommended that water level monitoring continue in order to clarify the maximum and minimum values.

2.0 INTRODUCTION

- 2.1. CampbellReith was instructed by London Borough of Camden (LBC) on 8th July 2015 to carry out a Category B Audit on the Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) submitted as part of the Planning Submission documentation for 98A Priory Road, NW6 3NT Reference 2015/1302/P.
- 2.2. The Audit was carried out in accordance with the Terms of Reference set by LBC. It reviewed the Basement Impact Assessment for potential impact on land stability and local ground and surface water conditions arising from basement development.
- 2.3. A BIA is required for all planning applications with basements in Camden in general accordance with policies and technical procedures contained within
- Guidance for Subterranean Development (GSD). Issue 01. November 2010. Ove Arup & Partners.
 - Camden Planning Guidance (CPG) 4: Basements and Lightwells.
 - Camden Development Policy (DP) 27: Basements and Lightwells.
 - Camden Development Policy (DP) 23: Water
- 2.4. The BIA should demonstrate that schemes:
- a) maintain the structural stability of the building and neighbouring properties;
 - b) avoid adversely affecting drainage and run off or causing other damage to the water environment; and,
 - c) avoid cumulative impacts upon structural stability or the water environment in the local area.
- and evaluate the impacts of the proposed basement considering the issues of hydrology, hydrogeology and land stability via the process described by the GSD and to make recommendations for the detailed design.
- 2.5. LBC's Audit Instruction described the planning proposal as the "Excavation of basement level, in association with erection of single storey rear and two storey side extension and side dormer extension."
- The Audit Instruction also confirmed that the basement proposals did not involve a listed building nor the site neighboured listed buildings.
- 2.6. CampbellReith accessed LBC's Planning Portal on 21th August 2015 and gained access to the following relevant documents for audit purposes:

- Basement Impact Assessment
- Ground water report
- Land stability report
- Ground investigations report
- Drawings;
 - S1006PL01-1 Existing Plans and Elevations
 - S1006PL01-2 Proposed Basement, Ground Floor and First Floor Plans
 - S1006PL01-3 Proposed Loft Plan and Section
 - S1006PL01-4 Proposed Elevations

3.0 BASEMENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT AUDIT CHECK LIST

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Are BIA Author(s) credentials satisfactory?	Yes	The authors of the BIA, the Ground water report, and the Ground Stability report have suitable credentials.
Is data required by Cl.233 of the GSD presented?	Yes	
Does the description of the proposed development include all aspects of temporary and permanent works which might impact upon geology, hydrogeology and hydrology?	Yes	BIA Executive Summary
Are suitable plan/maps included?	Yes	BIA and drawings.
Do the plans/maps show the whole of the relevant area of study and do they show it in sufficient detail?	Yes	BIA, land stability report, and ground water report.
Land Stability Screening: Have appropriate data sources been consulted? Is justification provided for 'No' answers?	Yes	Land stability report section 3.
Hydrogeology Screening: Have appropriate data sources been consulted? Is justification provided for 'No' answers?	Yes	Ground water report section 3.
Hydrology Screening: Have appropriate data sources been consulted? Is justification provided for 'No' answers?	Yes	BIA section 1.
Is a conceptual model presented?	Yes	Ground water report section 4.1, BIA section 2, and ground stability report section 6.

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Land Stability Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	No	No formal scoping is carried out. Comments in screening section provide some scoping but are not developed further
Hydrogeology Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	Yes	Ground water report section 4.
Hydrology Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	Yes	BIA Section 2.
Is factual ground investigation data provided?	Yes	Ground investigation report
Is monitoring data presented?	Yes	Groundwater monitoring in the Ground investigation report.
Is the ground investigation informed by a desk study?	Yes	BIA section 3.
Has a site walkover been undertaken?	Yes	BIA section 3 and site investigation report section 3.1.
Is the presence/absence of adjacent or nearby basements confirmed?	Yes	BIA section 3 displays that the neighbouring properties have been externally observed for basements.
Is a geotechnical interpretation presented?	Yes	Ground investigation report Section 6.
Does the geotechnical interpretation include information on retaining wall design?	Yes	Ground investigation report Section 6.
Are reports on other investigations required by screening and scoping presented?	No	No further reports were required by scoping.
Are baseline conditions described, based on the GSD?	Yes	BIA, land stability report, and ground water report.
Do the base line conditions consider adjacent or nearby basements?	Yes	BIA.

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Is an Impact Assessment provided?	Yes	Ground Movement Assessment within BIA. However this is deemed as incorrect.
Are estimates of ground movement and structural impact presented?	Yes	Ground Movement Assessment within BIA. However this is deemed as incorrect.
Is the Impact Assessment appropriate to the matters identified by screen and scoping?	Yes	The points raised by the screening and scoping have been addressed in the BIA, land stability report, and the ground water report.
Has the need for mitigation been considered and are appropriate mitigation methods incorporated in the scheme?	Yes	SUDS, upstand to lightwells, dual sump pumps are discussed. However confirmation of which measures are to be provided and further details of these measures have not been provided.
Has the need for monitoring during construction been considered?	Yes	BIA
Have the residual (after mitigation) impacts been clearly identified?	Yes	Residual risks regarding surface water flooding have been discussed in the BIA.
Has the scheme demonstrated that the structural stability of the building and neighbouring properties and infrastructure been maintained?	Yes	The ground movement assessment within the BIA. However this is deemed as incorrect.
Has the scheme avoided adversely affecting drainage and run-off or causing other damage to the water environment?	Yes	The BIA document recommends the use of a SUDS system that incorporates an attenuation tank due to the increase in hardstanding area. Further details of the suggested system are required with details to be shown on drawings.
Has the scheme avoided cumulative impacts upon structural stability or the water environment in the local area?	No	The ground water report concludes that there is a risk of ground water backup and that a ground water drainage system should be incorporated. Further ground water level monitoring is also recommended. Details to be provided.

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Does report state that damage to surrounding buildings will be no worse than Burland Category 2?	Yes	Estimated to be Burland Category 1 or less.
Are non-technical summaries provided?	Yes	Executive summary in BIA.

4.0 DISCUSSION

- 4.1. The BIA has been carried out by an established firm of structural engineers, Croft Structural Engineers, who have employed the services of Ground and Project Consultants Ltd and H Fraser Consulting to supplement the work needed to form the BIA. The authors and reviewers from all of these organisations have suitable qualifications.
- 4.2. The proposed basement will be excavated using a tunnelling method from the front of the property towards the rear. Reinforced concrete underpins/retaining walls are to be cast to support the existing loads from above and the retained soil. Sections are to be cast in a hit and miss sequence with the general direction of construction from the front towards the rear of the property. The existing ground floor ground bearing slab is to be retained and supported on steel beams and concrete lintels bearing onto the underpinning. A tunnelling technique as described is not the generally preferred method of construction and is considered of higher risk than traditional basement construction where individual underpins are constructed singly prior to the ground level being reduced.
- 4.3. The retaining walls/underpins have been designed to act as unpropped cantilevers both during the construction and permanent stages, with the rear earth face temporarily propped against a retained central 'dumpling' during the construction stage utilising sacrificial trench sheeting should it be required until the underpinning has been cast.
- 4.4. The sequence of the underpinning is shown in a hit and miss sequence, with the general direction of construction being from the front towards the rear of the property. Due to a tunnelling method being proposed this will mean that in order to maintain the hit and miss sequence they will be excavating beyond sections of foundation that are yet to be underpinned, in order to maintain stability the clay below these sections of foundation would require propping also.
- 4.5. The BIA mentions existing basements/cellars to the neighbouring properties, however their extent is not discussed.
- 4.6. The geological report indicates that the site consists of made ground, underlain by clay head, underlain by London Clay. The depth of the basement will mean that it founds well into the London Clay Strata, this is considered an acceptable bearing strata.
- 4.7. The ground investigations report provides a serviceable bearing capacity for the London Clay at the depth required of 120kPa.

- 4.8. A retaining wall design has been produced to BS 8002. This design has assumed the worst case for pore water pressure, neighbouring foundation surcharge, and axial loading. The bearing pressures are within the 120kPa serviceability limit as given in the ground investigations report.
- 4.9. The ground water report indicates that initially the ground water level has been identified at 4.2m below ground level, below the underside of the basement. However it is reported that a subsequent water level was observed at 1.02m below ground level following monitoring. It has been determined that there is a risk of daylighting of this ground water which could cause damage to nearby basements. Further groundwater monitoring has been recommended to identify high and low levels. A ground water drainage system is also recommended and further details should be provided.
- 4.10. Due to uncertainty as to the natural ground water level the current estimate based on the monitored standpipe indicates that the ground water level is at 1.02m below ground level, well above the formation level of the basement which is at approximately 3.6m below ground level. This could potentially require the dewatering of nearly 2.6m of soil. It is claimed in the BIA that local dewatering by pumping is not likely to be detrimental to the surrounding ground bearing capacity, due to the natural and seasonal variation in the water level which has a similar affect to temporary reduction by pumping. This view can be accepted to an extent but a dewatering of 2.6m in combination with the riskier tunnelling method of construction indicates that local dewatering would not be possible, and the entire excavated area at once would require dewatering, leading to concerns for ground stability and bearing capacity.
- 4.11. The BIA has shown that the surrounding slopes to the development are stable.
- 4.12. The BIA does not indicate whether the foundations to the basement will be lower than the foundations to the basement/cellar of the adjoining properties.
- 4.13. The BIA includes an assessment of whether the development is likely to be affected by surface water flooding, and even though nearby streets were flooded in 2002, the risk is accepted as being low. A number of mitigation options such as dual pumps, upstands to the lightwells, SUDS, and alarm systems are discussed.
- 4.14. The BIA confirms that the area of hardstanding will increase by 7%. The BIA recommends the use of SUDS incorporating attenuation tanks in order to attenuate surface water flow.
- 4.15. The Ground Movement Assessment concludes that any damage to the neighbouring properties will be Burland Category 2 or less. However there are some concerns with regards to how the movement assessment has been carried out. The movement assessment has been produced based on the guidance from CIRIA report 580, it appears that Croft have used the percentage values that determine the horizontal and vertical movements based on a high stiffness scenario,

whereas a low stiffness scenario is proposed by using unpropped cantilever walls. The movement assessment should be submitted again based on a low stiffness scenario.

- 4.16. An acceptable movement monitoring regime on the adjacent properties during construction is proposed, this includes the use of optical equipment to measure lateral and vertical movement.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 5.1. The BIA has been carried out by established organisations. The authors and reviewers from all of these organisations have suitable qualifications.
- 5.2. The ground water level is uncertain, with evidence of the standing water level at 1.02m below ground level. The ground water report concluded that the basement could be below the water table and could cause ground water backup and daylighting, and potential damage to adjacent properties. Further water level monitoring is required in order to confirm the water level and to identify seasonal high and low levels.
- 5.3. There are concerns over the tunnelling excavation method proposed, particularly in combination with the potential large reduction in ground water level required in order to carry out construction. The ground water level should be confirmed via water level monitoring in order to allow this concern to be better evaluated.
- 5.4. In conjunction with the tunnelling technique used to construct the basement the existing ground floor slab is proposed to be retained and supported on new steelwork and concrete lintels spanning between the new underpinning. The existing construction of the floor slab is not confirmed, and there are concerns regarding its suitability and capacity to withstand the extensive temporary propping that would be required until its permanent support can be provided.
- 5.5. The basement is founded within the London Clay and it is noted that the groundwater flow may be altered. A ground water drainage system is recommended by the ground water report for which further details are required to be submitted. Further water level monitoring has the potential to affect these recommendations.
- 5.6. The Ground Movement Assessment concludes that any damage to the neighbouring properties will be less than Burland Category 2. However the ground movement assessment is determined to be incorrect and should be resubmitted.
- 5.7. A movement monitoring regime on the adjacent properties during construction is proposed and this should be provided.

Appendix 1: Residents' Consultation Comments

Residents' Consultation Comments

Surname	Address	Date	Issue raised	Response
Rosen, Gadow, Almedia, Swithenbank, Curtis	Flats B-F, 98 Priory Road	22/06/2015	Adjacent property stability which is constructed on shallow foundation.	The BIA contains structural calculations for the permanent and temporary structure that is to support the adjacent land and foundations. The existing foundations are to be supported by concrete underpinning in a hit and miss sequence which is accepted as industry standard to help to prevent land/foundation instability. A method statement has been produced detailing industry standard practises for the excavation and formation of the basement. The fact that the property has been constructed on a shallow foundation has been accounted for due to worst case assumptions in the retaining wall design.
Rosen, Gadow, Almedia, Swithenbank, Curtis	Flats B-F, 98 Priory Road	22/06/2015	Damage to Robinia tree to front of property.	The BIA confirms that the proposed basement falls outside of the trees root protection zone.

Appendix 2: Audit Query Tracker

Audit Query Tracker

Query No	Subject	Query	Status	Date closed out
1	Subterranean groundwater	Due to conflicting conclusions regarding the ground water level and the proposed basements potential to cause ground water daylighting and damage to adjacent basements, clarification is required regarding the ground water level. Ideally this would be supported by water level monitoring data.	Open	
2	Movement assessment	Movement assessment to be resubmitted assuming a low stiffness scenario.	Open	
3	Ground water drainage	Details of recommended ground water drainage system to be provided along with calculations. This may not be required should the ground water level be confirmed to be lower than the basement level consistently.	Open	

Appendix 3: Supplementary Supporting Documents

None