**Basement Impact Assessment AUDIT: Instruction**

**Section A (Site Summary)** – to be completed by Case Officer

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Case officer contact details:** | 02079744546 | **Date of audit request:** | 27/09/2016 |
| **Camden Reference:** | 2016/4482/P | **Statutory consultation end date:** | 05/09/2016 |
| **Site Address:** | 75 Bayham StreetLONDON NW1 0AA |
| **Reason for Audit:** | Planning application / Basement Extension |
| **Proposal description: Variation of condition 3 (Plans) of planning permission ref: 2015/6036/P for the Conversion of B8 to B1, extension at rear at first floor level, extension of roof to create an additional floor space at second floor level to the rear of building and excavation of basement. Replacement of front doors and windows on the west elevation dated 26/04/2016. Namely the; Removal of proposed rear extension, alteration of roof to existing rear-end building, removal roof terrace screening and installation of roof plant with associated riser all at second floor level; Alterations to the glazing at the entrance and new rooflights at ground, first and second floor levels and; new timber sash windows to first and second floor rear elevation. Minor increase in depth below ground for basement by 500mm. Removal of condition 5 (roof terrace screening).** |
| **Relevant planning background** N/A |
| Do the basement proposals involve a listed building or does the site neighbour any listed buildings?  | No |
| Is the site in an area of relevant constraints? (check site constraints in M3/Magic GIS) | Slope stability  | No |
| Surface Water flow and flooding | No |
| Subterranean (groundwater) flow | No |
| Does the application require determination by Development Control Committee in accordance fall the Terms of Reference[[1]](#footnote-1)  | No |
| No/Does the scope of the submitted BIA extend beyond the screening stage?  | Yes |

**Section B: BIA components for Audit (to be completed by Applicant)**

|  |
| --- |
| **Items provided for Basement Impact Assessment (BIA)1**  |
| **Item provided** | **Yes/No/NA2** | **Name of BIA document/appendix in which information is contained.**  |
| 1 | Description of proposed development.  | Yes | *Description in 1.06 of BIA; refer also architect’s Design & Access Statement* |
| 2 | Plan showing boundary of development including any land required temporarily during construction. | Yes | *Location Plan drawing 107 01 00* |
| 3 | Plans, maps and or photographs to show location of basement relative to surrounding structures. | Yes | *Refer architects drawings; also structural drawings included in Appendix D of Michael Alexander’s BIA.* |
| 4 | Plans, maps and or photographs to show topography of surrounding area with any nearby watercourses/waterbodies including consideration of the relevant maps in the Strategic FRA by URS (2014) | Yes | *Sections 4.01 (topography) and section 5.01 (flood maps) of Michael Alexander’s BIA* |
| 5 | Plans and sections to show foundation details of adjacent structures. | Yes | *Structural drawings in Appendix D of Michael Alexander BIA* |
| 6 | Plans and sections to show layout and dimensions of proposed basement. | Yes | *Structural drawings in Appendix D of Michael Alexander BIA, Architect’s drawings* |
| 7 | Programme for enabling works, construction and restoration. | Yes | *An outline method statement giving a construction sequence is given in Appendix E and an outline Construction Programme is given in Appendix G of Michael Alexander’s BIA* |
| 8 | Identification of potential risks to land stability (including surrounding structures and infrastructure), and surface and groundwater flooding.  | Yes | *Sections 3,4 & 5 of Michael Alexander’s BIA* |
| 9 | Assessment of impact of potential risks on neighbouring properties and surface and groundwater.  | Yes | *Sections 3,4 & 5 of Michael Alexander’s BIA* |
| 10 | Identification of significant adverse impacts. | No | *No significant adverse impacts where identified after mitigation.* |
| 11 | Evidence of consultation with neighbours. | Yes | *Party wall surveyors ROC-haus are in contact with the neighbours or the appointed surveyors on their behalf* |
| 12 | Ground Investigation Report and Conceptual Site Model including * Desktop study
* exploratory hole records
* results from monitoring the local groundwater regime
* confirmation of baseline conditions
* factual site investigation report
 | Yes | *Ground Investigation report by LBH (LBH4318 Ver 1.8. dated September 2016)* |
| 13 | Ground Movement Assessment (GMA). | Yes | *Included in the Ground Investigation Report by LBH* |
| 14 | Plans, drawings, reports to show extent of affected area. | Yes | *This is within the GMA; extracts are also included in section 4.04 of Michael Alexander’s BIA* |
| 15 | Specific mitigation measures to reduce, avoid or offset significant adverse impacts. | Yes | *Sections 3,4 & 5 of Michael Alexander’s BIA* |
| 16 | Construction Sequence Methodology (CSM) referring to site investigation and containing basement, floor and roof plans, sections (all views), sequence of construction and temporary works. | Yes | *Appendices D & E of Michael Alexander BIA* |
| 17 | Proposals for monitoring during construction. | Yes | *Clauses 4.04.10 & 4.04. 11 of Michael Alexander’s BIA. Also clauses E03 & E10 of Appendix E within the same.* |
| 18 | Confirmatory and reasoned statement identifying likely damage to nearby properties according to Burland Scale  | Yes | *Included in the Ground Movement Assessment (within the Ground Investigation Report) by LBH* |
| 19 | Confirmatory and reasoned statement with supporting evidence that the structural stability of the building and neighbouring properties will be maintained (by reference to BIA, Ground Movement Assessment and Construction Sequence Methodology), including consideration of cumulative effects. | Yes | *Section 4.04 of Michael Alexander’s BIA* |
| 20 | Confirmatory and reasoned statement with supporting evidence that there will be no adverse effects on drainage or run-off and no damage to the water environment (by reference to ground investigation, BIA and CSM), including consideration of cumulative effects. | Yes | *Sections 3.04 & 5.04 of Michael Alexander BIA* |
| 21 | Identification of areas that require further investigation. | No | *No specific requirements were identified* |
| 22 | Non-technical summary for each stage of BIA. | Yes | *We would consider that the conclusions in sections 3.04, 4.04 & 5.04 of the Michael Alexander BIA are sufficiently clear to be read by a non-technical audience.* |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| **Additional BIA components (added during Audit)** |  |  |
| **Item provided** | **Yes/No/NA2** |  | **Comment** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Notes:

1 NB DP27 also requires consideration of architectural character, impacts on archaeology, amenity and other matters which are not covered by this checklist.

2 Where response is ‘no’ or ‘NA’, an explanation is required in the Comment section.

**Section C : Audit proposal (to be completed by the Auditor)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Date** | **Fee Categorisation (A/B/C) and costs (£ ex VAT)** | **Date estimate for initial report** | **Commentary (including timescales for completion of Initial Report)** |
| *Date* | *Category and cost -*  | *This will depend on date of completion of section D but some indication is required* | *If possible please ALSO provide estimate for possible additional fees required to review consultation responses received to date.*  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Note: Where changes to the fee categorisation are required during the audit process, this will require an update to the above table, with justification provided by the auditor. These changes shall be agreed with the planning officer and the applicant, in writing before the work is undertaken.

**Section D: Audit Agreement (to be completed by Applicant)**

**For data protection reasons this section should NOT be published on the Public website.**

I agree to pay the full costs of the independent audit of the Basement Impact Assessment associated with the planning application for the site identified in Section A.

Additional fees, which would be charged at the hourly rate, will also arise, for instance in the following circumstances:

* To assess detailed revisions to the originally submitted audit material
* To assess detailed technical consultation responses from Third Party consultants
* To attend Development Control Committee

Every effort will be made to minimise the occurrence of additional unforeseen expenses arising from the audit process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FULL Name of contact [to be sent Invoice for final costs]\***  | Ashleigh Louison |
| **Address of contact** | 70 Wapping Wall, London E1W 3SS |
| **Company (if relevant)** | W12 Studios |
| **Contact telephone number** | 020 3432 9405 |
| **Date** | 30/09/16 |

\*If no Company name provided then **full name** of Contact (First-name & Surname) must be provided – initials will not suffice.

1. Recommendations for approval of certain types of application require determination by Development Control Committee (DCC). From time to time applications which would normally be determined by officers under delegated authority are referred by the Director of Culture and Environment to DCC for decision. Where the Auditor makes representations at DCC on behalf of an application the fees for attendance will be passed to the applicant. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)