

26 West End Lane  
London, NW6 4PA

Basement Impact Assessment  
Audit

For

London Borough of Camden

Project Number: 12336-59  
Revision: F2

October 2016

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](mailto:london@campbellreith.com)  
W: [www.campbellreith.com](http://www.campbellreith.com)

### Document History and Status

Revision	Date	Purpose/Status	File Ref	Author	Check	Review
D1	June 2016	Comment	FDfd-12336-59-310516 - 26 West End Lane -D1.doc	F Drammeh	E Brown	E Brown
F1	August 2016	Planning	FDfd-12336-59-010816-26 West End Lane -F1.doc	F Drammeh	E Brown	E Brown
F2	October 2016	Planning	FDfd-12336-59-121016-26 West End Lane-F2.doc	F Drammeh	E Brown	E Brown

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	11/10/2016 16:14
Path	FDfd-12336-59-121016-26 West End Lane-F2.doc
Author	F Drammeh, MEng (Hons)
Project Partner	E M Brown, BSc MSc CGeol FGS
Project Number	12336-59
Project Name	26 West End Lane
Planning Reference	2016/2083/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

Appendix

- 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 26 West End Lane (Camden Planning reference 2016/2083/P). The basement is considered to fall within Category A 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 reviewed it against an agreed audit check list.
- 1.4. The Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) screening authors are a Chartered Structural and Chartered Civil Engineer respectively. Whilst CPG4 requires the input of a Chartered Geologist with respect to hydrogeology, given the modest proposals and the anticipated ground conditions, it is accepted that these could be provided by another professional in this instance.
- 1.5. It is proposed to extend an existing courtyard bounded by a 0.90m high retaining wall outwards by approximately 2.50m at the same depth. Although it is accepted that the scale of the proposal is modest, the description was not sufficiently detailed. TZG's response included in Appendix 3 states that the foundations will be 1m deep mass concrete strip footings.
- 1.6. No desk study or any indication of the underlying soils was given. It was stated that the 0.90m excavation is likely to extend just beyond the depth of the topsoil. TZG's response stated the anticipated ground conditions are Made Ground over London Clay. TZG have further stated that a desk study had been undertaken although this has not been presented.
- 1.7. The screening process has now been undertaken following a number of requests although this has not been undertaken in accordance with CPG4 requirements as discussed in Section 4.
- 1.8. Thames Water have stipulated a Planning Condition on the discharge of foul or surface water into the network drainage system.
- 1.9. An anticipated works duration is provided with the screening document.
- 1.10. It is accepted there are no slope stability issues, wider hydrogeological concerns or any other flooding issues as a result of the proposed development.
- 1.11. Despite some omissions in the BIA and the screening not undertaken in accordance with CPG4 requirements, it is acknowledged that the scale of the proposal is modest and no adverse

effects to the water environment or stability from the proposals have been identified. There are no further queries on this BIA.

## 2.0 INTRODUCTION

2.1. CampbellReith was instructed by London Borough of Camden (LBC) to carry out a Category A Audit on the Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) submitted as part of the Planning Submission documentation for 26 West End Lane, NW6 4PA (Camden Planning Reference 2016/2083/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;
- 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 *"Creation of one additional flat and reconfiguration of existing layout including erection of single storey rear extension at lower ground level with increased patio area and excavated garden with new retaining wall, revised front boundary treatment and landscaping with access stair and entrance to lower ground flat, side elevation access stair with canopy over entrance, installation of maintenance access hatch to roof level and alterations to side elevation windows."*

- 2.6. The Audit Instruction also confirmed 26 West End Lane is not listed, nor is it a neighbour to listed buildings.
- 2.7. CampbellReith accessed LBC's Planning Portal on 26 May 2016 and gained access to the following relevant documents for audit purposes:
- Basement Impact Assessment Report (BIA) Screening report: TZG Partnership, undated
  - Method Statement: TZG Partnership Engineering Consultants, dated March 2016
  - Nick Baker Architects Planning Application Drawings consisting of
    - Location Plan
    - Existing Plans
    - Proposed Plans
    - Existing Sections
    - Proposed Sections
    - Existing elevations
    - Proposed elevations
  - 2 No Planning Comments and Responses
- 2.8. Following the initial audit, a response from TZG to the queries raised was received by email on 13 June 2016. This response did not fully address those queries and it was requested via email to the Planning Officer for the outstanding queries to be resolved. TZG's response and a further email (received on 28 July 2016) are included in Appendix 3.
- 2.9. A response to the second audit was received by email on 5 September 2016 and this is also included in Appendix 3.

### 3.0 BASEMENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT AUDIT CHECK LIST

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Are BIA Author(s) credentials satisfactory?	No	See Audit paragraph 4.1.
Is data required by Cl.233 of the GSD presented?	No	Details lacking but acknowledged proposals are modest (see Audit paragraph 4.2)
Does the description of the proposed development include all aspects of temporary and permanent works which might impact upon geology, hydrogeology and hydrology?	No	As above.
Are suitable plan/maps included?	No	Not all of the relevant maps extracts are included (see Audit paragraph 4.8).
Do the plans/maps show the whole of the relevant area of study and do they show it in sufficient detail?	No	As above.
Land Stability Screening: Have appropriate data sources been consulted? Is justification provided for 'No' answers?	No	Now undertaken, however, relevant map extracts not referenced or provided with site location indicated. Justification not provided for 'No' answers (see Audit paragraphs 4.3 and 4.8).
Hydrogeology Screening: Have appropriate data sources been consulted? Is justification provided for 'No' answers?	No	Map extracts provided with site location indicated, however, clarification was requested on the responses to Q4 and Q5 (see Audit paragraph 4.5).
Hydrology Screening: Have appropriate data sources been consulted? Is justification provided for 'No' answers?	No	Not all relevant map extracts referenced or provided with site location indicated. Responses now provided for Q5 and Q6 which were not previously answered. However, the response to Q6 does not address the query (see Audit paragraphs 4.4 and 4.8).
Is a conceptual model presented?	No	Not presented.



Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Land Stability Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	N/A	No issues identified.
Hydrogeology Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	No	BIA not taken beyond screening stage.
Hydrology Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	No	BIA not taken beyond screening stage.
Is factual ground investigation data provided?	No	BIA not taken beyond screening stage.
Is monitoring data presented?	No	BIA not taken beyond screening stage.
Is the ground investigation informed by a desk study?	N/A	BIA not taken beyond screening stage. Although latest response form TZG states a desk study had been undertaken, desk study information not presented.
Has a site walkover been undertaken?	Yes	Photos of the site in the supporting documents indicate a walkover has been undertaken.
Is the presence/absence of adjacent or nearby basements confirmed?	No	No description of the neighbouring property presented although the property is semi-detached and the proposals are modest.
Is a geotechnical interpretation presented?	No	BIA not taken beyond screening.
Does the geotechnical interpretation include information on retaining wall design?	N/A	BIA not taken beyond screening.
Are reports on other investigations required by screening and scoping presented?	N/A	None identified.
Are the baseline conditions described, based on the GSD	No	No description of neighbouring properties and proposal not

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
		sufficiently detailed.
Do the base line conditions consider adjacent or nearby basements?	N/A	Baseline conditions not presented.
Is an Impact Assessment provided?	No	BIA not taken beyond screening although it is acknowledged proposals are modest.
Are estimates of ground movement and structural impact presented?	No	Although the property is semi-detached and the proposals are modest.
Is the Impact Assessment appropriate to the matters identified by screen and scoping?	N/A	BIA not taken beyond screening.
Has the need for mitigation been considered and are appropriate mitigation methods incorporated in the scheme?	No	Not provided although it is acknowledged proposals are modest.
Has the need for monitoring during construction been considered?	No	Not considered although the property is semi-detached and the proposals are modest.
Have the residual (after mitigation) impacts been clearly identified?	N/A	
Has the scheme demonstrated that the structural stability of the building and neighbouring properties and infrastructure will be maintained?	No	Unlikely to be a risk given the site is semi-detached and the proposals are modest, however, this still needs to be demonstrated by providing information as required by the Arup GSD.
Has the scheme avoided adversely affecting drainage and run-off or causing other damage to the water environment?	No	Unlikely to be a risk given the modest proposals, however, this has not been demonstrated.
Has the scheme avoided cumulative impacts upon structural stability or the water environment in the local area?	No	As above
Does report state that damage to surrounding buildings will be no	No	BIA not undertaken beyond screening however property is semi-

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
worse than Burland Category 2?		detached and proposals are modest.
Are non-technical summaries provided?	No	Not provided.

## 4.0 DISCUSSION

- 4.1. The Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) was prepared by TZG Partnership and the individuals involved in its production have CEng MStructE FConsE and CEng MICE qualifications. The preparation of a BIA also requires the involvement of a Chartered Geologist (C.Geol) with respect to appraisal of hydrogeological issues. Although it is considered that a sufficient response had not been received to one of the two queries relating to hydrogeology, the proposals are modest therefore it is accepted the screening could be completed by another professional in this instance.
- 4.2. The existing building is described as a semi-detached house of conventional construction and it is proposed to '*sub-divide the property*'. It is proposed to extend an existing courtyard bounded by a 0.90m high retaining wall outwards by approximately 2.50m at the same depth. No details were given on the existing or proposed retaining wall or foundations for the extension. Following the initial audit, a response from TZG Partnership (Appendix 3) stated that the foundations will be 1m deep mass concrete strip footings.
- 4.3. The screening process was not fully undertaken. The land stability screening questions were not answered. In response to the initial audit, rather than undertaking the screening, TZG again referred to Cl. 234 of the Arup GSD which was referenced in the BIA and stated '*the 0.90m deep excavations at this development will not have any effect on any macro topographical features. On a micro level, the proposed excavation will not extend beneath the footings of any adjacent property*'. These have now been answered although no justification is provided for the 'No' responses.
- 4.4. Questions 5 and 6 of the hydrology screening had not been answered. With respect to Question 6, West End Lane flooded in 2002 and the SFRA maps indicate the site is located in an area at risk from internal and external sewer flooding. A sufficient response has now been provided for Question 5. The response to Question 6 still does not address the query. Rather than answering the question, the response states in TZG's opinion they do not consider an FRA to be necessary. Despite this, it is considered there is reduced risk of surface water flooding due to the extension being located in the rear of an existing building. With regards to the sewer flooding, it is assumed the existing '*basement*' comprises fittings such non-return valves to mitigate this risk.
- 4.5. A 'No' response was given to Question 4 of the hydrogeology screening which relates to whether or not the proposal will lead to a change in the proportion of land surface/paved area. Drawing No P-007 appeared to indicate an increase in paved areas and clarification was requested. Clarification was also requested on the response to Question 5 which stated more surface water will not be discharged into the ground as permeable paving will be used. TZG's response (Appendix 3) indicated there will be no increase in paved areas, however, the

response to the clarification request with regards to Question 5 which stated that '*any changes in wetness will not affect stability*' was not appropriate in the context of the question. A further response states that surface water will continue to be drained as per existing, however, it is not stated what this existing condition is. There are no further queries on this due to the modest nature of the proposal.

- 4.6. Following the initial audit, it was requested that the full screening be undertaken in accordance with the Arup GSD guidance to demonstrate there are no potential impacts from the proposal. TZG's response (13/06/16) stated '*we reiterate here that this project is of such a size that the screening procedure is not set up to deal with it*'.
- 4.7. In response to the above, it was noted in the second audit that in order to comply with DP27, CPG4 and Cl.232 of the Arup GSD, the full screening needs to be undertaken to support the statements that there are no adverse effects. Cl. 232 of the Arup GSD states that '*screening is the process of determining whether or not a BIA is required for a particular project. ....all basement proposals should be subjected to the screening stage of a BIA to identify the relevant matters of concern with regard to the proposed development*'.
- 4.8. Whilst the land stability screening questions have now been answered, as discussed above, no justification has been provided for the 'No' responses. Most of the responses to clarification requests on the hydrogeology and hydrology screening questions did not address the queries. Although it is acknowledged the proposals are modest, at the very least, a thorough screening process with the requirements of CPG4 accurately followed by referencing and the inclusion of all the relevant map extracts from the Arup GSD, Environment Agency and the LBC Flood Risk Management Strategy identifying the site location on each map needs to be completed to demonstrate there are no potential impacts from the proposal. These extracts would help to support statements made in the screening process.
- 4.9. No desk study or intrusive ground investigation have been carried out. Anticipated ground conditions were not presented although it was stated in the screening document that '*excavation depths are likely to extend just beyond the depth of the topsoil*'. Following the initial audit, TZG stated that the ground conditions are Made Ground over London Clay. A further response states that a desk study has been undertaken. This has not been presented in any of the documents provided.
- 4.10. An anticipated works duration is provided with the screening document.
- 4.11. One of the consultation comments related to a '*long term subsidence problems and bulging*'. The BIA did not include baseline conditions and there was no mention of building distress. It was stated in the Method Statement that the lowering of the garden level will be near an existing tree, however, there was no mention of the effects of this. TZG's response stated that

*'the proposed moving of the retaining wall cannot possibly have any effect on long term subsidence problems and bulging'*. It further stated *'that any defects within the building will be dealt with as part of the proposed development, but this is not applicable to the BIA'*. It was stated in the second audit that the removal of a tree could have an effect on the foundations due to the potential for the ground to swell as a result of the excess moisture being retained in the ground as it was unclear if trees were to be felled due to the land stability screening not undertaken. Furthermore, any building defects could make the structure more susceptible to damage as a result of any foundation movements.

- 4.12. A further response from TZG (dated 18 August 2016) states that *'TZG have previously carried out an inspection of the building (access was not made to the adjoining property). The building exhibits all the normal distortions expected in buildings of this type and age. There is no subsidence. The existing building is beyond the bulb of pressure of the new retaining wall and cannot possibly be affected by it'*. The response to Question 6 of the land stability screening indicates no trees will be felled and it is stated in the latest response that no root protection zone is to be affected.
- 4.13. A response from Thames Water stated that the existing wastewater infrastructure is unable to accommodate the needs of the site. A Planning Condition stating that no discharge of foul or surface water from the site will be accepted into the public system until a detailed drainage strategy is submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in consultation with the sewerage undertaker has been stipulated by Thames Water. TZG's response states that this will be dealt with as part of the Planning Conditions process. It is accepted that this is subject to a separate approvals process although the Planning Condition should be stipulated.
- 4.14. It is accepted that the proposals are unlikely to affect the wider hydrogeology of the area and there are no slope stability or any other flooding concerns regarding the proposed development.

## 5.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 5.1. The Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) screening authors are a Chartered Structural and Chartered Civil Engineer respectively. Whilst CPG4 requires the input of a Chartered Geologist with respect to hydrogeology, given the modest proposals and the anticipated ground conditions, it is accepted that these could be provided by another professional in this instance.
- 5.2. It is proposed to extend an existing courtyard bounded by a 0.90m high retaining wall outwards by approximately 2.50m at the same depth. Although it is accepted that the scale of the proposal is modest, the description was not sufficiently detailed. TZG's response included in Appendix 3 states that the foundations will be 1m deep mass concrete strip footings.
- 5.3. No desk study or any indication of the underlying soils was given. It was stated that the 0.90m excavation is likely to extend just beyond the depth of the topsoil. TZG's response stated the anticipated ground conditions are Made Ground over London Clay.
- 5.4. The screening process has now been undertaken following a number of requests although this has not been undertaken in accordance with CPG4 requirements as discussed in Section 4.
- 5.5. Thames Water have stipulated a Planning Condition on the discharge of foul or surface water into the network drainage system.
- 5.6. An anticipated works duration is provided with the screening document.
- 5.7. It is accepted there are no slope stability issues, wider hydrogeological concerns or any other flooding issues as a result of the proposed development.
- 5.8. Despite some omissions in the BIA and the screening not undertaken in accordance with CPG4 requirements, it is acknowledged that the scale of the proposal is modest and no adverse effects to the water environment or stability from the proposals have been identified.

## Appendix 1: Residents' Consultation Comments



Residents' Consultation Comments

Surname	Address	Date	Issue raised	Response
Parsons	28 West End Lane London NW6 4PA	03/05/16	Subsidence and ' <i>bulging wall</i> '	See Audit paragraphs 4.11 and 4.12.
Thames Water	Development Planning Thames Water Maple Lodge STW Denham Way Rickmansworth WD3 9SQ	06/05/16	Inability of the existing wastewater infrastructure to accommodate the needs of this application. Discharge of foul or surface water into the public system will not be accepted until drainage strategy detailing any on and /or off site drainage works has been submitted.	See Audit paragraphs 4.13 and 5.5

## Appendix 2: Audit Query Tracker

Audit Query Tracker

Query No	Subject	Query	Status	Date closed out
1	BIA format	Screening not fully undertaken in accordance with CPG4 requirements	Closed – see Audit paragraphs 4.8 and 5.8.	11/10/2016
2	BIA format	No desk study information /baseline conditions presented	Closed - not provided but acknowledged proposals are modest. See Audit paragraph 5.8.	11/10/2016
3	BIA format/stability	No details of the temporary and permanent works	Closed – not provided but acknowledged proposals are modest. See Audit paragraph 5.8.	11/10/2016
4	Hydrogeology/surface flow and flooding	A 'No' response is given to the question on whether or not paved areas are to be increased	Closed – TZG response states no increase in paved areas.	29/07/2016
5	Hydrogeology	A 'No' response to given to whether or not more surface water will be discharged into the ground.	Closed – See Audit paragraphs 4.5 and 4.8.	11/10/2016
6	Surface flow and flooding	Thames Water comments on the inability of the existing infrastructure to accommodate the needs of the site	Drainage strategy to be provided for LBC and Thames Water approval (see Audit paragraph 4.13).	N/A

## Appendix 3: Supplementary Supporting Documents

TZG responses received on 13/06/16 and 28/07/16  
TZG response to second audit (dated 18/08/16) received on 05/09/16

PROJECT ADDRESS:

26 Westend Lane,  
London,  
NW6 4PA

Response to Campbell Reith Hill's  
Audit of Basement Input Assessment  
Ref: 12336-59 D1.

We have used their numbering system for the responses.

TZG have prepared a screening document for a BIA. BIA's are required for basements and lightwells – neither of which apply to this application.

TZG have considered the removal of soil and the replacement of a low retaining wall as the only elements of this project applicable to the Screening BIA. In the preparation of the document TZG have considered the advice given by the Arup GSD that the BIA should “.... obtain information appropriate to the potential impacts of the proposed basement”. We reiterate here that this project is of a size such that the screening procedure is not set up to deal with.

#### 4.0 DISCUSSION

4.2 The foundations of the extension do not fall into any requirements of any part of the screening process. However, in order to provide an answer the foundations may be described thus:-

Foundations will be mass concrete strip footings 1.0m deep.

4.3 Reference again, is made to CL. 234. There are no matters of concern. Figure 4 “slope stability screening flowchart” is for a basement. It is not applicable to a garden wall.



The moved retaining wall will continue to sit at the same level it currently sits.

4.4 Confirmation is repeated here that there is no increase in land surface/paved area. The architect may provide further confirmation that paved areas will be permeable. With regard to question 5 we confirm that any changes in “wetness” (F2 page F3) will not affect stability.

4.5 We disagree with the statement “*at the very least thorough screening process with the requirements of CPG4 accurately followed needs to be completed ....*” If the needs of CPG4 were “accurately” followed it would be found that it is not strictly applicable to the completely insignificant works on this project. It is our contention that the information provided in the TZG screening document is already far more than required.

4.6 The area is made ground over London Clay.

4.8 The current low retaining wall is not part of any existing building. The proposed moving of the retaining wall cannot possibly have any effect on “*long-term subsidence problems & bulging*”. Any superstructure or sub-structure defects with the building will be addressed as part of the proposed development, but this is not applicable to the BIA.

4.9 This will be dealt with as part of the Planning Conditions process.

4.10 We do not consider that a full screening is strictly applicable to this project. The screening document is sufficient.

5.2 For the avoidance of doubt showing a section through the new retaining is provided.

5.4 TZG’s response is covered in the items above.

Marek Glowinski BSc CEng MStructE MConsE





FW: 26 West End Lane- 2016/2083/P  
Craig, Tessa

to:  
FatimaDrammeh@campbellreith.com  
28/07/2016 17:26

Hide Details

From: "Craig, Tessa" <Tessa.Craig@camden.gov.uk>

To: "FatimaDrammeh@campbellreith.com" <FatimaDrammeh@campbellreith.com>

Security:

To ensure privacy, images from remote sites were prevented from downloading. Show Images

History: This message has been forwarded.

5 Attachments



~WRD042.jpg para 234.pdf response to audit.pdf screening bia appendix Hi.pdf screening bia.pdf

--

Tessa Craig  
Planning Officer

Telephone: 020 7974 6750

[h](#) [h](#) [h](#) [h](#)

**You can [sign up](#) to our new and improved planning e-alerts to let you know about new planning applications, decisions and appeals.**

From: Craig, Tessa  
Sent: 28 July 2016 17:26  
To: lizbrown@campbellreith.com  
Cc: camdenaudit@campbellreith.com  
Subject: FW: 26 West End Lane- 2016/2083/P

Dear Liz,

Please see the further information attached.

Kind regards,

--

Tessa Craig  
Planning Officer

Telephone: 020 7974 6750

[h](#) [h](#) [h](#) [h](#)



---

**You can [sign up](#) to our new and improved planning e-alerts to let you know about new planning applications, decisions and appeals.**

---

From: Ignacio Calvo [<mailto:ICalvo@nickbakerarchitects.com>]

Sent: 19 July 2016 10:14

To: Craig, Tessa

Subject: RE: 26 West End Lane- 2016/2083/P

Dear Tessa,

We passed this information to our structural engineers. Please see below their response in red:

I have previously addressed slope stability both in the original screening document and in my response to the audit by Campbell Reith Hill. See screen shots attached.

In my opinion the responses are proportionate with the size of the "project". This approach is expressly permitted in "London Borough of Camden, Camden Hydrogeological and hydrological study. Guidance for subterranean development - Paragraph 234". (See screenshot attached)

The purpose of this paragraph must work both ways. ie to make sure a large subterranean development BIA does not have insufficient information whilst also to make sure a micro- project is not burdened with an inordinate amount of information. It is my considered opinion that my responses regarding slope stability are more than sufficient.

Regards

 MAREK J GLOWINSKI  
B.Sc C.Eng. M.I. Struct. E. M.Cons.E  
SENIOR PARTNER  
T: +44 (0)20 8681 2137  
F: +44 (0)20 8667 1328  
E: [marek@tzgpartnership.com](mailto:marek@tzgpartnership.com)  
W: [www.tzgpartnership.com](http://www.tzgpartnership.com)

However, our structural engineers are very happy to discuss this with the auditors if needed, so in order to streamline the process the auditors could contact them directly.

Thanks in advance and we await for your response.

Kind Regards

Ignacio Calvo  
Architect

**Nick  
Baker  
Architects**  
Nick Baker Architects

2nd Floor Lindsey House  
40-42 Charterhouse Street  
London EC1M 6JN

T 020 7490 0644  
[www.nickbakerarchitects.com](http://www.nickbakerarchitects.com)

Link to email disclaimer. Nick Baker Architects Ltd trading as Nick Baker Architects. Registered in England 7286832 at Oddstones, Back Ln, Cross in Hand, TN21 0QG

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail

---

From: Craig, Tessa [<mailto:Tessa.Craig@camden.gov.uk>]  
Sent: 05 July 2016 14:57  
To: Ignacio Calvo <[ICalvo@nickbakerarchitects.com](mailto:ICalvo@nickbakerarchitects.com)>  
Subject: RE: 26 West End Lane- 2016/2083/P

Dear Ignacio,

As discussed just now, Campbell Reith have advised they need the screening questions from the Arup GSD in order to determine if a full BIA is needed or not, there are a series of questions on three flowcharts in the Arup GSD and CPG4 that relate to hydrology, hydrogeology and slope stability that should be answered.

In this case, the questions relating to land stability from the flowchart have not been answered and Campbell Reith requested that these questions be answered to complete the screening process required to demonstrate there will be no adverse effects on the environment and the neighbouring properties.

Please could you forward this on to your engineers so that the BIA audit can be completed and I can move toward determining the application.

Kind regards,

--

Tessa Craig  
Planning Officer

Telephone: 020 7974 6750



---

**You can [sign up](#) to our new and improved planning e-alerts to let you know about new planning applications, decisions and appeals.**

---

From: Ignacio Calvo [<mailto:ICalvo@nickbakerarchitects.com>]  
Sent: 13 June 2016 13:39  
To: Craig, Tessa  
Subject: RE: 26 West End Lane- 2016/2083/P

Dear Tessa,

Please find attached the response to the outstanding matters identified by the BIA audit.

Please let us know if you need any further information.

Could you please inform when it is expected the planning decision?

Kind Regards

Ignacio Calvo  
Architect

2nd Floor Lindsey House  
40-42 Charterhouse Street  
London EC1M 6JN

# Nick Baker Architects

T 020 7490 0644  
www.nickbakerarchitects.com

Nick Baker Architects

Link to email disclaimer. Nick Baker Architects Ltd trading as Nick Baker Architects. Registered in England 7286832 at Oddstones, Back Ln, Cross in Hand, TN21 0QG

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail

From: Craig, Tessa [<mailto:Tessa.Craig@camden.gov.uk>]  
Sent: 01 June 2016 18:11  
To: Ignacio Calvo <[Calvo@nickbakerarchitects.com](mailto:Calvo@nickbakerarchitects.com)>  
Subject: 26 West End Lane- 2016/2083/P

Dear Mr Calvo,

The initial Basement Impact Assessment audit has been returned by Campbell Reith today (please see attached).

The screening has not been completed which means that it has not been possible for Campbell Reith to confirm whether all potential impacts have been identified. Section 4 discusses the findings and a summary of the required actions is presented in Appendix 2.

Please review the audit and provide responses to the outstanding matters when possible.

Kind regards,

Tessa Craig  
Planning Officer  
Regeneration and Planning  
Culture and Environment  
London Borough of Camden

Telephone: 020 7974 6750  
Web: [camden.gov.uk](http://camden.gov.uk)  
Level 2  
5 Pancras Square  
5 Pancras Square  
London N1C 4AG



Please consider the environment before printing this email.

**You can [sign up](#) to our new and improved planning e-alerts to let you know about new planning applications, decisions and appeals.**

This e-mail may contain information which is confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected. This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer.

18 August 2016

5698

Further Response to Audit  
of  
26 Westend Lane  
London  
NW6 4PA

Item 4.3

- Q1. No
- Q2. No
- Q3. No
- Q4. No
- Q5. Yes - however see calculation page B.01. which is in response to Appendix F3.
- Q6. No
- Q7. No
- Q8. No
- Q9. No
- Q10. No
- Q11. No
- Q12. No
- Q13. No
- Q14. No.

Item 4.4

- Q5. No - a. There is no basement.  
b. Surface water will continue to be drained as per existing



Q6 The proposed extension is not deeper than the existing ground floor so the flood risk is not altered. Furthermore, Fig 2.5 PPS25 states "...confirm with LPA whether a FRA is required..." There is no automatic requirement to do a full FRA. It is our considered opinion (in light of CI234) that we not consider one necessary.

#### Item 4.5

Clarification has been previously provided that permeable paving will be used. The final part of the paragraph is not clear. We reiterate that there will be no increase in surface water run off. If this response is insufficient please amplify the query.

#### Item 4.8

A desk study has been carried out – this is implicit in the preparation of a screening BIA.

#### Item 4.10

TZG have previously carried out an inspection of the building (access was not made to the adjoining property). The building exhibits all the normal distortions expected in buildings of this type and age. There is no subsidence. The existing building is beyond the bulb of pressure of the new retaining wall and cannot possibly be affected by it.

The comments made by CRH in 4.10 regarding tree removal are generic and not relevant to the screening BIA. We have already confirmed that no root protection zone is being affected.

#### Item 5.8

It seems bizarre that a modification to the back garden so modest that it could be carried out as a minor DIY gardening project requires a full screening BIA.

I reiterate that CI.234 is pertinent and allows a degree of proportionality to be applied.

---

## London

Friars Bridge Court  
41- 45 Blackfriars Road  
London, SE1 8NZ

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

## Birmingham

Chantry House  
High Street, Coleshill  
Birmingham B46 3BP

T: +44 (0)1675 467 484  
E: birmingham@campbellreith.com

## Surrey

Raven House  
29 Linkfield Lane, Redhill  
Surrey RH1 1SS

T: +44 (0)1737 784 500  
E: surrey@campbellreith.com

## Manchester

No. 1 Marsden Street  
Manchester  
M2 1HW

T: +44 (0)161 819 3060  
E: manchester@campbellreith.com

## Bristol

Wessex House  
Pixash Lane, Keynsham  
Bristol BS31 1TP

T: +44 (0)117 916 1066  
E: bristol@campbellreith.com

## UAE

Office 705, Warsan Building  
Hessa Street (East)  
PO Box 28064, Dubai, UAE

T: +971 4 453 4735  
E: uae@campbellreith.com

Campbell Reith Hill LLP. Registered in England & Wales. Limited Liability Partnership No OC300082  
A list of Members is available at our Registered Office at: Friars Bridge Court, 41- 45 Blackfriars Road, London SE1 8NZ  
VAT No 974 8892 43