

14 Parliament Hill
London, NW3 2SY

Basement Impact Assessment
Audit

For
London Borough of Camden

Project Number: 12336-82
Revision: F1

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
W: www.campbellreith.com

Document History and Status

Revision	Date	Purpose/Status	File Ref	Author	Check	Review
D1	August 2016	Comment	FDfd-12336-82-040816-14 Parliament Hill-D1.doc	F Drammeh	E M Brown	E M Brown
F1	October 2016	Planning	FDfd-12336-82-261016-14 Parliament Hill-F1.doc	F Drammeh	A J Marlow	E M 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	26/10/2016 13:11
Path	FDfd-12336-82-261016-14 Parliament Hill-F1.doc
Author	F Drammeh, MEng (Hons)
Project Partner	E M Brown, BSc MSc CGeol FGS
Project Number	12336-82
Project Name	14 Parliament Hill
Planning Reference	2016/1248/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 14 Parliament Hill, NW3 2SY (Camden Planning reference 2016/1248/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 BIA was undertaken by Geotechnical & Environmental Associates (GEA) and the individuals involved have suitable qualifications.
- 1.5. The proposal includes the construction of a ground floor extension into the rear garden, however, due to the slope of the ground, this will require some excavation.
- 1.6. A site specific ground investigation has not been undertaken. Reference is made to a nearby ground investigation which recorded Made Ground over London Clay. The BIA has not confirmed the depth or nature of the foundations, however, they should be taken through to bear on to the London Clay.
- 1.7. Perched water may exist in the Made Ground and the BIA now recommends that this should be considered in the design of the temporary and permanent works.
- 1.8. Clarification was requested on where the additional surface water from the rear terraced area which is indicated to be permeable paving would be discharged. This has now been provided as discussed in Audit paragraph 4.7.
- 1.9. The screening exercise did not identify that the site is in an area which previously flooded. The BIA has now been updated to consider this impact as discussed in Audit paragraph 4.9.
- 1.10. A works programme is not included although it is understood construction will be undertaken in parallel with the works at No 15A. A detailed programme should be provided once details are agreed with No 15A.
- 1.11. Although no details are provided, it is acknowledged that due to the works being undertaken in parallel with No. 15A, which is the property most likely to be affected, adverse effects on stability are reduced. There are no slope stability concerns, any other surface water

considerations or wider hydrogeological issues regarding the proposed development. It is accepted that the information provided for the BIA reflects this.

2.0 INTRODUCTION

- 2.1. CampbellReith was instructed by London Borough of Camden (LBC) on 11 July 2017 to carry out a Category A Audit on the Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) submitted as part of the Planning Submission documentation for 14 Parliament Hill, NW3 2SY (Camden Planning reference 2016/1248/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 "*Erection of ground floor infill extension of side passage and ground floor rear/side extension with green roof and rooflights at rears of nos. 14 and 15a plus patios and landscaping works*".
- 2.6. The Audit Instruction also confirmed 14 Parliament Hill is not listed, nor is it a neighbour to listed buildings.

2.7. CampbellReith accessed LBC's Planning Portal on 26 July 2017 and gained access to the following relevant documents for audit purposes:

- Basement Impact Assessment (BIA): Geotechnical & Environmental Associates (GEA), dated May 2016
- Design & Access Statement (DAS): Barnaby Gunning Studio Ltd, dated March 2016
- Barnaby Gunning Studio Ltd Planning Application Drawings (all Revision A, dated 23 and 24 February 2016) consisting of
 - Location Plan and Proposed site plans (181_G_100A)
 - Existing Plans (181_G_050A)
 - Proposed Plans (181_G_110A)
 - Existing Elevations (181_G_051A)
 - Proposed Elevations (181_G_111A)
 - Proposed Sections (181_G_112A & 181_G_113A)
 - 3D views (181_V_200A)

2.8. Following the initial audit, queries on two issues relating to hydrology were raised. The revised GEA BIA (dated October 2016) was received from the Planning Officer by email on 10 October 2016. This has not been included in Appendix 3 due to file size although the accompanying email from Barnaby Gunning (received on 14 October 2016) which indicates the amendments to the BIA is included.

2.9. Further clarification was requested on one of the queries and the email response (received on 25 October 2016) from Barnaby Gunning 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?	Yes	See Audit paragraph 4.1.
Is data required by Cl.233 of the GSD presented?	No	No information provided (see Audit paragraph 4.4) and works programme not included.
Does the description of the proposed development include all aspects of temporary and permanent works which might impact upon geology, hydrogeology and hydrology?	No	No information provided but acknowledged groundworks may be undertaken in close coordination with the development at No. 15A which has planning permission (see Audit paragraph 4.4).
Are suitable plan/maps included?	No	Scheme drawings incomplete and relevant Arup GSD, SFRA or other relevant extracts with site location indicated not provided although references to these were made (see Audit paragraph 4.5).
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	Relevant map extracts with site location not provided. Justification to Q8 incomplete.
Hydrogeology Screening: Have appropriate data sources been consulted? Is justification provided for 'No' answers?	No	Relevant Arup GSD maps not provided. Response to Question 1b should be 'Unknown'. Justification to Q2 is incomplete and response to Q5 contradicted information in other parts of the report although this has since been clarified (see Audit paragraphs 4.6 to 4.8).
Hydrology Screening: Have appropriate data sources been consulted? Is justification provided for 'No' answers?	No	Relevant Arup GSD maps not provided. Response to Q6 was incorrect, however, this issue has since been addressed (see Audit paragraphs 4.5 and 4.9).
Is a conceptual model presented?	No	Not presented, although reference is made to a nearby ground investigation in the desk study sections.

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Land Stability Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	Yes	BIA Section 4.1
Hydrogeology Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	No	Not provided although one issue from the screening should have been carried forward. This issue has now been addressed.
Hydrology Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	No	Provided but one issue not carried forward from the screening. The scoping to Q5 is contradictory to information given in other parts of the report. These issues have now been addressed (see Audit paragraph 4.7).
Is factual ground investigation data provided?	No	Site specific ground investigation not undertaken.
Is monitoring data presented?	No	Site specific ground investigation not undertaken.
Is the ground investigation informed by a desk study?	N/A	Desk study presented, but ground investigation not undertaken.
Has a site walkover been undertaken?	No	Not stated.
Is the presence/absence of adjacent or nearby basements confirmed?	No	Not mentioned although it is stated in the Design and Access (DAS) statement that planning permission has been granted for the construction of a four storey building which includes a basement excavation at No. 15A.
Is a geotechnical interpretation presented?	No	Site specific ground investigation not undertaken.
Does the geotechnical interpretation include information on retaining wall design?	N/A	As above.
Are reports on other investigations required by screening and scoping presented?	N/A	None identified.

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Are the baseline conditions described, based on the GSD?	No	Detailed proposals not provided. Description of neighbouring properties included in DAS, however this is incomplete.
Do the base line conditions consider adjacent or nearby basements?	No	Not considered.
Is an Impact Assessment provided?	No	BIA not undertaken beyond scoping.
Are estimates of ground movement and structural impact presented?	No	Not provided although it is acknowledged that the property most likely to be affected (No. 15A) has planning permission which includes a basement level extension adjacent to the proposed No. 14 extension.
Is the Impact Assessment appropriate to the matters identified by screen and scoping?	N/A	BIA not undertaken beyond scoping.
Has the need for mitigation been considered and are appropriate mitigation methods incorporated in the scheme?	No	Details not provided, however, it is understood from the DAS that works are to be undertaken in conjunction with the proposals to No. 15A.
Has the need for monitoring during construction been considered?	No	It is understood from DAS that works are to be undertaken in conjunction with the works to No 15A which is the property most likely to be affected.
Have the residual (after mitigation) impacts been clearly identified?	N/A	Mitigation not provided.
Has the scheme demonstrated that the structural stability of the building and neighbouring properties and infrastructure will be maintained?	No	Although it is understood that works are to be undertaken in conjunction with the works to No. 15A which is the property most likely to be affected.
Has the scheme avoided adversely affecting drainage and run-off or causing other damage to the water environment?	No	Contradictory information was given on the drainage proposals. This issue has now been appropriately addressed in an email response (see Audit paragraph 4.8).

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Has the scheme avoided cumulative impacts upon structural stability or the water environment in the local area?	No	Structural stability not demonstrated.
Does report state that damage to surrounding buildings will be no worse than Burland Category 2?	No	Although it is understood that works are to be undertaken in conjunction with the works to No. 15A which is the property most likely to be affected.
Are non-technical summaries provided?	Yes	Summary of issues identified from the screening provided.

4.0 DISCUSSION

- 4.1. The Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) has been carried out by a well-known firm of engineering consultants, Geotechnical & Environmental Associates (GEA) and the individuals involved have CEng MICE, C.Geol and CIWEM qualifications.
- 4.2. The Design and Access Statement (DAS) prepared by Barnaby Gunning Studio Ltd also comprises a screening assessment, however, this was not audited.
- 4.3. The property comprises a four storey building which is part of 'three paired semi-detached' (13, 14 and 15A) properties. The site slopes up from street level to the rear garden by 1.20m. Due to the irregularly shaped plot of land, the site is bounded by both No. 15A and 15 to the east and No. 13 to the west.
- 4.4. The proposal includes the construction of a ground floor extension into the rear garden, however, due to the slope of the ground, this will require a 1.20m excavation. There is no indication of a construction methodology. It is stated in the DAS that planning permission has been granted for the demolition of the existing 2 storey building at No. 15A and the construction of a 4 storey building which also includes excavation at basement level. From the drawings, it appears the rear of the new building to No 15A will be adjacent to the proposed extension to No. 14. It is understood the works will be undertaken in parallel, therefore on this basis the eastern boundary with No. 15A would not be a retaining wall.
- 4.5. Although it is evident that a thorough screening process has been largely undertaken, it would be beneficial if the requirements of CPG4 are followed accurately by the inclusion of map extracts from the Arup GSD, Environment Agency and the LBC Flood Risk Management Strategy identifying the site location on each map. This would help to support statements made in the BIA screening process. The justifications to Question 3 of the hydrogeology screening and Question 8 of the hydrology screening were considered incomplete.
- 4.6. A 'No' response was given to Question 1b of the hydrogeology screening which relates to whether or not the proposed basement level will extend to beneath the water table. Whilst it is accepted as stated in the justification that the London Clay is not sufficiently permeable to support a water table, the response ignored the potential that perched water may be encountered which may require temporary dewatering measures. The revised BIA now acknowledges the possible presence of perched water in the Made Ground and recommends temporary dewatering measures during construction and for the basement to be tanked in the permanent case to prevent groundwater ingress.
- 4.7. A 'No' response was given to Question 4 of the hydrogeology screening which relates to whether or not there will be a change in the proportion of paved areas, however, it was noted

that this contradicted other sections of the report which stated there will be a slight increase in the paved area. Issues relating to this increase have since been addressed as discussed below.

- 4.8. It was stated in the hydrogeology screening that no surface water would be discharged into the ground due to the London Clay being unsuitable for SUDS type soakaways. This appeared to be contradictory to the statement in the scoping that part of the rear terrace area would be permeable paving. The revised BIA now states *'any discharged water would be routed with the roof water to the front of the property and into the sewers. Failing this, softer SUDs could be proposed such as rain gardens at the rear of the property'*. Further clarification was requested on the specific proposal and an email response from Barnaby Gunning on 25 October 2016 (Appendix 3) states the current proposal is for the additional water to be routed into the sewers.
- 4.9. A 'No' response was given to Question 6 of the hydrology screening which relates to whether or not the site is in an area at risk of flooding. Parliament Hill flooded in 2002 as indicated on Figure 3iii of the SFRA and Figure 15 of the Arup GSD. The revised BIA now considers this issue however the mitigation measure which includes installing a positive pump device does not fully address the issue as the issue relates to surface water run-off. The accompanying email to the revised BIA from Barnaby Gunning (dated 14 October 2016) however states that the owners of the property have indicated that during the 2002 event, flooding occurred *'significantly downstream of the site'*. Whilst the above responses do not fully address the issue, Barnaby Gunning Studio Ltd Drawing No 181_G_100A which includes levels, shows Parliament Hill slopes down significantly which would indicate surface water will flow downstream away from the site.
- 4.10. The response to Question 13 of the land stability screening states that due to the level of the garden and the assumption that the neighbouring properties are of similar construction, the proposed extension would not significantly increase the differential depth of the foundations relative to the neighbouring properties. Although no information is provided, due to the proposals to No. 15A, this is accepted.
- 4.11. It is stated in the land stability scoping that *'it is unclear at this stage whether there are plans to remove the existing trees on site'*. This should be confirmed. If the trees are to be removed, it is recommended the foundations be taken through to beyond the shrink-swell zone of influence determined from guidance given in the NHBC Standard.
- 4.12. A site specific ground investigation has not been undertaken. Reference is made to a site c.20m away where a *'nominal thickness'* of Made Ground over London Clay was encountered. Whilst the depth and nature of the proposed foundations are not indicated, they should be taken through to the London Clay beneath as the thickness of Made Ground could vary significantly on site.
- 4.13. A works programme has not been submitted as required by Cl.233 of the GSD.

- 4.14. Although a site specific investigation has not been undertaken and no construction details are provided, it is understood that construction is to undertaken in parallel with the proposals at No. 15A, which is the property most likely to be affected by the proposals to No. 14. It is therefore accepted that despite some omissions in the BIA, there are no slope stability concerns, any other surface water considerations or wider hydrogeological issues regarding the proposed development.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 5.1. The BIA was undertaken by Geotechnical & Environmental Associates (GEA) and the individuals involved have suitable qualifications.
- 5.2. The proposal includes the construction of a ground floor extension into the rear garden, however, due to the slope of the ground, this will require a 1.20m excavation.
- 5.3. A site specific ground investigation has not been undertaken. Reference is made to a nearby ground investigation which recorded Made Ground over London Clay. The BIA has not confirmed the depth or nature of the foundations, however, they should be taken through to bear on to the London Clay.
- 5.4. Perched water may exist in the Made Ground and the BIA now recommends that this should be considered in the design of the temporary and permanent works.
- 5.5. Clarification was requested on where the additional surface water from the rear terraced area which is indicated to be permeable paving would be discharged. This has now been provided as discussed in Audit paragraph 4.7.
- 5.6. The screening exercise did not identify that the site is in an area which previously flooded. The BIA has now been updated to consider this impact as discussed in Audit paragraph 4.9.
- 5.7. A works programme is not included although it is understood construction will be undertaken in parallel with the works at No 15A. A detailed programme should be provided once details are agreed with No 15A.
- 5.8. Although no details are provided, it is acknowledged that due to the works being undertaken in parallel with No. 15A, which is the property most likely to be affected, adverse effects on stability are reduced. There are no slope stability concerns, any other surface water considerations or wider hydrogeological issues regarding the proposed development. It is accepted that the information provided for the BIA reflects this.

Appendix 1: Residents' Consultation Comments

None

Appendix 2: Audit Query Tracker

Audit Query Tracker

Query No	Subject	Query	Status	Date closed out
1	BIA format	Works programme not included.	Open – Programme to be provided once details are agreed with No 15A.	N/A
2	Hydrology	Contradictory information on where the additional surface water as a result of the slight increase in paved areas will be discharged.	Closed – clarification provided. See Audit paragraph 4.8 and Appendix 3.	25/10/2016
3	Hydrology	BIA did not identify site is located in an area which previously flooded.	Closed – see Audit paragraph 4.9.	25/10/2016

Appendix 3: Supplementary Supporting Documents

Barnaby Gunning email responses dated 14 and 25 October 2016



Re: 14 Parliament Hill: Revised Geotech Report: email 4 of 4.

Barnaby Gunning

to:

Thuair, Charles, LizBrown

14/10/2016 10:36

Cc:

FatimaDrammeh, camdenaudit

Hide Details

From: Barnaby Gunning <barnabygunning@mac.com>

To: "Thuair, Charles" <Charles.Thuair@camden.gov.uk>, LizBrown@campbellreith.com

Cc: FatimaDrammeh@campbellreith.com, camdenaudit@campbellreith.com

Charles, Liz, please see my notes below and the

In the Campbell Reith Audit, 3 queries were raised.

1 BIA format Works programme not included.

Open – Programme to be provided once details are agreed with No 15A. N/A

Noted, my understanding is that response is necessary at present

2 Hydrology Contradictory information on where the additional surface water as a result of the slight increase in paved areas will be discharged.

Open – clarification requested.

See PDF file 3003_J16076_part_1.pdf, page 8, Table 3.1.3, response to question 3

"Any discharged water would be routed with the roof water to the front of the property and into the sewers. Failing this, softer SUDS could be proposed such as "rain gardens" at the rear of the property."

3 Hydrology BIA did not identify site is located in an area which previously flooded.

Open – risk to be assessed and addressed as appropriate.

See PDF file 3003_J16076_part_1.pdf, page 8, Table 3.1.3, response to question 6

"The SFRA does indicate that the street of Parliament Hill was flooded in 2002 although this does not indicate that the site flooded.

In accordance with paragraph 5.11 of the CPG a positive pumped device will be installed in order to further protect the site from sewer flooding."

Incidentally, in relation to point 3, I have checked with my clients to understand whether the property or neighbouring properties were affected by the 2002 flood. The owned the property at this date and have confirmed that the sewer flooding occurred substantially downstream of the site.

I trust this clarifies the queries raised

Kind regards,

Barnaby Gunning

On 14 Oct 2016, at 10:25, Thuair, Charles <Charles.Thuair@camden.gov.uk> wrote:

Can you advise our engineers as below? Note the possibility of extra fees.
thanks

--

Charles Thuair
Senior Planning Officer

Telephone: 020 7974 5867

From 1 October 2016 you will not receive a letter from us if your neighbour submits a planning application. You can still find out about planning applications:

- on new improved posters on lamp posts
- by signing up to [planning e-alerts](#)
- in the planning section of the [Camden Account](#)
- through adverts in the Camden New Journal and Ham & High

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

From: LizBrown@campbellreith.com [<mailto:LizBrown@campbellreith.com>]

Sent: 13 October 2016 21:43

To: Thuair, Charles

Cc: FatimaDrammeh@campbellreith.com; camdenaudit@campbellreith.com; Sexton, Gavin

Subject: Re: FW: 14 Parliament Hill: Revised Geotech Report: email 4 of 4.

Charles

Thanks for this updated information. As you say, the files are huge.

As I remember, we only had two queries on this BIA relating to the confirmation of the absence of any impacts on the hydrology. Can you ask the applicant to identify where we can find the information relating to the queries raised in our audit? If the supplementary information confirms there are no impacts, there will be no additional fees. If there are impacts which require assessment, we will have to charge a further £997.50 to review that information and update our report.

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Regards

Liz Brown
Partner

<ATT00001.jpg>

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

Tel +44 (0)20 7340 1700

www.campbellreith.com

From: "Thuair, Charles" <Charles.Thuair@camden.gov.uk>

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

<FatimaDrammeh@campbellreith.com>

Date: 10/10/2016 16:15

Subject: FW: 14 Parliament Hill: Revised Geotech Report: email 4 of 4.

Part 4

--

Charles Thuair
Senior Planning Officer

Telephone: 020 7974 5867

From 1 October 2016 you will not receive a letter from us if your neighbour submits a planning application. You can still find out about planning applications:

- on new improved posters on lamp posts
- by signing up to [planning e-alerts](#)
- in the planning section of the [Camden Account](#)
- through adverts in the Camden New Journal and Ham & High

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

From: Barnaby Gunning [<mailto:barnabygunning@mac.com>]
Sent: 10 October 2016 13:16
To: Smith, Kristina
Cc: Thuair, Charles
Subject: Re: 14 Parliament Hill: Revised Geotech Report: email 1 of 4.

Kristina, Charles

unbelievably our geotechnical engineers have taken until now to get back to us.

The amended document is quite large so I am sending, once again in 4 parts.

I have highlighted the amended text in pink in the document to make it easier to understand what has been changed.

Kind regards

Barnaby Gunning.

On 4 Aug 2016, at 14:14, Smith, Kristina <Kristina.Smith@camden.gov.uk> wrote:

Hello Barnaby,

On behalf of Charles, who is currently on leave, I am forwarding on the initial BIA audit report which identifies some areas where further information is required, as summarised in Appendix 2.

Kind regards,

Kristina Smith
Planning Officer

Telephone: 020 7974 4986

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.

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.

If you have received this e-mail in error please immediately notify the sender by email and delete it and any attachments from your system.

This email has been sent from CampbellReith, which is the trading name of Campbell Reith Hill LLP, a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales. Registered number, OC300082. Registered address: Friars Bridge Court, 41-45 Blackfriars Road, London, SE1 8NZ. No employee or agent is authorised to conclude any binding agreement(s) on behalf of Campbell Reith Hill LLP with any other party by email unless it is an attachment on headed paper. Opinions, conclusions and other information in this email and any attachments which do not relate to the official business of Campbell Reith Hill LLP are neither given or endorsed by it. Please note that email traffic and content may be monitored.

As this e-mail has been transmitted over a public network the accuracy, completeness and virus status of the transmitted information is not secure and cannot be guaranteed. If verification is required please telephone the sender of the email.

This message has been scanned for malware by Websense. www.websense.com

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.



Re: 14 Parliament Hill: Revised Geotech Report: email 4 of 4.

Barnaby Gunning to: FatimaDrammeh
Cc: camdenaudit, "Thuairé, Charles", camdenaudit

25/10/2016 09:48

History: This message has been replied to.

Dear Fatima

In the current proposals any additional water is routed to the front of the property and into the sewers.

Kind regards

Barnaby

> On 25 Oct 2016, at 09:46, FatimaDrammeh@campbellreith.com wrote:
>
> Good morning Barnaby,
> Thanks for the responses below. With regards to the second point, could you
> be more specific please? Your response below gives options rather than what
> is actually being proposed.
>
> Kind regards
> Fatima Drammeh
> Geotechnical Engineer
>
> (Embedded image moved to file: pic61508.jpg)
>
> Friars Bridge Court,
> 41-45 Blackfriars Road,
> London
> SE1 8NZ
>
> Tel +44 (0)20 7340 1700
> www.campbellreith.com
> (Embedded image moved to file: pic53753.gif)
>
>
>
> From: Barnaby Gunning <barnabygunning@mac.com>
> To: "Thuairé, Charles" <Charles.Thuairé@camden.gov.uk>,
> LizBrown@campbellreith.com
> Cc: FatimaDrammeh@campbellreith.com, camdenaudit@campbellreith.com
> Date: 14/10/2016 10:36
> Subject: Re: 14 Parliament Hill: Revised Geotech Report: email 4 of
4.
>
>
>
> Charles, Liz, please see my notes below and the
>
> In the Campbell Reith Audit, 3 queries were raised.
>
> 1 BIA format Works programme not included.
> Open - Programme to be provided once details are agreed with No 15A. N/A
> Noted, my understanding is that response is necessary at present
> page17image16408 page17image16728

> 2 Hydrology Contradictory information on where the additional surface water
> as a result of the slight increase in paved areas will be discharged.
> Open - clarification requested.
> See PDF file 3003_J16076_part_1.pdf, page 8, Table 3.1.3, response to
> question 3

>
> "Any discharged water would be routed with the roof water to the front of
> the property and into the sewers. Failing this, softer SUDS could be
> proposed such as "rain gardens" at the rear of the property."
>

>
> 3 Hydrology page 17 image 25536 BIA did not identify site is located in an area
> which previously flooded.
> Open - risk to be assessed and addressed as appropriate.
>

>
> See PDF file 3003_J16076_part_1.pdf, page 8, Table 3.1.3, response to
> question 6

>
> "The SFRA does indicate that the street of Parliament Hill was flooded in
> 2002 although this does not indicate that the site flooded.
> In accordance with paragraph 5.11 of the CPG a positive pumped device will
> be installed in order to further protect the site from sewer flooding."
>

> Incidentally, in relation to point 3, I have checked with my clients to
> understand whether the property or neighbouring properties were affected by
> the 2002 flood. The owner of the property at this date has confirmed that
> the sewer flooding occurred substantially downstream of the site.
>

> I trust this clarifies the queries raised
>

> Kind regards,
>
> Barnaby Gunning
>

>
> On 14 Oct 2016, at 10:25, Thuaire, Charles <
> Charles.Thuaire@camden.gov.uk> wrote:

>
> Can you advise our engineers as below? Note the possibility of extra
> fees.
> thanks
>

> --
> Charles Thuaire
> Senior Planning Officer
>

> Telephone: 020 7974 5867
>
>

>
> From 1 October 2016 you will not receive a letter from us if your
> neighbour submits a planning application. You can still find out
> about planning applications:

- > . on new improved posters on lamp posts
- > . by signing up to planning e-alerts
- > . in the planning section of the Camden Account
- > . through adverts in the Camden New Journal and Ham &
> High

>
> You can sign up to our new and improved planning e-alerts to let you
> know about new planning applications, decisions and appeals.
>

> From: LizBrown@campbellreith.com [mailto:LizBrown@campbellreith.com]
> Sent: 13 October 2016 21:43
> To: Thuaire, Charles
> Cc: FatimaDrammeh@campbellreith.com; camdenaudit@campbellreith.com;
> Sexton, Gavin
> Subject: Re: FW: 14 Parliament Hill: Revised Geotech Report: email 4
> of 4.
>

> Charles

> Thanks for this updated information. As you say, the files are huge.
>

> As I remember, we only had two queries on this BIA relating to the
> confirmation of the absence of any impacts on the hydrology. Can you
> ask the applicant to identify where we can find the information
> relating to the queries raised in our audit? If the supplementary
> information confirms there are no impacts, there will no additional
> fees. If there are impacts which require assessment, we will have to
> charge a further £997.50 to review that information and update our
> report.
>

> If you have any questions, please let me know.
>

> Regards
> Liz Brown
> Partner
>

> <ATT00001.jpg>
> Friars Bridge Court,
> 41-45 Blackfriars Road,
> London
> SE1 8NZ
>

> Tel +44 (0)20 7340 1700
> www.campbellreith.com
>

> From: "Thuairé, Charles" <Charles.Thuairé@camden.gov.uk>
> To: "'LizBrown@campbellreith.com'" <LizBrown@campbellreith.com>
>> , "FatimaDrammeh@campbellreith.com" <FatimaDrammeh@campbellreith.com>
>>

> Date: 10/10/2016 16:15
> Subject: FW: 14 Parliament Hill: Revised Geotech Report: email
> 4 of 4.
>

> Part 4
>

> --
> Charles Thuairé
> Senior Planning Officer
>

> Telephone: 020 7974 5867

>
>
>
>
> From 1 October 2016 you will not receive a letter from us if your
> neighbour submits a planning application. You can still find out
> about planning applications:

- > . on new improved posters on lamp posts
- > . by signing up to planning e-alerts
- > . in the planning section of the Camden Account
- > . through adverts in the Camden New Journal and Ham & High

> You can sign up to our new and improved planning e-alerts to let you
> know about new planning applications, decisions and appeals.

> From: Barnaby Gunning [mailto:barnabygunning@mac.com]
> Sent: 10 October 2016 13:16
> To: Smith, Kristina
> Cc: Thuaire, Charles
> Subject: Re: 14 Parliament Hill: Revised Geotech Report: email 1 of
> 4.

> Kristina, Charles

> unbelievably our geotechnical engineers have taken until now to get
> back to us.

> The amended document is quite large so I am sending, once again in 4
> parts.

> I have highlighted the amended text in pink in the document to make
> it easier to understand what has been changed.

> Kind regards

> Barnaby Gunning.

> On 4 Aug 2016, at 14:14, Smith, Kristina <
> Kristina.Smith@camden.gov.uk> wrote:

> Hello Barnaby,

> On behalf of Charles, who is currently on leave, I am forwarding on
> the initial BIA audit report which identifies some areas where
> further information is required, as summarised in Appendix 2.

> Kind regards,

> Kristina Smith
> Planning Officer

> Telephone: 020 7974 4986

>
 >
 > 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.
 > [Click here to report this email as spam.](#)

> If you have received this e-mail in error please immediately notify the
 > sender
 > by email and delete it and any attachments from your system.

> This email has been sent from CampbellReith, which is the trading name of
 > Campbell Reith Hill LLP, a limited liability partnership registered in
 > England
 > and Wales. Registered number, OC300082. Registered address: Friars Bridge
 > Court,
 > 41-45 Blackfriars Road, London, SE1 8NZ. No employee or agent is authorised
 > to
 > conclude any binding agreement(s) on behalf of Campbell Reith Hill LLP with
 > any
 > other party by email unless it is an attachment on headed paper. Opinions,
 > conclusions and other information in this email and any attachments which do
 > not
 > relate to the official business of Campbell Reith Hill LLP are neither given
 > or
 > endorsed by it. Please note that email traffic and content may be monitored.

> As this e-mail has been transmitted over a public network the accuracy,
 > completeness and virus status of the transmitted information is not secure
 > and
 > cannot be guaranteed. If verification is required please telephone the
 > sender of
 > the email.

>
 >
 >
 >
 >
 >
 >
 >
 >
 > This message has been scanned for malware by Websense.
 > www.websense.com

>
> 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.
>
> If you have received this e-mail in error please immediately notify the
sender by email and delete it and any attachments from your system. This email
has been sent from CampbellReith, which is the trading name of Campbell Reith
Hill LLP, a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales.
Registered number, OC300082. Registered address: Friars Bridge Court, 41-45
Blackfriars Road, London, SE1 8NZ. No employee or agent is authorised to
conclude any binding agreement(s) on behalf of Campbell Reith Hill LLP with
any other party by email unless it is an attachment on headed paper. Opinions,
conclusions and other information in this email and any attachments which do
not relate to the official business of Campbell Reith Hill LLP are neither
given or endorsed by it. Please note that email traffic and content may be
monitored.
>
> As this e-mail has been transmitted over a public network the accuracy,
completeness and virus status of the transmitted information is not secure and
cannot be guaranteed. If verification is required please telephone the sender
of the email. <pic61508.jpg><pic53753.gif>

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