

UPDATED
Independent Review
of
Basement Impact Assessment for
planning application 2017/2794/P
(Minor Material Amendment to 2015/4553/P)

in connection with
planned development at

254-256 Camden Road
London
NW1 9HF

for

London Borough of Camden

LBH4382

Ver 3.0

September 2017

LBH WEMBLEY

ENGINEERING

Project No: LBH4382

Report Ref: **LBH4382 Ver 3.0**

Date: 19th September 2017

Report approved by:

Seamus R Lefroy-Brooks

BSc(hons) MSc CEng MICE CGeol FGS CEnv MEnvSc FRGS SiLC
RoGEP UK Registered Ground Engineering Adviser

LBH WEMBLEY Geotechnical & Environmental
Unit 12 Little Balmer
Buckingham Industrial Park
Buckingham
MK18 1TF

Tel: 01280 812310

email: enquiry@lbhgeo.co.uk

website: www.lbhgeo.co.uk

Contents

Contents	3
Foreword-Guidance Notes	5
1. Introduction	6
1.1 Brief	6
1.2 Report Structure	6
1.3 Information Provided	6
2. Local Plan Policy A5 - Basements	8
3. Assessment of Adequacy of Information Provided	10
3.1 Basement Impact Assessment Stages	10
3.1.1 Stage 1: Screening	10
3.1.1.1 Subterranean (Groundwater) Flow	10
3.1.1.2 Stability	10
3.1.1.3 Surface Flow and Flooding	10
3.1.2 Stage 2: Scoping	11
3.1.3 Stage 3: Site Investigation and Study	11
3.1.4 Stage 4: Impact Assessment	11
3.2 The Audit Process	12
3.2.1 Qualifications / Credentials of authors	12
3.2.2 BIA Scope	13
3.2.3 Description of Works	13
3.2.4 Investigation of Issues	13
3.2.5 Mapping Detail	13
3.2.6 Assessment Methodology	13
3.2.7 Mitigation	14
3.2.8 Monitoring	14
3.2.9 Residual Impacts after Mitigation	14
4. Assessment of Acceptability of Residual Impacts	15
4.1 Proposed Construction Methodology	15
4.2 Soundness of Evidence Presented	15
4.3 Reasonableness of Assessments	15
4.4 Robustness of Conclusions and Proposed Mitigation Measures	15

5. Conclusions	16
5.1 Original Submission	16
5.2 Revised Submission	16

Foreword-Guidance Notes

GENERAL

This report has been prepared for a specific client and to meet a specific brief. The preparation of this report may have been affected by limitations of scope, resources or time scale required by the client. Should any part of this report be relied on by a third party, that party does so wholly at its own risk and LBH WEMBLEY disclaims any liability to such parties.

The observations and conclusions described in this report are based solely upon the agreed scope of work. LBH WEMBLEY has not performed any observations, investigations, studies or testing not specifically set out in the agreed scope of work and cannot accept any liability for the existence of any condition, the discovery of which would require performance of services beyond the agreed scope of work.

VALIDITY

Should the purpose for which the report is used, or the proposed use of the site change, this report may no longer be valid and any further use of or reliance upon the report in those circumstances shall be at the client's sole and own risk. The passage of time may result in changes in site conditions, regulatory or other legal provisions, technology or economic conditions which could render the report inaccurate or unreliable. The information and conclusions contained in this report should therefore not be relied upon in the future and any such reliance on the report in the future shall again be at the client's own and sole risk.

THIRD PARTY INFORMATION

The report may present an opinion based upon information received from third parties. However, no liability can be accepted for any inaccuracies or omissions in that information.

1. Introduction

Proposed development at this site includes demolition and replacement of a two-storey building with a partial undercroft basement on Camden Mews with a three storey building comprising flats with a single storey basement. A planning application was made under reference 2015/4553/P and permission was granted on 1st December 2016 subject to a Section 106 legal agreement.

A minor material application has subsequently been submitted (Ref: 2017/2794/P) which seeks to change the footprint and arrangement of the basement to the proposed building on Camden Mews.

1.1 Brief

LBH WEMBLEY Geotechnical & Environmental have been commissioned to provide an Independent assessment of information submitted primarily against the requirements of the Camden Local Plan (2017) but with close reference to the procedures, processes and recommendations of the guidance in Camden Planning Guidance 4 (CPG4 2015) and associated Camden geological, hydrogeological and hydrological study 2010 (referred to as the 'Arup report').

1.2 Report Structure

This report commences with a description of the Camden Development Plan policy requirements, and then considers and comments on the submission made and details any concerns in regards to:

1. The level of information provided (including the completeness of the submission and the technical sufficiency of the work carried out)
2. The proposed methodologies in the context of the site and the development proposals
3. The soundness of the evidence presented and the reasonableness of the assessments made.
4. The robustness of the conclusions drawn and the mitigation measures proposed in regard to drainage, flooding, groundwater conditions and structural stability

1.3 Information Provided

The information studied comprises the following:

1. Basement Impact Assessment by Campbell Reith, dated 11th September 2017, Ref: FDemb-12047-120917-BIA-F2
2. Ground Movement Assessment by Campbell Reith, dated 12th September 2017, Ref: FDemb-12047-020917-GMA-F2
3. Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Desktop by Campbell Reith, dated 12th September 2017, Ref: FDli-12047-020715-DS-F2
4. Design and Access Statement by Archadia Architects, dated August 2015, unreferenced
5. Arboricultural Site Appraisal by D F Clarke Bionomique, dated 26th November 2014, Ref: DFCEP 3353
6. Drawings of existing buildings by Archadia Architects, dated 4th July 2014, Ref: OH233-0-21 P1 and -22 P1
7. Drawings of proposed buildings by Archadia Architects, dated 4th July 2014, Ref: OH233-3-01 P1, OH233-1-01 P1, -05 P1 and -06 P1
8. Tree Survey Plan by D F Clarke Bionomique, dated 27th October 2014, Ref: DFC P3353TSP

9. Letter to Mark Wells from D F Clarke Bionomique, dated 25th May 2017, unreferenced
10. Letter to Camden from Campbell Reith, dated 1st June 2017, Ref: FDfd-12047-010617-Ashton Court.doc
11. Schedule of Planning Drawing Changes by Calford Seaden, undated, Ref: K160423 – Ashton Court – Rev004
12. Drawings of proposed buildings by Calford Seaden, Ref: K160423 A(0)101,110,111revB, A(2)200rev4, 220rev4, 240rev5, 260rev4, 280rev1, 300rev7 ,301rev6, 310, 320rev5, 321rev4, 401rev6, 402rev5, 403rev4, 900rev2

2. Local Plan Policy A5 - Basements

The Policy A5 reads as follows:

The Council will only permit basement development where it is demonstrated to its satisfaction that the proposal would not cause harm to:

- a. neighbouring properties;*
- b. the structural, ground, or water conditions of the area;*
- c. the character and amenity of the area;*
- d. the architectural character of the building; and*
- e. the significance of heritage assets.*

In determining proposals for basements and other underground development, the Council will require an assessment of the scheme's impact on drainage, flooding, groundwater conditions and structural stability in the form of a Basement Impact Assessment and where appropriate, a Basement Construction Plan.

The siting, location, scale and design of basements must have minimal impact on, and be subordinate to, the host building and property. Basement development should:

- f. not comprise of more than one storey;*
- g. not be built under an existing basement;*
- h. not exceed 50% of each garden within the property;*
- i. be less than 1.5 times the footprint of the host building in area;*
- j. extend into the garden no further than 50% of the depth of the host building measured from the principal rear elevation;*
- k. not extend into or underneath the garden further than 50% of the depth of the garden;*
- l. be set back from neighbouring property boundaries where it extends beyond the footprint of the host building; and*
- m. avoid the loss of garden space or trees of townscape or amenity value.*

Exceptions to f. to k. above may be made on large comprehensively planned sites.

The Council will require applicants to demonstrate that proposals for basements:

- n. do not harm neighbouring properties, including requiring the provision of a Basement Impact Assessment which shows that the scheme poses a risk of damage to neighbouring properties no higher than Burland Scale 1 'very slight';*
- o. avoid adversely affecting drainage and run-off or causing other damage to the water environment;*
- p. avoid cumulative impacts;*
- q. do not harm the amenity of neighbours;*
- r. provide satisfactory landscaping, including adequate soil depth;*

s. do not harm the appearance or setting of the property or the established character of the surrounding area;

t. protect important archaeological remains; and

u. do not prejudice the ability of the garden to support trees where they are part of the character of the area.

The Council will not permit basement schemes which include habitable rooms and other sensitive uses in areas prone to flooding.

We will generally require a Construction Management Plan for basement developments.

Given the complex nature of basement development, the Council encourages developers to offer security for expenses for basement development to adjoining neighbours.

The following policies in the Local Plan are also relevant to basement development and will be taken into account when assessing basement schemes:

- “Policy A2 Open space”;
- “Policy A3 Biodiversity”;
- “Policy D1 Design”;
- “Policy D2 Heritage”; and
- “Policy CC3 Water and flooding”.

In addition to the Local Plan Policy Camden publishes Camden Planning Guidance on Basements and Lightwells. These CPG documents do not carry the same weight as the main Camden Development Plan documents (including the above Policy A5) but they are important supporting documents.

It is noted that the current CPG4 Planning Guidance on Basements and Lightwells (2015) has not yet been updated to reflect the Local Plan and refers primarily to the now withdrawn Planning Policy DP27 on Basements and Lightwells.

It should be noted that the Basement Impact Assessment for the previous application had been prepared and was judged against the 2013 version of CPG4, not the 2015 version.

This report relies essentially upon the current policy A5 as stated above and also upon the technical guidance provided by the Council in November 2010 entitled the Camden Geological, Hydrogeological and Hydrological Study, Guidance for Subterranean Development (CGHHS) or the ‘Arup Report’.

3. Assessment of Adequacy of Information Provided

3.1 Basement Impact Assessment Stages

The methodology described in the CGHHS for assessing the impact of a proposed basement with regard to the matters described in A5 takes the form of a staged approach.

3.1.1 Stage 1: Screening

Screening uses checklists to identify whether there are matters of concern (with regard to hydrogeology, hydrology or ground stability) which should be investigated using a BIA (Section 6.2 and Appendix E of the CGHSS) and is the process for determining whether or not a BIA is required. There are three checklists as follows:

- subterranean (groundwater) flow
- slope stability
- surface flow and flooding

3.1.1.1 Subterranean (Groundwater) Flow

A screening checklist for the impact of the proposed basement on groundwater is included in the BIA (Document 1).

This identifies no potential issues of concern.

3.1.1.2 Stability

A screening checklist for the impact of the proposed basement on land stability is included in the BIA (Document 1).

This identifies the following potential issues of concern:

- **London Clay is the shallowest strata at the site.**
- **There is a history of seasonal shrink-swell subsidence in the local area, and/or evidence of such effects at the site.**
- **The site is within 5m of a highway or pedestrian right of way.**
- **The proposed basement will significantly increase the differential depth of foundations relative to the neighbouring properties.**

3.1.1.3 Surface Flow and Flooding

A screening checklist for the impact of the proposed basement on surface water flow and flooding is included in the BIA (Document 1).

This identifies no potential issues of concern.

3.1.2 Stage 2: Scoping

Where the checklist is answered with a “yes” or “unknown” to any of the questions posed in the flowcharts, these matters are carried forward to the scoping stage of the BIA process.

The scoping produces a statement which defines further the matters of concern identified in the screening stage. This defining should be in terms of ground processes, in order that a site specific BIA can be designed and executed (Section 6.3 of the CGHSS).

Checklists have been provided in the BIA and there is a scoping stage described in the BIA.

The issues identified from the checklists as being of concern have been assigned bold text in the previous sections and are as follows:

- **London Clay is the shallowest strata at the site.**
The guidance advises that of the at-surface soil strata present in LB Camden, the London Clay is the most prone to seasonal shrink-swell (subsidence and heave).
- **There is a history of seasonal shrink-swell subsidence in the local area, and/or evidence of such effects at the site.**
The guidance advises that there are multiple potential impacts depending on the specific setting of the basement development. For example, in terraced properties, the implications of a deepened basement/foundation system on neighbouring properties should be considered.
- **The site is within 5m of a highway or pedestrian right of way.**
The guidance advises that excavation for a basement may result in damage to the road, pathway or any underground services buried in trenches beneath the road or pathway.
- **The proposed basement will significantly increase the differential depth of foundations relative to the neighbouring properties.**
The guidance advises that excavation for a basement may result in structural damage to neighbouring properties if there is a significant differential depth between adjacent foundations.

3.1.3 Stage 3: Site Investigation and Study

Site investigation and study is undertaken to establish the baseline conditions. This can be done by utilising existing information and/or by collecting new information (Section 6.4 of the CGHSS).

The site investigation submitted comprised a single window sample hole to 10m below ground level and two foundation inspection pits. A further trial pit was undertaken in August 2017. A single groundwater and gas monitoring visit was also undertaken.

3.1.4 Stage 4: Impact Assessment

Impact assessment is undertaken to determine the impact of the proposed basement on the baseline conditions, taking into account any mitigation measures proposed (Section 6.5 of the CGHSS).

The submitted BIA (Document 1) includes an Impact Assessment stage and the following statement are made:.

- **There is a history of seasonal shrink-swell subsidence in the local area, and/or evidence of such effects at the site.**

“...the proposed basement level is beyond the recommended founding depth derived from NHBC Standards Part 4: Chapter 4.2, Building near trees [10]. This is therefore of neutral significance.”

- **The site is within 5m of a highway or pedestrian right of way.**

“The owner of the adjacent highways (likely to be the London Borough of Camden) should be consulted to establish associated constraints;

Statutory undertakers, including utility operators, should be consulted to establish if any such assets could be affected by the works and associated constraints”

- **The proposed basement will significantly increase the differential depth of foundations relative to the neighbouring properties.**

“An assessment of the strain as a result of the installation of the bored piled wall and basement excavation indicates that the maximum damage to 103 Camden Mews falls within Category 1, ‘very slight’.”

3.2 The Audit Process

The audit process is based on reviewing the BIA against the criteria set out in Section 6 of the CGHSS and requires consideration of specific issues:

3.2.1 Qualifications / Credentials of authors

Check qualifications / credentials of author(s):

Qualifications required for assessments

Surface flow and flooding	A Hydrologist or a Civil Engineer specialising in flood risk management and surface water drainage, with either: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The “CEng” (Chartered Engineer) qualification from the Engineering Council; or a Member of the Institution of Civil Engineers (“MICE”); or • The “C.WEM” (Chartered Water and Environmental Manager) qualification from the Chartered Institution of Water and Environmental Management.
Subterranean (groundwater) flow	A Hydrogeologist with the “CGeol” (Chartered Geologist) qualification from the Geological Society of London.
Land stability	A Civil Engineer with the “CEng” (Chartered Engineer) qualification from the Engineering Council and specialising in ground engineering; or A Member of the Institution of Civil Engineers (“MICE”) and a Geotechnical Specialist as defined by the Site Investigation Steering Group. With demonstrable evidence that the assessments have been made by them in conjunction with an Engineering Geologist with the “CGeol” (Chartered Geologist) qualification from the Geological Society of London.

The Authors meet the above requirements.

3.2.2 BIA Scope

Check BIA scope against flowcharts (Section 6.2.2 of the CGHSS).

Document 8 indicates that one tree will be removed from the garden area to the southwest of the site, adjacent to the proposed basement.

- **Trees will be felled as part of the proposed development and/or works are proposed within tree protection zones where trees are to be retained**

The guidance advises that the soil moisture deficit associated with felled tree will gradually recover. In high plasticity clay soils (such as London Clay) this will lead to gradual swelling of the ground until it reaches a new value. This may reduce the soil strength which could affect the slope stability. Additionally the binding effect of tree roots can have a beneficial effect on stability and the loss of a tree may cause loss of stability.

Document 8 states “One tree will be removed to facilitate the development. The tree has poor form and structural issues within the crown, resulting from historic pruning and mis-management, as well as outgrowing its location. The tree will be replaced...”

3.2.3 Description of Works

Does the description of the proposed development include all aspects of temporary and permanent works which might impact upon geology, hydrogeology and hydrology?

Yes

3.2.4 Investigation of Issues

Have the appropriate issues been investigated? This includes assessment of impacts including land stability, hydrology, hydrogeology.

It has not been possible to confirm the nature of the foundations to the adjacent building at 103 Camden Mews so a worst case has been assumed, with the foundations assumed to comprise strip foundations at 0.50m depth

3.2.5 Mapping Detail

Is the scale of any included maps appropriate? That is, does the map show the whole of the relevant area of study and does it show sufficient detail?

The line of the proposed piling is not well indicated but has been described.

3.2.6 Assessment Methodology

Have the issues been investigated using appropriate assessment methodology?

The assessment has been made using the damage category criteria set out in policy A5 (and using the updated CIRIA guidance for the movement of the embedded pile walls.)

3.2.7 Mitigation

Has the need for mitigation been considered and are appropriate mitigation methods incorporated in the scheme? (Section 5 of the CGHSS)

Mitigation has been considered and the adequacy of this has been confirmed for the new scheme..

3.2.8 Monitoring

Has the need for monitoring been addressed and is the proposed monitoring sufficient and adequate? (Section 7.2.3 of the CGHSS)

A monitoring strategy has been specified and outlined in Document 2.

3.2.9 Residual Impacts after Mitigation

Have the residual (after mitigation) impacts been clearly identified?

Yes. *"An assessment of the strain as a result of the installation of the bored piled wall and basement excavation indicates that the maximum damage to 103 Camden Mews falls within Category 1, 'very slight'.*

4. Assessment of Acceptability of Residual Impacts

4.1 Proposed Construction Methodology

The proposed construction methodology appears appropriate.

“An indicative basement Construction Sequence Report has been prepared by Campbell Reith(SKsk-12047-120917-CS-F2) and is contained within the ground movement assessment report. The proposed method of construction comprises the installation of a 450mm diameter contiguous bored piled wall around the perimeter of the basement following demolition of the existing building. This is proposed to be offset by c.1.20m away from the neighbouring property wall due to the rig size. Excavation would be carried out in two stages; approximately 500mm of the excavation undertaken then propping installed, followed by excavation down to 50mm below the underside of the basement slab level.”

4.2 Soundness of Evidence Presented

Evidence has been provided to justify the acceptability of the revised scheme.

4.3 Reasonableness of Assessments

The criteria used for the revised assessments meet the policy standards.

4.4 Robustness of Conclusions and Proposed Mitigation Measures

The conclusions appear to be sufficiently robust to meet the requirements of Policy A5.

5. Conclusions

5.1 Original Submission

The originally submitted BIA reflected the processes and procedures set out in DP27 and CPG4 (2013), but did not fully reflect the requirements of CPG4(2015) or, more importantly, Policy A5 of the new Local Plan.

Nevertheless, given the intended scheme and form of construction it was considered that the submission could be considered sufficient to accord with A5 in respect of drainage, flooding and groundwater conditions.

However, it was considered that the original submission did not demonstrate that the scheme posed a risk of damage to neighbouring properties no higher than Burland Scale 1 'very slight'.

It was therefore suggested that a revised submission should be provided.

5.2 Revised Submission

The revised submission contains a switch of construction methodology from steel sheet piling to stiffer 450mm diameter concrete bored piling, together with revised ground movement assessments that now accord with current Camden policy requirements.

The revised submission is considered acceptable.