**Basement Impact Assessment AUDIT: Instruction**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Case officer contact details:** | Robert Lester | **Date of audit request:** | | 23/01/2018 | |
| **Camden Reference:** | 2017/6891/P & 2017/6892/P | **Statutory consultation end date:** | | TBC | |
| **Site Address:** | 17 Ranulf Road, London, NW2 2BT | | | | |
| **Reason for Audit:** | Planning application (including Basement Extension/Lightwells) | | | | |
| **Proposal description:**  Single storey rear infill extension, single storey side/rear conservatory extension, side/rear dormer extensions with rooflights, erection of new chimney, rear terrace extension, extension to existing basement with lightwells, replacement terrace balustrading at ground and first floor levels, window and door alterations, new access gate and minor works to forecourt. | | | | | |
| **Relevant planning background**  N/A | | | | | |
| Do the basement proposals involve a listed building or does the site neighbour any listed buildings? | | | No | | |
| Is the site in an area of relevant constraints?  (check site constraints in M3/Magic GIS) | | | Slope stability | | No |
| Surface Water flow and flooding | | No |
| Subterranean (groundwater) flow | | No |
| Does the application require determination by Development Control Committee in accordance fall the Terms of Reference[[1]](#footnote-1) | | | No | | |
| No/Does the scope of the submitted BIA extend beyond the screening stage? | | | No | | |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Items provided for Basement Impact Assessment (BIA)1** | | | | |
| **Item provided** | | | **Yes/No/NA2** | **Name of BIA document/appendix in which information is contained.** |
| 1 | Description of proposed development. | | Yes | *Description in 1.06 of BIA (screening Report)* |
| 2 | Plan showing boundary of development including any land required temporarily during construction. | | Yes | *030 – A – Loc – P5*  *030 – B – Loc – P5* |
| 3 | Plans, maps and or photographs to show location of basement relative to surrounding structures. | | Yes | *Refer architects drawings.* |
| 4 | Plans, maps and or photographs to show topography of surrounding area with any nearby watercourses/waterbodies including consideration of the relevant maps in the Strategic FRA by URS (2014) | | Yes | *Sections 4.00 (Ground Stability) and associated diagrams ‘e to h’. Also section 5.00 (Surface flow and Flooding) and diagrams ‘j to m’ of Michael Alexander’s BIA* |
| 5 | Plans and sections to show foundation details of adjacent structures. | | No |  |
| 6 | Plans and sections to show layout and dimensions of proposed basement. | | Yes | *Refer Architects drawings in Section 2 of the BIA Screening Reports.* |
| 7 | Programme for enabling works, construction and restoration. | | No |  |
| 8 | Identification of potential risks to land stability (including surrounding structures and infrastructure), and surface and groundwater flooding. | | Yes | *Sections 3,4 & 5 of Michael Alexander’s BIA* |
| 9 | Assessment of impact of potential risks on neighbouring properties and surface and groundwater. | | Yes | *Sections 3,4 & 5 of Michael Alexander’s BIA* |
| 10 | Identification of significant adverse impacts. | | Yes | *No significant adverse impacts were identified after mitigation. Refer to Section 3.02.1 and 4.02* |
| 11 | Evidence of consultation with neighbours. | | No | *There has been informal conversations, minutes could be circulated* |
| 12 | Ground Investigation Report and Conceptual Site Model including   * Desktop study * exploratory hole records * results from monitoring the local groundwater regime * confirmation of baseline conditions * factual site investigation report | | No | *However reference has been made to the Ground Investigation report by GEA for number 15 Ranulf Road – a project Michael Alexander successfully completed in 2017.* |
| 13 | Ground Movement Assessment (GMA). | | No | Due to the limited impact of the basement proposals we do not consider this necessary or applicable in this instance. |
| 14 | Plans, drawings, reports to show extent of affected area. | | No |  |
| 15 | Specific mitigation measures to reduce, avoid or offset significant adverse impacts. | | Yes | *Sections 3,4 & 5 and particularly the Observations in section 4.02 of Michael Alexander’s BIA* |
| 16 | Construction Sequence Methodology (CSM) referring to site investigation and containing basement, floor and roof plans, sections (all views), sequence of construction and temporary works. | | No |  |
| 17 | Proposals for monitoring during construction. | | No | We do not consider this necessary or applicable to this scheme. |
| 18 | Confirmatory and reasoned statement identifying likely damage to nearby properties according to Burland Scale | | Yes | *Sections 3,4 & 5 and particularly the Observations in section 4.02.5 of Michael Alexander’s BIA* |
| 19 | Confirmatory and reasoned statement with supporting evidence that the structural stability of the building and neighbouring properties will be maintained (by reference to BIA, Ground Movement Assessment and Construction Sequence Methodology), including consideration of cumulative effects. | | Yes | *In Sections 3,4 & 5 the issues are discussed in general terms.* |
| 20 | Confirmatory and reasoned statement with supporting evidence that there will be no adverse effects on drainage or run-off and no damage to the water environment (by reference to ground investigation, BIA and CSM), including consideration of cumulative effects. | | Yes | *Sections 3,4 & 5 and particularly the clauses in 5.01 and section 5.02 of Michael Alexander’s BIA* |
| 21 | Identification of areas that require further investigation. | | No | *No specific requirements were identified* |
| 22 | Non-technical summary for each stage of BIA. | | Yes | *We would consider that the conclusions in sections 3.02.1, 4.02 & 5.02.1 of the Michael Alexander BIA are sufficiently clear to be read by a non-technical audience.* |
|  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | |  |  |
|  | | |  |  |
| **Additional BIA components (added during Audit)** | | |  |  |
| **Item provided** | | **Yes/No/NA2** |  | **Comment** |
|  | |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |

Notes:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FULL Name of contact [to be sent Invoice for final costs]\*** |  |
| **Address of contact** |  |
| **Company (if relevant)** |  |
| **Contact telephone number** |  |
| **Date** |  |

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

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