

**13 Prince Albert Road  
London, NW1 7SR**

**Basement Impact Assessment  
Audit**

For  
London Borough of Camden

Project Number: 12466-61

Revision: F1

March 2018

Campbell Reith Hill LLP  
Friars Bridge Court  
41-45 Blackfriars Road  
London  
SE1 8NZ

T: +44 (0)20 7340 1700  
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	April 2017	Comment	GMcKemb1246 6-61-040417- 13 Prince Albert Road- D1.docx	GMcK	EMB	EMB
F1	March 2018	For planning	GMcKemb1246 6-61-210318- 13 Prince Albert Road- F1.docx	GMcK	EMB	EMB

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 2017

### Document Details

Last saved	20/03/2018 15:06
Path	GMcKemb12466-61-040417-13 Prince Albert Road- D1.docx
Author	G McKenna, BSc FGS
Project Partner	E M Brown, BSc MSc CGeol FGS
Project Number	12466-61
Project Name	13 Prince Albert Road
Planning Reference	2016/7048/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 13 Prince Albert Road, London NW1 7SR (planning reference 2016/7048/P and 2016/5051/L). The basement is considered to fall within Category C 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. Subsequent to the issue of the initial audit, CampbellReith was advised by Camden that the basement had already been constructed and the audit was retrospective.
- 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 proposed development includes construction of an additional basement level and alteration to a current lightwell. There is minor alteration to the lower ground floor and ground floor.
- 1.5. The application refers to a previously accepted application from 2011. The application requests an increase in basement depth from the 2011 submission to accommodate services. The house and surrounding structures, including those sharing a Party Wall, are indicated as being grade I listed.
- 1.6. A BIA, Structural Methodology and Temporary Works scheme have been provided for review. The BIA prepared by Geotechnical and Environmental Associates (GEA) includes the desk study, screening and scoping, a record of a ground investigation and an impact assessment. The Structural Methodology prepared by Richard Tant Associates (RTA) includes a proposed basement construction sequence, temporary work systems and some structural calculations, including some prepared by WT&L consulting engineers. The BIA authors' qualifications are in accordance with CPG4 guidelines for all sections.
- 1.7. Information on the ground movement associated with basement construction and a monitoring strategy were not provided, although the results of monitoring carried out during construction were submitted in the latest BIA. Despite settlements of up to 20mm being reported, the applicant has advised that no cracking greater than 1mm (corresponding with Burland Category 1) was observed.

- 1.8. The BIA includes the majority of the information required from a desk study in line with the GSD Appendix G1. However, with the exception of Thames Water, it is unknown whether utility companies have been approached with regards to the presence of underground infrastructure within the development's zone of influence.
- 1.9. The ground conditions comprise Made Ground underlain by London Clay. An interpretative geotechnical report was not provided. The site walkover dates from 2011.
- 1.10. The London Clay is classified as an Unproductive Strata and the site is not located within a Groundwater Source Protection Zone. Groundwater was encountered at approximately 4m bgl. A standpipe was installed but not successfully monitored. Whilst outline calculations for the retaining wall assume groundwater at ground level, it is not clear what has been assumed for the design of the remaining walls.
- 1.11. The current basement is founded in the London Clay and the proposed development would be founded deeper within the London Clay and at some distance from surrounding basements. As such the proposed development is not considered to adversely affect the hydrogeology.
- 1.12. It is accepted that the proposed development is at a low risk of flooding.
- 1.13. It is stated that there will be no change in permeable site area due to the proposed development. This is unclear from the drawings. A subsequent clarification from the applicant notes that surfacing will be permeable, allowing surface water to drain into the ground.
- 1.14. Retaining wall calculations have only been presented for the party wall. The assumptions for those are not justified by a geotechnical interpretative report.
- 1.15. It was noted in the initial audit that the temporary works required assessment for stability of excavating adjacent to the underpinned building. This is no longer applicable as the audit is retrospective.
- 1.16. It is accepted that there are no land stability impacts caused by slopes.
- 1.17. Whilst there are queries and matters where further information is required to comply with CPG, it is noted that this audit is being carried out after construction. The only significant outstanding query is with respect to the permanent stability of the basement. It is assumed that this was found to be acceptable during the Party Wall award and Building Regulations checking processes.

## 2.0 INTRODUCTION

- 2.1. CampbellReith was instructed by London Borough of Camden (LBC) on 21<sup>st</sup> March 2016 to carry out a Category C Audit on the Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) submitted as part of the Planning Submission documentation for 13 Prince Albert Road, London, NW1 7SR, Camden Reference 2016/7048/P.
- 2.2. The Audit was carried out in accordance with the Terms of Reference set by LBC, noting that it is a retrospective audit as the basement has already been constructed. 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; and,
  - 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: "*Construction of basement extension with plant room and outlet, enclosed lightwell, relocated new tree all within front garden (Retrospective amendment to ref: 2011/6227/P dated 26/04/2012).*"
- 2.6. CampbellReith accessed LBC's Planning Portal on 4 April 2017 and gained access to the following relevant documents for audit purposes:

- Desk Study and Basement Impact Assessment Report – Revision 4 (ref J11186) dated 15<sup>th</sup> December 2016 by Geotechnical and Environmental Associates Limited.
- Structural Methodology Report – Revision E (ref RT/3561/Rev E) dated 19<sup>th</sup> December 2016 by Richard Tant Associates.
- Design and Access Statement New (ref 13 Prince Albert Road) dated December 2016 by Hugh Cullum Architects Limited.

2.7. Subsequent to the issue of the initial audit report, a revised BIA was uploaded to the planning portal on 7 September 2017. Also uploaded were numerous calculations and drawings, some of which dated back to 2015, and including superseded versions in some cases. The following documents and drawings were reviewed for this updated audit report:

- Desk Study and Basement Impact Assessment Report – Issue 5 (ref J11186) dated April 2017 by Geotechnical and Environmental Associates Limited
- Outline structural calculations for party wall retaining wall, temporary props and walers, and slabs, temporary works sequencing (Rev D), pile layout and schedule by RTA and WT&L
- Email clarification forwarded by LBC, 13 February 2018 (contained in Appendix 3).

### 3.0 BASEMENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT AUDIT CHECK LIST

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Are BIA Author(s) credentials satisfactory?	Yes	The author's qualifications are in accordance with CPG4 guidelines for all sections.
Is data required by Cl.233 of the GSD presented?	No	Information is broadly in line with the GSD Appendix G1. Assumptions have been made with regard to underground infrastructure. An up-to-date site walkover is not provided.
Does the description of the proposed development include all aspects of temporary and permanent works which might impact upon geology, hydrogeology and hydrology?	No	The application has included indicative temporary works that are to be designed by the contractor. The suggested method provided has a potential stability issue in Stage 3. However, it noted that construction has been completed.
Are suitable plans/maps included?	No	Arup GSD and Camden SFRA map extracts could be included.
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	"No" answers are not justified, however potential impacts have been correctly identified.
Hydrogeology Screening: Have appropriate data sources been consulted? Is justification provided for 'No' answers?	No	Some "No" answers are not justified, however potential impacts have been identified.
Hydrology Screening: Have appropriate data sources been consulted? Is justification provided for 'No' answers?	No	Some "No" answers are not justified, however potential impacts have been identified. Subsequent information notes that external areas comprise permeable paving.



Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Is a conceptual model presented?	Yes	However, no groundwater monitoring has been undertaken at the site.
Land Stability Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	Yes	
Hydrogeology Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	Yes	
Hydrology Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	Yes	Subsequent clarification describes SUDS.
Is factual ground investigation data provided?	Yes	A cable percussion log and two window sampler logs.
Is monitoring data presented?	No	A single round of groundwater monitoring was attempted. The standpipe was blocked at 2m.
Is the ground investigation informed by a desk study?	Yes	Comments relating to this are included in section 1.0 of the BIA.
Has a site walkover been undertaken?	Yes	Walkover survey carried out in 2011.
Is the presence/absence of adjacent or nearby basements confirmed?	Yes	Answer to Q13 of the stability screening assessment indicates that adjacent properties have shallow foundations.
Is a geotechnical interpretation presented?	No	Section 3 of BIA prepared by GEA includes geological information. No geotechnical information is presented in the BIA.
Does the geotechnical interpretation include information on retaining wall design?	No	Section 3 of BIA prepared by GEA includes geological information. No geotechnical information is presented in the BIA.
Are reports on other investigations required by screening and scoping presented?	No	The Structural Methodology report by RTA refers to advanced geotechnical analysis for a deep sewer that crosses the corner of the site but it has not been provided. Ground Movement

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
		Assessments for the adjacent building, highway and shallow sewer are not provided.
Are baseline conditions described, based on the GSD?	No	Refer to Section 4.
Do the base line conditions consider adjacent or nearby basements?	No	Refer to Section 4.
Is an Impact Assessment provided?	Yes	Impact assessments are provided in sections 5.0, 6.0 and 7.0 of the BIA but not all potential impacts have been fully assessed.
Are estimates of ground movement and structural impact presented?	No	Settlement and ground movement assessment is not provided nor referenced. Movement monitoring results subsequently presented.
Is the Impact Assessment appropriate to the matters identified by screening and scoping?	No	However, the effect of the proposed development on the amount of impermeable area subsequently clarified. With respect to stability, the audit is retrospective.
Has the need for mitigation been considered and are appropriate mitigation methods incorporated in the scheme?	No	Long term stability not demonstrated by structural calculations (not all scenarios presented, no geotechnical interpretation provided and no groundwater monitoring submitted).
Has the need for monitoring during construction been considered?	NA	Results of movement monitoring presented.
Have the residual (after mitigation) impacts been clearly identified?	No	Long term stability not demonstrated.
Has the scheme demonstrated that the structural stability of the building and neighbouring properties and infrastructure will be maintained?	No	Long term stability not demonstrated.
Has the scheme avoided adversely affecting drainage and run-off or causing other damage to the water environment?	Yes	

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Has the scheme avoided cumulative impacts upon structural stability or the water environment in the local area?	No	Long term stability not demonstrated.
Does report state that damage to surrounding buildings will be no worse than Burland Category 1?	No	Applicant states that no damage worse than Burland Category 1 observed.
Are non-technical summaries provided?	No	However, the BIA is written so as to be understandable.

## 4.0 DISCUSSION

- 4.1. A BIA, Structural Methodology and temporary works scheme have been provided for review. The BIA prepared by Geotechnical and Environmental Associates (GEA) includes the desk study, screening and scoping, a record of a ground investigation (including three logs), impact assessment and Envirocheck report. The Structural Methodology prepared by Richard Tant Associates (RTA) with input from WT&L includes the proposed basement construction sequence, temporary work systems and some structural calculations. The BIA authors' qualifications are in accordance with CPG4 guidelines for all sections.
- 4.2. The proposed development makes reference to an approved basement level. Based on our understanding and information in the Design and Access Statement the proposed development is an amendment to the 2011/6460/L and 2011/6227/P applications. The previously approved basement is no longer possible due to the requirement for the Thames Water soil main to remain in its current location, and therefore the basement was to be deepened.
- 4.3. It is understood that the basement has been constructed and this audit is therefore retrospective.
- 4.4. The development includes excavations in the front and rear garden and construction of an additional basement level beneath the existing lower ground floor level by approximately 3.60m. Locally, there is an additional 1.90m excavation to 5.50m below lower ground floor level for a swimming pool. Based on the architect drawings, the total excavation depth is in the order of 8.60m beneath the front driveway (adjacent to Prince Albert Road) and 4.30m beneath the rear garden. The proposed basement extends beyond the current footprint of the building into both the front and rear gardens.
- 4.5. The site and surrounding structures, including those sharing Party Walls, are indicated as being grade II listed.
- 4.6. The suggested construction methodology includes stepped underpinning of the Party Wall with 12 Prince Albert Road. The underpins are not specified and only shown indicatively on plans appended to the Structural Methodology report at the Party Wall with number 12 Prince Albert Road. The areas of basement outside the existing building footprint are to be formed within a contiguous piled wall with a reinforced concrete liner. A suggested method of works with sequencing of a contiguous pile wall with temporary props and struts is provided. It should be noted that Stage 3 of the suggested method of works indicates an approximately 4m high unreinforced vertical cutting adjacent to the underpins. It is assumed that an acceptable method of construction was agreed under the Party Wall award.

- 4.7. The BIA includes the majority of the information required from a desk study in line with the GSD Appendix G1. However, with the exception of Thames Water it is unknown if utility companies have been approached with regards to the presence of underground infrastructure within the development's zone of influence. It is assumed that any affected utilities would have been consulted during the planning process.
- 4.8. Baseline conditions are not fully represented as the depth of current basement is not provided, the groundwater table is unknown due to unsuccessful monitoring and the neighbouring foundations are not accurately known. An up-to-date site walkover survey was not presented.
- 4.9. A site investigation has been undertaken comprising a cable percussion borehole at the front of the house to 20m bgl and two window sample boreholes to a maximum depth of 6.0m bgl. The ground conditions comprise Made Ground underlain by London Clay (firm to stiff clay). An interpretative geotechnical report was not provided.
- 4.10. The London Clay is classified as an Unproductive Strata and the site is not located within a Groundwater Source Protection Zone. Groundwater was encountered at approximately 4m bgl during progression of one of the window sampler holes. A standpipe was installed in the cable percussion hole to 7m bgl however it was never successfully monitored as the first attempt to monitor indicated a block at 2m where it was dry. The proposed development will extend below the level of the groundwater strike. It is assumed that this was successfully dealt with during construction and that appropriate assumptions were made in design calculations submitted to satisfy the Party Wall surveyor and Building Regulations.
- 4.11. It is accepted that the proposed development will not adversely affect the hydrogeology. The current basement is already founded within the London Clay and therefore deepening the excavation within the London Clay will not affect groundwater flow. Although the area of basement is increased, the basement extension is remote from other basements. There are no other hydrogeological concerns such as ponds or lost rivers shown in the area.
- 4.12. It is accepted that the site not in a Flood Risk Zone and is at low risk of flooding. The site is within a Critical Drainage Area (Group 3-010) which requires a drainage assessment to be undertaken if impermeable areas are increased.
- 4.13. It is stated that there will be no change in impermeable site area due to the proposed development; however, review of the drawings provided did not permit this to be verified. Subsequent clarifications have stated that external areas are surfaced with permeable paving.
- 4.14. Structural calculations for the Party Wall have been included based on a  $K_a$  value of 0.33. An interpretive geotechnical report has not been provided and the retained material appears to be London Clay so the justification for this value is unclear. An allowable bearing capacity of

160kPa has also been cited but not justified by a geotechnical report. No structural design information is presented for the contiguous pile wall. It is assumed that sufficient calculations were submitted to satisfy the Party Wall surveyor and Building Regulations.

- 4.15. A Ground Movement Assessment (GMA) and calculations for the adjoining property and nearby Prince Albert Road have not been included. There has been no assessment of Damage Impact to surrounding structures, in accordance with the Burland Scale. The latest BIA includes the results of movement monitoring. Whilst records show lateral movement of up to 8mm and settlement of up to 20mm, the applicant has stated that no cracking greater than 1mm (equivalent to Burland Category 1) has been observed.
- 4.16. It is stated in the Structural Methodology report that two sewers cross the site, one at shallow depth and one at 18m, and that Thames Water have approved the scheme. It is assumed that confirmation of this approval was obtained prior to planning permission being granted.
- 4.17. It is accepted that there are no concerns regarding slope stability.

## 5.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 5.1. The qualifications of the authors are in accordance with LBC requirements.
- 5.2. The development includes excavations in the front and rear garden and construction of an additional basement level beneath the existing lower ground floor level. There is an additional excavation for a swimming pool. The basement has already been constructed.
- 5.3. The site and surrounding structures, including those sharing Party Walls, are indicated as being grade II listed.
- 5.4. Information within the BIA is broadly in line with the recommendations in the GSD Appendix G1. The presence of underground utility infrastructure, other than that owned by Thames Water, within the zone of influence was not identified.
- 5.5. Three borehole logs confirm the underlying ground conditions to comprise Made Ground over London Clay. Groundwater was encountered at approximately 4.0m bgl. The data is reported to be included within an interpretative report that has not been provided as part of the submission documents. Groundwater monitoring has not been undertaken at the site. The site walkover survey dates from 2011.
- 5.6. It is accepted that the proposed development will not impact the wider hydrogeological environment.
- 5.7. It is accepted that the site is at low risk of flooding.
- 5.8. Confirmation of the use of permeable paving to external areas has been submitted.
- 5.9. Structural calculations for the Party Wall have been provided; however, without a geotechnical interpretative report the assumptions cannot be justified. No structural calculations have been provided for the other retaining structures. It is assumed that satisfactory calculations were submitted to agree the Party Wall award and obtain Building Regulations approval.
- 5.10. A Ground Movement Assessment (GMA) has not been presented for the adjoining property or Prince Albert Road. However, the latest BIA includes the results of movement monitoring and the applicant has stated that no damage exceeding Burland Category 1 has been observed.
- 5.11. Temporary works sequencing and structural designs of props and slabs have been presented. The suggested temporary works plan shows a vertical unsupported face adjacent to the proposed underpins at Stage 3. It is assumed that an appropriate methodology was agreed for the Party Wall award.

- 5.12. It is accepted that there are no land stability impacts caused by slopes.
- 5.13. Although a number of the queries raised after the initial audit remain to be addressed, it is recognised that this is a retrospective application. The BIA identified potential impacts with respect to surface water runoff, a Thames Water sewer, the structural design of the substructure in the temporary and permanent cases, and damage to surrounding properties. Subsequent clarifications have addressed the issues of surface water and damage to neighbouring structures. It is assumed that the structural design has been approved by the Party Wall surveyor and Building Regulations and that Thames Water approval was obtained during the planning process.



## **Appendix 1: Residents' Consultation Comments**

None

## **Appendix 2: Audit Query Tracker**

Audit Query Tracker

Query No	Subject	Query	Status/Response	Date closed out
1	BIA	Underground infrastructure	Open – Underground utility infrastructure information for all utilities should be provided. The impact assessment should be updated, if required. Information on underground structures should be provided.	NA – retrospective application
2	BIA	Site investigation factual report; location of exploratory holes, GEA Ground Investigation Report ref J11186A dated 26 Oct 2012 is referenced in the Audit Instruction	Open – to be provided	NA – retrospective application
3	BIA	Site investigation interpretative report; parameters for retaining wall design	Open – to be provided	NA – retrospective application. Assumed that subsequent detailed design satisfied Party Wall surveyor and Building Regulations
4	BIA	Non-technical summaries	Open – to be provided	NA – retrospective application
5	BIA	Walkover survey	Open – to be provided	NA – retrospective application
6	BIA	Works programme	Open – to be provided	NA – retrospective application
7	Surface Water Flow	Confirmation of change in impermeable site area required.	Closed – to be provided including SUDS proposals if appropriate.	13/02/18 – see Appendix 3
8	Subterranean Water Flow	Lack of groundwater monitoring and assessment	Open – to be provided	NA – retrospective application. Assumed that subsequent detailed design satisfied Party Wall surveyor and Building Regulations

9	Subterranean Water Flow	Site Engineering Surveys Ltd Monitoring Report SES-8835-MR156 dated September 2016 is referenced in the Audit Instruction	Open – to be provided	NA – retrospective application.
10	Land Stability	GMA calculations and references	Closed – to be provided	13/02/18 – see Appendix 3
11	Land Stability	Outline structural monitoring proposals	Closed – to be reviewed in association with GMA calculations.	13/02/18 – see Appendix 3
12	Land Stability	Outline structural calculations	Open – to be provided	NA – retrospective application. Assumed that subsequent detailed design satisfied Party Wall surveyor and Building Regulations
13	Land Stability	Temporary stability	Open – to be provided	NA – retrospective application. Assumed that subsequent detailed design satisfied Party Wall surveyor and Building Regulations
14	Land Stability	Thames Water approvals	Open – to be provided	NA – retrospective application. Assumed that approval obtained during planning process

## **Appendix 3: Supplementary Supporting Documents**



RE: 13 Prince Albert Road - 2016/7048/P & 2017/0464/L

Whittingham, Gideon to: LizBrown@campbellreith.com

13/02/2018 16:49

Cc: "camdenaudit@campbellreith.com",  
"GregMckenna@campbellreith.com"

History: This message has been replied to.

Thank you Liz,

Please find the applicants responses.

*Regarding the surface water flow. The finished material will be permeable (as per PA013 -P520( ) - " **Water permeable pea shingle on hardcore base**" and will have two layers of hardcore underneath. Hence the water will drain naturally through the hardcore and around the underground structure in the natural stream that we assume ends in the canal nearby.*

*Land stability: Yes we are satisfied that Richard Tant's email, as well as the response from Paul Goldsmith (08 January 2018 15:02), our party wall surveyor, are sufficient. [see attached]*

Please issue the final audit .

Regards

Gideon Whittingham BA BSc DipTP  
Senior Planning Officer  
Development Management  
Supporting Communities  
London Borough of Camden

Telephone: 020 7974 5180  
Web: [camden.gov.uk](http://camden.gov.uk)  
2nd floor  
5 Pancras Square  
London N1C 4AG

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

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

Sent: 13 April 2017 16:09

To: Whittingham, Gideon <Gideon.Whittingham@camden.gov.uk>

Cc: camdenaudit@campbellreith.com; GregMckenna@campbellreith.com

Subject: 13 Prince Albert Road

Dear Gideon

Please find attached our initial audit report on the BIA for 13 Prince Albert Road. Reference to Section 4 and Appendix 2 will show that we have an number of queries and requests for further information, principally in connection with gaps in the site investigation information, the lack of a

ground movement assessment and the need for confirmation of the structural stability of the proposals.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to ask.

Regards  
**Liz Brown**  
Partner

**CampbellReith**  
consulting engineers

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

Tel +44 (0)20 7340 1700  
[www.campbellreith.com](http://www.campbellreith.com)

**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, company number, OC300082. Registered address: Friars Bridge Court, 41-45 Blackfriars Road, London, SE1 8NZ. No employee or agent is authorised to conclude any 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 advice given by 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 communication 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](http://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.

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

----- Message from Richard Tant <[richardt@richardtassociates.com](mailto:richardt@richardtassociates.com)> on Tue, 16 Jan 2018 17:12:52 +0000 -----

**To:** Olympia Anesti <[olympia@hughcullum.com](mailto:olympia@hughcullum.com)>, "Whittingham, Gideon" <[Gideon.Whittingham@camden.gov.uk](mailto:Gideon.Whittingham@camden.gov.uk)>

**Subject** RE: PA013 -pl- Re: 13 Prince Albert Road - 2016/7048/P & 2017/0464/L

:

Dear Gideon,

I can confirm the structural work are now finished and while movement was recorded this didn't manifest into any significant cracking. Indeed no new cracking greater than 1mm wide was evident.

Regards

Richard

**Richard Tant Associates**

Consulting Civil & Structural Engineers

54 Lisson Street

London NW1 5DF

T:020 7724 1002

F:020 7224 8883

From: Olympia Anesti [mailto:[olympia@hughcullum.com](mailto:olympia@hughcullum.com)]

Sent: 16 January 2018 16:03

To: Whittingham, Gideon <[Gideon.Whittingham@camden.gov.uk](mailto:Gideon.Whittingham@camden.gov.uk)>

Cc: Richard Tant <[richardtant@richardtantassociates.com](mailto:richardtant@richardtantassociates.com)>

Subject: Re: PA013 -pl- Re: 13 Prince Albert Road - 2016/7048/P & 2017/0464/L

Dear Gideon,

I was just about to write to you! Yes a letter from our structural engineer should be on its way shortly as we have just discussed the matter with him. His view is that the movement is not exceptional and there would be an issue should significant cracking have occurred, which in Prince Albert's case, has not and any small cracks that have occurred, are within the recommended guidelines.

Kind Regards

Olympia Anesti

For and on behalf of

Hugh Cullum Architects Ltd

61b Judd Street

London WC1H 9QT

t 020 7383 7647

f 020 7387 7645

e [mail@hughcullum.com](mailto:mail@hughcullum.com)

[www.hughcullum.com](http://www.hughcullum.com)

[Follow Us on Instagram!](#)

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender immediately and delete it and all copies from your system. This email and



any attachments are believed to be free of any virus, or defect, but it is the responsibility of the recipient to ensure this.

On 16 Jan 2018, at 15:53, Whittingham, Gideon wrote:

Olympia,

Could you confirm a date by which time a response will be provided?

Regards

Gideon Whittingham BA BSc DipTP  
Senior Planning Officer  
Development Management  
Regeneration and Planning  
Supporting Communities  
London Borough of Camden

Telephone: 020 7974 5180  
Web: [camden.gov.uk](http://camden.gov.uk)  
2nd floor  
Town Hall Extension (WC1H 8EQ)  
5 Pancras Square  
London N1C 4AG

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

From: Whittingham, Gideon  
Sent: 08 January 2018 18:42  
To: 'Olympia Anesti' <[olympia@hughcullum.com](mailto:olympia@hughcullum.com)>  
Cc: Richard Tant <[richardtant@richardtantassociates.com](mailto:richardtant@richardtantassociates.com)>  
Subject: RE: PA013 -pl- Re: 13 Prince Albert Road - 2016/7048/P & 2017/0464/L

Olympia,

This would be preferred; a response from the structural engineer regarding the outstanding matters in the BIA audit would be useful.

Regards

Gideon Whittingham BA BSc DipTP  
Senior Planning Officer  
Development Management  
Regeneration and Planning  
Supporting Communities  
London Borough of Camden

Telephone: 020 7974 5180  
Web: [camden.gov.uk](http://camden.gov.uk)  
2nd floor  
Town Hall Extension (WC1H 8EQ)  
5 Pancras Square  
London N1C 4AG

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

From: Olympia Anesti [<mailto:olympia@hughcullum.com>]  
Sent: 08 January 2018 15:02  
To: Whittingham, Gideon <[Gideon.Whittingham@camden.gov.uk](mailto:Gideon.Whittingham@camden.gov.uk)>  
Cc: Richard Tant <[richardtant@richardtantassociates.com](mailto:richardtant@richardtantassociates.com)>  
Subject: Fwd: PA013 -pl- Re: 13 Prince Albert Road - 2016/7048/P & 2017/0464/L

Dear Gideon,

Below please find the response from the party wall surveyor of 13 Prince Albert Road. Will it be helpful if we get a comment from the structural engineer as well (copied in for reference)?

Also, I attach the email of the 21st of April with the drawings and the LBC application reference.

Drawings are:

PA013- P550(\_) to P553(\_) and PA013 P600(\_) to P602(\_)

Please let me know if there is anything more you may need from us.

Kind Regards

Olympia Anesti  
For and on behalf of  
Hugh Cullum Architects Ltd  
61b Judd Street  
London WC1H 9QT  
t 020 7383 7647  
f 020 7387 7645  
e [mail@hughcullum.com](mailto:mail@hughcullum.com)  
[www.hughcullum.com](http://www.hughcullum.com)

[Follow Us on Instagram!](#)

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender immediately and delete it and all copies from your system. This email and any attachments are believed to be free of any virus, or defect, but it is the responsibility of the recipient to ensure this.

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Paul Goldsmith <[paul@goldsmithpartnership.co.uk](mailto:paul@goldsmithpartnership.co.uk)>  
**Date:** 8 January 2018 14:39:50 GMT  
**To:** Olympia Anesti <[olympia@hughcullum.com](mailto:olympia@hughcullum.com)>  
**Subject:** Re: PA013 -pl- Re: 13 Prince Albert Road - 2016/7048/P & 2017/0464/L

Olympia,

Regarding the movement recorded during the movement monitoring process, i would refer to the Structural Engineer's for any commentary re integrity of the structure. However, in terms of the party wall process, we have liaised with the Adjoining Owner's Surveyor and Consultant Engineer throughout and addressed the obligations of the agreed Awards.

Kind Regards

Paul  
**Paul Goldsmith**  
**Director**  
**m. 07572 317991**

**The Goldsmith Partnership**  
Unit A11,  
Jack's Place,  
[6 Corbet Place](#)  
[London E1 6NN](#)

The Goldsmith Partnership is the trading name of The Goldsmith Partnership Ltd (Company Reg No.09504899) whose registered address is [71-75 Shelton Street, London WC2H 9JQ](#).

The information contained in this communication is intended for the named recipients only. It may contain legally privileged and confidential information and if you are not the intended recipient, you must not copy, distribute or take any action in reliance on it. If you have received this communication in error, please return the original to the sender by email.

Sent from my iPhone

On 5 Jan 2018, at 13:33, Olympia Anesti <[olympia@hughcullum.com](mailto:olympia@hughcullum.com)> wrote:  
Dear Paul,

Happy New Year! Just got back from Greece and catching up with

emails.

The below is quite urgent from Prince Albert Road planning officer.  
Please do give me a call to discuss. I have to get back to him on  
Monday with a comment.

Kind Regards

Olympia Anesti  
For and on behalf of  
Hugh Cullum Architects Ltd  
61b Judd Street  
London WC1H 9QT  
t 020 7383 7647  
f 020 7387 7645  
e [mail@hughcullum.com](mailto:mail@hughcullum.com)  
[www.hughcullum.com](http://www.hughcullum.com)

[Follow Us on Instagram!](#)

This email and any files transmitted with it are  
confidential and intended solely for the use of the  
individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you  
have received this email in error please notify the  
sender immediately and delete it and all copies from  
your system. This email and any attachments are  
believed to be free of any virus, or defect, but it is the  
responsibility of the recipient to ensure this.

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** "Whittingham, Gideon" <  
[Gideon.Whittingham@camden.gov.uk](mailto:Gideon.Whittingham@camden.gov.uk)>  
**Date:** 27 December 2017 16:47:56 GMT  
**To:** Olympia Anesti <[olympia@hughcullum.com](mailto:olympia@hughcullum.com)>  
**Cc:** Hugh Cullum <[hugh@hughcullum.com](mailto:hugh@hughcullum.com)>, Jon  
Lowe <[jon.lowe@heritagecollective.co.uk](mailto:jon.lowe@heritagecollective.co.uk)>  
**Subject:** RE: PA013 -pl- Re: 13 Prince Albert  
Road - 2016/7048/P & 2017/0464/L

Olympia,

Apologies, I must have missed matters regarding the BIA  
assessment:

Please find attached excerpt of the D2 report for 13

Prince Albert Road summarising the outstanding issues.

I believe it would be beneficial for you to address these outstanding issues and then CR can provide a final (F1) report as opposed to issuing multiple additional reports (D2, D3 etc.).

We note that the movement monitoring report indicates up to 8mm lateral movement and up to 17mm and 20mm settlement at the facade and Party Wall of No 12 Prince Albert Road, respectively. We would expect this to be commented on by the Party Wall surveyor but no commentary is included. This would likely exceed the damage category 2 'slight' recommendation of LBC.

Regards

Gideon Whittingham BA BSc DipTP  
Senior Planning Officer  
Development Management  
Regeneration and Planning  
Supporting Communities  
London Borough of Camden

Telephone: 020 7974 5180  
Web: [camden.gov.uk](http://camden.gov.uk)  
2nd floor  
Town Hall Extension (WC1H 8EQ)  
5 Pancras Square  
London N1C 4AG

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

From: Olympia Anesti [<mailto:olympia@hughcullum.com>]  
Sent: 23 October 2017 14:55  
To: Whittingham, Gideon <[Gideon.Whittingham@camden.gov.uk](mailto:Gideon.Whittingham@camden.gov.uk)>  
Cc: Hugh Cullum <[hugh@hughcullum.com](mailto:hugh@hughcullum.com)>; Jon Lowe <[jon.lowe@heritagecollective.co.uk](mailto:jon.lowe@heritagecollective.co.uk)>  
Subject: PA013 -pl- Re: 13 Prince Albert Road - 2016/7048/P & 2017/0464/L

Dear Gideon,

Thank you for your email. We would like to draw your attention to an email on the 21st of April 2017. These drawings show our application for Listed Building Consent and, having taken advice from Heritage Collective, we believe they have addressed most of the issues below.

We should point out that we are not employed to visit site regularly, or to give instructions to the builder, or to monitor progress on site so any observations made below are simply made by us on our intermittent visits to site.

In more detail:

*We would expect this to be commented on by the Party Wall surveyor but no commentary is included.*

1. This comment will be forwarded to the party wall surveyor to comment

*Externally, at the front of the building, one of the pillars of the porch has been partially demolished and replaced in modern brickwork, which is still exposed. This element must be reinstated using appropriate materials.*

2. We believe that the pillar is now reinstated and rendered with period lime plaster, please see attached picture.

*To the rear, inappropriate pointing has been used and is of concern.*

3. We can confirm that this is now repointed, please see attached picture.

*In most of the ceilings, holes and wiring have been prepared for mini-spotlights. These are unconsented and inappropriate and must be removed and replaced with single pendant lamps.*

*At first-floor level, the chimney breast has at some point been walled in, and the resulting false wall has been cut away to allow the installation of air handling plant and pipework. The false wall was built without consent and should be removed to reinstate the chimney breast. The pipes and mechanical units are prominent, are not consistent with a principal room in a historic building and should be removed.*

4. We have submitted plans showing the proposed downlight positions as part of the LB consent application. Our understanding is that the client will work to these drawings.

*On the second floor, the chimney breast is still expressed. However, it is now flanked by*

*substantial pipework and wiring, and has air handling equipment suspended above and beside it. Presumably the intention is to wall up the chimney breast, as had happened downstairs, to conceal this equipment. Again, this is not consented, and the pipework and equipment are inappropriate and must be removed.*

*On the third floor, large air-handling devices have been installed under the windows of all three rooms. These are highly prominent and inappropriate and should be removed.*

5. As above, LB application drawings were submitted that we believe address these concerns and the items are explained in much more detail in the Statement attached to the email and LBC application. We hope the Council will consider these detailed proposals as a means of resolving the majority of the problems noted following your site visit with Nick Baxter in February.

Kind Regards

Olympia Anesti  
For and on behalf of  
Hugh Cullum Architects Ltd  
61b Judd Street  
London WC1H 9QT  
t 020 7383 7647  
f 020 7387 7645  
e [mail@hughcullum.com](mailto:mail@hughcullum.com)  
[www.hughcullum.com](http://www.hughcullum.com)

[Follow Us on Instagram!](#)

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender immediately and delete it and all copies from your system. This email and any attachments are believed to be free of any virus, or defect, but it is the responsibility of the recipient to ensure this.

On 11 Oct 2017, at 19:02, Whittingham, Gideon wrote:

Hugh,

Please find attached an excerpt of the second review summarising the outstanding issues.

It would be beneficial for you to address these outstanding issues prior to a final report, as opposed to issuing multiple additional reports.

We note that the movement monitoring report indicates up to 8mm lateral movement and up to 17mm and 20mm settlement at the facade and Party Wall of No 12 Prince Albert Road, respectively.

We would expect this to be commented on by the Party Wall surveyor but no commentary is included. This would likely exceed the damage category 1 'very slight' recommendation of LBC.  
Notwithstanding the above,

Could you please provide a full set of proposed drawings acknowledging our concerns raised in emailed dated Mon 27/02/2017 17:29, namely:

*Externally, at the front of the building, one of the pillars of the porch has been partially demolished and replaced in modern brickwork, which is still exposed. This element must be reinstated using appropriate materials.*

*To the rear, inappropriate pointing has been used and is of concern.*

*At lower-ground-floor level, a large number of the historic joists and bressumers have been cut or removed to allow the insertion of several substantial steel members. None of this work is consented in the drawings. There is no scope for restitution here and prosecution on this element alone will be considered.*

*In most of the ceilings, holes and wiring have been prepared for mini-spotlights. These are unconsented and inappropriate and must be removed and replaced with single pendant lamps.*

*At first-floor level, the chimney breast has at some point been walled in, and the resulting false wall has been cut away to allow the installation of air handling plant and pipework. The false wall was built without consent and should be removed to reinstate the*



*chimney breast. The pipes and mechanical units are prominent, are not consistent with a principal room in a historic building and should be removed.*

*On the second floor, the chimney breast is still expressed. However, it is now flanked by substantial pipework and wiring, and has air handling equipment suspended above and beside it. Presumably the intention is to wall up the chimney breast, as had happened downstairs, to conceal this equipment. Again, this is not consented, and the pipework and equipment are inappropriate and must be removed.*

*On the third floor, large air-handling devices have been installed under the windows of all three rooms. These are highly prominent and inappropriate and should be removed.*

*Given the concerns noted above, details should be provided making good of the above. In addition, details of servicing, demonstrating the relationship of new pipework with the structure of the building, should also be provided.*

I would ask this information be provided no later than 25<sup>th</sup> October, given the significant amount of time taken thus far, it is in the Council's interests to determine this application so that enforcement action can take place given the significant number of harmful alterations undertaken thus far.

Regards

Gideon Whittingham BA BSc DipTP  
Senior Planning Officer  
Development Management  
Regeneration and Planning  
Supporting Communities  
London Borough of Camden

Telephone: 020 7974 5180  
Web: [camden.gov.uk](http://camden.gov.uk)

2nd floor  
Town Hall Extension (WC1H 8EQ)  
5 Pancras Square  
London N1C 4AG

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

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.

Disclaimer

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation of the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

This email has been scanned for viruses and malware, and may have been automatically archived by Mimecast Ltd, an innovator in Software as a Service (SaaS) for business. Providing a safer and more useful place for your human generated data. Specializing in; Security, archiving and compliance. To find out more [Click Here](#).

<12466-61-051017-13 Prince Albert  
Road-D2 excerpt.pdf>

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.

Disclaimer

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation of the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

This email has been scanned for viruses and malware, and may have been automatically archived by Mimecast Ltd, an innovator in Software as a Service (SaaS) for business. Providing a safer and more useful place for your human generated data. Specializing in; Security, archiving and compliance. To find out more [Click Here](#).

<image002.jpeg>

<image003.jpg>

<12466-61-051017-13 Prince Albert Road-D2 excerpt.pdf>

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.

## Disclaimer

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation of the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

This email has been scanned for viruses and malware, and may have been automatically archived by Mimecast Ltd, an innovator in Software as a Service (SaaS) for business. Providing a safer and more useful place for your human generated data. Specializing in; Security, archiving and compliance. To find out more [Click Here](#).

---

## London

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

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

## Birmingham

Chantry House  
High Street, Coleshill  
Birmingham B46 3BP

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

## Surrey

Raven House  
29 Linkfield Lane, Redhill  
Surrey RH1 1SS

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

## Manchester

No. 1 Marsden Street  
Manchester  
M2 1HW

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

## Bristol

Wessex House  
Pixash Lane, Keynsham  
Bristol BS31 1TP

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