## **Basement Impact Assessment AUDIT: Instruction**

## **Camden Case** 55 Fitzroy Park Site Address: 2018/3672/P London N6 6JA **Reference: Case officer contact** Date of audit **Charles Thuaire** 11.10.18 details: 020 7974 5867 request: Statutory consultation end date: 30.9.18 **Reason for Audit:** Planning application including excavations below ground level to create semi-basements **Proposal description:** Demolition of all existing buildings on the site and their replacement with five detached dwelling houses (Class C3) (three x part 2 part 3 storey houses at front facing Fitzroy Park and two x part 1 part 2 storey houses at rear adjoining Millfield Lane) plus associated driveways, access paths, carparking, landscaping and pond enhancements **Relevant planning background** None Do the basement proposals involve a listed building or does the site neighbour any listed no buildings? Slope stability yes Is the site in an area of relevant constraints? Surface Water flow yes (check site constraints in M3/Magic GIS) and flooding Subterranean yes (groundwater) flow Does the application require determination by Planning Committee in accordance with the yes Terms of Reference<sup>1</sup>

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

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Recommendations for approval of certain types of application require determination by Planning Committee (PC). From time to time applications which would normally be determined by officers under delegated authority are referred by the Director of Regeneration and PC for decision. Where the Auditor makes representations at PC on behalf of an application the fees for attendance will be passed to the applicant.

| Does the scope of the submitted BIA extend beyond the screening stage? | yes |
|--|-----|
|  |     |

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

| Item provided |  |     | Name of BIA document/appendix in which information is contained.   |  |
|---------------|--|-----|--|--|
| 1             | Description of proposed development.   | Y   | See Geotechnical Assessment<br>Section 2.4 Proposed development  |  |
| 2             | Plan showing boundary of development<br>including any land required temporarily<br>during construction.  | Y   | See Geotechnical Assessment<br>Section 2.1 Site Location Plan  |  |
| 3             | Plans, maps and or photographs to show<br>location of basement relative to surrounding<br>structures.  | n/a | See Geotechnical Assessment<br>Section 3.1.3 Screening for stability. The<br>excavations will not extend into the zone<br>of influence of any neighbouring<br>structures.  |  |
| 4             | Plans, maps and or photographs to show<br>topography of surrounding area with any<br>nearby watercourses/waterbodies including<br>consideration of the relevant maps in the<br>Strategic FRA by URS (2014) | Y   | See Hydrological & hydrogeological<br>Impact Assessment<br>Section 2.2 Topographical Setting &<br>Section 5. Ground Water &<br>Section 7. Flood Risk   |  |
| 5             | Plans and sections to show foundation details of adjacent structures.  | n/a | See Geotechnical Assessment<br>Section 3.1.3 Screening for stability. The<br>excavations will not extend into the zone<br>of influence of any neighbouring<br>structures.  |  |
| 6             | Plans and sections to show layout and dimensions of proposed basement.   | Y   | See Geotechnical Assessment<br>Section 6.1.4 Excavation to Formation level   |  |
| 7             | Programme for enabling works, construction and restoration.  | Y   | See CMP  |  |
| 8             | Identification of potential risks to land<br>stability (including surrounding structures<br>and infrastructure), and surface and<br>groundwater flooding.  | Y   | See Geotechnical Assessment<br>Section 3 Stage 1 – Screening Assessment  |  |
| 9             | Assessment of impact of potential risks on neighbouring properties and surface and groundwater.  | Y   | No potential impact on neighbouring<br>houses. For assessment of impacts on<br>Heath Nature Reserve / Bird Sanctuary<br>Pond.<br>See Hydrological & Hydrogeological<br>Impact Assessment Section 6. Potential<br>Development Impacts |  |

| 10 | Identification of significant adverse impacts.  | Y   | See Hydrological & Hydrogeological<br>Impact Assessment as above  |
|----|---|-----|---|
| 11 | Evidence of consultation with neighbours.   |     | See Planning Statement / SCI  |
| 12 | <ul> <li>Ground Investigation Report and Conceptual</li> <li>Site Model including <ul> <li>Desktop study</li> <li>exploratory hole records</li> <li>results from monitoring the local groundwater regime</li> <li>confirmation of baseline conditions</li> <li>factual site investigation report</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | Y   | See Hydrological & Hydrogeological<br>Impact Assessment<br>Section 3.0 Desk Study &<br>Section 4.0 Ground Conditions &<br>Section 5.0 Groundwater<br>And also see Factual Site Investigation<br>Report dated 15 <sup>th</sup> September 2017, by<br>Concept, Ref: 17/3003-FR00) |
| 13 | Ground Movement Assessment (GMA).   | n/a | See Geotechnical Assessment<br>Section 3.1.3 Screening for stability. The<br>excavations will not extend into the zone<br>of influence of any neighbouring<br>structures.   |
| 14 | Plans, drawings, reports to show extent of affected area.   | n/a | See <b>Geotechnical Assessment</b><br><b>Section 3.1.3</b> Screening for stability. The<br>excavations will not extend into the zone<br>of influence of any neighbouring<br>structures.   |
| 15 | Specific mitigation measures to reduce, avoid or offset significant adverse impacts.  |     | See Geotechnical Assessment<br>Section 7. Stage 4 - Basement Impact<br>Assessment   |
| 16 | Construction Sequence Methodology (CSM)<br>referring to site investigation and containing<br>basement, floor and roof plans, sections (all<br>views), sequence of construction and<br>temporary works.  |     | See <b>Geotechnical Assessment Section 6.1</b><br>Construction Methodology  |
| 17 | Proposals for monitoring during construction.   |     | See Geotechnical Assessment<br>Section 3.1.3 Screening for stability. The<br>excavations will not extend into the zone<br>of influence of any neighbouring<br>structures.   |
| 18 | Confirmatory and reasoned statement<br>identifying likely damage to nearby<br>properties according to Burland Scale   | n/a | See Geotechnical Assessment<br>Section 3.1.3 Screening for stability. The<br>excavations will not extend into the zone<br>of influence of any neighbouring<br>structures.   |
| 19 | Confirmatory and reasoned statement with<br>supporting evidence that the structural<br>stability of the building and neighbouring<br>properties will be maintained (by reference<br>to BIA, Ground Movement Assessment and  | n/a | See <b>Geotechnical Assessment</b><br><b>Section 3.1.3</b> Screening for stability. The<br>excavations will not extend into the zone<br>of influence of any neighbouring<br>structures.   |

|                  |                              | struction Sequence Methodology),<br>uding consideration of cumulative<br>cts.   |     |  |
|------------------|------------------------------|---|-----|--|
| 20               | supp<br>adve<br>no c<br>refe | firmatory and reasoned statement with<br>porting evidence that there will be no<br>erse effects on drainage or run-off and<br>damage to the water environment (by<br>erence to ground investigation, BIA and<br>1), including consideration of cumulative<br>cts. | Y   | See Hydrological & Hydrogeological<br>Impact Assessment<br>Section 9.0 Conclusion                                    |
| 21               |                              | ntification of areas that require further<br>estigation.  | n/a | See Geotechnical Assessment<br>Section 8.0 Conclusion  |
| 22               | Non<br>BIA.                  | -technical summary for each stage of  | Y   | See Geotechnical Assessment<br>Executive Summary & Section 3.2 Non-<br>Technical Summary of the Screening<br>Process |
|                  |                              |   |     |  |
|                  |                              |   |     |  |
| Addit            | tional                       | BIA components (added during Audit)   |     |  |
| ltem<br>provided |                              | Yes/No/NA <sup>2</sup><br>ded   |     | Comment  |
|                  |                              |   |     |  |
|                  |                              |   |     |  |
|                  |                              |   |     |  |
|                  |                              |   |     |  |

Notes:

<sup>1</sup>NB policy A5 also requires consideration of architectural character, impacts on archaeology, amenity and other matters which are not covered by this checklist.

<sup>2</sup> 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<br>Categorisation<br>(A/B/C) and<br>costs (£ ex VAT) | Date estimate for<br>initial report  | Commentary (including timescales for completion of Initial Report)  |
|------------|--|--|---|
| Date       | Category and<br>cost -                                   | This will depend<br>on date of<br>completion of<br>section D but<br>some indication is<br>required | If possible please ALSO provide<br>estimate for possible additional fees<br>required to review consultation<br>responses received to date.  |
| 15/10/2018 | Cat C £4,750   | Approximately 4<br>weeks from<br>instruction   | <ul> <li>Additional fees may be required for</li> <li>site attendance</li> <li>reviewing revised/resubmitted documentation</li> <li>reviewing third part consultation comment</li> <li>attending DCC</li> </ul> |

Note: Where changes to the fee categorisation are required during the audit process, this will require details to be updated in section E, 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.