CampbellReith
consulting engineers

33 Belsize Avenue, London, NW3 4BL

Basement Impact Assessment Audit

For

London Borough of Camden

Project Number: 12727-79
Revision: F1

November 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
W:www.campbellreith.com

Document History and Status

Revision	Date	Purpose/Status	File Ref	Author	Check	Review
D1	June 2018	Comment	FDfd-12727-79-210618-33 Belsize Avenue-D1.doc	F Drammeh	G Kite	G Kite
D2	August 2018	Comment	FDfd-12727-79-210818-33 Belsize Avenue-D2.doc	F Drammeh	G Kite	G kite
F1	November 2018	Final – Planning	FDfd-12727-79-051118-33 Belsize Avenue-F1.doc	F Drammeh	G Kite	G Kite

Document Details

Last saved	05/11/2018 14:14
Path	FDfd-12727-79-051118-33 Belsize Avenue-F1.doc
Author	F Drammeh, MEng (Hons)
Project Partner	E M Brown, BSc MSc CGeol FGS
Project Number	12727-79
Project Name	33 Belsize Avenue
Planning Reference	2018/1045/P

Contents

Appendix

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 33 Belsize Avenue, NW3 4BL (Camden planning reference 2018/1045/P). The basement is considered to fall within Category B as defined by the Terms of Reference.

1.2. The Audit reviewed the Basement Impact Assessment for potential impact on land stability and local ground and surface water conditions arising from basement development in accordance with LBC's policies and technical procedures.

1.3. CampbellReith was able to access LBC's Planning Portal and gain access to the latest revision of submitted documentation and reviewed it against an agreed audit check list.

1.4. The qualifications of the individuals involved in the BIA broadly meet the Camden Planning Guidance (CPG) Basements requirements.

1.5. The BIA still makes reference to the superseded planning guidance despite this being requested to be updated following the initial and subsequent audit.

1.6. The depths of the neighbouring lower ground floors and foundations should be confirmed prior to construction.

1.7. The site comprises a detached five storey house with a lower ground floor. The proposal involves an extension to the rear of the property within the existing lightwell.

1.8. Appropriate construction details and outline calculations are included in the Elliot Wood submissions. The discrepancies between the proposals in the various reports have now been addressed.

1.9. A flood risk assessment and drainage strategy report is provided and this includes a SUDs proposal.

1.10. The retaining wall parameters have not been updated in the BIA, as previously requested, although they are included within the ground movement assessment (GMA).

1.11. The queries relating to the GMA have now been addressed, as discussed in Section 4.

1.12. A detailed monitoring strategy should be agreed with the relevant parties prior to construction to ensure the movements do not exceed agreed limits.

1.13. An indicative works duration is now provided. A detailed programme should be provided by the appointed contractor at a later date.

1.14. It is accepted that there are no slope stability or wider hydrogeological concerns regarding the proposed development and the site is not in an area prone to other flooding issues.

1.15. On the basis of the additional information presented, the BIA meets the requirements of CPG Basements.

2.0 INTRODUCTION

2.1. CampbellReith was instructed by London Borough of Camden (LBC) on 14 May 2018 to carry out a Category B Audit on the Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) submitted as part of the Planning Submission documentation for 33 Belsize Avenue, NW3 4BL (Camden planning reference 2018/1045/P).

2.2. The Audit was carried out in accordance with the Terms of Reference set by LBC. It reviewed the Basement Impact Assessment for potential impact on land stability and local ground and surface water conditions arising from basement development.

2.3. A BIA is required for all planning applications with basements in Camden in general accordance with policies and technical procedures contained within

- Guidance for Subterranean Development (GSD). Issue 01. November 2010. Ove Arup & Partners.
- Camden Planning Guidance Basements (March 2018)
- Camden Development Policy (DP) 27: Basements and Lightwells.
- Camden Development Policy (DP) 23: Water.
- Local Plan Policy A5 Basements.

2.4. The BIA should demonstrate that schemes:

a) maintain the structural stability of the building and neighbouring properties;

b) avoid adversely affecting drainage and run off or causing other damage to the water environment;

c) avoid cumulative impacts upon structural stability or the water environment in the local area, and;

d) evaluate the impacts of the proposed basement considering the issues of hydrology, hydrogeology and land stability via the process described by the GSD and to make recommendations for the detailed design.

2.5. LBC's Audit Instruction described the planning proposal as *'Erection of part single, part two storey rear extension at lower ground and ground floor levels with garden excavation; removal of a crossover, and associated landscaping'.*

2.6. CampbellReith accessed LBC's Planning Portal on 30 May and 7 June 2018 and gained access to the following relevant documents for audit purposes:

- BIA Impact Screening Assessment, Site Analytical Services Limited, dated January 2018 (which includes Ground Movement Assessment, Fairhurst, dated January 2018 as Appendix B).
- Structural Engineering Report and Subterranean Construction Method Statement (Revision P2), Elliot Wood, dated February 2018.
- Design and Access Statement, KSR Architects LLP, dated January 2018.
- Flood Risk Assessment and SUDS Strategy, XCO2, dated December 2017.
- Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Landmark Trees, dated 16 February 2018.
- KSR Architects planning application drawings, comprising:

  Drawings dated 26/27 July 2017

  - Location plan (P001)
  - Existing site plan (X010)
  - Existing basement plan (X090)
  - Existing ground floor plan (X100)
  - Existing section AA (X210)
  - Existing front (street) elevation (X301)
  - Existing front elevation (X310)
  - Existing rear (north) elevation (X311)
  - Existing east elevation (X312)
  - Existing west elevation (X313)
  - Proposed lower ground floor (P090)
  - Proposed ground floor (P100)
  - Proposed section AA (P210)
  - Proposed front elevation (P310)
  - Proposed north elevation (P311)
  - Proposed east elevation (P312)
  - Proposed west elevation (P313)

  Drawings dated 12 February 2018

  - Proposed front (street) elevation (P301)
  - Proposed rear (garden) elevation (P302)

2.7. The planning portal was again accessed on 12 June 2018 and it appears revised proposed drawings were uploaded on 11 June 2018. These drawings were dated as per the previous drawings which are now marked as superseded. A comparison of the lower ground floor plan, referenced above, to the new drawing did not indicate any changes. A minor amendment is noted on the ground floor plan, however, this has no impact on the audit.

2.8. Updated documents (BIA and desk study) were received by email from the planning officer on 25 July 2017, however, the files names, revision numbers and dates were unchanged from the initial submission and there is no indication of the sections of the reports which have been updated to address the initial comments/queries. It appears only the Fairhurst GMA (122998/R1.2 dated July 2018) which is appended to the BIA has been updated.

2.9. The BIA and desk study were again indicated to be updated in response to the queries and comments from the second audit. These were downloaded from a link sent by the planning officer on 21 September 2018. It appears only the Fairhurst GMA (122998/R1.3 dated September 2018) which is appended to the BIA has been revised. These are not included on Appendix 3 due to file size. An email response (dated 11 September 2018) to further queries on the ground movement assessment from Fairhurst is, however, included together with an indicative works duration from Orcadian Planning (dated 5 November 2018).

3.0 BASEMENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT AUDIT CHECK LIST

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Are BIA Author(s) credentials satisfactory?	Yes	Table A – Site Analytical Services (SAS) BIA (see Audit paragraph 4.1).
Is data required by Cl.233 of the GSD presented?	Yes	Proposal now consistent (see Audit paragraphs 4.2, 4.5 to 4.7). Works duration provided (see Audit paragraph 4.19 and Appendix 3).
Does the description of the proposed development include all aspects of temporary and permanent works which might impact upon geology, hydrogeology and hydrology?	Yes	Consistent information on proposed development now presented (see Audit paragraphs 4.5 to 4.7).
Are suitable plan/maps included?	Yes	SAS BIA Section 3 includes some of the relevant maps with the site location indicated.
Do the plans/maps show the whole of the relevant area of study and do they show it in sufficient detail?	Yes	As above.
Land Stability Screening: Have appropriate data sources been consulted? Is justification provided for 'No' answers?	Yes	Table 2, Section 3.8 of the SAS BIA.
Hydrogeology Screening: Have appropriate data sources been consulted? Is justification provided for 'No' answers?	Yes	Table 2, Section 3.8 of the SAS BIA.
Hydrology Screening: Have appropriate data sources been consulted? Is justification provided for 'No' answers?	No	Table 2, Section 3.8 of the SAS BIA which is largely valid, however, the response to Q6 which relates to the risk of flooding is incorrect (see Audit paragraph 4.8).

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Is a conceptual model presented?	Yes	Ground conditions presented in SAS Ground Investigation Report Section 3.
Land Stability Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	Yes	Section 4 of SAS BIA.
Hydrogeology Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	Yes	Section 4 of SAS BIA.
Hydrology Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	No	Section 4 of SAS BIA, not all of the potential issues identified in the BIA although this is addressed in a separate report (see Audit paragraph 4.8).
Is factual ground investigation data provided?	Yes	Appendix A of the SAS BIA.
Is monitoring data presented?	Yes	Section 5.3 the SAS BIA.
Is the ground investigation informed by a desk study?	Yes	Desk study information presented in Section 3 of the SAS BIA.
Has a site walkover been undertaken?	No	Not stated in BIA.
Is the presence/absence of adjacent or nearby basements confirmed?	No	Description of the neighbouring properties not included in the BIA although assumptions are included in SER&CMS (see Audit paragraph 4.10).
Is a geotechnical interpretation presented?	Yes	Some interpretation presented in Section 6 of SAS BIA. Noted that design bearing pressures exceed assessed allowable bearing capacity (see Audit paragraphs 4.12 and 4.16).

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Does the geotechnical interpretation include information on retaining wall design?	No	Provided in Section 6 of the BIA, however, this was noted as incomplete as stiffness parameters were not included (see Audit paragraph 4.12).
Are reports on other investigations required by screening and scoping presented?	Yes	Ground investigation report and GMA.
Are the baseline conditions described, based on the GSD?	No	Description of the neighbouring properties not included in the BIA although assumptions made in SER&CMS (see Audit paragraph 4.10).
Do the base line conditions consider adjacent or nearby basements?	No	As above.
Is an Impact Assessment provided?	Yes	SAS BIA Section 7.
Are estimates of ground movement and structural impact presented?	Yes	Fairhurst Ground Movement Assessment (GMA) report although there are comments on this (see Audit paragraphs 4.13 to 4.16).
Is the Impact Assessment appropriate to the matters identified by screening and scoping?	Yes	Potential risk of sewer flooding not identified in screening and scoping, however considered within FRA (see Audit paragraph 4.8).
Has the need for mitigation been considered and are appropriate mitigation methods incorporated in the scheme?	Yes	SER&CMS.
Has the need for monitoring during construction been considered?	Yes	SER&CMS (see Audit paragraph 4.17).
Have the residual (after mitigation) impacts been clearly identified?	N/A	None identified.

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Has the scheme demonstrated that the structural stability of the building and neighbouring properties and infrastructure will be maintained?	Yes	Revised Fairhurst GMA and email (see Audit paragraphs 4.13 to 4.16 and Appendix 3).
Has the scheme avoided adversely affecting drainage and run-off or causing other damage to the water environment?	Yes	Flood risk assessment and drainage strategy report (see Audit paragraph 4.9).
Has the scheme avoided cumulative impacts upon structural stability or the water environment in the local area?	Yes	Structural stability now demonstrated.
Does report state that damage to surrounding buildings will be no worse than Burland Category 1?	Yes	GMA predicts Category 0 (see Audit paragraphs 4.7, 4.10 to 4.16).
Are non-technical summaries provided?	Yes	SAS BIA Sections 3.9, 4.2, 5.5, 6.9 and 7.4.

4.0 DISCUSSION

4.1. The Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) was undertaken by Site Analytical Service (SAS) Ltd and the individuals involved hold CEng MIStructE and CGeol MCIWEM qualifications. A separate flood risk assessment (FRA) was undertaken by XCO2, however, the qualifications of the individuals involved are not included. A structural engineering report and construction method statement (SER & CMS) by Elliot Wood is provided and the reviewer holds CEng MIStructE qualifications.

4.2. The BIA was undertaken by SAS and this included a ground movement assessment (GMA) by Fairhurst. A separate flood risk assessment and drainage strategy was undertaken by XCO2 which was not referenced in the hydrology (surface flow and flooding) screening although it was undertaken prior to the BIA. The SER & CMS report prepared by Elliot Wood provides a summary of the findings of the other reports, however, there were discrepancies between the reports as discussed below.

4.3. The Elliot Wood report and SAS BIA make reference to CPG4. However, this document is superseded by the Camden Planning Guidance (CPG) Basements (2018). This was noted in both the initial and second audit, but these references have not been updated.

4.4. It is stated in the SER & CMS that 33 Belsize Avenue comprises a detached five storey house with a lower ground floor. To the rear is a lightwell which was previously extended to create a terraced area and lower ground floor level. The property is not listed but it is within the Belsize Park conservation area.

4.5. The proposal involves an extension to the rear of the property within the existing lightwell. The depth of the excavations vary between 0.80 and 3.55m. The Elliot Wood SER & CMS states the existing lightwell is enclosed by a contiguous piled wall which is to be retained. A reinforced concrete liner wall is to be constructed within this to support the new ground floor above. The Elliot Wood SER & CMS contains a construction sequence described in the text and illustrated on sketches included in Appendix A of the report. Drawing S.90 (revision P2 dated January 2018) indicates the lateral extent of the new basement to be the similar to the existing lightwell. Outline structural calculations are included in the SER & CMS.

4.6. The proposals in the Elliot Wood report were contradictory to the construction sequence referenced in Section 4.4 of the initial Fairhurst ground movement assessment (GMA), which indicated the first stage of construction as '*install contiguous piled wall to perimeter of the basement*', although an Elliot Wood sequence drawing (SK.01 dated December 2017) was included as an appendix to the GMA. The proposed lower ground floor plan and north (rear) elevation markups (P090 and P311 dated 29/09/17) included in Appendix B differ from the proposals in the SER & CMS and the architect's drawings. This plan indicated a lateral extension

of approximately 10m to the rear of the existing lower ground floor for a pool and associated facilities.

4.7. The proposals in the GMA text were updated to be consistent with the SER & CMS following the initial audit. However, the desk study still included a lower ground floor plan which was contradictory to the other reports. A revised plan which reflects the proposals within the other reports is now included.

4.8. Some of the relevant figures/maps from the Arup GSD and other guidance documents are included with the site location indicated to support the statements made in the screening assessments which are largely valid. The response to question 6 of the hydrology screening which relates to flood risk is, however, incorrect as this did not consider the risk of internal sewer flooding which is identified on one of the Camden SFRA maps. This issue was considered in the FRA and appropriately addressed.

4.9. It is stated in the FRA that the proposal will result in a reduction in the volume of run-off due to the impermeable paved areas reducing. The potential risk of sewer flooding is concluded to be low. The site is not at risk from flooding from any other sources. The report includes a SUDs proposal which comprises permeable paving and a non-infiltrating blanket system to the rear with a raingarden planter proposed to intercept run-off from the roof prior to discharge into the sewer network.

4.10. There were no mention of the neighbouring properties in the BIA, nor was it confirmed whether these include basements or not. This was also not addressed in the GMA which gives approximate heights of the properties considered with no indication of the foundation depths assumed. It was stated in the SER & CMS that the existing lower ground floor levels to Nos. 31 and 35 Belsize Avenue are assumed to be of similar construction and level to the subject site, No. 33. It appears these have been assumed to be at ground level in the input of the GMA which is now provided. Although this is considered to be conservative for the purposes of predicting ground movements, this should be confirmed prior to detailed design and construction.

4.11. A ground investigation was undertaken by SAS and this comprised two 15m boreholes to the rear and front of the property respectively. Made Ground was encountered to a maximum depth of 1.90m over London Clay. The shallowest groundwater level recorded during monitoring was 1.80m bgl. The BIA states this is likely to be '*surface water entering the pipe'* due to the geology. Groundwater monitoring prior to the site works is recommended in the SER & CMS together with sump pumping should groundwater be encountered during the works.

4.12. Although some interpretation and recommendations for design are included in Section 6 of the SAS report, the retaining wall parameters on Table 3 were considered incomplete as strength

and stiffness values (Cu and E) are not included. These have not been provided although they were requested following the initial and subsequent audit. These values are presented elsewhere in the report in relation to settlement/heave analysis. It was also noted that the bearing pressures adopted for design (Settle 3D analysis) were in excess of the assessed allowable bearing capacity. These have not been amended although they were highlighted in the second audit and are discussed further in 4.15 and 4.16.

4.13. Heave and settlement analysis within the new basement due to excavation and construction respectively were undertaken using Settle3D analysis. Section 4.7 of the GMA stated that the CIRIA C760 curves for the 'installation of a contiguous bored pile wall' has been used in the Oasys Xdisp analysis together with the excavation movements to undertake a damage assessment for the neighbouring properties. Category 0 (Negligible) damage was predicted. The full Xdisp input was not provided and the assumptions made with regards to the wall depth were not stated. In addition to this, the development proposals were unclear as there were discrepancies in the proposals between the Elliot Wood SER & CMS and the Fairhurst GMA. It was requested following the initial audit that the proposals be clarified and consistently presented.

4.14. The Fairhurst GMA text was made consistent with the SER and the full Xdisp input and output was provided in response to the comments in the initial audit. Curves for the installation of a contiguous wall were used to estimate the ground movements. As noted above, the contiguous wall is indicated to be present and ground movements due to excavation were not included in the Xdisp analysis. The GMA therefore did not reflect the proposals and it was requested that this issue be addressed following the subsequent audit.

4.15. Further to 4.12, settlement and heave associated with the proposals and design bearing pressures have been calculated. Following the previous audits, it was requested that consideration be given to these movements within the GMA.

4.16. The GMA has now been revised to reflect the proposals and consider the movements due to excavation rather than installation. The Settle 3D analysis does not appear to have been updated to reflect the previous comment regarding the bearing pressures, however, as noted on the email correspondence with Fairhurst (see Appendix 3), these movements are likely to be confined to the extents of the basement by the contiguous wall. On this basis and the distance to these properties, the effects on the neighbouring are therefore likely to be minimal as stated by Fairhurst.

4.17. An outline monitoring strategy with proposed trigger levels is included in the SER & CMS. A detailed strategy should be agreed with the relevant parties prior to construction to ensure acceptable limits are not exceeded.

4.18. An arboricultural impact assessment is included. Tree removal is not proposed and the report concludes that the proposals will not have any impact on the retained trees or wider landscape.

4.19. An indicative works programme was not included, as required within clause 233 of the Arup GSD. It was requested in the initial and subsequent audit. A works duration has now been provided by Orcadian Planning (Appendix 3). A detailed programme should be provided by the appointed contractor at a later date.

4.20. It is accepted that there are no slope stability concerns regarding the proposed development. The site is not in an area prone to other flooding issues and the wider hydrogeology of the area is unlikely to be affected.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

5.1. The qualifications of the individuals involved in the BIA broadly meet the CPG Basements requirements.

5.2. The depths of the neighbouring lower ground floors and foundations should be confirmed prior to construction.

5.3. The site comprises a detached five storey house with a lower ground floor. The proposal involves an extension to the rear of the property within the existing lightwell. Appropriate construction details and outline calculations are included in the Elliot Wood SER & CMS.

5.4. The discrepancies in the proposals in the SAS desk study have now been addressed.

5.5. A flood risk assessment and drainage strategy report is provided and this includes a SUDs proposal.

5.6. It was requested that the retaining wall design parameters in the BIA be updated. The requested parameters are provided within the GMA.

5.7. The ground movement assessment predicts negligible damage. The previous queries have now been addressed.

5.8. A structural monitoring strategy with proposed trigger levels is included in the SER & CMS. A detailed strategy should be agreed with the relevant parties prior to construction to ensure the movements do not exceed agreed limits.

5.9. An indicative works duration is now provided. A detailed programme should be provided by the appointed contractor at a later date.

5.10. It is accepted that there are no slope stability or wider hydrogeological concerns regarding the proposed development and it is not in an area prone to other flooding issues.

5.11. On the basis of the additional information presented, the BIA meets the requirements of CPG Basements.

Appendix 1: Residents' Consultation Comments

None

Appendix 2: Audit Query Tracker

Audit Query Tracker*

Query No	Subject	Query	Status	Date closed out
1	BIA format	Works programme	Closed – outline works duration provided (see Appendix 3).	06/11/2018
2	BIA format/stability	Discrepancies in the proposed development between the GMA and SER & CMS	Closed – proposals on various documents now consistent (see Audit paragraphs 4.7 and 4.13 to 4.16).	06/11/2018
3	Stability	Ground movement assessment (GMA)	Closed – GMA now reflects proposals (see Audit paragraphs 4.13 to 4.16 and Appendix 3).	06/11/2018
4	Stability	Retaining wall design parameters	Closed – see Audit paragraph 4.12.	06/11/2018
5	Stability	Movement monitoring proposal	Closed – outline proposal presented. The detailed strategy and trigger levels are to be agreed by the relevant parties to ensure movements do not exceed agreed limits.	06/11/2018 N/A.

Appendix 3: Supplementary Supporting Documents

Fairhurst email dated 11/09/2018
Orcadian Planning email dated 05/11/2018

RE: 122998 - 33 Belsize AvenueOliver Wells to: FatimaDrammeh, Andrew Smith 11/09/2018 12:14
Cc: "Tom Murray - Site Analytical", "Whittredge, Emily", camdenaudit
From: "Oliver Wells" <oliver.wells@fairhurst.co.uk>
To: <FatimaDrammeh@campbellreith.com>, "Andrew Smith" <andrew.smith@fairhurst.co.uk>
Cc: "Tom Murray - Site Analytical" <tommurray@siteanalytical.co.uk>, "Whittredge, Emily" <Emily.Whittredge@camden.gov.uk>, <camdenaudit@campbellreith.com>

Hi Faitma,

Thanks for your comments, will update the report based on the below.

Tom – will aim to re-issue the report by CoP today.

Kind Regards,

Ollie

Oliver Wells, MEng
Geotechnical Engineer

Tel: 01923 210 460

From: FatimaDrammeh@campbellreith.com [mailto:FatimaDrammeh@campbellreith.com]
Sent: 10 September 2018 17:33
To: Andrew Smith
Cc: Oliver Wells; Tom Murray - Site Analytical; Whittredge, Emily; camdenaudit@campbellreith.com
Subject: Re: 122998 - 33 Belsize Avenue

Hi Andrew/Oliver,
Please see our comments below in red.

Kind regards
Fatima Drammeh
Senior Geotechnical Engineer

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

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

From: "Andrew Smith" <andrew.smith@fairhurst.co.uk>
To: <FatimaDrammeh@campbellreith.com>
Cc: "Tom Murray - Site Analytical" <tommurray@siteanalytical.co.uk>, "Oliver Wells" <oliver.wells@fairhurst.co.uk>
Date: 07/09/2018 14:29
Subject: 122998 - 33 Belsize Avenue

Hi Fatima,

Further to our phone conversion today we can confirm that we will update the XDISP model in our Ground Movement Assessment to include the movements due to excavation. We understand from the structural engineer that the development will involve using high stiffness temporary props installed before permanent props at high level and therefore we propose to use the 'excavation front of a high stiffness wall in stiff clay' approach in accordance with CIRIA C760. Let me know if you have any issues with this. *No issues with this, the CMS indicates high level props will be installed.*

Regarding your separate point about a statement on how settlement will be limited during design to ensure it does not affect neighbouring properties, see text below which we can also add into our report – can you confirm this is acceptable?

'The results of the Settle3D analysis indicates movement beyond the site boundaries as shown on the output models. The modelling is based on an unrestrained excavation and is therefore unable to take account of the mitigating effect of the 200mm reinforced concrete liner wall bounding the excavation, which in reality will combine to restrict these movements to within the basement excavation. The movements predicted at or just beyond the site boundaries are therefore unlikely to be realised and should not therefore have a detrimental impact upon any nearby structures assuming good workmanship is employed by the main contractor. Agreed that these movements (esp the heave which is more onerous) are likely be restricted within the basement by the existing contig piled wall (not the liner wall which is to be constructed following the excavation for the basement).

I am away next week so please copy in my colleague Ollie Wells into your response or ring him if easier (01923 210460)

Regards

Andrew Smith
Project Geotechnical & Geoenvironmental Engineer

FAIRHURST
engineering solutions, delivering results

Oak House
Reeds Crescent
Watford, WD24 4PH
Tel: 01923 210460 Mobile: 07710 613397
Website: www.fairhurst.co.uk

Why not take a look at our Practice Profile to see the diverse range of skills we can offer. Just click <HERE>

Consider the environment.Please don't print this e-mail unless you really need to.

This email message and accompanying data are for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential information and/or copyright material. Unauthorised use, copying or disclosure of any of it is prohibited and may be unlawful. If you received this email message in error, please notify us immediately and erase all copies of this message and attachments.

Where this e-mail is unrelated to the business of Fairhurst, the opinions expressed within this e-mail are the opinions of the sender and do not necessarily constitute those of Fairhurst.

Fairhurst scans and monitors incoming and outgoing mail in accordance with its Email Policy. This email has been scanned for viruses but Fairhurst accept no liability for any virus which may be attached.

A full list of partners is available for inspection at any of the firm's offices.

Re: 33 Belsize Avenue

Zenab Haji-Ismail to: Whittredge, Emily 05/11/2018 17:26

Cc: Richard.Limbrick, FatimaDrammeh

History: This message has been replied to.

6 attachments

17023-P010-REVA- Proposed Site Plan.pdf image001.png image003.png image005.png image007.jpg

image007.jpg

Dear Emily,

In response to your email, and further to my conversation with Fatima, please be advised of the following:

- The indicative work programme is anticipated to last 12 months subject to a main contractor being appointed;
- The material is proposed to be asphalt; and
- attached is the revised site plan as requested.

I trust this provides you with the information you require to determine this application.

Kind regards

Zenab

On Mon, Nov 5, 2018 at 3:14 PM Whittredge, Emily <Emily.Whittredge@camden.gov.uk> wrote:

Dear Zenab,

Fatima at Campbell Reith is still awaiting the indicative works duration from your side in order to close out the BIA report this week, and she has asked if it can please be provided by tomorrow so that she can complete this work.

I can confirm the highways quote is being worked on today as a priority. Regarding materials, did the applicant intend the new pathway to be asphalt or cobbles? Could you also please resend the proposed site plan showing the forecourt/boundary works. I cannot find the current version since the previous ones were superseded.

I will update you when I have more information.

Kind regards,

London

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

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

Birmingham

Chantry House
High Street, Coleshill
Birmingham B46 3BP

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

Surrey

Raven House
29 Linkfield Lane, Redhill
Surrey RH1 1SS

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

Manchester

No. 1 Marsden Street
Manchester
M2 1HW

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

Bristol

Wessex House
Pixash Lane, Keynsham
Bristol BS31 1TP

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

UAE

Office 705, Warsan Building
Hessa Street (East)
PO Box 28064, Dubai, UAE

T: +971 4 453 4735
E: uae@campbellreith.com