

St Pancras Commercial Centre,  
London NW1 0BY

Basement Impact Assessment  
Audit

For  
London Borough of Camden

Project Number: 12727-79  
Revision: D1

October 2019

**AKT II Comments**  
05/11/19.



Campbell Reith Hill LLP  
15 Bermondsey Square  
London  
SE1 3UZ

T: +44 (0)20 7340 1700  
F: +44 (0)20 7340 1777  
E: london@campbellreith.com  
W: www.campbellreith.com

### Document History and Status

Revision	Date	Purpose/Status	File Ref	Author	Check	Review
D1	October 2019	Comment	GKemb12985-79-181019-St Pancras Commercial Centre-D1.doc	KB	GK	gk

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 2015

### Document Details

Last saved	18/10/2019 13:17
Path	GKemb12985-79-181019-St Pancras Commercial Centre-D1.doc
Author	G Kite, BSc MSc DIC FGS
Project Partner	E M Brown, BSc MSc CGeol FGS
Project Number	12727-79
Project Name	St Pancras Commercial Centre
Planning Reference	2019/4201/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 St Pancras Commercial Centre, London NW1 0SE (planning reference 2019/4201/P). 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.
- 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 Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) has been carried out by AKT II Consulting Structural and Civil Engineers. It should be demonstrated that the BIA authors hold appropriate qualifications in accordance with LBC guidance. The BIA authors and checkers are noted on page 2 of the BIA report. Rob Bennett, who checked the report has the following qualifications: BEng (Hons) MSc CEng MIStructE .
- 1.5. Screening and scoping assessments should be presented. We did undertake the screening and scoping assessments and presented in different parts of our report. We assume all the screening and scoping queries are laid out in Section 3. We have answered and given references to all the queries.
- 1.6. Site investigation data indicates the ground conditions to comprise areas of deep made ground over the London Clay formation. Interpretative geotechnical information should be provided including retaining wall parameters. This was included in the planning submission and referenced in our report
- 1.7. Numerous basement construction techniques and options are presented. It is likely that a piled retaining wall will be utilised to construct the basement. The depth and type of retaining wall and the proposed basement formation level should be confirmed. This will be confirmed as the project progresses. We have assessed the range of impact due to likely form of construction at this stage - ref. Chapter 8.2 of AKT II BIA Report (Issued on 13/10/2019).
- 1.8. A conceptual model in the context of the proposed basement and potential stability, hydrological and hydrogeological impacts should be confirmed based on the proposed methodology and formation levels. Please refer to AKT II BIA Report (Issued on 13/10/2019).
- 1.9. A qualitative ground movement assessment (GMA) is presented. This should be confirmed once construction methodology and levels are confirmed, as 1.7, including an assessment of impacts to surrounding highways, underground infrastructure and buildings within the zone of influence, as applicable. Noted
- 1.10. It is accepted that the development will not impact the wider hydrogeological environment. Noted
- 1.11. There will be no change in impermeable site area due to the proposed development and no impact on the wider hydrological environment. It is proposed to adopt attenuation SUDS. A final drainage design should be agreed with LBC and Thames Water. Noted

- 1.12. The site is at very low risk of surface water flooding. Standard flood risk mitigation measures should be adopted in the final design. **Noted**
- 1.13. An outline construction programme has been provided. **Noted**
- 1.14. Queries and requests for further information are discussed in Section 4 and summarised in Appendix 2. Until these are addressed, the BIA does not meet the criteria of CPG Basements.  
**Refer to our responses. We believe the that these have been addressed adequately to meet the BIA criteria.**

## 2.0 INTRODUCTION

- 2.1. CampbellReith was instructed by London Borough of Camden (LBC) on 18 September 2019 to carry out a Category C Audit on the Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) submitted as part of the Planning Submission documentation for St Pancras Commercial Centre, 63 Pratt Street, London NW1 0BY (Reference 2019/4201/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 *"Demolition of existing buildings (Class B1c/B8); erection of 3x buildings ranging in height from 5 to 7 storeys above ground and a single basement level comprising a mixed use development of light industrial floorspace (Class B1c/B8), office floorspace (Class B1), 32x self-contained dwellings (Class C3), flexible retail floorspace (Class A1/A3); associated access and servicing, public realm, landscaping, vehicular and cycle parking, bin storage and other ancillary and associated works"*

2.6. CampbellReith accessed LBC's Planning Portal on 11 October 2019 and gained access to the following relevant documents for audit purposes:

- AKT II, Basement Impact Assessment Report, Revision B, 13 September 2019 (BIA)
- Soiltechnics, Ground Investigation Report, ref. STQ4646-G01 Revision 0, dated April 2019 and May 2019 (GIA)
- Planning Application Drawings consisting of
  - Location Plan
  - Existing Plans
  - Proposed Plans
- Caruso St John, Design & Access Statement, Revision D, dated 7 August 2019
- Blackburn & Co, Construction Management Plan (Outline Construction Programme), dated August 2019
- AKT II, Flood Risk Assessment, dated August 2019
- Planning Comments and Responses

### 3.0 BASEMENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT AUDIT CHECK LIST

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Are BIA Author(s) credentials satisfactory?	No	Credentials not provided in BIA
Is data required by Cl.233 of the GSD presented?	No	BIA Section 8.1.2 states "Initial models will be developed once the form, construction and ground conditions have been finalised post planning." Construction methodology, proposed levels to be confirmed.
Does the description of the proposed development include all aspects of temporary and permanent works which might impact upon geology, hydrogeology and hydrology?	No	Section 6 describes a generic bottom up construction sequence. Construction methodology, proposed levels to be confirmed.
Are suitable plan/maps included?	Yes	
Do the plans/maps show the whole of the relevant area of study and do they show it in sufficient detail?	Yes	
Land Stability Screening: Have appropriate data sources been consulted? Is justification provided for 'No' answers?	No	No specific screening section is provided.
Hydrogeology Screening: Have appropriate data sources been consulted? Is justification provided for 'No' answers?	No	No specific screening section is provided.
Hydrology Screening: Have appropriate data sources been consulted? Is justification provided for 'No' answers?	No	No specific screening section is provided.
Is a conceptual model presented?	No	Conceptual model in the context of the proposed basement and potential stability, hydrological and hydrogeological impacts to be confirmed based on methodology and formation levels.

The Authors are qualified Structural Engineers. Rob Bennett, who checked the report, has the following qualifications: BEng (Hons) MSc CEng MIStructE .

Please refer to the last page of this document.

The construction methodology is still under development and it will be confirmed as the project progresses. The proposed level of the basement is mentioned in Chapter 5.1 of AKTII BIA report (Issued on 13/10/2019).

Data sources are listed in Section 3 of the report and Soiltechnics Ground Investigation Report ref. STQ4646-G01.

Please refer to Chapter 2.3 & 3 & 5.1 of AKT II BIA Report, 13 September 2019 and Chapters 7.6.2 & 3.5 of the Soiltechnics Ground Investigation Report ref. STQ4646-G01.



Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment	
Land Stability Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	No	Screening and Scoping not undertaken	We have undertaken screening and the information in the BIA reflects this outcome Please refer to Chapter 2.3 & 3 & 5.1 & 5.5 of AKT II BIA Report, 13 September 2019 and Chapter 7.6.2 of the Soiltechnics Ground Investigation Report ref. STQ4646-G01.
Hydrogeology Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	No	Screening and Scoping not undertaken	
Hydrology Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	No	Screening and Scoping not undertaken	
Is factual ground investigation data provided?	Yes		
Is monitoring data presented?	Yes		
Is the ground investigation informed by a desk study?	Yes		
Has a site walkover been undertaken?	Yes		
Is the presence/absence of adjacent or nearby basements confirmed?	No	Not presented.	The site is surrounded by roads on all four sides. The extent of nearby basements beyond the roads are being assessed. Where identified the impact on these will be assessed based on the criteria set out in Chapter 8 of AKT II BIA Report (Issued 13 September 2019).
Is a geotechnical interpretation presented?	Yes	Presented in the GIR	
Does the geotechnical interpretation include information on retaining wall design?	No	Not presented in the GIR	Please refer to Chapter 2.3 & 5.1 of AKT II BIA Report, 13 September 2019.
Are reports on other investigations required by screening and scoping presented?	N/A	Screening and Scoping not undertaken	
Are the base line conditions described, based on the GSD?	No	Construction methodology / conceptual model to be confirmed.	
Do the base line conditions consider adjacent or nearby basements?	No	Nearby basements not identified.	We have provided the construction methodology and the concept models. These will progress along with the project's development. Please refer to queries above.

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Is an Impact Assessment provided?	Yes	Section 8 of BIA; however, to be confirmed based on Construction methodology / conceptual model.
Are estimates of ground movement and structural impact presented?	Yes	However, to be confirmed based on construction methodology / proposed levels.
Is the Impact Assessment appropriate to the matters identified by screen and scoping?	No	Screening and Scoping not undertaken; construction methodology / conceptual model to be confirmed.
Has the need for mitigation been considered and are appropriate mitigation methods incorporated in the scheme?	No	To be confirmed based on Construction methodology / conceptual model.
Has the need for monitoring during construction been considered?	Yes	General suggestions made in 8.2.2 of BIA
Have the residual (after mitigation) impacts been clearly identified?	No	To be confirmed based on Construction methodology / conceptual model.
Has the scheme demonstrated that the structural stability of the building and neighbouring properties and infrastructure will be maintained?	No	Infrastructure not considered despite a number of sensitive assets identified adjacent to the site (BIA chapters 3.4 & 3.5). The requirement for third party liaison, licensing and/or approval has been identified. GMA to be updated based on confirmed construction methodology / conceptual model.
Has the scheme avoided adversely affecting drainage and run-off or causing other damage to the water environment?	Yes	
Has the scheme avoided cumulative impacts upon structural stability or the water environment in the local area?	No	GMA to be updated based on confirmed construction methodology / conceptual model.
Does report state that damage to surrounding buildings will be no worse than Burland Category 1?	Yes	Section 8.2.3 determines negligible damage. However, GMA to be updated based on confirmed construction methodology / conceptual model.

Please refer to Chapter 2.3 & 3 & 5.1 of AKT II BIA Report, 13 September 2019 and the Soiltechnics Ground Investigation Report ref. STQ4646-G01. The construction methodology is still under development and it will be confirmed as the project progresses.

The construction methodology is still under development and it will be confirmed at the end of Stage 3. Stage 2 proposal include Perimeter Secant wall to provide stability during excavation of basement box and minimize impacts on adjacent assets during construction.

We have provided a likely construction methodology and assessed the likely impact based on empirical data from CIRIA guides.

The third party liaison, licensing and/or approvals are work in progress. The GMA will be updated based on confirmed construction methodology.

The GMA will be updated based on confirmed construction methodology. Stage 2 proposal include Perimeter Secant wall to provide stability during excavation of basement box and minimize impacts on adjacent assets during construction.

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Are non-technical summaries provided?	Yes	

## 4.0 DISCUSSION

- 4.1. The BIA has been carried out by AKT II Consulting Structural and Civil Engineers. It should be demonstrated that the BIA authors hold appropriate qualifications in accordance with LBC guidance for each section of the assessment: land stability, hydrogeology and hydrology.
- 4.2. The proposed development will comprise the demolition of the existing buildings and the construction of three buildings between 5- and 7-storeys high with a shared single-storey basement covering the entire footprint of the site. The maximum excavation depth for the basement is indicated in the BIA to be 5.10m below ground level (bgl), although the Soiltechnics report states a basement formation level of 4.00m bgl, and the drawings are not dimensioned. Depths of retaining walls and formation levels should be confirmed and presented consistently within all submission documents and assessments.
- 4.3. LBC guidance, provided within CPG Basements, indicates the requirements of a BIA. Screening and scoping form key parts of the BIA process and should be presented for review. Desk study information has been provided and should be referenced as evidence for the responses provided.
- 4.4. A Ground Investigation Report was produced in April or May 2019 and details the findings of ground investigations carried out in February 2019. Made Ground is identified to depths of between 5.10m and 5.80m bgl, below which lies the London Clay Formation extending to a depth of 41.00m bgl, below which lies the Thanet Formation. A perched water table was identified within the Made Ground at a depths between 4.13m and 5.28m bgl.
- 4.5. A concrete obstruction was encountered within the Made Ground and asbestos contamination was identified. The BIA indicates that the extent of contamination is to be further investigated in the following stages. The contaminated land assessment has not been considered within this audit.
- 4.6. Its noted that some interpretative geotechnical information is provided in the Soiltechnics report, including a shear strength design line and indicative bearing pile capacities. With reference to the GSD Appendix G3, retaining wall design parameters should also be provided i.e. as a basis for assessing embedment depths of retaining walls into the London Clay. Depending upon the methodology adopted for ground movement assessments (GMA), additional parameters may be required to be defined to form the basis of a ground model.
- 4.7. The BIA appears to have been compiled without referencing the Soiltechnics report and refers to ground investigation as 'preliminary'. The Impact Assessment then states that "Site investigation has been completed and is being reviewed in order to establish the soil parameters necessary to complete a detailed assessment of the ground movements for

comparison against relevant acceptance criteria". The detailed assessment is not included in the BIA (see 4.11).

- 4.8. The BIA provides a general overview of basement construction options and numerous basement construction techniques and options are presented. The BIA states that "the solutions will be narrowed down as more detailed design is undertaken". It is likely that a piled retaining wall will be utilised to construct the basement and an outline, bottom up construction sequence is provided indicating a secant piled wall. The depth and type of retaining wall and the proposed basement formation level should be confirmed and, as 4.2, be consistently presented between documents and as the basis of assessment.
- 4.9. The BIA indicates a reinforced concrete raft foundation may be adopted for the basement foundation, whilst the Soiltechnics report discusses both piled foundations and the use of a raft. If a raft is adopted the founding stratum may be Made Ground or London Clay, based on the anticipated ground conditions. The Soiltechnics report indicates that the use of engineered fill may be required.
- 4.10. A conceptual model for the site showing the topography, proposed basement and retaining wall formation levels, geology, groundwater and adjacent structures should be provided, considering the proposed construction methodology, as a basis for the impact assessments. It is noted that the presence or absence of local basements has not been identified, which should be considered within impact assessments.
- 4.11. The GMA is not identified as being specific to any nominated construction technique. The assessment is qualitative and references Tables 6.1 and 6.3 of CIRIA C760 to define ground movement. The assessment does not attribute a Burland Category for ground movement but states *"if low support stiffness is being considered the movement to neighbours is minor although significant, for a high support stiffness the movement to neighbouring properties is negligible. Further ground movement assessments will be undertaken"*.
- 4.12. The GMA should be confirmed once construction methodology and levels are confirmed, including an assessment of impacts to surrounding highways, underground infrastructure and buildings within the zone of influence, as applicable. The assessment should be reasonably conservative and, as 4.27 of CPG Basements, calculations to justify the assessments should be provided.
- 4.13. The BIA identifies a number of utilities and below ground assets that surround the site and identifies the need for third party approvals prior to commencing construction. It also identifies the need for liaison with the Highways Agency regarding the public highways surrounding the site. As 4.12, these potential impacts should be considered within the BIA, with final asset protection criteria agreed with asset owners.

- 4.14. It is accepted that the development will not impact the wider hydrogeological environment. The perched water within the Made Ground should be considered within the temporary works strategy, to ensure stability during construction.
- 4.15. There will be no change in impermeable site area due to the proposed development and no impact on the wider hydrological environment. It is proposed to adopt attenuation SUDS in accordance with best practice. A final drainage design should be agreed with LBC and Thames Water.
- 4.16. The site is at very low risk of surface water flooding. Standard flood risk mitigation measures should be adopted in the final design and are discussed within the BIA submissions.
- 4.17. An outline construction programme has been provided.

## 5.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 5.1. It should be demonstrated that the BIA authors hold appropriate qualifications in accordance with LBC guidance.
- 5.2. Screening and scoping assessments should be presented
- 5.3. The ground conditions comprise Made Ground over the London Clay formation. Interpretative geotechnical information should be provided including retaining wall parameters.
- 5.4. The construction methodology, depth and type of retaining wall and the proposed basement formation level should be confirmed, and used as the basis of a conceptual model in the context of potential stability, hydrological and hydrogeological impacts.
- 5.5. The ground movement assessment (GMA) should be confirmed once construction methodology and levels are confirmed, including an assessment of impacts to surrounding highways, underground infrastructure and buildings within the zone of influence, as applicable.
- 5.6. It is accepted that the development will not impact the wider hydrogeological environment.
- 5.7. There will be no impact on the wider hydrological environment. It is proposed to adopt attenuation SUDS. A final drainage design should be agreed with LBC and Thames Water.
- 5.8. The site is at very low risk of surface water flooding. Standard flood risk mitigation measures should be adopted in the final design.
- 5.9. Queries and requests for further information are summarised in Appendix 2. Until these are addressed, the BIA does not meet the criteria 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	It should be demonstrated that the BIA authors hold appropriate qualifications in accordance with LBC guidance.		
2	BIA Format	Screening and scoping assessments should be presented.		
3	BIA Format	The construction methodology, depth and type of retaining wall and the proposed basement formation level should be confirmed, and used as the basis of a conceptual model in the context of potential stability, hydrological and hydrogeological impacts.		
4	Land Stability	Interpretative geotechnical information should be provided including retaining wall parameters.		
5	Land Stability	The ground movement assessment (GMA) should be confirmed once construction methodology and levels are confirmed, including an assessment of impacts to surrounding highways, underground infrastructure and buildings within the zone of influence, as applicable.		

## Appendix 3: Supplementary Supporting Documents

---

## London

15 Bermondsey Square  
London, SE1 3UN

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

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

## AKT II Comments regarding Cl. 233 of GSD Camden BIA:

Extract from Cl. 233 of GSD Camden BIA:  
Information likely to be needed for screening for a BIA

### 1.Characteristics of the Project

- Brief description of the proposed development. **Included in AKTII BIA Report, Rev. B, 13 September 2019.**
- A plan showing the boundary of the development including any land required temporarily during construction. **Included in AKTII BIA Report, Rev. B, 13 September 2019.**
- The physical form of the development (layout, dimensions, construction materials, etc). **Included in Planning Application Drawings and Design& Access Statement, Revision D, 7 August 2019 by Caruso St John.**
- A work programme for construction, operation and commissioning phases, and restoration and after-use where appropriate. **Please refer to Construction Environment Management Plan Pt 1& Pt 2 by Blackburn & Co dated 7 August 2019.**
- Construction methods. **An indicative construction method is included in Chapter 6 of the AKTII BIA Report, Rev. B, 13 September 2019. A more detailed construction methodology will be available as the project develops further following input from specialist contractor proposal.**
- Information about mitigation measures being considered. **Included in Chapter 3 & 8 of AKT II BIA Report, Rev. B, 13 September 2019.**
- Details of any other permits required for the project. **Included in Chapter 3 of AKT II BIA Report, Rev. B, 13 September 2019. These require further conversations and potentially third party approvals are to be sought in the subsequent stages of design.**

### 2.Location of the Project

- Maps and photographs showing the location of the project relative to surrounding buildings, topography, natural and man-made features. **Please refer to Chapter 3 of the AKTII BIA Report, Rev. B, 13 September 2019.**

### 3.Characteristics of the Potential Impact

- Impacts on soils, land use, water quality and hydrology. **Included in Chapter 3.8 of AKTII BIA Report, Rev. B, 13 September 2019 and Soiltechnics Ground Investigation Report dated April 2019 and May 2019 (GIA).**
- Nature and scale of the impacts (i.e. short, medium and long-term, permanent and temporary, positive and negative). **Estimated based on qualitative empirical analysis and considering a range of possible retaining wall options. This can be found in Chapter 8 of the AKTII BIA Report, Rev. B, 13 September 2019. These information will be updated further as the project progresses.**
- Extent of the impacted area. **As mentioned in Chapter 8.2.3 of the AKT II BIA Report Rev. B, 13 September 2019, the proposed basement works at a maximum excavation depth of 5.1m will give negligible movement behind a distance of appr. 2m behind the retaining wall during the installation of the props.**
- Mitigation incorporated into the project design to reduce, avoid or offset significant adverse impacts. **Please refer to Chapter 5.1 from AKTII BIA Report, Rev. B, 13 September 2019. Stage 2 proposal include Perimeter Secant wall to provide stability during excavation of basement box and minimize impacts on adjacent assets during construction including consideration of temporary propping.**