

111 Frognal
London NW3 6XP

Basement Impact Assessment
Audit

For
London Borough of Camden

Project Number: 13398-01
Revision: D1

January 2020

Campbell Reith Hill LLP
15 Bermondsey Square
London
SE1 3UN

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	January 2020	Comment	KBgk 13398-01-310120 111 Frognal-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	31/01/2020 11:34
Path	KBgk 13398-01-310120 111 Frognal-D1.doc
Author	K Barker
Project Partner	E M Brown, BSc MSc CGeol FGS
Project Number	13398-01
Project Name	111 Frognal
Planning Reference	2019/6089/P

Contents

1.0 Non-technical summary 1
2.0 Introduction 2
3.0 Basement Impact Assessment Audit Check List..... 4
4.0 Discussion 7
5.0 Conclusions 8

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 the London Borough of Camden (LBC) to carry out an audit on the Basement Impact Assessment submitted as part of the Planning Submission documentation for 111 Frognal, London NW3 6XR (planning reference 2019/6089/P). The basement is considered to fall within Category A 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 BIA has been prepared by Rose & Associates. Whilst the qualifications of the author are not consistent with LBC guidance for the hydrogeological assessment, it is accepted that the outcomes of the screening exercise are correct in the context of the proposed development.
- 1.5. The BIA screening exercise has shown that there will be no impacts to slopes or surrounding structures and highways.
- 1.6. The screening has confirmed that there are no impacts to subterranean groundwater flows in the local and wider area.
- 1.7. The screening has confirmed that the site does not lie in a flood risk area and the proposals will reduce the impact of surface water flows on the sewer network.
- 1.8. It is accepted the scoping and assessment stages of the BIA are not required for this scheme and that the BIA complies with the requirements of the CPG: Basements.

2.0 INTRODUCTION

- 2.1. CampbellReith was instructed by London Borough of Camden on 7 January 2020 to carry out a Category A Audit on the Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) submitted as part of the Planning Submission documentation for 111 Frognal, London, NW3 6XR.
- 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;

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 non-original extensions including rear box back extension, uPVC greenhouse and boiler house; excavation of rear garden and erection of basement room beneath garden; erection of single storey rear extension at upper ground level and reinstatement of historic sloping roof, rear dormer and gable; replacement front dormer windows; internal and external refurbishment including removal of non-original partition walls and staircase, alterations to front and rear fenestration and reinstatement of timber stable doors."*

2.6. CampbellReith accessed LBC's Planning Portal on 28 January 2020 and gained access to the following relevant documents for audit purposes:

- Basement Impact Assessment, Rose Associates, dated 29 October 2019.
- Proposed and Existing Floor Plans and Section by Chan and Eayrs, all dated 6 December 2019.
- Design, Access and Heritage Statement by Chan and Eayrs.
- Morphology Plan by Chan and Eayrs, dated 2 December 2019.

3.0 BASEMENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT AUDIT CHECK LIST

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Are BIA Author(s) credentials satisfactory?	No	Whilst the qualifications of the author are not consistent with LBC guidance for the hydrogeological assessment, it is accepted that the outcomes of the screening exercise are correct in the context of the proposed development.
Is data required by Cl.233 of the GSD presented?	Yes	Commensurate to scale of works.
Does the description of the proposed development include all aspects of temporary and permanent works which might impact upon geology, hydrogeology and hydrology?	Yes	
Are suitable plan/maps included?	Yes	Screening outcomes are correct.
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?	Yes	
Hydrogeology Screening: Have appropriate data sources been consulted? Is justification provided for 'No' answers?	Yes	
Hydrology Screening: Have appropriate data sources been consulted? Is justification provided for 'No' answers?	Yes	Identified the requirement for the development to be designed to satisfy SuDs criteria to accommodate the intended increase in hardstanding.
Is a conceptual model presented?	Yes	In the context of the proposals, sufficient detail is provided.

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Land Stability Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	NA	Not required.
Hydrogeology Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	NA	Not required.
Hydrology Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	NA	Not required.
Is factual ground investigation data provided?	NA	Reference made to trial pits, which corroborate BGS information. In the context of the proposals, this is accepted.
Is monitoring data presented?	NA	
Is the ground investigation informed by a desk study?	NA	
Has a site walkover been undertaken?	Unknown	Site description and photos provided.
Is the presence/absence of adjacent or nearby basements confirmed?	Yes	
Is a geotechnical interpretation presented?	NA	Not required.
Does the geotechnical interpretation include information on retaining wall design?	NA	
Are reports on other investigations required by screening and scoping presented?	NA	Arboricultural report provided.
Are the baseline conditions described, based on the GSD	Yes	In BIA screening exercise.
Do the baseline conditions consider adjacent or nearby basements?	Yes	

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Is an Impact Assessment provided?	NA	Screening concludes no impacts.
Are estimates of ground movement and structural impact presented?	NA	Not required.
Is the Impact Assessment appropriate to the matters identified by screen and scoping?	NA	Not required.
Has the need for mitigation been considered and are appropriate mitigation methods incorporated in the scheme?	Yes	SUDS to be implemented and approved by LBC / Thames Water.
Has the need for monitoring during construction been considered?	NA	
Have the residual (after mitigation) impacts been clearly identified?	Yes	No residual impacts.
Has the scheme demonstrated that the structural stability of the building and neighbouring properties and infrastructure will be maintained?	Yes	
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?	Yes	
Does report state that damage to surrounding buildings will be no worse than Burland Category 1?	No	Screening exercise shows no impact.
Are non-technical summaries provided?	No	

4.0 DISCUSSION

- 4.1. The BIA has been prepared by Rose & Associates. Whilst the qualifications of the author are not consistent with LBC guidance for the hydrogeological assessment, it is accepted that the outcomes of the screening exercise are correct in the context of the proposed development.
- 4.2. The proposed excavations consist of a new lower ground floor level extension into the rear garden of the property, which will require excavation into the adjacent garden slopes. A lowered garden area and existing lower ground floor / basement already exists at the same elevation as the proposed extension.
- 4.3. Trial pits are indicated to have been completed at the rear of the house and revealed the geology to comprise Bagshot Formation comprising sand. Although site investigation data is not provided, this corroborates the BGS mapping data and in the context of the proposed development is accepted.
- 4.4. With respect to the stability of the surrounding buildings and highways, the location of the excavation is at the rear of the property and toward the centre of the building, remote from neighbouring properties and the highway. It is accepted that, assuming good workmanship and best practice, the proposed development will not impact upon the stability of neighbouring structures.
- 4.5. The screening exercise confirms that slopes are present in the wider and local area. Construction techniques are proposed to include battering techniques and temporary props to ensure stability of excavation sides. Given the proposed development location, as 4.4, assuming best practice slope stability should be maintained sufficiently not to impact upon neighbouring structures.
- 4.6. The proposed development will result in an increase in impermeable area and it is indicated that drainage will be designed to current SuDS criteria to manage this. The drainage design should be agreed with LBC and Thames Water. It is noted that a large, permeable garden area will remain undeveloped above permeable ground conditions, and therefore options for attenuation or infiltration SUDS are feasible, in addition to the green roof proposed.
- 4.7. The site is not in a flood risk area and building elements that currently exist at the level of the proposed extension are not below the groundwater table. It is therefore accepted that there will be no impacts to the local and wider hydrological and hydrogeological environments.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 5.1. The BIA screening exercise has shown that there are no impacts to slopes or surrounding structures and highways.
- 5.2. The screening has confirmed that there are no impacts to subterranean groundwater flows in the local and wider area.
- 5.3. The screening has confirmed that there will be no impact to the wider hydrological environment.
- 5.4. It is accepted the scoping and assessment stages of the BIA are not required for this scheme and that the BIA complies with the requirements of the CPG: Basements.

Appendix 1: Residents' Consultation Comments

None

Appendix 2: Audit Query Tracker

None

Appendix 3: Supplementary Supporting Documents

None

