CampbellReith
consulting engineers

12 Keats Grove
London, NW3 2RN

Basement Impact Assessment Audit

For

London Borough of Camden

Project Number: 12985-97
Revision: F1

March 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	February 2020	For comment	CBcb 12985-97-120220-12 Keats Grove-D1.doc	C Botsialas	E M Brown	E M Brown
F1	March 2020	Planning	CBcb12985-97-0603201-12 Keats Grove-F1.doc	C Botsialas	E M Brown	E M Brown

Document Details

Last saved	12/02/2020 10:42
Path	CBcb 12985-97-0603201-12 Keats Grove-F1.doc
Author	C Botsialas, BSc MSc MBA CEng MIMMM CGeol FGS RoGEP Specialist
Project Partner	E M Brown, BSc MSc CGeol FGS
Project Number	12985-97
Project Name	12 Keats Grove
Planning Reference	2019/5443/P & 2019/5469/L

Contents

1.0 Non-technical Summary 1
2.0 Introduction 2
3.0 Basement Impact Assessment Audit Check List 5
4.0 Discussion 8
5.0 Conclusions 11

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 12 Keats Grove, London, NW3 2RN (planning reference 2019/5443/P & 2019/5469/L). 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 (BIA) 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 checklist. Additional information was provided by applicant's engineers.

1.4. The BIA has been carried out by individuals with suitable qualifications.

1.5. The site is irregularly shaped and is occupied by a Grade II listed three-storey detached villa.

1.6. The proposed development includes demolishing and rebuilding the house wings and construction of a basement under each. The new basements will require excavations c.2.00-2.20m below existing ground level. Outline construction methodology, construction sequence and drawings, preliminary calculations, and a construction management plan were presented.

1.7. The BIA reports included screening and scoping sections for land stability, hydrogeology and hydrology, supported by a desk study and a site walkover.

1.8. A site-specific intrusive ground investigation was undertaken.

1.9. Any groundwater inflows during construction are expected to be minor.

1.10. The proposed development is not anticipated to impact the hydrogeological environment.

1.11. The potential damage to the host building and neighbouring structures is anticipated to be negligible or very slight (Burland categories 0 and 1).

1.12. An outline movement monitoring strategy was presented.

1.13. It is accepted that there will be negligible impact to the hydrology of the site due to the proposed development.

1.14. It can be confirmed that the proposal adheres to the requirements of the CPG Basements.

2.0 INTRODUCTION

2.1. CampbellReith was instructed by London Borough of Camden (LBC) on 31 December 2019 to carry out a Category B Audit on the Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) submitted as part of the Planning Submission documentation for 12 Keats Grove, London, NW3 2RN (planning reference 2019/5443/P & 2019/5469/L).

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 (CPG 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 "*Enlargement of existing side entrance porch at ground and lower ground floor levels including excavation, replacement front door and alteration to surrounding fenestration; Erection of single storey plus basement side extension including excavation (following demolition of existing garage extension); Replacement window frames to all elevations; Removal and reapplication of external render; Alterations to front boundary wall including infilling of vehicle gate and formation of new pedestrian gate;*

Front garden side boundary wall and bin store; Front and rear garden landscaping including the erection of two garden outbuildings (following demolition of existing structures); Installation of 3 air conditioning units to rear garden".

The Audit Instruction confirmed that the proposal involves a listed building. According to available information the on-site building is a Grade II listed structure.

2.6. CampbellReith accessed LBC's Planning Portal on 14 January 2020 and gained access to the following relevant documents for audit purposes:

- "Ground Investigation and Basement Impact Assessment Report" (Geotechnical BIA report), dated 25 October 2019, issue 2, issued by Geotechnical & Environmental Associates (GEA) Ltd;
- "Structural Engineer's Basement Impact Assessment" (Structural BIA report), dated December 2019, v.4, issued by Price & Myers;
- "Design and Access Statement", dated October 2019, ref.no. 0431_DOC_001 Rev 00, issued by Chris Dyson Architects;
- "Arboricultural Report", dated 7 October 2019, issued by Andrew Day Arboricultural Consultancy Ltd;
- "Planning Stage Construction Management Plan", dated December 2019, v.2, issued by Price & Myers;
- "Project File Note, New Side Extension Foundations", dated December 2019, issued by Price & Myers;
- Planning application drawings dated 25/10/2019, proj.ref.no. 0431, issued by Chris Dyson Architects, consisting of:
  - 0010 Existing Site Plan;
  - 1010 Proposed Site Plan;
  - 0000 Existing Upper Ground Floor Plan;
  - -0000 Existing Lower Ground Floor Plan;
  - 0100 Existing Front Elevation (South);
  - 0101 Existing Rear Elevation (North);
  - 0200 Existing Long Section A-A;
  - 0201 Existing Section – Through Entrance Hall;
  - 1000 Proposed Upper Ground Floor Plan;
  - -1000 Proposed Lower Ground Floor Plan;
  - 1100 Proposed Front Elevation (South);
  - 1101 Proposed Rear Elevation (North);
  - 1200 Proposed Section – Through Kitchen Extension;

- 1201 Proposed Section – Through Entrance Hall & Boot Room Extension.

- Planning Comments.

2.7. CampbellReith issued by email on 22/01/2020, audit comments (attached in Appendix 3) raising a number of queries on the above relevant documents.

2.8. In response to the queries raised, the following reports were received by email (attached in Appendix 3) from Chris Dyson Architects, on 29 and 31 January 2020:

- "Ground Investigation and Basement Impact Assessment Report" (revised Geotechnical BIA report), dated 29 January 2020, issue 3, issued by Geotechnical & Environmental Associates (GEA) Ltd;
- Structural Engineer's Basement Impact Assessment" (revised Structural BIA report), dated January 2020, issued by Price & Myers.

2.9. This report presents the findings of our audit on the above revised documents.

3.0 BASEMENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT AUDIT CHECK LIST

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Are BIA Author(s) credentials satisfactory?	Yes	Refer to comment in audit paragraph 4.1.
Is data required by Cl.233 of the GSD presented?	Yes	Refer to the revised Geotechnical and the Structural BIA reports.
Does the description of the proposed development include all aspects of temporary and permanent works which might impact upon geology, hydrogeology and hydrology?	Yes	As above.
Are suitable plan/maps included?	Yes	As above.
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	Refer to Section 3.1.2 of the revised Geotechnical BIA report.
Hydrogeology Screening: Have appropriate data sources been consulted? Is justification provided for 'No' answers?	Yes	Refer to Section 3.1.1 of the revised Geotechnical BIA report.
Hydrology Screening: Have appropriate data sources been consulted? Is justification provided for 'No' answers?	Yes	Refer to Section 3.1.3 of the revised Geotechnical BIA report.
Is a conceptual model presented?	Yes	Refer to Sections 2.4 and 2.5 of the revised Geotechnical BIA report.
Land Stability Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	Yes	Refer to Section 4.1 of the revised Geotechnical BIA report.

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Hydrogeology Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	Yes	Refer to Section 4.1 of the revised Geotechnical BIA report.
Hydrology Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	N/A	No potential issues were identified from the screening process.
Is factual ground investigation data provided?	Yes	Refer to Section 5 of the revised Geotechnical BIA report.
Is monitoring data presented?	Yes	Refer to Section 5.4 of the revised Geotechnical BIA report.
Is the ground investigation informed by a desk study?	Yes	Refer to Section 2 of the revised Geotechnical BIA report.
Has a site walkover been undertaken?	Yes	Refer to Sections 1.3 and 2.1 of the revised Geotechnical BIA report.
Is the presence/absence of adjacent or nearby basements confirmed?	Yes	Refer to Section 2.1.1 of the revised Geotechnical BIA report.
Is a geotechnical interpretation presented?	Yes	Refer to Sections 6 to 8 of the revised Geotechnical BIA report.
Does the geotechnical interpretation include information on retaining wall design?	Yes	Refer to Section 8.1.2 of the revised Geotechnical BIA report.
Are reports on other investigations required by screening and scoping presented?	Yes	An arboricultural report was presented.
Are the baseline conditions described, based on the GSD?	Yes	Refer to the revised Geotechnical BIA report.
Do the base line conditions consider adjacent or nearby basements?	Yes	The absence of adjacent basements was discussed in Section 2.1.1 of the revised Geotechnical BIA report.
Is an Impact Assessment provided?	Yes	Refer to Sections 9 to 11 & 13 of the revised Geotechnical BIA

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
		report and Sections 3 to 5 of the revised Structural BIA report.
Are estimates of ground movement and structural impact presented?	Yes	Refer to Sections 10 and 11 of the revised Geotechnical BIA report.
Is the Impact Assessment appropriate to the matters identified by screening and scoping?	Yes	
Has the need for mitigation been considered and are appropriate mitigation methods incorporated in the scheme?	Yes	Refer to the revised Geotechnical BIA report.
Has the need for monitoring during construction been considered?	Yes	An outline monitoring strategy was presented in Section 6 of the Construction Management Plan report.
Have the residual (after mitigation) impacts been clearly identified?	N/A	No residual impacts are anticipated.
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	Refer to Section 3 of the revised Structural BIA report.
Has the scheme avoided cumulative impacts upon structural stability or the water environment in the local area?	Yes	Refer to Section 13.2 of the revised Geotechnical BIA report and Section 3 of the revised Structural BIA report.
Does report state that damage to surrounding buildings will be no worse than Burland Category 1?	Yes	Refer to Sections 11.1 and 12 of the revised Geotechnical BIA report and Section 5 of the revised Structural BIA report.
Are non-technical summaries provided?	Yes	Refer to Section 13.3 of the revised Geotechnical BIA report.

4.0 DISCUSSION

4.1. The Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) has been carried out by Geotechnical & Environmental Associates (GEA) Ltd (the Geotechnical BIA report) and by Price & Myers (the Structural BIA report), by individuals with suitable qualifications.

4.2. The site is irregularly shaped and is occupied by a three-storey detached villa that includes a lower ground floor, an attic, and single and two-storey wings located on either side. A garden and a driveway exist to the front and a large garden with outbuildings to the rear. The lower ground floor level covers the majority of the building footprint and is located c.500mm lower than the driveway. The existing building is a Grade II listed structure, constructed in the late 1810s.

4.3. The proposed development includes demolishing and rebuilding the house wings and construction of a basement under each. The new wings will comprise two-storey structures. The proposed basements will be c.1m lower than the existing lower ground floor level and approximately level with the formation level of the existing footings of the main building. The new basements will require excavations c.2.00-2.20m below existing ground level, adopting a 'hit and miss' technique for the construction of the load-bearing structural elements and underpins. The existing house footings will be underpinned so that the proposed extensions and the house are founded at the same level and ground formation. The structural proposal indicated one phase of underpin construction. Outline construction methodology, construction sequence drawings and preliminary calculations were presented within Section 5, and Appendices C and D of the Structural BIA report.

4.4. The revised Geotechnical BIA report included screening and scoping sections for land stability, hydrogeology and hydrology, supported by a desk study and a site walkover, as required by CPG Basements.

4.5. A site-specific intrusive ground investigation was undertaken comprising four boreholes, up to 15m depth, and two hand-excavated foundation inspection pits, up to 0.60m depth. The ground investigation recorded Made Ground to depths of between 0.40m and 0.80m over (locally in the eastern half of the site only) soft to firm clayey Head deposits to depths of between 2.60m to 4.00m over London Clay; the latter was confirmed to at least 15m depth.

4.6. Groundwater was not encountered during the fieldwork. Post-drilling monitoring revealed groundwater rested at c.0.80m depth but was assessed to reflect minor seepages from sandy pockets within the Head deposits or rainwater infiltration through the Made Ground, and as such were not considered representative of a continuous groundwater table. According to the revised Geotechnical BIA report (Section 8.1.1) any groundwater inflows during construction are anticipated to be minor and should be dealt with sump pumping. Trial excavations are proposed

by the revised Geotechnical BIA report (Section 14) to assess the extent of inflows prior to construction; water proofing and tanking is proposed in the long term (Section 3.1.3.).

4.7. Considering the ground conditions, the depth and plan dimensions of the proposed basements, the existing lower ground floor, the neighbouring structural levels, the monitored groundwater levels, and the fact that the on-site building is a detached structure, it is accepted that the proposed development is not anticipated to impact the hydrogeological environment.

4.8. Geotechnical interpretation including parameters for retaining wall design and a ground movement assessment (GMA) were presented in Sections 6 to 10 of the revised Geotechnical BIA report.

4.9. The GMA used proprietary software and CIRIA C760 methodology which is intended for embedded retaining walls, however, it is accepted that this approach can predict ground movements within the range typically anticipated for the proposed 'hit and miss' retaining wall techniques when carried out with good control of workmanship.

4.10. As anticipated, the GMA considered the proposed excavations and loads, the foundation characteristics of and distances to neighbouring structures, the proposed sequence of construction and short and long term conditions. Ground movements of c.2mm and between 3mm to 5mm were estimated due to underpin installation and subsequent basement excavation, respectively.

4.11. The potential impact and damage to the on-site listed building and the neighbouring building situated at 12B Keats Grove to the west, was predicted to be within Category 1 'very slight' damage or less, according to the Burland scale (Table 6.4, CIRIA C760 report). In order to minimise the anticipated ground movement the recommendations discussed in the GMA should be adopted, including good control of workmanship during construction.

4.12. According to information included in the revised Structural BIA report, the building located at 12A Keats Grove to the east of the site, is supported on pile foundations and ground beams and is therefore not anticipated to be affected structurally by the proposed works, as discussed in Section 9.1 of the revised Geotechnical BIA report. This was further confirmed in writing by Chris Dyson Architects (email dated 29/1/2020, attached in Appendix 3).

4.13. The existing boundary wall towards 12A Keats Grove is proposed to be supported with temporary support during construction. The boundary wall towards 12B Keats Grove is located within the subject site and was encountered significantly cracked during the site walkover. It was indicated that any pre-existing damage of that boundary wall to the west will be repaired during construction stage and, as such, was not considered in the GMA. The LBC should be

consulted with regard to the details of the proposed repair of that boundary wall given the Grade II listed status of the on-site structure.

4.14. It is understood that all temporary works will be designed and finalised post-planning and prior to construction by a specialist contractor.

4.15. In this context, the BIA has confirmed that the impact on land stability due to the proposed development can be limited within Category 1 'very slight' damage or less for the on-site and nearby structures.

4.16. An outline movement monitoring strategy was presented in Section 6 of the revised Structural BIA report with reasonable movement trigger levels. This monitoring strategy should be further refined and finalised prior to construction, taking into account the outcomes of GMA. It is recommended that survey targets are also installed prior to construction on the ground, at the edges of the proposed excavations to monitor the ground movements and compare them against the predictions of the GMA.

4.17. The subject site is not within an area prone to flooding. According to the revised Structural BIA report, the hardstanding area of the site will remain unchanged; the footprint of the proposed building will be c.5m^2 larger than the existing, however, this area comprises already hardstanding and so there will be no increase in surface flow. It is accepted that there will be negligible impact to the hydrology of the site due to the proposed development.

4.18. According to information presented in Section 5 and Appendix B of the revised Structural BIA report, underground drainage pipes enter the site from 12A Keats Grove, and join an existing pipe under the subject site. It should be ensured that 12A Keats Grove drainage pipes remain operational at all times. Details of the technical arrangements will need to be agreed in advance of the works between the interested parties.

4.19. An outline construction management plan was included in the BIA documents.

4.20. Subject to LBC's consultation and approval, the recommendations of the arboricultural report with regard to tree protection should be followed.

4.21. Based on the above comments, all previous queries were closed and can be confirmed that the proposal adheres to the requirements of the CPG Basements.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

5.1. The Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) has been carried out by individuals with suitable qualifications.

5.2. The site is irregularly shaped and is occupied by a Grade II listed three-storey detached villa.

5.3. The proposed development includes demolishing and rebuilding the house wings and construction of a basement under each. The new basements will require excavations c.2.00-2.20m below existing ground level. Outline construction methodology, construction sequence and drawings, and preliminary calculations were presented.

5.4. The revised Geotechnical BIA report included screening and scoping sections for land stability, hydrogeology and hydrology, supported by a desk study and a site walkover.

5.5. A site-specific intrusive ground investigation recorded Made Ground over clayey Head deposits over London Clay at depth.

5.6. Post-drilling monitoring revealed groundwater rested at c.0.80m depth. Any groundwater inflows during construction should be dealt with sump pumping.

5.7. The proposed development is not anticipated to impact the hydrogeological environment.

5.8. The potential damage to the host building and neighbouring structures is anticipated to be negligible or very slight.

5.9. The LBC should be consulted with regard to the details of the proposed repair of the boundary wall towards 12B Keats Grove, given the Grade II listed status of the on-site structure.

5.10. An outline movement monitoring strategy was presented in the Structural BIA report. It is recommended that survey targets are also installed prior to construction on the ground, at the edges of the proposed excavations to monitor the ground movements.

5.11. It is accepted that there will be negligible impact to the hydrology of the site due to the proposed development.

5.12. The underground drainage pipes joining the site from 12A Keats Grove should remain operational at all times.

5.13. An outline construction management plan was included in the BIA documents.

5.14. Subject to LBC's consultation and approval, the recommendations of the arboricultural report with regard to tree protection should be followed.

5.15. Based on the above comments, all previous queries were closed and can be confirmed that the proposal adheres to the requirements of the CPG Basements.

Appendix 1: Residents' Consultation Comments

Pertinent to the BIA

Residents' Consultation Comments

Surname	Address	Date	Issue raised	Response
The Heath & Hampstead Society	-	11/12/2019	The basement of the side extension will be on firm foundations very different from the existing house. Thus potential differential movement could cause considerable damage to the existing house.	According to the structural proposal, the existing house footings will be underpinned so that the proposed side extensions and the house are tied together and founded at the same level and ground formation. This is anticipated to mitigate any differential movement.
Steven & Vicky Bobasch	12A Keats Grove	3/1/2020	Request for a basement construction plan to be imposed if planning is granted.	According to Section 4.38 of CPG Basements, a basement construction plan is required for 'larger or more complex basement schemes and where excavation is close to neighbouring buildings and structures or involve listed buildings'. The on-site structure is a Grade II listed building and the proposed excavations are close to neighbouring buildings on both sides. However, the proposed basements are not considered large nor complex as they are proposed to be c.1m lower than the existing lower ground floor level and c.2.00-2.20m below existing ground level. Further, the applicant's engineers have provided a BIA which satisfies all the requirements of CPG Basements. In this context, and according to CPG Basements, a basement construction plan is not required unless otherwise be decided by LBC.
			The BIA (*auditor's note: it refers to a previous version of the BIA than the one considered in this audit report*) should provide more information on the potential settlement to the area on either side of the proposed underpinning.	As discussed in this audit, a satisfactory GMA that includes estimates of potential ground settlement are presented in the revised Geotechnical BIA report. According to information presented in Section 5 and

			Drainage pipe entering the site from 12A Keats Grove should remain operational at all times. A condition is requested to be included if planning is granted.	Appendix B of the revised Structural BIA report, underground drainage pipes enter the site from 12A Keats Grove, and join an existing pipe under the subject site. 12A Keats Grove drainage pipes should remain operational at all times. Details of the technical arrangements will need to be agreed in advance of the works between the interested parties. It is in LBC's discretion to impose a relevant condition if planning permission is granted.

Appendix 2: Audit Query Tracker

Audit Query Tracker

Query No	Subject	Query	Status	Date closed out
1	Hydrogeology	Page 8, Section 3.1.1, Geotechnical BIA report: Reference that no potential issues were identified from the groundwater screening process needs amendment.	Closed	29/01/2020
2	Stability	Page 9, Section 3.1.2, Geotechnical BIA report: Reference that the proposed basement will not increase the differential depth of foundations relative to neighbouring properties needs amendment.	Closed	29/01/2020
3	Stability	Page 26, Section 11, Geotechnical BIA report: Analysis and damage assessment should be undertaken and presented for the on-site Grade II listed building.	Closed	29/01/2020
4	Stability	Page 26, Section 11, Geotechnical BIA report: Analysis and damage assessment is required for the boundary walls towards 12B & 12A Keats Grove given the on-site structure is Grade II listed.	Closed	29/01/2020
5	Stability	Ground movement analysis, Geotechnical BIA report: A sketch/plan showing the twelve elements/walls considered in the analysis is requested.	Closed	29/01/2020
6	Stability	Drawing SK03, v.2, October 2019, Structural BIA report: Evidence is requested to prove that the neighbouring building at 12A Keats Grove is founded on piles. Assessment is requested for any potential influence to the piles' carrying capacity.	Closed	29/01/2020
7	General BIA	Appendix - Part 1, Geotechnical BIA report: The geotechnical laboratory test results are missing from the digital copy (available from LBC website) and are requested.	Closed	29/01/2020
8	General BIA	Page 3, Section 1, Structural BIA report: In the last paragraph it is stated that the house is not listed. An amendment is required.	Closed	29/01/2020

Appendix 3: Supplementary Supporting Documents

1. 29 & 31 January 2020 emails of Chris Dyson Architects LLP & 22 January 2020 email of CampbellReith (audit preliminary comments)

File Transfer: RE: 12985-97_12 Keats Grove_BIA audit preliminary comments - 12 Keats Grove
Koryn Steinbok to: ChristosBotsialas 31/01/2020 15:32
Please respond to Koryn.Steinbok

0 Attachment

newftmp_681bfdc7-6174-4136-8a87-48d53cfe0771.jpg newftmp_056d901e-fc8e-48f7-8dbb-22b2f2b075b9.jpg newftmp_e2924b95-f0f5-4339-b4ff-7a688ba6d42f.png

newftmp_40311f91-7cb6-4f2d-a85f-2463f091364b.jpg

IMPORTANT: Click a link below to access files associated with this transmittal that came in through the Chris Dyson Architects LLP Info Exchange web site.

Download all associated files

Additional links:
Reply to All

Project Name: 12 Keats Grove
Project Number: 0431

From: Koryn Steinbok (Chris Dyson Architects LLP)
To: ChristosBotsialas@campbellreith.com
CC: Thomas.Sild@camden.gov.uk; camdenaudit@campbellreith.com
Subject: RE: 12985-97_12 Keats Grove_BIA audit preliminary comments
Sent via: Info Exchange
Expiration Date: 3/1/2020
Remarks: Dear Christos,

GEA have re-shared version 3 of their Ground Impact Assessment; this includes all changes you requested highlighted yellow (for ease of reference) as well as the results from an additional groundwater monitoring visit carried out yesterday.
Hope this shall make review slightly clearer/easier. Thanks and look forward to your feedback,

Yours Sincerely,

Koryn Steinbok ARB
Architect

Chris Dyson Architects LLP
T: 0044 20 7247 1816
E: koryn.steinbok@chrisdyson.co.uk
Signup to our mailing list here

From: ChristosBotsialas@campbellreith.com <ChristosBotsialas@campbellreith.com>
Sent: 30 January 2020 08:55
To: Koryn Steinbok <Koryn.Steinbok@chrisdyson.co.uk>
Cc: camdenaudit@campbellreith.com; Sild, Thomas <Thomas.Sild@camden.gov.uk>
Subject: Re: File Transfer: RE: 12985-97_12 Keats Grove, London, NW3 2RN_BIA audit preliminary comments - 12 Keats Grove

Dear Koryn,
Thank you for providing the updated BIA reports.

We will review them shortly and let you know should we have any further queries.

Kind regards,

Christos Botsialas
Associate

CampbellReith
consulting engineers

15 Bermondsey Square
London
SE1 3UN

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

From: "Koryn Steinbok" <Koryn.Steinbok@chrisdyson.co.uk>
To: <ChristosBotsialas@campbellreith.com>
Date: 29/01/2020 17:53
Subject: File Transfer: RE: 12985-97_12 Keats Grove, London, NW3 2RN_BIA audit preliminary comments - 12 Keats Grove

Note: You have been CC'd on this notification.

IMPORTANT: Click a link below to access files associated with this transmittal that came in through the Chris Dyson Architects LLP Info Exchange web site.

Download all associated files

Additional links:

Reply to All

Project Name: 12 Keats Grove
Project Number: 0431

From: Koryn Steinbok (Chris Dyson Architects LLP)
To: Thomas.Sild@camden.gov.uk; GrahamKite@campbellreith.com
CC: camdenaudit@campbellreith.com; ChristosBotsialas@campbellreith.com
Subject: RE: 12985-97_12 Keats Grove, London, NW3 2RN_BIA audit preliminary comments
Sent via: Info Exchange
Expiration Date: 2/28/2020
Remarks: Dear Graham and Thomas,

Please see attached documents which have been updated to address your comments in below email.

- Basement Impact Assessment v.5 (prepared by Structural Engineers, Price & Myers)
  In respect of the query about an *"assessment requested by the consultant, due to the proximity of the proposed basement to 12A Keats Grove with regard to any potential influence of the anticipated ground movements induced by the basement excavation to the skin friction and carrying capacity of the upper part of the foundation piles"* I confirm that there may be some very minor reduction in shaft friction on the existing piles, but the effect will be negligible.
- Ground Investigation and Impact Assessment Issue 3 (prepared by Ground Works Team, GEA)

Please don't hesitate to get in touch if you have any further queries. It would be great to get an update of when the BIA Audit will be completed. Many thanks,

Yours Sincerely,

Koryn Steinbok ARB
Architect

Chris Dyson Architects LLP
T: 0044 20 7247 1816
E: koryn.steinbok@chrisdyson.co.uk
Signup to our mailing list here

From: GrahamKite@campbellreith.com <GrahamKite@campbellreith.com>
Sent: 22 January 2020 13:55
To: Koryn Steinbok <Koryn.Steinbok@chrisdyson.co.uk>
Cc: camdenaudit@campbellreith.com; ChristosBotsialas@campbellreith.com
Subject: Fw: 12985-97_12 Keats Grove, London, NW3 2RN_BIA audit preliminary comments

Hi Koryn

FYI the comments below were issued to LBC this morning, which will require responses from your engineering team, as indicated.

Regards

Graham Kite

CampbellReith
15 Bermondsey Square
London
SE1 3UN

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

----- Forwarded by Graham Kite/CRH on 22/01/2020 13:51 -----

From: Christos Botsialas/CRH
To: Thomas.sild@camden.gov.uk
Cc: Camden Audit/CRH@campbellreith
Date: 22/01/2020 08:54
Subject: 12985-97_12 Keats Grove, London, NW3 2RN_BIA audit preliminary comments

Dear Thomas,
We have reviewed the BIA information available on LBC's website for the subject site and have the following preliminary audit comments:

Structural BIA report (Price & Myers, v.4, December 2019)

- Page 3, Section 1: In the last paragraph it is stated that the house is not listed. This contradicts a statement in the previous paragraph that the house is a Grade II listed building. An amendment is required.
- Drawing SK03, v.2, October 2019: It is assumed that the neighbouring building at 12A Keats Grove is founded on piled ground beams/piles. Evidence is requested to prove this assumption as it may influence the outcome of the ground movement and damage assessment. Also, assessment is requested by the consultant, due to the proximity of the proposed basement to 12A Keats Grove with regard to any potential influence of the anticipated ground movements induced by the basement excavation to the skin friction and carrying capacity of the upper part of the foundation piles.

Geotechnical BIA report (GEA, 25 October 2019)

- Page 8, Section 3.1.1: A typo needs to be amended regarding no potential issues identified from the groundwater screening process.
- Page 9, Section 3.1.2, screening question no 13 & page 17, Section 8.1.1: It is stated that the proposed basement will not increase the differential depth of foundations relative to neighbouring properties. However, the proposed basements will require deeper excavations and therefore will increase the differential depth of foundations by about 1m (west) and 1.5m (east) when compared to current basement levels. It is requested that the screening answer is changed to 'yes'. This issue is anyway further analysed during the GMA, hence it does not affect the outcome of the analysis. It is further mentioned that No. 12A Keats Grove property is founded on piles. Evidence is requested to support this statement as previously requested in the Structural BIA report above.
- Page 26, Section 11: Analysis and damage assessment should be undertaken for a shallow foundation scenario if no evidence of a piled foundation be provided for the adjacent building located at 12A Keats Grove.
- Page 26, Section 11: Analysis and damage assessment should be undertaken and presented for the on-site Grade II listed building in accordance with 2.23, 2.24 of CPG Basements.
- Page 26, Section 11: Analysis and damage assessment may berequired for the boundary walls towards 12B Keats Grove (west) and 12A Keats Grove (east) given the on-site property is Grade II listed. Consultation with LBC is required in that regard together with an enquiry whether any construction damage and subsequent repair would be acceptable from LBC.
- Appendix - Part 1: The geotechnical laboratory test results are missing from the digital copy (available from LBC website) and are requested.
- Ground movement analysis: A sketch/plan showing the twelve elements/walls considered in the analysis is requested.
-

Please forward the above preliminary comments to the applicant's engineers for their response. We would anticipate the receipt of the updated BIA reports or an addendum report to cover the above matters.

We intend to issue our final audit report after receipt of the updated BIA reports as per the comments above and after the satisfactory closing out of all queries.

Kind regards,

Christos Botsialas
Associate

CampbellReith
consulting engineers

15 Bermondsey Square
London
SE1 3UN

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

Transferred Files

Name	Type	Date	Time	Size
Transmittal - 00015.pdf	PDF File	1/29/2020	5:53 PM	172 KB
0431_Basement Impact Assessment_v5.pdf	PDF File	1/29/2020	5:45 PM	6,227 KB
0431_Ground Investigation and Impact Assessment_Issue3.pdf	PDF File	1/29/2020	5:44 PM	32,382 KB

Transferred Files

NAME	TYPE	DATE	TIME	SIZE
Transmittal - 00016.pdf	PDF File	1/31/2020	3:32 PM	170 KB
J19228 - 12 Keats Grove Rep Iss 3 complete 31.01.2020.pdf	PDF File	1/31/2020	3:26 PM	31,629 KB

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