Basement Impact Assessment AUDIT: Instruction

Camden Case Reference:	2020/1025/P	Site Address:	Boncara 35 Templewood Avenue London NW3 7UY		
Case officer contact details:	Laura Hazelton	Date of audit request:	06/03/2020		
Statutory consultation end date:		02/04/2020	02/04/2020		
Reason for Audit:	Basement developme	nt			
single dwelling house with basement. Refurbishment of retained Listed swimming pool. Creation of a new vehicular access to proposed basement level via West Heath Road. Associated landscaping including reinstatement of earth mound around retained swimming pool building.					
Relevant planning background 2017/4498/P - Excavation of new basement level; erection of 2 storey extension to south east corner of the site to join the south and east wings; erection of new lift/stairwell to the eastern elevation of the south wing up to third floor level, extension of south wing 3rd floor level; installation of car lift to east elevation; refurbishment of listed swimming pool and associated landscaping. Granted 11/06/2018.					
Do the basement proposals involve a listed building or does the site neighbour any listed buildings?					
		Slope stability	Yes		
Is the site in an area of (check site constraints		Surface Water flow and flooding Yes			
		Subterranean (groundwater) f	flow		

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

Does the application require determination by Development Control Committee in accordance fall the Terms of Reference ¹	
Does the scope of the submitted BIA extend beyond the screening stage?	

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

		Yes/ No/N A ²	Name of BIA document/appendix in which information is contained.
Item	provided		Column below refers directly to Jomas' report: Geotechnical Desk Study, Ground Investigation, Basement Impact Assessment & Ground Movement Assessment for 35 Templewood Avenue, London, NW3 7UY. Jomas Associates Ltd, Final v3.1, February 2020.
1	Description of proposed development.	YES	Jomas Report Section 1.2
2	Plan showing boundary of development including any land required temporarily during construction.	YES	Jomas Report Appendix 2, page 2
3	Plans, maps and or photographs to show location of basement relative to surrounding structures.	YES	Jomas Report Appendix 11
4	Plans, maps and or photographs to show topography of surrounding area with any nearby watercourses/waterbodies including consideration of the relevant maps in the Strategic FRA by URS (2014)	YES	Jomas Report Appendix 3 Appendix 11
5	Plans and sections to show foundation details of adjacent structures.	YES	See P&M section 1-1 and section 3-3 on drawing 28585/3100 contained within the SMS
6	Plans and sections to show layout and dimensions of proposed basement.	YES	Jomas Report Appendix 11
7	Programme for enabling works, construction and restoration.	YES	an overall program is provided as part of the CSM
8	Identification of potential risks to land stability (including surrounding structures	YES	Jomas Report Section 7, Table 7.1

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

	and infrastructure), and surface and groundwater flooding.		
9	Assessment of impact of potential risks on neighbouring properties and surface and groundwater.	YES	Jomas Report Section 15
10	Identification of significant adverse impacts.	YES	The process of identifying significant adverse impacts was undertaken however, none were identified.
11	Evidence of consultation with neighbours.		The applicant representation has spoken to the neighbours within the Schreiber House
		YES	Jomas Report
12	 Ground Investigatin Report and Conceptual Site Model including Desktop study exploratory hole records results from monitoring the local groundwater regime confirmation of baseline conditions factual site investigation report 		 Desktop study Sections 1- 7 exploratory hole records Appendix 5 results from monitoring the local groundwater regime Appendix 8 confirmation of baseline conditions Sections 8-14 factual site investigation report Section 9
13	Ground Movement Assessment (GMA).	YES	Jomas Report Section 16
14	Plans, drawings, reports to show extent of affected area.	YES	Jomas Report Figures within Section 16.
15	Specific mitigation measures to reduce, avoid or offset significant adverse impacts.	N/A	The process of identifying significant adverse impacts was undertaken however, none were identified.
16	Construction Sequence Methodology (CSM) referring to site investigation and containing basement, floor and roof plans, sections (all views), sequence of construction and temporary works.	YES	Refer to Price & Myers CSM

17	Proposals for monitoring during construction.	YES	Refer to Price & Myers CSM
18	Confirmatory and reasoned statement identifying likely damage to nearby properties according to Burland Scale	YES	Jomas Report All façades or boundary walls have been classified as Category 0 or Category 1. Section 16.7.
19	Confirmatory and reasoned statement with supporting evidence that the structural stability of the building and neighbouring properties will be maintained (by reference to BIA, Ground Movement Assessment and Construction Sequence Methodology), including consideration of cumulative effects.	N/A	Jomas Report Section 16 (GMA) concludes that there is a low overall risk to structural stability of the building.
20	Confirmatory and reasoned statement with supporting evidence that there will be no adverse effects on drainage or run-off and no damage to the water environment (by reference to ground investigation, BIA and CSM), including consideration of cumulative effects.	YES	Jomas Report Section 16 (GMA) discusses effects linked with Thames Water Assets, See also section 10 of the Price & Myers CSM Appendix 11
21	Identification of areas that require further investigation.	YES	The process of identifying areas of potential further investigation was undertaken, however, none were identified.
22	Non-technical summary for each stage of BIA.	YES	Jomas Report Executive Summary
Addit	tional BIA components (added during Audit)		
ltem provi	Yes/No/NA ²		Comment

Notes:

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

²Where response is 'no' or 'NA', an explanation is required in the Comment section.

Section C : Audit proposal (to be completed by the Auditor)

Date	Fee Categorisation (A/B/C) and costs (£ ex VAT)	Date estimate for initial report	Commentary (including timescales for completion of Initial Report)
Date	Category and cost -	This will depend on date of completion of section D but some indication is required	<i>If possible please ALSO provide estimate for possible additional fees required to review consultation responses received to date.</i>
10/03/2020	Category C - £4,050	Approximately 4 weeks from instruction	 Additional fees may be required for site attendance reviewing revised/resubmitted documentation reviewing third party consultation comments attending DCC

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

These changes shall be agreed with the planning officer and the applicant, in writing before the work is undertaken.