



Document History and Status

Revision	Date	Purpose/Status	File Ref	Author	Check	Review
D1	21/05/2020	Comment	EMBjap13398- 25-49 Flask Walk-210520- D1.doc	ЕМВ	ЕМВ	EMB
F1	01/06/2020	Issued for Planning	EMBjap13398- 25-49 Flask Walk-010620- F1.doc	ЕМВ	ЕМВ	ЕМВ

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	01/06/2020 16:11
Path	EMBjap13398-25-49 Flask Walk-010620-F1 .doc
Author	E M Brown
Project Partner	E M Brown, BSc MSc CGeol FGS
Project Number	13398-25
Project Name	49 Flask Walk
Planning Reference	2019/1309/P

Structural ◆ Civil ◆ Environmental ◆ Geotechnical ◆ Transportation

Date: June 2020

i



Contents

1.0	Non-technical summary	1
	Introduction	
	Basement Impact Assessment Audit Check List	
	Discussion	
	Conclusions	

Appendix

Appendix 1: Residents' Consultation Comments

Appendix 2: Audit Query Tracker Appendix 3: Supplementary Supporting Documents

Date: June 2020



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 49 Flask Walk, London NW3 1HH (planning reference 2019/1309/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 provided with the BIA and supporting information by LBC's planning department and reviewed it against an agreed audit checklist.
- 1.4. The Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) has been carried out by GEA with a Structural Engineering Report by Price and Myers. The individuals concerned in its production have suitable qualifications.
- 1.5. The screening exercise identified no potential impacts to surface water and groundwater (subterranean flows).
- 1.6. Issue 2 of the BIA, Revision 3 of the SER and a letter from Price and Myers conclude that, assuming good workmanship, there are no potential significant impacts to surrounding properties and no other potential impacts to stability exist.
- 1.7. It is confirmed that the BIA complies with the requirements of Camden's Planning Guidance with respect to basements.



2.0 INTRODUCTION

- 2.1. CampbellReith was instructed by London Borough of Camden (LBC) on 11 May 2020 to carry out a category A audit on the Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) submitted as part of the Planning Submission documentation for 49 Flask Walk, London NW3 1HH, planning reference 2019/1309/P.
- 2.2. The audit was carried out in accordance with the Terms of Reference set by LBC. It reviewed the BIA 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;
- avoid adversely affecting drainage and run off or causing other damage to the water environment;
- 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.

LBC's Audit Instruction described the planning proposal as "Reconstruction & alteration of existing three storey rear extension. Alterations to rear fenestration. Ground floor rear infill extension and new rear bay window. Mansard roof extension and terrace. New bin store below front garden."



- 2.5. CampbellReith was provided with two documents by LBC on 9 April 2020:
 - Structural Engineering Report and Construction Method Statement, Rev 2, reference no 28349, by Price and Myers, dated March 2020.
 - Desk Study and BIA, Issue no 1, reference no J20020, by Geotechnical and Environmental Associates Ltd (GEA), dated March 2020.
- 2.6. In addition, CampbellReith obtained the following information from LBC's planning portal:
 - Design and Access Statement by Studio Carver, dated March 2019
 - Planning Application Drawings by Studio Carver consisting of:

Location plan

Existing drawings

Proposed (revised) drawings.

2.7. An initial review identified underpinning of the neighbouring properties, both of which are listed, suggesting potential impacts to stability and damage. Queries were raised with the BIA author via the planning officer, resulting in an updated Structural Engineering Report (Rev 3, April 2020), an updated Desk Study and BIA (Issue no 2, April 2020), a letter responding to the queries and Revision B of the architect's drawing 1802_PL_100. Pertinent email correspondence is presented in Appendix 3 and this report details the audit of revised and additional information.



3.0 BASEMENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT AUDIT CHECK LIST

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Are BIA Author(s) credentials satisfactory?	Yes	Qualifications in accordance with requirements of CPG: Basements.
Is data required by Cl.233 of the GSD presented?	Yes	Information broadly in compliance with GSD although programme provided.
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?	No	Not all plans and maps to support screening exercise are included in the BIA.
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	The BIA suggests that underpinning may be required to No 47 Flask Walk. However, the structural engineer has confirmed this is not the case.
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	
Is a conceptual model presented?	No	
Land Stability Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	Yes	



Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Hydrogeology Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	Yes	
Hydrology Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	NA	
Is factual ground investigation data provided?	Yes	Trial pits to expose neighbouring foundations.
Is monitoring data presented?	No	
Is the ground investigation informed by a desk study?	NA	
Has a site walkover been undertaken?	Yes	
Is the presence/absence of adjacent or nearby basements confirmed?	Yes	Incorrect reference to a basement beneath 51 Flask Walk has been amended.
Is a geotechnical interpretation presented?	No	
Does the geotechnical interpretation include information on retaining wall design?	NA	
Are reports on other investigations required by screening and scoping presented?	NA	None required
Are the baseline conditions described, based on the GSD?	Yes	Based only on desk study information
Do the base line conditions consider adjacent or nearby basements?	Yes	
Is an Impact Assessment provided?	Yes	
Are estimates of ground movement and structural impact presented?	No	



Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Is the Impact Assessment appropriate to the matters identified by screen and scoping?	Yes	
Has the need for mitigation been considered and are appropriate mitigation methods incorporated in the scheme?	Yes	
Has the need for monitoring during construction been considered?	Yes	By reference to Party Wall Act.
Have the residual (after mitigation) impacts been clearly identified?	Yes	
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	
Are non-technical summaries provided?	No	

EMBjap13398-25-49 Flask Walk-010620-F1 .doc Date: June 2020 Status: F1 6



4.0 DISCUSSION

- 4.1. The Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) has been carried out by GEA and the individuals concerned in its production have suitable qualifications. A separate Structural Engineering Report and Construction Method Statement (SER) has been prepared by Price and Myers consulting engineers.
- 4.2. The SER notes that No 47 Flask Walk is listed.
- 4.3. The proposed excavation comprises the lowering of the rear of the property by around 200mm and the rear garden by up to 1200mm. Foundation inspection pits have confirmed the foundations to both neighbouring properties. The revised BIA and SER note that underpinning is not proposed to either neighbouring building, although underpinning to the boundary walls is required.
- 4.4. The trial pit logs record Made Ground over clay, which is identified in the BIA as Claygate Beds.

 No groundwater was encountered and the BIA indicates, on the basis of information from surrounding sites, that the basement will not extend into the water table.
- 4.5. The screening exercise identified no potential impacts to surface water and subterranean flows. The site is underlain by an aquifer, but the basement will not extend below the water table and there is no change to the extent of impermeable area.
- 4.6. With respect to stability, a number of queries were raised by CampbellReith on the documents initially submitted. These were communicated by email to LBC on 15 April 2020 (see Appendix 3) and covered the following areas:
 - Issue 1 of the BIA reported that No 51 Flask Walk had a basement. This was not supported by the trial pits.
 - Cross sections showed excavation immediately adjacent to party wall foundations and justification was requested to confirm that the stability of those foundations would not be compromised.
 - The SER showed underpinning to the foundations of Nos 47 and 51 Flask Walk and a building damage assessment was requested.
 - Sketches showed an area of excavation exceeding the revealed foundation depth adjacent to No 47 and clarification was requested.

Status: F1

- 4.7. Responses to those gueries and a revised BIA and SER were received via LBC on 6 May 2020:
 - The BIA was updated to remove reference to a basement at No 51 Flask Walk.



- The letter responding to the queries confirmed that existing bearing pressures on the foundations of the Party Walls had been reviewed and the proposed excavations were considered to have little adverse effect on their bearing.
- Finished floor levels were clarified and revised to confirm that underpinning is not required to either neighbouring property, although it is necessary beneath the garden walls where proposed levels are slightly below those of the neighbouring gardens.
- 4.8. The BIA noted that the site has a slope angle of roughly 22°. It concluded that, provided the construction work is carried out in accordance with best practice, resulting ground movements should be within normal tolerable limits, and the proposed structure should not have a significant impact on the overall stability of the slope.

Date: June 2020



5.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 5.1. The Basement Impact Assessment (BIA), has been carried out by GEA with a Structural Engineering Report by Price and Myers. The individuals concerned in its production have suitable qualifications.
- 5.2. The screening exercise identified no potential impacts to surface water and groundwater (subterranean flows).
- 5.3. Issue 2 of the BIA, Revision 3 of the SER and a letter from Price and Myers conclude that, assuming good workmanship, there are no potential significant impacts to surrounding properties and no other potential impacts to stability exist.
- 5.4. It is confirmed, that the BIA complies with the requirements of Camden's Planning Guidance with respect to basements.

Date: June 2020



Appendix 1: Residents' Consultation Comments

None

EMBjap13398-25-49 Flask Walk-010620-F1 .doc

Status: F1



Appendix 2: Audit Query Tracker

None

EMBjap13398-25-49 Flask Walk-010620-F1 .doc Date: June 2020



Appendix 3: Supplementary Supporting Documents



Thanks David. Good to talk to you today.

The plan showing the listed status also confirms that the rear of No 47 extends beyond the rear of 49 as it is at present. That suggests the excavation for the lowered rear garden is against a party wall as opposed to a garden wall. The P&M structural engineering report (page 9) indicates that excavation along the boundary with No 47 is locally 1200mm deep and typically 750mm deep. Being as the structure is listed, I think this is almost certainly a Cat B basement.

I can complete the form as discussed - i.e. take the BIA on face value and assume there are no significant impacts, making it a Category A basement with an audit fee of £997.50. But I think we are likely to end up concluding it is a Cat B basement requiring a building damage assessment and therefore an additional audit fee of £2047.50 (total £3045). Or we can just confirm now that it is a Cat B basement.

Questions for the applicant are:

What evidence is there that No 51 has a basement as noted in GEA's BIA (Q10 of screening assessment on page 9)? The foundation inspection pit against the party wall shows the foundation at that location to be 900mm deep. If levels could be provided, that would help.

Sketch 103 of the Price and Myers structural assessment (p 32 of the pdf) shows soil being excavated from the side of a foundation. Has it been verified that the bearing capacity for the foundation remains adequate? (See App D1 of the Arup GHHS)

Stage 3 of Price and Myers construction sequencing shows underpinning to both neighbouring properties. Can this be confirmed?

Re No 47, the FIP 2 appears to show the foundation at c 960mm with excavation proposed to 1200mm. Can that be confirmed? Again, levels would help.

Maybe if we get clarity on the above, we can decide whether it is Cat A or Cat B. Let me know what you think is best,

Liz

Elizabeth Brown

Partner

CampbellReith

15 Bermondsey Square London SE1 3UN

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

"Fowler, David" Hi Liz, Further to our chat, please see audit form... 15/04/2020 15:40:21

From: "Fowler, David" < David. Fowler@camden.gov.uk>

To: "LizBrown@campbellreith.com" <LizBrown@campbellreith.com>

Date: 15/04/2020 15:40 Subject: 49 Flask Walk

Birmingham London Chantry House High Street, Coleshill Birmingham B46 3BP 15 Bermondsey Square London SE1 3UN T: +44 (0)1675 467 484 T: +44 (0)20 7340 1700 E: london@campbellreith.com E: birmingham@campbellreith.com Manchester Surrey No. 1 Marsden Street Raven House 29 Linkfield Lane, Redhill Surrey RH1 1SS Manchester M2 1HW T: +44 (0)1737 784 500 E: surrey@campbellreith.com 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: 15 Bermondsey Square, London, SE1 3UN VAT No 974 8892 43