

57 Camden Mews,
London
NW1 8BY

Basement Impact Assessment
Audit

For
London Borough of Camden

Project Number: 12985-69

Revision: F2

July 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	August 2019	Comment	GKemb12985-69-300819-57 Camden Mews-D1.docx	GK	EMB	EMB
F1	June 2020	For planning	GKjap12985-69-170620-57 Camden Mews-F1.docx	GK	EMB	EMB
F2	July 2020	For planning (updated following receipt of construction programme)	GKjap12985-69-220720-57 Camden Mews-F2.docx	GK	EMB	EMB

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 2019

Document Details

Last saved	22/07/2020 12:55
Path	GKjap12985-69-220720-57 Camden Mews-F2.docx
Author	G Kite, BSc MSc DIC FGS
Project Partner	E M Brown, BSc MSc CGeol FGS
Project Number	12985-69
Project Name	57 Camden Mews
Planning Reference	2019/2490/P

Contents

1.0 Non-Technical Summary 1
2.0 Introduction 3
3.0 Basement Impact Assessment Audit Check List..... 5
4.0 Discussion 8
5.0 Conclusions 10

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 (BIA) submitted as part of the Planning Submission documentation for 57 Camden Mews, London NW1 8BY, Camden Reference 2019/2490/P. 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 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.
- 1.4. The BIA has been prepared by Geotechnical and Environmental Associates with supporting documents prepared by Elliott Wood. The authors' qualifications are in accordance with LBC requirements.
- 1.5. The site currently comprises a two-storey dwelling with soft landscaping at the front and rear. The proposed development involves the demolition of the existing structure and construction of two three-storey houses, including single storey basements.
- 1.6. The BIA includes a desk study, Screening and Scoping Assessments which are generally accepted.
- 1.7. A site investigation was undertaken indicating shallow Made Ground over the London Clay Formation. Perched, discontinuous groundwater within the Made Ground has been observed.
- 1.8. The London Clay does not support groundwater flow. It is accepted there will be no impact to the local and wider hydrogeological environment.
- 1.9. Interpretative geotechnical information in accordance with LBC guidance is provided. Structural engineering calculations do not consistently adopt recommended geotechnical design parameters; this should be checked during design development.
- 1.10. The basement is proposed to be formed by contiguous piling and RC retaining walls formed in a hit and miss sequence, propped in the temporary and permanent conditions.
- 1.11. A ground movement assessment (GMA) has been undertaken indicating a maximum of Category 1 damage (Very Slight) to neighbouring properties, in accordance with the Burland Scale, and negligible impacts to the highway, utilities and infrastructure (Network Rail Tunnel). Asset Protection agreements should be entered into, as required.
- 1.12. An outline structural movement monitoring strategy is proposed, to control construction and ensure damage to the adjacent property is within the predicted limits.
- 1.13. Two trees are being removed to facilitate the proposed development. It has been confirmed that the neighbouring property is to be demolished. It is accepted therefore that there will be no adverse impacts from tree removal.

- 1.14. The site is classified as being at low risk of flooding. In accordance with Thames Water recommendations, standard flood risk mitigation should be adopted.
- 1.15. The proposed scheme will increase the proportion of impermeable site area. A SUDS strategy in accordance with LBC guidance and best practice is presented. A final drainage design should be agreed with Thames Water and LBC. It is accepted there will be no impact to the wider hydrological environment.
- 1.16. It can be confirmed that the BIA meets the criteria of CPG: Basements.

2.0 INTRODUCTION

2.1. CampbellReith was instructed by London Borough of Camden (LBC) on 29 July 2019 to carry out a Category B Audit on the Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) submitted as part of the Planning Submission documentation for 57 Camden Mews, London NW1 8BY, Camden Reference 2019/2490/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:

- Camden Local Plan 2017 - Policy A5 Basements.
- Camden Planning Guidance: Basements. March 2018
- Guidance for Subterranean Development (GSD). Issue 01. November 2010. Ove Arup & Partners.

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; and,
- 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 planning portal describes the proposal as "*Demolition of existing single family house and erection of 2 x single family houses including excavation of basements*".

The site is not listed and neither are the neighbouring buildings.

2.6. CampbellReith accessed LBC's Planning Portal on 21 August 2019 and gained access to the following relevant documents for audit purposes:

- Site Investigation and Basement Impact Assessment (ref J18300) date March 2019 by Geotechnical and Environmental Associates
- Structural Engineering Report and Subterranean Construction Method Statement (ref 2170774 P1) dated 5 April 2019 dated by Elliott Wood
- Drainage Strategy and SUDS Report (ref 2170774 P1) dated 5 April 2019 dated by Elliott Wood

- Existing and Proposed Elevations, Plans and Sections dated August 2015 (Existing) and August 2017 (Proposed) by John Kerr Associates Ltd
 - Existing Views (Photographs) dated December 2015 by John Kerr Associates
 - Location and Demolition Plans and Sections dated April 2019 by John Kerr Associates
 - Design and Access Statement dated 10 June 2019 by John Kerr Associates
- 2.7. On 11 June 2020, CampbellReith was advised by LBC that the neighbouring property is to be demolished. This removed any potential impact to neighbouring properties from the proposed tree removal allowing the related query to be closed out. A construction programme was received on 29 June 2020 (see Appendix 3).

3.0 BASEMENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT AUDIT CHECK LIST

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Are BIA Author(s) credentials satisfactory?	Yes	
Is data required by Cl.233 of the GSD presented?	Yes	
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 plans/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?	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	
Is a conceptual model presented?	Yes	

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Land Stability Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	Yes	However, impact of tree removal / change in soil moisture on neighbouring property foundations to be assessed.
Hydrogeology Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	Yes	
Hydrology Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	Yes	SUDS Strategy
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?	Yes	No adjacent or nearby basements.
Is a geotechnical interpretation presented?	Yes	
Does the geotechnical interpretation include information on retaining wall design?	Yes	Structural design should consistently adopt geotechnical parameters.
Are reports on other investigations required by screening and scoping presented?	Yes	SUDS, Structural Engineering Report
Are baseline conditions described, based on the GSD?	Yes	
Do the base line conditions consider adjacent or nearby basements?	Yes	

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Is an Impact Assessment provided?	Yes	
Are estimates of ground movement and structural impact presented?	Yes	
Is the Impact Assessment appropriate to the matters identified by screen and scoping?	Yes	Impact of tree removal not relevant due to proposed demolition of neighbouring property.
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	
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	Impact of tree removal not relevant due to proposed demolition of neighbouring property.
Does report state that damage to surrounding buildings will be no worse than Burland Category 1?	Yes	
Are non-technical summaries provided?	Yes	

4.0 DISCUSSION

- 4.1. The BIA has been prepared by Geotechnical and Environmental Associates with supporting documents prepared by Elliott Wood. The authors' qualifications are in accordance with LBC's requirements.
- 4.2. The site currently comprises a two-storey dwelling with soft landscaping at the front and rear. The proposed development involves the demolition of the existing structure and construction of two three-storey houses, including single storey basements. Although the existing property is detached, the new properties will be semi-detached and immediately adjacent No.59 Camden Mews, which does not have a basement.
- 4.3. A Network Rail tunnel has been identified approximately 18m laterally from the plot boundary. Correspondence with Network Rail asset protection engineers indicates they have been consulted and currently have not requested protection measures during construction.
- 4.4. The BIA includes a desk study, and Screening and Scoping Assessments which are generally accepted.
- 4.5. A site investigation was undertaken indicating shallow Made Ground over the London Clay Formation. Made Ground is approximately 0.50m in thickness. The London Clay was observed to be desiccated to a depth of approximately 2.75m below ground level (bgl). Foundation observation pits were undertaken, which indicate the neighbouring No.59 Camden Mews bears on shallow foundations at >0.50m bgl.
- 4.6. Perched, discontinuous groundwater within the Made Ground has been observed. The London Clay is classified as unproductive and does not support groundwater flow. It is accepted there will be no impact to the local or wider hydrogeological environment. Some provision for local groundwater control during construction is likely to be required, including to ensure stability is maintained during excavations.
- 4.7. Interpretative geotechnical information in accordance with LBC guidance is provided. It is noted that structural engineering calculations do not all consistently adopt the recommended geotechnical design parameters, which should be checked during design development.
- 4.8. The basement is proposed to be formed by contiguous piling at the front and rear of the site and RC retaining walls formed in a hit and miss sequence on either side, propped in the temporary and permanent conditions. A structural design strategy, sequencing and outline calculations are presented to demonstrate feasibility.
- 4.9. A ground movement assessment (GMA) has been undertaken indicating a maximum of Category 1 damage (Very Slight) to No.59 Camden Mews, in accordance with the Burland Scale. Other neighbouring buildings are beyond the zone of influence of the works. The GMA predicts negligible impacts to the highway, utilities and infrastructure (Network Rail Tunnel). Asset Protection agreements should be entered into, as required.
- 4.10. An outline structural movement monitoring strategy is proposed to control construction and ensure damage to the adjacent No.59 is within the predicted limits. Trigger values consistent with

the GMA are presented with contingency actions. It is recommended the strategy is adopted and agreed under the Party Wall Act.

- 4.11. Two trees are being removed to facilitate the proposed development, one at the front and one at the rear. The trees are described as semi-mature and approximately 10m high. The site walkover observations indicate that the existing property shows signs of historic ground movements, probably from shrink / swell of the clay soil. The site investigation indicates that the London Clay is desiccated and therefore liable to swell if moisture content increases (for example, due to tree removal). The BIA indicates the potential for the neighbouring property's shallow foundations to be impacted by changes in soil moisture content as a result of the trees being removed. It has since been confirmed that the neighbouring property is to be demolished (see Appendix 3).
- 4.12. The site is classified as being at low risk of flooding. In accordance with Thames Water recommendations, standard flood risk mitigation should be adopted, specifically a pumped positive device to protect against sewer surcharge.
- 4.13. The proposed scheme will increase the proportion of impermeable site area. A SUDS strategy incorporating attenuation of off-site discharge flows in accordance with LBC guidance and best practice is presented. A final drainage design should be agreed with Thames Water and LBC. There will be no impact to the wider hydrological environment.
- 4.14. An outline construction programme was provided after the issue of the F1 audit report and is presented in Appendix 3.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 5.1. The authors' qualifications are in accordance with LBC requirements.
- 5.2. The BIA includes a desk study, Screening and Scoping Assessments which are generally accepted.
- 5.3. A site investigation indicates shallow Made Ground over the London Clay Formation. Perched, discontinuous groundwater within the Made Ground has been observed.
- 5.4. The London Clay is classified as unproductive and does not support groundwater flow. There will be no impact to the wider hydrogeological environment.
- 5.5. Interpretative geotechnical information in accordance with LBC guidance is provided.
- 5.6. The basement is proposed to be formed by contiguous piling and RC retaining walls formed in a hit and miss sequence, propped in the temporary and permanent conditions.
- 5.7. A maximum of Category 1 damage (Very Slight) to neighbouring properties is predicted, in accordance with the Burland Scale, with negligible impacts to the highway, utilities and infrastructure. Asset Protection agreements should be entered into, as required.
- 5.8. An outline structural movement monitoring strategy is proposed, which should be adopted.
- 5.9. Two trees are being removed to facilitate the proposed development. It is accepted that the demolition of the neighbouring property removes any potential impacts.
- 5.10. The site is classified as being at low risk of flooding. In accordance with Thames Water recommendations, standard flood risk mitigation should be adopted.
- 5.11. A SUDS strategy is presented. A final drainage design should be agreed with Thames Water and LBC. It is accepted there will be no impact to the wider hydrological environment.
- 5.12. The BIA meets the criteria of CPG: Basements.

Appendix 1: Residents' Consultation Comments

Consultation Comments

Name	Address	Date	Issue Raised	Comment
Thames Water		19/06/2019	Fit positive pumped device as part of flood risk mitigation and drainage measures, to mitigate against sewer surcharge risk.	See Audit para 4.12

Appendix 2: Audit Query Tracker

Audit Query Tracker

Query No	Subject	Query	Status/Response	Date closed out
1	BIA	An outline construction programme should be provided.	Closed	29/06/2020
2	Land Stability	Assess impact of removing trees on adjacent property ie potential for damage due to change in soil moisture content. Provide mitigation, if required.	Neighbouring property to be demolished. Query closed.	11/06/2020

Appendix 3: Supplementary Supporting Documents



RE: FW: 57 Camden Mews
English, Rachel to: LizBrown@campbellreith.com 11/06/2020 18:00
Cc: "camdenaudit@campbellreith.com"
History:
This message has been replied to.

0 Attachment



image017.jpg



image018.jpg



image001.png



image009.png



image011.png



image013.jpg



image014.jpg



image015.png



image016.png



image019.png



image020.jpg

Hi Liz

I have had confirmation that next door (number 59) have received planning permission for their demolition and redevelopment. Do you think this makes a difference? They are planning to demolish this month.

I am hoping to close this one off as everything else is acceptable but please can you clarify if you think that this is a sticking point?

Thanks

Rachel

--

Rachel English
Senior Planner

Telephone: 020 7974 2726



From: LizBrown@campbellreith.com <LizBrown@campbellreith.com>
Sent: 06 March 2020 16:04
To: English, Rachel <Rachel.English@camden.gov.uk>
Cc: camdenaudit@campbellreith.com
Subject: Re: FW: 57 Camden Mews

Dear Rachel

I cannot say that this latest correspondence closes out our query with respect to trees. I have extracted part of the response from the applicant's geotechnical engineer of 26 February and highlighted in blue the problematic part.

In simple terms, **the removal of the trees** may lead to recovery of the clay soils if they have dried out as a result of the growth of the trees. However, as the trees are apparently younger than the properties, the upward movements will only be a recovery of the downwards movements have already arisen, and **should not therefore lead to any significant damage, provided that any cracking due to subsidence has not been repaired. If repairs have been carried out the heave might damage the repairs.**

This statement seems to confirm that there is the potential for damage to a neighbour's property. Camden require that any likely damage to neighbouring properties arising from the basement proposals is mitigated and does not exceed Burland Category 1. This has not yet been demonstrated.

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Regards,

Liz Brown
Partner

CampbellReith
consulting engineers

15 Bermondsey Square
London
SE1 3UN

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

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: 15 Bermondsey Square, London, SE1 3UN
VAT No 974 8892 43