

Basement Impact Assessment AUDIT: Instruction

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

Camden Case Reference:	2020/2330/P	Site Address:	69 Avenue Road London NW8 6HP
Case officer contact details:	Mark Chan Mark.chan@.camden.gov.uk	Date of audit request:	23/07/2020
Statutory consultation end date:			
Reason for Audit:	Planning application / Basement Extension		
Proposal description: Demolition of existing side extension and erection of a single storey side and rear extension; erection of a two storey rear extension with associated roof alterations; excavation of a basement; and associated works.			
Relevant planning background N/A			
Do the basement proposals involve a listed building or does the site neighbour any listed buildings?	No		
Is the site in an area of relevant constraints? (check site constraints in M3/Magic GIS)	Slope stability	Yes	
	Surface Water flow and flooding	Yes	
	Subterranean (groundwater) flow	Yes	
Does the application require determination by Development Control Committee in accordance fall the Terms of Reference ¹	No		
Does the scope of the submitted BIA extend beyond the screening stage?	Yes		

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.

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

Items provided for Basement Impact Assessment (BIA)¹			
Item provided		Yes/ No/ NA²	Name of BIA document/appendix in which information is contained.
1	Description of proposed development.	Yes	Please refer to Planning Statement by hgh Consulting
2	Plan showing boundary of development including any land required temporarily during construction.	Yes	Please see Site Location Plan (drawing no. 18030-P001) by KSR Architects
3	Plans, maps and or photographs to show location of basement relative to surrounding structures.	Yes	Please see Design and Access Statement and Proposed Basement (drawing no. 18030-P090) by KSR Architects
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	BIA report by GEA (Part 1, Section 3) FRA by Water Environment Ltd
5	Plans and sections to show foundation details of adjacent structures.	Yes	BIA – Structural Methodology by Croft Structural Engineers
6	Plans and sections to show layout and dimensions of proposed basement.	Yes	BIA – Structural Methodology by Croft Structural Engineers
7	Programme for enabling works, construction and restoration.	Yes	BIA – Structural Methodology by Croft Structural Engineers
8	Identification of potential risks to land stability (including surrounding structures and infrastructure), and surface and groundwater flooding.	Yes	BIA report by GEA (Part 1, Section 3) FRA by Water Environment Ltd
9	Assessment of impact of potential risks on neighbouring properties and surface and groundwater.	Yes	BIA report by GEA (Part 1, Section 4 and Part 4) FRA by Water Environment Ltd
10	Identification of significant adverse impacts.	Yes	BIA report by GEA (Part 1, Section 4 and Part 4) FRA by Water Environment Ltd

11	Evidence of consultation with neighbours.	No	A letter containing details of the proposals was distributed to the neighbouring properties (65 and 71 Avenue Road, 1 and 1a Norfolk road and 37 and 37a Queen's Grove). A copy of the letter can be provided upon request.
12	Ground Investigation Report and Conceptual Site Model including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desktop study - exploratory hole records - results from monitoring the local groundwater regime - confirmation of baseline conditions - factual site investigation report 	Yes	GEA report ref J19104, dated May 2020 (Sections 1, 2, 4 and appendix 1a & 1bx)
13	Ground Movement Assessment (GMA).	Yes	BIA report by GEA (Section 3 and appendix 2)
14	Plans, drawings, reports to show extent of affected area.	Yes	BIA report by GEA (Section 3 and appendix 2)
15	Specific mitigation measures to reduce, avoid or offset significant adverse impacts.	Yes	BIA report by GEA (Section 4) FRA by Water Environment Ltd BIA – Structural Methodology by Croft Structural Engineers
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	BIA – Structural Methodology by Croft Structural Engineers
17	Proposals for monitoring during construction.	Yes	BIA – Structural Methodology by Croft Structural Engineers
18	Confirmatory and reasoned statement identifying likely damage to nearby properties according to Burland Scale	Yes	BIA report by GEA (Section 3)
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),	Yes	BIA – Structural Methodology by Croft Structural Engineers BIA report by GEA (Section 3 and Section 4)

	including consideration of cumulative effects.		
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	BIA report by GEA (Section 4) FRA by Water Environment Ltd
21	Identification of areas that require further investigation.	Yes	BIA report by GEA (Section 4)
22	Non-technical summary for each stage of BIA.	Yes	BIA report by GEA (Executive Summary and Section 4)
Additional BIA components (added during Audit)			
Item provided	Yes/No/NA²		Comment

Notes:

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

² Where 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)
28/07/2020	Category B - £3045	Approximately 4 weeks from instruction	Additional fees may be required for <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.