CampbellReith
consulting engineers

313 A Royal College Street
London NW1 9QS

Basement Impact Assessment
Audit

For

London Borough of Camden

Project Number: 13398-42
Revision: D1

September 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	02/09/2020	Comment	EMBjap13398-42-313 A Royal College St-020920-D1.doc	EMB	EMB	KB

Document Details

Last saved	02/09/2020 12:11
Path	EMBjap13398-42-313 A Royal College St-020920-D1 .doc
Author	E M Brown
Project Partner	E M Brown, BSc MSc CGeol FGS
Project Number	13398-13
Project Name	313 A Royal College Street
Planning Reference	2020/2395/P

Contents

Appendix

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 313 A Royal College Street, London NW1 9QS (planning reference 2020/2395/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 directly from the applicant's engineer, and reviewed it against an agreed audit checklist. The BIA and supporting drawings are available on Camden's website and correspondence between CampbellReith and the applicant's engineer is presented in Appendix 3.

1.4. The Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) has been carried out by Lengineering Ltd. The individual concerned in its production does not have the required qualifications but the potential impacts have been identified correctly.

1.5. The screening exercise identified no potential impacts to surface water and groundwater (subterranean flows). The property lies within a Critical Drainage Area, however, it is accepted that flows to the sewer network will not be significantly altered. Some localised surrounding areas are shown to have a low flood risk however, it is accepted that flood risk to surrounding properties will not be significantly altered.

1.6. The BIA, with its addendum and subsequent emails, confirm that, assuming good workmanship, there are no potential significant impacts to surrounding properties, other than a boundary wall, and no other potential impacts to stability exist. Camden have confirmed that the boundary wall may be considered under the Party Wall Act.

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 13 August 2020 to carry out a category A audit on the Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) submitted as part of the Planning Submission documentation for 313 A Royal College Street, London NW1 9QS, planning reference 2020/2395/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

- 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;

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.

LBC's Audit Instruction described the planning proposal as *"Remodelling and conversion of existing storage space located at ground and lower ground floor levels into a 1 bedroom maisonette."*

2.5. CampbellReith was provided with the following information by LBC on 20 July 2020:

- LEN_313 Royal College Street - Screening Report (Rev B).pdf, by Lengineering Ltd, dated May 2020
- Drawings:
  - 103_LGF PI_EX.pdf - existing lower ground floor
  - 105_AA_EX.pdf existing section through lightwell
  - 107_LGF PI_PR.pdf proposed lower ground floor
  - 108_ELY_PR.pdf proposed rear elevation and section through lightwell
  - 109_AA_PR.pdf proposed section lightwell.

2.6. CampbellReith subsequently received two emails from Lengineering Ltd on 8 and 14 August 2020 providing further information, including the Appendix to the Screening Report. The emails are presented in Appendix 3 of this audit report; the Appendix to the Screening Report can be found on Camden's website. An email clarification from LBC on 13 August is also presented in Appendix 3 of this report.

3.0 BASEMENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT AUDIT CHECK LIST

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Are BIA Author(s) credentials satisfactory?	No	However, screening exercise completed correctly.
Is data required by Cl.233 of the GSD presented?	Yes	Information broadly in compliance with GSD, noting small scale of proposals.
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?	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?	No	

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Land Stability Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	NA	
Hydrogeology Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	NA	
Hydrology Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	NA	
Is factual ground investigation data provided?	Yes	Not site specific.
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	Neighbouring properties have same lower ground floor level as host property.
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	

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Is an Impact Assessment provided?	NA	
Are estimates of ground movement and structural impact presented?	No	
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?	No	
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	

4.0 DISCUSSION

4.1. The Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) has been carried out by Lengineering Ltd. Although the author does not have the qualifications required by Camden Panning Guidance, it is accepted that the potential impacts from the basement proposals have been correctly assessed.

4.2. The application is for the vertical and lateral extension of an existing lightwell. The existing part of the lightwell is to be deepened by approximately 0.50m. Where it is being enlarged, excavation to around 2.20m below ground level is proposed. The Appendix to the BIA contains a construction sequence showing the intention for form the retaining walls in an underpinning type sequence. It has been confirmed that no existing foundations require underpinning.

4.3. Desk study information in the BIA shows the site to be underlain by London Clay and the area is generally flat.

4.4. The screening exercise identified no potential impacts to subterranean flows.

4.5. The screening exercise did not identify that the site lies within a Critical Drainage Area. The enlarged lightwell potentially enlarges the area of impermeable surfacing, resulting in increased flows to the sewer network. However, in view of the small scale of the excavation, it is accepted that there are no significant impacts to surface water from the proposals

4.6. Whilst the property is shown not be at risk of flooding, some localised surrounding areas are shown to have a low risk. Again, in view of the small scale of the proposals, it is accepted that flood risk to surrounding properties will not be significantly altered.

4.7. With respect to stability, the only structure that is potentially undermined is a garden wall. The construction sequence includes measures to maintain the stability of the wall and LBC have confirmed that an impact assessment is not required for the wall and that it may be dealt with under the Party Wall Act. It is accepted that there are no other potential stability impacts.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

5.1. The Basement Impact Assessment (BIA), has been carried out by Lengineering Ltd. Despite the author not having the qualifications required by LBC, it is accepted.

5.2. The screening exercise identified no potential impacts to groundwater (subterranean flows) and no significant impacts to surface water.

5.3. The excavation for the enlarged lightwell potentially undermines a garden wall. However, a robust construction methodology has been submitted and Camden have confirmed that an assessment of the wall is not needed. The wall may be safeguarded by the Party Wall Act. No other stability impacts have been identified.

5.4. It is confirmed that the BIA complies with the requirements of Camden's Planning Guidance with respect to basements.

Appendix 1: Residents' Consultation Comments

None pertinent to BIA

Appendix 2: Audit Query Tracker

None

Appendix 3: Supplementary Supporting Documents

REF: Flat B, 313 Royal College Street, Camden Town, London NW1
Justyna Latecka to: LizBrown 08/08/2020 10:09
Cc: "Lawlor, Josh", "Piotr Adamczyk"
History:
This message has been replied to and forwarded.

1 Attachment

313 Royal College Street - Screening Report - Appendix 1.pdf

Dear Liz,
REF: Flat B, 313 Royal College Street, Camden Town, London NW1
Thank you for getting back to me.
In your email you asked for series of sketches demonstrating the sequence of construction and this suggests that you have not received a suggested method statement which forms part of the original screening report. This is attached to the email for your information.
With regards to your questions I would like to confirm:
Re:(i) - the removal of the existing inner leaf of the wall (which belongs to the property) will have no impact on the stability of the light well as this wall does not fulfil retaining function (except its very bottom section). This wall is not tied into the existing outer leaf wall (which does not belong to the property).
Re:(ii) - the proposal is to construct a new retaining wall, for the deepened light well (as shown on section 2-2 in the suggested methodology). This wall is to be constructed in sequence in order not to cause risk of damage to the existing wall, which is to remain as it does not belongs to the property.
I would like to confirm that none of the Party Walls are going to be underpinned.
The proposed excavation for the proposed retaining wall base along the existing rear wall of the property will be undertaken at 45 degree angle in order to limit the risk of undermining the existing foundation.
The purpose of the attached suggested structural methodology is to show that the formation of the proposed deepened light well is feasible and that it can be constructed safely with no risk of damage to the surrounding buildings.
The aim is for the contractor to adopt this suggested methodology as his own or suggests an alternative proposal.
Please let me know if you have further queries.
Kind Regards

Justyna Latecka
Director
Lengineering Ltd
10 Unwin Avenue
London TW14 9RG
07730533857
02087071544
office@lengineering.co.uk
[Suspicious URL detected]

RE: REF: Flat B, 313 Royal College Street, Camden Town, London NW1
Lawlor, Josh to: LizBrown@campbellreith.com 13/08/2020 10:19
Cc: "camdenaudit@campbellreith.com"
History:
This message has been replied to.

0 Attachment






image009.png image001.png image002.png image003.png image004.jpg image005.jpg

Liz

I do not think we would need a damage assessment for the garden wall, I think this can be considered as a party wall matter.

Thanks

--
Josh Lawlor
Planning Officer

Telephone: 020 7974 2337

The majority of Council staff are now working at home through remote, secure access to our systems. Where possible please now communicate with us by telephone or email. We have limited staff in our offices to deal with post, but as most staff are homeworking due to the current situation with COVID-19, electronic communications will mean we can respond quickly.

From: LizBrown@campbellreith.com <LizBrown@campbellreith.com>
Sent: 13 August 2020 09:57
To: Lawlor, Josh <Josh.Lawlor@camden.gov.uk>
Cc: camdenaudit@campbellreith.com
Subject: Fw: REF: Flat B, 313 Royal College Street, Camden Town, London NW1

Josh

Having reviewed the appendix to the BIA screening and scoping report, it seems that the only potential impact is to a garden wall to the rear of the property. Can you confirm whether Camden require a damage assessment for this and also, what category of damage would be acceptable?

Thanks,

Liz Brown
Partner

CampbellReith

15 Bermondsey Square
London
SE1 3UN

Tel +44 (0)20 7340 1700
www.campbellreith.com
----- Forwarded by Liz Brown/CRH on 13/08/2020 09:43 -----

From: "Justyna Latecka" <office@lengineering.co.uk>
To: <LizBrown@campbellreith.com>
Cc: "Lawlor, Josh" <Josh.Lawlor@camden.gov.uk>, "Piotr Adamczyk" <info@frontlinearchitects.com>
Date: 08/08/2020 10:09
Subject: REF: Flat B, 313 Royal College Street, Camden Town, London NW1

Dear Liz,
REF: Flat B, 313 Royal College Street, Camden Town, London NW1
Thank you for getting back to me.
In your email you asked for series of sketches demonstrating the sequence of construction and this suggests that you have not received a suggested method statement which forms part of the original screening report. This is attached to the email for your information.
With regards to your questions I would like to confirm:
Re:(i) - the removal of the existing inner leaf of the wall (which belongs to the property) will have no impact on the stability of the light well as this wall does not fulfil retaining function (except its very bottom section). This wall is not tied into the existing outer leaf wall (which does not belong to the property).
Re:(ii) - the proposal is to construct a new retaining wall, for the deepened light well (as shown on section 2-2 in the suggested methodology). This wall is to be constructed in sequence in order not to cause risk of damage to the existing wall, which is to remain as it does not belongs to the property.
I would like to confirm that none of the Party Walls are going to be underpinned.
The proposed excavation for the proposed retaining wall base along the existing rear wall of the property will be undertaken at 45 degree angle in order to limit the risk of undermining the existing foundation.
The purpose of the attached suggested structural methodology is to show that the formation of the proposed deepened light well is feasible and that it can be constructed safely with no risk of damage to the surrounding buildings.
The aim is for the contractor to adopt this suggested methodology as his own or suggests an alternative proposal.
Please let me know if you have further queries.
Kind Regards

Justyna Latecka
Director
Lengineering Ltd
10 Unwin Avenue
London TW14 9RG
07730533857
02087071544
office@lengineering.co.uk
[Suspicious URL detected]

Re: Flat B, 313 Royal College Street, Camden Town, London NW1
Justyna Latecka to: LizBrown 14/08/2020 19:42
Cc: "Piotr Adamczyk", "Lawlor, Josh", camdenaudit

2 Attachments

Screenshot 2020-08-14 at 17.04.45.png Screenshot 2020-08-14 at 17.05.39.png

Dear Liz,

REF: 313 A Royal College Street - outstanding screening questions

Further to your email dated 13th of August 2020 please find below answers to the outstanding screening questions.

Surface Water
Q1: Is the site within the catchment of the pond chains on Hampstead Heath?
Answer: No. Please find attached Figure 14 and the site location map.

Q6: Is the site in an area identified to have surface water flood risk according to either the local Flood Risk Management Strategy or the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment or is it at risk from flooding, for example because the proposed basement is below the static water level of nearby surface water feature?
Answer: Please refer to items 5.4, 5.5 and 5.6 in the screening report. In the report:

- the risk of site being flooded due to the surface water is low to very low.
- there is no risk that the site will be flooded by any reservoir.
- the site is not in a flood risk from rivers and the sea.

Subterranean Flows
Q3: Is the site within the catchment of the pond chains of Hampstead Heath?
Answer: No. Please find attached the Figure 14 and the site location map.

Q6: Is the lowest point of the proposed excavation (allowing for any drainage and foundation space under the basement floor) close to, or lower than, the mean water level in any local pond (not just the pond chains or Hampstead Heath) or spring line.
Answer: No.

Stability
Q4: Is the site within a wider hillside setting in which the general slope is greater than 7degree?(approximately 1 in 8).
Answer: No

I hope the above clarifies the outstanding queries. If you have further questions please let me know.

Kind Regards
Justyna Latecka
Director
Lengineering Ltd
10 Unwin Avenue
London TW14 9RG
07730533857
02087071544
office@lengineering.co.uk
www.lengineering.co.uk

From: <LizBrown@campbellreith.com>
Date: Thursday, 13 August 2020 at 10:16
To: Justyna Latecka <office@lengineering.co.uk>
Cc: Piotr Adamczyk <info@frontlinearchitects.com>, "Lawlor, Josh" <Josh.Lawlor@camden.gov.uk>, <camdenaudit@campbellreith.com>
Subject: Re: REF: Flat B, 313 Royal College Street, Camden Town, London NW1

Dear Justyna

Thank you for your email and attachment which we had not seen before. They both provide useful further information. We are just consulting with Camden about the extent of the impact assessments they require. Depending on their reply, we may require outline calculations for the retaining wall and a damage assessment for the boundary wall not in the ownership of 313A Royal College St.

We would note in the meantime though that the following screening questions remain to be answered:

Surface water - Q1 and Q6
Subterranean flows - Q3 and Q6
Stability - Q4.

We shall be in touch once we have agreed the extent of the BIA with Camden.

Regards,

Liz Brown
Partner

Image

15 Bermondsey Square
London
SE1 3UN

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

From: "Justyna Latecka" <office@lengineering.co.uk>
To: <LizBrown@campbellreith.com>
Cc: "Lawlor, Josh" <Josh.Lawlor@camden.gov.uk>, "Piotr Adamczyk" <info@frontlinearchitects.com>
Date: 08/08/2020 10:09
Subject: REF: Flat B, 313 Royal College Street, Camden Town, London NW1

Dear Liz,
REF: Flat B, 313 Royal College Street, Camden Town, London NW1
Thank you for getting back to me.
In your email you asked for series of sketches demonstrating the sequence of construction and this suggests that you have not received a suggested method statement which forms part of the original screening report. This is attached to the email for your information.
With regards to your questions I would like to confirm:
Re:(i) - the removal of the existing inner leaf of the wall (which belongs to the property) will have no impact on the stability of the light well as this wall does not fulfil retaining function (except its very bottom section). This wall is not tied into the existing outer leaf wall (which does not belong to the property).
Re:(ii) - the proposal is to construct a new retaining wall, for the deepened light well (as shown on section 2-2 in the suggested methodology). This wall is to be constructed in sequence in order not to cause risk of damage to the existing wall, which is to remain as it does not belongs to the property.
I would like to confirm that none of the Party Walls are going to be underpinned.
The proposed excavation for the proposed retaining wall base along the existing rear wall of the property will be undertaken at 45 degree angle in order to limit the risk of undermining the existing foundation.
The purpose of the attached suggested structural methodology is to show that the formation of the proposed deepened light well is feasible and that it can be constructed safely with no risk of damage to the surrounding buildings.
The aim is for the contractor to adopt this suggested methodology as his own or suggests an alternative proposal.
Please let me know if you have further queries.
Kind Regards

Justyna Latecka
Director
Lengineering Ltd
10 Unwin Avenue
London TW14 9RG
07730533857
02087071544
office@lengineering.co.uk
[Suspicious URL detected]

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