

77 Lawn Road,  
NW3 2XB

Basement Impact Assessment  
Audit

For  
London Borough of Camden

Project Number: 13398-71  
Revision: D1

January 2021

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	January 2021	Comment	JBemb13398-71-200121-77 Lawn Road_ D1.doc	JB	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 2020

### Document Details

Last saved	20/01/2021 11:21
Path	JBemb13398-71-200121-77 Lawn Road_ D1.doc
Author	J Brown, BSc MSc FGS
Project Partner	E M Brown, BSc MSc CGeol FGS
Project Number	13398-71
Project Name	77 Lawn Road
Planning Reference	2020/2014/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 ..... 11

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 submitted as part of the Planning Submission documentation for 77 Lawn Road (planning reference 2020/2014/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 check list.
- 1.4. Permission was granted for a basement at No. 77 Lawn Road in 2017 and the basement was constructed in 2019. The basement constructed differs from the proposed scheme so a retrospective BIA was submitted.
- 1.5. A single storey basement is indicated to have been constructed, c 4m deep beneath the entire extent of the above ground development with a light well to the rear of the property. The BIA text describes the construction as underpinning whilst drawings and calculations show a part piled basement.
- 1.6. A desk study and ground investigation has been undertaken which presents factual and interpretative information.
- 1.7. The BIA reports include screening, scoping, site investigation and impact assessment stages as required by CPG Basements.
- 1.8. The BIA identified potential impacts to surface water and proposed mitigation. Without further information, it cannot be confirmed therefore that the development will not impact on the wider hydrology of the area.
- 1.9. A tree has been removed as part of the development proposal. The location of any trees removed should be clearly indicated and the impact of their removal on neighbouring foundations should be assessed.
- 1.10. Southern Testing have estimated long term heave to be negligible which is accepted.
- 1.11. The description of the basement construction described by Momentum Engineering's BIA differs from the drawings and calculations presented elsewhere. Calculations to justify many elements

of the substructure are absent (underpinning, basement slab and liner wall). The BIA recommended a check against flotation which is not provided.

- 1.12. The soil parameters used in the design of the piles are not consistent with those recommended by the geotechnical interpretative report. It is not clear that all the recommended surcharge loads recommended in the BIA have been addressed.
- 1.13. It is accepted that the development will not impact upon the hydrogeological conditions or the slope stability of the site.
- 1.14. A non-technical summary is not provided.
- 1.15. It cannot be confirmed that the BIA complies with the requirements of CPG: Basements until the queries raised in Section 4 and Appendix 2 are addressed.

## 2.0 INTRODUCTION

2.1. CampbellReith was instructed by London Borough of Camden (LBC) on 12<sup>th</sup> December 2020 to carry out a Category B audit on the Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) submitted as part of the Planning Submission documentation for 77 Lawn Road, NW3 2XB (planning reference 2020/2014/P). The planning application is retrospective, with the basement having been constructed in 2019.

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;
- 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 Audit Instruction described the planning proposal as *"Variation of Condition 3 (approved plans) of planning permission ref 2016/1737/P dated 05/06/2017 for creation of basement and other alterations; changes to include replacement of the rear dormer instead of refurbishment; alterations to openings on side and rear elevations; alterations to rooflights above side extension; new rooflights on main rear roof; addition of 2x solar panels; changes to skylights in rear and front gardens; changes to landscaping; changes basement layout (Retrospective) (Amended description)."*

The Audit Instruction confirmed 77 Lawn Road does not involve, and is not neighbour to, listed buildings.

2.6. CampbellReith accessed LBC's Planning Portal on 8<sup>th</sup> January 2021 and gained access to the following relevant documents for audit purposes:

- 77 Lawn Road Basement Impact Assessment (Momentum Structural Engineers), Ref 2716 RPT, August 2020, including:
  - Southern Testing Desk Study and Ground Investigation Report (2016) and Ground Movement Assessment (2020)
  - Proposed Plans by Symmetry Ltd, ref 17304 drawing No 01 - 05, March 2018
  - Underpinning Construction Sequence, by Abtech Basement Design/Phillip Banks Design & Build Limited, ref A1282-01 to A1282-08;
  - Proposed Plans, Torner Architects, ref 010-GAB1-C7, April 2020, 010-GA00-C5, 010-GA01-C6, 010-GA02-C3, September 2020 and 010-GARF-C2 July 2018;
- Planning Application Drawings consisting of:
  - Location Plan, ref LWN\_L-P1, March 2016
- Planning Consultation Responses.

### 3.0 BASEMENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT AUDIT CHECK LIST

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Are BIA Author(s) credentials satisfactory?	Yes	Page 2 Momentum Engineering (ME) Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) report.
Is data required by Cl.233 of the GSD presented?	No	Programme has not been provided. However, it is noted that the basement has already been constructed.
Does the description of the proposed development include all aspects of temporary and permanent works which might impact upon geology, hydrogeology and hydrology?	No	BIA Audit Section 4.6.
Are suitable plan/maps included?	No	Tree survey should be provided.
Do the plans/maps show the whole of the relevant area of study and do they show it in sufficient detail?	No	BIA Audit Section 4.10.
Land Stability Screening: Have appropriate data sources been consulted? Is justification provided for 'No' answers?	Yes	Page 7 ME BIA report.
Hydrogeology Screening: Have appropriate data sources been consulted? Is justification provided for 'No' answers?	Yes	Page 7 ME BIA report.
Hydrology Screening: Have appropriate data sources been consulted? Is justification provided for 'No' answers?	Yes	Page 8 ME BIA report.
Is a conceptual model presented?	Yes	Section I and Appendix A of Southern Testing (ST) BIA/Ground Investigation Report.



Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Land Stability Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	Yes	Page 9 ME BIA report.
Hydrogeology Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	Yes	Page 9 ME BIA report.
Hydrology Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	Yes	Page 9 ME BIA report.
Is factual ground investigation data provided?	Yes	Appendix B ST BIA/ Ground Investigation Report.
Is monitoring data presented?	Yes	Section J-18 ST BIA/ Ground Investigation Report.
Is the ground investigation informed by a desk study?	Yes	Section E ST BIA/ Ground Investigation Report.
Has a site walkover been undertaken?	Yes	
Is the presence/absence of adjacent or nearby basements confirmed?	No	
Is a geotechnical interpretation presented?	Yes	Section J ST BIA/ Ground Investigation Report.
Does the geotechnical interpretation include information on retaining wall design?	Yes	Section J-21 ST BIA/ Ground Investigation Report.
Are reports on other investigations required by screening and scoping presented?	No	Utilities search and tree survey have not been provided.
Are the baseline conditions described, based on the GSD?	No	It is understood that a tree(s) was proposed to be removed as part of the development but no information is provided.
Do the base line conditions consider adjacent or nearby basements?	Yes	In respect of ground movement only - Section M ST BIA/ Ground Investigation Report.

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Is an Impact Assessment provided?	Yes	ME BIA report.
Are estimates of ground movement and structural impact presented?	Yes	Section M-28.5 ST BIA/Ground Investigation Report.
Is the Impact Assessment appropriate to the matters identified by screening and scoping?	No	Further information required to confirm long term impacts.
Has the need for mitigation been considered and are appropriate mitigation methods incorporated in the scheme?	No	Further information required to confirm long term impacts.
Has the need for monitoring during construction been considered?	Yes	Page 16 of the ME BIA describes monitoring required and trigger levels with required actions.
Have the residual (after mitigation) impacts been clearly identified?	No	Further information required to confirm long term impacts.
Has the scheme demonstrated that the structural stability of the building and neighbouring properties and infrastructure will be maintained?	No	Measures to ensure stability are provided, however, queries are raised in audit report Section 4.
Has the scheme avoided adversely affecting drainage and run-off or causing other damage to the water environment?	No	An attenuation tank has been proposed but no information is presented as to the location or its capacity.
Has the scheme avoided cumulative impacts upon structural stability or the water environment in the local area?	No	TBC after BIA updated.
Does report state that damage to surrounding buildings will be no worse than Burland Category 1?	Yes	TBC after BIA updated.
Are non-technical summaries provided?	No	

## 4.0 DISCUSSION

- 4.1. The Basement Impact Assessment alongside the Site Investigation & Ground Movement Assessment (BIA) Report, has been carried out by engineering consultants Momentum Engineering (ME). The individuals concerned in its production have suitable qualifications.
- 4.2. The LBC Instruction to proceed with the audit identified that the basement proposal does not involve a listed building, nor is it adjacent to listed buildings.
- 4.3. No. 77 Lawn Road prior to development comprised a semi-detached 2 storey house which shared a party wall with No. 78 to the South. No. 76 is located to the North with the closest wall of the house situated approximately 1.2m away. The BIA indicates the site slopes steeply from the west at 64.70m AOD to the east at 62.60m AOD.
- 4.4. Permission was granted for a basement in 2017 and the basement was constructed in 2019. However, the basement differs from the consented scheme, hence the need to submit a revised BIA retrospectively. It is understood that the current basement is shown in the Turner Architects (TA) drawings. These show a single storey basement, c 4m deep, beneath the entire extent of the above ground development with a light well to the rear of the property.
- 4.5. A ground investigation (GI) was undertaken by Southern Testing in 2016. The ground investigation identified Made Ground to 1.60m bgl. London Clay was encountered to 5.70m bgl. Ground water was not encountered during the ground investigation but a standing water level was encountered during monitoring at around 2.0m bgl. The BIA describes the London Clay as firm to stiff clay. An allowable bearing capacity in the London Clay of 125kPa is proposed.
- 4.6. Screening and scoping assessments are presented, supported by desk study information. The relevant figures/maps from the Arup GSD and other guidance documents are referenced within the BIA to support responses to the screening questions.
- 4.7. With respect to surface water, the screening and scoping noted the development is not in an area prone to flooding, however the area of new basement will increase the extent of impermeable surfacing. An attenuation tank has been proposed to reduce flow into the main sewer but no information is presented as to the location or its capacity. Further information is required to confirm there are no significant impacts to surface water flows.
- 4.8. The development is remote from the Hampstead Heath Pond chain or other pond catchment areas. The site is not close to any "lost" rivers or spring lines. The basement will be founding within the London Clay Member which is not classified as an aquifer and no infiltration drainage has been installed. Though the BIA indicates groundwater encountered during monitoring is

likely to be perched, the structural design by Geobond has assumed a ground water of 1m bgl. As such it is accepted that the basement will not impact on groundwater flows.

- 4.9. With respect to stability, the screening and scoping noted potential impacts in relation to tree removal, slope stability and the impact of the basement excavation on neighbouring structures. These are audited below alongside a review of the structural information presented.
- 4.10. A tree has been removed as part of the development proposal. The location of any trees removed should be clearly indicated and the impact of their removal on neighbouring foundations should be assessed before the BIA can be accepted.
- 4.11. With respect to ground movement and impact on neighbouring foundations, most movement occurs during construction so this audit has considered long term movements and stability. ST have estimated long term heave to be negligible which is accepted.
- 4.12. The basement construction is described on pages 12 and 14 of ME's BIA which refers to L-shaped reinforced concrete underpins. However, it is noted that drawings prepared by Torner Architects and the construction sequence prepared by Abtech (both in BIA Appendix A) show underpinning beneath the party wall and piled retaining walls, with a concrete liner wall, elsewhere.
- 4.13. Pile design and installation records, prepared by Geobond, are presented in Appendix A of the BIA. The soil parameters used in the structural design are not consistent with those recommended in the geotechnical interpretative report, although, as noted above, the contiguous pile wall has conservatively been designed to support long term hydrostatic pressure associated with a water head 1m bgl. Whilst surcharge loads associated with neighbouring foundations and light traffic loads are considered but they do not include any surcharge from the sloping site as recommended in the BIA.
- 4.14. Symmetrys construction drawings show the basement plan and associated building loadings. It is understood that these have been used in the design of the piled retaining walls.
- 4.15. The temporary propping arrangement is indicated in the Abtech drawings in Appendix A of the BIA based on calculations prepared by Geobond (also presented).
- 4.16. ME's BIA notes that the basement will have a reinforced concrete ground bearing slab that will be designed to resist heave and hydrostatic pressures. No details of the slab design are provided. The BIA also notes that a check against flotation will be undertaken to establish whether mitigation such as tension piles is needed. This check has not been presented.

- 4.17. Whilst structural calculations are provided by Abtech Basement Systems/Geobond UK for the temporary works and piled retaining wall, no calculations for the underpinning and concrete liner wall are provided.
- 4.18. Based on the above comments, it cannot be confirmed that the proposal adheres to the requirements of CPG Basements until the queries above and referenced in Appendix 2 are resolved.

## 5.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 5.1. The Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) and the Ground Movement Assessment (GMA) have been carried out by individuals who possess suitable qualifications.
- 5.2. Permission was granted for a basement for No. 77 Lawn Road in 2017 and the basement was constructed in 2019. However the basement constructed differs from the proposed scheme, hence a retrospective BIA was submitted.
- 5.3. No. 77 Lawn Road prior to development comprised a semi-detached 2 storey house which shared a party wall with No. 78 to the South. No. 76 is located to the North with the closest wall of the house situated approximately 1.2m away. A single storey basement is indicated to have been constructed, c 4m deep beneath the entire extent of the above ground development with a light well to the rear of the property. The BIA should be updated
- 5.4. A desk study and ground investigation has been undertaken which presents factual and interpretative information.
- 5.5. The BIA reports include screening, scoping, site investigation and impact assessment stages as required by CPG Basements.
- 5.6. The BIA identified potential impacts to surface water and proposed mitigation. It is not known if the mitigation (attenuation tank) was incorporated into the design and construction of the basement). It cannot be confirmed therefore that the development will not impact on the wider hydrology of the area.
- 5.7. A tree has been removed as part of the development proposal. The location of any trees removed should be clearly indicated and the impact of their removal on neighbouring foundations should be assessed.
- 5.8. As most movement occurs during construction, and Southern Testing have estimated long term heave to be negligible which is accepted, the focus of the audit has been on long term stability.
- 5.9. The description of the basement construction described by Momentum Engineering's BIA differs from the drawings and calculations presented elsewhere, although it is noted that calculations to justify many elements of the substructure are absent (underpinning, basement slab and liner wall). The BIA recommended a check against flotation which is not provided.
- 5.10. The soil parameters used in the design of the piles are not consistent with those recommended by the geotechnical interpretative report. It is not clear that the recommended surcharge loads associated with the sloping site have been considered as recommended in the BIA.

- 5.11. It is accepted that the development will not impact upon the hydrogeological conditions or the slope stability of the site.
- 5.12. A non-technical summary is not provided.
- 5.13. It cannot be confirmed that the BIA complies with the requirements of CPG: Basements until the queries raised in Section 4 and Appendix 2 are addressed.

## Appendix 1: Residents' Consultation Comments



Residents' Consultation Comments

Surname	Address	Date	Issue raised	Response
Tomlinson	-	5/10/2020	<p>The basement construction was completed before both the 2nd or 3rd BIA reports.</p> <p>No works were carried out on the basement in between the two BIAs. The predicted damage to the neighbouring properties (Nos. 78 and 76) was already known before the two BIAs were written.</p> <p>How therefore is it possible for the damage scale prediction for No.76 to have been changed from Burland Scale 2 to Burland Scale 1 between the 2nd BIA and the 3rd BIA?</p>	As the development proposal has been built the long term stability will be illustrated through the structural calculations.
Solomon	Formerly of 76 Lawn Road	04/10/2020	<p>The big question raised by the latest BIA is why have the damage predictions for my former house (No.76) been reduced from Burland scale 2 to Burland scale 1 despite the basement description in the two BIAs being essentially identical?</p> <p>These predictions are being made after the event so why doesn't the BIA incorporate the scale of the damage that actually took place at the two neighbouring properties (Nos. 76 and 78)? There is no need to predict what is already known.</p>	As the development proposal has been built the long term stability will be illustrated through the structural calculations.
Symes	-	04/10/2020	After the work has been completed this current application now predicts Burland Scale 1 damage, no reason has been given to support the change in predicted damage in the current application.	As the development proposal has been built the long term stability will be illustrated through the structural calculations.

## Appendix 2: Audit Query Tracker

Audit Query Tracker

Query No	Subject	Query	Status	Date closed out
1	Surface water	The BIA notes that increased surface water flows will be attenuated by on site storage but no information has been submitted to confirm whether this was take into account in the design of the basement.	Open	
2	BIA	BIA refers to the basement being constructed using underpinning whilst drawings and calculations show a combination of underpinning and piling.	Open	
3	Stability	The location of any trees that have been removed should clearly be indicated and the impact of tree removal on nearby properties should be clearly assessed.	Open	
4	Stability	The BIA advises that retaining walls are designed for a surcharge to reflect the sloping site. It is not clear where this has been taken into account.	Open	
5	Stability	The soil parameters used in the design of the piles differ from those recommended in the site investigation report.	Open	
6	Stability	The BIA noted that the basement slab should be designed to accommodate heave and hydrostatic pressures and that a check against flotation was required. These are not presented.	Open	
7	Stability	Calculations for the underpinning and concrete liner wall should be provided.	Open	

## Appendix 3: Supplementary Supporting Documents

None

---

## 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