

38 Frognal Lane
Campbell Reith BIA Audit Checklist Responses12.20

No	Item	Yes/ No	Comment	Responses
1.	Are BIA Author(s) credentials satisfactory?	Yes		
2.	Is data required by Cl.233 of the GSD presented?	No	Drawings showing the foundation layout are required. Utility data is required.	TAK Structures Construction Methodology & Premier Energy Utilities Search
3.	Does the description of the proposed development include all aspects of temporary and permanent works which might impact upon geology, hydrogeology and hydrology?	No	Drawings showing where the different pile lengths will be used, temporary works arrangement and a section of the split level basement should be provided.	TAK Structures Construction Methodology & Premier Energy Utilities Search
4.	Are suitable plan/maps included?	Yes		
5.	Do the plans/maps show the whole of the relevant area of study and do they show it in sufficient detail?	Yes		
6.	Land Stability Screening: Have appropriate data sources been consulted? Is justification provided for 'No' answers?	No	Question 8 regarding watercourses/spring line within 100m requires further consideration. The figure referenced shows two tributaries of the Lost Rivers of London within 100m of the site. Question 10 regarding dewatering should be 'yes'.	80m to tributary acknowledged
7.	Hydrogeology Screening: Have appropriate data sources been consulted? Is justification provided for 'No' answers?	No	Question 4 regarding an increase in impermeable area should be 'yes'.	30m increase in impermeable area acknowledged
8.	Hydrology Screening: Have appropriate data sources been consulted? Is justification provided for 'No' answers?	No	Question 3 regarding a change in the proportion of impermeable area should be 'yes'.	30m increase in impermeable area acknowledged
9.	Is a conceptual model presented?	Yes		
10.	Land Stability Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	No	Further consideration is required.	Slope Stability in 5.2 expanded to include Land Stability
11.	Hydrogeology Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	Yes	However, further assessment is required on completion of groundwater monitoring.	Ground Water Monitoring in 6.1 & Hydrogeology 5.5
12.	Hydrology Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	Yes	Despite the omission in the screening exercise, the increase in impermeable area is addressed.	
13.	Is factual ground investigation data provided?	Yes		

No	Item	Yes/ No	Comment	Responses
14.	Is monitoring data presented?	Yes	One groundwater monitoring visit is reported, with a further two visits yet to be undertaken. Two visits were undertaken in 2014.	Ground Water Monitoring in Soils SI & 6.1
15.	Is the ground investigation informed by a desk study?	Unknown	BIA includes a Desk Study but it is unclear whether this data was used to design the ground investigation.	As 6.1, 2014 SI used to plan 2020 Investigation
16.	Has a site walkover been undertaken?	Yes		
17.	Is the presence/absence of adjacent or nearby basements confirmed?	Yes		
18.	Is a geotechnical interpretation presented?	Yes		
19.	Does the geotechnical interpretation include information on retaining wall design?	No	Retaining wall design parameters and Young's modulus are not specified.	E and Φ_d in 7.1
20.	Are reports on other investigations required by screening and scoping presented?	Yes	Arboricultural Assessment and Flood Risk Assessment are provided.	
21.	Are the baseline conditions described, based on the GSD?	Yes		
22.	Do the base line conditions consider adjacent or nearby basements?	Yes		
23.	Is an Impact Assessment provided?	Yes		
24.	Are estimates of ground movement and structural impact presented?	No	Estimates of heave from the basement excavation are not provided.	Heave included in GM&DA.03
25.	Is the Impact Assessment appropriate to the matters identified by screening and scoping?	No	Impact to highway should be considered.	Highway included in GM&DA.03
26.	Has the need for mitigation been considered and are appropriate mitigation methods incorporated in the scheme?	No	Further information regarding the installation of a 'pea shingle blanket' around the piles is required. Mitigation relating to the predicted Category 2 damage is required.	See 5.5.15 [No category 2 damage in GM&DA.03]
27.	Has the need for monitoring during construction been considered?	Yes	However recommendations should be revised once the GMA has been updated.	As No 26
28.	Have the residual (after mitigation) impacts been clearly identified?	Yes	However this should be revised once the GMA has been updated.	As No 26
29.	Has the scheme demonstrated that the structural stability of the building and neighbouring properties and infrastructure will be maintained?	No	Impact to highway should be considered.	Highway included in GM&DA.03 along with Utility Assessment

No	Item	Yes/ No	Comment	Responses
30	Has the scheme avoided adversely affecting drainage and run-off or causing other damage to the water environment?	No	Further consideration of the impact to the hydrogeology is required once all groundwater monitoring is complete.	Ground Water Monitoring in 6.1 & Hydrogeology 5.5
31	Has the scheme avoided cumulative impacts upon structural stability or the water environment in the local area?	No		GM&DA.03 and Hydrogeology in 5.1 address
32	Does report state that damage to surrounding buildings will be no worse than Burland Category 1?	No	One of the critical section assessed returns Category 2. The ground movement assessment requires further consideration.	No category 2 damage in GM&DA.03
33	Are non-technical summaries provided?	Yes		