

329-333 Kentish Town Road  
London, NW5 2TJ

Basement Impact Assessment  
Audit

For  
London Borough of Camden

Project Number: 13693-04  
Revision: D1

July 2021

Campbell Reith Hill LLP  
15 Bermondsey Square  
London  
SE1 3UN

T: +44 (0)20 7340 1700  
F: +44 (0)20 7340 1777  
E: [london@campbellreith.com](mailto:london@campbellreith.com)  
W: [www.campbellreith.com](http://www.campbellreith.com)

Document History and Status

Revision	Date	Purpose/Status	File Ref	Author	Check	Review
D1	02/082021	Revised	AAemb-13693-04-020821-329-333 Kentish Town Road-D1	AA	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	03/08/2021 14:18
Path	AAemb-13693-04-21072021- 329-333 Kentish Town Road-D1.docx
Author	Ansaff Ashraff, B.Eng
Project Partner	E M Brown, BSc MSc CGeol FGS
Project Number	13693-04
Project Name	329-333 Kentish Town Road NW5 2TJ
Planning Reference	2021/1470/P

Contents

1.0 Non-technical Summary.....1  
2.0 Introduction.....2  
3.0 Basement Impact Assessment Audit Check List.....4  
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 submitted as part of the Planning Submission documentation for 329-333 Kentish Town Road NW5 2TJ (planning reference 2021/1470/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. The BIA was prepared by Entuitive with a Flood Risk Assessment by Herrington Consulting Ltd. Evidence of input into the BIA by individuals who possess suitable qualifications should be provided.
- 1.5. The BIA has confirmed that the proposed basement will be founded within London Clay. This is not an aquifer. It is likely that the ground water table will not be encountered, however perched water is recorded.
- 1.6. It is accepted that the development will not impact on the wider hydrology of the area and is not in an area subject to flooding. However, the BIA does not consider the impacts to stability and hydrogeology from the River Fleet which runs close to, or beneath, the site.
- 1.7. Mass concrete underpinning is to take place and a construction methodology for the proposed temporary and permanent works is presented. Structural engineering information as required by the Basements CPG is not presented
- 1.8. The BIA predicts no damage worse than Burland Category 1 to neighbouring properties. However, a ground movement analysis is not presented although the proposals increase differential founding depths. The damage prediction requires further justification.
- 1.9. Proposals are provided for a monitoring strategy in accordance with the Party Wall Act, but the monitoring criteria should be reviewed against a GMA and mitigation measures described.
- 1.10. 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 05/07/21 to carry out a Category B audit on the Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) submitted as part of the Planning Submission documentation for 329-333 Kentish Town Road London NW5 2TJ and Planning Reference 2021/1470/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 (CPG): Basements. January 2021.
- 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 *"Erection of 2 storey extension above existing ground floor, facing York Mews and change of use of upper floors from ancillary retail floor space (Class E) to residential (Class C3) to create 5 flats including alteration to ground floor elevation facing York Mews and relocation of plant"*. Although not stated in the planning proposal, the alterations include the lowering of the basement by up to nearly 1m.

The Audit Instruction confirmed neither 329-333 Kentish Town Road involves, or is a neighbour to, any listed buildings.

2.6. CampbellReith accessed LBC's Planning Portal on 07/07/2021 and gained access to the following relevant documents for audit purposes:

- Basement Impact Assessment Report (BIA) by Entuitive, Rev D dated April 2021, along with the associated appendices:
  - Appendix A – Structural Drawings
  - Appendix B – Architectural Drawings
  - Appendix C – Desk Study References
  - Appendix D – Ground Engineering Limited Soil Investigation Report
- Architects General Arrangement Plans & Sections, Rev D dated March 2021:
- Flood Risk and SuDS Assessment by Herrington Consulting, Rev 1 dated March 2021.
- Planning, design and access statement by Savills, v2 dated April 2021

### 3.0 BASEMENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT AUDIT CHECK LIST

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Are BIA Author(s) credentials satisfactory?	Yes	The qualifications of the individuals involved in the production of the Flood Risk Assessment are not included. The BIA author does not hold the qualifications required by the Basements CPG.
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	See Section 7.2 of the BIA
Are suitable plan/maps included?	Yes	The assessment is supported by suitable plan/maps.
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?	No	Section 4.1 of the BIA Evidence provided for Question 9 contained in Appendix C. Responses to Questions 8 & 13 should be Yes (proximity of River Fleet and significant increase in the differential depth to neighbouring foundations).
Hydrogeology Screening: Have appropriate data sources been consulted? Is justification provided for 'No' answers?	Yes	Section 4 of the BIA
Hydrology Screening: Have appropriate data sources been consulted? Is justification provided for 'No' answers?	Yes	Section 4.2 of the BIA
Is a conceptual model presented?	No	Proximity to highway and River Fleet not considered.

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Land Stability Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	No	Increase in differential founding depth.
Hydrogeology Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	No	Proximity of River Fleet not considered.
Hydrology Scoping Provided? Is scoping consistent with screening outcome?	Yes	Despite no anticipated impacts, a Flood Risk Assessment by Herrington Consulting is presented.
Is factual ground investigation data provided?	Yes	Refer to report by Ground Engineering Limited in Appendix D of the BIA.
Is monitoring data presented?	No	Refer to Appendix D of the BIA.
Is the ground investigation informed by a desk study?	Yes	Refer to Appendix C of the BIA.
Has a site walkover been undertaken?	Yes	Refer to Section 2.2 of the BIA.
Is the presence/absence of adjacent or nearby basements confirmed?	Yes	Refer section 2.3 of the BIA.
Is a geotechnical interpretation presented?	Yes	Refer to section 7.2 and Appendix D of the BIA.
Does the geotechnical interpretation include information on retaining wall design?	Yes	Refer to Appendix D of the BIA.
Are reports on other investigations required by screening and scoping presented?	Yes	Site Investigation Report and Construction Methodology presented. Flood Risk and SuDS Assessment also provided.
Are the baseline conditions described, based on the GSD?	No	A desk study has been undertaken in the BIA, a Ground Investigation Report with basic geotechnical parameters, and details of proposed and existing structures are presented. However, impact of River Fleet not fully assessed.



Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Do the base line conditions consider adjacent or nearby basements?	Yes	Refer to Section 2.3 (Impact on Adjacent Structures and Services)
Is an Impact Assessment provided?	Yes	A preliminary impact assessment is provided and the monitoring strategy need to be confirmed through a party wall process, prior to construction.
Are estimates of ground movement and structural impact presented?	Yes	BIA notes that damage to neighbouring properties can be limited to Burland Category 1, but no estimates of ground movement presented.
Is the Impact Assessment appropriate to the matters identified by screening and scoping?	No	Justification for building damage assessment required. No consideration of impact of nearby River Fleet.
Has the need for mitigation been considered and are appropriate mitigation methods incorporated in the scheme?	No	Refer to Section 7.4 of the BIA. To be confirmed when building damage and hydrogeological assessments completed.
Has the need for monitoring during construction been considered?	Yes	An indicative monitoring strategy is presented in Section 7.4 of the BIA.
Have the residual (after mitigation) impacts been clearly identified?	No	To be confirmed when building damage and hydrogeological assessments completed.
Has the scheme demonstrated that the structural stability of the building and neighbouring properties and infrastructure will be maintained?	No	Section 7.3 of the BIA does not include a detailed ground movement assessment but rather assumptions from previous experience.
Has the scheme avoided adversely affecting drainage and run-off or causing other damage to the water environment?	No	Impact on River Fleet not assessed.
Has the scheme avoided cumulative impacts upon structural stability or the water environment in the local area?	No	

Item	Yes/No/NA	Comment
Does report state that damage to surrounding buildings will be no worse than Burland Category 1?	Yes	Section 7.3 of the BIA states Burland Category 1, but no justification presented.
Are non-technical summaries provided?	Yes	

## 4.0 DISCUSSION

- 4.1. The Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) has been carried out by Entuitive and, whilst the authors are Chartered Engineers, they do not have the necessary qualifications for hydrology, hydrogeology and land stability, according to CPG: Basements. The Flood Risk Assessment and SuDS Strategy Report was prepared by Herrington Consulting, however, the qualifications of the individuals involved in its production, and their proof of expertise in hydrology, are not included and are required.
- 4.2. The LBC Instruction to proceed with the audit identified that the basement proposal at 329-333 Kentish Town Road is not listed, nor does it lie within a Conservation Area, as mentioned in the Planning, design and access statement prepared by Savills.
- 4.3. The terraced building is 3-storeys above ground to the front and reduces to 1-storey at the rear. A basement runs beneath the entire site and there is a nominal division between 329-331 and 333 Kentish Town Road at the upper levels. The proposed works include the lowering of the majority of the basement. The structural basement slab will be lowered in the range of 560mm and 930mm. As a result of this, mass concrete underpinning is required to the affected existing foundations, with excavation up to 1.30m required to form new deepened foundations.
- 4.4. It is stated that the proposed basement will be founded on London Clay. The ground investigation has identified that the site is underlain by Made Ground up to a maximum depth of 0.30m below the basement slab, followed by stiff weathered London Clay. Perched water was recorded in London Clay at a depth of 1.00m below basement slab and the BIA notes the need to exclude it from excavations during construction. The BIA indicates that surrounding walls to the site are supported on concrete strip footings confirmed via trial pits.
- 4.5. With respect to surface water, the screening exercise has identified the proposed development will not lead to a change in the hardstanding area on site and that the site is located in Flood Zone 1. It is noted that the site is within a Critical Drainage Area. A Flood Risk Assessment and SuDS Strategy Report has been provided which concludes that surface water flows off site will not change and the proposed development will not raise the risk of flooding in the surrounding area.
- 4.6. With respect to subterranean flows, whilst the site is not underlain by an aquifer, the scoping exercise has not considered any impacts from the proximity of the former course of the River Fleet.
- 4.7. Question 13 of the land stability screening should be a 'Yes' and carried through to scoping as foundations are being deepened by up to 1.30m. Similarly, Question 8 should identify that the

site is close to the course of the former River Fleet. Whilst Question 9 has been answered correctly, the evidence is presented in Appendix C rather than Appendices A and B as reported.

- 4.8. Section 7 of the BIA discusses in depth the proposals to construct the basement using mass concrete underpinning for party walls in the range of 560mm and 1320mm depth. Retaining walls will be constructed to south west corner and eastern side of the basement to accommodate new and existing staircases to higher levels.
- 4.9. A comprehensive construction methodology defining the permanent and temporary works to be done is outlined in depth and illustrated with drawings in Appendix A. The perimeter walls and underpins are to be laterally propped, allowing basement excavation and reinforced concrete basement slab and retaining walls to be constructed. The BIA requires that the contractor is to provide a method statement before commencing construction.
- 4.10. The BIA states that “we would expect any movements would be limited to resulting damage in line with Category 1 which is described as fine cracks of up to 1mm” but does not provide a ground movement assessment to justify this conclusion. Potential impacts on the surrounding highways are not considered.
- 4.11. Section 7.4 of the BIA suggests a structural monitoring strategy to control the works and impacts to neighbouring structures and includes a movement monitoring procedure. The monitoring criteria imply that a total movement in excess of 5mm is cause for high alert, and that the structural engineer should be notified on any movement greater than 2mm. Considering the usual tolerances associated with monitoring and the extent of the mass underpinning required, mitigation measures in the event of these triggers being reached should be presented. The monitoring criteria should also be reviewed on completion of the ground movement assessment.
- 4.12. Outline structural calculations, as defined by Camden’s planning guidance, has not been presented. For example, the BIA does not provide a structural load takedown of the existing structure to assess the loads acting on the on the proposed underside of the new concrete underpins.

## 5.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 5.1. Evidence of the involvement in the BIA of professionals with the required qualifications is requested.
- 5.2. The BIA has confirmed that the proposed basement will be of single storey, built within London Clay and overlain by a thin layer of made ground.
- 5.3. Perched water was encountered within the London Clay. It is likely that the ground water table will not be encountered during excavations due to the presence of London Clay.
- 5.4. The depths of adjacent foundations have been revealed via trial pitting. There are no adjacent basements in the site vicinity a confirmed through historical planning applications.
- 5.5. Screening sections for the hydrogeology, land stability and hydrology were included in the BIA. These were supported by desk study information and a site walkover. However, the land stability screening should be reviewed to reflect comments in section 4.7.
- 5.6. The proximity of the River Fleet needs to be assessed and any potential impacts carried forward to scoping under land stability and hydrogeology.
- 5.7. It is accepted that the development will not impact surface flow and flooding and is in a low risk of flooding.
- 5.8. There will be mass concrete underpinning to accommodate a significant increase in differential founding depths, and a construction methodology for the proposed temporary and permanent works are presented. However, no assessment has been undertaken of horizontal and vertical ground movements to support the prediction of maximum Burland Category 1 damage to neighbouring properties.
- 5.9. Proposals are provided for a movement monitoring strategy during excavation and construction. However, trigger levels should be reviewed against the completed ground movement assessment and mitigation measures described.
- 5.10. Structural engineering information, including outline calculations, is required as per the CPG.
- 5.11. Queries and requests for further information are summarised in Appendix 2. Until these are addressed the BIA does not meet the requirements of CPG: Basements

## Appendix 1: Residents' Consultation Comments

## Appendix 2: Audit Query Tracker

Audit Query Tracker

Query No	Subject	Query	Status	Date closed out
1	BIA	Evidence of input into BIA by appropriately qualified professionals required (refer to CPG Basements 2021).	Open	
2	Hydrogeology and land stability	Proximity of River Fleet and impacts on land stability and subterranean flow need to be assessed.	Open	
3	Land stability	Differential founding depths require a Ground Movement Analysis to justify conclusions regarding category of damage to neighbouring properties.	Open	
4	Land stability	Monitoring criteria should be reviewed with input from a GMA.	Open	
5	Land stability	Structural engineering information to be provided as described in Basement Impact Assessments: Defining the scope of Engineering input - Guidance note 1v0	Open	



## Appendix 1: 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