152 BIA Audited or Flood Prone Area Basement ApplicationsDecided under the current Local Plan since July 3rd 2017

The following list forms the evidence base for a number of statements made in the appellants Statement of Case. There is no intention of burdening the inspector with having to read it all, it is provided to be referred to only if required.

At the time of writing in July 2021, the Camden Planning web site returned 2,532 applications with the word Basement and/or Lower Ground in the application description. The majority are not new basements. Most involve discharge of conditions, change of use, machinery or alterations to extant basements etc.

The following table lists 152 applications isolated from that much larger search that fit the following criteria:

- New basement constructions that required a Campbell Reith BIA Audit and/or are located in one of Camden's Local Flood Risk Zones.
- **2.** Decided since the Local Plan was adopted on 3rd July 2017, by the LPA or at appeal.

The list is as accurate as possible given the complexities involved in compiling it. Applications that do not have the words 'Basement' or 'Lower Ground in the description, or documents that where never published will not have been found. Bedrooms are counted as such, rooms with windows as habitable rooms, bath, store, cinema or pool rooms etc as 'other rooms'. Plant rooms are counted as 'vulnerable' uses.

While it cannot claim to be a definitive record of all the LPA new basement decisions, it almost certainly contains a great majority of them and more than enough to present a representative picture of how the LPA has been deciding basement applications under the current local plan.

The study illustrates:

- **1.** How the LPA has evaluated flood risk in deciding each of the 152 listed cases.
- **2.** It's decisions with regard to Local Flood Risk Zones and Previously Flood Streets.
- **3.** Its decisions about what is or isn't held to be a 'self-contained' or a duplex basement unit.
- **4.** Evidence of Lead Local Flood Authority Officer's involvement in flood risk assessment.
- 5. It's approach to basement evacuation issues.

Shorter, abridged tables, derive from this main study are referred to in the main Statement of Case.

Is the Basement in a 'Local Area Flood Risk Zone'? **Decision making: Key to the table contents:** Is it a 'Previously Flooded Street'? Precise |Evident LLFA Officer involvement? Campbell Reith's Officer's Report or Application Number address's **BIA Audit** Informative Basement bedrooms Environment Surface Water Flood Risk Site address Basement l Basement Flood Risk or Agency Conclusions Type Risk habitable rooms General Conclusions Predominately just echoing Decision Date 'Vulnerable Campell Reiths conclusions uses' 2019/0000/P 11 Sep 2019 Campbell Reith BIA Audit **Householder Application Granted** 132 Excavation at lower ground floo level, following conversion of 12456-01 Rev: X1 April 2019 Informative(s): 1 Reason for granting permission: 18 Example Rd. storage space below front garden to 5.0 CONCLUSIONS 1 Reason for granting permission: The proposed conversation of vaults and storage below front garden to habitable room and toilet required excavation (at this level, which was supported by a Beament Impact Assessment (ImpAt Assessment Assessment (ImpAt Assessment London habitable room and toilet to single Risk Street not No LLFA Other Other family dwelling. Ancillary 5.6. It is accepted the site is in an area at Rasement Plant Surface Habitable Misc. GRANTED previously Comments Bedrooms Local Flood Notes: New Habitable Room and flooded Found Basement 5.7. There will be no impact to the wider Risk Zone Kitchen /Dinner at basement level in Flooding Rooms Rooms the Primrose Hill Local Flood Risk the requirements of policy A5 and CPG Basements Zone, rated by the EA as at Medium Risk Surface Water Flooding, [Flood Risk Zone goes nremarked in the Decision Notice] Very short summery of the application Other basement rooms Occasional additional Appelants own ref. Final and misc. spaces Appelants own research notes in blue appelants note in blue number internal use. Decision

152 BIA Audited or Flood Prone Area Basement Applications

Decided under the current Local Plan since July 3rd 2017

The following study is the result of downloading, reviewing and reading each of the applications plans, BIA Audits, FRA's, Officers Reports, Decision Notices and Appeal determinations. The purpose of the study was to ascertain, as a matter of fact, how the LPA makes its decisions given that some of the officers remarks and reasons for refusal was so at odd with our previous experience. There is no intention of burdening the inspector with having to read it all, it is provided to be referred to only if required.

1	2015/2203/P	- which thereafter carries full weight. 31 Oct 2017	Indes by the 2020/2936/P appellant Conversion of house to 4 flats Inc. 2 new basement and ground floor	Single	Local Flood Risk Zone	Risk Checker For the exact Address	Flooded Street Or other Flood Risk	Comments	Basement Bedrooms	Basement Habitable Rooms	Other Basement Rooms Bath, Gym, Pool, Games, Office, Workshop etc.	Plant Rooms Gas, Electric, Pump, Comms etc.	Surface Water Flood Risk Comments: Where applicable and necessarily abridged and paraphrased for brevity. No BIA Audit Undertaken	Recommended for Approval	Decision
	2015/2203IP 163 Sumatra Rd. London NW6 1PN	31 Oct 2017		2 x Duplex Flats	Sumatra Road Local Flood Risk Zone	Medium Risk Surface Water Flooding	Previously Flooded Street 1975 and	No LLFA Comments Found	2 Basement Bedrooms	2 Other Habitable Basement Rooms	4 Other Misc. Basement Rooms	-	Note: a BIA was provided and accepted by the LPA but seems no audit undertaken or published.	RECOMMENDED TO Approval FOR INFORMATION OILY - THIS IS NOT A FORMAL DECISION Town and County Planning Act 1990 (as annended) DECISION SUBJECT TO A SECTION 106 LEGAL AGREEMENT Informative[5]: I Reason for granting permission The proposed conversion from an existing five bedroom single family dwelling house to form four flats (2x 1 bedroom and 2x2 bedroom) is considered to be an acceptable use at this site. Appear Ref: APPIXS210WW17/3172882 Conclusion 2. Vmlist 1 have found no harm in relation to the character and appearance of the area	DISMISSI for lack of signed s10 NOT for Plu Surface Wi Flooding
2	2015/3049/P 51 Calthorpe St. London WC1X OHH	16 Feb 2018	"vulnerable uses". Flooding was not an issue in either decision. Bank refused to sign s106, the appeal was for non-determination, which was dismissal. Conversion; office to residential, 13x self-cont. flats, inc. excavation to create basement. Note: 5 Basement bedrooms. Officers accept Campbell Reith's	3 x Duplex Flats	Not in a Local Flood Risk Zone	Low Risk Surface Water Flooding	Street not previously flooded	No LLFA Comments Found	5 Basement Bedrooms	4 Other Habitable Basement	4 Other Misc. Basement	-	Campbell Reith BIA Audit 12066-39 Rev: F2 April 2017 5.0 CONCLUSIONS 5.11. It is accepted that the site is not in an area subject to flooding.	and the living conditions of neighbouring residents, I have found that the submitted planning obligations would inort? be effective in securing a CMP or a contribution towards highway works thus failing to mitigate the harm arising from such. 23. For the above reasons, and taking all matters raised into account, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed. Full Planning Permission Granted Subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement 6.86 The final audit report by Campbell Feith notes the following: The BIA has been carried out by engineering consultants with suitable qualifications. Appropriate site investigations have been carried out by engineering consultants with suitable qualifications. Appropriate site investigations have been carried out to determine the geology and the existing foundations. It has been concluded that the impact on ground water flows will be low as	
3	2015/5759/P Royal Academy of Dramatic (RADA) 16-18 Chenies St. London WC1E 7PA	14 Aug 2018	Flood Risk conclusions and Permission is Granted Part demolition alterations, extensions including at basement to create 300 seat theatre, refectory, bar kitchen, library, exhib space, offices, 60 student beds. Notes: Officers accept Campbell Reith's Flood Risk conclusions, the							Room	Rooms		Campbell Reith BIA Audit 12066-88 Rev: F1 March 2016 5.6. CONCLUSIONS 5.6. It is accepted that the development will not impact on the wider hydrogeology of the area, is not in an area subject to flooding and there are no adverse impacts on slope stability.	6.6 The BIA has been independently assessed by Campbell Reith who consider the assessment to be acceptable, and are satisfied that the impacts of the basement proposals have been identified in the Basement Impact Assessment and suitable	
			residual flood risk mitigation measures. The Officer notes at 'Flooding and Drainage 11.16' that there is no significant change in the new Policy CC3 compared with the previous policy DP23. Permission is Granted.	Basement to RADA	Not in a Local Flood Risk Zone	Low Risk Surface Water Flooding	Street not previously flooded	No LLFA Comments Found	-	-	15 Other Misc. Basement Rooms	5 Plant Room		midigation measures proposed. Damage category of (negligible) to Category 1 (very slight) has been predicted, which would still be in accordance with the requirements of Police AS(n) which reduced the maximum allowable damage category from 2 to 1 compared to the previous Development Plan Documents. 6.7 The Council is satisfied that the proposed basement excavation would not cause harm to the buil or natural environment or local amenity and would not result in flooding or ground instability, in line with the requirements of Policy A5. A Basement Construction Plan would not be required. Flooding and Drainage 11.16 Policy CC3 compared with DP23. No significant change in the policy. 11.17 The Basement Impact Assessment considers the issue of flooding and concludes that the site is not at risk of flooding from rivers or seas nor would it increase flood risk in the area. 11.18 The NPP requires all major developments to include a Sustainable Urban Drainage Strategy (SUDS). The SUDS statement submitted with the application concludes that SUDS are not fleasible due to the existing constraints of the site, but that 5 ° Copply that SUDS are not fleasible due to the existing constraints of the site, but that 5 ° Copply that SUDS are not fleasible due to the existing constraints of the site, but that 5 ° Copply that SUDS are not fleasible due to the existing constraints of the site, but that 5 ° Copply that SUDS statement submitted with the application concludes that SUDS are not fleasible due to the existing constraints of the site, but that 5 ° Copply that SUDS are not reasoned and the sound some statement submitted with the application concludes that SUDS are not fleasible due to the existing constraints of the site, but that 5 ° Copply the submit of the site of the site of the sound sound that such as of the site of the sound sound the submit of the site of the site of the sound that such as of the site of the sound the site of the site of the sound that such as of the site of the sound that such as of the site of	
4	2015/6064/P 10 Agamemnon Rd. London NW6 1DY	12 Jul 2017	Change of use from 7 individual studio flats and 2 bedsits, to 4 x 2 bedroom flats, inc. extension to existing basement, including new lightwells. Notes: Officers accept Campbell Reith's Flood Risk conclusions, the residual flood risk mitigation measures and Permission is Granted. Flooding is otherwise unremarked in the Decision Notice.	Self Contained Basement Flat 'Akin' to a Duplex?	Not in a Local Flood Risk Zone	Low Risk Surface Water Flooding	Previously Flooded Street 2002	No LLFA Comments Found	2 Basement Bedrooms	2 Other Habitable Basement Rooms	1 Other Misc. Basement Room	-	Campbell Reith BIA Audit 12466-02 Rev: F1 Sept. 2016 5.0 CONCLUSIONS 5.7. Mitigation measures are discussed within the BIA, but the effects and residual impactsower not included in the original further in the revides dismission, specifical further in the revides dismission, specifical volumes of the properties of the	systems will be installed to recycle some water from showers Full Planning Permission Granted Subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement [Flooding unremarked in the Decision Notice]	GRANTE
5	2015/6537/P 32 Percy St. London W1T 2DE	5 Oct 2017	Erection of 2 storey rear extension including basement excavation following partial demolition. Notes: Officers accept Campbell Reith's Flood Risk conclusions, the residual flood risk mitigation measures and Permission is Granted in spite of the site being at EA Medium Flood Risk and a 'ground water flooding vulnerability zone'; with a Basement Bedroom, an additional Habitable Room and a Plant Room.	Basement to Offices	Not in a Local Flood Risk Zone	Medium Risk Surface Water Flooding Site in a ground water 'flooding vulnerability	Street not previously flooded	No LLFA Comments Found	1 Basement Bedroom	1 Other Habitable Basement Room	2 Other Misc. Basement Rooms	1 Plant Room	submissions confirming winter groundwater levels to be below proposed basement slab level. 12.1 It is accepted that no known ponds, spring lines or wells are in close vicinity to the site and that the site is custified the Hampstead pond chain catchment area. 13.1 It is accepted that the site is not in a surface water or rivers and seas Flood Risk Amangement Stratey maps and Stratey maps and Management Stratey maps and Stratey maps and 1975 or 2002.	Full Planning Permission Granted Subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement. 2.13. Basement 2.14. A Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) has been provided and independently audited. The audit confirms there would be no harm to neighbouring structures and it would not adversely affecting drainage or damage to the water environment. A condition would be included requiring details of a chartered engineer and for the development to be carried out in stirct accordance with the recommendations of the BIA and associated supporting documents.	GRANTE
6	2015/6955/P 156-164 Gray's Inn Rd. London WC1X 8ED	1 Nov 2017	Redevelopment to create part 4 storey, part 7 storey plus basement buildings for office, retail, restaurant at LG/GF plus 15 flats above. Notes: The LLFA officer seems to have limited their input to recommending two SuDS related conditions; 1. That SuDS be installed in accordance with the FRA/Drainage	Basement To Offices		zone.'					2	5	5.0 CONCLUSIONS 5.0. It is accepted that there are no siope stability concerns and no hydrological concerns with respect to the development proposals. 5.7. The revised BIA meets the criteria of CPO4 Campbell Reith BIA Audit 12336-03 Rev: F2 Feb. 2017 4.8. [The BIA] has identified that the site has a low risk to flooding from surface water, severes, reservoirs (and their artificial sources) required the result of th	Full Planning Permission Granted Subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement 11.2 A Structural Report and Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) has been submitted by Exherely of Cadaghani (with input from GEA on ground movement and geotechnical matters). A full flood risk assessment prepared by Robert West was also provided. These documents have been independently reviewed by the Council's independent auditor Campbell Reith. During the course of the application further information was requested to clarify the conclusions of the Ground Movement Assessment (GMA). These have been received and considered acceptable. Overall, Campbell Reith accepted that there are no slope stability concerns, hydrogeological concerns or hydrological concerns with respect to the development proposable.	1
7	2015/7293/P	8 Feb 2018	Statement and drawings etc. 2. Prior to occupation, evidence SUDS were implemented as described be provided and that the system be maintained thereafter. The author is indicated as being Amy Farthing MSc B(Arch), a Sustainability Officer at LB Camden. Otherwise, officers accept Campbell Reith's Flood Risk conclusions, with mitigation measures and Permission was Granted. New self contained basement flat including lightwells front and back	And Service Floor to Block	Not in a Local Flood Risk Zone	Surface Water Flooding	Street not previously flooded	LLFA Comments Made	-	-	Other Misc. Basement Rooms	Plant Rooms	5.4. The site is located within a Critical Drainage Area. A Flood Risk Assessment and Surface Water Drainage Statement has acceptable own risk to flooding. 5.5. The provision of green roofs and below ground attenuation will reduce surface water run off railes 5.8. There are a number of outstanding issues and it is recommended these can be provided within a Basement Construction PRIII Campbell Reith BIA Audit 12466-01 Rev: F1 Dec. 2017	Full Planning Permission Subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement	GRANTE
	114 Prince of Wales Rd. London NW5 3NE		Notes: Officers accept Campbell Reith's Flood Risk conclusions and, along with mitigation measures. Permission was Granted for a fully self contained basement flat with 2 Basement Bedrooms, open plan Living Room/kitchen at a EA Medium Flood Risk Site on a Street listed as having previously flooded.	Fully Self Contained Basement Flat	Not in a Local Flood Risk Zone	Medium Risk Surface Water Flooding	Previously Flooded Street 2002	No LLFA Comments Found	2 Basement Bedrooms	1 Other Habitable Basement Room	1 Other Misc. Basement Rooms	-	4.14. The BIA screening has identified that the canda has previously flooted, and that a FFAA may be required. The revised submissions of low. 2017 confirm that there is a medium surface water flood risk that will be mitigated such as non-return valves to drainage. It is recommended that threshold levels to lightwells and entrances are elevated in relation to surrounding ground level, such prince the detailed superior to be assessed as participation of the detailed despire to be assessed as participation of the detailed despire to be assessed as participation of the wider hydrogeology of the area. 5.12. The development should implement appropriate flood risk mitigation measures. 5.12. Considering the revised submissions, the BIAS meets LBC's policy requirements.	Informative(s): 1 Reasons for granting permission. A Basement Impact Assessment has been submitted and audited by the Council's independent engineering consultant in order to review the potential impact of the conditions. It is accepted the development will not harmfully impact on local land stability and hydrogeology of the area	GRANTE
8	2016/1091/P 12-14 Greville St. London EC1N 8SB	15 Jan 2019	Demolition. of 14 Greville St, part demolition of 12-13 Greville St. inc. enlarge existing basements. New 5-storey office, workshop and retail spaces. Notes: Officers accept Campbell Reith's conclusions that the BIA complies with the requirements of CPG4, flooding seems unremarked in the Decision Notice and Permission was Granted.	Basement Workshop Space & Service Floor to Office Block	Not in a Local Flood Risk Zone	Very Low Risk Surface Water Flooding	Street not previously flooded	No LLFA Comments Found	-	-	2 Other Misc. Basement Rooms	1 Plant Room	Campbell Reith BIA Audit 12466-22 Rev: F1 Feb. 2018 5.0 CONCLUSIONS 5.2 The BIA was initially based on a Desktop Study undertaken by GEA. Subsequent intrusive for undertaken by GEA. Subsequent intrusive for this impact assessment. 5.3. It is accepted that the new development and associated basement is at low risk of flooding. 5.4. The BIA has stated that the excavation for the proposed basement will be up to around 1.0 m below the estimp tassement stab level. The GI has shown that some Hackney Gravet I has shown that some Hackney Gravet in the control of the proposed basement will be up to around 1.0 m below the estimp tassement stab level. The GI has shown that some Hackney Gravet in the some that the estimp that the some stable to the 2.6. Auters and requests for their information which were reased during the audit process are General for the control of the process for the professions and in Section 4 and summarised in Appendix 2. It is confirmed that, with the supplementary information presented in	Full Planning Permission Granted Subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement [Flooding issues unremarked in the Decision Notice]	GRANTE
9	2016/2027/P 51 Tottenham Court Rd London W1T 2EH	8 Mar 2018	Demolition then of 4 storey rear extension, basement, roof extensions comprising an additional storey for retail, office and residential development inc. New flat on 4th. Notes: Although the site is identified as being at High Risk of Surface Water Flooding by the EA. Officers accept Campbell Reith's conclusions that the development is at Low Risk and that the BIA complies with the requirements of CFG4. Flooding seems largely unremarked in the Decision Notice and Permission was Granted.	Basement Retail and Service Space	Not in a Local Flood Risk Zone	High Risk Surface Water Flooding	Street not previously flooded	No LLFA Comments Found	-	-	3 Other Misc. Basement Rooms	-	Appendix 3, the BIA complies with the requirements of CPG4. Campbell Reith BIA Audit 12336-87 Rev: F1 Dec. 2017 5.0 CONCLUSIONS 5.10. It is accepted that there are no slope stability issues and that the development is at low risk of flooding. 5.11. Queries and that the development is at low risk of flooding. 5.11. Queries are discussed in section 4 and summarised in Appendix 2. The revised BIA cose meet the relevant LBC's publicy criteria, subject to a BCP to confirm: the ground conditions through additional investigation; the ground methodology and design, sufficient surrectural monitoring	Full Planning Permission Refused A Insufficient Information has been submitted in relation to the impacts of the proposed basement to allow the Local Planning Authorityto ascertain whether the basement development would maintain the surrcural stability of the building and neiphouring properties and avoid adversely affecting fratiange and run-off or causing other damage to the water environment, contraty to polecy DP27 of the Candero Development Policies 2013-2026. [Flooding issues otherwise unremarked in the Decision Notice] Appeal Decision 1. The appeal is dismissed. [On amenity grounds] Living Conditions/Amenity of Nearby Occupiers If not that the proposal would be so close to nearby office windows that it would be significantly overtearing on the outdook from the windows There would also be conflict with the core planning principle of the Framework which requires that a good standard of amenity is secured for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings	DISMISS On Appe Bulk Mass Issues NOT refuse Pluvial/Sur Water Floor
10	2016/2457/P 1-3.4,6 and 8 Ferdinand PI. London NW1 8EE	14 Dec 2018	Demolition then two new four storey plus basement buildings. Funeral facility at ground and basement levels with 19 new flats above. Notes: The CR BIA Audit comments do not seem to accord with the EA Flood Checker which shows: 1, 2, 3 and 4 Ferdinand Place NW1 8EE are all High Risk. 6 Ferdinand Place NW1 8EF as again at High Risk. However, Officers accept Campbell Reith's conclusions that the development is "in an area known to be at low risk of surface water flooding, with higher risk areas in the vicinity of the site", works to	Duplex Basement Funeral Director Cold Room Plant to Residential above	Not in a Local Flood Risk Zone	High Risk Surface Water Flooding Not Low Risk	Street not previously flooded	No LLFA Comments Found	-	-	8 Other Misc. Basement Rooms	3 Plant Rooms	Campbell Reith BIA Audit 12336-78 Rev: FI Date: Oct. 2017 1.9. It's accepted that the dovelopment will not impact on the wide hydrogeology and hydrology of the area and is not in an area subject to flooding. There are no impacts related to slope stability. 4.12. The surface water and flooding accreening identified the site is be in a rea flooding, with higher risk areas in the vicinity of the site. The updated submissions confirm that standard flood risk mitigation measures will be adopted in the permanent worksto militate against flood risk. 5.6. CONCLUSIONS 5.6. It is accepted that the development will not impact on the wider hydrogeology and hydrology of the area and is not in an area	12.6 in the revised submissions, the ground movement and damage impact assessment predict a maximum of Burland Category. I damage to neighbouring structures in line with policy AS. The revised submissions confirm that groundwater has not been encountered and that the proposed development will not impact the wider hydrogeological environment. The surface water and flooding screening identified the site is be in a rare known to be at low risk of surface water flooding, with higher risk areas in the vicinity of the site. The updated submissions confirm that standard flood risk mitigation measures will be adopted in the permanent works tomitigate against flood risk. Campbell Reith conclude that the revised BLA meets the relevant policy	GRANTE
11	2016/2597/P GF Flat 15 Lymington Rd. London NW6 1HX	12 Jan 2018	mitigate against flood risk are recommended and Permission is Granted. The term 'area' is used with no qualification. The basement is to be a very large Funeral Directors with 3 Plant Rooms, but this does not seem to have been flagged as a 'vulnerable use'. Excavation of single storey basement with lightwells to front and rear and replace rear extension. Notes: Officers accept Campbell Reith's Flood Risk conclusions, the		Not in a	Very Low Risk	Street not	No LLFA	2 Basement		2 Other	1 Plant	Campbell Reith BIA Audit 12336-81 Rev: F1 June 2017 1.12. It is accepted that there are no potential impacts on the wider hydrogeology and that the development is not in an area subject to flooding.	risk. Campbell Reith conclude that the revised BIA meets the relevant policy criteria. Full Planning Permission Granted Subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement [Flooding unremarked in the Decision Notice]	
12	2016/2689/P 190 Goldhurst Terr. London NW6 3HN	25 Jan 2018	residual flood risk mitigation measures and Permission is Granted. Flooding is otherwise unremarked in the Decision Notice. Excavation of a basement to create a new, fully self contained two bedroom basement flat, under a Victorian house with two bedrooms, in the Goldhurst Local Flood Risk Zone and a twice flooded street but considered by officers to be 'akin to the arrangement in a duplex', in	Basement to House	Local Flood Risk Zone	Surface Water Flooding	previously flooded	Comments Found	Bedrooms	-	Misc. Basement Rooms	Room	4.18. It is accepted that the site has no risk of groundwater or fluvial flooding and has no past history of flooding. 5.0 CONCLUSIONS 5.8. It is accepted that there are no potential impactsoon the wider hydrogeology and that the evelopment is not in an area subject to flooding. Campbell Reith BIA Audit 1.2466-45 Rev: F1 Jan. 2018 4.11. The BIA states that the site has as having a low risk of flooding, which is continued by EA data. However, the site is located within the Softmust Labert Flooding	Recommendation(s) Grant Condition Planning Permission: 4.2 The proposed flat is accessed via a communal entrance ground floor level and internal starcase. This is considered to be akin to the arrangement in a duplex arrangement ground floor level and still be within the main building. The proposals also include sizeable rear sunken terrace which provides a secondary means of escape and an escape ladder has been included to access ground level It is considered in this instance that the proposals for a self-contained	a a
			that the flats main entrance exits to an internal corridor. The arrangement is identical to that being appealed at 23 Ravenshaw Street Officers conclude that: 'It is considered in this instance that the proposals for a self-contained unit at basement level are acceptable.' Evacuation safety appears to officers actual concern, such that 'in the event of a flood occurrence, occupants can exit the lower level to the ground floor level and still be within the main building.' Coupled with the provision of escape ladders. Otherwise, Officers accept Campbell Reith's Flood Risk conclusions and Permission is Granted.	Fully self contained Single Floor Flat 'Akin' to a Duplex	Goldhurst Local Flood Risk Zone	Very Low Risk Surface Water Flooding	Previously Flooded Street 1975 and 2002	No LLFA Comments Found	2 Basement Bedrooms	2 Other Habitable Basement Rooms	2 Other Misc. Basement Rooms	-	water flooding and sever surcharging. These should be implemented as stated. 5.0 CONCLUSIONS 5.8. The site is located within the Goldhurst Local Flood Risk Zone and the flood risk mitigation measures proposed in the BIA should be implemented. 5.12. Queries and matters requiring further information or clientification are summarised in Appendix 2. The additional information requirements of CPG4 have been met.	unit at pasement level are acceptable.	GRANTE
13	2016/2822/P 30 Greencroft Gdns. London NW6 3JQ	17 Apr 2018	Extensions to basement, new light wells, sub-division from 4 x into 7 x self-contained flats. Note: Two duplex flats, (with exits at ground floor to an internal corridor) each with large double basement bedrooms. Sited in the Goldhurst Local Flood Risk Zone on a twice flooded street. Officers accept Campbell Reith's final BIA Audit and Flood Risk conclusions and in tandem with flood risk mitigation measures being proposed. No mention is made of the 2 Basement Bedrooms and 4 habitable rooms being 'vulnerable uses' by Officers in their decision and Permission is Granted.	2 x Duplex Flats	Goldhurst Local Flood Risk Zone	Very Low Risk Surface Water Flooding	Previously Flooded Street 1975 and 2002	No LLFA Comments Found	2 Basement Bedrooms	4 Other Habitable Basement Rooms	4 Other Misc. Basement Rooms	-	Campbell Reith BIA Audit 12466-48 Rev: F1 Sept. 2017 5.0 CONCLUSIONS 5.1 The site is within the Goldhurst Local Flood Risk Zone. A Flood Risk Assessment indicates a potential risk of flooding to the basement and mitigation measures are described. 5.15. With the revised and supplementary information (listed in Section 2). It is accepted that BIA and supporting documents meet the requirements of CPG4.	Cofficers Report: 6.3. In accordance with the requirements of policy A5, the applicants have submitted Basement impact Assessment reports which review the impacts of the proposed basement structure and construction methods in terms of its impact upon drainage, flooding, groundwater conditionsand structural stability. 6.4. As outlined above, the BIA reporting initially/submitted valar reviewed and found to be nadequate for the Council's policy requirements. As a result, the applicant made reappointments for their consultant engineers, moving to a well-known firm of consultant singli individuals who possess suitable qualifications in line with CPC requirements produced the submitted BIA. The resubmitted BIA and Flood Risk Assessment reports provided after the initial audit were produced by Cord Structural Engineers. Due to the complexities of development constraints for the site and growinly to the canal, these documents have undergone a full audit from the Council's third party auditors – Campbell Reith (CR) in line with the requirements of policy A5 / CPC4. 6.7. Hydrology Surface water floods 6.1. Hydrology Surface water floods 6.1. Hydrology Surface water floods 6.1. Hydrology Surface water floods 6.2. Hydrology Surface water floods 6.3. Hydrology Gills Rássessment (FRA) confirms the site to be at a low potential for the basement to flood. Despite this, mitigation measures are proposed which should be implemented on site.	GRANTE
14	2016/2997/P 28 Redington Rd. London NW3 7RB	16 Nov 2017	New 4 storey plus basement building to provide 8 flats. Note: The principal reasons for refusal are heritage assets loss plus bulk, scale, mass, height and design, but refusal 3 is due to a BlA Audit query about a Ground Movement Assessment not being provided. Irrespective of the outcome, Officers demonstrably accept and act upon Campbell Retirbs conclusions. Policy Note: The Inspector comments: 'Policy A6 is part of a recently adopted and up-to-date Local Plan and therefore carries full weight.' The case officer was David Peres Da Costa.	Duplex Flat Plus Service Floor / Garage	Not in a Local Flood Risk Zone	Very Low Risk Surface Water Flooding	Street not previously flooded	No LLFA Comments Found	-	2 Other Habitable Basement Rooms	1 Other Misc. Basement Room	1 Plant Room	Campbell Reith BIA Audit 12336-98 Rev: D2 Date: Aug. (Published Version) 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. 5.0 CONCLUSIONS 5.6. It is anticipated that the proposed development will not impact the wider hydrological or hydrogeological environments. 5.7. Monitoring and condition surveys are proposed. These should be revised to reflect that the proposed of the proposed of the proposed of the proposed. These should be revised to reflect 5.8. Below ground drainage and waterproofing are considered. 5.9. Queries are summarised in Appandix 2, until additional information and assessment request have been presented, the BIA is not assessed as meeting the criteria of CPGA.	NOTIFICATION OF DECISION WHEN AN APPEAL HAS BEEN MADE Reason(s) for Refusal 1 The proposed demolition would result in the complete loss of a non-designated heritage asset which has historic, aesthetic, and communal significance and which makes a positive contribution to the Redingion Frogratic Convervation Area 2 The proposed replacement building, by reason of its bulk, scale, mass, height and cossign, would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the Redington Frogratic Convervation Area 3 Inthe absence of sufficient information in the basement impact assessment, the applicant has failed to demonstrate the development will not cause harm to the built and abtural environment including the local water environment, ground conditions and the structural stability of neighbouring properties contrary to policy Plus others. Decision 1. The appellant explained at the hearing that they were advised by their engineers that ground movement calculations did not need to be included in the BlA 12. Policy of s. d each, roovere, that basement development will one to such parmitted once it has been demonstrated that the proposal would not cause harm to resimbouring rooperties. The assement development will one to such as the proposal would not cause harm to resimbouring rooperties. The assement development will one to be included in the BlA	DISMISSI On Appe Inadequate Informati Flood Ri Inconclus
15	2016/3174/P 70 Churchway London NW1 1HY In association with 53-55 Chalton St. London NW1 1HY	20 Apr 2021	3 Flats: New 3 storey building plus basement building of 3 new Flats. Residential offsetting in connection with new hotel at Chalton Street, 2016/5266/P. Note: The BIA Audit comments at 4.13 seem to contradict the EA Flood Risk Checker which shows the actual site address of 53-55 Chalton Street London NW1 1H7 as being at Medium Risk and 60-70 Churchway London NW1 1LT at High Risk. This application originally had 4 Basement bedrooms which where removed in a later revision, however, the associated hotel has 12 basement bedrooms. It is noted that the application contains 4 other habitable rooms which are not commented upon as being "vulnerable uses". Officers accept Campbell Reith's Flood Risk conclusions, along with the flood risk the mitigation measures and Permission (along with 2016/5266/P) is Granted.	Duplex Flat	Not in a Local Flood Risk Zone	Medium to High Risk Surface Water Flooding	Street not previously flooded	LLFA Officer Comments Made Inc. Hotel at Chalton Street 2016/5266/P	-	4 Other Habitable Basement Rooms	1 Other Misc. Basement Rooms	-	Campbell Reith BIA Audit 12985-71 Rev: F1 Nov. 2019 [See Notes] 4.13. A flood risk assessment (FRA) has been undertaken. Whilst 33-56 Chainon Street and 66 Churchway are classified as being at low risk of flooding, 70 Churchway is classified as having a medium risk of moding from surface waters. Flood risk recommended, to include: pumped positive educes to protect against sever surcharge; raised thresholds; demountable floor guards; non-return valves; sealed cable entry points; etc. 5.0 CONCLUSIONS 5.9. The site schassified as being at low to medium risk of hodrig. The flood risk mitigation measures that should be adopted. 5.10. A SUDS strategy is presented. A final drainage design should be agreed with Thames Water and LBC. There will be no impact to the wider hydrological environment. 5.11. An outline construction programme has been provided. 5.12. Discussion is presented in Section 4. The BIA meets the criteria of CPG Basements.	As is part of a recertly adopted and up-to-date Local Plan and therefore carries full weight. On the evidence before me I cannot, therefore, conclude that it has been demonstrated that the proposal would not be harmful to neighbouring properties Grant conditional planning permission Subject to a Section 106 legal agreement Decide along with 2016/5266/P Officers Report: 14.3 A Flood Risk Assessment has been submitted as part of this application. The site is located in an area of medium (in 1 100 year) surface water flood risk and borders an area of high (1 in 30 year) surface water flood risk. The development includes a Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SUDS) in order to reduce run-off rates from the pre-development rates. For this development site this will include attenuation of rainwater and discharge into a combined sever full details of SUDS will be secured via condition. 6 SUDS Prior to commencement of the relevant part of the development details of a sustainable urban drainage system shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. SUDS shall be will be implemented prior to the occupation of the relevant parts of the development and permanently retained and maintained the relevant part of the development and permanently retained and maintained thereafter. 8 In respect of surface water it is recommended that the applicant should ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network rhough on or off site storage. When it is proposed to connect to a combined public sever, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final marhole nearest developer proposes to discharge to a public sever, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required.	GRANTE
16	2016/3545/P Maryon House 115-119 Goldhurst Terr. London NW6 3EY NW6 3HN	11 May 2018	*See LLFA Note at 2016/5266/P New four storey residential building 3 with basement to provide 11 new units. inc. 3 x new basement flats. Note: New apartment block with 3 single floor, self-contained basement flats with entrances onto a core stairwell; presumably considered 'akin' to a duplex, but there is no indication of emergency exits/ladders in the basement light wells. Also there seems to be no mention of 'vulnerable uses' and no LLFA Officer comments are evident in the the Decision Notice or Officers Report, which states that the development is; 'unlikely to set a precedent for basement development in the street.' Officers accept Campbell Reith's Flood Risk conclusions, along with the flood risk the mitigation measures and Permission is Granted.	3 x Single Floor Flats 'Akin' to a Duplex?	Goldhurst Local Flood Risk Zone	No.113 Low Risk No.121 High Risk Surface Water Flooding (Actual site has no current Post Code)	Street not previously flooded	No LLFA Comments Found	4 Basement Bedrooms	6 Other Habitable Basement Rooms	4 Other Misc. Basement Rooms	2 Plant Rooms	Campbell Reith BIA Audit 12336-99 Rev: F1 Dec. 2016 5.0 CONCLUSIONS 5.0.0 Ris accepted that the new development and associated basement is at low risk of flooding and with the implementation of SUDS at the site, there will be no increase in flood risk elsewhere as a result of the development. [No final comment but BIA clearly approved as policy compliant]	Full Planning Permission Subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement [RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY] 'It isaccepted that the new development and associated basement is at low risk of flooding and with the implementation of SUSS at the other control of the second of the development.'	GRANTE
17	2016/4136/P 9 Maresfield Gdns. London NW3 5SJ	11 Jul 2017	Excavation of basement extension to existing semi-basement to create four new 4 x Self Contained, Single Floor Basement Flats. Note: EA Flood Risk Checker which indicates Low Risk, not No Risk. Officers accept Campbell Reith's Flood Risk conclusions, along with the flood risk the mitigation measures and Permission is Granted.	4 x Self Contained Single Floor Basement Flats 'Akin' to a Duplex?	Not in a Local Flood Risk Zone	Low Risk Surface Water Flooding	Street not previously flooded	No LLFA Comments Found	5 Basement Bedrooms	4 Other Habitable Basement Rooms	5 Other Misc. Basement Rooms	-	Campbell Reith BIA Audit 12336-95 Rev: F1 Dec. 2016 4.16. It is accepted that the site has no risk of groundwater or fluvial flooding and has no past history of flooding. 5.0 CONCLUSIONS 5.8. It is accepted that the development will not impact on the wider hydrogeology of the area and is not in an area subject to flooding.	Full Planning Permission Granted Subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement 2.13 Campbell Reith requested additional information, which has been further assessed with Campbell Reith concluding: It is unlikely that the ground water table will be encountered during basement foundation excavation, although mitigation measures are necountered unique passement foundation excavation, although mitigation measures are of the formation of the properties of the properties of the properties of the consult Movement Assessment conducted indicated damage to neighbouring properties to be Burland Category 1, or slight. Monitoring and condition surveys have been proposed and are required to comply with Party Wall Process. It is accepted that the development will not impact on the wider hydrogeology of the area and is not in an area subject to flooding: 2.14 As such, officers consider that based on the expert advice from Campbell Reith the applicant has demonstrated that the proposal would accord with the requirements of policy DPZ and associated Camber Planning Guidance. A condition will require the applicant to submit details of a qualified engineer to inspect, constitution works throughout their duration.	GRANTE
18	2016/5181/P 3-6 Spring Pl. London NW5 3BA	21 Dec 2017	Demolition then new part-six and part-two storey building over basement for office, cafe, event space. Note: Although the site is identified as being at Medium Risk of Surface Water Flooding by the EA, Officers accept Campbell Reith's conclusions that the development is at Low Risk. The application included basement plant rooms which are not identified as "vulnerable uses". Officers accept Campbell Reith's Flood Risk conclusions, along with the flood risk the mitigation and Permission is Granted. Policy Note: While the the Decision Notice addresses the outgoing policy, the Inspectors comments in Appeal 3164577, make clear that: "Policy A5 sp part of a recently adopted and up-to-date Local Plan and therefore carries full weight." * 1:100 year storm climate change provision is described as being 20% and 30%. We understand it should be 40% in any case.	Service Basement To a Block	Not in a Local Flood Risk Zone	Medium Risk Surface Water Flooding	Street not previously flooded	No LLFA Comments Found	-	-	1 Other Misc. Basement Room	3 Plant Rooms	Campbell Reith BIA Audit 12466-17 Rev: F1 Nov. 2016 4.3. The site lies directly on a designated non- aquiler, the London Cley and it is accepted that flooding at the site or impact to the wider hydrogelogical environment. 4.4. The BIA states that the site is at very low risk of surface water flooding but does read of the site of surface water flooding but does read (rough 300.3. as determined by LBC). In line with CP54 (Section 3.51), a drainage solution has been presented incorporating attenuation SUDS to reduce peak discharge rates. 4.5. The site area is currently 100% imper meable and there will be no change under the proposed development. It is accepted that the site is at low risk of surface water flooding and that it is unsuitable for soskaway SUDS due takes into account various storm event return periods plus an increase of 20% (edw97) in peak rainfall intensity to account for potential climate change effects. 5.0 CONCLUSIONS 5.4. It is accepted that the tes a very low risk of surface water flooding and the site or impact to the wider hydrogeological environment. 5.1 it is accepted that the site is at low risk of surface water flooding and that it is unsuitable for sockaway SUDS. A drainage	Full Planning Permission Granted Subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement 2 Prior to commencement of the development, full details of the sustainable drainage system shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Such a system should be designed to accommodate all storms up to and including a 1:00 year storm with a 30% provision for climate change, such that flooding does not occur in any part of a building or in any utility plant susceptible to water, and shall demonstrate maximum run-off of 5 % Details shall include a lifetime maintenance plant in the storm of t	
19	2016/5266/P 53-55 Chalton St. London NW1 1HY In association with 60-70 Churchway London NW1 1LT	30 Oct 2020	**The published Decision Notice is dated 21 Dec. 2017. The Camden web site records the decision date as 10 Jan. 2018. Hotel: Erection of part 4 part 2 storey plus basement for 46 room hotel in association with flats 2016/3174/P. Note: The BIA Audit comments seem incorrect? The actual site addresses of 55-55 Chalton Street London NVI 1HY are Medium Risk, 60 and 70 Churchwy London NVI, 1LT are High Risk on the EA Flood Risk Checker. The LLFA officer remarks on the site being located in an area of medium surface water flood risk, brothering an area of high risk and it being 300m West of the King Cross LFRZ. Concerning flood risk from the development. The officer finds the applications SuGS drainage strategy to be inordinately explained and										strategy incorporating attenuation SUDS is proposed and benefitshe wider hydrological environment. Campbell Reith BIA Audit 12985-71 Rev: F1 Nov. 2019 53-95 Chalton Street London NW1 1HY are Medium Risk, 60 and 70 Churchway London NW1 1LT are High Risk. 4.13. A flood risk assessment (FRA) has been undertaken. Whilst 53-95 Chalton Street and 60 Churchway are classified as being at low risk of flooding, 70 Churchway is classified as having a medium risk of flooding from surface waters. Flood risk recommended, to Include pumped positive devices to protect against sever suncharge; raised thresholds; demountable floor guards; non-return valves; sealed cable entry points; etc.	Grant conditional planning permission Subject to a Section 106 legal agreement Decide along with 2016/3174/P 0.19 The proposals at site 2 would create a new basement level under the whole site, below what is currently the existing building slootprint, to a depth of approximately 2.7m. 10.20 A Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) was submitted as part of the application. The independent review by the Council's basement consultant (Campbell Reith) concluded that the BIA is adequate and in accordance with policy AS and guidance contained in CPG Basements and assement Construction Plant (BCPS) sont required. The applicant has satisfactorily demonstrated that the proposed basements of the contained in CPG Basements and sasement Construction Plant (BCPS) and pulling the proposed propriet of the proposed propriet of the proposed propriet on the proposed propriet of the proposed propriet on the proposed propriet on the propriet of the propriet on the propriet on the propriet on the propriet of the propriet on the propriet on the propriet of the propriet of the propriet on the propriet of the propriet of the propriet of the propriet on the propriet of the pro	
			SUDS scheme and drainage plan etc. These issues are closed off in the Officers Report at 1.43: "will include attenuation of narwater and discharge into a combined sever further and discharge into a combined sever further and the DN at: 6 SUDS. Concerning flood risk to the development: The officer comments, "The development appears to overliga an area of medium risk of flooding from high risk. Further the Drainage Strategy by (Waterco.) State under Development Proposals the "The 2-bed apartment will occupy the basement and ground floor (will seleging includes an enclosed guiden area. There is no mention of flood miligation measures. Action for applicant Applicant to demonstrate how the basement and ground floor will be resilient to sufficie water flooding and not increase the risk elsewhere. We don't see mention of the 12 bedrooms in the hotel, but these issues must flave been closed off, otherwise permission would have been withheld. The Officers Report does not seem to address resilience to surface valeer floodings, where the risk elsewhere. Clearly, evident Flood Risk is not used as blanket excuse to prevent the development; Officers accept the FRA. Campbel Rethirs BIA Audit conclusions, condition the miligation measures and Permission is Granted.	2 storey plus basement for 46 room hotel	Not in a Local Flood Risk Zone	Medium to High Risk Surface Water Flooding	Street not previously flooded	LLFA Officer Comments Made Inc. Flats at 70 Churchway NW1 1HY 2016/3174/P	12 Basement Bedrooms	-	1 Other Misc. Basement Room	1 Plant Room	5.9. The site is classified as bring at low to medium risk of flooding. The flooding the flooding the flooding the flooding the flood risk mitigation measures that should be adopted. 5.10. A SUBOS strategy is presented. A final drainage design should be agreed with Thames Water and LEC. There will be no impact to the wider hydrological environment. 5.12. Discussion is presented in Section 4. The BIA meets the criteria of CPG Basements.	includes a Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SUDS) in order to reduce run-off rates from the pre-deopment rates. For this developments teit his will include attenuation of rainwater and discharge into a combined sewer full details of SUDS will be secured via condition.	GRANTE
20	2016/5372/P Highgate Centre A&A Self (Lensham House) 19-37 Highgate Rd 19-37 Highgate Rd 19 Greenwood Pl. NW5 1JY NW5 1LB	29 Mar 2019	Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment to provide two buildings of 7 and 8 storeys plus double basement. Self-Storage (Basements and GF) - 4,360m² Office Space - 1,798m² Community Cafe - 95m² 60 Flats - 52 Market, 8 Social. Notes: BIA Audit state that the FRA states that "surrounding streets to be at medium risk of surface water flooding" The Camden SFRA seems to show High Risk (1:30 year) on two sides, while the EA Ratings for the actual addresses are High and Medium Risk. Also, having a double bassement with plant rooms this is just the type of application one may have expected to find at least some LLFA Officer Comments, but there doesn't seem to be any in the published documents. In any case, Officers accept the FRA, Campbell Reith's BIA Audit conclusions, condition the mitigation measures and Permission is Granted.	Double Basement Commercial Storage	Not in a Local Flood Risk Zone	Medium Risk / High Risk Surface Water Flooding	Street not previously flooded But Site is in "highly flood sensitive" Counters Creek Catchment	Large Dev. In an area of notable Flooding issues. No LLFA Officer Comments seem to have been published application documents.	-	-	2 Other Misc. Basement Rooms	4 Plant Rooms	Campbell Reith BIA Audit 12466-3/Rev. FL April 2017 4.12. The BIA references the Histon Moran Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and Environment Agency Data, which indicates the site and surrounding streets to be at medium risk of surfaces water Blooding and at risk from surfaces water Blooding and at risk from surfaces water Blooding and at risk from annually operated flood barrier and prouposed mitigation measures.such as a proposed mitigation measures.such as a droundwater drainage scheme, which are considered satisfactory. 5.4. The BIA addresses Bood risk and proteinal hydrological impacts with reference to the Histon Moran report, with suitable mitigation and drainage proposed. 5.5. A site specific ground investigation is recommended in the BIA to establish the ground and groundwater conditions. This should be undertaken and presented in a BCP. 5.6. Suitable outline mitigation to potential hydrologological impacts hasbeen presented. However, assessment should be confirmed following further investigation and monitoring, and should be presented within a BCP. 5.1. Considering the revisions submitted, and the requirement for a BCP, the BIA meets the criteria of CPG4.	investigation details, outline retaining wall designs and an outline monitoring strategy. The audit reviewed the BIA for potential impacts on land stability and local ground and surface water conditions arising from basement development in accordance with	GRANTE
21	2016/5528/P 11 Glenilla Rd. London NW3 4AJ Flat 1	2 Aug 2017	Excavation to enlarge existing basement including installation of front & rear lightwells and extension to existing part width ground floor rear projection. Notes: Medium Risk site with 3 basement bedrooms and a bathroom, not identified as 'vulnerable uses', with no apparent escape ladder at the front light well. Officers accept Campbell Reith's BIA Audit conclusions and along with mitigation measures Permission is Granted.	Duplex Flat	Not in a Local Flood Risk Zone	Medium Risk Surface Water Flooding	Street not previously flooded	No LLFA Comments Found	3 Basement Bedrooms	-	3 Other Misc. Basement Rooms	-	Campbell Reith BIA Audit 12466-24 Rev: F1 April 2017 5.0 CONCLUSIONS 5.8. A Flood Risk Statement shows that the development generates negligible flooding risk mitigation measures to prevent flooding of the basement which should be incorporated into the detailed design proposals and these are endorsed. 5.9. It is accepted that there are no hydropological or sides statifying concerns cause by the development to the surrounding area.	Full Planning Permission Granted Subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement [Flooding unremarked in the Decision Notice, no published officers report]	GRANTE
22	2016/5652/P Oman Court 2 Oman Rd. London NW3 4PT	3 May 2018	Excavation of basement to create 2x 2 bedroom self-contained flats (Class C3) with associated front lightwells and cycle stores. Notes: Two flats, with 4 basement bedrooms in a previously flooded street. The BIA notes that Ornan Road was subject to surface flooding in 2002 although the site is not located within a Local Flood Risk Zone, as defined by the Council. Within the BIA, the site itself is noted to be topographically higher than Ornan Road – which was accepted, along with The Environment Agency rating, which indicates the site to be at a Very Low risk of surface water flooding. In short, Officers accept Campbell Reith's BIA Audit conclusions and	2 x Single Floor Flats Flats To the Basement Lightwell	Not in a Local Flood Risk Zone	Very Low Risk Surface Water Flooding	Previously Flooded Street 2002	No LLFA Comments Found	4 Basement Bedrooms	2 Other Habitable Basement Rooms	4 Other Misc. Basement Rooms	-	Environment Agency indicates the site to be at a Very Low Tisk of surface water flooding, which is accepted. The development should which is accepted. The development should profess the surface of the	The Environment Agency Indicates the site to be at a Very Low risk of surface water flooding, which is accepted. The audit divises that the development should incorporate appropriate mitigation measures to protect against potential sewer surcharge flood risk.	ı.
23	2016/5697/P 43 Croftdown Rd. London NW5 1EL	17 Apr 2018		Basement To House	York Rise Local Flood Risk Zone	High Risk Surface Water Flooding	Street not previously flooded	No LLFA Comments Found	-	2 Other Habitable Basement Rooms	-	-	Campbell Reith BIA Audit 12727-45 Rev: DI April (Only Published Revision) 4.14. It is accepted that the proposed development will not change the impermeable site area not impact the hydrodigical measures should be incorporated into the final construction. 5.0 CONCLUSIONS 5.4. It is accepted that the basement construction will not impact the hydrogeological environment. 5.5. It is accepted that the proposed development will not impact the hydrogeological environment.	Full Planning Permission Granted [Flooding unremarked in the Decision Notice, no published officers report]	GRANTE
			Officers accept Campbell Reith's BIA Audit conclusions and along with										environment.		

Campbell Reith BIA Audit 12466-36 Rev: F1 April 2017

5.11. Queries and requests for further information/clarification are summarised in Appendix 2. Following receipt of the revised BIA and supporting supplementary documents, the criteria contained in CPG4 and DP27 have been met

Campbell Reith BIA Audit 12466-54 Rev: D2 Aug. 2017

5.8. A Surface Water Flow Assessmen completed by RSA and includes an evaluation of surface water flow and appropriate mitigation measures to of effects of basement construction.

Campbell Reith BIA Audit 12466-47 Rev: F1 May 2017

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

A 12. Although the basement footprint will extend marginally into the rear garden, there will not be an increase in the proportion of hard surfaced areas due to existing hardstanding in this area. The lightwells at the fornt and rear of the propenty will cause an increase the missing the state of the development, together with drainage proposals, are presented in the BIA, and consider the findings as presented in the FIOOd Risk Assessment.

5.9. It is accepted that the site is not located within the catchment area of the Hampstead Heath pond chain. **5.10.** It is accepted that there are no hydrogeological or slope stability concerns caused by the development to the surrounding

Campbell Reith BIA Audit 12466-46 Rev: F1 July 2017

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

5.8. It is accepted that the new development is at low risk of flooding, based on raised levels in relation to the adjacent road, which should be confirmed at detailed design

Campbell Reith BIA Audit 12466-59 Rev: F1 March 2017

4.15. It is accepted that the development will not affect the hydrogeological setting as no known ponds, spring lines or wells are in close vicinity to the site and that the site is outside the Hampstead pond chain catchment area.

5.4. Perched groundwater was encountered between 2.8m and 3.0m bgl over two rounds of groundwater monitoring. Further groundwater monitoring is proposed by CGL to confirm the "researce of water along with appropriate"

5.10. The BIA meets the criteria of CPG4 and DP27.

Campbell Reith BIA Audit 12985-15 Rev: F1 March 2019

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

Other Misc.

Other Misc.

Other Misc. Basement

Other Misc.

Other Habitable Basement

Other Habitable Basement Rooms

Other Habitable

Other Habitable Basement

5.14. Considering the updated information presented, the BIA meets the requirement

Campbell Reith BIA Audit 12466-42 Rev: F1 Feb. 2017

Campbell Reith BIA Audit 12466-61 Rev: F1 March 2018

5.7. It is accepted that the site is at low risk of flooding.

513. Although a number of the queries raised after the initial audit remain to be addressed, it is recognised that this is a retrospective application. The BIA identified potential impactively respect to surface water run-of, a Trames Water sewer, the structural potential impactively respect to surface water run-of, a Trames Water sewer, the structural permanent cases, and damage to surrounding properties. Subsequent clarifications have addressed the issues of surface water and damage to neighbouring structures. It is assumed that the structural despin has been addressed the issue of surface water and substitution for the surface substitution of the substitution of substitution of the substitution of substituti

Campbell Reith BIA Audit

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

12727-27 Rev: D2 April 2018 (Only Published Revision)

5.17. It has not been demonstrated that the proposal adheres to the requirements of

1.9. It is accepted that the site is not in a Flood Risk Zone and is at low risk of flooding. The site is within a Critical Drainage Area (Group 3-0103).

Drainage Area (Group 3-0103).
4.13. The site is within a Critical Drainage Area (Group 3-0103) and the Parmahrook document identifies that Prince of Wales Road did flood in 2002. However, current Environment Agency and Canden SFFA data indicate that the site is generally at very low risk of flooding, with the exception of the western flooding. The het exception of the western believed to the company of the company of the property of the control of the company of the control of the company of the control of the considered in line with best practise.

5.8. It is accepted that the site is at low risk of flooding.

Campbell Reith BIA Audit 12066-52 Rev: F1 March 2016

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

Campbell Reith BIA Audit 12466-56 Rev: F1 Aug. 2017

5.7. In the revised submissions, further assessment is presented and it is accepted that the proposed development is at very low risk of flooding from all sources.

Audit by LBH Wembley LBH 4237 June 2014

Campbell Reith BIA Audit

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

5.12. Queries and matters requiring further

5.7. It is accepted that the development will not impact on the wider hydrogeology of the area and is not in an area subject to flooding.

Campbell Reith BIA Audit 12466-65 Rev: F1 Sept. 2017

Campbell Reith BIA Audit 12466-83 Rev: F2 Nov. 2018

Campbell Reith BIA Audit 12466-92 Rev: F1 Oct. 2017

5.11. The site is identified as being at very low risk of flooding. The revised submissions confirm threshold levels will be suitably elevated compared to adjacent areas at risk of flooding.

Campbell Reith BIA Audit 12466-78 Rev: F1 June 2018

Campbell Reith BIA Audit 12466-74 Rev: F1 Feb. 2018

5.11. Queries and matters that required further information or clarification are summarised in Appendix 2. The additional information requested has been provided and the BIA meets the requirements of CPG4.

5.8. Assessments are based on assumed ground and groundwater conditions. Until a site investigation is undertaken, the exact ground and groundwater conditions remain unknown, and an updated assessment should be suibmitted as part of the BCP.

5.11. A ground movement assessment has been carried out that predicts damage to neighbouring buildings of Category 2 (Slight). LBC guidance requires that where Category I (eye Slight) or greater is predicted, mitigation measures must be proposed. It should be noted that Category I damage is the maximum

Campbell Reith BIA Audit 12466-79 Rev: F1 July 2017

Campbell Reith BIA Audit

Campbell Reith BIA Audit 12727-08 Rev: F1 Dec. 2017

Campbell Reith BIA Audit 12466-91 Rev: D1 Aug.

5.13. Queries and matters requiring further information or clarification are summarised in Appendix 2. Until the additional information requested has been provided, the requirements of CPG4 have not been met.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

Other Habitable Basement

Other Misc.

12466-82 Rev: F1 October 2017

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

5.6. It is accepted that the site is at very low risk of flooding. Flood risk mitigation measures proposed should be adopted.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

Campbell Reith BIA Audit 12466-27 Rev: F2 April 2017

1.12. It is accepted that the site is not at risk from surface water flooding but proposals to

3.1.1.3 Surface Flow and Flooding A screening checklist for the impact of the

Campbell Reith RIA Audit

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

5.6. The revised BIA states that Environment Agency data indicates a low to high surface water flood risk for all the street. The revised is raised 200mm above street level and that rither flood risk mitigation is not required. It is recommended that this assessment is reviewed and that final threshold theyels are reviewed and that final threshold theyels are lower to the reviewed and that final threshold theyels are lower to the reviewed and that final threshold theyels are lower to the reviewed and that final threshold theyels are lower to the reviewed and that final threshold theyels are lower to the reviewed and that final threshold theyels are lower to the reviewed and that final threshold theyels are lower to the review to the reviewed and that final threshold theyels are lower to the reviewed and that final threshold theyels are lower to the reviewed and that final threshold theyels are lower to the reviewed and that final threshold theyels are lower to the reviewed and that final threshold theyels are lower to the reviewed and that final threshold theyels are lower to the reviewed and that final threshold theyels are lower to the reviewed and that final threshold theyels are lower to the reviewed and that final threshold theyels are lower to the reviewed and that final threshold theyels are lower to the reviewed and that final threshold theyels are lower to the review the reviewed and that final threshold they lower to the review the reviewed and that final threshold they lower threshold the reviewed and that final threshold they lower threshold the reviewed and that final threshold they lower threshold the reviewed and that final threshold they lower threshold threshol

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

Other Misc. Basement

4 Other Misc. Basemer Rooms

Other Misc.

Other Habitable Basement Rooms

Other Habitable Basement Rooms

Full Planning Permission Granted Subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement

Full Planning Permission Granted Subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement

Full Planning Permission Granted Subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement

Full Planning Permission Granted Subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement

Full Planning Permission Granted Subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement

Full Planning Permission Granted

Full Planning Permission Granted Subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement

His remaining comment are principally all about SUDS measures.

Full Planning Permission Granted

Full Planning Permission Refused

Full Planning Permission Granted Subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement Warning of Enforcement Action

7.7 Campbell Reith concluded:

5.3 Campbell Reith conclude:

15. BASEMENT EXCAVATION

6.71 Campbell Reith issued their final report on 11 April 2017 and confirmed that the revised details satisfactorily addressed their queries:

-Further groundwater monitoring is ongoing to establish equilibrium levels and seasonal variation, which will inform the detailed design. -I was accepted that there will be no increase in impermeable area across the ground and the surface flow regime will remain unchanged. Green roots and associated SUDs have been specified in the Flood Risk Assessment. - A detailed Flood Risk Assessment was conducted and concluded the develop is deemed to be at low flood risk.

A.0 Basement impact
4.1 A Basement impact Assessment (BIA) has been submitted as part of this application. This document has been independently reviewed by Campbell Reith with subsequent information provided by the author of the BIA during the course of the application. Within their final audit report, Campbell Reith conclude that the revise has addressed initial concerns and that the development as proposed would rem in accordance with policy AS / CPG Basements.

4.4 The site is within a Critical Drainage Area. The Audit acceptshat the proposal would not alter the existing proportion of hard surfaces and paved areas, and hence the quantity of local arinfall entering the existing sever system; and the submitted Surface Water Flow Assessment includes appropriate mitigation measures to offset the effects of the basement construction.

4.5 The Audit confirms that the BIA has met the requirements of Policy A5 and CPG Basements for the identification of the potential impacts of the proposed basement construction and the proposed mitigation.

3 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

8.3 in accordance with the requirements of policy A5, the applicants have submitted a Basement Impact Assessment which reviews the impacts of the proposed basement structure and construction methods in terms of its impact upon drainage flooding, groundwater conditions and structural stability.

8.4 This has been independently reviewed by the Council's Consultants. In the conclusions, the audit notes the following: • It is accepted that the new development is at low risk of flooding, based on raised levels in relation to the adjacent road, which should be confirmed at detailed design

8.5 In light of these conclusions it is considered that the applicant has taken the appropriate steps and measures to ensure that the basement level can be constituted and extended the constituted and the constituted and the proposal accords with policy A1 and A5 of the Camden Local Plan

15.1 The proposal includes the excavation of a single storey basement under the northern part of the site. The proposed excavation works and the impact on drainage, flooding coundwater conditions and structural stability are assessed in respect of policy DP27 and the guidance contained within CPG4 (but to an extent also CSS, CS14, DP23, DP25, DP26).

3 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 16.1168-01, 16.1168-02, 16.1168-03, 16.1168-04, 16.1168-R5, 16.1168-R6, 16.1168-R

LLFA Officer comments on Surface Water Flood Risk:

The Basement Impact Assessment has also screened out a site-specific surface water flood risk assessment, as there are no recorded historial flood events nor is the site in a LFR Zone. However, Fig. 3ii in Appendix B of Camden's updated Strategic Flood risk Assessment (Zold) identifies the surrounding streets location as having both 1 in 30 year and 1 in 100 year flood risk according to modelling.

Recommendation: While not requiring a site specific FRA I would recommend the above be borne in mind by the applicant and their design team. With special regard to mitigating the impacts of potential storm surface water flows into and out of the site."

B) Prior to occupation of the development, evidence that the sustainable drainage sys-has been implemented in accordance with the approved details as part of the development shall be submitted to the Local Authority and approved in writing. The systems shall thereafter be retained and maintained in accordance with the approved maintenance pital.

- It is accepted that the proposed development will not impact the wider hydrogeological environment.

environment.

- It is accepted that the site is at low risk of flooding.
- The latest BIA includes the results of movement monitoring and the applicant has stated that no damage exceeding Burland Category 1 has been observed - It is accepted that there are no land stability impacts caused by slopes.

 \star A flood risk assessment confirms that the property is in a low to medium risk of flooding from surface water.

+ The developed area is increasing which will increase the volume of surface water drainage into the sewer system. It is indicated that SUDs will be provided by way of greens node and an acceptable unto off rate has been caculated. However further details are required to show how the flow is attenuated in order to achieve the stated run off rate.

Whilst the proposal would result in the provision of a basement below an existing lower ground foor, the basement aready has permission, ref 2013/7182P dated 2400/2010. This permission is still capable of being implemented and thus an exception from policy AS on basements is justified in this case. The basement works have been submitted with a Basement Impact Assessment, which was independently assessed for the previous application and which concluded that the works would not harm conditions. Memorphisms are worked to the provious application and which conclude that the works would not harm conditions. Memorphisms are successfully and ground movement conditions. Memorphisms are well as the provious provious application and which concludes the provious application and the provious application and

1.21. Basement
1.22. The previous application submitted a Basement Impact Assessment (BIA)
which was a sedied by Campbell Reith. The audit confirms that a Ground Movement
which was a sedied by Campbell Reith. The audit confirms that a Ground Movement
which was sedied by Campbell Reith. The audit confirms that Campbell Reith Category 2 (Slight) has been predicted for the neighbouring properties. The audit accepts
that there are no slope stability concerns, no hydrogeological concerns and no
hydrological concerns with respect to the development proposals. Campbell Reith have
continued that the based on the reduced size, the previous assessment represents a
number of conclusions are based on necessary assumptions at present, Campbell
Reith recommended that a Basement Construction Plan is provided and approved

1.110. Recommendation:
1.111. Refuse planning permission on the following grounds:
1.112. Refuse planning permission on the following grounds:
1.112. Refuse planning permission on the following prouds:
1.112. The proposal has not demonster to existing building could not retained and improved contrary to Policy CCI.
1. In the absence of a legal agreement for Car free; CMP; Highway works; BCP and affordable house).

Decision 1. The appeal is dismissed.
27...benefits would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm identified above including the concerns over the residents parking permits. The development would also provide 5 units of accommodation of a high standard. However, these considerations do not outweigh the harm and conflict with the development plan identified above.

Recommendations: Refuse Planning Permission

Full Planning Permission Granted Subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement

Full Planning Permission Granted Subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement

Full Planning Permission Granted Subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement

Householder Application Subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement

Full Planning Permission Granted Subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement

Full Planning Permission Granted Subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement

12.2 The site is not within a Local Flood Risk Zone; it is within Flood Zone 1 (where there is a 0.1% annual probability of flooding.

3.1 Policy A5 of the Camden Local Plan 2017 is relevant with regards basements and seeks to protect neighbouring properties, the structural, ground, or water conditions of the area, the character and amenity of the area, the architectural character of the building and the significance of any heritage assets.

13.2 A basement is proposed across the whole site, which is similar in extent to the basement approved in the the previous planning permission for this site. 13.3 A Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) was submitted as part of thi application. Campbell Reith, the Council's independent basement const

application. Campbell Retin, the Council's independent basement consultant, assessed the proposals and are satisfied with the proposed basement excavation s to the submission of a Basement Construction Plan, given the proposed permeation grouting. If not properly controlled, grouting has the potential to cause adverse grou movements. A section 106 obligation is therefore attached accordingly.

NOTIFICATION OF WHEN AN APPEAL HAS BEEN MADE REFUSAL

[Flooding unremarked in the Decision Notice, no published Officers

Full Planning Permission Subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement

Full Planning Permission Granted Subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement

Full Planning Permission Refused

3 The proposed basement, by virtue of its excessive size and e relation to the size of the site and host dwelling...

Full Planning Permission Granted Subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement

Full Planning Permission Granted Subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement

A. I. As a result of the additional information provided, CR produced a second and final audit report in April 2018 within which it is confirmed that the information presented confirms that the basement constructed any harm to neighbouring buildings or structures as well as the local water environment. Within their final audit report, CR note that: "It is accepted that the site is not in a Flood Risk Zone and is at low risk of flooding"; that "The development will not increase the impermeable site are an impact the wider hydrological environment; and that "For the structures assessed, Category 0 (Negligible) to Category 1 (Very Slight) damage is predicted in accordance with the Burland Scale"

Due to the above Campbell Reith confirm that a flood risk assessment would not have been created as the assessment didn't not identify any potential impact in this regard. CR do however recommend that a Basement Construction Pain (ECP) should be secured via legal agreement due to the lyeo of construction piling to be used. . Subject to the securing of a BCP, Campbell Reith confirm that the development would accord with securing the securing of a BCP, Campbell Reith confirm that the development would accord waity engineers have confirmed the acceptability of the scheme in this regard no further objection is raised by officers.

6.7. As a result of the additional information provided, CR produced a second and final audit report in April 2018 within which it is confirmed that the information presented

1. The proposed demolition, by reason of the loss of the existing building which makes a positive contribution to the Fitzjohns/ Netherhall Conservation Area, would cause harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Informative(s):

1 Reasons for granting permission.

1 Reasons for granting permission.

The subdivision proposal is considered acceptable as the increase in the self-container.

The subdivision proposal is considered acceptable as the increase in the self-container, the self-container with the self-container.

The subdivision proposal is considered acceptable acceptable acceptable acceptable and the site and maximising the supply of additional homes in the borough is therefore considered appropriate.

As such, the proposed development is in general accordance with policies H1 ,H6, H7, A1, A5, D1, D2, T1 and T2 of the Camden Local Plan...

Reason(s) for Refusal

REFUSED

GRANTED

GRANTED

GRANTED

APPENDIX A

Sheet 2

BASEMENT CONSIDERATIONS
 S.1. Basement developments can help to make efficient use of the borough's limited is enequired by the development plan. But they have the potential to cause harm to the serious problems, or damage the character of areas and the natural environment. Local Plan policy AS includes a range of includors to manage and mitigate these operational problems are problems. The following table demonstrates how the proposed basement is compliant with Policy AS of the Camiden Local Plan 2017.

A Reasons for granting permission
Whilst the proposal would result in the provision of a basement below an existing
lower ground floor, this basement already has permission, ref 2013/7182P dated
24/03/2015. This permission is still capable of being implemented and thus an
exception from policy 45 on basements is justified in this case. The basement works
have been submitted with a Basement impact Assessment, which was def that the
works would not harm groundwater flow, surface water flow, structural stability and
ground movement conditions. Nevertheless it was considered appropriate to
control the excavation works by a Basement Construction Plan (BCP) to be secured
by \$100 legal agreement; as well as control of the associated traffic
yation provides the provided of the provided provided in
monitoring fee. These will continue to be required by a \$106 for this new scheme.

2.22 The application is accompanied by a Basement Impact Assessment (BIA), which has been independently audited by Campbell Reith, a line with the requirements of CPC4. In the properties of CPC4 and the propert

6 The development hereby approved shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the BIA compiled by Chelmer Consultancy Services dated November 2016 and the recommendations in the Camphell Reith Audit dated August 2017 specifically insofar it relates to a detailed works programme, condition surveys of neighbouring properties, movement monotioning and trigger values, trial pitting, groundwater monitoring, protection of the party wall, and boundary drainage.

Documents: Geotechnical, Ground movement and Basement Impact Assessment, Prepared by LBH Wembley dated March 2017, Flood Risk ass Assessment, Prepared by LBH Wembley dated September 2016,...

3. Basement 3.1 Campbell Reith was instructed by London Borough of Canden, (LBC) to carry out an audit on the Basement Impact Assessment submitted. This assessment encapsulated both the vordisproposed beneath the existing single story rear extension, in addition to those sought beneath the footprint of the main building and consented rear extensions as per ref. 2016/F3220.

3.2 The Audit reviewed the submitted Basement Impact Assessment (BIA), Grou Movement Assessment (GMA), Construction Management Statement (CMS) and Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) for potential impact on land stability and local ground and surface water conditions arising from basement development in accordance with LPG spoties and technical procedure the chief spread of the conditions arising from basement development in accordance with LPG spoties and technical procedure.

flooding
- SI Mark's Crescent did not suffer from surface water flooding in 1975 or 2002.
- Despite this, due to the proximity to the Regent's Canal at the end of the rear
garden a flood risk assessment vas undertaken.
- Following a review of updated information, Campbell Reith accept that the findings of
the flood risk assessment.

GRANTED

Informative(s): 1 Reasons for granting permission

GRANTED

GRANTED

GRANTED

GRANTED

Application Number Site Address	Decision Date Decided since the Local Plan was adopted 03/07/2017 - which thereafter carries full weight.	Application Description Necessarily abridged and paraphrased for brevity. [Notes by the 2020/2936/P appellant]	Multi vs. Single Level	Camden Local Flood Risk Zone	EA Flood Risk Checker For the exact Address	Previously Flooded Street Or other Flood Risk	LLFA Comments	Basement Bedrooms	Basement Habitable Rooms	Other Basement Rooms Bath, Gym, Pool, Games, Office, Workshop etc.	Plant Rooms Gas, Electric, Pump, Comms etc.	Campbell Reith BIA Audit Surface Water Flood Risk Comments: Where applicable and necessarily abridged and paraphrased for brevity.	Officer's Report or Decision Notice Extracts Necessarily abridged and paraphrased for brevily.	i
2016/5974/P 26 Christchurch Hill London NW3 1LG	10 Jan 2018	New basement extension under the modern wing of Grade 2 listed house. Notes: Proposed panic room, gym and office on a Very Low Risk site. The BIA audit states that the site is 'adjacent to Willow Road' a Street with Flooded in 1975 and 2002. This seem rather an odd point to pick up on as Willow Rd. is at a minimum, 140m away. The Basement was reduced in size an heavily revised during the application from that applied for and it is noted that (2.3. Revisions) 'the BIA audit process also involved several negotiations to secure full details.' Nevertheless, the BIA Audit conclusions and mitigation measures eventually accepted and application is approved.	Basement to House	Not in a Local Flood Risk Zone	Very Low Risk Surface Water Flooding	Street not previously flooded	No LLFA Comments Found	-	1 Other Habitable Basement Room	5 Other Misc. Basement Rooms	-	Campbell Reith BIA Audit 12466-30 Rev. F1 October 2017 412. It is accepted that the site is not in a Flood Risk Zone based upon Camden Flood Risk Management Strategy maps and is not identified as a street that flooded in either 1975 or 2002 but is adjacent to Willow Road, which flooded in both events. The effect of the proposed development on Willow Road's environment. has been considered and is stated as not causing an impact. 4.13 details have been provided of measures to prevent potential flooding of the basement in the form of non-return valves 5.0 CONCLUSIONS 5.4. The wider hydrogeological environment, including the presence of local spring lines, historic wells and groundwater flow, has now wider hydrogeological environment will not be adversely impacted. This should be confirmed within the Basement Construction Plan (BCP) once the lateral / vertical extent of permeation grouting is detailed.	Full Planning Permission Granted Subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement Basement Impact Assessment 4.3. in accordance with the requirements of policy A5, the applicants have submitted Basement Impact Assessment reports which review the impacts of the proposed basement structure and construction methods in terms of its impact upon drainage, flooding, groundwater conditionsand structural stability. A well-known firm of consultants using individuals who possess subtaile qualifications in line with CPG consultants using individuals who possess subtaile qualifications in line with CPG as well as the significant site constraints, these documents have undergone a full audit from the Council's third party auditors - Campbell Reith (CR). 4.4. Following the public consultation process, a number of responses were received which included anecdotal and faculae evidence of various site constraints - in particular comments have all informed the BA audit process and led to the applicants being required to undertake a comprehensive analysis of the potential impact to the wider hydrogeological environment (i.e. wider local area rather than just the site and immediately adjacent plots), including the presence of local spring lines, historic wells and groundwater flows. After an initial review, therefor details were also requested in relation to a range of factors relating to land stability as well as the steen and immediately adjacent plots), including the presence of local spring lines, historic wells and groundwater flows. After an initial review, therefor details were also requested in relation to a range of factors relating to land stability as well as it by the original place over the course of a 10 month period (Dec 2016 – Oct 2017) and have involved regular involvement from CR who have provided comment as matters have progressed. 4.5. They conclude that subject to securing a number of conditions as well as a Beament Construction Plant (BCP) which neareset that the minitigation measures and anomication beckningers outli	

Double depth basement Notable Flooding

No LLFA Officer Comments seem to have been

No LLFA

Comments Found

No LLFA Comments

No LLFA

No LLFA Comments Found

No LLFA

Comments Found

No LLFA Comments

Found

No LLFA

No LLFA

Found

Found

No LLFA

No LLFA

No LLFA

10 Storey Dev. minor flooding

issues

No LLFA Comments

No LLFA

Found

No LLFA

No LLFA

No LLFA

Found

Specific details of each application listed can always be verified by checking the original application files on the LB Camden Planning web site itself. Compiled July 2021. E&OE.

Street not

Risk Surface Water Flooding

Not in a

Local Flood Risk Zone

Not in a Local Flood Risk Zone

Ancillary Basement to GF Flat

Ancillary asement to House

Ancillary asement to House

Basement Bedroom

Street not

Not in a Local Flood Risk Zone

Not in a

Plus

Basement To Offices

Duplex

Ancillary Basement Office

1 x Fully Self Contained

Plus Duplex

Duplex

Ancillary asement to House

Ancillary Hill
asement to Local Flood
House Risk 7

Ancillary

High Risk

Basements to 2 x Houses

Basement Work Spaces

Duplex

Basement To Large Theatre Complex

Listed here in order of application number, not decision date.

2016/6356/P

London WC1X 9BN WC1X 9JT

2016/6426/

NW3 4NS

2016/6697/P

2016/6712/F

NW3 4AN

2016/6891/F

NW1 7EP

2016/6906/P

2016/6959/P

2016/7048/P

2016/7088/P

Rochester Sq. London NW1 9RY

2017/0001/P

2017/0579/P

2017/0911/P

NW6 1NP

2017/1006/F

NW3 5QS

2017/1229/P

2017/1263/P

NW3 5JY

2017/1534/P

31 St. Mark's

2017/1718/P

2017/1827/P

WC1V 7JG

2017/2064/P

2017/2153/P

NW3 4BY

2017/2204/P

2017/2471/P

NW3 5QA

2017/2579/P

NW3 4DA

2017/3029/P

2017/3348/P

London NW3 4HN

34A King Henrys Rd.

27 Feb 2019

29 May 2018

2 Jan 2019

And

60-70 Shorts Garden

14-16 Betterton St. WC2H 9AU

46

46 Avenue Rd.

5 Templewood Av.

15 Wedderburn Rd.

26 Netherhall Gdns.

Prince of Wales Rd.

13 Prince Albert Rd.

Hope and Anchor Crowndale Rd. NW1 7JE

коко

1-2 Falkland Mews

15 Mar 2019

15 Nov 2017

28 Mar 2018

25 May 2018

6 Aug 2018

26 Apr 2019

9 Jul 2019

15 Mar 2018

29 Aug 2018

6 Jul 2017

1-6 Centric Cl.

30 Apr 2019

251 Goldhurst Terr.

13A Crossfield Rd

17 Apr 2018

Demolition, then erection of a 3

storey **plus basement** building. Office at GF, 1st and 2nd flexible

basement with offices, showers and plant in a Local Flood Risk Zone at High Risk of Surface Water flooding, a highly detailed FRA but seemingly no LLFA officer comment in

published in docs correspondence Officers Conclusion: "development is deemed to be at low flood risk."

Audit conclusions and along with mitigation measures Permission is Granted.

Excavation of basement with lightwell plus single storey rear conservatory to lower ground floor flat.

basement bedroom, media room, bathroom and gym. No mention of 'vulnerable uses'.

Officers accept Campbell Reith's BIA

Onicers accept campoein retirs BIA Audit conclusions and along with mitigation measures. The officer concludes: 4.5 The Audit confirms that the BIA has met the requirements of Policy A5 and CPG Basements for the identification of the proposed.

the potential impacts of the proposed basement construction and the proposed mitigation'. Permission is

Excavation of **new basement** level under house plus lightwells front and rear. Basement Bedroom.

Bathroom, Family room and Study in a Local Flood Risk Zone and previously Flooded Street. No LLFA officer comments are apparent and nothing in mentioned of 'vulnerable uses'.

mentioned in the FRA, BIA Audit or Decision Notice but the BIA is clearly

Demolition of Church then erection of 2 x new houses inc. **basements.**

surrounded by obvious surface wat flood risk and shows **High Risk** at

Officer echo's Audit conclusions: **5.8.** It is accepted that the new development is at **low risk of**

flooding, based on raised levels in relation to the adjacent road, * which should be confirmed at detailed design stage.

* Detailed flood risk mitigation design is conditioned, not insisted upor No LLFA officer comments are annarent and nothing is made of **3** basement bedrooms being 'vulnerable uses'. Officers accept Campbell Reith's BIA Audit conclusions and along with mitigation measures Permission is Granted.

Demolition then erection of a part 4, part 5, part 6 and part 7 storey building inc. **basement** and ground to provide 76 residential units.

Note: Large development with Basement work spaces, site with a mixed EA Flood Risk picture:
No. 1 = Medium risk

No LLFA officer comments are

apparent. Officers accept Campbell Reith's BIA Audit conclusions and

along with mitigation measures
Permission is Granted.

Excavation of basement floor beneath 2 x semi-detached

properties with lightwells to the front.

Proposed basement living rooms, Proposed basement living rooms, kitchens and dining rooms for 2 houses. No LLFA officer comments are apparent and nothing is made of habitable rooms being 'vulnerable uses'. Officers accept Campbell Reitit's BIA Audit conclusions and along with principles.

along with mitigation measures Permission is Granted.

Demolition and major redevelopment. Change of Use from offices inc. erection of 5 storey building with basement to provide 32 bedroom hotel. Plus Change of Use of Pub to Hotel. Inc. recording studio,

LLFA officer comments seem to cover 2017/6058/P too. In correspondence the LLFA Officer making comments is: Gabriel Berry-Khan *PIEMA MInstP

Management and Assessment

The LLFA officer recommends mitigation measures, but otherwise Campbell Reith's BIA Audit conclusions that the the site is elevated and at low risk of flooding is seconds and allow with difficulties.

accepted and along with mitigation measures **Permission is Granted.**

Retrospective Amendment to 2011/6227/P required new BIA Audit.

Construction of **basement extension** with plant room and outlet, enclosed lightwell.

Note: 3 Basement Bedrooms and Plant Rooms in a Local Flood Risk Zone. No LLFA officer comments are apparent and nothing in mentioned of 'vulnerable uses'.

Local Flood Risk Zone is not mentioned in the BIA Audit or Decision Notice. Officers accept Campbell Reith's BIA Audit conclusions and along with mitigation measures **Permission is Granted**.

Demolition then erection 3-storey building, plus **basement** level for community centre and 9 self contained flats.

residential units on an EA Medium Risk Site.

Water Flooding. BIA failed due to inadequate SUDS details and

stability issues with Burland Category 2 being unacceptable and additional structural calculations were required but not provided.

Part Demolition of building attached to 2 story Grade 2 listed Methodist

basement level rear extension and

gallery storage, kitchenette and plant rooms ('vulnerable uses').

The BIA Audit states that the site is 'generally' at a **Very Low** and **Low Risk** of surface water flooding. However, surface water issues are evident on the EA street map and the

EA Flood risk for this address is in fact **Medium**. The site is also on **Previously Flooded Street** which seems not to be mentioned. Otherwise Officers accept Campbell Reith's BIA Audit conclusions and along with mitigation measures (details conditioned), **Permission is Granted.**

Erection of a four storey plus basement and sub-basement

detached property to provide 5 flats

Note: Refused and Dismissed on appeal for basement size, not Flood Risk. Otherwise Officers accept Campbell Reith's BIA Audit conclusions and along with mitigation measures.

* BIA Audit 5.1. Rare instance of * BIA Audit 5.1. Rare instance of otherwise strict qualifications criteria being slightly relaxed. *...the author of SJ's BIA has provided no proof of expertise in engineering geology as required by CPG4 although it is anticipated that, as a Technical

Director and charted structural engineer, sufficient experience has been accumulated."

Demolition of existing house then

Note: Officers Report: 6.32

Low Risk of flooding from all

access to our BIA audit and we would standby the conclusions within that."

(details conditioned). Appeal dismissed but Flood Risk was not an

Change of Use from 3 x flats to 2 x 1 flats. inc. **double basement** with lightwells plus excavation of new basement.

one-bedroom flat in the basement playroom Gym swimming pool, sauna

would result in the provision of a basement below an existing lower ground floor, this basement already has permission, ref 2013/7182/P dated 24/03/2015. This permission is

still capable of being implemented and thus an exception from policy A5

Otherwise Officers accept Campbell Reith's BIA Audit conclusions.

Conversion of 3 x units to 2 x units

Vulnerable uses permitted in a **Previously Flooded Street** 2002, which goes unmentioned. The need fro SUDS is identified in BIA audit

Construction of basement floor

Note: 6 Basement Bedrooms on to

lightwells, on a site indicted by the EA Flood Risk Checker as being High Risk of Surface Water Flooding.

Officers accept the FRA, Campbell

Reith's BIA Audit conclusions and Permission is Granted.

Entire **new basement** level under house; site backing onto a canal.

backs right onto the Regents Canal, in a Primrose Hill Local Flood Risk Zone, with a basement 'playroom', lightwell and Gym - all below the Canal's water line.

Local Flood Risk Zone, the

No LLFA Officer comments about 'vulnerable uses' are evident,
Officers accept Campbell Reith's BIA
Audit conclusions and Permission
is Granted.

bedrooms, swimming pool and cinema room on a **Medium Risk Site**

on previously flood street – however, after 'several rounds' of further information to seek clarity, CR accept that "the site itself is at a slightly elevated level and not considered to be at risk from

flooding."

15 Aug 2018

3 May 2019

detail at all apart from the oetail at all apart from the commenting on the BIA Audit but comments: "8.1. Basement developments can help to make efficient use of the borough's limite land as required by the developmentan"."

New 9 storey building for retail at

basement and ground floor levels, office at 1st and 2nd plus 10 residential units above

Note: Basement to include room substation shower room, and retail and food outlet shop space. Based on a previous planning permission for this site. BIA Audit Comments

"...revised submissions confirm threshold levels will be suitably

is recommended requiring these [which is the more usual practice] but Campbell Reith's BIA Audit

Erection of two x 4 bedroom 3 storey

plus basement residential dwelling houses on car-park.

Note: Campbell Reith's BIA Audit conclusions are accepted and flooding is not raised as an issue

Convert a house into 4 x 2 bed flats; enlargement of existing basement level inc. lightwells.

basement bedrooms, en-suites and bathrooms and lightwells. Campbell Reith's BIA Audit conclusions are accepted and **Permission is Granted.**

Refurbish and extension inc. bring vacant **basement** back into use to provide a mix of uses.

Note: The BIA Audit acknowledges previous basement flooding and requires and additional ground movement assessment – but the application was still subsequently

Officers conclude: "14.9 Given that the Council's 3rd party engineers have confirmed the schemes adherence to policy A5 and CPG4 subject to the BCP within their final audit, no objection to these proposed whether are gired."

Replacement two storey residential dwelling with basement, following demolition of existing house.

Notes: Permission is refused and Notes: Permission is refused and dismissed at appeal only on Conservation Area and size grounds. Surface Water Flooding is not an issues. Campbell Reith's BIA Audit conclusions are accepted.

Subdivision of 3 partially self-

Note: Medium Risk site. Duplex flat with a basement bedroom and bathroom. Campbell Reith's BIA Audit conclusions are accepted and Permission is Granted.

Enforced stair removal?: An

possible to know if this was forced upon the applicant to prevent independent access/use to the basement level, as appears to have been done in some other

Notes: Flood risk is Very Low risk on the EA Checker. Enlarging an existing occupied basement flat with 2 extant bedrooms. Adding 2 new basement bedrooms, en-suite's and

conclusions are accepted,but with are recommendation that sewer flooding should be considered further during the detailed design. Flood risk is otherwise unremarked in the Decision Notice and **Permission is Granted**;

Demolition and replacement of house

Notes: Extensive nearby risk flood. New basement bedroom gym and shower room. Seems rather

ridiculous to not have had a flood risk

[Flooding unremarked in the Decision Notice]

refore <u>a condition</u>

Systems (SUDS) have be submitted and therefore a

restaurant and bar

No. 2 = Very low risk No. 5 = Low risk No. 6 = Medium risk

Local Flood Risk Zone is not

Notes: New double depth

Reason(s) for Refusal

1 The proposed extension, by reason of its sting, scale, and design would result in an overlydominant and incongruous addition to the area, adversely impacting the character and appearance of the building and this part of the conservation area contray to policies
D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan (2017).

2. The proposed development, by mean of the recessive loss of test Bhorspace within a protected shopping formage, would harm the retail character, function, vitality and visibility of the neighbourhood centre, contrary to policies TCI (Quantity and location of retail development) and TC4 (Town centre uses) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.

22 Prior to commercement of development on each job; other than works of demolition, site clearance and repreadation, life ideated of the substainable drainage system as stated in the approved document. Flood Risk Assessment and SuDS Strategy dated 2009/2017, prepended by Water Environment Limited on behalf of G Partnership Ltd, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, Details shall include the following SuDS measures:....

Such a system should be designed to accommodate all storms up to and including a 1:100 year storm with a 40% provision for climate change such that flooding does not occur in any part of a building or in any uiltip plant susceptible to water, and shall demonstrate a minimum 50% reduction in total run-off rate as stated in the approvidenment

Basement A single storey basement under the footprint of the building is proposed. A BIA has been submitted which has been assessed by the council's independent auditors, committed Reith. The audit confirms the proposed dasement adheres to the requirements of CP6A se excavation is proposed close to the highway an approval in principle from highways would be required. This would be secured by legal agreement.

Full Planning Permission Subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement

Refuse Planning Permission

Gabriel Berry-Khan acted as LLFA Officer on the 2017/6058/P 'KOKO' application. His stated qualifications do not seem to be any of those required by:

Canden Planning Guidance Basements January 2021
4.7. At any stage in the process experienced engineering professionals who hold qualifications relevant to the matters being considered, should be engaged undertaking qualifications relevant to the matters being considered, should be engaged undertaking pudance on the engineering input likely to be required to complete a BLK (filts can be downloaded from the Council's website at camdien grow/Lebszements). This will assist applicants when engaging the services of engineers. The Council will only accept the qualifications set out in the following table:

7.78. The basement is substantially smaller than that originally proposed (2016/6559P). Campbell Reith have reviewed the application and advised it does not appear to be any more onerous than the scheme audited previously. The authors are the same and have presented a modified version of the BIA, based on the changed scheme. Damage category 0 (Negligible) is predicted for all buildings. Given this, Campbell Reith have confirmed another audit of this scheme would not be warranted. The items that were previously advised to be presented within a Basement Construction Plant (BCP) would still be applicable (final contractor's structural design / temporary works; final damage impact threshold levels / midgation actions in regards to flood risk). This would be secured by legal agreement.

Note: Gabriel Berry-Khan acted as LLFA Officer on the 2017/6058/P 'KOKO' application His stated qualifications do not seem to be any of those required by:

Camden Planning Guidance Basements January 2021.
4.7. At any stage in the process experienced engineering professionals who hold qualifications relevant to the matters being considered, should be engaged undertaking quidance on the engineering input likely to be required to complete a BIA (this can be downloaded from the Council's weblies at canden gove, ubchasements). This will assist applicants when engaging the servicesof engineers. The Council will only accept the qualifications set out in the following table:

DECISION [GRANTED]
SUBJECT TO A SECTION 106 LEGAL AGREEMENT

Full Planning Permission Granted Subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement

Full Planning Permission Granted Subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement

Full Planning Permission Granted Subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement

Full Planning Permission Granted Subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement

Full Planning Permission

[No mention of flooding the in Decision Notice]

7.5 in terms of the first section, a Basement Impact Assessment is required. ...It goes on to advise when vertification is required, such as where a scheme requires applicants to proceed beyond the screening stage and where the proposed basement development is located within an area of concern regarding sloge statility, surface water or groundwater flow, which are both applicable in this instance. This is also referred to in CTPG4 (3.33).

7.6 The applicant submitted a Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) and Campbell Reith reviewed the BIA and requested more information about how the developm would deal with groundwater, surface water and the impact on the stability. The applicant provided additional basement information which was further reviewed Campbell Reith.

2 The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposed development would ensure the provision of the maximum reasonable amount of replacement cultural or leisure facilities within the scheme contrary to Policy C3 (Cultural and leisure facilities) and Policy D2 (Heritage)of the Camden Local Plan 2017...

Continon(s) and reason(sp: continue) and interest and int

3 Reasons for granting permission.

... A Basement impact Assessment (BIA) wassubmitted with the scheme, this document was independently assessed by Campbell Reith, Camden Council's BIA Auditor. Upon review of the property of the proposed works are compliant with policy and current regulations.

Full Planning Permission Refused

Full Planning Permission Refused

Full Planning Permission Granted Condition(s) and Reason(s):

Full Planning Permission Granted

[No mention of flooding the in Decision Notice]

4.9 Basement impact 4.1 The Basement impact Assessment (BIA) submitted with the application has been independently assessed by a third party engineering firm (Campbell Reith), with subsequent information provided by the author of the BIA during the course of the application. The audit reviewed the BIA for potential impact on land stability and local ground and surface water conditions arising from basement development.

[No mention of flooding the in Decision Notice and there is no

GRANTED

GRANTED

GRANTED

GRANTED

APPENDIX A Sheet 3

Qualifications required for assessments: In summary; CEng, C.WEM, MICE, MCIWEM, FCIWEM, CGeol, ROGEP.

Full Planning Permission Granted Subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

5.13. Queries and matters requiring further information or clarification are summarised in Appendix 2. The requirements of CPG4 have been met, subject to submission of a BCP to confirm assessments and design prior to construction.

5.8. A movement monitoring proposal has been provided, this should be agreed with owner of neighbouring assets. It is proposed to implement attenuation SUDS and it is accepted that there will be no impact to the wider

5.6. The proposed development will not impact the wider hydrogeological environment.

Campbell Reith BIA Audit 12466-42 Rev: F1 Feb. 2017

Campbell Reith BIA Audit 12727-39 Rev: F1 May 2018

Campbell Reith BIA Audit 12727-37 Rev: F1 April 2018

Campbell Reith BIA Audit 12727-13 Rev: F2 Date: Aug. 2018

5.6. It is accepted that there are no potential impactson subterranean flows. Potential impacts on and from surface water have been confirmed to be absent.

5.8. No proposals are provided for a movement

Campbell Reith BIA Audit 12727-58 Rev: F1 Date: May 2018

Campbell Reith BIA Audit 12727-50 Rev: F1 Aug. 2018

4.19. It is accepted that the development i not in an area subject to flooding, howeve is stated in the BIA that the site lies within a borough Critical Drainage Area. Details of proposed SVDs/attenuation should be provid

Campbell Reith BIA Audit 12727-69 Rev: F1 October 2018

Campbell Reith BIA Audit 12727-41 Revision:F1 April 2018

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

Campbell Reith BIA Audit

Campbell Reith BIA Audit 12727-48 Rev: F1 October 2018

5.11. No change will be made on the area of the hard paved surfaces as the existing open yard is already paved. No SUDS is proposed as there will be no change in the surface drainage regime.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

3 Other Misc.

Other Misc.

Other Misc. Basement Rooms

Other Misc.

Campbell Reith BIA Audit 12727-34 Rev: F1 April 2018

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

2017/5303/P

157 York Way

2017/5497/P 2-6 St Pancras Way

2017/5590/P

Land at 23 Carol St. London

114-116 Malden Rd. London NW5 4BY

2017/6045/P

Gondar Gdns. Reservoir London NW6 1QF

2017/6058/P

2017/6230/F

WC1X 8UL

2017/6275/P

NW3 3EL

2017/6307/P 106 King Henrys Rd

2017/6513/P

London WC1X 8PX

2017/6579/P

London WC1A 2QA

2017/6899/P

London NW3 7LT

2017/7020/P

Rochester Sq. London NW1 9RY

2017/7051/F

2018/0029/F

207 Sumatra Rd.

7 Denmark St

WC2H 8LZ

4 Oct 2019

135-149 Shaftesbury Av. London WC2H 8AH

31 Oct 2018

29 May 2018

4 Bloomsbury Pl.

323 Gravs Inn Rd.

25 Jan 2019

195-199

1A Camden High S Hope & Anchor 74 Crowndale Rd. 1 Bayham 65 Bayham

5 Jul 2018

10 Jun 2019

2 May 2018

London N7 9LN

Formation of 1 x 2 bed duplex at ground and basement levels; re

extension at basement and first

Demolition then erection of 6 new buildings, from 2 to 12 storeys plus 2 basement levels; very extensive

mixed use development inc. Hotel

volinerable uses; Showers & Changing Rooms, Plant Room, Gym, Substation, Retail Workspaces. The site is hard by Regents Canal, the application has input from Canal & River Trust, is

For such a very large site one may have expected to find LLFA Officer Comments in the published application documents, but there

don't seem to be any. Otherwise Campbell Reith's BIA Audit

Erection of a 3 storey **plus** basement building to provide live-

work studio plus 2 bed flat above.

Medium EA Flood Risk but flooding

roused. Commercial Change of Use from Class B8 storage to Flats.

deliberately over exaggerate the potential flood risk, claiming: "Sustainability officers also advise that Malden Road is a local flood risk

Malden Road is not listed as a 1975 or 2002 previously floode street and the EA Risk for this address is in fact Low Risk.

Notes: Complicated 2 level basement, almost pointless including the basement rooms.

This very large development with and extensive FRA was refused on a wide variety of ecological and design issues with flooding hardly coming into it at all. but overall Campbell

Reith's BIA Audit conclusions and assessment of flood risk were are accepted by the Officers.

Major redevelopment. Offices to 5 storey building providing pub and private club with enlargement of basement and sub-basement. Retention of ground floor and

correspondence the LLFA Officer making comments is: Gabriel Berry-Khan *PIEMA MInstP Senior Sustainability Officer

Demolition of existing single storey structure. Erection of 3 storey inc. a part sunken lower ground and **plus basement** building for office use.

Note: Medium EA Flood risk but the

Campbell Reith's BIA Audit conclusions are accepted and **Permission is Granted.**

Extensions to ground floor flat inc. basement excavation with rear

storey basement under the footprint of the building including 4 new bedrooms with en-suites and

Campbell Reith's BIA Audit

existing 2 storey house.

Notes: Medium EA Flood Risk and

the possibility of extensive local street risk flooding is very evident on the EA map. However, there is little made of flooding the in decision notice and Campbell Reith's BIA

Notes: Extending existing offices at basement level. Campbell Reith's BIA Audit conclusions are accepted. Permission is Granted

Erection of rear 2 storey extension

at basement and ground floor level

with 3 x Basement bedrooms. No rooms actually added. Campbell

Reith's BIA Audit conclusions are

Demolition of single storey rear wing,

erection of new two storey rear extension, **plus basement** to provide

Note: Medium Risk on the EA Flood Note: Medium Risk on the EA Flood Checker and the site is surrounded by very significant street flood risk 6 Basement Bedrooms. Same site as 2016/7088/P, also refused and with similar issues; but this time not refused for Pluvial Flood Risk.

No mention of basement bedrooms being 'vulnerable uses'. SUDS measures are proposed and accepted along with Campbell Reith's BIA Audit conclusions that the site is at "low to medium risk of flooding

Major refurbishment of listed building, roof ext., **new basement with 4 screen cinema,** rest. bar at ground plus 94 Bed Hotel on 6 floors over.

Very deep double basement to 8 storey hotel with:

B1: 4 x Cinemas, 2 x Public WC
Blocks, Fire Command, Storage B2:
Main Plant Room. Hotel Staff
Changing, WC's Bike Stores.
B3: Plant Room, Spa., No mention of basement beforepose being

mitigation measures are proposed and accepted along with Campbell Reith's BIA Audit conclusions. The application is not refused on Flood Risk grounds.

Sumatra Road Local Flood Risk

Zone, in a twice previously flooded street goes unremarked in the BIA Audit and Decision Notice and there is no mention of basement bedrooms

and habitable rooms being 'vulnerable uses'. Campbell Reith's BIA Audit conclusions are accepted. **Permission is Granted**

rear elements; additional storey to the rear workshop building to crea an eating area for the existing bar

Notes: High EA Checker Flood Risk

on the map. Campbell Reith's BIA Audit conclusions are accepted. Permission is Granted

basement extension to provide

No mention of flooding the in

Permission is Granted

Duplex

House

Duplex

Ancillary Basement to Fast Food Restaurant

Ancillary Basement to Office

Duplex

Not in a

Not in a Local Flood Risk Zone

Local Flood Risk Zone

Note: Extensive multi-storey development with a very large double basement with numerous

accepted.

Not in a Local Flood

Plus

Ancillary Basement to House

No LLFA

No LLFA

Street not

No LLFA

No LLFA

Found

No LLFA

3 x Level deep basement High Flood

Flood Risk

No LLFA

Found

Specific details of each application listed can always be verified by checking the original application files on the LB Camden Planning web site itself. Compiled July 2021. E&OE.

Street not

Other Habitable Basement Rooms

Other Habitable Basement Rooms

Report seems to have been published – the publish Committee Report is oddly for a different application entirely; 9 Pilgrim's Ln – Specific details of each application listed can always be verified by checking the original application files on the LB Camden Planning web site itself. Compiled July 2021. E&OE.

No LLFA Officer

Campbell Reith BIA Audit 13398-32 Rev: D1 Sept. 2020

(Last Version Published?)

4.21. A minor decrease of the impermeable
areas is proposed for the subject development.
The Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and Store
within a Critical Porlange Area (Group 3, 005).
Further, the site is located within the low risk.
Flood Zone 1 and is not located in an area bein
at risk from reservoir flooding. The risk from
groundwater Roding is not located in an area bein
at risk from reservoir flooding. The risk from
groundwater Roding is considered low,
however, the presence of groundwater within the
design. Publish watalable data (gov.uk)
reserval area for the site, there is a medium risk
of flooding from surface water. According to the
FRA report, there have been no incidents of
internal or external sewer flooding within the
WCI34 postocy.

5.9. The impact on groundwater flow will be very low. Further assessment will be presented during the BCP stage.

5.10. Additional ground investigation, a project-specific performance specification, design details, a monitoring strategy, an action plan and refined mitigation measures shall be presented within a BCP.

(Last Version Published?)

No Decision Notice and no Officers Report seems to have beer published – the publish Committee Report is oddly for a differer application entirely; 9 Pilgrim's Ln – 2020/2462/P.

spectre of flood risk is raised here in support of refusal where previously it

Although Campbell Reith's BIA A conclusions are again accepted, refused primarily for inadequate services, Daylight and amenity; but not refused for flood risk.

Note: Medium EA flood risk site, Very large-development with a 4 x depth 20m+ deep basement but it seems no LLFA Officer comments

multiple event spaces, offices

large WC's, multiple plant and electrical switch rooms, store rooms, treatment rooms, show lounge, spa, screening room, b and foyer.

No Decision Notice and no Officers

Campbell Reith's BIA Audit

Not in a Local Flood Risk Zone

level deep basement.

2020/2470/P

Lethaby Building 12-42

1-4 Red Lion Sa London WC1B

St Martins College

Campus)

147

30 Oct 2020

GRANTED

Quick Ref No.	Application Number Site Address	Decision Date Decided since the Local Plan was adopted 03/07/2017 - which thereafter carries full weight.	Application Description Necessarily abridged and paraphrased for brevity. [Notes by the 2020/2936/P appellant]	Multi vs. Single Level	Camden Local Flood Risk Zone	EA Flood Risk Checker For the exact Address	Previously Flooded Street Or other Flood Risk	LLFA Comments	Basement Bedrooms	Basement Habitable Rooms	Rooms Bath, Gym, Pool	Plant Rooms Gas, Electric, Pump, Comms etc.	Campbell Reith BIA Audit Surface Water Flood Risk Comments: Where applicable and necessarily abridged and paraphrased for brevity.	Officer's Report or Decision Notice Extracts Necessarily abridged and paraphrased for brevity.	Final Decision
148	2020/2936/P 23 Ravenshaw St. London NW6 1NP	3 Mar 2021	Erection of a three storey plus hasement building comprising 7 flats (4 x 3-bed units and previously 3 x 2-bed units) with balconies at rear, following demolition of the existing house Note: Site previously described in the Officer Report 2017/0911/P 6.32 Ravenshaw Street is within the designated 'Sumaira Road' Local Filood Risk Zone and within a Critical Drainage Area. Campbell Reith state that the development is at very Low Risk of flooding from all sources: Where Campbell Reith's BIA Audit conclusions and along with mitigation measures the details of which were conditioned. Appeal dismissed but Flood Risk was not an issue in the appeal decision at all. CR confirm in April 2021, that "The LLFA obviously have access to our BIA audit and we would standby the conclusions within that." This new refusal states instead: "The proposed development, by reason of the provision of self-contained dwellings at basement level within the Sumatra Road Local Flood Risk Zone, would introduce highly vulnerable uses into an area prone to flooding contrary to policies A5 etc."	2 x Self Contained Basement Flats 'Akin' to a Duplex	Sumatra Road Local Flood Risk Zone	Medium Risk Surface Water Flooding	Street not previously flooded	LLFA Comments Made	6 Basement Bedrooms	4 Other Habitable Basement Rooms	4 Other Misc. Basement Rooms	1 Plant Room	Campbell Reith BIA Audit 12466-56 Rev: F1 Aug. 2017 4.12. Ravenshaw Street is within the designated 'Sumatra Road' Local Flood Risk Zone and within Critical Drainage Area within Critical Drainage Area within Critical Drainage Area within the control of the Critical Drainage Area (See Area) and See Area (See Are	No coherent explanation is provided for: 1. The difference between the two decisions on flood risk. 2. What is it about this particular application that attracted LLFA comments? 3. Why the basement flats are seen as 'akin to the arrangement in a duplex" as is 2016/2689/P? 4. Why is the entity of a LFRZ here considered synonymous with "an area prone to flooding". 5. Why have Officers have ignored: A. Camden's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment statement that: 6.4.11 "It should be noted that the uFMISW should not be used on a site-specific basis due to the limitations of the modelling, but instead should be used as a guide for potential risk." 8. EA Flood Risk Summary Checker identifies Medium Risk for 23A, but states that: -1'ts very unlikely to be reliable for a local area and extremely unlikely to be reliable for in local area and extremely unlikely to the reliable for identifying individual properties at risk." 6. Why were officers 'not persuaded' by the detailed site specific evidence presented in our SFRA? 7. Why were our flood risk mitigation measures not taken into account? 8. Why are the Surface Water Flood Risk conclusions in Campbell Reith's BlA Audit ignored and the LLFA officers assertions that the site is 'flood prone' just for being in the LFR2 given precedence? 9. What qualifications does the LLFA office have that would give their opinion greater weight that: A. Our Geotechnical and Structural Engineers, Maund Geo-Consulting Limited and Croft Structural Engineers BlA Audit. D. Site specific FRAP Structural Engineers BlA Audit. D. Site specific reports from Groundswer and Landmark Reports, trivialised by the LLFA Officer as 'homeowner' reports, which are in fact derived from the LKFs two leading flood risk data providers: JBA Consulting Floodability® Data and Ambiental's FloodScore™.	REFUSED
149	2020/3553/P Land between Gondar House and South Mansions Gondar Gdns. and rear 1 Hillfield Rd. London NW6 1QD	11 Mar 2021	The construction of a new part two, part three storey plus basement residential building to deliver 6 x residential (Class C3) dwellings. Note: 3 x Basement Duplex Flats. 5 basement bedrooms on to lightwells and 4 x basement bathrooms. The FRA and Campbell Reith's BIA Audit conclusions are accepted, it is refused primarily on height, mass, scale, site coverage and detailed design grounds, but not refused for flood risk . (*Campbell Reith omit reference to complying with Policy A5.)	2 x Duplex Flats	Not in a Local Flood Risk Zone	Very Low Risk Surface Water Flooding	Street not previously flooded	No LLFA Comments Found	5 Basement Bedrooms	-	4 Other Misc. Basement Rooms	-	Campbell Reith BIA Audit 13398-45 Rev: F1 Feb. 2021 5.0 CONCLUSIONS 5.4. It is accepted that the proposed development well not impact the hydrogeology or slope stability of the area. 5.5. Surface water mitigation measures have been included in the proposals, therefore it accepted that the bassement will not impact the wider hydrogeal environment. 5.8. Based on the revised submission it can be confirmed that the BIA complies with the requirements of CPG: Basements.	The proposed development, due to its height, massing, scale, location, positioning of windows and terraces, would have an overbearing impact on neighbouring Occupiers	Pluvial/Surface Water Flooding Issues.
150	2020/3875/P 1 Lidlington PI. London NW1 2JU	23 Nov 2020	Erection of three storey single family dwelling including basement level. EA Medium Risk Surface Water Flooding 2 Basement Bedrooms, Plant Room, laundry and utility room, bathroom and en-suite. Surface Flooding seemingly not addressed in the Decision Notice or Officers Report aside from Campbell Reith's BIA Audit conclusions are again accepted and Permission is Granted. (*Campbell Reith omit reference to complying with Policy A5.)	Duplex Basement to House	Not in a Local Flood Risk Zone	Medium Risk Surface Water Flooding	Street not previously flooded	No LLFA Comments Found	2 Basement Bedrooms	-	3 Other Misc. Basement Rooms	1 Plant Room	Campbell Reith BIA Audit 13398-07Rev: F1 July 2020 5.0 CNGLUSIONS 5.4 It is also accepted that the development will not have a significant impact on the hydrogeology and hydrology of the area. 5.9. Based on the revised submission, the BIA meets the criteria of CPG Basements.	Full Planning Permission Refused Reason(s) for Refusal The prospeed development, by reason of its size, height, bulk and mass, would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the streetscene, wider Canden Town Conservation Area and the setting of the adjacent Grade Il listed buildings, resulting in less than substantial harm to the heritage assets, contrary to policies D1 (Design), D2 (referatinge) of the Londion Biorough of Candien Local Plana 20.17 7. Basement developmentGiven the scale and dimensions of the basement, the proposal is considered to be in line with the requirements of policy A5. Furthermore, the proposal is supported by a Basement Impact Assessment (BJA), which has been independently reviewed by the Basement Impact Assessment (BJA), which has been independently reviewed by the 2020/0571/P. The findings in the audit report confirm that the excavation works would not cause harm to neighbouring buildings, surrounding highways, slope stability and the hydrogeology of the site. In light of the above, the proposed basement excavation would be in accordance with policy A5 and CPG Basements.	REFUSED
151	2020/4562/P 67A Gascony Av. London NW6 4ND	10 Jun 2021	Erection of single storey side/rear extension; excavation of basement and formation of rear lightwell. Note: Basement Living Room, Bathroom and Plant Room, smack in the middle of the Kingsgate Local Flood Risk Zone. Not remarked in the BIA Audit or Decision. That applicants Surface Water Drainage Pro-forma states: 1. Site Details. Is the development in a LFRZ or in an area known to be at risk of surface or ground water flooding? If yes, please demonstrate how this is managed, in line with DP23? The applicants answer is No. This statement is not true and cannot have been checked. The site is near the centre of the Kingsgate LFRZ, as shown on the Camden's Strategie Flood Risk Assessment Map Figure 6. Campbell Reith's BIA Audit conclusions are accepted and Permission is Granted. (*Campbell Reith omit reference to complying with Policy A5.)	Ancillary Basement to House	Kingsgate Local Flood Risk Zone	Very Low Risk Surface Water Flooding	Street not previously flooded	No LLFA Comments Found	-	1 Other Habitable Basement Room	1 Other Misc. Basement Rooms	1 Plant Room	Campbell Reith BIA Audit 13398-64 Rev: F1 April 2021 5.0 CONCLUSIONS 5.5.The Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) states the site is at medium risk from sewer flooding, against which the FRA included adequate mitigation measures to reduce the risk to a low level. 5.12. Queries and requests for information are summarised in Appendix 2. Considering the additional information presented, the BIA meets the requirements of Camden Planning Guidance: Basements.	Full Planning Permission Granted Informative(s): 1 Reasons for granting permission The basement excavation would deepen the existing cellars to create additional habitable accommodation and would include a lightwell at the rear. These considered with the parameters set out in Local Plan policy AS (considered with the parameters set out in Local Plan policy AS (considered with the parameters and the policy AS (considered with the parameters) and the policy AS (considered with the parameters) and the policy AS (considered with the policy AS (considered with the parameters) and the policy AS (considered with the parameters) and the policy AS (considered with the parameters) and the parameters and the paramet	GRANTED
152	2020/5214/P 18A Frognal Gdns. London NW3 6XA Re-application of: 2019/5348/P	30 Jun 2021	Demolition of existing three-storey dwelling house and replacement with 1 x 4-bet four-storey single family dwelling house with basement excavation, landscaping and associated works (Use Class C3). Note: Three months earlier in Aug. a basement next door was approved with little tiss over flood risk and no LLFA comments we can see. The flood risk issues are identical, so this application does appear to have been singled out for hypercritical LLFA Comments for no obvious reason. The Architects responded to LLFA comments fully but the application is withdrawn soon after. The proposed replacement house is a larger, highly individualistic, pale green tiled, almost 'Egyptian Revival' style in a Conservation area. The LLFA authority officer is actually commenting (apart from the pool tank) on the Ground Floor – which is partially inset into a hill slope and largely replaces the extant lower ground structure anyway; but s/he comments as if it were a full basement. Contrast this with the light touch given to flood risk in the application next door at 16 Frognal Gdns. in Aug. 2020 over flood risk – see 2018/2440/P.	Ancillary Basement to House	Frognal Lane Local Risk Zone	Very Low Risk Surface Water Flooding	Previously Flooded Street 1975	LLFA Comments Made LLFA Officer comments on the Ground Floor which is partially inset into a hill.	-	1 Other Habitable Basement Room	2 Other Misc. Basement Room	2 Plant Rooms	Campbell Reith BIA Audit 12985-86 Rev: F1 Nov. 2020 5.0 CONCLUSIONS 5.4. It is accepted the site is at very low risk of looding. Flood risk intigation measures are proposed in regards to impacts from surcharged severs. The proposed development will not increase the risk of flooding in the surrounding environment. 5.8. Based on the revised submission, the BIA is considered to meet the criteria of CPG Basements.	risk mitigation measures are proposed in regards to impacts from surcharged sewers. They determined the proposed development will not increase the risk of flooding in the	GRANTED