FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT & DRAINAGE STRATEGY 9 THE MOUNT, HAMPSTEAD LONDON, NW3 6SZ

MR & MRS BARNETT

August 2022

Prepared for

Charlton Brown Architecture & Interiors The Belvedere, 2 Back Lane Hampstead London, NW3 1HL

Prepared by

Constructure Ltd

Unit D 15 Bell Yard Mews London SE1 3TY

Contact

Jon Burgess Principal Infrastructure Engineer Civil & Structural Engineering

Tel: 0207 403 7989

FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT INCLUDING DRAINAGE STRATEGY

FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT

INCLUDING DRAINAGE STRATEGY

VERSION CONTROL

| PROJECT NAME: | 9 The Mount, Hampstead |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| PROJECT NUMBER: | 2230 |
| DOCUMENT REFERENCE: | |
| DOCUMENT STATUS: | Final Issue |

| | DATE | DESCRIPTION | AUTHOR | CSE | ICSE |
|---|------------|------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|------|
| - | 05.09.2022 | Initial Issue | Jon Burgess | Tom Goodall | |
| A | 11.10.2022 | Final Issue Borehole Logs added | Jon Burgess | Tom Goodall | |

INCLUDING DRAINAGE STRATEGY

CONTENTS

| 1. INTROD | DUCTION | 7 |
|-----------|--|----|
| 1.1. | Appointment and Brief | 7 |
| 1.2. | Aims and Objectives | 7 |
| 1.3. | Limitations | 8 |
| 1.4. | Reference Information | 9 |
| 2. PROJEC | T BACKGROUND | 11 |
| 2.1. | Site Location and Existing Land Use | 11 |
| 2.2. | Existing Drainage Infrastructure | 11 |
| 2.3. | Topography | 12 |
| 2.4. | Geology and Hydrogeology | 12 |
| 2.5. | Hydrology | 12 |
| 2.6. | Proposed Development | 14 |
| 3. ANALYS | SIS OF NATIONAL AND LOCAL POLICY | 17 |
| 3.1. | National Policy | 17 |
| 3.2. | London Plan | 18 |
| 3.3. | Local Policy | 18 |
| 3.4. | Assessing Flood Risk | 19 |
| 3.5. | Easements and Other Constraints | 21 |
| 3.6. | Below Ground Drainage Diversions and Other Constraints | 21 |
| 3.7. | Opportunities | 22 |
| 4. FOUL W | ATER MANAGEMENT | 24 |
| 4.1. | Existing Discharge Rates and Points of Connection | 24 |
| 4.2. | Proposed Discharge Rates and Points of Connection | 24 |
| 4.3. | Analysis | 24 |
| 5. SURFAC | CE WATER MANAGEMENT | 26 |
| 5.1. | Proposed Drainage Catchments | 26 |
| 5.2. | SuDS Management Train | 26 |
| 5.3. | Catchment Contributing Areas | 27 |
| 5.4. | Allowance for Climate Change | 27 |
| 5.5. | Allowable Discharge Rates | 27 |
| 5.6. | Proposed SUDS Features | 28 |
| 5.7. | Water Quality | 32 |
| 5.8. | Ownership and Maintenance | 33 |
| 6. CONCLU | JSIONS | 1 |

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

| AOD | Above Ordnance Datum |
|--------|---|
| CIRIA | Construction Industry Research and Information Association |
| CL | Cover Level |
| DEFRA | Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs |
| EA | Environment Agency |
| ha | Hectares |
| IL | Invert Level |
| LLFA | Lead Local Flooding Authority |
| LPA | Local Planning Authority |
| m | Metres |
| NPPF | National Planning Policy Framework |
| NPPG | National Planning Policy Guidance to the National Planning Policy Framework |
| NTS | Non-statutory Technical Standards |
| LFRA | Local Flood Risk Assessment |
| SuDS | Sustainable Drainage Systems |
| LBC | London Borough of Camden |
| PPG | Planning Practise Guide |
| BGS | British Geological Society |
| TE2100 | Thames Estuary 2100 |
| SPZ | Source Protection Zone |
| CDA | Critical Drainage Area |

APPENDICES

- Appendix A Existing Site Plan
- Appendix B Proposed Site Plans
- Appendix C Thames Water Asset Plans
- Appendix D Surface Water Calculations
- Appendix E Existing Drainage Route
- Appendix F Environment Agency Flood Map
- Appendix G British Geological Survey Soil Map
- Appendix H Possible Drainage Layout
- Appendix I Storage Volume Estimate HR Walingford
- Appendix J London Sustainable Drainage Pro Forma
- Appendix K Borehole Logs

SECTIONS 1 INTRODUCTION

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Appointment and Brief

This Surface and Foul Water Drainage Strategy (DS) including a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has been prepared by Constructure Ltd on behalf of Charlton Brown Architecture & Interiors ("The Applicant"), for the Proposed Development at 9 The Mount, Hampstead, London, NW3 6SZ (hereby referred to as the 'Site'). The Site is located within the London Borough of Camden.

The purpose of this document is to outline the development of the proposed DS, providing sufficient detail to enable both a thorough review of design principles adopted and further refinement of the design as part of the ongoing development of the project.

It aims to demonstrate the foul and surface water management at the Application Site, as follows:

- By providing an analysis of the impact of the proposed development on surrounding foul water infrastructure and identify the constraints present on the site in terms of suitability of conventional gravity drainage; and
- By demonstrating the principles of surface water management in terms of constraints on discharge, permitted discharge rates and required volumes of attenuation (where required), describing how these can be accommodated within the development proposals.

The proposed DS outline below may be subject to further detailed analysis at design stage.

1.2. Aims and Objectives

The DS has been prepared with reference to the following requirements:

- The DS <u>must</u>:
 - Ensure that flood risk to the Application Site and surrounding area is not increased over the lifetime of the Proposed Development;
 - Conform with all relevant national and local flood risk polices;

- Adopt current design standards; and
- Consider long-term maintenance with respect to practicality, ownership and funding.
- The DS <u>should</u>:
 - Mimic the existing drainage characteristics of the Application Site as far as is practical;
 - Look for opportunities to provide a reduction in flood risk to the Application Site and the surrounding area;
 - Adhere to current best practice guidance;
 - Contribute to the enhanced amenity and aesthetic value of the Application Site; and
 - Propose opportunities for biological enhancement and provide habitats for wildlife in urban areas.

1.3. Limitations

The purpose of this report is as outlined in Section 1.2, together with those related matters specifically referred to, and it is not intended to be used for any other purposes. The report is for the sole benefit and may only be relied upon by the addressee, to whom we will owe a duty of care. The report and any part of it is confidential to the addressee and should not be disclosed to any third party for any purpose, without the prior written consent of Constructure Ltd as to the form and context of such disclosure. The granting of such consent shall not entitle the third party to place reliance on the report, nor shall it confer any third-party rights pursuant to the Contracts (Rights of Third Parties) Act. The report may not be assigned to any third party.

1.4. Reference Information

The following information has been obtained and interrogated as part of this study:

- Charlton Brown Drawing Ref: 21041 EX-00-100 & 101 Existing Lower Ground & Ground Floor Plans.
- British Geological Society Geological Maps.
- UK SUDS HR Wallingford Surface Water Storage Requirements;
- DEFRA / EA Interactive online mapping (magic.defra.gov.uk); and
- BS EN 752: 2017 Drain and sewer systems outside buildings

In addition, the following documents have been consulted:

- Communities and Local Government Document. (2021). The National Planning Policy Framework;
- Environment Agency. (2016). Flood Risk Assessments: Climate Change Allowances;
- Environment Agency. (2013). Rainfall Runoff Management for Developments;
- Environment Agency. (2019). Flood Risk Assessments: Climate Change Allowances;
- CIRIA. (2015). C753 The SuDS Manual;
- Secretary of State. (2015). Building Regulations Approved Document H;
- Butler & Davies. (2012). 2nd Ed. Urban Drainage;
- Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs. (2015). Non-Statutory Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems;
- Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs & Environment Agency. (2017).
 Flood Risk Assessment for Planning Applications;
- London Borough of Camden Basements January 2021;
- North London Strategic Drainage Strategy August 2008;
- London Borough of Camden Design Strategic Flood Assessment;
- London Borough of Camden Design Water & Flooding March 2019.
- London Borough of Camden (LoDEG pro forma)

SECTION 2 PROJECT BACKGROUND

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND

2.1. Site Location and Existing Land Use

The Application Site is situated off The Mount. Specifically, the Site is located close to the junction with Heath Street. The Ordinance Survey (OS) grid reference is 51° 33' 31" N 000° 10' 44" W (55.55863°N, 0.17904°W), and the post code is NW3 6SZ.

The Site is currently a residential property located within its own gardens. Where the orientation of the house is adjusted to the North:-

- The North elevation abuts a pedestrian alley way and No. 12, 'Holly Cottage', a residential property;
- The East elevation faces onto The Mount itself;
- The South elevation abuts a residential dwelling No. 8 The Mount; and
- The West elevation abuts a residential dwellings Nos. 4 14 The Mount.

2.2. Existing Drainage Infrastructure

The Sewerage Undertaker for the area is Thames Water and review of their asset records (see appendices) suggests the following public infrastructure within close vicinity of the Application Site:

- To the East Elevation:
 - 300mm diameter foul water sewer flowing North to South along The Mount (Northern side). Its depth adjacent to the Site is not known. However, further up the road at MH 3003 the cover level (CL), is 125.8m AOD and has an invert level (IL) of 121.59m AOD, this makes its depth 4.21m below road level.
 - There are no dedicated surface water sewers

The existing Application Site is not known to have any surface water flow restriction or benefit from existing SuDS features. It discharges both foul and surface water drainage to the public combined sewer network. A CCTV survey has been carried and its route is shown in **Appendix E**

2.3. Topography

Currently there is no topographical survey drawing available. However, the Site appears to be approximately 120m Above Ordnance Datum and is on a gradient from North to South. It is approximately 340m² in area and therefore below the 1.0ha trigger for a Flood Risk Assessment. However, this is being undertaken as there is an existing basement/lower ground floor, that it is proposed be extended. Whilst not containing any bedrooms, it is thought prudent to provide a Flood Risk Assessment.

2.4. Geology and Hydrogeology

British Geological Survey (BGS) online mapping indicates that the Application Site is situated on a bedrock of Bagshot Formation. This is a fine to coarse grain sand which can be locally clayey.

It is likely that due to this Bedrock, the Environment Agency's online groundwater mapping confirms that the site is not located within a Source Protection Zone (SPZ). It is, however, within a high-risk zone of potential flooding from Ground Water. This is likely due to the Sand being porous in nature and possibly subject to artesian pressure.

Trial pits will be able to confirm at what level, if any, this water table may be. See Hydrology below.

See borehole logs Appendix K

2.5. Hydrology

From Thames Waters sewer records, there appears to be a foul/combined sewer in The Mount. It is to this (300mm) that the Application Site is likely to connect. Unfortunately, the sewer records do not provide invert or cover levels.

A 4" (100mm) water main also exists within the curtilage of the footway. There are no major water mains in the area.

It is assumed that surface water currently generated by properties surrounding the Application Site is combined with the foul water and discharge to the foul/combined sewer, as was normal practice in London. As this is likely to be the case, the separation of surface

chamber prior to it leaving the Site. This is subject to Thames Waters' agreement under a Section 106 Application Agreement despite the Site benefiting from an existing connection.

The British Geological Survey maps show that Bagshot Formation is present. This may enable infiltration to take place at a high level depending on the level of the Ground Water Table present. This is the preferred method of surface water disposal, at source, in the SuDS hierarchal tree.

On site infiltration testing should therefore be carried out to provide:

- An insight as to a safe method of excavation should a high water table be found;
- And if not, its' reliable infiltration capabilities.

The Site currently has an underground tunnel linking the lower ground floor/basement with its garage. One of the proposals is to remove this tunnel by excavation and provide new underground storage vaults and other spaces, whilst still linking to the garage. Therefore, there is likely to be limited space for infiltration devices such are soakaways. In fact, current Building Regulations state that any infiltration chamber should be at least 5.0m away from any building or permanent structure. This requirement will effectively preclude the use of such infiltration devices on this Site.

Thus, for the purposes of this report, infiltration techniques will be largely ignored as not being a practical solution. Attention will be focussed on attenuation instead.

Greenfield Runoff Rates

Greenfield runoff rates have been estimated for the site using the Institute of Hydrology Report 124 method, in accordance with the latest Environment Agency Guidance, as summarised below and are included within the appendices of this study:

| CATCHMENT | AREA | 1:1 AEP EVENT | 1:30 AEP EVENT | 1:100 AEP EVENT |
|------------|----------|---------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Total Site | 0.034 Ha | 0.1l/s | 0.3 l/s | 0.4 l/s |

Peak Existing Runoff Rates

Peak existing runoff rates have been calculated using the Modified Rational Method and obtained from the Causeway Flow simulation model Flow+ for the 1:1 AEP, 1:30 AEP and 1:100 AEP events respectively with a 20 % and 40 % climate change allowances included to the 1:100 AEP event.

The following design inputs were adopted in accordance with guidance contained within the Flow Design software:

Storm Duration: 60 Minutes.
Volumetric Runoff Coefficient (Cv): 0.75
Routing Coefficient (Cr): 1.30

Findings as summarised below and included within the appendices of this study:

| CATCHMENT | AREA | % IMPERMEABLE | 1:1 AEP EVENT | 1:30 AEP EVENT | 1:100 AEP EVENT | 1:100 AEP + 1.2 CC | 1:100 AEP + 1.4 CC |
|------------|---------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Total Site | 0.034Ha | 90 % | 5.6 l/s | 10.0 l/s | 12.2 l/s | 13.0 l/s | 13.0 l/s |

2.6. Proposed Development

This project whilst undertaking many internal changes to the existing property removes the underground tunnel to the existing garage by excavating a large void and creating large vaults and other storage areas, maintaining an underground connection to the existing garage. Therefore, no major visible changes will appear once completed.

The scheme as outlined on the proposed layouts (**Appendix B**) proposes the removal of the existing linking tunnel between the existing lower ground floor/basement and the existing garage by excavating it out. New underground storage vaults and other spaces are to be created with a corridor connecting to the existing garage.

The basement could house an infiltration/attenuation structure beneath, providing a relaxation of the Building Regulation requirement of 'No soakaway within 5.0m of a structure'

FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT INCLUDING DRAINAGE STRATEGY

is given, but this is unlikely. If an attenuation tank was to be located there then this would require pumping to reach the invert level of the termination inspection chamber.

This is not a satisfactory solution given that any fixed volume and discharge rate designed may be exceeded at any time by climate change and or failure of the pump equipment giving rise to flooding of the basement.

The roof layout of the existing structure will remain unchanged and therefore the introduction of blue, green or brown roofs are not suitable for this development.

There is an opportunity to provide a water butt locate next to one of the down pipes to enable the irrigation of the small area of the existing garden, however, due to the limited space available this is likely to encroach.

See 3.6 later in this document.

ANALYSIS OF NATIONAL AND LOCAL **SECTION 3** POLICY

3. ANALYSIS OF NATIONAL AND LOCAL POLICY

3.1. National Policy

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Communities and Local Government Document. (2021). *The National Planning Policy Framework* requires any Planning Application to demonstrate that the Proposed Development will be safe for the duration of its' design life, taking into account the vulnerability of its' users and without increasing flood risk elsewhere and reducing flood risk overall, where possible.

Non-Statutory Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems

Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs. (2015). *Non-Statutory Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems* state that the peak rate of discharge from a redevelopment during the 1:1 year and 1:100 year rainfall events should be as close as reasonably practical to the corresponding greenfield runoff rate, but should never exceed that of the pre-development state.

The standards also recommend that, where reasonably practicable, the runoff volume generated from the 1:100 year, 6 hour rainfall event should be constrained to the corresponding greenfield runoff volume.

Building Regulations Approved Document H

Secretary of State. (2015). *Building Regulations Approved Document H* establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal and encourages a SuDS approach. The hierarchy stipulates that surface water runoff which is not collected for re-use must be discharged in the following order of priority:

- 1. Discharge to ground via infiltration; or, where not reasonably practicable;
- 2. Discharge to a surface water body (i.e. river, watercourse or the like); or, where not reasonably practicable:
- 3. Discharge to a surface water sewer, highway drain or other surface water drainage system; or, where not reasonably practicable:
- 4. Discharge to a combined sewer.

3.2. London Plan

The London Plan recognising that due to the way in which London has historically developed over its history, it is not practically possible to return sites, which are generally small in nature, to match Greenfield rates of run off.

It has therefore, been decreed that where possible a 50% reduction in existing discharge rates is acceptable.

3.3. Local Policy

Lead Local Flood Authority SUDS Policy Statement

The London Borough of Camden, in their role as Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA), stipulates the required standards for sustainable drainage systems for all major developments within their jurisdiction. A minor development such as this one creates little opportunity to play a major role in reducing the quantities of water from the neighbouring systems to help ease the burden of flooding elsewhere in its neighbourhood. However, every opportunity must be looked at to see what can be implemented in order to assist in this National requirement.

The London Borough of Camden Strategic Flood Risk Assessment **DP27 Basements and Lightwells** outlines the following main policies, and in line with the London Plan Policy si 13 relevant to the development of the DS, as follows:

- Developments will be expected to incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) to reduce the risk of surface water flooding, both to the site in question and to the surrounding area;
- Any proposed development must attempt to make use of and work within the constraints of the existing site topography where possible;
- Any SuDS system must consider the effects of climate change and reduce the potential for environmental damage both on and off site;

- Preference should be for the adoption of SuDS systems which enhance public realm, wherever possible;
- Drainage Strategies must assess the hydrology of the site along with landform, geology, drainage and flood risk and incorporate this within the adopted SuDS proposal; and
- Recommendations given within national policy (as outlined above) should be adhered to in full, avoiding adversely affecting drainage and run-off or causing other damage to the water environment unless demonstrated to be inappropriate.

3.4. Assessing Flood Risk

The Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs & Environment Agency (2017). *Flood Risk Assessment for Planning Applications* confirms that detailed flood risk assessment is required where the Application Site is:

- Located in Flood Zone 2 or 3, including minor development and change of use; or
- More than 1 hectare (Ha) in Flood Zone 1; or
- Less than 1 Ha in Flood Zone 1, including change of use in a development type to a more vulnerable class, where the development could be affected by sources of flooding other than by rivers and the sea; or
- In an area within Flood Zone 1 that has critical drainage problems as notified by the Environment Agency.

The Government's online Flood Map for Planning indicates that the Proposed Development is situated within Flood Zone 1. In accordance with Table 1 (Flood Zones) of the NPPF, this classifies the site of having a less than 1:1000 annual probability of river or sea flooding. See appendices.

Table 2 (Flood Risk Vulnerability Classification) of the NPPF classifies the existing basement this is classed as 'More Vulnerable'.

Table 3 (Flood Risk Vulnerability and Flood Zone Compatibility) of the NPPF states that More Vulnerable development is compatible within Flood Zone 1 and therefore the Sequential Test is considered to be satisfied and an Exception Test is not required here. Finally, the site is within Flood Zone 1 and the total area for the Application Site has been determined as 0.034 hectares (340m²), that falls below the trigger criteria for a formal Flood Risk Assessment

Therefore, on this basis provision of a full formal Flood Risk Assessment is not considered to be required for the Proposed Development and it is felt that flood risk does not represent a constraint to the development of the Site. However, as a basement is in existence it was felt prudent to provide an outline guide and as such one has been produced.

3.5. Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Sources of Flooding

There are a number of key potential sources of flooding that can put Sites at risk. These include fluvial (rivers), tidal (the sea), ground water, sewer, surface water and infrastructure failure (including reservoirs, canals industrial process, burst water mains and blocked sewers or failed pumping stations). Each of these will now be considered in turn and the risk posed to the Site considered.

| Definition of the flood Hazard source | LIKELIHOOD - Very Likely, Possible, Negligible, Very Unlikely |
|---|---|
| Fluvial | The Site is within a flood zone 1 and as stated in 3.4 of the SFRA there is no risk Flood Risk – Very unlikely |
| Coastal - Sea | This area is not near the coast Flood Risk – Very unlikely |
| Coastal- Estuarine | This area is not near the coast Flood Risk – Very unlikely |
| Pluvial/ Sheet run off | The property sits above the local Highway and many walls exist that cut off possible overland flows Flood Risk – Very unlikely |

| Sewer – SWS, FWS, CS | Thames Water have indicated no surcharge within their network locally Flood Risk - Negligible |
|-------------------------|--|
| Groundwater | Bagshot formation – Sands/Gravels Flood Risk – Possible |
| Dam Breach | No Dams near by Flood Risk – Very Unlikely |
| Canal | No Canals near by Flood Risk – Very unlikely |
| Major Water Main | Thames Water shows no major trunk water mains in The Mount only a 4" (100mm) Elood Risk – very unlikely |
| | |

3.6. Easements and Other Constraints

A limited number of Utilities records have been obtained for the site and included within the Appendices. They suggest the presence of an existing water main within the immediate vicinity of the Application Site. It is highly likely that Gas, Telecommunications and Cable are also present. It is unlikely that any of these benefit from easements within the Site and therefore will not impact on the future development of the Application Site and DS, during the course of the ongoing design development.

3.7. Below Ground Drainage Diversions and Other Constraints

No diversions of publicly owned drainage infrastructure are known to be present at the Application Site at the time of writing.

Similarly, no other notable constraints are envisaged apart from the size of the proposed footprint and the area available for SuDS structures.

3.8. Opportunities

The changes being made to the Application Site still present an opportunity to contribute to a reduction in flood risk by reducing the current rate of discharge to the public sewer network. Further, whilst not decreasing the overall volume discharged, the any reduction in rate will ease the immediate burden on the sewerage network during the peak of storm events.

The incorporation of some form of attenuation within the Proposed Development would seek to offer a reduction in such peak runoff rates in accordance with both the national and local policies described above. Subsequently, a reduction in peak flow rates would result in a lower surface water flood risk downstream of the Proposed Development.

Surface water generated by the Application Site is believed to discharge un-treated directly to the public surface water network. However, the main catchment for the surface water element is the roof water with little else contributing and Subsequently, the management of surface water in accordance with the requirements of local policy and CIRIA. (2015). *C753 – The SuDS Manual* would not result in an great increase in the quality of the surface water generated by the Application Site as a result of the Proposed works.

FOUL WATER MANAGEMENT **SECTION 4**

4. FOUL WATER MANAGEMENT

4.1. Existing Discharge Rates and Points of Connection

Currently, the Application Site features an existing domestic property, and this will not change due to the proposed works. Therefore, whilst there might be an slight increase in water usage, and therefore foul water disposal, it will not be possible to determine exactly what this would be or adversely affect the increase in foul waste disposal that would make a significant increase to its current state.

A CCTV survey shows that the existing system runs through to the garage before discharging to the public sewerage system.

4.2. Proposed Discharge Rates and Points of Connection

As mentioned above the proposed foul discharge rates will not significantly increase due to the works being proposed.

4.3. Analysis

The Proposed Development will not generate a measurable net increase in foul water volume and therefore demand to the public foul water sewer network.

The relatively small nature of the increased flow, assuming a conventional gravity discharge, would be unlikely to exceed the capacity of the existing public sewer network. However, this will be discussed with Thames Water at the time of S106 application.

SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT **SECTION 5**

5. SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT

5.1. Proposed Drainage Catchments

Owing to the relatively small area of the Application Site (less than 1.0ha), it is proposed to utilise a single drainage catchment for the purposes of the surface water analysis.

5.2. SuDS Management Train

In accordance with the discharge hierarchy identified in Section 3, ideally surface water generated by the Proposed Development should be discharged to ground via infiltration, where practicable to do so.

Infiltration / percolation testing in accordance with BRE Digest 367 could be undertaken at the application site as part of intrusive site investigation. This test comprises the formation of a trial pit to a depth of 1.00 m below ground level, squaring of the pit sides and subsequent rapid filling with potable water. The fall in water level from 75 % to 25 % effective fill depth is then timed to ascertain an infiltration rate in m/s.

In the case of the Application Site, an infiltration method of disposal is unlikely to be accepted due to the current Building Regulation requirement that a minimum of 5.0m should be maintained between a soakaway and a structure.

Similarly, the presence of a watercourse as a method of disposal is not available and therefore, the Public Combined Sewer to the East of the Application Site is believed the most likely receptive point into which surface water could be discharged.

Therefore, it is proposed that the Application Site will continue to dispose of surface water into the public combined system, re-utilising existing connections where possible or via new appropriately designed connections if needs be. This is subject to seeking appropriate approvals from Thames Water.

5.3. Catchment Contributing Areas

A breakdown of the contributing areas for the proposed surface water drainage system, are as follows:

| CATCHMENT | OPEN SPACE | DEVELOPABLE AREA | %IMPERMEABLE | IMPERMEABLE / DESIGN AREA |
|------------|------------|------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Total Site | 0.004 Ha | 0.030 Ha | 88.0 % | 0.030 Ha |

An area of soft landscaping appears to the East, over the extended basement and as described earlier, as such a minimal depth of top and sub-soil is to be provided but ignored as permeable for the purposes of the calculations.

5.4. Allowance for Climate Change

Table 2 (Peak Rainfall Intensity Allowance in Small and Urban Catchments) of Environment Agency. (2019). Flood Risk Assessments: Climate Change Allowances confirms the climate change allowance of 40% should be adopted for the Application Site, assuming a lifespan of 100 years for residential development as recommended within the NPPF.

5.5. Allowable Discharge Rates

In accordance with the national and local policies outlined within Section 3 the Proposed Development should seek to limit the peak flow rate to the greenfield runoff rates, wherever practicable. Where this cannot be achieved, a betterment rate may be considered acceptable.

As has already been confirmed in Section 2, the greenfield runoff rate for the Application Site has been determined as 5.6 l/s for the 1:1 AEP event and it is not considered practicable to limit the discharge rate to 50% as required by the London Plan in this instance. A discharge rate of **5.0l/s** however, will be set for all storms thus reducing the peak flow when it is likely that the local sewerage network will be in greater demand.

Environment Agency. (2013). *Rainfall Runoff Management for Developments* stipulates that a minimum discharge rate of **5.0 I/s** should be adopted to mitigate risks associated with blockage of the flow control device.

However, commercially available flow control technologies have since been developed which can better this minimum value, with published minimum flow rates of 0.7 l/s being achievable using vortex-flow systems, for design head values as low as 0.4 m.

Notwithstanding this, a clear balance must be struck between limiting discharge flows, maintaining practicality of construction, minimising ongoing maintenance requirements, and ensuring the scheme remains commercially viable.

Owing to the constraints present at the Application Site due to its small plan area and likely space restrictions, it is considered prudent, from a design perspective, to ensure a constant discharge flow to minimize attenuation volume requirements and mitigate flood risk.

This limits the choice of available flow control devices to that of a float operated system as other types (i.e. vortex systems, throttle pipes, orifice plates etc.) are reliant upon the generation of head pressure to develop the specified peak discharge rates. In simple terms, these systems require a larger volume of water behind the device to activate the peak discharge flows and hence require larger attenuation volumes.

It is therefore proposed to limit the discharge from the Proposed Development to **5.0 l/s**.

Limiting the maximum discharge rate from the Proposed Development to this value would present a reduction in peak discharge rates for the key design events and an overall betterment of:

- **61.5%** during the 1:100 AEP event, including the 40 % allowance for climate change.
- **59.0** % during the 1:100 AEP event.
- **50.0 %** during the 1:30 AEP event.

5.6. Proposed SUDS Features

Due to the constraints imposed on the Proposed Development, the incorporation of aboveground SuDS features offering complementary benefits is not considered feasible. However, it may be possible, and subject to Client acceptance, to reduce the size of any attenuation tank proposed, by promoting the use of rainwater gardens over the new basement feature where limited top/sub-soil will be available. This also provides additional benefits as it promotes biodiversity.

Similarly, owing to the limited area of proposed external works, it is not considered feasible to adopt permeable surfaces at the Proposed Development.

Options available are either;

- To install an attenuation tank within the limited area of existing garden. The attenuation tank will discharge with a controlled outflow to the termination inspection chamber. It will discharge at a rate of no more than 5.0l/s or;
- To provide a rainwater garden over the proposed basement to reduce the volume of the attenuation tank. This needs to be discussed with the Client and their Landscape Architect

The required attenuation volume has been determined for a range of storm events in accordance with the requirements of the non-statutory standards for sustainable drainage systems. See **Appendix D**

Estimated attenuation volumes have been calculated in two stages. Firstly, an anticipated range has been determined using the Quick Storage Estimate function of an Industry Standard design package, to inform further rigorous assessment. Secondly, a preliminary model has then been developed using that package to determine a more refined attenuation estimate as summarised in the table below, with calculations given in the **Appendix D**.

The preliminary model is based upon a single attenuation tank ignoring for now the possible provision of a rainwater garden, the discharge from surface water generated from Site will be limited to 5.0 l/s to the existing combined sewer in The Mount. This will represent an improvement to the existing conditions, it must be remembered that foul discharge adds to the total flow but as stated there is unlikely to be any measurable increase from existing flows.

Following a storage estimate exercise, a minimum volume of 3.04 m³ will be required in order to provide the maximum achievable betterment of 61.5% during the 1:100 AEP event plus a 40% allowance for climate change, as outlined above. The proposed attenuation tank has been appropriately sized to ensure that no flooding occurs during the 1:100yr +40% CC

6 hour storm event to prevent the possibility of flood water finding its way into the basement/lower floor

It should also be understood that the during storm events the neighbourhood might be experiencing the controlled discharge from the Site will not contribute immediately and as such the peak in the receiving sewer may have already passed.

As there is minimal change in impermeable area, there would be little increase in existing discharge volumes as a result of the 1:100 AEP 6-hour event however, this has been considered as it is an opportunity to provide some benefit to the neighbourhood.

| STORM EVENT | CONTRIBUTING AREA | MAXIMUM DISCHARGE | ATTENUATION VOL (RANGE) | ATTENUATION VOL (OPTIMISED) |
|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1:1 AEP | 0.030 Ha | 5.0 l/s | 0.0-1.0 m ³ | 0.0m³ |
| 1:30 AEP | 0.030 Ha | 5.0 l/s | 2.0-4.0 m ³ | 0.0m³ |
| 1:100 AEP | 0.030 Ha | 5.0 l/s | 3.0-6.0 m ³ | 2.0m ³ |
| 1:100 AEP + 20% CC | 0.030 Ha | 5.0 l/s | 4.0-7.0 m ³ | 2.5m ³ |
| 1:100 AEP + 40% CC | 0.030 Ha | 5.0 l/s | 5.0-9.0m ³ | 3.8m ³ |

During the analysis it has been necessary to ensure that a minimum pipe size of a 150mm ϕ connects to the attenuation tank otherwise the restriction of a smaller pipe size will cause flooding whilst the tank remains only partially filled.

The use of a Hydroslide CTL VS unit has been used in the analysis to limit the volume/size of the attenuation tank.

With the above in consideration, the Proposed Development would therefore contribute to a reduction in flood risk associated with the exceedance of the public surface water sewer network in the vicinity of the Application Site. But it would provide a significant reduction in peak runoff rates and avoid an increase in the total runoff volume during the critical period.

As a summary of the principles being incorporated:

| Item | Feasible (Y/N/TBC) | Comments |
|---|--------------------|---|
| 1. Rainwater use as a resource (for example rainwater harvesting, blue roofs for irrigation) | N | The existing pitched roof will not change and therefore it is considered that the use of blue roofs is not suitable. Likewise, there is no intention to carried out a major overhaul of the existing plumbing system enabling the installation or a grey water tank |
| 2. Rainwater infiltration to ground at or close to source | Ν | The site has limited area and could not meet the Building Regulation requirement |
| 3. Rainwater attenuation in green infrastructure features for gradual release (for example green roofs, rain gardens) | TBC | The existing pitched roof will not change and therefore it is considered that the use of Green or broen roofs are not suitable. It may be possible to divert an existing rainwater down pipe to the soft landscaped area over the proposed basement vaults and create a rainwater garden during the design stage |
| 4.Discharge rainwater direct to a watercourse | Ν | None available |
| 5. Controlled rainwater discharge to a surface water sewer or drain | Ν | No dedicated surface water sewer available |

5.7. Water Quality

The Proposed Development would utilise existing connections to the public surface water sewers in the immediate vicinity of the site, wherever possible.

As there is a little in significant change of use of the Proposed Development which is mainly roof water considered 'clean', it would not greatly reduce pollutant loading and subsequently the vulnerability of the existing surface water sewer is considered to be negligible.

5.8. Ownership and Maintenance

To ensure the long-term performance of the proposed DS, the on-site drainage system will be owned and maintained by the site operator or a maintenance company (MC) in accordance with the indicative schedule below:

| ELEMENT / DRAINAGE COMPONENT | OWNERSHIP / ADOPTION | MAINTENANCE REQUIREMENTS |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| Pumping stations | Freeholder | To be monitored electronically and be on a maintenance regime with a professional service team. |
| (Basement toilet) | | Inspection and service annually. |
| Rain Water Pipes | Freeholder | Clearance of leaves / debris from guttering and hopper inlets. Rodding points provided to clear blockages via conventional rodding methods. |
| | | Inspection annually and before / after extreme storm events. |
| Soil Vent Piles / "Stub Stacks" | Freeholder | Rodding points to be provided to clear blockages via conventional rodding methods. |
| | | Inspection annually. |
| Gullies (Internal & External) | Freeholder | To be monitored for silt build-up and cleaned as required. Where provided, ensure air traps are primed and sealed to prevent smells. |
| | | Inspection quarterly. |
| Surface Water Drainage Channels | Freeholder | To be monitored and cleaned via jetting when any debris / silt reduces the cross- sectional area by 25% or more. Inspection to include both the channel and silt trap / gulley outlets. |
| | | Inspection annually and before / after extreme storm events. |

SURFACE AND FOUL WATER DRAINAGE STRATEGY

| Below Ground Pipework Generally | Freeholder | To be inspected for reduction in cross-sectional area (i.e due to blockage, silt or debris build-up, root ingress etc) general condition of materials, pipe displacement and the like. |
|--|------------|--|
| | | Inspection annually and where appropriate before / after extreme storm events. |
| Manholes / Inspection Chambers Generally | Freeholder | To be inspected for debris and integrity of chambers and covers generally. |
| | | Inspection annually and where appropriate before / after extreme storm events. |
| Attenuation tank including flow control device | Freeholder | To be monitored for silt build-up and cleaned as required |
| | | Inspection annually and before/after extreme storm events. |
| Rainwater Garden | Occupier | To reduce weeds and remove wind blown debris etc, as and when |
| | | Inspection as moving in and out of the house |

SECTION 6 CONCLUSIONS
6. CONCLUSIONS

- The scheme proposes many internal changes to the existing dwelling with the main construction being the removal of an existing tunnel between the existing basement and the garage by excavation. Extending the basement up to the garage.
- It is assumed that both surface and foul water sewer currently generated by the Site is discharged to the combined public sewer network in The Mount. The CCTV has proven a single connection to the combined public sewer.
- Due to the proximity of the foundations and adjacent structures, the incorporation of a soakaway or other infiltration devices is not considered to be appropriate.
- The peak greenfield runoff rate at the site has been determined as being well below the minimum practicable discharge rates for commercially available flow restriction devices. A discharge limit of **5.0 I/s** has been adopted as the minimum. it is not considered practicable to limit discharge from the development to the greenfield runoff rate in accordance with SuDS Policy 14.
- The discharge from the site post-development will be limited to a maximum rate of 5.0 l/s during all events up to and including the 1:100 AEP event including a 40% allowance for climate change. This would provide a significant betterment to the existing condition without introducing an additional source of flood risk.
- To achieve the above limitations of discharge, a 3.0m³ of attenuation will be provided under the existing garden
- The development proposal is unlikely to increase the peak foul water flows from the site.
 However, given the relatively small flow rates, it would be unlikely that the public sewer network would not have sufficient capacity to cater for the Proposed Development. Clarification has not been sought from Thames Water at the time of writing.
- The development proposal will contribute to a reduction in flood risk associated with the exceedance of the public surface water sewer network in the vicinity of the site by providing a significant reduction in both peak discharge rates and reducing volume during peak storm intensities.
- The proposed Drainage Strategy has been prepared to be robust and to demonstrate that it is
 possible to drain the site in a sustainable manner in keeping with local policy requirements
 without increasing flood risk to or from the Proposed Development. It should be noted that this

strategy presents one possible solution to demonstrate that the Proposed Development can be sustainably drained and should not be interpreted as the definitive solution.

APPENDIX A EXISTING SITE PLAN



All dimensions and conditions are to be checked on site by the contractor prior to preparing drawings or commencing any work. The contractor is responsible for checking that there is no conflict between site dimensions and drawn dimensions.

In the event of any detail or dimensional conflict between Charlton Brown Architects drawings, the matter must be referred back to Charlton Brown Architects for clarification



Rev Date

Details

By

Charlton Brown Architecture & Interiors

The Belvedere, 2 Back Lane, Hampstead, London, NW3 1HLTelephone+44(0)20 7794 1234Emailoffice@charltonbrown.comWebsitewww.charltonbrown.com

Client Alex and Emma Barnett Project 9 The Mount Drawing Title Existing Lower Ground Floor Plan Date Drawn Checked 22/03/2022 JLB LS Scale 1:50 @ A1 Issue Status NOT FOR PLANNING Drawing Number Revision EX-00-100 Project Number 21041



All dimensions and conditions are to be checked on site by the contractor prior to preparing drawings or commencing any work. The contractor is responsible for checking that there is no conflict between site dimensions and drawn dimensions.

In the event of any detail or dimensional conflict between Charlton Brown Architects drawings, the matter must be referred back to Charlton Brown Architects for clarification



Rev Date

Details

By

Charlton Brown Architecture & Interiors

The Belvedere, 2 Back Lane, Hampstead, London, NW3 1HLTelephone+44(0)20 7794 1234Emailoffice@charltonbrown.comWebsitewww.charltonbrown.com

Client Alex and Emma Barnett Project 9 The Mount Drawing Title Existing Ground Floor Plan Date Drawn Checked 22/03/2022 JLB LS Scale 1:50 @ A1 Issue Status NOT FOR PLANNING Project Number 21041 Drawing Number Revision EX-00-101



All dimensions and conditions are to be checked on site by the contractor prior to preparing drawings or commencing any work. The contractor is responsible for checking that there is no conflict between site dimensions and drawn dimensions.

In the event of any detail or dimensional conflict between Charlton Brown Architects drawings, the matter must be referred back to Charlton Brown Architects for clarification



Rev Date

Details

By

Charlton Brown Architecture & Interiors

The Belvedere, 2 Back Lane, Hampstead, London, NW3 1HLTelephone+44(0)20 7794 1234Emailoffice@charltonbrown.comWebsitewww.charltonbrown.com

Client Alex and Emma Barnett Project 9 The Mount Drawing Title Existing First Floor Plan Drawn Checked Date 22/03/2022 JLB LS Scale 1:50 @ A1 Issue Status NOT FOR PLANNING Project Number 21041 Drawing Number Revision EX-00-102



All dimensions and conditions are to be checked on site by the contractor prior to preparing drawings or commencing any work. The contractor is responsible for checking that there is no conflict between site dimensions and drawn dimensions.

In the event of any detail or dimensional conflict between Charlton Brown Architects drawings, the matter must be referred back to Charlton Brown Architects for clarification



Rev Date

Details

By

Charlton Brown Architecture & Interiors

The Belvedere, 2 Back Lane, Hampstead, London, NW3 1HLTelephone+44(0)20 7794 1234Emailoffice@charltonbrown.comWebsitewww.charltonbrown.com

Client Alex and Emma Barnett Project 9 The Mount Drawing Title Existing Second Floor Plan Drawn Checked Date 22/03/2022 JLB LS Scale 1:50 @ A1 Issue Status NOT FOR PLANNING Project NumberDrawing NumberRevision21041EX-00-103-C



All dimensions and conditions are to be checked on site by the contractor prior to preparing drawings or commencing any work. The contractor is responsible for checking that there is no conflict between site dimensions and drawn dimensions.

In the event of any detail or dimensional conflict between Charlton Brown Architects drawings, the matter must be referred back to Charlton Brown Architects for clarification



Rev Date

Details

By

Charlton Brown Architecture & Interiors

The Belvedere, 2 Back Lane, Hampstead, London, NW3 1HLTelephone+44(0)20 7794 1234Emailoffice@charltonbrown.comWebsitewww.charltonbrown.com

| Client | | |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|----------|
| Alex and Emma Barr | nett | |
| Project | | |
| 9 The Mount | | |
| Drawing Title | | |
| Existing Roof Pla | n | |
| Date | Drawn | Checked |
| 22/03/2022 | JLB | LS |
| Scale | | |
| 1:50 @ A1 | | |
| Issue Status | | |
| NOT FOR PL | ANNING | |
| Project Number 21041 | Drawing Number EX-00-104 | Revision |

APPENDIX B PROPOSED SITE PLANS





All dimensions and conditions are to be checked on site by the contractor prior to preparing drawings or commencing any work. The contractor is responsible for checking that there is no conflict between site dimensions and drawn dimensions.

In the event of any detail or dimensional conflict between Charlton Brown Architects drawings, the matter must be referred back to Charlton Brown Architects for clarification



Key:

1 11 Demolish 11 11 1 - - - - I New

Floor lowered

Floor level raised or lowered

Rev Date

Details

By

Charlton Brown Architecture & Interiors

The Belvedere, 2 Back Lane, Hampstead, London, NW3 1HL +44(0)20 7794 1234 Telephone Email office@charltonbrown.com Website www.charltonbrown.com

Client Alex and Emma Barnett Project 9 The Mount Drawing Title Lower Ground Floor Plan Date Drawn Checked 22/03/2022 JLB LS Scale 1:50 @ A1 Issue Status NOT FOR PLANNING Project Number Drawing Number Revision 21041 PL-00-100



All dimensions and conditions are to be checked on site by the contractor prior to preparing drawings or commencing any work. The contractor is responsible for checking that there is no conflict between site dimensions and drawn dimensions.

In the event of any detail or dimensional conflict between Charlton Brown Architects drawings, the matter must be referred back to Charlton Brown Architects for clarification



Key:

---Demolish 1 - - - - I New Floor lowered Floor level raised or lowered

Rev Date

Details

By

Charlton Brown Architecture & Interiors

The Belvedere, 2 Back Lane, Hampstead, London, NW3 1HL Telephone +44(0)20 7794 1234 office@charltonbrown.com Email Website www.charltonbrown.com

| Client | | |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|----------|
| Alex and Emma B | arnett | |
| Project | | |
| 9 The Mount | | |
| Drawing Title | | |
| Ground Floor I | Plan | |
| Date | Drawn | Checked |
| 22/03/2022 | JLB | LS |
| Scale | | |
| 1:50 @ A1 | | |
| Issue Status | | |
| NOT FOR I | PLANNING | |
| Project Number 21041 | Drawing Number PL-00-101 | Revision |





NOTES

-Missing sections of existing cornices added to match existing. -Removal of all unathorised recessed downlights.





AA

All dimensions in millimetres. Where dimensions are not given, drawings must not be scaled and the matter referred back to Charlton Brown Architects.

All dimensions and conditions are to be checked on site by the contractor prior to preparing drawings or commencing any work. The contractor is responsible for checking that there is no conflict between site dimensions and drawn dimensions.

In the event of any detail or dimensional conflict between Charlton Brown Architects drawings, the matter must be referred back to Charlton Brown Architects for clarification



Key:

----Demolish 11 1 - - - - I New Floor lowered

Floor level raised or lowered

Rev Date

Details

By

Charlton Brown Architecture & Interiors

The Belvedere, 2 Back Lane, Hampstead, London, NW3 1HL +44(0)20 7794 1234 Telephone Email office@charltonbrown.com Website www.charltonbrown.com

Client Alex and Emma Barnett Project 9 The Mount Drawing Title First Floor Plan Date Drawn Checked 22/03/2022 JLB LS Scale 1:50 @ A1 Issue Status NOT FOR PLANNING Drawing Number Project Number Revision PL-00-102 21041





All dimensions and conditions are to be checked on site by the contractor prior to preparing drawings or commencing any work. The contractor is responsible for checking that there is no conflict between site dimensions and drawn dimensions.

In the event of any detail or dimensional conflict between Charlton Brown Architects drawings, the matter must be referred back to Charlton Brown Architects for clarification



Key:

---Demolish 11 1 - - - - I New Floor lowered

Floor level raised or lowered

Rev Date

Details

By

Charlton Brown Architecture & Interiors

The Belvedere, 2 Back Lane, Hampstead, London, NW3 1HL Telephone +44(0)20 7794 1234 Email office@charltonbrown.com www.charltonbrown.com Website

Client Alex and Emma Barnett Project 9 The Mount Drawing Title Second Floor Plan Date Drawn Checked 22/03/2022 JLB LS Scale 1:50 @ A1 Issue Status NOT FOR PLANNING Project Number Drawing Number Revision 21041 PL-00-103-C Project Number



Important note

All dimensions in millimetres. Where dimensions are not given, drawings must not be scaled and the matter referred back to Charlton Brown Architects.

All dimensions and conditions are to be checked on site by the contractor prior to preparing drawings or commencing any work. The contractor is responsible for checking that there is no conflict between site dimensions and drawn dimensions.

In the event of any detail or dimensional conflict between Charlton Brown Architects drawings, the matter must be referred back to Charlton Brown Architects for clarification



Key:

Demolish New Floor lowered Floor level raised or lowered

Rev Date

Details

By

Charlton Brown Architecture & Interiors

The Belvedere, 2 Back Lane, Hampstead, London, NW3 1HL Telephone +44(0)20 7794 1234 office@charltonbrown.com Email Website www.charltonbrown.com

| Client | | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------|----------|
| Alex and Emma Bar | nett | |
| Project | | |
| 9 The Mount | | |
| Drawing Title | | |
| Roof Plan | | |
| Date | Drawn | Checked |
| 22/03/2022 | JLB | LS |
| Scale | | |
| 1:50 @ A1 | | |
| Issue Status | | |
| NOT FOR PL | LANNING | |
| Project Number 21041 | Drawing Number PL-00-104 | Revision |



APPENDIX C THAMES WATER ASSET PLANS

Asset location search



Constructure Ltd Bell Yard Mews 15Bermondsey Street LONDON SE1 3TY

Search address supplied

9 The Mount London NW3 6SZ

Your reference

Our reference

ALS/ALS Standard/2022_4702854

Search date

16 August 2022

2230

Knowledge of features below the surface is essential for every development

The benefits of this knowledge not only include ensuring due diligence and avoiding risk, but also being able to ascertain the feasibility of any development.

Did you know that Thames Water Property Searches can also provide a variety of utility searches including a more comprehensive view of utility providers' assets (across up to 35-45 different providers), as well as more focused searches relating to specific major utility companies such as National Grid (gas and electric).

Contact us to find out more.



Thames Water Utilities Ltd Property Searches, PO Box 3189, Slough SL1 4WW DX 151280 Slough 13



searches@thameswater.co.uk www.thameswater-propertysearches.co.uk



0800 009 4540





Search address supplied: 9, The Mount, London, NW3 6SZ

Dear Sir / Madam

An Asset Location Search is recommended when undertaking a site development. It is essential to obtain information on the size and location of clean water and sewerage assets to safeguard against expensive damage and allow cost-effective service design.

The following records were searched in compiling this report: - the map of public sewers & the map of waterworks. Thames Water Utilities Ltd (TWUL) holds all of these.

This searchprovides maps showing the position, size of Thames Water assets close to the proposed development and also manhole cover and invert levels, where available.

Please note that none of the charges made for this report relate to the provision of Ordnance Survey mapping information. The replies contained in this letter are given following inspection of the public service records available to this company. No responsibility can be accepted for any error or omission in the replies.

You should be aware that the information contained on these plans is current only on the day that the plans are issued. The plans should only be used for the duration of the work that is being carried out at the present time. Under no circumstances should this data be copied or transmitted to parties other than those for whom the current work is being carried out.

Thames Water do update these service plans on a regular basis and failure to observe the above conditions could lead to damage arising to new or diverted services at a later date.

Contact Us

If you have any further queries regarding this enquiry please feel free to contact a member of the team on 0800 009 4540, or use the address below:

Thames Water Utilities Ltd Property Searches PO Box 3189 Slough SL1 4WW

Email: <u>searches@thameswater.co.uk</u> Web: <u>www.thameswater-propertysearches.co.uk</u>

Asset location search



Waste Water Services

Please provide a copy extract from the public sewer map.

Enclosed is a map showing the approximate lines of our sewers. Our plans do not show sewer connections from individual properties or any sewers not owned by Thames Water unless specifically annotated otherwise. Records such as "private" pipework are in some cases available from the Building Control Department of the relevant Local Authority.

Where the Local Authority does not hold such plans it might be advisable to consult the property deeds for the site or contact neighbouring landowners.

This report relates only to sewerage apparatus of Thames Water Utilities Ltd, it does not disclose details of cables and or communications equipment that may be running through or around such apparatus.

The sewer level information contained in this response represents all of the level data available in our existing records. Should you require any further Information, please refer to the relevant section within the 'Further Contacts' page found later in this document.

For your guidance:

- The Company is not generally responsible for rivers, watercourses, ponds, culverts or highway drains. If any of these are shown on the copy extract they are shown for information only.
- Any private sewers or lateral drains which are indicated on the extract of the public sewer map as being subject to an agreement under Section 104 of the Water Industry Act 1991 are not an 'as constructed' record. It is recommended these details be checked with the developer.

Clean Water Services

Please provide a copy extract from the public water main map.

Enclosed is a map showing the approximate positions of our water mains and associated apparatus. Please note that records are not kept of the positions of individual domestic supplies.

For your information, there will be a pressure of at least 10m head at the outside stop valve. If you would like to know the static pressure, please contact our Customer Centre on 0800 316 9800. The Customer Centre can also arrange for a full flow and pressure test to be carried out for a fee.

<u>Thames Water Utilities Ltd</u>, Property Searches, PO Box 3189, Slough SL1 4WW, DX 151280 Slough 13 T 0800 009 4540 E <u>searches@thameswater.co.uk</u> I <u>www.thameswater-propertysearches.co.uk</u>





For your guidance:

- Assets other than vested water mains may be shown on the plan, for information only.
- If an extract of the public water main record is enclosed, this will show known public water mains in the vicinity of the property. It should be possible to estimate the likely length and route of any private water supply pipe connecting the property to the public water network.

Payment for this Search

A charge will be added to your suppliers account.





Further contacts:

Waste Water queries

Should you require verification of the invert levels of public sewers, by site measurement, you will need to approach the relevant Thames Water Area Network Office for permission to lift the appropriate covers. This permission will usually involve you completing a TWOSA form. For further information please contact our Customer Centre on Tel: 0845 920 0800. Alternatively, a survey can be arranged, for a fee, through our Customer Centre on the above number.

If you have any questions regarding sewer connections, budget estimates, diversions, building over issues or any other questions regarding operational issues please direct them to our service desk. Which can be contacted by writing to:

Developer Services (Waste Water) Thames Water Clearwater Court Vastern Road Reading RG1 8DB

Tel: 0800 009 3921 Email: developer.services@thameswater.co.uk

Clean Water queries

Should you require any advice concerning clean water operational issues or clean water connections, please contact:

Developer Services (Clean Water) Thames Water Clearwater Court Vastern Road Reading RG1 8DB

Tel: 0800 009 3921 Email: developer.services@thameswater.co.uk



Based on the Ordnance Survey Map (2020) with the Sanction of the controller of H.M. Stationery Office, License no. 100019345 Crown Copyright Reserved

Thames Water Utilities Ltd, Property Searches, PO Box 3189, Slough SL1 4W, DX 151280 Slough 13 T 0800 009 4540 E searches@thameswater.co.uk I www.thameswater-propertysearches.co.uk

| Manhole Reference | Manhole Cover Level | Manhole Invert Level | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| 38GA | n/a | n/a | | | | | |
| 38GB | n/a | n/a | | | | | |
| 3901 | n/a | n/a | | | | | |
| 3807 | 117.06 | 113.66 | | | | | |
| 38GC | n/a | n/a | | | | | |
| 3902 | n/a | n/a | | | | | |
| 3803 | 116.12 | n/a | | | | | |
| 48CI | n/a | n/a | | | | | |
| 3903 | n/a | n/a | | | | | |
| 39AJ | n/a | n/a | | | | | |
| 291A | n/a | n/a | | | | | |
| 291B | n/a | n/a | | | | | |
| 291C | n/a | n/a | | | | | |
| 39BA | n/a | n/a | | | | | |
| 39BB | n/a | n/a | | | | | |
| 2903 | n/a | n/a | | | | | |
| 3001 | n/a | n/a | | | | | |
| 301D | n/a | n/a | | | | | |
| 401D | n/a | n/a | | | | | |
| 401C | n/a | n/a | | | | | |
| 30DE | n/a | n/a | | | | | |
| 30EF | n/a | n/a | | | | | |
| 30EE | n/a | n/a | | | | | |
| 30EH | n/a | n/a | | | | | |
| 301C | n/a | n/a | | | | | |
| 301B | n/a | n/a | | | | | |
| 3003 | 125.8 | 121.59 | | | | | |
| 3004 | 127.12 | 122.96 | | | | | |
| 30DD | n/a | n/a | | | | | |
| 3005 | 125.99 | 120.75 | | | | | |
| 3006 | 121.79 | 119.81 | | | | | |
| 30GB | n/a | n/a | | | | | |
| 2901 | n/a | 113.83 | | | | | |
| 2904 | n/a | n/a | | | | | |
| 3809 | 123.06 | 116.05 | | | | | |
| 3810 | 123.02 | n/a | | | | | |
| 3806 | 120.89 | 119.98 | | | | | |
| 2001 | 123.76 | 120.01 | | | | | |
| 201A | n/a | n/a | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| The position of the engenties of the set of the | | | | | | | |
| ne position of the apparatus shown on this plan shown but their presence should be anticipated. No | is given without obligation and warranty, and the acc liability of any kind whatsoever is accented by Thames | curacy cannot be guaranteed. Service pipes are not solve water for any error or omission. The actual position | | | | | |
| of mains and services must be verified and established on site before any works are undertaken. | | | | | | | |



Asset Location Search - Sewer Key



- 1) All levels associated with the plans are to Ordnance Datum Newlyn.
- 2) All measurements on the plan are metric.
- 3) Arrows (on gravity fed sewers) or flecks (on rising mains) indicate the direction of flow.
- 4) Most private pipes are not shown on our plans, as in the past, this information has not been recorded.

5) 'na' or '0' on a manhole indicates that data is unavailable.

6) The text appearing alongside a sewer line indicates the internal diameter of the pipe in millimeters. Text next to a manhole indicates the manhole reference number and should not be taken as a measurement. If you are unsure about any text or symbology, please contact Property Searches on 0800 009 4540.

Thames Water Utilities Ltd, Property Searches, PO Box 3189, Slough SL1 4W, DX 151280 Slough 13 T 0800 009 4540 E searches@thameswater.co.uk I www.thameswater-propertysearches.co.uk



Based on the Ordnance Survey Map (2020) with the Sanction of the controller of H.M. Stationery Office, License no. 100019345 Crown Copyright Reserved.



Asset Location Search - Water Key









Meter

End Items



Undefined End

Manifold

Customer Supply

Fire Supply

Operational Sites



Other Symbols

Data Logger



Casement: Ducts may contain high voltage cables. Please check with Thames Water.



Terms and Conditions

All sales are made in accordance with Thames Water Utilities Limited (TWUL) standard terms and conditions unless previously agreed in writing.

- 1. All goods remain in the property of Thames Water Utilities Ltd until full payment is received.
- 2. Provision of service will be in accordance with all legal requirements and published TWUL policies.
- 3. All invoices are strictly due for payment 14 days from due date of the invoice. Any other terms must be accepted/agreed in writing prior to provision of goods or service, or will be held to be invalid.
- 4. Thames Water does not accept post-dated cheques-any cheques received will be processed for payment on date of receipt.
- 5. In case of dispute TWUL's terms and conditions shall apply.
- 6. Penalty interest may be invoked by TWUL in the event of unjustifiable payment delay. Interest charges will be in line with UK Statute Law 'The Late Payment of Commercial Debts (Interest) Act 1998'.
- 7. Interest will be charged in line with current Court Interest Charges, if legal action is taken.
- 8. A charge may be made at the discretion of the company for increased administration costs.

A copy of Thames Water's standard terms and conditions are available from the Commercial Billing Team (cashoperations@thameswater.co.uk).

We publish several Codes of Practice including a guaranteed standards scheme. You can obtain copies of these leaflets by calling us on 0800 316 9800

If you are unhappy with our service you can speak to your original goods or customer service provider. If you are not satisfied with the response, your complaint will be reviewed by the Customer Services Director. You can write to her at: Thames Water Utilities Ltd. PO Box 492, Swindon, SN38 8TU.

If the Goods or Services covered by this invoice falls under the regulation of the 1991 Water Industry Act, and you remain dissatisfied you can refer your complaint to Consumer Council for Water on 0121 345 1000 or write to them at Consumer Council for Water, 1st Floor, Victoria Square House, Victoria Square, Birmingham, B2 4AJ.

| Credit Card | BACS Payment | Telephone Banking | Cheque |
|--|--|---|--|
| Call 0800 009 4540 quoting your invoice number starting CBA or ADS / OSS | Account number 90478703 Sort code 60-00-01 A remittance advice must be sent to: Thames Water Utilities Ltd., PO Box 3189, Slough SL1 4WW. or email ps.billing@thameswater. co.uk | By calling your bank and quoting: Account number 90478703 Sort code 60-00-01 and your invoice number | Made payable to ' Thames Water Utilities Ltd' Write your Thames Water account number on the back. Send to: Thames Water Utilities Ltd., PO Box 3189, Slough SL1 4WW or by DX to 151280 Slough 13 |

Ways to pay your bill

Thames Water Utilities Ltd Registered in England & Wales No. 2366661 Registered Office Clearwater Court, Vastern Rd, Reading, Berks, RG1 8DB.

SURFACE WATER CALCULATIONS **APPENDIX D**

| | Hull Raiser Ltd | File: Greenfield.pfd | Page 1 |
|----------|-----------------|------------------------|----------------|
| ainage | Dagmar House | Network: Storm Network | 9 The Mount |
| Highways | Mill Hill Road | Jon Burgess | Hampstead |
| | Cowes, PO31 7EJ | 03/09/2022 | Existing flows |

Design Settings

| Rainfall Methodology | FSR | Maximum Time of Concentration (mins) | 30.00 |
|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------|
| Return Period (years) | 1 | Maximum Rainfall (mm/hr) | 50.0 |
| Additional Flow (%) | 0 | Minimum Velocity (m/s) | 1.00 |
| FSR Region | England and Wales | Connection Type | Level Soffits |
| M5-60 (mm) | 20.000 | Minimum Backdrop Height (m) | 0.200 |
| Ratio-R | 0.400 | Preferred Cover Depth (m) | 1.200 |
| CV | 0.750 | Include Intermediate Ground | \checkmark |
| Time of Entry (mins) | 2.00 | Enforce best practice design rules | \checkmark |

Circular Link Type

| Shape | Circular | Auto Increment (mm) | 75 |
|---------|----------|---------------------|----|
| Barrels | 1 | Follow Ground | х |

Available Diameters (mm) 100 150

<u>Nodes</u>

| Name | Area (ha) | T of E (mins) | Cover Level (m) | Diameter (mm) | Width (mm) | Easting (m) | Northing (m) | Depth (m) |
|-------|--------------|------------------|-----------------------|------------------|---------------|----------------|-----------------|--------------|
| 1 | 0.030 | 2.00 | 121.000 | 1200 | 640 | 95.397 | 82.375 | 1.000 |
| 2 | | | 121.000 | 1200 | 640 | 38.470 | 63.713 | 1.250 |
| Sewer | | | 120.000 | | | -10.729 | 46.560 | 1.250 |

<u>Links</u>

| Name | US Node | DS Node | Length (m) | ks (mm) / n | US IL (m) | DS IL (m) | Fall (m) | Slope (1:X) | Dia (mm) | T of C (mins) | Rain (mm/hr) |
|-------|------------|------------|---------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|------------------|-----------------|
| 1.000 | 1 | 2 | 20.000 | 0.600 | 120.000 | 119.750 | 0.250 | 80.0 | 100 | 3.00 | 50.0 |
| 1.001 | 2 | Sewer | 10.000 | 0.600 | 119.750 | 118.750 | 1.000 | 10.0 | 100 | 3.87 | 50.0 |

| Name | Vel | Сар | Flow | US | DS | Σ Area | Σ Add | Pro | Pro |
|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|-------|----------|
| | (m/s) | (I/s) | (I/s) | Depth | Depth | (ha) | Inflow | Depth | Velocity |
| | | | | (m) | (m) | | (I/s) | (mm) | (m/s) |
| 1.000 | 0.861 | 6.8 | 4.1 | 0.900 | 1.150 | 0.030 | 0.0 | 56 | 0.900 |
| 1.001 | 2.458 | 19.3 | 4.1 | 1.150 | 1.150 | 0.030 | 0.0 | 31 | 1.939 |

Simulation Settings

| Rainfall Methodology | FSR | Drain Down Time (mins) | 240 |
|----------------------|-------------------|---|--------------|
| FSR Region | England and Wales | Additional Storage (m ³ /ha) | 0.1 |
| M5-60 (mm) | 20.000 | Check Discharge Rate(s) | \checkmark |
| Ratio-R | 0.400 | 1 year (l/s) | 0.1 |
| Summer CV | 0.750 | 30 year (l/s) | 0.3 |
| Winter CV | 0.840 | 100 year (l/s) | 0.4 |
| Analysis Speed | Normal | Check Discharge Volume | \checkmark |
| Skip Steady State | х | 100 year +40% 360 minute (m³) | 14 |
| | | | |
| | Storm Dura | ations | |
| 15 30 60 120 | 180 240 36 | 0 480 600 720 9 | 60 1440 |

| | Hull Raiser Ltd | Fi | le: Greenf | ield.pfd | Pa | age 2 | |
|--------------------|--------------------|---------------|------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|--|
| Drainage | Dagmar House | N | etwork: St | torm Network | 9 | The Mount | |
| velopment Highways | Mill Hill Road | Jo | n Burgess | 5 | H. | ampstead | |
| | Cowes, PO31 7EJ | 03 | 3/09/2022 | 2 | E> | kisting flows | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Return Period | Climate | Change | Additional Area | Additional | Flow | |
| | (years) | (CC | :%) | (A %) | (Q %) | 1 | |
| | 1 | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | |
| | 30 | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | |
| | 100 | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | |
| | 100 | | 20 | 0 | | 0 | |
| | 100 | | 40 | 0 | | 0 | |
| | | _ | | | | | |
| | | <u>Pre-de</u> | velopmei | <u>nt Discharge Rate</u> | | | |
| | Site | e Makeup | Greenfi | eld Growth | Factor 30 yea | ar 1.95 | |
| | Greenfiel | d Method | IH124 | Growth F | actor 100 yea | ar 2.48 | |
| | Positively Drained | Area (ha) | 0.034 | B | etterment (% | 6) 0 | |
| | S/ | AAR (mm) | 650 | | QB | ar <mark>0.2</mark> | |
| | | Soil Index | 4 | | Q 1 year (l/ | s) <mark>0.1</mark> | |
| SPR | | | | | Q 30 year (I/ | s) <mark>0.3</mark> | |
| Region | | | | C | 2 100 year (l/ | s) 0.4 | |
| | Growth Fac | tor 1 year | 0.85 | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

Pre-development Discharge Volume

| | Site Makeup | Greenfield | Return Period (years) | 100 |
|----|----------------------------|------------|---------------------------------|-------|
| | Greenfield Method | FSR/FEH | Climate Change (%) | 40 |
| Po | sitively Drained Area (ha) | 0.034 | Storm Duration (mins) | 360 |
| | Soil Index | 4 | Betterment (%) | 0 |
| | SPR | 0.47 | PR | 0.469 |
| | CWI | 97.778 | Runoff Volume (m ³) | 14 |
| | | | | |



| Results for 1 | year Critical Storm | Duration. | Lowest m | ass balance: | 100.00% |
|---------------|---------------------|-----------|----------|--------------|---------|
| | | | | | |

| Node Event | N | US I ode (i | Peak mins) | Level (m) | De (I | pth lı n) | nflow (I/s) | Node Vol (m³) | Flood (m³) | Status |
|------------------|-------|----------------|---------------|--------------|----------|--------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|-----------|
| 15 minute summe | er 1 | | 9 | 120.07 | 90. | 078 | 5.6 | 0.0605 | 0.0000 | ОК |
| 15 minute summe | er 2 | | 9 | 119.78 | 80. | 038 | 5.6 | 0.0289 | 0.0000 | ОК |
| 15 minute summe | er Se | wer | 9 | 118.78 | 7 0. | 037 | 5.6 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | ОК |
| Link Event | US | Link | D | S Ou | tflow | Veloci | ity F | low/Cap | Link | Discharge |
| (Upstream Depth) | Node | | NO | de (| l/s) | (m/s | 5) | | Vol (m³) | Vol (m³) |
| 15 minute summer | 1 | 1.000 |) 2 | | 5.6 | 1.1 | 85 | 0.826 | 0.0928 | |
| 15 minute summer | 2 | 1.001 | L Sev | ver | 5.6 | 2.0 | 96 | 0.288 | 0.0266 | 1.7 |



| Page 4 |
|----------------|
| 9 The Mount |
| Hampstead |
| Existing flows |

Results for 30 year Critical Storm Duration. Lowest mass balance: 100.00%

| Node Event | US Node | Peak (mins) | Level (m) | | Depth (m) | Inflow (I/s) | Node Vol (m³) | Flood (m³) | Status |
|------------------|------------|----------------|--------------|----|--------------|-----------------|------------------|---------------|--------------------------------------|
| 15 minute summer | 1 | 10 | 120.53 | 4 | 0.534 | 13.8 | 0.4118 | 0.0000 | SURCHARGED |
| 15 minute summer | 2 | 10 | 119.80 |)3 | 0.053 | 10.0 | 0.0405 | 0.0000 | ОК |
| 15 minute summer | Sewer | 10 | 118.80 |)1 | 0.051 | 10.0 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | ОК |
| Link Event | US | Link | DS | Ou | tflow | Velocity | Flow/Cap | Link | Discharge |
| (Upstream Depth) | Node | | Node | (| l/s) | (m/s) | | Vol (m | ³) Vol (m ³) |
| 15 minute summer | 1 | 1.000 | 2 | | 10.0 | 1.461 | 1.474 | 0.120 |)1 |
| 15 minute summer | 2 | 1.001 | Sewer | | 10.0 | 2.434 | 0.519 | 0.041 | L1 4.3 |



| Results for 100 | ear Critical Storm Dur | ation. Lowest mass balance: | 100.00% |
|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|---------|
| | | | |

| Node Event | US Node | Peak (mins) | Levo) (m | el) | Depth (m) | Inflow (I/s) | Node Vol (m³) | Flood (m³) | Status |
|------------------|------------|----------------|--------------|---------|--------------|-----------------|------------------|---------------|------------|
| 15 minute summer | 1 | 10 |) 120.8 | 359 | 0.859 | 17.9 | 0.6623 | 0.0000 | FLOOD RISK |
| 15 minute summer | 2 | 10 |) 119.8 | 310 | 0.060 | 12.2 | 0.0460 | 0.0000 | ОК |
| 15 minute summer | Sewer | 10 |) 118.8 | 808 | 0.058 | 12.2 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | ОК |
| Link Event | US | Link | DS | Ou | tflow | Velocity | Flow/Cap | Link | Discharge |
| (Upstream Depth) | Node | | Node | (| l/s) | (m/s) | | Vol (m³) | Vol (m³) |
| 15 minute summer | 1 | 1.000 | 2 | | 12.2 | 1.719 | 1.802 | 0.1272 | |
| 15 minute summer | 2 | 1.001 | Sewer | | 12.2 | 2.545 | 0.632 | 0.0480 | 5.5 |



Results for 100 year +20% CC Critical Storm Duration. Lowest mass balance: 100.00%

| Node Event | U: No | 6 Pe de (m | eak ins) | Level (m) | De (r | pth n) | Inflov (I/s) | v Node Vol (m³) | Flood (m³) | Status |
|------------------|------------|---------------|-------------|--------------|-----------------|-----------|-----------------|--------------------|---------------|------------|
| 15 minute summe | er 1 | | 9 | 121.00 | 0 1. | 000 | 21.4 | 4 0.7710 | 0.5075 | FLOOD |
| 15 minute winter | 2 | | 10 | 119.81 | .3 0. | 063 | 13.0 | 0.0481 | 0.0000 | ОК |
| 15 minute summe | er Sew | ver | 10 | 118.81 | .1 0. | 060 | 13.0 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | ОК |
| Link Event | US Node | Link | DS Nor | S Ou | utflow (I/s) | Velo | ocity | Flow/Cap | Link | Discharge |
| | 1 NOUE | 1 000 | 2 | ue | (1/3) | 1) | 010 | 1 0 2 0 | 0 1 200 | voi (iii) |
| 15 minute summer | T | 1.000 | 2 | | 13.0 | T | .810 | 1.930 | 0.1299 | |
| 15 minute winter | 2 | 1.001 | Sew | /er | 13.0 | 2 | .581 | 0.676 | 0.0506 | 7.1 |



Results for 100 year +40% CC Critical Storm Duration. Lowest mass balance: 100.00%

| Node Event | U: No | S Po de (m | eak ins) | Leve (m) | l De (r | pth n) | Inflov (I/s) | v Node Vol (m³) | Flood (m³) | Status |
|------------------|----------|---------------|-------------|-------------|------------|-----------|-----------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------|
| 15 minute winter | 1 | | 9 | 121.00 | 00 1. | 000 | 22.3 | 3 0.7710 | 0.8260 | FLOOD |
| 15 minute summe | er 2 | | 10 | 119.8 | 13 0. | 063 | 13.0 | 0.0481 | 0.0000 | ОК |
| 15 minute summe | er Sew | /er | 10 | 118.8 | 11 0. | 060 | 13.0 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | ОК |
| Link Event | US | Link | D | s o | utflow | Vel | ocity | Flow/Cap | Link | Discharge |
| (Upstream Depth) | Node | | No | de | (I/s) | (n | 1/S) | | Vol (m³) | Vol (m³) |
| 15 minute winter | 1 | 1.000 | 2 | | 13.0 | 1 | 816 | 1.930 | 0.1299 | |
| 15 minute summer | 2 | 1.001 | Sew | ver | 13.0 | 2 | .581 | 0.676 | 0.0506 | 6.9 |

| | Hull Raiser Ltd | File: Greenfield.pfd | Page 1 |
|-------------|-----------------|------------------------|-------------|
| rainage | Dagmar House | Network: Storm Network | 9 The Mount |
| Highways | Mill Hill Road | Jon Burgess | Hampstead |
| \setminus | Cowes, PO31 7EJ | 03/09/2022 | Attenuation |
| | | | |

Design Settings

| Rainfall Methodology | FSR | Maximum Time of Concentration (mins) | 30.00 |
|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------|
| Return Period (years) | 1 | Maximum Rainfall (mm/hr) | 50.0 |
| Additional Flow (%) | 0 | Minimum Velocity (m/s) | 1.00 |
| FSR Region | England and Wales | Connection Type | Level Soffits |
| M5-60 (mm) | 20.000 | Minimum Backdrop Height (m) | 0.200 |
| Ratio-R | 0.400 | Preferred Cover Depth (m) | 1.200 |
| CV | 0.750 | Include Intermediate Ground | \checkmark |
| Time of Entry (mins) | 2.00 | Enforce best practice design rules | \checkmark |

Circular Link Type

| Shape | Circular | Auto Increment (mm) | 75 |
|---------|----------|---------------------|----|
| Barrels | 1 | Follow Ground | х |

Available Diameters (mm) 100 150

<u>Nodes</u>

| Name | Area (ha) | T of E (mins) | Cover Level (m) | Diameter (mm) | Width (mm) | Easting (m) | Northing (m) | Depth (m) |
|-------|--------------|------------------|-----------------------|------------------|---------------|----------------|-----------------|--------------|
| 1 | 0.030 | 2.00 | 121.000 | 1200 | 640 | 95.397 | 82.375 | 1.000 |
| 2 | | | 121.000 | 1200 | 640 | 38.470 | 63.713 | 1.250 |
| Sewer | | | 120.000 | | | -10.729 | 46.560 | 1.250 |

<u>Links</u>

| Name | US Node | DS Node | Length (m) | ks (mm) / n | US IL (m) | DS IL (m) | Fall (m) | Slope (1:X) | Dia (mm) | T of C (mins) | Rain (mm/hr) |
|-------|------------|------------|---------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|------------------|-----------------|
| 1.000 | 1 | 2 | 20.000 | 0.600 | 120.000 | 119.750 | 0.250 | 80.0 | 150 | 3.00 | 50.0 |
| 1.001 | 2 | Sewer | 10.000 | 0.600 | 119.750 | 118.750 | 1.000 | 10.0 | 100 | 3.87 | 50.0 |

| Name | Vel | Сар | Flow | US | DS | Σ Area | Σ Add | Pro | Pro |
|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|-------|----------|
| | (m/s) | (I/s) | (I/s) | Depth | Depth | (ha) | Inflow | Depth | Velocity |
| | | | | (m) | (m) | | (I/s) | (mm) | (m/s) |
| 1.000 | 1.125 | 19.9 | 4.1 | 0.850 | 1.100 | 0.030 | 0.0 | 46 | 0.886 |
| 1.001 | 2.458 | 19.3 | 4.1 | 1.150 | 1.150 | 0.030 | 0.0 | 31 | 1.939 |

Simulation Settings

| Rainfall Methodology | ESR | Drain Down Time (mins) | 240 | | | | | |
|----------------------|-------------------|--|--------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| FSR Region | England and Wales | Additional Storage (m ³ /ha) | 0.1 | | | | | |
| M5-60 (mm) | 20.000 | Check Discharge Rate(s) | \checkmark | | | | | |
| Ratio-R | 0.400 | 1 year (l/s) | 0.1 | | | | | |
| Summer CV | 0.750 | 30 year (l/s) | 0.3 | | | | | |
| Winter CV | 0.840 | 100 year (l/s) | 0.4 | | | | | |
| Analysis Speed | Normal | Check Discharge Volume | \checkmark | | | | | |
| Skip Steady State | х | 100 year +40% 360 minute (m ³) | 14 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Storm Durations | | | | | | | | |
| 15 30 60 120 | 180 240 36 | 0 480 600 720 90 | 50 1440 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

| | Hull Raiser Ltd | File: Greenfield. | ofd | Page 2 | | | | |
|----------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Drainage | Dagmar House | Network: Storm | Network | 9 The Mount | | | | |
| | Mill Hill Road | Jon Burgess | | Hampstead | | | | |
| nguways | Cowes, PO31 7EJ | 03/09/2022 | | Attenuation | | | | |
| | | ,, | | | | | | |
| | Return Period Cli | mate Change Add | itional Area Additio | onal Flow | | | | |
| | (years) | (CC %) | (A %) (C | 2 %) | | | | |
| | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| | 100 | 20 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| | 100 | 40 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | <u>P</u> | re-development Dis | <u>scharge Rate</u> | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | Site Ma | keup Greenfield | Growth Factor 30 |) year 1.95 | | | | |
| | Greenfield Me | thod IH124 | Growth Factor 100 |) year 2.48 | | | | |
| | Positively Drained Area | (ha) 0.034 | Bettermer | nt (%) 0 | | | | |
| | SAAR (| mm) 650 | | QBar 0.2 | | | | |
| | Soil I | ndex 4 | Q 1 yea | r (l/s) 0.1 | | | | |
| | | SPR 0.47 | Q 30 yea | r (l/s) 0.3 | | | | |
| | Re | egion 6 | Q 100 yea | r (l/s) 0.4 | | | | |
| | Growth Factor 1 | year 0.85 | | | | | | |
| | D** | development Dise | harra Valuma | | | | | |
| | <u>P10</u> | e-development Disc | narge volume | | | | | |
| | Site Ma | keun Greenfield | Return Period (ve | aars) 100 | | | | |
| | Greenfield Me | thod FSR/FFH | Climate Change | (%) 40 | | | | |
| | Positively Drained Area | (ha) 0.034 | Storm Duration (m | nins) 360 | | | | |
| | Soil I | ndex 4 | Betterment | · (%) 0 | | | | |
| | | SPR 0.47 | Betterment | PR 0.469 | | | | |
| | | CWI 97.778 | Runoff Volume | (m^3) 14 | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | <u>N</u> | ode 2 Online <mark>Hydro</mark> | <mark>slide</mark> Control | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | Flap Valve x | Design Depth | n (m) 1.000 | Diameter (m) 0.100 | | | | |
| | Replaces Downstream Link \checkmark | Design Flow | (I/s) 5.0 | Max Head (m) 1.350 | | | | |
| | Invert Level (m) 119.75 | 0 M | odel <mark>CILIVS</mark> Mi | in Node Dia (mm) 1200 | | | | |
| | No | la 2 Danth /Araa Sta | rage Structure | | | | | |
| | <u>1101</u> | <u>le 2 Deptil/Alea Sto</u> | <u>nage Structure</u> | | | | | |
| | Base Inf Coefficient (m/hr) 0.00000 |) Safety Factor | 2.0 | Invert Level (m) 119.750 | | | | |
| | Side Inf Coefficient (m/hr) 0.00000 |) Porosity | 0.95 Time to ha | If empty (mins) 14 | | | | |
| | | , | I | | | | | |
| | Depth Area Inf Area | Depth Area | Inf Area Depth | Area Inf Area | | | | |
| | (m) (<mark>m²)</mark> (m²) | (m) (m²) | (m²) (m) | (m²) (m²) | | | | |
| | 0.000 4.0 0.0 | 0.800 4.0 | 0.0 0.801 | 0.0 0.0 | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

₽


| Results for 1 | year Critical | Storm Duration. | Lowest mass | balance: 98.03% |
|---------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------------|
| | | | | |

| Node Even | t | US Node | Peak (mins) | Lev (m | el) | Depth (m) | Inflow (I/s) | Node Vol (m³) | Flood (m³) | Status |
|------------------|------|------------|----------------|-----------|---------|--------------|-----------------|------------------|---------------|-----------|
| 15 minute sum | nmer | 1 | 8 | 120.0 |)55 | 0.055 | 5.6 | 0.0421 | 0.0000 | ОК |
| 15 minute sum | nmer | 2 | 10 | 119.8 | 336 | 0.086 | 5.6 | 0.3945 | 0.0000 | ОК |
| 15 minute sum | nmer | Sewer | 1 | 118.7 | 750 | 0.000 | 4.1 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | ОК |
| Link Event | US | Lir | ık | DS | Ou | tflow | Velocity | Flow/Cap | Link | Discharge |
| (Upstream Depth) | Node | | | Node | (| l/s) | (m/s) | | Vol (m³) | Vol (m³) |
| 15 minute summer | 1 | 1.000 | | 2 | | 5.6 | 0.921 | 0.282 | 0.1490 | |
| 15 minute summer | 2 | Hydro | slide | Sewer | | 4.1 | | | | 1.7 |



| Results for 30 | year Critical St | torm Duration. | Lowest mass | balance: 98.03% |
|----------------|------------------|----------------|-------------|-----------------|
| | | | | |

| Node Event | US Node | Peak e (mins) | Level (m) | Depth (m) | Inflow (I/s) | Node Vol (m³) | Flood (m³) | S | itatus |
|------------------|------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|------|-----------|
| 15 minute winter | 1 | 11 | 120.114 | 0.114 | 12.3 | 0.0877 | 0.0000 | ОК | |
| 15 minute winter | 2 | 12 | 120.100 | 0.350 | 11.9 | 1.5997 | 0.0000 | SUR | CHARGED |
| 15 minute summer | Sewe | er 1 | 118.750 | 0.000 | 5.0 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | ОК | |
| Link Event | US | Link | DS | Outflow | Velocity | / Flow/C | Cap Li | nk | Discharge |
| (Upstream Depth) | Node | | Node | (I/s) | (m/s) | | Vol | (m³) | Vol (m³) |
| 15 minute winter | 1 | 1.000 | 2 | 11.9 | 0.996 | 5 0.5 | 698 0. 3 | 3193 | |
| 15 minute winter | 2 | Hydroslide | Sewer | 5.0 | | | | | 4.8 |



2

15 minute winter

0.0000

SURCHARGED

| Results for 100 year Critical Storm Duration. Lowest mass balance: 98.03% | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------|------------------|---------------|------------|
| Node Event | US Node | Peak (mins) | Level (m) | Depth (m) | Inflow (I/s) | Node Vol (m³) | Flood (m³) | Status |
| 15 minute winter | 1 | 11 | 120.316 | 0.316 | 15.9 | 0.2439 | 0.0000 | SURCHARGED |

0.545

14.1

2.4882

12 120.295

| 15 minute summe | r Sew | er 1 | 118.750 | 0.000 | 5.0 | 0.0000 0 | .0000 OK | |
|--------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------------|-------------------|----------|------------------|-----------------------|
| Link Event (Upstream Depth) | US Node | Link | DS Node | Outflow (I/s) | Velocity (m/s) | Flow/Cap | Link Vol (m³) | Discharge Vol (m³) |
| 15 minute winter | 1 | 1.000 | 2 | 14.1 | 1.021 | 0.709 | 0.3521 | |
| 15 minute winter | 2 | Hydroslide | Sewer | 5.0 | | | | 6.3 |

Flow+ v10.4 Copyright © 1988-2022 Causeway Technologies Ltd

| | Hull Raiser Ltd | File: Greenfield.pfd | Page 6 |
|-------------|-----------------|------------------------|-------------|
| Drainage | Dagmar House | Network: Storm Network | 9 The Mount |
| nt Highways | Mill Hill Road | Jon Burgess | Hampstead |
| \sum | Cowes, PO31 7EJ | 03/09/2022 | Attenuation |
| | | | |

Developme

| Node Event | US Nod | Peak e (mins) | Level (m) | Depth (m) | Inflow (I/s) | Node Vol (m³) | Flood (m³) | Status | |
|------------------|-----------|------------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------|------------------|---------------|--------------------------|-----|
| 15 minute winter | 1 | 11 | 120.498 | 0.498 | 19.1 | 0.3837 | 0.0000 | SURCHARGED |) |
| 15 minute winter | 2 | 13 | 120.476 | 0.726 | 16.6 | 3.3163 | 0.0000 | SURCHARGED |) |
| 15 minute summer | Sewe | er 1 | 118.750 | 0.000 | 5.0 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | ОК | |
| Link Event | US | Link | DS | Outflow | Velocity | / Flow/C | Cap Lii | nk Dischar | ge |
| (Upstream Depth) | Node | | Node | (I/s) | (m/s) | | Vol | (m³) Vol (m ^³ | ³) |
| 15 minute winter | 1 | 1.000 | 2 | 16.6 | 1.092 | 2 0.8 | 33 0.3 | 3521 | |
| 15 minute winter | 2 | Hydroslide | Sewer | 5.0 | | | | 7 | '.5 |



| Results for 100 | year +40% C | C Critical Stor | m Duration. | Lowest mass | balance: 98.03% |
|-----------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|
| | | | | | |

| Node Event | U No | S Peak de (mins) | Level (m) | Depth (m) | Inflow (I/s) | Node Vol (m³) | Flood (m³) | Status |
|------------------|---------|---------------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------|------------------|---------------|--------------|
| 15 minute winter | · 1 | 13 | 120.901 | 0.901 | 22.2 | 0.6949 | 0.0000 | FLOOD RISK |
| 15 minute winter | 2 | 13 | 120.885 | 1.135 | 19.2 | 3.9134 | 0.0000 | FLOOD RISK |
| 15 minute summ | er Sev | ver 1 | 118.750 | 0.000 | 5.0 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | ОК |
| Link Event | US | Link | DS | Outflow | Velocity | Flow/Ca | ap Lin | k Discharge |
| (Upstream Depth) | Node | | Node | (I/s) | (m/s) | | Vol (| m³) Vol (m³) |
| 15 minute winter | 1 | 1.000 | 2 | 19.2 | 1.139 | 0.9 | 64 0.3 | 521 |
| 15 minute winter | 2 | Hydroslide | Sewer | 5.0 | | | | 8.8 |

EXISTING DRAINAGE LAYOUT **APPENDIX E**



APPENDIX F ENVIRONMENT AGENCY FLOOD MAP



© Environment Agency copyright and / or database rights 2021. All rights reserved. © Crown Copyright and database right 2021. Ordnance Survey licence number 100024198.

BRITISH GEOLOGICAL SURVEY APPENDIX G SOIL MAP



Most of the Bagshot Formation is composed of pale yellow-brown to pale grey or white, locally orange or crimson, fine- to coarse-grained sand that is frequently micaceous and locally clayey, with sparse glauconite and sparse seams of gravel. The sands are commonly cross-bedded but some are laminated.



Ground Water Vulnerability Map (High)



Site is not within a SPZ

(Source Protection Zone)

POSSIBLE DRAINAGE LAYOUT **APPENDIX H**



All dimensions in millimetres. Where dimensions are not given, drawings must not be scaled and the matter referred back to Charlton Brown Architects.

All dimensions and conditions are to be checked on site by the contractor prior to preparing drawings or commencing any work. The contractor is responsible for checking that there is no conflict between site dimensions and drawn dimensions.

In the event of any detail or dimensional conflict between Charlton Brown Architects drawings, the matter must be referred back to Charlton Brown Architects for clarification



Rev Date

Details

By

Charlton Brown Architecture & Interiors

The Belvedere, 2 Back Lane, Hampstead, London, NW3 1HL Telephone +44(0)20 7794 1234 Email office@charltonbrown office@charltonbrown.com www.charltonbrown.com Website

| Client Alex and Emma Barr | nett | |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------|
| Project 9 The Mount | | |
| Drawing Title Existing Roof Pla | ın | |
| Date | Drawn | Checked |
| 22/03/2022 | JLB | LS |
| Scale 1:50 @ A1 | | |
| Issue Status NOT FOR PL | ANNING | |
| Project Number 21041 | Drawing Number EX-00-104 | Revision |

STORAGE VOLUME ESTIMATE HR WALINGFORD **APPENDIX I**

Print





| Calculated by: | jon burgess |
|----------------|-------------|
| Site name: | 9 The Mount |
| Site location: | Hampstead |

This is an estimation of the storage volume requirements that are needed to meet normal best practice criteria in line with Environment Agency guidance "Rainfall runoff management for developments", SC030219 (2013), the SuDS Manual C753 (Ciria, 2015) and the non-statutory standards for SuDS (Defra, 2015). It is not to be used for detailed design of drainage systems. It is recommended that hydraulic modelling software is used to calculate volume requirements and design details before finalising the design of the drainage scheme.

Sι requirements for sites

www.uksuds.com | Storage estimation tool

Site Details

Growth curve factor 1 year:

Growth curve factor 10 year:

Growth curve factor 30 year:

Growth curve factor 100

Q_{BAR} for total site area (I/s):

Q_{BAR} for net site area (I/s):

years:

| Latitude: | 51.55863° N |
|------------|-------------------|
| Longitude: | 0.17904° W |
| Reference: | 41566421 |
| Date: | Aug 13 2022 13:42 |

| Site characteristics | | Methodology | | | | |
|--|----------------|------------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|----------|-----|
| Total site area (ha): | 0.034 | esti IH124 | | | | |
| Significant public open space (ha): | 0 | Q _{BAR} estimation method | Calcula | Calculate from SPR and SAAR | | AAR |
| Area positively drained (ha): | 0.034 | SPR estimation method: | PR estimation method: Calculate from SOIL type | | OIL type | |
| Impermeable area (ha): | 0.017 | Soil characteristics | Default | E | Edited | |
| Percentage of drained area that is impermeable (%): | 50 | SOIL type: | 4 | 4 | | |
| Impervious area drained via infiltration (ha): | 0 | SPR: | 0.47 | 0.4 | 7 | |
| Return period for infiltration system design (year): | 100 | Hydrological Default | | Ed | ited | |
| Impervious area drained to rainwater harvesting (ha): | 0 | characteristics | | | 1 | |
| Return period for rainwater harvesting system (year): | 10 | Rainfall 100 yrs 6 hrs: | | | 63 | |
| Compliance factor for rainwater harvesting system (%): | 66 | Rainfall 100 yrs 12 hrs: | | | 101.6 | 64 |
| Net site area for storage volume design (ha): | 0.03 | FEH / FSR conversion fa | ctor: 1.0 | 32 | 1.32 | |
| Net impermable area for storage volume design (ha): | 0.02 | SAAR (mm): | 65 | 0 | 650 | |
| Pervious area contribution to runoff (%): | 30 | M5-60 Rainfall Depth (mi | m): 20 |) | 20 | |
| * where rainwater harvesting or infiltration has been used | t for managing | 'r' Ratio M5-60/M5-2 da | y: 0.4 | 4 | 0.4 | |
| surface water runoff such that the effective impermeable | area is less | Hydological region: | 6 | | 6 | |

surface water runoff such that the effective impermeable area is less than 50% of the 'area positively drained', the 'net site area' and the estimates of $\mathsf{Q}_{\mathsf{BAR}}$ and other flow rates will have been reduced accordingly.

2

Design criteria

| Climate change allowance factor: | 1.4 |
|--------------------------------------|---------------|
| Urban creep allowance factor: | 1.1 |
| Volume control approach | Use long term |
| Interception rainfall depth (mm): | 5 |

| Use long terr | n storage |
|---------------|-----------|
| 5 | |
| | - |
| 5 | |

Minimum flow rate (l/s):

| urface water | storage |
|--------------|-----------|
| equirements | for sites |

6 6 0.85 0.85 1.62 1.62 2.3 2.3 3.19 3.19

| 0.15 | 0.15 |
|------|------|
| 0.15 | 0.15 |

| Site discharge rates | Default | Edited | Estimated storage volumes | Default | Edited |
|----------------------|---------|--------|--|---------|--------|
| 1 in 1 year (l/s): | 2 | 2 | Attenuation storage 1/100 years (m ³): | 4 | 4 |
| 1 in 30 years (l/s): | 2 | 2 | Long term storage 1/100 years (m ³): | 0 | 0 |
| 1 in 100 year (l/s): | 2 | 2 | Total storage 1/100 years (m ³): | 4 | 4 |

This report was produced using the storage estimation tool developed by HRWallingford and available at www.uksuds.com. The use of this tool is subject to the UK SuDS terms and conditions and licence agreement, which can both be found at http://uksuds.com/termsand-conditions.htm. The outputs from this tool have been used to estimate storage volume requirements. The use of these results is the responsibility of the users of this tool. No liability will be accepted by HR Wallingford, the Environment Agency, CEH, Hydrosolutions or any other organisation for the use of these data in the design or operational characteristics of any drainage scheme.

APPENDIX J LONDON SUSTAINABLE DRAINAGE **PRO FORMA**





| | Project / Site Name (including sub- catchment / stage / phase where appropriate) | |
|----------------------|---|---|
| | Address & post code | 9 The Mount, Hampstead |
| | OS Crid rof (Facting Northing) | E 0.17904 W |
| | OS GHUTEL (Easting, Northing) | N 55.55863 |
| tails | LPA reference (if applicable) | |
| 1. Project & Site D€ | Brief description of proposed work | Extension of existing basement and internal changes |
| | Total site Area | 340 m ² |
| | Total existing impervious area | 40 m ² |
| | Total proposed impervious area | 40 m ² |
| | Is the site in a surface water flood risk catchment (ref. local Surface Water Management Plan)? | no |
| | Existing drainage connection type and location | to combined sewer |
| | Designer Name | Jon Burgess |
| | Designer Position | Principal Infrastructure Engineer |

| | 2a. Infiltration Feasibility | | | | | | |
|----------|--|-------------|-------------------|-------------------|--|--|--|
| | Superficial geology classification | | None | | | | |
| | Bedrock geology classification | | Bagshot Sands | | | | |
| | Site infiltration rate | 0 | m/s | | | | |
| | Depth to groundwater level | unkown | m belo | w ground level | | | |
| | Is infiltration feasible? | | No | | | | |
| | 2b. Drainage Hierarchy | | | | | | |
| ements | | | Feasible (Y/N) | Proposed (Y/N) | | | |
| ange | 1 store rainwater for later use | У | Ν | | | | |
| arge Arr | 2 use infiltration techniques, such a surfaces in non-clay areas | Ν | N | | | | |
| d Disch | 3 attenuate rainwater in ponds or o features for gradual release | Y | Y | | | | |
| Propose | 4 attenuate rainwater by storing in sealed water features for gradual re | Y | Y | | | | |
| 2. | 5 discharge rainwater direct to a w | atercourse | Ν | Ν | | | |
| | 6 discharge rainwater to a surface sewer/drain | Ν | N | | | | |
| | 7 discharge rainwater to the comb | ined sewer. | Y | Y | | | |
| | 2c. Proposed Discharge Details | | | | | | |
| | Proposed discharge location | | Existing | | | | |
| | Has the owner/regulator of the discharge location been | no | | | | | |



GREATER **LONDON** AUTHORITY



| | Designer Company | Constructure Ltd | | consulted? | |
|---|------------------|------------------|--|------------|--|
| 4 | | | | | |



GREATER **LONDON** AUTHORITY



| 3a. Discharge Rates & Required Storage | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| | | Greenfield (GF) runoff rate (I/s) | Existing discharge rate (I/s) | Required storage for GF rate (m ³) | Proposed discharge rate (I/s) | | |
| | Qbar | 0.2 | \ge | \ge | \geq | | |
| | 1 in 1 | 0.1 | 5.6 | 3 | 5 | | |
| | 1 in 30 | 0.3 | 10 | 3 | 5 | | |
| | 1 in 100 | 0.4 | 12.2 | 3 | 5 | | |
| | 1 in 100 + CC | \geq | \geq | 3 | 5 | | |
| | Climate change a | llowance used | 40% | | | | |
| Strategy | 3b. Principal Method of Flow Control | | Hydroslide | | | | |
| e St | 3c. Proposed SuD | S Measures | | | | | |
| inag | | | Catchment | Plan area | Storage | | |
| Dra | | | area (m²) | (m²) | vol. (m ³) | | |
| з. | Rainwater harves | ting | 0 | \geq | 0 | | |
| | Infiltration system | าร | 0 | \geq | 0 | | |
| | Green roofs | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| | Blue roofs | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| | Filter strips | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| | Filter drains | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| | Bioretention / tre | e pits | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | | |
| | Pervious paveme | nts | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| | Swales | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| | Basins/ponds | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| | Attenuation tanks | 5 | 0 | \geq | 2.5 | | |
| | Total | | 0 | 0 | 3 | | |

| | 4a. Discharge & Drainage Strategy | Page/section of drainage report |
|----------|---|---|
| | Infiltration feasibility (2a) – geotechnical factual and interpretive reports, including infiltration results | No due to within 5.0m of structure failing Building Regulation requirements |
| | Drainage hierarchy (2b) | water garden to reduce size of atte |
| u | Proposed discharge details (2c) – utility plans, correspondence / approval from owner/regulator of discharge location | existing connection |
| ormatic | Discharge rates & storage (3a) – detailed hydrologic and hydraulic calculations | Appendix D |
| ting Inf | Proposed SuDS measures & specifications (3b) | Appendix D |
| Iodo | 4b. Other Supporting Details | Page/section of drainage report |
| Sup. | Detailed Development Layout | Appendix H |
| 4 | Detailed drainage design drawings, including exceedance flow routes | Strategy to be designed |
| | Detailed landscaping plans | None available |
| | Maintenance strategy | in report |
| | Demonstration of how the proposed SuDS measures improve: | |
| | a) water quality of the runoff? | All roof water so clean |
| | b) biodiversity? | rainwater garden |
| | c) amenity? | Attenuation |

APPENDIX K BOREHOLE LOGS

| | | Contr | act Name: | | | | | Client: | | | Hole ID: | | |
|--------------|------------|-----------------------|--------------|--------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|---------------------------|
| | | | he Mount | t, Hamp r: | ostead, L | ONDON, N | W3 6SZ | | Checked By: | Status: | Hole Tyr | BH1 | |
| | | | 20353 | 1. | 25/08/22 | 2 - 26/08/22 | Logged Dy | W | Checked by. | PRFLIM | | BH | |
| | | Eastir | | | Northina: | 20/00/22 | Ground Lev | /el: | Plant Used: | Print Date: | Scale: | BII | |
| LIM | 11 | F E D | 5 | | 5 | | | | Cutdown | 23/09/2022 | | 1:50 | |
| Weather: Fir | ne | I | | Terr | nination: | | | | SPT Hammer: N/R, | Energy Ratio: N/R | | Sheet | 1 of 2 |
| San | nples & In | Situ Testing | | | 1 | | | Strata Detail | ls | | | Grour | ndwater |
| Depth | Туре | Results | (mAOD) (| Depth (m) (Thickness) | Legend | <u> </u> | | | Strata Description | | | Water Strike | Backfill/ Installation |
| 0.20 | D | | | (0.40) | | clinker gravel. | Frequent root | lets. MADE C | GROUND | led to angular film brick and | | | |
| 0.50 | D | | | 0.40 | | Soft brown sa | ndy CLAY. Oc | casional fine | to medium subrounded toar | ngular flint and brick fragme | ents. | | |
| 0.50 - 1.00 | В | | | | | Presence of a | sh. MADE GR | OUND | | | | | |
| 1.00 | D | | | | | | | | | | - 1 | | •. • |
| | | | | | | | | | | | - | | |
| 1.50 | SPT | N=17 (2,2/3,4,5,5) | | (2.10) | | | | | | | - | | |
| 1.50 - 2.00 | D B | | | | | | | | | | - | | |
| 2.00 | D | | | | | | | | | | - 2 | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.50 | SPT | N=12 (2,2/2,3,3,4) | | 2.50 | | Yellowish brow | yn slighty gray | velly fine to c | Darse SAND, Gravel is fine | to medium subrounded to | | | |
| 2.50 - 3.00 | D B | | | (0.50) | | subangular flir | nt. | | | | - | | |
| 3.00 | D | | | 3.00 | | Fine Brownish | vellow SAND | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | The brownish | | | | | - | | |
| 3.50 | SPT | N=14 (2,2/3,4,4,3) | | | | | | | | | - | | |
| | D | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.00 | D | | | | | | | | | | - 4 | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | - | | |
| 4.50 | SPT | N=14 (2,4/3,4,3,4) | | | | | | | | | - | | |
| | D | | | | | | | | | | - | | |
| 5.00 | D | | | | | | | | | | - 5 | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | - | | |
| 5.50 | D | | | (5.00) | | | | | | | - | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | - | | |
| 6.00 | SPT | N=16 (2,3/4,3,4,5) | | | | | | | | | - 6 | | |
| | D | | | | | | | | | | - | | |
| 6.50 | D | | | | | | | | | | - | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | - | | |
| 7.00 | D | | | | | | | | | | - 7 | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | - | | |
| 7.50 | SPT | N=20 (3,4/3,5,6,6) | | | | | | | | | - | | |
| | U | | | | | | | | | | ŀ | | |
| 8.00 | D | | | 8.00 | | Soft brownish | yellow sandy | CLAY | | | 8 | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | - | | |
| 8.50 | D | | | | | | | | | | - | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | ŀ | | |
| 9.00 | SPT | N=20 (3,3/4,5,5,6) | | (4.00) | | | | | | | - 9 | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | ŀ | | |
| 9.50 | D | | | | | | | | | | Ē | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | - | | |
| 10.00 | D | | | | | | | | | | | D | |
| St | art & End | of Shift Observations | N/otc= (| Boreho | le Diamete | r Casing Di | ameter Re | marks: | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Date | rime | Deput (m) Casing (m | y vvater (m) | Depth (n | וטן (mn (mn | 15.00 | 200 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Chiselling | | | | tallation | C+ | rike (m) | sing (m) Sealed (m) Time | Vater Strikes | arks | | |
| From (m) To | (m) Du | ration Rema | rks | Top (m |) Base (n | n) Type [| Dia (mm) | | | 0 0.00 Watte | er added to | aid drillir | ig. Any |
| | | | | 1.00 | 6.00 | PLAIN | 33 | | | been | masked. | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | Hand v | ane (HV), Hand penetrome | ter (HP) reported in kPa. Pl | D reported | in ppm. | |

| | | | Contra | ct Name: | | | | | Client: | | | Hole ID: | |
|-------------|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| | | | 9 TI | he Mour | nt, Ham | pstead, l | ONDON, N | W3 6SZ | | | Otation | | BH1 |
| | | | Contra | 20353 | er: | 25/08/2 | End Date: 2 - 26/08/22 | Logged By S | W | Checked By: | Status: PRELIM | Hole Typ | BH |
| LIM | | Γ E D | Easting | g: | | Northing: | | Ground Lev | /el: | Plant Used: | Print Date: 23/09/2022 | Scale: | 1.50 |
| Weather: Fi | ne | | | | Terr | mination: | | | | SPT Hammer: N/R, | Energy Ratio: N/R | | Sheet 2 of 2 |
| Sar | nples & In | Situ Testing | | | | | | | Strata Details | s | | | Groundwater |
| Depth | Туре | Result | S | Level (mAOD) | Depth (m) (Thickness) | Legend | | | | Strata Description | | | Water Backfill/ Strike Installation |
| | | | | | | | Soft brownish | yellow sandy | CLAY | | | - | |
| 10.50 | ерт | N-20 (2 4/2 | 5 6 6) | | | | | | | | | - | |
| 10.50 | D | N=20 (3,4/3 | ,5,0,0) | | | | | | | | | | |
| 44.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | - | |
| 11.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | - 11 | |
| | _ | | | | | | | | | | | - | |
| 11.50 | D | | | | | | | | | | | Ē | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | - | |
| 12.00 | SPT D | N=29 (7,7/7 | ,6,8,8) | | 12.00 | | Yellowish oran | ge fine to me | dium SAND | | | 12 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | [| |
| 12.50 | D | | | | | | | | | | | - | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | [| |
| 13.00 | D | | | | | | | | | | | - 13 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13.50 | SPT D | N=30 (4,6/7 | ,8,7,8) | | | | | | | | | - | |
| | | | | | (3.45) | | | | | | | Į. | |
| 14.00 | D | | | | | | | | | | | - 14 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | - | |
| 14.50 | D | | | | | | | | | | | [| |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | - | |
| 15.00 | SPT | N=31 (3,5/6 | ,8,8,9) | | | | | | | | | - 15 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | - | |
| | | | | | 15.45 | <u>990,099</u> | | | End | of Borehole at 15.45m | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | [| |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | - 16 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | Į | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | - | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | Ē | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | - 17 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | - | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | - | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | - | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | - 10 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | ŀ | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | F | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | - 19 [| |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | - | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | - | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | [| |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | - 20 | |
| S Date | tart & End Time | of Shift Obser | vations sing (m) | Water (m | Boreho | n) Dia (mr | m) Depth (m) | ameter Re Dia (mm) | marks: | | | | |
| Date | | | y (11) | | , <u> </u> | | 15.00 | 200 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Object" | | | | | -4-11-4 | | riko (m) | | Vater Strikes | | |
| From (m) To | o (m) Du | cniselling ration | Remar | ks | Top (m | Ins) Base (r | stallation n) Type [| Dia (mm) | inke (m) Cas | sing (m) Sealed (m) Time | 0 0.00 Watte | ar added to a | aid drilling. Any |
| | | | | _ | 0.00 1.00 | 1.00 6.00 | PLAIN PLAIN | 33 33 | | | water been | strike are li masked. | kely to have |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | Hand va | ane (HV), Hand penetrome | ter (HP) reported in kPa. Pl | D reported i | n ppm. |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | Contra | ct Name: | • | | | | Client: | | | Hole ID: | WCA |
|----------|----------------|-------------------|-----------|-----------|----------------|-------------|---------------|-------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|---------------------|
| | | ĭ1e | 9 II | ne Moun | t, Ham | pstead, | EUNDON, P | NVV3 6SZ | | Chookod Pyr | Status | | WS1 |
| | | | Contra | 20252 | ÷r. | Start and | | Logged | Dy. CIR | Checked by. | | | we. |
| | | | Facting | 20353 | | Jorthing | 100/22 | Cround | GJD | Diant Llood: | PRELIIVI Drint Date: | | W5 |
| LI | ΜI | TED | Easung |]: | | Northing: | | Ground | Levei: | | 13/00/2022 | Scale: | 1.50 |
| | | | | | | | | | | 111003 | 13/09/2022 | | 1.50 |
| vveather | : Complee 9 | In City Testing | | | Ierr | mination: | | | Strata D | ataila | | | Sheet 1 of 1 |
| Denth | Samples o | | lte | Level | Depth (m) | Legend | | | Strata De | Strata Description | | | Water Backfill/ |
| Depui | - Typ | | 11.5 | (mAOD) | (Thickness) | | Dark brown o | clavev fine to | o medium SA | ND with frequent rootlets a | nd occasional fine to medium | flints. | Strike Installation |
| | | | | | 0.25 | | MADE GRO | JND brown clow | y fine to ma | | dium flinte and fine brick froom | | |
| | | | | | () | | MADE GRO | JND | ey line to met | | dium mints and time brick fragin | - | |
| | | | | | (0.65) | | | | | | | - | |
| | | | | | 0.90 | | Light brown (| clavev fine t | o medium sa | ndy fine to medium angular | flint GRAVEL Fine brick trace | | |
| 1 20 | | | | | 1.00 | | | JND | | | | | |
| 1.20 | ES | | | | | | gravel. | e light oran | gisn brown si | ignuy clayey SAND. Rare n | ooliels. Rare line sub-rounded | | |
| 1.50 | D ES | | | | (1.10) | | | | | | | - | |
| | | | | | | | - - | | | | | - | |
| 2.00 | D | | | | 2 10 | | | | | | | -2 | |
| | | | | | 2.10 | | Soft dark ora | nge brown : | sandy becom e sand | ing very CLAY. Rare occas | ional intermittent pockets of lig | jht _ | |
| 2.50 | D | | | | | | 3 , | | | | | - | |
| | | | | | (1.20) | | | | | | | - | |
| 3.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | -3 | |
| 0.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0.50 | | | | | 3.30 | | Fine to coars | e medium c | orangish grey | brown slightly clayey SANI | D. Rare intermittent bands of | | |
| 3.50 | | | | | | | medium orar | ige brown ti | ne to coarse | sand. | | - | |
| | | | | | (1.00) | | | | | | | - | |
| 4.00 | D | | | | | | | | | | | - 4 | |
| | | | | | 4.30 | | Soft medium | orangish gr | ev brown slic | htly sandy CLAY. Rare root | tlets. Rare intermittent bands of | of | |
| 4.50 | D | | | | (0.30) 4.60 | | medium orar | ige brown fi | ne to coarse | sand. | | | |
| | | | | | | | Fine to coars | e light yello | wish grey bro | own SAND. | | - | |
| 5.00 | D | | | | | | | | | | | - 5 | |
| | | | | | (1 40) | | | | | | | - | |
| 5.50 | D | | | | (1.40) | | | | | | | - | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | - | |
| 6.00 | | | | | 6.00 | | | | | | | | |
| 0.00 | | | | | 0.00 | | | | ł | End of Borehole at 6.00m | | 0 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | - | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | - | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | - | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | - 7 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | - | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | - | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | - 8 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | - | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | - | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | - | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | - | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | -9 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | - | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | F | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | F | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | - 1/ | 0 |
| | Start & E | End of Shift Obse | ervations | | Boreho | le Diamete | er Casing D | Diameter | Remarks: | | | I | |
| Date | Tim | e Depth (m) C | asing (m) | Water (m) | Depth (r | n) Dia (m | m) Depth (m) | Dia (mm) | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | Water Strikes | | |
| Eroy (| Te /> | Chiselling | Der | (D | To:: / | | stallation | Die (m.) | Strike (m) | Casing (m) Sealed (m) | Time (mins) Rose to (m) Ren | narks | |
| F10m (m) | ιυ (m) | Duradon | Remark | 15 | iop (m |) base (| п) туре | ויט (mm) | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | - | | | | | in ne~ |
| | | | | | | | | | Har | iu vane (HV), Hand penetro | ometer (HP) reported in kPa. F | reported עוי | ווו ppm. |

| | | | Contra | ct Name: | 4 11 | 4 | | | Client: | | | | | Hole | ID: | | |
|----------|------------|----------------|-------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------|------------------------------|--|--------------|----------|-----------------|---------------------------|
| | | í e | 911 | ne Moun | t, Ham | ostead, L | | NW3 6SZ | . | 0 | | 0 | | | <u>۲</u> | VS2 | |
| | | | Contra | ct Numbe | er: | Start and | End Date: | Logged | By: | Check | ed By: | Statu | s: | Hole | Type | | |
| | | | | 20353 | | 31 | /08/22 | | GJB | | | | PRELIM | | | ws | |
| | 1 1 - | T F D | Easting | g: | | Northing: | | Ground | Level: | Plant U | Jsed: | Print | Date: | Scale | e: | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | HHWS | | 13/09/2022 | | · · · | 1:50 | |
| Weather: | | | | | Terr | nination: | | | | | | | | | | Sheet | 1 of 1 |
| Sar | mples & In | n Situ Testing | | | | 1 1 | | | Strata I | Details | | | | | | Groun | dwater |
| Depth | Туре | Result | s | Level (mAOD) | Depth (m) (Thickness) | Legend | | | | Strata D | escription | | | | | Water Strike | Backfill/ Installation |
| | | | | | | | Dark orange | brown claye/ עואו | ey fine to me | edium SAND v | vith fine to med | lium flints a | nd fine brick fra | gments. | | | |
| | | | | | (0.70) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | - | | |
| | | | | | 0.70 | | Light brown | clayey fine t | o medium s | andy fine to m | edium angular | flint GRAV | EL. Fine brick tra | aces. | | | |
| | | | | | (0.30) 1.00 | | MADE GRO | UND | | | | | | | - 1 | | |
| 1.20 | D | | | | | | Dark orangis Rare fine an | h grey brow gular to sub | n slightly cla -rounded flir | ayey silty SAN nt gravel. Occa | D. Rare rootlet | s. Rare fine ermittent ba | e ash, brick fragi Inds of light orar | ments. | | | |
| | ES | | | | (0.80) | | brown fine to | coarse san | nd. MADE G | ROUND. | | | - | - | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | - | | |
| 1.70 | D ES | | | | 1.80 | | Dark orange | brown sligh | itly clavey sl | ightly silty fine | to coarse SAN | ID Rare fin | e brick ash frac | iments | | | |
| | | | | | | | Rare fine and | gular to sub- | -angular to s | sub-rounded fl | int gravel. MAD | DE GROUN | D | jinents. | -2 | | |
| 2.20 | D | | | | (0.70) | | | | | | | | | | - | | |
| | ES | | | | 2 50 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.60 | D | | | | 2.00 | | Soft dark ora | ingish grey l gular to sub | brown slight -angular flip | ly gravelly san t gravel | dy CLAY. Rare | fine ash fr | agments. Occas | ional fine | | | |
| | ES | | | | 2.10 | | Dark orangis | h grey mottl | led brown cl | layey fine to co | oarse SAND. R | are rootlets | . Rare intermitte | ent bands | | | |
| 3 10 | | | | | (0.50) | | of light orang | je brown fin | e to coarse | sand. | | | | | -3 | | ¥ X |
| 0.10 | ES | | | | 3.20 | | Light yellowi | sh fine to co | arse grey S | AND. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | - | | |
| 3.60 | D | | | | (1 10) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | (1.10) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.10 | D | | | | | | | | | | | | | | -4 | | |
| 4.40 | | | | | 4.30 | | Soft dark vel | lowish arev | brown sand | IV CLAY. | | | | | | | |
| 4.40 | | | | | 4.50 | | Soft light ora | nge grey me | ottled brown | sandy CLAY. | | | | | - | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.90 | D | | | | | | | | | | | | | | - 5 | | |
| | | | | | (1.20) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5.40 | D | | | | | | | | | | | | | | - | | |
| | | | | | 5 70 | | | | | | | | | | - | | |
| | | | | | (0.30) | | Soft light ora | nge grey mo | ottled brown | sandy CLAY. | | | | | - | | |
| 6.00 | D | | | | 6.00 | | | | | End of Borel | hole at 6.00m | | | | -6 | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | - | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | - | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | - 7 | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | . ' | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | - | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | - 8 | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | - | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | - | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | -9 | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | - | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | - | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | - | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | _ 10 | | |
| | | | 16 | | | | | | | | | | | | 10 | | |
| Date S | tart & End | Depth (m) Ca | vations ising (m) | Water (m) | Boreho Depth (n | n) Dia (mr | r Casing [n) Depth (m) | Diameter Dia (mm) | Remarks: | | | | | | | | |
| | | | 3 () | | | 1 | , | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | Water St | rikes | | | | |
| | - (r-) - | Chiselling | D - ¹ | (0) | T - (| | stallation | | Strike (m) | Casing (m) | Sealed (m) T | Time (mins) | Rose to (m) R | emarks | | | |
| | | | remark | 15 | iop (m |) base (r | пу туре | ויט (mm) | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | Ha | and vane (HV) | , Hand penetro | meter (HP) | reported in kPa | a. PID repor | ted in | ppm. | |

| •= | Soils L | imited | | | | Probe No. | | |
|--|---------------------------|-------------------------|-----------|-----------------|------------|----------------------|--|--|
| SOIS | Newton House Cross R | nad Tadworth KT20 5SF | , | Probe L | .oa | DP1 | | |
| | Tel: 01737 814221 Email: | admin@soilslimited.co.u | ik | | 5 | Sheet 1 of 1 | | |
| Proiect Name: | 9 The Mount, Hampstead, | Project No. | Co-ords: | | | Hole Type | | |
| · · · , · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | LONDON, NW3 6SZ | 20353 | | | | DP Scale 1:50 | | |
| Location: | 9 The Mount, Hampstead, L | ONDON, NW3 6SZ | Level: | m AOD | | | | |
| Client: | | | Dates: | 30/08/2022 | | Logged By GJB | | |
| Depth | | Blows/10 |)0mm | | · | Torque | | |
| (m) | 10 | 20 | 30 | 4 | 0 | (Nm) | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | 2 3 | | | | | | | |
| | 3 3 4 | | | | | | | |
| 1- | 4 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | 5 5 5 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | 2 4 | | | | | | | |
| 3- | 4 | | | | | | | |
| | 4 4 5 | | | | | | | |
| | 6 5 | | | | | | | |
| | 4 5 6 | | | | | | | |
| 4 | 5 4 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | 5 | | | | | | | |
| 5 | 7 10 | | | | | | | |
| | 12 | | | | | | | |
| | 10 | | | | | | | |
| | 4 | | | | | | | |
| 6 | 7 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | | | | | | | | |
| - | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| 10 – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – | 1 | Fall Height | 760mm | Cone Base Diar | neter 52mm | | | |
| | | Hammer Weight | 63.5kg | Final Depth | 6m | | | |
| | | Probe Type | DPSH | Energy Ratio (E | r) 73.7% | REGISTERED USER 2020 | | |

| •= | Soils L | imited | | | | Probe No. |
|---------------|--|-------------------------|---------|-----------------|----------------|----------------------|
| SOIS | Newton House, Cross Ro | oad, Tadworth KT20 5SR | | Probe L | _og | DP2 |
| LIMITE | D Tel: 01737 814221 Email: | admin@soilslimited.co.u | lk | | | Sheet 1 of 1 |
| Project Name: | 9 The Mount, Hampstead, LONDON, NW3 6SZ | Project No. 20353 | Co-ord: | s: | | Hole Type DP |
| Location: | 9 The Mount, Hampstead, L | ONDON, NW3 6SZ | Level: | m AOD | | Scale |
| | · · · · | · | Datas | 00/00/0000 | | 1:50 Logged By |
| | | | Dates: | 30/08/2022 | | GJB |
| Depth | | | Torque | | | |
| (m) | 10 | 20 | 3 | 0 4 | 10 1 | (NM) |
| 0 | 1 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | 3 3 4 | | | | | |
| 1 | 4 4 3 | | | | | |
| | 2 2 | | | | | |
| | 2 3 4 | | | | | |
| 2 | 4 4 | | | | | |
| | 4 | | | | | |
| | 55 | | | | | |
| | 555 | | | | | |
| 3- | | | | | | |
| | 5 | | | | | |
| | 4 | | | | | |
| 4- | 4 | | | | | |
| | <u> </u> | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 5 | 6 | | | | | |
| | 4 5 | | | | | |
| | 99 | | | | | |
| | 99 | | | | | |
| 6 | 7 | | | | | |
| - | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 7 | | | | | | |
| - | | | | | | |
| - | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 9 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Remarks | | Fall Height | 760mm | Cone Base Dia | meter 52mm | |
| | | | DPSH | Energy Ratio (F | om r) 73.7% | AGS |
| | | | | | -,, | KEGISTEKED USEK ZUZU |