4a CEPC 7

Subject: Chester Terrace balustrade
From: Nick Packard [redacted]
Date: 15/09/2020, 18:21
To: Richard Loftus [redacted]
CC: Loretta Home [redacted] Allan Murry-Jones
[redacted]

Dear Richard

As discussed following the last meeting I have been in contact with the CEPC's insurers and HP+M regarding the safety of the existing balustrades (see attached). I have asked that HP+M design temporary support for all relevant areas and we will need to then get it installed. We will also need to write to residents and put up signs.

Kind regards

Nick

Nick Packard
Director (Clerk & Treasurer to Commissioners)

Crown Estate Paving Commission
12 Park Square East
Regent's Park
London NW1 4LH
[redacted]
W: www.cepc.org.uk

—Attachments:

ForwardedMessage.eml	109 kB
ForwardedMessage.eml	2.8 MB

Subject: 24509 Chester Terrace balustrade
From: Michael Chung [redacted]
Date: 14/09/2020, 16:06
To: Nick Packard [redacted]
CC: Jack Harrold [redacted] Andrew Maskell [redacted]

Hi Nick

There are certain sections of the balustrade which are loose. These are identified in Appendix A of our report (copy attached) and are the ones for which Defect 5 'Balustrade shows movement under pressure'. In reference to the plan, these are:

- C2
- F1
- G10
- H1
- I1, I2, I3, I4 and I5 (these are the ones that have been scaffolded).

I would say that these sections would definitely not take a child jumping on them. This also applies to the scaffolded sections as the coping stones are likely to roll over.

With regards to the other sections of the balustrade and as noted in the report, the balustrades can take a lateral load of somewhere between 0.3kN/m and 0.6kN/m run (30kg/m run to 60 kg/m run), depending on the condition of the mortar. These sections of balustrade can easily take the weight of a child (weight acts vertically), but whether they are good enough to take someone jumping onto them could be open to debate. Therefore, as the balustrade does not meet the minimum lateral loading requirement for this environment, the only recommendation that I can put forward is that it represents a risk. Therefore, warning signs will need to be displayed if required by the insurers.

Happy to discuss in more detail if you wish. Let me know if you need anything further.

Regards
Michael Chung
[redacted]
For and on behalf of Hurst Peirce and Malcolm LLP

HURST PEIRCE + MALCOLM LLP
Consulting Civil and Structural Engineers
Celtic House, 33 John's Mews, Holborn, London, WC1N 2QL
[redacted]
www.hurstpm.co.uk
Office registered in England and Wales at the above address.
Reg No OC307252

From: Nick Packard [redacted]
Sent: 14 September 2020 14:41
To: Michael Chung [redacted]
Cc: Jack Harrold [redacted] Andrew Maskell [redacted]
Subject: 24509 Chester Terrace balustrade

Michael, Jack

Thanks for the two recent updates which I will process separately.

We have been in correspondence with our insurers on the balustrades. They have suggested 'we take advice from [our] structural engineers on whether or not you require warning signs. Insurers concern is whether the balustrades in their current condition pose an increased risk of injury to a member of the public or to an employee. If a young child jumped on a section of the balustrade that is under investigation, is it likely to give way causing injury? If yes then they will want warning signs to be displayed.'

Please could you let me know your views. If we need signs/notifications I can go back to the insurers for the relevant wording.

Thanks

Nick

Nick Packard
Director (Clerk & Treasurer to Commissioners)

Crown Estate Paving Commission
12 Park Square East
Regent's Park
London NW1 4LH
[redacted]
W: www.cepc.org.uk

---Attachments:

image001.jpg	0 bytes
image002.png	0 bytes
24509 - Appendix A - Detailed Record of Defects.pdf	2.0 MB