



Dear Mr. Freeney,

You will have received the e-mail below from my next door neighbour, Jo Conrad.
Which I fully endorse.

I remain seriously concerned about **access to my flat**. Although in the revised drawings there is now a temporary staircase - it is also at the only place of vehicular access which raises questions of safety as well as blocking. Perhaps I should say also that I am in my mid 70s with limited capacity to climb over uncomfortable structures. It remains unclear what will happen when the permanent staircase is being built?

It would also seem from the drawings that **I will lose a large proportion of my terrace**, up to 2/3. Surely this cannot be permitted??

I have no technical expertise and can only write to you in common sense layman language. However in view of the legal/procedural requirement to consider **"loss of amenity to neighbours"**, I hope you will ensure that the 3rd surveyor is fully aware of our objections.

Yours sincerely,

Lady Ellen Dahrendorf
flat 2, 15 Wedderburn Road



Fergus - I know that you spoke to my neighbour last week, and I thank you for your time and effort to explain this process. Despite your best efforts, and having reviewed all the additional paperwork online, I must admit to being extremely concerned. It is my understanding that you are referring the technical

submissions to a 3rd surveyor. Whilst my neighbours and I are not in a position to enter in to open ended expense with costly professionals, I have looked at the new online data from a non-technical, lay perspective. I cannot understand much of the technical content. However, I have one common-sense observation which does not seem to be addressed. My neighbours and I have previously raised this point.

To go through the construction sequence, the following emerges from the Applicant's Advisors:

1. Due to the depth of the proposed excavation, and local groundwater depths, the Applicant's Advisors say that it is crucial that the piled retaining walls will be of secant construction. They refer to a process using male and female piles, although the proposal is that 75% of the piles will be male.
2. They state at 3.1 that: 'Piling will take place with the rig wholly within the site'
3. The deepest male piles (4.2) are specified at 13.3M in depth.
4. To facilitate this, surely the headroom must be at least 13.3M + tolerance. Hence a headroom of at least 15M is required for this work to take place.
5. At 4.1 GEA say that: 'Fluid Structures have proposed a limited headroom piling rig for the internal piles and this MAY be suitable for the deeper retaining wall piles as well'

My question, which I ask you to put specifically to the 3rd surveyor is a very simple one. Given that some of the deepest piles have to be installed from inside the property, which is currently only one floor high, how can 15M piles be installed in this situation? They refer to limited headroom rigs, but how do piles of 15M fit into a headroom of +/- 3M. I simply cannot understand this. To be specific, some of these piles have to be installed around the lift shaft and staircase of Flat 3, with two fully occupied flats above the ceiling of Flat 1. I should like the 3rd surveyor to express in lay terms, how this can be done. I do not understand how a 'limited headroom rig' reduced the height of the piles which still need to be accommodated.

This question should not be deemed to indicate that I have no further technical reservations. Simply the above question is the most basic one, and it has never been meaningfully answered by the Applicant's Advisors.

It is my understanding that you will only now start to review the non-technical aspects of this application. You have the detailed submissions of my neighbours and me. However, when you review this I would urge you to consider the amenity issue, viz the vast loss of amenity to immediate neighbours, compared to the relatively small gain in amenity to the Applicant, of underground parking (instead of an existing, double garage) and a slightly larger swimming pool than already exists. We have specified in our earlier submissions the many and various aspects of amenity loss to immediate neighbours.

One detail that is still not addressed is continuing concern for the safe and continuous access for the occupant of Flat 2. Whilst the building site boundary has been set back so the temporary staircase can now be used, the submission gives no indication of when it will be erected or presumably moved as and when

piling and building works take place in that area. Flat 2's parking space can only be accessed by crossing the only vehicular access into the site. This is unsafe. Additionally now the revisions have excluded 3 parking spaces from the building site I do not understand how it will be possible to cope with the deliveries, visitors etc to the site when there is such a limited area available in the site, given that the Applicant's advisors still state that there will be no need to make use of any on street parking.

Finally, may I ask you to acknowledge receipt of this email, and confirm that it has been passed to the 3rd surveyor? May I also request a copy of the instruction letter to the 3rd surveyor?

Jo Konrad