

212685/ew1/gtp
11 August 2014

David Gillerman
Flat 1
8 Lindfield Gardens
London NW3 6PU

Dear David,

Re Proposed basement at 8 Lindfield Gardens

We write in response to the Independent Assessment report (August 2014) prepared by LBH Wembley with regard to the Basement Impact Assessment prepared by ourselves and Site Analytical Services Ltd.

In particular, we respond to section 4 and 5 in the LBH report.

The groundwater has been covered in great detail. It is not correct to say that that the report needs to be updated to take into account recent groundwater monitoring. Section 3.1 of SAS's report clearly indicates water levels from the April 2014 borehole.

It demonstrates that the water level even after a considerable period of time is still lower than the lowest proposed level of basement. It is, indeed, lower than the existing basement level as well so unless there is evidence of regular flooding to that basement, groundwater cannot be considered to be an issue at this site.

The proposed underpinning is therefore not being taken into any groundwater and so can be constructed in the conventional manner. However, we acknowledge that an initial trial pin can be excavated clear of the existing rear wall to confirm this. If near surface groundwater is discovered, and at the moment this seems unlikely, then it can be locally pumped clear and the effect of any softening of the clay can be taken into account in the permanent design of the underpins.

This can be provided as part of the Contractors Method Statement at the time that Party Wall Awards are sought. It is not, in our opinion, a matter for refusal of planning.

A detailed monitoring scheme would, and must, be provided at the same time as the Party Wall Awards are put in place. This would be insisted upon by neighbouring party wall surveyors and their engineers. It again is not required at this stage.

We do not agree that the structural stability of the building and neighbouring properties has not been adequately considered. A full ground movement analysis has been carried out which demonstrates that the impact will be no more than 'very slight.' There is nothing particularly onerous about the proposals and providing competent, experienced Contractors are appointed this should remain the case.

We are not sure what is meant by 'adverse impact on drainage and run-off'. The Basement Impact Assessment has identified the need to allow for attenuation as a result of the increase in hardstanding. We have also noted that the site is within Flood Risk Zone 1 and so does not require a Flood Risk Assessment.

Elliott Wood Partnership LLP Consulting Structural and Civil Engineers

Central London
4 John Prince's Street
London W1G 0JL
020 7499 5888
www.elliottwood.co.uk

Wimbledon
241 The Broadway
London SW19 1SD
020 8544 0033
info@elliottwood.co.uk

Nottingham
1 Sampsons Yard
Halifax Place
Nottingham NG1 1QN
0870 460 0061



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

Detailed drainage design and attenuation details will be provided during the construction process as part of obtaining Building Regulations Approval and/or Party Wall Awards as appropriate.

We are also not sure what is meant by 'avoiding cumulative impacts on structural stability or the water environment'. These matters have both been addressed in great detail.

We are only required to produce evidence that the proposal will not affect the matters addressed by Camden's CPG4. We are not required to provide what is essentially detailed design at this stage.

We do not dis-agree that a topographical survey will be necessary. This can be commissioned at the appropriate time but again we do not feel that this is necessary at this stage.

We note that LBH have said that there is little doubt that the proposed development is entirely feasible which suggests that whilst detailed design will obviously be required at the appropriate stages, there is no reason why planning cannot be granted in this case.

We also note that they suggest that further information and assessment might reasonably be sought by condition. This seems to be a very sensible approach and one in which we are in complete agreement.

We trust the above answers the questions raised by LBH's report and would welcome any meeting with them and any other relevant parties if this would help conclude these matters.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'G. Povey', written in a cursive style.

Gary Povey
For Elliott Wood Partnership LLP

cc. Martin Canaway-Canaway Fleming Architects
Andy Smith-SAS