

Neil Quinn
Planning Officer (East Area Team)
Development Management Planning Services
London Borough of Camden
6th Floor, Town Hall Extension
Argyle Street
London WC1H 8EQ

940/JGBB

15 April 2014

Dear Mr Quinn,

33 South Hill Park Ref: 2014/1943/P 35 South Hill Park Ref: 2014/1938/P

I am writing in response to the representations that have been raised by neighbours, insofar as they relate to our construction method statement and the structural proposals for these two applications.

1. Letter from Michael Ledger-Lomas

The ground conditions were found to be stiff to very stiff clay. This is not incompatible with subsidence being a problem in the area, as the clay is vulnerable to tree roots and desiccation. It does however mean the ground is a very stable material in which to excavate, and will provide a good founding stratum.

The site investigation found no permeable horizons with free groundwater within the underpinning zone, and therefore the risks of water ingress or instability during underpinning works are minimal.

We have had to make assumptions about some of the foundation levels at No. 37, and these are shown on our drawings. These are not uncommon assumptions at this stage of the application process. As work proceeds more information will become known, and our details adjusted as necessary, but importantly this will not affect the principles of the design.

HEAD OFFICE BTA Structural Design Ltd, Street Farmhouse, Shipton Moyne, Tetbury GL8 8PN

T 01666 880532 F 01666 880541 E post@bta.co.uk

LONDON OFFICE 17 Devonshire Mews, London W4 2HA T 020 8995 0567

JGB Birdwood MA CEng MICE MIStructE

The flank wall of No. 37 has five wall plates visible externally, attached to tie bars. This is to deal with lateral movement in the wall as a result of inadequate tying in of floor structures. It has nothing to do with foundations and is not likely to be affected by the proposed works.

2. Letter from the Heath & Hampstead Society

I look forward to seeing Mr de Freitas' report, and will respond further if appropriate.

3. Letter from David Evans

This does not raise any structural issues.

4. Letter from Shura & Alice Gailey & Beverley Griffiths

Structural issues

The works are not likely to affect the flank wall as mentioned above. The site is not unduly steep and is not unstable. The condition of No. 37 will be recorded in the party wall condition surveys.

Flooding and subsidence

As mentioned above, the site investigation shows that we will be excavating in clay with no free groundwater present. There is therefore little likelihood of the proposed works causing any flooding or subsidence. The survey work was undertaken in late November after a period of substantial rainfall and still revealed favourable conditions for the proposed basement works

5. General Comments

The proposed works are straightforward from a structural point of view. It is always the case that basement excavation must be carried out carefully, to protect the workforce, the public and neighbouring buildings.

In this particular case, the ground conditions are favourable, and the adjoining building (no. 37) is a typical example of Victorian construction, and not especially vulnerable.

This kind of work has become increasingly common in recent years in London, including several examples on South Hill Park. Many basements have been constructed successfully in much more adverse circumstances than here. There is no evidence to indicate that a similarly successful development cannot be achieved in relation to the application proposals.

I hope these additional comments, alongside the detailed evidence and survey work that supports the application proposals, provide the necessary reassurance that the proposed works will not result in any material adverse problems to third parties.

Yours sincerely

James Birdwood

MA CEng MICE MIStructE