

From: Kelly, Faye DWFM Beckman [REDACTED]
Sent: 20 April 2016 16:32
To: Peres Da Costa, David
Subject: 36 Redington Road, London NW3 7RT

THIS EMAIL IS SENT FOR AND ON BEHALF OF PHILIP BECKMAN

Philip.beckman@dwfmbeckman.com

(Our ref: PB/36RedingtonRoad/Personal)

Dear Mr Peres Da Costa

Re: 36 Redington Road, London NW3 7RT - Planning Application 2015/3004/P

Thank you for forwarding the latest BIA Audit. I am writing to express our continued concern at the level of risk to which our property is exposed by the proposed basement and what, in our view, are the inadequate measures proposed for its protection.

Measures Proposed

Paragraph 1.13 of the BIA Audit does propose that the condition survey should be extended to 7 Redington Gardens and also that a monitoring regime should be put in place. However to give reasonable protection a monitoring scheme needs to be put forward and approved by the Council before the work is started and should include a proposal for limits to acceptable movement. The Developer's own consultants Southern Testing support this. See last paragraph of 1.4 of their addendum to their letter of 8 October 2015.

Damage to Property

Paragraph 1.9 of the BIA Audit refers to the two proposed methods of construction. As we understand it, it is now proposed to have a cantilevered wall with temporary propping.

On page 7 of the BIA Audit the reply to the question regarding damage says "the revised SER refers to temporary propping to restrict ground movements for which GMA suggest category 0 damage".

Where is this "suggestion" made? And what GMA is referred to? Southern Testing in the last GMA of which we are aware in October 2015 calculated the level of damage to be category 2 to 3 for an unpropped wall. What evidence is there that temporary propping will reduce this to category 0.

In our view this is too important a point to be left to a "suggestion".

Surely a further ground movement analysis should be carried out as proposed by the developer's own consultants Southern Testing. Without this, it cannot be assumed that the level of damage will be 0. Category 2 to 3 is surely too high to be permitted.

CPG 4, says that Planning Permission will only be given where it is demonstrated that the proposals will not cause any harm to the built environment.

This clearly has not been demonstrated

Yours sincerely

Philip Beckman

Faye Kelly *Secretary to Joshua Steinhaus and Monty Frankel*

T: +44 (0)20 7408 8888 | F: +44 (0)20 7408 8889



101 Wigmore Street, London, W1U 1FA www.dwfbeckman.com

This email and any attachments are confidential and may be the subject of legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately and delete your copy from your system. You should not copy it, re-transmit it, use it or disclose its contents. DWFMBECKMAN SOLICITORS, SRA Number 352390, is authorized and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority. A full list of the names of the partners is available for inspection at the above address. DWFMBECKMAN SOLICITORS, SRA Number 352390, is authorized and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority. A full list of the names of the partners is available for inspection at the above address. DWFMBECKMAN SOLICITORS reserves the right to monitor emails in accordance with the Telecommunications (Lawful Business Practice) (Interception of Communications) Regulations 2000 as amended.