

18 August 2016

5698

Further Response to Audit
of
26 Westend Lane
London
NW6 4PA

Item 4.3

- Q1. No
- Q2. No
- Q3. No
- Q4. No
- Q5. Yes - however see calculation page B.01. which is in response to Appendix F3.
- Q6. No
- Q7. No
- Q8. No
- Q9. No
- Q10. No
- Q11. No
- Q12. No
- Q13. No
- Q14. No.

Item 4.4

- Q5. No - a. There is no basement.
b. Surface water will continue to be drained as per existing



Q6 The proposed extension is not deeper than the existing ground floor so the flood risk is not altered. Furthermore, Fig 2.5 PPS25 states "...confirm with LPA whether a FRA is required..." There is no automatic requirement to do a full FRA. It is our considered opinion (in light of Cl234) that we not consider one necessary.

Item 4.5

Clarification has been previously provided that permeable paving will be used. The final part of the paragraph is not clear. We reiterate that there will be no increase in surface water run off. If this response is insufficient please amplify the query.

Item 4.8

A desk study has been carried out – this is implicit in the preparation of a screening BIA.

Item 4.10

TZG have previously carried out an inspection of the building (access was not made to the adjoining property). The building exhibits all the normal distortions expected in buildings of this type and age. There is no subsidence. The existing building is beyond the bulb of pressure of the new retaining wall and cannot possibly be affected by it.

The comments made by CRH in 4.10 regarding tree removal are generic and not relevant to the screening BIA. We have already confirmed that no root protection zone is being affected.

Item 5.8

It seems bizarre that a modification to the back garden so modest that it could be carried out as a minor DIY gardening project requires a full screening BIA.

I reiterate that Cl.234 is pertinent and allows a degree of proportionality to be applied.