

19 April 2018

Sam Harding
Project Manager

Taylor Wimpey Central London
20 Air Street
London
W1B 5AN

Phoenix Place, Mount Pleasant (Phase 1)

Dear Sam

As requested, we have reviewed the Basement Impact Assessment (Oct 2013) by Waterman Energy, Environment & Design Limited in order to verify whether the assumptions and conclusions detailed therein are still valid now that the design of the project has developed.

The headline conclusions made in the document are extracted below;

Conclusions

The Basement Impact Assessment sets out mitigation measures to manage the potential impacts identified. Implementation of these mitigation measures during the design and construction of the proposed basement would ensure that there would not be negative impacts on the underlying aquifer, groundwater flows, adjacent properties and highways and the Fleet River Sewer.

- Ground investigation would be undertaken as part of the design process to confirm the level of the water table on the Site.
- The design of the basement construction would take into account the results of the groundwater monitoring and the potential of water ingress over the lifetime of the structure.
- Once foundation details for the adjacent property to the north are obtained they would be reviewed and the requirement for underpinning would be reviewed. The design for this would be undertaken in consultation with the adjacent property owner / tenant under a Party Wall Agreement.
- Consultation with the relevant authority with regard to any easement or permit requirements for works in the vicinity of the Fleet River Sewer would be undertaken prior to the commencement of works.
- The temporary and permanent works would be designed to ensure that there would be no adverse impacts on the Fleet River Sewer.
- The temporary and permanent works would be designed and implemented to ensure that there would be no adverse impact on the adjacent property.
- The design of the temporary works would take into account the potential for water ingress and would include for control of groundwater during construction and would ensure that the stability of the adjacent public highway would be maintained at all times.

Of the conclusions listed above, the only item that may no longer be relevant is the third bullet point that discusses the foundation details of the adjacent property to the north. We presume that this point was included by Waterman due to the lower basement in the approved planning scheme extending much further to the north where it would be likely to have an impact on the foundations of the adjacent property. Since the basement is no longer extending this far north, the impact on the adjacent property will be significantly lessened. Notwithstanding this, the third bullet point is still a valid statement since the design team will still review any existing buildings in proximity to the proposed development and review if any underpinning, party wall agreements are necessary.

We are therefore of the opinion that the conclusions listed by Waterman are still valid

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "David Cuckow". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial 'D'.

David Cuckow CEng MStructE
Regional Director
AECOM Limited
M: 07803 169573
E: david.cuckow@aecom.com