

Our Ref: 1675/118/DR/ca

Fitzroy Park Residents Association  
c/o Karen Beare  
49 Fitzroy Park  
Highgate  
London  
N6 6HT

75 Cowcross Street  
London EC1M 6EL

t 020 7250 1555

e aba@alanbaxter.co.uk  
w www.alanbaxter.co.uk

18 October 2018

Dear Karen

**55 Fitzroy Park, Highgate, N6**

Following our discussion we have reviewed again the information included in support of the planning application for 55 Fitzroy Park and confirm that, in many areas, important information has not been provided. Elsewhere, where some information has been provided it is often unclear or lacks the necessary detail. In particular there are important gaps in the information relating to the BIA as follows: -

- 1) Clause 8.7.2 of the Planning Statement states that the Geotechnical Assessment and the Hydrological and Hydrogeological assessment 'equate' to a BIA. In fact whilst the Geotechnical Assessment includes standardised screening and scoping assessments for potential hydrogeological, hydrological and stability impacts, the impacts identified have generally only have been addressed by broad statements and summary information, with little detail.
- 2) None of the original factual site investigation information such as borehole and window sample logs or test results has been provided. It appears that some groundwater monitoring has been undertaken but the results have not been provided. There is an important 'buried valley' feature which crosses the site but little information is available on the nature of the head and fill materials or groundwater flows within this feature. It is difficult to see therefore that the hydrogeological and hydrological issues have been properly considered.
- 3) Again broad statements have been made about existing surface water flows feeding into the pond but no evidence has been provided to confirm this. Statements are made regarding contamination, but no water sample test results have been provided. 'Indicative' surface water path directions are shown on schematic drawings, along with elements of a FRA and SUDS strategy, but there are no details of how the SUDS will work to achieve the stated aim to control the discharge of water to the heath in exactly the same manner as present.
- 4) There is a proposal for installing a pipe below Millfield Lane to improve flows and reduce the risk of pollution to the Bird Sanctuary Pond Nature Reserve. However no details of levels or existing and proposed flows are provided. We understand that this is unlikely to be acceptable to City of London as it will disrupt the existing water regime on the Heath, but no alternative solution has been proposed.

2/...

**ABA** STRUCTURAL & CIVIL ENGINEERING URBAN DESIGN MASTERPLANNING TRANSPORT & MOVEMENT CONSERVATION SUSTAINABILITY

Alan Baxter CBE BSc MICE FStructE  
Michael Coombs MSc DIC FStructE  
**Directors**  
James Gardiner BSc MICE MStructE  
William Filmer-Sanke MA DPhil FSA MCIFA  
Adam Sewell MEng MStructE

Alan Fleet BSc MICE MStructE  
Andrew Morton BSc MICE  
Richard Pollard MA MA  
Clare Coats BSc Dip LA CMLI  
Nicholas Davies BSc ACA

**Associates**  
John Mason MA MStructE  
Ian Taylor BSc MICE MStructE  
Trenton Williams BSc(Eng) MPhil  
David Lankester MEng MStructE  
Thomas Roberts BSc MSc MStructE  
David Rathbone BSc MICE MStructE  
Adrian Tucker BEng MStructE

Raihan Abu BEng MSc DIC MICE MStructE  
Olivier Fernandez MA MStructE  
Ing. Luca Frasca  
Fredrik Nyberg MEng MStructE  
Rory Dack MEng  
Alice Eggeling BSc MA MRTPI IHBC  
Robert Hradsky BA MA  
Thomas Brewster MEng MStructE

Daniel Zwietsloot MEng  
André Siwek MEng MSc  
Alexander O'Hare MEng  
**Consultants**  
Robert Thorne MA FSA  
Paul Ragsdale BEng MStructE  
Kit Wedd BA IHBC

.../2

- 5) No existing or proposed surface or foul water plans have been submitted and the projected foul flows from five properties will be significantly greater than from the one house to be demolished. We understand that an existing foul water sewer that runs at shallow depth under the proposed plots 4 and 5 will need to be diverted but no details of the proposals are provided. There are references to connections to an existing combined sewer but no details or drawings have been provided. Suggestions that there might be a connection to the Kenwood sewer within the nature reserve are unlikely to be acceptable to the City of London. Without more information, including drawings, it is impossible to assess the viability of the drainage proposals.
- 6) Extensive excavations to around 50% of the site will be needed for the five basements which appear to be of the order of 1.5m to 2.5m deep, but no engineers' drawings for the proposals have been provided. Further earthworks are proposed to create access roads to plots 4 and 5 and the rear of plots 1 to 3 and the freeboard to the pond is to be raised. Only schematic sketches and statements have been submitted with the CMP. No details are available.
- 7) No slope stability drawings, details or calculations have been provided despite proposals for extensive temporary sheet piling, soil stabilisation of the retained ground and a Mechanical Stabilising Earth Retaining Wall System (MSE) on the south side of the pond. It also appears that reliance may be placed on the existing retaining wall along part of the frontage with Fitzroy Park, but no details of the existing wall, proposed strengthening or any temporary works proposals have been provided.
- 8) No damage assessments have been carried out although there is a risk of ground movements during excavations for the basements to plot 1 to 3, which could impact on the existing road.
- 9) The various statements on the volumes of material/spoil to be removed from site are contradictory and unclear, as are the proposed arrangements for HGV manoeuvres. These need to be clarified and assessed cumulatively with vehicle movements from other construction sites locally.
- 10) The cumulative hydrogeological and hydrological impacts in relation to neighbouring basements, particularly at 51 and 53 Fitzroy Park should also be considered.
- 11) Overall, given the nature and extent of the proposals, it is unusual not to include any information on the engineering proposals in the BIA or the submission more generally. We would expect to see engineers' drawings for the proposed piling and basement construction, a Basement Construction Plan, drainage plans and details and some form of damage assessment. Without more information and in particular more details we do not consider that it is possible to properly assess the impact of the proposals.

I trust that the above is all clear but if you have any queries or would like to discuss any points in more details please give me a call.

Yours sincerely



David Rathbone  
for Alan Baxter Ltd