

**From:**  
**Sent:**  
**To:**  
**Cc:**

**Subject:** 2018/4718/L: The Garden House 24 Well Road

Dear Nick,  
HCAAC did not cover this in our meeting in November but I had a note from the meeting to Object – no documents.  
Having caught up with this, I can't see we need to or should object. The wall appears to need remedial work urgently

**Application description:**

**Website**

“Works to stabilise boundary wall with bed joint reinforcement, anchors, weep holes and re-pointing”;

**Application form**

“Works to stabilise an existing Grade II listed wall that forms the boundary of 24 Well Road, Hampstead with Well Road, the wall being on the boundary of the property with back edge of footway. The proposals involve the strengthening of the wall by the installation of bed joint reinforcement and the installation of anchors through the wall along with weep holes, all to stabilise the wall, along with the re-pointing of brickwork which has been eroded by the effects of de-icing salts splashed onto the face of the wall from the adjacent public highway. Without the works the continued stability of the wall can not be relied upon”.

Noting that this application is as yet not shown as determined, HCAAC offers the following Comment:

Changes to appearance appear minor in the regular anchor heads, piecing-in replacement bricks and some resin jointing for Helifix bars.  
No other changes proposed.

One problem I see is whether the proposed ground ties are long enough, but that is apparently for engineer's site assessment.

I am surprised at the recommendation of the HGS Trust for repointing in 1:1:6 cement:hydrated lime: sand. I follow other recommendations to use only lime as Naturally Hydraulic (NHL) 3.5 grade now widely available. Cement mortar joints may be intended to add strength but can shrink and crack as well as holding rainwater in the wall. Reliance on the weeps to counter this might be irrelevant.

*“Like you, I am surprised that the proposed mortar should include Portland cement on a Grade II wall. The anchorage proposals appear to have no backing of calculations on length, assumed friction or end anchorage and overall stability of the soil/wall as a whole against slip circle failure and the angle of the rods if installed as shown would not be very effective. The 75 mm. cores for the rods surprises me a little as other cases are often drilled a smaller diameter through the mortar joints. I agree the proposal for the weep holes but would have expected a drainage layer backing the wall to ensure their effectiveness and reduce the need for the number proposed. All that said, if we are leaving all structural and stability assessment to others and concentrating solely on the visual effects on the wall I see no reason to object.”*  
Mark Nevard. HCAAC member.

Weeps of the number proposed might be as effective at 50mm dia. Especially with a drainage layer.

Best regards,

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature.

Regards,

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature.

---