[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc. Please note there have been reports of emails purporting to be about Covid 19 being used as cover for scams so extra vigilance is required.

Dear Mr Peres Da Costa and Ms Charlotte Meynell
Apologies, I do not have an email address to your colleague Charlotte Meynell, so please may I ask you to forward this email to her?
Further to our conversations and email exchanges, I would like to give you an update on my findings.
 (i) I have attached a copy of the report by the consulting engineers Clarke Nichols and Marcel, dated 16th August 1976. This is a desk based assessment of the structural stability of the HAC beams used in the construction of Phase 1 of the Chalcots Estate (i.e. Quickswood). Construction of the remainder of Chalcots was circa some 10 years later, when the use of HAC had been discontinued, so this information is specific to Quickswood. It is not applicable to any other sector of the Chalcots Estate. (ii) Below is the response I received from the Concrete Society in answer to my questions regarding HAC, and Attached are my notes of the discussion with Henderson Thomas Associates to whom I also sent a copy of the Clarke Nicholls report.
I cannot seem to find any way to contact Building Control at Camden, so I would be most grateful if you could please forward this email and attachments to them.
I also do not understand the demarcation between Planning and Building Control and which of you decides what restrictions and caveats might be given to any consent. Given that we now live in a post-Grenfell world, may I suggest that you pass this email and attachments to your legal department so that they can advise. I assume that in a worst-cas scenario, adding additional load to a HAC structure could lead to a partial collapse, so this is a 'safety of life' issue.
Best Regards
Allen
Allen Withington
From: Richard Day

Date: Tuesday, 19 January 2021 16:21 To: Allen Withington Subject: Re: High Alumina Cement Alan The last sentence of the Clarke Nicholls report's conclusion is key. "It is important that regular maintenance is carried out and especially that any water penetration should be corrected as soon as it occurs." As the report says, HAC is stable so long as the environmental conditions are maintained. The HAC will have converted resulting in loss of strength, but this is not considered to be the main issue. After 45 years the HAC will have carbonated reducing the protection against corrosion of the reinforcement. In dry conditions there is no real risk generally. However, prolonged water penetration and frequent wetting cycles, whether due to poor maintenance or change of use, may result in corrosion of the steel. I would suggest that the building inspector is made aware of the HAC floor beams etc. The beam bearings are probably the most vulnerable element to moisture ingress. As the report is some 45 years old, it would be appropriate for an Engineer to check the condition of the elements, especially as refurbishment is being undertaken, as a precautionary measure. See BRE Special Digest 3 Regards Richard Day on behalf of The Concrete Society

From: Allen Withington Sent: 18 January 2021 14:33

To:

Subject: High Alumina Cement

Fiona

I live on an estate of 67 two, three and three and a half storey houses built in 1965. The houses are constructed basically of load bearing brick party walls supporting high alumina cement (HAC) precast, prestressed units at floor and roof levels and are mostly terraced.

The issue is that as a result of the recent relaxing of Permitted Development rules a number of residents wish to add a further floor to their properties. I would appreciate a conversation with someone with knowledge in this area to discuss what the issues may be given the existence of HAC.

For you information a detached 2 storey property on the estate, which is currently undergoing refurbishment, has removed the roof and floors.

A report was commissioned in 1976, and is attached. Given the consulting engineers report which was purely a desk base study and was produced 45 years ago what might be the best way to proceed.

I would welcome an open discussion.

Best regards

Allen

Allen Withington



DISCLAIMER & CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

This email is intended for the addressee only, if you have received this in error, please notify the sender immediately. Do not read, disclose or use the content in any

way.

Please note that the views expressed in this email may be those of the originator and do not necessarily reflect those of this organisation.

The Concrete Society believes that this email and any attachments are free of viruses.

The Concrete Society does not accept any responsibility for any loss or damage that may arise from the use of this email or its contents.

Registered office: The Concrete Society, Riverside House, 4 Meadows Business Park, Station Approach, Blackwater, Camberley, Surrey GU17 9AB