

From: Richard Arthur  
Sent: 23 August 2021 17:59  
To: John Sheehy  
Cc: Suzanne Cochrane; Joe de la Croix  
Subject: Re: 11 Highgate West Hill, ref. 2020/5806/P

Dear John

Thank you for your time in discussing this application. I have also spoken to Graham Tite of your structural engineers, Campbell Reith. I have also looked at the information supplied by the applicant as it appears on your website.

I have some continuing concerns:

1. Several weeks ago the Party Wall surveyor stated that the proposal as presently put was unacceptable due to the risk of heave. No response has been received to this from the applicant or his advisors.
2. The Groundwater and Surface Water and Basement impact statements both presume that there is no basement in my property. This is incorrect as I have a cellar adjoining Mr Payne's cellar and separated by a wall. I believe they were originally a single cellar.
3. Graham Tite asked if my cellar was about 2metres deep. I said yes, but on reflection this may be misleading. The floor to ceiling height varies in the cellar and is about 1.7m at the higher part. I believe the Party wall surveyor, Joe de la Croix, ( to whom a copy of this email is being sent) has correct drawings.
4. The study stated that there is no seasonal shrink or swell. In fact there is seasonal shrink and swell. My side gate can be closed in dry weather but in wet or winter weather movement stops closure.
5. It is stated that there is a need for special precautions for the concrete due to Gypsum in the soil. I can't find evidence that this is being addressed.
6. There is very little detail in the construction plan. Apparently the contractor has been appointed but its name is not given. It is obviously important that any contractor is reputable, experienced in work of this nature and a member of the professional underpinning association with the appropriate insurance.
7. Previous work done by the applicant led to damage to my refuse bin container and a tree destroyed in the garden of No. 10, apparently due to chemicals wrongly disposed. Mr Payne and his family have moved out of the premises for the duration of the work. It is therefore very important to have a clear plan for the handling of materials, the disposal of soil, hours of working etc.
8. The conclusion of the report submitted by the applicant is that 'there is risk of movement or damage.' This is obviously concerning, particularly with a fragile listed building.
9. The Party Wall surveyor is seeking clarification on the validity of the house insurance in view of the absence of the householder and the works contemplated.

10. Thames Water permission will be needed regarding the drain and I cannot see this among the documents. Mr Payne has advised me that the Thames Water map of the drain is inaccurate and there needs to be agreement on its precise location as well as TW's permission.

In the light of the report conclusion and the various omissions and errors, I would suggest there is not adequate and satisfactory information to allow permission to be granted.

The application assumes:

- A) Excavation below a listed building increasing the depth of the cellar, losing the original dimensions and York stone floor of the original cellar.
- B) Destruction of an original staircase to the cellar.
- C) Destruction of a large part of the front wall of the cellar which holds up this listed building.
- D) Destruction of part of the back wall of the cellar which holds up this listed building.
- E) Creation of new staircases by excavating directly next to the wall supporting my house. The wall sits on historic foundations which are far below modern standards. The basic foundation construction of wooden beams on beaten earth has been described by a surveyor as 'fragile'.
- F) Addition of a box shaped extension which necessarily disrupts the careful Georgian symmetry of the back elevation and exceeds the footprint of the existing conservatory.

Camden evidently regards maintenance of this listed building as important, and I was stopped from changing the layout of an external ex-lavatory on the grounds that the lavatory was 'historic'. Consistency suggests that the considerably greater changes being suggested by this application should not be approved on conservation grounds.

The demolition of the existing staircase and its replacement by a new one generating engineering risk to my property seems unnecessary and raises problems in both engineering and conservation terms.

In view of the above and the points made in my previous email, I object to the application. I should be grateful if you could advise me of the date and time of the committee or sub-committee meeting to consider this application, so that I can attend.

Kind regards

Richard Arthur  
11d Highgate West Hill  
London  
N6 6JR