				Printed on: 10/11/2021
Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/4570/L	Peter Cassidy	09/11/2021 11:23:12	OBJ	2021/4570/L for 5 The Grove, London N6 6JU
				These are Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee's objections in respect of the above application.
				This application is in respect of the Structural Method Statement required by condition 5 of listed building consent 2021/2717/L, dated 16/08/2021.
				The HCAAC requested a structural method statement due to, amongst other things, its concern about the applicant's intention to alter the windows to the staircase to a single vertical slot. We note that the applicant no longer intends to proceed with that alteration.
				Having said that, the structural method statement produced leaves far too much important information to be provided by the Contractor and others at a later date. As the applicant's engineer makes clear the "proposed construction method is indicative with detailed method statements to be carried out." HCAAC objects to this approach which cannot possibly satisfy condition 5.
				There are numerous references in the method statement to further information being required such as, but not limited to:
				<ol> <li>The extent of poor floor timbers is to be "confirmed upon completion of the full strip out";</li> <li>"Further investigations are required to confirm that the flat roof is formed from a hollow clay pot slab";</li> <li>As far as the stairs are concerned, the "sequence of works will need to be carefully considered as part of the Contractor's design and in accordance with their Temporary Works Engineer's details";</li> <li>The applicant's engineer sets out an "indicative" sequence and "general" outline in respect of the staircase works;</li> <li>The engineer also states that a "detailed method statement will be produced by the Contractor"; and</li> <li>The engineer states on the drawings with the report that:         <ul> <li>"The existing foundations TBC following completion of trial pits";</li> <li>"All structural alterations are to be reviewed following full strip out, to confirm details/nature of existing structure";</li> <li>"Existing floor structure TBC following completion of trial pits"; and</li> </ul> </li> </ol>
				d. "Existing roof span assumed". Given all the above significant issues which are yet to be determined and understood, the applicant's engineer is not in a position to summarise with any certainty, as it seeks to do, that the:
				<ol> <li>"proposal to replace the existing staircase will not have a significant impact on the existing structure";</li> <li>"proposed works can be undertaken satisfactorily without impairing the stability or integrity of the existing structure"; or</li> <li>"new permanent structure will provide a robust and secure support without detriment to the overall building stability".</li> </ol>
				Indeed, as we have set out above and contrary to what is said in the summary to the method statement, the engineer accepts that what is set out is "indicative" only.

## Comment: Response:

In the above circumstances, the Council cannot possibly accept that the structural method statement as currently formulated satisfies condition 5 adequately or at all. As a result, the structural method statement must be rejected.