

Planning and Borough
Development
London Borough of
Camden
Judd Street
London WC1H 9JE

*
29 April 2022

Ref. number: ✦ 2022/0190/P

Dear Sirs,

**Re: 82 Fitzjohn's Avenue, London NW3
Dismantling and rebuilding the existing wall along Spring Walk**

Further to the email of 14.04.22, we have discussed the matter with our fellow consultants in order to further explore the options and seek the most appropriate solution. Accordingly, we enclose two reports:

1. A report from DWH Consulting dated 25th April 2022. DWH Consulting were appointed at the outset of the project as Principal Designer responsible for Health & Safety as required under the Construction (Design & Management) Regulations 2015.
2. An email from South Downs Safety dated 28th April 2022. South Downs Safety are the CMP consultant and have addressed the impact on traffic and vehicular movement if smaller lorries were used.

Both reports are summarised below:

DWH Consulting's advice:

The key advice is in DWH's conclusion which reads as follows:
Given the very small tolerance between the boundary wall and construction vehicles, there is a real risk of damage to the wall include its collapse. This could cause serious injury or death to any member of the public walking along Shepherds Walk. We consider the risk of retaining the wall too great. We highly recommend that the wall is taken down in a controlled manner (salvaging bricks for its later reinstatement) and that a safe temporary hoarding is erected.

South Downs Safety's advice:

South Downs Safety's table shows a comparison between a standard 4 Axle Rigid Spoil and a smaller 2 Axle Rigid Spoil. Data sheets for these

two vehicles are also attached. As seen in the table, the smaller vehicle is only 90mm smaller in width, but has a disproportionately small capacity: only one third of the larger vehicle's. This would significantly extend the construction period prolonging the impact of construction work on the neighbours. And, more importantly, using smaller vehicles would result in more vehicular crossings on the footpath and at the pinch point on the driveway, increasing the risk of collision with the wall by three times (as also noted in DWH's report).

The architect's response to the Conservation Officer's comments:

We wish to address the concern regarding the *lack of guarantee* over the quality of the reinstated wall – the Conservation Officer's understandable concern.

We are experienced in conservation architecture and often work with Listed Buildings. We can ensure that the wall is rebuilt to exactly the same design as exists at present. Regarding the brick type and patina of age, the existing bricks will be re-used by carefully dismantling the existing wall although we appreciate the Conservation Officer's point that cementitious mortar has been used, but only to re-point the wall. This is nonetheless likely to result in the loss of some of the existing bricks but we are able to have imperial-sized bricks made to match the existing. If deemed necessary, we would suggest a condition requiring a sample panel to be built and approved by the council prior to re-construction of the wall to enable the Conservation Officer to approve the appearance (i.e. we will require sample panels whether conditioned or not). This may involve a number of brick sample panels to be built to achieve the desired reference panel before works commence. We would achieve this by building sample panels in carefully selected metric bricks (if imperials aren't available) before ordering custom imperials to be manufactured. The same applies to the existing specials. The approved reference panel will be kept on site to ensure that the contractor's specialists repeat the approved appearance (and if our inspections prove that this is not the case, the work will have to be re-done).

At present the wall is cracking in places (as photographs in DWH's report show) which is caused by a combination of natural ground movement (affecting an old wall that lacks deep foundations) and the non-original and unyielding cementitious mortar. This cracking will increase with time. In the proposed reinstatement of the wall, a traditional mortar will be used which is soft and accommodates natural ground movement. This is a reinstatement of the original pointing which is a conservation benefit in the longterm.


SUMMARY

To reiterate the key conclusion from DWH as quoted above, we would urge the council to take the very real risk of the existing wall's collapse seriously and

permit the current application, the only purpose of which is to protect against any danger to the public.

We are wholly sympathetic to the Conservation Officer's concern over *guaranteeing* the quality of the reinstated wall (the only issue raised by the Council) and hope that the information above assuages that concern.

Yours faithfully,



Jo Maudsley

✦ ⊗ ✧

Director