



GEOTECHNICAL CONSULTING GROUP

150 Brompton Road, London SW3 1HX, United Kingdom.

Tel: +44 (0)20 7581 8348

Email: admin@gcg.co.uk

Fax: +44 (0)20 7584 0157

Web: www.gcg.co.uk

Our ref:

Your ref:

Mark Chan
Haringey Planning Service
5th Floor Alexandra House
10 Station Road,
Wood Green N22 7TR

11th September 2026

Dear Mr Chan,

CASE REFERENCE: HGY/2026/1858

Approval of details pursuant to condition 8 (Chartered Engineer), 9 (Hydrogeological and Geotechnical Investigations), 10 (Ground Movement Assessment), 11 (Movement Monitoring) and 12 (Drainage) attached to planning permission ref: HGY/2024/1676

With reference to engineersHRW note dated 27th August 2026, in our opinion the Conditions, imposed by Haringey, have not been addressed sufficiently for Conditions 8 to 12 to be discharged. However, we would like to expand on some of the points raised in the note by engineersHRW.

There are three points that we can expand on:

1. Alan Baxter's letter, Condition 9: The WALLAP analysis (presumably GEA's) does not form a check on the validity of Create's parameters. That can only be done by back analysis not prediction. It is not sufficient to simply repeat the calculations. Even so Create cited a case where they predicted Category 1 borderline Category 2 damage to 6a Grange Road depending on the assumptions made in the assessment. If they did not think this assessment was reasonable why include it in their report?
2. Geotechnical Consulting Group, Condition 9, Paragraph 6: Although the assessment may have been approved this does not reduce the risk of damage resulting from the damming effect caused by construction of the basement nor does it absolve engineersHRW of their responsibilities. Evidence has been provided of damage to a building very close to the proposed development where this effect (i.e. damming of groundwater upslope of the basement) did cause damage, due to the nature of the ground. In relation to that case, recommendations were made on to how such problems may be avoided in future namely

Senior Partners:

Lord Mair CBE FREng FRS FICE A Bracegirdle MSc DIC FICE K G Higgins MSc DIC FREng FICE FCIHT N Kovacevic MSc PhD DIC MICE C O Menkiti MSc PhD DIC
Z Cabarkapa MSc PhD MICE FGS FSRASA F C Schroeder MEng ACGI PhD DIC MICE J A Davis MSc DIC EurGeol CGeol FGS G Choy BEng PhD FICE
A Grammatikopoulou MSc PhD DIC FICE A Gasparre Dott. Ing. PhD DIC FICE M Wan BEng MSc PhD DIC FICE MHKIE

Associate Directors:

M S Crilly MSc DIC P G Smith MSc PhD DIC

Senior Consultants:

D W Hight MSc PhD DIC FREng FRS FICE G W E Milligan MA MEng PhD FICE H D St John BSc PhD Hon. DSc J P Love MA DPhil FICE J A Skipper BSc PhD DIC CGeol FGS D Giles BSc PhD
CGeol FHEA FGS

Associates:

D Muir Wood MA PhD FREng FICE R J Jardine MSc PhD DIC FREng FRS FICE FCGI A Gens MSc PhD DIC R N Taylor MA PhD MICE B M New MSc PhD MICE S Shibuya MSc PhD DIC
R C Bridle BSc MSc DIC FICE S A Jefferis MA MEng MSc PhD FICE FGS J R Standing MSc PhD DIC MICE L Zdravkovic MSc PhD DIC T O'Rourke MSc PhD NAE
K Soga MEng PhD FREng FICE B W Byrne BCom MA DPhil J Lawrence BSc MSc PhD FGS FHEA S Kontoe Dipl. Eng. MSc PhD DIC CEng MICE D M G Taborda PhD DIC



“installing groundwater drainage or more particularly overflow measures”. These effects combined with the nature of the ground were not considered by the hydrogeologist who did not account for local experience namely *“erosion of the ground behind the retaining structure”*. In this respect the hydrogeological report was lacking.

3. Geotechnical Consulting Group, Condition 9, Paragraph 3: It is true to say that this approach is widely used across the industry but that does not mean that it is appropriate in all cases. In this instance it is obviously not appropriate.

The graph in C760 used in the assessment is often used without the user referring to or considering the accompanying text as quoted in our letter dated 4th August 2026. Both the case histories cited in C760 have a large thickness of superficial material which is normally consolidated over the London Clay which is over consolidated. This influences the behaviour of the retaining structures. The ground conditions at Grange Road differ markedly from those cases; the Claygate beds are very different in nature to the London Clay Formation found in central London (Westminster and Tottenham Court Road).

It is not reasonable consider the Claygate Beds in part (i.e. the cohesive part) and ignore other fractions. Further, because the ground is sloping, the basement structure will tend to “sway”. The C760 procedure does not consider such an effect; it assumes level ground. In reality, sloping ground will increase predicted movements upslope (6a Grange Road) making them greater than currently estimated whereas downslope the situation is more complex and requires more detailed consideration. The structure downslope (10 Grange Road) will experience combined tension and compression which cannot be assessed by the methodology adopted, nor has it been. Rather than rely on C760 other methods of assessing building damage could, and should, have been used.

In summary, we are of the opinion that a number of points need to be addressed before Conditions 8 to 12 should be discharged and that none of the points made in engineersHRW’s note are sufficient to do so. The designers need to reconsider their approach to the design of the basement and take more detailed account of the ground conditions in relation to hydrogeology and building damage assessments.

Yours sincerely,
for GEOTECHNICAL CONSULTING GROUP LLP

Professor K. G. Higgins BSc., MSc., DIC., CEng., FEng., FICE., FCIHT.
Adviser, UK Register of Geotechnical Engineering Professionals

Cc Haringey Planning Service: Catherine Smyth
Haringey Planning Service Matthew Gunning
Haringey Planing Service James Argles
Haringey Building Control Dennis Ioannou