

Our Ref: 1675/100/LF

75 Cowcross Street
London EC1M 6EL

t 020 7250 1555

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

e aba@alanbaxter.co.uk
w www.alanbaxter.co.uk

14 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

We have been instructed by Mr and Mrs Purves of No. 8 Grange Road and by Messrs Schulz and Cossio Murillo of No. 6 Grange Road, London N6 4AP, to review the document 'Planning Conditions Consultation Response' dated 27/08/26, prepared by Haskins Robinson Waters (HRW), recently uploaded to the Haringey Planning Portal in relation to the above conditions attached to planning permission ref. HGY/2024/1676.

Comments:

HRW appears to have treated information that may have been sufficient for the original planning approval as though it were also sufficient for the later discharge of pre-commencement planning conditions. These are separate matters. Campbell Reith audited the information submitted at planning stage; that does not mean Campbell Reith has audited or approved the subsequent HRW/GEA material now relied upon for the discharge of the conditions.

The relevant conditions were imposed because further detailed information was required before development, including excavation, could commence. The Local Planning Authority therefore needs to be satisfied that each condition has been fully met before discharge. A "conditional discharge" of a pre-commencement condition is, in practical terms, illogical because it would purport to discharge a condition while leaving key requirements still to be satisfied.

Condition 8:

HRW's response does not address the point raised in our letter. The concern is not the appointment of a suitably qualified engineer for the permanent works, but the absence of evidence that a suitably qualified temporary works engineer has been appointed. Condition 8 expressly refers to the inspection, approval and monitoring of critical elements of both the temporary and permanent basement works. Without evidence of the temporary works

STRUCTURAL & CIVIL ENGINEERING URBAN DESIGN MASTERPLANNING TRANSPORT & MOVEMENT CONSERVATION SUSTAINABILITY

Strategic advisors

Alan Baxter CBE BSc MICE
Michael Coombs MSc DIC FStructE

Directors

Adam Sewell MEng MStructE
William Filmer-Sankey MA DPhil FSA MCIFA
Andrew Morton BSc MICE
Richard Pollard MA

Clare Coats BSc Dip LA CMLJ
David Lankester MEng MStructE
Nicholas Davies BSc ACA
Trenton Williams BSc(Eng) MPhil
Fredrik Nyberg MEng MStructE
Olivier Fernandez MA MStructE
Ing. Luca Frasca
Rory Dack MEng MStructE

Associates

David Rathbone BSc MICE MStructE
Adrian Tucker BEng MStructE
Raihan Abu BEng MSc DIC MICE MStructE
Alice Eggeling MA MSc MRTPI IHBC
Robert Hradsky MA
Thomas Brewster MEng MStructE
Hannah Butlin MEng MStructE

David Bowles BEng
Gabriele Burelli MEng MStructE
Michael Bredin MSc
Megan Morrison MEng MStructE
Paul Snape MEng MStructE
Tom Jerry MEng MStructE
Daniel Blower MEng MStructE
James Davies MEng

Technical Consultants

James Gardiner BSc MICE MStructE
John Mason MA MStructE

Consultants

Robert Thorne MA FSA

.../2

appointment, including qualifications and responsibilities, Condition 8 should not be discharged.

Condition 9:

HRW relies on the construction sequence assumed by Create at planning stage. That assumed sequence may have been sufficient for the planning approval, but it is not sufficient for the discharge of a post-planning condition. In our view, Condition 9 requires an assessment based on the actual sequence of construction and temporary works that the appointed contractor proposes to adopt, together with any necessary mitigation measures.

Condition 10:

The same point applies to Condition 10. A ground movement assessment suitable for discharge of the condition should be based on the detailed structural design and the contractor's actual proposed sequence of construction and temporary works. The detailed structural design has not yet been provided, and reliance on an assumed planning-stage sequence is therefore insufficient to demonstrate that ground movements can be limited to Burland Category 1 for all neighbouring properties. Accordingly, in our view, the information provided is insufficient to discharge Condition 10.

Condition 11:

Our comments on Condition 11 follow from Condition 8. The condition requires continuous supervision by a suitably qualified chartered structural or geotechnical engineer, and movement monitoring to be installed and undertaken in accordance with the updated Ground Movement Assessment approved under Condition 10. In the absence of evidence of the relevant temporary works appointment, and without an approved Ground Movement Assessment based on detailed design and the actual construction sequence, Condition 11 should not be discharged.

Condition 12:

HRW states that the information is sufficient to show the principles of the site drainage. However, Condition 12 does not ask only for drainage principles. It expressly requires revised drainage layout drawings following detailed design of the scheme, demonstrating full coordination with the approved structural and piling design. As explained in our letter of 10 August 2026, the information submitted to date does not demonstrate that coordination. In particular, a complete package of detailed structural and piling drawings has not been provided, so the drainage proposals have not been shown to avoid physical conflict with the structural and piling design.

Summary and Conclusions:

Overall, our position remains that Conditions 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 should not be discharged at this stage. The applicant should be asked to provide a complete and coordinated package of detailed structural, temporary works, geotechnical, ground movement, monitoring and drainage information before discharge is reconsidered.

.../3

Yours sincerely

Luca Frasca
for Alan Baxter Ltd

cc:	Haringey Planning Service	-	Catherine Smyth	-	by email
	Haringey Planning Service	-	Matthew Gunning	-	by email
	Haringey Planning Service	-	James Argles	-	by email
	Haringey Building Control	-	Denis Ioannou	-	by email