

HGY/2023/0328: Dyne House: BASEMENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT PART 5

We presume that because this document is 'Part 5' that the document submitted consists of Parts 1 - 4 and possibly more after Part 5. This document cannot be evaluated as a standalone document.

It states at the end of Part 5:

"4.2. Impact Assessment

4.2.1. General The potential impact/damage induced on primary façade/wall elements of the buildings surrounding the proposed scheme have been evaluated on the basis of the calculated ground movement fields. Façades of the existing Dyne House building and auditorium were not considered in this analysis. The masonry walls of concern are shown in Figure 4.5."

There is no Figure 4.5 so we presume the text as submitted is not the whole of Part 5 but has been edited.

Fig. 4.4 gives rise to considerable concern as does the text of the document.

This report is based in information by others which has not been submitted.

Looking at dwg. no A/HS-DH3 2622F we see a note stating "Retaining wall option 2/4 tbc by Expedition". Has it been so confirmed?

The text states "15m long piles" although on the drawings the piles disappear off the bottom of the drawings in the text.

If those piles are contiguous then they would appear to create a substantial barrier to ground water. Ground water was not part of it this study. The study addresses potential structural damage to adjoining buildings but it must be noted the adjoining buildings are too far from the proposed construction to fall with the Party Wall etc. Act.

Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee considers the risks found in Part 5 are considerable and unacceptable. HCAAC requests that the full suite of Parts and full information on which this Assessment was based be submitted. Once that is to hand we consider Haringey must have any risks relating to structural movement, basement impacts and changes to ground water flows independently evaluated. More information than we have identified as necessary may be essential.