From: Joseph Staines < jstaines@jmsengineers.co.uk>

Sent: 13 November 2024 11:11

To: Adam Greenhalgh <Adam.Greenhalgh@camden.gov.uk>;

katharinebarker@campbellreith.com

Cc: Daniel Staines <dstaines@jmsengineers.co.uk>; Shulem Posen

<shulem@eadeplanning.com>; Antony Ronaldson <aronaldson@jmsengineers.co.uk>
Subject: RE: FW: Additional audit fee - 2024/1541/P - 154 Royal College Street, NW1 0TA

You don't often get email from jstaines@jmsengineers.co.uk. Learn why this is important

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc.

Hi All,

These have all been updated in the latest BIA revision (see attached). We have addressed all the auditing queries (also attached).

Below is a summary of the updates. We made in line with the comments:

Outdated Guidance Reference:

Audit Comment: The initial BIA used outdated guidance (CPG4).

Revised BIA (Rev C): This has been updated to use Camden Planning Guidance Basements (January 2021).

Qualifications of Authors:

Audit Comment: The qualifications did not meet the requirements.

Revised BIA (Rev C): The qualifications of the authors are now listed, including relevant chartered professionals such as David Brunning (Chartered Civil Engineer) and Daniel Staines (CEng)

Site-Specific Ground Investigation:

Audit Comment: A site-specific ground investigation was not undertaken, and information presented in the BIA contradicted that in the SFBIA.

Revised BIA (Rev C): Borehole data from adjacent properties (Nos. 152 and 156) has been referenced, and a summary of ground conditions is provided.

Screening and Scoping Inconsistencies:

Audit Comment: Inconsistencies between screening and scoping stages, such as questions not forwarded correctly.

Revised BIA (Rev C): The updated report includes revised screening flowcharts and scoping outcomes, attempting to align them. Screening responses related to slope stability and surface flow have been forwarded to scoping.

Ground Movement Assessment (GMA):

Audit Comment: The GMA lacked geotechnical interpretation and proper justification for the damage category.

Revised BIA (Rev C): The GMA section provides a detailed assessment of heave and considers the impact of removing overburden. It estimates both vertical and horizontal movements, predicting negligible to very slight damage (Category 1 or 2)

Utility Information:

Audit Comment: Utility plans were missing.

Revised BIA (Rev C): The revised document now includes references to utility plans and mentions the need for agreements regarding Thames Water assets. Thames Water asset maps are included in the appendix.

Drainage and Surface Water:

Audit Comment: No consideration for the impact of increased impermeable areas.

Revised BIA (Rev C): The revised BIA discusses drainage strategy, including the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) and control of surface water runoff to mitigate the effects of increased impermeable areas.

Kind Regards,

Joseph Staines

02070431781 ext. 2103

07506828845

jstaines@jmsengineers.co.uk

www.jmsengineers.co.uk



LONDON · MIDLANDS · EAST ANGLIA · MANCHESTER · EUROPE



This e-mail is only intended for the person(s) to whom it is addressed and may contain confidential information. Unless stated to the contrary, any opinions or comments are personal to the writer and do not represent the official view of the company. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify us immediately by reply e-mail and then delete this message from your system. Please do not copy it or use it for any purposes, or disclose its contents to any other person.