

Gentet, Matthias

From: Karen Beare <zbkarli@me.com>
Sent: 01 February 2016 08:34
To: Thuaire, Charles
Cc: Anthony Beare; Mary-Jane O'Neill; Bob Warnock; Michael Hammerson; Tye Blackshaw; Elspeth Clements; Marc Hutchinson; Lynda Cook; Susan Rose; Harley Atkinson; Dr Colin Cooper; Georgia Abrams; Richard Stokes; Derrick Dale QC; Berry, Sian (Councillor); Gimson, Sally (Councillor); Lewis, Oliver (Councillor); Jane Shallice; Mary Cane
Subject: Water house - BIA
Attachments: Supplementary Comments on Revised Planning Application January 2016.pdf

Charles

Please find attached supplementary comments from Alan Baxter Associates. Their report is pretty self-explanatory but the headline issues are detailed below for your convenience.

We note from FOI emails that the need for a 4th BIA audit is being resisted strenuously by the Agent who is putting considerable pressure on you to accept the most recent basement drainage changes as non-material. They are not.

Alan Baxter has confirmed that in their opinion the removal of the proposed gravel drain in response to the City's refusal to grant a new easement will continue to cause uncontrolled surface water flooding across the Lane into the bird sanctuary pond. In addition, it is also likely to discharge ground water unlawfully on that part of the Lane owned by no55 downstream. The situation will therefore not be an improvement of previous proposals as the applicant would have you believe. It will be most likely be worse, as two landowners will potentially be affected.

It should also be noted that the engineers have stated that any surcharge of ground water for the proposed soak away will drain into an existing gravel drain that runs parallel with Millfield Lane. Photographic evidence below shows no such drain exists, so this is a fundamental flaw in the scheme and extremely misleading.

The FOI email dated 5 Dec 2015 from the Agent, Tom Horne from DP9 is factually incorrect and is extremely misleading. He restates incorrectly that the City asked for the gravel drain in 2011 and the removal of it "improves the existing situation and the (BIA) has not changed." The agent is fundamentally wrong to suggest the COL has had a "change of direction" and furthermore to use it as a point of leverage to insist that these last minute changes are of the City's making, not theirs and so no further scrutiny of their BIA is necessary.

It is unclear if DP9 are missing the point either because they genuinely don't understand, or because it suits them not to. Dr Haycocks's focus was on maintaining the integrity of the Highgate chain's catchment. Specifically he objected (as did CGL) to ground water being discharged into the sewer as originally proposed. The gravel drain was HRW's proposed solution and Dr Haycock was always clear that he did not believe the City would ever agree to it. What DP9 forget is that, along with the Dales, I shared costs of the BIA review by Haycock, so I was intimately involved in those discussions.

It is therefore our collective opinion that should you decide not to refer this latest BIA for a further audit, then Camden will have failed to consider a material issue in determining this application.

With regards
Karen Beare

On behalf of the Friends of Millfield Lane

I) the permeability of the 'made ground' where the engineer proposes ground water will now re-infiltrate in a soak away has not been tested, so HRW are relying on assumption only. This is a serious omission.

ABA correctly point out that the borehole data for made ground is described as a type of Clay and this contradicts what HRW is saying. As a result, ABA consider the made ground will have a low permeability and the scheme will not work, resulting in surface water flooding downstream onto City land and possibly no55, particularly when the soak away is surcharged during periods of heavy or prolonged rain.

II) in any event, as the photos below show, there is no gravel drain running along the boundary with Millfield Lane, so the contingency plan, should the soak away surcharge, is based on false information and surface flooding will occur.

III) HRW are relying heavily on the existing pond in the corner by the T5 Oak being lined to support their infiltration assumptions and theory. Their position is that if the made ground was clay, a liner would not have been needed.

ABA disagree and consider it unreasonable to have such an important aspect of the BIA for such a complex hydrologic site left to guesswork and assumption at this late stage.

IV) as SWP drawing 2391-SKPH04 rev F shows, there are two 6000l rainwater harvesters, discharging into two attenuation tanks (dims not given) each being controlled by a separate hydro brake.

ABA note that for a hydro brake to function it needs to flow at 5l/sec. Given that there are two on site, the total rate of discharge into Thames water sewer will be 10l/sec. This is contrary to what has been agreed with TW which was a maximum rate of 6l/sec.

photo shows no gravel drain along water house boundary with Millfield Lane.



Sent from my iPad