

Information Systems Division

Kensington Town Hall, Hornton Street, London, W8 7NX

Head of Information Systems Division

Barry Holloway

Simon Haslam
Basement Force

19 March 2014

My reference: FOI2014-276
Please ask for: Robin Yu

Dear Mr. Haslam

Thank you for your email of 16th February, in response to your follow up questions:

1. Unfortunately the Council's response was inadequate as it does not answer the reasonably put questions. Some points are:

2. It does not provide the types of building material used and these are not given in the Eight Associates report. From the information provided it is not possible to assess if the correct materials have been included or if materials have been missed.

The types of building materials used are provided in the Eight Associates report. Please see the table from Appendix 1 of the report where you can find the description of the build ups used for the report and the functional units considered. The build-ups used were the same for subterranean extensions as above ground, the types of extensions were not treated differently.

3. The quantities of each type of material are not given. It is not reasonable to give a scanned drawing from the Council's website and expect someone to measure the same quantities.

Eight Associates has used the drawings from the RBKC website, they were measured using digital takeoff software to ensure maximum accuracy given that some of them are scanned drawings.

Direct Line: 020 7938 8226

Email: robin.yu@rbkc.gov.uk

Web: www.rbkc.gov.uk

4. Waste material – in the Baxter report the addresses of the case studies are not given so it is not possible to match the Baxter case studies to the Eight Associates case studies.

The information used from the Baxter report is regarding the bulking factor numbers, and the spoil removal volumes, the case studies are not related to each other.

5. The assumptions used in the Eight Associates report are not all listed in the report.

Please be more specific regarding the assumptions you consider are missing (list of assumptions). Everything required to replicate the results and the study was provided in the appendices or within the report.

6. The Council's response states that the spreadsheets used for calculations are Eight Associates property and will not be provided – this means that no one can check the calculations and that any results can be produced and not checked. Can you please confirm that the council has paid for a report but not for the ability to check the calculations.

The report provided by Eight Associates follows the best practice in relation to report content as per BS ISO 21931. The contents of the report allow for the results to be replicated and peer reviewed. In assessing the conclusions and results of technical reports, best practice is to carry out studies with the same scope that show different or similar key findings. Any additional study that provides evidence that Eight Associates report's key findings require amending are welcome.

7. The Council's response states that some of the information / assumptions used in the spreadsheets / calculations are proprietary property. This means that some of the information / assumptions are not standard or open source. This conflicts with statements in the Eight Associates report that states that all assumptions and inputs are standard.

All assumptions used by Eight Associates are open source or were provided in the report. The methodology and the spreadsheets (the LCA model) is proprietary. Also, some assumptions (i.e. electricity consumption during construction works) were calculated based on the electricity consumption from previous Eight Associates' projects, the electricity factor is provided but disclosure of the individual case studies used would be a breach of contract agreed by Eight Associates for the case studies in question. The Eight associates report states that the construction works results should be analysed carefully as the available data for the analysis was limited due the lack of accurate information provided by contractors in the project's planning applications. As such calculations were made based on basement volumes and excavation rates. Temporary works for basements were excluded because of a lack of quantifiable data, case study data on this would be welcome.

8. The level of information provided does not allow the Eight Associates report analysis to be checked.

The level of information provided does not allow every detail of the Eight Associates report to be checked on a number by number basis, but allows for the report's results and methodology to be replicated following the best practice advised by the BS ISO 21931 standard. Any environmental expert should be capable to conducting a similar study to replicate and evaluate the findings of the study, and then to determine if the Eight Associates report results are realistic.

The purpose of Eight Associates report is to provide a comparative analysis of the carbon footprint of subterranean extensions and above ground extensions. To provide the Excel spreadsheets used by Eight Associates would affect the commercial interests of the company and would not provide a constructive discussion about the environmental factors associated with the RBKC policy. To facilitate a constructive discussion of the report's results, further technical and scientific analysis should be undertaken for comparison with the Eight Associates report.

Yours sincerely

Robin Yu

Information Protection Assistant
Information Governance Team
Information Systems Division (ISD)
The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea
The Town Hall, Hornton Street, London W8 7NX
Tel: 020 7938 8226

Web: <http://www.rbkc.gov.uk>