

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|---|------------|------------|------------|---|--|--|--|--|-----------------|
| PINKHAM WAY | | | | | | | | | | | ISSUE 01 |
| STRATEGIC RISK ASSESSMENT | | | | | | | | | | | 27th March 2015 |
| Objective: | | To identify the probable, relative, high-level Planning Risks, Physical Risks and Cost Risks attached to any development of the site | | | | | | | | | |
| Context / Basis of Reference: | | <p>This Risk Assessment has been prepared following proposals put forward by the NLWA for an MBT Waste Treatment Plant and the London Borough of Barnet for a Waste Lorry Depot.</p> <p>Pinkham Way Alliance has carefully studied the implications of these proposals. PWA and the London Borough of Haringey have had discussions for the purpose of exploring the possibility of alternative uses for the site and its environs.</p> <p>PWA has carefully considered these studies, and has concluded that development of the site would have significant negative impact.</p> <p>This Risk Assessment calibrates the risk stemming from the above studies and discussions, and it incorporates material prepared for, and by the NLWA, LBH, LBB and PWA which is referenced in this matrix.</p> | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | RISK LEVEL | RISK LEVEL | RISK LEVEL | | | | | | |
| Item No | Subject | | High | Medium | Low | Key References/Comments | | | | | |
| 1 | Impact on SINC Grade 1 Nature Conservation Value | | | | | ref: NPPF Core Principles 7 & 8 and paras 111 & 118, Brownfield Sites of High Environmental Value GLA Biodiversity Strategy and LBH Biodiversity Plan Special Criteria apply to land as part of an Ecological Green Corridor Network linked to Metropolitan Land | | | | | |
| 2 | Ecological Impact | | | | | ref: Preliminary Ecological Appraisal prepared by Huma Pearce & Denis Vickers for PWA, date October 2013; Reference No: 2013_012 Preliminary Invertebrate Survey 2014-2015 by Edward Milner identifies rich "Open Mosaic" Area ref: LUC Report, Oct 2014 for LBH, Appendix 7 | | | | | |
| 3 | Environmental Corridor & Metropolitan Open Land | | | | | ref: NPPF para 109,113 and 117; coherent ecological networks and wildlife corridors ref: Mayor's Biodiversity Strategy, Appendix 1, items, A1.2.17; A1.2.18 and A1.2.19:- sites of importance are included in (green) corridors, but these deserve protection in their own right MOL land abuts site and forms part of site containing features of nature conservation and habitat interest and forms part of an ecological corridor All London Green Grid (ALGG): Mayor's Policy to promote the design and delivery of green infrastructure across London | | | | | |
| 4 | Existing Culvert | | | | | ref: Jacobs Development Constraints Report, April 2008 - para 2.4 and 2.9 - condition of culvert unknown and its vulnerability to contamination; risks associated with flooding ref: Arup Scoping Report, 07/03/11, para 3.8 ref: Environment Agency letter to LBH, date 20/03/14 Deculverting watercourses are to include a set back to incorporate at least an 8m buffer zone. Buffer Zones are to provide habitat and 'green corridors' for flora and fauna; support the ecology and natural functioning of the watercourse and provide safe access alongside the watercourse ref: LBH Biodiversity Action Plan and London Rivers Action Plan | | | | | |
| 5 | Loss of Existing Environmental Benefit | | | | | ref: Environmental Protection Act, 1990 ref: Air Quality Strategy for London, 2010 London Borough of Haringey, Air Quality Action Plan 2010-2018, Feb 2011 ref: Arup Scoping Report, 07/03/11, para 3.1 - It is recognised that the site is sensitive in terms of Air Quality The site is located within LBH's Air Quality Management Area and in close proximity to the AQMAs of Barnet and Enfield Health Impact Assessment would be required | | | | | |
| 6 | Planning Risk | | | | | Incompatibility with Adopted Planning Framework - NPPF, London Plan and London Borough of Haringey and DEFRA Guidance Potential for call-in by the Mayor or Secretary of State for determination prior to decision by the Local Authority | | | | | |
| 7 | Contaminated Land | | | | | ref: Jacobs Development Constraints Report, April 2008 - para 2.2, Lead at concentrations above CLEA Guidelines para 2.3, Microbiological Risk para 2.4, Groundwater Contamination para 2.5, Gas Protection Measures Extent of Contaminated Land is approx 80% of site area ref: Arup Scoping Report, 07/03/11, para 3.2 - confirm the following:- Elevated concentrations of lead; Elevated concentrations of microbial contaminants in soils and groundwater; Further gas monitoring required | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 8 | Historic Landfill | | | | | | | | | ref: Jacobs Development Constraints Report, April 2008, para 2.7 - The volume of buried concrete waste is difficult to quantify. Extensive waste has been deposited throughout the site |
| 9 | Geotechnical Ground Conditions | | | | | | | | | ref: Jacobs Development Constraints Report, April 2008, para 2.8 Settlement & Foundation Design - The loose and variable nature of the Made Ground poses a risk of excessive settlement for foundations located within it. This risk is compounded by potential infiltration of water which can lead to localised ground collapse in poorly consolidated areas. A thin covering of Made Ground provides a pathway to weathered London Clay, the surface properties of which sensitive to variations in moisture content. |
| 10 | Existing Roads Infrastructure | | | | | | | | | ref: Arup WIDP 27/10/2009: High Risk Residential Roads to west of site unable to accommodate any increase in traffic movements |
| 11 | Access to and Egress from Site | | | | | | | | | ref: Arup WIDP 27/10/2009: High Risk ref: Arup Scoping Report, 07/03/11, para 3.6 Access from Orion Way not possible without destroying land rich in invertebrates Direct access / egress to and from the North Circular Road (A406) is not feasible |
| 12 | Public Transport Links | | | | | | | | | ref: PTLA rated 1a (LBH lowest rating) The site is isolated and there is a lack of transport accessibility ref: Atkins ELS, Feb 2015, para 5.41 - site contaminated and not close to public transport |
| 13 | Flood Risk | | | | | | | | | ref: Ove Arup & Partners Ltd, WIDP, RevB, 27/10/09 Figure 2. Pinkham Way Flood Risk ref: Environment Agency letter to LBH, date 20/03/14 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment required Environment Agency require a thorough evidence base in the form of a sequential test supported by SFRAs Sites with potentially contaminated land will be expected to submit a preliminary risk assessment in line with para 007 of the National Planning Practice Guide. Any sites with former contaminative uses would be subject to land quality conditions |
| 14 | Conflict of Ownership | | | | | | | | | Landlocked part of site is owned by LB Barnet therefore Access would be required across MOL or "Open Mosaic" LBB area equates to approx 40% of total PW site area |
| 15 | Tree Preservation Orders | | | | | | | | | Protected by legislation Town & Country Planning Act 1990 Town & Country Planning (Trees) Regulations 1999 |
| 16 | Existing Topography | | | | | | | | | ref: Jacobs Development Constraints Report, April 2008, Figure 4, Topographical Survey Figure 6, Areas of Significant Gradient ref: Arup Scoping Report, 07/03/11, para 3.4.1 - the topography of the site is very uneven due to former landfill and sewage works; the level difference is approx 15metres between the highest southernmost point of the site and the lowest level adjacent to Pinkham Way/NCR |
| 17 | Utilities Infrastructure | | | | | | | | | ref: Jacobs Development Constraints Report, April 2008, para 4.3 and para 4.4 and Figure 3 EDF Electricity buried cables in an East-West central location across the site |
| 18 | Network Rail | | | | | | | | | British Transport Commission Act 1949 NR Guidelines to be followed in conjunction with building works in proximity to NR Property - ie structural stability of NR property, drainage and flood risk implications, foundations, electromagnetic interference, fire risk, etc |
| 19 | Cost Risk (VFM) | | | | | | | | | This Strategic Assessment indicates that there is a significantly high level of cost risk attached to development of this site. Additionally, it must be noted that there is considerable potential for heightened Cost Risks attached due to the cumulative impact arising from the synergy of elements that comprise this Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) - Borough Grade 1 Importance. Consequently, the site is not likely to provide VFM for any developer, let alone a public body. |
| 20 | Transfer of Long-Term Legal Risk | | | | | | | | | Ref: The Environmental Protection Act 1990 and the Contaminated Land (England) Regulations 2000 |

