

**Brent Cross Cricklewood Consultation Meeting –  
presenting ecological enhancement measures within the landscaping design  
of Phase 1A (North)**

**Summary of Meeting held 22/10/2014, 1400hrs,  
at Waterman London office (SE1 9DG)**

**Present:** David Hammond **DH**, Natural England  
Graham Tibbetts **GT**, Natural England (**NE**)  
Mathew Frith **MF**, London Wildlife Trust (**LWT**)  
Clare van Someren **CvS**, MacGregorSmith  
Joanna Ferguson **JF**, Waterman

- |   | <b>Action</b>           |
|---|-------------------------|
| <p><b>1.0</b> <b>JF</b> introduced the Brent Cross Regeneration Scheme (the Scheme) and the consultation process so far regarding the potential ecological impacts of the Scheme (see below Appendix A and B). On 6<sup>th</sup> September 2013 a meeting was held between the Brent Cross Development Partners (DPs) and Brent Wildlife Trust (BWT) to discuss BWT's comments and concerns regarding the Scheme. No further comments were received from BWT after the meeting (pers. coms. Simon Lawrence, London Communications Agency (LCA)).</p> <p>The Phase 1A (North) Reserved Matters Application (RMA) required fresh consultation, in addition to that provided by London Borough of Barnet (LBB), and whereas BWT gave a local perspective, it was felt that regional and national interested parties needed to be consulted to give their comment and guidance. Therefore <b>NE</b> and <b>LWT</b> were contacted by <b>JF</b> in October 2014.</p> <p>The meeting was undertaken as an informal discussion, questions were asked by <b>DH / GT / MF</b> and <b>CvS / JF</b> as the meeting progressed to gather a better understanding of how the ecological enhancements would be incorporated, what the thinking was behind the landscaping proposed but also so <b>DH / GT / MF</b> could provide guidance based on their experience of urban regeneration schemes and landscaping.</p> | <p><b>N/A</b></p>       |
| <p><b>2.0</b> <b>CvS</b> took <b>DH / GT</b> and <b>MF</b> through each open space strategy and <b>JF</b> provided information on how the ecological enhancement measures would be incorporated into the design for each area / area type:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Clitterhouse Playing Fields</li><li>• Claremont Park</li><li>• Brent Riverside Park</li><li>• The Living Bridge</li><li>• Brent Triangles</li><li>• Infrastructure</li></ul>   |                         |
| <p><b>3.0</b> <b>DH / GT / MF</b> were positive about the landscaping plans and ecological enhancements proposed for the Phase 1A North open spaces, in particular the Brent Riverside Park and Clitterhouse Playing Fields. Both parties are keen to see native species planting wherever possible (and acknowledged the maintenance and conflicting landscaping issues LBB had often had with this), <b>JF</b> and <b>CvS</b> assured <b>DH / GT / MF</b> that this is the approach being taken, especially where retained native habitat was being enhanced. However <b>CvS</b> also explained that LBB had requested non-native planting in a number of new planting areas for low maintenance and also for security reasons for example, native scrub would not be included around playgrounds.</p>  |                         |
| <p><b>4.0</b> The main concern from <b>DH / GT / MF</b> with the landscaping and</p>  | <p>Ensure a robust,</p> |

	<b>Action</b>
<p>ecological enhancement measures was that, through overuse and poor management, the habitats would not become established long-term and habitats created for wildlife would fail to fulfil their purpose.</p> <p><b>MF</b> noted that this had become a problem at Burgess Park, south London (which has a very similar planting palette to the Scheme) and that <b>MF</b> was providing Southwark LPA with advice to counter this. Ideas raised during the meeting to ensure this doesn't happen at the Scheme included a robust Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP), signed agreements for the land managers of these areas to take responsibility for the maintenance and education and involvement of the local community; possibly include a working panel that would comprise LWT members as well as other local interested parties / residents. It was agreed that this was a 'positive' problem, in that these landscaping designs had the potential to reengage residents with their local open spaces, in addition to the increase in residents to the area via the Scheme.</p>	<p>long-term LEMP, potentially tied to a Section 106 agreement that ensures the habitats are not only well-established, but that they continue to be so.</p> <p>BWT or LWT should be considered to help give advice and join a working group for the area as required.</p>
<p><b>5.0 DH</b> wanted it noted that cumulative impacts from the recreational pressure to the Welsh Harp / Brent Reservoir Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) should be considered, especially as there is a development on the opposite side of the SSSI at West Hendon. However DH did note that each area of the development appeared to have its own green infrastructure (courtyard gardens, nature parks etc.) and that that would assist with mitigating the increase in recreational pressure likely to the SSSI.</p>	<p>The cumulative environmental assessment to take into account the impacts upon Welsh Harp / Brent Reservoir SSSI.</p>
<p><b>6.0</b> To summarise, <b>DH</b> and <b>GT</b> are happy to defer comment to <b>MF</b> and <b>DH / GT / MF</b> are broadly happy with the proposals for the landscaping and ecological enhancement measures and required no further information providing to them. However both said to contact them if further questions arose or comment was needed.</p>	<p>Waterman to circulate meeting outcome to wider project team.</p>

## **Appendix A – DP and BWT draft meeting notes (from Simon Lawrence at London Communications Agency in an email dated 23/09/14)**

### **Draft Barnet Wildlife Trust meeting note**

Set out below is a brief note on the points discussed and actions arising from the meeting between the Brent Cross Cricklewood Development Partners and the Barnet Wildlife Trust on Friday 6 September 2013.

#### **1. Introductions**

#### **2. Update on Section 73 application**

Jonathon Joseph (JJ) explained that the BXC Development Partners (DPs) will submit a Section 73 planning application at the end of September for the three changes proposed to the masterplan. The effect of this application is to deliver a whole new outline consent for the masterplan, but detailed design work will still need to be undertaken at a later date.

JJ suggested that much of the masterplan already bears the 'fingerprints' of the Barnet Wildlife Trust (BWT) from earlier consultation and that, as a result, it has evolved into an even better scheme. This was agreed by those present.

#### **3. Changes to the River Brent**

The changes were explained and the DPs will look to incorporate the following measures, in line with the comments from BWT:

1. The DPs agreed with the BWT that the River Brent would not be the main pedestrian route through the development and that it would be more likely to form a leisure or secondary route. BWT agreed that this would help preserve the river corridor.
2. The River Brent culvert on the south side of the North Circular will be opened up at a later phase in the development.
3. The existing trees along the River Brent will be retained where possible and there will be particular focus on the poplars in the area. New trees will be taller than present to act as a better screen for wildlife.
4. The DPs will look to include sandbanking, swift bricks and ledges along bridges for wildlife to perch, nest and burrow once further design work is undertaken at the detailed planning stage.
5. Appropriate drainage works will be undertaken to prevent polluting run-off from surrounding areas entering the River Brent, particularly the bus station.
6. Low level lighting, at an appropriate level for the security and safety of pedestrians, will be incorporated to prevent any negative impact on wildlife, particularly bats. The DPs expect the new planning permission to reapply the relevant planning conditions that specifically deal with this matter.
7. The issue of potential disturbance from young people to the River Brent was discussed and the DPs committed to a robust management plan to deter this disturbance.
8. The DPs will provide assistance to BWT in a possible campaign to prevent illegal dumping of pollutants into the River Brent.
9. PZ agreed to send the river cross sections very shortly to the BWT

#### **4. Ecology and wildlife surveys**

1. New surveys have been undertaken to support the Section 73 application, these have not found anything significantly different to the surveys that were previously carried out in support of the full application.
2. LCA will send across a CD with the full Environmental Impact Assessment (including the Public Realm and Open Space Strategy) to BWT once this is submitted later this month. LCA will also send a link to the application, which will be hosted on the [www.brentcrosscricklewood.com](http://www.brentcrosscricklewood.com) website.

#### **5. Flood Risk Assessment**

1. The flood risk modelling is, in line with the comments from BWT, using a risk level of 1 in 100 years plus climate change and plus 20%.

#### **6. Clitterhouse Playing Fields**

1. In line with comments from BWT it was accepted that the DPs will assess the requirements for drainage on the playing fields, so as to maintain this habitat for wildlife if possible.
2. Hedgerows and new planting will enhance habitats in this area and provide a greater connectivity between habitats than exists at present.
3. The floodlights are very likely to be extinguished on the new all-weather pitches from 10pm to prevent night time disturbances for residents and wildlife.
4. In line with the concerns heard from BWT, the playing pitches at the improved Clitterhouse Playing Fields will be informally marked out and will remain free for public use. The fields will also retain their 'open' character.

#### **7. Environmental sustainability measures – green roofs/walls, rain water collection etc**

1. Green roofs/walls and rain water collection will be incorporated into the development. SuDS proposals will be presented in the Drainage Strategy submitted with the application.
2. Further details on these measures will emerge during the detailed design stages and will incorporate the comments heard from BWT.

#### **8. Local transport – routes for pedestrians and cyclists, the new railway station and linkages**

1. In line with the comments from BWT, routes for pedestrian and cyclists will be separated where possible or designed in such a way as to strongly deter commuters/serious cyclists mixing with pedestrians.
2. It was explained that significant funding would be made available by the DPs for Transport for London and London Borough of Barnet to invest in improved bus links between the new railway station, Brent Cross underground station and Brent Cross Shopping Centre.
3. As part of the proposals, there will be bus-only access routes to improve the speed and accessibility around the area by public transport.

#### **9. AOB and next steps**

1. Railway lands and wildlife potential in this area – the DPs fully recognise the importance of the railway sidings to wildlife, which cannot be underestimated. This area will be managed to optimise its potential for habitat creation.

## **Appendix B** – Pre-meeting information circulated to meeting attendees for 6 September 2013 consultation meeting (from an email 23/09/14 provided by Phillipa Zieba, Hammerson plc)

*FYI - Alistair mentioned that ERM can pull together a team crib sheet for circulation before the meeting. Attending from the Barnet Wildlife Trust will be Dianne Murphy, Dennis Pepper and Bob Husband. Their questions are below for reference:*

I am the chairman of the Barnet group of the London Wildlife Trust ([wildlondon.org.uk](http://wildlondon.org.uk))

I attended the event with some of our members (Robert Husband and Dennis Pepper) The staff there were very helpful but we were hoping to discuss with your ecological consultants some details of aspects that might have impact on wildlife.

The main area are as follows:

- River Brent diversion - how will the new water course be constructed, will it have concrete or natural banks for example. How will it be protected from litter, fly tipping and pollution. As it will be more open and accessible than it is currently.
- The new bus station will be on the edge of the river how will you prevent polluted run off from this area entering the river.
- The new leisure complex will be open in the evenings so will require more street lighting. How will you ensure the river corridor is protected from light spillage we are concerned about impact on bats who feed and commute along the river.
- Have bat surveys been carried out on the current river course.
- Flood Risk Assessment - what new SuDs features are being incorporated, attenuation pools etc.
- Clitterhouse playing fields - why is so much of it going to be formal sports pitches? only a small proportion appears to be available for informal recreation.
- Will these pitches be freely accessible to the general public when not in use for matches or will they be fenced off and only be available for hire? Will there be flood lighting and/or any artificial pitches? Whitefield Schools currently have two artificial sports pitches.
- Will there be rain water collection and recycling from the new glass roof over the shops?
- Green roofs are mentioned. How many square metres? Will there be green walls too?
- We are keen to promote sustainable travel and have two questions regarding travel,
- The new wide pedestrian and cycle bridge across the NCR. - Will cyclists and pedestrians be separated in some way?

The new railway station is a similar distance from the shops as the existing tube station. Very few shoppers currently use the Tube to get to Brent Cross because of the distance and poor access route. A shuttle bus service or similar connecting the three locations would greatly encourage shoppers as well as residents to use public transport. Plans for a "rapid transport link" from Brent Cross tube station to the railway line via the shopping centre have been discussed in the past and identified in the councils UDP, are you aware if this is still likely to go ahead?

**Distribution: All attendees + non-attendees**