

Minutes

ARUP

Project title	Pinkham Way	Job number 124572-60
Meeting name and number	Ecology Valuation and Mitigation	File reference
Location	13.5	Time and date 11.30 3 March 2011
Purpose of meeting	To discuss on and off-site mitigation requirements for ecology	Page 1 of 2
Present	Neil Harwood (Arup), Matthew Wright (Arup), Ian Holt (London Borough of Haringey)	
Apologies		
Circulation	Those present Nicola White (NLWA)	

Action

1. NH ran through the agenda for the meeting and the intention to talk about both the value of the ecological resources on site and the mitigation requirements resulting from the proposals, as provided in note form to all present during the previous day.
2. NH ran through the figures (area) of habitat losses (from recent site constraints plans) and habitat gains (from the Indicative Landscape Plan), which confirmed that approximately half of the site (3.3 of 6.6 hectares) would be retained or recreated as ecological habitats. The major loss, which cannot be recreated on site, is that of regenerating secondary deciduous woodland.
3. IH raised that the Draft SPD on Sustainable Design and Construction (not yet adopted by LBH) should be used to inform planning applications. This includes its standards for biodiversity and the standard of like for like replacement of area to be lost, following PPS9's 'no net loss'.
4. NH suggested that there should be an additional consideration of quality, such that the habitats on site are in sub-optimal condition and reinstated habitats could be better, but IH disputed this and would request that an equivalent compensation of 3.3 hectares be found off site, if it cannot be accommodated within the application site.
5. NH confirmed that the green roof would most likely be designed to recreate the short perennial vegetation communities to be lost at

Prepared by Neil Harwood
Date of circulation 7 March 2011
Date of next meeting TBC

Project title	Job number	Date of Meeting
Pinkham Way	124531	3 March 2011

Action

ground level, rather than more complex grassland communities. These would be lightweight and quick to evolve.

6. IH suggested that a wasteland site of that size would most likely be considered to be of county level importance. NH agreed but raised the question of whether the site could still be categorised as wasteland in its current (established regenerating to scrub and woodland) condition.
7. IH suggested that the site selection criteria used by the GLA for BAP habitats and site designations could be used to assess value and off site opportunities.
8. IH requested that more information/evidence be provided to demonstrate that the culvert cannot be opened up on site, including substantive reasons as to why it is not feasible to be explained in the ES/DAS.
9. IH recommended that the selection of potential off-site compensation sites could refer to the GIGL opportunity mapping project and research into areas of deficiency and lack of access to nature conservation.
10. IH stated that the onus was on the NLWA to find potential off-site compensation sites and that although one large compensation area would be best, the use of 3-4 smaller stepping stone sites may be acceptable. All agree that the focus should be on native, deciduous woodland recreation/planting to replace the most significant losses from the existing site.
11. MW suggested that the principles for reserved matters would be set in landscape strategy or within chapter of ES, in as much detail as possible within the confines of an outline application.
12. The details of off-site mitigation could be presented within the S106 and monies ring-fenced as appropriate to achieve this.
13. MW confirmed that a comprehensive tree survey of the site is underway and is to be completed by the end of this month.
14. IH questioned the lag time between site clearance and a landscaped green roof establishing. NH confirmed that in his experience this would only take a couple of years.
15. IH questioned the value of the 'bat cave' in terms of the contribution it could make to the mitigation package. NH provided further details of its design, confirming the positive biodiversity features that would be part of this design, including swales and hibernacula, bat and bird roost and nest units, native climbing plant species etc.
16. IH requested that the issues of site and habitat fragmentation are considered in full within the ES to consider how on and off-site mitigation could link together.