

EH RESPONSE

Most work undertaken through phone calls, visits to site and meetings on site with developers, contractors and consultants on site. Where information has been recorded this is provided below.

Cases:

- **SSCP/18/02584**
- **SSSR/18/03170**
- **SSSR/18/04672**
- **SSCP/18/04693**
- **SSSR/18/05961**
- **SSSR/18/08146**
- **SSCP/19/11166**
- **PHCP/20/00244**

SSCP/18/02584 – complaint of dust and noise from construction works – explosion SBSS (MOD) – The case is likely to be of interest to many residents including Pond Life and Finchley Nurseries because of the impact on them from the explosions, but liaison at the time of the event is between a complainant, the Council and Barratts directly – there is no reference or correspondence with Pondlife/ Finchley nurseries. The Council had not been aware of any explosions until they were rung by complainants. The explosions were stopped by a council officer by telephone conversation the moment that they were informed.

SSSR/18/03170 – Information from Barratts on Section 61 (Noise Mitigation from construction site) details - request for more details - Barratts consultants. A Section 61 is a formal Notice agreement under the Control of Pollution Act 1974 complied to assess and provide noise mitigation from construction works especially out of hours work. Scientific Services asked for Pond Life to be included in the sensitive receptors. Note that: this case was closed once a later revised S61 (case reference: SSSR/18/05961) was submitted.
See below for further information on SSSR/18/05961.

Correspondence:

From: [REDACTED]@barnet.gov.uk
Sent: 13 April 2018 11:11
To: [REDACTED]@Barratts London
Subject: RE: NIMR, Mill Hill: Section 61 Application

Hello [REDACTED]

I have the following comments:

Section 6 of the application does not list sound power levels of the machinery to be used

Section 7. Noise mitigation. I require further detail on proposed noise and vibration mitigation. For instance detail of type of piling, choice of generator, specific measures for the noisiest construction equipment.

Section 8. Actual predicted noise levels at the sensitive receptors need to be calculated.

This should allow me to see how likely it is that noise at the key receptors will be greater than the proposed limits and trigger levels. And whether BPM is going to be used.

Can you please include the Pond Life business as a sensitive receptor for the purpose of monitoring and predictions of noise/vibration impact.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Team Leader, Scientific Services

I am available Wednesdays, Thursdays and Fridays. In my absence please contact our admin team on [REDACTED]

London Borough of Barnet, Barnet House, 1255 High Road Whetstone, N20 0EJ

Tel: 020 8359 7406

Barnet Online: www.barnet.gov.uk <<http://www.barnet.gov.uk>>

Please consider the environment - do you really need to print this

email?

From: [REDACTED]@barrattlondon.com]

Sent: 09 April 2018 18:05

To: ScientificServices

Cc: [REDACTED]@barnet.gov.uk; [REDACTED]@barnet.gov.uk; [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]@barnet.gov.uk; [REDACTED]@barrattlondon.com; [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]@barrattlondon.com

Subject: NIMR, Mill Hill: Section 61 Application

Good evening,

Please find attached our section 61 application for the NIMR development in Mill Hill.

All appendices to support the application can be downloaded at the following location: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Should you need anything further, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Many thanks,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

3rd Floor, Press Centre, Here East | 13 East Bay Lane | Queen Elizabeth Park,
Stratford | London E15 2GW
<<http://www.barrattlondon.com>>

The sender of this e-mail is a member of the Barratt Developments PLC group of companies, the ultimate parent of which is Barratt Developments PLC (company number 00604574). Barratt Developments PLC is registered in England and Wales with its registered office at Barratt House, Cartwright Way, Forest Business Park, Bardon Hill, Coalville, Leicestershire LE67 1UF, together with its principal subsidiaries BDW Trading Limited (03018173), and Wilson Bowden Developments Limited (00948402). Barratt Homes, Barratt London and David Wilson Homes are trading names of BDW Trading Limited. This e-mail message is meant only for use by the intended addressee and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. If you have received this message in error please notify us and remove it from your system. Please view our 'Email Addendum v2.0' at www.barrattcommercialsupport.co.uk/barratt-developments-plc-email-a for further details.

From: [REDACTED]@barnet.gov.uk>
To: pondlifeaquatics [REDACTED] andrew
<andrew@andrewdismore.org.uk>
CC: [REDACTED]@barnet.gov.uk>; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]@barrattlondon.com>;
Members Enquiries <members.enquiries@Barnet.gov.uk>; Re-MembersEnquiries
<Re-
MembersEnquiries@Barnet.gov.uk>; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]@barnet.gcsx.gov.uk>;
[REDACTED]@Barnet.gov.uk>; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]@Barnet.gov.uk>;
[REDACTED]@Barnet.gov.uk>

Sent: Thu, 14 Jun 2018 10:16

Subject: RE: NIMR institute Dust explosions SSSR/18/04672 & 04693

[REDACTED]
I have sympathy with the vibration levels – [REDACTED] will check the readings, however the British standards are primarily to protect building from damage and allow normal demolition and construction techniques. If you can see instances where they are dropping large amounts of demolished material close to the boundary, close to your premises to break it up that would be an example of not using best practical means, that with evidence we would be able to take formal action. From your photos of demolition and our site visits its shows the interior of the premises are clear from their former uses and we know asbestos was surveyed and removed prior to demolition and we have been involved in assessing the contaminated land mitigation and removal so we are sure the vast majority of hazards have been removed prior to demolition, however as the council is not directly doing the work we cannot give 100% assurances but we obviously looks for hazard removal in the planning process and on site visits. We have made a lot of visits in 2018 pre and post demolition and whilst we completely understand resident's concerns we have no evidence of clouds of dust leaving the site affecting neighbouring premises that we can take formal action about as yet however thank you for the photos. For your information regarding photos, for us to take formal action we need evidence that the dust is visibly affecting neighbouring habitable premises and they are not using best practical means to suppress this, we obviously make checks and our own photos on site visits but welcome residents evidence and log sheets to help with assessment. Please find attached logs to document specific incidents that affect your business from noise and dust.

The council does not have powers with respect to H&S on construction sites. I have not seen these documents. I would advise you to contact the Health and Safety Executive Construction section regarding requesting this information.

regards

**Group Manager Consultancy and Scientific Services, Environmental Health
Department of Development and Regulatory Services**
London Borough of Barnet, Barnet House, 1255 High Road Whetstone, N20 0EJ Tel:

Barnet Online: www.barnet.gov.uk

□ please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

www.re-ltd.co.uk

RE (Regional Enterprise) Limited is a joint venture between Capita plc and London Borough of Barnet.

Registered in England 08615172. Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT.

From: [REDACTED]@barnet.gov.uk>

To: pondlifeaquatics [REDACTED] andrew

<andrew@andrewdismore.org.uk>

CC: [REDACTED]@barnet.gov.uk>; [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]@barrattlondon.com>;

Members Enquiries <members.enquiries@Barnet.gov.uk>; Re-MembersEnquiries <Re-

MembersEnquiries@Barnet.gov.uk [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]@barnet.gcsx.gov.uk>;

[REDACTED]@barnet.gov.uk>; Armitage, James

<James.Armitage@Barnet.gov.uk>

Sent: Tue, 12 Jun 2018 10:44

Subject: RE: NIMR institute Dust explosions SSSR/18/04672 & 04693

Thank you for your email.

I have every sympathy with you and your businesses situation. I would just like to clarify the LA was not

informed about the SBS exercise in late March. Unfortunately there is not any enforcement activity I

can take retrospectively that can recompense you for the damage to your business.

You can consider

private action against the Developer demolition company and the MOD.

[REDACTED] has been asking the developers about their vibration monitoring and seen the results since

the 18th May. The vibration levels are significantly below the levels that cause damage to surrounding

buildings, however there was one event that vibration levels were just above the British Standard for

nuisance.

In my experience vibration can be experienced well below the British standard levels which

understandably leads to complaints by residents, but LA have limited enforcement powers if this is the case.

The vast majority of hazardous materials have been removed prior to demolition. Further to my recent email, during the drier weather an Officer visited on the 1st June and saw the 2

dust busters in operation, and water sprays from the JCB pecker see first 3 photos above. The road

condition was good and largely free from dust.

The weather was hot and sunny over the weekend so an officer visited yesterday morning and noticed

there was good spraying on site and watering from a bowser, however there was a dust problems on the

road as there was some mud turned into dusty earth near the access where lorries wheels were

trundling through causing dust on the road. The jet wash facility was being used but not satisfactory as

the lorries were going over dusty ground after their wheels were washed. See 4th photo attached.

The 5th photo shows the dust suppression yesterday.

The officer spoke to the site manager on site to rectify this and it was agreed there will be a dedicated

wheel wash facility installed in a couple of weeks when the access to the site changes. In the meantime

the developer will be told to sweep the roads more than twice a day with their road sweeper and use

the Jet wash closer to the exit to clean wheels if practicable.

I understand your concerns about the dust levels when the site is closed on Sundays on Sundays, to be

fair to the developers it is rare on any site when it is closed to be watered down and I note your

concerns with effectiveness of the water suppression out of hours- we will ask the developer to use

coagulants in the dust suppressors if it's hot ,windy or prior to when the site closes as this takes 4 times

longer than water to dry out.

██████████ visited the site in the afternoon and took more pictures of the site which show on site there

was not a lot of dust from the demolition area but there was still dust on the roads from the materials

being removed from lorries dusty wheels. we will monitor this for nuisance.

The case law for statutory nuisance states that clouds of dust from sites have to visibly affect the

habitable part of premises to be a formal nuisance, unfortunately dust on the road or cars is in itself

does not constitute a nuisance.

From the 3 recent visits officers did not witness dust clouds affecting habitable parts of neighbouring

premises to have the power to take formal action. However Environmental Health completely

understand residents' concerns about dust and will continue to monitor site activities. [REDACTED] has written to the site with our above concerns regarding the dust from lorries leaving the site, and has asked for the records of the vibration monitoring prior to the 18th May, however the incident at the end of March was prior to the main demolition and monitoring may not have occurred. Please contact the case officer if you have further concerns.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]
**Group Manager Consultancy and Scientific Services, Environmental Health
Department of Development and Regulatory Services**
London Borough of Barnet, Barnet House, 1255 High Road Whetstone, N20 0EJ Tel:

[REDACTED]
Barnet Online: www.barnet.gov.uk

□ please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

www.re-ltd.co.uk

RE (Regional Enterprise) Limited is a joint venture between Capita plc and London Borough of Barnet.

Registered in England 08615172. Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT.

Email from [REDACTED] to [REDACTED]@BarrattsLondon.com on 29 May 2018:
Hello [REDACTED]

Thank you for the phone call today.

I am covering Mill hill and have got your contact details from [REDACTED] my colleague and the site CEMP.

We have a further complaint concerning the vibrations as felt by a local neighbouring business owner. As you are already aware of this complainant through your liaison officer [REDACTED] and your dealings with them, I can identify them as [REDACTED]

The issues to date have included : explosions – noise and vibration, dust from demolition and site earthworks, vibration (and potentially noise) from current works. I have checked the CEMP (18/0021/CON) and it covers all issues with environmental management satisfactorily. The explosions were authorised by Rye demolition and you were not aware of them. They were stopped as soon as they were brought to your attention.

Regarding the specific points now:

Vibrations from current work – you carry out vibration monitoring between the residential and the most intensive demolition work at present to inform relevant mitigation; this should show worst case scenario and the levels are below those considered unacceptable in British Standard guidance. The complainants' premises are at a greater distance so the vibrations should be less if ground conditions are consistent. This should be explained to the complainant.

Dust from unsheeted lorries – what action was taken should be detailed. Dust from site- as you have explained often the dust mitigation measures such as a fine spray from a dust buster appear themselves to be dust where there is a fine water spray

which can be misleading. It would be helpful for this to be shown to the complainant within a meeting.

A visit/ meeting could have been carried out to the complainants' premises and this is a major concern for him; in my opinion, this was not unreasonable. However, you mentioned that all offers of meetings had been refused. Please could you acknowledge this and please could you ensure a meeting is carried out with the complainant as soon as possible to provide more detail and provide assurance on your methodologies. For example, you said that you carry out site inspections around the site boundary to check for noise, dust and vibration during periods of work. This is logged. Details of this methodology could be provided.

Were the complainant closer to the site I would have advised vibration monitoring ; if it helps the case I would advise the monitoring is moved to a point between heavy works and his site so that you have monitoring results (which can be extrapolated over distance) to provide assurance that levels are acceptable (or show if adverse).

██████ was sent a repeated email which I would advise is responded to in full detail providing detail as from our discussion today. I would advise that in these cases more information is useful. I shall visit the site next week.

I would appreciate a response as soon as possible.

Thanks.

██████████

Team Leader, Scientific Services

SSSR/18/04672

Case was closed after further visits to site after Barratts complied with our requests. However the larger complaint file which contains all aspects of complaints from the site has been kept open and information is withheld due to the fact it is an ongoing case.

Correspondence

Email sent 29/5/2018 to [REDACTED] Barrattslondon.com:

Hello [REDACTED]

Thank you for the phone call today.

I am covering Mill hill and have got your contact details from [REDACTED], my colleague and the site CEMP.

We have a further complaint concerning the vibrations as felt by a local neighbouring business owner. As you are already aware of this complainant through your liaison officer [REDACTED] and your dealings with them, I can identify them as [REDACTED]

The issues to date have included : explosions – noise and vibration, dust from demolition and site earthworks, vibration (and potentially noise) from current works. I have checked the CEMP (18/0021/CON) and it covers all issues with environmental management satisfactorily. The explosions were authorised by Rye demolition and you were not aware of them. They were stopped as soon as they were brought to your attention.

Regarding the specific points now:

Vibrations from current work – you carry out vibration monitoring between the residential and the most intensive demolition work at present to inform relevant mitigation; this should show worst case scenario and the levels are below those considered unacceptable in British Standard guidance. The complainants' premises are at a greater distance so the vibrations should be less if ground conditions are consistent. This should be explained to the complainant.

Dust from unsheeted lorries – what action was taken should be detailed. Dust from site- as you have explained often the dust mitigation measures such as a fine spray from a dust buster appear themselves to be dust where there is a fine water spray which can be misleading. It would be helpful for this to be shown to the complainant within a meeting.

A visit/ meeting could have been carried out to the complainants' premises and this is a major concern for him; in my opinion, this was not unreasonable. However, you mentioned that all offers of meetings had been refused. Please could you acknowledge this and please could you ensure a meeting is carried out with the complainant as soon as possible to provide more detail and provide assurance on your methodologies. For example, you said that you carry out site inspections around the site boundary to check for noise, dust and vibration during periods of work. This is logged. Details of this methodology could be provided.

Were the complainant closer to the site I would have advised vibration monitoring ; if it helps the case I would advise the monitoring is moved to a point between heavy works and his site so that you have monitoring results (which can be extrapolated over distance) to provide assurance that levels are acceptable (or show if adverse).

[REDACTED] was sent a repeated email which I would advise is responded to in full detail providing detail as from our discussion today. I would advise that in these cases more information is useful. I shall visit the site next week.

I would appreciate a response as soon as possible.

Thanks.

Team Leader, Scientific Services

I am available Mondays and Tuesdays. In my absence please contact our admin team on [REDACTED]

Development and Regulatory Services (DRS)

London Borough of Barnet, Barnet House, 1255 High Road Whetstone, N20 0EJ

Tel: 020 8359 7494

Barnet Online: www.barnet.gov.uk <<http://www.barnet.gov.uk/>>

Please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

Email dated 18.06.2018 from [REDACTED]@barnet.gov.uk to complainant, copying in Andrew Dismore AM confirming that the case officer will visit the site again this week to check dust and noise levels

Email dated 18.06.2018 from complainant to [REDACTED]@barnet.gov.uk, copying in [REDACTED]@Barrattslondon.com explaining noise and vibration today is significantly worsened

Email dated 14.06.2018 from [REDACTED]@barnet.gov.uk to complainant confirms [REDACTED] to check noise readings and sets out that for Council to take formal action we need evidence that the dust is visibly affecting neighbouring habitable premises in addition to Council checks and our own photos on site visits and supplied log sheets for residents evidence and to help with assessment. The council does not have powers with respect to H&S on construction sites and advised complainant to contact the Health and Safety Executive Construction section regarding requesting this information

Email dated 13.06.2018 from complainant to Andrew Dismore AM, [REDACTED]@barnet.gov.uk and [REDACTED]@Barrattslondon.com reporting substantial increase in noise and vibration on 13 June and dust.

Email dated 12.06.2018 from [REDACTED]@barnet.gov.uk to Andrew Dismore AM and complainant setting out the outcome of council actions.

3 recent visits officers did not witness dust clouds affecting habitable parts of neighbouring premises to have the power to take formal action. [REDACTED] has written to the site with our above concerns regarding the dust from lorries leaving the Site, and has asked for the records of the vibration monitoring prior to the 18th May, however the incident reported at the end of March was prior to the main demolition and monitoring may not have occurred.

Email dated 13.06.2018 from complainant to Andrew Dismore AM, [REDACTED]@barnet.gov.uk, [REDACTED]@Barrattslondon.com and Andrew Dismore with further concerns about dust and noise on 8th June 2018.

Email dated 30.05.2018 from [REDACTED] response to Andrew Dismore AM and complainant about dust and vibration from extensive asbestos surveys and removal prior to demolition

[REDACTED]@barnet.gov.uk has contacted [REDACTED]@BarrattLondon.com yesterday with your constituents concerns

SSCP/18/04693 - This is the largest complaint file – as is standard with large construction sites this file remains open with complaints from multiple complainants about noise, dust and vibration from the construction site. Case is not closed because it contains several different issues which would all being responded to on a complaint driven basis. This case is exempt not least because there are many third parties included; R12(5)(b) Course of Justice exception applies. R13 Personal data of complainant and applicant exception applies; therefore it is exempt.

SSSR/18/05961 – Final comments about S61.

The S61 now includes Pond life as a receptor. This S61 was informally agreed by phone call to be final version. Due to there being no proposed works outside of hours and also as all calculated levels were acceptable for all receptors under BS5228 2:2009 +A1: "Code of practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites". This document was informally accepted. There was no formal S61 agreement because there were no proposed works Out of Hours and S61s are usually carried out to agree on conditions for out of hours works to minimise disruption to neighbours. The Council did not want to be legally confined to the works in case we received complaints from the residents. Discussed at the time with team manager. This was discussed with the applicants on phone.

Correspondence:

Email sent from [REDACTED]@BarrattsLondon.com to [REDACTED]@barnet.gov.uk

14 August 2018 with attached updated version of S61 on noise including pondlife as a receptor in calculations.

Please find attached our revised document stating predicted noise levels after mitigation.

I trust the information provided is satisfies your queries pertaining to our S61 application.

Regards,

[REDACTED]
TECHNICAL CO-ORDINATOR

T: [REDACTED] | M: [REDACTED]@barrattlondon.com <mailto:{E-mail}>
3rd Floor, Press Centre, Here East | 13 East Bay Lane | Queen Elizabeth Park,
Stratford | London E15 2GW
<<http://www.barrattlondon.com>>

The sender of this e-mail is a member of the Barratt Developments PLC group of companies, the ultimate parent of which is Barratt Developments PLC (company number 00604574). Barratt Developments PLC is registered in England and Wales with its registered office at Barratt House, Cartwright Way, Forest Business Park, Bardon Hill, Coalville, Leicestershire LE67 1UF, together with its principal subsidiaries BDW Trading Limited (03018173), and Wilson Bowden Developments Limited (00948402). Barratt Homes, Barratt London and David Wilson Homes are trading names of BDW Trading Limited. This e-mail message is meant only for use by the intended addressee and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. If you have received this message in error please notify us and remove it from your system. Please view our 'Email Addendum v2.0' at www.barrattcommercialsupport.co.uk/barratt-developments-plc-email-a for further details.

From: [REDACTED]@barnet.gov.uk]

Sent: 16 July 2018 15:15

To: [REDACTED]@barrattlondon.com>

Cc: [REDACTED]@barrattlondon.com>; [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]@barrattlondon.com>

Subject: *EXTERNAL: RE: NIMR, Mill Hill: Section 61 Application
<<https://mail.barratthomes.co.uk/email.png>>

[REDACTED]

Thanks for the S61 application.

I cannot find in the text the noise trigger points for the noise monitoring nor the predicted noise levels after mitigation due to these trigger levels? The predicted levels are very high and it would be useful to know how long these will last.

I have seen works being carried out closer than 200m from the Pondlife site? Please could you provide a google maps photo of the site with distances superimposed as I would suggest that the distances may be less than stated. I would advise the use of the nearest façade to the closest point of operation for each case.

This is clear that the site is likely to cause concerns with the neighbouring residents and so this detail would be helpful.

You also mention dust and safety concerns? I am in the office today and tomorrow. If you want any further clarification please ask.

Thanks.

[REDACTED]

Team Leader, Scientific Services

I am available Mondays and Tuesdays. In my absence please contact our admin team on [REDACTED]

Development and Regulatory Services (DRS)

London Borough of Barnet, Barnet House, 1255 High Road Whetstone, N20 0EJ

SSSR/18/08146 - Ref: 101001610680 – member's enquiry – noise, dust and vibration from construction site from [REDACTED] at pond life.

Correspondence:

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 August 2018 10:54
To: [REDACTED]@Barnet.gov.uk>
Cc: [REDACTED]@barnet.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: NIMR Mill Hill NW7 dust and vibration. (Case Ref: GL209) Your ref: 101001610680 MEMBERS ENQ
[REDACTED]

Please could you pass this on to members enquiries.

We have had extensive contact with [REDACTED] and other complainants at this site. We have visited the site at least ten times and regularly since we received the first complaint. We had regular discussions and contact with the developers. I responded to [REDACTED] with this email as attached when I received his email to Ms Norman. My only outstanding possible concerns are dust at the weekends (when no one is on site) although the air quality/ dust monitoring to date has shown no significant issues: I asked for a visit to be carried out last week by our Out of hours team at the weekend to assess dust. Additionally, I would prefer for the neighbours to see for themselves the results of the continual noise, vibration and air quality monitoring on site because it should allay their fears that the results are within the British standards and other British best practice for such sites; largely, the site has been well managed. There was one very early exception whereby the demolition contractors - Rye demolition in charge of the site at the time allowed the Navy seals to carry out covert operations on site (without any consultation or warning to neighbours) which resulted on noisy explosions. The instant they were reported to us they were stopped.

I have attached the email I sent [REDACTED] in response to this email to [REDACTED]@barratts.london:

Re the remediation (more detail than in attached email). This detail I was proposing to go through with [REDACTED] during the visit I suggested.

NIMR did extensive remediation from the burial pits prior to Barratt's taking over the site and for insurance purposes to assure potential buyers.

The LA have been assured that as far as is practicable the risk from previous uses is as low as possible to future users and existing neighbours.

There are advantages of London clay where waste was buried as in normally, unless dry at surface, the clay is impermeable and contains pollution to stop it migrating (hence all landfill sites are capped in clay). Over long periods of time organic matter and contaminated land naturally attenuates and also the water soluble waste will have been diluted and ran off in the times just after the waste was buried initially. Therefore is very little still present in the local environment and what there was has been diluted in rainstorms or attenuated.

The asbestos was mainly removed before disposal and small amounts of low risk concrete asbestos(which is not mobile or friable) has been found and contained and is in the process of being removed using the best procedures to minimise risk top neighbours.

The organic matter from burial pits would have been contained in the clay, and naturally attenuated significantly over many decades but has now been removed. All the radioactive materials were licensed and not buried on site and removed before

demolition with surveys done to prove this, along with chemical and biological surveys.

The only potential I can think of is spore contamination, as virus' naturally attenuate out of living bodies over time. However this problem is extremely rare from spores and is usually associated with chemical warfare establishments and is then strictly controlled in the UK environment. The Environment Agency would have covered this in their remit.

I am sure if there is large rain run-off from the site, the pollution will be from dust and debris run off from the demolished non-hazardous building materials. Which will increase suspended solids in the water coarse but with the dilution of excess rain is not going to have any significant local effects. Barratts have terraced the site early on to reduce run off.

It will increase the silt in rivers and water treatment works to some extent.

The LA, former users, and developers are proceeding with caution. If in the unlikely event there does remain some unmarked burial pits the natural clay in the soil provides the best defence to existing and future users of the site and neighbouring area. The consultants Cognition are on site to deal with any event like this however unlikely. If pits are found in the future and disturbed, then any significant waste will be contained and removed.

It's a shame that the legislation and case law regarding public protection of neighbouring premises that the British Standards of nuisance and building damage are quite high in my experience allowing perceptible vibration.

Regards

[REDACTED]
Team Leader, Scientific Services

Letter attachment to above email:

From [REDACTED]

Sent: 07 August 2018 11:02

To: finchleynursery [REDACTED]
pondlifeaquatics [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]@barnet.gov.uk> [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]@barrattlondon.com>

Subject: RE: NIMR Dust Supression

[REDACTED] and [REDACTED]

Following on from your email, I would like to advise you that yesterday I visited the site. I checked the dust emissions at the ridgeway and could see no evidence of dust in the air from the site. The site was being well watered down in this area. I checked the air quality, dust and noise reports during my visit. These cover the whole site. I apologise as I did not have time to visit you specifically.

Unfortunately, I am unable to visit today however I can visit next Monday at a time convenient to you to assess noise, vibration and dust.

I have met with the contaminated land consultants, read the reports spoken with the team members who signed off the contaminated land reports and am reassured that the contaminated land issues as we discussed on my meeting with you on site have been dealt with satisfactorily. The Environment Agency were very involved in the signing off of the site and would have assessed potential for water contamination issues and they have approved all the documents.

I have asked [REDACTED] if he will visit you at your premises to discuss your concerns. I have asked for the vibration, noise and dust reports to be made available. I have

checked them and can see that the results are acceptable; there is a team available and on site of contaminated land, air quality and noise specialists.

Please can you call me to arrange a visit next Monday.

If there is excessive noise or dust please ring and we will visit on [REDACTED]

Please ring the weekend team for Out of Hours on 0208 359 2000.

Regards

[REDACTED]

Team Leader, Scientific Services

I am available Mondays and Tuesdays. In my absence please contact our admin team on 020 8359 7995

Development and Regulatory Services (DRS)

London Borough of Barnet, Barnet House, 1255 High Road Whetstone, N20 0EJ

Tel: 020 8359 7494 Barnet Online: www.barnet.gov.uk

SSCP/19/11166 – Open case therefore all information to be withheld. Exemption under R12(5)(b) Course of Justice exception applies. R13 Personal data of complainant and applicant exception applies – see Refusal Notice.

PHCP/20/00244 – Open case therefore all information to be withheld. Exemption under R12(5)(b) Course of Justice exception applies. R13 Personal data of complainant and applicant exception applies – see Refusal Notice.

I