

North London Waste Plan to 2035 Independent Examination

Environment Agency Representation

Prepared by Eleri Randall, Sustainable Places Planning Advisor Direct dial 020 30255516 Direct e-mail HNL.SustainablePlaces@environment-agency.gov.uk

We are writing to inform you that we no longer need to attend the hearing sessions on November 20th and 21st 2019 as our original concerns have been addressed. I have provided a short summary below of our updated response and provided answers to the two questions (11 and 68) which were directed towards our previous concerns.

In our representations to the proposed submission we found the plan unsound as the sequential test had been based on a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) which hadn't assessed climate change using the 2016 climate change allowances. After receiving the updated Sequential Test Report and meeting with the North London Waste Plan (NLWP) Programme Manager and consultants on the 26th of September 2019 we decided to accept the updated Sequential Test Report which is based on the existing flood modelling using a 20% climate change extent. Although we normally expect an assessment based on the latest climate change allowances, given the constrained nature of the allocations (including vulnerability classification and level of risk), the climate change extent in this case is adequate. We also consider that any additional assessment work is unlikely to change the outcome of the sequential test exercise for the NLWP. We are working with the policy officers to strengthen the wording on Policy 5 or accompanying paragraph 9.48 to ensure that the latest climate change allowances are applied within any site-specific assessments.

However the exception we have made in this case will not be applied to any future waste plans or local plans. Future updates to SFRA's will need to fully take account of the published 2016 climate change allowances and any further updates to the allowances. The Statement of Common Ground between the NLWA and ourselves should summarise our position and any wording changes to be agreed.

These are our comments on the specific questions raised:

Question 11. Is the Strategic Flood Risk Appraisal (SFRA) adequate, up to date and compliant with paragraph 157 of the NPPF?

The SFRA to support the NLWP made use of the existing SFRA's of the London Boroughs and our latest flood models. Unfortunately since the publication of the 2016 climate change allowances, the Borough SFRA's and many of our flood models had not been updated with the latest climate change allowances. Following discussion with the NLWA and the update of the Sequential Test Report, we consider the SFRA as adequate, mainly as the use of the previous climate change extents are considered conservative enough for the purposes of applying the sequential test. There also remains scope to apply the sequential approach (locating the any vulnerable uses of the development in the lowest risk areas of the site) for individual developments coming forward within the areas allocated.

Cont/d..

Although we would have preferred the SFRA to have been updated with the latest climate change allowances to assess future flood risk, it has been acknowledged within the Sequential Test Report that a further assessment of future flood risk will be required by developers when developments come forward within the allocated areas.

Question 68: With regard to Flood Risk, should the Sequential Test be re-applied to the Bartrip Street Site (LLDC1-HC), Brantwood Road (A19-HR), Chapman Road (LLDC2-HC), Friern Barnet Sewage Works/Pinkham Way (A22-HR), Argall Avenue (A24-WF) and Temple Mill Lane (LLDC3-WF)?

The Sequential Test Report has been updated to ensure that the most up to date *present* day flood risk information is taken into account, with the acknowledgement that future flood risk will need further assessment to account for climate change. In light of this, we do not think that the areas listed above need to have the Sequential Test re-applied as the Sequential Test Report demonstrates that no alternative sites would be available, and there will still be a sequential approach adopted for any development coming forward in any of these areas. We will be able to review the flood risk assessments undertaken in support of any future developments, and determine whether the flood risk has been adequately mitigated taking climate change into account.

We hope the above clarifies our position and are happy to provide any further information if required.