# EIA Quality Mark Case Study

## Beam Park – 3,000 home residential led redevelopment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Issues:</th>
<th>Purpose of the project:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Complex design of project responding to environment and utility infrastructure constraints on site.</td>
<td>Redevelopment of a long-time vacant former 32 hectare industrial site. The scale of the site means it is strategically significant and will help deliver much needed housing to meet London’s need. The development also includes a new railway station on the c2c railway line within the site, improving public transport access to the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Much of the site is overlain with peat which is compressible, therefore enabling works are required to create a stable development platform. Following necessary contamination remediation, ‘surcharge’ material is to be laid on the peat to compress it for several months.</td>
<td>Description of the project: Up to 3,000 new homes (including several tall buildings of up to 16 storeys), two schools, a new railway station, medical centre, two energy centres and supporting commercial and community facilities. Associated public realm includes a new central park along the River Beam, flood attenuation and a public square.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Several minor amendments were made to the scheme. First during the initial determination period, then prior to a call in hearing by the Mayor of London.</td>
<td>The site is quite self-contained, bounded to the south by the railway line with industrial land further south and to the west. There are residential areas to the north of the site on the opposite side of the A1306 New Road (closest residential receptors 30m from the site), as well as proposed residential development to the east. Two elevated roads cross the site north-south, rising to the south from new road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ The location and scale means the site spans the boundaries of London Borough of Havering (LBH) to the east and London Borough of Barking and Dagenham (LBBD) to the west. The application was made in hybrid: parts in LBH in full and LBBD in outline.</td>
<td>Construction is anticipated to commence in 2019 with completion in 2030.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ After being refused planning permission by LBH the Mayor of London determined to call the application in and become the planning decision maker. The decision was made as the site is of strategic importance to London.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lessons learnt:

The complex nature of the site meant that it was imperative for the EIA coordinator to be present at regular Design Team Meetings. The EIA coordinator had a full briefing from each technical assessment team prior to each meeting, using this information and previous experience to inform live discussions on design iterations of the scheme. This allowed for potential environmental effects to be avoided through mitigation embedded in the scheme, as well as helping the project run smoothly by reducing environmental risks. Meeting attendance also allowed the EIA coordinator to feed back to the technical teams any details that would have implications for their assessments (e.g. location of service yards, internal layouts, locations of energy centres etc.).

Lessons learnt continued:

▪ The surcharging material has to be on-site for 5-7 months to compress the peat layer. The applicant (also the developer) was keen that this work did not hold up to the start of development. Therefore, a separate application for these works was made (not EIA development), to allow it to be determined within a shorter timeframe. The EIA coordinator worked closely with the application team to balance the expedient progress of the works with the timing for the wider application. This was to make sure the assessment of effects of the surcharging works was addressed in the ES for the wider ‘Beam Park’ application. This approach allowed the applications to be submitted concurrently yet provided for the surcharging works to progress during determination of the wider application.

▪ The application went through several minor amendments, as well as additional environmental information submitted in the determination period. This resulted in two ES Addenda (Nov 17 and August 18) and a ‘Additional Information’ letter (Feb 18). It was therefore essential to be consistent and thorough in cross referencing the correct environmental reporting, in particular when defining the reporting stage that ‘new or different environmental effects’ are assessed against (which varied topic to topic). Reducing the ‘paper trail’ was also aided by appending previous additional information/addenda to the latest version of environmental reporting.

For access to more EIA case studies and hundreds of non-technical summaries of Environmental Statements visit:

https://www.iema.net/eia-quality-mark/eia-quality-mark-case-studies
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