

From: Philip Elliott
Sent: 18 July 2023 16:33
To: Philip Elliott
Subject: FW: Planning Consultation - LB Haringey - HGY/2023/0261 - Berol Quarter, Ashley Road, London N17 9LJ

From: Dalia Alghoul <Dalia.Alghoul@networkrail.co.uk>
Sent: Tuesday, July 18, 2023 2:54 PM
To: Philip Elliott <Philip.Elliott@haringey.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Planning Consultation - LB Haringey - HGY/2023/0261 - Berol Quarter, Ashley Road, London N17 9LJ

OFFICIAL

Hello Phillip,

Please see below, comments from our Asset Protection Team.

Please see below my comments on this 3rd Party Application Internal Consultation: Full planning permission for the refurbishment and extension of Berol House to include Use Class E floorspace; and the redevelopment of 2 Berol Yard to provide new residential homes and Use Class E floorspace; with associated landscaping, public realm improvements car and cycle parking, and other associated works.

Item 1. Concerns - Encroachment on the boundary fence, interference with sensitive equipment, space for inspection and maintenance of the railway infrastructure.

Reasons/Mitigations:

The developer / designer must ensure that the development line is set back from the Network Rail fence line to achieve sufficient gap / space to inspect and maintain Network Rail fence line and provide an access for inspection and maintenance of the proposed development or other assets in the future without imposing any risks to the operational railway. This would normally be 2-5m from the boundary fence depending on the adjacent NR assets or boundary fence.

Item 2. Concerns - Stability of railway infrastructure and potential impact on the services.

Reasons/Mitigations:

Existing railway infrastructures including embankment should not be loaded with additional surcharge from the proposed development unless the agreement is reached with Network Rail. Increased surcharge on railway embankment imports a risk of instability of the ground which can cause the settlement on Network Rail infrastructure (Overhead Line Equipment / gantries, track, embankment etc.).

Item 3. Concerns - Potential buried services crossing under the railway tracks. Some of the services may be owned by Network Rail or Statutory Utilities that may have entered into a contract with Network Rail.

Reasons/Mitigations:

The developer is responsible for a detailed services survey to locate the position, type of services, including buried services, in the vicinity of railway and development site. Any utility services identified shall be brought to the attention of Senior Asset Protection Engineer (SAPE) in Network Rail if they belong to railway assets. The SAPE will ascertain and specify what measures, including possible re-location and cost, along with any other asset protection measures shall be implemented by the developer.

Item 4. Concerns - Proximity of the development to the Network Rail infrastructure and boundary fence and adequate space for future maintenance of the development.

Reasons/Mitigations:

The developer must ensure any future maintenance does not import the risks to the operational railway. The applicant must ensure that the construction and subsequent maintenance of their development can be carried out without adversely affecting the safety of operational railway.

Item 5. Concerns - Collapse of lifting equipment adjacent to the boundary fence/line.

Reasons/Mitigations:

Operation of mobile cranes should comply with CPA Good Practice Guide 'Requirements for Mobile Cranes Alongside Railways Controlled by Network Rail'. Operation of Tower Crane should also comply with CPA Good Practice Guide 'Requirements for Tower Cranes Alongside Railways Controlled by Network Rail'. Operation of Piling Rig should comply with Network Rail standard 'NR-L3-INI-CP0063 - Piling adjacent to the running line'. Collapse radius of the cranes should not fall within 4m from the railway boundary unless possession and isolation on NR lines have been arranged or agreed with Network Rail.

Item 6. Concerns - Collapse of temporary structure near the railway boundary and infrastructure.

Reasons/Mitigations:

Any temporary structures which are to be constructed adjacent to the railway boundary fence (if required) must be erected in such a manner that at no time will any item fall within 3 metres from the live OHLE and running rail or other live assets. Suitable protection on temporary works (for example: Protective netting around scaffold) must be installed.

Item 7. Concerns - Piling adjacent to the railway infrastructure if any. Concerns with ground movement affecting the track geometry and surrounding ground and structure stability.

Reasons/Mitigations:

The developer must ensure that any piling work near or adjacent to the railway does not cause an operational hazard to Network Rail's infrastructure. Impact/Driven piling scheme for a development near or adjacent to Network Rail's operational infrastructure needs to be avoided, due to the risk of a major track fault occurring. No vibro-compaction/displacement piling plant shall be used in development.

Item 8. Concerns - Trespasses and unauthorised access through an insecure or damaged boundary fence.

Reasons/Mitigations:

Where required, the developer should provide (at their own expense) and thereafter maintain a substantial, trespass proof fence along the development side of the existing boundary fence, to a minimum height of 1.8 metres. Network Rail's existing fencing / wall must not be removed until it is agreed with Network Rail.

Item 9. Concerns - Interference with the Train Drivers' vision from artificial lighting and human factor effects from glare.

Reasons/Mitigations:

Any lighting associated with the development (including vehicle lights) must not interfere with the sighting of signalling apparatus and/or train drivers' vision on approaching trains. The location and colour of lights must not give rise to the potential for confusion with the signalling arrangements on the railway. The developers should obtain Network Rail's Asset Protection Engineer's approval of their detailed proposals regarding lighting.

Item 10. Concerns - Errant vehicle onto the railway land.

Reasons/Mitigations:

If there is hard standing area / parking of vehicles area near the property boundary with the operational railway, Network Rail would recommend the installation of vehicle incursion barrier or structure designed for vehicular impact to prevent vehicles accidentally driving or rolling onto the railway or damaging the railway lineside fencing.

Item 11. Concerns - Potential impact on the adjacent railway infrastructure from the construction activities.

Reasons/Mitigations:

The applicant shall provide all construction methodologies relating to works that may import risks onto the operational railway and potential disruption to railway services, the assets and the infrastructure for acceptance prior to commencing the works. All works must also be risk assessed to avoid disruptions to the operational railway.

Item 12. Concerns - Structural stability and movement of Network Rail Assets.

Reasons/Mitigations:

Network Rail's infrastructures should be monitored for movement, settlement, cant, twist, vibration etc if there are risks from the proposed development (if there the proposed development import these risks in the operational railway to mitigate the risk of adverse impact to the operational railway in accordance with Network Rail standard 'NR/L2/CIV/177 - Monitoring track over or adjacent to building or civil engineering works'.

Item 13. Concerns - Invasive or crawling plants near the railway.

Reasons/Mitigations:

The developer must ensure that the locations and extent of invasive plant (if any, for example: Japanese Knotweed) are identified and treated in accordance with the current code of practice and regulations if exists on site. Any asbestos identified on site should be dealt in accordance with current standard, Health and Safety Guideline and regulations by the developer.

Item 14. Concerns - Interference with the Train Drivers' vision from sunlight and human factor effects from glare.

Reasons/Mitigations:

Glint and Sunlight glare assessment should be carried out (if there is a risk) to demonstrate the proposed development does not import risk of glare to the train drivers which can obstruct in the visibility of the signals.

Item 15. Concerns - Effects due to electromagnetic compatibility on the users and the development located within proximity of a high voltage overhead electrification lines. Any Outside Party projects that will be within 20m and/or any transmitter within 100m of the operational railway will be required to undertake an Electromagnetic Compatibility assessment to be carried out in accordance with Network Rail standards 'NR/L1/RSE/30040 & 'NR/L1/RSE/30041' and NR/L2/TEL/30066'

Reasons/Mitigations:

The developer will be required to undertake a full Electro Magnetic Interference (EMC) risk assessment on the impact the project will have upon NR.

Item 16. Concerns - Risk of electrocution and EMC interference to human health due to 25kV live OHLE on railway:

Reasons/Mitigations:

- Electrocution Clearance - within 3m of the overhead cable. Distance within which any works will require the overhead cable to be isolated.
- Electromagnetic interference – within 5.2m. Distance within which the effect on human health should be considered.
- De wirement zone – within 5.2m. Distance within which the overhead cable could reach in the event of a failure.
- Electromagnetic compatibility – within 7m. Distance within which the affect of the building on the cable function needs to be considered in the design.

Item 17. Concerns - Environmental pollution (Dust, noise etc.) on operational railway.

Reasons/Mitigations:

Contractors are expected to use the 'best practical means' for controlling pollution and environmental nuisance complying all current standards and regulations. The design and construction methodologies should consider mitigation measures to minimise the generation of airborne dust, noise and vibration in regard to the operational railway.

Item 18. Concerns - Tree species alongside the railway boundary.

Reasons/Mitigations:

Contractors are expected to use Network Rail recommended tree species only if required alongside the railway boundary. List of recommended tree species can be made available when requested.

Item 19. Concerns - Disruption of access to operational railway.

Reasons/Mitigations:

If there are any access points / gates to the railway, it's contractor's responsibility to maintain 24/7 unobstructed access to the railway for maintenance purposes.

Item 20. Concerns - Flying objects on operational railway from the playground if any adjacent to the operational railway.

Reasons/Mitigations:

If there are playgrounds next to the operational railway, the developer shall consider a barrier / fence to hold the objects (for example: balls).

Item 21. Concerns - There is a risk of obstruction to the visibilities of railway signals due to the development, railway alignment is in a curve.

Reasons/Mitigations:

Project shall engage signal sighting chair and carry out full signal sighting assessment to confirm the railway signals are visible to the train drivers.

Item 22. Concerns - Drainage.

Reasons/Mitigations:

Drainage from the shall be taken away from the railway infrastructure. There shall not be any attenuation tank or soakaways within 10-20m from the railway boundary.

Item 23. Concerns- Close proximity of Level Crossing:

Close proximity to level crossing should be consider in layout for the road design and the access to development should be away from the level crossing. Traffic increase could build up the congestion at level crossing which result in safety issues for level crossing and general public

Kind Regards,



Dalia Alghoul MSc

Town Planning Technician

Network Rail Property | Eastern | Anglia

1 Stratford Place | London | E15 1AZ

07732641896

dalia.alghoul@networkrail.co.uk

www.networkrail.co.uk/property