

Committees: Corporate Projects Board [for decision] Projects Sub [for decision] Epping Forest and Commons Committee [for decision]		Dates: 28 February 2019 22 March 2019 11 March 2019
Subject: Wanstead Park Ponds Project Unique Project Identifier: tbc	Gateway 2: Project Proposal Complex	
Report of: Director of Open Spaces Report Author: Tim Munday, Department of the Built Environment		For Decision
<h1>PUBLIC</h1>		

Recommendations

1. Next steps and Requested decisions	<p>Approval track: 1. Complex</p> <p>Next Gateway: Gateway 3 - Outline Options Appraisal (Complex)</p> <p>Next Steps:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To establish a Project Board to be chaired by the Director of Open Spaces. 2. To procure and undertake an engineering assessment of the Wanstead Park Ponds to establish their capacity to overtop safely during the Maximum Probable Flood. 3. To outline, if required, possible engineering solutions including those looking at resolving related issues. 4. To appoint a communications officer to begin engagement with stakeholders. <p>Requested Decisions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To approve the project proposal to progress to the next gateway. 2. To approve the budget of £150 000 to get to next gateway. <p>Please note total estimated cost should additional works be required is 8 – 12 million for statutory work alone.</p>											
2. Resource requirements	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Item</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Reason</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Funds/ Source</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Cost (£)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Item	Reason	Funds/ Source	Cost (£)							
Item	Reason	Funds/ Source	Cost (£)									

to reach next Gateway			of Funding	
	Investigations and preliminary surveys	Engineering Assessment	Capital	16 500
	Engineering Assessment Study	Engineering Assessment	Capital	60 500
	Project staff time	Project administration	Capital	27 500
	Communication officer time	Stakeholder engagement	Capital	45 500
	Total			150 000
3. Governance arrangements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Epping Forest and Commons Committee • Colin Buttery, Director of Open Spaces • A project board will be established. 			

Project Summary

4. Context	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Wanstead Park, in the south of Epping Forest, is a nationally, potentially internationally, important historic designed landscape and is listed as Grade II* on Historic England's Register of Gardens of Special Historic Interest. 2. A central feature of the park is the cascade of lakes which are considered to be London's greatest surviving designed historic waterscape. 3. A cascading chain of three ponds (Heronry, Perch and the Ornamental Waters) have been designated by the Environment Agency (EA) as being Large Raised Reservoirs and High Risk under the Flood and Water Management Act 2010. 4. The High Risk designation has been given due to the consequences of dam failure and the impact of this downstream. The City of London has a statutory duty to ensure that the pond structures meet the standards required of High Risk reservoirs.
-------------------	---

5. The capacity of the pond structures to safely overtop during the Probable Maximum Flood needs to be established through conducting an engineering assessment of the pond structures and modelling the pond system.
6. If this study identifies that the current situation is not sufficient, then further work will need to be undertaken to bring the ponds structure up to required standard.
7. Should work be required it would present an opportunity to improve aspects affecting the ponds and the park more widely in an efficient and holistic manner.
8. Wanstead Park is currently on the Heritage at Risk Register. It is considered by Historic England to be an asset in decline with extensive significant problems and a high vulnerability. The current degraded condition of the ponds has contributed to this At Risk rating. The Wanstead Parkland Plan is seeking to achieve the removal of the At Risk status of the park.
9. The Wanstead Parkland Plan proposes a Heritage Lottery Fund Bid to achieve this. As the Lake System is integral to the landscape it is felt that aspects of the funding work to the ponds that are non-statutory could be considered as match funding for this bid.
10. The ponds have a variety of longstanding issues surrounding adequate supply of water and leakage. At present water is supplied from the aquifer by a borehole. This water extraction is done under a licence from the EA, who have stated that it will be revoked in four years time should no action be taken to reduce leakage from the ponds.
11. Supplying water in this way is exacerbating biodiversity issues within the ponds due to a reduced level of oxygen in the aquifer water.
12. In addition, the EA are also reviewing the flood risk within the Roding Valley, including the stretch of the River Roding adjoining the site. The City, as extensive riparian owners in this area, will likely be asked to contribute to any improvements that are required.
13. It is considered a possibility that making upstream improvements to the water attenuating capacity within the park or using the Ornamental Water for winter storage could reduce this liability.

	<p>14. There is a strong local interest in Wanstead Park with a variety of engaged stakeholders, including the local MP, local councillors and an active Friends group.</p> <p>15. From a previous similar project at Hampstead Heath the City of London learnt the importance of coherent engagement with interested groups at this stage of the project.</p> <p>16. It will be vital to the success of the project that the local community and other interested parties are kept informed of the work being undertaken, notified of its impact and of any potential outcomes to enable them to be suitably consulted.</p>
5. Brief description of project	<p>1. The project is to undertake an engineering assessment of the ponds and the pond structures at Wanstead Park following their High Risk designation by the EA. An engineer will be appointed to carry out the surveys and modelling required to determine the current capacity of the ponds to safely overtop.</p> <p>2. Should the current capacity not be adequate, the project will be extended to develop further options on how to bring the structures up to the required standard, including options that address the wider issues effecting the ponds and the park.</p>
6. Consequences if project not approved	<p>1. If no action is taken, the Supervising Engineer can call for a formal inspection by an Inspecting Engineer at any time. If the City of London fail to comply with a recommendation of the Inspecting Engineer, the EA have statutory enforcement powers.</p>
7. SMART Project Objectives	<p>1. To carry out an engineering assessment of the ponds to the cascade to determine if they meet the required standards and to do this by the end of 2019 to ensure that the EA are confident that action is being taken.</p> <p>2. If required, to explore options to increase the capacity of the dam structures and addressing the other issues affecting the ponds. Carrying out the work required and in doing so making the Large Raised Reservoirs meet the statutory requirements, contributing to the Wanstead Parkland Plan and the removal of the 'At Risk' status. With initial options consider by Spring 2020 and work completed by Spring 2025.</p>
8. Key Benefits	<p>1. A City asset, which may currently be a risk to the public, will meet statutory requirements and the EA will not take enforcement action.</p>

	<p>2. An opportunity to address non-statutory issues affecting the ponds in conjunction with the wider aims of the Wanstead Parkland Plan and a proposed Heritage Lottery Fund Bid. Contributing to the removal of the 'At Risk' status.</p> <p>3. Stakeholders will feel that they have been engaged with throughout the project and that the City is being proactive in its management of Wanstead Park.</p>
9. Project category	2. Statutory
10. Project priority	A. Essential
11. Notable exclusions	1. None

Options Appraisal

12. Overview of options	<p>1. Proceed with actions required to reach Gateway 3.</p> <p>2. Do nothing and await enforcement action by the EA.</p> <p>Its is recommend that Members approve option1 to proceed with actions required to reach Gateway 3.</p>
--------------------------------	--

Project Planning

13. Delivery Period and Key dates	<p>Overall project: 12 months for engineering assessment, completion before Spring 2020. 4/5 further years should additional work be required.</p> <p>Key dates:</p> <p>Critical deadline: Autumn 2019 (at EA's discretion)</p> <p>Should additional work be required the anticipated timeframe is:</p> <p> Consultation following Modelling: (3 months)</p> <p>G3: Options Appraisal: (3-4 months)</p> <p> Designer Appointment: (3-4 months)</p> <p> Detailed Options: (6 months)</p> <p> Options Consultation: (3 months)</p> <p>G4: Options Approval (3-4 months)</p> <p> Detailed Design: (6 months)</p> <p> Contractor Tender and Appointment: (6-9 months)</p> <p>G5: Authority to Start Work (3 months)</p> <p> Lead In (3 months)</p> <p> Work on Site (12-18 months)</p>
--	--

	<p>Lower Range estimate: Start: April 2019, End: June 2024 Upper Range estimate: Start: April 2020, End: January 2026</p> <p>Other works dates to coordinate: Wanstead Parkland Plan works and Heritage Lottery Fund bid to be coincided should additional work be required.</p>
14. Risk implications	Overall project risk: High
15. Stakeholders and consultees	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Environment Agency 2. Historic England 3. London Borough of Redbridge 4. Heritage Lottery Fund 5. Wanstead Park Friends Group 6. Local MP 7. Park Users

Resource Implications

16. Total estimated cost	<p>Likely cost range: Modelling and investigation £150 000. Should additional work be required £8-12 million (statutory work only). With further supplementary funding required dependent on the extent of the Wanstead Parklands Plan implementation.</p>									
17. Funding strategy	Choose 1: No funding confirmed	Choose 1: Internal - Funded wholly by City's own resource								
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Funds/Sources of Funding</th> <th>Cost (£)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Capital Funding (Modelling and investigation)</td> <td>150 000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Capital Funding (Additional statutory works)</td> <td>8 - 12 million</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: right;">Total</td> <td>8.15-12.15 million</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Funds/Sources of Funding	Cost (£)	Capital Funding (Modelling and investigation)	150 000	Capital Funding (Additional statutory works)	8 - 12 million	Total	8.15-12.15 million
	Funds/Sources of Funding	Cost (£)								
Capital Funding (Modelling and investigation)	150 000									
Capital Funding (Additional statutory works)	8 - 12 million									
Total	8.15-12.15 million									
<p>There is no existing financial provision to meet the cost of this project and it is therefore currently unfunded. Resources to deliver this programme will be subject to a request to the Resource Allocation Sub Committee and will be subject to prioritisation against other competing bids in the context of the City's Cash medium term financial plans.</p>										
18. Investment appraisal	Not applicable.									

19. Procurement strategy/Route to Market	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is proposed that the City's current Panel Engineer will be appointed to carry out the engineering assessment, this will be in discussion with Procurement and will be confirmed following Corporate Projects Board. 2. Should additional work be required following the outcome of this study the City of London's Procurement Code shall be followed with the expectation that this will be the rules for contracts of a value greater than the EU Works Threshold.
20. Legal implications	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If no action is taken, the Supervising Engineer can call for a formal inspection by an Inspecting Engineer at any time. If the City of London fail to comply with a recommendation of the Inspecting Engineer, the EA have statutory enforcement powers.
21. Corporate property implications	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. None.
22. Traffic implications	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Should additional work be required this will likely increase work traffics in the area of the park.
23. Sustainability and energy implications	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. None.
24. IS implications	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. None.
25. Equality Impact Assessment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. An equality impact assessment will be undertaken should additional work be required.
2. Data Protection Impact Assessment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>The risk to personal data is less than high or non-applicable and a data protection impact assessment will not be undertaken</i>

Appendices

Appendix 1	Project Briefing
-------------------	------------------

Contact

Report Author	Tim Munday
Email Address	Tim.munday@cityoflondon.gov.uk
Telephone Number	020 7332 1949