

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 The following document addresses those comments received during consultation on the proposed development at Enderby Place LPA ref: 15/0973/F.
- 1.2 Comments have been received from statutory consultees, local residents and local resident groups. Many of these responses that have been received are positive and supportive of these development proposals and this document has been composed to address any outstanding comments, concerns or points of clarification.
- 1.3 This document is responding to comments made under the following topic headings:
 - Density
 - Height
 - Affordable Housing
 - Open Space
 - Wheelchair Accommodation
 - Affordable Family Dwellings
 - Transport / Coach Parking
 - Energy
 - AQ Neutral
 - Cold Ironing
 - Winter Gardens and Enclosed Balconies
 - Lobby Arrangements
 - Fire Strategy
 - Accommodation Standards

2.0 Residential Density

- 2.1 An analysis of the density calculation is contained within the submitted planning application. Consistent with discussions during the pre-application process, an allowance has been made for non-residential elements given the mixed use character of the application. In summary, an allowance of 8% has been made for non-residential elements (terminal, kiosks and skills academy) which results in a habitable rooms per hectare figure of 807. This is slightly less than reported in the planning application (818) given the changes to Block A which have resulted from discussions with officers during the determination process.

3.0 Height

- 3.1 Comments received from local residents and amenity groups make reference to heights of the scheme in the context of surrounding properties and also the impact on views particularly from the Greenwich Maritime World Heritage Site.
- 3.2 The height, massing and detail of the design proposed has been considered through an assessment of 19 views in the Townscape, Heritage and Visual Impact Assessment (THVIA), which were selected in agreement with officers from the Royal borough to allow consideration of potential impacts on the local residential townscape, the Greenwich WHS and strategic views, the combined impact with the blocks under construction on the south of the Enderby Wharf site and potential impacts on the setting of the East Greenwich Conservation Area.

- 3.3 As is evident in the THVIA, the difference in height will be mediated by the consented and part-constructed blocks on Enderby Wharf and on the Peninsula which together with the proposed materials and detail of the design will result in a light presence on the local skyline.
- 3.4 The proposed towers will appear well to the right of the protected panorama from Greenwich Park and will not affect the significant axial view to the WHS. The WHS Executive Committee has reviewed the proposal and are supportive of the application.
- 3.5 The proposed towers will appear as a group of slender forms which will act as a visual counterpoint to the more horizontal building blocks under construction on the south part of the site. They will provide variety and less density at lower levels, enhancing the appearance of the riverside.
- 3.6 The views assessed in the THVIA show that the visibility of the proposed towers will be limited in views from both the Greenwich CA and Maritime Greenwich WHS, and where it will be seen it will be read as a part of the emerging wider urban setting of these heritage assets and will not affect their heritage significance.

4.0 Affordable Housing

- 4.1 Comments received in consultation refer to the amount of affordable housing proposed on the site and suggest that the provision is low and question why it has solely been provided in Block A.
- 4.2 As outlined within the planning statement, Policy 3.11 and Policy 3.12 in the London Plan (Consolidated with Alterations since 2011) states that the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing provision should be sought when negotiating on individual private residential and mixed use schemes. It also states that targets should be applied flexibly, taking into account site costs, the availability of public subsidy and other scheme requirements. Policy 3.11 states that 60% of the affordable housing provision should be social housing and 40% intermediate housing.
- 4.3 This is reiterated within the Council's Core Strategy policy H3 which requires that developments of 10 or more units should seek to provide 35% affordable housing noting that the exact percentage, distribution and type of affordable housing will be determined by the particular circumstances and characteristics of the site and of the development.
- 4.4 It is proposed, based on an assessment of the financial viability of the scheme that 75 of the residential units would be provided as affordable units. Of these 75 units 28 would be provided as social rent and 47 as intermediate units.
- 4.5 The Viability Assessment produced by Savills which accompanies the application demonstrates that the proposed level of affordable housing, in accordance with the provisions of the NPPF, is the maximum viable amount of affordable housing achievable on the site.
- 4.6 The affordable housing would be provided as an appropriate cluster advocated by Registered Providers in order to maximise efficiencies in building management and to reduce service charge levels.

5.0 Open Space

- 5.1 Comments from amenity groups and the GLA in consultation have requested clarification on the amount and location of play space provided. The comments received are summarised below:

- Clarification requested on how play space is distributed across the development;
- Further clarification on figures presented in the planning statement and those used in the play strategy requested;
- Total area of play space to be provided on Block A to be shown;
- Confirmation requested on whether all residents will have access to all play spaces;
- The applicant should demonstrate how the development will meet the recreational space requirements for older children set out within the child yield calculation in the submitted planning statement;
- Child yield for the wider Enderby Wharf site including the revised proposals should be provided including a site wide landscape plan illustrating the overall play space provision.

5.2 Child yield has changed since planning application was submitted due to change in unit mix for block A. Revised figures are provided below:

	Block A	Blocks Y and Z	Total
0-5	24	14	38
5 to 11	12	7	19
12+	6	4	10
Total	42	25	67

- 5.3 Total requirement of play space is 670sq m. Drawing number TOWN568(08)0001 and Table 1 below show how this is provided.
- 5.4 Drawing number TOWN568(08)0001 shows the open space area provided on Block A is 240m². The child yield for Block A is as above.
- 5.5 The rooftop play space on Block A will only be accessible to residents of Block A. Play space on the podium in the Eastern Gardens is approximately 1 minutes' walk away from the entrance to Block A and will be accessible to all residents and the general public.
- 5.6 Table 1 below shows the recreational space requirements for older children. Distribution of this within the development is shown on Drawing number TOWN568(08)0001 and TOWN568(08)0002 and in Table 1 below. This shows there is a shortfall in provision for the older children within the Enderby Place development (if the Alcatel area is excluded) but that this is compensated for by the over-provision of play space for this age group in the wider Enderby Wharf development.
- 5.7 Play space for older children provided as part of the wider Enderby Wharf development and Alcatel development are both open to the public and are within two minutes' walk of the Enderby Place development. There is therefore a good provision of easily accessible play space for older children within the vicinity of Enderby Place. Overall, the provision of play space in the wider Enderby Wharf Development (including Enderby Place) exceeds the play standards set by the GLA. Furthermore, there is additional open space and recreation facilities within walking distance of older children in Greenwich Park, Greenwich Park Way and Greenwich Ecology Park.

Table 1 Enderby Place

	Child yield	Play space requirement based on GLA standards	Play Space Area Total (Including Alcatel, Block A, Y and Z landscape proposals)	Block A Play space area (TLA)	Block Y and Z Play space area (The Landscape Partnership)	Play space area Alcatel proposals (within application area)
Under 5	38	380	666	240	270	156
5 - 11	19	190	266	0	110	156
12+	10	100	211	0	55	156
Total	67	670	1143	240	435	468

5.8 Table 2 below sets out the site wide child yield, site wide play requirements and site wide play provision. Drawing number TOWN568(08)0002 illustrates the overall play space provision and forms part of the additional drawing set which can be seen in Appendix 3.

Table 2 Wider Enderby Wharf site (including Enderby Place)

	Child yield	Play space requirement based on GLA standards	Play Space Area Total (Including Alcatel, Enderby Wharf, Block A and Blocks Y and Z)	Play space area - Enderby Wharf section 73 app (Inc. block A)	Play space area – Blocks Y and Z	Play space area Alcatel proposals
Under 5	110	1100	1640	1214	270	156
5 - 11	106	1060	1366	1100	110	156
12+	77	770	1134	923	55	156
Total	293	2930	4140	3237	435	468

5.9 As can be seen, an appropriate amount of play space has been provided in suitable locations in line with local and regional policy requirements.

6.0 Wheelchair Accommodation

- 6.1 In consultation with the Council's Occupational Therapist, comments were made in relation to the classification of the wheelchair adaptable units.
- 6.2 In response to this, a small alteration to the layouts of apartments A-1-01 to A-9-01 (the same apartment type over floors 1 to 9) were standardised to a 2B3P wheelchair unit. All of these apartments now have the capability of being fully wheelchair compliant with minimal reconfiguration.
- 6.3 These changes involved slight reduction in the size of the corridors and an alteration to the layout of the bathrooms in these apartments to make them more efficient.
- 6.4 The apartments are now classified as the following:
- A-1-01 RENTED: changed from 2B3P to an amended 2B3P (classified as ACCESSIBLE)
 - A-2-01 RENTED: changed from 2B3P to an amended 2B3P (classified as ACCESSIBLE)
 - A-3-01 RENTED: changed from 2B3P to an amended 2B3P (classified as ACCESSIBLE)
 - A-4-01 RENTED: changed from 2B3P to an amended 2B3P (classified as ACCESSIBLE)
 - A-5-01 INTERMEDIATE: changed from 3B5P to 2B3P (classified as ACCESSIBLE ADAPTABLE)
 - A-6-01 INTERMEDIATE: changed from 3B5P to 2B3P (classified as ACCESSIBLE ADAPTABLE)
 - A-7-01 INTERMEDIATE: changed from 3B5P to 2B3P (classified as ACCESSIBLE ADAPTABLE)
 - A-8-01 INTERMEDIATE: changed from 3B5P to 2B3P (classified as ACCESSIBLE ADAPTABLE)
 - A-9-01 INTERMEDIATE: changed from 3B5P to 2B3P (classified as ACCESSIBLE ADAPTABLE)
- 6.5 The apartment type at the north west of the tower on levels 18 to 20 (units B-18-04, B-19-04 and B-20-04) had been designated as wheelchair unit (taking the total for Block A to 21). Following a further review. It became apparent that the reconfiguration work to convert these units to a wheelchair unit would be extensive. Therefore, as per units A-1-01 to A-9-09, the layout has been amended so that the units can be converted to fully wheelchair compliant apartments with minimal reconfiguration. These apartments are now classified as:
- B-18-04 PRIVATE: 3B4P to an amended 3B4P (classified as ACCESSIBLE ADAPTABLE)
 - B-19-04 PRIVATE: 3B4P to an amended 3B4P (classified as ACCESSIBLE ADAPTABLE)
 - B-20-04 PRIVATE: 3B4P to an amended 3B4P (classified as ACCESSIBLE ADAPTABLE)
- 6.6 The above indicated two types of unit, accessible adaptable and adaptable. These are defined as:
- Accessible – fully wheelchair homes compliant
 - Accessible adaptable - spatially wheelchair homes compliant but without compliant fittings (i.e capable of being adapted for full compliance)
- 6.7 The substitute drawings as well as a full drawing substitution list are provided in Appendix 3.

7.0 Affordable Family Dwellings

7.1 The GLA has sought clarification on the amount of affordable family housing proposed.

7.2 As a result of the changes made to apartments A-1-01 to A-9-01, this created a loss of the 4 x 3B5P family units on floors 6 to 9. In order to rectify this, we propose that the layout of the 2 adjacent units in the north west corner are adjusted so that instead of 2 x 2 bed unit, we incorporate 1 x 2 bed unit and 1 x 3 bed units. We are proposing this arrangement over 9 floors as follows:

- A-1-03 RENTED: changed from 2B4P (74.7 m²) to 1B2P (57.6 m²)
- A-1-04 RENTED: changed from 2B4P (74.6 m²) to 3B5P (93.4 m²)

- A-2-03 RENTED: changed from 2B4P (74.7 m²) to 1B2P (57.6 m²)
- A-2-04 RENTED: changed from 2B4P (74.6 m²) to 3B5P (93.4 m²)

- A-3-03 RENTED: changed from 2B4P (74.7 m²) to 1B2P (57.6 m²)
- A-3-04 RENTED: changed from 2B4P (74.6 m²) to 3B5P (93.4 m²)

- A-3-03 RENTED: changed from 2B4P (74.7 m²) to 1B2P (57.6 m²)
- A-3-04 RENTED: changed from 2B4P (74.6 m²) to 3B5P (93.4 m²)

- A-4-03 RENTED: changed from 2B4P (74.7 m²) to 1B2P (57.6 m²)
- A-4-04 RENTED: changed from 2B4P (74.6 m²) to 3B5P (93.4 m²)

- A-5-03 INTERMEDIATE: changed from 2B4P (74.7 m²) to 1B2P (57.6 m²)
- A-5-04 INTERMEDIATE: changed from 2B4P (74.6 m²) to 3B5P (93.4 m²)

- A-6-03 INTERMEDIATE: changed from 2B4P (74.7 m²) to 1B2P (57.6 m²)
- A-6-04 INTERMEDIATE: changed from 2B4P (74.6 m²) to 3B5P (93.4 m²)

- A-7-03 INTERMEDIATE: changed from 2B4P (74.7 m²) to 1B2P (57.6 m²)
- A-7-04 INTERMEDIATE: changed from 2B4P (74.6 m²) to 3B5P (93.4 m²)

- A-8-03 INTERMEDIATE: changed from 2B4P (74.7 m²) to 1B2P (57.6 m²)
- A-8-04 INTERMEDIATE: changed from 2B4P (74.6 m²) to 3B5P (93.4 m²)

- A-9-03 INTERMEDIATE: changed from 2B4P (74.7 m²) to 1B2P (57.6 m²)
- A-9-04 INTERMEDIATE: changed from 2B4P (74.6 m²) to 3B5P (93.4 m²)

7.3 As a result of these changes, the provision of affordable family dwellings is 17%

7.4 A full drawing substitution list is provided in Appendix 3 which demonstrate the changes that have been made.

8.0 Transport/Coach Parking

8.1 Comments have been received from local residents in relation to the transport impacts of the proposed development and the level of proposed parking. The applicants Transport Consultant has reviewed these comments and has provided the following responses:

Traffic Impact

- 8.2 Regarding the queries raised in relation to a potential increase in traffic from the proposed residential use and cruise terminal, the traffic impact of the revised Enderby Place scheme compared to the consented Enderby Wharf development has been assessed in detail in the Transport Statement (TS) submitted with the application.
- 8.3 The TS found that the worst-case volume of trips generated by the proposed cruise terminal will be virtually identical to the volume of trips previously approved.
- 8.4 Regarding the residential element of the scheme, the TS demonstrates that, due to the proposed reduced car parking provision and the accessibility of the site by sustainable transport, the proposed residential development will not generate a significant volume of extra trips over and above the consented residential traffic, and taking into account the fact that the proposals will remove the consented peak hour hotel trips from the site, it is clear that the proposed scheme will have no material impact on the consented overall traffic attraction of the site.

On-site Parking

- 8.5 The lower level of on-site residential parking proposed (0.42 spaces per dwelling compared to the consented 0.58 spaces per dwelling) is supported by TfL as it satisfies London Plan Policy 6.13 Car Parking.
- 8.6 As set out in the TS, the site is highly accessible by sustainable travel modes and the latest Census Data has shown a marked reduction (-8%) in car driver trips in the Peninsula Ward where this site is located. The residential parking ratio proposed has therefore been set to reflect this increase in sustainable travel use.
- 8.7 To reduce parking demand at the site to a minimum, the site will operate a comprehensive Residential Travel Plan aimed at encouraging the use of sustainable modes of transport. Residents will also have access to a Car Club allowing residents access to a number of communal use vehicles.
- 8.8 Off-site parking by residents will be discouraged by restricting access to on-street parking permits within the Greenwich Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ).

Public Transport

- 8.9 Regarding public transport, the site is highly accessible by a large variety of sustainable travel modes including the underground and mainline rail as well as by bus.
- 8.10 The proposed public transport improvements to come forward as a result of the proposed development includes a new River Bus pier consistent with the previous planning permissions at Enderby Wharf.
- 8.11 It is expected that a large proportion of residents would travel using the London Underground network, as supported by the results of the 2011 Census.

Coach Movement

- 8.12 Regarding coach movement, the internal movement of coaches around the site has been extensively covered in the TS, including swept path analysis to ensure sufficient manoeuvring room has been provided.

8.13 There will be no more than six coaches on-site at any one time. We have consulted with an international cruise ship ground handler who has confirmed that:

"It is our understanding that the maximum ship size accommodated will be 1800 passengers. The planned six coach bays will be ample. A coach can typically be parked, loaded and dispatched within thirty minutes, with the typical turnaround debark lasting four hours. The planned six coach bays will thus provide a passenger throughput in excess of 1500 passengers, assuming an average of 32 passengers per coach, or 85% of the theoretical capacity of the largest ship that will be accommodated, which is more than ample in our experience, with private car/limousine dispatch area and taxis accommodating the remainder."

On-Street Parking Permits

8.14 New residents will not be granted on-street parking permits within the Greenwich CPZ. As part of the Section 106 (S106) agreement, residents will be prevented from applying for residential parking permits (unless the resident has a disability).

Traffic Movements

8.15 In relation to comments about proposed traffic movements across the site, we can confirm that the proposed scheme has been designed so that all of the site traffic will be directed along Telegraph Road.

Access to Boulevard Road

8.16 In response to the comment made by asking for all footpaths to be a minimum of 2m wide along Boulevard Road, it can be confirmed that for the most part, this is a wide shared surface of more than 5m wide. Where the road passes between Enderby House and the terminal, and at all other pinch points, it is wider than the minimum 2m required.

9.0 Energy

9.1 The GLA in their Stage 1 response have sought clarification on the carbon savings that the development will achieve.

9.2 A full Energy Statement has been prepared to support this response document and address the queries that have been raised on this topic. This document can be seen in Appendix 1

10.0 AQ Neutral

Assessment of Skill Academy and Terminal Building

10.1 As part of the GLA Stage 1 report, a request was made for the Skills Academy and the Cruise Terminal to be assessed as part of the Air Quality neutral calculations

10.2 Air Quality Neutral Planning Support: GLA 80371 indicates that;

'Where a specific Transport Emission Benchmark (TEB) has not been calculated, it will be possible to show that a development would meet the benchmark if the scheme-generated trip rate for a

particular land-use class does not exceed the benchmark trip rate, derived from TRAVL, as shown in Appendix A1.'

- 10.3 Within the proposed development there are land uses (i.e. skills academy and cruise terminal) which do not have a TEB.
- 10.4 The cruise liner terminal is classed as "Sui Generis" and no TRAVL benchmark is available. Therefore, class "C1" Hotels has been used as the closest surrogate for a "Sui Generis" class and the type of land use which is a cruise terminal.
- 10.5 Consultation has been undertaken with the applicants transport team (Mayer Brown) to establish the predicted trip generation for the skills academy and the cruise terminal. The traffic team indicate that the skills academy is expected to have 12.2 trips/m²/annum and the cruise terminal approximately 7.6 trips/m²/annum
- 10.6 In terms of the D1 use, the TRAVL benchmark trip rate of 65.1 trips per 1m² per annum equates to approximately 113 trips per day for the skills academy (635m²). In comparison, the estimate of the daily trips for this use is approximately 21 vehicles for the skills academy, which is far below the TRAVL benchmark numbers of trips of 113.
- 10.7 With the above in mind, the skills academy to have a lower vehicle trip generation rate than the benchmark trip rates for Class D1 use on site.
- 10.8 In terms of the cruise terminal, the surrogate TRAVL benchmark trip rate of 5 trips per 1m² per annum equates to approximately 29 trips per day for the cruise terminal (2,085 m²). In comparison, the estimate of the daily trips for this use is approximately 43 vehicles however, a hotel will be in operation 365 days in a year whereas the London City Cruise Port operates approximately 180 days per year (c. 50% of the time) with the peak season between April and September and with a small minority outside this season servicing 55 cruise vessels. This will result in 27% less trips per year than the hotel benchmark trip total for a year. Therefore, the cruise terminal is considered to be air quality neutral.
- 10.9 Therefore the skills academy and the cruise terminal are air quality neutral.

Air quality and cruise vessel movements

- 10.10 A matter arising from the current application is whether the current proposal would negatively impact on Air Quality in comparison with the existing approved and implemented cruise terminal planning permission.
- 10.11 This application does not cover the ship mooring facilities as this has already been consented by the Royal borough. The changes proposed within this application relate to the onshore portion of the terminal (primarily the enlargement of the baggage hall and introduction of improved vertical circulation and customs and other management facilities). Notwithstanding the issue of the applicability of the question, following observations are offered in this regard.
- 10.12 The approved 2012 scheme was subject to an approved Environmental Impact Assessment which followed the methodology contained within the 2009 DEFRA guidance in Local Air Quality Management which requires assessment of ports or shipping emissions if there are between 5,000 and 15,000 movements per year (and sensitive receptors within 250m). This equates to an average

of over 13 vessel movements per day. This same guidance takes account of cruise liner movements and hoteling, where all vessels only operate axillary engines using low-sulphur fuel. Indeed the ferry Port of Dover has now stopped monitoring (despite a sailing every 10 minutes) because of the advances in engine emission technology. Dover District Council has revoked the Eastern Docks Air Quality Management Area there.

- 10.13 The approved planning permission anticipated approximately 100 visits a year by cruise ship – 65 of these would be turnaround calls (where passengers start and end their cruise) and 35 transit calls.
- 10.14 The current application anticipates 55 cruise ships per season with approximately 28 turnaround calls and 27 transit calls.
- 10.15 The forecast ship movements (together with associated support vessels etc. and ‘alongside engine/generator hours’) associated with this planning application is therefore lower than tested previously as part of the planning approval process and vastly lower than the levels which the DEFRA guidance regard as significant enough to be assessed for its impact on Air Quality. It is also important to note that all vessels will be required to meet both MARPOL regulations in terms of SO_x, NO_x and particulate matter but also that the sulphur content of their fuel must be within limits of the London Emission Control Area.

11.0 Cold Ironing

- 11.1 Again this issue does not form part of the current planning application given the previous planning permissions at Enderby Wharf. Nevertheless, discussions with local utility operators has confirmed that a new dedicated power supply (cold ironing) sufficiently large to power the fleet anticipated is not available in East Greenwich. Such a supply is estimated to be six or more times larger than the supply otherwise required for the whole of the Enderby Place development. Technical feasibility of suppliers delivering such a supply has not been forthcoming but if such a supply could be provided, the applicant is advised that it would be need to be ‘dedicated’ for this purpose and would require to be laid for 4.5 miles through Greenwich from Shooters Hill to Enderby Wharf and would terminate in a very large, bespoke substation for which there is no site available and which would be inappropriate within a residential district. Beyond the associated, up-front infrastructure costs the dedicated facility would continue to attract major standing charges – regardless of power consumption as it would be deemed to have a minimum annual consumption representing regular, significant use.
- 11.2 It is important to note that only 5% of the target fleet of ships to the proposed terminal would be technically capable of making use of this facility. This figure is unlikely to increase as operators are favouring investment in reduction of engine emissions via generator design, exhaust scrubbing technologies and fuel changes as the vast majority of their ports of call will never be able to provide a shore supply. The one or two European ports currently with a shore supply are extremely large with many berths for cruise ships and commercial vessels (no European dedicated cruise liner terminals offer this facility). Enderby Wharf has only one berth in seasonal use
- 11.3 Variations in load across ships of varying sizes, with varying equipment to be powered and across varying ambient weather conditions, voltage spikes, and grounding and cable systems also have to accommodate each difference between those few ships. There is no evidence that cold ironing solutions reduce noise/ vibration effects beyond conventional mitigation measures.

11.4 Accordingly, a cold-ironing solution is not proposed within this current application which is an application to amend the onshore approved terminal building and which in itself has no bearing on the issue raised in relation to ships at the offshore mooring facility. Notwithstanding the relevance of applicability to this application, a more detailed set of analysis and information is contained within the submitted TMC report on operational environmental issues. It is worth noting that the recent GLA Stage 1 Report dated 3 June 2015 does not consider on-shore power supply an alternative solution.

12.0 Winter Gardens and Enclosed balconies

12.1 GLA and PLA reference the current safeguarded wharf ("Tunnel Wharf") to the north of the application site and the potential need for mitigation measures if the safeguarded wharf boundary is not relocated despite the recommendation by the Mayor of London within the Safeguarded Wharf Review document to amend the boundary of the wharf approximately 250m metres away from the application site. This boundary relocation also has the support of the GLA, the Royal Borough of Greenwich, the PLA, Morden College as landowner and their development partner.

12.2 GLA and the PLA have recommended that winter gardens and/or enclosed balconies to those apartments with balconies facing Tunnel Wharf (which currently lies vacant as a cleared site) are introduced in the event that the Tunnel Wharf boundary is not relocated in advance of the Enderby Place development coming forward. This recommendation is supported by the Enderby Place applicant's

12.3 As a result and given discussions with officers from the Royal borough, please find within Appendix 3 a plan – drawing reference 1285_SK_580 identifying the specific apartment balconies which would be enclosed if, in the unlikely event, the safeguarded boundary is not relocated prior to the development coming forward. In addition, Appendix 3 contains a series of images – drawing references 14165_L(08)002, 14165_L(08)003 for Block A and 1285_P435 and 1285_P436 for Blocks Y and Z - which clearly illustrate the minor elevational changes required to facilitate the enclosing of the balconies identified on plan 1285_SK_580. **These drawings (14165_L(08)002, 14165_L(08)003, 1285_P435 and 1285_P436) are provided for information purposes only and do not form part of the application documentation.**

12.4 It is recommended that the ability to introduce the enclosed north facing balcony mitigation measure is identified within, and facilitated by, Condition 3 entitled "Mitigation Measures" which has been adopted on both the preceding Enderby Wharf planning permissions dated 30 March 2012 and 7 August 2014. The wording of these mitigation conditions is reproduced below for ease:

Condition wording from application 10/3036/F and 13/3025/MA

Condition 3 – Mitigation Measures

Prior to the commencement of development, a schedule setting out the Environmental Mitigation Measures presented in the Environmental Statement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the mitigation measures set out in the Environmental Mitigation Schedule.

Reason 3

To ensure that the details of the development are within the parameters assessed in the Environmental Statement and that the development is carried out in accordance with the mitigation measures set out in the Environmental Statement in order to minimise the environmental effects of the development.

12.5 The wording of a slightly amended Condition 3 is proposed below:

Condition 3 - Mitigation Measures

Prior to the commencement of development, a schedule setting out the Environmental Mitigation Measures presented in the Environmental Statement dated March 2015 and the Thematic Response Document dated 1 July 2015 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Authority. The development shall be carried out in the accordance with the mitigation measures set out in the Environmental Mitigation Schedule.

Reason 3

To ensure that the details of the development are within the parameters assessed in the Environmental Statement and as identified in the Supplementary Clarification Document, and that the development is carried out in accordance with the mitigation measures set out in the Environmental Statement and the Supplementary Clarification Document in order to minimise the environmental effects of the development.

12.6 The applicant's team would welcome further discussion with the Royal borough on this proposal which we believe provides a robust approach to delivering the enclosed balcony mitigation strategy if required whilst enabling the planning permission to be implemented in the highly likely event that the Tunnel Wharf boundary is relocated entirely in accordance with the recommendation of the Mayor of London which is supported by all the principal parties including the GLA, PLA and Royal borough.

13.0 Block A – Proposed Lobby Arrangement

13.1 Comments have been received which relate to the proposed lobby arrangement within Block A.

13.2 As a result, the design team have enhanced the lobbies within Block A.

13.3 There are now two entrance lobbies within Block A. The southern entrance lobby serves both affordable and private units together. In relation to the northern entrance and in order to provide an improved entrance the previous two lobbies have been combined to form a single comprehensive point of entry. By combining the two entrances, tenants now enjoy a more generous double height space which at 40 sq.m, is 20% larger in area than the two separate entrances. In addition, the access for the combined northern entrance lobby is taken from the west, which is off a landscaped square provided as part of the extensive public realm works surrounding all the residential buildings

13.4 In terms of the architectural treatment of the façade of the new northern lobby arrangement, the stainless steel perforated panel treatment has been incorporated into the rhythm of the façade at the base of the lower block and a bronze anodised metal portal frame defines the double height entrance itself. The perforated panel treatment will be carefully detailed at ground level to ensure that security considerations are robust, while maintaining street level interest and quality.

13.5 A glazed cantilevered canopy runs across the top of the entrance doors providing shelter. This is supported by tensile cables which connect back to an intermediate solid bronze anodised metal cladding panel which aligns with the brick piers above.

13.6 For clarity, the table below identifies the sizes of the proposed ground floor lobbies:

- Block A (63 serving affordable units) – 40sq.m
- Block A (151 serving affordable and private units) – 69sq.m
- Block Y (113 serving private units) – 41sq.m
- Block Z (150 serving private units – 51sq.m

13.7 All the lobbies are comparable in size and in fact, in terms of floorspace per unit, the northern Block A lobby serving the 63 affordable units is by far the highest floor area of any entrance proposed.

13.8 The substitute drawings which demonstrate the changes that have been made are included within Appendix 3

14.0 Fire Strategy

14.1 Comments have been received from the Fire Brigade in relation to the proposed access for fire vehicles.

14.2 Access for fire brigade vehicles has been carefully considered within the landscape design for Enderby place. The transport statement which was included within the original application submission included a tracking plan which demonstrates the movements of fire vehicles across the site.

14.3 Further to this, an outline fire strategy has been produced which further addresses this issue. Section 5 of this document outlines the means of access and facilities for the fire services and how these would accord with the relevant standards outlined within Fire Safety Guidance Note 29.

14.4 The full outline fire strategy can be seen in Appendix 2 of this response.

15.0 Accommodation Standards

15.1 A request was made as part of the GLA Stage 1 report to clarify that the proposed accommodation was meeting the relevant design standards.

15.2 This information was submitted as part of the original application within the Appendices to the Environmental Statement. However for clarity, the relevant section has been extracted and can be seen in Appendix 4.

15.3 In addition to this, a point was also raised within the GLA Stage 1 Report which asked for adequate showering and changing facilities to be provided for users of the commercial floor space.

15.4 Staff changing and showering facilities have been provided within the terminal building which all commercial units surrounding the terminal will have access to. The provision of these facilities has been outlined in the BREEAM assessment and go towards the target of BREEAM excellent for the terminal building.

Appendix 1 – Energy Statement

Appendix 2 – Outline Fire Strategy

Appendix 3 – Substitute and Additional Drawings

Scale Drawings provided under separate cover

Appendix 4 – Accommodation Standards Checklist