

## PLANNING BOARD - TUESDAY, 21ST MAY, 2024

Plannign Officer addendum report(s)

### Agenda No    Item

5.    **Enderby Place, Telcon Way, Greenwich, London, SE10 0AG - Ref: 23/3911/F**  
**(Pages 3 - 22)**

***Ward: East Greenwich***

The Planning Board is requested to grant full planning permission for the erection of part-3, part-23, part-35 storey buildings, providing up to 564 residential apartments (Class C3), light industrial (Class E(g)(iii)) and community / café use (Sui Generis), and associated highways, landscaping and public realm works.

This page is intentionally left blank

<b>Planning Board</b>  <b>21 May 2024</b>	<b>Agenda Item: 5</b> <b>Reference No: 23/3911/F</b> <a href="#">Document Link</a>
---	--

**Applicant: Maritime View Ltd**  
**Agent: Centro Planning Consultancy**

<b>Site Address:</b> Enderby Place, Telcon Way, Greenwich, London, SE10 0AG	<b>Ward:</b> East Greenwich  <b>Application Type:</b> Full Planning Permission
---	---

## ADDENDUM

### **I.0 Updates to Consultee Section – I.1 and 7.3**

I.1 Since the Planning Board report was published the Environment Agency (EA) have responded and removed their objection to the scheme subject to a number of detailed conditions. Therefore, the recommendation set out within section I.1 is amended to the following:

*That full planning permission be granted for the erection of part-3, part-23, part-35 storey buildings, providing up to 564 residential apartments (Class C3), light industrial (Class E(g)(iii)) and community / café use (Sui Generis), and associated highways, landscaping and public realm works.*

*(This application is an EIA development and is accompanied by an Environmental Statement)*

I.2 *Subject to:*

- (i) Referral of the application to the Mayor of London as required under the terms of The Town and Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008;*
- (ii) The satisfactory completion of a Section 106 Legal Agreement (obligations set out in Section 30); and*
- (iii) Conditions set out in Appendix 2 and any addendums;*
- (iv) Members confirming in their decision that account has been taken of environmental information, as required by Regulation 26 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017;*
- (v) statement being placed on the statutory Register confirming the main reasons and consideration of which the Planning Board decision was based were those set out in the report of the Director of Regeneration, Enterprise and Skills as*

required by Regulations 30 (1) (d.) of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017.

~~(vi) The removal of the Environment Agency Objection.~~

1.3 Noting these comments section 7.3 is updated with the EA's comments summarised below:

<b>Consultee:</b>	Environment Agency
<b>Date received:</b>	21/05/2024
<b>Summary of third consultation responses:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The EA are now in a position to remove our objection subject to the following conditions being added to any relevant consent; securing implementation of the Flood Risk Assessment; Flood defence condition survey; Flood defence remediation or replacement strategy; Flood defence monitoring and maintenance plan; As built tidal flood defence structures.</li></ul>	
<b>Officer comments on consultation response:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>These comments are noted and the recommended conditions proposed to be secured against the scheme. These are detailed within section 4 of this addendum report.</li></ul>	

## 2 Updates to Consultee Section - 7.4

2.1 Since the Planning Board report was published the Councils Waste Service team commented on the details submitted and the applicant has responded to those comments with further details. The updated Council Waste Services teams comments are shown below:

<b>Consultee:</b>	Waste
<b>Date received:</b>	14/05/2024 and 20/05/2024
<b>Summary of secondary consultation responses:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Vehicle movements should be different to what is proposed, i.e. service vehicles should reverse towards the bin store of Morden Tower rather than that proposed.</li><li>There are serious concerns over the swept path provided as there is not enough clearance for when a vehicle in manoeuvring.</li><li>The proposed final location of refuse vehicles is not practical for the Morden Tower.</li><li>Queries over what happens if a car is coming out whilst a vehicles is coming in/and or the other way.</li></ul>	

- Concerns over collections vehicles manoeuvring over a pedestrian path and visibility within collection points.
- Details of the full gradient within the entrance point shall be provided and ensuring 30cm clearance, as recommended, is available each side of the access lane from any obstructions.

### **Summary of third consultation response**

- A. Following the additional details provided, the waste team have two outstanding points to raise which relate to the turning circle provided for a refuse truck to reverse between central parking bays with
- B. The other point of note is in relation to the proposed entry and exit point with the waste management team setting out there should be a traffic light system to enter the lower ground floor with the suggestion that removing the existing soft landscaping area adjacent to the vehicular access could assist this.

### **Officer comments on second consultation response:**

The applicant has responded to these comments and they have been passed onto the Waste team for review including additional swept path details. At the time of writing this addendum they have not responded. However, to summarise the applicant has responded to the comments accordingly.

- a) The proposed recommended movements set out by the Councils waste team have been proposed and detailed.
- b) The car parking spaces, hatched zone and aisle widths are standard dimensions. It is appropriate for vehicles to drive over hatched zone of disabled bays, as required. Wheel stops can be used at the end of the central bank of parking spaces to ensure vehicles do not overhang the front of the space. However, to further improve this relationship the proposed central parking bays have been moved slightly north, reducing the proposed potential overhang of the vehicles within any hatched areas.
- c) The applicant has set out that on-site management staff will be on hand to assist council collectors on collection day by lining up bins at the entrance of the bin store and switching out emptied bins to ensure continuous and swift movements.
- d) As detailed in the main report, the car park serves 20 car parking spaces with minimal vehicle in and out movements with minimal trips expected during the AM peak (i.e. 13 two way movements expected) with appropriate passing spaces available for vehicles to wait should they need to give way to a refuse vehicle entering the site.
- e) Whilst there are pedestrian paths within the lower ground floor area, the primary residential access will be from the Podium level

where all main entrances are provided. The response also sets out that pedestrian would have clear visibility of a reversing vehicle from a loading bay before continuing accordingly. As detailed for point 3, on-site staff are all proposed to be present during bin collection to assist where required.

- f) The gradient of the slope is 1:13 with width of the vehicle gate opening (including 30 cm clearance on each side totalling 4.60m)

**Officer comments on third consultation response:**

- A. Officers note these points and that the proposed vehicle manoeuvring between the middle and the right rows of parking spaces is not completely clear but is improved from the original submission and that noting the proposed mitigation including for instance wheel stops to reducing the potential for cars to overhang this space alongside on-site staff to aid any refuse collections.
- B. Officers understand and note this point, however there needs to be a balance between servicing and collection needs versus the impact of any loss of soft landscaping especially as this could negatively impact upon pedestrian accessibility too and from the proposed commercial space on Telcon Way and if required the lower ground floor area. Therefore, ensuring that the right approach meets all those considerations further details are proposed to be secured by amending the existing refuse and recycling condition.

It is noted that condition 40 already proposed to be added to the application sets out that prior to the first occupation of the residential element of first use of the commercial areas a refuse and recycling strategy including confirmed collections arrangements for all uses has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This condition has been further amended noting the additional responses and is set out further within section 4 of this addendum report.

**3 Updates to Consultee Section – 7.6**

- 3.1 Since the Planning Board report was published, the Greenwich Society have objected to the application. Their comments are summarised below:

Summary of Comments	Officers' comments
This objection is submitted on behalf of the Greenwich Society and is restricted solely to the height of the	This is noted and the proposed schemes height is discussed in detail

<p>proposed 35 storey tower building. We have had a useful conversation with the developers and architects and welcome many of the aspects of this scheme but a 35 storey is unacceptable and is objected on the following grounds:</p>	<p>within section 14 of the main planning board report.</p>
<p>1. It would be visually obtrusive to Greenwich Park and the World Heritage Centre of Maritime Greenwich. The site ( and that of Morden Wharf) are much closer to those locations than the developments around the O2.</p>	<p>The proposed schemes height is discussed in detail within section 14 of the main planning board report which sets out that whilst officers do consider there to be harm caused to the World Heritage Site, this harm is considered to be less than substantial harm and therefore in-line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the public benefits of the scheme are considered to outweigh the harm caused.</p>
<p>2. We are unaware whether the developers have discussed their plans with the UN Body responsible for Word Heritage Sites, and obtained their approval to this scheme. If not we have concerns that this development could jeopardise the World Heritage Site status of Maritime Greenwich.</p>	<p>This is noted.</p>
<p>3. We do not accept that the 35 story tower is integral to the development or that it would not be feasible economically if the height of the major tower was substantially reduced.</p>	<p>This is noted.</p>
<p>4. The Morden Wharf scheme attracted a large measure of local opposition including that of Council officers, such as the Conservation</p>	<p>This is noted and as discussed within the officer response to point 1, officers agree harm is caused, but in-line with the NPPF, consider that</p>

<p>Officers. Those objections were based on the height of the principal tower and are equally valid and applicable to the Enderby Place scheme.</p>	<p>harm is considered to be less than substantial harm which is agreed by both the Councils Conversation and Planning officers as well as the GLA within their Stage 1 response. It is the opinion of officers that, the harm is outweighed by the public benefits of the scheme and this is discussed within section 14 of the main planning board report.</p>
---	---

#### **4 Amendments to appendix 1 – drawing numbers and appendix 2 - proposed conditions (relating to ref. 23/3911/F)**

- 4.1 Noting the additional details submitted in response to the Councils Waste Officers response, the EA removal of their objection and recommended conditions and additional details in relation to active frontage and heritage documents, appendix 1 relating to the approved drawing numbers/documents and condition 2 relating to 23/3911/F require updating. These updates are set out below and those additional/amended details highlighted in red with additional EA conditions proposed to be added to the consent as outlined below.
- 4.2 Following the World Heritage Site co-ordinators comments which are detailed within the planning board report it is proposed that a cultural strategy should be secured via condition so that the development can further enhance the proposals reference to the sites historic and industrial heritage within, primarily but not limited to, its detailed proposed landscaping, wayfinding and community/café space. This is detailed within section 4.0 below.

### **Appendix 1**

#### **Drawings:**

<b>Drawing Title</b>	<b>Drawing Reference</b>	<b>Revision</b>
Site Location Plan	1136_LP-100	P1
Ground Level Plan	1136_GA-00	P7 <sup>9</sup>
Podium Level Plan	1136_GA-01	P6
Podium Mezzanine Level	1136_GA-02	P2



Level 1	I136_GA-03	P4
Level 2	I136_GA-04	P2
Level 3-16	I136_GA-05	P2
Level 17-19	I136_GA-06	P2
Level 20	I136_GA-07	P2
Level 21	I136_GA-08	P2
Level 22	I136_GA-09	P2
Level 23	I136_GA-10	P2
Level 24-31	I136_GA-11	P2
Level 32	I136_GA-12	P2
Level 33-34	I136_GA-13	P2
Roof Level	I136_GA-14	P2
1 Bed Unit Types A	I136_GA-U-100	P2
1 Bed Unit Types B	I136_GA-U-101	P2
2 Bed Unit Types A	I136_GA-U-102	P2
2 Bed Unit Types B	I136_GA-U-103	P2
2 Bed Unit Types C	I136_GA-U-104	P2
3 Bed Unit Types	I136_GA-U-105	P2
4 Bed Unit Types	I136_GA-U-106	P2
Proposed Elevation - River / Telegraph Block South	I136_GE-100	P2
Proposed Elevations - River West	I136_GE-101	P1
Proposed Elevation - River /Telegraph Block North	I136_GE-102	P2
Proposed Elevation - River / Telegraph Block East	I136_GE-103	P2
Proposed Elevations - Telcon South	I36_GE-104	P1
Proposed Elevations - Telcon / Morden West	I136_GE-105	P1
Proposed Elevations - Morden North	I136_GE-106	P1
Proposed Elevations - Telcon / Morden East	I136_GE-107	P1
Proposed Elevations - Site Elevation South	I136_GE-109	P2
Proposed Elevations - Site Elevation North	I136_GE-110	P2
Proposed Elevation Study - 1	I136_GE-400	P1
Proposed Elevation Study - 2	I136_GE-401	P1
Proposed Elevation Study - 3	I136_GE-402	P1
Proposed Elevations - Site Elevation East	I136_GE-111	P1
Proposed Elevations - Site Elevation South	I136_GE-112	P1
Proposed Elevations - Site Elevation North	I136_GE-113	P1
Proposed P Section 01+02	I136_GS-103	P3
Proposed Site Proximity Sections 03 + 04	GS-104	

Proposed Site Proximity Section 05	GS-105	
Proposed Section AA	1136_GS-100	P4
Proposed Site Plan - Without Morden Wharf Development	1136_SP-101	P2
Proposed Site Plan - With Morden Wharf Development	1136_SP-102	P2
Proposed Site Plan - With Red Line Boundary Excluding Telcon Way	1136_SP-103	P2
Proposed Site Plan - With Red Line Boundary Excluding Telcon Way	1136_SP-104	P1
Proposed EA Buffer Zone	0711-020-P3	
Typical Tree Pit and Flood Defence Interface Details	8416-DE-SD-501	P01
Landscape General Arrangement Plan - Urban Greening Factor	8416-PL-X-GA-102	P01
Landscape General Arrangement Plan - Roof Plan	8416-PL-X-GA-101	P02
Existing Site Elevations	1136_EE-100	P1
Existing Site Plan	1136_SP-000	P1
Swept Path Analysis Refuse Vehicle	22181-MA-XX-XX-DR-C-7051	P08

## Documents:

Title	Author	Reference/date
Environmental Statement Volume 1 (Chapters 1-6 and 8 -14), Volume 2, Volume 3 (Appendices 2.1 – 2.5, 5.1, 6.1, 8.1, 9.1 – 9.2, 10.1-10.5, 11.1 - 11.3, 13.1) and Volume 4	Avison Young	5 <sup>th</sup> December 2024
ES Volume 1 – Chapter 7 – Daylight and Sunlight Addendum	Avison Young	12 <sup>th</sup> February 2024
ES Addendum Covering Letter	Avison Young	12 <sup>th</sup> February 2024
Response to ES Review	Avison Young	12 <sup>th</sup> February 2024
Rapid Health Impact Assessment Matrix – Self Completion Form	Centro Planning Consultancy	1 <sup>st</sup> December 2023
Ecological Assessment Report	Redstone Ecology	January 2024
Fire Statement	Marshall Fire	03 – 5 <sup>th</sup> April 2024
Framework Site Delivery and Servicing Management Plan	Markides Associates	Rev C – 15 <sup>th</sup> April 2024

Framework Operational Waste Management Plan	Markides Associates	Rev A – 20 <sup>th</sup> November 2023
Transport Assessment Addendum	Markides Associates	Rev B – 15 <sup>th</sup> April 2024
Transport Technical Note Addendum	Markides Associates	Rev A – 22 <sup>nd</sup> April 2024
Access Statement	David Bonnett Associates	November 2023
Planning Statement	Centro Planning Consultancy	Rev 2 - January 2024
Financial Viability Appraisal - Appraisal Input Assumptions Report: Impact of bus loop on proposed scheme	U.L.L Property	1st December 2023
Design and Access Statement	BGY	December 2023
Cover Letter	Centro Planning Consultancy	5 <sup>th</sup> December 2023
Accommodation Schedule	BGY	30 <sup>th</sup> November 2023
Area Schedule Commercial	BGY	5 <sup>th</sup> December 2023
Flood Risk Assessment	MAB Consultancy	P2 – 29 <sup>th</sup> November 2023
Intertidal Terrace Letter	CMPC	6 <sup>th</sup> March 2024
Flood Defence Structural Assessment Report	HHack Engineering	P2 - April 2024
Enderby Place, Flood Defence Memo	HHack Engineering	1333-MEM001 - 6th March 2024.
FRA Addendum 2	-	PI – 04 <sup>th</sup> March 2024
Desk Study and Preliminary Risk Assessment	Milvum Engineering Services	01 – November 2023
Sustainable Design and Construction Statement incorporating Energy Enderby Place	JS Lewis Ltd	Rev C – January 2024
Circular Economy Statement	JS Lewis Ltd	Rev A – December 2023
Circular Economy Spreadsheet	JS Lewis Ltd	
BREEAM Accredited Professional Stage 2/3 Pre-assessment Report	The PES	30 <sup>th</sup> November 2023
Overheating Risk Assessment	JS Lewis Ltd	Rev B – December 2023
Construction Management Plan	OM Group	02 – November 2023

ITEM NO: 5 - Addendum

Page No: 9

Construction Logistics Plan	Markides Associates	27 <sup>th</sup> November 2023
Lifecycle Carbon Assessment	JS Lewis Ltd	Rev A - December 2023
Whole Life Cycle Assessment	JS Lewis Ltd	23 <sup>th</sup> November 2023
Arboricultural Impact Assessment & Method Statement Report (BS5837:2012)	Arboricultural Design & Consultancy	AIA/MF/0189/23 – November 2023
Archaeological Desk Based Assessment	PCA	November 2023
Biodiversity Net Gain Calculation Spreadsheet	Sara Curtis	13 <sup>th</sup> November 2023
Landscape and Public Realm Strategy	Spacehub	November 2023
Statement of Community Involvement	Lowick	October 2023
Utilities Report	Landmark Information	
Active Frontage Diagrams	BGY	
Built Heritage, Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment: Supplementary Information	Monatgu Evans	May 2024

## Appendix 2 - Update to Condition 2

### Drawings:

Drawing Title	Drawing Reference	Revision
Site Location Plan	I136_LP-100	P1
Ground Level Plan	I136_GA-00	P7 <sup>9</sup>
Podium Level Plan	I136_GA-01	P6
Podium Mezzanine Level	I136_GA-02	P2
Level 1	I136_GA-03	P4
Level 2	I136_GA-04	P2
Level 3-16	I136_GA-05	P2
Level 17-19	I136_GA-06	P2
Level 20	I136_GA-07	P2
Level 21	I136_GA-08	P2
Level 22	I136_GA-09	P2
Level 23	I136_GA-10	P2
Level 24-31	I136_GA-11	P2

ITEM NO: 5 - Addendum

Page No: 10

Level 32	1136_GA-12	P2
Level 33-34	1136_GA-13	P2
Roof Level	1136_GA-14	P2
1 Bed Unit Types A	1136_GA-U-100	P2
1 Bed Unit Types B	1136_GA-U-101	P2
2 Bed Unit Types A	1136_GA-U-102	P2
2 Bed Unit Types B	1136_GA-U-103	P2
2 Bed Unit Types C	1136_GA-U-104	P2
3 Bed Unit Types	1136_GA-U-105	P2
4 Bed Unit Types	1136_GA-U-106	P2
Proposed Elevation - River / Telegraph Block South	1136_GE-100	P2
Proposed Elevations - River West	1136_GE-101	P1
Proposed Elevation - River /Telegraph Block North	1136_GE-102	P2
Proposed Elevation - River / Telegraph Block East	1136_GE-103	P2
Proposed Elevations - Telcon South	136_GE-104	P1
Proposed Elevations - Telcon / Morden West	1136_GE-105	P1
Proposed Elevations - Morden North	1136_GE-106	P1
Proposed Elevations - Telcon / Morden East	1136_GE-107	P1
Proposed Elevations - Site Elevation South	1136_GE-109	P2
Proposed Elevations - Site Elevation North	1136_GE-110	P2
Proposed Elevation Study - 1	1136_GE-400	P1
Proposed Elevation Study - 2	1136_GE-401	P1
Proposed Elevation Study - 3	1136_GE-402	P1
Proposed Elevations - Site Elevation East	1136_GE-111	P1
Proposed Elevations - Site Elevation South	1136_GE-112	P1
Proposed Elevations - Site Elevation North	1136_GE-113	P1
Proposed P Section 01+02	1136_GS-103	P3
Proposed Site Proximity Sections 03 + 04	GS-104	
Proposed Site Proximity Section 05	GS-105	
Proposed Section AA	1136_GS-100	P4
Proposed Site Plan - Without Morden Wharf Development	1136_SP-101	P2
Proposed Site Plan - With Morden Wharf Development	1136_SP-102	P2
Proposed Site Plan - With Red Line Boundary Excluding Telcon Way	1136_SP-103	P2
Proposed Site Plan - With Red Line Boundary	1136_SP-104	P1

Excluding Telcon Way		
Proposed EA Buffer Zone	0711-020-P3	
Typical Tree Pit and Flood Defence Interface Details	8416-DE-SD-501	P01
Landscape General Arrangement Plan - Urban Greening Factor	8416-PL-X-GA-102	P01
Landscape General Arrangement Plan - Roof Plan	8416-PL-X-GA-101	P02
Existing Site Elevations	1136_EE-100	P1
Existing Site Plan	1136_SP-000	P1
Swept Path Analysis Refuse Vehicle	22181-MA-XX-XX-DR-C-7051	P08

## Documents:

Title	Author	Reference/date
Environmental Statement Volume 1 (Chapters 1-6 and 8 -14), Volume 2, Volume 3 (Appendices 2.1 – 2.5, 5.1, 6.1, 8.1, 9.1 – 9.2, 10.1-10.5, 11.1 - 11.3, 13.1) and Volume 4	Avison Young	5 <sup>th</sup> December 2024
ES Volume 1 – Chapter 7 – Daylight and Sunlight Addendum	Avison Young	12 <sup>th</sup> February 2024
ES Addendum Covering Letter	Avison Young	12 <sup>th</sup> February 2024
Response to ES Review	Avison Young	12 <sup>th</sup> February 2024
Rapid Health Impact Assessment Matrix – Self Completion Form	Centro Planning Consultancy	1 <sup>st</sup> December 2023
Ecological Assessment Report	Redstone Ecology	January 2024
Fire Statement	Marshall Fire	03 – 5 <sup>th</sup> April 2024
Framework Site Delivery and Servicing Management Plan	Markides Associates	Rev C – 15 <sup>th</sup> April 2024
Framework Operational Waste Management Plan	Markides Associates	Rev A – 20 <sup>th</sup> November 2023
Transport Assessment Addendum	Markides Associates	Rev B – 15 <sup>th</sup> April 2024
Transport Technical Note Addendum	Markides Associates	Rev A – 22 <sup>nd</sup> April 2024
Access Statement	David Bonnett Associates	November 2023
Planning Statement	Centro Planning Consultancy	Rev 2 - January 2024

ITEM NO: 5 - Addendum

Page No: 12

Financial Viability Appraisal - Appraisal Input Assumptions Report: Impact of bus loop on proposed scheme	U.L.L Property	1st December 2023
Design and Access Statement	BGY	December 2023
Cover Letter	Centro Planning Consultancy	5 <sup>th</sup> December 2023
Accommodation Schedule	BGY	30 <sup>th</sup> November 2023
Area Schedule Commercial	BGY	5 <sup>th</sup> December 2023
Flood Risk Assessment	MAB Consultancy	P2 – 29 <sup>th</sup> November 2023
Intertidal Terrace Letter	CMPC	6 <sup>th</sup> March 2024
Flood Defence Structural Assessment Report	HHack Engineering	P2 - April 2024
Enderby Place, Flood Defence Memo	HHack Engineering	1333-MEM001 - 6th March 2024.
FRA Addendum 2	-	PI – 04 <sup>th</sup> March 2024
Desk Study and Preliminary Risk Assessment	Milvum Engineering Services	01 – November 2023
Sustainable Design and Construction Statement incorporating Energy Enderby Place	JS Lewis Ltd	Rev C – January 2024
Circular Economy Statement	JS Lewis Ltd	Rev A – December 2023
Circular Economy Spreadsheet	JS Lewis Ltd	
BREEAM Accredited Professional Stage 2/3 Pre-assessment Report	The PES	30 <sup>th</sup> November 2023
Overheating Risk Assessment	JS Lewis Ltd	Rev B – December 2023
Construction Management Plan	OM Group	02 – November 2023
Construction Logistics Plan	Markides Associates	27 <sup>th</sup> November 2023
Lifecycle Carbon Assessment	JS Lewis Ltd	Rev A - December 2023
Whole Life Cycle Assessment	JS Lewis Ltd	23 <sup>th</sup> November 2023
Arboricultural Impact Assessment & Method Statement Report (BS5837:2012)	Arboricultural Design & Consultancy	AIA/MF/0189/23 – November 2023

Archaeological Desk Based Assessment	PCA	November 2023
Biodiversity Net Gain Calculation Spreadsheet	Sara Curtis	13 <sup>th</sup> November 2023
Landscape and Public Realm Strategy	Spacehub	November 2023
Statement of Community Involvement	Lowick	October 2023
Utilities Report	Landmark Information	
Active Frontage Diagrams	BGY	
Built Heritage, Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment: Supplementary Information	Monatgu Evans	May 2024

### Reason

In the interests of good planning and to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved documents, plans and drawings submitted with the application and is acceptable to the local planning authority.

### Appendix 2 - Update to Condition 40

#### Refuse and Recycling

The relevant part of the development shall not be first occupied (in regards to the residential use) or its first use (in regards to the proposed non-residential uses) until a refuse and recycling strategy including confirmed collection arrangements for all uses has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority of the development. Such details shall include but are not limited to:

- Separate storage areas for bulk storage and bin storage;
- Any safety measures required to ensure the effective collection of waste so as to not conflict with the use of the development site or any surrounding uses including traffic light system to enter and exit the lower ground floor area which clear indication of stopping points detailed.
- On-site management staff's support to Council operatives on collection days;

The Refuse and Recycling Strategy as approved shall be implemented prior to first occupation of the relevant part of the Development and shall thereafter be retained and maintained in accordance with the approved details.



## **Reason**

In order that the Council may be satisfied with the details of the proposal and ensure compliance with Policy SI 7 of London Plan (2021) and DHI of the Royal Greenwich Core Strategy and Detailed Policies 2014.

## **Appendix 2 – Additional EA conditions**

### **Condition 61 - Secure Implementation of the FRA**

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted Flood Risk Assessment by MAB Consultancy (dated: 29/11/23; ref: 0711, rev P2) and the following mitigation measures it details:

- The podium finished floor level of the residential blocks shall be set no lower than 6.067 metres above Ordnance Datum (mAOD), as set out in drawing titled 'Section A1-A1' by Buckley Gray Yeoman (drawing no. GS-100, revision P4; dated 01/05/24)
- The built development will be set back from the flood defences as outlined in drawing titled '0711-020-P3 – Proposed EA Buffer Zone' by MAB Consultancy (drawing number 0711-020-P3; dated 19.04.24)

These mitigation measures shall be fully implemented prior to the first occupation (residential) and/or first use (non-residential) whichever is first and subsequently in accordance with the scheme's timing/phasing arrangements.

The measures detailed above shall be retained and maintained thereafter throughout the lifetime of the development.

## **Reason**

To reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future occupants. To protect the structural integrity of the flood defence and to ensure adequate space is available for future maintenance, inspection, raising and emergency works, including space for plant machinery to carry out these works as detailed in drawing '0711-020-P3 – Proposed EA Buffer Zone' by MAB Consultancy (drawing number 0711-020-P3; dated 19.04.24). To ensure flood risk is not increased elsewhere. To comply with Paragraph 159 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), Policy SI 12 of The London Plan (2021), and Policies E2 Flood Risk and E3 Residual Flood Risk of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan (2014).

### **Condition 62 - Flood Defence Condition Survey**

Exception for demolition and enabling works, the development hereby permitted must not be commenced until a scheme of condition surveying, including intrusive investigation works, to establish the condition and residual life of all elements of the

ITEM NO: 5 - Addendum

Page No: 15

flood defence structures that are proposed to be retained have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with the Environment Agency.

The scheme of condition surveying must, as a minimum, include a full visual inspection of the flood defence to identify general and localised issues or defects and the overall condition of the flood defences. This should include intrusive ground investigations to assess any buried elements of the flood defence. Any issues or defects identified must then be investigated in detail to determine how they have or may impact the performance and stability of the flood defence.

Should any part of the existing flood defence be retained as part of the development, then the stability assessment must demonstrate the flood defence will remain stable with the change in loading conditions the new development and climate change will impose on them. The stability assessment must also consider ground water levels over the development's lifetime, including seasonal variations, tidal characteristics and sea level rise.

The condition and stability assessment must also cover any buried supporting structures and assess for accelerated corrosion or deterioration in the condition of the landward side of the flood defence as a result of the ground conditions and contamination.

The approved scheme of investigation works should then be implemented in full and a report detailing the findings should be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with the Environment Agency.

### **Reason**

To protect the structural integrity of the flood defence. To ensure the development is safe from flood risk for its lifetime and to ensure that there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere or on site as a result of the development. This is supported by Paragraph 159 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), Policy SI 12 of The London Plan (2021), and Policies E2 Flood Risk and E3 Residual Flood Risk of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan (2014).

### **Condition 63– Flood Defence Remediation or Replacement Strategy**

Except for demolition and enabling works, the development hereby permitted must not be commenced until such time as a Thames tidal flood defence remediation or replacement strategy has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority in consultation with the Environment Agency.

If the condition and stability assessment demonstrate the residual life of the flood defences can be extended to a minimum of 100 years, a remediation strategy would be acceptable as detailed in 'Flood Defence Structural Assessment Report' by

ITEM NO: 5 - Addendum

Page No: 16

HHACK Engineering (report reference 1333-SCR001; April 2024). If the assessment does not demonstrate the minimum 100 years residual life, the applicant will need to design and build a new flood defence with a design life of at least 100 years, as detailed in 'Flood Defence Structural Assessment Report' by HHACK Engineering (report reference 1333-SCR001; April 2024).

The remediation or replacement strategy shall include:

- that the flood defence shall be designed with a lifetime no less than 100 years from the date the last dwelling is expected to be completed;
- that the flood defence shall be designed with a crest level no lower than the Thames Estuary Plan 2090 level. At present, the flood defence will be raised to a minimum of 6.2 mAOD, as set out in 'Proposed Flood Defences' by HHACK Engineering (drawing number 1333-0001, rev P1; dated 19/04/24)
- details of how the improved flood defence structure will tie into the flood defences and ground levels on the neighboring sites both upstream and downstream. Indicative concepts are set out in 'Proposed Flood Defences' by HHACK Engineering (drawing number 1333-0001, rev P1; dated 19/04/24).
- details of how the proposed tree planting will not impact the structural integrity of the flood defence. Indicative concepts are set out in the tree root containment drawing titled 'Tree Pit Detail' by Spacehub Design (drawing number 8416-DE-SD-501, rev P01; dated 19/04/2024).

The development shall then only proceed in strict accordance with the approved strategy.

### **Reason**

To protect the structural integrity of the flood defence. To ensure the development is safe from flood risk for its lifetime and to ensure that there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere or on site as a result of the development. This is supported by Paragraph 159 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), Policy SI 12 of The London Plan (2021), and Policies E2 Flood Risk and E3 Residual Flood Risk of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan (2014).

### **Condition 64 – Flood Defence Monitoring and Maintenance Plan**

- a) Except for demolition and enabling works, the development hereby permitted must not be commenced until a 100 year flood defence monitoring and maintenance plan has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Environment Agency. The 100 year flood defence monitoring and maintenance plan shall include:

ITEM NO: 5 - Addendum

Page No: 17

- details of how and when the flood defence structures will continue to be inspected and tested;
- success criteria for the condition of each element of the flood defence structures;
- periodic monitoring and reporting of the structural condition of the flood defences, with set inspection milestone dates over the lifetime of the development.

The approved flood defence monitoring and maintenance plan shall then be implemented in full thereafter.

- b) If the flood defence structures are not shown to be meeting their success criteria at an inspection milestone date, then within 4 months an improvement plan shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Environment Agency. The approved improvement plan shall then be implemented in full within 12 months of approval.

### **Reason**

To protect the structural integrity of the flood defence. To ensure the development is safe from flood risk for its lifetime and to ensure that there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere or on site as a result of the development. This is supported by Paragraph 159 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), Policy SI 12 of The London Plan (2021), and Policies E2 Flood Risk and E3 Residual Flood Risk of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan (2014).

### **Condition 65 – ‘As Built’ Flood Defence Drawings**

Within 3 months of completion of the tidal flood defence structures, ‘as built’ drawings of the tidal flood defence shall be submitted to, and approved in writing, by the Local Planning Authority and the Environment Agency.

### **Reason**

For the avoidance of doubt, to facilitate any future flood defence intervention and to prevent an increased risk of flooding, in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Paragraphs 159, Policy SI 12 of The London Plan (2021), and Policies E2 Flood Risk and E3 Residual Flood Risk of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan (2014)

### **Condition 66 – Cultural Strategy**

- a) Prior to the commencement of the superstructure a cultural strategy shall be submitted to, and approved in writing, by the Local Planning Authority setting

ITEM NO: 5 - Addendum

Page No: 18

out how the proposed historic and industrial heritage of the site can be incorporated into the development by submitting a public engagement strategy outlining how the scheme will engage with residents, residents groups and any other interested parties.

- b) Following the approval of the public engagement strategy set out by part a of this condition, full details shall be submitted to, and approved in writing, by the Local Planning Authority prior to the completion of the superstructure setting out how the historic and industrial heritage of the site will be incorporated into the detailed landscaping, wayfinding and community/café space (and/or any other aspect identified by public consultation).

The approved scheme will be implemented prior to the first occupation of the development and retained for the lifetime of the development.

### **Reason**

To encourage early and inclusive engagement with stakeholders, including local communities in line with Policy GG1 of the London Plan (2021) and to provide a positive relationship between the proposed and existing urban context by taking account of the cultural diversity and historical features and their settings as set out by Policy DI of and Policy DH(m) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014) and HCI of the London Plan (2021)

## **5 Amendments to appendix 2 – informatives**

- 5.1 The EA have also recommended the following informative is added to the proposal:

### **Informative No.8 – Environment Agency**

#### ***Environmental Permitting***

*The Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 require a permit or exemption to be obtained for any activities which will take place:*

- *on or within 8 metres of a main river (16 metres if tidal)*
- *on or within 8 metres of a flood defence structure or culverted main river (16 metres if tidal)*
- *on or within 16 metres of a sea defence*

- involving quarrying or excavation within 16 metres of any main river, flood defence (including a remote defence) or culvert
- in the floodplain of a main river if the activity could affect flood flow or storage and potential impacts are not controlled by a planning permission

For further guidance please visit <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-activitiesenvironmental-permits> or contact our National Customer Contact Centre on 03708 506 506 (Monday to Friday, 8am to 6pm) or by emailing [enquiries@environmentagency.gov.uk](mailto:enquiries@environmentagency.gov.uk).

The applicant should not assume that a permit will automatically be forthcoming once planning permission has been granted, and we advise them to consult with us at the earliest opportunity.

Report Author: Tim Edwards (Senior Principal Planning Officer)  
Tel No.: 020 8921 2620  
Email: [tim.edwards@royalgreenwich.gov.uk](mailto:tim.edwards@royalgreenwich.gov.uk)

Reporting to: Victoria Geoghegan, (Assistant Director Planning & Building Control)  
Tel No.: 020 8921 4296  
Email: [victoria.geoghegan@royalgreenwich.gov.uk](mailto:victoria.geoghegan@royalgreenwich.gov.uk)