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1 Introduction

1.1.1 Knight Dragon Developments Ltd. (the “Applicant”) has submitted a planning application to the Royal Borough of Greenwich (RBG) to secure outline planning permission for a residential led mixed-use development (the ‘2015 Masterplan’), of the Greenwich Peninsula site (the ‘Site’) as follows:

“Outline planning permission with all matters reserved for demolition of buildings and mixed use redevelopment comprising up to 12,678 (or up to 1,171,909 sqm) residential dwellings; up to 23,475 sqm non-food retail and food retail and restaurants and bars and cafes; up to 35,999 sqm hotel(s), up to 220 or up to 20,306 sqm serviced apartments, up to 59,744 sqm of B1 office use; up to 37,900 sqm education facilities, up to 1,462 sqm health care facilities, up to 38,693 sqm film and media studios; up to 19,526 sqm of visitor attraction (D1/D2 use), residential and non-residential car parking, up to 2,000 AEG parking spaces, cycle parking, associated community facilities, public realm and open space, hard and soft landscaping, a new transport hub and associated facilities, works to the river wall, a star ferry jetty terminal, P5K running track, highway and transport works and associated ancillary works”

1.1.2 The Site is located wholly within the Greenwich Peninsula and the administrative area of RBG and extends to approximately 80 hectares (ha), within which the built and non-built elements of the 2015 Masterplan will be situated as defined in Figure 1 below. The Site is located on a sharp meander of the River Thames with a river frontage of approximately 2.5 km that includes a riverside walk and cycle routes. It was previously occupied by one of the principal gas works in Europe and other industrial processes until the mid-1970s. In the late 1980s, work began on the comprehensive land clearance, remediation and redevelopment of the Site.

1.1.3 The Site excludes The O2 to the north and Greenwich Millennium Village (GMV) to the south and is surrounded by the River Thames on three sides. To the north-west, located on the opposite bank of the River Thames, is Canary Wharf which forms a backdrop to the Site.

1.1.4 The Site is identified in the adopted RBG Core Strategy (2014) and London Plan (2011/2013) as an Opportunity Area. The Site location and application boundary are shown on Figure 1.

Figure 1: 2015 Masterplan Location and Application Boundary

1.1.5 The Site is well served by both public transport (North Greenwich Underground Station and bus interchange) and has good road connections in the form of the A102 and Blackwall Tunnel. The northbound Blackwall Tunnel passes, at depth, beneath the northern section of the Site and is served by Vent Shaft No. 4
with a dome shaped concrete cap. This structure is protected by an exclusion zone and separate access is provided to TfL staff to facilitate its maintenance. The southbound Blackwall Tunnel passes beneath The O2 (located outside of the Site boundary), and traffic emerges in a steep sided ramp, some 10m below the surface of the Site. The exit to the tunnel contains a contractible flood protection barrier.

1.1.6 The North Greenwich Pier, which offers a commuter boat service via the Thames Clipper to various locations along the River Thames, is located further to the east and to the south-east of the 2015 Masterplan is the Emirates Air Line (formerly known as the London Cable Car) which opened to passengers in late 2012. A number of car parks (scattered across the north and central portions of the Site) associated with The O2 (outside the Site boundary) are located within the Site. The London Soccerdome in the east of the Site is in the process of being dismantled.

1.1.7 The O2 lies to the north, with associated landscaping and infrastructure and blocks of permitted development are being constructed, or under construction, in the north-east of the Greenwich Peninsula. South of The O2, areas of new public realm have been created, including Peninsula Square. To the east of Peninsula Square is Ravensbourne College (outside the Site boundary) which relocated to this purpose-built accommodation in September 2010. To the south-east of Peninsula Square, the six storey 14 Pier Walk provides offices for TfL (outside the Site boundary). Adjacent to this building is the eleven storey 6 Mitre Passage office building (outside the Site boundary). New restaurants and shops have opened facing onto Peninsula Square.

1.1.8 Central Park runs through the central spine of the Site. Within Central Park, to the south, is a row of terraced cottages and public house (Listed Building 1386008) on River Way and Locally Listed Building the ‘The Pilot’ Public House. The southern entrance building to the Blackwall Tunnel survives from the original tunnel (Listed Building 1246738). A new, eastern tunnel was added in 1967, of which the southern ventilation shaft survives (Listed Building 1246738). There are no Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens or Conservation Areas located within the Site boundary.

1.1.9 The Victoria Deep Water Terminal (VDWT), an aggregates wharf and jetty operated by Hanson Plc, is located approximately 400m south-west of the Site. In between is a separate aggregates site which is leased on a temporary basis by the landowner.

1.1.10 In addition there are areas of public open space and schools / residential developments to the far south of the Site. The nearest statutory designated site is Mudchute Park Farm, located 650m to the west of the Site, which is designated as a Local Nature Reserve.

1.1.11 There are no Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens or Conservation Areas located within the Site boundary. The wider study area contains a number of sensitive townscape and heritage receptors. Maritime Greenwich World Heritage Site is located approximately 1.5km to the south-west of the Site and comprises an internationally important architectural ensemble of the Queen’s House, the Royal Observatory, the Royal Hospital and The Royal Greenwich Park (‘The Park’). The Park features the well-known view of London from the Wolfe Monument which is designated within the London View Management Framework as ‘London Panorama 5: Greenwich Park’. Other sensitive receptors within the wider study area include; Coldharbour Conservation Area on the Isle of Dogs, approximately 400m to the west of the Site; East Greenwich Conservation Area, approximately 800m to the south-west and the Grade I listed Blackwall Basin located approximately 500m to the west.
1.2 The Purpose of this Document.

1.2.1. This document is a Non-Technical Summary (NTS) of the Environmental Statement submitted with the 2015 Masterplan Application. The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011 (EIA Regulations) require that before planning permission is granted for certain types of development an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) must be undertaken that identifies the likely significant environmental effects of a development and suggests ways in which any significant negative effects on the environment can be prevented, reduced and/or offset.

1.2.2. Given the size of the Site and nature of the development proposed by the 2015 Masterplan, an EIA was undertaken of the likely significant environmental effects of the development on the environment including demolition/construction works and the completed development. The Environmental Statement (ES) (including baseline information, survey information and technical assessments) submitted with the application presents the findings of the EIA process, the scope of which was agreed with RBG as part of a scoping exercise in direct consultation with a number of consultees.

1.2.3. The ES is based on the total extent of the 2015 Masterplan, as defined by the Parameter documents submitted for approval with the application. The purpose of this NTS is to present a summary of the findings of the EIA process in non-technical language compliant with the EIA Regulations.

1.2.4. The NTS is presented as a series of key questions and answers regarding the 2015 Masterplan and identifies the likely significant environmental effects of the development and describes how any significant negative effects are proposed to be mitigated, prevented and/or offset during the construction and future operation of the completed 2015 Masterplan. Both the ES and the NTS are publicly available for anyone to review to understand the nature and form of the 2015 Masterplan.

1.2.5. The Project Team appointed by Knight Dragon to prepare the Application as submitted is confirmed in the Table 1 below.

Table 1: Project Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Members</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knight Dragon Developments Ltd</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nlp Nathaniel Lichfield &amp; Partners</td>
<td>Planning Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allies and Morrison Architects</td>
<td>Masterplanner and Architect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROSS MAX</td>
<td>Landscape Architect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEINHARDT</td>
<td>M&amp;E, Energy and Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arup ARUP</td>
<td>Water Resources and Food Risk; Ground Conditions &amp; Contamination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPS</td>
<td>Archaeology;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 What is proposed by Knight Dragon?

2.1 Background and Context

2.1.1. The 2015 Masterplan application proposals stem from the approved comprehensive 2004 Masterplan, which granted outline planning permission (Planning reference: 02/2903/O) for a mixed use residential led development comprising up to 10,010 dwellings (C3 uses), commercial (B1), retail (A1-A3), leisure (D1) retail, community facilities and open spaces arranged around various ‘districts’ across the Greenwich Peninsula with provision for the retention of the Millennium Dome (now The O2) (63,640m²) (the ‘2004 Masterplan’). All potential reserved matters were reserved at the time for later approval.

2.1.2. The approved 2004 Masterplan set the framework for the phased regeneration of the Greenwich Peninsula on a plot-by-plot basis to create new sustainable communities to be contained in the principal districts; more recently known as Peninsula Quays, Peninsula Central, Peninsula Riverside, Peninsula Parkside and Peninsula Gateway. It was intended that development on the 2004 Masterplan plots would be brought forward through either reserved matters applications consistent with the parameters, planning conditions and Section 106 obligations imposed upon by the 2004 Masterplan or, where necessary, separate full applications. All of the relevant site-wide pre-commencement conditions and section 106 obligations of the 2004 Masterplan consent have been discharged to date and complied with to enable construction to commence on the Greenwich Peninsula.

2.1.3. As well as development taking place on the Greenwich Peninsula via the approval of reserved matters applications pursuant to the 2004 Masterplan, there have also in the last decade, been a number of full ‘drop-in’ applications which have been approved for development similar to the principles established by the 2004 Masterplan. The 2015 Masterplan red-line application boundary as shown in Figure 1 above is similar to the 2004 Masterplan, with certain elements excluded. Principally these excluded elements are the buildings developed since 2004 and in use (or, in the case of The O2, built pursuant to a predecessor planning permission to the 2004 Masterplan); buildings under construction; or buildings which are soon to obtain planning permission and which the intention is to develop out pursuant to that permission rather than via the 2015 Masterplan.
2.2 What is proposed by the 2015 Masterplan?

2.2.1. The outline application for the 2015 Masterplan, as prepared and submitted by Knight Dragon, reserves all matters for future determination, although the land uses and the maximum quantum of development which is being applied for across the entire Site is confirmed in Table 2 below.

Table 2: 2015 Masterplan – Maximum Quantum of Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Use Class</th>
<th>Maximum Floorspace Proposed (GEA) m²</th>
<th>Maximum No. units/spaces/beds Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AEG Parking</td>
<td>Sui Generis</td>
<td>Up to 68,297</td>
<td>Up to 2,000 parking spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Up to 1,171,909</td>
<td>Up to 12,678 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor Attraction</td>
<td>D1/D2</td>
<td>Up to 19,526</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>Up to 37,900</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Up to 59,744</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film Studios</td>
<td>Sui Generis</td>
<td>Up to 38,694</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Up to 35,999</td>
<td>Up to 500 rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>A1-A5</td>
<td>Up to 23,472</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serviced Apartments</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Up to 20,306</td>
<td>Up to 220 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care Facilities</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>Up to 1,462</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Up to 1,477,311</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 2,000 parking spaces
- Up to 12,678 residential units
- Up to 500 hotel rooms
- Up to 220 Serviced Apartments
2.2.2. Figure 2 provides a visual representation of the 2015 Masterplan.

Figure 1: 2015 Illustrative Masterplan

Parameter Control Documents

2.2.3. The outline planning application is accompanied by a number of Reports and Plans which are either submitted for approval or submitted in support of the Application. The documentation submitted for approval as part of the outline planning application comprises the following which are known as ‘The Control Documents’ for the purposes of the application:

- 8 x Parameter Plans;
- Development Specification; and
- Design Guidelines.
2.2.4. The Development Specification and the eight parameter plans, which should be read together, define and describe the proposed development. To comply with the legal framework, each technical assessment reported in the ES has assessed the 2015 Masterplan against the three Control Documents submitted for approval as set out above. However, in certain instances, parts of the parameter documents are particularly relevant and determinative for the assessments undertaken. The quantum of development, as set out in in the Development Specification is the fundamental parameter used for the assessment of the effects on Socio-economics and Population; and Traffic and Transportation. The scale and location of development, as set out in the Parameter Plans and Design Guidelines, are the fundamental parameters used for the assessment on Ecology; Archaeology; Ground conditions; and Water resources.

2.2.5. A critical point to note from the effect of the Control Documents being read and complied with together, is that the entire development of the maximum quantum set out in the Development Specification could never entail that every building reaches the "maximum heights" set out on the maximum height Parameter Plan. Whilst some buildings may reach the maximum heights that would therefore entail that other buildings would be smaller by some margin than that shown on the maximum heights plan. Further, the Design Guidelines document secures further design principles on the heights of buildings to demonstrate desired height contours of zones.

2.2.6. An assessment predicated on that the maximum heights plan therefore would be a "work of fiction" which could never be carried out. Therefore, in the case of three assessments, further reliance along with the Control Documents has been placed on the Illustrative Masterplan. This, along with the Control Documents, provides further detail and certainty about the eventual form of development that could come forward compliant with the Control Documents.

2.2.7. The three assessments are Environmental Wind; Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing; and Townscape, Visual and Built Heritage Assessment. Each of those assessments considered the particular way the Illustrative Masterplan has implemented the parameters set by the Control Documents. In each case, the chapter authors in their professional opinion consider that there are no likely significant effects on the environment over and above that assessed which could come forward if any other form of development compliant with the Control Documents, although differing from the Illustrative Masterplan, were implemented. Further detail in respect of those three assessments, the approach to the assessment undertaken in each case, and the professional opinions provided, are set out in the three chapters.

2.2.8. In any event, further environmental assessment is in law required if the Council require further environmental effects to be assessed pursuant to a subsequent application under any outline planning permission granted to this application.

2.2.9. Additional documentation is submitted in support of the 2015 Masterplan which includes the Environmental Statement and Non-Technical Summary and the following Reports: Planning Statement; Retail Statement; Design and Access Statement (DAS), including Waste Management Strategy and Public Realm/Open Space Strategy; Statement of Community Engagement; Transport Assessment and Travel Plan; Flood Risk Assessment; Energy and Sustainability Statement; Illustrative Masterplan together with an Illustrative Landscape Plan.

2.2.10. The Site is divided into five development zones (A, B, C, D and E) as confirmed in Table 3 below. Each zone is made up of a number of development parcels and plots with a reference which is used throughout the application documentation for ease of understanding of the 2015 Masterplan.
Table 3: 2015 Masterplan – Development Zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Summary Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Meridian Quays will provide a residential area designed around a network of exemplary new streets and spaces along with a primary school; a vehicular street connecting to Peninsula Square and the River; Meridian Quays park providing a green connection to the Thames and a new jetty, including a Clipper river stop. Peninsula Central will provide a transformed transport interchange and local retail and the widening of Central Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Brickfields North will provide a diverse and varied mix of uses including film studios. A series of residential buildings will front Central Park including local neighbourhood retail at ground floor level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Brickfields South will form a family focused neighbourhood. The neighbourhood is centred around a quiet pedestrian street that leads to St Mary Magdalene C of E through school. A strong residential frontage is provided to Central Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Lower Riverside/Parkside will form an extension to the residential units to the north and south. A vehicular spine connecting north to south, a landscaped residential waterfront edge and a strong residential frontage to Central Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Meridian Quays (south) will provide a residential neighbourhood around a network of exemplary new streets and spaces.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.11. Together with the Design Guidelines, the Parameter Plans and the Development Specification act as the control parameters for the development as submitted and assessed and provide clear parameters for all the plots and sufficient detail to enable the application to be determined and to enable the detailed design to be progressed at reserved matters stage. The Control Documents will be the subject of planning conditions to control the detailed design of the development at the reserved matters application stage.

2.2.12. All subsequent reserved matters submissions will be in accordance with the principles of these Control Documents which show how the quantum of development and uses are distributed around the Site and also include provision for the following elements:

**Parking and Access**

2.2.13. It intended that parking across the 2015 Masterplan is 0.25 spaces per dwelling, (0.30 spaces per dwelling for the residential units with an existing consent on the Site). This level of provision is considered appropriate based on the accessibility of the Site and the improved transport facilities introduced as part of the 2015 Masterplan.

2.2.14. The majority of the cycle parking for the residential units will be provided within the undercroft parking areas alongside the vehicular parking, although other secure, sheltered and well lit areas will be provided across the Site together with lockers and showers and changing facilities for the commercial elements.

**Landscaping**

2.2.15. The 2015 Masterplan will be a well-connected neighbourhood composed of a network of distinctive open spaces linked together by tree-lined streets and green links. The proposal will provide a safe, green and appealing public realm, supporting pedestrian and cycle connections within the regeneration area and to key destinations beyond.
2.2.16. The key design approach is to create attractive, legible streets, with a distinctive character that create a 'sense of place', rather than focused on vehicular access. Giving priority to pedestrians will create a place of social activity, accessible and safe for all users, where playing and interaction within the community is encouraged.

**Infrastructure**

2.2.17. The 2015 Masterplan application boundary includes infrastructure that is already in place. However, there are some changes proposed to the internal infrastructure as this provides key connections for the 2015 Masterplan, including:

- realignment of West Parkside;
- new bus route to the south of the new transport hub;
- the introduction of small access roads, with the feature of the main residential areas being ‘Home Zone’ environments where pedestrian and cyclists will have priority over cars; and
- a new pedestrian bridge over the Blackwall Tunnel Approach Road.

2.3 How has the 2015 Masterplan scheme evolved over time?

2.3.1. The 2015 Masterplan has evolved in response to design and environmental considerations and feedback from a series of meetings and public consultation events that have been held between the 2015 Masterplan project team with the public and statutory consultees, including officers at RBG and the Greater London Authority (GLA).

2.3.2. The over-arching objective has been to ensure the creation of a deliverable, sustainable development, as defined by the *National Planning Policy Framework (2012) (NPPF)*, which responds to local needs, environmental conditions and the Site context, and development plan policies and objectives. The design evolution from 2014 has been an iterative process that has been informed by the baseline studies for the EIA and where practicable, measures to mitigate likely significant effects are now inherent in the plans assessed in this ES. The evolution of the layout, scale and appearance of the built form, together with the landscape / public realm is outlined below.
2004 Consented Masterplan

- The consented 2004 Masterplan included provision for the following:
  - Up to 325,000 sqm office uses (B1)
  - Up to 22,800 sqm of retail uses (A1 and/or A2)
  - Up to 10,950 sqm food and drink uses (A3)
  - Up to 60,000 sqm hotel use (C1)
  - Up to 820,550 sqm of residential dwellings (C3) (up to 10,010 residential dwellings, student and special needs housing).

July 2014

- Positions of primary proposed uses are nominated in outline form including Residential Districts, Transport Interchange, Film Studios, AEG parking, Cultural Attraction, and new School.
- A preliminary movement network and massing grain is proposed, emphasising east-west permeability.
- A major new park stretching east-west is proposed in the Meridian Quays residential area.
September 2014

- Central Park enlarged to full width at its northern end, increasing green open space and rationalising the high frequency bus route.
- Massing and public realm further structured and clarified. Development of perimeter blocks allowing more flexibility in types whilst retaining street borders.
- Mixing of towers with conventional perimeter blocks explored in terms of massing, and microclimate, especially daylight and sunlight.
- Connections between key north and south components of the Site (Central Park, Transport Interchange, The O2) improved by forming a direct connection.

November 2014

- Street diversity introduced with primary, secondary and tertiary routes of different spatial quality included with the revision of the vehicular grid.
- Open space distribution balanced by reintroducing parks on both east and west river edges.
- Significant transport improvements introduced: enlargement of the bus station, inclusion of taxi and private hire area, relocation of existing AEG parking.
- Improvements better integrate AEG needs in the Masterplan structure.
January / February 2015

- Massing greatly modulated and reduced. Building heights studied in detail responding to different spatial conditions, and building rotations improving microclimate conditions. Key view corridors formed to reveal central landmark buildings.
- Visual and pedestrian articulation between Central Park, Transport interchange, and The O2 premises significantly enhanced through smaller-grain permeable typologies. Possibilities for hybrid uses introduced, enriching social/typological mix.
- Visual continuity and legibility achieved through rotation of the streets to match Canary Wharf.
- Primary school area given pedestrian priority to foster a family-oriented environment.
- Street layout adjacent to the film studios introduced offering flexibility to develop area into other uses in the future.
- Vehicular and pedestrian movement significantly improved with hierarchies, clarifying movement and gaining spatial diversity.

2.4. Who has been consulted about the EIA?

2.4.1 Consultation has been undertaken with both statutory and non-statutory consultees and members of the public as part of the EIA Scoping exercise and technical studies reported in the Environmental Statement. This was to identify any sensitivities or concerns which may have needed to be considered in the design process and assessed as part of this Environmental Statement.

2.4.2 The following organisations were consulted during the preparation of this Environmental Statement:

- Various departments and officers at RBG;
- Greater London Authority;
- Port of London Authority;
- Transport for London;
- Thames Water;
- Environment Agency;
- English Heritage;
- Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service
2.5. **Have any alternative sites been considered?**

2.5.1 As there are existing planning consents granted for the 2004 Masterplan, and the Site is identified in the RBG Core Strategy and London Plan as an area for mixed-use development, no alternative sites have been considered by Knight Dragon Developments Ltd. There are no reasonable or feasible alternative sites to assess given the clear planning policy context which supports the proposed comprehensive development.

2.6. **When will it be built?**

2.6.1 Subject to the grant of planning permission and the discharge of relevant conditions, construction of the 2015 Masterplan is anticipated to commence in 2016 and it is estimated that the 2015 Masterplan will be completed and operational in approximately 20 years.

3. **Environmental Effects**

3.1 **Will the existing local community be disturbed as a result of the construction phase?**

3.1.1 The development will be built out over a 20 year period during which time there will be controls in place to mitigate any unavoidable negative effects on nearby existing residents that may arise from the disturbance during the construction works. Such effects may include noise from construction works, dust during certain activities and construction traffic. These effects have been assessed as part of the EIA and reported in the ES. The effects will be of temporary duration.

3.1.2 As part of the 2004 Masterplan, in order to mitigate the effects, it was required that an Integrated Management System (IMS) and Environmental Management System (EMS) were prepared and submitted to RBG for approval before construction could start. It is expected that the Applicant would adopt a similar approach for the 2015 Masterplan and implement an IMS for construction environmental management procedures. The contractor will be required to sign up to the Considerate Constructors Scheme, which will set out the management measures that the contractors will adopt and implement for construction to avoid and manage any construction effects on the environment and the local community. There will also be regular liaison with the local community throughout the construction period. Through the proposed mitigation measures to be secured, it is not anticipated there will be significant long-term negative effects on the local community.

3.2 **Will the new development benefit the local economy?**

3.2.1 During construction works, it is anticipated that the 2015 Masterplan will provide up to 4,696 Full Time Equivalent (FTE) jobs, which would be expected to be filled in part by workers in the local area. Additional jobs are expected to be created through induced employment.

3.2.2 The 2015 Masterplan will have a positive effect on the socio-economics of the area once it is completed. It will create approximately 6,787 direct jobs on the Site, with a further 5,345 indirect jobs created. The 2015 Masterplan will also provide key school and health facilities on Site for the benefit of both residents of the 2015 Masterplan and other residents living in the local area.
3.2.3 The 2015 Masterplan will provide a range of housing, which will make a significant contribution to housing demands in RBG. In addition the new residents of the 2015 Masterplan will increase the spending in the local area, providing a positive economic uplift for RBG.

3.3 Will the existing community facilities be able to accommodate existing and new residents?

3.3.1 The population will increase owing to the increase in the number of dwellings proposed. It is therefore anticipated that there will be an increase in demand on local healthcare facilities; however the local area was found to be well served by dentists and GPs. The 2015 Masterplan also includes provision for 12 - 13 new GPs. As such, there will be an overall improvement in the accessibility of local healthcare.

3.3.2 It is anticipated that the planned school capacity within the 2015 Masterplan and the local area will accommodate the additional children from the increased population as a result of the 2015 Masterplan.

3.4 Will there be more traffic along the surrounding local road network?

3.4.1. The likely increase in additional vehicle trips and Heavy Goods Vehicle trips on the local road network during the construction works would be negative. A Construction Logistics Plan would however be prepared to manage additional traffic flows. Potential impacts on road surfaces from mud and dirt, as well as temporary footway closures, if and when required, would be actively managed in accordance with measures set out in the proposed Construction Logistics Plan.

3.4.2. The assessment has demonstrated that the 2015 Masterplan will have a largely negligible impact on both National Rail and London Underground services which is predominantly as a result of capacity increases on both modes as well as the introduction of Cross Rail. A minor negative effect will however be noted on the bus mode which will be mitigated by the introduction of the new Transport Hub, and an increase in bus services which is could be funded as part of the S106 agreement.

3.4.3. The 2015 Masterplan is likely to have a negligible to minor negative effect on highway conditions at a number of key junctions that have been identified. Mitigation is therefore proposed in terms of more detailed modelling and the funding of highway mitigation measures where required.

3.5 What will happen to the local air quality?

3.5.1. A quantitative assessment of the likely significant effects during the operation phase was undertaken using advanced dispersion modelling to predict the changes in emissions of Nitrogen Dioxide ($NO_2$), PM$_{10}$ (Particulate matter up to 10 micrometres in size) and PM$_{2.5}$ (Particulate matter up to 2.5 micrometres in size) concentrations that would occur due to traffic and energy plant emissions generated by the 2015 Masterplan.

3.5.2. Overall, the results show that the 2015 Masterplan would cause medium to imperceptible changes in NO$_2$ concentrations and imperceptible to no change in PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$ concentrations at the assessment receptors modelled. According to the EPUK significance criteria, the effects of the operation phase are considered to be permanent direct long term major negative to major beneficial for NO$_2$ and minor negative to minor positive for PM10.

3.5.3. Notwithstanding the above, the results of the assessment showed that with the 2015 Masterplan in operation, the predicted annual mean NO$_2$ concentrations exceed the annual mean objective at 21 existing receptor locations, resulting in a negative effect.

3.5.4. Using the London Council’s exposure criteria, the 2015 Masterplan ranges from APEC (Air Pollution Exposure Criteria) Level A to C for annual mean NO$_2$ concentrations at residential dwellings. Therefore, it is
recommended that for those building floors where APEC Levels B and C are expected, a suitable mechanical ventilation system that has the appropriate NO2 filtration to reduce the level of exposure to below the AQS of 40µg/m3 should be implemented.

3.5.5. The results of the Air Quality Neutral Assessment show that the performance against the BEB for NOx emissions was found to be deficient, whilst performance against the TEB’s was found to be compliant in respect of both NOx and PM10. Where a benchmark is exceeded, on- or off-site mitigation or offsetting is required.

3.5.6. Overall, with the recommended mitigation measures in place, the 2015 Masterplan would comply with European and national air quality legislation, and national, regional and local planning policy.

3.6 Will the construction and operation cause a lot of noise?

3.6.1 The assessment indicates that no elements of the project are predicted to result in significant long term noise or vibration effects. The assessment has been undertaken in accordance with the statutory legislation and guidance, local planning policy and relevant British Standards.

3.6.2 Noise and vibration effects during demolition and construction activities have been assessed and have been predicted to result in some disturbance on existing resident’s receptors. However, this disturbance would be of minor negative significance with the mitigation specified. Residual operational noise and vibration effects on the existing population and users of the Site would be minor negative with the mitigation specified.

3.6.3 The assessment of the suitability of the Site for noise sensitive uses indicates that mitigation measures will need to be applied to residential buildings and hotels at the detailed design stage in order to provide protection from high levels of road traffic noise and noise from activities on the neighbouring Victoria Deep Water Terminal Wharf (VDWT). An open window ventilation strategy will not be appropriate for the school. More detailed studies will be employed for particularly sensitive areas of the Site to determine the exact specifications for mitigation as each plot of land comes forward for development.

3.6.4 On the basis of the above, the project is commensurate with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). In terms of the Noise Policy Statement for England (NPSE) and the Planning Practice Guidance Noise (PPGN), it is considered that noise and vibration effects due to the project are well below the Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level (SOAEL) and hence are commensurate with the requirements of the NPSE/PPGN.

3.6.5 The project is also commensurate with the requirements of local planning policies, as it has been demonstrated that the 2015 Masterplan complies with current guidance, and RBG’s adopted guidance, in terms of noise and vibration.

3.7 Will I be able to see the new development?

3.7.1. The 2015 Masterplan would cause negative effects on the townscape and visual environment of the Site and immediate surrounding area during construction which would be temporary in nature lasting for the duration of the works. Similar levels of negative effects would arise on the setting of onsite built heritage. There would be no effects on the physical fabric of heritage assets. Lower levels of negative effect would occur in the wider surrounding area which would not be significant. No other significant negative effects would arise during construction, including in relation to London views protected in the LVMF, in particular London Panorama 5, local views designated in the RBG Core Strategy, the setting of Maritime Greenwich WHS and Greenwich Park RPG, and the character and setting of East Greenwich and Coldharbour Conservation Areas.

3.7.2. During operation, the 2015 Masterplan would generate significant positive effects on the townscape and visual environment of the Site and immediate surrounding area which would be permanent in nature. There
would be no negative effects on the physical fabric of onsite heritage assets and their settings would be preserved. Lower levels of not significant positive effect would occur in the wider surrounding area. No other significant effects (positive or negative) would arise during operation including in respect of designated London views in the LVMF including London Panorama 5 and local views protected in the RBG Core Strategy, and the character and settings of Maritime Greenwich WHS, Greenwich Park RPG, and East Greenwich and Coldharbour Conservation Areas would be preserved and unharmed.

3.8 Are there any concerns relating to contaminated land or ground conditions within the Sites?

3.8.1. There are well established inherent mitigation measures to minimise potential environmental effects which have been effectively utilised on the Greenwich Peninsula, since the 2004 Masterplan to remediate the Site.

3.8.2. With the inherent mitigation measures in place, the overall environmental effects from the 2015 Masterplan with respect to ground conditions, hydrogeology and geology are likely to be negligible. The 2015 Masterplan would result in a minor positive permanent long-term effect through the reduction in rainwater infiltration and subsequent contamination mobilisation.
3.9 Will the new development have microclimatic effects?

Environmental Wind

3.9.1. The likely significant effects of the 2015 Masterplan on the local wind environment have been assessed against best practice criteria for pedestrian comfort and safety.

3.9.2. The results of the pedestrian comfort assessment for pedestrian business and leisure walking, indicates that all areas within the Site and its surroundings remain within the comfort criteria suitable for pedestrian walking. The assessment identified areas of wind acceleration exceeding the sitting and standing criteria in areas around the Peninsula Waterfront and certain access routes such as the northern segment of Millennium Way, West Link Park, the open areas south and north of Zone A, Parcel 8, the east-west corridors between Plots 16 in Zone B, 17 in Zone C and 18 in Zone C, and other smaller localised regions. However, most of these areas would be suitable for leisure walking which is the main intended use of the circulation areas.

3.9.3. It is envisaged that these areas would be mitigated and improved with the presence of the tree planting and landscape design proposed for the Site, enabling pedestrian sitting, standing and leisure and business walking. Tree planting and landscape features would also help to mitigate wind acceleration in other pockets of the Site to reduce the wind effects identified and ensure pedestrian safety.

3.9.4. The landscape design for the roof gardens is expected to have a mitigating effect particularly through perimeter wind screening and low level planting such as hedges and trellises in seating areas to increase the time when the roof gardens can be used for sitting and standing.

3.9.5. The results of the pedestrian comfort assessment for pedestrian leisure and business walking indicate that all the surroundings areas remain within the comfort criteria suitable for pedestrian leisure walking. There are a number of existing areas surrounding the Site which will benefit from the 2015 Masterplan. A localised area of wind speed increase is observed at the eastern end of John Harrison Way, residential areas to the south side of John Harrison Lane on the south east of the Site and also in the areas of residential development east of E Parkside. However, generally the overall effect of the 2015 Masterplan is an increase of the areas suitable for sitting and standing compared to the existing situation. It is anticipated that both new and existing trees in the area would help improve the wind environment of the existing surrounding area. Following mitigation, the residual effects are likely to be a direct, permanent and long term effect of negligible significance on the wind assessment for pedestrian sitting and standing.

3.9.6. There are some areas of high wind speeds during strong winds observed on the west side of the Site boundary in the areas west of the Blackwall Tunnel Approach, although these areas would benefit from local mitigation to reduce the wind effects identified. In particular the tree planting proposed along the Waterfront is expected to contribute to the improvement of the windy areas identified.

3.9.7. The requirement for strategic wind landscaping would vary with each development zone and would be adopted within the parameter based approach which allows some flexibility of the definition of the final design. Detailed wind studies would be undertaken for each development plot to further inform and test the specific planting to improve the wind environment where necessary.

Sunlight/Daylight and Overshadowing

3.9.8. The assessment of the effects on the daylight available to surrounding properties beyond the Site indicates that the effect on daylight will be relatively minor for the majority of existing and permitted development as a result of the 2015 Masterplan measured against the criteria of the BRE guidance and legislation.

3.9.9. There would be further detailed daylight studies for buildings of the proposed Masterplan at the detailed design stage to address the effects to neighbouring adjacent buildings and bring them closer to the BRE recommendations.
3.9.10. The sunlight assessment focused on the receptors that have windows facing 90° of due south of the Site and which are sensitive to direct sunlight, in line with BRE Guide. The results indicated that over 80% of those assessed are within the sunlight criteria. Those properties showing the highest level of change for sunlight are largely due to solar obstruction from buildings on plots 14, 19.04 and 20 of the 2015 Masterplan. Access to sunlight to windows can be improved by reducing obstruction to south facing windows through design, building form and also by size of massing. Since the parameter based approach allows some flexibility of the definition of the final massing, it will be possible at the detailed design stage to undertake further detailed sunlight studies to further improve the solar access on parcels 14, 19.04 and 20 of the 2015 Masterplan to address such effects to neighbouring adjacent buildings.

Effects of Overshadowing on the Site and in the Surrounding Area

3.9.11. The results of the overshadowing studies indicated that the majority of open spaces surrounding the Site are unaffected by the 2015 Masterplan and that more than 50% of the area will remain sunlit for at least two hours on 21st March, in line with the recommended criteria. Out of the six open spaces surrounding the Site, three will remain within the recommended guidelines and three will be below the criteria, with one of the latter three open spaces already experiencing overshadowing below the criteria. 

3.9.12. In the surrounding area, the results indicated that eighteen open spaces out of thirty-eight are within the recommended criteria in terms of overshadowing on the basis that more than 50% of its area will remain sunlit for at least two hours on 21st March, in line with the recommended criteria. The main areas of the Principal Public Realm such as Waterfront West Park, West Link Park, Peninsula Square, Upper Riverside Plaza, Emirates Airlines Park and Central Park, are all within the recommended criteria. Many of the spaces currently below the recommended criteria are the private courtyards between the proposed buildings.

3.9.13. Access to sunlight to open spaces can be improved by reducing the obstruction of direct sunlight from the south and west through design, building form and by size of massing. Since the parameter based approach allows some flexibility of the definition of the final massing, it will be possible to undertake further detailed overshadowing and sunlight studies for the open spaces at the detailed design stage for each development zone to further improve the solar access of these spaces and reduce the level of overshadowing in the proposed open areas and bring them closer to the BRE recommendations.

3.9.14. Such requirements would vary with each development zone and the results would be applied in the context that, whilst the BRE Guide provides numerical guidelines for daylight, sunlight and overshadowing, it is not an instrument of planning policy, therefore some level of flexibility should be applied where appropriate. This is particularly relevant in cases where the aim is optimise land use and floor space in an urban context such as the 2015 Masterplan development.

3.10 Will the new development affect any on-site ecology?

3.10.1 The 2015 Masterplan Site comprises habitats typical of a highly urbanised environment. At present, the Site predominantly consists of highly modified, intensively managed, readily established habitats (hard-standing [roads, car-parking and pedestrian access], buildings, amenity grassland and introduced shrub beds) supporting common and widespread plant species.

3.10.2 Areas in the south and north-west of the Site have been partitioned into a number of development plots. A proportion of the plots are currently in the process of being constructed. However, some support brownfield habitat which is of conservation value at the local scale and provides habitat for bird species, foraging bat species and terrestrial invertebrate species on Site.

3.10.3 The Site includes sections of the River Thames which is designated as a Site of Metropolitan Important for Nature Conservation (SMINC), due to its function as a wildlife corridor through the capital, and habitats supported which include mud flats, shingle beach and intertidal vegetation. The interface between the Site and
river corridor has already been enhanced in sections, under the 2004 Masterplan, where river terraces have been installed which support intertidal vegetation including reedbed habitat.

3.10.4 Comprehensive redevelopment of the Site in line with the 2015 Masterplan will result in the removal of brownfield habitat, and extension of managed urban green space to include new areas of landscaping, planting at ground level and extensive green and/or brown roofs on new buildings. Landscaping will include the creation of new intertidal habitat in association with the Meridian Quays area, and enhancement of existing amenity space within the Central Park area between Lower Riverside and Parkside and Brickfields (North and South).

3.10.5 Whilst temporary negative effects upon on-site habitats are anticipated during the construction phase, resulting from the temporary reduction in coverage, in the long term permanent positive effects are anticipated once the 2015 Masterplan has been completed as habitat becomes established significant at the local scale.

3.10.6 In the absence of mitigation, site clearance activities could have direct effects upon nesting birds and roosting bats (if present in three buildings with low potential to support roosts), which could have direct, negative effects upon these species groups. Mitigation is proposed to avoid this, and is also required to ensure legal compliance with respect to these species. In addition the design specification includes the provision of replacement nesting/roosting opportunities and foraging habitat for both birds and bats, and habitat suitable for a range of terrestrial invertebrate species. For this reason, whilst it is probable that temporary negative effects upon fauna will occur during the construction phase resulting from the temporary reduction in habitat availability, in the long term, permanent positive effects are anticipated once the 2015 Masterplan has been completed which would be significant at the Site and local scale respectively.

3.11 Will the development increase the risk of flooding?

3.11.1 During the site preparation and construction phase, the residual effects of the 2015 Masterplan on water resources are generally negligible due to the good construction practice. Specific measures would be implemented as part of the WMS and IMS and EMS in order to prevent contamination of surface water and maintaining the viability of the existing Network.

3.11.2 Once the 2015 Masterplan has been completed, there are minor positive impacts where surface and ground water quality will be improved. Use of modern systems built in accordance with Environment Agency Pollution Prevention Guidelines will reduce the total number of pollutants entering the River Thames, whilst retaining and improving the existing capping layer will prevent additional water entering the contaminated ground.

3.11.3 The 2015 Masterplan does increase pressure and demand on both the foul and potable water off site networks operated by Thames Water. Based on current Thames Water modelling, the 2004 Masterplan would exceed available capacity. However working with Thames Water to improve and reinforce the offsite network and reduce total demand associated with the 2015 Masterplan by pursuing sustainable development models will reduce the risk of a deterioration of Thames Water's provision of service.

3.12 Does the Site have archaeological potential?

3.12.1 In any desk-based assessment, a degree of uncertainty is attached to the baseline data sources. However, the fact that parts of the Site have been subject to previous archaeological and geo-archaeological evaluation and assessment, and the surface of the Shepperton Gravel has been re-modelled as part of this EIA process (where data is available) meaning that the baseline and ES Chapter are formed on real evidence and are considered robust.

3.12.2 Relevant elements of the 2015 Masterplan that have been assessed include;
- Site set-up works, including contractor's compound set-up and associated temporary services, levelling work and other preparatory groundworks including remediation;
- Construction, including foundation excavation or pile installation, service installation, road construction;
- Landscaping, including ground reduction or levelling;
- Compression of buried remains from vehicle movement, construction of spoil tips, bunds or raised landscape areas; and
- De-watering of waterlogged or organic archaeological remains through alterations to the level of groundwater across the Site.

3.12.3. Consultation has been undertaken with English Heritage (Greater London Archaeology Advisory Service).

3.12.4. The location of the Site within a LPA designated Area of High Archaeological Potential indicates that surviving archaeological/geo-archaeological remains that may be present on the Site could be of Medium significance (Designated or undesignated assets that contribute to regional research objectives).

3.12.5. Re-modelling of the surface of the Shepperton Gravel, which has taken place as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment, has provided a review of the previously assessed Landscape Zones for archaeological/geo-archaeological remains across Greenwich Peninsula. This has contributed to a revised model of the buried prehistoric landscape of the Site.

3.12.6. After mitigation, it is considered that the effect of site set-up works, including contractors compound set-up and associated temporary services, levelling work and other preparatory groundwork and particularly remediation works will be of a minor negative effect with the 2015 Masterplan expected to result in a small, barely noticeable effect on potential archaeological and geo-archaeological remains.

3.12.7. After mitigation it is considered that the effect of construction, including foundation excavation or pile installation, service installation, road construction will be a minor negative effect with the 2015 Masterplan expected to result in a small, barely noticeable effect on potential archaeological and geo-archaeological remains.

3.12.8. After mitigation it is considered that the effect of Landscaping, including ground reduction or levelling will be negligible where no discernible effect is expected as a result of the 2015 Masterplan on potential archaeological and geo-archaeological remains.

3.12.9. Due to the general thickness of Made Ground across the Site, the compression of buried remains from vehicle movement, construction of spoil tips, bunds or raised landscape areas is unlikely to occur. This will cause "no change" to archaeological/geo-archaeological deposits.

3.12.10. Due to the location of the Site within the Thames Valley and the tidal movement of the River Thames it is considered unlikely that de-watering of waterlogged or organic archaeological remains through alterations to the level of groundwater across the Site will occur outside of areas of direct construction impact.

3.12.11. The assessment of cumulative effects of the 2015 Masterplan in conjunction with other developments in the local area considers a number of committed developments.

3.12.12. The limited effect that the identified cumulative developments have had on the archaeological resource indicates that the overall cumulative effect of the 2015 Masterplan will not exceed the effects that have been assessed for both the construction and operation Phase of the 2015 Masterplan.

3.12.13. Communication from the Archaeological Adviser to the Royal Borough of Greenwich suggests that a staged condition will be utilised to manage the LPA's archaeological requirements dependent upon development impacts and the potential of specific plots.
3.13 What are the likely effects of the 2015 Masterplan, together with other committed developments in the area?

3.13.1. The likely effects of the 2015 Masterplan together with the committed developments have been assessed. The construction works may result in negative effects should the committed developments be constructed at the same time as the 2015 Masterplan, resulting in an increase in disturbance from construction activities, an increase in noise and dust as a result of construction activities and a change in townscape character.

3.13.2. During site preparation and construction of the 2015 Masterplan, the majority of likely effect interactions relate to nearby residents where temporary effects are expected in terms of noise and vibration, dust generation, townscape views and character of the Site.

3.13.3. It is important to note that these effects will be temporary and intermittent during the construction works. The IMS for the 2015 Masterplan will reduce and control any negative effects on the existing environment, including effects on existing residential properties near the Site.

3.13.4. Once the 2015 Masterplan is complete, long-term positive in-combination effects of the 2015 Masterplan on existing and future residents (within the Site) are expected to arise from changes in road traffic, changes in views, an increase in housing numbers and local facilities.

3.14 What measures will be used to avoid and reduce the environmental effects of the 2015 Masterplan?

3.14.1. The 2015 Masterplan application is controlled by the Control Documents submitted for approval which defines and control the form of the development to be the subject of the detailed design applications. This documentation includes the Development Specification and Design Guidelines. A summary of the proposed measures which will be secured and implemented as part of the detailed design to avoid and reduce any negative environmental effects and enhance environmental benefits associated with the 2015 Masterplan is confirmed in the table below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic area</th>
<th>Measures to avoid or offset potential negative environmental effects / Enhancement measures</th>
<th>Construction Phase</th>
<th>Completed Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socio-Economics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Where feasible, the Applicant will employ local people during construction works and supports UTC and GLLaB.</td>
<td>None Required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transport and Access</strong></td>
<td>Construction Logistics Plan.</td>
<td>Introduction of new Transport Hub and further services to be agreed with TfL; New streets, public realm, Cycle Superhub, linkages to existing routes and increased permeability; and Localisation mitigation to be identified through further modelling.</td>
<td>None Required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noise and Vibration</strong></td>
<td>Measures to reduce noise consistent with an IMS/EMS approach.</td>
<td>None Required.</td>
<td>None Required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Air Quality</strong></td>
<td>Measures to reduce noise consistent with an IMS/EMS approach.</td>
<td>Travel Plan.</td>
<td>General tree planting and wind deflecting landscape features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Wind</strong></td>
<td>None Required.</td>
<td>None Required.</td>
<td>Further studies at the detailed design stage to inform the final scale and modulation of buildings within 2015 Masterplan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daylight, Sunlight &amp; Overshadowing</strong></td>
<td>None Required.</td>
<td>None Required.</td>
<td>None Required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ecology &amp; Nature Conservation</strong></td>
<td>Pollution prevention controls and management of surface water drainage during construction phase; Installation of brown / green roofs to compensate for habitat lost from brownfield plots to be developed; Installation of brown / green roofs to compensate for habitat lost from brownfield plots to be developed Implementation of appropriate measures to avoid direct harm to bats during site clearance, and replacement (and enhancement) of roosting opportunities; and Implementation of appropriate measures to avoid direct harm to birds during site clearance, and replacement (and enhancement) of nesting opportunities.</td>
<td>Pollution prevention controls and management of surface water drainage during construction phase; Management of newly created habitats to ensure the establishment of planted tree and shrub specimens and maintain as required in the long term.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Archaeology</strong></td>
<td>Mitigation measures – arranged in conjunction with the LPA’s Archaeological Adviser - will vary from mitigation by design (reduction of impacts) and may include a process of archaeological/geological evaluation and possible further mitigation.</td>
<td>Mitigation measures – arranged in conjunction with the LPA’s Archaeological Adviser - will vary from mitigation by design (reduction of impacts) and may include a process of archaeological/geological evaluation and possible further mitigation.</td>
<td>Mitigation measures – arranged in conjunction with the LPA’s Archaeological Adviser - will vary from mitigation by design (reduction of impacts) and may include a process of archaeological/geological evaluation and possible further mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ground Conditions, Hydrogeology and Contamination</strong></td>
<td>Review effectiveness of inherent mitigation measures (e.g. EMS, RAMS). Revise and update documentation as deemed necessary. Inherent mitigation measures (e.g. EMS, groundwater monitoring) should be sufficient to mitigate potential risk. Inherent mitigation measures (e.g. EMS, groundwater monitoring, foundation risk assessment, selection of CFA piling) should be sufficient to mitigate potential risk. Foundation design is to be agreed with the EA. Inherent mitigation measures (e.g. EMS) should be sufficient to mitigate potential risk. Higher level of control required in areas adjacent to the river.</td>
<td>Inherent mitigation measures to reduce infiltration, such as hardcover and positive surface water drainage. Review effectiveness of inherent mitigation measures (e.g. EMS). Revise and update documentation where necessary. Inherent mitigation measures (e.g. soil gas monitoring and appropriate design of soil gas protection measures) should be sufficient to mitigate potential risk. Limited residential areas to ground floor. Inherent mitigation measures (e.g. Placement of cover layer) should be sufficient to mitigate potential risk. Limited residential areas at ground level including private gardens (if any).</td>
<td>Inherent mitigation measures to reduce infiltration, such as hardcover and positive surface water drainage. Review effectiveness of inherent mitigation measures (e.g. EMS). Revise and update documentation where necessary. Inherent mitigation measures (e.g. soil gas monitoring and appropriate design of soil gas protection measures) should be sufficient to mitigate potential risk. Limited residential areas to ground floor. Inherent mitigation measures (e.g. Placement of cover layer) should be sufficient to mitigate potential risk. Limited residential areas at ground level including private gardens (if any).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water Resources</strong></td>
<td>Contractor WMS;</td>
<td>Retain and improve capping layer</td>
<td>Retain and improve capping layer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic area</td>
<td>Measures to avoid or offset potential negative environmental effects / Enhancement measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction Phase</strong></td>
<td><strong>Completed Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Water Quality, Flood Risk and Drainage | ■ Installation of works in parallel with operational network;  
■ Contain and treat water prior to discharge;  
■ Capping layer above contaminated water to be replaced as works continue;  
■ No infiltration allowed during works or otherwise; and  
■ Works to be completed in accordance with Environmental Method Statements assessed by designated Environmental Coordinator. |
  | ■ No infiltration of surface water to underlying contaminated soil  
■ Surface water from areas of pollutant generation to be captured in accordance with Environment Agency’s Pollution Prevention Guidance (PPG)  
■ No discharge of contaminated water to Thames Allowed  
■ Use of SuDS  
■ Defining local levels to provide ‘safe’ areas to drain  
■ Increase flood defence levels  
■ Residential levels above overtopping flood defence levels  
■ Warning and safe access routes established  
■ Work with Thames Water to improve/reinforce offsite network  
■ Reduce on site demand by adopting 4 star Rating in code for sustainable homes  
■ Work with Thames Water to improve/reinforce offsite network  
■ Reduce surface water discharge to combined sewer network. |
| Townscape, Visual and Built Heritage | ■ Implementation of good site management;  
■ Use of high quality hoardings with advertising or artwork;  
■ Use of building wraps; and  
■ Advance planting and tree protection. |
  | ■ None Required |

### 3.15 Conclusion

3.15.1. The 2015 Masterplan will deliver a new mixed-use development compromising 12,678 residential units, retail floorspace, B1 Office Floorspace, local amenities, visitor attractions, hotel, health care and education facilities, film and media studios and associated car-parking, public space and landscaping.

3.15.2. The 2015 Masterplan is considered to be appropriate in terms of location and viability, including links to the existing public transport and highways network. The 2015 Masterplan will deliver a variety of dwelling types, as well as commercial, retail and public open space that will benefit future residents and the wider community, accompanied by improved pedestrian and cycle provision around the 2015 Masterplan.

3.15.3. The overall design of the 2015 Masterplan and commitments that have been made upon agreement with RBG to the proposed management practices during construction and operation will incorporate a range of enhancement and mitigation measures. These measures will minimise any significant environmental effects and ensure that the sustainability and environmental performance of the 2015 Masterplan is optimised.

3.15.4. Planning conditions, obligations, or other means may be used to secure the delivery of the agreed mitigation and enhancement measures set out in this ES and other documents submitted in support of the Planning Application.
3.16 What happens next?

3.16.1. The Environmental Statement has been submitted together with other planning application documents and drawings to RBG for the officers to consider in consultation with various stakeholders in the context of planning policy before making a recommendation to the Planning Committee on the planning application.

3.16.2. During the period of determination, the Council will contact government bodies and agencies and other consultees regarding the 2015 Masterplan. Members of the general public are also invited to make comments on the planning application. The feedback from these discussions will be taken into account by RBG in reaching the decision on the planning application.

3.17 Who can I contact if I want some more information?

3.17.1. Further information, including a copy of the planning application documents, the Environmental Statement and this Non-Technical Summary, is available at the following website. Copies of the 2015 Masterplan documentation can also be provided by the Applicant on request.

http://www.royalgreenwich.gov.uk/info/200074/planning

Any comments can be sent to:

Royal Borough of Greenwich
Planning Department
Woolwich Centre
35 Wellington Street
London
SE18 6HQ

Email: planningapps@royalgreenwich.gov.uk