

From: Verster, Andre
Sent: 19 October 2011 13:06
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: 11ap3157: Greenland Dock

Dear [REDACTED]

It would be appreciated if you can provide comments as to the content of my email sent 14 October 2011.

It would also be appreciated if you can consider and comment on the following comments from the a) Council's Ecology officer and the b) Environmental Protection Team (EPT):

a)

1, Floating nest rafts and waterfowl.

Although the proposed development is at the end of the bird nesting season waterfowl tend to nest later than woodland birds so could still be actively nesting on the floating rafts (at the western end of the dock) during this time. Disturbance to the nesting birds would be an offence under the Wildlife and Countryside Act. Under the current proposals the rafts would be in the way of the pontoons and moorings.

Young birds and the resident swans could also be negatively affected by the scale of this development. Swans need a large area of open water for take off and landing and are very territorial when they have a brood of cygnets. The reduced open water could result in a conflict with other waterfowl.

A mitigation strategy would need to be produced by the developer and agreed by the Council to address this issue.

2, Black water and grey water

The discharge of grey/black water into the dock would pollute the dock and raise the nutrient levels, which in turn could result in increased algal blooms posing a health and safety issue. I think it would be almost impossible to stop/enforce discharge from boats. This discharge could result in a negative impact on the ecology of the docks water quality.

The Environment Agency may be able to advise more as this site is a registered fishery.

3, Silt disturbance

I would advise that the Environment Agency are best placed to comment on silt disturbance. How would the pontoons be anchored? How many buoys and how would they be anchored?

b)

There is an inadequate noise assessment submitted within the documentation, there is no assessment of the noise from the masts, engine and / or generator noise, extra footfall around the site.

There is no lighting assessment submitted with the application.

There is no water monitoring provisions – how are sea valves being securely sealed and checked, the Greenland Dock is prone to blue – green algae growths. No environmental assessment for the wildlife being disturbed by the extra berths.

These EPT comments are made in the context of the following policies:

London Plan Policy 4A.19 – Improving Air Quality

London Plan Policy 4A.20 – Reducing noise and enhancing soundscapes

London Plan Policy 4A.33 – Bringing contaminated land into beneficial use

L. B. Southwark: (Southwark Plan)

Policy 3.6 - Air quality

Policy 3.1 - Environmental Effects

Regards,
Andre Verster
Planning Officer

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 17 October 2011 08:09
To: Verster, Andre
Subject: Re: 11ap3157: Greenland Dock

Hi Andre,
Is it OK if you receive my reaction to your mail on coming Wednesday?
Best regards,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Dear [REDACTED]

I am drafting a report and would appreciate if you can clarify the following matters please:

1. Showers and toilets

a) The two floating facility units would provide (how many?) showers and toilets and would be moored at the western end of the dock. b) These would supplement (how many?) facilities at the Surrey Quays Watersports Centre.

Temporary floating disabled toilet and shower facilities would be provided for users - are these the same as in 1a? If so, please refer to point 4.

2. Opening hours

What are the existing opening hours of The Surrey Quays Watersport Centre ?

3. Remaining area of dock to be used

The layout of the pontoons would allow the continued use of part of the dock by other users. Users from the Surrey Quays Watersports Centre have raised concerns that they would only be able to use the area to the north east of the centre. This equates to approximately 25% of the docks currently at their disposal - do you agree with that %.

4. Access

The applicant aim to provide wheelchair accessible ramps down to the pontoons from the Watersports Centre. No details have been provided but it is considered that this matter could be dealt with by an appropriate condition. It would be good if this could be prepared prior to the meeting on 1 November as members may need to be satisfied that this could realistically be done. (this relates to point 1).

5. Legacy

The applicant states that one of the floating sanitary facility units would be relocated to the South Dock marina to replace an existing life-expired unit. What mechanism would ensure that this will happen?

Do you agree with the following (relates to above)?

The likely adverse or less good implications for any particular communities/groups have been also been discussed above (in context of draft report). Specific actions to ameliorate these implications are that one of the floating sanitary facility units would be relocated to the South Dock marina to replace an existing life-expired unit.

6. Please note that Tideway Sailability called me yesterday and advised that the local planning authority could expect up to 400 individual letters of objection from their members. They also advised that if planning permission is granted it is highly likely that they would challenge the decision by Judicial Review.

7. Comments on the following 12 letters of objection would also be welcomed:

[REDACTED]:

350 moorings and supporting facilities will have a significant impact on the dock, as this is a large marina, significantly affecting not just the dock but also the surrounding area.

The proposal would reduce the current usage of the dock and the Watersports Centre for sport and physical activity. The provision of facilities for visiting spectators at the expense of facilities for local people's participation in sport and physical activity is to the detriment of local people.

The movement of up to 350 boats into and out of Greenland Dock will itself cause traffic disruption as it will require the repeated closure of Rope Street to allow access to the dock from South Dock.

The boat dwellers and their visitors would also generate a significant amount of traffic to and from the marina and may involve a significant influx of vehicles into the vicinity. There is also the possibility that there is a potential need for parking spaces for visitor cars and hire cars.

350 boats and their inhabitants will be moved into close proximity of a residential area and it is likely that significant noise as a result of their movement and activities from inhabitants.

The movement into and out of the dock is also likely to involve a significant increase in the motorised movement of boats in the dock, increasing the likelihood of pollutants in the waters of the dock.

Greenland Dock has a large population of water birds, many of them nesting in the dock. This proposal could cause distress to the bird population and damage an important habitat.

[REDACTED]:

Concerns raised with regard to increased foot traffic, noise, litter and anti-social behaviour.

The proposal would cause the closure of the sailing club, Tideway, for 25% of the summer to the detriment of members of the club.

██████████:

There would be a lot of noise and disturbance in building the facilities for 350 visitors moorings.

The total closure of Tideway for 5 weeks out of our 20 week summer programme of sailing would potentially lead to loss of member activities.

The area remaining (25%) for members to sail is not sufficient

██████████:

Noise from inhabitants of 350 yachts within a few yards from residential properties.

Noise from rigging, which is a common source of noise in all marinas, within a few yards from residential properties.

Inadequate transport - the Jubilee line is unable to cope with the current traffic flow.

A large number of yachts and pontoon will be unsightly.

██████████:

For security reasons there will need to be a space between the pontoons and the dock edge. The plan does not seem to show this.

The plan should be modified to retain the wildlife at the west end of the dock without interfering with nesting.

Many waiting moorings outside the lock will be needed. Where will these be located and will they be properly provided by the applicant?

The following condition are suggested before planning consent is given:

Full compensation will be required for loss of use of the sailing area by Tideway Sailability and others.

As part of the legacy all of the amenity blocks need to be refurbished and possibly expanded.

Also as part of the legacy, could the awning to the watersports centre be retained so that it can be erected for future events?

The pontoons could be brought in and taken away by river rather than by lorry to avoid a heavier load of traffic?

The following questions were raised:

Has an assurance been received from Thames Clippers that the service will be adequate?

Full monitoring of water pollution will be needed and regulations regarding grey water discharge and fuel leakage fully enforced. The dock office will need extra staff.

It appears that water and electricity will not be provided. In this case what provision will be made?

Unknown address (member of Tideway Sailability):

Objects and states that the facility is precious to locals who use it on a regular basis.

Unknown address:

It is feared that the local road infrastructure will not cope and that residents are effectively 'locked in' for the duration. The immediate area between Plough Way and Greenland Dock is in fact a large residential cul-de-sac of narrow streets after turning into Sweden Gate. The lack of an alternative exit makes it completely unsuitable to use as a 'superhighway' or for local roads being cordoned off in order to give preference to visitors.

This temporary development process to be operational for 24 days plus the assembling and dismantling period which will inevitably involve large carrier vehicles blocking the local streets and obstructing local traffic, thus preventing residents going about their business.

If the entire development can be constructed and accessed via the waterway from the Thames through South Dock and into Greenland Dock - including construction - delivering, assembling and removing the infrastructure, and the waterway can be used for guest arrivals and departures rather than the local streets then there would be no concerns regarding the impact of local traffic.

Would not want to see disruption of service of the Thames Clipper due to the local pier being blocked off.

[REDACTED] :

Questioned who will profit from the large income from moorings. It is believed that the profit will go to a private company.

The facilities in South Dock consist of one shower block with 4 showers, 4 toilet stalls, 2 urinals and 3 sinks between over 100 people living on the marina. At the moment they are unable to cope, especially in the morning and they are in a terrible state of repair with leaking pipes, raw sewage dripping into the dock, no heating and bare wires in places. Will the 100 people living on the South Dock marina benefit from the invasion of an extra 1750 people (as per the application 350 berths at an average occupation of 5 per vessel)? The objector would like a guarantee that once the facilities blocks in Greenland Dock have served their purpose, both would be installed in South Dock.

There are no facilities for washing clothes or for emptying porta-potties as present. This has been highlighted numerous times to the council but residents of South Dock and Greenland Dock have to carry all their washing down to a laundrette. When people want to empty their porta-potties they have to try and tip them down the toilet thereby often creating a mess and rendering the toilet unusable.

Many of the residents of South Dock are concerned that instead of the Council running a marina properly for the Olympics, it will be a constant battle between the Council, Sail Greenwich Ltd and the 'special spectators' for who does what when. This will result in a significant degradation of the quality of life for people in South Dock and Greenland Dock.

The proposal make no mention of the nesting platform at the end of Greenland Dock near Tesco. Are these to be ripped up for the duration of the Olympics? There is a wide variety of birdlife using these nesting platforms including cormorants, swans, gerbes, coots, ducks and geese. There appears to be no mention of the environmental impacts on these birds. The biodiversity section in the submitted documents address discharge affecting things living in the water, but nothing on the wild life living on the water.

When boats traverse through South Dock to Greenland Dock, the opening of the lock gates to the Thames can cause large amounts of swell within the water which is disturbing to the boating community. There is also an alarm on the bridge that lifts between the two docks. Will there be strict times that this can be used or will it be a 24 hour operation disrupting the residents both on land and water, as well as stopping traffic on the road? It is stated that there would be up to 100 boat movements a day. This would be well over a hundred fold increase in current boat movements.

[REDACTED]

Have the following questions:

Safety - rescue and medical back-up (safety boat) if any problems in the water?

Will the new marina provide direct access to shore or will dingies / water taxis be used?

If 350 betrhs there could be several hundred cars for owners and crew, friends and relatives etc. Are they going to park around existing roads and car parks, or will new parking be created.

Navigation marks and lights/collusion avoidance?

Assumed incorrectly that the marina would be on the tidal Thames.

[REDACTED]:

No mention of any environmental problems arising, such as impact on birds and any provision made for water contamination.

The dock has only limited 'fresh' water supply from the Thames and is the main recreational space in this area. Any contamination of the water would have a huge impact on the value of this space.

The applicant has not given any details of how it is intended to ensure that the dock and the watersports centre will be maintained and / or left in the good condition as it is now. It took more than 10 years and more than £1.5m to refurbish the watersports centre to the high standard as it is now. There are concerns that 1500 people using the facility will require repairs for which the council has no money.

Planning permission should be conditional in that more than sufficient provisions are made by the applicant to ensure that water will be filtered and cleaned if required, an environmental friendly solution is found for the bird islands, any repairs to the dock are done if required and any repairs to the watersports centre is made by the applicant as well if required.

[REDACTED]:

There is insufficient parking in Rope Street to accommodate the demand that would arise as a result of this development. There would be need for a parking permit scheme developed for residents. This is in any case required in any case as the Thames Clipper service has increased the day time parking demand from non-residents as they park in Rope Street and then catch the Thames Clippers.

The lifting bridge is an old structure and sometimes gets stuck when open. If it is used constantly it is likely to break down again and cause major inconvenience to residents and users. It is unlikely that this bridge is robust enough to allow constant movement of potentially 350 craft.

[REDACTED]:

The consultation has not allowed fair response for all parties affected with regard to Tideway Sailability, Greenland Dock who were not included in the consultation letters sent on 29 September 2011.

The proposal does not account for the activities of Tideway Sailability who have used Greenland Dock uninterrupted for over 20 years providing access to sailing sports activities for people with and without disabilities.

No impact assessment to the activities of Tideway Sailability has been undertaken including damage to existing infrastructure, including pontoons, slipways and accommodation facilities.

No impact assessment has been undertaken with regard to the activities of Tideway Sailability to determine current and future economic loss to Tideway Sailability by imposition of restrictions on usual activities during the proposed period.

No impact assessment has been undertaken with regard to PPS5 Planning for the Historic Environment and associated heritage assets in the Greenland Dock and wider affected area.

The proposal does not accord with the Preferred Options Core Strategy for Positive Changes in that it disadvantages Tideway Sailability members and the local community from Objective 1C Be Healthy and Active in discouraging or preventing shared leisure and sports activities in the affected areas.

International Capital Connections Limited

The visiting yachtsmen would expect all aspects of their visit. If this includes celebrations and entertaining on large vessels this would be problematic in the wholly residential nature of Greenlands Quay / Brinswick Quay. During summer weather windows are open at night and sound carries perfectly across the water.

Questioned whether the gym facilities at the watersports centre would remain open as normal.

The exercise would not doubt generate substantial revenues. Does the plan include some benefit for local residents?

Andre Verster - Team Leader

Development Management - East Team

Southwark Council

Regeneration & Neighbourhoods Division

PO BOX 64529

London
SE1P 5LX
Tel 020 7525 5457
Email andre.verster@southwark.gov.uk

To help create a sustainable environment please think carefully before you print this e-mail. Do not print it unless it is really necessary.

Southwark Council does not accept liability for loss or damage resulting from software viruses.

The views expressed in this e-mail may be personal to the sender and should not be taken as necessarily representing those of Southwark Council.

The information in this e-mail and any attached files is confidential and may be covered by legal and/or professional privilege or be subject to privacy legislation. It is intended solely for the individual or entity to which it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, the retaining, distribution or other use of any transmitted information is strictly prohibited.

E-mails are transmitted over a public network and Southwark Council cannot accept any responsibility for the accuracy of a message that may have sustained changes in transmission

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept by MIMESweeper for the presence of computer viruses.

This email has been scanned by the MessageLabs Email Security System.
For more information please visit <http://www.messagelabs.com/email>
