



[www.landuse.co.uk](http://www.landuse.co.uk)

# **London Borough of Tower Hamlets**

## **SEA Report Addendum**

Strategic Environmental Assessment for the South Quay Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document  
Prepared by LUC on behalf of London Borough of Tower Hamlets  
May 2015

**Project Title:** South Quay Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document: Strategic Environmental Assessment

**Client:** London Borough of Tower Hamlets

Version	Date	Version Details	Prepared by	Checked by	Approved by
V1	17/04/2015	Internal Draft	Jonny Hill	Juliette Young	
V2	29/04/2015	Final Draft	Jonny Hill	Juliette Young	
V3	05/05/2015	Final	Jonny Hill	Juliette Young	Jon Grantham



[www.landuse.co.uk](http://www.landuse.co.uk)

# London Borough of Tower Hamlets

## SEA Report Addendum

Strategic Environmental Assessment for the South Quay Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document  
Prepared by LUC on behalf of London Borough of Tower Hamlets  
May 2015

Planning & EIA  
Design  
Landscape Planning  
Landscape Management  
Ecology  
Mapping & Visualisation

LUC LONDON  
43 Chalton Street  
London  
NW1 1JD  
T +44 (0)20 7383 5784  
[london@landuse.co.uk](mailto:london@landuse.co.uk)

Offices also in:  
Bristol  
Glasgow  
Edinburgh



Land Use Consultants Ltd  
Registered in England  
Registered number: 2549296  
Registered Office:  
43 Chalton Street  
London NW1 1JD  
LUC uses 100% recycled paper

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
	South Quay Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document	1
	SEA work to date	1
	Purpose and approach of the SEA Report Addendum	2
<b>2</b>	<b>Baseline Characteristics &amp; Plan and Programme Review</b>	<b>4</b>
	Baseline Characteristics	4
	Policy, Plans and Programmes	4
<b>3</b>	<b>Consultation Representations on the SEA and the Response to these</b>	<b>6</b>
	Historic England	6
	GVA (on behalf of Berkeley Homes)	6
	Local Resident	7
<b>4</b>	<b>Outstanding SEA Recommendations and LBTH's Response to these</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>SEA of Proposed Changes to the South Quay Masterplan</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Summary of Effects of Changes</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Cumulative Effects</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>Conclusions</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>Appendix 1</b>	<b>– Consultation Comments on the Draft SEA Report and the Response to these</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>Appendix 2</b>	<b>– SEA Addendum Matrix</b>	<b>57</b>

## Tables

Table 1.1	SEA objectives	2
Table 5.1	SEA of Masterplan changes since the Draft Masterplan was consulted upon (post-mitigation)	11
Table 5.2:	Summary of SEA Changes to the Draft South Quay Masterplan SPD (post-mitigation)	35
Table 6.1:	Summary of the changes to the post-mitigation effects recorded in the Draft SEA Report	38
Table 7.1:	Summary of Cumulative Effects	41



# 1 Introduction

## South Quay Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document

- 1.1 South Quay is located to the south of Canary Wharf on the Isle of Dogs.
- 1.2 Since 2010, interest from the development industry and land owners has resulted in a high number of development proposals which seek to maximise densities along Marsh Wall (within the South Quay area), specifically in tall building typologies. If these developments are not appropriately managed, there is a risk that the townscape and wider environment of the South Quay area will suffer and development opportunities across the whole area will not be optimised. This will result in the lost opportunity to deliver a sustainable place and capture benefits for the community.
- 1.3 Currently development in the South Quay area is managed in accordance with policies and site allocations set out in the Local Plan (the adopted Core Strategy and Managing Development Document; and policies within the London Plan). The western side of South Quay also falls within the boundary covered by the Millennium Quarter Masterplan (Interim), which was produced in 2000. The Masterplan is used for the purpose of development management alongside the Local Plan and London Plan to determine planning applications.
- 1.4 Given the scale of development which has been coming forward in this area (and to ensure benefits are maximised, whilst adverse impacts are appropriately managed at a strategic scale), LBTH consider that a bespoke Masterplan is required for the South Quay area to supplement the Local Plan and London Plan.
- 1.5 The proposed Masterplan for South Quay is therefore required to assist with the management of the proposed growth within the area, securing the associated benefits of this growth for the wider community. Specifically, it is needed to ensure that development contributes to an overall high quality and sustainable connected morphology and that social and physical infrastructure requirements are planned for and delivered in line with the proposed levels of growth. It is intended that the Masterplan be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and it will become a material consideration in future planning decisions.
- 1.6 The Masterplan Area comprises a series of development sites which are at varying stages in the planning process. All of these sites are brownfield comprising existing residential or commercial buildings and associated public realm. Some of the sites are vacant and the buildings are unoccupied.
- 1.7 The proposed applications seek to redevelop the sites for large-scale residential and/ or mixed use developments.
- 1.8 The Masterplan will apply to those sites currently classed as 'potential development' sites, where 'pre-application' discussions are currently underway or where current planning applications are in place.

## SEA work to date

- 1.9 The first stage of the SEA process, setting the context and objectives, establishing the baseline and deciding the scope, was undertaken by LUC and the SEA Scoping Report published for consultation in September 2014. The SEA Scoping Report also identified the key sustainability issues for the Masterplan area and considered how these would evolve without production of the Masterplan.
- 1.10 Comments received during the scoping consultation were taken into account and a framework of Objectives were finalised covering all of the SEA topics. The SEA framework was developed

taking account of the objectives already established in the SA/ SEA of the Local Plan (Core Strategy and Managing Development Document) as well as the London Plan.

- 1.11 The next stage of the SEA involved testing a series of reasonable options including potential overall growth scenarios (using habitable rooms per hectare, as a proxy for density and overall growth), development delivery options (i.e. towers in space, or delivery of development as podiums/plinths towers) and finally the different components of the Masterplan were tested.
- 1.12 The subsequent Draft SEA Report set out the findings of the appraisal, highlighted the likely significant effects (both positive and adverse taking into account likely secondary, cumulative, synergistic, short, medium, long-term, permanent and temporary effects), made recommendations for improvements which may help to mitigate adverse effects and maximise the benefits of the Masterplan and outlined proposed monitoring measures.
- 1.13 The Masterplan and Draft SEA Report were published for a six week consultation period from 5<sup>th</sup> January 2015 to 16<sup>th</sup> February 2015.

## Purpose and approach of the SEA Report Addendum

### Purpose

- 1.14 During the six-week formal consultation on the Draft Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document (November 2014) and Draft SEA Report (November 2014) a number of comments were raised by stakeholders which LBTH has evaluated. As a result of this evaluation, the Masterplan has been revised. This SEA Report Addendum therefore appraises the changes made to the Masterplan since the preparation of the October 2014 Draft Masterplan, in particular to determine if there any changes to the identification of significant environmental effects.
- 1.15 This SEA Addendum supplements the overall Draft SEA Report which comprises:
  - SEA Non-Technical Summary (November 2014);
  - Draft SEA Report (November 2014); and
  - Draft SEA Technical Appendices (November 2104).
- 1.16 Henceforth, the Draft SEA Report comprises all of the above elements, with the SEA Report Addendum providing the most up to date summary of effects.
- 1.17 For ease of reference the SEA objectives that provide the framework for the November 2014 assessment and for this SEA Report Addendum are reproduced in **Table 1.1**.

**Table 1.1 SEA objectives**

SEA Objective
1. To create and sustain a liveable, well-designed environment that promotes long-term social cohesion, sustainable healthy lifestyles and a sense of place
2. To protect, conserve and enhance the biodiversity within the Masterplan Area and wider borough and where appropriate create habitats, green and open spaces and watercourses
3. To minimise flood risk to people and property within the Masterplan Area, the wider borough and elsewhere, and promote the use of sustainable urban drainage systems
4. To enhance and protect the significance of heritage assets and archaeological heritage
5. To enhance local townscape/ landscape character and improve the quality of the built environment and public open spaces
6. To achieve a planned and aesthetically balanced skyline, as seen in protected views

SEA Objective
7. To protect views and the visual amenity of people living and working in and visiting the area and surroundings
8. To increase the proportion of journeys made by walking and cycling followed by bus or train (relative to those taken by car)
9. To maximise the accessibility to key services and amenities
10. To improve the quality of water within the Masterplan Area and to achieve the wise management and sustainable use of water resources
11. To minimise the production of waste across all sectors and increase reuse, recycling and remanufacturing and recovery rates
12. To protect existing, make provision for new, and maximise accessibility to education facilities to meet the needs of all sectors of the population
13. To maximise the health and well-being of the population and reduce inequalities in health
14. To ensure that all residents have access to good quality, well-located, affordable housing that promotes liveability
15. To provide all residents with the opportunity of employment, particularly in deprived areas
16. To reduce pollution to land through direct action or mitigation; to seek to improve the quality of land as far as possible
17. To reduce pollution to the air and reduce disruption from noise and vibrations through direct action or mitigation measures; to seek to improve the quality of air as far as possible
18. To ensure the Masterplan adapts to the effects of climate change (both now and in the future) and contributes to climate change mitigation, achieves greater energy efficiency and reduces its reliance of fossil fuels

## 2 Baseline Characteristics & Plan and Programme Review

- 2.1 The Draft SEA Report provided a detailed review of the environmental, social and economic baseline characteristics and plans and programmes of most relevance to the Masterplan and is not repeated here. This section provides a review of the baseline characteristics included within the Draft SEA Report and identifies any changes to it since November 2014.

### Baseline Characteristics

- 2.2 Since the publication of the Draft SEA Report no new evidence studies have been prepared or adopted relevant to the Masterplan.

- 2.3 However, three major schemes within the South Quay area have been granted planning permission. These are:

- Arrowhead Quay – PA/12/03315 (decision issued on 19/02/2015):

*"Erection of two buildings of 55 and 50 storeys to provide 756 residential units (Use Class C3) and ancillary uses, plus 701sqm ground floor retail uses (Use Classes A1-A4), provision of ancillary amenity space, landscaping, public dockside walkway and pedestrian route, basement parking, servicing and a new vehicular access".*

- South Quay Plaza – PA/14/00944 (decision issued on 30/03/2015):

*"Demolition of all existing buildings and structures on the site (except for the building known as South Quay Plaza 3) and erection of two residential-led mixed use buildings of up to 68 storeys and up to 36 storeys comprising up to 890 residential (Class C3) units in total, retail (Class A1-A4) space and crèche (Class D1) space together with basement, ancillary residential facilities, access, servicing, car parking, cycle storage, plant, open space and landscaping, plus alterations to the retained office building (South Quay Plaza 3) to provide retail (Class A1-A4) space and office (Class B1) space".*

- Meridian Gate – PA/14/01428 (decision issued on 06/03/2015):

*"Full planning application for the demolition of all existing structures and the redevelopment of the site to provide a building of ground plus 53 storeys comprising residential (Use Class C3) and office (Use Class B1), basement parking; residents gym and associated health facilities; public realm improvements; and the erection of a single storey amenity building comprising a sub-station, reception for basement access, car lifts and café (Use Class A1/A3)".*

- 2.4 The Masterplan SPD, once adopted, would therefore not apply to the above consented schemes<sup>1</sup>. However, any amendments to the approved schemes granted prior to the adoption date or new planning applications for the sites within the Masterplan boundary area will need to take into account the Masterplan SPD as a material consideration.

### Policy, Plans and Programmes

- 2.5 At the national level on 18<sup>th</sup> December 2014 the government published a Ministerial Statement confirming that all planning applications for major developments will be required to include sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) for the management of surface water run-off, unless

---

<sup>1</sup> Although the Masterplan was not adopted prior to the approval of these applications the developers of the schemes voluntarily took into account the Draft Masterplan. As such, the Draft Masterplan subsequently helped shape the design of the approved schemes.

demonstrated to be inappropriate. The changes were adopted on 6<sup>th</sup> April 2015 and the Ministerial Statement should now be read in conjunction with the policies set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

- 2.6 At the regional planning level the Further Alterations to the London Plan (FALP) was published in March 2015. The FALP consolidates further alterations to the London Plan, the Revised Early Minor Alterations (REMA) and the original London Plan (2011) into one document.
- 2.7 The FALP was commissioned to ensure that the London Plan reflects the Mayor's priorities as set out in the 2020 Vision: *The Greatest City on Earth – Ambitions for London*, particularly the need to plan for housing and economic capacity following the forecasted growth revealed by the 2011 Census. As a result the 10 year housing supply target for London has increased from 322,100 to 423,887 with a specific increase in LBTH from 28,850 to 39,314.
- 2.8 South Quay is located within the Isle of Dogs Opportunity Area as set out in the FALP and preparation of the 'Isle of Dogs and South Poplar Opportunity Area Planning Framework' is expected to commence in 2015-2016. The Framework is likely to take the form of Supplementary Planning Guidance to the FALP and will examine the cumulative effect of development in the area and its supporting infrastructure. The content of the South Quay Masterplan SPD is expected to complement and inform the development of the Framework.
- 2.9 There have been no material changes in the local planning policy context since the Draft SEA Report was prepared.

## 3 Consultation Representations on the SEA and the Response to these

- 3.1 Consultation on the Draft Masterplan and Draft SEA Report ran from the 5<sup>th</sup> January to 16<sup>th</sup> February 2015. In total, 63 representations were received by LBTH. No comments were received on the South Quay Masterplan Statement in respect of the Habitats Regulations Assessment Statement.
- 3.2 Three of the representations related specifically to the SEA and were received from the following stakeholders:
- Historic England (formerly English Heritage);
  - GVA (on behalf of Berkley Homes); and
  - a Local Resident.
- 3.3 The stakeholder representations in relation to the Draft SEA Report and our response to each detailed point are provided in **Appendix 1**.
- 3.4 A summary of their comments is provided below.

### Historic England

#### Summary of Stakeholder Comments

- 3.5 We note the mitigation/recommendation in respect of SEA Objective 4: *To enhance and protect the significance of heritage assets and archaeological heritage*. Historic England noted the LBTH officer's response to recommendations 3 and 4 in respect of ensuring design does not overwhelm conservation areas and developers should demonstrate the impact of developments on the setting of heritage assets. The response also draws attention to the aforementioned comments in respect of immediate impacts on the Coldharbour Conservation Area and Glen Terrace. Development up to ten storeys is indicated at this location and as such Historic England would value clarification as to whether development up to this scale can be accommodated without harm to the setting of the conservation area (this is also fundamental to SEA Objective 5.2: *Ensuring a positive relationship in the transition in scale from Canary Wharf to smaller scale residential areas*).

#### SEA Response

- 3.6 Whilst this point has been listed in relation to the overall SEA Report it is considered that it is more relevant to the specific consideration of applications adjacent to the Coldharbour Conservation Area and Glen Terrace during development management. LBTH will ensure these comments and the guidance set out in the adopted Masterplan are taken into account during the consideration of applications in this locality.

### GVA (on behalf of Berkeley Homes)

#### Summary of Stakeholder Comments

- 3.7 GVA raised concerns regarding the methodology of the SEA assessment of alternatives. They believe reasonable alternatives have been discounted, including the 'No Plan' scenario, contrary to applicable law, policy and guidance. A letter response raising these points was originally provided following consultation on the SEA Scoping Report in September 2014. This letter was subsequently appended again to the overall Berkeley Homes response to the consultation on the Draft Masterplan and accompanying Draft SEA Report.

### SEA Response

- 3.8 All of the points raised were responded to in Appendix 2: *Scoping Consultation Comments* of the Draft SEA Report Technical Appendix document and were available for the public and stakeholders to view during the consultation period held in January and February 2015. For clarity, the original table of responses has been appended to this SEA Report Addendum– see **Appendix 1**.
- 3.9 In respect of the 'Do Nothing' or 'No Plan' alternative this has been considered consistently through the SEA process through the consideration of sustainability issues within the Masterplan Area and their likely evolution without the Plan (assuming development would proceed in accordance with the Adopted Development Plan).

## Local Resident

### Summary of Stakeholder Comments

- 3.10 The resident's main concern is that LBTH officers seemed to indicate that density was just one of a range of issues that needed to be considered within the Masterplan Area. The resident found this statement confusing. The LUC report (this has been interpreted to mean the Draft SEA Report) lists 18 separate criteria on which to judge development including the need for new housing (Objective 14), climate change (Objective 18) maximising health of residents (objective 13) etc. The criteria seems to represent a balanced view on development, if not why has the LUC scoping report not been amended in order to provide a more balanced view?

### SEA Response

- 3.11 The comments misinterpret the approach to establishing a set of sustainability objectives (through the SEA framework). The objectives have been established to consider the potential impact of the Masterplan on a range of sustainability issues. The decision to test different quantum of development (using density as a proxy) was undertaken to enable the different impacts of different amounts of development to be properly understood.

## 4 Outstanding SEA Recommendations and LBTH's Response to these

- 4.1 Table 6.4: *Summary of Mitigation/ Recommendations and Identification of Residual Effects for the Appraisal of Different Development Amounts and Delivery of Development Options* and Table 6.5: *Summary of Mitigation/ Recommendations and Identifications of Residual Effects for the Appraisal of the Draft Masterplan SPD* of the Draft SEA Report set out the proposed mitigation measures and recommendations as a result of the SEA process. All proposed the measures and recommendations have been responded to by LBTH in some form. In many instances, the issues raised are already covered by extant development management policies within the London Plan and adopted Local Plan.
- 4.2 Additional, overarching recommendations were provided in Chapter 8: *Conclusions and Summary* of the Draft SEA Report and these are repeated below for ease of reference:
- 4.3 "Development management officers in LBTH should look more favourably on development which seeks to go beyond required standards in terms of sustainability and design.
- 4.4 *In particular, positive support will be provided for development which:*
- **Promotes exemplar standards of design and sustainability** focusing on demand reduction (e.g. in terms of energy and water) and demonstrates how overall waste production will be reduced.
  - **Promotes innovative technologies** e.g. inclusion of Combined Heat and Power proposals/ Energy from Waste Plants, delivered onsite.
  - **Designs to account of protected views, is appropriate in scale** (for example, steps down from Canary Wharf Major Centre and appropriately reflects street scale at ground level) and **ensures there is open sky between buildings.**
  - **Designs to avoid significant adverse effects** as a first principle – for example, through genuinely building in daylight/ sunlight/ microclimate (including wind) considerations in development design at the outset.
  - **Incorporates ecological enhancement measures** into the building design.
  - **Promotes car free development and/ or contributes to car clubs, electric vehicle charging points** in order to reduce car based travel and its consequent impacts.
  - **Designs to take account of surrounding new and existing development and vacant plots within the Masterplan Area** (i.e. scheme at scoping stage/ pre-application stage and other early stages in the planning system, in addition to consideration of consented schemes). In essence, developers should be demonstrating how they are responding to a better Masterplan overall. In particular, cumulative visualisations will be key. New development should not blight adjacent development sites.
  - **Designs to take account of features** set out in the Masterplan SPD such as principal open spaces (i.e. it a specific development plot is adjacent to a planned principal, public open space it would need to demonstrate that it would not adversely affect the usability of this space e.g. through microclimate effects/ daylight/ sunlight issues).
  - **Provides public and private open space and social infrastructure** (e.g. primary schools, healthcare facilities) onsite as a first principle rather than relying on financial contributions. Open spaces and social infrastructure should be of a sufficient size and quality to enable use by the wider population of LBTH.
  - **Provides appropriate employment onsite to meet development needs** (e.g. B1 use classes) as a first principle rather than relying on financial contributions."

- 4.5 **These recommendations have been considered by LBTH and are now included in the 'Delivery, Management and Monitoring' section of the revised Masterplan.**
- 4.6 Consequently, there are no outstanding mitigation measures or recommendations from the Draft SEA Report.

## 5 SEA of Proposed Changes to the South Quay Masterplan

- 5.1 This chapter assesses the various changes made to the Masterplan as a result of the six-week formal consultation period, between 5<sup>th</sup> January and 16<sup>th</sup> February 2015.
- 5.2 **Table 5.1** sets out the changes made to the Masterplan and provides an appraisal of the sustainability effects of each of those changes on the residual (i.e. post-mitigation) effects recorded within the Draft SEA Report.
- 5.3 A detailed appraisal matrix can be found in **Appendix 2** of this SEA Report Addendum.
- 5.4 LBTH have confirmed that the modifications made to the Masterplan SPD (as consulted on in November 2014) are minor textual changes for consistency and clarity and do not consider that there are any new reasonable alternative modifications which would require further assessment through the SEA process.

**Table 5.1 SEA of Masterplan changes since the Draft Masterplan was consulted upon (post-mitigation)**

* Text in red is an addition and text in red and struck through has been deleted from the Masterplan. Masterplan Section	Proposed Modification	Explanation for Change	SEA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects?
<p>Placemaking Principles</p> <p>Principle 7: Waste Management Infrastructure</p>	<p><b>Waste Management Infrastructure (SQ5)</b></p> <p>Development should contribute to the delivery of <b>waste management infrastructure.</b></p>	<p>SQ5 now solely deals with waste management infrastructure. General infrastructure requirements are covered within the existing Local Plan. Provision of primary schools infrastructure is dealt with in SQ3.</p>	<p>Yes. The proposed changes results in the removal of guidance for general infrastructure. Subsequently, SQ5 now only provides guidance on waste management infrastructure.</p>	<p>No.</p> <p>However, the changes will have a minor change on Objectives 11, 12, and 13 resulting in minor effects as indicated below.</p> <p>The effects of the changes will be as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Obj 11: negligible (0) to minor positive (+)</li> <li>• Obj 12: minor positive (+/?) to negligible (0)</li> <li>• Obj. 13: minor positive (+/?) to negligible (0)</li> </ul>
<p>Guidance: Housing Density SQ1</p> <p>SQ1 Housing Density</p>	<p>Guidance text:</p> <p>Development seeking to exceed London Plan Housing densities <b>should will be required to:</b></p> <p>a) robustly demonstrate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. how it successfully mitigates its impacts; and</li> <li>ii. how it delivers the</li> </ul>	<p>Representations made during the consultation raised concerns that the supplementary policies were going beyond their legislative remit by including requirements. It was considered that this was something that should be covered by the Local Plan.</p> <p>The Masterplan has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework</p>	<p>Yes. Although the intention remains the same and it has the same legislative weight as a material consideration in the determination of a planning application the applicant is now not required to provide the</p>	<p>No.</p> <p>However, the changes will result in an uncertain effect on Objective 16. The effect on this objective has changed from minor positive (+) to minor positive uncertain (+/?).</p> <p>The changes would also have affected a number of the</p>

* Text in red is an addition and text in red and struck through has been deleted from the Masterplan. Masterplan Section	Proposed Modification	Explanation for Change	SEA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects?
	<p>vision, principles and guidance of the masterplan.</p> <p>b) deliver exemplary design for housing and non-residential units; and</p> <p>c) provide the required infrastructure in accordance with <b>the Local Plan and the London Plan SQ5</b>.</p> <p>Supporting text: Minor changes to text to provide clarity.</p>	<p>(NPPF) (2012) and the Town and County Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 and the supplement policies act within their remit by supplementing the Local Plan.</p> <p>That said, LBTH acknowledges this perceived concern and has replaced the phrases 'required', 'need' and 'must' with 'should'.</p> <p>The wording of criterion C has changed to make it clear that it is the infrastructure requirements of the Local Plan and London Plan that will need to be met, not policy SQ5 of the Masterplan.</p>	<p>information set out in SQ1. They are only advised to provide it. This raises uncertainty as to whether an applicant would submit the suggested information.</p> <p>The amendment to criterion C does not have an implication on the SEA as the infrastructure requirements to be met are set out in the Local Plan and London Plan.</p> <p>The changes to the supporting text are not considered to have an implication on the SEA.</p>	<p>other objectives; however, they were already scored uncertain (?).</p> <p>There is now uncertainty as there is no requirement for developers to respond to policy guidance criteria.</p>
<p>Guidance: Connections &amp; Public Spaces SQ2</p> <p>SQ2.1 Connections &amp; Public Realm</p>	<p>Guidance text: Development <del>should will be required to</del> deliver legible and well-defined networks of routes and spaces by:...</p>	<p>Representations made during the consultation raised concerns that the supplementary policies were going beyond their legislative remit by including requirements. It was considered that this was something that should be covered by</p>	<p>Yes. Although the intention remains the same and it has the same legislative weight as a material consideration in the</p>	<p>No. However, the changes will bring uncertainty to the appraisal of Objective 12, 15, 16, 17 and 18. The effects</p>

* Text in red is an addition and text in red and struck through has been deleted from the Masterplan. Masterplan Section	Proposed Modification	Explanation for Change	SEA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects?
	Supporting text: Minor changes to text to provide clarity.	the Local Plan.  The Masterplan has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012) and the Town and County Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 and the supplement policies act within their remit by supplementing the Local Plan.	determination of a planning application the applicant is now not required to provide the information set out in SQ2.2. They are only advised to provide it.	on the objectives have changed from minor positive (+) to minor positive uncertain (+/?).
Guidance: Connections & Public Spaces SQ2  SQ2.2 New Public Open Space	Guidance text: Development <del>should will be required to</del> :...  Supporting text:  Both smaller and larger <del>development</del> sites adjacent to <del>agreed the identified</del> Principal public open spaces <del>should are require to</del> contribute to their delivery of these communal spaces through the coordination of their provision through the development management process of <del>onsite public open space</del> . The location of the principal public open spaces is illustrated in the masterplan. These are indicative locations; some of these have been agreed as part of negotiations on specific planning permissions, others remain indicative. The Council acknowledges that the indicative locations of	That said, LBTH acknowledges this perceived concern and has replaced the phrases 'required', 'need' and 'must' with 'should'.  Changes to the supporting text have been made in response to representations made during the consultation and to provide clarity.	This raises uncertainty as to whether an applicant would submit the requested information.  The changes to the supporting text are not considered to have an implication on the SEA.	The changes would also have affected a number of the other objectives; however, they were already scored uncertain (?).

* Text in red is an addition and text in red and struck through has been deleted from the Masterplan. Masterplan Section	Proposed Modification	Explanation for Change	SEA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects?
	<p>these spaces may change, however the Council expects applications for development in the area to demonstrate how they have approached the delivery of the Council's open space requirements in a coordinated way; one that seeks to maximise opportunities to deliver the aspirations of this supplementary policy guidance.</p> <p>Minor changes to the supporting text have also been made to provide clarity.</p>			
<p>Guidance: Connections &amp; Public Spaces SQ2</p> <p>SQ2.3 Principal and DLR Public Open Space</p>	<p>Guidance text:</p> <p>Development adjacent to the Principal and DLR public open spaces <del>should</del> <del>will be required</del> <del>to</del>...</p> <p>Supporting text:</p> <p>Minor change to text to provide clarity.</p>			
<p>Guidance: Massing &amp; Urban Blocks SQ3</p>	<p>Guidance text:</p> <p>Development <del>should</del> <del>will be</del></p>	<p>Representations made during the consultation raised concerns that the</p>	<p>Yes. Although the intention remains the</p>	<p>No. Uncertainty (?) was already built into the relevant</p>

* Text in red is an addition and text in red and struck through has been deleted from the Masterplan. Masterplan Section	Proposed Modification	Explanation for Change	SEA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects?
SQ3.1 Massing	<del>required to</del> define and enclose the network of connections and spaces set out in SQ2 by:...	supplementary policies were going beyond their legislative remit by including requirements. It was considered that this was something that should be covered by the Local Plan.	same and it has the same legislative weight as a material consideration in the determination of a planning application	objectives.
Guidance: Massing & Urban Blocks SQ3 SQ3.2 Hybrid Urban Blocks	Guidance text: Hybrid urban blocks <del>will be required to</del> <b>should</b> consist of three core components in accordance with figures 3.1 to 3.2: a Podium; Plinth; and Taller elements.	The Masterplan has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012) and the Town and County Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 and the supplement policies act within their remit by supplementing the Local Plan.  That said, LBTH acknowledges this perceived concern and has replaced the phrases 'required', 'need' and 'must' with 'should'.	the applicant is now not required to provide the information set out in SQ3.2. They are only advised to provide it. This raises uncertainty as to whether an applicant would submit the requested information.	
Guidance: Massing & Urban Blocks SQ3 SQ3.3 Podiums and Plinths Massing	Guidance text: SQ3.3 Podiums and Plinths <b>Massing</b>  Podium and plinth massing <del>should will be required to</del> :...	'Massing' added to title for clarity.  Representations made during the consultation raised concerns that the supplementary policies were going beyond their legislative remit by including requirements. It was considered that this was something that should be covered by the Local Plan.  The Masterplan has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework	'Massing' added to the title does not have an implication for the SEA.  Yes. Although the intention remains the same and it has the same legislative weight as a material consideration in the determination of a	No. Uncertainty (?) was already built into the relevant objectives.

* Text in red is an addition and text in red and struck through has been deleted from the Masterplan. Masterplan Section	Proposed Modification	Explanation for Change	SEA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects?
		<p>(NPPF) (2012) and the Town and County Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 and the supplement policies act within their remit by supplementing the Local Plan.</p> <p>That said, LBTH acknowledges this perceived concern and has replaced the phrases 'required', 'need' and 'must' with 'should'.</p>	<p>planning application the applicant is now not required to provide the information set out in SQ3.3. They are only advised to provide it. This raises uncertainty as to whether an applicant would submit the requested information.</p>	
<p>Guidance: Massing &amp; Urban Blocks SQ3 SQ3.4 Podium and Plinth Design</p>	<p>Guidance text: This <del>should</del> <del>will be required</del> <del>to</del>:...</p>	<p>Representations made during the consultation raised concerns that the supplementary policies were going beyond their legislative remit by including requirements. It was considered that this was something that should be covered by the Local Plan.</p> <p>The Masterplan has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012) and the Town and County Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 and the supplement policies act within their remit by supplementing the Local Plan.</p> <p>That said, LBTH acknowledges this</p>	<p>Yes. Although the intention remains the same and it has the same legislative weight as a material consideration in the determination of a planning application the applicant is now not required to provide the information set out in SQ3.4. They are only advised to provide it. This raises uncertainty as to whether an applicant</p>	<p>No. Uncertainty (?) was already built into the relevant objectives.</p>

* Text in red is an addition and text in red and struck through has been deleted from the Masterplan. Masterplan Section	Proposed Modification	Explanation for Change	SEA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects?
		perceived concern and has replaced the phrases 'required', 'need' and 'must' with 'should'.	would submit the requested information.	
<p>Guidance: Massing &amp; Urban Blocks SQ3</p> <p>SQ3.5 Taller Elements Massing and Design</p>	<p>Guidance text:</p> <p>SQ3.2 Taller Elements <b>Massing and Design</b></p> <p>Taller element massing and design <del>should will be required to:</del>...</p> <p>Supporting text:</p> <p><del>A hybrid urban block refers to the typology of urban block that is comprised of three elements which accommodate a mix of uses that clearly defines street edges on all sides.</del></p> <p><del>While a mixed use urban block is not uncommon in new London development, what makes the hybrid urban block specific to South Quay is the way it accommodates and allows for a mix of block typologies of varying proportions within South Quay whilst maintaining</del></p>	<p>'Massing and Design' added to title for clarity.</p> <p>Representations made during the consultation raised concerns that the supplementary policies were going beyond their legislative remit by including requirements. It was considered that this was something that should be covered by the Local Plan.</p> <p>The Masterplan has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012) and the Town and County Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 and the supplement policies act within their remit by supplementing the Local Plan.</p> <p>That said, LBTH acknowledges this perceived concern and has replaced the phrases 'required', 'need' and 'must' with 'should'.</p> <p>Changes to the supporting text have been made to improve the readability of the text.</p>	<p>'Massing and Design' added to the title does not have an implication for the SEA.</p> <p>Yes. Although the intention remains the same and it has the same legislative weight as a material consideration in the determination of a planning application the applicant is now not required to provide the information set out in SQ3.5. They are only advised to provide it. This raises uncertainty as to whether an applicant would submit the requested information.</p> <p>The changes to the</p>	<p>No. Uncertainty (?) was already built into the relevant objectives.</p>

* Text in red is an addition and text in red and struck through has been deleted from the Masterplan. Masterplan Section	Proposed Modification	Explanation for Change	SEA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects?
	<p><del>continuous active street frontage and maximising the use of open spaces. Potential variations are depicted in figure 3.10.</del></p> <p>Currently, South Quay suffers from a poorly defined movement network that lacks legality and permeability. <del>At street level, the use of hybrid urban block creates a clear street pattern that helps to define and improve movement routes and spaces.</del></p> <p>The masterplan encourages the use of hybrid blocks in the South Quay area, in appropriate locations as illustrated Figure 3.2-3.5.</p> <p>A hybrid block, for the purposes of this masterplan, consists of <del>the these three</del> following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• podium;</li> <li>• plinth; and</li> <li>• taller element(s).</li> </ul> <p>This block structure helps to</p>		<p>supporting text are not considered to have an implication on the SEA.</p>	

* Text in red is an addition and text in red and struck through has been deleted from the Masterplan. Masterplan Section	Proposed Modification	Explanation for Change	SEA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects?
	<p>define streetscape and define street frontages. It allows for a mix of typologies and uses to be accommodated in a compact area, with clearly defined and active street edges and frontages on all sides. At street level, the use of hybrid urban blocks helps to create a clear street pattern that defines and improves movement routes and spaces.</p>			
<p>Guidance: Massing &amp; Urban Blocks SQ3 SQ3.6 Housing Typologies</p>	<p>Guidance text: In addition to Local Plan Policies, development should deliver a range of housing typologies and their design should aim to including: a) directing wheelchair accessible housing to: i. the ground floor where non-residential uses are not suitable; or ii. lower floors served by at least two lifts with easy access to street level and</p>	<p>Text has been added and amended to this policy in response to representations for clarity and so that the policy reads correctly.  Criteria C and D have been moved from the supporting text to the guidance text itself as this was an error within the Draft Masterplan.</p>	<p>Yes. Although the intention remains the same and it has the same legislative weight as a material consideration in the determination of a planning application the applicant is now not required to provide the information set out in SQ3.6. They are only advised to provide it. This raises uncertainty as to whether an applicant</p>	<p>No. Uncertainty (?) was already built into the relevant objectives.</p>

* Text in red is an addition and text in red and struck through has been deleted from the Masterplan. Masterplan Section	Proposed Modification	Explanation for Change	SEA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects?
	<p>communal amenity space.</p> <p>b) directing family housing to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. on the ground floor where non-residential uses are not suitable, in the plinth element and in the lower levels of the taller element;</li> <li>ii. have easy access to child play space, communal amenity space and service cores; and</li> <li>iii. enable passive surveillance over child play space and communal amenity space with elements of play.</li> </ul> <p>c) accommodate in the hybrid urban blocks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. a range of residential types including town houses, flats, maisonettes and duplexes;</li> <li>ii. maximise the proportion of dual-aspect units;</li> <li>iii. limit units on each floor to 8 per floor; and</li> <li>iv. maximise floor to ceiling heights, particularly at lower</li> </ul>		<p>would submit the requested information.</p> <p>The inclusion of two additional criterions (C and D) within the guidance will not have an effect on the SEA as they were originally within the supporting text which was appraised as part of the Draft SEA Report.</p>	

* Text in red is an addition and text in red and struck through has been deleted from the Masterplan. Masterplan Section	Proposed Modification	Explanation for Change	SEA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects?
	<p>levels.</p> <p>d) maximise daylight and prevent overheating of single aspect units by considering the depths of the unit.</p> <p>Supporting text:</p> <p><del>Specifically, the hybrid urban block should accommodate a range of residential types including town houses, flats, maisonettes, and duplexes. Common to these typologies, housing design should:</del></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>• maximise the proportion of dual aspect units;</del></li> <li><del>• limit units on each floor to 8 per floor; and</del></li> <li><del>• maximise floor to ceiling heights, particularly at lower levels.</del></li> </ul> <p><del>Where single aspect units are proposed, development should maximise all other elements of residential quality and in particular consider the depths of units to maximise daylight and prevent</del></p>			

* Text in red is an addition and text in red and struck through has been deleted from the Masterplan. Masterplan Section	Proposed Modification	Explanation for Change	SEA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects?
	<del>overheating.</del>			
Guidance: Massing & Urban Blocks SQ3 SQ3.8 Communal Amenity Space	Guidance text: <b>This</b> should:...	Text added to improve how the guidance reads.	Amendment has no implication on SEA.	No.
Guidance: Massing & Urban Blocks SQ3 SQ3.9 Child Play Space & SQ3.10 Private Amenity Space	Guidance numbering: SQ3. <b>109</b> Child Play Space SQ3. <del>910</del> Private Amenity Space	Numbering rearranged to improve how the guidance read.	Amendment has no implication on SEA.	No.
Guidance: Massing & Urban Blocks SQ3 SQ3.11 Car Parking & Servicing	Guidance text: Where parking is proposed, it <del>should will be required to</del> deliver:...	Representations made during the consultation raised concerns that the supplementary policy guidance were going beyond their legislative remit by including requirements. It was considered that this was something that should be covered by the Local Plan.  The Masterplan has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012) and the Town and County Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 and the supplement policies act within their remit by	Yes. Although the intention remains the same and it has the same legislative weight as a material consideration in the determination of a planning application the applicant is now not required to provide the information set out in SQ3.11. They are only advised to provide it. This raises	No. Uncertainty (?) was already built into the relevant objectives.

* Text in red is an addition and text in red and struck through has been deleted from the Masterplan. Masterplan Section	Proposed Modification	Explanation for Change	SEA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects?
		<p>supplementing the Local Plan.</p> <p>That said, LBTH acknowledges this perceived concern and has replaced the phrases 'required', 'need' and 'must' with 'should'.</p>	<p>uncertainty as to whether an applicant would submit the requested information.</p>	
<p>Guidance: Massing &amp; Urban Blocks SQ3</p> <p>SQ3.12 Developments with Car Parking and Servicing Shared Access</p>	<p>Guidance text:</p> <p>SQ3.12 <b>Development with Car Parking and Servicing Shared Access</b></p> <p>Development with car parking and servicing below the podium element should explore shared access with adjacent sites.</p>	<p>Text added to improve how the guidance reads.</p>	<p>Amendment has no implication on SEA.</p>	<p>No.</p>
<p>Guidance: Massing &amp; Urban Blocks SQ3</p> <p>SQ3.13 Mechanical Parking Systems</p>	<p>Guidance text:</p> <p><b>This</b> should reflect:...</p>	<p>Text added to improve how the guidance reads.</p>	<p>Amendment has no implication on SEA.</p>	<p>No.</p>
<p>Guidance: Massing &amp; Urban Blocks SQ3</p> <p>SQ3.14 Car Parking for Disabled People</p>	<p>Guidance text:</p> <p><b>This</b> should be provided within or below the podium element with clear access and in close proximity to access cores.</p>	<p>Text added to improve how the guidance reads.</p>	<p>Amendment has no implication on SEA.</p>	<p>No.</p>

* Text in red is an addition and text in red and struck through has been deleted from the Masterplan. Masterplan Section	Proposed Modification	Explanation for Change	SEA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects?
<p>Guidance: Massing &amp; Urban Blocks SQ3</p> <p>SQ3.15 Integrating Social Infrastructure &amp; Primary Schools</p>	<p>Guidance text:</p> <p>SQ3.15<del>16</del> <b>Integrating</b> Social Infrastructure &amp; Primary Schools</p> <p>Social infrastructure and primary schools should:</p> <p>a) be integrated with the podium and plinth elements (as shown in figures 3.8 and 3.9); and</p> <p>b) provide play space for primary schools at:</p> <p>i. ground level for younger children; and</p> <p>ii. <b>on podiums</b> for play decks <b>and MUGAs</b> <del>and podiums</del>.</p>	<p>Text added and amended to improve how the guidance reads.</p> <p>Guidance renumbered as it was incorrectly numbered in the Draft Masterplan.</p>	<p>Amendment has no implication on SEA.</p>	<p>No.</p>
<p>Guidance: The Skyline SQ4</p> <p>SQ4.1 Maritime Greenwich Grand Axis</p>	<p>Guidance text:</p> <p>Development located on the Grand Axis <del>should will be required to</del>:...</p>	<p>Representations made during the consultation raised concerns that the supplementary policies were going beyond their legislative remit by including requirements. It was considered that this was something that should be covered by the Local Plan.</p>	<p>Yes. Although the intention remains the same and it has the same legislative weight as a material consideration in the determination of a planning application the applicant is now</p>	<p>No.</p> <p>However, the changes will have an uncertain effect on Objectives 8 and 14. The effects on these objectives have changed from minor positive (+) to minor positive uncertain (+/?).</p>
<p>Guidance: The Skyline SQ4</p> <p>SQ4.2 Layering and</p>	<p>Guidance text:</p> <p>Development <del>should will be required to</del>:...</p>	<p>The Masterplan has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the</p>		

* Text in red is an addition and text in red and struck through has been deleted from the Masterplan. Masterplan Section	Proposed Modification	Explanation for Change	SEA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects?
Clustering	<p>Guidance text:</p> <p>Development <del>should</del> <b>will need</b> <del>to</del> provide verified daytime and evening/nighttime views of the proposal from the: General Wolfe Statue; Grand Square of the Royal Naval College; and junction of Blackheath Avenue and Great Cross Avenue.</p>	<p>National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012) and the Town and County Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 and the supplement policies act within their remit by supplementing the Local Plan.</p> <p>That said, LBTH acknowledges this perceived concern and has replaced the phrases 'required', 'need' and 'must' with 'should'.</p>	<p>not required to provide the information set out in the guidance. They are only advised to provide it. This raises uncertainty as to whether an applicant would submit the requested information.</p>	<p>The changes would also have affected a number of the other objectives; however, they were already scored uncertain (?).</p>
<p>Guidance: The Skyline SQ4</p> <p>Supporting Text</p>	<p>Supporting text:</p> <p>The following text has been removed from sub-section 'Maritime Greenwich Grand Axis:</p> <p><del>The masterplan requires is a uniform palette of material for the sites along the Grand Axis. Over time this has a way of standing out amongst the cluster of buildings unified by their colour and materiality visible in the distant view.</del></p>	<p>Text removed to avoid introducing a new policy within the Masterplan.</p>	<p>No. Although the change removes the requirement for a uniform material palette along the Grand Axis it is considered that the existing proposed supplementary policies provide sufficient guidance to ensure a well-designed, legible environment is developed.</p>	<p>No.</p>

* Text in red is an addition and text in red and struck through has been deleted from the Masterplan. Masterplan Section	Proposed Modification	Explanation for Change	SEA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects?
<p>Guidance: Infrastructure SQ5</p> <p>SQ5 Waste Management Infrastructure</p>	<p>Guidance text: SQ5 <b>Waste Management Infrastructure</b></p> <p><del>1. Development should identify the most up-to-date infrastructure priorities to contribute to the delivery of infrastructure in accordance with the:</del></p> <p><del>a. most up-to-date infrastructure planning for South Quay; and</del></p> <p><del>b. Council's Community Infrastructure Levy Guidance:</del></p> <p><del>Primary Schools</del></p> <p><del>2. Development should to:</del></p> <p><del>a. demonstrate delivery of an onsite primary school; and</del></p> <p><del>b. provide a primary school if:</del></p> <p><del>i. demonstrated to be deliverable; and</del></p> <p><del>ii. identified to be required</del></p>	<p>SQ5 now solely deals with waste management infrastructure. General infrastructure requirements are covered within the existing Local Plan. School infrastructure is dealt with in SQ3.</p>	<p>Yes. The proposed changes results in the loss of guidance for general infrastructure. Subsequently, SQ5 now only provides guidance on waste management infrastructure.</p> <p>However, general infrastructure guidance is included within the Local Plan. It is however uncertain whether the infrastructure will be provided.</p>	<p>No.</p> <p>The changes will result in a minor change on Objectives 1, 2, 3, 8 and 18.</p> <p>The effect of the changes will be as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Obj. 1: minor positive (+) to minor positive uncertain (+/?)</li> <li>• Obj. 2: minor positive (+) to minor positive uncertain (+/?)</li> <li>• Obj. 3: minor positive (+) to minor positive uncertain (+/?)</li> <li>• Obj. 8: significant positive (++) to significant positive uncertain (++)</li> <li>• Obj. 18: minor positive (+) to minor positive uncertain (+/?)</li> </ul> <p>Other objectives may have changed, however, uncertainty was already built into the original appraisal.</p>

* Text in red is an addition and text in red and struck through has been deleted from the Masterplan. Masterplan Section	Proposed Modification	Explanation for Change	SEA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects?
	<p><del>by the Council.</del></p> <p><del>Waste Management</del></p> <p><del>3.</del> Development should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. explore the provision of innovative and appropriate waste and recycling storage and collection systems; and</li> <li>b. connect to or demonstrate a potential connection to a masterplan wide waste storage and collection system.</li> </ul> <p>Supporting text:</p> <p><del>This section provides further detail, guidance, explanations and narrative for SQ5.</del></p> <p><del>To ensure that housing delivery is optimised in South Quay, the appropriate types and amounts of social and physical infrastructure need to be delivered. To deliver this, the Council will monitor the density of development across South Quay to inform development management discussions regarding S106</del></p>			

* Text in red is an addition and text in red and struck through has been deleted from the Masterplan. Masterplan Section	Proposed Modification	Explanation for Change	SEA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects?
	<p><del>contributions and Community Infrastructure Levy receipt expenditure.</del></p> <p><del>Table 1 (influenced by the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan) identifies the strategic infrastructure required and illustrates how the amount of infrastructure will be calculated based on masterplan wide densities.</del></p> <p><del>Development proposals will be expected to liaise with development management officers to confirm the infrastructure requirements at that point in time.</del></p> <p><del>Walking and Cycling</del></p> <p><del>With regard to sustainable transport infrastructure, the delivery of an additional footbridge across South Dock from South Quay to Canary Wharf Major Centre is critical to enable existing and new residents, workers and visitors to access public</del></p>			

* Text in red is an addition and text in red and struck through has been deleted from the Masterplan. Masterplan Section	Proposed Modification	Explanation for Change	SEA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects?
	<p><del>transport services.</del></p> <p><del>The delivery of the footbridge will require partnership working with landowners including the Canals &amp; River Trust and Canary Wharf Group.</del></p> <p><del>To support new and improved walking and cycling routes, public realm improvements are key to the delivery of a coherent movement network and public open spaces.</del></p> <p><del>Public Open Spaces</del></p> <p><del>The emerging unique high density character of South Quay will result in the Council's monitoring target of 12m<sup>2</sup> per person to be difficult to achieve. As such the Council will be seeking to coordinate the delivery of onsite public open space to provide usable size and design of spaces between adjacent sites and to contribute to the delivery of</del></p>			

* Text in red is an addition and text in red and struck through has been deleted from the Masterplan. Masterplan Section	Proposed Modification	Explanation for Change	SEA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects?
	<p><del>the six principal public open spaces.</del></p> <p><del>Public Transport</del></p> <p><del>The Council is working with TfL to understand how the increase in housing will impact on the public transport network. Through the development management process, the Council will work with TfL to ensure site specific impacts are addressed (this may include new and increased bus services and increased services on the DLR). Critical to improving public transport accessibility is improving accessibility to the Canary Wharf transport interchange.</del></p> <p><del>The Council and GLA are committed to exploring the development of an Opportunity Area Planning Framework for the Isle of Dogs which will provide the appropriate mechanism for delivering further</del></p>			

* Text in red is an addition and text in red and struck through has been deleted from the Masterplan. Masterplan Section	Proposed Modification	Explanation for Change	SEA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects?
	<p><del>improvements to the public transport network beyond South Quay.</del></p> <p><del>IDEA Stores and Libraries</del></p> <p><del>The Council's Local Plan seeks to direct IDEA Stores to accessible location, such as town centres, and identifies that a new IDEA Store should be delivered in Wood Wharf within the Canary Wharf Major Centre.</del></p> <p><del>Community Centres and Young People Facilities</del></p> <p><del>To help support sustainable and integrated communities, the coordinated delivery of community centres provides opportunities for social interaction and other community activities.</del></p> <p><del>Leisure Centres</del></p> <p><del>The Council's Local Plan seeks</del></p>			

* Text in red is an addition and text in red and struck through has been deleted from the Masterplan. Masterplan Section	Proposed Modification	Explanation for Change	SEA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects?
	<p><del>to improve the quality, usability and accessibility of existing leisure centres. The nearest leisure centre being the Tiller Leisure Centre to the south of South Quay.</del></p> <p><del>Primary School</del></p> <p><del>Primary Schools are critical to the delivery of a mixed sustainable community. The masterplan is unable to allocate sites for a primary school. As such the Council is asking each development site to explore the potential for delivering a primary school to meet emerging needs as part of the development management process.</del></p> <p><del>Waste</del></p> <p>The potential levels of waste generated by development in South Quay will exceed the capacity of the Council's current waste management system and will likely have a</p>			

* Text in red is an addition and text in red and struck through has been deleted from the Masterplan. Masterplan Section	Proposed Modification	Explanation for Change	SEA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects?
	<p>negative impact on the capacity of the road network. As such innovative solutions are being explored within and beyond South Quay which could include a pneumatic waste collection system.</p> <p>Development should demonstrate how it is exploring the use of innovative solutions to maximise the prevention of waste generation while reusing and recycling the remainder.</p>			
Delivery, Management and Monitoring	<p>The Delivery section of the Draft Masterplan has been revised and is now titled 'Delivery, Management and Monitoring'.</p> <p>Additional text has been added regarding the delivery and monitoring of the plan. Text from the Development Management section of the Draft Masterplan has been moved to this section and revised accordingly.</p>	<p>This change is to respond to the representations regarding confusion about the 'Development Management' and 'Delivery' sections of the Draft Masterplan published between 5<sup>th</sup> January and 16<sup>th</sup> February 2015.</p>	<p>Yes. The redrafting of this section has implications for the SEA.</p>	<p>Yes, in respect of objectives 10 and 11 (see below):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Obj. 10: significant mixed (-/+/? ) to minor positive (+)</li> <li>Obj. 11: significant mixed (+/-/? ) to minor positive (+)</li> </ul> <p>The changes will result in minor changes to Objectives 5, 6, 7, 12, 13, 14 and 15.</p> <p>The effect of the changes will</p>

* Text in red is an addition and text in red and struck through has been deleted from the Masterplan. Masterplan Section	Proposed Modification	Explanation for Change	SEA Implication	Potential changes to significant effects?
	<p>The previous list of indicative infrastructure projects included within this section of the Draft Masterplan has been moved to Appendix 1 which is referred to in the revised section. It is assumed that the proposed schemes will still be delivered in the short, medium and longer term.</p> <p>The overarching SEA Recommendations from the Draft SEA Report have also been included within this section and will be used by LBTH development management officers during negotiations on development applications.</p>			<p>be as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Obj. 5: negligible (0) to minor positive (+)</li> <li>• Obj. 6: negligible (0) to minor positive (+)</li> <li>• Obj. 7: negligible (0) to minor positive (+)</li> <li>• Obj. 12: uncertain (?) to minor positive (+)</li> <li>• Obj. 13: uncertain (?) to minor positive (+)</li> <li>• Obj. 14: uncertain (?) to minor positive (+)</li> <li>• Obj. 15: uncertain (?) to minor positive (+)</li> </ul>

5.5 A summary of the SEA of changes to the Draft South Quay Masterplan SPD (post-mitigation) is provided in **Table 5.2** below.

**Table 5.2: Summary of SEA Changes to the Draft South Quay Masterplan SPD (post-mitigation)**

Effects in bold and with dark green borders illustrate effects which have changed since the Draft SEA Report.

SEA Objectives	Likely Effects							
	The Vision	Principles	Guidance: Housing Density	Guidance: Connections and Public Spaces	Guidance: Massing & Urban Blocks	Guidance: The Skyline	Guidance: Infrastructure	Delivery
1. To create and sustain a liveable, well-designed environment that promotes long-term social cohesion, sustainable healthy lifestyles and a sense of place	++/--/?	+/?	++/--/?	++/--/?	++/--/?	+/?	<b>+/?</b>	+
2. To protect, conserve and enhance the biodiversity within the Masterplan Area and wider borough and where appropriate create habitats, green and open spaces and watercourses	+/--/?	+/?	+/--/?	+/?	-/+/?	0	<b>+/?</b>	+
3. To minimise flood risk to people and property within the Masterplan Area, the wider borough and elsewhere, and promote the use of sustainable urban drainage systems	+/--/?	0	+/--/?	+/?	-/+/?	0	<b>+/?</b>	+
4. To enhance and protect the significance of heritage assets and archaeological heritage	+/--/?	0	+/--/?	0	+/--/?	+	0	+
5. To enhance local townscape/ landscape character and improve the quality of the built environment and public open spaces	+/?	+/?	+/?	+/?	+/?	0	0	<b>+</b>
6. To achieve a planned and aesthetically balanced skyline, as seen in protected views	0	+	0	0	+/?	+/?	0	<b>+</b>
7. To protect views and the visual amenity of people living and working in and visiting the area and surroundings	+	+	+/?	+/?	+/?	+/?	0	<b>+</b>
8. To increase the proportion of journeys made by walking and cycling followed by bus or train (relative to those taken by the car)	+/--/?	+/?	+/--/?	<b>++/?</b>	+/--/?	<b>+/?</b>	<b>++/?</b>	<b>++</b>
9. To maximise the accessibility to key services and amenities	+/?	+	+/--/?	+	+	0	+/?	+
10. To improve the quality of water within the Masterplan Area and to achieve the wise management and sustainable use of water resources	+/--/?	0	+/--/?	0	0	0	+/--/?	<b>+</b>
11. To minimise the production of waste across all sectors and increase reuse, recycling, remanufacturing and recovery rates	+/--/?	<b>+</b>	+/--/?	0	0	0	+/--/?	<b>+</b>
12. To protect existing, make provision for new, and maximise accessibility to education facilities to meet the needs of all sectors of the population	<b>++/?</b>	<b>0</b>	+/--/?	<b>+/?</b>	<b>++/?</b>	0	<b>++/?</b>	<b>+</b>
13. To maximise the health and well-being of the population and reduce inequalities in health	+/?	<b>0</b>	+/--/?	+/?	<b>++/?</b>	0	<b>++/?</b>	<b>+</b>
14. To ensure that all residents have access to good quality, well-located, affordable housing that promotes liveability	<b>++/?</b>	+/?	++/--/?	+/?	<b>++/?</b>	<b>+/?</b>	+/?	<b>+</b>
15. To provide all residents with the opportunity of employment, particularly in deprived areas	+/--/?	0	+/--/?	<b>+/?</b>	+/?	0	0	<b>+</b>
16. To reduce pollution to land through direct action or mitigation; to seek to improve the quality of the land as far as possible	+	0	<b>+/?</b>	<b>+/?</b>	0	0	0	<b>?</b>
17. To reduce pollution to air and reduce disruption from noise and vibration through direct action or mitigation measures; to seek to improve the quality of the air as far as possible	+/--/?	0	+/--/?	<b>+/?</b>	+/?	0	0	+
18. To ensure the Masterplan adapts to the effects of climate change (both now and in the future) and contributes to climate change mitigation, achieves greater energy efficiency and reduces its reliance on fossil fuels	+/--/?	0	+/--/?	<b>+/?</b>	+/--/?	0	<b>+/?</b>	+



## 6 Summary of Effects of Changes

- 6.1 LBTH has put forward a series of modifications to the Masterplan SPD which consolidates issues raised during the consultation on the Draft Masterplan and Draft SEA Report. One of the key concerns raised during the consultation was that the supplementary policies within the Draft Masterplan were going beyond their legislative remit by including requirements. LBTH responded by removing a 'requirement' to respond within policy guidance wording and replaced this with the use of wording such as 'should' respond to.
- 6.2 Other substantive changes included revisions to the infrastructure section of the Masterplan. This section of the Masterplan now solely provides guidance on waste management infrastructure. General infrastructure requirements (such as healthcare and schools) are considered to be adequately covered within the existing Local Plan and will be considered in the forthcoming Isle of Dogs and South Poplar Opportunity Area Planning Framework. This is to ensure the Masterplan genuinely supplements the Local Plan and does not repeat it.
- 6.3 Finally, the Delivery section of the Draft Masterplan was expanded to include information on Delivery, Management and Monitoring and now includes a standalone section on the overarching SEA Recommendations (to provide a starting point for development management discussions with applicants).
- 6.4 The other changes to the Masterplan are largely to correct factual inaccuracies, involve minor text/number changes, involve restructuring of text within the Masterplan for clarity, and removal of superfluous supporting text.
- 6.5 The changes and the implications of the changes are discussed in full in Chapter 5 of this Report.
- 6.6 As a result of the change to the supplementary policy guidance wording (which required developers to respond to policy guidance criteria) it is now uncertain whether developers will provide the information set out within the guidance as they are now only advised to provide it. This has resulted in uncertainty in the appraisal of certain SEA objectives. No new significant effects have been identified (nor have any significant effects been removed) as a result of this change.
- 6.7 The change to the infrastructure section has not resulted in the identification of any new significant effects (nor have any significant effects been removed) as a result of this change. However, there is now uncertainty in the scores presented in respect of certain SEA objectives as it unclear whether non-waste management infrastructure requirements will be adequately delivered within the Masterplan area.
- 6.8 In respect of the change to the Delivery section, the inclusion of the overarching SEA recommendations has resulted in a number of new positive effects being identified. In addition, two previous significant mixed effects (--/+/?) identified for objectives 10 and 11 are now considered to be minor positive (+).
- 6.9 The other changes to the Masterplan have resulted in minor changes to effects (but no changes to significant effects).
- 6.10 **Table 6.1** below provides a summary of the changes to the post-mitigation effects recorded in the Draft SEA Report. Changes to significant effects are highlighted in bold.

**Table 6.1: Summary of the changes to the post-mitigation effects recorded in the Draft SEA Report**

Masterplan Section	Change to Post-mitigation effect
<b>The Vision</b>	
The Vision has not changed since the Draft Masterplan.	N/A
<b>Placemaking Principles</b>	
Objective 11. <i>To minimise the production of waste across all sectors and increase reuse, recycling and remanufacturing and recovery rates.</i>	Negligible (0) to minor positive (+)
Objective 12. <i>To protect existing, make provision for new, and maximise accessibility to education facilities to meet the needs of all sectors of the population.</i>	Minor positive (+) to negligible (0)
Objective 13. <i>To maximise the health and well-being of the population and reduce inequalities in health.</i>	Minor positive (+) to negligible (0)
<b>Guidance: Housing Density</b>	
Objective 16. <i>To reduce pollution to land through direct action or mitigation; to seek to improve the quality of the land as far as possible.</i>	Minor positive (+) to minor positive uncertain (+/?)
<b>Guidance: Connections &amp; Public Spaces</b>	
Objective 12. <i>To protect existing, make provision for new, and maximise accessibility to education facilities to meet the needs of all sectors of the population</i>	Minor positive (+) to minor positive uncertain (+/?)
Objective 15. <i>To provide all residents with the opportunity of employment, particularly in deprived areas.</i>	Minor positive (+) to minor positive uncertain (+/?)
Objective 16. <i>To reduce pollution to land through direct action or mitigation; to seek to improve the quality of the land as far as possible.</i>	Minor positive (+) to minor positive uncertain (+/?)
Objective 17. <i>To reduce pollution to air and reduce disruption from noise and vibration through direct action or mitigation measures; to seek to improve the quality of the air as far as possible.</i>	Minor positive (+) to minor positive uncertain (+/?)
Objective 18. <i>To ensure the Masterplan adapts to the effects of climate change (both now and in the future) and contributes to climate change mitigation, achieves greater energy efficiency and reduces its reliance on fossil fuels.</i>	Minor positive (+) to minor positive uncertain (+/?)
<b>Guidance: Massing &amp; Urban Block</b>	
No changes were recorded against this section of the Masterplan as uncertainty (?) was already built into the relevant objectives.	
<b>Guidance: The Skyline</b>	

Masterplan Section	Change to Post-mitigation effect
Objective 8. <i>To increase the proportion of journeys made by walking and cycling followed by bus or train (relative to those taken by the car).</i>	Minor positive (+) to minor positive uncertain (+/?)
Objective 14. <i>To ensure that all residents have access to good quality, well-located affordable housing that promotes liveability.</i>	Minor positive (+) to minor positive uncertain (+/?)
<b>Guidance: Infrastructure</b>	
Objective 1. <i>To create and sustain a liveable, well-designed environment that promotes long-term social cohesion, sustainable healthy lifestyles and a sense of place.</i>	Minor positive (+) to minor positive uncertain (+/?)
Objective 2. <i>To protect, conserve and enhance the biodiversity within the Masterplan Area and wider borough and where appropriate create habitats, green and open spaces and watercourses.</i>	Minor positive (+) to minor positive uncertain (+/?)
Objective 3. <i>To minimise flood risk to people and property within the Masterplan Area, the wider borough and elsewhere, and promote the use of sustainable urban drainage systems.</i>	Minor positive (+) to minor positive uncertain (+/?)
Objective 8. <i>To increase the proportion of journeys made by walking and cycling followed by bus or train (relative to those taken by the car)</i>	Significant positive (++) to significant positive uncertain (++/?)
Objective 18. <i>To ensure the Masterplan adapts to the effects of climate change (both now and in the future) and contributes to climate change mitigation, achieves greater energy efficiency and reduces its reliance on fossil fuels.</i>	Minor positive (+) to minor positive uncertain (+/?)
<b>Delivery, Management and Monitoring</b>	
Objective 5. <i>To enhance local townscape/ landscape character and improve the quality of the built environment and public open spaces.</i>	Negligible (0) to minor positive (+)
Objective 6. <i>To achieve a planned and aesthetically balanced skyline, as seen in protected views.</i>	Negligible (0) to minor positive (+)
Objective 7. <i>To protect views and the visual amenity of people living and working in and visiting the area and surroundings.</i>	Negligible (0) to minor positive (+)
Objective 10. <i>To improve the quality of water within the Masterplan Area and to achieve the wise management and sustainable use of water resources.</i>	<b>Significant mixed (--/+/?) to minor positive (+)</b>
Objective 11. <i>To minimise the production of waste across all sectors and increase reuse, recycling, remanufacturing and recovery rates.</i>	<b>Significant mixed (--/+/?) to minor positive (+)</b>

Masterplan Section	Change to Post-mitigation effect
Objective 12. <i>To protect existing, make provision for new, and maximise accessibility to education facilities to meet the needs of all sectors of the population.</i>	Uncertain (?) to minor positive (+)
Objective 13. <i>To maximise the health and well-being of the population and reduce inequalities in health.</i>	Uncertain (?) to minor positive (+)
Objective 14. <i>To ensure that all residents have access to good quality, well-located, affordable housing that promotes liveability.</i>	Uncertain (?) to minor positive (+)
Objective 15. <i>To provide all residents with the opportunity of employment, particularly in deprived areas.</i>	Uncertain (?) to minor positive (+)

6.11 The most substantive changes were recorded within the Delivery, Management and Monitoring section where two significant mixed (--/+/? ) effects have changed to minor positive (+) in respect of Objectives 10 and 11.

## 7 Cumulative Effects

- 7.1 In considering the likely effects of the modifications to the Draft Masterplan, the SEA Addendum also considers any knock-on changes in respect of cumulative effects (i.e. the effect of the Plan as a whole).
- 7.2 As already discussed, the changes to the Draft Masterplan resulted in two key changes to the significant effects previously identified (removal of significant mixed effects in respect of SEA objectives 10 and 11). These changes are considered have a consequent positive impact on the overall cumulative effects of the Masterplan. Therefore, the cumulative effects of the Masterplan on Objectives 10 and 11 have been revised from significant mixed (--/+/?) to significant mixed (-/+ +/?) –i.e. an additional significant positive effect against this objective has been identified. .
- 7.3 The other changes set out in Chapter 6 are not considered to have an effect on the overall cumulative effects assessment.
- 7.4 **Table 7.1** below provides a revised summary of the likely cumulative effects.

**Table 7.1: Summary of Cumulative Effects**

SEA Objectives	Cumulative Effects of the Masterplan
1. To create and sustain a liveable, well-designed environment that promotes long-term social cohesion, sustainable healthy lifestyles and a sense of place	++/-/?
2. To protect, conserve and enhance the biodiversity within the Masterplan Area and wider borough and where appropriate create habitats, green and open spaces and watercourses	+/-/?
3. To minimise flood risk to people and property within the Masterplan Area, the wider borough and elsewhere, and promote the use of sustainable urban drainage systems	+/-/?
4. To enhance and protect the significance of heritage assets and archaeological heritage	+/-/?
5. To enhance local townscape/ landscape character and improve the quality of the built environment and public open spaces	+++/?
6. To achieve a planned and aesthetically balanced skyline, as seen in protected views	+/?
7. To protect views and the visual amenity of people living and working in and visiting the area and surroundings	+++/?
8. To increase the proportion of journeys made by walking and cycling followed by bus or train (relative to those taken by car)	+++/--/?
9. To maximise the accessibility to key services and amenities	+++/?
10. To improve the quality of water within the Masterplan Area and to achieve the wise management and sustainable use of water resources	--/+ +/?

SEA Objectives	Cumulative Effects of the Masterplan
11. To minimise the production of waste across all sectors and increase reuse, recycling and remanufacturing and recovery rates	--/+//?
12. To protect existing, make provision for new, and maximise accessibility to education facilities to meet the needs of all sectors of the population	++?
13. To maximise the health and well-being of the population and reduce inequalities in health	++/?
14. To ensure that all residents have access to good quality, well-located, affordable housing that promotes liveability	++/?
15. To provide all residents with the opportunity of employment, particularly in deprived areas	+/-/?
16. To reduce pollution to land through direct action or mitigation; to seek to improve the quality of land as far as possible	+/?
17. To reduce pollution to the air and reduce disruption from noise and vibrations through direct action or mitigation measures; to seek to improve the quality of air as far as possible	+/-/?
18. To ensure the Masterplan adapts to the effects of climate change (both now and in the future) and contributes to climate change mitigation, achieves greater energy efficiency and reduces its reliance of fossil fuels	+/-/?

## 8 Conclusions

- 8.1 Generally, the proposed changes have resulted in no or limited changes to the SEA objectives scores. One of the key changes is that an element of uncertainty has now arisen in the appraisal of the Masterplan as a result of changes to the policy guidance wording, specifically, the replacement of 'required', 'need' and 'must' with 'should'. As such, a number of scores attributed to SEA objectives which were not considered to be uncertain within the Draft SEA Report are now considered to be uncertain (e.g. +/-?).
- 8.2 Substantive changes to the 'Delivery, Management and Monitoring' section of the Masterplan have resulted in a number of scores being revised to minor positive (+), including two previous significant mixed (-/+/? ) scores in relation to Objective 10. *To improve the quality of water within the Masterplan Area and to achieve the wise management and sustainable use of water resources* and Objective 11. *To minimise the production of waste across all sectors, and increase reuse, recycling and remanufacturing and recovery rates*. This was as a result of the inclusion of recommendations set out in the Draft SEA Report within the 'Delivery, Management and Monitoring' section of the Masterplan.

# Appendix 1 – Consultation Comments on the Draft SEA Report and the Response to these

LBTH received three responses with regard to the Draft SEA Report (November 2014) of the Draft Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document (November 2014). These were from:

- Historic England (formerly English Heritage);
- GVA (on behalf of Berkley Homes); and
- a local resident.

**The table below contains the consultation comments received from the public and the consultees during the consultation into the Draft SEA Report, as well as a response from LBTH**

Respondent	Comment	Response to comments
<p>Historic England (formerly English Heritage)</p>	<p>Historic England note the mitigation/ recommendation in respect of SEA Objective 4 – <i>to enhance and protect the significance of heritage assets and archaeological heritage</i>. They also note that the LBTH officer’s response to recommendations 3 and 4 in respect of ensuring design does not overwhelm conservation areas and developers should demonstrate the impact of developments on the setting of heritage assets.</p> <p>Historic England would like draw LBTH’s attention the aforementioned comments in respect of immediate impacts on the Coldharbour Conservation Area and Glen Terrace. Development up to ten storeys is indicated at this location and, as such, Historic England would value clarification as to whether development up to this scale can be accommodated without harm to the setting of the conservation area (this is also fundamental to SEA Objective 5.2 – <i>ensuring a positive relationship in the transition in scale from Canary Wharf to smaller scale residential areas</i>).</p>	<p>Development coming forward within the Coldharbour Conservation Area will be determined in accordance with the relevant heritage planning policies contained within the Development Plan.</p> <p>Where necessary, the setting of the Coldharbour Conservation Area will be a material consideration during the determination of a planning application.</p> <p>It is at this stage that it will be determined whether the scale of development can be accommodated without unacceptably harming the setting of the Conservation Area.</p>
<p>GVA on behalf of Berkeley Homes (this response was previously received October 2014 and re-appended to GVA overall response to</p>	<p>Berkeley has not been formally notified of this consultation. As a major developer and landowner... Berkeley should be given an early and effective opportunity to engage with the Council on the preparation of the Masterplan and associated documents including the Scoping Report.</p> <p>We formally request that Berkeley is notified of any future consultations and other updates about the Masterplan, the Scoping Report and the Environmental Report, including any drafts and revisions to such documents.</p> <p>It is clear that work on the draft Masterplan, including the ‘preferred option’ is well advanced. Preparation of the SPD has been progressed ahead of the associated SEA. It is questionable whether</p>	<p>Noted. The SEA Scoping Report has been consulted on for 5 weeks as per the statutory consultation period.</p> <p>Formal consultation on the Draft Masterplan and Draft SEA Report will be in January and February 2015.</p> <p>The SEA has tested a number of options over summer/autumn 2014</p>

Respondent	Comment	Response to comments
Masterplan consultation in 2015)	<p>the Draft Environmental Report will properly inform preparation of the Masterplan.</p> <p>The lawfulness of the Masterplan will be questionable if environmental considerations and stakeholder representations are not properly integrated in the plan-making process.</p>	<p>on an iterative basis which has informed consideration of the Masterplan SPD.</p>
	<p>The purposes of the Masterplan are unclear. The Council will need to explain how new proposals will be aligned with its emerging CIL charging schedule and 'scaled back' Section 106 requirements.</p> <p>There is a compelling case for work on the Masterplan to be held back until proper infrastructure planning and funding analysis has been carried out for the proposed Masterplan Area.</p>	<p>Noted. The Masterplan has been developed with LBTH infrastructure planning colleagues in relation to the merging CIL charging schedule and Section 106 requirements. Guidance will be provided in the Masterplan.</p>
	<p>The need for the Masterplan has not been justified. The Scoping Report fails to properly consider whether other plans, programmes and policies adequately regulated relevant planning matters. We submit that existing policies in the London Plan and the Council's Local Plan are sufficient. This should be taken into account when assessing the reasonable 'No Plan' alternative.</p>	<p>Noted. The SEA is assessing the value of a Masterplan over and above existing Development Plan policy (contained in the Local Plan, London Plan). Residual effects take account of existing Development Management Policies and their application.</p>
	<p>The Scoping Report indicates that the Masterplan will seek to introduce new policies. This would be unlawful.</p>	<p>If reference has been made to new policies in the SPD this is in error. The SPD will provide guidance only, supplementing the policies already set down the Local Plan and Local Plan.</p>
	<p>The Masterplan (as a SPD) must be consistent with the Local Plan. Its primary objective should be to facilitate delivery of the optimum level of growth envisaged in the London Plan and the Draft Further Alterations to the London Plan. The Masterplan cannot legitimately be used as a tool for limiting or preventing provision of new development to meet objectively assessed needs.</p>	<p>The Masterplan is not seeking to limit or prevent new development.</p> <p>One of the purposes of the SEA has been to test different densities of development which could conceivably come forward in order</p>

Respondent	Comment	Response to comments
		<p>to identify potential impacts (both positive and adverse). This has helped to inform the development of development management guidance within the SPD.</p>
	<p>The assessment of alternatives in the Scoping Report is fundamentally flawed. Reasonable alternatives have been discounted, including the 'No Plan' scenario, contrary to applicable law, policy and guidance.</p> <p>The alternative growth scenarios which have been selected are inappropriate, unrepresentative and not justified.</p> <p>The use of density as the defining characteristic of alternative growth scenarios is not compatible with the Masterplan's stated purposes, including those relating to infrastructure delivery and affordable housing provision.</p>	<p>The 'Do Nothing' scenario has not been formally discounted. The baseline section includes consideration of the 'likely evolution without the Masterplan' for all sustainability issues (i.e. the 'No Plan' scenario).</p> <p>The alternative growth scenarios are considered appropriate. They represent a range of development densities which could conceivably come forward (in some instances reflecting consented developments). The intention of testing different densities is to help understand the implications for infrastructure delivery etc. and as such has been a logical step in informing the Masterplan SPD</p>
	<p>Statements about the Masterplan's purposes are not sufficiently clear and unambiguous.</p>	<p>The GLA's London Plan is being updated to reflect the need to deliver more housing across the capital, including additional housing in Tower Hamlets.</p> <p>The need to deliver more housing is resulting in higher densities being proposed by housing developers in</p>

Respondent	Comment	Response to comments
		<p>greater numbers across the borough.</p> <p>Within the South Quay area, the amount, scale and densities of residential development being proposed by developers is greater than envisaged in the Council's Local Plan and Millennium Quarter Masterplan.</p> <p>As such, further planning guidance is required to manage this growth to ensure affordable housing and infrastructure is planned for and delivered to support existing and future residents whilst creating a liveable and vibrant place.</p>
	<p>The Councils should consider making significant revisions to the Masterplan's purposes. Such revisions may well require production of a revised Scoping Report.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
	<p>The Masterplan should not be promoted as a tool for limiting growth.</p>	<p>See earlier response.</p>
	<p>The scope and prioritisation of the purposes for the Masterplan need to be clarified. Specific reference needs to be made to the delivery of private housing required to support the provision of affordable housing and other infrastructure.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
	<p>Existing baseline – the Scoping Report discounts existing sites with planning permission, even where that planning permission has not been implemented. The Council should consider the likelihood of these permissions being implemented and the potential environmental effects if they are not.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
	<p>The Scoping Report refers to a preferred Masterplan Option. This suggests that the Council has identified a preferred option before assessing its environmental effects, which is a flawed approach.</p>	<p>The SEA has been undertaken over a number of months as an iterative process and has informed development of the Masterplan</p>

Respondent	Comment	Response to comments
		SPD.
	The Scoping Report discounts alternatives to the Masterplan which do not meet the purposes of the Masterplan, despite the fact that those purposes have not yet been properly consulted on or assessed.	The generation of alternative options was used to inform the development of the Masterplan.
	The Council has discounted alternatives outside the Masterplan Area without consideration of its definition of that area. Alternative options for the scope of the Masterplan Area should be assessed.	Noted. The Masterplan boundary was defined by the grouping of development sites.
	Paragraph 2.11 refers to different amounts of development within the Masterplan Area and different ways to deliver development based on development clusters. The Scoping Report fails to expand on how the different ways to deliver development will be assessed.	The SEA Scoping Report sets out the broad approach to appraising reasonable alternatives and type of reasonable alternatives under consideration. Further detailed methodology is provided in the Draft SEA Report.
	<p>Paragraph 2.11 states that the Masterplan will assess different amounts of development, this is not carried forward into the proposed methodology outlined in paragraph 2.12 of the Scoping Report which is structured around density rather than the amount of development.</p> <p>In accordance with the London Plan and GLA Housing SPD, density should only be used as one of a number of ways of assessing the impacts of each scenario.</p> <p>Alternative growth scenarios should be defined by different amounts of development.</p>	Density has been used a proxy for the amount of development.
	The density range identified in the Scoping Report appears too conservative in the light of recent planning permissions, such as City Pride (approximately 7,300 hr/ha).	<p>The SEA has tested a density option in the range of 7,000hr/a reflecting the City Pride scheme.</p> <p>It is not considered appropriate to appraise every possible density which could conceivably come forward and hence a range has been used.</p>

Respondent	Comment	Response to comments
		It would be possible to infer the potential impacts of even higher density development from the range which has been assessed.
	The SEA should test alternative growth scenarios based on the minimum housing requirements set out in both the adopted London Plan and the draft FALP.	<p>In recognising the need to respond to the higher housing figures in the FALP, high density housing scenarios have been tested through the SEA.</p> <p>Each of these options would respond positively to the housing figures set down.</p>
	<p>The Council should provide its calculations for the projected minimum targets for the Masterplan Area based on these overall figures. Given that these housing targets are minima and the London Plan states that Boroughs should seek to exceed these targets (policy 3.3) the SEA should include at least one growth scenario above the minimum target for the Masterplan Area based on the figures in the draft FALP.</p> <p>In addition, the SEA should include a scenario based on the identified need for new housing in London set out in the 2013 SHMAA that was published alongside the FALP.</p>	Noted. The SEA provides a number of growth scenarios that exceed the density guidance stated within the London Plan (2011) and FALP.
	The reasons for choosing each alternative are unclear and impossible to comment on.	<p>The reasons for choosing the alternatives are considered to be adequately set out in the Scoping Report.</p> <p>This has been expanded on further in the Draft SEA Report.</p>
	Paragraph 2.13 of the Scoping Report refers to 'maximum' densities from the London Plan. This is incorrect. Paragraph 1.3.13 of the GLA Housing SPG states that exceptionally, higher densities than those provided in the London Plan may be acceptable where these can be clearly and robustly justified by local circumstances.	Noted. This provides the rationale for testing high density options above 1,100 hr/ha.

Respondent	Comment	Response to comments
	Paragraphs 2.19/2.20 raise doubts regarding the potential to influence plan-making in a timely and effective manner. Can the Council confirm that in Winter 2014 it will still be possible to comment on the preferred growth scenario/ quantum?	Formal consultation on the draft Masterplan will commence in December 2014
	We recommend that the Draft Environmental Report published alongside the Draft Masterplan should ('reasonably') present an assessment of reasonable alternatives that vary both in terms of quantum and approach to delivery.	Noted. This has been undertaken. Density is taken to form a proxy to quantum.
	Paragraph 2.12 needs to be clarified regarding whether the potential effects of delayed or re-planned schemes will be taken into account as part of the baseline.	Noted. Should delayed or re-planned schemes be considered to have an impact on the baseline, inclusion of these sites will be explored.
	The Scoping Report says nothing about other developments which have been submitted for planning together with an EIA Scoping Request. The status of such developments and the related environmental information needs to be clarified.	Noted. As stated in the Environmental Report, there is considerable uncertainty in the appraisal process as a whole. The SEA has sought to assess broad principles i.e. different amounts of development and different forms of development delivery which could come forward. It is not appropriate to consider individual developments in detail at this strategic scale.
	There does not seem to be any explanation of how the symbols/ criteria in paragraph 2.2 and Table 2.2 have been derived or how they will be applied. For example, what would differentiate a minor positive effect to that of a significant positive effect?	A table of assumptions has been used to help inform the identification of significant effects (both positive and adverse). This is included as an Appendix to the Draft SEA Report.
	Paragraph 2.27 of the Scoping Report suggests that the cumulative effects of the Masterplan with	The SEA Regulations refer to the

Respondent	Comment	Response to comments
	wider development taking place will be assessed. A SEA should assess the cumulative effects with other plans, policies and programmes.	need to consider 'cumulative effects'. The form this assessment should take is not specifically prescribed.
	Paragraph 2.29 – The Scoping Report states that the Environmental Report will be published for consultation alongside the South Quay Masterplan. Should this state 'Draft'?	It should state 'Draft'.
	It is not clear whether any updated/ reissued Environmental Report would be made available for further public consultation.	If there are significant changes required to the Draft Masterplan following public consultation, this would be consulted on, alongside an updated SEA.
	Review of Plans, Policies and Programmes – Given that the primary focus for the Masterplan should be to support the optimum level of housing delivery in an area that is identified for very high housing growth, particular emphasis should be given to exceeding London Plan and LBTH Core Strategy Minimum housing targets as part of this process.	Noted.
	<p><b>Baseline Information – paragraphs 39 – 62</b></p> <p>Relates to the baseline information in the Scoping Report and the commentary made in respect of the 'likely evolution without the Masterplan'. Various comments are made noting that there is an extant Development Plan (including Development Management Policies) in place which already control development as well as the existing site allocations which cover this area. It is considered that the Scoping Report does not adequately take the existing Development Plan policies into account.</p> <p>Reference is made to the use of the S106 and CIL to enable infrastructure requirements to be met (without the need for a Masterplan) and recognises that developments will be subject to EIA which requires assessment of impacts including cumulative effects.</p> <p>It is stated that the introduction of new policies through the SPD would be unlawful.</p>	<p>The GLA's London Plan is being updated to reflect the need to deliver more housing across the capital, including additional housing in Tower Hamlets.</p> <p>The need to deliver more housing is resulting in higher densities being proposed by housing developers in greater numbers across the borough.</p> <p>Within the South Quay area, the amount, scale and densities of residential development being</p>

Respondent	Comment	Response to comments
		<p>proposed by developers is greater than envisaged in the Council's Local Plan and Millennium Quarter Masterplan.</p> <p>As such, further planning guidance is required to manage this growth to ensure affordable housing and infrastructure is planned for and delivered to support existing and future residents whilst creating a liveable and vibrant place.</p> <p>The Masterplan SPD does not seek to create new policies. It is intended to supplement the existing Local Plan and London Plan.</p> <p>It is required in recognition of the amount of development coming forward, the scale of which was not anticipated during preparation of the Local Plan.</p> <p>It is recognised that Local Plan policies are in place and these have been taken into account during the consideration of likely evolution without the Plan as well as in the identification of residual effects through the SEA appraisal process. It has been necessary to also consider how effectively these existing policies are working to manage the impacts of growth on this scale.</p>

Respondent	Comment	Response to comments
		The Masterplan SPD does not seek to limit growth, but rather to manage it better for existing and future residents.
	The Scoping Report states that the ' <i>Do Nothing alternative will also be assessed against each of the SEA objectives, to show the difference the Masterplan will make</i> '. Will the do nothing option also be explicitly assessed as part of the assessment of alternatives proper? We submit that it should be assessed.	The Scoping Report includes consideration of this through the 'likely evolution without the Masterplan' section of the baseline environment.
	In Table 5.1, it is not clear whether the objectives are prioritised or carry equal weight.	None of the objectives are prioritised. There is no weighting of objectives.
	In relation to objective 5, the amount of land designated as open space is identified as a key indicator. However, no reference is made to the quality or accessibility of the space which should be given equal weight to the amount.	Agreed. Add quality as an indicator.
	In relation to objective 6, a brief reference to 'parameter guidance' is made in the key indicators. Clarification is requested about the meaning of this reference.	Parameters set out a way in which buildings, routes, spaces should be placed in relation to each other, to create a good quality residential environment in South Quay. Parameter Guidance gives more clarity to what is being proposed and what has been assessed as part of the Strategic Environmental Assessment.  In relation to Skyline and design parameters – Podium/Plinth/Towers approach provides for a varying skyline by creating varying building heights, creating gaps between the

Respondent	Comment	Response to comments
		tall buildings, stepping down from north to south thus consolidating Canary Wharf cluster centred around 1, Canada Square. The policies in SQ3 and SQ4 together ensures that the schemes in the South Quay Master plan area is carefully considered to consolidate the Canary Wharf cluster with a layering of building heights and does not result in a wall of development.
	Objective 14 refers only to affordable housing. It should also make reference to the delivery of private housing as this contributes to meeting housing need and can help support the provision of affordable housing and mixed and balanced communities.	Objective 14 states <i>'To ensure that all residents have access to good quality, well-located, affordable housing that promotes liveability.</i>  Delivery of private housing is considered as part of the assessment against this objective.
	Berkeley has significant concerns regarding the scope, purposes and objectives of the Masterplan and the associated SEA, as indicated in the Scoping Report.  Work on the draft Masterplan and the Draft Environmental Report should be put on hold until these fundamental issues have been addressed. Berkeley is keen to engage proactively with the Council to discuss a way forward.	Noted.
Local Resident	The resident's main concern is that LBTH officers seemed to indicate that density was just one of a range of issues that needed to be considered. The resident found this statement confusing. The LUC report (this has been interpreted to mean the November 2014 SEA Report) lists 18 separate criteria on which to judge development including the need for new housing (Objective 14), climate change (Objective 18) maximising health of residents (objective 13) etc. The criteria seems to represent a balanced view on development, if not why has the LUC scoping report not been amended in order to	Noted. It is considered that the SEA Framework which was used to assess the Masterplan covers the key sustainability issues relevant to development within the South Quay area. As such, the SEA Framework is considered acceptable and has

Respondent	Comment	Response to comments
	provide a more balanced view?	not been amended.

## Appendix 2 – SEA Addendum Matrix

This matrix has been used to appraise the proposed changes to the Draft Masterplan SPD.

Symbols will be used to record effects as follows:

<b>++</b>	Significant positive effect likely
<b>+</b>	Minor positive effect likely
<b>0</b>	Negligible effect likely
<b>-</b>	Minor adverse effect likely
<b>--</b>	Significant adverse effect likely
<b>+/-</b>	Mixed effect likely
<b>?</b>	Likely effect uncertain
<b>N/A</b>	Policy is not relevant to SA objective

SEA Objective	Likely Effects	Significance of effect
<b>1. To create and sustain a liveable, well-designed environment that promotes long-term social cohesion, sustainable healthy lifestyles and a sense of place</b>		
<b>The Vision</b>	The vision for the Masterplan Area has potential to result in significant positive effects for the area – reference is made to ‘exceptional standards of design’; provision of new primary schools, community facilities and public transport connections all of which would contribute positively to this objective. The vision refers to a ‘substantial residential and working population’ which could result in feelings of overcrowding and impact on the ‘liveability’ of the area if very tall buildings are developed (e.g. through micro-climate effects such as overshadowing or wind funnelling). This could result in a mixed significant uncertain effect.	++/--/?
<b>Placemaking Principles</b>	There are 8 urban principles in total which should contribute positively to this objective. There is uncertainty in achievement of a number of the criteria underpinning this objective notably encouraging healthier lifestyles and achievement of a genuinely liveable place.  This reflects uncertainty in the overall amount of development which will be delivered.	+/?
<b>Guidance: Housing Density</b>	As demonstrated through the earlier SEA work, higher development densities could impact significantly adversely on this objective.  This Guidance requests new developments (seeking to exceed London Plan densities) to demonstrate how it will mitigate its impacts, how it will deliver the principles and guidance of the Masterplan, deliver exemplary design for housing and non-residential uses; and provides the required infrastructure.  Whilst the Guidance is non-specific it is assumed that this will include consideration of potential health impacts, delivery of health infrastructure etc.  As such, a significant positive, mixed effect is anticipated. The potential for significant positive effects reflect the request for development to deliver exemplary design for housing and non-residential uses which will contribute indirectly positively to this objective by creating better living conditions.  There is uncertainty in the appraisal and this in part reflects the change from ‘requiring’ developers to respond to ‘requesting’ their consideration of issues.	++/--/?
<b>Guidance: Connections and Public Spaces</b>	This Guidance sets out the Masterplan expectations in terms of connections for walking, cycling (and the division of primary, secondary and tertiary streets) and well as requesting new	++/--/?

SEA Objective	Likely Effects	Significance of effect
	<p>development to contribute to six new principal open spaces in addition to meeting public realm/ open space requirements to meet their own development needs.</p> <p>The proposals within this section could lead to significant positive effects on this objective through delivery of new spaces for physical activity and maximising opportunities for new residents to walk and cycle.</p> <p>Adverse effects are also predicted as the amount of open space on site is unlikely to be sufficient to meet the needs of the future population (when considered in relation to accepted standards such as the National Playing Fields Association Standards).</p> <p>There is uncertainty in the appraisal and this in part reflects the change from 'requiring' developers to respond to 'requesting' their consideration of issues.</p>	
<p><b>Guidance: Massing &amp; Urban Blocks</b></p>	<p>The section on Massing &amp; Urban Blocks provides a range of prescribed guidance including the anticipated massing, the provision of hybrid urban blocks (consisting of podium/ plinth and taller elements), creation of enclosure and differentiation between public and private spaces, activating frontages (including along the Docks), provision of a range of housing typologies, directing car parking within and/ or below the podium element and integration of social infrastructure and primary schools within the podium and plinth elements.</p> <p>This Guidance responds significantly positively to a number of the sub-criteria underpinning this objective.</p> <p>Due to the potential for very high density development (resulting in significant population growth within the area) there remain concerns over the general 'liveability' of the area – i.e. the potential for overcrowding and ensuring all open/ private spaces are not overshadowed and or affected by wind tunnelling effects.</p>	<p>++/--/?</p>
<p><b>Guidance: The Skyline</b></p>	<p>This section provides guidance on how development should respond to the Maritime Greenwich Grand Axis, requests development to provide visual layering and clustering across the Masterplan Area and sets out what verified visualisations are expected with development applications.</p> <p>For the most part, this Guidance is not relevant to this objective, however, 2 (iv) requests development to enable views of the open sky between buildings which should help support creation of a more liveable place at street level.</p> <p>An overall minor positive, uncertain effect is predicted.</p> <p>There is uncertainty in the appraisal and this in part reflects the change from 'requiring'</p>	<p>+/?</p>

SEA Objective	Likely Effects	Significance of effect
	developers to respond to 'requesting' their consideration of issues.	
<b>Guidance: Infrastructure</b>	<p>This section provides guidance for how waste management infrastructure should be delivered. This includes a request for development to explore the provision of innovative and appropriate waste and recycling storage and collection systems.</p> <p>General infrastructure guidance is included within the Local Plan.</p> <p>This should contribute positively to the creation of a well-designed environment. There is uncertainty in the appraisal and this in part reflects the change from 'requiring' developers to respond to 'requesting' their consideration of issues.</p> <p>An overall minor positive uncertain effect is anticipated.</p>	+/?
<b>Delivery, Management and Monitoring</b>	<p>The Delivery, Management and Monitoring Section sets out how development will be delivered, managed and monitored. It defines the approach to coordinated development, identifies delivery organisations and key stakeholders and confirms the SPD will be reviewed as part of LBTH's Annual Monitoring Report (AMR).</p> <p>Setting out the approach to delivery and management ensures that the aspirations set out in the Masterplan SPD will happen on the ground in accordance with the Local Plan. Monitoring the Masterplan will ensure that the supplementary policies are performing correctly and will be updated or replaced where necessary.</p> <p>Development management discussions should be informed by the outputs of the SEA which include looking more favourably on development which promotes exemplar design which avoids significant effects as a first principle.</p> <p>The previous list of infrastructure included within this section of the Draft Masterplan has been moved to Appendix 1 which is referred to in the revised section.</p> <p>This will result in a positive effect on this objective.</p>	+
<b>2. To protect, conserve and enhance the biodiversity within the Masterplan Area and wider borough and where appropriate create habitats, green and open spaces and watercourses</b>		
<b>The Vision</b>	The vision does not specifically mention biodiversity or habitat creation. There is potential for impacts arising from the 'substantial residential and working population' e.g. impacts on water quality or overshadowing of the Millwall and West India Docks SINC. However, the Local Plan	--/+/?

SEA Objective	Likely Effects	Significance of effect
	<p>provides guidance on the delivery of biodiverse green roofs and nectar rich planting</p> <p>As the predicted population is uncertain a significant mixed, uncertain effect is predicted.</p>	
<b>Placemaking Principles</b>	<p>None of the urban principles specifically mention biodiversity or creation of habitats etc. However, provision of new public open spaces could have an indirect positive impact.</p>	+/?
<b>Guidance: Housing Density</b>	<p>As demonstrated through the earlier SEA work, higher development densities could impact significantly adversely on this objective.</p> <p>This Guidance requests new developments (seeking to exceed London Plan densities) to demonstrate how it will mitigate its impacts, how it will deliver the principles and guidance of the Masterplan, deliver exemplary design for housing and non-residential uses; and provides the required infrastructure.</p> <p>Whilst the Guidance is non-specific it is assumed that this will include consideration of potential biodiversity impacts (specifically impacts on the SINC through overshadowing, change to water quality through discharges from development and potential loss of parts of the Docks for development purposes).</p> <p>As such, a mixed effect is predicted.</p> <p>There is uncertainty in the appraisal and this in part reflects the change from 'requiring' developers to respond to 'requesting' their consideration of issues.</p>	+/-/?
<b>Guidance: Connections and Public Spaces</b>	<p>This Guidance sets out the Masterplan expectations in terms of connections for walking, cycling (and the division of primary, secondary and tertiary streets) and well as requesting new development to contribute to six new principal open spaces in addition to meeting public realm/ open space requirements to meet their own development needs.</p> <p>The supporting text states that larger sites will be expected to provide onsite standalone public open spaces... with the character varying from quiet gardens, adventure playgrounds, urban forest, meadows and marshes, offering a network of spaces.</p> <p>There is potential for the new open spaces delivered across the Masterplan Area to contribute positively to this objective through creation of a range new habitats of value to biodiversity.</p> <p>There is uncertainty in the appraisal and this in part reflects the change from 'requiring' developers to respond to 'requesting' their consideration of issues. Furthermore, the locations of new principal open spaces are shown as indicative so it is unclear if cooperation and delivery of</p>	+/?

SEA Objective	Likely Effects	Significance of effect
	open spaces would be achieved in practice.	
<b>Guidance: Massing &amp; Urban Blocks</b>	<p>The section on Massing &amp; Urban Blocks provides a range of prescribed guidance including the anticipated massing, the provision of hybrid urban blocks (consisting of podium/ plinth and taller elements), creation of enclosure and differentiation between public and private spaces, activating frontages (including along the Docks), provision of a range of housing typologies, directing car parking within and/ or below the podium element and integration of social infrastructure and primary schools within the podium and plinth elements.</p> <p>There are anticipated to be mixed effects on this objective. Taller buildings have potential to result in overshadowing of the Docks SINC. Inclusion of communal and private amenity space offers potential for biodiversity enhancements.</p> <p>There is uncertainty in the appraisal and this in part reflects the change from 'requiring' developers to respond to 'requesting' their consideration of issues.</p>	-/+/?
<b>Guidance: The Skyline</b>	<p>This section provides guidance on how development should respond to the Maritime Greenwich Grand Axis, requests development to provide visual layering and clustering across the Masterplan Area and sets out what verified visualisations are expected with development applications.</p> <p>This Guidance is not considered relevant to this objective.</p>	0
<b>Guidance: Infrastructure</b>	<p>This section provides guidance for how waste management infrastructure should be delivered. This includes a request for development to explore the provision of innovative and appropriate waste and recycling storage and collection systems.</p> <p>General infrastructure guidance is included within the Local Plan.</p> <p>There is uncertainty in the appraisal and this in part reflects the change from 'requiring' developers to respond to 'requesting' their consideration of issues.</p> <p>An overall minor positive uncertain score is predicted.</p>	+/?
<b>Delivery, Management and Monitoring</b>	<p>The Delivery, Management and Monitoring Section sets out how development will be delivered, managed and monitored. It defines the approach to coordinated development, identifies the key delivery organisations and key stakeholders and confirms the SPD will be reviewed as part of LBTH's AMR.</p> <p>Setting out the approach to delivery and management ensures that the aspirations set out in the Masterplan SPD will happen on the ground in accordance with the Local Plan. Monitoring the</p>	+

SEA Objective	Likely Effects	Significance of effect
	<p>Masterplan will ensure that the supplementary policies are performing correctly and will be updated or replace where necessary.</p> <p>Development management discussions should be informed by the outputs of the SEA which include looking more favourably on development which takes into account principal open spaces, incorporates ecological enhancements measures into building design and provide public and private open spaces.</p> <p>The previous list of infrastructure included within this section of the Draft Masterplan has been moved to Appendix 1 which is referred to in the revised section.</p> <p>This will result in positive effects on this objective.</p>	
<p><b>3. To minimise flood risk to people and property within the Masterplan Area, the wider borough and elsewhere, and promote the use of sustainable urban drainage systems</b></p>		
<p><b>The Vision</b></p>	<p>The vision makes reference to 'exceptional standards of design'. It is assumed that this also refers to Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems with potential for minor positive effects.</p> <p>However, the 'substantial residential and working population' proposed will increase the number of people and properties vulnerable to future flood risk. As such, an overall significant adverse mixed effect is predicted.</p>	<p>+/--?</p>
<p><b>Placemaking Principles</b></p>	<p>None of the principles directly relate to this objective. As such a negligible effect is predicted.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p><b>Guidance: Housing Density</b></p>	<p>As demonstrated through the earlier SEA work, higher development densities could impact significantly adversely on this objective.</p> <p>This Guidance requests new developments (seeking to exceed London Plan densities) to demonstrate how it will mitigate its impacts, how it will deliver the principles and guidance of the Masterplan, deliver exemplary design for housing and non-residential uses; and provides the required infrastructure.</p> <p>Whilst the principle is non-specific it is assumed that this will include consideration of impact on flood risk.</p> <p>As such, an overall mixed effect is predicted.</p> <p>There is uncertainty in the appraisal and this in part reflects the change from 'requiring' developers to respond to 'requesting' their consideration of issues.</p>	<p>+/-/?</p>

SEA Objective	Likely Effects	Significance of effect
	<p>Furthermore, the locations of new principal open spaces are shown as indicative so it is unclear if cooperation and delivery of open spaces would be achieved in practice.</p>	
<p><b>Guidance: Connections and Public Spaces</b></p>	<p>This Guidance sets out the Masterplan expectations in terms of connections for walking, cycling (and the division of primary, secondary and tertiary streets) and well as requesting new development to contribute to six new principal open spaces in addition to meeting public realm/ open space requirements to meet their own development needs.</p> <p>New public open spaces have potential to incorporate SUDs and increase the amount of permeable surfaces across the Masterplan Area. As such, a minor positive, uncertain effect is predicted.</p> <p>There is uncertainty in the appraisal and this in part reflects the change from 'requiring' developers to respond to 'requesting' their consideration of issues.</p> <p>Furthermore, the locations of new principal open spaces are shown as indicative so it is unclear if cooperation and delivery of open spaces would be achieved in practice.</p>	<p>+/?</p>
<p><b>Guidance: Massing &amp; Urban Blocks</b></p>	<p>The section on Massing &amp; Urban Blocks provides a range of prescribed guidance including the anticipated massing, the provision of hybrid urban blocks (consisting of podium/ plinth and taller elements), creation of enclosure and differentiation between public and private spaces, activating frontages (including along the Docks), provision of a range of housing typologies, directing car parking within and/ or below the podium element and integration of social infrastructure and primary schools within the podium and plinth elements.</p> <p>Overall mixed effects are anticipated on this objective. Increased housing across the Masterplan Area (delivered through the typologies proposed) will increase the number of people and properties at risk of flooding. Inclusion of communal amenity space provides scope for SUDs, and permeable surfaces.</p> <p>There is uncertainty in the appraisal and this in part reflects the change from 'requiring' developers to respond to 'requesting' their consideration of issues.</p>	<p>-/+/?</p>
<p><b>Guidance: The Skyline</b></p>	<p>This section provides guidance on how development should respond to the Maritime Greenwich Grand Axis, requests development to provide visual layering and clustering across the Masterplan Area and sets out what verified visualisations are expected with development applications.</p> <p>This Guidance is not considered relevant to this objective.</p>	<p>0</p>

SEA Objective	Likely Effects	Significance of effect
<b>Guidance: Infrastructure</b>	<p>This section provides guidance for how waste management infrastructure should be delivered. This includes a request for development to explore the provision of innovative and appropriate waste and recycling storage and collection systems.</p> <p>General infrastructure guidance is included within the Local Plan.</p> <p>There is uncertainty in the appraisal and this in part reflects the change from 'requiring' developers to respond to 'requesting' their consideration of issues.</p> <p>An overall minor positive uncertain effect is predicted.</p>	+/?
<b>Delivery, Management and Monitoring</b>	<p>The Delivery, Management and Monitoring Section sets out how development will be delivered, managed and monitored. It defines the approach to coordinated development, identifies the key delivery organisations and key stakeholders and confirms the SPD will be reviewed as part of LBTH's AMR.</p> <p>Setting out the approach to delivery and management ensures that the aspirations set out in the Masterplan SPD will happen on the ground in accordance with the Local Plan. Monitoring the Masterplan will ensure that the supplementary policies are performing correct and will be updated or replaced where necessary.</p> <p>Development management discussions should be informed by the outputs of the SEA which include looking more favourably on development which promotes exemplar standards of design and sustainability (e.g. in terms of water).</p> <p>The previous list of infrastructure included within this section of the Draft Masterplan has been moved to Appendix 1 which is referred to in the revised section.</p> <p>This will result in positive effects on this objective.</p>	+
<b>4. To enhance and protect the significance of heritage assets and archaeological heritage</b>		
<b>The Vision</b>	<p>The vision does not specifically mention heritage or archaeology although it seeks to deliver an exceptional standard of design.</p> <p>There are statutorily listed structures and a locally listed structure within 500m of the Masterplan Area and the heritage interest could be indirectly affected by new development.</p> <p>Coldharbour Conservation Area lies partially within the Masterplan Area to the east and would be directly and indirectly affected by new development.</p>	+/-/?

SEA Objective	Likely Effects	Significance of effect
	Recognising that there is potential for new development needed to support the 'substantial residential and working population' to have adverse effects, significant adverse mixed effects are predicted (the podium/ plinth/ towers development typology could deliver better designed development resulting in the minor positive effect).	
<b>Placemaking Principles</b>	None of the urban principles directly relate to this objective. As such a negligible effect is predicted.	0
<b>Guidance: Housing Density</b>	<p>As demonstrated through the earlier SEA work, higher development densities could impact significantly adversely on this objective.</p> <p>This Guidance requests new developments (seeking to exceed London Plan densities) to demonstrate how it will mitigate its impacts, how it will deliver the principles and guidance of the Masterplan, deliver exemplary design for housing and non-residential uses; and provides the required infrastructure.</p> <p>Whilst the Guidance is non-specific it is assumed that this will include consideration of impacts on designated and undesignated heritage assets as well as archaeology.</p> <p>As such, an overall mixed effect is anticipated.</p> <p>There is uncertainty in the appraisal and this in part reflects the change from 'requiring' developers to respond to 'requesting' their consideration of issues.</p>	+/-/?
<b>Guidance: Connections and Public Spaces</b>	<p>This Guidance sets out the Masterplan expectations in terms of connections for walking, cycling (and the division of primary, secondary and tertiary streets) and well as requesting new development to contribute to six new principal open spaces in addition to meeting public realm/ open space requirements to meet their own development needs.</p> <p>Provision of open space can contribute positively to the setting of heritage assets. However, the overall effect is considered to be negligible.</p>	0
<b>Guidance: Massing &amp; Urban Blocks</b>	The section on Massing & Urban Blocks provides a range of prescribed guidance including the anticipated massing, the provision of hybrid urban blocks (consisting of podium/ plinth and taller elements), creation of enclosure and differentiation between public and private spaces, activating frontages (including along the Docks), provision of a range of housing typologies, directing car parking within and/ or below the podium element and integration of social infrastructure and primary schools within the podium and plinth elements.	+/-/?

SEA Objective	Likely Effects	Significance of effect
	<p>Massing Guidance 1b. states development should: sustain and enhance heritage assets, their setting and their significance (this should result in positive effects). Recognising that development of the scale proposed in South Quay could have adverse effects, an overall mixed effect is predicted.</p> <p>There is uncertainty in the appraisal and this in part reflects the change from 'requiring' developers to respond to 'requesting' their consideration of issues.</p>	
<b>Guidance: The Skyline</b>	<p>This section provides guidance on how development should respond to the Maritime Greenwich Grand Axis, requests development to provide visual layering and clustering across the Masterplan Area and sets out what verified visualisations are expected with development applications.</p> <p>This section should contribute positively to this objective by providing specific guidance in respect of the Greenwich Maritime WHS.</p> <p>There is uncertainty in the appraisal and this in part reflects the change from 'requiring' developers to respond to 'requesting' their consideration of issues.</p>	+/?
<b>Guidance: Infrastructure</b>	<p>This section provides guidance for how waste management infrastructure should be delivered. This includes a request for development to explore the provision of innovative and appropriate waste and recycling storage and collection systems. This section is not considered to impact on this objective.</p>	0
<b>Delivery, Management and Monitoring</b>	<p>The Delivery, Management and Monitoring Section sets out how development will be delivered, managed and monitored. It defines the approach to coordinated development, delivery organisations and key stakeholders and confirms the SPD will be reviewed as part of LBTH's AMR.</p> <p>Setting out the approach to delivery and management ensures that the aspirations set out in the Masterplan SPD will happen on the ground in accordance with the Local Plan. Monitoring the Masterplan will ensure that the supplementary policies are performing correctly and will be updated or replaced where necessary.</p> <p>The previous list of infrastructure included within this section of the Draft Masterplan has been moved to Appendix 1 which is referred to in the revised section.</p> <p>This will result in positive effects on this objective.</p>	+
<b>5. To enhance local townscape/ landscape character and improve the quality of the built environment and public open spaces</b>		

SEA Objective	Likely Effects	Significance of effect
<b>The Vision</b>	<p>The vision sets out the planned thriving nature of the neighbourhood, the exceptional quality of design and character of the Isle of Dogs.</p> <p>The vision indicates that the quality of the built environment will be improved, although details are not known.</p>	+/?
<b>Placemaking Principles</b>	The principles indicate some positive effect on townscape character and quality, although this is fairly uncertain given the level of detail.	+/?
<b>Guidance: Housing Density</b>	Guidance on average density of the Masterplan Area focuses on quantitative rather than qualitative issues. However, it does refer to a request for a high quality environment and the proposed urban typology of plinths, podiums and taller elements which indicate a positive effect on townscape although this is uncertain given the level of detail.	+/?
<b>Guidance: Connections and Public Spaces</b>	<p>'Connections &amp; public realm' does not refer to this objective.</p> <p>'New public open space' refers to 'quality that provides for the residents and visitors in the area'. Effect is therefore uncertain.</p> <p>'Principal and DLR public open space' refers to delivery of visually engaging and welcoming active frontages and activation of spaces which indicate a positive effect on townscape although this is uncertain given the level of detail.</p>	+/?
<b>Guidance: Massing &amp; Urban Blocks</b>	Reference to human scale at street level, activation of the docks and docksides and stepping down in height from the Canary Wharf Major Centre indicates that guidance this will result in a positive effect on townscape/ landscape character. However, the extent is uncertain.	+/?
<b>Guidance: The Skyline</b>	This guidance does not make specific reference to local landscape/ townscape character. As such a negligible effect is predicted.	0
<b>Guidance: Infrastructure</b>	This guidance does not make specific reference to local landscape/ townscape character. As such a negligible effect is predicted.	0
<b>Delivery, Management and Monitoring</b>	The Delivery, Management and Monitoring Section sets out how development will be delivered, managed and monitored. It defines the approach to coordinated development, identifies delivery organisations and key stakeholders and confirms the SPD will be reviewed as part of LBTH's AMR.	+

SEA Objective	Likely Effects	Significance of effect
	<p>Setting out the approach to delivery and management ensures that the aspirations set out in the Masterplan SPD will happen on the ground in accordance with the Local Plan. Monitoring the Masterplan will ensure that the supplementary policies are performing correctly and will be updated or replaced where necessary.</p> <p>Development management discussions should be informed by the outputs of the SEA which include looking more favourably on development which promotes exemplar standards of design, takes into account protected views and provides public and private open spaces.</p> <p>The previous list of infrastructure included within this section of the Draft Masterplan has been moved to Appendix 1 which is referred to in the revised section.</p> <p>This will result in a positive effect on this objective.</p>	
<b>Overall commentary</b>	<p>The vision and guidance on massing indicate that the Masterplan will result in a positive effect on landscape/ townscape character and quality, although wording could be strengthened, as suggested above.</p> <p>Other aspects of the SPG will result in uncertain effects on the character and quality of the area, although this may be strengthened with some additional wording, as suggested above.</p>	
<b>6. To achieve a planned and aesthetically balanced skyline, as seen in protected views</b>		
<b>The Vision</b>	The vision does not make reference to the skyline. As such a negligible effect is predicted.	0
<b>Placemaking Principles</b>	Principle 6 relates to a visually engaging skyline which indicates a positive effect on the skyline.	+
<b>Guidance: Housing Density</b>	The guidance on density does not directly relate to this objective. As such a negligible effect is predicted.	0
<b>Guidance: Connections and Public Spaces</b>	This guidance does not relate to this objective.	0
<b>Guidance: Massing &amp; Urban Blocks</b>	The reference to creating articulation/ visual interest and stepping down in scale from Canary Wharf Major Centre indicates that this will result in a positive effects on the skyline as seen in protected views, although the exact details are uncertain as the exact location/ shape of blocks is not known.	+/?

SEA Objective	Likely Effects	Significance of effect
<b>Guidance: The Skyline</b>	Reference to WHS Management Plan, stepping down of development from 1 Canada Square and visual layering indicates that this aspect of the Masterplan will result in a positive effect on the skyline. However, the exact extent is uncertain as the exact location/ shape and materiality of blocks is not known at this stage.	+/?
<b>Guidance: Infrastructure</b>	This objective does not make specific reference to the skyline. As such a negligible effect is predicted.	0
<b>Delivery, Management and Monitoring</b>	<p>The Delivery, Management and Monitoring Section sets out how development will be delivered, managed and monitored. It defines the approach to coordinated development, identifies delivery organisations and key stakeholders and confirms the SPD will be reviewed as part of LBTH's (AMR).</p> <p>Setting out the approach to delivery and management ensures that the aspirations set out in the Masterplan SPD will happen on the ground in accordance with the Local Plan. Monitoring the Masterplan will ensure that the supplementary policies are performing correctly and will be updated or replaced where necessary.</p> <p>Development management discussions should be informed by the outputs of the SEA which include looking more favourably on development which protects open views and ensures there is open sky between buildings.</p> <p>The previous list of infrastructure included within this section of the Draft Masterplan has been moved to Appendix 1 which is referred to in the revised section.</p> <p>This will result in positive effects on this objective.</p>	+
<b>Overall commentary</b>	Principle 6 (skyline), guidance on massing and guidance on the skyline will result in a positive effect on this objective (to achieve a planned and aesthetically balanced skyline, as seen in protected views). However, this could be strengthened further by inclusion of additional wording suggested above. Other parts of the SPG are less relevant to this objective.	
<b>7. To protect views and the visual amenity of people living and working in and visiting the area and surroundings</b>		
<b>The Vision</b>	Although the vision does not refer directly to views or visual amenity, the reference to the areas being "designed to an exceptional standard" indicates that visual amenity will be enhanced.	+
<b>Placemaking Principles</b>	Principle 4 refers to active frontages and Principle 5 refers to maximising natural light which	+

SEA Objective	Likely Effects	Significance of effect
	indicates a positive effect on visual amenity.	
<b>Guidance: Housing Density</b>	Guidance on average density of the Masterplan Area focuses on quantitative rather than qualitative issues. However, it does refer to a requirement for a high quality environment which indicate a positive effect on visual amenity although this is uncertain given the level of detail.	+/?
<b>Guidance: Connections and Public Spaces</b>	<p>'Connections &amp; public realm' does not refer to this objective.</p> <p>'New public open space' refers to 'quality that provides for the residents and visitors in the area'. Effect is therefore uncertain.</p> <p>'Principal and DLR public open space' refers to delivery of visually engaging and welcoming active frontages and activation of spaces which indicate a positive effect on views and visual amenity although this is uncertain given the level of detail.</p>	+/?
<b>Guidance: Massing &amp; Urban Blocks</b>	Reference to human scale at street level, activation of the docks and docksides and stepping down in height from the Canary Wharf Major Centre indicates that guidance this will result in a positive effect on views and visual amenity. However, the extent is uncertain.	+/?
<b>Guidance: The Skyline</b>	Reference to stepping down of development from 1 Canada Square, visual layering and views of open sky between buildings indicates that this aspect of the Masterplan will result in a positive effect on the skyline. However, the exact extent is uncertain as the exact location/ shape and materiality of blocks is not known at this stage.	+/?
<b>Guidance: Infrastructure</b>	This objective does not make specific reference to views/ visual amenity. As such a negligible effect is predicted.	0
<b>Delivery, Management and Monitoring</b>	<p>The Delivery, Management and Monitoring Section sets out how development will be delivered, managed and monitored. It defines the approach to coordinated development, identifies delivery organisations and key stakeholders and confirms the SPD will be reviewed as part of LBTH's AMR.</p> <p>Setting out the approach to delivery and management ensures that the aspirations set out in the Masterplan SPD will happen on the ground in accordance with the Local Plan. Monitoring the Masterplan will ensure that the supplementary policies are performing correctly and will be updated or replaced where necessary.</p> <p>Development management discussions should be informed by the outputs of the SEA which include looking more favourably on development which protects open views and ensures there is</p>	+

SEA Objective	Likely Effects	Significance of effect
	<p>open sky between buildings.</p> <p>The previous list of infrastructure included within this section of the Draft Masterplan has been moved to Appendix 1 which is referred to in the revised section.</p> <p>This will result in positive effects on this objective.</p>	
<b>Overall commentary</b>	<p>The vision, principle 4 on 'urban structure &amp; frontages' and guidance on massing &amp; urban blocks and the skyline indicate that the Masterplan will result in a positive effect on views and visual amenity, although some of the wording could be strengthened as suggested above.</p> <p>Other parts of the SPG are less relevant to this objective.</p>	
<b>8. To increase the proportion of journeys made by walking and cycling followed by bus or train (relative to those taken by the car)</b>		
<b>The Vision</b>	<p>The vision references benefits generated by new development (which it is assumed includes public transport connections). New and improved walking and cycling connections and new and improved foot bridges to Canary Wharf will also form part of the overall Community Benefits. Minor positive effects are anticipated.</p> <p>However, the 'substantial residential and working population..' envisaged in the Masterplan Area could still result in adverse effects (potentially significant depending on the densities accepted) as car use is possible.</p>	+/-/?
<b>Placemaking Principles</b>	<p>Provision of new public open spaces could incorporate walking and cycling routes. As such, an overall minor positive, uncertain effect is predicted.</p>	+/?
<b>Guidance: Housing Density</b>	<p>As demonstrated through the earlier SEA work, higher development densities could impact significantly adversely on this objective.</p> <p>This Guidance requests new developments (seeking to exceed London Plan densities) to demonstrate how it will mitigate its impacts, how it will deliver the principles and guidance of the Masterplan, deliver exemplary design for housing and non-residential uses; and provides the required infrastructure.</p> <p>Whilst the Guidance is non-specific it is assumed that this will include consideration of each development's contribution to vehicular travel (both during the construction and operation phase).</p> <p>As, such an overall mixed effect is anticipated.</p>	+/-/?

SEA Objective	Likely Effects	Significance of effect
	<p>There is uncertainty in the appraisal and this in part reflects the change from 'requiring' developers to respond to 'requesting' their consideration of issues.</p>	
<p><b>Guidance: Connections and Public Spaces</b></p>	<p>This Guidance sets out the Masterplan expectations in terms of connections for walking, cycling (and the division of primary, secondary and tertiary streets) and well as requesting new development to contribute to six new principal open spaces in addition to meeting public realm/ open space requirements to meet their own development needs.</p> <p>The Masterplan sets out proposals to address barriers to existing and future movement including requiring development to step back from Dock edges, provision of additional and improved footbridges over the Docks.</p> <p>As such, an overall significant positive effect is anticipated. There is uncertainty as dedicated cycle lanes are only proposed for Marsh Wall which could result in conflicts between pedestrian and cycle movements. Secondly, the population arising from the high density development could result in issues of overcrowding discouraging walking and cycling.</p> <p>There is uncertainty in the appraisal and this in part reflects the change from 'requiring' developers to respond to 'requesting' their consideration of issues.</p>	<p>++/?</p>
<p><b>Guidance: Massing &amp; Urban Blocks</b></p>	<p>The section on Massing &amp; Urban Blocks provides a range of prescribed guidance including the anticipated massing, the provision of hybrid urban blocks (consisting of podium/ plinth and taller elements), creation of enclosure and differentiation between public and private spaces, activating frontages (including along the Docks), provision of a range of housing typologies, directing car parking within and/ or below the podium element and integration of social infrastructure and primary schools within the podium and plinth elements.</p> <p>The previous Guidance section on Connections and Public Spaces is directly relevant to this objective. However, this section does provide guidance on provision of car parking within the Masterplan Area which could result in significant adverse effects on this objective depending on how much comes forward across the Masterplan Area. A positive effect is identified reflecting the potential to create a sense of enclosure within development blocks which could encourage more walking and cycling.</p> <p>There is uncertainty in the appraisal and this in part reflects the change from 'requiring' developers to respond to 'requesting' their consideration of issues.</p>	<p>+/--/?</p>
<p><b>Guidance: The Skyline</b></p>	<p>This section provides guidance on how development should respond to the Maritime Greenwich Grand Axis, requests development to provide visual layering and clustering across the Masterplan</p>	<p>+/?</p>

SEA Objective	Likely Effects	Significance of effect
	<p>Area and sets out what verified visualisations are expected with development applications.</p> <p>This Guidance is not expected to significantly impact on this objective. However, 2 (iv) requests development to enable views of the open sky between buildings. This will be important in ensuring walking and cycling within the Masterplan Area is a pleasant experience. An overall minor positive uncertain effect is anticipated as it cannot be predicted with any certainty that views between buildings will be provided.</p>	
<p><b>Guidance: Infrastructure</b></p>	<p>This section provides guidance for how waste management infrastructure should be delivered. This includes a request for development to explore the provision of innovative and appropriate waste and recycling storage and collection systems.</p> <p>General infrastructure guidance is included within the Local Plan.</p> <p>There is uncertainty in the appraisal and this in part reflects the change from 'requiring' developers to respond to 'requesting' their consideration of issues.</p> <p>This should contribute significantly positively towards achievement of this objective.</p>	<p>++/?</p>
<p><b>Delivery, Management and Monitoring</b></p>	<p>The Delivery, Management and Monitoring Section sets out how development will be delivered, managed and monitored. It defines the approach to coordinated development, identifies the key delivery organisations and key stakeholders and confirms the SPD will be reviewed as part of LBTH's AMR.</p> <p>Setting out the approach to delivery and management ensures that the aspirations set out in the Masterplan SPD will happen on the ground in accordance with the Development. Monitoring the Masterplan will ensure that the supplementary policies are performing correctly and will be updated or replaced where necessary.</p> <p>Development management discussions should be informed by the outputs of the SEA which include looking more favourably on development which promote car free development and/ or contribute to car clubs.</p> <p>The previous list of infrastructure included within this section of the Draft Masterplan has been moved to Appendix 1 which is referred to in the revised section.</p> <p>This is likely to contribute significantly positively to this objective.</p>	<p>++</p>
<p><b>9. To maximise the accessibility to key services and amenities</b></p>		

SEA Objective	Likely Effects	Significance of effect
<b>The Vision</b>	<p>The vision does not specifically state that new community facilities will be provided, but this is assumed to be inferred through the benefits generated by new development (which is referenced). These are assumed to include leisure centres and Idea Stores.</p> <p>Retail is not specifically mentioned. Notwithstanding this, South Quay is located within the Canary Wharf Activity Area which seeks to ensure appropriate mixed-use development comes forward including not only residential but business, retail and leisure facilities. As such, the provision of retail uses will be a material planning consideration during the determination of a planning application.</p> <p>A minor positive, uncertain effect is predicted.</p>	+/?
<b>Placemaking Principles</b>	<p>Existing urban principle 4. Urban Structure &amp; Frontages notes that active frontages would be focused onto Marsh Wall, open spaces and Docksidcs. It is assumed this includes key services and facilities such as leisure, retail and Idea stores. As such, a minor positive effect is predicted.</p>	+
<b>Guidance: Housing Density</b>	<p>As demonstrated through the earlier SEA work, higher development densities could impact adversely on this objective (if insufficient facilities are provided to support the required density).</p> <p>This Guidance requests new developments (seeking to exceed London Plan densities) to demonstrate how it will mitigate its impacts, how it will deliver the principles and guidance of the Masterplan, deliver exemplary design for housing and non-residential uses; and provides the required infrastructure.</p> <p>Whilst the Guidance is non-specific it is assumed that this will include consideration of each development's requirements in respect of infrastructure (including retail, leisure facilities and Idea Stores) and how this will be met either in the existing development, the wider Masterplan Area or through delivery offsite.</p> <p>As, such an overall mixed effect is anticipated.</p> <p>There is uncertainty in the appraisal and this in part reflects the change from 'requiring' developers to respond to 'requesting' their consideration of issues.</p>	+/-/?
<b>Guidance: Connections and Public Spaces</b>	<p>This Guidance sets out the Masterplan expectations in terms of connections for walking, cycling (and the division of primary, secondary and tertiary streets) and well as requesting new development to contribute to six new principal open spaces in addition to meeting public realm/ open space requirements to meet their own development needs.</p>	+

SEA Objective	Likely Effects	Significance of effect
	<p>The Guidance supports access to and from Canary Wharf Major Centre and supports a number of internal links to/ from Marsh Wall which will become the local High Street for the Masterplan Area. As such an overall minor positive effect is predicted in respect of this objective.</p>	
<p><b>Guidance: Massing &amp; Urban Blocks</b></p>	<p>The section on Massing &amp; Urban Blocks provides a range of prescribed guidance including the anticipated massing, the provision of hybrid urban blocks (consisting of podium/ plinth and taller elements), creation of enclosure and differentiation between public and private spaces, activating frontages (including along the Docks), provision of a range of housing typologies, directing car parking within and/ or below the podium element and integration of social infrastructure and primary schools within the podium and plinth elements.</p> <p>This section does not make specific reference provision of retail, leisure facilities or Idea Stores, however, active frontages (within the Podium) are promoted which are intended to include such uses. An overall minor positive effect is predicted.</p>	<p>+</p>
<p><b>Guidance: The Skyline</b></p>	<p>This section provides guidance on how development should respond to the Maritime Greenwich Grand Axis, requests development to provide visual layering and clustering across the Masterplan Area and sets out what verified visualisations are expected with development applications.</p> <p>This is not expected to impact on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p><b>Guidance: Infrastructure</b></p>	<p>This section provides guidance for how waste management infrastructure should be delivered. This includes a request for development to explore the provision of innovative and appropriate waste and recycling storage and collection systems. Key strategic infrastructure includes new and improved foot bridges, new principal open spaces etc.</p> <p>General infrastructure guidance is included within the Local Plan.</p> <p>There is uncertainty in the appraisal and this in part reflects the change from 'requiring' developers to respond to 'requesting' their consideration of issues.</p> <p>An overall minor positive, uncertain effect is identified.</p>	<p>+/?</p>
<p><b>Delivery, Management and Monitoring</b></p>	<p>The Delivery, Management and Monitoring Section sets out how development will be delivered, managed and monitored. It defines the approach to coordinated development, identifies the key delivery organisations and key stakeholders and confirms the SPD will be reviewed as part of LBTH's AMR.</p> <p>Setting out the approach to delivery and management ensures that the aspirations set out in the</p>	<p>+</p>

SEA Objective	Likely Effects	Significance of effect
	<p>Masterplan SPD will happen on the ground in accordance with the Local Plan Monitoring the Masterplan will ensure that the supplementary policies are performing correctly and will be updated or replaced where necessary.</p> <p>Development management discussions should be informed by the outputs of the SEA which include looking more favourably on development which provides public and private open spaces and social infrastructure.</p> <p>The previous list of infrastructure included within this section of the Draft Masterplan has been moved to Appendix 1 which is referred to in the revised section.</p> <p>An overall minor positive effect is predicted.</p>	
<b>10. To improve the quality of water within the Masterplan Area and to achieve the wise management and sustainable use of water resources</b>		
<b>The Vision</b>	<p>The vision does not make specific reference to improved water quality and sustainable water resource management. However, it does make reference to sustainability which encompasses a desire to minimise water usage and improve water quality.</p> <p>The Local Plan also provides guidance on this as well as other sections of the Masterplan.</p> <p>The substantial new population envisaged could result in significant uncertain mixed effects on the water supply and wastewater treatment capacity.</p>	<p>--/+/?</p>
<b>Placemaking Principles</b>	<p>The placemaking principles do not specifically reference water quality or sustainable water resource management.</p> <p>As such, a negligible effect is anticipated.</p>	<p>0</p>
<b>Guidance: Housing Density</b>	<p>As demonstrated through the earlier SEA work, higher development densities could impact adversely on this objective through placing further pressure on the capacity of the water supply and wastewater treatment network.</p> <p>This Guidance requests new developments (seeking to exceed London Plan densities) to demonstrate how it will mitigate its impacts, how it will deliver the principles and guidance of the Masterplan, deliver exemplary design for housing and non-residential uses; and provides the required infrastructure.</p> <p>Whilst the Guidance is non-specific it is assumed that this will include consideration of each development's requirements in respect of water and wastewater treatment.</p>	<p>+/-/?</p>

SEA Objective	Likely Effects	Significance of effect
	<p>As, such an overall mixed effect is anticipated.</p> <p>There is uncertainty in the appraisal and this in part reflects the change from 'requiring' developers to respond to 'requesting' their consideration of issues.</p>	
<b>Guidance: Connections and Public Spaces</b>	<p>This Guidance sets out the Masterplan expectations in terms of connections for walking, cycling (and the division of primary, secondary and tertiary streets) and well as requesting new development to contribute to six new principal open spaces in addition to meeting public realm/ open space requirements to meet their own development needs.</p> <p>This Guidance is not considered to have a significant impact on this objective and an overall negligible effect is predicted.</p>	0
<b>Guidance: Massing &amp; Urban Blocks</b>	<p>The section on Massing &amp; Urban Blocks provides a range of prescribed guidance including the anticipated massing, the provision of hybrid urban blocks (consisting of podium/ plinth and taller elements), creation of enclosure and differentiation between public and private spaces, activating frontages (including along the Docks), provision of a range of housing typologies, directing car parking within and/ or below the podium element and integration of social infrastructure and primary schools within the podium and plinth elements.</p> <p>This Guidance is not considered to specifically impact upon this objective.</p>	0
<b>Guidance: The Skyline</b>	<p>This section provides guidance on how development should respond to the Maritime Greenwich Grand Axis, requests development to provide visual layering and clustering across the Masterplan Area and sets out what verified visualisations are expected with development applications.</p> <p>This Guidance is not expected to impact on this objective.</p>	0
<b>Guidance: Infrastructure</b>	<p>This section provides guidance for how waste management infrastructure should be delivered. This includes a request for development to explore the provision of innovative and appropriate waste and recycling storage and collection systems.</p> <p>The section makes no reference to the capacity of wastewater treatment infrastructure.</p> <p>However, it is considered that the Local Plan provides guidance on this topic and LBTH agree that a strategic capacity study should be undertaken</p> <p>There is uncertainty in the appraisal and this in part reflects the change from 'requiring' developers to respond to 'requesting' their consideration of issues.</p>	--/+/?

SEA Objective	Likely Effects	Significance of effect
	Recognising the population densities which could be supported within the Masterplan Area, there are potential for significant mixed uncertain effects against this objective.	
<b>Delivery, Management and Monitoring</b>	<p>The Delivery, Management and Monitoring Section sets out how development will be delivered, managed and monitored. It defines the approach to coordinated development, identifies the key delivery organisations and key stakeholders and confirms the SPD will be reviewed as part of LBTH's AMR.</p> <p>Setting out the approach to delivery and management ensures that the aspirations set out in the Masterplan SPD will happen on the ground in accordance with the Local Plan. Monitoring the Masterplan will ensure that the supplementary policies are performing correctly and will be updated or replaced where necessary.</p> <p>Development management discussions should be informed by the outputs of the SEA which include looking more favourably on development which promotes exemplar standards of design and sustainability (e.g. water).</p> <p>The previous list of infrastructure included within this section of the Draft Masterplan has been moved to Appendix 1 which is referred to in the revised section.</p> <p>This will result in positive effects on this objective.</p>	+
<b>11. To minimise the production of waste across all sectors and increase reuse, recycling, remanufacturing and recovery rates</b>		
<b>The Vision</b>	<p>The vision does not make specific reference to Waste. However, it does make reference to sustainability which encompasses a desire to minimise waste and increase reuse and recycling</p> <p>The Local Plan also defines what developers should take into consideration with regard to waste.</p> <p>The substantial new population envisaged could result in significant mixed uncertain effects through waste production during construction and operation.</p>	--/+/?
<b>Placemaking Principles</b>	Principle 8 states development should contribute to the delivery of waste management infrastructure. As such, a minor positive effect is anticipated.	+
<b>Guidance: Housing Density</b>	<p>As demonstrated through the earlier SEA work, higher development densities could impact adversely on this objective through increasing the amount of waste produced.</p> <p>This Guidance requests new developments (seeking to exceed London Plan densities) to demonstrate how it will mitigate its impacts, how it will deliver the principles and guidance of the</p>	+/-/?

SEA Objective	Likely Effects	Significance of effect
	<p>Masterplan, deliver exemplary design for housing and non-residential uses; and provides the required infrastructure.</p> <p>Whilst the Guidance is non-specific it is assumed that this will include consideration of each development's contribution to waste (and how this would be managed).</p> <p>As, such an overall mixed effect is anticipated.</p> <p>There is uncertainty in the appraisal and this in part reflects the change from 'requiring' developers to respond to 'requesting' their consideration of issues.</p>	
<p><b>Guidance: Connections and Public Spaces</b></p>	<p>This Guidance sets out the Masterplan expectations in terms of connections for walking, cycling (and the division of primary, secondary and tertiary streets) and well as requesting new development to contribute to six new principal open spaces in addition to meeting public realm/ open space requirements to meet their own development needs.</p> <p>This Guidance is not considered to have a significant impact on this objective.</p>	0
<p><b>Guidance: Massing &amp; Urban Blocks</b></p>	<p>The section on Massing &amp; Urban Blocks provides a range of prescribed guidance including the anticipated massing, the provision of hybrid urban blocks (consisting of podium/ plinth and taller elements), creation of enclosure and differentiation between public and private spaces, activating frontages (including along the Docks), provision of a range of housing typologies, directing car parking within and/ or below the podium element and integration of social infrastructure and primary schools within the podium and plinth elements.</p> <p>This Guidance is not considered to have a significant impact on this objective.</p>	0
<p><b>Guidance: The Skyline</b></p>	<p>This section provides guidance on how development should respond to the Maritime Greenwich Grand Axis, requests development to provide visual layering and clustering across the Masterplan Area and sets out what verified visualisations are expected with development applications.</p> <p>This Guidance is not expected to have an impact on this objective.</p>	0
<p><b>Guidance: Infrastructure</b></p>	<p>This section provides guidance for how waste management infrastructure should be delivered. This includes a request for development to explore the provision of innovative and appropriate waste and recycling storage and collection systems.</p> <p>SQ5 (5) states that development should explore the provision of innovative and appropriate waste recycling storage and collection systems and connect to or demonstrate a potential connection to a Masterplan wide waste storage and collection system. Delivery of a pneumatic waste collection</p>	+/-/?

SEA Objective	Likely Effects	Significance of effect
	<p>system is identified as a high priority for the Masterplan Area.</p> <p>Whilst commitment to a coordinated waste collection/ storage system will help manage the waste produced, this would not reduce or respond positively to the amount of additional waste produced. An overall significant adverse, mixed effect is predicted.</p> <p>There is uncertainty in the appraisal and this in part reflects the change from 'requiring' developers to respond to 'requesting' their consideration of issues.</p>	
<p><b>Delivery, Management and Monitoring</b></p>	<p>The Delivery, Management and Monitoring Section sets out how development will be delivered, managed and monitored. It defines the approach to coordinated development, identifies the key delivery organisations and key stakeholders and confirms the SPD will be reviewed as part of LBTH's AMR.</p> <p>Setting out the approach to delivery and management ensures that aspirations set out in the Masterplan SPD will happen on the ground in accordance with the Local Plan. Monitoring the Masterplan will ensure that the supplementary policies are performing correctly and will be updated or replaced where necessary.</p> <p>Development management discussions should be informed by the outputs of the SEA which include looking more favourably on development which demonstrates how overall waste production will be reduced and promotes the delivery of innovative technologies (e.g. energy from waste plants) onsite. This will result in positive effects on this objective.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">+</p>
<p><b>12. To protect existing, make provision for new, and maximise accessibility to education facilities to meet the needs of all sectors of the population</b></p>		
<p><b>The Vision</b></p>	<p>The vision makes reference to the benefits to be generated by new development being available to people from across the Isle of Dogs and beyond. This is assumed to include consideration of schools, particularly primary schools.</p> <p>It is assumed that sufficient secondary school capacity can be accessed offsite.</p> <p>A significant positive effect is anticipated.</p> <p>There is uncertainty as to whether primary school facilities such as playing fields/ sports pitches can be delivered within easy reach.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">++/?</p>
<p><b>Platemaking Principles</b></p>	<p>The principles do not make specific reference to education facilities. As such, a negligible is anticipated.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p>

SEA Objective	Likely Effects	Significance of effect
<b>Guidance: Housing Density</b>	<p>As demonstrated through the earlier SEA work, higher development densities could impact adversely on this objective (if insufficient education facilities are provided to support the required density).</p> <p>This Guidance requests new developments (seeking to exceed London Plan densities) to demonstrate how it will mitigate its impacts, how it will deliver the principles and guidance of the Masterplan, deliver exemplary design for housing and non-residential uses; and provides the required infrastructure.</p> <p>Whilst the Guidance is non-specific it is assumed that this will include consideration of each development's requirements in respect of infrastructure (including education) and how this will be met either within the existing development plot, the wider Masterplan Area or through delivery offsite.</p> <p>As, such an overall mixed effect is anticipated.</p> <p>There is uncertainty in the appraisal and this in part reflects the change from 'requiring' developers to respond to 'requesting' their consideration of issues.</p>	+/-/?
<b>Guidance: Connections and Public Spaces</b>	<p>This Guidance sets out the Masterplan's expectations in terms of connections for walking, cycling (and the division of primary, secondary and tertiary streets) and well as requesting new development to contribute to six new principal open spaces in addition to meeting public realm/ open space requirements to meet their own development needs.</p> <p>There is potential for new public open spaces to also incorporate educational facilities (e.g. nature education centres) and/ or school playing fields/ pitches, as such uncertain minor positive effects are predicted.</p> <p>There is uncertainty in the appraisal and this in part reflects the change from 'requiring' developers to respond to 'requesting' their consideration of issues. Furthermore, the locations of new principal open are shown as indicative so it is unclear if cooperation and delivery of open spaces would be achieved in practice.</p>	+/?
<b>Guidance: Massing &amp; Urban Blocks</b>	<p>The section on Massing &amp; Urban Blocks provides a range of prescribed guidance including the anticipated massing, the provision of hybrid urban blocks (consisting of podium/ plinth and taller elements), creation of enclosure and differentiation between public and private spaces, activating frontages (including along the Docks), provision of a range of housing typologies, directing car parking within and/ or below the podium element and integration of social infrastructure and</p>	++/?

SEA Objective	Likely Effects	Significance of effect
	<p>primary schools within the podium and plinth elements.</p> <p>The Guidance promotes provision of primary schools within the podium and plinth elements of urban blocks, also incorporating play space at ground level for younger children and play decks, MUGA at ground level and on podiums. This should ensure provision of primary school infrastructure as part of developments. As such a significant positive effect is anticipated. There is uncertainty as no provision is made for secondary schools or other forms of education (e.g. further education on site). This may result in secondary school pupils/ those attending further education establishments having to travel some distance outside of the Masterplan Area.</p>	
<b>Guidance: The Skyline</b>	<p>This section provides guidance on how development should respond to the Maritime Greenwich Grand Axis, requests developers to provide visual layering and clustering across the Masterplan Area and sets out what verified visualisations are expected with development applications.</p> <p>This Guidance is not expected to impact on this objective.</p>	0
<b>Guidance: Infrastructure</b>	<p>This section provides guidance for how waste management infrastructure should be delivered. This includes a request for development to explore the provision of innovative and appropriate waste and recycling storage and collection systems. Key strategic infrastructure includes new and improved foot bridges, new principal open spaces etc.</p> <p>General infrastructure guidance is included within the Local Plan.</p> <p>There is uncertainty in the appraisal and this in part reflects the change from 'requiring' developers to respond to 'requesting' their consideration of issues.</p> <p>An overall significant positive uncertain effect is predicted.</p>	++/?
<b>Delivery, Management and Monitoring</b>	<p>The Delivery, Management and Monitoring Section sets out how development will be delivered, managed and monitored. It defines the approach to coordinated development, identifies the key delivery organisations and key stakeholders and confirms the SPD will be reviewed as part of LBTH's AMR.</p> <p>Setting out the approach to delivery and management ensures that the aspirations set out in the Masterplan SPD will happen on the ground in accordance with the Local Plan. Monitoring the Masterplan will ensure that the supplementary policies are performing correctly and will be updated or replaced where necessary.</p> <p>Development management discussions should be informed by the outputs of the SEA which include looking more favourably on development which provides social infrastructure (e.g. primary</p>	+

SEA Objective	Likely Effects	Significance of effect
	<p>schools) onsite as a first principle rather than relying on financial contributions.</p> <p>The previous list of infrastructure included within this section of the Draft Masterplan has been moved to Appendix 1 which is referred to in the revised section.</p> <p>This will result in positive effects on this objective.</p>	
<b>13. To maximise the health and well-being of the population and reduce inequalities in health</b>		
<b>The Vision</b>	<p>The vision does not specifically reference access to healthcare facilities, although these are assumed to be delivered as part of the overall community benefits of new development.</p> <p>A minor positive, uncertain effect is predicted.</p>	+/?
<b>Placemaking Principles</b>	<p>The principles do not make specific reference to healthcare facilities. As such, a negligible effect is anticipated.</p>	0
<b>Guidance: Housing Density</b>	<p>As demonstrated through the earlier SEA work, higher development densities could impact adversely on this objective (if insufficient healthcare facilities are provided to support the required density).</p> <p>This Guidance requests new developments (seeking to exceed London Plan densities) to demonstrate how it will mitigate its impacts, how it will deliver the principles and guidance of the Masterplan, deliver exemplary design for housing and non-residential uses; and provides the required infrastructure.</p> <p>Whilst the Guidance is non-specific it is assumed that this will include consideration of each development's requirements in respect of infrastructure (including health) and how this will be met either within the existing development plot, the wider Masterplan Area or through delivery offsite.</p> <p>As, such an overall mixed effect is anticipated.</p> <p>There is uncertainty in the appraisal and this in part reflects the change from 'requiring' developers to respond to 'requesting' their consideration of issues.</p>	+/-/?
<b>Guidance: Connections and Public Spaces</b>	<p>This Guidance sets out the Masterplan expectations in terms of connections for walking, cycling (and the division of primary, secondary and tertiary streets) and well as requesting new development to contribute to six new principal open spaces in addition to meeting public realm/</p>	+/?

SEA Objective	Likely Effects	Significance of effect
	<p>open space requirements to meet their own development needs.</p> <p>There is potential for new public open spaces and encouraging walking and cycling to contribute positively to this objective by providing opportunities to engage in physical activity etc.</p> <p>There is uncertainty in the appraisal and this in part reflects the change from 'requiring' developers to respond to 'requesting' their consideration of issues.</p>	
<b>Guidance: Massing &amp; Urban Blocks</b>	<p>The section on Massing &amp; Urban Blocks provides a range of guidance including the anticipated massing, the provision of hybrid urban blocks (consisting of podium/ plinth and taller elements), creation of enclosure and differentiation between public and private spaces, activating frontages (including along the Docks), provision of a range of housing typologies, directing car parking within and/ or below the podium element and integration of social infrastructure and primary schools within the podium and plinth elements.</p> <p>Healthcare facilities are not specifically mentioned (although it is assumed this would form part of the social infrastructure to be delivered within the plinth and podium elements). Recognising that this would contribute to the healthcare requirements for the wider Masterplan Area and overall significant positive uncertain effect is predicted.</p>	++/?
<b>Guidance: The Skyline</b>	<p>This section provides guidance on how development should respond to the Maritime Greenwich Grand Axis, requests developers to provide visual layering and clustering across the Masterplan Area and sets out what verified visualisations are expected with development applications.</p> <p>This Guidance is not expected to impact on this objective.</p>	0
<b>Guidance: Infrastructure</b>	<p>This section provides guidance for how waste management infrastructure should be delivered. This includes a request for development to explore the provision of innovative and appropriate waste and recycling storage and collection systems. Key strategic infrastructure includes new and improved foot bridges, new principal open spaces etc.</p> <p>General infrastructure guidance is included within the Local Plan.</p> <p>There is uncertainty in the appraisal and this in part reflects the change from 'requiring' developers to respond to 'requesting' their consideration of issues.</p> <p>An overall significant positive uncertain effect is anticipated.</p>	++/?
<b>Delivery, Management and</b>	<p>The Delivery, Management and Monitoring Section sets out how development will be delivered, managed and monitored. It defines the approach to coordinated development, identifies the key</p>	+

SEA Objective	Likely Effects	Significance of effect
<b>Monitoring</b>	<p>delivery organisations and key stakeholders and confirms the SPD will be reviewed as part of LBTH's AMR.</p> <p>Setting out the approach to delivery and management ensures that the aspirations set out in the Masterplan SPD will happen on the ground in accordance with the Local Plan. Monitoring the Masterplan will ensure that the supplementary policies are performing correctly and will be updated or replaced where necessary.</p> <p>Development management discussions should be informed by the outputs of the SEA which include looking more favourably on development which provides social infrastructure (e.g. healthcare facilities) onsite as a first principle rather than relying on financial contributions.</p> <p>The previous list of infrastructure included within this section of the Draft Masterplan has been moved to Appendix 1 which is referred to in the revised section.</p> <p>This will result in positive effects on this objective.</p>	
<b>14. To ensure that all residents have access to good quality, well-located, affordable housing that promotes liveability</b>		
<b>The Vision</b>	<p>The vision does not specifically mention the type or mix of housing which is envisaged.</p> <p>Recognising that new housing will be delivered within the Masterplan Area a significant positive, uncertain effect is predicted.</p>	++/?
<b>Placemaking Principles</b>	<p>Principle 1. refers to delivery of exemplary housing meeting the needs of residents, Registered Providers and service providers. It is assumed this includes delivery of onsite affordable housing.</p> <p>An uncertain, minor positive score is predicted.</p>	+/?
<b>Guidance: Housing Density</b>	<p>As demonstrated through the earlier SEA work, higher development densities could impact on this objective (depending on the amount of affordable housing required and whether this can be delivered on site). Higher density development will also contribute significantly positively to the overall amount of new housing delivered.</p> <p>This Guidance requests new developments (seeking to exceed London Plan densities) to demonstrate how it will mitigate its impacts, how it will deliver the principles and guidance of the Masterplan, deliver exemplary design for housing and non-residential uses; and provides the required infrastructure.</p> <p>Whilst the Guidance is non-specific it is assumed that this will include consideration of each</p>	++/-/?

SEA Objective	Likely Effects	Significance of effect
	<p>development's contribution to affordable housing and the balance and mix of residential development and how this will be met either within the existing development plot, the wider Masterplan Area or through delivery offsite.</p> <p>As, such an overall mixed effect is anticipated.</p> <p>There is uncertainty in the appraisal and this in part reflects the change from 'requiring' developers to respond to 'requesting' their consideration of issues.</p>	
<p><b>Guidance: Connections and Public Spaces</b></p>	<p>This Guidance sets out the Masterplan expectations in terms of connections for walking, cycling (and the division of primary, secondary and tertiary streets) and well as requesting new development to contribute to six new principal open spaces in addition to meeting public realm/ open space requirements to meet their own development needs.</p> <p>The delivery of new open spaces and maximising opportunities for walking and cycling is likely to contribute positively to overall liveability of the Masterplan Area. There is uncertainty as higher density development could result in extremely high population densities with potential for feelings of overcrowding.</p> <p>There is uncertainty in the appraisal and this in part reflects the change from 'requiring' developers to respond to 'requesting' their consideration of issues.</p>	<p>+/?</p>
<p><b>Guidance: Massing &amp; Urban Blocks</b></p>	<p>The section on Massing &amp; Urban Blocks provides a range of prescribed guidance including the anticipated massing, the provision of hybrid urban blocks (consisting of podium/ plinth and taller elements), creation of enclosure and differentiation between public and private spaces, activating frontages (including along the Docks), provision of a range of housing typologies, directing car parking within and/ or below the podium element and integration of social infrastructure and primary schools within the podium and plinth elements.</p> <p>This Guidance seeks to encourage a range of housing typologies to come forward including wheelchair accessible housing and family housing. Guidance is also provided to support delivery of communal and private amenity space which will help support the overall 'liveability' of the Masterplan Area. The Plinth is identified as the appropriate location for affordable housing. An overall significant positive, uncertain effect is predicted.</p>	<p>++/?</p>
<p><b>Guidance: The Skyline</b></p>	<p>This section provides guidance on how development should respond to the Maritime Greenwich Grand Axis, requests developers to provide visual layering and clustering across the Masterplan Area and sets out what verified visualisations are expected with development applications.</p>	<p>+/?</p>

SEA Objective	Likely Effects	Significance of effect
	<p>For the most part, this Guidance is not expected to impact on this objective. However, creation of development across the Masterplan Area that provides variation in the skyline as well as enabling open views of the sky between buildings is likely to support creation of a more 'liveable' place.</p> <p>An overall minor positive uncertain effect is anticipated as it cannot be predicted with any certainty that views between buildings or a varied skyline will be provided.</p>	
<b>Guidance: Infrastructure</b>	<p>This section provides guidance for how waste management infrastructure should be delivered. This includes a request for development to explore the provision of innovative and appropriate waste and recycling storage and collection systems. Key strategic infrastructure includes new and improved foot bridges, new principal open spaces etc.</p> <p>General infrastructure guidance is included within the Local Plan.</p> <p>There is uncertainty in the appraisal and this in part reflects the change from 'requiring' developers to respond to 'requesting' their consideration of issues.</p> <p>An overall minor positive, uncertain effect is predicted.</p>	+/?
<b>Delivery, Management and Monitoring</b>	<p>The Delivery, Management and Monitoring Section sets out how development will be delivered, managed and monitored. It defines the approach to coordinated development, identifies the key delivery organisations and key stakeholders and confirms the SPD will be reviewed as part of LBTH's AMR.</p> <p>Setting out the approach to delivery and management ensures that the aspirations set out in the Masterplan SPD will happen on the ground in accordance with the Local Plan. Monitoring the Masterplan will ensure that the supplementary policies are performing correct and will be updated or replace where necessary.</p> <p>The previous list of infrastructure included within this section of the Draft Masterplan has been moved to Appendix 1 which is referred to in the revised section.</p> <p>This will result in positive effects on this objective.</p>	+
<b>15. To provide all residents with the opportunity of employment, particularly in deprived areas</b>		
<b>The Vision</b>	<p>The vision refers states that the Masterplan Area will be "...home to a substantial residential and working population...", however it does not explicitly state that new employment will be provided.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, South Quay is located within the Canary Wharf Activity Area which seeks to</p>	+/-/?

SEA Objective	Likely Effects	Significance of effect
	<p>ensure appropriate mixed-use development comes forward including not only residential but business, retail and leisure facilities. As such, the provision of employment uses will be a material planning consideration during the determination of a planning application.</p> <p>A mixed uncertain effect is predicted.</p>	
<b>Placemaking Principles</b>	<p>There is no specific mention of employment and as such a negligible effect is predicted.</p> <p>However, it is recognised that employment is dealt with through the development management process.</p>	0
<b>Guidance: Housing Density</b>	<p>As demonstrated through the earlier SEA work, there will be a loss of existing employment to new residential-led development.</p> <p>This Guidance requests new developments (seeking to exceed London Plan densities) to demonstrate how it will mitigate its impacts, how it will deliver the principles and guidance of the Masterplan, deliver exemplary design for housing and non-residential uses; and provides the required infrastructure.</p> <p>Whilst the Guidance is non-specific it is assumed that this will include consideration of each development's contribution to employment through the balance and mix of other types of development proposed and how this will be met either within the existing development plot, the wider Masterplan Area or through delivery offsite. In particular, developers would be expected to demonstrate how the employment needs of higher population densities would be met.</p> <p>As, such an overall mixed effect is anticipated.</p> <p>There is uncertainty in the appraisal and this in part reflects the change from 'requiring' developers to respond to 'requesting' their consideration of issues.</p>	+/-/?
<b>Guidance: Connections and Public Spaces</b>	<p>This Guidance sets out the Masterplan expectations in terms of connections for walking, cycling (and the division of primary, secondary and tertiary streets) and well as requesting new development to contribute to six new principal open spaces in addition to meeting public realm/open space requirements to meet their own development needs.</p> <p>Access to the Canary Wharf Major Centre to the North is supported, as are connections to key locations in the South. This should have a minor positive benefit in enabling new residents to access existing employment.</p> <p>There is uncertainty in the appraisal and this in part reflects the change from 'requiring'</p>	+/?

SEA Objective	Likely Effects	Significance of effect
	developers to respond to 'requesting' their consideration of issues.	
<b>Guidance: Massing &amp; Urban Blocks</b>	<p>The section on Massing &amp; Urban Blocks provides a range of prescribed guidance including the anticipated massing, the provision of hybrid urban blocks (consisting of podium/ plinth and taller elements), creation of enclosure and differentiation between public and private spaces, activating frontages (including along the Docks), provision of a range of housing typologies, directing car parking within and/ or below the podium element and integration of social infrastructure and primary schools within the podium and plinth elements.</p> <p>The Guidance does not specifically mention employment, however, it is assumed that active frontages within the podium and plinth design will include new employment. An overall minor positive, uncertain effect is predicted.</p>	+/?
<b>Guidance: The Skyline</b>	<p>This section provides guidance on how development should respond to the Maritime Greenwich Grand Axis, requests developers to provide visual layering and clustering across the Masterplan Area and sets out what verified visualisations are expected with development applications.</p> <p>This Guidance is not expected to impact on this objective.</p>	0
<b>Guidance: Infrastructure</b>	<p>This section provides guidance for how waste management infrastructure should be delivered. This includes a request for development to explore the provision of innovative and appropriate waste and recycling storage and collection systems.</p> <p>This section is not considered to impact significantly on this objective.</p>	0
<b>Delivery, Management and Monitoring</b>	<p>The Delivery, Management and Monitoring Section sets out how development will be delivered, managed and monitored. It defines the approach to coordinated development, delivery organisations and key stakeholders and confirms the SPD will be reviewed as part of LBTH's AMR.</p> <p>Setting out the approach to delivery and management ensures that the aspirations set out in the Masterplan SPD will happen on the ground in accordance with the Local Plan. Monitoring the Masterplan will ensure that the supplementary policies are performing correctly and will be updated or replaced where necessary.</p> <p>Development management discussions should be informed by the outputs of the SEA which include looking more favourably on development which provides appropriate employment onsite to meet development need as a first principle rather than relying on financial contributions.</p> <p>The previous list of infrastructure included within this section of the Draft Masterplan has been</p>	+

SEA Objective	Likely Effects	Significance of effect
	<p>moved to Appendix 1 which is referred to in the revised section.</p> <p>This will result in positive effects on this objective.</p>	
<b>16. To reduce pollution to land through direct action or mitigation; to seek to improve the quality of the land as far as possible</b>		
<b>The Vision</b>	<p>The vision does not make reference to pollution or improvements to land quality.</p> <p>However, the principle of redevelopment offers the opportunity to further remediate contaminated land.</p>	+
<b>Placemaking Principles</b>	There is no specific mention of pollution or land quality in the principles. As such as negligible effect is predicted.	0
<b>Guidance: Housing Density</b>	<p>As demonstrated through the earlier SEA work, all sites within the Masterplan Area have potential to further remediate contaminated land.</p> <p>This Guidance requests new developments (seeking to exceed London Plan densities) to demonstrate how it will mitigate its impacts, how it will deliver the principles and guidance of the Masterplan, deliver exemplary design for housing and non-residential uses; and provides the required infrastructure.</p> <p>There is uncertainty in the appraisal and this in part reflects the change from 'requiring' developers to respond to 'requesting' their consideration of issues.</p>	+/?
<b>Guidance: Connections and Public Spaces</b>	<p>This Guidance sets out the Masterplan expectations in terms of connections for walking, cycling (and the division of primary, secondary and tertiary streets) and well as requesting new development to contribute to six new principal open spaces in addition to meeting public realm/ open space requirements to meet their own development needs.</p> <p>This Guidance proposes development of new public open spaces (which would require remediation of contaminated land) and an overall long-term positive effect is predicted.</p> <p>There is uncertainty in the appraisal and this in part reflects the change from 'requiring' developers to respond to 'requesting' their consideration of issues.</p>	+/?
<b>Guidance: Massing &amp; Urban Blocks</b>	The section on Massing & Urban Blocks provides a range of prescribed guidance including the anticipated massing, the provision of hybrid urban blocks (consisting of podium/ plinth and taller elements), creation of enclosure and differentiation between public and private spaces, activating	0

SEA Objective	Likely Effects	Significance of effect
	<p>frontages (including along the Docks), provision of a range of housing typologies, directing car parking within and/ or below the podium element and integration of social infrastructure and primary schools within the podium and plinth elements.</p> <p>The Guidance sets out the development typology which would be supported within the Masterplan Area. The principle of hybrid urban blocks would not directly impact on this objective, however, understanding the nature and type of contamination and providing appropriate remediation will be necessary to support development.</p>	
<b>Guidance: The Skyline</b>	<p>This section provides guidance on how development should respond to the Maritime Greenwich Grand Axis, requests developers to provide visual layering and clustering across the Masterplan Area and sets out what verified visualisations are expected with development applications.</p> <p>This Guidance is not expected to impact on this objective.</p>	0
<b>Guidance: Infrastructure</b>	<p>This section provides guidance for how waste management infrastructure should be delivered. This includes a request for development to explore the provision of innovative and appropriate waste and recycling storage and collection systems. This section is not considered to impact on this objective.</p>	0
<b>Delivery, Management and Monitoring</b>	<p>The Delivery, Management and Monitoring Section sets out how development will be delivered, managed and monitored. It defines the approach to coordinated development, delivery organisations and key stakeholders and confirms the SPD will be reviewed as part of LBTH's AMR.</p> <p>Setting out the approach to delivery and management ensures that the aspirations set out in the Masterplan SPD will happen on the ground in accordance with the Local Plan. Monitoring the Masterplan will ensure that the supplementary policies are performing correctly and will be updated or replaced where necessary.</p> <p>The previous list of infrastructure included within this section of the Draft Masterplan has been moved to Appendix 1 which is referred to in the revised section.</p> <p>No specific reference is made to land quality/ land remediation. As such there is uncertainty in delivery of remediation, particularly where cross-developer coordination is required.</p>	?
<b>17. To reduce pollution to air and reduce disruption from noise and vibration through direct action or mitigation measures; to seek to improve the quality of the air as far as possible</b>		

SEA Objective	Likely Effects	Significance of effect
<b>The Vision</b>	<p>The vision does not make reference to pollution or improvements to air quality. However, it does make reference to sustainability which encompasses a desire to reduce pollution and disruption from noise.</p> <p>It is assumed that reference to the exceptional standard of design includes consideration of tall buildings and potential impacts from aircraft noise.</p> <p>The substantial population proposed could also result in impacts from increased energy demand with potential for emissions to air.</p> <p>The Local Plan also defines what developers should take into consideration with regard to air pollution and noise and vibration.</p> <p>An uncertain, significant mixed effect is predicted (recognising the potential for significant cumulative construction impacts).</p>	--/+/?
<b>Placemaking Principles</b>	<p>There is no specific mention of noise pollution or air quality. As such a negligible effect is predicted.</p>	0
<b>Guidance: Housing Density</b>	<p>As demonstrated through the earlier SEA work, higher density developments have potential to significantly adversely affect this objective through increased noise and air pollution during construction and operation.</p> <p>This Guidance requests new developments (seeking to exceed London Plan densities) to demonstrate how it will mitigate its impacts, how it will deliver the principles and guidance of the Masterplan, deliver exemplary design for housing and non-residential uses; and provides the required infrastructure.</p> <p>Whilst the Guidance is non-specific it is assumed that this will include consideration of potential noise and air pollution during both the construction and operational phases (both singularly and in combination with other development within the Masterplan Area and more widely) on existing residents and employees and on new residents.</p> <p>Developments would also be expected to demonstrate how they contribute to innovative and highly sustainable means to manage operational impacts e.g. through use of onsite CHP plants and maximising movement on foot and by bike.</p> <p>An overall mixed, significant adverse, mixed effect is predicted.</p> <p>There is uncertainty in the appraisal and this in part reflects the change from 'requiring'</p>	+/--/?

SEA Objective	Likely Effects	Significance of effect
	<p>developers to respond to 'requesting' their consideration of issues.</p>	
<p><b>Guidance: Connections and Public Spaces</b></p>	<p>This Guidance sets out the Masterplan expectations in terms of connections for walking, cycling (and the division of primary, secondary and tertiary streets) and well as requesting new development to contribute to six new principal open spaces in addition to meeting public realm/ open space requirements to meet their own development needs.</p> <p>Provision of new open spaces (assuming natural habitats are provided) has potential to improve air quality in the long term. This is considered to be a minor positive effect.</p> <p>There is uncertainty in the appraisal and this in part reflects the change from 'requiring' developers to respond to 'requesting' their consideration of issues.</p>	<p>+/?</p>
<p><b>Guidance: Massing &amp; Urban Blocks</b></p>	<p>The section on Massing &amp; Urban Blocks provides a range of prescribed guidance including the anticipated massing, the provision of hybrid urban blocks (consisting of podium/ plinth and taller elements), creation of enclosure and differentiation between public and private spaces, activating frontages (including along the Docks), provision of a range of housing typologies, directing car parking within and/ or below the podium element and integration of social infrastructure and primary schools within the podium and plinth elements.</p> <p>Massing Guidance SQ5 b. notes the need to accord with the latest Civil Aviation Authority heights guidance for London City Airport – this is required for safety reasons, but also to minimise potential impacts on new residents from aircraft noise. SQ3 4 c (iv) references the need to ensure Podium and Plinth design mitigate impacts on residential amenity created by DLR services (through encouraging residential uses to be delivered at higher levels); 11./12. Car Parking &amp; Servicing seeks to manage car parking access separate to other uses to maintain active frontages and support a high quality public realm. This should have a positive effect on this objective in the long term once developments are operational.</p> <p>No reference is made as to how other operational issues e.g. emissions arising from increased energy demand will be managed, bringing uncertainty to the appraisal.</p>	<p>+/?</p>
<p><b>Guidance: The Skyline</b></p>	<p>This section provides guidance on how development should respond to the Maritime Greenwich Grand Axis, requests developers to provide visual layering and clustering across the Masterplan Area and sets out what verified visualisations are expected with development applications.</p> <p>This Guidance is not expected to impact on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p>

SEA Objective	Likely Effects	Significance of effect
<b>Guidance: Infrastructure</b>	<p>This section provides guidance for how waste management infrastructure should be delivered. This includes a request for development to explore the provision of innovative and appropriate waste and recycling storage and collection systems.</p> <p>This section of Guidance is not expected to impact on this objective.</p>	0
<b>Delivery, Management and Monitoring</b>	<p>The Delivery, Management and Monitoring Section sets out how development will be delivered, managed and monitored. It defines the approach to coordinated development, identifies the key delivery organisations and key stakeholders and confirms the SPD will be reviewed as part of LBTH's AMR.</p> <p>Setting out the approach to delivery and management ensures that the aspirations set out in the Masterplan SPD will happen on the ground in accordance with the Local Plan. Monitoring the Masterplan will ensure that the supplementary policies are performing correctly and will be updated or replaced where necessary.</p> <p>Development management discussions should be informed by the outputs of the SEA which include looking more favourably on development which promote car free developments and/ or contributes to car clubs to reduce car based travel and its consequent impacts.</p> <p>The previous list of infrastructure included within this section of the Draft Masterplan has been moved to Appendix 1 which is referred to in the revised section.</p> <p>This will result in positive effects on this objective.</p>	+
<b>18. To ensure the Masterplan adapts to the effects of climate change (both now and in the future) and contributes to climate change mitigation, achieves greater energy efficiency and reduces its reliance on fossil fuels</b>		
<b>The Vision</b>	<p>The vision makes some reference to factors with potential to affect this objective e.g. benefits generated by new development (it is assumed this includes new public transport provision).</p> <p>Other factors (as referenced in earlier objectives) are not mentioned e.g. provision of SUDs (to respond to flood risk), commitments to high standards of energy efficiency and sustainability and reference to walking.</p> <p>Consequently a significant adverse, mixed effect is predicted.</p>	+/--/?
<b>Placemaking Principles</b>	<p>There is no specific mention of mitigating the effects of climate change/ adapting to climate change.</p>	0

SEA Objective	Likely Effects	Significance of effect
	As such a negligible effect is predicted.	
<b>Guidance: Housing Density</b>	<p>As demonstrated through earlier SEA work, higher density developments have potential to significantly adversely affect this objective.</p> <p>This Guidance requests new developments (seeking to exceed London Plan densities) to demonstrate how it will mitigate its impacts, how it will deliver the principles and guidance of the Masterplan, deliver exemplary design for housing and non-residential uses; and provides the required infrastructure.</p> <p>Whilst the Guidance is non-specific it is assumed that this will include consideration of how new development achieves exemplary design in respect of sustainability standards and energy efficiency.</p> <p>An overall, significant adverse mixed effect is predicted.</p> <p>There is uncertainty in the appraisal and this in part reflects the change from 'requiring' developers to respond to 'requesting' their consideration of issues.</p>	<p>+/-/?</p>
<b>Guidance: Connections and Public Spaces</b>	<p>This Guidance sets out the Masterplan expectations in terms of connections for walking, cycling (and the division of primary, secondary and tertiary streets) and well as requesting new development to contribute to six new principal open spaces in addition to meeting public realm/ open space requirements to meet their own development needs.</p> <p>Provision of new open spaces (assuming natural habitats are provided) has potential to contribute to climate change mitigation and adaptation (e.g. through provision of permeable surfaces to absorb runoff, natural habitats to absorb pollutants etc.).</p> <p>An overall minor positive effect is predicted.</p> <p>There is uncertainty in the appraisal and this in part reflects the change from 'requiring' developers to respond to 'requesting' their consideration of issues.</p>	<p>+/?</p>
<b>Guidance: Massing &amp; Urban Blocks</b>	<p>The section on Massing &amp; Urban Blocks provides a range of guidance including the anticipated massing, the provision of hybrid urban blocks (consisting of podium/ plinth and taller elements), creation of enclosure and differentiation between public and private spaces, activating frontages (including along the Docks), provision of a range of housing typologies, directing car parking within and/ or below the podium element and integration of social infrastructure and primary schools within the podium and plinth elements.</p>	<p>+/-/?</p>

SEA Objective	Likely Effects	Significance of effect
	<p>An overall mixed effect is predicted – support for new private and communal amenity space could incorporate climate change adaptation measures with minor positive effects, however, support for car parking raises potential for car based travel to increase, contributing adversely to greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>There is uncertainty in the appraisal and this in part reflects the change from ‘requiring’ developers to respond to ‘requesting’ their consideration of issues.</p>	
<p><b>Guidance: The Skyline</b></p>	<p>This section provides guidance on how development should respond to the Maritime Greenwich Grand Axis, requests developers to provide visual layering and clustering across the Masterplan Area and sets out what verified visualisations are expected with development applications.</p> <p>This Guidance is not expected to impact upon this objective.</p>	0
<p><b>Guidance: Infrastructure</b></p>	<p>This section provides guidance for how waste management infrastructure should be delivered. This includes a request for development to explore the provision of innovative and appropriate waste and recycling storage and collection systems. Key strategic infrastructure includes new and improved foot bridges, new principal open spaces etc.</p> <p>General infrastructure guidance is included within the Local Plan.</p> <p>There is uncertainty in the appraisal and this in part reflects the change from ‘requiring’ developers to respond to ‘requesting’ their consideration of issues.</p> <p>An overall uncertain minor positive effect is anticipated.</p>	+/?
<p><b>Delivery, Management and Monitoring</b></p>	<p>The Delivery, Management and Monitoring Section sets out how development will be delivered, managed and monitored. It defines the approach to coordinated development, delivery organisations and key stakeholders and confirms the SPD will be reviewed as part of LBTH’s AMR.</p> <p>Setting out the approach to delivery and management ensures that the aspirations set out in the Masterplan SPD will happen on the ground in accordance with the Local Plan. Monitoring the Masterplan will ensure that the supplementary policies are performing correctly and will be updated or replaced as necessary.</p> <p>Development management discussions should be informed by the outputs of the SEA which include looking more favourably on development which promotes exemplar standards of design and sustainability focusing on demand reduction (e.g. in terms of energy and water) and promotes the delivery of innovative technologies (e.g. energy from waste plants) onsite.</p>	+

SEA Objective	Likely Effects	Significance of effect
	<p>The previous list of infrastructure included within this section of the Draft Masterplan has been moved to Appendix 1 which is referred to in the revised section.</p> <p>This will result in positive effects on this objective.</p>	

**Table A2.1: Summary of SEA of changes to Draft South Quay Masterplan SPD (post-mitigation)**

Effects in bold and with dark green borders illustrate effects which have changed since the Draft SEA Report.

SEA Objectives	Likely Effects							
	The Vision	Principles	Guidance: Housing Density	Guidance: Connections and Public Spaces	Guidance: Massing & Urban Blocks	Guidance: The Skyline	Guidance: Infrastructure	Delivery
1. To create and sustain a liveable, well-designed environment that promotes long-term social cohesion, sustainable healthy lifestyles and a sense of place	++/--/?	+/?	++/--/?	++/--/?	++/--/?	+/?	<b>+/?</b>	+
2. To protect, conserve and enhance the biodiversity within the Masterplan Area and wider borough and where appropriate create habitats, green and open spaces and watercourses	+/--/?	+/?	+/--/?	+/?	-/+/?	0	<b>+/?</b>	+
3. To minimise flood risk to people and property within the Masterplan Area, the wider borough and elsewhere, and promote the use of sustainable urban drainage systems	+/--/?	0	+/--/?	+/?	-/+/?	0	<b>+/?</b>	+
4. To enhance and protect the significance of heritage assets and archaeological heritage	+/--/?	0	+/--/?	0	+/--/?	+	0	+
5. To enhance local townscape/ landscape character and improve the quality of the built environment and public open spaces	+/?	+/?	+/?	+/?	+/?	0	0	<b>+</b>
6. To achieve a planned and aesthetically balanced skyline, as seen in protected views	0	+	0	0	+/?	+/?	0	<b>+</b>
7. To protect views and the visual amenity of people living and working in and visiting the area and surroundings	+	+	+/?	+/?	+/?	+/?	0	<b>+</b>
8. To increase the proportion of journeys made by walking and cycling followed by bus or train (relative to those taken by the car)	+/--/?	+/?	+/--/?	<b>++/?</b>	+/--/?	<b>+/?</b>	<b>++/?</b>	<b>++</b>
9. To maximise the accessibility to key services and amenities	+/?	+	+/--/?	+	+	0	+/?	+
10. To improve the quality of water within the Masterplan Area and to achieve the wise management and sustainable use of water resources	+/--/?	0	+/--/?	0	0	0	+/--/?	<b>+</b>
11. To minimise the production of waste across all sectors and increase reuse, recycling, remanufacturing and recovery rates	+/--/?	<b>+</b>	+/--/?	0	0	0	+/--/?	<b>+</b>
12. To protect existing, make provision for new, and maximise accessibility to education facilities to meet the needs of all sectors of the population	<b>++/?</b>	<b>0</b>	+/--/?	<b>+/?</b>	<b>++/?</b>	0	<b>++/?</b>	<b>+</b>
13. To maximise the health and well-being of the population and reduce inequalities in health	+/?	<b>0</b>	+/--/?	+/?	<b>++/?</b>	0	<b>++/?</b>	<b>+</b>
14. To ensure that all residents have access to good quality, well-located, affordable housing that promotes liveability	<b>++/?</b>	+/?	++/--/?	+/?	<b>++/?</b>	<b>+/?</b>	+/?	<b>+</b>
15. To provide all residents with the opportunity of employment, particularly in deprived areas	+/--/?	0	+/--/?	<b>+/?</b>	+/?	0	0	<b>+</b>
16. To reduce pollution to land through direct action or mitigation; to seek to improve the quality of the land as far as possible	+	0	<b>+/?</b>	<b>+/?</b>	0	0	0	<b>?</b>
17. To reduce pollution to air and reduce disruption from noise and vibration through direct action or mitigation measures; to seek to improve the quality of the air as far as possible	+/--/?	0	+/--/?	<b>+/?</b>	+/?	0	0	<b>+</b>
18. To ensure the Masterplan adapts to the effects of climate change (both now and in the future) and contributes to climate change mitigation, achieves greater energy efficiency and reduces its reliance on fossil fuels	+/--/?	0	+/--/?	<b>+/?</b>	+/--/?	0	<b>+/?</b>	<b>+</b>