

		Cremorne Wharf - planning	No objection to the safeguarding, however, will require access in the future maintenance process both to existing combined sewer discharging from pumping station and proposed Thames Tunnel works. Important to note that that combined sewer is wholly within the wharf site and are aware of the landowners' wish to promote commercial development on site. This could severely impact on the necessary interception of the existing CSO. Thames Tunnel does not believe that their own current proposals will affect the future use of the site as a safeguarded wharf. The Review does not advise on the road access which is a viability criterion (para 7.77 of London Plan 2011) but does state RBKC's advice. It is suggested that the Review advises that there is suitable access, given that the wharf is currently operated under a planning permission that permits up to 150 HGV movements per day.	Surrounding Land Use section of site assessment addresses the access issue. As set out in the Implementation section of the site assessment, the long term viability of the wharf for the time after the completion of Thames Tunnel should be ensured.
42	Tower Hamlets	Flexibility - alternative uses	Suggest that long-term flexibility is embedded within the safeguarded wharves guidance to assess the potential for additional and/or alternative uses to be located.	The review process itself provides an appropriate level of flexibility; the outcome has to be sufficiently clear to form the basis of regulations.
		Northumberland Wharf - operation	LBTH confirm that wharf will no longer be used by the Council for the transfer of its municipal waste for the remainder of its current waste contract. As the site is safeguarded the Council intends to lease the site on a short-term to a private waste provider.	Noted. This does not affect the designation.
		Northumberland Wharf - future review	In preparation of LBTH's Managing Development DPD, the Council is working closely with the GLA to ensure it is able to meet its London Plan waste apportionment target in the most suitable way. If having agreed with the GLA the best means of meeting its waste apportionment target, it can be demonstrated that Northumberland Wharf is not required for the transfer or processing of waste, then LBTH would request a review of its safeguarded status, in respect of the surrounding areas residential status.	Any change to the current situation can only be pick up in future reviews
		Northumberland Wharf - future review	Suggested amendments to line 26, Table 7.1 - Safeguarding status/justification column - add "(transfer of additional waste)" Under 'proposed implementation actions' add "if needed for the transfer of waste. If it can be demonstrated that the site is not needed to meet the Council's London Plan Waste apportionment target then a review of the safeguarded status of the site will be undertaken with the potential for alternative uses much more compatible with the residential character of the surrounding areas."	Any change to the current situation can only be pick up in future reviews
43	Treasury Holdings	Cringle Dock and Kirtling Wharf - implementation	Does not suggest that wharves should no longer be safeguarded, but the Review should acknowledge the potential of redeveloping Cringle Dock and Kirtling Wharf to deliver more modern facilities, that better fit a world class regeneration project. Therefore, an additional bullet point should be added to Table 7.1, sites 6 and 7: "The Wharf owners and operators are encouraged to continue discussions with the Council, GLA and adjoining land owners to consider potential redevelopment options to achieve modern wharf facilities, potentially as part of a mixed use redevelopment of the wharves." Positive consequences as a result of development of modern facilities would include; state of the art facilities for the operators, increasing efficiency in handling of waste and aggregates. The enclosure of operations would result in the achievement of far higher environmental standards, reducing risk of noise, dust and odor, and they would also more attractive in the context of a major regeneration zone.	Planning policy and should ensure this through mitigation measures that would be required as part of redevelopment. We consider continued safeguarding to be appropriate
44	Una Hodgkins	Thames Tunnel	Important not to leave the fate of the wharves in the hands of developers, especially in context of Thames Tunnel.	Review promotes that water transport of construction/excavation material when Thames Tunnel is built - see Implementation section of relevant wharves
45	Wandsworth - Officer	Wandsworth wharves	Agrees that all wharves in Wandsworth should be safeguarded, as per review.	Noted
		Middle Wharf - future review	The Council supports the current safeguarding of the wharf during the construction of the Thames Tunnel to maximise the wharf's use for enabling waterborne transportation of construction and excavation materials, and supports its de-designation to support increased access to the riverside and support the regeneration objectives of the VNEB OA.	Any change to the current situation can only be pick up in future reviews
		Hurlingham Wharf - operation	Supports continued safeguarding, in context of Thames Water's proposed Carnwarth Road Riverside Thames Tunnel main shaft site. Use of Carnwarth Road would require the continued use of Hurlingham Wharf for removal of spoil and for importing of construction materials.	Noted
46	Western Riverside Waste Authority	Smugglers Way, Cringle Dock and Middleton Jetty	Support the continued safeguarding of these wharves. However, the transfer stations are becoming increasingly surrounded by uses that are not industrial or freight related.	Noted
		Consolidation opportunities and mechanisms	Supports safeguarding and promoting use of the Thames, but the Review also needs to include clear policy mechanisms whereby a consolidation, rationalisation or relocation of wharves can be permissible. - Consolidation of small wharves to allow the shared use of infrastructure and more flexible interim storage arrangements together with space for better vehicle utilisation would seem to be a strategy more likely to increase use of the river in the Western region.	Not principally against consolidation, and paragraph 8.2.4 sets out underlying approach
		Cringle Dock - future review	Lies within the VNEB regeneration area and it could be in everyone's interests to consider a future relocation of the wharf so as to mitigate potential conflicts with neighbours, stimulate capital investment in the site and maintain or increase its throughput potential.	Any change to the current situation can only be pick up in future reviews
		Hurlingham Wharf - consolidation	Constraint by the fact that two of its potential access routes go through residential areas and have six foot six inch width restrictions. - Consolidation opportunities exist to the east of Wandsworth Bridge which would retain capacity and make the prospect of sites becoming operational more realistic as they would enjoy better access to the strategic road network whilst simultaneously releasing redundant sites of regeneration.	No in principle objection to consolidation, however there are a number of substantial issues that would have to be resolved before this could be considered as a serious proposition, and continued designation is appropriate.
		Waste demand forecast	Questions report's waste demand and capacity estimates for the Western region and accuracy of some of the non-operational site assessments in relation to supply and demand in the Western region. In WRWA's view there has been little or no positive change in the eight years since the Authority responded to the last consultation and believes it is a result of the policy being too rigid and is attempting to safeguard wharves for historic rather than pragmatic reasons. Waste tonnages have fallen by 38 % between 2005 and 2010, a reduction that began prior to the 2008 downturn in the economy. This mirrors Authority's experience particularly marked drop in residual tonnage although this still represents around 70 % of the overall waste stream.	Section 3.3 sets out a robust approach to the forecasting of waste by water, which is also informed by policy drivers and stakeholder consultation