

Page / Paragraph	LBRuT Comments	S&P Comments
Page 12 – phases of development	This does not correspond with the build out phases as identified in the CMS	
3.1.1	<p>With regards to ‘extension zones’ – the following are not accepted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Block 19 (results in a poor relationship with Block 18); • North west corner of Block 18. <p>The minimum gap of 8.5m gap between buildings is too small</p> <p>Where the minimum gap between facades with windows is below 18m consideration should be given of overlooking as noted below in Section 3.4.5</p> <p>➤ replace should with must</p>	<p>The gap is now noted as 10m which is achievable between all buildings</p> <p>Amended</p>
3.1.7	How do you define refuse / bicycle stores ‘must’ be kept to a minimum?	Amended
3.3	<p>The development of the detailed design of the building typologies should take into account views of this area of the development from the river and in particular the relationship of the new buildings to the setting of the Listed Buildings and other buildings that face the river on Thamesbank –</p> <p>➤ replace should with must</p> <p>The design of the new buildings should provide a contrast and variation of material in relation to these buildings. – why?</p>	<p>Amended</p> <p>Amended</p>
3.4.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the recess/elevation break is in the form of a rebate within the façade, then the minimum depth and width must be 0.5m ➤ this is insufficient. • Block Massing and Articulation Residential square buildings should be articulated as an assemblage of aggregated elements. To the higher elements and long elevations this should be achieved with steps in storey, sections of recesses within the facade, variation of material tones and corner treatments as outlined on the page opposite ➤ What are ‘higher elements’ and ‘long elevations’ – need definitions? • Height of Buildings A set back to the upper floors of buildings should be incorporated in circumstances where: 	<p>0.5m x 1m is sufficient and has been amended</p> <p>Amended to remove reference to higher elements</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ replace should with must 	
3.4.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For mixed use buildings elevations must create a subtle distinction between ground and upper level uses. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ this is irrelevant as there are no mixed use buildings. • Where ground floor uses have greater public access, this must be articulated in the design of ground floor frontage <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ how is this relevant, as all uses are residential? • As per the London Housing Design Guide, balconies must be a minimum depth of 1500mm and be large enough to achieve the minimum amount of amenity space required for each unit. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ insert 'should' between 'and be' 	<p>Amended</p> <p>Amended</p>
3.4.4	<p>Consideration of building appearance and massing needs to be made from each of these viewpoints.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ replace 'needs' with 'must' <p>Recommend also considering:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • View from Lower Richmond Road looking towards new cinema building 	Amended
3.4.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staggered windows and recessed balconies should be utilised to avoid any negative impact on privacy between units. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Replace 'should' with 'must'. • Buildings 20 and 21 are located 15.5m from Building 18 and particular care should be taken in this relationship to avoid overlooking. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ the plan on the same page shows 18m 	<p>Amended</p> <p>Amended</p>
Rule set A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rule Set A (Block end to end elevations 10m) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ however, the plan identifies Rule A elevations as those with 10-18m gaps between buildings. • Staggered windows should be used on the facing elevations to avoid potential overlooking issues between rooms. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ replace 'should' with 'must' 	Amended
Rule set B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No projecting facades within these areas. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ However, PR001 and 2 shows 1.5m extension zone within these areas. <p>There must not be any extension zones within rule set B.</p>	Amended
Plan on page 28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will the scheme ensure satisfactorily living conditions for the 'right' angle corners on building 18? 	These units are dual aspect

3.4.6	Circulation core must be limited to 8 flats – London Housing Design Guide	Amended
3.4.8	<p>Contradiction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brick / masonry ‘should’ be considered as primary material • Next paragraph says brick / masonry ‘must’ be predominant material 	Amended
4.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Street widths (kerb to kerb) should generally to be 5.5m with pedestrian footpaths on at least one side of the street (minimum of 1.2m) [fig. 01]. Road reserves are to be typically 15m wide. The School access street should be a minimum of 10.5m wide. To include a 5m wide carriageway (minimum) and 1.2m wide footpaths on both sides of the road. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ a minimum of 5.5m wide carriageway must be incorporated with a minimum 2m footpath proposed. • Footpaths must be a minimum of 1.2m wide, but typically a minimum of 1.8m clear from back of kerb is to be maintained. ➢ – Insufficient – must be 2m. • Any remaining space should be utilised for either a planted verge or on-street parking for the school. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ Omit comment in red. • Footpaths must be a minimum of 1.2m wide, but typically a minimum of 1.8m clear from back of kerb is to be maintained. Tree pits are to be minimum of 1m wide x 1.5m long at the back of kerb, allowing centre of trees to be a minimum of 0.5m from back of kerb <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ this would only allow 0.2m of uninterrupted surface – pavements must be 2m wide. • Vehicle crossovers of footpaths may be configured as either single or double crossing, a maximum permissible width for a single crossover will be 5m <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ SPD ‘Transport’ states, “5.14. Where a new development is built as a row of houses on a plot of land adjacent to a publicly maintained footway and vehicle accesses are part of the scheme, where these are acceptable and they meet current policy, these will be paired to a maximum width of 4.8m flat section. Between each pair a 5.5m 	Amended without change to overall plans

	<p>gap/footway width must be provided, which will allow a safe area for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ pedestrians to stand whilst waiting for manoeuvring vehicles ▪ locating street furniture and utility boxes ▪ maintaining a useable on street parking space.” 	
4.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lighting should be provided for safety and security of users. ➢ Replace with ‘must’. Who will be responsible for installing and maintaining lighting if the road is adopted? • Pathways should be minimum of 1.8m, contradicts paragraph 4.2, which requires 1.2m – as outlined previously, pavements should be a minimum of 2m wide. 	<p>Amended</p> <p>Please refer to Stantec drawing 38262/5501/100H – Proposed Highway Layout Possible Areas for Adoption</p>
4.3.1	<p>Shared cycle / pedestrian paths must be a minimum of 3.5m wide, with signage to guide shared use. - Please provide further explanation as to whether this is single or two way. If the latter, the 3.5m width is too narrow.</p>	
4.3.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not acceptable to have 2 tier cycle stores in public realm • Not acceptable to integrate play with cycle stores • ‘must’ instead of ‘should’ when looking at minimising look of cycle stores 	<p>This is residential cycle store within the courtyard (public realm) Reference to integrated play removed</p> <p>‘Must’ amended.</p>
4.4.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why is courtyard garden only a minimum of 50% soft landscaping? (Particularly with low UGF) – could this be increased? 	<p>Increased to 70% which is what is currently shown.</p>
4.4.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UK native species ‘must’ predominate (not should) 	<p>Amended</p>
4.4.6	<p>Living roofs ‘must’ be incorporated into development (must aim for 70%)</p>	<p>Amended</p>
5.1	<p>This refers to the ‘residential square and street buildings’ as 4-7 stories high, however paragraph 3.3.2 refers to 4-6 stories high</p> <p>A buffer zone must be provided within the landscape between the street and ground floor level residential units – how large is this buffer zone?</p>	<p>Amended</p> <p>1.5m</p>
5.1.3	<p>Maximum of 8 units per core not 9. (London Housing Design Guide)</p>	<p>Amended</p>
5.1.4	<p>Refers to 4-7 stories high, however page 47 refers to 4-8 storeys high</p>	<p>Amended</p>
5.2.2	<p>Western unit of block 22 should be reduced to 2 storeys</p>	<p>We have not reduced this unit to keep the row of houses uniform with a consistent roof level. We considered this to be the most appropriate approach within the design of the masterplan</p>

5.2.4	Depth of windows should be a minimum of one brick length deep to add a sense of depth and interest to the elevations ➤ Window depth of 1 brick depth is insufficient – the document refers to 150mm in section on fenestration	Amended
5.3.2	Maximum of 9 units per core – this ‘must’ not be more than	Amended
PR001 E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Block 18 must not have an extension zone closer to Reid Court Block 18 must not have an extension zone in SE and NE corner Block 19 must not have an extension zone in NW corner Block 18 must not have an extension zone closer to Block 20 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amended Extension zone to the northern façade has been removed which reduced the impact of the NE corner Extension zone to the northern façade has been removed Amended
PR002 E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Block 18 must not have extension zone: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o closer to Reid Court o closer to Block 20 	Amended
PR003 E	Block 18 must not have extension zone closer to Reid Court on 5th storey	Amended
PR004 E	Remove all +2.2m and +3.014m extension zones – limit this to +1.5m	The +3m extension zones have been removed, however we have retained the +2.2m zones as these are on the set back floors of B18 and allow that storey to align with the floor below which would be required for certain sloped roof designs (such as a mansard roof)
PR007 E	<p>Why is there such a difference in ground levels:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54cm between courtyard and buildings 18/19 27cm between ground and building 20 52cm between garden and block 16 	Unclear where these measurements are taken from, but the ground floor levels have been set due to flooding restrictions. All level differences are relatively minor and can be ramped within the ground floor corridors.
General comments for parameter plans	<p>General comments on extension zones</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Must not get closer to Reid Court Blocks 18/19 must not get closer Top floors may only have balconies 	Amended

Observations when comparing parameter plans with site elevation drawings

S&P General note on all site sections/elevations:

The block datum referred to on PR007 is the ground floor level of the buildings, which is 6.6m for all except for the terraced houses. It does not refer to the exterior ground level shown on the drawings as this varies at different points across the buildings.

The site sections/elevations show the proposed massing (which is shown as the green lines in the parameter plans) and have the maximum extents dotted on in red. S&P have added spot levels to the maximum extents of the buildings to clear up any confusion about building height. The red lines of the maximum extents do vary in how much they are above the proposed massing. This is because the heights were calculated by multiplying a standard floor to floor height by the number of storeys, and then rounded up to the nearest whole number to make the

numbers as simple as possible to follow. Due to this rounding up the increases in height vary across different buildings. This strategy is consistent with the original application.

	PR 008 E	PR 007 E Block Datum (ground level)	Site elevations	LBRuT comments	S&P Comments
Block 13	<p>North - UP TO 22 m FROM BLOCK DATUM TO PARAPET UP TO 29m PARAPET A.O.D</p> <p>South - UP TO 16 m FROM BLOCK DATUM TO PARAPET UP TO 23m PARAPET A.O.D</p>	+6.60	<p>Drawings RR and NN</p> <p>North – 21.88m or 28.48m AOD</p> <p>South – 15.76m or 22.36m AOD</p>		<p>North – 22m from block datum, 28.60m AOD</p> <p>South – 16m from block datum, 22.6m AOD</p>
Block 14	<p>North - 6 STOREYS UP TO 22 m FROM BLOCK DATUM TO PARAPET UP TO 29m PARAPET A.O.D</p> <p>South - UP TO 16 m FROM BLOCK DATUM TO PARAPET UP TO 23m PARAPET A.O.D</p>	+6.60m	<p>Drawing RR</p> <p>North – 22.3m or 28.9m AOD</p> <p>South – 15.7m or 22.3m AOD</p>		<p>North – 22m from block datum, 28.60m AOD</p> <p>South – 14.5m from block datum, 21.1m AOD</p>
Block 15	<p>Main - UP TO 26 m FROM BLOCK DATUM TO PARAPET UP TO 33m PARPAET A.O.D</p> <p>Top floor - UP TO 30 m FROM BLOCK DATUM TO PARAPET UP TO 37m PARPAET A.O.D</p>	+6.6m	<p>Drawing PP</p> <p>Main – 24.57m or 31.17m AOD</p> <p>Top – 28.08m or 34.88m AOD</p>	There is a significant difference between what is illustrated in site elevations than those dimensions listed on drawings.	<p>Please see general note above</p> <p>Main – 26m from block datum, 32.6m AOD</p> <p>Top floor - 30m from block datum, 36.6m AOD</p>
Block 16	<p>North - UP TO 19 m FROM BLOCK DATUM TO PARAPET UP TO 26m PARAPET A.O.D</p> <p>South - UP TO 22 m FROM BLOCK DATUM TO PARAPET UP TO 29m</p>	+6.6m	<p>Drawing DD</p> <p>North – 18.15m or 24.75AOD</p> <p>South – 21.21m or 27.81m AOD</p>	Elevations show 1.25m lower than PR006.	<p>North – 22m from block datum, 28.60m AOD</p> <p>South – 19m from block datum, 25.6m AOD</p>

	PARAPET A.O.D				
Block 17	<p>North –UP TO 19 m FROM BLOCK DATUM TO PARAPET UP TO 26m PARAPET A.O.D</p> <p>South –UP TO 26 m FROM BLOCK DATUM TO PARAPET UP TO 33m PARAPET A.O.D</p>	+6.03m – +6.6m	<p>Drawing NN</p> <p>North - 18.24m or 24.84 AOD</p> <p>South – 24.97m or 31m AOD</p>	Elevations show 1.16m- 2m lower than PR006.	<p>North – 19m from block datum, 25.6m AOD</p> <p>South – 26m from block datum, 32.6m AOD</p>
Block 18	<p>North element West –UP TO 16 m FROM BLOCK DATUM TO PARAPET UP TO 23m PARAPET A.O.D</p> <p>Middle - UP TO 13 m FROM BLOCK DATUM TO PARAPET UP TO 19m PARAPET A.O.D</p> <p>South element Main –UP TO 19 m FROM BLOCK DATUM TO PARAPET UP TO 26m PARAPET A.O.D</p> <p>Top - UP TO 22 m FROM BLOCK DATUM TO PARAPET UP TO 29m PARAPET A.O.D</p>	+6.6m	<p>Drawing KK</p> <p>North element:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • West element – 14.8m (21.1AOD) • Middle element – 11.9m (18.2AOD) <p>South elevation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Main – 17.85m or 24.45m AOD • Top – 21.21m or 27.81m AOD 	<p>Disingenuous – whilst illustrative only – these are showing approx. 1m lower than max heights on the PR006 E</p>	<p>See general note above</p> <p>North element:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • West element – 16m (22.6AOD) • Middle element – 13m (19.6m AOD) <p>South elevation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Main – 19m or 25.6m AOD • Top – 22m or 28.6m AOD
Block 19	<p>Main - 13 m FROM BLOCK DATUM TO PARAPET UP TO 19m PARAPET A.O.D</p> <p>Top floor - UP TO 16 m FROM BLOCK DATUM TO PARAPET UP TO 23m PARAPET A.O.D</p>	+6.6m	<p>Drawing QQ</p> <p>Main – 11.6m or 18.2m AOD</p> <p>Roof – 14.83m or 21.43m AOD</p>	Disingenuous – elevations show a height significantly lower than PR006 E	<p>Main – 11.15m or 17.75m AOD</p> <p>Roof – 16m or 22.6m AOD</p>
Block 20	UP TO 13 m FROM BLOCK DATUM TO PARAPET UP TO 19m PARAPET A.O.D	+6.3m	<p>EE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shows – 12.28m or 18.58m AOD <p>FF</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shows – 12.27m or 18.57m AOD 		<p>12.37m from block datum or 18.67m AOD</p>

Block 21	UP TO 13 m FROM BLOCK DATUM TO PARAPET UP TO 19m PARAPET A.O.D	+6.3m	EE Shows – 12.28m or 18.58m AOD		12.37m from block datum or 18.67m AOD
----------	--	-------	--	--	---

Other comments:

- Proposed site section FF – incorrectly labels Building 18 (as 19) – both are building 18.

S&P comment - Amended

- It is recommended that the site elevations / section drawings are resubmitted and are labelled with the ground level and maximum height – otherwise, the current site elevation plans are misleading.

S&P comment - Amended

- During the consideration of the original application, a condition was secured on the addendum to add the following height restrictions on Development Area 2 – refer to the table below. It is recommended this is followed through into the application and referred to in the Design Code:

Height restriction conditions in original application	Recommend the following are incorporated within the Design Code (these take into account the renumbering of buildings)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building 18 (west elevation) – 14.4m –with any additional height (up to the maximum height specified in part (A) no less than 2m from the elevation. • Building 19 – (north west elevation) – 14.7m –with any additional height (up to the maximum height specified in part (A) no less than 2.5m from the elevation • Building 20 / 21 (north elevation) - 10.5m 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building 19 – 14.4m –with any additional height (up to the maximum height no less than 2m from the elevation) • Building 18 – (north west elevation) – 14.7m –with any additional height (up to the maximum height no less than 2.5m from the elevation) • Building 20 / 21 (north elevation) - 10.5m

S&P are largely happy with these conditions. However can they be amended to reflect that B19 is 14.5m from the block datum (21.1 AOD) as this is what we are currently showing in the drawings.