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1 Executive summary

1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 This *Open Space Assessment* has been prepared in accordance with Government policy for the provision of major waste water infrastructure as set out in the National Policy Statement for Waste Water (NPS).

1.1.2 The NPS at paragraphs 4.8.13 and 4.8.14 identifies the criteria for judgement by the decision maker for any application for development control consent under the Planning Act 2008, as follows:

“The decision maker should not grant consent for development on existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land unless an assessment has been undertaken either by the local authority or independently, which has clearly shown the open space or the buildings and land to be surplus to requirements or the decision maker determines that the benefits of the project (including need) outweigh the potential loss of such facilities, taking into account any positive proposals made by the applicant to provide new, improved or compensatory land or facilities. The loss of playing fields should only be allowed where applicants can demonstrate that they will be replaced with facilities of equivalent or better quantity or quality in a suitable location.

In reaching a judgment, the decision maker should consider whether any adverse impact is temporary, such as during construction, and/or whether any adverse impact on the landscape will be capable of being reversed in a timescale that the decision maker considers reasonable.”

1.1.3 This assessment together with the *Environmental Statement* seeks to address those issues with regard to open space.

1.1.4 In assessing effects of the project on open space, the NPS advises applicants to:

“use any up-to-date local authority assessment or, if there is none, provide an independent assessment to show whether the existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land is surplus to requirements” (para. 4.8.6).

1.1.5 Each of the local authorities affected by the Main tunnel route has carried out an assessment of open space. However, to ensure a consistent approach to assessing all open spaces along the route Thames Water\(^1\) has carried out an independent open space assessment, but where adequate and relevant local planning authority assessments have been used.

---

\(^1\) Thames Water Utilities Ltd (TWUL). The draft Development Consent Order (DCO) contains an ability for TWUL to transfer powers to an Infrastructure Provider (as defined in article 2(1) of the DCO) and/or, with the consent of the Secretary of State, another body.
1.2 Purpose of study

1.2.1 The objectives of the study are:

a. To undertake an independent open space assessment to consistently assess those open spaces that will be affected by the project proposals incorporating a review of existing Council assessments and policies, in line with para. 4.8.6 of the NPS.

b. To undertake an assessment of the effects of current proposals, on open space by identifying direct and indirect effects and recommending mitigation measures (paras. 4.8.20, 21 and 4.8.24 of the NPS make reference to the need for appropriate mitigation measures).

1.2.2 The study included:

a. A desk based review of open space assessments in each of the local authorities along the likely preferred route of the main tunnel where open spaces potentially could be directly or indirectly affected. The review also considered local authority open space assessments against the requirements of Planning Policy Guidance Note 17: Planning for open space, sport and recreation (PPG17).

b. An independent assessment of the quality and value of each of the open spaces potentially affected by the project proposals, in order to provide a consistent and comprehensive approach to the assessment of effects of the project proposals on open spaces,

c. An assessment of the effects of the project proposals on open space, including on the function, quantity, quality, accessibility and value of the open space.

d. Identification of possible mitigation measures, where potential adverse effects may arise.

1.3 Definition of open space

1.3.1 To allow the effects of the project proposals on open spaces and foreshore to be assessed a definition of open space is required. The NPS refers to the definition of open space as used in the Town and Country Planning Act 1990:

“land laid out as a public garden, or used for the purposes of public recreation, or land which is a disused burial ground.” (para. 4.8.1).

The NPS also states:

“in applying the policies in this section, open space should be taken to mean all open space of public value, including not just land, but also areas of water such as rivers, canals, lakes and reservoirs which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation and can also act as a visual amenity.” (para. 4.8.1).

1.3.2 On the basis of the wider definition of open space set out in the NPS the River Thames is classified as open space. However given its unique role
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and functions (that are very different to those performed by other types of open space) the River Thames has been excluded from this study. Effects of the proposals on the River Thames are assessed in the Environmental Impact Assessment.

1.3.3 The Thames foreshore has been included in this assessment (see Table 6.1 Assessed Open Spaces). In places the foreshore is publicly accessible at low tide and can therefore provide similar functions as found in open spaces. The inclusion of the Thames foreshore in this assessment is additional to what would normally be included in open space assessments prepared by local authorities. However, due to the nature of the project proposals and the potential for direct effects on publically accessible foreshore it has been considered necessary and is consistent with the definition of open space with public value as outlined in the NPS.

1.4 Relationship to the socio-economic impact assessment section of the Environmental Statement

1.4.1 The Socio-economic Impact Assessment (SEIA) was prepared as part of the Environmental Statement, while this Open Space Assessment has been prepared separately to meet the requirements of the NPS that relate specifically to open space. Paragraph 4.8.6 of the NPS advises applicants to:

“use any up-to-date local authority assessment or, if there is none, provide an independent assessment to show whether the existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land is surplus to requirements”.

1.4.2 Key differences between the studies are:

a. The Open Space Assessment considers local authority open space assessments, the SEIA does not.

b. The Open Space Assessment only considers effects on open spaces directly or indirectly affected by worksites or adjacent to worksites. Unlike the SEIA, it does not consider other neighbouring sensitive receptors.

c. For those spaces affected the SEIA includes an assessment of existing facility or space utilisation (and access to and quality of other facilities or spaces locally), whereas the Open Space Assessment particularly considers whether the space is in an area of deficiency in order to assess whether the space might be surplus to requirements.

d. The Open Space Assessment considers the effects of the proposals (which include embedded mitigation) without additional mitigation, whereas the SEIA specifies additional mitigation, where appropriate, as part of the assessment.

e. The Open Space Assessment considers the function, quantity, quality, accessibility and value of open space. It assesses the quality and value of open spaces in order that the project can incorporate mitigation measures or positive proposals to improve existing open
spaces. Whereas the SEIA focuses on the size and function of open space in the context of its neighbourhood.

1.4.3 The two studies complement each other and have shared information including baseline data and preliminary assessment findings.

1.4.4 This ensures that the two assessments are drawing on a common understanding of the relevant physical characteristics. There are differences with how the two pieces of work assess the effects of the proposals on open space. This assessment assesses the function, quantity, quality, accessibility and value of the open spaces affected, whereas the SEIA focuses on the environmental implications. The open space assessment also considers the effects of the proposals without mitigation, whereas the SEIA considers the proposals with mitigation in place, and as such some differences in findings are likely.

1.5 Proposals

1.5.1 The project proposals assessed in this study include a total of 24 sites. Open spaces affected are set out in Table 3.1 and maps are provided in Appendix E.

1.5.2 For each project worksite Table 3.1 identifies:
   a. Whether the project worksites are likely to, directly or indirectly affect open spaces and foreshore.
   b. Those sites where the project proposals could potentially create new open space.

1.5.3 No replacement open space is proposed that would satisfy the requirements of Sections 131(12) or 132(12) of the Planning Act 2008, but there is an opportunity on some foreshore sites to create new areas of public realm on reclaimed land.

1.5.4 In broad terms proposed works at each site can be considered as either permanent or temporary, where temporary works refer to the construction phase while permanent works refer to the operational phase at each site.
   a. Permanent works can include: underground structures to intercept and divert the flow of sewerage, below / above ground ventilation structures, electric and control kiosks and cabinets and permanent hardstanding for operational use.
   b. Temporary works can include: hoardings, lay down areas, temporary office and welfare accommodation and the creation of temporary access routes for road haul and the installation and maintenance of construction area.

1.6 Policy context

1.6.1 The NPS was designated in March 2012. It sets out Government policy for the provision of major waste water infrastructure. The NPS is to be used as the primary basis for deciding applications for development consent for waste water developments that fall within the definition of Nationally
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Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIP) as defined in the Planning Act 2008. The Thames Tideway Tunnel project (the ‘project’) is classed as an NSIP and therefore the NPS is the primary planning context for this study.

1.6.2 The study reviews other relevant policy at the national and regional level as this forms the policy context for borough open space assessments. The reviewed policy relates to wastewater infrastructure, open space and recreation as well as the Thames. The following table lists key policy documents which are reviewed in Section 3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National</th>
<th>Date of publication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Policy Guidance Note 17: Planning for Open Space Sport and Recreation (PPG 17)</td>
<td>July 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towards a Level Playing Field, Sport England</td>
<td>July 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)</td>
<td>March 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Mayor’s Guide to preparing Open Space Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPG: Providing for Children and Young People’s Play and Informal Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The London Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor’s Revised Early Alterations to the London Plan²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.7 Local authority assessments

1.7.1 The NPS (para. 4.8.6) provides advice to applicants where their proposals would affect open space, as follows

“applicants should use any up to date local authority assessment or, if there is none, provide an independent assessment to show whether the existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land is surplus to requirements.”

1.7.2 Taking this advice into consideration this assessment has reviewed the local authority assessments for those local authorities through which the proposed route for the main tunnel passes through and where there are sites that potentially affect open space directly or indirectly. Although there are 14 authorities on the proposed route, only those assessments in Boroughs with potentially affected sites were reviewed. For each local authority the following information was provided:

- a. assessment information: detail on when and how the assessment was undertaken
- b. key issues: this includes issues in terms of quantity, quality and accessibility

² This is not an adopted document at the time of writing
c. standards: open space standards that have been adopted

d. policy approach: Local Development Framework open space policies including any saved policies

e. assessment of local authority assessments by this assessment: review of the assessment against NPPF requirements

f. implications for the project proposals.

1.7.3 This assessment assesses existing local authority assessments of open space as advised by the NPS which recommends that when proposals impact on open space applicants should use any up-to-date local authority assessments.

1.7.4 The aim of this assessment is therefore to identify the current status of affected local authority assessments to determine whether they are up-to-date and in conformity with policy guidance and as a result identify the implications of the Borough assessments for the project sites. The assessment has been undertaken to ensure a consistent approach has been employed in identifying the current status of local authority assessments and therefore in identifying the potential effects of the project proposals on the function, quantity, quality, accessibility and value of open spaces and foreshore.

1.7.5 Section 6 includes our own assessment of open spaces and foreshore to ensure a consistent approach has been used when assessing potential impacts of the project proposals.

1.7.6 In order to assess the robustness of each local authority open space assessment Thames Water considered NPPF requirements. The PPG17 requirements were also considered as local authorities have undertaken local assessments of open space need and audits of open space provision in line with the now revoked PPG17. Taking each local authority in turn the findings are:

a. London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames – partially meets requirements

b. London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham – partially meets requirements

c. London Borough of Wandsworth – meets requirements

d. Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea – partially meets requirements

e. London Borough of Lambeth - partially meets requirements

f. City of Westminster – partially meets requirements

g. City of London – partially meets requirements

h. London Borough of Southwark – partially meets requirements

i. London Borough of Lewisham – meets requirements

j. London Borough of Greenwich – partially meets requirements

k. London Borough of Tower Hamlets – partially meets requirements.
1.7.7 The review of the local authority open space assessments shows that none of the open spaces affected by the project have been identified as being ‘surplus to requirements’.

1.7.8 Many of the sites are not specifically referred to in the relevant local authority assessment, and where open space is referred to there is often limited information. In particular foreshore sites are not included in any open space assessment. This makes it difficult to draw conclusions about the quality and value of open spaces from these sources.

1.8 Site assessment

1.8.1 The review of local authority assessments has shown that some local authority assessments only partially meet the requirements of the NPPF and PPG17, and in some cases provide little or no information on individual open spaces (including those potentially directly or indirectly affected by the project proposals). Given the lack of information in borough assessments on these sites, in order to meet the requirements of the NPS (set out above) Thames Water carried out an independent assessment of open spaces and foreshore that are potentially directly or indirectly affected (see Table 5.1) by the project proposals. This open space assessment provides a consistent approach to assessment of open spaces along the preferred route of main tunnel.

1.8.2 In addition to the areas within the project boundary, a further seven open spaces adjacent to project sites were also assessed, as they potentially could be directly or indirectly affected by the proposals.

1.8.3 The sites assessment considered the quality and value of open spaces. Quality of open space relates to the design, management and maintenance, but also considers whether the space is fit for purpose. Value relates to three things, the context (for example inaccessible spaces are of little value), level and type of use and wider benefits. Wider benefits can include: structural and landscape benefits; ecological benefits; education benefits; social inclusion and health benefits; cultural and heritage benefits; amenity benefits; and economic benefits.

1.8.4 An independent assessment of the quality and value of open spaces was undertaken for the following reasons:

a. Some of the local authority assessments are several years old and therefore more up to date information is required.

b. Some of the open spaces in question have not been assessed in detail in the local authority assessments.

c. Surveying all the open spaces independently provides a consistent approach and method for assessing quality and value.

d. This assessment of quality and value is used to inform the assessment of the benefits to open space from the scheme.

1.8.5 Scoring criteria are based on a method derived by the Civic Trust Green Flag standard assessment. The assessments are based on 18 Green Flag criteria. Each of the criteria are attributed a score of 0 to 10 with 0 being
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‘Very Poor’ and 10 being ‘Exceptional’. Foreshore sites are scored 0 as given the nature of foreshore (only available at low tide). Scoring against park criteria is not relevant.

1.8.6 Of the sites that potentially could be directly affected by the project proposals, those sites noted for their value include:

a. Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre, which has a particular value for recreation serving a wide area.

b. King George’s Park which has a multi-functional role and strong structural and amenity value.

c. Ranelagh Gardens which plays a key role in an area with limited publicly accessible open space, as well as performing a key cultural role.

d. King Edward Memorial Park which has high value and also has Green Flag status and supports a range of recreational facilities and provides a District Park function in a densely populated area with limited open space.

1.9 Effects during construction and operation

1.9.1 The review of local authority assessments in Section 5 has shown that none of the open spaces potentially directly affected or indirectly affected by the project proposals is surplus to requirements. Therefore, it is important to consider the effects of the project proposals on the open space (which could include a quantitative or qualitative loss of open space), in order that the decision maker can consider the benefits of the project against the loss of the open space.

1.9.2 The NPS provides no detailed guidance on how to assess the effects of wastewater infrastructure proposals on open space. Therefore this study uses an amended approach that is based on Environmental Impact Assessment good practice.

1.9.3 Effects during the construction and operational phases of the development have been assessed. Effects are assessed as direct, or indirect, temporary or permanent.

Unaffected open spaces

1.9.4 Chelsea Bridge Gardens (adjacent to Chelsea Embankment Foreshore) and Whitehall Gardens (adjacent to Victoria Embankment Foreshore) have both been assessed as not being affected at all by the proposals either direct or indirectly.

Directly affected open spaces

1.9.5 Open spaces that are negatively affected directly during construction phase but with positive effects in the operational phase comprise:

a. Barn Elms School Sports Centre

b. Putney Embankment Foreshore

c. Waterman’s Green
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- King George’s Park
- Chelsea Embankment Foreshore
- Albert Embankment Foreshore
- The Public Realm in front of Vauxhall Cross
- Victoria Embankment Foreshore
- Blackfriars Bridge Foreshore
- Deptford Church Street
- King Edward Memorial Park.

1.9.6 Ranelagh Gardens will have some negative effects during construction only.

**Indirectly affected open spaces**

1.9.7 Indirectly affected open spaces including Frank Banfield Park and Cremorne Gardens which will be indirectly affected in the construction phase. York Gardens is also included in the category of open space indirectly affected because, although a small area of the park will be permanently acquired, this area is so small that any direct impact is insignificant. These negative effects will cease in the operational phase and some positive effects will be felt during the operational phase.

1.10 **Mitigation**

1.10.1 The study identifies a range of potential mitigation measures that could be used for mitigating the potential effects of the project proposals. These include:

- quality improvements within the open space affected, and or improvements to other open spaces nearby
- temporary creation of replacement facilities within the affected site
- creation of replacement open space
- improvements in the accessibility to the affected open spaces
- appropriate diversions to the Thames Path
- amendments to the design and massing and size of construction and operational structures
- screening of construction and operational structures through planting etc.

1.10.2 Much of the mitigation will be related to ensuring that construction activities are properly screened to ensure that disruption to open space is minimised.

1.10.3 There are two sites where the potential mitigation measures needed are greater.
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a. Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre
   i. Reconfiguration of existing pitch layout to compensate for the temporary loss of one grass pitch.
   ii. Improve drainage to pitches liable to ‘waterlogging’ to increase capacity on these pitches.
   iii. Construction of new changing facilities on site, to be completed before demolition of existing facilities is undertaken.
   iv. The relocation of track and field facilities to remain within close proximity of existing facilities.
   v. Proposed road surface of ‘grasscrete’ should minimise the potential for visual impact.

b. King Edward Memorial Park
   i. Relocate the hard surface sports pitch within the park. Quality improvements within the park and in open spaces in close proximity to the park.

1.10.4 In addition to the measures above, there are various temporary diversions to the Thames Path that will be required.

1.11 Conclusions

1.11.1 In terms of the criteria against which the decision maker must be satisfied (by reference to paras. 4.8.13 and 4.8.14 of the NPS), the conclusions are that:

a. Thames Water is not able to create new areas of open space to replace that which will be permanently lost as a result of the project;

b. None of the open space areas identified in this assessment as being affected directly or indirectly by the project can be deemed surplus to requirements;

C. The project will provide enhancements to the open space areas at the following locations:
   i. Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre – re-provision of better quality changing facilities.
   ii. Putney Embankment Foreshore and Waterman’s Green - creation of additional hard landscaped embankment.
   iii. King George’s Park – hard and soft landscaped quality improvements to the part of the park that will be affected by the proposals, which will also allow better views of the lake.
   iv. York Gardens – new public realm will be created to the front of the Falconbrook Pumping Station. This new area of public realm will form part of the Park.
   v. Chelsea Embankment Foreshore – additional hard landscaping will be created on the embankment providing a space for sitting out and relaxation.
vi Albert Embankment Foreshore – additional hard landscaping will be created on the embankment providing a space for sitting out and relaxation.

vii Victoria Embankment Foreshore – additional hard landscaping will be created on the embankment providing a space for sitting out and relaxation.

viii Blackfriars Bridge Foreshore – additional hard landscaping will be created on the embankment in an area that is identified as having open space deficiencies. The public realm will provide a space for sitting out and relaxation.

ix King Edward Memorial Park – additional open space extending the park (including planting) and adding more space for sitting out and relaxation.

x Deptford Church Street – the project proposals provide an opportunity for enhancement of the open space to meet local community needs.

d. Other specific mitigation measures will be provided at:

i Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre – potential reconfiguration of pitch layout to compensate for temporary loss of one pitch, the project’s drainage measures may enable better pitch utilisation, use of ‘grasscrete’ road surface for the access road to reduce visual impact.

ii Frank Banfield Park - erection of temporary screening / hoarding along the Distillery Road edge of the park.

iii Putney Embankment Foreshore – provision of temporary slipway and temporary diversion of the Thames Path.

iv Waterman’s Green – erection of temporary hoarding around the construction site (potentially transparent).

v King George’s Park – erection of temporary hoarding around the construction site, on site improvement of hard and soft landscaping features, investment in improving quality of existing recreational facilities (areas for sitting out and relaxation), temporary signage/maps to direct users to entry points.

vi King Edward Memorial Park – tree planting to screen construction, possible relocation of children’s play area, improved surface for the multi-sports pitch, provision of alternative means of launching small boats into the river, enhancements to the Thames Path, improvements to the wildflower meadow, possible enhancements to the dockside area around the Shadwell Basin.

e. Of the impacts identified, the following will be temporary only:

i Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre – construction traffic, noise and air pollution and loss of land to provide an access route affecting one pitch, during the period of construction (2.5 years).
Putney Embankment Foreshore – impact on embankment for sitting out and walking and the foreshore will be inaccessible, during the period of construction (3.5 years).

Waterman’s Green – views of river from the open space will be blocked and the site will be partially inaccessible, during the period of construction (3.5 years).

King George’s Park – construction traffic, noise and air pollution, a small part of the park will be inaccessible and access from Buckhold Road will be restricted, during the period of construction (2.5 years).

York Gardens – loss of a very small part of the park and closure of the access to the park from York Way during the period of construction (3 years).

Ranelagh Gardens - loss of a very small part of the open space during the period of construction (4 years).

Albert Embankment Foreshore – effect on visual amenity and loss of access, during the period of construction (3.5 years).

King Edward Memorial Park – loss of the area of the park by the embankment, which would affect the visual amenity value of the park. Noise, air pollution and traffic associated with the construction site would have a negative effect on the quality of the remaining site, during the period of construction (3.5 years).

Deptford Church Street – loss of the whole site, during the period of construction (3.5 years).
2 Introduction

2.1.1 This Open Space Assessment has been prepared in accordance with Government policy for the provision of major waste water infrastructure as set out in the National Policy Statement for Waste Water (NPS).

2.1.2 The NPS at paragraphs. 4.8.13 and 4.8.14 identifies the criteria for judgement by the decision maker for any application for development control consent under the Planning Act 2008 as follows:

“The decision maker should not grant consent for development on existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land unless an assessment has been undertaken either by the local authority or independently, which has clearly shown the open space or the buildings and land to be surplus to requirements or the decision maker determines that the benefits of the project (including need) outweigh the potential loss of such facilities, taking into account any positive proposals made by the applicant to provide new, improved or compensatory land or facilities. The loss of playing fields should only be allowed where applicants can demonstrate that they will be replaced with facilities of equivalent or better quantity or quality in a suitable location.

In reaching a judgment, the decision maker should consider whether any adverse impact is temporary, such as during construction, and/or whether any adverse impact on the landscape will be capable of being reversed in a timescale that the decision maker considers reasonable.”

2.1.3 This assessment together with the Environmental Statement seeks to address those issues with regard to open space.

2.1.4 In assessing effects of the project on open space, the NPS advises applicants to:

“use any up-to-date local authority assessment or, if there is none, provide an independent assessment to show whether the existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land is surplus to requirements” (para. 4.8.6).

2.1.5 Each of the local authorities affected by the Main tunnel route has carried out an assessment of open space, however to ensure a consistent approach to assessing all open spaces along the route Thames Water carried out an independent open space assessment, but where adequate and relevant local planning authority assessments have been used.

2.2 Purpose

2.2.1 The objectives of the study are:

a. To undertake an independent open space assessment to consistently assess those open spaces that will be affected by the project proposals incorporating a review of existing local planning authority assessments and policies, in line with paragraph 4.8.6 of the NPS.
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b. To undertake an assessment of the effects of current proposals, on the open space by identifying direct and indirect effects and recommending mitigation measures (pars. 4.8.20, 21 and 24 of the NPS make reference to the need for appropriate mitigation measures).

2.2.2 Thames Water completed assessments of both open spaces (April 2011) and associated foreshore areas (October 2012) affected by the project proposals.

2.2.3 Work on the open space assessment began in early 2011. Since then the project proposals have changed. This has resulted in the removal of a number of sites initially assessed in 2011 that are no longer relevant to the project. As the scheme has evolved the open space assessment has also evolved.

2.2.4 Work completed for the open space assessment has been used to inform the development of the project since early 2011. The Thames foreshore has been considered by this assessment. An assessment of the foreshore area has been included in Section 6 of this report. Generally foreshore is not considered in open space assessments due to their temporary nature as a result of tidal fluctuations, limited public access and their restricted recreational role. For the purposes of this assessment, only foreshore that is publicly accessible is considered open space.

2.2.5 As noted above, there is a requirement set out in the NPS to use up-to-date local authority assessments or if there are none, provide an independent assessment to show whether existing open space, sports and recreational buildings are surplus to requirements (para. 4.8.6). This study includes an independent assessment of open spaces (included in Section 5 of this report) for the following reasons:

a. To update existing, and in some cases out of date, local authority assessments.

b. To ensure all of the affected open spaces and foreshore have been assessed in detail and consistently.

c. To develop an independent view on each of the affected open spaces and foreshore.

2.2.6 Section 5 of this report identifies the current status of affected local authority assessments of open space to determine whether they are up-to-date and in conformity with policy guidance. This assessment has been undertaken to ensure a consistent approach has been employed in identifying the current status of local authority assessments.

2.2.7 Section 6 of this report includes an assessment of each open space and foreshore area. For each site consideration is given to the quality and value of the open space or foreshore area. Quality of open space relates to its design, management and maintenance, but also considers whether the space is fit for purpose. Value relates to three things: the context (for example inaccessible spaces are of little value); level and type of use and wider benefits. Wider benefits can include: structural and landscape benefits; ecological benefits; education benefits; social inclusion and
health benefits; cultural and heritage benefits; amenity benefits, and economic benefits.

2.2.8 On 22 June 2012, the Secretary of State made the Infrastructure Planning (Waste Water Transfer and Storage) Order 2012 pursuant to Section 14(3) of the Planning Act 2008 (as amended by the Localism Act 2011) (the ‘2008 Act’). This order created a new category of Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) into which the project falls. Following the making of the order, the project formally became an NSIP to which the procedures under the 2008 Act apply.

The Planning Inspectorate is responsible for examining applications for NSIPs, which are granted in the form of Development Consent Orders. The Secretary of State has assumed responsibility under the 2008 Act for deciding such applications and will judge the application for development consent for the project primarily on the basis of the policies in the NPS.

2.3 Scope

2.3.1 The scope for this study includes completing a desk based review of open space assessments in each of the local authorities along the preferred route of the main tunnel where potential exists for both direct and indirect effects on existing open spaces and foreshore.

2.3.2 Paragraph 4.8.1 of the NPS states:

“A waste water infrastructure project will have direct effects on the existing use of the proposed site and may have indirect effects on the use, or planned use, of land in the vicinity for other types of development. Given the likely locations of waste water infrastructure projects there may be particular effects on open space including green infrastructure”.

2.3.3 The review of local authority assessments includes assessing information on key issues related to open spaces directly affected by the project proposals.

2.3.4 The review of local authority open space assessments will be in accordance with general requirements outlined in the NPPF because local authorities need to ensure their assessments are consistent with the requirements of the NPPF and the review is also consistent with the requirements of the NPS.

2.3.5 The NPPF sets out the Government’s requirements for the planning system. The NPPF states:

"Assessments should identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreational facilities in the local area” (para.73).

2.3.6 The NPS for waste water states that:

“Applicants should use any up-to-date local authority assessment......” (para. 4.8.6).

3 In this case, the Secretaries of State for the Department for Communities and Local Government and the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs will act as joint decision maker.
2.3.7 In line with the study objectives it is important to adopt a consistent and comprehensive approach to the assessment of effects resulting from the project proposals on affected open spaces and foreshore by including an independent assessment of quality and value. Preparing a consistent open space assessment will be important to ensure the study is both objective and comprehensive across all affected open spaces and foreshore.

2.3.8 This approach has been adopted to ensure affected open spaces and foreshore have been assessed consistently across all of the Local Planning Authorities which have themselves employed varying approaches in assessing open space and foreshore and to take account of the fact that none of the Local Planning Authority open space assessments has identified whether those open spaces affected by the project proposals are surplus to requirements.

2.3.9 The independent assessment of quality and value of each open space and foreshore has been completed in accordance with the approach adopted by many of the Borough’s affected by the project in preparing their own open space assessments and strategies. Existing open space assessments and strategies have generally been prepared in accordance with the now superseded PPG17: Open Space, Sport and Recreation (2002) and Assessing the Needs and Opportunities: A Companion Guide to PPG17 (2002).

2.3.10 Quality of open space relates to the design, management and maintenance, but also considers whether the space is fit for purpose. Value relates to three things: the context (for example inaccessible spaces are of little value); level and type of use and wider benefits.

2.3.11 The scope of the study includes completing an assessment of the effects of the project proposals on open space (see below for definition of open space).

2.3.12 Where adverse effects are identified in relation to green infrastructure and open space, potential mitigation measures have been highlighted as outlined in paras. 4.8.19 to 4.8.21 of the NPS. The NPS states:

“Applicants can minimise the direct effects of a project on the existing use of the proposed site, or proposed uses near the site by the application of good design principles, including the layout of the project” (para. 4.8.19).

2.4 Definition of open space

2.4.1 To allow the effects of the project proposals on open spaces and foreshore to be assessed a definition of open space is required. The NPS refers to the definition of open space as used in the Town and Country Planning Act 1990:

“land laid out as a public garden, or used for the purposes of public recreation, or land which is a disused burial ground.” (para. 4.8.1).

The NPS also states:

“in applying the policies in this section, open space should be taken to mean all open space of public value, including not just land, but also areas
of water such as rivers, canals, lakes and reservoirs which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation and can also act as a visual amenity.” (para. 4.8.1).

2.4.2 On the basis of the definition of open space set out in the NPS the River Thames is classified as open space. However given its unique role and functions (that are very different to those performed by other types of open space) the River Thames has been excluded from this study. Effects of the proposals on the River Thames are assessed in the Environmental Statement.

2.4.3 The Thames foreshore has been included in this assessment (see Table 6.1 Assessed Open Spaces, for foreshore sites that have been assessed in this study). In places the foreshore is publicly accessible at low tide and can therefore provide similar functions as found in open spaces. The inclusion of the Thames foreshore in this assessment is additional to what would normally be included in open space assessments prepared by local authorities. However, due to the nature of the project proposals and the potential for direct effects on publically accessible foreshore it has been considered necessary and is consistent with the definition of open space with public value as outlined in the NPS.

2.4.4 The London Plan (2011) refers to the Thames foreshore in Policy 7.27 the London Plan (2011),

“the historic steps and slipways to the Thames foreshore are often overlooked, neglected or even removed. These facilities are vital for enabling access to the Thames foreshore given the huge tidal range of the river and the Mayor wishes to see these facilities retained, improved and where disused, brought back into use.” (para. 7.83).

In addition, the London Plan (2011) Policy 7.28 indicates that development should restore and enhance the blue ribbon network including:

“protecting the value of the foreshore of the Thames and tidal rivers". (para. 7.84)

2.4.5 As highlighted above there are areas of the Thames foreshore that will be used as worksites. For the purposes of this assessment, areas of foreshore where the public can and do have access have been deemed to have open space/recreational value. The assessment has therefore included foreshore areas as open space, in order to be comprehensive.

2.5 Relationship to the socio-economic impact assessment section of the Environmental Statement

2.5.1 The Socio-economic Impact Assessment (SEIA) was prepared as part of the Environmental Statement, while this Open Space Assessment has been prepared separately to meet the requirements of the NPS that relate specifically to open space. Paragraph 4.8.6 of the NPS advises applicants to:
“use any up-to-date local authority assessment or, if there is none, provide an independent assessment to show whether the existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land is surplus to requirements”.

2.5.2 Key differences between the study are:

a. The Open Space Assessment considers local authority open space assessments, the SEIA does not.

b. The Open Space Assessment only considers effects on open spaces directly or indirectly affected by worksites or adjacent to worksites. Unlike the SEIA, it does not consider other neighbouring sensitive receptors.

c. For those spaces affected the SEIA includes an assessment of existing facility or space utilisation (and access to and quality of other facilities or spaces locally), whereas the Open Space Assessment particularly considers whether the space is in an area of deficiency in order to assess whether the space might be surplus to requirements.

d. The Open Space Assessment considers the effects of the proposals (which include embedded mitigation) without additional mitigation, whereas the SEIA specifies additional mitigation, where appropriate, as part of the assessment.

e. The Open Space Assessment considers the function, quantity, quality, accessibility and value of open space. It assesses the quality and value of open spaces in order that the project can incorporate mitigation measures or positive proposals to improve existing open spaces. Whereas the SEIA focuses on the size and function of open space in the context of its neighbourhood.

2.5.3 The two studies complement each other and have shared information including baseline data and preliminary assessment findings.

2.5.4 This ensures that the two assessments are drawing on a common understanding of the relevant physical characteristics. There are differences with how the two pieces of work assess the effects of the proposals on open space. This study assesses the quality and value of the open spaces affected, whereas the SEIA focuses on the environmental implications. This study also considers the effects of the proposals without mitigation, whereas the SEIA considers the proposals with mitigation in place, and as such some differences in findings are likely.

2.6 Structure of the Open Space Assessment

2.6.1 The report is set out in five sections as follows:

a. Section 3: Proposals. Sets out the project proposals that are included in this study.

b. Section 4: Policy Context. Sets out the planning context for the project, and open space planning nationally and regionally.

c. Section 5: Local Authority Assessments. Reviews the open space assessments of those local authorities that are on the main tunnel
route where open spaces could potentially be affected either directly or indirectly.

d. Section 6: Site Assessments. Sets out the approach to independent assessment open space quality and value, and sets out the results of this assessment on a site by site basis.

e. Section 7: Assessment of effects and mitigation. Sets out the approach to assessing effects of proposals on open space and sets out the assessment of effects of the proposals on each site. Identifies recommendations for mitigation measures that may be required to overcome effects on open spaces directly or indirectly affected by the project proposals.

f. Section 8: Conclusions. Sets out the conclusions of the local authority and our independent assessments, effects and mitigation.

2.6.2 There are various appendices providing supporting information to the main report.
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3 Proposals

3.1 Introduction

3.1.1 This section identifies the sites that are included in the project’s proposed route. The section provides a list of sites and a brief summary of the description of permanent and temporary works at each site.

3.1.2 The proposals referred to in this section are those that have been considered in the remainder of the report.

3.2 Sites

3.2.1 The project proposals assessed in this study include a total of 24 sites. Open spaces affected are set out in Table 3.1 and maps are provided in Appendix E.

3.2.2 Both direct and indirect effects of the project proposals have been considered. The NPS states that waste water infrastructure projects:

“will have direct effects on the existing use of the proposed site and may have indirect effects on the use, or planned use of land in the vicinity for other types of development. Given the likely locations of waste water infrastructure projects it is recognised that there may be particular effects on open space, including green infrastructure” (para. 4.8.1).

3.2.3 For each project worksite Table 3.1 identifies:

a. Whether the project worksites are likely to, directly or indirectly affect open spaces and foreshore.

b. Those sites where the project proposals could potentially create new open space.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local authority</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Open space</th>
<th>Foreshore</th>
<th>Potential direct/indirect effect on open space</th>
<th>Creation of new open space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LB Ealing</td>
<td>Acton Storm Tanks</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB Hammersmith</td>
<td>Hammersmith Pumping Station</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Fulham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB Richmond</td>
<td>Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upon Thames</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB Wandsworth</td>
<td>Putney Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Direct/Indirect</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB Wandsworth</td>
<td>Dormay Street</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB Wandsworth</td>
<td>King George’s Park</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local authority</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Open space</th>
<th>Foreshore</th>
<th>Potential direct/indirect effect on open space</th>
<th>Creation of new open space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LB Hammersmith and Fulham</td>
<td>Carnwath Road Riverside</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB Wandsworth</td>
<td>Falconbrook Pumping Station</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington and Chelsea</td>
<td>Cremorne Wharf Depot</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington and Chelsea</td>
<td>Chelsea Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Direct/Indirect</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB Wandsworth</td>
<td>Kirtling Street</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB Wandsworth</td>
<td>Heathwall Pumping Station</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambeth</td>
<td>Albert Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Westminster</td>
<td>Victoria Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Direct/Indirect</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of London</td>
<td>Blackfriars Bridge Foreshore</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwark</td>
<td>Shad Thames Pumping Station</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwark</td>
<td>Chambers Wharf</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower Hamlets</td>
<td>King Edward Memorial Park</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham</td>
<td>Earl Pumping Station</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham</td>
<td>Deptford Church Street</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB Greenwich</td>
<td>Greenwich Pumping Station</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB Newham</td>
<td>Abbey Mills Pumping Station*</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB Newham</td>
<td>Beckton Sewage Treatment Works</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower Hamlets</td>
<td>Bekesbourne Street</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Abbey Mills Pumping Station is designated in the Newham Core Strategy as green space; however, it is not publicly accessible and is located within a Thames Water operational facility.*
3.2.4 The Description of Works, detailing each of the sites listed in Table 3.1 is included in the draft Development Consent Order (DCO) for the project (also refer to overall project description in Appendix D).

3.2.5 Plans of the project worksites that affect open space or foreshore are attached in Appendix E.
4 Policy context

4.1 Introduction

4.1.1 This section sets out the planning policy context at both the national and regional level related to wastewater infrastructure, open space and recreation and the Thames. The policy context at the local level is considered in Section 5.

4.2 National

National Policy Statement for Waste Water

4.2.1 The NPS was designated in March 2012. It sets out Government policy for the provision of major waste water infrastructure. The NPS is to be used as the primary basis for deciding development consent applications for waste water developments that fall within the definition of Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIP) as defined in the Planning Act 2008. The Major Infrastructure Planning Unit within the Planning Inspectorate will examine applications for development consent for NSIPs including the project proposals and then make recommendations to the Secretaries of State for the Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) and the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) as to whether consent should be granted.

Applicant’s assessment

4.2.2 The NPS advises applicants to consult with local communities in relation to any proposals to build on open space, sports or recreational buildings and land:

“Taking account of the consultations, applicants should consider providing new or additional open space, including green infrastructure, sport or recreation facilities, to substitute for any losses as a result of their proposal.” (para. 4.8.6).

4.2.3 Paragraph 4.8.6 also advises applicants to:

“use any up-to-date local authority assessment or, if there is none, provide an independent assessment to show whether the existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land is surplus to requirements.”

4.2.4 By completing a review of existing local authority assessments of open space and completing a consistent, independent assessment of affected open spaces and foreshore the criteria outlined in the NPS will have been met by this study.

Decision making

4.2.5 The NPS identifies what decision makers will consider when assessing generic impacts on land-use including open space, green infrastructure and green belt.
4.2.6 Paragraph 4.8.13 states that:
“the decision maker should not grant consent for development on existing open space, sports or recreational buildings and land unless an assessment has been undertaken either by the local authority or independently which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to the requirements of the decision maker or determined that the benefits of the project (including need) outweigh the potential loss of such facilities, taking into account any positive proposals made by the applicant to provide new, improved or compensatory land or facilities.”

4.2.7 The above statement outlines that the decision maker should consider if the benefits of the project (including need) would outweigh the potential loss of facilities.

4.2.8 Paragraph 4.8.13 also outlines that the loss of playing fields should only be allowed:
“where applicants can demonstrate that they will be replaced with facilities of equivalent or better quality in a suitable location.”

4.2.9 In addition, paragraph 4.8.15 outlines that:
“Where networks of green infrastructure have been identified in development plans, they should normally be protected from development and where possible, strengthened or integrated within proposals.”

4.2.10 This study has been prepared with due consideration given to the above advice given to decision makers.

Mitigation

4.2.11 The NPS identifies that where green infrastructure is affected, the decision maker is advised to consider whether the applicant’s proposals to maintain the connectivity of the green infrastructure network are acceptable.

4.2.12 The decision maker is also advised to consider whether mitigation of any adverse effects on green infrastructure or open space is adequately provided for by means of any development consent obligations, for example:
“Any exchange land should be at least as good in terms of size, usefulness, attractiveness, quality and accessibility” (para. 4.8.21).

National Planning Policy Framework

4.2.13 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published in March 2012. The NPPF sets out the Government’s requirements for the planning system. This is of relevance to this Open Space Assessment, as local authorities will need to undertake their open space assessments in accordance with the NPPF requirements.

4.2.14 The NPPF outlines national policy with which local authority’s policy must be in accordance and which those authorities will have taken into consideration when preparing Local Plans and open space assessments and strategies. The NPPF is only relevant to normal planning applications and as such the project is not subject to the requirements of the NPPF. However, because the NPPF outlines the policy requirement for local
authorities to prepare open space assessments and strategies it has been included in this study. Guidance for the preparation of open space assessments and strategies in the NPPF has been used as an informant for assessing open space assessments in those local authorities affected by the project proposals.

4.2.15 With specific reference to nationally significant infrastructure projects, including the project as outlined in the NPS, the NPPF states that:

“it does not contain specific policies for nationally significant infrastructure projects for which particular considerations apply. These are determined in accordance with the decision-making framework set out in the Planning Act 2008 and relevant national policy statements for major infrastructure, as well as any other matters that are considered both important and relevant. National policy statements form part of the overall framework of national planning policy and are a material consideration in decisions on planning applications.” (para. 3).

4.2.16 The NPS acknowledges that waste water infrastructure projects will have particular effects on open space, including green infrastructure and also that applicants should consult with local communities in relation to any proposals to build on open space, sports or recreational buildings and land. The NPPF refers to the promotion of healthy communities and links this aspiration to the provision of high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation. LPA’s are advised that when developing planning policies they should be based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the needs for open space, sports and recreation:

“Assessments should identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreational facilities in the local area while information gained from the assessments should be used to determine what open space, sports and recreational provision is required.” (para. 73).

4.2.17 The NPPF states that existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, should not be built on unless:

“an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements; the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location; or the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the needs for which clearly outweigh the loss.” (para. 74).

4.2.18 The NPPF replaced Planning Policy Statements (PPS) and Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) including previous open space guidance outlined in Planning Policy Guidance 17: Planning for open space, sport and recreation (PPG17). These were abolished and replaced by 12 ‘core planning principles’. However, as noted above, the NPPF does not contain specific policies for waste water management or nationally significant infrastructure projects generally.

4.2.19 Many of the open space assessments and strategies prepared by local authorities impacted by the project proposals were prepared with reference to PPG17.
**4.3 Regional policy**

**London Plan**

4.3.1 The *London Plan* is the overall strategic plan for London which sets out a fully integrated economic, environmental, transport and social framework for the development of the capital to 2031. The *London Plan* was published in July 2011.

4.3.2 The *London Plan* (2011) was published before the NPPF (2012). In June 2012 the Mayor published Revised Early Minor Alterations to the London Plan. These alterations have not been adopted and therefore only have limited weight. These were aimed at ensuring the London Plan is fully consistent with the NPPF. These alterations were considered together by an independent planning inspector at an Examination in Public (EiP) held for 3 days from 19 November 2012.

4.3.3 The following policies are considered relevant to this study as they will have influenced London Borough’s in their preparation of open space assessments and strategies. Where necessary *London Plan* (2011) policies have been updated to reflect the Revised Early Minor Alterations to the London Plan, ensuring that the policies listed are both in conformity with the NPPF and the NPS.

4.3.4 Policy 2.18: Green Infrastructure – the network of open space and natural spaces, refers to London’s strategic network of open spaces. This policy seeks to:

“protect, promote and expand and manage the extent and quality of, and access to, London’s network of green infrastructure....Enhancements to London’s green infrastructure should be sought from development and where a proposal falls within a regional or metropolitan park deficiency area it should contribute to addressing this need.”

4.3.5 Boroughs are advised to:

“follow the guidance in NPPF paragraphs 73 and 74 and undertake audits of all forms of green and open space and assessments of need. These should be both qualitative and quantitative, and have regard to the cross-borough nature and use of many of these open spaces.”

4.3.6 Furthermore Boroughs should:

“produce open space strategies that cover all forms of open space and the interrelationship between these spaces.”

4.3.7 Policy 2.18 draws an important link between the NPPF, the London Plan and London Borough’s approach to preparing open space assessments and strategies.

4.3.8 The guidance set out in the NPPF does not relate directly to the project proposals, however, it has informed the preparation of the London Plan and Local Planning Authority assessments of open space.
4.3.9 Policy 7.17: Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) supports:

"the current extent of MOL its extension in appropriate circumstances and its protection from development having adverse impact on openness. The strongest protection is given to MOL and inappropriate development should be refused, except in very special circumstances."

4.3.10 Policy 7.17 highlights the particular importance and protections placed on MOL by the London Plan and London Boroughs.

4.3.11 Policy 7.18: Protecting local natural space and addressing local deficiency identifies that in preparing LDFs Boroughs:

"should include appropriate designations and policies for the protection of local open space, and identify public open space deficiency using the open space categorisation (see Table 3.1)."

### Table 4.1 Public open space categorisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open space categorisation</th>
<th>Size guide</th>
<th>Distances from homes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Parks</td>
<td>400 hectares</td>
<td>3.2 to 8 Km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Parks</td>
<td>60 hectares</td>
<td>3.2 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Parks</td>
<td>20 hectares</td>
<td>1.2 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Parks and Open Spaces</td>
<td>2 hectares</td>
<td>400 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Open Spaces</td>
<td>Under 2 hectares</td>
<td>Less than 400 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocket Parks</td>
<td>Under 0.4 hectares</td>
<td>Less than 400 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear Open Spaces</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Wherever feasible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: London Plan 2011

4.3.12 Policy 5.14: Water Quality and sewerage infrastructure outlines the Mayor’s approach to the project. Policy 5.14 states that:

"The development of the Thames Tideway Sewer Tunnels to address London’s combined sewer overflows should be supported in principle."

4.3.13 The policy also states that:

"relevant Boroughs should in principle support the Thames Tideway Sewer Tunnels."

### 4.4 Other GLA guidance


4.4.1 This guidance sets out best practice guidance on the methodology and content of an open space strategies within London. It provides advice on assessing the quantity and quality of open spaces and in identifying the needs of local communities and other users of open spaces. The guide indicates that the production of a strategy should also meet the requirements for assessments and audits for open spaces contained in the now superseded PPG 17.
4.4.2 The guide states:

“Open space strategies should have the following principle objectives: protect and improve open space provision in terms of quality / quantity / accessibility / safety; improve linkages within and between the open space network; ensure open spaces meet the needs of all local people and promote greater social inclusion; ensure open spaces enhance the quality of the local environment; and provide a clear framework for investment priorities and action.”

Supplementary Planning Guidance: Providing for Children and Young People’s Play and Informal Recreation

4.4.3 Providing for Children and Young People’s Play and Informal Recreation (2008) provides guidance to London Boroughs on providing for the play and recreation needs of children and young people under the age of 18 and the use of benchmark standards in the preparation of play strategies and the implementation of Policy 3.6 as set out in the London Plan.

4.4.4 The preparation of play strategies should provide comprehensive guidance on play provision including quantitative and qualitative deficiencies in provision relative to future need as well as mechanisms to address these. The guidance states that play strategies will be required to take account of the importance of high quality design and integration of play provision into overall open space strategies.

4.4.5 Application of standards should reflect local circumstances and needs while benchmark standards outlined in the guidance (including a benchmark of 10m$^3$ of play space per child) are intended to provide a tool for assisting the development of local standards and to be flexible enough to meet the varying needs of children and young people across London, taking into account differences in local circumstances. The SPG recommends that boroughs should use the benchmark standards in setting local standards in the context of their open space and play strategies.

4.4.6 It is likely that this Guidance has informed how local authorities approach planning for the provision of children and young people’s play and is therefore relevant to this study.

4.5 Other guidance

4.5.1 One of the key objectives of the study (see para. 1.2.1 above) is to review existing Borough assessments of open space. In reviewing the open space assessment of the London Borough of Richmond we considered the following Sport England Guidance to be relevant, as this is the guidance that local authorities should follow when assessing the supply of and demand for playing pitches (through their open space assessment).

Towards a Level Playing Field, Sport England

4.5.2 The guidance outlined in Towards a Level Playing Field relates to the potential impact of the project proposals on outdoor sports facilities at Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre. Section 5 identifies that the London
Borough of Richmond upon Thames has not completed a full outdoor sports assessment incorporating the Playing Pitch Model methodology.

4.5.3 Sport England developed the eight-stage Playing Pitch Model (identified in the *Towards a Level Playing Field*, 2005) which represents current best practice for assessing the relationship between the supply of and demand for playing pitches.

4.5.4 The PPM approach uses surveys of actual demand to assess the number of pitches required in order to meet local needs. The results serve to model the existing demand for playing pitches on the ground and can also be used to determine the adequacy of existing provision, and predict future demand and supply scenarios.

4.5.5 The PPM is a useful tool which will have informed the approaches that Local Planning Authorities used to prepare their open space assessments and playing pitch strategies. Local Planning Authority assessments of playing pitch provision should be considered robust where the PPM has been employed. As such the PPM is relevant guidance for this study.

*A Sporting Future for the Playing Fields of England, Sport England*

4.5.6 The guidance outlined in *A Sporting Future for the Playing Fields of England* relates to the potential impact of the project proposals on outdoor sports facilities at Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre.

4.5.7 *A Sporting Future for the Playing Fields of England* (no publication date available) is Sport England’s policy statement setting out their policy on planning applications for development on playing fields. Policy P1 outlines that Sport England will oppose any development that would lead to the loss of playing fields, unless specific circumstances apply.

4.5.8 Policy P1 is clear in stating that Sport England will oppose development on existing playing fields. However, the policy also outlines specific circumstances whereby the loss of playing pitches may be justified or mitigated. The Sport England advice is likely to have informed the preparation of the affected Borough open space assessments and strategies. Where Borough assessments of playing pitch needs have followed this guidance, they should be considered robust.
5 Local authority assessments

5.1 Introduction

5.1.1 The NPS (para. 4.8.6) provides advice to applicants where their proposals affect open space, as follows:

“applicants are advised to use any up-to-date local authority assessment or, if there is none provide an independent assessment to show whether the existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land is surplus to requirements”.

5.1.2 Taking this advice into consideration this assessment has reviewed the local authority assessments for those local authorities through which the proposed route for the main tunnel passes through and where there are sites that potentially affect open space directly or indirectly. Therefore, although there are 14 local authorities on the proposed route only assessments in Boroughs with potentially affected sites were reviewed. For each local authority the following information was provided:

a. assessment information: detail on when and how the assessment was undertaken
b. key issues: this includes issues related to quantity, quality and accessibility
c. standards: open space standards that have been adopted;
d. policy approach: Local Development Framework open space policies including any saved policies
e. assessment of local authority assessments by this assessment: review of the assessment against NPPF requirements
f. implications for the project proposals.

5.1.3 The assessment for this study involves completing an assessment of the effects of the project proposals on open space including potential effects on the function, quantity, quality, accessibility and value of open spaces and foreshore. In addition, this section assesses existing local authority assessments of open space as advised by the NPS which recommends that when proposals impact on open space applicants should use any up-to-date local authority assessments.

5.1.4 The aim of this assessment is therefore to identify the current status of affected local authority assessments to determine whether they are up-to-date and in conformity with policy guidance and as a result identify the implications of the Borough assessments for the project sites. The assessment has been undertaken to ensure a consistent approach has been employed in identifying the current status of local authority assessments and therefore in identifying the potential effects of the project proposals on the function, quantity, quality, accessibility and value of open spaces and foreshore.
Section 6 includes our own assessment of open spaces and foreshore to ensure a consistent approach has been used when assessing potential impacts of the project proposals.

5.2 Method

5.2.1 The methodology for reviewing local authority assessments was, as follows:

a. Local authority open space assessments and open space evidence based documents were reviewed to allow Thames Water to assess any information related to open spaces and foreshore which could potentially be affected by the project proposals.

b. Local authority assessments were assessed in mid-2011 and again in late 2012 ensuring the review takes account of the most up to date information available.

c. The review represents Thames Water’s interpretation of each individual local authority’s approach to assessing open space and how up-to-date they are. Emphasis has been placed on drawing out findings related to those open spaces that could be affected.

d. The review identifies the extent of existing deficiencies in open space provision as well as any provision that is considered surplus to requirements within areas affected by the project proposals where this information is available.

e. To meet the requirements set out in the NPS. Thames Water has considered the robustness of each local authority open space assessment. Local authority open space assessments have been assessed against the requirements for open space needs assessments set out in the NPPF. The NPPF states:

“planning policies should be based on robust and up to date assessments of the needs for open space, sports and recreation facilities and opportunities for new provision” (para. 73).

5.2.2 Additionally the NPPF outlines that:

“assessments should identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreation facilities in the local area while information gained from the assessments should be used to determine what open space, sports and recreational provision is required” (para. 73).

5.3 London Borough of Richmond upon Thames

Assessment information

5.3.1 The site containing open space within the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames is Barn Elms only.

5.3.2 The most recent open space work undertaken in the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames was the Borough’s Sport, Open space and Recreation Needs Assessment (2007). This assessment was completed to
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form both a basis for the Local Development Framework and to feed into a series of strategy documents including the published *Play Strategy 2007-2011* (London Borough of Richmond Play Partnership), the *Play Strategy Review 2011-2014* (London Borough of Richmond) as well as a *Strategy for Sport and Physical Activity and Open Spaces Strategy (2011-2021)* neither of which have been published. Some work on the assessment of existing provision (qualitative and quantitative) and future needs for open land was carried out during preparation of the Council’s *Open Spaces Strategy (2003)*.

5.3.3 The assessment does not provide a full suite of locally derived quantitative standards nor do the stated recommendations constitute a strategy for the long term use and management of open spaces. The only completed strategy document to date is the *Play Strategy 2007-2011* and subsequent *Play Strategy Review 2011-2014*.

**Key issues**

5.3.4 The London Borough of Richmond upon Thames’ *Sport, Open Space and Recreation Needs Assessment (2007)* has made a number of observations and recommendations that are relevant to Barn Elms. In their assessment the London Borough of Richmond have considered Barn Elms as two separate sites referred to as Barns Elms (LBRUT) and Barn Elms (LB Wandsworth). This is because the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames controls the Richmond Barn Elms Sport Pitches via the Barn Elms Sports Trust (BEST), whilst although within the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames, Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre is owned and managed by the London Borough of Wandsworth (see subsection 6.5 for further information on London Borough of Wandsworth open space assessment).

**Quantity**

a. Current provision of open spaces for informal recreation equates to 13ha per 1,000 population. This compares favourably with the National Playing Field Association (NPFA)\(^4\) ‘six acre standard’ (2.43ha). This high level provision is due to the large size of two Royal Parks situated in the west of the Borough: Richmond Park (973ha); and Bushy Park (417ha). The assessment does not breakdown provision by ward or sub area.

b. The assessment recommended that if there is sufficient demand for mini or touch rugby additional provision should be made in the east of the Borough.

c. The assessment does not include a Sport England compliant assessment of outdoor sports provision. It has therefore not been possible to identify supply and demand characteristics for individual sports or open spaces managed by the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames.

---

\(^4\) The NPFA are now known as the Fields in Trust (FIT) but where a local authority assessment refers to the NPFA six standard this is stated in this report.
Quality

a. The quality of open space sites was not assessed as part of the study. However, Barn Elms serves the wider community through the provision of outdoor sport facilities.

b. The assessment recommends a number of quality improvements at Barn Elms including:
   i. the improvement of existing sports pavilion
   ii. the improvement of playing pitch surfaces e.g. by levelling, installation of drainage etc.
   iii. Barn Elms to continue its role as a training site for athletics with potential to accommodate other specialised sports in future
   iv. treating Barn Elms as a Key Park, Strategic Playing Field.
   v. the potential for accommodating additional floodlit multi-use games areas (MUGA)
   vi. the potential for local and commercial events and activities to be hosted at Barn Elms.

c. In general terms the assessment has made recommendations for open space and informal recreation that may be of relevance to Barn Elms:
   i. protect open spaces generally as well as access to them
   ii. improve the overall walking environment
   iii. secure signage
   iv. promote or support others in promoting the six recognised walks in the Borough including the Thames Path
   v. support and enhance areas of nature importance.

Accessibility

a. 79% of the Barnes area is within 3.2km of a Metropolitan / Regional Park.

b. 86% of the area is within 1.2km of a District Park.

c. 99% of the area is within 400m of a Local Park.

d. 81% of the area is within 400m of an equipped playground. The study goes on to recommend that a new children’s play facility at Suffolk Road Rec could help meet this deficiency.

Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre

5.3.5 The following section examines information provided by London Borough of Wandsworth\(^5\) for Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre. This information is included here because Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre is located in the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames, although it owned and managed by the London Borough of Wandsworth. The London Borough of

---

\(^5\) Data provided by Technical Services Department April 2011
Richmond upon Thames has not provided any information for the Richmond Barn Elms Sports Pitches.

**Pitch provision**

5.3.6 Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre provides seasonal sports pitch provision, outlined below:

**Table 5.1 2010/11 Summer pitch provision**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cricket Pitch</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics 100m</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics - 400m</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics - Discus</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics - Javelin</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics - Long Jump</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics - High Jump</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics - Shot Putt</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archery Area</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touch Rugby</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aussie Rules</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football – 5-a-side</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rounders</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: London Borough Wandsworth

**Table 5.2 2010/11 Winter pitch provision**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Football Pitch</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football - 5 aside</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football Pitch (Junior)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby Pitch</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby Pitch (Junior)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Grid</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: London Borough Wandsworth

**Capacity and utilisation**

5.3.7 The pitches are primarily used by schools for their sports teams, and have some club use. Total pitch capacity has been determined by assessing the availability of total time slots on a monthly basis for each pitch type while pitch usage has been determined by assessing the total number of these time slots utilised also on a monthly basis. With this information it has been possible to assess the degree to which current capacity is being used for both winter and summer sports in 2010/11 (see Appendix A). We have established that there are no updates available from the local authority.
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5.3.8 **Summer capacity** - expressed in percentage terms indicates that cricket pitch utilisation peaks in August with 41.7% of slots utilised while touch rugby peaks in July (15.6%), Australian Rules Football ('Aussie rules') peaks in August (16.7%), football – 5-a-side peaks in August (36.5%) and rounders also in August (7.6%).

5.3.9 **Winter capacity** - expressed in percentage terms indicates that football pitch utilisation peaks in October with 42.6% of slots utilised while football pitch (Junior) peaks in September (17.9%), rugby pitch peaks in November (36.9%), rugby pitch (Junior) peaks in November (12.3%) and football – 5-a-side peaks in October (32.3%).

5.3.10 This information identifies that there may be scope for the intensification of remaining pitches, to absorb any lost capacity due to the temporary loss of pitches during the construction phase of proposals for Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre. It is worth noting that although some of the above utilisation figures are low, this is partly explained by the very high estimate for the level of carrying capacity for each pitch that the London Borough of Wandsworth are assuming (they assume four matches per day). Sport England Guidance\(^6\) states that the number of community matches a grass pitch can absorb is a function of the needs of users and quality, noting that a dual use council pitch may be able to accommodate two matches over a weekend. Guidance recommends that an informed judgement on carrying capacity should be made for each locale.

**Temporal demand**

5.3.11 In addition to assessing capacity and utilisation for the period 2010/11 it has been possible to assess peak periods of demand; by sport on a daily basis using booking records provided by Wandsworth (see Appendix A). By using this information it has been possible to identify periods of peak demand for different sports and minimum requirements for pitch provision based on the assumption that at least one pitch would be required per booking (detailed information indicating the number of pitches used per booking was not available at the time of writing).

5.3.12 **Winter Term Time** - During this period demand for football pitches (excluding junior pitches) peaks on Saturday afternoons between 2pm and 4pm when 71.4% of maximum capacity is booked. Demand for 5-a-side pitches is more evenly spread during week days with most bookings placed for mornings and early afternoons. Demand for Rugby (excluding junior pitches) peaks on Thursday and Friday afternoons and all day Saturday when 40% of maximum capacity is booked.

5.3.13 **Winter (Holidays – Half Term)** – During this period demand for football pitches (excluding junior pitches) peaks on Saturday afternoons between 2pm and 4pm when 85.7% of maximum capacity is booked. Demand for 5-a-side pitches is more evenly spread during week days with most bookings placed for mornings and early afternoons. Demand for Rugby (excluding junior pitches) peaks on Saturday mornings and afternoons when 20% of maximum capacity is booked.

---

\(^6\) Towards a Level Playing Field (2005)
5.3.14 **Summer Term Time** – During this period demand for Cricket is consistent throughout the week when 66.7% of maximum capacity is booked during afternoon and early evening play. Demand for Aussie Rules peaks on a Saturday when 100% of capacity is utilised on a Saturday between 12am and 6pm.

5.3.15 **Summer (Holidays – Half Term)** – During this period demand for Cricket peaks on Sundays when 100% of maximum capacity is utilised between 1pm and 7pm. Demand for Aussie Rules peaks on a Saturday when 100% of capacity is utilised on a Saturday between 12am and 6pm.

5.3.16 The above information identifies weekday mornings and Saturday afternoons as peak times for pitch use at Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre.

### Standards

5.3.17 The assessment states “*local standards of provision were derived by adapting National and local standards, to suit the Borough*”. However, the standards outlined below focus on the accessibility of outdoor activity and they have not been adopted in the Council’s Core Strategy.

#### Table 5.3 Standards of provision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outdoor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Play</td>
<td>400m of an equipped play space</td>
<td>Accessibility Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing Fields</td>
<td>6 acre standard</td>
<td>Quantitative standard used to assess overall provision regardless of type of sport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organised outdoor pitch sports (football, rugby, cricket, hockey, tennis, bowls, and netball).</td>
<td>One multiple pitch located either side of Borough. Facilities within 1.2km catchment</td>
<td>Quantitative standard + Accessibility standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organised outdoor sports requiring specialised facilities (athletics, golf, water sports)</td>
<td>Athletics - one National standard facility per Borough. Each Borough secondary school / community sports facility to have a range of athletics facilities.</td>
<td>Quantitative + Accessibility standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal recreation</td>
<td>Local Park - 400m catchment; District Park - 1.2km catchment; Strategic walking route 1.2km catchment</td>
<td>Accessibility Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Conservation</td>
<td>Wildlife site - 500m catchment</td>
<td>Accessibility Standard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy approach

5.3.18 The London Borough of Richmond upon Thames’s Core Strategy, adopted April 2009 is underpinned by the Borough’s Sport, Open space and Recreation Needs Assessment (2007). The Core Strategy includes several relevant policies identified below.

5.3.19 Policy CP10: Open Land and Parks; considers the open environment, stating that it will be “protected and enhanced” with a particular emphasis placed on “the Borough’s Green Belt, World Heritage Site (Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew), land on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest” while Green Chains and Green Corridors will be safeguarded and improved for biodiversity, sport and recreation and heritage, and for visual reasons. The Proposals Map identifies Barn Elms as MOL.

5.3.20 The Core Strategy adopts the Open Space Hierarchy outlined in the now superseded PPG17 and outlines that:

"new provision will be encouraged in areas of open space deficiency at Upper Richmond Road West, between Park Road / Uxbridge Road Hampton Hill, Fulwell, South Twickenham, parts of St Margaret’s and parts of Whilton."

5.3.21 It should be noted that none of these areas impact those sites potentially affected by proposals for the project. All developments will be expected to incorporate appropriate elements of open space that make a positive contribution to the wider network. No standards for provision have been incorporated into the Core Strategy.

5.3.22 In addition, Policy CP11: River Thames Corridor; states that:

"the natural and built environment and the unique historic landscape of the River Thames corridor within the Borough will be protected and enhanced, and the special character of the different reaches identified in the Thames Strategy and the Thames Landscape Strategy respected."

5.3.23 The site at Barn Elms could be affected by this policy.

5.3.24 There are various UDP policies that have been saved beyond the adoption of the Core Strategy. This includes:

a. ENV1: Metropolitan Open Land – “The Council will protect and conserve MOL as defined on the Proposals Map by keeping it in predominantly open use.”
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5.3.25 Barn Elms is designated as MOL on the Borough’s Proposals Map and is therefore protected under policy ENV1.

**Assessment of the study**

5.3.26 The Borough open space assessment has been assessed in line with the NPS which advises applicants to:

“*use any up-to-date local authority assessment or, if there is none, provide an independent assessment to show whether the existing open space, sports and recreation buildings and land is surplus to requirements*” (para. 4.8.6).

5.3.27 To meet the requirements set out in the NPS, Thames Water has considered the robustness of each local authority’s assessment of open space. Local authority open space assessments have been assessed against the requirements for open space needs assessments set out in the NPPF. The NPPF states that:

“*assessments should identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreation facilities in the local area while information gained from the assessments should be used to determine what open space, sports and recreational provision is required*” (para. 73).

5.3.28 Local authority open space assessments have been prepared in conformity with the now superseded PPG17. Table 5.4 assesses the Richmond upon Thames, Sport, Open Space and Recreation Needs Assessment (2007) against criteria set out in the Companion Guide to PPG17. Where assessments meet these criteria it can be considered in conformity with the NPPF and therefore meets the requirements set out in the NPS.

**Table 5.4 Assessment of London Borough of Richmond upon Thames, Sport, Open Space and Recreation Needs Assessment (2007)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Local Authority Assessment meets requirement</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of existing and future needs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of open space undertaken</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Although audit information is not included in the report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative deficits identified</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative deficits identified</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility deficits identified</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy for future planning of open space in place</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative standards derived</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative standards derived</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility standards derived</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The assessment of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames, *Sport, Open Space and Recreation Needs Assessment* (2007) identified that the Borough has not made an assessment of quantitative or qualitative deficits. In addition a strategy has not been prepared outlining future plans nor have open space standards been derived. On this basis the Richmond upon Thames Sport, Open Space and Recreation Needs Assessment (2007) does not meet the requirements outlined in the NPPF.

**Implications for project sites**

While the open space work completed to date by London Borough of Richmond upon Thames provides an evidence base, strategy documents related to open space and sports provision have yet to be published. In the absence of a full strategy the Council have an approach to open space as set out in Policy CP10. This seeks to safeguard and improve the existing hierarchy of spaces and encourages new provision in areas of open space deficiency. The project proposals could result in a temporary effect on one pitch.

There is no evidence at present that shows that the affected playing pitches at Barn Elms are surplus to requirements, as required by Sport England (as set out in their policy P1 in their policy statement).

The Council’s policy approach (as set out in Policy CP10) is to protect open space.

The key issue with Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre will be the potential temporary loss of one playing pitch. At present the Council has not undertaken a Sport England compliant sports pitch assessment and strategy. It is therefore difficult to draw any conclusions about how much demand there is for sports pitches in the Borough and in particular the use and need for the pitches at Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre.

While it has not been possible to accurately gauge the overall level of demand for sports pitches in Richmond, information on usage is available for the Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre.

Wandsworth pitch usage data (2010/11) provides a detailed breakdown of winter and summer pitch provision, winter and summer pitch availability and usage as well as year round time tabling. This shows that the site is well used by schools although there is potentially spare capacity at certain times.

The project proposals impact one sports pitch for a temporary period. It will therefore be important to consider the possibility of reconfiguring existing pitches to ensure that the number of pitches can be maintained, although it has been identified that there is sufficient capacity within the site to support demand (2010/11).

---

7 A Sporting Future for the Playing Fields of England
5.4 London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham

Assessment information

5.4.1 The sites containing open space within the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham are Hammersmith Pumping Station and Carnwath Road Riverside.

5.4.2 The London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham prepared a study titled *Open Spaces and Outdoor Recreation Facilities in Hammersmith and Fulham (2006)*. A subsequent background paper: *Metropolitan Open Land and other open space boundary changes (2010)* provides background evidence to support the proposed alterations to the boundaries of a number of areas of the Borough’s MOL.

5.4.3 The study undertaken in late 2004 and 2005 provides a comprehensive understanding of the supply of open spaces in the Borough and the sport and children’s play facilities that they provide. The study also identifies existing deficiencies in open space provision.

Key issues

5.4.4 The study identifies the following key issues with regard to open space in the Borough:

Quantity

a. There are 386ha of open space in the Borough (excluding the area of the River Thames and Grand Union Canal).

b. Overall, there is 1.35ha of public open space per 1,000 people. However, the amount of open space available to individuals varies across the Borough.

c. There are 114 play spaces in the Borough. Most of these (96) are equipped. There are playgrounds in supervised facilities as well as unequipped kick-about areas.

d. There are over 315 outdoor sports facilities in the Borough, across 69 sites.

e. There is a total of approximately 48ha of outdoor playing space within the Borough; 25.6ha of which consists of pitches and playing fields, equating to 0.3ha/1,000 population overall and 0.15ha of playing pitches per 1,000 people. This is below the NPFA ‘Six Acre Standard’ applied in this assessment.

Quality

a. The Hammersmith Pumping Station Site is operational land and therefore has not been assessed as part of the Borough’s audit.

b. Carnwath Road Riverside is not open space and therefore has not been assessed as part of the Borough’s audit. To clarify, the Borough has not included this area of foreshore in its audit.
Accessibility

a. The area to the south of the Hammersmith flyover (A4) has an access deficiency in relation to the provision of 'Local Parks' when a 400m catchment is applied to Local Parks including Hammersmith Cemetery (which performs the role of a local park). However, there is good provision of 'Small Local Parks' within the vicinity of the proposed Hammersmith Pumping Station including Frank Banfield Park.

b. The area around Hammersmith Pumping Station is considered to be a priority 3 area for improvement in access to children's play. Output areas within the Borough were assessed to identify areas with a higher level of need for children's play provision. Priority areas were developed with priority 1 signifying highest need and Priority 3 the least.

c. The area around Carnwath Road Riverside is well served by open space with no deficiencies in provision recorded. Nearby parks include South Park and Hurlingham Park. Hurlingham Park is only partially publicly accessible.

Standards

5.4.5 In applying standards the Borough uses the accessibility standards as in The London Plan. The access standards adopted are summarised below:

Table 5.5 Accessibility standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of open space</th>
<th>Area (Ha)</th>
<th>Catchment area (km)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Park</td>
<td>Over 400 ha</td>
<td>8km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Park</td>
<td>Over 60 ha to 400 ha</td>
<td>3.2km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Park</td>
<td>Over 20 ha to 60 ha</td>
<td>1.2km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Park</td>
<td>Over 2 ha to 20 ha</td>
<td>0.4km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Local Parks and Open Spaces</td>
<td>0.4 ha to 2 ha</td>
<td>0.4km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocket Parks</td>
<td>Less than 0.4 ha</td>
<td>0.4km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear open spaces</td>
<td>Variable, wherever feasible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4.6 The deficiency analysis undertaken as part of the assessment focused on ‘Local Parks’ and ‘Small Local Parks’, using as its basis a 400m indicative catchment.

5.4.7 Referring to play areas the Borough has adopted NPFA accessibility standards:
Table 5.6 Summary of NPFA ‘Six Acre Standard’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Play space</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Maximum Time</th>
<th>Catchment Distance</th>
<th>Minimum Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LAP</td>
<td>Under 6</td>
<td>1 min</td>
<td>60m</td>
<td>100sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAP</td>
<td>4-8</td>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>240m</td>
<td>400sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEAP</td>
<td>Older Children</td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>600m</td>
<td>1,000sqm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4.8 Finally with reference to the provision of outdoor sports facilities the Borough has applied the NPFA ‘Six Acre Standard’ of 1.6ha of outdoor playing space per 1,000 population (1.2ha should be playing fields).

Policy approach

5.4.9 Hammersmith and Fulham’s Core Strategy was adopted in October 2011. Core Strategy Objective 15 identifies the requirement to:

“protect and enhance the Borough’s open spaces and create new parks and open spaces where there is major regeneration, promote biodiversity and protect private gardens.”

5.4.10 The Strategic Objectives for open space are outlined as follows:

“Improve and protect amenity and quality of life of residents and visitors by ensuring a safe, accessible and pleasant local environment, where there is a strong sense of place; Encourage and promote healthier lifestyles and reduce health inequalities; Preserve and enhance the quality, character and identity of the borough’s natural and built environment through respect for local context, good quality, inclusive and sustainable design; and Protect and enhance the Borough’s open green spaces and create new parks and open spaces where there is major regeneration, promote biodiversity and protect private gardens.”

5.4.11 Borough wide strategic policy OS1: “Improving and Protecting Parks and Open Spaces” aims to protect and enhance parks, open spaces and biodiversity in the Borough by:

“designating a hierarchy of open space; requiring a mix of new public and private open space in the White City and Earls Court and West Kensington Opportunity Areas and the South Fulham Riverside regeneration area when development takes place; improving parks and recreational facilities through a planned asset renewal programme in accordance with the Council’s Parks and Open Spaces Strategy; ensuring provision of quality accessible and inclusive open space, including areas of nature conservation interest, and children’s play provision in new developments, including in the identified regeneration areas; and improving provision and access to parks and open spaces, play space and areas of nature conservation interest.”

5.4.12 A number of UDP policies have been saved, beyond the adoption of the Core Strategy DPD until such a time as the adoption of the Borough’s Development Management DPD, including:
a. EN22: “Open Space of Local Importance – in the case of public or private open space that is not identified on the Proposals Map, development will not be permitted where such land either individually or cumulatively has local importance for its open character or as a sport, leisure or recreational facility, or for its contribution to local biodiversity or visual amenity unless: the proposed development would release a site for built development needed to realise a qualitative gain for the local community in pursuance of other physical, social and economic objectives of the UDP and would provide for relocation of open space to a site in the locality which is at least equivalent in size, quality, accessibility, usefulness and attractiveness to that being lost.”

b. EN34: “The Riverside Walk – this safeguards the route for a continuous riverside walk through the Borough alongside the River Thames.”

c. EN34A: “Access to the Foreshore – development proposals on sites extending to the river edge will be required to ensure that safe access to and from the foreshore is maintained or, where appropriate enhanced.”

Assessment of the study

5.4.13 The Borough open space assessment has been assessed in line with the NPS which advises applicants to:

“use any up-to-date local authority assessment or, if there is none, provide an independent assessment to show whether the existing open space, sports and recreation buildings and land is surplus to requirements” (para. 4.8.6).

5.4.14 To meet the requirements set out in the NPS, Thames Water considered the robustness of each local authority’s assessment of open space. Local authority open space assessments have been assessed against the requirements for open space needs assessments set out in the NPPF. The NPPF states that:

“assessments should identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreation facilities in the local area while information gained from the assessments should be used to determine what open space, sports and recreational provision is required” (para. 73).

5.4.15 Local authority open space assessments have been prepared in conformity with the now superseded PPG17. Table 5.7 assesses the Hammersmith and Fulham, *Open Spaces and Outdoor Recreation Facilities in Hammersmith and Fulham* (2006) against criteria set out in the Companion Guide to PPG17. Where assessments meet these criteria it can be considered in conformity with the NPPF and therefore meets the requirements set out in the NPS.
Table 5.7 Assessment of London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham, Open Spaces and Outdoor Recreation Facilities in Hammersmith and Fulham (2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Local authority assessment meets requirement</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of existing and future needs</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Some analysis of quantity against population, but doesn’t look at future population requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of open space undertaken</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Quality and value of open spaces not assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative deficits identified</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative deficits identified</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility deficits identified</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy for future planning of open space in place</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative standards derived</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative standards derived</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility standards derived</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4.16 The assessment of the Hammersmith and Fulham, *Open Spaces and Outdoor Recreation Facilities in Hammersmith and Fulham* (2006) identified that quantitative and qualitative deficits have not been assessed. In addition an open space strategy and standards for future provision have not been outlined. On this basis the Hammersmith and Fulham, *Open Spaces and Outdoor Recreation Facilities in Hammersmith and Fulham* (2006) does not meet the requirements outlined in the NPPF.

**Implications for project sites**

5.4.17 The Council’s expressed priority is to protect and enhance existing open space while at the same time encouraging the development of new open space and recreational facilities where possible.

5.4.18 The Pumping Station is not a publicly accessible open space. Within the area where the proposed Hammersmith Pumping Station is sited there are currently access deficiencies for Local Parks and children’s play areas. Despite noted open space deficiencies, Frank Banfield Park, a Small Local Park is located next to the Hammersmith Pumping Station Site. The proposals could indirectly impact on Frank Banfield Park, through noise and disruption during construction. These impacts are considered by the *Environmental Statement*. In addition there are proposals for a substantial residential development by St Georges on the site adjacent to the Pumping Station. Increased traffic on Distillery Road (as a result of the St Georges development) could contribute to a cumulative impact on Frank Banfield Park.

5.4.19 The Carnwath Road Riverside site is located on brownfield land that does not directly affect public open space, however, the foreshore to the site is
accessible via a slipway approximately 100m to the west. The foreshore was not assessed in the Borough’s open space assessment. A new open space will be created as a result of the proposals within an area deficient in local parks. This newly created open space is located on part of Whiffin Wharf and is set out within the Project’s proposals.

5.5 **London Borough of Wandsworth**

**Assessment information**

5.5.1 The sites containing open space within the London Borough of Wandsworth are Putney Embankment Foreshore, King George’s Park and Falconbrook Pumping Station.

5.5.2 The most recent open space work undertaken in the London Borough of Wandsworth was the Borough’s *Open Space Study* (2007). The purpose of the study was to produce a qualitative and quantitative audit and analysis of the supply of, and demand for, open space and outdoor sports provision in the Borough. This study was designed to:

a. Inform the development of the Local Development Framework.

b. Provide the Council with adequate planning guidance and open space standards.

c. Assist the Council in identifying needs for new open spaces and outdoor sports facilities.

d. Inform the future management of open spaces and sports facilities and identify opportunities to enhance and reconfigure open space provision.

e. Enable the Council to identify priorities for future investment.

5.5.3 The Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre is owned and managed by the London Borough of Wandsworth however it is located in the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames, and therefore information on the use and supply of pitches at Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre that was provided by the London Borough of Wandsworth is included in the section above on The London Borough of Richmond upon Thames (sub section 5.3).

**Key issues**

5.5.4 The study identifies the following key issues with regard to open space across the Borough:

**Quantity**

a. Wandsworth has a relatively high quantity of public park provision for an outer London Borough, with 2.15ha of public parks per 1,000 population. The provision of public parks equates to 60% of the total area of assessed open space in the Borough, but the distribution of public park provision varies significantly between wards.

b. Putney Embankment Foreshore and the adjacent Waterman’s Green are situated in Thamesfield Ward. Thamesfield has 29.68ha (2.40ha
per 1,000 population) of public park provision. This is below, although close to, the Borough average of 2.45ha per 1,000 population.

c. Children’s play provision equates to 0.0049ha per 1,000 population in Thamesfield Ward, below the Borough average of 0.013ha per 1,000 population.

d. King George’s Park is situated in Southfields Ward. Southfields has 19.25ha (1.54ha per 1,000 population) of public park provision. This is below the Borough average of 2.45ha per 1,000 population. Children’s play provision equates to 0.0085ha per 1,000 population in Southfields Ward, below the Borough average of 0.013ha per 1,000 population.

e. The Dormay Street Site is situated in Fairfield Ward. Fairfield has 1.31ha (0.11ha per 1,000 population) of public park provision. This is significantly below the Borough average of 2.54ha per 1,000 population. Children’s play provision equates to 0.0015ha per 1,000 population in Fairfield Ward, just above the Borough average of 0.013ha per 1,000 population.

f. Falconbrook Pumping Station is situated in Latchmere Ward. Latchmere Ward has 8.41ha (0.67ha per 1,000 population) of public park provision. This is significantly below the Borough average of 2.54ha per 1,000 population. Children’s play provision equates to 0.0206ha per 1,000 population in Latchmere Ward, above the Borough average of 0.013ha per 1,000 population.

g. The Kirtling Street Site and Heathwall Pumping Station Site are both situated in Queenstown Road Ward. Queenstown Road Ward has 183.58ha (14.68ha per 1,000 population) of public park provision. This is significantly above the Borough average of 2.45ha per 1,000 population. Children’s play provision equates to 0.0432ha per 1,000 population in Queenstown Road Ward, significantly above the Borough average of 0.013ha per 1,000 population.

Quality

a. Around 35% of open spaces assessed were identified as being below the Wandsworth average in terms of their quality and value. 48 spaces within the Borough (25%) were identified as representing open spaces of high quality and of high value to the community.

b. Putney Embankment Foreshore and Waterman’s Green, were not assessed in the study.

c. King George’s Park is a District Park considered to be fragmented with a diverse range of facilities. This park was assessed as having a ‘Good’ quality score (score of 7.1 out of 10) although the same park was rated as having “Poor” value (26.5 out of 100).

d. Dormay Street, Falconbrook Pumping Station, Kirtling Street and Heathwall Pumping Station do not include open space and therefore were not assessed in the study. York Gardens adjacent to Falconbrook Pumping Station was assessed as ‘Good’ quality with a score of 7.2 out of 10.
Accessibility

a. Some areas of the Borough are deficient in public open space, these deficiency areas are localised and can be found in the east and west of the Borough. Measures to extend the existing catchments of existing parks will be different for each park but could include creating more park gates, ‘greening’ of routes and better signposting.

b. None of the areas around Putney Embankment Foreshore, King George’s Park, Dormay Street or Falconbrook Pumping Station suffer from significant deficiencies in access to open space provision.

c. The area around the Kirtling Street and Heathwall Pumping Station sites are deficient in terms of access to Small Local Park, Local Park, District Park and children's play provision.

Standards

5.5.5 The study recommends quantity and accessibility standards for a range of open space types that include:

a. 2.15ha of public parks per 1,000 population

b. all residents within the Borough should have access to a Regional Park within 3,200m from home

c. all residents within the Borough should have access to a Metropolitan Park 3,200m from home

d. all residents within the Borough should have access to a District Park within 1,200m from home

e. all residents in the Borough should have access to a Local Park within 800m of home

f. all residents within the Borough should have access to a Small Local Park within 800m from home

g. all residents within the Borough should have access to a public park as defined by the parks hierarchy within 800m from home

h. public parks within the Borough should be of ‘Good’ or ‘Very Good’ quality as defined by the Green Flag score and provide a range of facilities associated with their respective tier of the parks hierarchy

i. 0.021ha of children’s play provision per 1,000 population. An additional 2.8ha of play provision are required to meet the population of the Borough up to 2018

j. all residents within the Borough should have access to areas of formal and informal play provision for children and teenagers within 400m of home

k. children’s play provision should be of adequate quality and provide a range of facilities associated with the size of facility

l. 1.0 ha of Sites of importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs) per 1,000 population
m. all residents should have access to a Site of Metropolitan Importance or Site of Borough Importance (Grade I or II) within a 500m distance from home

n. 0.077ha of allotment provision per 1,000 population

o. all households should have access to an allotment garden within 800m of home

p. 0.29ha of playing pitches per 1,000 population.

**Policy approach**

5.5.6 Wandsworth Borough’s Core Strategy, adopted 2010 is underpinned by the Borough’s *Open Space Study* (2007). The Core Strategy outlines that Wandsworth is well served by all types of open space, including MOL which contributes to London’s network of strategically important open space, “however, Government guidance makes it clear that developing more housing should not mean building on urban green spaces”.

5.5.7 Policy PL4: ‘Open Space and the Natural Environment’, considers the open environment. The Wandsworth LDF Proposals Map identifies York Gardens and King George’s Park as being directly affected by this policy:

“The Council is committed to protecting and improving public and private open space in the Borough including playing fields where opportunities for participation in sport, recreation and children’s play will be promoted".... “It is envisaged that new developments should incorporate appropriate elements of public open space, and to make a wider contribution to the wider network of open spaces”.... “The Council would like to ensure new development does not cause ecological damage while ensuring appropriate mitigation and compensation measures take place where damage does occur.”

5.5.8 Policy PL9: ‘River Thames and the riverside’, seeks to protect existing river infrastructure that provides access to the river and foreshore, such as piers, jetties, drawdocks, slipways, steps and stairs. The Wandsworth LDF Proposals Map identifies Waterman’s Green as being directly affected by this policy.

5.5.9 Core Strategy Policy IS6: ‘Community services and the provision of infrastructure’ states that:

“The Council will work with Thames Water to support the timely implementation of the Thames Tideway Sewer Tunnel project, including the connection of the combined sewer overflows in the borough.”

5.5.10 There are various UDP policies that have been saved beyond the adoption of the Core Strategy. This includes:

a. Policy R2: “The River Thames and Riverside’ – “developments on the Thames Riverside within the Thames Policy Area will not be permitted unless provision is made for a riverside walk along the entire frontage.”

b. Policy ON1: ‘Development which would lead to the loss of open space or any part of open space will not be permitted if the open space contributes to the character and appearance of its surroundings, or
has the potential for recreation, or there is a deficiency of open space in the area.”

c. Policy ON4: On MOL, “except in very special circumstances, planning permission will not be granted for development other than: (a) essential facilities for outdoor sport and recreation, for cemeteries, or for other uses of land which preserve the openness of MOL and do not conflict with its purpose (b) the carrying out of an engineering operation or the making of any material change in the use of land provided that it maintains the openness of MOL and does not conflict with its purpose.”

d. Policy ON7: “Development proposals which would harm the open nature of any open land, which could contribute to a Green Chain, or links between open spaces, especially between areas of Metropolitan Open Land, and where they would form strategic links with adjoining boroughs will not be permitted.”

5.5.11 King George’s Park is identified as MOL on the UDP proposals map.

**Assessment of the study**

5.5.12 The Borough open space assessment has been assessed in line with the NPS which advises applicants to:

“use any up-to-date local authority assessment or, if there is none, provide an independent assessment to show whether the existing open space, sports and recreation buildings and land is surplus to requirements” (para. 4.8.6).

5.5.13 To meet the requirements set out in the NPS. Thames Water considered the robustness of each local authority’s assessment of open space. Local authority open space assessments have been assessed against the requirements for open space needs assessments set out in the NPPF. The NPPF states that:

“assessments should identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreation facilities in the local area while information gained from the assessments should be used to determine what open space, sports and recreational provision is required” (para. 73).

5.5.14 Local authority open space assessments have been prepared in conformity with the now superseded PPG17. Table 5.8 assesses the Wandsworth, *Open Space Study* (2007) against criteria set out in the Companion Guide to PPG17. Where assessments meet these criteria it can be considered in conformity with the NPPF and therefore meets the requirements set out in the NPS.
5 Local authority assessments

Table 5.8 Assessment of London Borough of Wandsworth, Open Space Study (2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Local authority assessment meets requirement</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of existing and future needs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of open space undertaken</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative deficits identified</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative deficits identified</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility deficits identified</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy for future planning of open space in place</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative standards derived</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative standards derived</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility standards derived</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.5.15 The assessment of the Wandsworth, Open Space Study (2007) identified that the Borough assessment meets all the requirements identified in Table 5.8, the assessment is therefore considered to be in conformity with the requirement outlined in the NPPF.

Implications for project sites

5.5.16 There are six sites located within the London Borough of Wandsworth. King Georges Park was the only space specifically assessed in the Borough’s open space assessment; it was not identified as being surplus to requirements. As none of the other open spaces were assessed in the Borough’s open space assessment, none have been identified as being surplus to requirements. The Council’s current approach is to protect and improve both public and private open space in the Borough.

5.5.17 There is currently good access to the foreshore at Putney Embankment Foreshore. There are two slipways allowing access to the Foreshore at this location for recreational activity. The project proposals would result in the temporary loss of one of the slipways although this would be replaced temporarily during the construction phase.

5.5.18 The current proposals for the existing Waterman’s Green open space at the Putney Embankment Foreshore will result in the temporary loss of access to this space. The proposals will lead to the creation of more, accessible open space at the Putney Embankment Foreshore site through the introduction of a new permanent platform.

5.5.19 Of the six sites, proposals for King George’s Park would likely have the most significant impact on existing open space provision. King George’s Park is a District Park which has been assessed as being of ‘Good’ quality but low value. The area is below the quantitative standard for open space.
provision therefore any loss of open space may need to be offset by quality improvements in King George’s Park.

5.5.20 Proposals at the Falconbrook Pumping Station will not result in the loss of open space. However, the site is located adjacent to York Gardens which was assessed as being of ‘Good’ quality. Potential exists for indirect effects on this space, although these could be mitigated by proposed improvements to existing public realm and the creation of additional open space adjacent to the Pumping Station.

5.5.21 None of the other proposed sites in Wandsworth affect open space, and none offer potential for the provision of additional open space.

5.6 Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea

Assessment information

5.6.1 The site containing open space within the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea is Chelsea Embankment Foreshore.

5.6.2 The most recent open space work undertaken by the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea was the Borough’s Draft Ten-Year Parks Strategy – 2006-2015. This Strategy was underpinned by the Kensington and Chelsea Open Space Audit (2004).

5.6.3 The overall aim of the open space study was to undertake an audit and assessment of open space within the Borough while taking account of guidance provided by PPG17. An assessment of quality was undertaken separately to support the development of the Draft Ten-Year Parks Strategy.

5.6.4 In terms of supporting the Parks Strategy the audit of open space assisted by providing information on the deficiency of open space and the number and distribution of outdoor leisure facilities in the Borough.

Key issues

5.6.5 The study identifies the following key issues with regard to open space in the Borough:

Quantity

a. In total 339 spaces were surveyed as part of the open space audit, ranging in size from 22.6ha to 50sqm. The Royal Hospital Grounds adjacent to Ranelagh Gardens is one of the five largest open spaces in the Borough.

b. Over half of the Royal Borough’s open space is located in just four wards; St Charles, Holland, Royal Hospital and Camden.

c. In total there are 60.9ha of public open space. This figure is made up of 80 public open spaces in the Royal Borough.

d. Both Ranelagh Gardens and the Chelsea Embankment Foreshore Site are located in the Royal Hospital Ward. This contains 13% of the total publicly accessible open space area in the Borough, while 4% of
the total is situated in Cremorne Ward, where the Cremorne Wharf Depot site is located.

e. There is a significant proportion of private open space and garden squares in both Royal Hospital Ward (6.6ha) and Cremorne Ward (2.4ha). This is important as many of these private spaces play a significant role in providing for open space needs in these areas.

Quality

a. The study did not assess the quality of sites in the Borough.

Accessibility

a. Chelsea Bridge Gardens, adjacent to the Chelsea Embankment Foreshore Site is identified as publicly accessible open space, however it is gated.

b. By applying the 400m accessibility standard it is evident there is little deficiency of publicly accessible open space in Royal Hospital and Cremorne Wards where the sites are located.

c. There are, however, higher deficiency levels in relation to play space, in this regard Royal Hospital Ward is particularly deficient including the area covering Ranelagh Gardens and the area adjacent Chelsea Embankment Foreshore.

Standards

5.6.6 The open space audit states that the Royal Borough is unable to create a new District, Metropolitan or Regional Park. Supply is concentrated at the local level, notably provision of Small Local Parks and open spaces, Pocket Parks and Linear Open Spaces. It was also deemed inappropriate to apply NPFA standards for playing fields due to local circumstance and the unlikely event that such a standard would be achievable.

5.6.7 In applying standards the Royal Borough uses the accessibility standards as set out in the London Plan, although due to the low number of larger spaces in the Royal Borough the 400m accessibility standard was applied to existing open spaces. This has allowed the Royal Borough to assess open space deficiency within the Royal Borough. The access standards adopted are summarised below:

Table 5.9 Accessibility standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of open space</th>
<th>Area (Ha)</th>
<th>Catchment area (km)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Park</td>
<td>Over 400 ha</td>
<td>8km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Park</td>
<td>Over 60 ha to 400 ha</td>
<td>3.2km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Park</td>
<td>Over 20 ha to 60 ha</td>
<td>1.2km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Park</td>
<td>Over 2 ha to 20 ha</td>
<td>0.4km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Local Parks and Open Spaces</td>
<td>0.4 ha to 2 ha</td>
<td>0.4km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocket Parks</td>
<td>Less than 0.4 ha</td>
<td>0.4km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear open spaces</td>
<td>Variable, wherever feasible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy approach

5.6.8 The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea adopted its Core Strategy in 2010. It is expected that policies related to open space will be supported by The Parks Strategy, Local Biodiversity Action Plan, The Play Strategy and regular updating of Playable Space Audits, the last audit was completed in 2004. The Core Strategy includes the following relevant policies:

5.6.9 Policy CR 5 – ‘Parks, Gardens, Open Spaces and Waterways’:

“The Council has outlined that it will protect, enhance and make the most of existing parks gardens and open spaces, and require new high quality open spaces to be provided.” .... “The Council will particularly resist the loss of existing MOL, Public open space and private communal space and private garden space.” .... “The Council will also resist development that has an adverse effect upon the environmental character or visual amenity of MOL or sites which are listed within the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historical Interest in England.” .... “The Council will require opportunities to be taken to improve access to, and along the Thames and Grand Union Canal.”

5.6.10 Policy CP 18 – ‘Lot’s Road/World’s End’:

“The Council will maintain, protect and enhance the character of the area by supporting better local shopping facilities, social and community uses, small cultural and creative uses and requiring improvements to connectivity and integration within the place, the wide area, and the river.”

5.6.11 Policy CE 2 – ‘Flooding’:

“Require works associated with the construction of the Thames Tideway Tunnel to: Preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Cheyne Royal Hospital and Thames Conservation Areas; Preserve listed buildings and their settings, and Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest (i.e. the Royal Hospital Grounds); Not adversely impact amenity; Not compromise the future of Cremorne Wharf which is a Safeguarded Wharf.”

5.6.12 There are several policies that have been saved beyond the adoption of the Core Strategy including UDP Policy CD9: ‘Protect open spaces around the Royal Hospital from development’. This policy protects the open spaces surrounding the Royal Hospital from inappropriate development both in the landscaped areas and in neighbouring streets.

Assessment of the study

5.6.13 The Borough open space assessment has been assessed in line with the NPS which advises applicants to:

“use any up-to-date local authority assessment or, if there is none, provide an independent assessment to show whether the existing open space, sports and recreation buildings and land is surplus to requirements” (para. 4.8.6).

5.6.14 To meet the requirements set out in the NPS. Thames Water considered the robustness of each local authority’s assessment of open space. Local
Local authority open space assessments have been assessed against the requirements for open space needs assessments set out in the NPPF. The NPPF states that:

“assessments should identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreation facilities in the local area while information gained from the assessments should be used to determine what open space, sports and recreational provision is required” (para. 73).

5.6.15 Local authority open space assessments have been prepared in conformity with the now superseded PPG17. Table 5.10 assesses the Kensington and Chelsea, Draft 10 Year Parks Strategy (2006-2015) against criteria set out in the Companion Guide to PPG17. Where assessments meet these criteria it can be considered in conformity with the NPPF and therefore meets the requirements set out in the NPS.

Table 5.10 Assessment of Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea Draft 10 Year Parks Strategy (2006-2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Local authority assessment meets requirement</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of existing and future needs</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Some analysis against current population, no analysis against future population. Usage not assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of open space undertaken</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Does not include quality and value information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative deficits identified</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative deficits identified</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility deficits identified</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy for future planning of open space in place</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative standards derived</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative standards derived</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility standards derived</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Standards for parks only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.6.16 The assessment of the Kensington and Chelsea, Draft 10 Year Parks Strategy (2006-2015) identified that the Borough has not made a full assessment of existing and future needs. A strategy has been prepared by the Borough, however, an assessment of quantitative and qualitative deficits has not been made while open space standards have not been derived. On this basis the Kensington and Chelsea, Draft 10 Year Parks Strategy (2006-2015) does not meet the requirements outlined in the NPPF.

Implications for project sites

5.6.17 Ranelagh Gardens, Cremorne Gardens and Chelsea Bridge Gardens are located in areas where no deficiencies in park provision have been
identified. None of the open spaces are identified as being surplus to requirements. The Foreshore sites are not identified in the open space assessment.

5.6.18 Chelsea Embankment Foreshore is located within the Royal Hospital Ward. Royal Hospital has nine public spaces and 22ha of total open space. It is likely that the Chelsea Embankment Foreshore Site will result in temporary disruption to the Thames Path at this location due to potential site works. The proposals will create permanent new public realm at Chelsea Embankment Foreshore for passive enjoyment of the riverside location, although there will be some loss of Foreshore, although the foreshore is not publically accessible.

5.6.19 The works at Chelsea Embankment Foreshore will require a very small part of Ranelagh Gardens during construction, but this part of the gardens is not well used by the public, and therefore the effect of this is not considered to be an issue. There is no public access to the foreshore in this location.

5.6.20 The proposals are unlikely to impact on the adjacent Chelsea Bridge Gardens.

5.6.21 It is proposed that the river’s edge at Cremorne Wharf Depot will be of a level and width for the Thames Path to be provided here in future by the landowner, in agreement with the relevant authority for the Safeguarded Wharf. There may however be indirect effects on the adjacent Cremorne Gardens during the construction phase such as noise or air pollution. However, these are dealt with in the Environmental Statement.

5.6.22 Open space within the Royal Borough is strongly protected by Core Strategy Policy CR5. In particular, due to the lack of larger or permissively accessible open spaces as described above, the protection extends to the many private (non-publicly accessible) open spaces and gardens in the Royal Borough. However the proposed sites situated within the Royal Borough will not have a permanent impact upon existing open space provision.

5.6.23 The assessment of the foreshore identified that access to the foreshore is only possible near to the Cremorne Wharf Depot site. The foreshore is therefore not directly affected by the project proposals. Access nearby is possible for water-sports users and is located far enough from the proposed site that works would not impact on current activities.

5.6.24 Each of the sites are located in areas where it has been assessed there is no deficiency in park provision although there are deficiencies in children’s play facilities, however there is no scope for meeting existing deficiencies on affected sites. In addition, the Thames Path will be closed during construction although it will be opened at weekends, where practicable.

5.7 London Borough of Lambeth

Assessment information

5.7.1 The site containing open space within the London Borough of Lambeth is Albert Embankment Foreshore only.
5.7.2 The most recent open space work undertaken in the London Borough of Lambeth was the Borough’s Open Space Strategy (2004), subsequently updated in 2007. The brief for the open space strategy includes the need to:

a. review the outcomes of the Best Value Review (of Parks and Open Spaces), including the Action and Improvement Plan and the Business Plan, with a view to providing advice on the targeting of revenue and capital resources to specific parks or areas; and

b. develop a series of policies to form Supplementary Planning Guidance to the (then) Lambeth Plan, since superseded by the Lambeth LDF Core Strategy (2011).

5.7.3 To realise the vision for Lambeth outlined in the Strategy the Council would be required to:

a. safeguard existing spaces
b. increase the provision of open spaces
c. identify opportunities to enhance access to open space
d. implement a phased programme of quality improvements
e. raise awareness of the value of public open space and sports facilities in Lambeth
f. encourage all members of the community to use public open space
g. maximise the effectiveness of capital and revenue expenditure.

Key issues

5.7.4 The study identifies the following key issues with regard to open space across the Borough:

**Quantity**

a. The Albert Embankment Foreshore Site is located in Princes Ward. This area is considered to be deficient in the provision of District Parks.

b. Princes Ward has a low level of open space provision, with 0.85 ha per 1,000 population. However, these figures are indicative of the urban character of this Ward.

c. The study sets a Borough wide standard of 1.54ha per 1,000 population. Princes Ward currently is therefore below this provision standard.

**Quality**

a. The Best Value Review consultation showed that the assessed quality and maintenance issues were a key issue in the Borough.

b. The Albert Embankment Foreshore Site has not been assessed within the study.

c. The nearest sites to the Albert Embankment Foreshore Site are Albert Embankment Gardens and Albert Embankment Roadside, these are
identified as small local open space. The quality of these is fairly poor scoring only 47% and 32% respectively.

**Accessibility**

a. Surveys suggest that large areas of Lambeth are over 400m from any Local Park and can therefore be classed as deficient in access to open space. The area around the Albert Embankment Foreshore Site is located in an area of deficiency in access to Small Local Parks and Local Parks (400m catchment) and District Parks (1.2km catchment).

b. Many open spaces in Lambeth are not large enough to provide sports facilities while these spaces are distributed unevenly across the Borough. Generally, there are insufficient sports facilities across Lambeth.

**Standards**

5.7.5 The Open Space Strategy (2004) states “In keeping with recommendations in PPG17, we consider that it is desirable to set local standards for the amount of open space per 1,000 people. We believe that such standards should be realistic for the short to medium term and to be capable of revision in the future”.

5.7.6 The strategy recommends that Lambeth Council adopt a Borough wide target of 1.54ha of public open space per 1,000 population up to 2016.

5.7.7 In addition to the quantitative open space standard, accessibility standards have also been applied to derive areas deficient in provision. Catchments have been applied in line with The London Plan.

**Policy approach**

5.7.8 Lambeth Borough’s Core Strategy, adopted 2011 is underpinned by the Borough’s Open Spaces Strategy (2004) which was subsequently updated in 2007. The Core Strategy indicates that the Borough has a deficiency in open space while recognising that there are limited opportunities to create significant areas of additional open space.

5.7.9 The Borough’s approach to open space is set out in Policy S5 – ‘Open Space’; this seeks to protect and maintain existing open spaces, and aims to increase the quantity of open space through the development of major sites. The policy refers to the need to link existing open spaces through Green Chains such as the Thames Path. The policy also seeks the improvement of the quality of and access to existing open space including providing a better range of facilities and improving biodiversity.

5.7.10 There are several UDP policies that have been saved beyond the adoption of the Core Strategy, including:

a. Policy 43: ‘The River Thames Policy Area’ – “Urban Design seeks to protect and enhance the historic and architectural character of the Thames Policy Area by: paying attention to appropriate design quality; enhancing the character of the river frontage and views along and from the river; using scale, massing and height alongside material and colour to frame the river; enhancing the setting of local landmarks;
creating safe, attractive and ‘people friendly’ public realm; allowing sufficient sunlight and daylight to the river and riverside walk, associated spaces and hinterland development; orientating layout and access points of development toward the river and river approaches; enhancing river edge treatment for nature conservation and flood defence benefits; and enhancing the draw dock, slipways, steps, stairs and other historic features associated with the river.”


c. Policy MDO 1: ‘Camelford House/Tintagel House 89 Albert Embankment’ - an area specific policy that seeks widening and improvement of the Thames Path at this location.

Assessment of the study

5.7.11 The Borough open space assessment has been assessed in line with the NPS which advises applicants to:

“use any up-to-date local authority assessment or, if there is none, provide an independent assessment to show whether the existing open space, sports and recreation buildings and land is surplus to requirements” (para. 4.8.6).

5.7.12 To meet the requirements set out in the NPS, Thames Water considered the robustness of each local authority’s assessment of open space. Local authority open space assessments have been assessed against the requirements for open space needs assessments set out in the NPPF. The NPPF states that:

“assessments should identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreation facilities in the local area while information gained from the assessments should be used to determine what open space, sports and recreational provision is required” (para. 73).

5.7.13 Local authority open space assessments have been prepared in conformity with the now superseded PPG17. Table 5.11 assesses the Lambeth, Open Space Strategy (updated 2007) against criteria set out in the Companion Guide to PPG17. Where assessments meet these criteria it can be considered in conformity with the NPPF and therefore meets the requirements set out in the NPS.

Table 5.11 Assessment of London Borough of Lambeth, Open Space Strategy (updated 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Local authority assessment meets requirement</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of existing and future needs</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Assessment against current population no analysis against future population. Usage of spaces not assessed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 Local authority assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Local authority assessment meets requirement</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audit of open space undertaken</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative deficits identified</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative deficits identified</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility deficits identified</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy for future planning of open space in place</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative standards derived</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative standards derived</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility standards derived</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.7.14 The assessment of the Lambeth, *Open Space Strategy* (updated 2007), identified that the Borough has partially completed an assessment of existing and future needs. Quantitative deficits have not been identified while qualitative standards have not been derived. The Borough have not prepared an open space strategy outlining future plans. On this basis the Lambeth, *Open Space Strategy* (updated 2007) only partially meets the requirements outlined in the NPPF.

**Implications for project sites**

5.7.15 Neither the public realm in front of Vauxhall Cross or the Albert Embankment Foreshore has been assessed in the Borough’s Open Space Assessment, nor has either site has been identified as being surplus to requirements.

5.7.16 The Council’s current approach is to protect and maintain existing open spaces and their function.

The proposals at Albert Embankment Foreshore do not affect existing open space as identified by the *Lambeth Open Space Strategy* (2007) although they will impact on foreshore, which is not included in the open space strategy. However, a new area of additional hard landscaping is to be provided as a result of the proposals in an area that is deficient in public park provision.

5.7.17 Works will have an impact on the accessibility of the Thames Path at this location, although a temporary diversion will be put in place. The foreshore survey identified an extensive area of accessible foreshore at this location. The foreshore is accessed via Lack’s Dock. Access to the foreshore will be restricted to the Duck Tours Company during the construction period. The public will not have access due to safety concerns. The alternative access proposal does not affect any open space.
5.8 City of Westminster

Assessment information

5.8.1 The site containing open space within the City of Westminster is Victoria Embankment Foreshore only.

5.8.2 The most recent open space work undertaken in the City of Westminster was the City’s Open Space Strategy (2007). The Strategy is designed to improve the quality, management, accessibility and usage of parks and other open spaces in the city, and provide new facilities where there are deficits in provision.

5.8.3 The strategy responds to the unique circumstances of the City, and also follows Government advice and the Mayor’s best practice guidance. It has several functions:

a. It sets out a planning policy framework for protecting and improving Westminster’s open space network.

b. It will inform future decision making, especially the funding review of capital expenditure programmes, Neighbourhood Renewal Area project, Local Area Agreements, and the groundwork programme.

c. It supports the Council’s S106 planning obligation policy and guidance, by providing the necessary information as to where new or improved facilities are needed, and what should be requested from private developments.

d. It provides a framework for all those involved in raising standards of open space management in the City of Westminster.

Key issues

5.8.4 The audit used Westminster Area Forum Boundaries as at 2005. These have since changed. The study identifies the following key issues with regard to open space in the City:

Quantity

a. Current supply across Westminster equates to 1.86ha of publicly accessible open space per 1,000 population. This compares with a generally accepted standard of 1.6ha per 1,000.

b. The majority of Westminster’s open space lies within the Royal Parks, which are generally distant from the main residential areas.

c. The Victoria Embankment Foreshore is located in St James’s Ward which part of the Central forum area as outlined in the Open Space Strategy. This forum area has a high level of open space provision, amounting to 11.6ha of publicly accessible open space per 1,000 population.

---

8 Central Forum Area as defined in the Open Space Strategy includes Knightsbridge & Belgravia, West End and St James’s Wards.
d. The public open space network in Westminster is characterised by a very large number of Small Local Parks and Pocket Parks. 87% of public spaces are less than 2ha.

**Quality**

a. The study did not assess the quality of sites in the City.

b. The Green Corridors are Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation, as are one third of the Parks and Gardens. The Royal Parks, Thames and Grand Union Canal are the most important habitats of nature conservation value.

**Accessibility**

a. Nearly half the open spaces in Westminster are not publicly accessible (85 out of 182 spaces).

b. The Central Forum area is an area of access deficiency for children’s playspace in terms of both formal and informal play provision.

c. In relation to public open space there are no deficiencies within the Central Forum area.

5.8.5 The City’s Open Space Strategy prioritises the protection of existing open space while actively working towards overcoming deficiencies in open space, play areas and wildlife. Deficiencies will be addressed primarily by requesting public open space in appropriate new developments in or near areas of deficiency.

**Standards**

5.8.6 The City of Westminster has applied a City wide standard for open space of 1.6ha per 1,000 population. In addition to this accessibility standards have been applied to different open space typologies and children’s play. These accessibility standards are in line with those in *The London Plan*.

**Policy approach**

5.8.7 The City of Westminster’s Core Strategy, adopted in January 2011 is underpinned by the City’s Open Space Strategy SPD (2007). It is identified that:

“*land in Westminster is scarce, under intense competition, has a high monetary value and is built upon, with the exception of open space and public realm/highway. This means that new open space to alleviate current deficiencies and meet growing demands is very difficult to achieve, and therefore all spaces must be protected.*”

5.8.8 Policy CS34: ‘Open Space’, outlines: “*The Council will protect and enhance Westminster’s open space network, and work to develop further connections between open spaces. The Council will seek to address existing public open space deficiencies, including active play space deficiency, and current and future open space needs by: Protecting all open spaces, and their quality, heritage and ecological value, tranquillity and amenity: Mitigating additional pressure on open spaces by securing new improved public open space in new developments; space for children’s active play; and seeking public access to private spaces;*
Securing contributions to improving quality, ecological value and accessibility of local public open spaces an delivering new open spaces from under-used land.”

5.8.9 Another key policy within the Core Strategy of relevance to the project is Policy CS45: ‘Thames Tideway Tunnel’: This policy states that:
“The Council will work with Thames Water to support the timely implementation of the Thames Tideway Tunnel project, including the connection of the combined sewer overflows in the city.”

5.8.10 There are various UDP Policies that have been saved beyond the adoption of the Core Strategy. These include the following:

5.8.11 Policy CENT 4: ‘Central London Supporting Activities and Local Services’ - “planning permission will not be granted for development which results in the loss of uses supporting Central London Activities or the loss of local service uses, within the Central Activities Zone (CAZ) or on the CAZ Frontages, where such uses contribute to the character and function of these areas.”

5.8.12 Policy ENV 15: ‘Public and Private Open Space’ - protects open space from development unless development is essential and ancillary to maintaining and enhancing the open space. The Council encourages the provision of new and enhanced open space for public use. The policy also seeks to protect open spaces including watercourses from development that would detract their green and open character.

5.8.13 Policy DES 12: ‘Parks, Gardens and Squares’ - only permits development adjacent to open spaces which safeguard their appearance, wider setting and ecological value, preserve historic integrity, and protect views into and out of these spaces.

5.8.14 Policy RIV 10: ‘Encouraging Access to the River and Its Foreshore’ – “developments that would restrict public access to riverside steps and stairs will be refused; and development within the Thames Policy Area will be encouraged to contribute to the improvement of steps and stairs, where necessary.”

5.8.15 Policy RIV 3: ‘Environment, Open Space and Wildlife’ - ensures that habitats and species of nature conservation value within the Thames Policy Area will be protected while the provision of new habitats and open spaces or improvements to existing habitats and open spaces will be sought as part of new developments. In addition all new developments are encouraged to include links between the river and other open spaces and habitats.

5.8.16 Policy RIV 9: ‘The Thames Path’ - for sites immediately adjacent the river, without an existing riverside path, proposed developments will be required to include a public riverside path. For sites adjacent to the river with an existing riverside path planning permission for developments that would remove, narrow or adversely affect the riverside path will be refused while development proposals will be encouraged to include improvements to the riverside path where they are needed.
Assessment of the study

5.8.17 The Borough open space assessment has been assessed in line with the NPS which advises applicants to:

“use any up-to-date local authority assessment or, if there is none, provide an independent assessment to show whether the existing open space, sports and recreation buildings and land is surplus to requirements” (para. 4.8.6).

5.8.18 To meet the requirements set out in the NPS. Thames Water considered the robustness of each local authority’s assessment of open space. Local authority open space assessments have been assessed against the requirements for open space needs assessments set out in the NPPF. The NPPF states that:

“assessments should identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreation facilities in the local area while information gained from the assessments should be used to determine what open space, sports and recreational provision is required” (para. 73).

5.8.19 Local authority open space assessments have been prepared in conformity with the now superseded PPG17. Table 5.12 assesses the Westminster, Open Spaces Strategy (2007) against criteria set out in the Companion Guide to PPG17. Where assessments meet these criteria it can be considered in conformity with the NPPF and therefore meets the requirements set out in the NPS.

Table 5.12 Assessment of City of Westminster Open Spaces Strategy (2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Local Authority Assessment meets requirement</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of existing and future needs</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Analysis against current population but not future population. No analysis of usage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of open space undertaken</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative deficits identified</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative deficits identified</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility deficits identified</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy for future planning of open space in place</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative standards derived</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative standards derived</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility standards derived</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.8.20 The assessment of the City of Westminster, Open Spaces Strategy (2007), identified that the City has completed a partial assessment of
existing and future needs. Qualitative deficits have not been identified while quantitative standards have not been derived. In addition an open space strategy has not been prepared outlining future plans. On this basis the City of Westminster, *Open Spaces Strategy (2007)* only partially meets the requirements outlined in the NPPF.

**Implications for project sites**

5.8.21 Neither the Whitehall Gardens nor the Victoria Embankment Foreshore has been assessed in the Borough’s Open Space Assessment, nor has either site has been identified as being surplus to requirements.

5.8.22 The Victoria Embankment Foreshore Site does not directly affect existing open space. The foreshore is not publicly accessible at this point and the surrounding area has a high level of open space provision. However, site works will require the temporary diversion of the Thames Path. The site works could indirectly affect the enjoyment of the view of the River Thames, this is considered in the *Environmental Statement*.

5.8.23 The Council’s expressed priority is to protect and enhance existing open space while at the same time aiming to meet existing deficiencies wherever possible. The proposals for Victoria Embankment foreshore site include the creation of 0.1ha of new public realm which is consistent with this policy approach.

**5.9 City of London**

**Assessment information**

5.9.1 There are no sites containing accessible open space within the City of London.

5.9.2 *The City of London Open Space Strategy (2008)* was informed by a complete audit of all open spaces within the City which was most recently updated in March 2011. Audit information subsequently collected has not altered the recommendations or standards outlined in the strategy.

**Key issues**

5.9.3 The updated audit (2011) identifies the following quantitative issues with regard to open space across the City:

**Quantity**

a. As at 31 March 2007, the total amount of open space in the City was 32.18 hectares.

b. Between 1 April 2007 and 31 March 2011, there has been a loss of 0.88 hectares of open space (including temporary losses), but also 1.17 hectares of open space have been created.

c. As a result of changes in provision since 2007, the total open space in the City as at 31 March 2011 is 32.47 hectares. This represents a net increase of 0.29 hectares since 31st March 2007.

5.9.4 The City of London Open Space Strategy (2008) identifies the following quantitative issues with regard to open space across the City:
a. The existing level of publicly accessible open space is low in both absolute and relative terms.

b. There are a significant number of small sites, with over half of all spaces being less than 0.2 hectares in size. This is low when it is considered that many authorities exclude open spaces which are less than 0.4 hectares from their open space assessments.

c. The Blackfriars Bridge Foreshore Site is located in the West Character Area\(^9\) which currently has only 0.094ha of publicly accessible open space per 1,000.

d. Along with the Thames Path to the north of the proposed site, there are two open spaces in close proximity to the site, one of which is classified as a park and garden (200m to the west of the site) and an amenity space directly north of the site in between the A3211 and Victoria Embankment Road.

5.9.5 The City of London Open Space Strategy (2008) identifies the following additional issues with regard to open space across the City:

**Quality**

a. Over half of all spaces in the City consist of hard landscaping rather than traditional green landscaped elements.

b. The quality of publicly accessible open space is generally high, but there are a number of challenges to maintaining these high standards, mostly related to funding and the fact that spaces are intensively used.

c. The Blackfriars Bridge Foreshore Site is located on the bank of the River Thames and was therefore not assessed as an existing open space within the study.

**Accessibility**

a. The whole of the City has been identified as being in deficient in areas in relation to District Parks, Local Parks and access to nature.

**Demand/usage**

a. The City’s communities are generally satisfied with the City’s public gardens and spaces, but want more ‘green’ areas and trees, an increase in benches, more natural planting to help biodiversity, more play space and activities for young people and better links between spaces.

**Standards**

5.9.6 The study considers that the most appropriate standard would be to maintain the existing City-wide ratio of 0.06ha of publicly accessible open space per 1,000 week-day, day-time population. In the context of a growing week-day population this is considered to be a challenging yet achievable local standard.

5.9.7 No standards on accessibility or quality were identified in the study.

\(^9\) This character area incorporates Castle Baynard, Farringdon Without, Farringdon Within, Broad Street and Queenhithe Wards
Policy approach
5.9.8 The City of London’s Core Strategy, adopted in September 2011 is underpinned by the *City of London Open Space Strategy* (2008). The Core Strategy outlines that providing enough publicly accessible open space to meet the needs of the daytime population in the densely developed City has long been a challenge, made increasingly difficult by predicted growth in the workforce.

5.9.9 Policy CS19: ‘Open Space and Recreation’ - aims to encourage healthy lifestyles for all the City’s communities through improved access to open space and facilities, increasing the amount and quality of open spaces and green infrastructure, while enhancing biodiversity by:

“Seeking to maintain a ratio of at least 0.06 hectares of high quality, publicly accessible open space per 1,000 week-day, day-time population: protecting existing open space, or ensuring that it is replaced on redevelopment by space of equal or improved quantity and quality on or near the site; securing public access, where possible, to existing private spaces; securing additional publicly accessible open space and pedestrian routes, where practical, particularly in the eastern part of the City; creating additional civic spaces from underused highways and other land where this would not conflict with other strategic objectives; and encouraging high quality green roofs, particularly those which are publicly accessible; improving access to new and existing open spaces, including those in neighbouring boroughs; increasing the biodiversity value of open spaces, paying particular attention to sites of importance for nature conservation such as the River Thames. Protecting the amenity value of trees and retaining and planting more trees wherever practicable; improving inclusion and access to affordable sport, play and recreation, protecting and enhancing existing facilities and encouraging the provision of further facilities within major developments.”

5.9.10 Policy CS9: ‘Thames and the Riverside’ - aims to ensure that the City capitalises on its unique riverside location, sustaining the river’s functional uses in transport, navigation and recreation, whilst minimising risks to the City’s communities from flooding by:

“Designating the Thames Policy Area and preparing and keeping under review an area appraisal which identifies the attributes of the area and gives guidance on development within this area; Ensuring that buildings and spaces on or near the riverside contribute to the aims of the Riverside Walk Enhancement Strategy; Supporting the construction of the Thames Tideway Tunnel, including connection of the Fleet combined sewer outflow, resulting in reduced storm water discharges into the River Thames and improved water quality; Promoting the functional uses of the River Thames and its environs including for recreation uses.”

Assessment of the study
5.9.11 The Borough open space assessment has been assessed in line with the NPS which advises applicants to:
5 Local authority assessments

“use any up-to-date local authority assessment or, if there is none, provide an independent assessment to show whether the existing open space, sports and recreation buildings and land is surplus to requirements” (para. 4.8.6).

5.9.12 To meet the requirements set out in the NPS. Thames Water considered the robustness of each local authority’s assessment of open space. Local authority open space assessments have been assessed against the requirements for open space needs assessments set out in the NPPF. The NPPF states that:

“assessments should identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreation facilities in the local area while information gained from the assessments should be used to determine what open space, sports and recreational provision is required” (para. 73).

5.9.13 Local authority open space assessments have been prepared in conformity with the now superseded PPG17. Table 5.13 assesses the City of London, Open Space Strategy (2008) against criteria set out in the Companion Guide to PPG17. Where assessments meet these criteria it can be considered in conformity with the NPPF and therefore meets the requirements set out in the NPS.

Table 5.13 Assessment of City of London Open Space Strategy (2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Local Authority Assessment meets requirement</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of existing and future needs</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>No analysis of future needs. No usage information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of open space undertaken</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative deficits identified</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative deficits identified</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility deficits identified</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy for future planning of open space in place</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative standards derived</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative standards derived</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility standards derived</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.9.14 The assessment of the City of London, Open Space Strategy (2008), identified that the City has completed a partial assessment of existing and future needs. Qualitative deficits have not been identified while qualitative standards have not been derived. In addition a strategy has not been prepared outlining future plans. On this basis the City of London, Open Space Strategy (2008) only partially meets the requirements outlined in the NPPF.
Implications for project sites

5.9.15 The City seeks to maintain existing levels of open space provision and to secure new provision where possible. The foreshore at this site is not publicly accessible and was not considered as part of the borough’s open space assessment. As the proposals at Blackfriars Bridge Foreshore will potentially generate new open space, this is consistent with the aim of securing additional open space set out in policy CS19, particularly as this area is also deficient in access to open space.

5.9.16 The study does not make significant reference to the Thames Path, but any effects on the Thames Path as a result of the development will need to be assessed. However, Policy CS9 indicates support for the project and encourages contribution to the Riverside Walk Enhancement Strategy. The survey of the foreshore identified that there is no public access to the foreshore at this site.

5.10 London Borough of Lewisham

Assessment information

5.10.1 The site containing open space within the London Borough of Lewisham is Deptford Church Street only.

5.10.2 The London Borough of Lewisham recently prepared the Lewisham Leisure and Open Space Study (2010). The aim of the study is outlined as being to:

a. Identify accessible open spaces, sports and recreation provision in Lewisham for existing and future needs.

b. To provide an appropriate balance between new provision and the enhancement of existing provision.

c. To enable clarity and reasonable certainty for developers and landowners in terms of the local authority’s requirements for such provision.

d. To enable the provision of space which is economically and environmentally sustainable.

5.10.3 The study includes an audit of all existing open space, sport and recreational facilities with public access or community use, in terms of: quantity; quality and accessibility.

5.10.4 Consideration has been given to likely open space needs up to 2025. While recommendations for local standards of provision with regard to quantity, quality and accessibility have been made for inclusion within the emerging Local Development Framework they have not been adopted as part of the recently adopted Core Strategy.

Key issues

5.10.5 The study identifies the following general issues at a Borough-wide level:
Quantity

a. In relation to parks and gardens there is a total of 1.41ha per 1,000 population across the Borough in 2008. To maintain this level by 2025 there is a requirement for a further 63.59ha.

b. In relation to natural and semi-natural green space including Green Corridors there is a current Borough wide provision of 2.44ha per 1,000 population.

c. Throughout Lewisham there is currently a provision of 0.15ha per 1,000 population, children and young people, for children’s play space. There are deficiencies in provision in Crofton Park, Brockley, Perry Vale, Catford South, Whitefoot and Downham Wards.

d. The study has identified that Lewisham has a total of 43 sites used exclusively for outdoor sports with a total of 111 pitches, in total there are 120ha of playing pitches in Lewisham or 0.45ha per 1,000 population (2008).

e. There are currently no deficiency areas for outdoor sport in Lewisham.

f. Deptford Church Street is in Evelyn Ward which had a 2008 provision of 0.91ha, significantly below the Borough wide standard for parks and gardens provision.

g. Evelyn Ward had a 2008 provision of 0.34ha per 1,000 population, children and young people, for children’s play space. This is significantly higher than the Borough average.

Quality

a. The Deptford Church Street Site is identified in the open space assessment as amenity green space which is assessed as being below average quality scoring only 35% (N.B. the study refers to the sites as Crossfield Street Open Space).

Accessibility

a. There are few deficiencies within Evelyn Ward and the areas surrounding Deptford Church Street. The project site is within the catchment of Local Parks and Small Local Parks and Metropolitan Parks but beyond the catchment of a District Park.

b. No other access deficiencies are identified for the site.

Standards

5.10.6 The study recommends the following standards for adoption. The standards devised reflect the information received from the various needs surveys and the audit information. The standards that need to be applied across the borough are summarised below:

a. Parks and gardens:
   i. Quantity – 1.41 ha per 1,000 population
   ii. Quality – All sites to achieve 46% or above, All large parks to achieve 61% or above
iii. Accessibility – Distance threshold of Local Parks and Gardens 400 metres, District 1.2 km and Metropolitan Parks 3.2km

b. Natural and semi-natural green space:
   i. Quantity – 2.44 ha per 1,000 population including Green Corridors
   ii. Quality – To achieve 46% or above ‘Good’, Local Nature Reserves (LNRs) will be maintained to 61% or above ‘Very Good’
   iii. Accessibility – Distance threshold 1km

c. Amenity green space:
   i. Quantity – Amenity green space 0.12 ha per 1,000 population
   ii. Quality – All sites to be of ‘Good’ standard – 46% or above
   iii. Accessibility – Distance threshold of 400m

d. Provision for children and young people:
   i. Quantity – 10sqm (of play space) per child recommended
   ii. Quality – All sites to be maintained to a ‘Good’ standard of 46% or above
   iii. Accessibility – Distance threshold of 400m

e. Allotments:
   i. Quantity – 0.9ha per 1,000 population
   ii. Quality – To achieve 46% ‘Good’ or above
   iii. Accessibility – Distance threshold of 1.2km

f. Cemeteries and churchyards:
   i. Quantity – No standard set
   ii. Quality – To achieve 66% or above
   iii. Accessibility – Distance threshold of 1.2km

g. Outdoor sports facilities:
   i. Quantity – 0.48ha per 1,000 population, Bowling Greens – 0.02 greens per 1,000 population, Tennis Courts – 0.24 courts per 1,000 population, Athletics Track – 0.004 tracks per 1,000 population
   ii. Quality – All sites to be of ‘Good’ standard – 46% or above, all pitches to achieve 65% pitch score or above
   iii. Accessibility – Distance threshold of 1.2km.

**Policy approach**

5.10.7 The London Borough of Lewisham adopted its Core Strategy in 2011. The Lewisham Core Strategy sets out the vision, objectives, strategy and policies that will guide public sector investment to manage development and regeneration in the Borough over the next 15 years. The Core Strategy includes a strategic objective to protect and enhance the borough’s open spaces and environmental assets.
5.10.8 The Core Strategy Policy 12: ‘Open Space and Environmental Assets’ - recognises the importance of the natural environment. In particular the policy seeks to:

“protect open space and Green Corridors from inappropriate development; maintain and improve the publicly accessible open space network (including the Thames Path); improve accessibility to existing open space by cycle and foot; achieve new on-site provision of public and private open space as part of new development; exemplary design for new, and improvements to existing open space; and improve accessibility in existing areas of deficiency.”

5.10.9 Open space deficiency areas are identified in the Wards of Brockley, Catford South, Lee Green, Perry Vale and Telegraph Hill. Therefore, Deptford Church Street is not in an area of deficiency.

5.10.10 There are various UDP policies that have been saved beyond the adoption of the Core Strategy. This includes OS7: ‘Other Open Space’; which resists the inappropriate development of open space that is shown on the Proposals Map. This includes the loss of or damage to public open space, or development that adversely affects the amenity, open character or appearance of the public open space. The exception to this is where the development is small and unobtrusive that is ancillary to the open space, development that facilitates or enhances public access to open space or development that makes provision nearby for replacement open space of equal or better quality and size.

5.10.11 Whilst the Borough’s Open Space Assessment identifies Deptford Church Street as an amenity green space, the saved UDP Proposals Map identifies the Deptford Church Street site as Public Open Space (See saved UDP policy OS7 above).

**Assessment of the study**

5.10.12 The Borough open space assessment has been assessed in line with the NPS which advises applicants to:

“use any up-to-date local authority assessment or, if there is none, provide an independent assessment to show whether the existing open space, sports and recreation buildings and land is surplus to requirements” (para. 4.8.6).

5.10.13 To meet the requirements set out in the NPS, Thames Water considered the robustness of each local authority’s assessment of open space. Local authority open space assessments have been assessed against the requirements for open space needs assessments set out in the NPPF. The NPPF states that:

“assessments should identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreation facilities in the local area while information gained from the assessments should be used to determine what open space, sports and recreational provision is required” (para. 73).

5.10.14 Local authority open space assessments have been prepared in conformity with the now superseded PPG17. Table 5.14 assesses the
Lewisham, *Leisure and Open Space Study (2010)* against criteria set out in the Companion Guide to PPG17. Where assessments meet these criteria it can be considered in conformity with the NPPF and therefore meets the requirements set out in the NPS.

**Table 5.14 Assessment of London Borough of Lewisham Leisure and Open Space Study (2010)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Local Authority Assessment meets requirement</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of existing and future needs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of open space undertaken</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative deficits identified</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative deficits identified</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility deficits identified</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy for future planning of open space in place</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative standards derived</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative standards derived</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility standards derived</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.10.15 The assessment of the Lewisham, *Leisure and Open Space Study (2010)*, identified that the Borough has completed a full assessment meeting all of the requirements outlined in Table 5.14. On this basis the Lewisham, *Leisure and Open Space Study (2010)* meets the requirements outlined in the NPPF.

**Implications for project sites**

5.10.16 The proposals for Deptford Church Street will affect an amenity green space. The site is protected under the saved UDP policy OS7. The Borough assessment shows that the site is within a ward that is significantly below the Borough wide quantity standard for parks and gardens (when related to population). However, it should be noted that the Sue Godfrey Nature Reserve (which is designated open space) and the amenity open space in front of St Paul’s Church as well as the Graveyard to the Church are adjacent to the site.

5.10.17 The Borough assessment has assessed the site as being of poor quality. However, the area is below the borough’s quantity standard for parks and gardens and therefore the space is not considered surplus to requirements. Given the poor quality of the site and the proximity of other open space types in the area, upgrades to the quality and usability of the site (or nearby sites) may be more beneficial than providing replacement off site open space.

5.10.18 Foreshore sites were not considered in the Borough’s open space assessment.
5.11 **London Borough of Tower Hamlets**

**Assessment information**

5.11.1 The site containing open space within the London Borough of Tower Hamlets is King Edward Memorial Park only.

5.11.2 The key assessment document prepared by Tower Hamlets is the *Tower Hamlets Open Space Strategy* (2006).

**Key issues**

5.11.3 The study identifies the following key issues with regard to open space across the Borough:

**Quantity**

a. Three quarters of the Borough’s parks are less than the size of a single football pitch.

b. Tower Hamlets is deficient in open space against the NPFA standard of 2.4ha per 1,000 population, with some parts of the Borough outside of the GLA accessibility thresholds for District, and Local Parks, of 1.2km and 400m respectively.

c. The west of the Borough (0.5 hectares per 1,000 population) and the Leaside area (0.4 hectares per 1,000 population), have the lowest area of open space. Anticipated increases in residential density and daytime working community will put further pressure on open spaces in these parts of the Borough.

d. The King Edward Memorial Park is within the Shadwell Ward. The study identifies that this ward has an average amount of open space (when compared with other areas in the Borough), with 0.8-1.2ha of publicly accessible open space per 1,000 population, although this is below the NPFA standard.

**Quality**

a. Quality of open space varies considerably across the Borough. A consistent approach to investment and quality assurance (e.g. Green Flag standard) is required to guide future planning.

b. King Edward Memorial Gardens scored 80.3 out of 100 for overall quality – one of the highest scores recorded in the Borough.

**Accessibility**

a. The limited size of many of the Borough’s parks is affecting the ability of the Council to increase accessibility to the more popular field sports.

b. The area around King Edward Memorial Park is not deficient in access to parks, but no analysis on access to other types of open space (allotments, playing pitches, children’s play etc) appears to have been included within the study.
Demand/usage

a. Local demand for outdoor sports and recreational use of parks and open spaces is already high, given the young population and large amount of local employment. Demand for sports pitches (in terms of pitch bookings) cannot be fully met at present.

b. Further work is needed to determine the level of unsatisfied demand for field sports and allotments and the potential for increasing public access to school facilities.

c. King Edward Memorial Gardens was recorded as being one of the most visited parks in the Borough.

d. The study identified The Highway, a major road which borders the north of King Edward Memorial Park, as a major severance barrier, making access to the park difficult.

Standards

5.11.4 The Open Space Strategy identifies a minimum standard of provision of 1.2ha per 1,000 population and no net loss of open space. The standard relates to publicly accessible open space in general, with no standards identified for specific types of open space. No specific standards are identified with regard to quality, although the accessibility standards recommended by The London Plan have been applied.

Policy approach

5.11.5 The Core Strategy, adopted in September 2010, states that:

"in continuing to deliver the 1.2ha standard, the council would need to provide 99ha of publicly accessible open space by 2025 (approximately the same area as Victoria Park and Mile End Park combined). Due to this physical constraint, the Council’s approach will be to ‘Protect, Create, Enhance and Connect’ open space and use the 1.2ha standard as a monitoring standard to justify local need.”

5.11.6 As part of this, policy SP04 in the Core Strategy states that:

“there should be no net loss of open space during the plan period. The Council will also seek to secure new open space and enhance the quality of existing spaces.”

5.11.7 Policy SP04 sets out the Council’s approach to the project:

“Supporting the development of the Thames Tideway Tunnel and associated storm relief connections by working closely with Thames Water to facilitate its implementation.”

5.11.8 Some of the policies within the UDP (1998) have been saved beyond the adoption of the Core Strategy. This includes OS1: ‘Reservation of Sites’ – protects those sites on the Proposals Map (and included in Table 3) as public open space. King Edward Memorial Park is identified in Table 3, it is also identified for improvements in the UDP. Policy OS7: ‘Loss of Open Space’ - states that:
“Planning permission will not be given for any development which results in the loss of public or private open space having significant recreational or amenity value except where such development is ancillary to and complements the outdoor recreational use. In exceptional circumstances where development is permitted the council may require an equivalent or better recreational facility.”

The Council has adopted the Core Strategy and Interim Planning Guidance for the purpose of development control which will be used alongside the adopted UDP ‘saved’ policies and the London Plan to determine planning applications. This includes the following relevant policies on open space:

a. OSN2: ‘Open Space’ – restricts development on open space to developments that are ancillary to the open space function and there is a demonstrated need for the development that cannot reasonably be satisfied elsewhere.

b. OSN3: ‘Ribbon Network and the Thames Policy Area’ – outlines that all development adjacent to the Blue Ribbon Network including the Thames Policy Area, must respect its water location. This includes providing a mix of uses including open space, respecting waterway heritage, enhancing views across and along waterways, and ensuring access for all to the water.

Assessment of the study

The Borough open space assessment has been assessed in line with the NPS which advises applicants to:

“use any up-to-date local authority assessment or, if there is none, provide an independent assessment to show whether the existing open space, sports and recreation buildings and land is surplus to requirements” (para. 4.8.6).

To meet the requirements set out in the NPS. Thames Water considered the robustness of each local authority’s assessment of open space. Local authority open space assessments have been assessed against the requirements for open space needs assessments set out in the NPPF. The NPPF states that:

“assessments should identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreation facilities in the local area while information gained from the assessments should be used to determine what open space, sports and recreational provision is required” (para. 73).

Local authority open space assessments have been prepared in conformity with the now superseded PPG17. Table 5.15 assesses the Tower Hamlets, Open Space Strategy (2006) against criteria set out in the Companion Guide to PPG17. Where assessments meet these criteria it can be considered in conformity with the NPPF and therefore meets the requirements set out in the NPS.
### Table 5.15 Assessment of London Borough of Tower Hamlets Open Space Strategy (2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Local Authority Assessment meets requirement</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of existing and future needs</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Does not cover needs of workers which is significant in Tower Hamlets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of open space undertaken</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative deficits identified</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative deficits identified</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility deficits identified</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy for future planning of open space in place</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative standards derived</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Although limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative standards derived</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility standards derived</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.11.14 The assessment of the Tower Hamlets, *Open Space Strategy* (2006), identified that a partial assessment of existing and future needs has been completed. Qualitative deficits have not been identified and qualitative standards have not been derived. A strategy has not been prepared outlining future plans. On this basis the Tower Hamlets, *Open Space Strategy* (2006) only partially meets the requirements outlined in the NPPF, which is the policy guidance that local authority’s open space assessments are assessed against.

**Implications for project sites**

5.11.15 The Council’s current approach to open space is to seek no net loss over the plan period. King Edward Memorial Park is designated as open space under policy OS1. It is identified in the Borough’s open space assessment as a high quality site that is one of the most visited across the Borough. The site is not identified as being surplus to requirements in the Borough assessment. The impact of the project proposals will need to be considered within this context.

5.11.16 There is access to the foreshore at the King Edward Memorial Park with one slipway currently only accessible to users of the Shadwell Outdoor Activity Centre. This slipway will not be directly affected by the project proposals. Foreshore was not assessed as part of the Borough’s open space assessment.

### 5.12 Summary

5.12.1 This section provides a review of the local authority open space assessments for those local authorities on the likely preferred route of the
main tunnel. All the sites have not been identified as being surplus to requirements in the Borough assessments. Table 5.16 below sets out a summary of the review of local authority assessments against PPG17 requirements.

**Table 5.16 Summary of Review of Local Authority Assessments against PPG17 Requirements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority</th>
<th>Assessment of existing and future needs</th>
<th>Audit of open space undertaken</th>
<th>Quantitative deficits identified</th>
<th>Qualitative deficits identified</th>
<th>Accessibility deficits identified</th>
<th>Strategy for future planning of open space in place</th>
<th>Quantitative standards derived</th>
<th>Qualitative standards derived</th>
<th>Accessibility standards derived</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Wandsworth</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Lambeth</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Westminster</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of London</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Lewisham</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Tower Hamlets</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6 Assessment of sites

6.1 Introduction

6.1.1 This section includes an independent assessment of the quality and value of open spaces that may be directly or indirectly affected by the project proposals. This study includes an independent assessment of open spaces for the following reasons:

a. To update existing, and in some cases out of date, local authority assessments.

b. To ensure all of the affected open spaces and foreshore have been assessed in detail and consistently.

c. To develop an independent view on each of the affected open spaces and foreshore.

6.1.2 Quality of open space relates to the design, management and maintenance, but also considers whether the space is fit for purpose. Value relates to three things: the context (for example inaccessible spaces are of little value); level and type of use and wider benefits. Wider benefits can include: structural and landscape benefits; ecological benefits; education benefits; social inclusion and health benefits; cultural and heritage benefits; amenity benefits; and economic benefits.

6.1.3 The previous section provides a review of Local Planning Authority assessments of open space. National policy outlined in the NPS advises that where NSIP’s are likely to impact on open space, applicants should use up-to-date local authority assessment. However, an independent assessment of the quality and value of open spaces have been undertaken for reasons identified in para. 2.2.5 above.

6.1.4 This section sets out the method for undertaking the site assessments and the results for each site. The full site survey results are provided in Tables C1-8 in Appendix C.

6.2 Method

6.2.1 Site reconnaissance visits to open spaces that could be potentially affected by the project proposals were carried out in June 2011. Further foreshore assessments were carried out in November 2012 in order to capture the effects of the project and its evolution.

6.2.2 The primary aim of the site reconnaissance visits was to collect information on the quality and value of open spaces in order to provide an independent judgement on the quality and value.

6.2.3 The site reconnaissance visits to open spaces collected the following information:

a. type of open space

b. role/function
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c. ownership
d. site access arrangements
e. value
   i structural
   ii amenity
   iii heritage
   iv environmental
   v educational
   vi cultural
   vii recreational
f. quality assessment
g. physical character
h. vegetation cover and condition.

6.2.4 For some types of open space, for example foreshore, not all of the information outlined above was relevant and therefore was not collected. It was not considered necessary to assess the following for foreshore sites:

a. value
   i structural
   ii amenity
   iii heritage
   iv educational
   v cultural
b. quality assessment (only characteristics related to access considered)
c. physical character
d. vegetation cover and condition.

6.2.5 The site reconnaissance visits to the foreshore resulted in the collection of information regarding the extent of the foreshore at low tide and particularly the accessibility of the foreshore. A foreshore site has been considered publically accessible where public access to the foreshore is possible within 800m of the project worksite and affected foreshore area. Table 6.1 identifies those foreshore sites that are publically accessible.

6.2.6 To ensure a consistent approach to the collection of data, a proforma and a set of proforma guidelines were used on site (see Appendix B).

6.2.7 As identified in Section 3 the project proposals assessed in this study include a total of 24 sites. Thames Water carried out an assessment of the open spaces and foreshore. In addition to the four sites that are considered to comprise open space and the ten foreshore sites, a further seven open spaces adjacent to project sites were also assessed, as they could potentially be indirectly affected by the proposals.
6.2.8 The open spaces that were assessed are set out in Table 6.1. The table identifies the open space and the project site that is potentially affecting the open space.

6.2.9 Table 6.1 identifies where a site may have potential direct or indirect effects on an open space and foreshore. Direct effects may occur where the project site is located in an open space, indirect effects may occur where the project site is adjacent to an open space.

Table 6.1 Assessed open spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority</th>
<th>Open Space Assessed</th>
<th>Foreshore Assessed</th>
<th>Foreshore Publically Accessible</th>
<th>Project site potentially affecting the open space</th>
<th>Potential Direct/Indirect Effects on Assessed Open Space/Foreshore</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LB Richmond Upon Thames</td>
<td>Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td>Barn Elms</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB Hammersmith and Fulham</td>
<td>Frank Banfield Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hammersmith Pumping Station</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB Hammersmith and Fulham</td>
<td>Carnwath Road Foreshore</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Carnwath Road Riverside</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB Wandsworth</td>
<td>Putney Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Putney Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB Wandsworth</td>
<td>Waterman’s Green</td>
<td></td>
<td>Putney Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>Direct / Indirect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB Wandsworth</td>
<td>King George’s Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>King George’s Park</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB Wandsworth</td>
<td>York Gardens</td>
<td></td>
<td>Falconbrook Pumping Station</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB Wandsworth</td>
<td>Heathwall Pumping Station Foreshore</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Heathwall Pumping Station</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington and Chelsea</td>
<td>Cremorne Gardens</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cremorne Wharf Depot</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Authority</td>
<td>Open Space Assessed</td>
<td>Foreshore Assessed</td>
<td>Foreshore Publicly Accessible</td>
<td>Project site potentially affecting the open space</td>
<td>Potential Direct/Indirect Effects on Assessed Open Space/Foreshore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington and Chelsea</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cremorne Wharf Depot</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Cremorne Wharf Depot</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington and Chelsea</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chelsea Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Chelsea Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington and Chelsea</td>
<td>Chelsea Bridge Gardens</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chelsea Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington and Chelsea</td>
<td>Ranelagh Gardens</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ranelagh Gardens</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB Lambeth</td>
<td></td>
<td>Albert Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Albert Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB Lambeth</td>
<td>Public Realm in Front of Vauxhall Cross</td>
<td></td>
<td>Albert Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Westminster</td>
<td>Victoria Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td></td>
<td>Victoria Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Westminster</td>
<td>Whitehall Gardens</td>
<td></td>
<td>Victoria Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of London</td>
<td>Blackfriars Bridge Foreshore</td>
<td></td>
<td>Blackfriars Bridge Foreshore</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB Lewisham</td>
<td>Deptford Church Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deptford Church Street</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB Southwark</td>
<td>Chambers Wharf Foreshore</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chambers Wharf</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB Tower Hamlets</td>
<td>King Edward Memorial Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>King Edward Memorial Park</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2.10 As it can be difficult to objectively assess qualitative factors the following methodology has been adopted to enable the consistent scoring and ranking of the condition and quality of assessed open space.

6.2.11 The range and condition of facilities within each open space has been assessed using a scoring criterion method derived from the Civic Trust Green Flag standard assessment which is also consistent with GLA guidance.

6.2.12 The open space assessments included consideration of 18 green flag criteria which could be assessed through a visual appraisal of the site. The dimensions of quality considered were:

a. the conservation of natural features
b. the conservation of landscape features
c. the conservation of buildings and structures
d. the provision of educational and interpretation facilities
e. standards of arboriculture and woodland management
f. whether the space was welcoming
g. the accessibility of a site and the safety of site access
h. how well signposted the space is
i. whether there is equality of access to and within the space
j. the safety of equipment and facilities
k. levels of personal security within the space
l. evidence of dog fouling and availability of appropriate provision (designated bins, dog walks)
m. the appropriate provision of facilities for the type of space
n. the quality of facilities
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- the cleanliness of the site including litter and waste management arrangements
- standards of grounds maintenance and horticulture
- standards of building and infrastructure maintenance
- standards of equipment maintenance.

6.2.13 Each of the 18 criteria have been attributed a score between 0 and 10, where 0 is considered to be ‘Very Poor’ and 10 is considered ‘Exceptional’. The score for each of the criterion was evaluated against a range of issues relating to each factor. The Green Flag scoring system used to assess criteria within the standard is as follows:

- 0 – 1: Very Poor
- 2 – 4: Poor
- 5 – 6: Fair
- 7: Good
- 8: Very Good
- 9: Excellent
- 10: Exceptional.

6.2.14 Not all of the criteria were applicable to each type of open space (e.g. conservation of buildings, equipment maintenance). Therefore an average score was derived for each open space based upon those aspects of quality considered. However a percentage score has also been calculated which assumes all 18 quality variables.

6.2.15 For an open space to achieve the Green Flag standard the minimum quality score required of a site is 66%. In order to achieve this quality standard the open space must achieve an overall score of at least 60% on the site based assessment.

Value

6.2.16 Value is a different and separate concept from quality. It relates to three things:

- Context: a space which is inaccessible may be of little value, irrespective of its quality. If there is a high level of open space provision in an area some of it may be of relatively little value, conversely if there is very little provision even a space of mediocre quality may be valuable.
- Level and type of use: context should also be interpreted in terms of use by people and wildlife.
- Wider benefits: generated for people, biodiversity and the wider environment.

6.2.17 The benefits and value of open space to local communities extends beyond their active recreational role. Both public and private open space perform recreational and non-recreational roles contributing to community and quality of life. These roles are summarised by the following:
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a. the context of open space, which largely concentrates on the local open space need within the vicinity of the space and site access
b. the recreational function performed by the open space
c. the structural role of open space in separating and defining communities.
d. the amenity value of spaces
e. the ecological role performed by spaces
f. the environmental value of spaces
g. the existing educational value of spaces to the community
h. the cultural and social value of spaces.

6.3 Results

Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre: Direct effect

Overview

6.3.1 Surrounding the project site of Barn Elms, the Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre provides a wide range of outdoor sports provision which is predominately used by local school groups. The site is owned and managed by the London Borough of Wandsworth despite being located in the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames. As Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre provides outdoor sports facilities for schools, access for the general public is restricted while the sports centre can only be accessed from Queen Elizabeth Walk.

6.3.2 The assessment identified that approximately 80% of the sports centre is comprised of formal recreational grassland, 10% informal recreational grassland, 5% hard playing surface and 5% natural woodland.

Quality

6.3.3 Overall the quality of Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre was assessed as being ‘Very Good’, achieving an average quality score of 8.24. In percentage terms the sports centre achieved a quality score of 77.8%.

6.3.4 Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre scored well in the quality assessment. The conservation of natural and landscape features signage, equality of access to and within the space, the safety of equipment and facilities, evidence of dog fouling, the quality of facilities, the cleanliness of the site and standards of grounds maintenance and horticulture all scored 9.

Value

Site context

6.3.5 Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre has a lower community value in terms of site context due to the site not being accessible to the general public thereby preventing informal activity from taking place.
Recreational value

6.3.6 Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre provides excellent recreational value to the community it serves. The site assessment identified provision for a range of active recreational activities including pitch sport, athletics, tennis and rowing. The assessment identified three cricket pitches, four touch rugby pitches, one Aussie rules pitch and six grass 5-a-side football pitches.

6.3.7 Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre was assessed as having a low informal recreational value. This can be attributed to the fact the site is not accessible to the general public thereby preventing informal activity from taking place.

Amenity value

6.3.8 Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre was assessed as having some amenity value. The space contributes somewhat to the visual amenity of the surrounding area having been assessed as ‘visually attractive’ and ‘providing relief from the built up area’. The open space also plays a structural role which is reflected in its designation as MOL.

Environmental role

6.3.9 Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre was assessed as having limited environmental value given that is mostly laid out to formal recreational grassland. However, vegetation around Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre does provide relief from the built environment while mature tree coverage comprises approximately 5% of the open space.

Education value

6.3.10 Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre has been assessed as having existing educational value in terms of sports and organised games.

Frank Banfield Park: Indirect effect

Overview

6.3.11 Adjacent to the project site of Hammersmith Pumping Station, Frank Banfield Park is a Small Local Park managed by the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham. Frank Banfield Park was assessed as having dedicated provision for a range of informal recreational activities including sitting out, children’s play and dog walking. Frank Banfield Park is open to public while access to the park is restricted via five entry points, although accessible from all directions.

6.3.12 The assessment identified that approximately 5% of the park is natural woodland, 90% recreational grassland and 5% hard playing surface.

Quality

6.3.13 Frank Banfield Park was assessed as a Green Flag Park by the Civic Trust. This standing is supported by this most recent quality assessment. The quality of Frank Banfield Park has been assessed as being 'Very Good', achieving an average quality score of 8.31. In percentage terms the park achieved a quality score of 73.9%.
6.3.14 Frank Banfield Park scored well in the quality assessment with most categories scoring 8 ('Very Good') or above. The lowest scoring components of the quality assessment still scored well being assessed as ‘Good’, these include levels of personal security in the park, evidence of dog fouling and the standard of building and infrastructure maintenance.

Value

Site context

6.3.15 Frank Banfield Park has good community value in terms of site context with the park being publicly accessible. Accessibility to the park is slightly restricted due to the limited number of entry points however the park can be accessed from all directions.

Recreational value

6.3.16 Frank Banfield Park does not have an active recreational role. However, the park has good value as a destination for informal recreation. Informal recreational activity observed in the park with dedicated provision include children’s play, sitting out and dog walking while there is informal provision for teenagers and cyclists as well as a kick-about area.

6.3.17 The children’s play space within Frank Banfield Park has three pieces of equipment suitable for younger children and is therefore considered a local playable space, seating is also provided.

Amenity value

6.3.18 Frank Banfield Park was assessed as having some amenity value. The park contributes to the visual amenity of the local area having been assessed as being ‘visible from parts of the surrounding area’, ‘visually attractive’, and ‘providing relief from the built environment’.

Environmental role

6.3.19 Frank Banfield Park was assessed as having limited environmental value. However, the park does provide relief from the built environment while mature tree coverage comprises approximately 5% of the open space.

Putney Embankment Foreshore: Direct effect

Overview

6.3.20 Putney Embankment Foreshore consists solely of the foreshore of the River Thames which accessible to the general public during periods of low tide.

Quality

6.3.21 It was not deemed appropriate to assess the quality of this space against the majority of the open space quality assessment criteria (as identified in above). This is because the quality criteria are adapted from the Green Flag assessment, which provides a robust basis on which to assess parks and other accessible open space. The foreshore site does not have the same characteristics as these types of spaces and so quality scores cannot be derived in the same way. The foreshore was deemed to be of generally good condition for a space of this type, with small amounts of
rubbish observed. There is also sewage outfall onto parts of the foreshore but nothing else to detract from the site.

**Value**

**Site context**

6.3.22 The foreshore has generally low open space related value given that it is largely inaccessible and supports no recreational functions by itself.

**Recreational value**

6.3.23 The foreshore is not deemed to have any open space related recreational value located specifically at this site. However, the site does allow access to the water and the Thames as a whole supports a range of recreational functions including sailing, kayaking and other tourism-related uses.

**Amenity value**

6.3.24 The site does have a visual amenity role which varies according to the tide. The foreshore is only visible during periods of low tide and submerged at high tide. Overall, the amenity value is deemed to be relatively low.

**Environmental role**

6.3.25 The whole of the River Thames is designated as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC), so the site has a clear environmental role as part of the wider river.

**Education value**

6.3.26 The site is not deemed to support any clear open space related educational value.

**Waterman’s Green: Direct/indirect effect**

**Overview**

6.3.27 Adjacent to the project site of Putney Embankment Foreshore, Waterman’s Green is a small open space managed by the London Borough of Wandsworth. Waterman’s Green was assessed as having a limited informal recreational role with dedicated facilities for sitting out and relaxation. Waterman’s Green is publicly accessible however there is only one entry point.

**Quality**

6.3.28 Waterman’s Green was assessed as being ‘Fair’, achieving an average quality score of 6.29. In percentage terms the park achieved a quality score of 48.9%.

6.3.29 Waterman’s Green scored particularly poorly in terms of equality of access for all and the standard of building and infrastructure maintenance. In addition, scoring for safety and litter were also poor.
Value

Site context

6.3.30 Waterman’s Green has fair value in terms of site context with the park being publicly accessible. Accessibility within the park is restricted due to there being only one entry point. There is also a stairway down to Waterman’s Green from Lower Richmond Road but this is currently closed.

Recreational value

6.3.31 Waterman’s Green has been assessed as having an informal recreational role which includes dog walking and sitting out.

Amenity value

6.3.32 Waterman’s Green was assessed as having limited amenity value. The open space contributes to the visual amenity of the local area by being visually attractive (creating a break from the built environment) although views into the site are restricted by the bridge which limits visual amenity. However the park does enable views of the river which adds to its amenity value.

6.3.33 It should be noted that there are two extant planning permissions (ref 2001/4311 and ref 2007/5387) to convert the vaults under Lower Richmond Road (adjacent to the site) into cafes / restaurants, permission includes opening up and glazing the vault ends that front onto Waterman’s Green. This could impact on the amenity value of Waterman’s Green.

Environmental role

6.3.34 Waterman’s Green has a limited environmental role. Mature tree coverage and shrubbery each comprise 5% of the open space.

King George’s Park: Direct effect

Overview

6.3.35 King George’s Park is a District Park managed by the London Borough of Wandsworth. The park was assessed as having dedicated provision for a range of formal and informal recreational activities including tennis, bowls, pitch sports, sitting out, children’s play and dog walking. King George’s Park is open to public while access to the park is restricted, although accessible from all directions.

6.3.36 The assessment identified that approximately 5% of the park is natural woodland, 5% formal planted park, 75% recreational grassland, 10% hard playing surface and 5% water.

Quality

6.3.37 King George’s Park was assessed as being ‘Good’, achieving an average quality score of 7.83. In percentage terms the park achieved a quality score of 78.3%. This is similar to the findings of the Wandsworth Open Space Study (2007) which assessed King George’s Park as having a quality score of 7.1 or ‘Good’.
6.3.38 King George’s Park scored well in the quality assessment with most categories scoring 8 ('Very Good') or above. The lowest scoring components in the quality assessment still scored well being assessed as ‘Good’, these include levels of personal security in the park, evidence of dog fouling, the standard of building and infrastructure maintenance and the provision of educational interpretation.

Value

Site context

6.3.39 King George’s Park has good community value in terms of site context with the park being publicly accessible. Accessibility to the park is restricted due to the limited number of entry points. However, the park can be accessed from all directions.

Recreational value

6.3.40 King George’s Park has been assessed as having both an active and informal recreational role. Active recreational activities include the provision of dedicated facilities including a bowling green, 10 enclosed tennis courts and a large area for pitches sports (used for cricket, adult and junior football). Informal recreational activity observed in the park with dedicated provision includes dog walking, children’s play and sitting out while there is informal provision for teenagers and cyclists as well as a kick-about area.

6.3.41 The children’s play space within King George’s Park has 10 pieces of equipment suitable for younger children and is therefore considered a LEAP, seating is also provided.

Structural role

6.3.42 King George’s Park has been assessed as having a structural role in terms of creating a positive open space experience when passed, contributing to the local sense of place and accommodating recognisable features of local importance including the lake.

Amenity value

6.3.43 King George’s Park was assessed as having amenity value. The park contributes to the visual amenity of the local area having been assessed as being ‘visible from parts of the surrounding area’, ‘visually attractive’, providing a ‘clearly definable townscape value’ and ‘providing relief from the built environment’.

Environmental role

6.3.44 King George’s Park has been assessed as having environmental value as the park incorporates a lake as well as an underground river and natural drainage. In addition the park is more tranquil than the surrounding area, providing relief from the built environment. Mature tree coverage comprises approximately 5% of the open space.
Education value

6.3.45 King George’s Park has been assessed as having an educational role both in terms of sports and organised games and historical interpretation / understanding.

Carnwath Road Riverside Foreshore: Direct effect

Overview

6.3.46 The project site of Carnwath Road Riverside’s foreshore consists solely of the foreshore of the River Thames which is accessible to the general public during periods of low tide.

Quality

6.3.47 It was not deemed appropriate to assess the quality of this space against the majority of the open space quality assessment criteria (as identified in above). This is because the quality criteria are adapted from the Green Flag assessment, which provides a robust basis on which to assess parks and other accessible open space. The foreshore site does not have the same characteristics as these types of spaces and so quality scores cannot be derived in the same way. The foreshore was deemed to be of generally good condition for a space of this type, with small amounts of rubbish observed.

Value

Site context

6.3.48 The foreshore has generally low open space related value given that it is largely inaccessible and supports no recreational functions by itself.

Recreational value

6.3.49 The foreshore is only deemed to have minor recreational value for the informal use of the foreshore for walking at low tide. However, the Thames as a whole does support a range of recreational functions including sailing, kayaking and other tourism-related uses.

Amenity value

6.3.50 The site does have a visual amenity role which varies according to the tide. The foreshore is only visible during periods of low tide and submerged at high tide. Overall, the amenity value is deemed to be relatively low.

Environmental role

6.3.51 The whole of the River Thames is designated as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC), so the site has a clear environmental role as part of the wider river.

Education value

6.3.52 The site is not deemed to support any clear open space related educational value.
York Gardens: Indirect effect

Overview

6.3.53 Adjacent to and surrounding the project site of Falconbrook Pumping Station, York Gardens is a Small Local Park managed by the London Borough of Wandsworth. The park was assessed as having dedicated provision for informal recreational activities including dog walking, children’s play, sitting out and relaxation. York Gardens is open to the public while access to the park is restricted, although accessible from all directions.

6.3.54 The assessment identified that approximately 20% of the park is natural woodland, 60% recreational grassland and 20% hard playing surface.

Quality

6.3.55 York Gardens was assessed as being ‘Fair’, achieving an average quality score of 6.94. In percentage terms the park achieved a quality score of 61.7%.

6.3.56 York Gardens was scored ‘Good’ or better for most criteria however a number were ranked as ‘Fair’. These lower scoring components in the quality assessment include levels of personal security, the standard of grounds maintenance and horticulture and the standard of arboriculture and woodland management.

Value

Site context

6.3.57 York Gardens has good community value in terms of site context with the park being publicly accessible. The park is adjacent to a housing estate and therefore provides a valuable open space to residents. Accessibility to the park is restricted due to the limited number of entry points however the park can be accessed from all directions.

Recreational value

6.3.58 York Gardens has been assessed as having an informal recreational role. Informal recreational activity observed in the park with dedicated provision includes dog walking, children’s play and sitting out and relaxation while there is informal provision for teenagers and cyclists as well as a kick-about area.

6.3.59 The children’s play space within York Gardens is an adventure play area with 14 pieces of equipment suitable for children, seating is also provided.

Amenity value

6.3.60 York Gardens was assessed as having amenity value. The park contributes to the visual amenity of the local area having been assessed as being ‘visible from parts of the surrounding area’, ‘visually attractive’ and ‘providing relief from the built environment’.
Environmental role

6.3.61 The park is more tranquil than the surrounding area, providing relief from the built environment. Mature tree coverage and shrubs and bushes each comprise approximately 10% of the open space.

Cremorne Gardens: Indirect effect

Overview

6.3.62 Adjacent to the project site of Cremorne Wharf Depot, Cremorne Gardens is a Small Local Park managed by the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea. Cremorne Gardens was assessed as having dedicated provision for sitting out and relaxation and dog walking. Cremorne Gardens is open to the public while access to the park is restricted with a single access point.

6.3.63 The assessment identified that approximately 20% of Cremorne Gardens is considered formal planted park and 80% informal recreational grassland.

Quality

6.3.64 Cremorne Gardens was awarded a Green Flag by the Civic Trust. This standing is supported by this most recent quality assessment. The quality of Cremorne Gardens has been assessed as being ‘Good’, achieving an average quality score of 7.5. In percentage terms the park achieved a quality score of 75%.

6.3.65 Cremorne Gardens scored well in the quality assessment with most categories scoring 7 (‘Good’) or above. The highest scoring components of the quality assessment achieved an ‘Excellent’ rating and include the park being welcoming and having good and safe access.

Value

Site context

6.3.66 Cremorne Gardens has good community value in terms of site context with the park being publicly accessible although accessibility to the park is restricted due to the single entry and exit point. There is limited publicly accessible open space available to the residents to the north of the open space, making the gardens a valuable space.

Recreational value

6.3.67 Cremorne Gardens does not have an active recreational role however the park has good value as a destination for informal recreation. Informal recreation activity observed taking place in the park with dedicated provision include sitting out and relaxation while there is informal provision for teenagers, dog walkers and children’s play. However, the Thames as a whole does support a range of recreational functions including sailing, kayaking and other tourism-related uses.

Amenity value

6.3.68 Cremorne Gardens were assessed as having some amenity value. The park contributes to the visual amenity of the local area having been
assessed as being ‘visible from parts of the surrounding area’, ‘visually attractive’, and ‘providing relief from the built environment’. The Gardens also provide a break in the built area allowing views out to the Thames.

Environmental role

6.3.69 Cremorne Gardens were assessed as having limited environmental value, however the park is tranquil, providing relief from the built environment while mature tree coverage comprises approximately 5% of the open space.

Education value

6.3.70 Cremorne Gardens was assessed as having the potential to provide more historical interpretation facilities.

Cremorne Wharf Depot Foreshore: Indirect effect

Overview

6.3.71 Cremorne Wharf Foreshore falls outside the project site and consists solely of the foreshore of the River Thames which is not accessible to the general public during periods of low tide. The area contains a Campshed which barges used to rest on when using the wharf. Site is Designated Safeguarded Wharf by the Mayor. The project are proposing to use barges at this site so may refurbish the Campshed if necessary.

Quality

6.3.72 It was not deemed appropriate to assess the quality of this space against the majority of the open space quality assessment criteria (as identified in above). This is because the quality criteria are adapted from the Green Flag assessment, which provides a robust basis on which to assess parks and other accessible open space. The foreshore site does not have the same characteristics as these types of spaces and so quality scores cannot be derived in the same way. The foreshore was deemed to be of generally good condition for a space of this type, with small amounts of rubbish observed.

Value

Site Context

6.3.73 The foreshore has generally low open space related value because it is not publically accessible.

Recreational Value

6.3.74 The foreshore is only deemed to have minor recreational value for informal use of the foreshore for walking at low tide. However, the Thames as a whole supports a range of recreational functions including sailing, kayaking and other tourism-related uses.

Amenity value

6.3.75 The site does have a visual amenity role which varies according to the tide. The foreshore is only visible during periods of low tide and submerged at high tide. Overall, the amenity value is deemed to be relatively low.
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Environmental role

6.3.76 The whole of the River Thames is designated as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC), so the site has a clear environmental role as part of the wider river.

Education value

6.3.77 The site is not deemed to support any clear open space related educational value.

Chelsea Embankment Foreshore: Direct effect

Overview

6.3.78 The only area of foreshore within the Chelsea Embankment Foreshore Site is inaccessible to the general public. The foreshore is only visible during periods of low tide.

Quality

6.3.79 It was not deemed appropriate to assess the quality of this space against the majority of the open space quality assessment criteria (as identified in above). This is because the quality criteria are adapted from the Green Flag assessment, which provides a robust basis on which to assess parks and other accessible open space. The foreshore site does not have the same characteristics as these types of spaces and so quality scores cannot be derived in the same way. The foreshore was deemed to be of generally good condition for a space of this type.

Value

Site context

6.3.80 The foreshore has generally low open space related value given that it is inaccessible and supports no recreational functions by itself.

Recreational value

6.3.81 The foreshore is not deemed to have any open space related recreational value located specifically at this site. However, the Thames as a whole does support a range of recreational functions including sailing, kayaking and other tourism-related uses.

Amenity value

6.3.82 The site does have a visual amenity role which varies according to the tide. The foreshore is only visible during periods of low tide and submerged at high tide. Overall, the amenity value is deemed to be relatively low.

Environmental role

6.3.83 The whole of the River Thames is designated as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC), so the site has a clear environmental role as part of the wider river.

Education value

6.3.84 The site is not deemed to support any clear open space related educational value.
**Chelsea Bridge Gardens: Indirect effect**

**Overview**

6.3.85 Adjacent to the project site of Chelsea Embankment Foreshore, Chelsea Bridge Gardens is a semi-natural urban green space managed by the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea. The open space was assessed as having no formal or informal recreational role. Chelsea Bridge Gardens is not open to the public, the single access gate being locked.

6.3.86 The assessment identified that approximately 100% of this open space is considered natural woodland.

**Quality**

6.3.87 Chelsea Bridge Gardens was assessed as being ‘Poor’, achieving an average quality score of 4.27. In percentage terms the open space achieved a quality score of 26.1%.

6.3.88 Chelsea Bridge Gardens scored particularly poorly in terms of equality access for all, good and safe access and the provision of signage. Each of these quality criteria were assessed as being ‘Poor’.

**Value**

**Site context**

6.3.89 Chelsea Bridge Gardens has very poor value in terms of site context with the open space not being publicly accessible.

**Recreational value**

6.3.90 This space has no recreational value as it is not currently open accessible to the general public.

**Environmental role**

6.3.91 Chelsea Bridge Gardens has a significant environmental role. Mature woodland comprises approximately 80% of the open space while shrubbery comprises 10%.

**Ranelagh Gardens: Direct effect**

**Overview**

6.3.92 Adjacent to the project site of Chelsea Embankment Foreshore, Ranelagh Gardens is a Local Park owned and managed by the Royal Chelsea Hospital. This park was assessed as having dedicated provision for informal activity including sitting out and relaxation. Ranelagh Gardens is open to the public while access to the park is restricted via the main south gate. The assessment identified that approximately 95% of the park is comprised of natural woodland.

**Quality**

6.3.93 Ranelagh Gardens was assessed as being ‘Good’, achieving an average quality score of 7.13. In percentage terms the park achieved a quality score of 63.3%,
Ranelagh Gardens scored ‘Good’ or better for most quality criteria however a number were ranked as ‘Fair’. These lower scoring components in the quality assessment include levels of personal security and the appropriate provision of facilities.

**Value**

**Site context**

Ranelagh Gardens has good community value in terms of site context with the park being publicly accessible. Accessibility to the park is restricted due to the limited number of entry points. However, the park can be accessed from all directions.

**Recreational value**

Ranelagh Gardens has been assessed as having an informal recreational role. Informal recreational activity observed in the park with dedicated provision includes sitting out and relaxation while there is informal provision for dog walking, children’s play and teenagers.

**Structural role**

Ranelagh Gardens has been assessed as having a structural role in terms of creating a positive open space experience, contributing to the local sense of place, accommodating recognisable features of local importance, contributing to the special identify of the Borough and defining neighbourhoods.

**Cultural role**

Ranelagh Gardens has a cultural role in that the space is used to support the annual Chelsea Flower Show.

**Cultural role**

The open space has historical value as designated as a Grade II park on Register of Historic Parks and Gardens.

**Amenity value**

Ranelagh Gardens has been assessed as having amenity value. The park contributes to the visual amenity of the local area having been assessed as being ‘visible from parts of the surrounding area’ and ‘visually attractive’.

**Environmental role**

The park is more tranquil than the surrounding area, providing relief from the built environment. Mature tree coverage comprises approximately 80% of the park while shrubs and bushes comprise approximately 15% of the open space.

**Albert Embankment Foreshore: Direct effect**

**Overview**

The area of foreshore within the Albert Embankment Foreshore Site is accessible to the general public via Lack’s Dock during low tide. The foreshore is only visible during periods of low tide.
### Quality

6.3.103 It was not deemed appropriate to assess the quality of this space against the majority of the open space quality assessment criteria (as identified in above). This is because the quality criteria are adapted from the Green Flag assessment, which provides a robust basis on which to assess parks and other accessible open space. The foreshore site does not have the same characteristics as these types of spaces and so quality scores cannot be derived in the same way. The foreshore was deemed to be of generally good condition for a space of this type, with small amounts of rubbish observed but nothing else to detract from the site.

### Value

#### Site context

6.3.104 The foreshore has generally low open space related value given that it is largely inaccessible and supports no recreational functions by itself.

#### Recreational value

6.3.105 The foreshore has a limited recreational value for informal use of the foreshore for walking at low tide. However, the Thames as a whole does support a range of recreational functions including sailing, kayaking and other tourism-related uses.

#### Amenity value

6.3.106 The site does have a visual amenity role which varies according to the tide. The foreshore is only visible during periods of low tide and submerged at high tide. Overall, the amenity value is deemed to be relatively low.

#### Environmental role

6.3.107 The whole of the River Thames is designated as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC), so the site has a clear environmental role as part of the wider river.

#### Education value

6.3.108 The site is not deemed to support any clear open space related educational value.

---

**Public Realm in Front of Vauxhall Cross: Indirect effect**

#### Overview

6.3.109 Adjacent to the project site of Albert Embankment Foreshore, the hard landscaped spaces either side of the east side of Vauxhall Bridge are publicly accessible and form part of the Thames Path. The spaces are 100% hard landscaping and provide opportunities for sitting out with views over the Thames.

### Quality

6.3.110 Overall the quality of the space was assessed as being ‘Good’, achieving an average quality score of 7.09.
6.3.111 It was not assessed against criteria relating to the conservation of natural and landscape features, but scored relatively well on safety, the provision of facilities for a space of this type and litter and waste management. The space scored slightly lower on the equality of access given that, to access the spaces from the Bridge, stairs must be used.

**Value**

**Site context**

6.3.112 The site is relatively small, with a relatively limited number of functions, meaning that its overall value score is lower than some larger open spaces. However, the site clearly has some recreational value related to walking and sitting out.

**Recreational value**

6.3.113 The spaces form part of the Thames Path and also provide opportunities for sitting out with views out over the Thames. No other recreational functions were recorded at the site.

**Amenity value**

6.3.114 The site was assessed as having some amenity value. The spaces contribute somewhat to the visual amenity of the surrounding area having been assessed as ‘visually attractive’. The spaces also have a clear townscape value as they help to frame the buildings which adjoin the site.

**Environmental role**

6.3.115 No environmental role was recorded for this space.

**Education value**

6.3.116 A small amount of information on the wildlife that the Thames supports is available within the space, which contributes somewhat to the education value of the space.

**Victoria Embankment Foreshore: No effect**

**Overview**

6.3.117 There is no foreshore at this site, even at low tide. It was not deemed appropriate to assess this small area of the Thames as a distinct site.

**Whitehall Gardens: No effect**

**Overview**

6.3.118 Whitehall Gardens is a Small Local Park which features attractive planted gardens and facilities for sitting out. The space is managed by the City of Westminster. There is no direct or indirect effect identified on this open space.

**Blackfriars Bridge Foreshore: Direct effect**

**Overview**

6.3.119 There is no foreshore at this site, even at low tide. It was not deemed appropriate to assess this small area of the Thames as a distinct site.
King Edward Memorial Park: Direct effect

Overview

6.3.120 King Edward Memorial Park is a District Park and provides a wide range of outdoor sports provision and other recreational functions. The space is managed by the London Borough of Tower Hamlets and is publicly accessible to all during the day.

6.3.121 The assessment identified that approximately 75% of the space is formal planted gardens, with 25% being hard playing surface.

Quality

6.3.122 Overall the quality of King Edward Memorial Park was assessed as being ‘Good’, achieving an average quality score of 7.82.

6.3.123 The site scored well in terms of the range of facilities available, the quality of the grounds maintenance and horticulture and general quality of the facilities. The site scored less well on equality of access given that the road immediately to the north of the site (‘The Highway’) forms a barrier to entering the park from the north. However, it is recognised that there is an underpass in the north-west corner of the site and a traffic light junction that allow relatively safe crossing of the road.

Value

Site context

6.3.124 King Edward Memorial Park was considered to have very high value, it has a Green Flag award and supports a good range of recreational facilities for a site of this size. The site is the only District Park in this part of the Borough, which is densely populated, and the Borough’s open space assessment has identified the site as popular and well used by local residents.

Recreational value

6.3.125 Some parts of King Edward Memorial Park provide recreational value to the community it serves. The site assessment identified provision for a range of active recreational activities including multi-purpose sports pitch, tennis courts and bowls. The site also forms part of the Thames Path and has facilities for sitting out and for children’s play.

Amenity value

6.3.126 King Edward Memorial Park was assessed as having high amenity value. The space contributes to the visual amenity of the surrounding area having been assessed as ‘visually attractive’ and ‘providing relief from the built up area’. The space is also visible from parts of the surrounding area, including from the other side of the Thames.

Environmental role

6.3.127 The space has some environmental role, given that the eastern part of the park includes a nature conservation garden. The space also accommodates a large number of mature trees.
Education value
6.3.128 The space has some education value, with information available within the nature garden and on the historic context of the Rotherhithe Tunnel. Thames Water was also advised that the site is regularly used by schools for educational trips.

King Edward Memorial Park Foreshore: Direct Overview
6.3.129 The area of foreshore within the King Edward Memorial Park Foreshore is accessible to users of the Shadwell Basin Outdoor Activity Centre. The Shadwell Basin Outdoor Activity Centre launch their boats from King Edward Stair’s and there are some moorings near to the project site.

Quality
6.3.130 It was not deemed appropriate to assess the quality of this space against the majority of the open space quality assessment criteria (as identified in above). This is because the quality criteria are adapted from the Green Flag assessment, which provides a robust basis on which to assess parks and other accessible open space. The foreshore site does not have the same characteristics as these types of spaces and so quality scores cannot be derived in the same way.

Value
Site context
6.3.131 The foreshore has generally low open space related value given that it has only limited accessibility and supports no recreational functions by itself.

Recreational value
6.3.132 The foreshore is not deemed to have any open space related recreational value located specifically at this site. However, the Thames as a whole does support a range of recreational functions including sailing, kayaking and other tourism-related uses.

Amenity value
6.3.133 The site does have a visual amenity role which varies according to the tide. The foreshore is only visible during periods of low tide and submerged at high tide. Overall, the amenity value is deemed to be relatively low.

Environmental role
6.3.134 The whole of the River Thames is designated as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC), so the site has a clear environmental role as part of the wider river.

Education value
6.3.135 The site is not deemed to support any clear open space related educational value.
Deptford Church Street: Direct effect

Overview

6.3.136 Deptford Church Street is identified in the Borough’s open space assessment as an amenity green space known as Crossfield Street Open Space, although for the purposes of this study the space is referred to as Deptford Church Street. The space consists solely of non-recreational grass and is managed by the London Borough of Lewisham.

Quality

6.3.137 Overall the quality of Deptford Church Street was assessed as being ‘Poor’, achieving an average quality score of 5.50. The site scored poorly in terms of its access arrangements and in terms of the maintenance of the site in general, with rubbish noted within the site and some damaged railings.

Value

Site context

6.3.138 Deptford Church Street has relatively low value given the very limited range of functions it supports.

Recreational value

6.3.139 The site has limited informal recreational value, as it is sometimes used by dog walkers.

Amenity value

6.3.140 Deptford Church Street was assessed as having limited amenity value. The open space detracts from its setting in its current state and has no visible links or features that are in character with the Grade I listed St Pauls Church opposite the space.

Environmental role

6.3.141 It is part of the Borough designated SINC, it is also adjacent to the Sue Godfrey Nature Reserve is adjacent to the site.

Education value

6.3.142 No educational value was noted at this site, although St Joseph’s Primary School adjacent to the site have advised that they use the open space as an emergency evacuation muster point and sometimes as an outdoor learning space.

6.4 Summary

6.4.1 This section sets out an assessment of the quality and value of open spaces potentially affected either directly or indirectly by the project proposals. Table 6.2 below sets out the total score for each site, the total

---

10 Scores vary from those in the London Borough of Lewisham Open Space Assessment; this is as a result of different criteria being considered in the quality assessment. For amenity greenspace Lewisham Leisure Open Space Study 2010 assess quality based on only four criteria, presence and quality of signage and information, the quality of key furniture, the quality of grassed areas, and cleanliness.
number of categories that are marked as not applicable in the quality
assessment, the number of categories that have been scored, the average
score and the overall percentage score.

6.4.2 Total score is marked out of a possible 180. The average score is average
for all the categories that have been scored, whilst the percentage score is
the percentage score for the site out of a possible 100%.

6.4.3 The ten foreshore sites do not have an assessed quality score as the
criteria for assessing the quality of sites are not relevant to these sites (as
explained in para. 5.2.4 above), therefore each of these sites has received
a quality score of 0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open space</th>
<th>Total score</th>
<th>Total n/a</th>
<th>Cat scored</th>
<th>Average score</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>77.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Banfield Park</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.31</td>
<td>73.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putney Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterman’s Green</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>48.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King George’s Park</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>78.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnwath Road Foreshore</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York Gardens</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>61.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremorne Gardens</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremorne Wharf Depot</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea Bridge Gardens</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>26.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathwall Pumping Station Foreshore</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranelagh Gardens</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>63.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Realm in front of Vauxhall Cross</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.3 below provides a summary of the value of each site. The detailed results from the quality and value assessment are at Appendix C.

**Table 6.3 Summary of value**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open space</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre</td>
<td>Excellent recreational value, serves a wide area. Provides educational value for organised sports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond Barn Elms Sports Pitches</td>
<td>Good recreational value serves a wide area. Provides educational value for organised sports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Banfield Park</td>
<td>Good community value, serves the local area for informal recreational needs, has some amenity value as it is visually attractive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putney Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>Low value as relatively inaccessible and performs limited recreational function other than enabling access to the water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterman’s Green</td>
<td>Limited recreational value and limited amenity value due to views into site being restricted, The site does however provide views of the river.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King George’s Park</td>
<td>Is a key multi-functional park with strong structural and amenity roles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York Gardens</td>
<td>Provides valuable open space to nearby residents, by providing a role for children’s play and other informal recreation. The site also provides amenity value particularly providing relief from the built environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremorne Gardens</td>
<td>Valuable local space serving local recreational needs, and has historical value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>Low value, no recreational value and low amenity value. Environmental role as part of wider river.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea Bridge Gardens</td>
<td>Poor value, not currently accessible. However the site does</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Open space Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open space</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ranelagh Gardens</td>
<td>Plays a key role in an area with limited publicly accessible open space, as well as performing a cultural role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>Low value, no recreational value and low amenity value. Environmental role as part of wider river.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames Path adjacent to Vauxhall Bridge</td>
<td>Some recreational value in particular providing space for sitting out, with views of the Thames with environmental interpretation boards on site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>It was not deemed appropriate to assess the value of this site as a distinct site separate from the wider river.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehall Gardens</td>
<td>Provides a valuable space for nearby workers. Has high amenity value being visually attractive and providing a relief from the built up area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackfriars Bridge Foreshore</td>
<td>It was not deemed appropriate to assess the value of this site as a distinct site separate from the wider river.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Edward Memorial Park</td>
<td>High value park that supports a range of recreational facilities and provides a District Park in densely populated area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deptford Church Street</td>
<td>Low value, no recreational value, provides some amenity value as it provides relief from the built area and townscape value when considered within the wider context of surrounding spaces and built environment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6.4.5

The following sites that have the potential to be directly affected by the project proposals are noted for their value although none are considered to be surplus to requirements:

a. Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre  
b. King George’s Park  
c. Ranelagh Gardens  
d. King Edward Memorial Park.

#### 6.4.6

The following sites that potentially could be indirectly affected by the project proposals are noted for their value include:

a. Frank Banfield Park  
b. Cremorne Gardens

#### 6.4.7

In terms of quality and value the following sites are considered to be sensitive to potential disturbance by the project proposals:

a. Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre  
b. King George’s Park  
c. Ranelagh Gardens  
d. King Edward Memorial Park
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e. Frank Banfield Park
f. Cremorne Gardens.
7 Assessment of effects on open spaces and foreshore and potential mitigation

7.1 Introduction

7.1.1 This section sets out the approach adopted to assess the effects of the project proposals on open spaces and foreshore. The section sets out the results of the assessment of effects on a site by site basis.

7.1.2 This section includes measures that could potentially mitigate effects of the project proposals on a site by site basis.

7.1.3 This section begins by setting out the approach that has been used to assess the effects of the project proposals. The section then sets out the types of measures that could be used to mitigate effects.

7.1.4 The assessment of effects on open spaces and foreshore during the construction and operational phases of the project proposals is set out on a site by site basis and considers, in turn, effects on function, quantity, quality, accessibility and value. For each of the affected sites mitigation measures have been identified.

7.2 Guidance on assessing effects

7.2.1 Guidance on planning decisions for nationally significant wastewater infrastructure projects is set out in the NPS. Section 4 of the NPS outlines that the decision maker should consider a range of relevant, generic impacts. Of particular relevance to this study are impacts on land-use including open space, green infrastructure and green belt, outlined in Section 4.8 of the NPS.

7.2.2 The review of local authority assessments in Section 5 has shown that none of the open spaces or foreshore that have the potential to be directly or indirectly affected by the project proposals are surplus to requirements. The assessment set out in this section has directly responded to the advice in NPS paragraphs 4.8.13 and 4.8.14 by identifying the “positive proposals to provide new, improved or compensatory land or facilities” and “whether an adverse impact is temporary” or reversible. The positive proposals to provide new, improved or compensatory land or facilities are identified on a site by site basis in this section (and in Table 7.1), adverse effects are also identified in this section (including whether they are temporary or permanent) and are summarised in Table 7.1. It is therefore important to consider the effects of the project proposals on open space and foreshore including both quantitative and qualitative in order to ensure that effects on open space are minimised and to help identify appropriate mitigation measures.

7.2.3 Considering the limited guidance contained within the NPS on how the effects on open space and foreshore should be assessed Thames Water considered and adopted an amended assessment procedures normally employed for Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA).
7.3 Criteria for assessing effects

7.3.1 In assessing the effects of project proposals various criteria have been considered:

a. Function of the site – will the proposal have an impact on the primary function of the open space.

b. Quantity – will the proposal lead to a decrease or increase in the amount of open space; and, how would this compare to adopted standards and is the space surplus to requirements?

c. Accessibility – will the proposal impact on the accessibility to the open space, how would this impact on the catchment area of the site, as defined by adopted accessibility standards? Will the proposal improve or adversely affect accessibility to the wider open space network?

d. Value – will the proposal impact on the value of the site? Value represents a range of cultural and usage factors which are harder to measure than quality, and can be even harder to change. The Companion Guide to the now superseded PPG17 set out that value of open space depends on two things: the extent to which the open space meets local needs and the wider benefits they generate for people, wildlife, biodiversity and the wider environment. The Companion Guide goes on to advise how value can be assessed, the guide advises that value relies on three things: context; level and type of use and wider benefits. The wider benefits of open space include: ecological benefits; education benefits; cultural and heritage benefits; amenity benefits and sense of place; and structural and landscape benefits.

e. Quality - will the proposal lead to an improvement or deterioration in quality of the site? Quality will be assessed through the site reconnaissance work. The assessment of quality is based on the Civic Trust’s Green Flag award criteria. This includes considering whether the site is: welcoming; healthy safe and clean; clean and well maintained; well managed and has a degree of community involvement (see the survey pro-forma and guidelines for further details). Bristol’s Parks and Green Spaces Strategy is acknowledged as best practice, especially within the latest 2009 CABE and Mayor of London best practice guidance for Open Space Strategies, which also acknowledges that quality standards should relate to information collected in the on-site audit survey and it is important to use an appropriate benchmark, such as the Green Flag.

7.3.2 In assessing the effects of the project proposals this section draws from the findings of the local authority assessments outlined in Section 5 and the assessment of sites outlined in Section 6. The effects of the project proposals on each of the affected sites have been assessed using the information collected from these assessments.
7.4 Mitigation

7.4.1 Where the project proposals have the potential to directly or indirectly affect open space or foreshore it is important to assess the potential mitigation measures that might be acceptable.

7.4.2 Thames Water considered the type of work that might be necessary to mitigate any adverse impact. The range of potential mitigation measures that could be used include:

a. quality improvements within the open space affected, and or improvements to other open spaces within the catchment of the affected open space
b. temporary creation of replacement facilities within the affected site (e.g. replacement playground)
c. creation of replacement open space within the catchment (based on the GLA hierarchy and or local authority standards) of the affected open space
d. improvements in the accessibility to the affected open spaces, in particular creating or improving links to surrounding residential areas and links to the wider open space network
e. appropriate diversions, enhancements and additions to the Thames Path
f. amendments to the design and massing and size of construction and operational structures
g. screening of construction and operational structures through planting etc
h. reduction in size of foreshore permanent sites.

7.4.3 The assessment of potential mitigation measures is set out site by site after the assessment of effects.

7.5 Assessment of effects on open space or foreshore and mitigation: Site by site

Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre

7.5.1 Surrounding the project site of Barn Elms, the Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre provides a range of outdoor sports provision which is predominately accessed by local school groups. The centre is owned and managed by the London Borough of Wandsworth despite being located in the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames.

7.5.2 As set out in Section 5 (para. 5.3.30 above) there is no evidence at present indicating that the Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre is surplus to requirements, although, paragraph 5.3.34 above identifies that while the site is well used by schools there is potentially some spare capacity at certain times.
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Function

7.5.3 The site functions as an outdoor sports centre at present which includes the provision of sports pitches and track and field facilities. The current provision of sports pitches may be adversely affected by the project proposals for Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre. Proposals could result in the temporary loss of one pitch, re-provision of changing facilities prior to the demolition of existing changing facilities and the permanent relocation of track and field facilities near their present location on site prior to the removal of existing provision.

7.5.4 The temporary loss of one pitch, replacement of changing room accommodation and the permanent relocation of track and field facilities near their present location on site would not affect the functioning of the site during the construction phase. This is because the replacement changing rooms and relocation of track and field facilities would be undertaken in advance of any construction works; and the loss of one pitch temporarily can be accommodated as there is under-usage of the existing pitches.

7.5.5 Potential effects on the function of the Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre could include disruption to outdoor sports caused by construction traffic, noise and air pollution as well as the temporary loss of one sports pitch and relocation of changing accommodation. The relocation of track and field facilities near their current location on site would be permanent.

Quantity

7.5.6 Potential quantitative effects include the temporary loss of one sports pitch. There would be the permanent loss of a strip of land to provide an access route around part of the perimeter of the site (3m during operation phase and 5m during construction phase). The temporary construction area will cover 3.12ha. The access route would be fenced off during construction. However, it should be noted that the Council prefer the new access route to the existing access route and it could mean that the existing access could be removed and returned to grass.

Quality

7.5.7 Potential qualitative effects have been assessed by considering the impact project proposals may have on the current quality score for Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre. Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre has been assessed as having a quality score of 8.24 or ‘Very Good’. It is considered that during the construction and operational phase’s quality criteria will not be adversely impacted.

Accessibility

7.5.8 Potential accessibility effects have been assessed by considering the impact project proposals may have on the ability of local communities to access Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre. With the exception of the pitch that will be temporarily unavailable during the construction phase, the site will remain publicly accessible. Therefore, the centre’s accessibility will be not adversely impacted by the proposals.
Value

7.5.9 Potential effects on value include the impact on recreational value, related to the potential temporary loss of one playing pitch. The site will continue to retain its recreational value throughout the construction and operational phases. Amenity value of the site is likely to be impacted by the disruptive effect of construction traffic, noise and air pollution as well as visual impacts from temporary fencing and other construction materials and equipment.

Mitigation

7.5.10 The potential measures to mitigate temporary and permanent effects during construction of the project proposals on function, quantity, accessibility and value of Barn Elms Schools Sports Ground include:

a. Reconfiguration of existing pitch layout to compensate for the temporary loss of one grass pitch.

b. Improve drainage to pitches liable to ‘waterlogging’ to increase capacity on these pitches.

c. Construction of new changing facilities on site, to be completed before demolition of existing facilities is undertaken.

d. The relocation of track and field facilities to remain within close proximity of existing facilities.

e. Proposed road surface of ‘grasscrete’ should minimise the potential for visual impact.

7.5.11 As set out above the effects of the project proposals during construction on the quality of Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre are considered to be neutral and therefore no mitigation measures are required.

7.5.12 There are no appropriate measures to mitigate the minor loss of land due to the proposed access route during the operational phase.

Frank Banfield Park

7.5.13 Adjacent to the project site of Hammersmith Pumping Station, Frank Banfield Park is a Local Park with a range of dedicated provision for informal recreational activities including sitting out, children’s play and dog walking. The park is managed by the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham.

7.5.14 The project proposals will not directly affect Frank Banfield Park. However, there will be a kerb realignment within the footway next to Frank Banfield Park. The park will continue to function as a park both during and after construction. There could be some limited disruption to current recreational activity on site caused by construction traffic, noise and air pollution.

7.5.15 Potential effects on value include the cumulative impact of the Thames Tideway proposals and St George development proposals on the amenity value of the park. The park may be affected due to the disruptive effect of construction including traffic noise and air pollution.
Potential measures to mitigate temporary effects during construction of the project proposals on the function and value of Frank Banfield park include:

a. erection of temporary screening / hoarding along the Distillery Road edge of the park.

**Putney Embankment Foreshore**

The Putney Embankment Foreshore was surveyed in October 2012 at low tide. The foreshore was assessed as being publicly accessible and could therefore be used by the public for walking, sitting out and relaxation. Additionally the Putney Embankment Foreshore has recreational value for water based recreation as existing slipways at the foreshore can be used to access the River for rowing and boating. The embankment adjacent to the foreshore includes hard landscaping and benches and is used for sitting out and relaxation.

As set out in Section 5 (para. 5.5.15 above) the foreshore was not assessed in the Borough’s open space assessment so there is no evidence at present indicating that it is surplus to requirements.

**Function**

The project proposals could potentially affect the function of the foreshore. During construction access to the slipway is likely to be unavailable, however a temporary slipway will be constructed which will allow continuing access to the foreshore for water sports activities. In addition the use of the embankment for walking, sitting out and relaxation etc is likely to be both directly and indirectly affected by the works.

During the operational phase 0.56ha of additional hard landscaped embankment would be created. This would result in the permanent loss of some of the foreshore. Despite this loss there are likely to be benefits in relation to the functionality of the additional hard landscaped embankment which will act as a space for sitting out and relaxation with the provision of seating.

**Quantity**

During construction there will be a loss of part of the foreshore which would be permanent.

In the operational phase there would be a permanent loss of foreshore although 0.56ha of additional hard landscaped embankment would be created, which will act as a space for sitting out and relaxation.

**Accessibility**

Potential effects on accessibility include the loss of public access to parts of the foreshore and part of the adjacent embankment to during construction.

**Value**

Potential effects on value include the temporary loss of recreational and amenity value during the construction phase of the project proposals. However the provision of a temporary slipway during the construction phase will allow use of the river to continue.
Mitigation

7.5.25 The potential measures to mitigate the temporary effects during construction of the project proposals on function, quantity, accessibility and value of Putney Embankment Foreshore include:

a. Replacement of temporary slipway facilities in close proximity to the site.

b. Temporary minor diversion of the Thames Path around the proposed vehicle entrance to the site works.

Waterman’s Green

7.5.26 Adjacent to the project site of Putney Embankment Foreshore, Waterman’s Green is an amenity green space. It has been assessed as having a limited informal recreational role with no dedicated facilities for sitting out and relaxation. Waterman’s Green is managed by the London Borough of Wandsworth.

7.5.27 As set out in Section 5 (para. 5.5.15 above) the site was not assessed in the Borough’s open space assessment so there is no evidence at present indicating that it is surplus to requirements.

7.5.28 It should be noted that there are three extant planning permissions which could affect the amenity value of Waterman’s Green:

a. Ref no.2012/1998: An application was granted for Listed building Consent on 01/10/12 for 4 to 6 Putney High Street for the ‘formation of arched openings in listed river wall with flood barrier for each vault in connection with the use of the basement as a restaurant / Cafe and bar (Class A3 / A4) to provide access onto Waterman’s Green.

b. Ref nos. 2010/3543 and 2010/3543: An application for planning permission and Listed Building Consent was granted consent on 07/01/11 for 2 Putney High Street for alterations to existing restaurant (Class A3) including extension at rear of ground and basement floors; alterations to the shop front, provision of additional floorspace within existing basement vault and a provision of an opening in the river wall with flood barrier to provide access onto Waterman’s Green.

7.5.29 Each of these extant planning permissions relate to two buildings on Putney High Street, no. 2 and nos. 4-6. Each of these applications will affect Waterman’s Green because access is to be provided onto Waterman’s Green from these properties via vaults below Putney High Street.

Function

7.5.30 The project proposals would include works on the foreshore adjacent to Waterman’s Green. These works are likely to affect the function of the space both directly and indirectly for much of the construction phase. Function will be indirectly affected due to the erection of temporary hoarding which will block the view of the river, although this hoarding could be transparent. Function will be directly affected as the site will be made temporarily inaccessible to allow for the construction of a kiosk. There may
be some additional disturbance to users of the open space during the construction phase through noise and air pollution.

7.5.31 During the operational phase 0.56ha of additional hard landscaped embankment will be created adjacent to Waterman’s Green. This could potentially improve the function of the open space as it will become a more usable space for sitting out and relaxing.

**Quantity**

7.5.32 The project proposals include the construction of a kiosk within Waterman’s Green. This will result in Waterman’s Green being made temporarily inaccessible during the construction phase. During the operational phase, given the size of the kiosk, it is not considered to have an impact on the quantity of provision.

**Quality**

7.5.33 During the operation phase the kiosk will not affect the quality of Waterman’s Green.

**Accessibility**

7.5.34 Waterman’s Green will be temporarily inaccessible during the construction phase of the project works. During the operational phase access will not be affected.

**Value**

7.5.35 Potential effects on value include the impact of project proposals on the amenity value of the open space. The amenity value of the open space will be directly affected during the construction phase.

7.5.36 Waterman’s Green may also be affected due to the disruptive effect of construction traffic noise and air pollution on the amenity value of the open space.

**Mitigation**

7.5.37 Potential measures that could be used to mitigate temporary effects during construction of the project proposals at Waterman’s Green particularly in relation to function include:

a. The erection of temporary screening / hoarding around the construction site (potentially transparent)

**King George’s Park**

7.5.38 King George’s Park is a District Park that provides dedicated provision for a range of formal and informal recreational activities including tennis, bowls, sitting out, children’s play and dog walking. The park is managed by the London Borough of Wandsworth.

7.5.39 As set out in Section 5 (para. 5.5.15) the site was not identified in the Borough’s open space assessment as being surplus to requirements.

**Function**

7.5.40 The project proposals will require the temporary fencing off of a small part of the park during construction.
7.5.41 During the operational phase there will be a permanent net loss of 0.04ha of soft landscaping. However, given the scale of the works compared to the overall scale of the park, the potential impact on the function of the park is considered to be limited. The park will continue to serve its primary function as a District Park with a range of informal and formal recreational facilities both in the construction and operational phases.

7.5.42 The new landscaped area includes provision of connections for water and power which could allow for a mobile cafe. The new landscaped area is raised, which will provide an improved vantage point for views over the lake.

7.5.43 During the construction phase, use of the site for recreation may be adversely affected by the effects of construction traffic, noise and air pollution.

**Quantity**

7.5.44 Potential quantitative effects include the temporary loss of a small part of the park (0.34ha) during construction phase.

7.5.45 The park at present is 22.72ha, so the temporary loss of 0.34ha represents less than 1.5 percent of the park.

7.5.46 During the operational phase there will be an additional 0.07ha of hard landscaping including an area of 0.05ha with utility connections suitable for a temporary cafe. The area that is likely to be hard landscaped is not considered a loss of open space as this area could still be used in the same way that the grass area is used at present (i.e. informal recreation). It should also be noted that 0.02ha of the new hard landscaping is required by the London Borough of Wandsworth to improve access to the park.

**Quality**

7.5.47 Potential qualitative effects have been assessed by considering the impact project proposals may have on the current quality of King George’s Park. King George’s Park has been assessed as having a quality score of 7.83 or ‘Good’. It is considered that during the construction phase and operational phase quality criteria will be adversely impacted. This minimal impact would be due to the proposed development site being located away from key site amenities. Where the project could have an impact on quality is in relation to natural and landscape features such as the lake and the loss of mature trees which would be directly affected by proposals. However, this effect will be mitigated somewhat by improvements to hard and soft landscaping which will lead to a significant improvement in the operational phase.

7.5.48 An advance planting scheme would be in place prior to works commencing which would result in a significant improvement in the quality of the affected area. There would be significant planting to mitigate any visual impacts.
Accessibility

7.5.49 Potential accessibility effects have been assessed by considering the impact project proposals may have on the ability of local communities to access King George’s Park. The proposed site is located within the park at the corner of Buckhold Road and Neville Gill Close, adjacent to the entrance to the park on Buckhold Road. This entrance will remain open during the construction and operational phases of the development. However, during the construction phase access through the entrance may be more restricted than at present and the presence of a construction site may make this entrance less appealing to potential users. As a result it is considered that one entrance to the park will be temporarily affected by the proposals.

Value

7.5.50 Potential effects on value include the impact of project proposals on the amenity value of the park. The park may be affected due to the disruptive effect of construction traffic, noise and air pollution during the construction phase. However, advance planting might help to reduce effects on amenity.

Mitigation

7.5.51 Potential measures to mitigate the temporary effects, during construction, of the project proposals on function, quantity, quality, accessibility and value of King George’s Park include:

a. Erection of temporary screening / hoarding around the construction site.

b. On site improvement of hard and soft landscaping features.

c. Investment in improving quality of existing recreational facilities (areas for sitting out and relaxation).

d. Temporary signage/maps to direct users to entry points.

7.5.52 The potential measures to mitigate the permanent effects during the operational phase of the project proposals on the quality of King George’s Park include:

a. Minimising the scale and massing of permanent structures, including the use of extensive planting.

b. Including permanent qualitative improvements to the park in the affected area (including planting, tree planting landscaping and seating areas).

Carnwath Road Riverside Foreshore

7.5.53 The Carnwath Road Riverside site foreshore is publicly accessible via a slipway further along the foreshore (approximately 250m).

7.5.54 As set out in Section 5 (para. 5.4.19 above) the foreshore was not included in the Borough’s open space assessment, and therefore there is no evidence that it surplus to requirements.
The Carnwath Road Riverside foreshore will be directly affected by the Thames Tideway Proposals resulting in the loss of the foreshore by the construction site. The foreshore at this location has little functional value and therefore the loss of foreshore at this location will not have a significant impact.

**York Gardens**

Surrounding the project site of Falconbrook Pumping Station, York Gardens is a Small Local Park that has been assessed as having a dedicated provision for informal recreational activities including children’s play and sitting out and relaxation. York Gardens is managed by the London Borough of Wandsworth.

As set out in Section 5 (para. 5.5.15 above) the site was not identified in the Borough’s open space assessment as being surplus to requirements.

**Function**

The project proposals for Falconbrook Pumping Station indirectly affect York Gardens. Whilst a very small area of the existing Gardens will be permanently acquired, this site has been assessed for indirect impact, which will be the only significant impact on open space considerations. During both the construction and operational phases York Gardens will continue to function as a Small Local Park that is used for informal recreational activities. It is proposed that an advance planting scheme will be implemented to reduce visual impact. There are some potential effects on the park such as disruption to recreational activity particularly in the adventure play park due to the effects of construction traffic, noise and air pollution.

**Quantity**

The project proposals for Falconbrook Pumping Station will positively impact on the quantity of provision at York Gardens as new public realm will be created to the front of the pumping station facing onto York Road in the operational phase.

**Quality**

Potential qualitative effects have been assessed by considering the impact project proposals may have on the current quality score for York Gardens. York Gardens have been assessed as having a quality score of 6.94 or ‘Fair’. It is considered that during the construction phases the quality of the park will not be adversely impacted.

The project proposals include some public realm improvements to the open space adjacent to the Pumping Station (on York Road). The improvements are likely to have a beneficial impact on the quality of the park.

An advance planting scheme would be in place prior to works commencing which would result in a significant improvement in the quality of the affected area. There would be significant planting to mitigate any visual impacts.
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**Accessibility**

7.5.63 Access to the park will be directly affected by the temporary closure of an entrance to the park from York Way during the construction phase. During the operational phase access to York Gardens from York Road will be rationalised and improved.

**Value**

7.5.64 Potential effects on value include the loss of amenity value as a result of construction activities at Falconbrook Pumping Station.

**Mitigation**

7.5.65 The potential measures to mitigate the temporary effects during construction of the project proposals on function and value of York Gardens include:

a. Erection of temporary screening / hoarding around the construction site.

b. Planting/screening between the worksite and York Gardens Adventure Playground.

**Cremorne Gardens**

7.5.66 Adjacent to the project site of Cremorne Wharf Depot, Cremorne Gardens is a Small Local Park that has been assessed as having dedicated provision for sitting out and relaxation as well as dog walking. The park is managed by the London Borough of Kensington and Chelsea. It has been assessed that Cremorne Gardens will only experience indirect effects as a result of the project proposals.

7.5.67 As set out in Section 5 (para. 5.6.16 above) the site was not identified in the Borough’s open space assessment as being surplus to requirements.

7.5.68 It is considered that no mitigation measures will be required for Cremorne Gardens.

**Chelsea Embankment Foreshore**

7.5.69 The area of Chelsea Embankment Foreshore is located on the banks of the River Thames and is only visible during low tide. The space is not publicly accessible. The space has some limited visual amenity and environmental value as part of the wider River Thames but no recreational value.

7.5.70 As set out in Section 5 (para. 5.6.16 above) the foreshore was not included in the Borough’s open space assessment. However, the foreshore is not publicly accessible.

**Function**

7.5.71 The project proposals do not affect the function of the foreshore as it is currently inaccessible and therefore does not function as a recreational open space.

7.5.72 During the operational phase additional hard landscaping, extending along the embankment would create 0.12ha of new public realm. This is likely to
have benefits in terms of the functionality of the space for sitting out and relaxation.

**Quantity**

7.5.73 During construction there will be permanent loss of this section of the foreshore. However, the foreshore at Chelsea Embankment is not publicly accessible.

7.5.74 During the operational phase additional hard landscaping, extending along the embankment would create 0.12ha of new public realm. This is likely to have benefits in terms of the functionality of the space for sitting out and relaxation. The site is located in close proximity to two large open spaces to the north (Ranelagh Gardens and the Royal Hospital). Provision of new publicly accessible open space in this location is therefore considered less significant than in areas where there are open space deficiencies.

**Quality**

7.5.75 During the construction phase effects would include the permanent loss of a small area of foreshore.

7.5.76 During the operational phase positive effects include the creation of a new publically accessible hard landscaped area.

**Accessibility**

The foreshore is not publicly accessible at this location. There will therefore not be any effects on accessibility during the construction phase. During the operational phase positive effects would include the creation of a new publically accessible hard landscaped area along the embankment.

**Value**

7.5.77 The foreshore is not publically accessible at this location. There will therefore not be any effects on value during the construction phase. During the operational phase positive effects would include the creation of a new hard landscaped area along the embankment for sitting out and relaxation.

**Mitigation**

7.5.78 There are no potential measures to mitigate the temporary effects during construction of the project proposals on function, quantity and quality of Chelsea Embankment Foreshore.

7.5.79 As set out above the effects during the operational phase are beneficial and therefore no mitigation measures are required.

**Chelsea Bridge Gardens**

7.5.80 Adjacent to the project site of Chelsea Embankment Foreshore, Chelsea Bridge Gardens is a semi-natural green space that has been assessed as having no formal or informal recreational role. Chelsea Bridge Gardens is managed by the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea.

7.5.81 As set out in Section 5 (para. 5.6.16 above) the site was not identified in the Borough’s open space assessment as being surplus to requirements.
The Thames Tideway proposals at the Chelsea Embankment take place in the foreshore adjacent to the Chelsea Bridge Gardens; the proposals will not affect the green space as a semi-natural green space either directly or indirectly.

No mitigation measures are required.

Adjacent to the project site of Chelsea Embankment Foreshore, Ranelagh Gardens is a privately owned open space that is publicly accessible and has been assessed as being used for informal activity including sitting out and relaxation. Ranelagh Gardens is also used for cultural events throughout the year including providing space for the operational activities for the Chelsea Flower Show.

As set out in Section 5 (para. 5.6.16 above) the site was not identified in the Borough’s open space assessment as being surplus to requirements.

During the construction phase a small 0.04ha area along the southern edge of Ranelagh Gardens, bordering the Embankment will be directly affected. This is unlikely to have any effect on the function of Ranelagh Gardens as this area is currently planted and inaccessible to the public. Elsewhere within Ranelagh Gardens it is possible activities would be indirectly affected during the construction phase due to construction traffic, noise and air pollution.

The project proposals are likely to result in temporary loss of a small 0.04ha area along the edge of Ranelagh Gardens. The affected area has very limited public accessibility due to existing planting and topography.

Potential qualitative effects have been assessed by considering the impact project proposals may have on the current quality score for Ranelagh Gardens. Ranelagh Gardens have been assessed as having a quality score of 7.13 or ‘Good’. This area is not considered to be deficient in the provision of open space.

Despite the small area of Ranelagh Gardens directly affected by the proposals it is considered that the qualitative effects of the construction phase would only have a small effect on the quality score.

In the operational phase the park would be returned to its previous state and quality.

Potential accessibility effects have been assessed by considering the impact project proposals may have on the ability of local communities to
access Ranelagh Gardens. It is considered that during construction most of the park will remain accessible to the public.

**Value**

7.5.93 Potential effects on value include the impact of project proposals on the amenity, recreational value of the park. During construction, the recreational value of the Gardens will be affected due to construction traffic noise and air pollution.

7.5.94 Following completion of the project the value of the site will be restored.

**Mitigation**

7.5.95 There are no potential measures to mitigate the effects of the project proposals during the construction phase of the project in relation to function, quantity, quality, accessibility and value of the open space.

7.5.96 There will be no permanent effects on Ranelagh Gardens during the operational phase and therefore no need for mitigation measures.

**Albert Embankment Foreshore**

7.5.97 The area of the Albert Embankment Foreshore is only visible during low tide. The foreshore is publicly accessible. The foreshore provides good visual amenity and environmental value as part of the wider River Thames although it has limited recreational value.

7.5.98 As set out in Section 5 (para. 5.7.14 above) the foreshore was not included in the Borough’s open space assessment, and therefore there is no evidence that it surplus to requirements.

**Function**

7.5.99 The project proposals will affect the function of the foreshore. The foreshore will lose its current limited visual amenity as a result of the visual impact of the construction of the project while public access to the foreshore will be lost during the construction phase.

7.5.100 During the operational phase additional hard landscaping, extending along the embankment will create a new area of public realm. This is likely to have benefits in terms of the functionality of Thames path for sitting out and relaxation.

**Quantity**

7.5.101 During construction there will be a permanent loss of this section of the foreshore.

7.5.102 The operational phase would see additional hard landscaped embankment come into use which could be used for sitting out and relaxation.

**Quality**

7.5.103 During the construction phase there will be a loss of part of the foreshore.

7.5.104 During the operational phase positive effects include the creation of a new publically accessible hard landscaped area.
Accessibility

7.5.105 The foreshore is publicly accessible. During the construction phase public access to the foreshore would be restricted, however new public realm will be made accessible during the operational phase.

Value

7.5.106 Potential effects on value include the temporary loss of environmental, amenity and recreational value during the construction phase of the project proposals.

7.5.107 During the operational phase, a new hard landscaped space will improve facilities for sitting out, therefore generating improved recreational value.

Mitigation

7.5.108 There are no potential measures to mitigate the temporary effects during construction phase of the project proposals on function, quantity, quality, and value of this area of foreshore.

7.5.109 As set out above the effects during the operational phase are beneficial and therefore no mitigation measures are required.

Public Realm in Front of Vauxhall Cross

7.5.110 Adjacent to the project site of Albert Embankment Foreshore, the Public Realm in Front of Vauxhall Cross accommodates facilities for sitting out, public art and educational information on wildlife in the Thames. The space also forms part of the Thames Path and therefore has a recreational role.

7.5.111 As set out in Section 5 (para. 5.7.14 above) the site was not identified in the Borough’s open space assessment as being surplus to requirements.

7.5.112 The project proposals here will include closure of the Thames Path with the path being diverted during the construction phase. Furthermore, the existing space would not be open for sitting out.

7.5.113 During the operational phase, two areas of additional hard landscaping would be created. One of these spaces (located immediately next to Vauxhall Bridge) will not be accessible to the public. The second, located further downstream would provide steps down to the foreshore will be publically accessible and will provide additional facilities for sitting out.

7.5.114 Potential qualitative effects have been assessed by considering the cumulative impact project proposals may have on the current quality score for the space. The space has been assessed as having a quality score of 7.09 or ‘Good’. As a result of the new publicly accessible hard landscaping the quality of the space would improve.

7.5.115 The operational phase will result in a small increase in the total quantity of open space at the site, although due to security concerns of adjacent occupiers of Vauxhall Cross this will be gated and not publicly accessible. The proposals will not generate new types of open space and will not improve the accessibility to any type of open space over and above current levels of accessibility.
The project proposals at this site will result in the closure of publicly accessible open space at the site during the construction phase. It is understood that the Thames Path would be closed and diverted during the construction phase. Furthermore noise and visual impacts are likely to make sitting out less attractive for those sitting out during the construction phase.

There are no potential measures to mitigate the temporary effects during construction of the project proposals on quantity, accessibility quality and value of Thames Path adjacent to Vauxhall Bridge.

**Victoria Embankment Foreshore and Thames Path**

This area of foreshore is not publically accessible open space. However, the path along Victoria Embankment, which would be affected by the proposals, does form part of the Thames Path and therefore has some recreational role.

The foreshore in this location does not have any function as an open space. However, the Thames Path will need to be diverted slightly as a result of the construction phase.

During the operational phase 0.10 ha of new hard landscaped open space will be available. This will provide new opportunities for sitting out in an improved landscaped environment. The new area for sitting out will provide direct views of the London Eye and other parts of the Southbank and the Thames, and will be located in an area designated for coach pick up and drop off. It will become part of the Thames Path providing a new area of open space within this wider regional network of open space.

The Victoria Embankment Foreshore site does not have any function as an open space and therefore the value of open space will not be affected at this site as a result of construction.

The operational phase is likely to improve the quality and quantity of open space for relaxation, and therefore improve its recreational value. The newly created open space will be linked to the Thames Path which means the value of the space will be significant.

There are no effects during construction on the quantity, quality, accessibility and value of the foreshore site, and therefore no mitigation measures are required.

**Whitehall Gardens**

The project proposals at Victoria Embankment will not have any direct or indirect effects on the function of the open space at Whitehall Gardens in either the construction or operational phase.

As set out in Section 5 (para. 5.8.20 above) the site was not identified in the Borough’s open space assessment as being surplus to requirements.

Any construction noise or visual impact is likely to be insignificant compared to the negative amenity impact of Victoria Embankment road.

No mitigation measures would be required for Whitehall Gardens.
Blackfriars Bridge Foreshore and Thames Path

7.5.128 Blackfriars Bridge Foreshore is not considered to accommodate any open space. However, the footpath between the foreshore and Victoria Embankment road, which would be affected by the proposals, does form part of the Thames Path and therefore has some recreational role.

Function

7.5.129 The area of foreshore on this site does not have any function as an open space as it is not publically accessible. However, the Thames Path will need to be diverted slightly as a result of the construction phase. During the operational phase 0.44ha of new hardstanding will be created. This will provide new opportunities for sitting out in an improved landscaped environment. The new area for sitting out will provide direct views of the Southbank and the Thames. The new space will form part of the Thames Path, forming part of a wider regional network of open space.

Quantity

7.5.130 Blackfriars Bridge Foreshore does not have any function as an open space and no open space will be lost as a result of construction.

7.5.131 During the operational phase 0.44ha of new hardstanding will be created. This will provide significant new opportunities for sitting out in an improved landscaped environment in an area of open space deficiency.

Quality

7.5.132 Blackfriars Bridge Foreshore does not have any function as an open space and therefore the quality of open space will not be affected at this site as a result of construction.

7.5.133 During the operational phase new hard landscaped open space will be available. This will provide new opportunities for sitting out in an improved landscaped environment.

Accessibility

7.5.134 The area of foreshore is not publically accessible and therefore the accessibility of open space will not be affected at this site as a result of construction.

7.5.135 The operational phase will result in a considerable increase in the total quantity of publicly accessible public realm at the site. The City of London’s Open Space Study identified the whole of the City as an area deficient in access to open space, creation of new open space here will help to reduce these deficiencies. The new open space will be linked to the Thames Path which provides a regionally significant walking route.

Value

7.5.136 Blackfriars Bridge Foreshore does not have any function as an open space and therefore the value of open space will not be affected at this site as a result of construction.

7.5.137 The operational phase is likely to improve the quality of public realm for relaxation, and therefore improve its recreational value.
Mitigation

7.5.138 There are no effects during construction on the quantity, quality, accessibility and value of the site, and therefore no mitigation measures would be required.

7.5.139 As set out above during the operational phase of the project proposals the effects on the quantity, quality accessibility of Blackfriars Bridge are considered to be beneficial and therefore no mitigation measures are required.

King Edward Memorial Park

7.5.140 King Edward Memorial Park is a District Park that provides dedicated provision for a range of formal and informal recreational activities including tennis, bowls, sitting out, children’s play and dog walking. The park is managed by the London Borough of Tower Hamlets and Trees for Cities. The Council’s Open Space Study identifies King Edward Memorial Park as one of the highest quality open spaces in the Borough. The Park was awarded Green Flag status in July 2012 in recognition of its quality.

7.5.141 As set out in Section 5 (para. 5.11.14 above) the site was not identified in the Borough’s open space assessment as being surplus to requirements.

Function

7.5.142 During the construction phase, the park will continue to serve its primary function as a District Park. Prior to construction work taking place existing children’s play facilities will be permanently relocated as will the multi-purpose pitch and tennis courts. There will be a negative effect on those who use the space for sitting out, caused by the temporary loss of the embankment. The temporary loss of the embankment would negatively affect the visual amenity role of the space, which currently supports good views over the Thames.

7.5.143 The existing multi-purpose pitch and tennis courts will be reconfigured before construction begins. The existing children’s play space will be relocated before construction begins to enable the facility to remain in use throughout construction. Along the embankment a new hard landscaped space will be created and a new sensitively designed, access road will provide access to the new structure from Glamis Road.

7.5.144 The new hard landscaped space will add to the quantity of open space at the park, but will not alter the function of the space. Furthermore, the reinstatement of the children’s play and hard surface football pitch would mean that the recreational role of the space will not be permanently affected.

Quantity

7.5.145 The construction area for the project within the park would occupy an area of 0.87ha. However, a portion of this, around 0.35ha, is included within the construction boundary specifically to allow the reconfiguration of the multi-purpose sports pitch and the re-provision of the children’s play area. These areas will continue to form part of the useable open space during the main construction phase. The construction phase would therefore
entail the temporary removal of approximately 0.52ha of open space from public use, in the southern portion of the park.

7.5.146 In the operational phase proposals would provide additional 0.26ha open space on the foreshore structure by extending the park and adding value to its open space function. This represents an approximate 8% increase in open space at King Edward Memorial Park, once the works are complete. A new, sensitively designed, access road comprising 0.12ha would provide access to the new structure from Glamis Road and apart from occasional access for maintenance this would be restricted for use by pedestrians and cyclists. Therefore, in the operational phase there will be no quantitative loss of open space.

7.5.147 The road would be designed to remain part of the park and so is not considered to detract from the quantity of open space. The new hard landscaped space would add to the overall quantity of open space at the park.

Quality

7.5.148 During the construction phase, the project proposals will require the temporary fencing off of the majority of the south of the park which includes the embankment with the Thames. Noise, air pollution and traffic associated with the construction site would have a negative effect on the quality of the remaining space.

7.5.149 During the operational phase, the recreational functions will have been fully restored; as will opportunities for sitting out on the embankment (new open space and Thames Path will be created). The proposed design parameters and principles would ensure the green portion of the park and mature planting area is extended to the south, onto the foreshore structure. The works would improve the quality, usability, function and accessibility of the open space environment within the park, increase the overall area of open space available to the community and integrate the new space with the rest of the park.

Accessibility

7.5.150 Prior to construction phase the project proposals will reconfigure the multi-purpose pitch and tennis courts and relocate the children’s play facilities. During construction there will be no public access to part of the south of the park which includes part of the embankment with the Thames in the park.

7.5.151 Prior to construction starting and during the operational phase, all of the above recreational functions will have been restored and a new area of open space alongside the river frontage will have been created this could include an enhanced Thames Path.

Value

7.5.152 As the proposals will result in the temporary loss of the embankment adjacent to the Thames, there would be a clear temporary negative impact on the recreational value of the space during the construction phase.
During the operational phase, the seating area on the embankment will have been restored and a new area of open space alongside the river frontage will have been created including an enhanced Thames Path. 

Mitigation

To further mitigate the effects of construction on the park and its surroundings, Thames Water has proposed, and discussed with the Council, a package of measures which could be implemented prior to the commencement of main construction including:

a. the provision of tree planting along the central avenue (north to south) to assist in screening views of construction site from within the park;

b. the possible relocation of the children’s play area further to the north (or another improved location) within the park, to provide an enhanced facility away from the existing Rotherhithe Tunnel Ventilation Shaft and proposed construction access;

c. the provision of an enhanced and improved surface and quality of the multipurpose sports pitch. It could be reconfigured to be a football pitch (reflecting its current predominant use);

d. planting along construction access to provide new planting with time to mature before works are complete, and forming screening during construction;

e. provision of alternative means of launching small boats into the River Thames for the Shadwell Basin Outdoor Activity Centre, such as a floating pontoon attached to the Shadwell Basin lock or river wall;

f. closure of the existing western part of the Thames Path which is part of a narrow alleyway, and incorporating the space into an enhanced landscaping scheme including a possible fitness activity zone;

g. improvements to the wildflower meadow ecological area to the east of the park;

h. new landscaping (both hard and soft) within the wider park, including around the Rotherhithe Tunnel Ventilation Shaft; and,

i. possible enhancements of the dockside area around the Shadwell Basin, including benches and landscaping.

The principal of advanced permanent works and landscaping was appreciated by Design Council CABE as helping to address inconvenience during construction. It is proposed that the above measures would be discussed further with the Council and details could be subject to consultation with the local community.

There are very few open spaces in the vicinity of Kind Edward Memorial Park, so quality improvements should be focused on the remaining sections of the park. There may be scope to improve the quality of two nearby spaces the open space at St George’s in the East and Wapping Woods.
King Edward Memorial Park Foreshore

7.5.157 Access to the foreshore at King Edward Memorial Park is limited and can only be gained via a slipway and steps on land occupied by the Shadwell Basin Outdoor Activities Centre.

7.5.158 As set out in Section 5 (para. 5.7.14 above) the foreshore was not included in the Borough’s open space assessment, and therefore there is no evidence that it surplus to requirements.

7.5.159 The foreshore in this location is not designated as open space in the London Borough of Tower Hamlets Core Strategy and has limited public accessibility via the Shadwell Basin Outdoor Activities Centre. The temporary loss of 0.88ha of this foreshore area during construction would not represent a significant loss of open space or recreational facility, given the wider area of foreshore that will remain accessible in the vicinity.

Deptford Church Street

7.5.160 Deptford Church Street is a 0.6ha amenity green space known as Crossfield Street Open Space that provides relief from the built up area but has been assessed as having only a limited informal recreational role for dog walking. Deptford Church Street is managed by the London Borough of Lewisham.

7.5.161 As set out in Section 5 (para. 5.10.16 above) the site was not identified in the Borough’s open space assessment as being surplus to requirements.

Function

7.5.162 The project proposals would include works which will occupy the whole of the open space at the Deptford Church Street site. However, given the limited function, and low value and limited use of the site the effects of the project proposals are considered to be minor. During the construction period, the function of this space will be temporarily lost. However, there are open spaces in close proximity, on the opposite side of Coffey Street and Deptford Church Street (the Sue Godfrey Reserve and playground area), which provide similar functions.

7.5.163 During the operational phase, the project proposals provide an opportunity for enhancement of the open space to meet local community needs. This could potentially improve the function of the current open space.

Quantity

7.5.164 The project proposals would include works which will occupy the whole of the Deptford Church Street open space (an area of 0.42ha). During the construction period, this would negatively impact on the quantity of open space available at the site. However, given the limited function, and low value and limited use of the site the effects of the project proposals are considered to be minor. However, the open spaces in close proximity, on the opposite side of Coffey Street and Deptford Church Street (the Sue Godfrey Reserve and playground area) provide similar functions.

7.5.165 During the operational phase, there would be no loss of open space, however, there are some permanent structures proposed for the site.
(structures that would take up only one percent of the site area). However, there would be no loss of open space.

**Quality**

7.5.166 Potential qualitative effects have been assessed by considering the impact project proposals may have on the current quality of Deptford Church Street.

7.5.167 The project proposals would include works will occupy the whole of the open space. During the construction period, this would negatively impact on the quality of the open space. However, given the low value and limited use of the site the effects of the project proposals are considered to be minor.

7.5.168 During the operational phase, the project proposals provide an opportunity for enhancement of the quality of the open space to meet local community needs.

**Accessibility**

7.5.169 The project proposals would include works that are likely to occupy the whole of the Deptford Church Street open space. However, the open space only has a limited recreational role and is not generally used by the public. There is also a publicly accessible open space (Sue Godfrey Nature Reserve) adjacent to the site that will remain accessible during the works. In addition, there is also another designated open space for the church yard and green space adjacent Deptford Church Street.

7.5.170 During the operational phase, the project proposals provide an opportunity for enhancement of the quality of the open space to meet local community needs.

**Value**

7.5.171 The project works will occupy the whole site and therefore during construction the amenity value of the open space will be affected. However, given the limited function, and low value and limited use of the site the effects of the project proposals are considered to be minor.

7.5.172 During the operational phase, the project proposals provide an opportunity for enhancement of the quality of the open space to meet local community needs. This could provide a new recreational role for the space which would improve overall value.

**Mitigation**

7.5.173 There are no potential measures to mitigate the temporary effects during construction of the project proposals on quality and value of Deptford Church Street.

7.5.174 There are no potential measures to mitigate the temporary effects during construction of the project proposals on quantity and function of Deptford Church Street. Alternative areas for the St Joseph Catholic Primary School muster point have been indicated on the Site Works Parameter Plan (submitted as part of our application for development consent) as mitigation for the temporary loss of the open space that is currently used for this function.
7.6 Summary

7.6.1 Table 7.1 sets out a summary of the assessment of effects and potential mitigation measures. It identifies each of the impact criteria for each site during the construction and operational phases and sets out whether the effects are direct or indirect, temporary or permanent, and the significance.
Table 7.1 Summary of adverse effects, potential mitigation measures and additional positive proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project site</th>
<th>Open space assessment</th>
<th>Potential mitigation measures/positive proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hammersmith Pumping Station</td>
<td>Frank Banfield Park</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Erection of temporary screening / hoarding along Distillery Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct/indirect</td>
<td>Direct, Indirect, None, None, None, None, None, None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact type</td>
<td>Direct, Indirect, None, None, None, None, None, None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Temporary, Temporary, None, None, None, None, None, None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct/indirect</td>
<td>Direct, Indirect, None, None, None, None, None, None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Erection of temporary screening / hoarding along Distillery Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional Positive Proposals</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project site</th>
<th>Open space assessment</th>
<th>Potential mitigation measures/positive proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre</td>
<td>Barn Elms (Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre)</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Reorganise layout of pitches and track and field facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct/indirect</td>
<td>Direct, Permanent, None, None, None, None, None, None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact type</td>
<td>Direct, None, None, None, None, None, None, None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Temporary, Temporary, None, None, None, None, None, None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct/indirect</td>
<td>Direct, None, None, None, None, None, None, None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Reorganise layout of pitches and track and field facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional Positive Proposals</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Barn Elms (Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre)
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## Assessment of effects on open spaces and foreshore and potential mitigation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project site</th>
<th>Open space</th>
<th>Impact type</th>
<th>Direct/indirect</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Potential mitigation measures/positive proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Operational</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Additional Positive Proposals</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provision of better quality changing facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putney Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>Putney Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td><strong>Construction</strong></td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>Replacement temporary slipway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Temporary minor diversion of Thames Path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No appropriate mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Operational</strong></td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>Replacement temporary slipway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Temporary minor diversion of Thames Path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No appropriate mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Additional Positive Proposals</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provision of better quality changing facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Assessment of effects on open spaces and foreshore and potential mitigation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project site</th>
<th>Open space</th>
<th>Impact type</th>
<th>Direct/indirect</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Potential mitigation measures/positive proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Putney Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>Waterman's Green</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Direct / Indirect</td>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>Erection of temporary screening / hoarding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Erection of temporary screening / hoarding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Additional Positive Proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Creation of additional hard landscaped embankment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King George's Park</td>
<td>King George's</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>Appropriate screening of construction activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>Investment in better quality facilities (sitting and relaxation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>On site improvements to landscape features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>Appropriate screening of construction activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>Temporary signage/maps to direct users to entry points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>No appropriate mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Assessment of effects on open spaces and foreshore and potential mitigation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project site</th>
<th>Open space</th>
<th>Impact type</th>
<th>Direct/indirect</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Potential mitigation measures/positive proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Function</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>Minimise scale and massing of permanent structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Qualitative improvement to the park (planting, landscaping and accessibility)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Positive Proposals</td>
<td>Hard and soft landscape improvements to the part of the park affected by the proposals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falconbrook Pumping Station</td>
<td>York Gardens</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>Erection of temporary screening / hoarding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Function</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Planting / screening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>No appropriate mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>Erection of temporary screening / hoarding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planting / screening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Assessment of effects on open spaces and foreshore and potential mitigation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project site</th>
<th>Open space</th>
<th>Impact type</th>
<th>Direct/indirect</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Potential mitigation measures/positive proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cremorne Wharf Depot</td>
<td>Cremorne Gardens</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Function</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>No appropriate mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Operational</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Function</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>No appropriate mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>temporary</td>
<td>No appropriate mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>temporary</td>
<td>No appropriate mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Positive Proposals**

Creation of new public realm will be created which will form part of the park, hard and soft landscape improvements to the part of the park affected by the proposals.
### Assessment of Effects on Open Spaces and Foreshore and Potential Mitigation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project site</th>
<th>Open space</th>
<th>Impact type</th>
<th>Direct/indirect</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Potential mitigation measures/positive proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chelsea Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>Chelsea Bridge Gardens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Direct/Direct</td>
<td>No appropriate mitigation measures</td>
<td>No appropriate mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional Positive Proposals</td>
<td>Chelsea Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td></td>
<td>Creation of additional hard landscaped embankment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chelsea Embankment Foreshore</th>
<th>Ranelagh Gardens</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Functional</th>
<th>Indirect/Direct</th>
<th>Temporary</th>
<th>No appropriate mitigation measures</th>
<th>No appropriate mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>Appropriate screening to reduce visual impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### 7 Assessment of effects on open spaces and foreshore and potential mitigation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project site</th>
<th>Open space</th>
<th>Impact type</th>
<th>Direct/indirect</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Potential mitigation measures/positive proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>Appropriate screening to reduce visual impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>No appropriate mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>No appropriate mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>No appropriate mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accessible</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>No appropriate mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>Albert Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>No appropriate mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>No appropriate mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>No appropriate mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>No appropriate mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>No appropriate mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>No appropriate mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>No appropriate mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accessible</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Positive Proposals**

Creation of additional hard landscaped embankment
### Assessment of effects on open spaces and foreshore and potential mitigation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project site</th>
<th>Open space</th>
<th>Impact type</th>
<th>Direct/indirect</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Potential mitigation measures/positive proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albert Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>Public Realm in Front of Vauxhall Cross</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>Temporary diversion of Thames Path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>No appropriate mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>No appropriate mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>No appropriate mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>No appropriate mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Additional Positive Proposals (creation of additional hard landscaped embankment adjacent to this existing public realm (the new hard landscaping area would not be publicly accessible))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>Victoria Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Additional Positive Proposals (creation of additional hard landscaped embankment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Embankment</td>
<td>Whitehall Gardens</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 7 Assessment of effects on open spaces and foreshore and potential mitigation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project site</th>
<th>Open space</th>
<th>Impact type</th>
<th>Direct/indirect</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Potential mitigation measures/positive proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foreshore</td>
<td></td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Additional Positive Proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackfriars Bridge</td>
<td>Blackfriars Bridge Foreshore</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Foreshore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Additional Positive Proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Edward Memorial Park</td>
<td>King Edward Memorial Park</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>Quality improvements to open spaces in close proximity to site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Replacement hard pitch (within the site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Re-provide children’s play facilities within the park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Erection of temporary screening / hoarding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quality improvements to other sections of the open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improvements to other open space within close proximity to site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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### Assessment of effects on open spaces and foreshore and potential mitigation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project site</th>
<th>Open space</th>
<th>Impact type</th>
<th>Direct/indirect</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Potential mitigation measures/positive proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>Quality improvements to other sections of the open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>Improvements to other open space within close proximity to site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>No appropriate mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deptford Church Street</td>
<td>Deptford Church Street</td>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>No appropriate mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>No appropriate mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>No appropriate mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>No appropriate mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>No appropriate mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No appropriate mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Additional Positive Proposals</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enhancement of the open space to meet local community needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative areas for the St Joseph Catholic Primary School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Positive Proposals**

- Creation of additional open space extending the park (including planting).
### Assessment of effects on open spaces and foreshore and potential mitigation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project site</th>
<th>Open space</th>
<th>Impact type</th>
<th>Direct/ indirect</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Potential mitigation measures/positive proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>muster point have been indicated as mitigation for the temporary loss of the open space that is currently used for this function.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7 Assessment of effects on open spaces and foreshore and potential mitigation
8 Conclusions

8.1 Introduction

8.1.1 This section provides a brief summary of the main conclusions of the assessment, highlighting the key findings from the review of Local authority assessments, the independent assessment of open space sites and the assessment of effects. It identifies the potential measures that could be used to mitigate the effects of the project proposals.

8.2 Local authority assessments

8.2.1 Section 5 sets out the review of local authority open space assessments and evidence base documents.

8.2.2 To meet the requirements set out in the NPS. The Thames Tideway project team considered the robustness of each local authority open space assessment. Local authority open space assessments have been assessed against the requirements for open space needs assessments set out in the NPPF.

8.2.3 Taking this advice into consideration this study reviewed local authority open space assessments and evidence documents to allow Thames Water to assess any information related to open spaces and foreshore which could potentially be affected by the project proposals.

8.2.4 None of the open spaces affected by the project sites have been assessed as being ‘surplus to requirements’ for open space. However, given that the proposed Main tunnel route passes through some very densely populated areas, where open space is in high demand, none of the local authorities in question had identified any surplus open space.

8.2.5 The review of the local authority open space assessments shows that some assessments identify deficiencies in open space provision, this is important as the effects of the project proposals on open spaces and foreshore in areas that are deficient in open space could have a bigger impact on the population the open space serves.

8.2.6 Each of the local authority assessments has been assessed against the requirements of the NPPF, a summary of this is provided in Table 5.16. Taking each local authority in turn the findings are:

a. London Borough of Richmond upon Thames – partially meets requirements
b. London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham – partially meets requirements
c. London Borough of Wandsworth – meets requirements
d. Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea – partially meets requirements
e. London Borough of Lambeth - partially meets requirements
f. City of Westminster – partially meets requirements

g. City of London – partially meets requirements

h. London Borough of Lewisham – meets requirements

i. London Borough of Tower Hamlets – partially meets requirements.

8.2.7 Many of the sites are not specifically referred to in the relevant local authority assessment, and where open spaces are referred to there is often limited information.

8.3 Independent assessment

8.3.1 Section 6 sets out the findings of the independent assessment of the quality and value of open spaces potentially directly and indirectly affected by the project proposals. Thames Water undertook an independent assessment of the open space areas which may be affected by the project because many of the assessments only partially meet the requirements of the NPPF and in many cases do not provide sufficient information to fully assess the effects of the project proposals on open space.

8.3.2 Undertaking an independent assessment allowed for a consistent approach to the assessment. The quality of open space has been assessed using the Green Flag award criteria. Although all of the open space areas have been assessed against these criteria, for some types of open space (e.g. foreshores) these criteria are often not relevant.

8.3.3 Of those open space areas that are likely to be directly impacted by the project proposals, the following are identified as either ‘Very Good’ or ‘Good’ quality sites:

a. Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre

b. King George’s Park

c. Ranelagh Gardens

d. King Edward Memorial Park

8.3.4 One open space area that is likely to be directly affected by the proposals scored ‘Poor’ in terms of quality, this is Deptford Church Street while York Gardens was assessed as being ‘Fair’.

8.3.5 Several open spaces could potentially be indirectly affected by the project proposals, some of these scored ‘Very Good’ or ‘Good’ in terms of quality:

a. Frank Banfield Park

b. Cremorne Gardens

c. Public Realm in Front of Vauxhall Cross

d. Whitehall Gardens.

8.3.6 Other indirectly affected open spaces included Waterman’s Green which was assessed as being ‘Fair’ and Chelsea Bridge Gardens which was assessed as being ‘Poor’.
8.3.7 The value of open space was also assessed to provide an indication of the role of each open space. This considered the site context, recreational value, structural value, amenity value, environmental value, cultural and historical value and educational value.

8.3.8 Of the open space areas that could potentially be directly affected by the project proposals, those sites noted for their value include:

a. Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre – pitches that have particular value for recreation serving a wide area;
b. King George’s Park – has a multi-functional role and strong structural and amenity value;
c. York Gardens – provides valuable open space to nearby residents by providing a role for children’s play and other informal recreation. The park has an amenity value by providing relief from the built environment.
d. Ranelagh Gardens – plays a key role in an area with limited publicly accessible open space, as well as performing a cultural role;
e. King Edward Memorial Park – has high value and supports a range of recreational facilities and provides a District Park function in densely populated area with limited open space; and

8.3.9 These open spaces have been noted for their value and could potentially be affected by the proposals. They will be particularly sensitive to development as they are all high value and good quality sites.

8.4 Effects

8.4.1 Effects during the construction and operational phases of the development have been assessed. Effects are assessed as direct, or indirect, temporary or permanent.

Unaffected open spaces

8.4.2 Chelsea Bridge Gardens (adjacent to Chelsea Embankment Foreshore) and Whitehall Gardens (adjacent to Victoria Embankment Foreshore) have both been assessed as not being affected at all by the proposals either direct or indirectly.

Directly affected open spaces

8.4.3 Open spaces that are negatively affected directly during the construction phase but with positive effects in operational phase include:

a. Barn Elms School Sports Centre
b. Putney Embankment Foreshore
c. Waterman’s Green
d. King George’s Park
e. Chelsea Embankment Foreshore
f. Albert Embankment Foreshore
g. The Public Realm in front of Vauxhall Cross
h. Victoria Embankment Foreshore
i. Blackfriars Bridge Foreshore
j. Deptford Church Street
k. King Edward Memorial Park

8.4.4 Ranelagh Gardens will have some negative effects during construction only.

Indirectly affected open spaces

8.4.5 Indirectly affected open spaces are Frank Banfield Park and Cremorne Gardens, which will be indirectly affected during the construction phase. York Gardens is also included in the category of open space indirectly affected because, although a small area of the park will be permanently acquired, this area is so small that any direct impact is insignificant. These negative effects will cease in the operational phase and some positive effects will be felt during the operational phase.

8.5 Mitigation

8.5.1 The study identifies a range of potential mitigation measures that could be used for mitigating the potential effects of the project proposals; these include:

a. quality improvements within the open space affected, and or improvements to other open spaces nearby
b. temporary creation of replacement facilities within the affected site
c. creation of replacement open space
d. improvements in the accessibility to the affected open spaces
e. appropriate diversions to the Thames Path
f. amendments to the design and massing and size of construction and operational structures
g. screening of construction and operational structures through planting etc.

8.5.2 Much of the mitigation will be related to ensuring that construction activities are properly screened to ensure that disruption to open space is minimised.

8.5.3 There are two sites where the potential mitigation measures needed are greater.

a. Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre—potentially reconfiguring pitches on site to accommodate lost pitches.
b. King Edward Memorial Park—Relocate the hard surface sports pitch within the park. Quality improvements within park and open spaces in close proximity to the park.
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8.5.4 In addition to the measures above, there are various temporary diversions to the Thames Path that will be required.

8.5.5 In terms of the criteria against which the decision maker must be satisfied (by reference to paras. 4.8.13 and 4.8.14 of the NPS) the conclusion is that:

a. The project is not able to create new areas of open space to replace that which will be permanently lost as a result of the project;

b. None of the open space areas identified in this assessment as being affected directly or indirectly by the project can be deemed surplus to requirements;

c. The project will provide enhancements to the open space areas at the following locations:

   i  Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre – re-provision of better quality changing facilities.

   ii Putney Embankment Foreshore and Waterman’s Green - creation of additional hard landscaped embankment.

   iii King George’s Park – hard and soft landscaped quality improvements to the part of the park that will be affected by the proposals, which will also allow better views of the lake.

   iv York Gardens – new public realm will be created to the front of the Falconbrook Pumping Station. This new area of public realm will form part of the Park.

   v Chelsea Embankment Foreshore – additional hard landscaping will be created on the embankment providing a space for sitting out and relaxation.

   vi Albert Embankment Foreshore – additional hard landscaping will be created on the embankment providing a space for sitting out and relaxation.

   vii Victoria Embankment Foreshore – additional hard landscaping will be created on the embankment providing a space for sitting out and relaxation.

   viii Blackfriars Bridge Foreshore – additional hard landscaping will be created on the embankment in an area that is identified as having open space deficiencies. The public realm will provide a space for sitting out and relaxation.

   ix King Edward Memorial Park – additional open space extending the park (including planting) and adding more space for sitting out and relaxation.

   x Deptford Church Street – the project proposals provide an opportunity for enhancement of the open space to meet local community needs.

d. Other specific mitigation measures will be provided at:
i Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre – potential reconfiguration of pitch layout to compensate for temporary loss of one pitch, the project’s drainage measures may enable better pitch utilisation, use of ‘grasscrete’ road surface for the access road to reduce visual impact.

ii Frank Banfield Park - erection of temporary screening / hoarding along the Distillery Road edge of the park.

iii Putney Embankment Foreshore – provision of temporary slipway and temporary diversion of the Thames Path.

iv Waterman’s Green – erection of temporary hoarding around the construction site (potentially transparent).

v King George’s Park – erection of temporary hoarding around the construction site, on site improvement of hard and soft landscaping features, investment in improving quality of existing recreational facilities (areas for sitting out and relaxation), temporary signage/maps to direct users to entry points.

vi King Edward Memorial Park – tree planting to screen construction, possible relocation of children’s play area, improved surface for the multi-sports pitch, provision of alternative means of launching small boats into the river, enhancements to the Thames Path, improvements to the wildflower meadow, possible enhancements to the dockside area around the Shadwell Basin.

e. Of the impacts identified, the following will be temporary only:

i Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre – construction traffic, noise and air pollution and loss of land to provide an access route affecting one pitch, during the period of construction (2.5 years).

ii Putney Embankment Foreshore – impact on embankment for sitting out and walking and the foreshore will be inaccessible, during the period of construction (3.5 years).

iii Waterman’s Green – views of river from the open space will be blocked and the site will be partially inaccessible, during the period of construction (3.5 years).

iv King George’s Park – construction traffic, noise and air pollution, a small part of the park will be inaccessible and access from Buckhold Road will be restricted, during the period of construction (2.5 years).

v York Gardens – loss of a very small part of the park and closure of the access to the park from York Way, during the period of construction (3 years).

vi Ranelagh Gardens - loss of a very small part of the open space during the period of construction (4 years).

vii Albert Embankment Foreshore – effect on visual amenity and loss of access, during the period of construction (3.5 years).
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viii King Edward Memorial Park – loss of the area of the park by the embankment, which would affect the visual amenity value of the park. Noise, air pollution and traffic associated with the construction site would have a negative effect on the quality of the remaining space site, during the period of construction (3.5 years).

ix Deptford Church Street – loss of the whole site, during the period of construction (3.5 years).
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## Glossary: General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ancient monument</td>
<td>A monument protected under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of outstanding natural beauty</td>
<td>A landscape whose distinctive character and natural beauty are so outstanding that it is in the nation’s interest to safeguard them. There are 40 AONBs in England and Wales. These are designated by reason of their high qualities, which include their flora, fauna, historical and cultural associations, as well as scenic views.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>biodiversity</td>
<td>Biological diversity – or ‘biodiversity’ – is the term given to the variety of life on Earth and the natural patterns formed as a result. Biodiversity has been defined by the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), signed in 1992, as: &quot;The variability among living organisms from all sources including, inter alia, terrestrial, marine and other aquatic ecosystems and the ecological complexes of which they are part; this includes diversity within species, between species and of ecosystems.&quot; – CBD Article 2. UNEP 1992.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Ribbon Network (BRN)</td>
<td>The Blue Ribbon Network, which is part of the London Plan, includes the Thames, the canal network, and other tributaries, rivers and streams within London and London’s open water spaces, such as docks, reservoirs and lakes. It includes culverted (or covered over) parts of rivers, canals or streams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined sewer</td>
<td>A sewer conveying both rainwater and wastewater of domestic or industrial origin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined sewer overflow (CSO)</td>
<td>A structure, or series of structures, designed to allow spillage of excess wastewater from a combined sewer under increased rainfall conditions. Flows may discharge by gravity or by pumping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core strategy</td>
<td>Every local planning authority should produce a core strategy, which includes an overall vision which sets out how the area and the places within it should develop. These are relatively new documents that are a key part of the Local Development Framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO site</td>
<td>A site that contains the CSO interception chambers, connection culverts and the drop shaft from which the connection tunnel is built. Each site needs to provide enough space for all the construction related activities, which vary depending on the diameter of the shafts and the method of tunnel construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive (shaft) site</td>
<td>A main tunnel site containing the shaft from where the TBM is ‘driven’ forward, i.e., starts from. Excavated material is removed from and segments are fed into the tunnel via the shaft at the drive site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecology</td>
<td>The relationship between organisms and their environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effect</td>
<td>The result of an impact on a particular resource or receptor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental impact assessment (EIA)</td>
<td>An assessment of the possible positive or negative impact that a proposed project may have on the environment, consisting of natural, social and economic aspects. The purpose of the assessment is to ensure that decision-makers consider the ensuing environmental impacts when deciding whether to proceed with a project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination in public (EIP/EiP)</td>
<td>This is designed to test the soundness of the documents produced as part of the local development framework or London Plan. A development plan document is considered sound if it has been produced based on good evidence and prepared in accordance with procedures, including those outlined in the statement of community involvement, as well as PPS12. Whether or not there are comments in support of or opposed to policies produced, this examination will consider all policies and the inspector's report is binding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flood plain</td>
<td>Generally low-lying areas adjacent to a watercourse, tidal lengths of the river or sea, where water flows in times of flood or would flow but for the presence of flood defences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foreshore</td>
<td>Ground uncovered by the river when the tide is low.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foul water sewer</td>
<td>A sewer conveying wastewater of domestic or industrial origin, but little or no rainwater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green belt</td>
<td>Designated land – primarily open land – around built-up areas, designed to limit urban sprawl and to define town and country areas. It is protected land through this designation with a strong presumption against development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>green chains</td>
<td>A series of open spaces within an urban area, usually following existing physical features of the land, such as streams and rivers, linked by a pedestrian route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>green corridor</td>
<td>An area which forms visual and vegetated links, often along transport routes between open areas. These links may provide opportunities for the dispersal of wildlife and the improvement of landscape and amenity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groundwater</td>
<td>Water located beneath the ground surface in soil pore spaces and in the fractures of rock formations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haul roads</td>
<td>Temporary roads provided within the contractors’ site area to allow the transportation of material around the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hectare (ha)</td>
<td>A unit of area, defined as 10,000 square metres, primarily used in the measurement of land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic parks and gardens</td>
<td>A park or garden of special historic interest graded I (highest quality), II* or II. Designated by English Heritage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impact</td>
<td>A physical or measurable change to the environment attributable to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interception chamber</td>
<td>A structure built within an existing combined sewer which diverts stormwater from the sewer into the new system of structures, allowing stormwater flow to be transferred to the sewage treatment works. In order to transfer the flow from the existing sewer to the sewage treatment works, a series of structures need to be built and these include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• connection culvert – this covered channel structure connects the interception chamber to the drop shaft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• drop shaft – this vertical circular structure is used to drop the flow down to the main tunnel level and therefore connects the connection culvert to the connection tunnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• connection tunnel – this tunnel connects the drop shaft to the main tunnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• main tunnel – this tunnel connects the connection tunnels to the Beckton Pumping Station at the end of the tunnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• pumping station – this vertical circular structure with pumps located at the bottom is used to lift the stormwater flows up to the sewage treatment works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interceptor sewer</td>
<td>Sewer which captures spillages from the existing sewers and transports them to be properly treated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Tunnel</td>
<td>The Lee Tunnel comprises a storage and transfer tunnel from Abbey Mills Pumping Station (PS) to Beckton STW and the interception of the Abbey Mills CSO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>listed buildings</td>
<td>A structure of architectural and/or historical interest included on the Secretary of State’s list, which affords statutory protection. Such buildings are subdivided in to Grades I, II* and II (in descending importance).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>locally listed buildings</td>
<td>Buildings designated by the local planning authority as having local significance, which are included on a local list. Although such buildings are not statutorily protected, in general close scrutiny will be given to any development affecting them as a recognised heritage asset.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Plan</td>
<td>The London Plan is the strategic spatial planning document for London, produced by the Mayor of London. It sets out a fully integrated, economic, environmental, transport and social framework for the development of the capital to 2031, and forms part of the development plan for greater London.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Tideway Improvements (LTI)</td>
<td>London Tideway Improvements comprises three major engineering schemes to help prevent sewer overflows and improve water quality in the River Thames. This includes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upgrades to all five major sewage works in London, and construction of the Lee Tunnel and the proposed Thames Tideway Tunnel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>main tunnel</td>
<td>The large diameter tunnel from Acton Storm Tanks to Abbey Mills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>main tunnel site</td>
<td>A site from where the main tunnel is built. Each site needs to provide enough space for all the construction related activities, which vary depending on the type of TBM used and whether the site is a drive site, a double drive site or a reception site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mitigation measures</td>
<td>Proposed actions to prevent or reduce adverse effects arising from the whole or specific elements of a development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>open space</td>
<td>Land laid out as a public garden, or used for the purposes of public recreation, or land which is a disused burial ground. Open space should be taken to mean all open space of public value, including not just land, but also areas of water such as rivers, canals, lakes and reservoirs which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation and can also act as a visual amenity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public realm</td>
<td>Any publicly-owned area, including streets, pathways, parks, publicly accessible open spaces, and public and civic facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Right of Way</td>
<td>Route to which the public has right of access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsar site</td>
<td>Sites identified under the Ramsar Convention (the Convention on Wetlands of International Importance, especially as Waterfowl Habitat) relating to the conservation and sustainable utilization of wetlands, recognizing the fundamental ecological functions of wetlands and their economic, cultural, scientific, and recreational value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled monument</td>
<td>An ancient monument or archaeological deposit designated by the Secretary of State as a ‘Scheduled Ancient Monument’ and protected under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites of nature conservation importance (SNCI)</td>
<td>Locally important sites of nature conservation adopted by local authorities for planning purposes and identified in the local development plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites of special scientific interest (SSSI)</td>
<td>A site identified under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000) as an area of special interest by reason of any of its flora and fauna geological or physiological features (basically plants, animals and natural features) relating to the earth’s structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special parliamentary procedure</td>
<td>Once a compulsory purchase order or development consent order is confirmed, it must be approved by Parliament if it includes some types of special land. A special parliamentary procedure is then required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>procedure is used to seek this approval.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stormwater</td>
<td>Rainwater that funnels into sewers and mixes with sewage and is either treated at sewage works or overflows into rivers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable drainage system (SuDS)</td>
<td>A drainage system that controls the quantity and speed of rainwater run-off from a development as defined in the Environment Agency and London Plan hierarchy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temporary works</td>
<td>Works required to facilitate construction, including any works left in place after completion (e.g. temporary steel piles that do not need to be removed).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>topography</td>
<td>The study of Earth’s surface shape and features or those of planets, moons, and asteroids. It is also the description of such surface shapes and features (especially their depiction in maps).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unitary development plan</td>
<td>Where policies are saved, a statutory plan which sets out the planning policies of a London authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wastewater or sewage</td>
<td>Waterborne wastes from domestic uses of water, derived from households, trade and industry.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendices

Appendix A: Information on use of Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre

A.1 Total capacity used

A.1.1 Table A.1 and Table A.2 identify capacity information for Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre.

Table A.1 2010 / 11 Total summer capacity used (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Cricket Pitch %</th>
<th>Touch Rugby Pitch %</th>
<th>Aussie Rules Pitch %</th>
<th>5-a-side Pitch %</th>
<th>Rounders %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2010/11 Avg % (In season)</strong></td>
<td><strong>23.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>15.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>11.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: London Borough Wandsworth

Table A.2 2010 / 11 Total winter capacity use (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Football Pitch %</th>
<th>Football Pitch (JR) %</th>
<th>Rugby Pitch (JR) %</th>
<th>Rugby Pitch %</th>
<th>5-a-side Pitch %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Football Pitch %</th>
<th>Football Pitch (JR) %</th>
<th>Rugby Pitch %</th>
<th>Rugby Pitch (JR) %</th>
<th>5-a-side Pitch %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/11 Avg % (In season)</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: London Borough Wandsworth

A.2 Temporal demand

A.2.1 Table A.3 and Table A.6 identify temporal demand information for Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre.

Table A.3 Winter term time daily peak demand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Football</th>
<th>Football 5-aside</th>
<th>Rugby</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peak Time</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Peak Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>13:30 - 15:30</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14:00 - 15:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>15:00 - 15:30</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>09:00 - 10:00 / 13:00 - 14:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>15:00 - 15:30</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>09:00 - 10:00 / 14:00 - 15:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>15:30 - 16:30</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>09:00 - 11:30 / 13:30 - 15:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>13:30 - 14:30</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>09:00 - 10:00 / 13:30 - 14:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>14:00 - 16:00</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>09:30 - 11:30 / 15:00 - 16:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>10:00 - 12:00</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: London Borough Wandsworth
Table A.4 Winter (Holidays: Half term)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Football Peak Time</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Football 5-aside Peak Time</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Rugby Peak Time</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10:00 - 15:00</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10:00 - 15:00</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>13:30 - 15:30</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10:00 - 15:00</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>13:30 - 15:30</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10:00 - 15:00</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>13:30 - 15:30</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10:00 - 15:00</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>13:30 - 15:30</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>14:00 - 16:00</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>09:30 - 11:30 / 14:30 - 16:30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>10:00 - 12:00</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: London Borough Wandsworth

Table A.5 Summer term time daily peak demand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cricket Peak Time</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Rounders Peak Time</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Aussie Rules Peak Time</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>14:00 - 15:30</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>14:00 - 15:30</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>14:00 - 15:30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>14:00 - 15:00</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>14:00 - 15:00</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>14:00 - 15:00</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>14:00 - 15:00</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>14:00 - 15:00</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>14:00 - 15:00</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>13:00 - 19:00</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12:00 - 18:00</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>10:00 - 19:00</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: London Borough Wandsworth

Table A.6 Summer (Holidays: Half term)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cricket Peak Time</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Football 5-aside Peak Time</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Aussie Rules Peak Time</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10:00 - 15:00</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10:00 - 15:00</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10:00 - 15:00</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10:00 - 15:00</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10:00 - 15:00</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>12:30 - 19:00</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12:00 - 18:00</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>13:00 - 19:00</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: London Borough Wandsworth
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Appendix B: Site reconnaissance proforma and guidelines

B.1 Site reconnaissance proforma and guidelines

B.1.1 Site reconnaissance visits to open spaces were carried out in June 2011. The proforma below was used to collect information.

Figure B.1 Survey proforma

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thames Tunnel Open Space Assessment Site Reconnaissance Pro-forma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1. Date of Site Reconnaissance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2. Atkins Ref No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5 Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6 Context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7 Type of Open Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Local Park / open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocket Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear open space / green corridors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity green space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor sports facilities / playing fields (public)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor sports facilities / playing fields (private)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural or semi natural greenspace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for young people and teenagers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q8 What is the role(s) / function(s) does the open space have (tick all that apply)

Formal Recreational
Informal Recreational
Educational
Biodiversity
Cultural
Historical
Structural
Amenity
### Q.9 Site Ownership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership Type</th>
<th>Ticking Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Authority Ownership</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other public sector owned</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicly owned and private sector managed</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicly owned and voluntary sector managed</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector owned and managed</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary sector owned and managed</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q.10 Site Access Arrangements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access Type</th>
<th>Ticking Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Public Access</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Facto Public Access</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared / dual use</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Access (e.g. to clubs)</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Public Access</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry Point</th>
<th>Ticking Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted Access</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted but accessible from all directions</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited Entry</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Access Point</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q.11 Does the Open Space fulfill a structural role (Tick any that apply)

**Criteria**
- Is it clearly distinguishable from the built up area providing separation between different communities? □
- Does it contribute to the special identity of the borough? □
- Does it create a positive and significant open space experience when passed or crossed while travelling on the adjacent road or rail network? □
- Does it contribute to the ‘sense of place’ of the local area? □
- Does it help to define neighbourhoods within the urban area? □
- Does it accommodate recognised and recognisable features of local importance (e.g. buildings/structures, landscape, events/activities)? □

### Q.12 Does the Open Space have significant amenity value? (Tick any that apply)

**Criteria**
- Is it visible from parts of the surrounding area? □
- Is it visually attractive? □
- Does it have a clearly definable townscape value? □
- Does it provide relief from the built up area? □
- Site mitigates visual impact of unsightly land uses (buffer, bunding, screening) □

### Q.13a Heritage Designations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Ticking Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EH Registered Park and Garden of Special historic interest</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site located within a conservation area</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listed buildings or structures located within extent of the site</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled monument located within extent of the site</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site located within the setting of any of the above designations</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendices

#### Q.13b Is the open space contemporary with its surroundings (i.e. part of the original designed townscape)
- **Yes**

#### Q.14 Conservation and heritage
- Conservation of natural features (score out of 10)
- Conservation of landscape features (score out of 10)
- Conservation of buildings and structures (score out of 10)

**Strengths / problems**

**Recommendations**

#### Q.15 Environmental Value
- Floodplain / Flood attenuation
- Lake / man made water features
- River / natural drainage
- Vegetation forming a shelter belt

#### Q.16 Does the open space fulfil an educational role?
- Sport / organised games
- Nature / environmental interpretation facilities
- Historical interpretation

**Educational interpretation (score out of 10)**

#### Q.17 Does the open space perform a cultural role?
- Venue for large scale outdoor events
- Dedicated venue for small scale outdoor events
- Events programme
- Community / youth centre / meeting hall
- Indoor sports hall / leisure centre

**Provision of sculpture / public art**

**Condition**

**Comments**
## Appendices

### Q.18 What type of recreational role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Dedicated Provision</th>
<th>Informal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitch Sports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court based sports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watersports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking / dog walking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s play</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teenagers “hanging out”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitting out / relaxation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other activity / past time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q.19 Children's Play Provision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active Recreation</th>
<th>No of items of play equipment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rebound Wall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skateboarding facility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered seating / youth shelter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putting green</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paddling pool</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard surfaced area (min 20m x 20m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal games area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Play Area fulfils the NPFA criteria for LEAP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play Area fulfils the NPFA criteria for LEAP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doorstep playable Space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Playable Space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Playable Space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Q.20 Pitch Provision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of pitches</th>
<th>Pitches (quality)</th>
<th>Changing (quality)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grass All weather</td>
<td>hard Floodlit Enclosed</td>
<td>G F p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football (full size)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football (junior)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football (5 a-side)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket (full size)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket (junior)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby (full size)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby (junior)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hockey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Q.21 Other Outdoor sports Provision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of pitches</th>
<th>Pitches (quality)</th>
<th>Changing (quality)</th>
<th>Social facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grass All weather</td>
<td>hard Floodlit Enclosed</td>
<td>G F p</td>
<td>G F F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Weather</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi use games area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netball</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball court (full size)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle circuit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Q.22 Indications of Informal Use

- Desire Lines
- Skateboarding
- BMX
- Cycling
- Basketball practice area
- Kick about area
- Dog walking

Provision of other amenities

---

Open Space Assessment
## Appendices

### Q 23 Quality Assessment (score out of 10)

**Welcoming place for all**
- Welcoming
- Good and safe access
- Signage
- Equal access for all

Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Healthy safe and secure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Safe Equipment and facilities
| Personal security
| Dog Fouling
| Appropriate provision of facilities
| Quality of facilities

Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clean and well maintained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Litter and waste management
| Grounds maintenance and horticulture
| Building and infrastructure maintenance
| Equipment maintenance

Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Involvement Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Open Space Assessment site reconnaissance survey guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1-5</th>
<th>Site details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>Context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Note the surrounding context of the site. Is it located within a housing area, adjacent to other open space / water body, etc? How does the open space relate to the context?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>Type of Open Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Select main purpose. If there is more than one major role select secondary purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>District Park</strong> – (20-60 ha) Landscape setting with a variety of natural features and a range of facilities including outdoor sports facilities and playing fields, children’s play for different age groups and informal recreation pursuits. Some car parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Local Park</strong> – (2-20 ha) They have an important children’s play function. Provision for court games, important children’s play function, sitting-out areas, nature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
conservation, landscaped environment, and playing fields if the parks are large enough.

**Small Local Park or Open Space** – (0.4 - 2 ha) These are open spaces less than 2 ha in size (threshold to be determined). These are likely to include gardens, sitting out areas, children’s play grounds and other publicly accessible open space uses.

**Pocket Park** – (< 0.4 ha) Similar to Small Local Parks, these are likely to include gardens, sitting out areas and children’s playgrounds, but are less than 0.4ha

**Linear Open Space / Green Corridors** – River and canal banks, canal towpaths, road and rail corridors, cycling routes, paths, disused railways, and other routes which provide opportunities for informal recreation (including nature conservation).

**Amenity Green Space** – Includes informal recreational spaces and housing green spaces. This category would include green spaces in and around housing areas, large landscaped areas, and domestic gardens.

**Outdoor Sports Facilities / Playing Fields** - Sites which are not located within a public park and which the primary role is for formal recreation. Sites include tennis courts, bowling greens, sports pitches, golf courses, athletics tracks, school playing fields, other institutional playing fields and outdoor sports areas. Categorise by ownership i.e. public/private/education.

**Natural or Semi-Natural Urban Greenspaces** – Woodland (coniferous, deciduous, mixed) and scrub, grassland (e.g. downland, meadow), heath or moor, wetlands (e.g. marsh, fen), open and running water, wastelands (including disturbed ground), bare rock habitats (e.g. cliffs, quarries, pits).

**Civic spaces / pedestrianised areas** – more formally laid out hard surfaced public spaces including squares, pedestrian streets, sitting out areas. These spaces would not normally have a formal recreational function.

**Green Spaces within Grounds of Institution** - Open space located within the grounds of hospitals, universities and other institutions which are accessible to the general public or some sections of the public.

**Provision for young people and teenagers** – sites that are specifically designed for young people this would include playgrounds, adventure playgrounds, skateparks, etc.

---

**Q8**

**Role / Function of the open space**

**Formal Recreational Role** – Open spaces that include dedicated sports facilities (pitches or courts)

**Informal Recreational Role** – Open spaces that are used for / can be used for a range of informal recreational pastimes such as walking, jogging, informal sports games (kick about etc) or children’s play.

**Educational Role** – Open Spaces that are used either by schools for outdoor lessons, or have educational interpretation facilities (could include visitor centres, boards, or themed walking routes etc)

**Cultural Role** – Open spaces that are used for a formal events programme (fireworks, fairs, etc). Open spaces that include cultural facilities such as libraries, cultural centres, bandstands, amphitheatres, public art etc.

**Historical Role** – Opens spaces that are registered as historic landscapes, include historic buildings or structures or have historical interpretation facilities.

**Structural Role** – Open spaces that help to create an identity or sense of place
and may help to define a neighbourhood.

**Amenity Role** – Open spaces that are visible from surrounding areas and provide relief from built up areas, essentially people can enjoy these spaces by simply viewing them from the surrounding area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q9</th>
<th><strong>Site Ownership</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Public sector</strong> – includes spaces owned by other national, regional or local government agencies. Excludes utility companies and Network Rail owned land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Voluntary sector</strong> – includes community organisations, charities, clubs and societies, private schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Private sector</strong> – Company sports grounds, land owned by statutory undertakers, university owned sites.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q10</th>
<th><strong>Site access arrangements</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>General public access</strong> - unrestricted public access or management agreements for public access. This usually relates to publicly owned parks and open spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>De-facto public access</strong> - general public use of spaces for short cuts, walks, playing games etc., without formal public access arrangements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Shared / dual use</strong> - formal arrangements exist for the use of open space which is not normally accessible to the general public e.g. formal arrangements which allow the use of school sports facilities out of hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Restricted access</strong> – access only to members of clubs or associations, where formal shared use arrangements are unlikely to exist. This could include private spaces within housing estates open to local residents or company sports grounds which are accessible and used by other teams not associated with the company.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>No access</strong> means that no public access is possible, usually for safety or security reasons (e.g. to railway embankments, vacant land, areas of wildlife etc). These areas are generally securely fenced off to prevent public access.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q11</th>
<th><strong>Does the open space fulfil a structural role?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This question relates to the spaces structural role in the physical environment in which it is located. Physical structure within a large built up area provides a sense of orientation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Criteria 1</strong> - sites clearly distinguishable from the built up area providing separation between different settlements or communities. This is likely to apply to large open spaces on the edge of settlements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Criteria 2</strong> - contribution to the setting of townscapes which are important in a Borough or Regional context because of location or characteristics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Criteria 3</strong> - whether it provides any impression from a major transport corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Criteria 4</strong> - whether the local population is able to positively identify with the space (e.g. importance for leisure activities, regular visits, important element of their local or wider area).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Criteria 5</strong> - whether it contributes (by itself or with another space) to a separation/definition of the local neighbourhoods within the Borough, e.g. sites on ward boundaries or transport corridors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Criteria 6</strong> - whether the local population is likely to attach a level of importance to the space due to the presence of recognisable features (e.g. historic buildings, sports clubs, significant landscapes or events).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Q12: Does the open space have a significant amenity value?

This question relates to the level to which the space makes a pleasant contribution to the locality which people can identify with (e.g. views, landscaping, openness, settings etc).

**Criteria 1** - relates to whether the space is visible from adjacent buildings, transport corridors, footpaths or the wider area.

**Criteria 2** - seeks to determine whether the space is ‘visually attractive’. Whilst this is subjective, the attractiveness of the space will be determined by positive features such as the condition, quantity, size and appropriateness of planting features; landforms, street scene; views etc., or negative features such as pylons, industrial features railway tracks etc.

**Criteria 3** - seeks to determine whether the space makes a contribution to the setting of the townscape surrounding it e.g. a green corridor providing a space for buildings to look onto it.

**Criteria 4** - assesses whether the open space provides visual relief of built up areas, such as spacing between buildings including whether the space provides a ‘window’ for views from adjacent buildings, road or built up areas.

**Criteria 5** – seeks to determine whether the open space helps to shield the surrounding area from unsightly land uses, such as heavy industry, through the use of buffer, bunding or screening.

### Q13a: Heritage Designations

Heritage designations are to be derived prior to site reconnaissance surveys. The on-site reconnaissance survey should identify whether the open space forms part of the setting for any of the heritage designations and note the approximate distance of the site from the boundary of the designation.

### Q14: Conservation and heritage

i) Using a scale of 1-10 consider the state of conservation of natural features within the site

Natural defined as (Geomorphological features, woodland, scrub, grasslands, wetlands, open sand, running water, wasteland and derelict open land).

0,1. Very Poor / 2,3,4 Poor / 5,6 Fair / 7 Good / 8 Very good / 9 Excellent / 10 Exceptional

ii) Using a scale of 1-10 consider the conservation of landscape features within the site including individual landscape components, the ‘strength of character’ of the landscape defined as its distinctiveness and integrity and its overall condition.

iii) Using a scale of 1-10 consider the condition of historic buildings and structures. Structures include railings, gates and gate posts, walls, statues, fountains, bandstands etc.

Consider also whether the building is on the English Heritage ‘At Risk’ Register (Condition: the appearance and present management of the feature, along with its stability and likely rate of change from existing state).

*Not to be confused with survival. This can be defined as: the percentage of the original structure or features which remains intact/extant*.

Poor – little of the original style and finish can be recognised and the present condition will likely lead to further degradation.
Moderate – most of the original style and finish can be recognised but unless the rate of degradation can be arrested it will lead to loss of the present intelligibly of the feature.

Good – the feature survives in its perceived original condition and at present no factors are exist to depreciate its current form.

Where appropriate refer to the extent/survival of historical features/structures in the comments box.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q15</th>
<th>Environmental role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Floodplain to be determined prior to site visit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On site reconnaissance survey to identify whether the site has any lakes, man-made drainage dykes/balancing ponds, or natural drainage features. Tick if trees/vegetation forms a shelter belt adjoining residential development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q16</th>
<th>Educational role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sport / Organised Games – LBG information to determine existing use of parks by schools. Site assessment to determine potential use – In order for the sites to be suitable for schools use. The areas to be used should be free from dog fouling and other potential hazards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nature / Environmental Study - To be determined from site reconnaissance survey. Sites should have a range of ecological/environmental features. For the sites to have an existing role there should be some form of interpretation provision (e.g. boards, leaflets part of a trail, programme of events/activities). Education role should be assessed in terms of the potential benefit to the wider community (not just schools).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Historical interpretation / understanding - Such sites should have been identified within Q16. For the sites to have an existing role there should be some form of interpretation provision (e.g. boards, leaflets part of a trail). Education role should be assessed in terms of the benefit to the wider community (not just schools).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Using a scale of 1-10 consider whether the provision of education/interpretation provision relating to the park is fit for purpose (considering the type of open space).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0,1, Very Poor / 2,3,4 Poor / 5,6 Fair / 7 Good / 8 Very good / 9 Excellent / 10 Exceptional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comment on what additional facilities could be provided to make it fit for purpose (bearing in mind the type of open space it is).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q17</th>
<th>Cultural role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criteria relating to existing events should be ticked if there is a formal outdoor venue on site (e.g. bandstand, stage, amphitheatre etc) which is in reasonable condition. The comments box should describe the type of on-site provision (i.e. type/s of venues present on site).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q18</th>
<th>Recreational role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The relevant boxes should be ticked if the site performs one or more of the recreational role identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Active Recreation - a major role is where at least 40% of the usage of the site is likely to be dedicated to the type of activity identified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Noisy sports to be identified

**Informal recreation** - a major role is where it is considered that the identified activity accounts for at least 40% of all on site activity.

A minor role is where an activity is likely to take place but does constitute a major activity.

N/A should be ticked where the site does not support the recreational activity identified.

Dedicated provision should be identified if there are facilities for undertaking the activity.

Informal provision should be ticked where there are no formal facilities but where other evidence suggests an activity takes place.

### Q19 Children’s Play Provision

Note the total number of pieces of children play equipment.

**Type of play equipment**

Tick all boxes that apply to the type of each play item:

- Balancing, e.g. beams, stepping logs, clatter bridges, or graphic line elements such as hopscotch.
- Rocking, e.g. see-saw or spring animals.
- Climbing or agility, e.g. frames, nets, overhead bars, or angled climbers.
- Sliding, e.g. traditional slides, straight or angled ‘fire-fighter’s’ poles.
- Social play, e.g. sheltered areas or child seating.

Additional items might focus upon rotating, swinging, jumping, crawling, viewing (e.g. ground graphics), or counting.

**Quality**

Tick the boxes for LEAPs and NEAPs if the children’s play area meets most of the following criteria:

**Criteria for a LEAP:**

- It caters for children of 4-8 years in age
- It has an activity zone a minimum of 400m² in area
- It contains at least 5 types of play equipment (i.e. balancing, rocking etc.)
- There is adequate space around the equipment for children to play games of ‘tag’ and ‘chase’
- It has a barrier to limit the speed of a child entering or leaving the facility
- There is at least 10 metres between the edge of the play area and the boundary of the nearest property
- The buffer zone includes planting to enable children to experience natural scent, colour and texture.
- Some individual seats are provided for parents or carers
- It has a notice to indicate that the area is for use by children only
- It has a litter bin
Criteria for a NEAP:

- It caters predominantly for older children
- It has an activity zone a minimum of 1000m² divided into 2 areas; one containing a range of play equipment and the other provided with a hard surface of at least 465m² (minimum 5-a-side pitch)
- It contains at least 8 types of play equipment
- There is adequate space around the equipment for children to play games of ‘tag’ and ‘chase’
- It has a barrier to limit the speed of a child entering or leaving the facility
- There is at least 30 metres between the edge of the play area and the boundary of the nearest property
- The buffer zone includes planting to enable children to experience natural scent, colour and texture.
- Some individual seats are provided for parents or carers
- It has a notice to indicate that the area is for use by children only
- It has litter bins at each access point and in proximity of each group of seats
- It has convenient and secure cycle parking

Criteria for an Adventure Playground:

- A playground with playworkers at which children have challenging opportunities
- Activities may well include using tools, lighting fires, digging etc
- It has sufficient space outside for such activities
- Has indoor space for arts and crafts activities

Criteria for a Doorstep/Toddler Playground:

- Designed for small children and is very close to housing
- Limited number of items of equipment, usually no more than 3, available.
- Play area should be located away from busy roads
- A 5 metre wide buffer zone should exist between the perimeter of the playground and housing
- Adequate seating should be provided for adults

Summary characteristics of a Neighbourhood Playable Space;

- It caters for children of all ages
- A varied natural space with secluded and open areas, landscaping and equipment so that children of all ages can play. Space for carers to sit and talk. Flexible use, may include youth space. May be supervised.
- Minimum size of 500sqm.
- Facilities can include: landscaping to create natural feel; equipment integrated into the landscaping that allows swinging, climbing and sliding; seating away from equipment, bike skate and skateboard facilities; kick about area; basketball
nets; sand; hard surface; and shelter.

- Located in larger residential areas and housing estates, local or district parks or school playgrounds.

**Summary characteristics of a Local Playable Space;**

- It caters for children of 0-11 years in age
- A landscaped space with landscaping and equipment for children aged 0-11. Space for carers to sit and talk. Flexible use, no formal supervision.
- Minimum size of 300sqm.
- Facilities can include: landscaping to create a natural feel; equipment integrated into the landscaping that allows swinging, climbing and sliding; ball walls; kick about area; basketball nets; seating area away from equipment; sand (if possible).
- Located in residential areas including housing estates, local parks.

### Q20 Pitch Provision

Write the **number** of pitches which fall into each category.

**Pitch type/size (size of pitch excluding safety margins)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pitch type/size</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Football full size</td>
<td>90-120m (length) x 46-90m (width)</td>
<td>1.4 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football Junior</td>
<td>Approx 70 x 50m</td>
<td>0.5 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football 5-a-side</td>
<td>Approx 27-55m (length) x 18-37m (width)</td>
<td>0.2-0.3 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket full size</td>
<td>46m x 46m</td>
<td>1.6-2.0 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket junior</td>
<td>37m x 37m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby full size</td>
<td>Approx 100m x 55m (min)</td>
<td>1-1.2 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby junior</td>
<td>(smaller than above)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hockey</td>
<td>91 x 55m (grass)</td>
<td>0.6 ha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pitch surface**

- All weather - artificial Astroturf type surfaces which are normally green and have a textured surface normally fine plastic strands.
- Hard surface – concrete, or other type of surface not identified above.

### Q21 Other outdoor sports provision

**Pitch/court provision**

Write the number of pitches which fall in to the each category.

- Do not double count pitches which are noted in previous question.
- Full sized artificial pitches should be noted in this Q only.
- Basketball count full sized courts in this section (29x17m). Note practice areas
MUGAs (multi use games areas) are totally enclosed games areas which provide facilities for a range of sports normally 5-a-side football, basketball practice etc. These facilities are a recent 'invention' and will not be more than about 5 years old. For other court type uses (normally concrete surfaces) the facility should be classified according to the court markings and any other tell-tale signs (portable goal posts etc.) which indicate the range of activities which are supported (tennis, netball, 5-a-side). Courts which are used for a number of sports (e.g. tennis and netball) should be noted in both rows but placed in brackets.

- Tick if there are dedicated changing or social facilities rather than noting the No. facilities.

### Pitch/court/facility condition

**Good**

Grass cover 85-94%

Length of grass and evenness of pitch – Excellent

Pitch/court is of adequate size

Slope of pitch/court – Flat

No evidence of dog fouling, glass, stones, litter, unofficial use or damage to surface.

**Fair**

Grass cover 60-84%

Length of grass and evenness of pitch – Good

Pitch/court is of adequate size

Slope of pitch/court - Slight

Some evidence of dog fouling, glass, stones, litter, unofficial use or damage to surface.

**Poor**

Grass cover <60%

Length of grass and evenness of pitch – Poor

Pitch/court is of inadequate size

Slope of pitch/court – severe

Dog fouling, glass, stones, litter, unofficial use or damage to surface pose major problem.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q22</th>
<th>Indications of informal use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tick boxes if there are indications of the any of the activities listed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provision of other amenities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tick boxes if any of the amenities are provided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q23</th>
<th>Quality/condition audit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Using a scale of 1-10 consider the following factors bearing in mind the range of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
provision which is appropriate for each type of open space.

0,1, Very Poor / 2,3,4 Poor / 5,6 Fair / 7 Good / 8 Very good / 9 Excellent / 10 Exceptional

**A list of criteria which should be considered in relation to each factor is provided below. If the rating given does not adequately reflect all of the issues/problems identified on site highlight any differences in the comments box.**

### A WELCOMING PLACE FOR ALL

**Welcoming**

Is there a clearly defined entrance?

Is there a welcome/advisory sign which is an appropriate size and clear?

Is the entrance clean, tidy, well maintained and inviting

Are the site boundaries including hedges, gates etc. clearly defined and well maintained?

**Good and safe access**

How well is the open space linked with neighbouring areas? (consider both formal and informal connections and the number of entrances to the open space)

Is there adequate car parking spaces either within or adjacent to the open space? (Note if parking has to be paid for)

Are spaces well defined/maintained?

Is there provision for cycling within the open space including cycle routes (larger spaces) and cycle parking (if there are facilities which cyclists are likely to frequent)

Are roads, pathways and cycle ways constructed using appropriate materials are they level for safe use, are edges well defined, surfaces clean and debris and weed free?

0,1, Very Poor / 2,3,4 Poor / 5,6 Fair / 7 Good / 8 Very good / 9 Excellent / 10 Exceptional

**Signage**

Is the open space easy to locate?

Is there adequate signage to the open space? (if appropriate)

Is there a site plan within the space identifying the location of facilities/amenities? (if relevant)

Is there appropriate directional signage within the open space? (e.g. finger posts)

**Equal access for all**

Are there any physical barriers which prevent/obstruct access for pedestrian or cyclists? (Physical barriers may include busy roads with absence of pedestrian crossings in close proximity to the open space)
Are there barriers which would deter/preclude certain user groups from accessing the space (e.g. young children, women, the elderly etc)
Are there any physical barriers of access for people with mobility difficulties?
Flights of steps with no ramps, inadequate pathways, lack of disabled parking, toilets etc.

HEALTHY, SAFE AND SECURE

Safe equipment and facilities
Do any of the facilities or equipment within the open space present a potential risk to users either because they are damaged or poorly maintained?

Personal security
Consider whether potential park users may be deterred from using the park for reasons of safety and security. Consider the following issues:
Is there natural surveillance from neighbouring properties?
Are there potential ambush areas?
Is there vandalism of park buildings/changing facilities which presents a poor image of the space?
Is the space well frequented? Does it have regular flows of people on routes through the open space?
Is the space well provided with lighting if it is likely to be used or has potential to be used at night?
Do the approaches to the open space feel open or do they feel intimidating?
Does the park have park rangers or similar?

Dog fouling
Is there evidence of dog fouling within the open space?
Are children’s play areas and sports pitches fenced from dogs?
Are there clearly defined dog walks or areas for Dogs?
Is there provision of bins for dog waste?

Appropriate provision of facilities
Does the park have the range of facilities (variety, size and number) which would be expected for the type of open space it is? Consider:
Children’s play provision (for different age groups)
Spaces for different functions, informal recreation, walks, active sport, spaces for nature
Amenities (toilets, café, seating, shelters, club house, changing facilities)
Provision for a range of age ranges
Does the open space provide a varied and stimulating environment/landscaped
Is there provision for interpretation facilities if there are features of interest
0,1, Very Poor / 2,3,4 Poor / 5,6 Fair / 7 Good / 8 Very good / 9 Excellent / 10 Exceptional
### Quality of facilities
Are the facilities which are provided fit for purpose? Consider the quality of facilities, whether they are in use, their physical condition/state of repair and their attractiveness to existing and potential users.

### CLEAN AND WELL MAINTAINED
Are facilities within the open space clean and well maintained? (check for signs of graffiti/vandalism, broken glass etc).
Check toilets and other indoor facilities if access is available

### Litter and waste management
Are there enough bins? Are they emptied regularly enough?
Are there facilities for recycling?
Is there evidence of fly tipping/abandoned cars etc?

### Grounds maintenance and horticulture
Consider the number, variety, condition and health of planted areas within the park including grassed areas, trees, shrubs and bushes and formal planted areas.
Is there the range of vegetation types that may be expected for the type of open space?
Are there unmanaged or overgrown areas?

### Buildings and infrastructure maintenance
Park buildings (roofs, windows, signs of graffiti/vandalism, arson)
Fences/site boundary (safe and secure)
Other structures (bandstands, historic structures, information/interpretation points)
Lighting (working)
Paths etc. Good condition

### Equipment maintenance
Park benches, Play equipment, Drinking fountains, etc.

### Management Comments
Add any further comments on overall perception of the management of the open space.

### Community Involvement Comments
Add any further comments on overall perception of the community involvement. In particular the site may have community notice board referring to community involvement activities.

### Q24 Physical Character
Which of the following best describe the physical character of the open space?
Assess the composition of the park in terms of its land use pattern (to nearest 5% for each category. (Aerial photographs may assist with assessing the percentages for some of the larger spaces).

### Q25
0,1, Very Poor / 2,3,4 Poor / 5,6 Fair / 7 Good / 8 Very good / 9 Excellent / 10 Exceptional
### Vegetation coverage and condition

Assess the coverage and type of vegetation within the space to nearest 5% for each category. Landscape assessment of vegetation.

Using a scale of 1-10 consider the appropriateness of arboricultural and woodland management arrangements.

| Q26 | Any other comments |
Open Space Assessment
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Appendix C

APFP Regulations 2009: Regulation 5(2)(q)
## Appendix C: Site reconnaissance results

### C.1 Table of results for site assessments

Tables C.1 to C.8 set out the results of the quality and value assessment. The Columns in each table relate to the proforma questions as identified in Appendix B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Albert Embankment Foreshore</strong></td>
<td>London Borough of Lambeth</td>
<td>Site is located on foreshore and consists of no open space (as defined by PPG17) which could be potentially affected.</td>
<td>Site located on foreshore, not within an open space as defined by PPG17.</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other publicly owned and managed</td>
<td>No public access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Realm in front of Vauxhall Cross</strong></td>
<td>London Borough of Lambeth</td>
<td>Hard landscaped spaces, just south of construction site, either side of Vauxhall Bridge fronting onto the Thames</td>
<td>Site located next to security services building on northern side of Vauxhall Bridge and within residential area on southside</td>
<td>Civic Spaces</td>
<td>Local Authority</td>
<td>General public access</td>
<td>Limited Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Victoria Embankment Foreshore</strong></td>
<td>City of Westminster</td>
<td>Site is located on foreshore and consists of no open space (as defined by PPG17) which could be potentially affected.</td>
<td>Site located on foreshore, not within an open space as defined by PPG17.</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other publicly owned and managed</td>
<td>No public access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Whitehall Gardens</strong></td>
<td>City of Westminster</td>
<td>Attractive space with planted gardens and facilities for sitting out which provides a buffer between Victoria Embankment and buildings to west.</td>
<td>Site located between busy Victoria Embankment and 7 storey building. Acts largely as a sitting out space for local workers, tourists and for people waiting for coach pickups</td>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>Local Authority</td>
<td>General public access</td>
<td>Restricted but accessible from all directions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Blackfriars Bridge Foreshore</strong></td>
<td>City of London</td>
<td>Site is located on foreshore and consists of no open space (as defined by PPG17) which could be potentially affected.</td>
<td>Site located on foreshore, not within an open space as defined by PPG17.</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other publicly owned and managed</td>
<td>No public access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>King Edward Memorial Park</strong></td>
<td>London Borough of Tower Hamlets</td>
<td>Well used and attractive park with range of facilities and good views over the Thames</td>
<td>Located within a relatively dense residential area</td>
<td>District Park</td>
<td>Local Authority</td>
<td>General public access</td>
<td>Restricted but accessible from all directions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deptford Church Street</strong></td>
<td>London Borough of Lewisham</td>
<td>Small piece of highway land amenity space with no facilities.</td>
<td>Located close to small scale employment uses beneath the railway line, an attractive church and residential uses</td>
<td>Amenity Green space</td>
<td>Local Authority</td>
<td>General public access</td>
<td>Unrestricted access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre</strong></td>
<td>Royal Borough of Richmond</td>
<td>Outdoor sports centre with formal provision for rowing, athletics, football and cricket on</td>
<td>Site bounded by the London Wetland Centre to the North, Thames to Outdoor Sports Facilities -</td>
<td>Local Authority</td>
<td>Restricted Access (e.g. to clubs)</td>
<td>Single Access point</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3. Name of Open Space</td>
<td>Q4 Location</td>
<td>Q5. Description</td>
<td>Q6. Context</td>
<td>Q7 Type of Open Space</td>
<td>Q9 Site Ownership</td>
<td>Q10 Site Access Arrangements</td>
<td>Q10 Entry Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Banfield Park</td>
<td>London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham</td>
<td>Attractive public park with children's play facilities on site.</td>
<td>Site surrounded by high density residential while a development site across the road is being managed by St George.</td>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>Provision for young people and teenagers</td>
<td>Local Authority</td>
<td>General public access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King George's Park</td>
<td>London Borough of Wandsworth</td>
<td>Attractive public park with a wide range of formal recreation provision including tennis courts, bowls and children's play facilities.</td>
<td>This park is located in a residential area on the southern edge of Wandsworth Town Centre.</td>
<td>Local Park</td>
<td>Provision for young people and teenagers</td>
<td>Local Authority</td>
<td>General public access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterman's Green</td>
<td>London Borough of Wandsworth</td>
<td>Site located next to Putney Bridge.</td>
<td>Pocket Park</td>
<td>Local Authority</td>
<td>General public access</td>
<td>Single Access point</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York Gardens</td>
<td>London Borough of Wandsworth</td>
<td>Public park with children's play facilities (York Gardens Adventure Play Park).</td>
<td>Site situated next to a busy road and surrounded by mixed residential land-use.</td>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>Provision for young people and teenagers</td>
<td>Local Authority</td>
<td>General public access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremorne Gardens</td>
<td>Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea</td>
<td>Attractive Small Local Park with some amenity value.</td>
<td>Site located next to the Thames with residential developments to the north and west.</td>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>Provision for young people and teenagers</td>
<td>Local Authority</td>
<td>General public access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea Bridge Gardens</td>
<td>Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea</td>
<td>Small semi-natural green space on the bank of the Thames.</td>
<td>Site located next to Chelsea Bridge and the Thames.</td>
<td>Local Authority</td>
<td>No public access</td>
<td>Single Access point</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranelagh Gardens</td>
<td>Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea</td>
<td>Wooded area with public footpaths.</td>
<td>Site located beside the embankment and near Chelsea Bridge.</td>
<td>Local Park</td>
<td>Other publicly owned and managed</td>
<td>General public access</td>
<td>Restricted but accessible from all directions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea</td>
<td>Site is located on foreshore and consists of no open space (as defined by PPG17) which could be potentially affected.</td>
<td>Site is located on the foreshore, to the north of the site is Chelsea Embankment road and beyond that Ranelagh Gardens, To the north east is Chelsea Bridge Gardens</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other publicly owned and managed</td>
<td>No public access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table C.2 Value information (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Open Space</th>
<th>Q.8 Role / Function</th>
<th>Q11. Structural role</th>
<th>Q12. Amenity Role</th>
<th>Q13.a) Heritage Designations</th>
<th>Q13(b) Open Space Contemporary with Surroundings?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formal Rec.</td>
<td>Informal Rec.</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>Biodiversity</td>
<td>Cultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>0 1 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 1 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Realm in front of Vauxhall Cross</td>
<td>0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>0 1 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehall Gardens</td>
<td>0 1 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackfriars Bridge Foreshore</td>
<td>0 1 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Edward Memorial Park</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 0 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 0 1 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deptford Church Street</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre</td>
<td>1 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Banfield Park</td>
<td>1 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 0 1 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King George's Park</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 0 1 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterman's Green</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York Gardens</td>
<td>1 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 0 1 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremorne Gardens</td>
<td>0 1 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 0 1 0 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea Bridge Gardens</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranelagh Gardens</td>
<td>0 1 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Table C.3 Value information (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Open Space</th>
<th>Q14. Conservation and Heritage</th>
<th>Q15. Environmental Value</th>
<th>Q.16 Education Role</th>
<th>Q.17 Cultural Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natural Features</td>
<td>Landscape Features</td>
<td>Buildings and Structures</td>
<td>Strengths / Problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Realm in front of Vauxhall Cross</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehall Gardens</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackfriars Bridge Foreshore</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Edward Memorial Park</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deptford Church Street</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Banfield Park</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King George's Park</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterman's Green</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Railing and bridge structure require maintenance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York Gardens</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremorne Gardens</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea Bridge Gardens</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>There is little evidence of site management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranelagh Gardens</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Open Space</td>
<td>Q18. Active Recreation</td>
<td>Q18. Informal Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pitch Sports</td>
<td>Pitch Sports</td>
<td>Court Sports</td>
<td>Court Sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Realm in front of Vauxhall Cross</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehall Gardens</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackfriars Bridge Foreshore</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Edward Memorial Park Foreshore</td>
<td>minor</td>
<td>dedicate d provision</td>
<td>minor</td>
<td>dedicate d provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deptford Church Street</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barn Elms School Sports Centre</td>
<td>major</td>
<td>dedicate d provision</td>
<td>major</td>
<td>dedicate d provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Banfield Park</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King George's Park</td>
<td>minor</td>
<td>informal</td>
<td>major</td>
<td>dedicate d provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterman's Green</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York Gardens</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremorne Gardens</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea Bridge Gardens</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranelagh Gardens</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table C.5 Value information (4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Open Space</th>
<th>Q19. Children’s Play</th>
<th>Q22. Indications of Informal Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of items</td>
<td>Design Lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rebound wall</td>
<td>Skateboarding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sheltered seating</td>
<td>Putting green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Padding pool</td>
<td>Putting green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseball area</td>
<td>Informal games area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seating</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specify</td>
<td>BMX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Basketball Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kick about area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dog Walking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provision of other amenities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Realm in front of Vauxhall Cross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehall Gardens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackfriars Bridge Foreshore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Edward Memorial Park</td>
<td>6 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 LEAP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deptford Church Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Banfield Park</td>
<td>3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 Local Playable Space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King George's Park</td>
<td>10 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 LEAP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterman's Green</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York Gardens</td>
<td>14 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 Other Adventure Play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremorne Gardens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea Bridge Gardens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranelagh Gardens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C.1.2 Question 20 and Q21 in the proforma referred to sports pitch provision. Given the nature of the sites only 4 of the sites include sports provision, and therefore the information from these questions is summarised below rather than include tabulated responses for all questions on all sites.

- **King Edward Memorial Park**
  - 1 hard landscape pitch, enclosed, fair quality
  - Tennis 4 hard surface Courts, all enclosed, 2 good quality 2 fair
  - Bowls 1 grass pitch, enclosed, good quality
  - Changing facilities

- **Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre**
  - Five-a-side football 6 pitches, fair quality
  - Cricket 3 grass pitches, good quality
  - Touch Rugby 4 pitches, good quality
  - Aussie Rules 1 pitch, good quality
  - Rounders 4 pitches, good quality
  - 2 All-weather pitch, enclosed, good quality
  - Tennis 14 hard surface Courts, all enclosed, 14 fair quality
  - Athletics 1 grass track, good quality
  - Changing facilities, good quality

- **King George’s Park**
  - Junior football 2 pitches
  - Cricket 1 grass pitch
  - Tennis 10 hard surface Courts, all enclosed, 10 good quality
  - Bowls 1 grass pitch, enclosed, good quality
  - Changing facilities
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Open Space</th>
<th>Welcoming</th>
<th>Healthy and Safe</th>
<th>Clean and Well Maintained</th>
<th>Management Comments</th>
<th>Community Involvement Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Welcoming</td>
<td>Good and safe access</td>
<td>Signage</td>
<td>Equal access for all</td>
<td>Safe equipment and facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Realm in front of Vauxhall Cross</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehall Gardens</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackfriars Bridge Foreshore</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Edward Memorial Park</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deptford Church Street</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Banfield Park</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King George's Park</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterman's Green</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York Gardens</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremorne Gardens</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea Bridge Gardens</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranelagh Gardens</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Open Space</td>
<td>Q.24. Physical Character</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natural Heathland</td>
<td>Natural Woodland</td>
<td>Wetland</td>
<td>Scrubland</td>
<td>Unimproved Meadows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Realm in front of Vauxhall Cross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehall Gardens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackfriars Bridge Foreshore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Edward Memorial Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deptford Church Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Banfield Park</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King George's Park</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterman's Green</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York Gardens</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremorne Gardens</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea Bridge Gardens</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranelagh Gardens</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table C.7 Quality information (2)
### Table C.8 Quality information (3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Open Space</th>
<th>Mature Tree Coverage</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Shrub and Bushes</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Formal planted gardens</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Arboriculture and woodland management</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albert Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Realm in front of Vauxhall Cross</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehall Gardens</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>Deciduous</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackfriars Bridge Foreshore</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Edward Memorial Park</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>Deciduous</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deptford Church Street</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ashlone Wharf - Beverly Brook outfall works taking place. The area affected by these works overlaps with the proposed Barn Elms site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Banfield Park</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King George's Park</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterman's Green</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>Deciduous</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>Deciduous</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York Gardens</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>The proposed project site would be situated next to the adventure play park and as a result may have an impact on the facility during the construction phase.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremorne Gardens</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>A short pier runs into the Thames from this park.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea Bridge Gardens</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranelagh Gardens</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendices

Appendix D: Description of works

D.1 Project context

D.1.1 At present, untreated sewage mixed with rainwater (combined sewage) regularly overflows into the River Thames from London’s Victorian sewerage system via combined sewer overflows (CSOs).

D.1.2 Combined sewage discharges must be reduced in order to comply with relevant wastewater legislation. The primary objective of the proposed Thames Tideway Tunnel project (the ‘project’) is to control discharges from CSOs in order to meet the requirements of the European Union’s Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive (91/271/EEC) (UWWTD) and the related United Kingdom (UK) Urban Waste Water Treatment Regulations 1993. Other European Union and UK legislation also forms part of the legal framework within which the project is to be designed and delivered. The Water Framework Directive, and the regulations that transpose it into UK law, set out various ‘environmental objectives’ to be achieved in relation to surface water quality.

D.1.3 Solutions to the problem of wastewater discharges into the tidal reaches of the River Thames have been under examination for more than ten years. The project has been determined to be the most technologically-sound and cost-effective means of controlling CSO discharges and satisfying regulatory requirements. This has been confirmed by independent studies and by Thames Water.

D.2 The proposed solution

D.2.1 The project would control CSO discharges by intercepting and diverting combined sewage flows into a new storage and transfer tunnel. The tunnel would run from Acton Storm Tanks in west London to Abbey Mills Pumping Station in the east, where it would connect to the Lee Tunnel, which would transfer the flows to Beckton Sewage Treatment Works for treatment.

D.2.2 The new infrastructure would protect the tidal Thames from increasing pollution for at least the next 100 years. The current assumption is that construction would commence in 2016 and be completed by 2023.

D.2.3 The project forms part of the wider London Tideway Improvements scheme, which includes the Lee Tunnel project and improvements at Mogden, Crossness, Longreach and Riverside Sewage Treatment Works, and a major capacity extension at Beckton Sewage Treatment Works to treat flows collected by the Thames Tideway and Lee tunnels.

D.3 Planning context

D.3.1 The National Policy Statement for Waste Water, which was designated on 26 March 2012, clearly states that the need for the project has been
demonstrated. It concludes that “detailed investigations have confirmed the case for a Thames Tunnel\(^{11}\) as the preferred solution” (para. 2.6.33).

**D.3.2** On 22 June 2012, the Secretary of State made the Infrastructure Planning (Waste Water Transfer and Storage) Order 2012 pursuant to Section 14(3) of the Planning Act 2008 (as amended by the Localism Act 2011) (the ‘2008 Act’). This order created a new category of Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) into which the project falls. Following the making of the order, the project formally became an NSIP to which the procedures under the 2008 Act apply.

**D.3.3** The Planning Inspectorate is responsible for examining applications for NSIPs, which are granted in the form of Development Consent Orders. The Secretary of State has assumed responsibility under the 2008 Act for deciding such applications and will judge the application for development consent for the project primarily on the basis of the policies in the National Policy Statement for Waste Water.

**D.3.4** Promoters of applications for development consent must undertake pre-application public consultation and publicity and have regard to feedback prior to submission of the application. The planning team has therefore carried out extensive consultation and publicity in accordance with the relevant statutory requirements.

**D.4 Project overview**

**D.4.1** The project comprises two principal elements:

a. **tunnels:**
   i. the main tunnel
   ii. connection tunnels.

b. **sites:**
   i. main tunnel sites
   ii. CSO sites
   iii. system modification sites
   iv. Beckton Sewage Treatment Works.

**D.5 Tunnels**

**Main tunnel**

**D.5.1** The main tunnel would capture and store combined sewage from the unsatisfactory CSOs along its route and transfer it to Beckton Sewage Treatment Works.

---

\(^{11}\) The project changed its name from the Thames Tunnel project to the Thames Tideway Tunnel project in July 2012.

\(^{12}\) In this case, the Secretaries of State for the Department for Communities and Local Government and the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs will act as joint decision maker.
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D.5.2 The horizontal alignment of the main tunnel would generally follow the River Thames, where possible and practical, in order to:
   a. ensure the most efficient route to connect the CSOs located on both banks of the river
   b. enable river transport during construction to supply and remove materials, where practicable and economic
   c. minimise the number of structures the tunnel would pass beneath in order to reduce the number of third parties affected.

D.5.3 The main tunnel route would take the shortest line from Acton Storm Tanks to the River Thames and stay beneath the river from west London to Rotherhithe. It would then divert from beneath the River Thames to the northeast via the Limehouse Cut and terminate at Abbey Mills Pumping Station, where it would connect to the Lee Tunnel.

D.5.4 The main tunnel would be approximately 25km long with an approximate internal diameter of 6.5m in the west increasing to 7.2m through central and east London. The approximate depth of the tunnel would be between 30m in west London and 65m in the east in order to provide sufficient clearance to existing tunnels and facilities under the city and meet the hydraulic requirements.

**Connection tunnels**

D.5.5 Two long connection tunnels would be required in order to connect five remote CSOs to the main tunnel. The tunnels are known as:
   a. the Frogmore connection tunnel (approximately 3m internal diameter and approximately 1.1km long), which would be situated in the London Borough of Wandsworth
   b. the Greenwich connection tunnel (approximately 5m internal diameter and approximately 4.6km long), which would pass through the London boroughs of Southwark and Lewisham and the Royal Borough of Greenwich.

D.5.6 A series of nine shorter connection tunnels would also be necessary to connect various CSOs that would be close to the proposed alignment of the main tunnel.

**D.6 Site types**

D.6.1 The Environment Agency has identified 34 ‘unsatisfactory’ CSOs that the project needs to address. CSO control studies and design development have established that 14 of these CSOs could be controlled indirectly, which reduces the number of worksites required.

D.6.2 Main tunnel sites would be used to construct the main tunnel as ‘drive sites’ and/or ‘reception sites’, depending on the direction in which the TBM would be driven. The five main tunnel sites include:
   a. Acton Storm Tanks (main tunnel reception site and CSO interception site)
b. Carnwath Road Riverside (main tunnel drive and reception site; Frogmore connection tunnel reception site)

c. Kirtling Street (main tunnel double drive site)

d. Chambers Wharf (main tunnel drive and reception site; Greenwich connection tunnel reception site)

e. Abbey Mills Pumping Station (main tunnel reception site).

D.6.3 A total of 16 CSO sites would be used to construct the CSO interception structures and associated connection tunnels, as follows.

a. Two CSO sites would be used to drive long connection tunnels:
   i. Dormay Street (Frogmore connection tunnel drive site)
   ii. Greenwich Pumping Station (Greenwich connection tunnel drive site).

b. One CSO site would be used to receive a long connection tunnel:
   i. King George’s Park (Frogmore connection tunnel reception site).

c. Nine CSO sites would also be used to construct short connection tunnels to the main tunnel:
   i. Hammersmith Pumping Station (Hammersmith connection tunnel)
   ii. Barn Elms (West Putney connection tunnel)
   iii. Putney Embankment Foreshore (Putney Bridge connection tunnel)
   iv. Falconbrook Pumping Station (Falconbrook connection tunnel)
   v. Cremorne Wharf Depot (Lots Road connection tunnel)
   vi. Chelsea Embankment Foreshore (Ranelagh connection tunnel)
   vii. Heathwall Pumping Station (Heathwall/SWSR connection tunnel)
   viii. Albert Embankment Foreshore (Clapham/Brixton connection tunnel)
   ix. Victoria Embankment Foreshore (Regent Street connection tunnel).

d. Four CSO sites would connect directly either to the main tunnel or to a long connection tunnel via a drop-shaft:
   i. Blackfriars Bridge Foreshore (main tunnel)
   ii. King Edward Memorial Park Foreshore (main tunnel)
   iii. Deptford Church Street (Greenwich connection tunnel)
   iv. Earl Pumping Station (Greenwich connection tunnel).

D.6.4 Two system modification sites would be used to control CSOs by locally altering the operation of the existing sewerage system rather than intercepting and connecting them to the main tunnel:

a. Shad Thames Pumping Station (Shad Thames Pumping Station CSO)

b. Bekesbourne Street (Holloway Storm Relief CSO).
The Beckton Sewage Treatment Worksite would be used to:

a. extend the pumping capacity of the treatment works by installing two pumps in the Tideway Pumping Station and pipeline works to transfer the flows from this pumping station to the inlet works

b. install additional mechanical and electrical equipment at the inlet works

c. construct two shafts and a siphon tunnel to transfer tunnel overflows to the Lee Tunnel overflow shaft.

**D.7 Above-ground permanent works**

D.7.1 Some permanent above-ground infrastructure would be required, which would vary according to the type of site. This infrastructure might include:

a. structures in the foreshore at seven sites which would enclose the below-ground functional infrastructure

b. air management facilities at all sites and would include ventilation structures and ventilation columns, which would typically be 4m to 8m high, with a maximum height of 15m at two sites: Acton Storm Tanks and Carnwath Road Riverside

c. electrical and control equipment housed in a kiosk structure at most sites, but at some sites they would be housed in existing Thames Water site buildings.

d. a means of access at all sites

e. areas of hardstanding adjacent to shafts and/or structures to enable periodic inspection and maintenance at all sites.

D.7.2 Maintenance visits would be required approximately every three to six months for above-ground equipment inspections and every ten years for tunnel system and shaft inspections.

D.7.3 Construction sites would be restored on completion of the works by means of levelling, in-filling, landscaping and making good.
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