

Document	Comment	Response
Environmental Statement	5.22 – something that comes up later on in other documents too. This sentence suggests the level 26 access is by stairs only, without an accessible option.	<p>The ES provides only a summary of the scheme design in order to remain a suitable focused and accessible document, it should be read alongside the DAS for a full scheme description. P176 of the DAS states:</p> <p><i>"An office terrace, set discretely apart from the public terrace, is included at level 26. To minimize the building's height the office lifts terminate at level 23 and the final transfer to the roof terrace is provided by an external grade platform lift."</i></p> <p>This clarification has no material impact on the effects set out in the ES.</p>
	6.7-6.9 – appendix 6.1 and the phasing drawings in the CEMP do not separately list the works to the listed terrace, which is shown to be the construction offices. I couldn't see them referenced in section 6.34-6.43 either. Does the 44 month programme include these demolition, construction and fit out works too?	These contain the works to the terraces: Month 21 – Month 32.
	6.48 – this comes up a few times. I think the allowed working hours on Saturdays are 9am to 2pm, not an 8am start.	Noted. This should have stated 9am start on Saturdays, and it is anticipated that this will be subject to planning condition. However, this does not change the findings of the EIA.
	7.25 – the Transport Assessment does not include a copy of the consolidation report. See TA comments later.	This can be issued separately.
	7.99 – given the proposed scheme proposes/assumes widening of the St Thomas Street pavement to accommodate its cycle parking, does the proposal assume or rely on a particular layout will happen? 7.130 doesn't mention the St Thomas Street works.	<p>The proposed development is not reliant on a particular layout of St Thomas Street and can operate successfully if the one-way proposals are not taken forward by TfL or should the road operate one-way eastbound. The successful operation of the scheme has been provided for the following:</p> <p>- Drawing 30848/AC/84: Operation of the service yard with St Thomas Street operating one-way eastbound.</p> <p>- Drawing 30848/AC/85: Operation of the service yard with St Thomas Street operating two-way, assuming the TfL proposals for the road do not go ahead.</p> <p>- Drawing 30848/AC/86: This shows how short cycle parking can be accommodated within the dissused parking bays should the TfL proposals and the footway widening did not go ahead.</p>
	7.131 – what are the proposed Kings Head Yard improvements referenced? The highway is outside the application site, so please clarify what pedestrian improvement works you are proposing.	The improvements to Kings Head Yard include provision of an active frontage with a new public square fronting the Kings Head public house and paving enhancements to Kings Head Yard itself.
	7.144 – see comments below on the separate Space Syntax report's figures and assumptions on whether there are benefits to pedestrian comfort and numbers on St Thomas Street, and whether the Beak Alley route is being provided.	There are benefits to pedestrian comfort on St Thomas Street as shown within the Space Syntax report. Pedestrians will be able to continue to travel through the site to make a connection with Beak Alley.
	7.151 – is there an effect on the Santander cycle hire?	The Proposed Development will provide high quality cycle parking and associated facilities to cater for the demand for cycle parking from the site. The additional demand for the hire bikes is not expected to be significant. At present, TfL do not provide data usage for the existing docking stations, other than in real time and therefore only TfL can carry out such an assessment.
	8.66 "Access to the service area is off White Hart Yard and St Thomas Street" – is this an error, or are the rear doors in the servicing yard intended to be used day to day (contrary to the other documents)?	This is a typographic error. The on-site service yard is accessed from St. Thomas Street. Access from St Thomas Street was assessed in Chapter 8 in line with the scheme description.
	11.95 – Thames Water in their consultation response have raised issues with network capacity.	Discussions are ongoing with TW. We would note that despite the outstanding consultation at the time of submission, it is Thames Water's statutory duty to ensure that sufficient capacity exist in the foul water drainage system (including sewage treatment and network infrastructure) to cope with the demands of existing and future population demands. Accordingly, it is considered likely that the Proposed Development would still have an insignificant effect upon the capacity of foul water drainage infrastructure and sewage treatment works.
	Separate request to resend the drainage appendix as the figures seem to be missing on the version I look at.	The submitted Drainage Strategy contains the schematic attenuation layout drawings as an appendix. Please confirm which figures are being referred to?
	Chapter 13 – I didn't get very far with the "Assessment of likely significant effects" section as I didn't follow why there were so many changes in the properties, windows etc that have been tested.	GIA to issue consolidated response to LBS daylight and sunlight comments (including comments issued on 09/09/2021) on w/c 13/09/2021.
	Comparing the number of properties/windows/rooms tested in the 2018 ES, there appear to be some differences – maybe for good reason, but not explained. E.g. Iris Brook House previously had 71 windows tested, Orchard Lisle House had 131 windows tested, Shard Place had 519 (now 988), Guys Chapel had one more window before. "St Thomas Church" is residential in the tower not solely a church converted to a restaurant in 13.138. New properties are now tested including another 48 "Guy's Campus" windows (I haven't spotted which page of the window maps they are), Southwark Cathedral annex, the hotel at 10-18 London Bridge Street, Shepherds House, and 24 Southwark Street - but not 8 Borough High Street even though there are window maps for it. As a broader tower it would likely affect more properties near the western side of the site (and more significantly affect windows/rooms that may have passed in the previous application) than the 2018 proposal, and I need to work through these in more detail to find the logic in the differences and understand the impacts. Comments from you on why the number of windows/rooms have changed with the same assessed properties would help (or point me to where this is in the submission if it's already there). If this current proposed scheme causes more light impacts those additional harms may form a further reason for refusal.	GIA to issue consolidated response to LBS daylight and sunlight comments (including comments issued on 09/09/2021) on w/c 13/09/2021.
	Then the next bit that I didn't follow with was in paragraph 13.124 – Table 13.8 shows that of the 1255 rooms assessed for NSL, only 890 (70.9%) would meet the BRE criteria, not the 1031 stated in the paragraph. Which figure is correct, and do the later commentary paragraphs need updating?	GIA to issue consolidated response to LBS daylight and sunlight comments (including comments issued on 09/09/2021) on w/c 13/09/2021.
	The commentary section on sun hours on ground (page 38) doesn't refer to the News Buildings Public Plaza in 13.292 as those results are for the roof terrace, not the ground level public realm at the south-eastern end of the building. This area is shown to have a reduction from 25% down to 13%. So what classification is that effect given?	GIA to issue consolidated response to LBS daylight and sunlight comments (including comments issued on 09/09/2021) on w/c 13/09/2021.
Design and Access Statement	Adds useful detail to the drawings, although we disagree that the height and form of the proposal are appropriate for this historic site and area.	Understood.
	Page 95 – what does the service entrance look like? A box is suggested here and on the proposed north elevation drawing – is that some form of entrance archway, shutter etc in front of the angled yard entrance set back from the road?	The area on page 95 is part of the side elevation of the extension behind Conybeare House. There are no shutters or gates proposed in this area. The shutter / gate is proposed only to the entrance into the loading bay within the footprint of the building. It is shown on page 87.
	Page 98 – where is the toilet provision for the Keats House affordable workspace? With the Georgian terrace not being wheelchair accessible, and Keats House's entrance improved to be accessible there needs to be accessible toilet provision in Keats House.	Keats House forms part of the overall affordable workspace linked with footprint of the main building behind. Full WC provision including accessible WCs are provided within the main building on levels 03 and 04 immediately adjacent to Keats House and both can be accessed via lift. This maximises the space available within Keats House.
	105 – are the very tall street trees shown in the visuals likely to happen above the pavements and utilities below?	<p>The three trees are proposed to enhance the quality of St Thomas Street and was an aspiration Southwark advised during early discussions. Given existing utilities surveys (conducted prior to Covid – implementation of temporary wider footpaths) the project team feel that there is an opportunity to coordinate new tree pits alongside existing services as well as the underground vaults. Trail pits would be proposed at the next stage to open up the areas proposed to further examine the vault construction and confirm service diversions required. Additional measures such as root guides and barriers will be added to protect the back wall of the vaults.</p>
	The pavement cycle parking indicated (outside GPE's ownership given its public highway) means the St Thomas pavement isn't widened much to address the pedestrian congestion. Could visitor cycle parking be included between the gallery columns at the rear of the listed buildings and/or other locations to improve the on-site (GPE's ownership) provision and take up less public highway space?	The proposed widening of the footway allows this route to accommodate some of the visitor cycle parking. There is also some visitor cycle parking provided to the rear of Georgian terrace in the corner subject to least projected pedestrian movement (as it is positioned clear of the desire line). Our intention is to avoid using the new gallery route to provide cycle parking, as one of the key objectives of this route is to ease pedestrian congestion in this east-west direction.
	Page 148 says that no HGV servicing has been assumed, although the ES and TA refer to HGV servicing.	No HGVs are required for servicing deliveries – which will be managed via smaller vehicles and the consolidation centre, however as per the stated preference of TfL and Southwark, refuse vehicles will make use of the onsite loading bay for waste collections.
	Page 156 – the Beak Alley is shown to be the primary route for firefighting, but its width to provide the access for fire fighters to the stairs requires access over an adjoining site. Not clear whether relieving work is necessary in this area too.	This page contents has been updated in the Addendum document following a meeting with the LFB – the existing NCC site is currently accessed via fire tenders using Beak Alley – for which there is a retained right of access with the hospital. For the new scheme, 2no. tenders will access King's Head Yard (as per existing conditions) and all remaining tenders will use St. Thomas Street and congregate via the fire command centre set within Keats House.
	Page 173 – similar question on what work is the applicant proposing along Beak Alley, how much of what is shown in the right-hand diagram is new work, and is it being committed to as part of this application? The width within the red line doesn't look to be wide enough to be useable. With the level changes behind the hospital buildings is this route possible? Does the public have the right to use it currently or in the future – presumably another owner would need to agree this?	The definition of Beak Alley terminates at the southern boundary of the site, and given it is currently accessible to both emergency vehicles / on foot – no works are proposed to relevel this area. To the area of external space set between the eastern boundary of the site and the adjacent GST hospital estate, negotiation will be required to revise the levels to enable the creation of a suitable accessible route that can negotiate the level change between St. Thomas Street and Beak Alley – existing legal framework exists for such negotiations. Whilst there is no current right of way north-south across the site / hospital land – there will be a new public route created north-south predominantly across GPE land – which would be retained / maintained as private land.
	Page 176 seems to be the only mention of a platform lift up to the top roof terrace.	The upper floor terrace provided separately for office tenants only, will have a suitable lifting platform – to avoid any visibility of a lift over run.
	Page 178 has a confusing sentence "Public WCs are provided at level 23 inclusive of accessible provision. These facilities are separate to those for the amenity space". Should it be level 24 rather than 23, or is there something more complicated than the floorplan drawing P144 suggests? And what does the second sentence mean? Further down the same page there's another sentence referring to amenity space which I don't think means the planning term of amenity – "Space and plumbing is provided to install accessible WCs as part of the amenity space fit-outs" – does it mean the restaurant area instead?	<p>Apologies, the amended text below:</p> <p><i>"Public terrace WCs are provided on Level 24, including accessible provision. There are separate toilet facilities (inclusive of accessible provision) provided for the rooftop restaurant / café, both for visitors and the staff."</i></p> <p><i>"Both plumbing and spatial allowances are provided to install the toilet facilities as a part of the restaurant / café fitouts."</i></p>
Planning Statement	Now that you have had the consultee responses, are you able to set out in better detail the heads of terms you would agree to?	Please find enclosed an updated draft heads of terms schedule.
Drawing Pack	Level 26 floorplan – the office tenant terrace appears to only be accessible by stairs. How would wheelchair users or those who can't use stairs get to this amenity space? See comment above on DAS.	There will be a platform lift from L24 to L26.
	The elevation drawings show the level 26 terrace dotted but is not detailed. Is this element of the proposal not definite?	This is a glazed balustrade and is part of the proposed development.
Listed Building Study	Page 55, where do types A1 and A2 feature - are they the eastern flank of no. 16 given they are shown at the end?	Wall type E applies to the eastern No.16 elevation / side wall. A1/A2 are applied to parts of the rear wall elevation at level L00 only to no.4-12 only. Given the wall constructions are quite complex and the LBC report includes an overview – we would suggest a detailed review of the proposed drawings that accompany the LBC application will provide greater clarity on a floor by floor basis.
	Page 15 and 56 – note that slightly more historic fabric being lost on the ground level to provide the stairwell (orange on page 15, losing curved above) than the 2018 scheme. Is that correct?	Page 15 shows the fabric that was altered previously – i.e. not connected with the current proposal, which we believe did result in the loss of some of the original fabric associated with the curved walls to original staircase positions. All existing curved wall fabric at ground floor level is to be maintained and reinstated where required to suit any reintroduction of staircases – as per the detailed drawings submitted with the LBC. On Page 56 there is a simple graphical representation of where stairs are being reinstated – which include an overlap with the front rooms – this is a graphical misalignment only and not representative of any proposed demolition.
	Page 61 – change to the chimney widths to no. 16, and proposed openings. Page 61 – query if the width of no. 14 is correctly shown on the right-hand image as it appears a lot wider behind no. 16 on the rear, when it doesn't seem to project that far on the floorplans.	<p>Width of 14 vs 16 is correct.</p> <p>Chimney query answered on p 60.</p> <p>Additional windows on the end wall of no. 16 were added to activate the St Thomas Square and provide connectivity between the office floor and the public realm.</p>
	Section 5 - What investigation work has been done to see whether the suggested tree planting on St Thomas Street is possible? Would the locations accord with the SSDM (I think it's a minimum 5m distance required between trunk and building façade)?	Please see response in row 24 above. Further work is being undertaken regarding the tree locations in relation to the existing buildings.

Landscaping Strategy	<p>Beak Alley connection – most of this alley is outside the application site, so what is the applicant proposing or committing to in this application? Is it already a public route or would the owner(s) agree to make it a public route through?</p> <p>Section 12 – alternative step-free access is needed to the level 26 terrace; it cannot be stairs only. At minimum a platform lift will be needed (which might be what the second black arrow on page 100 is suggesting, but it is not clear). DAS page 176 seems to be the only mention of a platform lift.</p>	<p>Please see response in row 28 above.</p> <p>A platform lift will be provided.</p>
Statement of Community Involvement	The pie chart at the bottom of page 14 seems to be the same question as a differently coloured pie chart at the top of page 15. Is the title question wrong on one of them? It comes up again in the Development Consultation Charter where they have been copied.	Yes, this was an error. Please find enclosed the updated SCI and DCC.
Marketing Strategy	<p>1.12 - 1067sqm of affordable workspace seems to be hangover from the 2018 scheme. I assume this doesn't change other figures in the rest of the report?</p> <p>3.3 – was the Cushman and Wakefield and JLL Market Overview and Demand Analysis report for this 2021 application, or the 2018 application? E.g. 3.6 refers to auditorium and events space for hire which I hadn't seen in the 2021 proposal. Figure 4 says it was a 2021 report, so I hope that's the case to account for the 2020 pandemic changes too.</p> <p>3.20 – what are 'dry lab based users'? Would the proposed tower be able to accommodate such users in its fit out?</p>	<p>Apologies, yes, the reference was an error from the previous report. This has now been updated and does not affect the calculations. Please find enclosed an updated report.</p> <p>This was updated for the April 2021 planning submission. The specific reference to the types of uses such as events and auditorium space was a suggestion by C&W/JLL of the broad types of space that would generate strong demand in the proposed tower. Although the April 2021 submission does not include any events space, the recommendations in general have been taken into account. The Marketing Strategy has therefore not been updated in this regard.</p> <p>We have added in a footnote in the updated report to define these. Broadly these spaces are for research and development involving computers and incorporate some specialist computing equipment. These may involve additional requirements such as access to high internet speeds or high-power usage equipment, but generally can be accommodated within typical office spaces within the proposed tower.</p>
CMP	<p>Note that this is only a draft ahead of having all contractors on board and that a final, more detail would be needed if permission were granted. It hasn't been assessed in detail against the template requirements of the environmental and highways aspects the council has (plus TfL as highway authority for St Thomas Street). To flag to you in section 5.2 – I think the council's agreed Saturday working hours are 9am to 2pm (not 8am to 1pm).</p> <p>A final version required by any permission would need to be clearer on what the council will need to agree, e.g. 8.3 talks about agreement being reached on hoarding without saying who is agreeing it, then 8.3.1 talks about agreeing with the council when TfL will have its role on St Thomas Street. The final version will need to provide more detail on the actual mitigation measures – e.g. 10.9 dust management, 10.10 and 18.5 setting out where the dust monitoring points will be, 10.14 committing to the frequency of road sweeping. Section 12 a minimum of FORS silver is the current requirement. The appendix B phasing diagrams don't seem to include rebuilding Keats House or the works to the listed buildings (which are to be used for site offices and welfare), which suggests the overall construction programme would be longer. Does this affect the ES assumptions, and if so how?</p>	<p>Noted - these changes can be picked up in the final version.</p> <p>Noted - these changes can be picked up in the final version. The construction programme captures all the works required and is consistent with the ES assumptions.</p>
Fire Statement	The GLA questioned the qualifications of the authors, and requested a declaration of compliance in a revised statement. No comments from me other than the DAS query on the firefighting route being outside the site.	Please find enclosed an updated Fire Statement.
Pedestrian Movement Forecast	<p>Note that the modelling assumes the Beak Alley route will be made available as part of the proposal – see questions elsewhere about whether the applicant is committing to providing this off-site route, whether it is a public route, whether it needs releveling to provide flush access etc.</p> <p>Note that a scenario hasn't been provided that excludes widening the St Thomas Street pavement (which is not in the applicant's ownership) as part of the proposal. How do the assumed widths of the St Thomas Street pavement relate to the design TfL consulted on?</p> <p>Page 5 – the arrows along St Thomas Street in the do nothing and with scheme diagrams show a change of only 50 people, suggesting the flows though the proposal are people going into the development, instead of the proposal taking people off St Thomas Street's southern pavement. Pages 17 and 18 show no change in pedestrian number in this location.</p> <p>Page 6 – suggests the St Thomas Street would have improved comfort level. Is that taking account of the cycle parking and tree planting proposed along the southern pavement? Page 23 suggests that stationary objects have a 20cm buffer around them. The image on page 27 doesn't show anything in the pavement however.</p> <p>Page 13 – the list of 'planned developments' does not include Capital House, nor the current applications at the eastern end of St Thomas Street in the future baseline – am I reading that correctly?</p>	<p>The model includes all accessible spaces in the surrounding area and therefore also includes Beak Alley despite being outside the property boundary.</p> <p>The modelling is based on the proposed plans as the preferred solution. The proposed widths are consistent with the initial TfL proposals for St Thomas Street.</p> <p>Space Syntax has carried out a forecast for both an All day average and an AM Peak scenario. Page 5 of the report shows the AM peak forecast, which can also be found on pages 20 and 21. Pages 17 and 18 show the All day average forecast.</p> <p>The image on page 27 incorrectly showed a layout without any cycling parking and tree planting. Please find enclosed an updated report with the correct image now included. The PCL assessment table on Page 30 remains unchanged for the St Thomas Street Pavement.</p> <p>The forecast is made of three components: layout, land use, and transport variables. The planned development list refers to projects that propose changes to the street network (for example by introducing or closing a new publicly accessible route through them). Additional growth has been included by changes to land use patterns: future transport growth (London Bridge projected station demand as additional demand, and additional New City Court trips where applicable).</p>
Circular Economy and Whole Life Cycle Carbon Assessment	The GLA had technical comments on this. My only query is whether this considers the listed building works, or is it only for the new build Keats House and tower? The Georgian terrace is only a small proportion of the overall works, but I want to be clear in my report whether this document is the whole proposal (or not).	The GLA comments have been addressed in the amendments pack. The report does include Keats House and Georgian Terrace.
Delivery, Servicing and Waste Management Plan	<p>5.3.1 onwards – is the D&R study available to share? Is the hospital using the consolidation service at the moment or is the 'strategy' a document rather than a working process?</p> <p>Top of page 18 – this figure suggests all 7 different types of deliveries on the left would all be delivered separately to New City Court's receiving bay (in place of 200 GR), rather than suggesting they would be consolidated offsite and brought to NCC in one/few deliveries. I.e. it seems to show a standard arrangement, not the consolidation approach.</p> <p>End of page 18 – refers to 22 or 5 HGVs. The DAS on page 148 says that no HGV servicing has been assumed. If the DAS is correct, what does this do to the number of LGVs with and without consolidation, the number of vehicles per hour, the number on site at any time etc?</p> <p>5.5 – how long are the deliveries expected to take to unload/load in the service bays? Especially if the vehicles from the consolidation centre are filled with more deliveries to drop off, instead of just one box, they may be there for some time.</p> <p>Section 7 - Appendix A seems to show vehicles arriving from the west and exiting to the east, the reverse of the current one way street. Do these tracking drawings work the same in reverse for vehicle arriving from the east and leaving to the west?</p> <p>Section 9 – what would happen to deliveries arriving that aren't booked in through the system? Would their deliveries be refused? Or would they use the loading bay on-street and be accepted by the management anyway? What would happen with the motorcycle couriers mentioned earlier in the document? How long do the on-street restrictions allow such deliveries to park up for?</p> <p>Sections 9 and 10 don't read as being firm commitments to using off-site consolidation to achieve the reduction in vehicles set out in 5.4, and not for the numbers to creep up. If we were to grant permission the council would expect the delivery vehicle numbers to be secured with a final version of the DSP, with a monitoring fee, regular surveys post-occupation, and a deposit to be paid that would be returned if no issues arise or used for highways changes to address delivery and servicing issues.</p> <p>In a pre-application meeting there was a suggestion from the applicant team that the servicing area could be used for other activities (such as a food market) when not in use. I haven't seen that mentioned here so will assume that is not part of the proposal – and probably best to keep it as simply a servicing yard at this stage.</p>	<p>Please see enclosed TPP response.</p> <p>Please see enclosed TPP response.</p> <p>Please see enclosed TPP response.</p> <p>Please see enclosed TPP response.</p> <p>Please see enclosed TPP response.</p> <p>Please see enclosed TPP response.</p> <p>Please see enclosed TPP response.</p> <p>Please see enclosed TPP response.</p>
Transport Assessment	<p>4.5.2 – suggests the number of HGVs will be minimised, not ruled out.</p> <p>4.7.6 – a long row of visitor cycle spaces are outside GPE's site. Where would these go if the highway authority does not agree this many spaces can go in the indicative highway layout (given this isn't the current St Thomas Street arrangement, and TfL's design is not finalised)? As these on-street spaces cannot be guaranteed, the under provision would need to be flagged in the Committee report. No mention later in the report of cycle hire demand being addressed.</p> <p>4.8.2 – could delivery vehicles under 7.5 tonnes use the two-way road?</p> <p>4.8.4 and 4.8.5 - what if this assumption in 4.8.4 turns out to be incorrect. If TfL's two-way design is kept can the pavement cycle parking and pavement widening still be provided, the servicing yard turning and visibility still ensured? In 4.8.5, where do I see the scheme layout that would "operate successfully" in the submission? To see what this does to visitor cycle parking provision, pavement widths, vehicle tracking etc.</p> <p>4.10 – see separate comments on the DSWP.</p> <p>4.11/appendix A – the swept path drawings look to assume the vehicles are arriving from the west – which might be what TfL change the road to, but that's not for certain yet. Do the swept paths work the same if vehicles arrive from the east?</p> <p>5.6 – what is the logic behind walking route B – i.e. why would someone walk from the site, to the Underground entrance (but not then go onto the Underground network), then turn back on themselves to head to the Post Office and Market?</p> <p>6.8, 6.9 – see comments on the DSP, and statement in DAS about no HGVs.</p> <p>7.5 – no mention of whether the proposal would increase demand on the cycle hire docking stations in the area, or require its own station/station extension.</p>	<p>Please see enclosed TPP response.</p> <p>Please see enclosed TPP response.</p> <p>Please see enclosed TPP response.</p> <p>Please see enclosed TPP response.</p> <p>Please see enclosed TPP response.</p> <p>Please see enclosed TPP response.</p> <p>Please see enclosed TPP response.</p> <p>Please see enclosed TPP response.</p> <p>Please see enclosed TPP response.</p>
Travel Plan	5.4: what about measures to encourage Santander cycle use as well? On figure 3 there are a few more docking stations in the local area, e.g. on Snowfield and on Duke Street Hill.	Please see enclosed TPP response.
Accommodation Schedules	We had some emails back at validation stage back in April about having schedules to show each building's NIA, GIA and GEA per floor and per use, and the existing buildings' areas. I don't remember receiving new schedules?	Please find enclosed the updated area schedule which includes a breakdown of GEA, GIA and NIA for the amended areas.
Energy Strategy	Good to see a healthy reduction in carbon beyond the 35% minimum on-site	Noted.
Sustainability Statement	Note the new buildings are targeting the excellent rating, which is the minimum policy requirement rather than going beyond	Excellent' is our target however, 'Outstanding' remains an aspiration for the scheme.
Other Documents	No comments from me on the ventilation, TV and radio, telecoms, structural statement and HIA reports, other than noting where they recommend mitigation measures for any permission.	Noted.