

**Boris Johnson**

Mayor of London  
City Hall  
The Queen's Walk  
London SE1 2BR

Via email to: [mayor@london.gov.uk](mailto:mayor@london.gov.uk)

**Date:** 12 August 2015

Dear Boris,

**Land at Enderby Wharf, Christchurch Way, Greenwich, SE10 0AG (ref: 15/0973/F)**

I write on behalf of a number of constituents who have contacted me with concerns over the above planning application, which includes provision of a new cruise liner terminal, 477 residential units and associated tourist, community and retail facilities.

I understand that Greenwich Council has recently resolved to grant planning permission subject to various conditions. I am therefore writing to request that you use your power of call-in for the following reason:

Potential air quality impact of the development

As you may know, when at berth, ships typically use auxiliary engines to generate electrical power for communications, lighting, ventilation and other on-board equipment. Boilers (using conventional fuels) are also used to supply hot water and heating. The use of these engines, however, causes significant greenhouse gas emissions and air pollution, leading to negative health and environmental effects.

Whilst I understand the results of recent dispersion modelling have indicated that emissions arising from vessels in the proposed port will not lead to any exceedance of national air quality objectives, I remain concerned about the impact on short-term nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) concentrations, particularly in light of the growing residential population in and around the Greenwich Peninsula.

As our understanding of the sources of air pollution has improved, so too has our knowledge of its adverse effects on human health, with recent evidence suggesting the risks associated with nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) are as large, if not larger, than those arising from exposure to particulate matter (PM).<sup>1</sup>

Furthermore the advice from the World Health Organisation (WHO) is clear in stating that "it is unlikely any standard or guideline value will lead to complete protection for every individual against all possible adverse health effects of particulate matter".<sup>2</sup>

To that end, although compliance may have been demonstrated for particulate matter (PM), it is clear that by further reducing concentrations of PM, additional health benefits can be achieved. Indeed, the London Health Commission recently found that if annual PM10 levels were reduced by

---

<sup>1</sup> See the evidence of Professor Frank Kelly (Professor of Environmental Health, Kings College London) appearing before the London Assembly Environment committee on 6 November 2014:  
<http://www.london.gov.uk/moderngov/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=305&MIId=5512>

<sup>2</sup> World Health Organisation Air Quality Guidelines (2005): [http://www.who.int/phe/health\\_topics/outdoorair/outdoorair\\_aqq/en/](http://www.who.int/phe/health_topics/outdoorair/outdoorair_aqq/en/)

just five micrograms per cubic metre, London would save 150 lives a year and prevent 643 hospital admissions which currently result from pollution-related respiratory and cardiac illnesses.<sup>3</sup>

In light of the above, I would ask you to re-assess the feasibility of using of shore power to supply vessels with electrical power at Enderby Wharf in order to reduce emissions at source. I understand this is now common practice in New York and many other global cities.

While naturally I recognise the important role that sea ports play in encouraging the tourism and leisure industries, this should not come at the expense of protecting the health of Londoners or improving the quality of our city's air. I trust you will take this issue into account before making your final planning decision.

Yours sincerely,



**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM**  
**Leader of the London Assembly Liberal Democrat Group**

---

<sup>3</sup> London Health Commission, 'Better Health for London' (2014): <http://www.londonhealthcommission.org.uk/better-health-for-london/>