



Meeting Minutes

Subject:	Thames Tideway Tunnel proposals in RBKC
Purpose:	Agree the scope of environmental submissions for demolition works at Cremorne Wharf Depot - Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP)
Date and time:	Wednesday 15 April 2015, 10.00-12.00
Location:	Kensington Town Hall
Attendees:	<p>RBKC Patricia Cuervo (PC), Ian Hooper (IH), Kyri Eleftheriou-Vaus (KE-V), Nayani Chandran (NC)</p> <p>TW Tim Snell (TS), Barney Forrest (BF), Nick Remfry (NR), Zoe Chick (ZC)</p>
Apologies:	RBKC: Elizabeth Fonseca (EF), Steven Roberts (SR)
Minute taker:	ZC
Doc ref:	100-OM-PNC-RBKEN-110190

Item	Action item/Notes for the record	By who	By when
1.	Introductions		
2.	Description of the works		
2.1.	<p>TS explained the context of the enabling works at Cremorne Wharf Depot. Article 3 of the DCO provides development consent to works, in accordance with the approved plans, subject to the Schedule 3 Requirements and the other Order provisions. The demolition of the depot works are specified in Schedule 1 of the DCO and are subject to relevant Requirements and provisions within the CoCP.</p> <p>TS noted that TTT informed RBKC of the appointment of the demolition contractor Coleman and Company, in compliance with the commitments in the Section 106.</p> <p>TTT have already partially discharged Requirement PW19 (baseline monitoring) and will submit PW4 for information shortly.</p> <p>Requirement PW6 requires compliance with the CoCP and includes the ability to 'agree otherwise' with the relevant planning authority.</p> <p>There are no other project wide Requirements considered appropriate to the demolition works at this time.</p> <p>Site specific Requirement CREWD1 specifies compliance with the CoCP Part B and CREWD6 relates to contaminated land.</p> <p>The CoCP Requirements both allow the local authority to 'agree otherwise'.</p> <p>TS described the demolition works at the site, which comprise of a 13.5m high steel clad building with associated weighbridge, road ramp, and ancillary single storey welfare/ office building. All existing services to the structures will be disconnected, the buildings demolished to slab level and</p>		



	any sub-surface structures back-filled with no ground required to be broken. The site will retain the existing jetty and all its boundary walls. Approximate dates from the TTT programme were provided. TS noted that these may be different to what the contractor proposes.		
3.	Requirements and consents associated with the works		
3.1.	<p>BF explained that TTT are helping out the enabling works contractors with consents. In particular TTT is undertaking a scoping exercise to agree from the long list of possible consents a proportionate list of consents that apply to the relatively limited scope and nature of the early works.</p> <p>The CoCP part A requires the contractor to produce a Construction Environmental Management Plan in line with template set out in Appendix B of the CoCP Part A. The CEMP requirements are relatively onerous and include four parts. Part one and two cover general management and environmental management and would be contract wide. Part three is a suite of supporting 'topical' CEMPs and Part four is the site specific CEMP. Of these only specific topical plans are submitted to regulators for approval.</p> <p>Of the topical plans, four are for approval by RBKC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise and vibration management plan • Air quality management plan • Community liaison plan • Construction logistics plan <p>TS explained the context and that Requirement PW6 states the CoCP Part A (and Part B) will be complied with unless otherwise agreed with the local authority (see full PW6 in section 3.4 below). If complying with the Requirement it would require Schedule 17 of the DCO to be followed, which requires a 28 day draft submission period and 56 day formal application for determination.</p> <p>The CEMPs were intended to apply to the main works but a site specific CEMP will be prepared for these enabling works, including topical sub plans.</p>		
3.2.	<p><i>Community liaison plan</i></p> <p>BF explained that it is intended the Community liaison plan (CLP) will be included in the site specific CEMP rather than as a stand-alone submission. It is considered disproportionate to prepare a standalone CLP for approval, for this limited scope of works.</p>		
3.3.	<p><i>Noise and vibration management plan</i></p> <p>Noise and vibration to be covered by a Section 61 applications.</p> <p>IH said he had spoken with Allen Summerskill at the last EHO Forum regarding TAPs. He had flagged a concern regarding a possible BF to get back to RBKC regarding Ian Hooper's concern (flagged at last EHO forum) regarding the TAPs, gaps between sound insulation being installed and noisy activities on site.</p> <p>ACTION: TTT to get back to RBKC regarding Ian Hooper's concern (flagged at last EHO forum) regarding the TAPs,</p>	BF	



	<p>gaps between sound insulation being installed and noisy activities on site.</p> <p>BF flagged that S61s also need to identify these properties.</p> <p>Post meeting note: Response provided via email by ZC on 3 June 2015</p>		
3.4.	<p><i>Air quality management plan</i></p> <p>BF explained that dust control measures are included in the CoCP and will also be within the site specific CEMP in more detail. It is proposed not to submit these following the Schedule 17 process.</p> <p>BF identified that some of the CEMP documents require approval but the documents were written with the main works contractor in mind. The contractor will be responsible for the CEMPs for approval for the main works, but TTT are helping out the smaller contractors for the smaller scale enabling works.</p> <p>BF explained that Wandsworth has agreed to this approach for the Dormay Street site</p> <p>KE-V requested sight of the submission and said she would like to think about this. Normally their comments would be regulated by the planning process.</p> <p>Action: TTT to send Dormay Street enabling works CEMP submission to RBKC for reference and information</p> <p>KE-V said that monitoring would be in place.</p> <p>BF confirmed yes</p> <p>KE-V said that the document (CoCP) was too generic and has since been superseded by new guidance.</p> <p>TS requested KE-V list all the details she would expect to see to provide to TTT.</p> <p>Action: RBKC to provide detailed list for air quality</p> <p>Post meeting note: PW6 (CoCP Part A) wording: <i>Until completion of construction the authorised development described in Schedule 1 (authorised project) shall be carried out in accordance with the CoCP Part A subject to the provisions of paragraph 11 of Part 3 of Schedule 16 to this Order and any site-specific variations made through the approval of a revised CoCP Part B, unless otherwise agreed by the relevant planning authority, in consultation with other relevant stakeholders. This requirement is subject to requirement KEMPF18.</i></p> <p>BF noted also that other plans within the CEMP would not be for local authority approval, but would be included in the document.</p>	BF	KE-V/PC
3.5.	<p>PC asked about the programme.</p> <p>BF said that the current programme forecasts early 2016 for the demolition. The contractor may make some amendments to the programme.</p> <p>BF explained that a submission would need to be made under Requirement CREWD7 (Archaeology) as the drafting of the Requirement doesn't have the flexibility for the local authority to agree otherwise.</p> <p>PC noted that it (the CEMP) doesn't say that RBKC would review the heritage and ecology elements. There may also be impacts of the listed pumping station.</p>		



	<p>Post meeting note: More details will be provided to RBKC with reference to Requirement PW8 as a method of protection is developed.</p>		
3.6.	<p><i>Land quality</i></p> <p>BF explained that a due diligence report was prepared for when TWUL purchased/leased the Cremorne site. This looked at ground water monitoring.</p> <p>NV requested a copy of the report.</p> <p>Action: TTT to provide RBKC with Cremorne Wharf due diligence report.</p> <p>Post meeting note: Documents sent via document control to PC. Received on 2 June 2015.</p> <p>BF asked whether it would be possible to agree that no formal submission is require under Schedule 17 if the documents are provided. At Dormay Street (for a substation slab), Wandsworth and the EA agreed no formal submission required.</p> <p>PC said they would need to consider this.</p> <p>NC asked whether discussions with the EA had commence. BF confirmed not yet.</p> <p>NC asked if there were any tanks on site and does the due diligence report cover unexploded ordnance (UXO)?</p> <p>BF confirmed there are no tanks on the site and explained the Environmental Statement covers UXO.</p> <p>Action: TTT to provide link to UXO section of ES</p> <p>Post meeting note: Links provided via email by ZC on 3 June 2015</p>	BF	
3.7.	<p>PC requested a list of all the consents that would come in the submission</p> <p>Action: TTT to prepare and provide the CEMP scoping table</p> <p>Post meeting note: Table provided via email by ZC on 3 June 2015</p> <p>KE-V asked how the technical memos previously provided fit into this process.</p> <p>IH referred to the requirement for monitoring during the works.</p> <p>KE-V referred to the possible impacts on air quality from waste and from river transport.</p> <p>BF said TTT are working on a feasibility study regarding more use of the river.</p> <p>KE-V referred to submission of a construction logistics plan in the CEMP instead of a traffic management plan.</p> <p>TS said this will be included in the scoping table to be produced for RBKC review.</p>	BF/ZC	
4.	AoB		
	N/A		

Next meeting (date, time, location):	tbc
Next minute taker:	tbc