



Meeting minutes

Subject:	Thames Tideway Tunnel proposals in RBKC
Purpose:	Chelsea Embankment Foreshore Design Workshop
Date and time:	Tuesday 10 December 2013 12.00-16.00
Location:	Westbourne Meeting Room, The Point, Paddington
Attendees:	<p>Environment Agency (EA) Candice Albon (CA), Isobel Bain (IB)</p> <p>Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England (HBMCE) Claire Craig (CC), Timothy Jones (TJ)</p> <p>Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea (RBKC) Richard Craig (RC), Patricia Cuervo (PC)</p> <p>Transport for London (TfL) Lucy Ryan (LR)</p> <p>Thames Water (TW) Clare Donnelly (CD), Alex Gilmour (AG), Charlotte Goodwin (CG), Simon Green (SG), Michael Parsons (MP), Zoe Chick (ZC)</p> <p>Note: Detailed delegate list attached.</p>
Apologies:	TW: Andy Eccles, John Pearson
Minute taker:	ZC
Doc ref:	100-OM-PNC-RBKEN-110185

Item	Action item/Notes for the record	By who	By when
1.	Introductions		
1.1.	MP led the introductions and handed over to CD.		
2.	Agenda for the workshop		
2.1.	<p>CD explained the workshop is a result of requests by EH and RBKC to have the opportunity to revisit the illustrative design at Chelsea Embankment Foreshore (CEF)</p> <p>CD identified the running order of the day which would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the rules of engagement for the workshop; • the engineering constraints; • analysis, ideas and precedents; and • sketch options for discussion. <p>MP explained that the group could discuss and edit a live version of the design principles at the end of the session.</p> <p>CD said it was not envisaged the group would necessarily have decided on a definitive design by the end of the session, but will ideally have agreed upon design principles to inform a new design.</p> <p>CD explained three visual options had been prepared for discussion.</p> <p>MP noted that RHC were unable to attend the workshop due to the hearing but TW are meeting them 13 December 2013.</p>		



2.2.	<p><i>Rules of engagement</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parameter on site works parameter plans will not change • The design will need to not result in any materially different environmental effect • The design will not affect any land owner differently i.e. not affect the CPO. 		
2.3.	<p>IB questioned the parameters and checked that they are the worst case/max boundaries with regards of encroachment MP confirmed yes and that TW consider they have been minimised as much as possible.</p>		
3.	<p>Engineering Constraints</p>		
3.1.	<p>CD presented a visual of the proposed below ground structures at CEF and ran through the engineering constraints as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All access hatches should be above or protected by flood defences • The position of the existing CSO (off axis) • The existing river wall retains the road and services • The foreshore structure has been assessed by fluvial modelling • Structure must withstand ship impact 		
4.	<p>Analysis, ideas and precedents</p>		
4.1.	<p>CD ran through a selection of drawings and images looking at Christopher Wren's 'other' Royal Hospital at Greenwich and the historical context of the Royal Hospital Chelsea. CD discussed features such as gates, water gates and the former ozier/osier beds (willows for basket making), the former rotunda in Ranelagh Gardens in the 19th century. CD looked to other 17th century landscapes for inspiration such as Versailles, examined the use of geometry by Wren, moving on to the fashion for follies and less formal planting.</p>		
4.2.	<p>CD asked if there were any questions before moving on to the visuals. MP explained that TW had explored having one surface connecting the foreshore and the Bull Ring but TfL had been uncomfortable with this proposal. LR said she could review this outside the meeting but it was likely to be problematic because of problems with materials and referred to an example in the City of London where HGVs are damaging the road surface. MP requested examples of where setts are used on the TLRN. Action: LR to get back to TW on TfL issues with single surface and examples of setts on the TLRN.</p>	LR	
4.3.	<p>CD presented the illustrative landscape plan submitted with the application and explained that the intertidal terraces are shown as being not accessible but that floodable public realm is achievable within the parameters. TW would like to explore such matters in the discussion.</p>		



5.	Sketch options for discussion		
5.1.	CD presented and described the thought process behind the three designs produced to promote discussion at the workshop.		
5.2.	<p><i>Option 1</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Circular public realm • Less river wall lost • Lose one less lamp standard • Informed by geometry • Marking the axis on the paving • Relocated signature vent columns (within parameters) • Public realm slopes towards the river at the front of the foreshore structure • Terraces inaccessible • Formal planting of willows terrace planting • Incorporation of a water feature in the Bull Ring roundabout (RHC property) <p>All options affecting the roundabout will need to be discussed with RHC following the workshop.</p> <p>CD referred to an access hatch drawing and identified that it would not be practical to run water through the public realm near to the hatches, in response to a suggestion by RBKC.</p> <p>CD raised a possible concern with this option in that the slope and sunken area of public realm may not be overlooked enough to be safe.</p>		
5.3.	<p><i>Option 2</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oval shaped public realm • Pleached limes (or other species) around the new public realm and the Bull Ring, breaking for views along the axis • Change of kerb line in Bull Ring to echo the new foreshore public realm • Stepped public realm • Willow knot garden (inaccessible) • New trees in the Bull Ring would require the loss of parking spaces and the bus stand would need to relocate within the Bull Ring. • Planted Bull Ring roundabout with water feature. <p>Post meeting note – It was thought that five parking spaces would need to be lost but RBKC have confirmed this would be 10 residents' parking spaces as they are double bays.</p>		
5.4.	<p><i>Option 3</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No symmetry • Geometric patterns on the surface • More informal treatment of intertidal terraces. One intertidal terrace with willow and one floodable public realm 		



6.	Discussions/feedback		
6.1.	<p>TJ said that HBMCE like elements of Options 1 and 2 and consider the revised designs respond well to a challenging site, and are more appropriate than the illustrative design within the application. TJ thanked TW.</p> <p>RC said he is happy to agree with HBMCE. RC commented that the intertidal and floodable public realm of option 3 is interesting but happy to go with options 1/2.</p>		
6.2.	<p><i>Option 1</i></p> <p>MP asked the group whether they wish the two sides of the road to be connected. It is a fundamental principle of the design.</p> <p>CC said that the circle in the Bull Ring roundabout is a nice part of the procession of spaces.</p> <p>RBKC noted that they did not like the focus on geometry and science in option 1.</p>		
6.3.	<p><i>Option 2</i></p> <p>CC said the pleached trees are a good reference to the Chelsea Flower Show.</p> <p>RC asked about having pleached trees on south side only as the existing wall on the north side would echo the trees.</p> <p>CD said that the two sides would not be similar enough for people to read it as a single space.</p> <p>PC said it is imagined that the loss of parking spaces would be an issue.</p> <p>Action: PC to check use of parking spaces and whether it would be possible to lose them.</p> <p>Post meeting note: PC checked with RBKC's Transport department (James McCool) who confirmed that a report should go to the Cabinet member for his approval before the removal of the spaces is confirmed.</p> <p>LR asked whether RBKC have trees species guidelines.</p> <p>Action: LR to check with TfL horticultural team regarding trees species by the road.</p> <p>SG said it would be possible to propose a different species if limes not appropriate.</p> <p>MP noted that the pleached trees and water feature would lead to an increased maintenance liability.</p> <p>CD noted that the willows would be on the terraces rather than the main structure.</p> <p>AG commented that willow should not be planted near structures or utilities unless with root barriers.</p>	<p>PC</p> <p>LR</p>	<p>Dec 13</p> <p>Jan 14</p>
6.4.	<p><i>Option 3</i></p> <p>HBMCE noted that they were less keen on this option due to the lack of formality, and overall felt it was not suitable for the site.</p> <p>RBKC indicated they quite liked the informality of option three.</p>		
6.5.	<p>CD asked the EA for comment.</p> <p>CA said that any encroachment needs to be for operational purposes only. The EA are aware TW have acknowledged</p>		



	<p>that one of the terraces is purely for symmetry. CA asked why the wall of the terraces is so high.</p> <p>CD said that it would be at the same height as the brick in the existing river wall so it blends in. It could be lowered but depends on how formal the intertidal terrace is to be. The new wall also needs to tie into the existing river wall.</p> <p>AG said that access hatches all have to be above the flood defence level.</p> <p>IB said ideally there would be no wall at all and fully functional intertidal habitat. An EA concern is the functionality of the intertidal terraces.</p> <p>RC asked how often it would flood. RC would enjoy the dynamic of it being flooded some days and not others.</p> <p>CD said it would inundate from below through pipes in the wall at average mean high water spring tide.</p> <p>Post meeting note: IB noted that the EA preferred option is that submitted in the DCO application. Of the options discussed at the workshop Option 3 is the best as this includes an intertidal terrace (Option 3).</p> <p>CG confirmed that Chelsea Embankment Foreshore was not included in the calculations for habitat creation as intertidal terraces was only one of two options (the other being floodable public realm).</p> <p>IB asked if modelling had been carried out for just one terrace and asked whether it would affect flood levels.</p> <p>CD said the design would match the current flood level and be adaptable TE2100.</p> <p>CC said HBMCE have not yet agreed a position on TE2100 which is a very complicated issue.</p>		
6.6.	<p>MP asked how important the planting on the terraces is to design and heritage.</p> <p>CC said the formality is important and asked if possible to have formal intertidal terraces.</p> <p>RC said natural planting for the lower levels gives it an extra something over the formal South Grounds.</p> <p>MP sought clarification that all parties would like intertidal terraces.</p> <p>RC said RBKC are still interested in discussing floodable public realm.</p> <p>CD pointed out that Options 1 and 2 were both inaccessible terraces.</p> <p>SG said that the regularity of flooding would affect the tree planting.</p> <p>CA said the EA always require native species away from the flood defences so the roots do not affect the integrity of the structure.</p> <p>CD sketched a revised option to show that it could be possible to have intertidal terraces by the outer river wall and floodable public realm to the front of the structure. The height of the back of the structure has to be height shown because of the engineering below.</p> <p>IB said she could not advise as not sure about the design of intertidal terraces.</p> <p>CC said that historic environment is just one element of</p>		



	<p>sustainable development and HBMCE would not want to preclude design options.</p> <p>CA said not sure what plants would establish here.</p> <p>CC said it seems high levels of public usage is not a big issue here.</p> <p>SG identified that there would be more residents in the future because of the Chelsea Barracks development.</p> <p>RC identified that you would still be able to see the traffic under the pleached trees and asked why is this site different to the South Bank - where children go down on to the beach.</p> <p>CD identified that there is more of a drop from the edge at Chelsea Embankment Foreshore.</p> <p>CC asked if functional intertidal terraces could be incorporated into Option 2. Potential to design structured intertidal terraces graduating between formal and informal.</p> <p>The outcome of the discussion was for TW to produce a variation on Option 2 to include lower terraces than previously proposed, allowing creation of functional habitat, with a gradation from formal to informal from top to bottom of structure.</p>		
7.	Design Principles		
7.1.	CD noted that the Design Principles need to be revised to capture the workshop discussions. The points discussed and conclusions are summarised below.		
7.2.	<p><i>Lower level</i></p> <p>LR raised maintenance.</p> <p>RC confirmed RBKC still want willows.</p> <p>SG said the design principle could state "riparian species used in a formal manner" (Riparian species are those that live on or in proximity to the banks of a natural course of water)</p> <p>IB said that trees/willows are less beneficial as intertidal habitat.</p> <p>CD said they could be willow withies.</p> <p>IB said imperative that the design principles mean functioning intertidal habitat.</p>		
7.3.	<p><i>Upper level</i></p> <p>RC said this should be formal and he likes the pleached trees</p> <p>CC and RC like the ellipse</p> <p>CD would resist a design principle that ties down the shape.</p> <p>CD suggested HBMCE can say they like the elliptical shape and the pleached trees in the SoCG.</p> <p>CC said it should be regal and secure the royal element, such as at Versailles</p> <p>LR said it is difficult to move bus stands and when there is a loss of parking then people get involved.</p> <p>PC said they can investigate how well used the parking spaces are and what the council reaction may be to their</p>		



	<p>loss.</p> <p>Action: PC to report back on parking space usage and under what circumstances their loss may be acceptable.</p> <p>Post meeting note: PC checked with RBKC's Transport department (James McCool) who confirmed that a report should go to the Cabinet member for his approval before the removal of the spaces is confirmed.</p> <p>LR will discuss the tree species in the Bull Ring with colleagues and report back.</p> <p>Action: LR to investigate preferred tree species near roads with the horticultural team.</p> <p>RC said the axis would need to be clear of the pleached trees.</p> <p>CC and RC said HBMCE and RBKC could take Option 2 for the SoCG.</p>	PC	Dec 13
		LR	Dec 13
7.4.	<p><i>Specific Design Principle comments</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CHEEF.01 – remain as is • CHEEF.02 – remove option for floodable public realm • CHEEF.03 – minor amendment • CHEEF.04 – remain as is • CHEEF.05 – revise design principle in line with text agreed with RBKC for the response to ExA first written question 5.17-5.18. • CHEEF.06 – Text regarding conceiving foreshore and Bull Ring as one space to be moved into new design principle. <p>Action: RBKC to investigate the history of the bollards.</p> <p>Post meeting note: RBKC consider the bollard are most likely reproduction installed within the last 20 years – installed to prevent vehicles mounting and damaging the footway.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CHEEF.07 – minor amendment <p>Action: TfL to investigate history of the traffic island</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CHEEF.08 – minor amendment • CHEEF.09 – keep as is • CHEEF.10 - keep as is • CHEEF.11 – minor amendment • CHEEF.12 – minor amendment • CHEEF.13 – minor amendment • CHEEF.14 – regarding gate in the Ranelagh boundary. This was still to be agreed. <p>Post meeting note: National Grid now confirmed no gate required. Railings and wall will be replaced following the utilities diversion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CHEEF.15 - keep as is • CHEEF.16 – to be edited to refer to robust and durable materials. • CHEEF.17 - keep as is 	PC/RC	Dec 13
		LR	Dec 13



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CHEEF.18 – EA requested the principle to refer to the kiosks being structurally separate from the flood defences. RC said they should be visually integrated though. CHEEF.19 – Delete 		
7.5.	<p>Insert new design principle regarding conceiving the foreshore structure and Bull Ring as one space, formal landscape and mirrored on each side</p> <p>Post meeting note: inserted as CHEEF.03</p> <p>LR requested new Design Principle regarding robust and durable materials and said that red lines will be needed.</p> <p>Post meeting note: inserted as CHEEF.21</p> <p>LR commented on the TfL have had ideas for segregated cycle route along Chelsea Embankment.</p> <p>RC said RBKC would resist cycle parking and cycle hire bikes here. It should be clutter free.</p> <p>LR said that if TfL land then planning permission not required.</p> <p>LR requested TfL be sent Option 2 as a pdf.</p> <p>Action: TW to send to TfL</p> <p>Post meeting note: Sent on 20 Dec 13 with Option 1 and revised Design Principles.</p> <p>LR said TfL would be able to respond by 13 January 2014.</p> <p>MP said the response could be captured in the final SoCGs.</p> <p>Action: TfL to provide response on Chelsea items.</p>	CD/ZC	Dec 13
8.	Statement of Common Ground		
8.1.	<p>IB sought clarification of how the revised illustrative design fit within the DCO process and that revised visual would just be for HBMCE and RBKC SoCG. EA are not changing their SoCG now for the January submission.</p> <p>MP confirmed for HBMCE and RBKC only and revised visual to be sent out. The revised illustrative design would be secured by the design principles.</p> <p>Action: TW to send revised drawing asap.</p> <p>Post Meeting Notes</p> <p>Revised Design Principles issued on 19 December for comment on by 31 December 2013.</p> <p>Revised illustrative drawings sent to stakeholders 6/7 January 2013.</p>	LR	13 Jan 14

Next meeting (date, time, location):	n/a
Next minute taker:	n/a



**Chelsea Embankment Foreshore – Design Workshop
10th December 2013**

Attendees

RBKC

Patricia Cuervo - Senior Flood and Water Management Officer
Richard Craig - Senior Urban Design Officer

HBMCE

Claire Craig - Principal Adviser - Historic Places Team: London
Timothy Jones - Principal Inspector of Historic Buildings and Areas

Environment Agency

Isobel Bain - Thames Tideway Project Manager
Candice Albon - Major Projects Officer - North London

TfL

Lucy Ryan - Network Impact Assessment Manager (Central)

TW

Clare Donnelly – Lead Architect
Michael Parsons – Planning Manager (Development)
Alex Gilmour – Principal CSO Engineer
Charlotte Goodwin - Assistant Environmental Manager (West)
Simon Green - Landscape Architect and Urban Designer
Zoe Chick – Town Planner – (Central)