



Meeting minutes

Subject:	Thames Tideway Tunnel proposals in RBKC
Purpose:	Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) Meeting
Date and time:	Monday 14 January 2014, 10.00-12.00
Location:	
Attendees:	RBKC Patricia Cuervo (PC), Ashley Brooks (AB) TW John Pearson (JP), John Gullick (JG), Zoe Chick (ZC)
Apologies:	
Minute taker:	ZC
Doc ref:	100-OM-PNC-RBKEN-110184

Item	Action item/Notes for the record	By who	By when
1.	Introductions		
2.	Code of Construction Practice (CoCP)		
2.1.	<i>Air quality guidance and monitoring</i> JG explained that the CoCP monitoring text AB had requested was not an issue in principle, but he thought it was unnecessary in the CoCP as the details would be submitted as part of the Air Quality Management Plans (AQMP) for RBKC as planning authority. JG said that once the examination is over, workshops will be set up with the boroughs to take forward matters such as the AQMPs. AB thought this seems an acceptable approach.		
2.2.	<i>Dewatering</i> ZC raised the comments regarding dewatering in the RBKC response to the draft DCO and CoCP received on 30 December 2013. PC said they have no issue and agree it should be subject to the controls set out in the CoCP. PC is happy with RBKC supporting the Environment Agency on this matter.		
3.	Environmental Statement (ES)		
3.1.	<i>Air quality assessment</i> AB said she understands that the baseline concentrations and monitoring are based on figures from DEFRA. RBKC do not consider that those figures are realistic but accept that it was the only way for TW to undertake the assessment. AB and PC requested this item remain in the table of outstanding matters in the SoCG.		
3.2.	<i>Air quality receptor locations</i> AB considers that there is not enough information in the ES regarding the receptor locations. JG explained that the monitoring locations will be in the		



	<p>AQMP and by updating the details now will not change the effects and AB agreed.</p> <p>JG said that the Air Quality team will have the details of the receptor locations but at this stage it is sensible to agree to disagree.</p> <p>AB and PC requested this item remain in the table of outstanding matters in the SoCG.</p>		
4.	Requirements		
4.1.	<p><i>Land quality – CREWD07 and CHEEF11</i></p> <p>AB confirmed she is happy with the revised land quality DCO requirements.</p>		
4.2.	<p><i>Ground water monitoring – PW14</i></p> <p>PC and AB said they have no outstanding matters of ground water monitoring and it can be removed from the outstanding matters table in the SoCG.</p>		
4.3.	<p>JP said that the Requirements discussed now and to be reflected in the SoCG may change as a result of the DCO hearing on 6/7 February. Wording will therefore need to be in the SoCG to cover this.</p> <p>Action: TW to draft a caveat for the SoCG.</p> <p>Post meeting note: Text added: ‘The DCO Requirements are agreed save for CHEEF7 regarding the maximum height of the signature ventilation columns and any matters arising in respect of Cremorne Wharf Depot and Chelsea Embankment Foreshore raised at the DCO issue specific hearings on 6/7 February 2014.’</p>	TW	Jan 14
5.	Bat boxes		
5.1.	<p>JP explained that the CoCP Part B states that replacement bat habitat boxes will be installed in Cremorne Gardens.</p> <p>PC asked for wording also to go in the SoCG and enquired whether a drawing would be needed to show their proposed location in the trees agreed with the Biodiversity Officer on site.</p> <p>JP suggested the location be captured by saying in the CoCP Part B that the locations are to be agreed with RBKC.</p> <p>PC agreed this as a suitable method.</p> <p>Action: TW to add “The location shall be agreed with the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea”</p> <p>Post meeting note: The text was added for the 12 February submission.</p>	TW	Jan 14
6.	Design principles (as at 13 January submission)		
6.1.	<p>JP said that TW are talking to Royal Hospital Chelsea (RHC) this week about how to ensure RHC operational access through the Bull Ring Gate is secured through the Design principles.</p> <p>PC requested TW check the text with Richard Craig (RC) at RBKC after RHC.</p> <p>PC said RBKC would like there to be no clutter.</p>		January



	<p>them to create an addendum to the committee report.</p> <p>JP said that BLP had suggested an Article 12/17 agreement be appropriate for the highway works. PC asked if BLP had sent a draft to RBKC.</p> <p>JP said the S106 will need to be signed by Friday 7 February for the 12 February print deadline.</p> <p>PC asked whether just the HoT or the whole agreement.</p> <p>Action: JP to confirm S106 approach and Article 12/17 with RBKC.</p> <p>Post meeting note: Wording in Schedule 1 Part 3 of the S106 states the Undertaker will enter into the Highways Works Agreement with the Council prior to the Construction Phase Completion Date of the Development Site at Chelsea Embankment Foreshore. The agreement will be through article 17 of the DCO.</p> <p>JP said that TW need to know by Wed 21 January whether RBKC will be in a position to sign, otherwise TW will unfortunately have to draft a unilateral agreement.</p> <p>JP said the documents will need to be with RBKC for 30 January to enable them to be signed in time.</p> <p>Action: PC to confirm whether RBKC will be in a position to sign S106.</p>	JP	Jan 14
		PC	21 Jan
8.2.	<p><i>Property</i></p> <p>PC said that Dean Fischer (DF) will need to reply this week so the property approach and text can be agreed.</p> <p>Action: PC to chase DF</p> <p>Post meeting note: New property contact Simeon Nnyombi (SN) took over the TW case at RBKC and resolved the text for the SoCG submission.</p>	PC	Jan 14
8.3.	<p>PC requested TW send a list of things that RBKC may need to do between March and September, to enable her to prepare the Policy Manager Preeti Gulati Tyagi for when PC is on maternity leave.</p> <p>Action: TW to provide RBKC with a list of possible workload.</p> <p>Post meeting note: TW will seek to discuss with RBKC emerging management plans relating to the construction of the project. These could potentially include relevant parts of the Construction Environmental Management Plan as set out in the CoCP as well as the Consents Management Plan and any potential pre application discussions to discharge DCO requirements early works. TW will review this post the close of the examination.</p>		

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