



Meeting minutes

Subject:	Thames Tideway Tunnel proposals in RBKC
Purpose:	Post consent Thames Tideway Tunnel update
Date and time:	Friday 10 October 2014, 10.00-11.00am
Location:	Kensington Town Hall
Attendees:	RBKC Patricia Cuervo (PC), Robert Krzyszowski (RK), Steven Roberts (SR) TW Tim Snell (TS), Barney Forrest (BF), Zoe Chick (ZC)
Apologies:	RBKC: Allison Flight
Minute taker:	ZC
Doc ref:	100-OM-PNC-RBKEN-110189

Item	Action item/Notes for the record	By who	By when
1.	Introductions		
2.	Project update and DCO decision		
2.1.	<p>TS provided a project update regarding the development consent on 12 September 2014 and ran through some points of relevance to the TTT sites in RBKC in the Examining Authority's Report and Secretaries of State letter. The DCO is now the Thames Water Utilities Limited (Thames Tideway Tunnel) Order 2014 (the Order) and came into force on 24 September.</p> <p>TS explained there was an additional project-wide Requirement PW19 Baseline Monitoring (discussed further under item 3).</p> <p>TS said there were no substantive changes to the RBKC site specific Requirements.</p>		
2.2.	<p><i>London Permitting Scheme (LoPS)</i></p> <p>TS explained that LoPS is the default position and the bespoke scheme included in the draft DCO was taken out by the SoS. May add some time to programmes.</p>		
2.3.	<p><i>Safeguarding</i></p> <p>TS explained that Article 52 of the Order is the new safeguarding and the previous Safeguarding Direction was revoked on 24 September.</p> <p>PC said RBKC have received the shapefiles and there is one for sites and one for subsoil (route).</p> <p>TS asked if RBKC had received the latest guide for developers.</p> <p>PC confirmed yes and explained it is on the RBKC website now.</p>		



3.	Air quality and noise monitoring		
3.1.	<p>TS referred to the new project wide requirement PW19 which was added by the SoS for 'Baseline Monitoring'. This will formalise a process already being undertaken by TTT with the boroughs, for monitoring locations.</p> <p>TS explained that TTT had met with Preeti Gulati-Tyagi and Ian Hooper in June 2014 to discuss air quality and noise baseline monitoring locations. This Requirement is only about noise monitoring.</p> <p>TS referred to Schedule 17 of the Order 'Procedure for discharge of requirements etc and appeals'.</p> <p>RK identified this is an important schedule for the boroughs.</p>		
3.2.	<p><i>Draft application</i></p> <p>TS said that Schedule 17 states no less than 28 days before making an application, the draft should be submitted to the discharging authority for review, unless otherwise agreed with the authority.</p> <p>The Technical Memorandum has already been discussed and agreed with Ian Hooper in this instance and TS said it is hoped that RBKC may allow less time for review of the draft.</p> <p>SR asked how detailed are the method statements as the review time would depend on Ian Hooper's existing workload.</p> <p>BF said they are not too detailed and referred to the one that has been submitted in draft to London Borough of Southwark.</p> <p>RK requested sight of the Southwark draft submission so they can see the details.</p> <p>Action: Provide RBKC with the draft Southwark submission</p> <p>Post meeting note: Draft Southwark submission sent on 14 October 2014.</p>	TS	18 Oct
3.3.	<p><i>Validation</i></p> <p>ZC asked about RBKC validating the application and how they would want to receive submissions.</p> <p>SR said CDs would be best and would check if paper copies also required. The Council is generally paperless.</p> <p>Post meeting note. It was discussed at the Service Level Agreement workshop in July 2014 that TTT would provide 2 x hard copies and 1 x CD for each submission</p> <p>SR said the two sites would have their own references.</p> <p>ZC said the City of Westminster will have their own TTT application references also.</p> <p>PC referred to the Earls Court redevelopment and said that they have their own application webpage. RBKC could put a link to a TTT page on their website.</p> <p>TS said there is the intention we will have a Common Data Environment (CDE) in the future, which could be a way to transmit documents to the boroughs, but it is not established yet.</p>		



3.4.	<p><i>Determination</i></p> <p>SR referred to the eight week determination period. There may not be public consultation on the discharge of the Requirements.</p> <p>PC said they may need to go to Public Realm Scrutiny Committee.</p> <p>SR asked how TTT would want to see the sign off.</p> <p>TS said a formal email or letter would be sufficient.</p> <p>SR said there is normally a pre-application sign off report and letters for pre-apps.</p>		
3.5.	<p><i>Notices</i></p> <p>TS said the site notices at the pre-app stage are TTT's responsibility and asked if RBKC would normally put up approval of details notices.</p> <p>SR said not.</p>		
4.	Future consents required		
4.1.	<p>TS explained that TTT are currently preparing draft registers of all the different types of consents. It is envisaged the key outputs from these can be shared before Christmas.</p> <p>RK referred to the Service Level Agreements meeting and request for info on submissions.</p> <p>BF gave example of 78 submissions for the EA and 24 for the borough.</p> <p>TS said it will be at least 100 submissions across the lifetime of the project construction, with clear peaks prior to commencement and before the construction of permanent structures. TS warned that these figures are just our initial view, which may change when the contractor is appointed.</p> <p>PC said they will be really useful and RBKC need to identify internal consultees.</p> <p>RK asked if there would be any submissions before RBKC receive the draft register.</p> <p>TS said in the next three months there should be PW19 and some submissions relating to the demolition of Cremorne Wharf Depot - contaminated land and archaeology (CREWD6 and CREWD7)</p> <p>PC referred to the TTT forum and a discussion on statutory undertakers. Would consents be required for utility diversions at Chelsea Embankment Foreshore?</p> <p>TS said these diversions should not be until the main works (2017), but there may be the need for consents some time in advance.</p> <p>PC and RK thanked TTT for providing approximate dates for the RBKC sites in response to a request from councillors.</p>		
5.	Update on Lots Road Power Station planning application		
5.1.	<p>ZC asked SR for an update on the Lots Road Power Station pending planning application.</p> <p>SR explained that the Section 73 application to vary a</p>		



	condition is awaiting completion of the S106. Development is expected to commence on the RBKC site later this year. TS noted this would affect baseline noise monitoring.		
6.	AoB		
6.1.	None		

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