



## Meeting minutes

<b>Subject:</b>	Thames Tideway Tunnel proposals in RBKC
<b>Purpose:</b>	Planning and design update for RBKC
<b>Date and time:</b>	7 <sup>th</sup> September 2012, 9-10am
<b>Location:</b>	Kensington Town Hall
<b>Attendees:</b>	<p><b>RBKC:</b>            Patricia Cuervo – Senior Planning Policy Officer (PC)            Richard Craig – Senior Urban Design Officer (RC)            Jonathan Wade – Planning Policy Team Leader (JW)</p> <p><b>TW:</b>            John Pearson (JP), Zoe Chick (ZC)</p>
<b>Apologies</b>	
<b>Minute taker:</b>	ZC
<b>Doc ref:</b>	100-OM-PNC-RBKEN-110159

Item	Action item/Notes for the record	By who	By when
1	<b>Introductions</b>		
2	<b>Section 48 publicity</b>		
2.1	<p><i>Update</i></p> <p>JP explained that the end of Section 48 publicity is Friday 5<sup>th</sup> October. PC said she has already produced the response in draft and it will go to the Public Realm Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 19<sup>th</sup> September and the Key Decision date will be 8/9 October. TTT will get the final draft ready for the close of publicity.</p>		
2.2	<p><i>RBKC Initial Views</i></p> <p>PC said that the response is quite positive. Mainly comments on transport and CoCP.</p>		
3	<b>Draft Requirements / Design principles (combined)</b>		
3.1	<p>JP explained that with regards to the consents packs issued, previously RBKC have seen the design principles and the previous take was that if something is on a parameter plan than it doesn't need to be in the design principles.</p> <p>RC commented that we have only been offered the chance to make changes on the design principles and not on the drawings. There are still comments which have not been picked up, such as the scale of the equipment which needs to be brought down from 1.5m. They are not sunk as requested and proof is needed that they need to be as big as they currently are. Do the ventilation columns need to be 6m tall? RBKC street furniture columns are 4m. Can they not be brought down?</p> <p>JP noted that the project had discussed the design with RBKC including the drawings and had sort to reduce the visual appearance of as much as possible. JP said the columns are 6m for odour dispersion.</p> <p>Post Meeting Note: Columns are 6m in accordance with Thames Water design standards</p>		



	<p>RC asked about the zoning for the kiosks and pointed out it wraps around the back.</p> <p>JP explained that the zoning covered all the above ground structures including the vent columns. RBKC could suggest a design principle specifying for example that the kiosk column is positioned as close to the road as practicable. It was stated that TTT will not know whether the floodable public realm design is possible until more detailed design work is undertaken and this will be post submission.</p> <p>RC acknowledged that while it is illustrative it can change.</p> <p>JP said that an illustrative design requires the parameter plan zones.</p> <p>RC asked who will be going to clear this.</p> <p>JP asked whether the council still preferred the floodable public realm design of which the project presented a sketch. If so, the design would stay as illustrative, but if the council were happy with the intertidal terraces then it could move to indicative in the submission.</p> <p>RC said that floodable public realm is still the aspiration.</p> <p>PC commented that Jonathan Bore was happy with that.</p> <p>JP said that is fine but cannot guarantee that it can be engineered. Therefore the parameters are important.</p> <p>RC asked whether the shaft and engineering would need to change</p> <p>JP said that the access points to the below ground structures may be different depending on changes to the landscape designs. Therefore the landscape design needed to ensure that the maintenance to the below ground structures was possible.</p> <p>RC said that they will look to minimise visual impact through scale and positioning. The kiosks are dominant pieces of kit. It would be good if they could be incorporated into the parapet wall or sunk. If not possible they will have to be of a high quality design.</p> <p>JW said that maybe it is not possible to sink them.</p> <p><b>Post meeting note:</b> At Section 48 publicity it is proposed that the kiosks will be incorporated into the parapets</p> <p>JP said the design principles say that clutter will be avoided. The intention is that the equipment cabinets will be where the old and new river walls meet within the parapet. TTT can put in a principle to seek to reduce the height of the kiosks. There needs to be flexibility in the design.</p> <p>PC noted that the different types of above ground structure have not been separated in the parameter plan.</p> <p>RC said that the separation of the kiosks and the vent columns should be put in writing.</p> <p>JP said this is possible. It can be put in the Requirements – RBKC to approve the location of the vent columns at both sites. The details would be submitted in accordance with the requirements and the parameter plan.</p> <p>JW asked whether the conditions would allow RBKC to approve the design of the kiosk.</p> <p>JP said yes. Effectively the DCO will be an outline planning approval.</p> <p>RC said that natural stone is not specified in the design principles. And what if RBKC do not like the proposed design?</p> <p>JP said then RBKC can refuse it then. Thames Water could then appeal the decision.</p> <p>JW said that they need something more specific than natural stone.</p> <p>PC said this was not a subject of the Section 48 publicity.</p> <p>JP said that very shortly the drafting of the Statement of Common Ground will commence.</p> <p>PC asked if specific comments should be made on requirements and</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>design principles.</p> <p>RC said they will go through and see where short changed. RBKC are trying to tie TTT down as much as possible on design, or they're not doing their job. Still thinks there will be an issue of cost at the end.</p> <p>JP requested that they would be happy to receive feedback on the design principles and requirements in light of the above discussion.</p> <p>JP apologised if any previous comments had been missed. Thought they had been picked up.</p> <p>RC suspects that TTT probably don't know yet the size of equipment needed. Already rationalised at Cremorne.</p>		
<b>4</b>	<b>Requirements</b>		
4.1	<p>JP explained that there are general Requirements and there are site specific Requirements which cover items not included in the CoCP Part B. Requirements can specify who approves each of them. Archaeology Requirements could specify the borough, English Heritage or the Greater London Archaeology Advisory Service (GLAAS).</p>		
4.2	<p><i>Chelsea Embankment</i></p> <p>CEFX7 (Archaeology) – RC said it just needs to 'prior to any further works'.</p> <p>JP said that it is a pre-commencement condition.</p> <p>RC said would have thought archaeology studies would already have been done.</p> <p>JP said desk based studies have been produced. The Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) will set out the methodology for further works. If there is a low potential then just a watching brief will be required.</p> <p>CEFX8 (Landscaping) – RC said the 'unless otherwise agreed by the local authority' should be added.</p> <p>RC said RBKC are trying to pin the project down, but with some flexibility, if agreed by the council.</p> <p>PC said they could just give site specific requirements where not over ridden by the generic.</p> <p>JP said that is the approach which has been taken. Model provisions have been used and the projects are happy to amend them.</p> <p>RC asked what 'landscaping works' means?</p> <p>JP said happy for RBKC to suggest different wording</p> <p>PC will go through and provide comments. Already been sent through to transport and environment colleagues.</p> <p>RC said two years not long enough for the trees Requirement (CEFX8).</p> <p><b>Post meeting note:</b> RBKC provided comments on the draft requirements via email on 27<sup>th</sup> September 2012.</p>		
4.3	<p><i>Cremorne Wharf Depot</i></p> <p>RC said generally happy with requirements and pleased about the comment to review the vent at Cremorne Wharf.</p> <p>JP said the project can clad or remove the existing vent but designs will be submitted by a contractor and be subject to RBKC approval as an application for Listed Building Consent.</p> <p>JP also said that the signature vent columns are being proposed – fluted columns – subject to further detailed design.</p>		

<b>5</b>	<b>S106</b>		
5.1	<p><i>Local Procurement Process</i></p> <p>JP said that Jon Medlin was going to send some information about the RBKC local procurement process following the meeting on 2<sup>nd</sup> August. Please send through more comments and advice on this as we TTT needs to be aware of where the project is on this.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> Jon Medlin (S106 Officer) to send through details.</p>	JM	asap
5.2	<p><i>Heads of Term</i></p> <p>It is expected that the main HoT for Cremorne will be signed by the end of November.</p>		
<b>6</b>	<b>AoB</b>		
6.1	<p>JP asked about the preference for willow trees at Chelsea Embankment Foreshore.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> PC to ask RC about the willows.</p> <p><b>Post Meeting Note:</b> RBKC confirmed via email (24<sup>th</sup> October 2012) that willows towards the river would be a good addition to the design, so long as they were not under the canopy of plane trees and not on the axis view.</p>	PC/RC	Sept 2012

<b>Next meeting (date, time, location):</b>	TBC
<b>Next minute taker:</b>	ZC