



## Meeting minutes

<b>Subject:</b>	Thames Tideway Tunnel proposals in RBKC
<b>Purpose:</b>	Discuss draft Statement of Common Ground (SoCG)
<b>Date and time:</b>	Friday 18 January 2013 15.00-17.000
<b>Location:</b>	Smart Room 214, Kensington Town Hall
<b>Attendees:</b>	Patricia Cuervo (PC) (RBKC) Jonathan Wade (JW) (RBKC) Zoe Chick (ZC) (TTT) John Pearson (JP) (TTT)
<b>Apologies:</b>	
<b>Minute taker:</b>	John Pearson (JP) (TTT)
<b>Doc ref:</b>	100-OM-PNC-RBKEN-110174

Item	Action item/Notes for the record	By who	By when
<b>1.</b>	<b>Introductions</b>		
<b>2.</b>	<b>Previous minutes of 19 December 2012</b>		
2.1.	Minor changes suggest by PC agreed by ZC		
2.2.	ZC then ran through the actions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) JW confirmed he had reviewed the draft SoCG</li> <li>b) Policy - PC said this will be covered in today's meeting</li> <li>c) JW confirmed there was still not a new committee date for the Cremorne planning application</li> <li>d) PC said she will review whether she had responded to Thames Waters consultants Mouchel regarding the property confirmation schedules</li> <li>e) ZC noted she would review the layout of the SoCG when she took on board all RBKCs comments</li> <li>f) JW noted that in terms of timescales he would have to review the Council's sign off for the SoCG. JP noted it was draft and that would be subject to further discussions. JW agreed that as it is draft and is based on facts then it could possibly be agreed by officers.</li> </ul>		
2.3.	ZC presented minutes of meeting held at Lots Road Pumping station regarding locating electrical and control equipment in the existing pumping station and asked PC to review.		
<b>3</b>	<b>Draft Statement of Common Ground (SoCG)</b>		
3.1	ZC explained that they would run through PCs comments in the draft SoCG.		
3.2	ZC noted that RBKCs sign off was discussed earlier and that as it was a draft document it didn't need 'signing off' at this stage, but that both sides should be comfortable with the content.		
3.3	ZC noted PCs request for a glossary and asked if there was any need for this. If PC could identify any terms which were not clear then Thames Water would explain in the text of the document		



	rather than provide a separate glossary. PC agreed.		
3.4	JW noted that the council had concerns regarding the signature vent columns being between 4 and 8 metres in height. JW noted that the Council would not like to see the columns above 5 metres. JP noted that the proposed height was a parameter to allow a robust environmental assessment and the final details would be submitted through a proposed DCO requirement for RBKC to approve. JW noted that they would not agree to columns above 5 metres. Action: ZC to remove reference to the column heights in the SoCG.	ZC	
3.5	ZC noted addition by PC of a reference to the National Planning Policy Framework to paragraph 5.2 (policy framework) and said Thames Water felt this was not necessary as the policy criteria for the Thames Tunnel was contained in the National Policy Statement for Waste Water (NPS).		
3.6	PC noted that Thames Water needed to take account of any change in the safeguarded status of Cremorne Wharf. ZC noted that TW were monitoring this but needed to progress based on current policy.		
3.7	JW asked whether RBKC's Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) should be included in the policy section as they guide RBKC's approach to noise, trees and views amongst others. JW also noted that the Core Strategy is being updated to include current saved UDP and that the examination would be in September 2013. JP noted that the SPDs are not policy for the determination of the Thames Tideway Tunnel but, noted the contents should have been taken into account through discussions with RBKC on the environmental impact assessment and Code of Construction Practice. JW noted that he didn't have a strong preference for inclusion but, rather flagged for discussion.		
3.8	JW agreed wording regarding most suitable sites.		
3.9	PC noted that she had raised concerns regarding settlement effects on Lots Road Pumping Station. JP noted that this should be included in the construction section and that TW were proposing to respond to RBKCs letter.		
3.10	JW noted that he didn't have any concerns regarding the tunnelling drive strategy as it did not affect RBKC.		
3.11	ZC noted that they would remove text on nature of construction activities and add CoCP rather than environmental statement as proposed by PC. PC agreed.		
3.12	JW noted that neither he nor PC could agree property section. ZC noted this would be agreed through discussions with RBKC property department.		
3.13	ZC tabled new text for section 10 stating RBKC agreed the methodologies, significance criteria and survey locations for the EIA. PC noted this seemed o.k. but, would need to review. <b>Action:</b> PC to review revised text and respond.	PC	
3.14	ZC noted that the requirement on page 11 regarding monitoring of heritage structures relied on the heritage statement which RBKC hadn't seen this. ZC tabled relevant section from the Heritage Statement but, agreed with PC to amend to say not agreed at this stage.		



3.15	PC said RBKC were concerned about effects on Cremorne Riverside Activity Centre (CRAC). ZC noted that the preliminary navigation risk assessment which would form part of Thames Waters application documents didn't identify any major issues regarding use of the river during construction. PC asked whether Thames Water had any discussion with CRAC and whether ZC had any contact details. Action: ZC to send PC CRAC contact.		
3.16	ZC explained how the project wide Design Principles are referenced in the site specific principles table.		
3.17	PC asked whether English Heritage (EH) need to be consulted regarding the requirements on Cremorne. ZC noted that this was only where EH had requested this, which they hadn't at Cremorne. JP noted that RBKC could still consult EH regarding the submission to discharge the requirement but, by not including them in the requirement it wasn't a legal requirement.		
3.18	ZC said she'd update the SoCG and send to PC the week beginning 21 January 2013.		
<b>4.0</b>	<b>AOB</b>		
4.1	None		

<b>Next meeting (date, time, location):</b>	Friday 18 <sup>th</sup> January 2013, 3-5pm
<b>Next minute taker:</b>	ZC