



Meeting minutes

Subject:	Thames Tideway Tunnel (TTT) proposals in RBKC
Purpose:	Discuss EIA issues for the draft Statement of Common Ground (SoCG)
Date and time:	Tuesday 30 th April 2013 10.00-12.00
Location:	Rooms 8 & 9, Kensington Town Hall
Attendees:	Patricia Cuervo (PC) (RBKC) Ian Hooper (IH) RBKC Rebecca Brown (RB)(RBKC) Ashley Brooks (AB) (RBKC) Leanne Brisland (LB) (RBKC) James McCool (JM) John Pearson (JP) (TTT) John Sweetnam (JS) (TTT) Amanda Kuffel (AK) (TTT) Zoe Chick (ZC) (TTT)
Apologies:	Jon Wade (JW), Richard Craig (RC) (RBKC)
Minute taker:	Zoe Chick (ZC) (TTT)
Doc ref:	100-OM-PNC-RBKEN-110176

Item	Action item/Notes for the record	By who	By when
1.	Introductions / apologies		
1.1.	PC explained that RB is leaving RBKC and AB will be taking her place in relation to the TTT. There will soon be a new EHO manager from London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham (LBHF) Elizabeth Fonseca, who will be looking at air and land quality. Apologies from JW and RC.		
2.	The application – an overview		
2.1.	<i>Planning</i> JP ran through a presentation (see attached) on how to navigate the application documents, JP explained that the documents are set out as prescribed by PINS Advice Note 6e.g. Application Form, Plans and Drawings, DCO, Reports and statements and ES. As a result a number of important documents are classed as 'other documents' which are those considered to assist the application, these include the Planning Statement, Design Principles and Code of Construction Practice. In addition the project has provided background reports on the need for the project. JP explained the parameters approach on the drawings and that the EIA had considered the worst case scenario for the most robust approach. IH asked about the size of the parameters for the shaft at Cremorne Wharf Depot (CWD). JP explained they are big at CWD to take account of uncertainties about the borough's mixed use planning application and Counters Creek. JS		



	explained that the parameters for the shaft at Chelsea Embankment Foreshore (CEF) are much more defined.		
2.2.	<p><i>Environmental Statement</i></p> <p>AK ran through the structure of the ES and explained there was a slide per ES section (see attached).</p> <p>AK identified that RBKC should refer to Volumes 1, 2, 3 and 12 (CWD) and 13 (CEF).</p> <p>AK explained that the Non-technical Summary structure replicates the ES structures and has approx. 15 pages per site and focuses on any significant effects (adverse or beneficial).</p> <p>AK explained Volume 28 has a glossary.</p>		
2.3.	RB asked about the timeframe. JP explained the last slides of the presentation set out the draft schedule tbc by the Planning Inspectorate (PINS).		
3.	Draft Statement of Common Ground (SoCG)		
3.1.	<p>IH asked where RBKC and TTT are with the SoCG.</p> <p>PC explained that RBKC had made two rounds of comments on the SoCG and that RBKC and TTT need to work towards 24th June 2013 to input into the Local Impact Report (LIR) which is an internal take on how the project will affect the borough. The LIR is not just for identifying negative effects, it can also identify the positive.</p>		
3.2.	<p>IH talked about the scoping and how he has previously asked questions which have not been answered. For example, the noise related to the tunnel boring machines (TBMs) has always need scoped out because the TBMs would be too deep Why not quantify it?</p> <p>JP said that the comment should be identified in the ES and the project will have responded. AK explained this would be in Volume 2, Noise and Vibration (N&V), Appendix G.</p> <p>Post Meeting Note: Appendix G, Table 2, comments on page 12 and page 53.</p>		
3.3.	<p>JS said that an N&V assessment for the TBM had been carried out. In the western section, the tunnel is shallower and actually goes below properties. Where the tunnel passes directly beneath properties, it is possible that a slight rumble or faint noise will be experienced as the tunnel head goes beneath but this would be transient for only a few days. The main tunnel runs beneath the river in RCK&C and so it is very unlikely that N&V effects would be experienced from the tunnel boring machine.</p> <p>IH questioned N&V associated with the connection tunnels. JS explained that the connection tunnel would have a sprayed concrete lining and would be dug out using a JCB-type machine and so TBM N&V would not be an issue. IH tends to agree but like to see it in the EIA. Post Meeting Note: See Volume 12 Cremorne Wharf Depot, Volume 13 Chelsea Embankment Foreshore – Section 9.5</p>		
4.	Local Impact Report (LIR)		



4.1.	<p>JP stressed that it will be good to start on the LIR early as PINS will only allow 28 days for turnaround. The SoCG is not an Examination deliverable but PINS will ask to see it.</p> <p>JP also said that if the borough has any queries about matters it would be best to ask them now, via PC, to avoid any Regulation 17 requests which could halt the examination. It may just be a case of navigating RBKC to the right section of the application.</p> <p>RB asked about official responses? PC said it is fine if people have queries for them to contact the TTT team directly and cc her in.</p>		
4.2.	<p>LB asked about the ecology and landscape plans. AK said she will check the timescale for these. LB asked if they will be ready before the examination. JP explained that they are covered by the CoCP Part A and are not required for approval but the contractor will consult with the local authority as part of their Construction Environmental Management Plans (CEMP).</p> <p>PC said that the plans connect with other documents.</p>		
4.3.	<p>RB asked about the council's official response.</p> <p>PC explained that the LIR would be the council's official response. Section 56 is for any group/person who wants to submit a relevant representation. PC said she asked PINS if the boroughs should submit a response and PINS had said it would be a good idea.</p> <p>Action: PC asked for a paragraph from each discipline by 10th May for submission to PINS for Section 56 deadline.</p> <p>PC said the next step will be to explain and go into detail on each identified effect for the LIR.</p> <p>Action: PC asked all to check the EIA, identify queries and keep the dialogue flowing.</p> <p>PC said if anything remains unresolved; it will go in the LIR. PC to identify queries arisen today in an email.</p> <p>Post Meeting Note: PC sent email on 30th April 2013.</p> <p>JP reiterated that if anyone has any queries, just ask the TTT team.</p>	<p>RBKC</p> <p>RBKC</p>	<p>10th May</p> <p>Ongoing</p>
4.4.	<p>RB asked about the boroughs that aren't engaging. JP explained that all boroughs have responded to the formal consultations, but that the dialogue has continued with RBKC with meetings every six weeks.</p> <p>JP explained that the environmental mitigation is generally embedded in the design or it points to where it is secured, for example by a Requirement (DCO planning condition) or in the CoCP (which is secured by Requirements).</p> <p>AK identified that all embedded mitigation is identified in section X.2 of the ES chapters.</p> <p>JMc asked what scope PINS have to change the application.</p> <p>JP explained that at Hinkley PINS added some Requirements but the project would prefer to be able to say these are the requirements which have been agreed with the borough.</p> <p>JMc asked whether it was only Requirements that could be changed. JP said changes to the application may be</p>		



	<p>considered but, the project would only consider those which were agreeable to all parties and did not change the environmental effect as assessed. The project would not wish to have to reconsult on amendments as this could add three months to the programme.</p> <p>LB asked whether a borough can say they are not happy with the proposed mitigation. JP confirmed new comments could be raised but, would hope these would be limited given the level of engagement the project has had with RBKC.</p> <p>LB asked about the additional planting at Chelsea Embankment Foreshore, which she could not see in the application. JP identified that the proposed design for Chelsea Embankment Foreshore is illustrative as we couldn't agree the landscape/planting with the borough ready for submission. Details of the landscape and river wall will be submitted to the borough for approval at a later date. PC said this detail is also in the design principles. JP explained it is an either/or scenario, which just cannot go beyond the parameters.</p> <p>LB said RBKC would like ecological enhancements as it is of 'Metropolitan Importance'.</p> <p>PC explained that if/once the application has been approved by PINS, the other details will come to the boroughs for approval.</p> <p>JP identified that the drawings for approval include the site parameter plans which specify the maximum heights. At Chelsea Embankment Foreshore details will need to be submitted for all above ground structures - kiosks, vent columns, landscape and materials.</p>		
5.	RBKC Initial comments on the application		
5.1.	<p><i>Planning</i></p> <p>PC went through RC initial design/heritage comments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RC remains unhappy with the vent columns being up to 8m in height. <p>JP explained that a lower height is required for adequate dispersal of air. The max height of 8m is the worst case scenario for the townscape and visual assessment. Clare Donnelly (CD) the project architect said they would most likely be 5.5m because of the way they are fluted and one side is higher than the other.</p> <p>PC said RBKC may still raise this as an issue though unless TTT can confirm they are to be less than 5m.</p> <p>IH asked whether there are passive vents. JS said that all air will be filtered and will only be released as the tunnel is filling up. He did not have the figures to hand but considered this to be something like 10 hours a year. There may be an occasion every few years when the air would be discharged at a velocity sufficient to bypass the filters.</p> <p>Post Meeting Note: CWD and CEF are both expected to have 13 hours of air exhaust in a typical year, which will be treated 100% of the time.</p> <p>IH asked about the velocity of the discharge. JS said he did not have the exact figure but it could be around 0.05m a second.</p>		



5.2.	<p>JS explained the Air Management Plan gives all the information. RB said the information was also included at phase 2 consultation.</p> <p>JP identified that the project wide design principles for the ventilation columns sets out the height/width ration for the architecture.</p> <p>Post meeting note: Generic design principle FNCC.03 <i>'The 'signature' design shall be used for all ventilation columns serving the shaft, except where stated otherwise in site-specific principles. The ventilation columns shall stand a maximum 8m high and have a minimum proportion of 1:5 (girth to height). Multiples of the signature design shall be used to achieve the cross-sectional areas required for ventilation.'</i></p>		
5.3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RC unhappy with the removal of part of the Ranelagh Gardens wall at CEF. <p>JP explained that the interception chamber will be below the wall and utilities need to be diverted into Ranelagh Gardens. Utility access is required into the gardens via a new gate. PC asked whether this would be temporary. JP confirmed permanent and it will match the existing. It means that the utility companies do not need a long easement route through the Royal Hospital.</p> <p>Post meeting note: Design principle CHEEF.14 <i>'The boundary treatment of Ranelagh Gardens shall include a gate for utility company maintenance access. The new wall, railings and gate shall be designed to match the existing walls and railings.'</i></p>		
5.4.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RC raised betterment of the paving on Chelsea Embankment. <p>JP identified that the footway is generally not in the parameters, though it could be done through S106. JMc asked why the TTT needs to intervene with the paving. JP said it doesn't. JMc thought the project probably didn't need to then.</p>		
5.5.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RC would like more evidence of the 'recent' linear character of Chelsea Embankment. <p>JP thought perhaps the Heritage Statement refers to the Bazalgette embankment as being 'recent'.</p> <p>Action: PC to ask RC for more clarity on this item.</p> <p>Post meeting note: Paragraph F.4.44 of the Heritage Statement states <i>'The clear, linear nature of the river to the west of Chelsea Bridge is, however, a recent characteristic, which postdates the removal of the last Battersea Park piers in 1998.'</i></p>	PC	May 2013
5.6.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RC raised the consultation on the proposed new Lots Road Conservation Area which will take in the pumping station and Cremorne Wharf Depot access points. 		



	<p>JP confirmed the TTT was aware of this.</p> <p>Post Meeting Note: ZC previously reviewed the proposed conservation area documents to consider whether a TTT response was required. It was considered that no response was needed.</p>		
5.7.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RC queried the definition of low/medium/high heritage values in the Heritage Statement. <p>AK identified these should be included in the methodology chapter of the ES, Vol 2.</p>		
5.8.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RC considered the project may wish to make reference to WWII bomb damage at Lots Road. <p>Noted.</p> <p>Action: To review.</p>	ZC	May 2013
5.9.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RC query regarding design principle relating to repair to internal tiles should there be any damage. <p>JP said details of the monitoring of damage to listed buildings and the process of dealing with heritage assets. can be found in paragraphs 3.6 and 3.7 of the Heritage Statement.</p> <p>Post meeting note: CREWD.05 states '<i>Electrical and control equipment located in the Lots Road pumping station shall be freestanding away from the existing tiled walls. The tile wall finish to the pumping station shall not be removed unless approved by the local planning authority.</i>'</p>		
5.10.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RC asked if there are any proposed changes to the entrance gates <p>JP could not recall in the meeting</p> <p>Post Meeting Note: The CoCP Part B states: '<i>The gates to the construction site will remain closed as far as reasonably practicable and either clad (with a material of similar specification the site hoarding) or replaced with solid gates. The gates will include an overlapping section at the centre and minimal gap at the bottom and edges.</i>'</p> <p>No other changes to the gates are specified in the application. RBKC will need to approve any changes to accesses under Requirement CREWD.9.</p>		
5.11.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RC asked about the Cremorne Wharf jetty. <p>JP confirmed that the TTT do not propose to use the jetty but, it is included within the LLAU. Barges would moor against the river wall and rest on a refurbished campshed. If the project damages the jetty it will repair it.</p>		
5.12.	<p><i>Transport</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JMc said there is a potential objection to the proposed removal of five parking bays through the construction period. It doesn't seem necessary to remove them all for the proposed volume of construction traffic. 		



	<p>JP said that they are proposed for suspension because of the tracking lanes.</p> <p>Action: JMc said he'll check the tracking lanes</p>	JMc	May 2013
5.13.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> JMc said not sure the cumulative impact of the works at Chelsea Embankment Foreshore have been assessed. <p>AK directed JMc to Volume 3 (Project-wide effects) of the ES which includes as assessment of multiple TTT sites along The Embankment.</p> <p>JP said that the activity associated with Lots Road Power Station development has been assessed.</p> <p>JMc agreed that work had commenced but said there is no agreed construction traffic plan.</p> <p>JP asked whether the developers would be using the river during construction. JMc said the borough have raised it but expects they won't use the river.</p>		
5.14.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> JMc and PC raised that TTT are not proposing the Thames Path. <p>PC asked whether the retention of the safeguarded wharf status means that the PLA will be more forceful about objecting to the Thames Path at CWD.</p> <p>JP said that TTT have no objection to the Thames Path and have allowed 5m to allow for it. RBKC own the site and if they choose not to use it for a wharf use they can build the Thames Path. TTT will reinstate the land after construction. The site isn't subject to a landscaping requirement but Paragraph 34 (4) of the draft DCO says that it will be reinstated in agreement with the landowner.</p> <p>JMc asked whether 4 or 5 m were being allowed for. The planning application in at present for the CWD site allows 6m.</p> <p>Post Meeting Note: The application for a mixed use scheme on Cremorne Wharf been withdrawn on 2nd May 2013.</p> <p>JP said that TTT have tried to ensure the same size depot building can be replaced, but if RBKC want a smaller depot building a wider Thames Path is possible. Also, at CEF, the CoCP Part B states the Thames Path will be reopened when no work is taking place.</p> <p>JMc referred to the modification of the crossovers from Lots Road into the depot site. These should only take day to a few days. Can the CoCP Part B be more specific.</p> <p>JS said that the contractor may decide that they don't even need to change the crossovers. It has been included to allow flexibility.</p> <p>JP identified that they may also say they don't want to remove all the car parking spaces during the works.</p>		
5.15.	<p><i>Lots Road Power Station development</i></p> <p>JP asked how Hutchison Whampoa are proposing to mitigate their proposed residential buildings facing on to a safeguarded wharf / council depot.</p>		



	<p>IP asked whether TTT had been liaising with the developers. JP said yes.</p> <p>JMc identified that most of the construction traffic would be coming in and out via RBKC as there are weight restricted bridges and barriers through to the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham (LBHF).</p>		
5.16.	<p><i>Skills and Employment</i></p> <p>PC asked if TTT have met with Graham Hart (GH) (Regeneration Manager).</p> <p>JP said we TTT have the RBKC comments on the draft S106.</p> <p>Action: TTT to check if Graham Hart has provided comments at TTT forums.</p> <p>Post meeting note: Graham Hart attended the Skills and Employment Strategy Forum on 4th December 2012. At the forum, discussions were held in small working groups, the comments from which were noted by Thames Tideway Tunnel. Comments were taken on board in finalising the strategy as appropriate, with those comments relating to implementation of the strategy to be taken into consideration by the Forum going forward.</p> <p>JP said that TTT currently exploring how to deliver skills and employment. It could possibly be a project wide S106 with the GLA. This is what's in Section 6 of the Planning Statement Currently looking at the TTT programme already in place which covers schools near the drive sites and recently included a visit to Chelsea Academy. RBKC have shown an interesting in including local schools and local procurement. Is there an existing route that is used by developers?</p> <p>PC identified that the S106 officer had left RBKC.</p> <p>Action: PC will email JW, GH and legal advisor on skills and employment.</p>	AK	May 2013
5.17.	<p><i>Flood risk</i></p> <p>PC referred to the river walls being tidal barriers and identified possible effect of settlement reducing the height of the river wall, resulting in a breach of the river wall, especially at Cremorne. PC asked if the Environment Agency had got back to the project on this matter. PC also asked about groundwater.</p> <p>AK said the EA have looked at the cumulative assessment and will check the responses.</p> <p>Action: AK to check EA response on settlement and flood walls.</p> <p>Post meeting note: All Environment Agency comments are contained in the application documentation contained on the PINS website. Comments received in relation to groundwater are contained within ES Vol 2 Appendix K and site specific ES volumes (Vols 4-27, Section X.3) where relevant. Comments received in relation to flood risk are contained within ES Vol 2 Appendix M. Comments are also contained in the Consultation Report which forms one of the 'other documents' in the application.</p>	AK	May 2013



6.	AOB		
6.1.	<p>RB said she would go through the application documents and check if any queries.</p> <p>PC asked if she could be copied in to all correspondence.</p> <p>PC requested all response for Section 56 by 10th May</p> <p>Action: PC to send an email out of issues discussed today to all.</p> <p>Post Meeting Note: PC sent email. 30th April 2013.</p>	PC	May 2013
6.2.	<p>PC asked about the January minutes for the RBKC website.</p> <p>Action: ZC to check the January minutes have been issued.</p> <p>Post Meeting Note: Minutes have now been issued.</p>	ZC	May 2013
6.3.	<p>JP requested whether TTT could see the draft LIR before it goes to public consultation.</p> <p>JP raised the monitoring of listed buildings and the process of dealing with heritage assets as he knows RC is concerned with this. JP noted that details can be found in paragraphs 3.6 and 3.7 of the Heritage Statement and are covered by the DCO requirements.</p>		

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