



Meeting minutes

Subject:	Thames Tideway Tunnel proposals in RBKC
Purpose:	Design Meeting – Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) and Local Impact Report (LIR)
Date and time:	Friday 18th October 2013 09.00-12.30
Location:	Kensington Town Hall
Attendees:	RBKC Patricia Cuervo (PC), Ian Hooper (IH), Ashley Brooks (AB), Richard Craig (RH) TTT John Pearson (JP), John Sweetnam (JS), Dermot Scanlon (DS), Clare Donnelly (CD), Zoe Chick (ZC)
Apologies:	RBKC: Jon Wade (JW), Leanne Brisland (LB), James McCool (JMc) EH: Claire Craig (CC)
Minute taker:	ZC
Doc ref:	100-OM-PNC-RBKEN-110181

Item	Action item/Notes for the record	By who	By when
1.	Introductions / apologies		
2.	Local Impact Report (LIR) update		
2.1.	PC explained that some changes had been made to the draft following the TTT response and it will now be approved through the key decision process towards the end of the month. PC said JMc is looking at the TTT transport tables provided.		
3.	Draft Statement of Common Ground (SoCG)		
3.1.	JP said that later today he would send an email asking for RBKC to say in writing that it is agreed that the SoCG is a fair representation of where RBKC and TTT are at present. PC agreed. Action: Email exchange to take place between JP and PC Post meeting note: actioned on 24 and 25 October. JP said that TW will arrange to get a CD to PC on the 4th November submission to RBKC asap following the submission - to avoid delay between submission and being uploaded onto the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) website. PC said the RBKC LIR and Written Representation would be emailed to TW. Action: Documents to be exchanged. Post meeting note: PC emailed the RBKC documents and ZC sent CD of TW submission recorded next day delivery.	JP/PC ZC/PC	25 Oct 4 Nov
3.2.	<i>Matters agreed</i> JP explained that the requirement regarding the signature vent columns has been changed to cap the maximum height		



	<p>to 6m.</p> <p>PC said RBKC are OK with 6m at Cremorne Wharf Depot (CWD) but would prefer 5.5m at Chelsea Embankment Foreshore (CEF).</p> <p>PC noted the matters agreed:</p> <p>Item e - alignment of the Chelsea Embankment Foreshore signature vent columns.</p> <p>JP explained it refers to the location of the river wall. TW note that RBKC do not agree the possible alignment of the vent columns at CEF..</p> <p>PC to check this item is OK</p> <p>Item f:PC noted this is a new item.</p> <p>JP said TW aware that RBKC do not agree with the height but the problem is not the design of the signature vent columns.</p> <p>Item g (design principles): PC said they are agreed except those matters in the track change table (Appendix C of the draft SoCG) and Table 4.1 (Matters not agreed).</p> <p>PC said RBKC feel they did not really have enough time to discuss the CEF design because the discussion had been about the former Ranelagh Gardens site before.</p> <p>PC said that the CoCP is agreed except for the matter identified below in the SoCG.</p> <p>PC said TW (in the draft response to draft LIR) explained how the CoCP is secured through Requirements in the draft response to the draft LIR.</p> <p>PC noted that an item which TW said they would action regarding the addition of the word 'size' in the Requirements for CWD and CEF.</p> <p>JP apologised and said this was added in to other site Requirements and missed from RBKC by accident. This will be addressed when the next version is issued.</p> <p>Action: JP to revise proposed Requirements</p>	JP	29 Nov
3.3.	<p><i>Transport powers.</i></p> <p>JP explained the TTT tracking shows HGV would clip the car parking spaces on Lots Road. The contractors will have to do their own assessment.</p> <p>PC said that the only resident who responded on the LIR was unhappy about the loss of parking spaces and asked if this item could be added to the CoCP?</p> <p>JP requested JMc to look at the CoCP and suggest wording.</p> <p>Action: JMc to look at the CoCP and suggest wording regarding the Lots Road parking spaces.</p>	JMc	asap
3.4.	<p><i>Air quality</i></p> <p>DS noted that the outstanding matters raised in the LIR are new items.</p> <p>AB said not necessarily new items but unanswered questions.</p> <p>DS explained that position papers were issued early on in the process on methodology and receptors and this was discussed with the borough.</p> <p>AB said that there was a different officer lead on air quality at the beginning of the TTT EIA process.</p>		



	<p>AB said the CoCP is vague on air quality. DS said this can be all discussed in more detail at the dedicated air quality meeting arranged for 22nd October.</p>		
3.5.	<p><i>Land quality</i> JP explained that the land quality requirement has been updated and it is agreed that RBKC should be the approval body. AB asked if there was scope to amend the wording slightly. JP said yes and for AB to send proposed wording. Action: AB to propose revised wording for Requirements CREWD7 and CHEEF11. DS said it would be very helpful if AB issued questions to TW in advance of the meeting on Tuesday. Action: AB to issue questions to TW Post meeting note: issued to DS on 21 October 2013. JP asked whether RBKC were happy with the land quality EIA methodology. AB confirmed RBKC were happy with the Land Quality EIA methodologies.</p>	<p>AB</p> <p>AB</p>	<p>Asap</p> <p>21 Oct</p>
3.6.	<p><i>Noise and vibration</i> JP asked IH if he was happy with the methodology for the noise and vibration assessment. IH said yes and that the details had been agreed with the noise survey consultants Peter Brett Associates (PBA) at an earlier stage. It is not considered there will be much impact. Fans need to be assessed to ensure they comply with the RBKC Noise Supplementary Planning Document. IH raised the PINS first written questions, which had made him consider other items. In the CoCP TW should add 'shall' rather than 'may'. DS explained it is being redrafted for the tender documents. IH referred specifically to 6.42 of the CoCP Part A. JP referred IH to the revised CoCP which was issued to the PINS Examining Authority (ExA) on 23rd September. JP asked IH to suggest additional wording to TW is possible. Action: IH to provide additional wording to TW for the CoCP. PC noted the Section 61 process and the trigger for rehousing. RBKC equalities colleagues have commented. DS requested comments on this. Action: PC to provide equalities comments to DS. Post meeting note: PC provided on 18 October 2013 IH said that PINS have raised the impact on schools and that all schools within 300m should be assessed. Chelsea Academy is about 280m away. IH does not consider the school will be affected but TW should include it as one of the receptors. JP said this can be added to the CoCP Part B. Action: Update the CoCP Part B for CWD with reference to Chelsea Academy. DS noted that no construction traffic would be passing by</p>	<p>IH</p> <p>PC</p> <p>JP</p>	<p>Asap</p> <p>Asap</p> <p>asap</p>



	<p>the Academy Part A of the SoCG states the 300m threshold. IH referred to the BS 5228 and the ABC method. IH said that RBKC have been asked if the ambient noise survey fully represents the current situation - which it is very hard to agree to. IH said it is not considered the compensation level will be triggered</p> <p>“</p>		
3.7.	<p><i>Ecology</i></p> <p>PC said LB is now on maternity but had provided information for TW on green roofs.</p> <p>Action: PC to provide TW with green roofs info.</p> <p>Post meeting note: PC provided on 18 October.</p> <p>JP said TW had requested this because RBKC had referred to it.</p> <p>RC said RBKC do not actually have a standard for green roofs, but Dusty Gedge had been in to discuss them with the council.</p> <p>JP raised the bat roosts in the depot building and whether it would be acceptable to relocate in Cremorne Gardens.</p> <p>Post meeting note: TTT met with Kelly Gunnell from RBKC on 21st November 2013 and agreed three trees in Cremorne Gardens for bat boxes.</p>	PC	asap
4.	Design matters		
4.1.	<p><i>Cremorne Wharf Depot</i></p> <p>JP explained that TW had met with Hutchison Whampoa and they object to the proposed (Illustrative) location of the vent columns at CWD, by the 4m set back for a future Thames Path and the power station site.</p> <p>RC said they are happy with the current proposed location and do not want the location to change.</p> <p>RC is concerned the drawings are illustrative and the parameters show the vent columns could be located in the pumping station.</p> <p>JP said the parameters do not just refer to the vent columns.</p> <p>CD said the vent columns could be located the other side of the jetty and that the parameters are meant to work around the uncertainty of the future use of the site.</p> <p>RC said that jetty should be preserved and the columns should stay in the position shown. Keen to have them by the Thames Path - they would be a sign of the project by the Thames Path. If they were over by the jetty TW may end up needing to rebuild the jetty.</p> <p>JP explained that the position of the campshed (which is to be refurbished) to the west of the jetty means that the barges would be at the other side of the site.</p> <p>JP said that if TW ended up submitting details for the vent columns in a position RBKC were not happy with then RBKC could refuse it and TW would have to appeal and explain to PINS why the Thames side location is not practical.</p> <p>RC said TW say 'may develop' the depot - what are TW holding it open for?</p>		



	<p>JP said that when the TTT application was submitted RBKC had an application in for a mixed use development on the site. There is a collaboration agreement in place between TW and RBKC.</p> <p>RC said Design Principle CREWD.04 should say "unless unpractical". They wish the design principle to be strengthened.</p> <p>JP asked RC to suggest wording.</p> <p>Action: RBKC and TW to discuss and strengthen Design Principle CREWD.04</p> <p>JS explained that TW are currently speaking to stakeholders to try and close out any existing objections.</p> <p>RC restated it would not be ideal to have columns next to the jetty.</p> <p>JS said they could go adjacent to Chelsea Wharf.</p> <p>CD referred to the S106 agreement which requires Chelsea Wharf to open up the Thames Path through their property when it is possible to connect with provision through Cremorne Wharf.</p>	JP/RC	asap
4.2.	<p><i>Cremorne Wharf Depot</i> <i>Ventilation stack</i></p> <p>CD raised the pumping station vent column. Historical drawings have been sourced which show the original vent column was brick but it is known that RBKC would like cast iron. Considered it was likely a truck knocked into the vent column and it was replaced in concrete.</p> <p>RC said the Design Principle CREWD.09 should then state "in cast iron or reinstate original".</p> <p>RC said TW will be making use of the route and not the stack and the word 'modified should be removed.</p> <p>JP requested RBKC provide working.</p> <p>Action: RC/PC to provide TW with suggested wording so TW can amend the Design Principle CREWD.09.</p>	RC/PC	asap
4.3.	<p><i>Chelsea Embankment Foreshore</i> <i>Ranelagh Gardens proposed utilities gate</i></p> <p>CD explained it is proposed to build a weir chamber on the low level sewer no. 1, which is underneath the wall and railings at this location, and divert utilities into Ranelagh Gardens.</p> <p>JP said the proposed gate would mean the raised bank in Ranelagh Gardens can be replanted after the works.</p> <p>RC asked how big the access would need to be.</p> <p>JS said it would need to be big enough to get a digger through.</p> <p>RC said he would rather avoid having a gate and disrupting the distinctive stepped wall and railings. It would be better if both were replaced. It was not understood that it was a bank behind the railing. Will go on site and look and try and understand reason for proposed gate.</p> <p>Action: RC to visit the site.</p> <p>CD said it could be possible to put in a vertical joint so the sections of brick could be replaced and taken out when access is required. It is in panelled sections in between the</p>	RC	Asap



	<p>piers. RC asked when this would be dug up. Not just a section of pipe? JS said TW would need to liaise with Royal Hospital Chelsea (RHC) on this. RC commented that there has already been a gate recently installed insensitively. Shame to do so again. JP said TW will go and talk with RHC. Could use the existing access and put access steps in the banking - it may be that the trees would need to be lost. RC said it is highly desirable to work with the idea CD suggested and create a design solution for a removable section. Agree to disagree at the moment. Action: TW to speak with RHC and utilities companies about the design solution of a removable section of wall and railings.</p>	JP/JS	Asap
4.4.	<p><i>Chelsea Embankment Foreshore</i> <i>Signature vent columns</i> JP asked whether RBKC generally approve the form and shape of the proposed signature vent columns. It is understood the height is still a matter not agreed. CD presented drawings showing the signature vent columns at three different heights: 4m, approximately 5.1m and 8m. Between 4 and 6 is achievable (new parameters in the Requirements). TW have had them modelled. RC asked about minimum diameter. CD said the diameter may be slightly different when cast - will have to put a caveat on that. RC commented that the top is decorative only to improve the proportion. CD said that WCC have asked if the column could be slightly less flared at the top. WCC have also asked for dark bronze. The columns are shown as metallic on RBKC at present but the materials are for RBKC approval. RC said there is a lot of dark bronze in the borough but he has no strong feeling on colour of materials at the moment. Would like to see the models. CD said the intention is to cast or escribe writing on the vent columns. RC said he is comfortable with where the design is going. 8m columns are too big, 4m to stumpy and at 5.1 they are most elegant. Satisfied with the design intent for the signature vent columns. Will deal with materials etc through the Requirement.</p>		

Next meeting (date, time, location):	Friday 15th November 2013, 10-12.00, Kensington Town Hall
Next minute taker:	ZC