



Meeting minutes

Subject:	Thames Tideway Tunnel proposals in RBKC
Purpose:	Air Quality Meeting relating to the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) and Local Impact Report (LIR)
Date and time:	Tuesday 22nd October 2013 10.00-11.30
Location:	RBKC Offices, Pembroke Road.
Attendees:	RBKC Patricia Cuervo (PC), Kyri Eleftheriou-Vaus (KE-V), Ashley Brooks (AB) TTT Dermot Scanlon (DS), Gareth Collins (GC), Zoe Chick (ZC)
Apologies:	
Minute taker:	ZC
Doc ref:	100-OM-PNC-RBKEN-110182

Item	Action item/Notes for the record	By who	By when
1.	Introductions		
2.	Air quality assessment within the ES		
2.1.	<p>DS explained the meeting is in response to RBKC comments in the draft Local Impact Report (LIR).</p> <p>DS set out that TW had submitted a scoping report and preliminary environmental information and held seven Environmental Health Officer (EHO) forum meetings, where the process was explained, EHO issues were addressed.</p> <p>DS explained there were two rounds of public consultation, which resulted in changes to the scheme. The application was submitted at the end of February 2013 and accepted by the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) end of March.</p> <p>The preliminary meeting was held on 12th September and requested information was submitted by TW on 23rd September 2013, including a revised CoCP. A further revision is expected to be submitted in response to RBKC and other local authority comments and outstanding issues.</p>		
2.2.	<p><i>RBKC concerns</i></p> <p>AB said RBKC just want to make sure they understand why things have been done the way they have.</p> <p>DS explained the CoCP is likely to be a live document and will use the Section 61 process.</p>		
2.3.	<p><i>HGVs</i></p> <p>DS explained that the Transport Statement (TS) sets out the commitment to 90% minimum excavated spoil to be carried away by barge and, at foreshore sites, the importation of cofferdam fill material. The contractor will be incentivised and this will be either a Requirement or S106. There is a discussion going on with TfL and the PLA on how it is secured.</p> <p>If it is not possible to use the river in certain circumstances -</p>		



	<p>matters beyond TW control - TW will seek derogations. For example, if the Thames Barrier is up. These instances are listed in the TS. At CEF and CWD there are not many barges so barges may stay put at the sites for a few days.</p> <p>DS said the contractors will be legally committed to the Transport Strategy. Currently being discussed how it should be secured.</p>		
2.4.	<p><i>RBKC Receptors</i></p> <p>GC explained that there was consultation with boroughs regarding the receptor locations. Some receptors are not buildings.</p> <p>KE-V said some receptors at locations where they might not experience effects.</p> <p>KE-V said traffic data and air quality data didn't seem to correlate.</p> <p>GC said the latest COPERT emissions data was used. If they had not used those they would have been criticised.</p> <p>DS said CoCP has embedded design measures in response to the assessment.</p>		
2.5.	<p><i>Sensitivity analysis</i></p> <p>GC gave RBKC a prepared note on NO₂ and DEFRA emissions based on COPERT work. Interim measures seemed reasonable.</p> <p>Action: DS said TW will issue the note through document control.</p> <p>GC said the latest figures from DEFRA are overly optimistic. PC said will address it in the next SoCG.</p>	DS/ZC	15 Nov
2.6.	<p><i>9% figure does not correlate – predicted increase in traffic data and decrease in NO₂ and PM₁₀ in the air quality assessment</i></p> <p>KE-V considered this must be because of the overly optimistic DEFRA figures. It is known from RBKC monitoring that NO₂ emissions are going up.</p> <p>GC said the table is from the traffic emissions tool kit. Fair chance that there may be a drop off by 2017.</p> <p>PC asked about the DEFRA figures.</p> <p>GC explained that DEFRA work with the Transport Road Laboratory (TRL). There is a difference between US and Euro modelling.</p>		
2.7.	<p><i>Tug boat emissions</i></p> <p>GC explained the figures were taken from the Corinair emissions factors. Assumptions made but minimal data.</p> <p>KE-V said would they be 'medium'?</p> <p>GC said done on the basis of them being most common.</p> <p>DS explained TW now looking at training and kit for barges.</p>		
2.8.	<p><i>CoCP</i></p> <p>AB said mitigation in the CoCP is vague.</p> <p>DS said best practice guidance (BPG) will be followed and has not been repeated verbatim (Section 7). Requirement PW6 (CoCP) secures the CoCP.</p>		

