



## Meeting minutes

<b>Subject:</b>	Thames Tunnel proposals in RBKC
<b>Purpose:</b>	Planning and design update for RBKC
<b>Date and time:</b>	11 <sup>th</sup> June 2012, 3:00pm – 5.00pm
<b>Location:</b>	The Point, Earl Conference Room
<b>Attendees:</b>	<p><b>RBKC:</b> Patricia Cuervo – Senior Planning Policy Officer (PC) Richard Craig – Senior Urban Design Officer (RC)</p> <p><b>English Heritage:</b> Claire Craig (CC), Zosia Mellor (ZM)</p> <p><b>TW:</b> John Pearson (JP), Sarah Dye (SD), Clare Donnelly (CD), Ken Sabel (KS), Zoe Chick (ZC)</p>
<b>Apologies</b>	
<b>Minute taker:</b>	ZC
<b>Doc ref:</b>	100-OM-PNC-RBKEN-110157_AA

Item	Action item/Notes for the record	By who	By when
<b>1</b>	<b>Introductions</b>		
<b>2</b>	<b>Agree minutes from previous meeting</b>		
2.1	<b>Action:</b> ZC to go through minutes provided by RBKC and to agree them with PC. ZC to take future minutes.	ZC	
<b>3</b>	<b>Project / Programme Update</b>		
3.1	JP explained TW currently out to targeted consultation on four sites (Albert Embankment Foreshore, Victoria Embankment Foreshore, Barn Elms and Putney Foreshore) and there are minor amendments to the red line boundaries of the Cremorne Wharf and Chelsea sites. Targeted consultation ends Wednesday 4th July. S48 publicity will be held in Summer 2012 and the DCO submission will be early 2013.		
<b>4</b>	<b>Cremorne Wharf inc. Lots Road Power Station</b>		
4.1	JP identified that changes at Cremorne allow for barges and the transportation of excavated material by river transport. RC questioned what would occur if something happened to the jetty during TT construction works. RBKC would want something better putting back. JP said we will talk about how TW will protect the jetty and other borough assets at the Other Consents meeting on 19th June. RC raised the issue of access to the Cremorne Wharf site. TW own the access in front of Lots Road Pumping Station. This needs raising with RBKC property as this route would become the public access. Do they have TW agreement? JP explained that it would be wrapped up in an agreement between RBKC and TW. TW would still need access though for maintenance.		

	RC said there will need to be public realm improvements on site. SD expressed that they would not be allowed pave over the access covers to the below ground infrastructure.		
4.2	<p><i>Settlement</i></p> <p>KS explained the details of the study on settlement which analysed the possible effects on listed buildings due to the Thames Tunnel works. KS outlined that the positioning of the proposed infrastructure is parallel with the listed Lots Road Pumping Station which means the settlement contours are in line with the building's front facade rather than at an angle. It is considered there may be a 15mm differential settlement, which will be fairly gradual over the 20-30m width of the building. The southern back elevation is plain stock brick but the side and front elevations are glazed bricks and more sensitive. The front wall should experience very little movement as it is furthest away. Some damage may occur on the side cross walls as a result of differential ground movement across the width of the building.</p> <p>KS explained that using the same methods as used on other tunnelling projects, which are inherently conservative in their predictions, there is a predicted Damage Risk Category of 2 (Slight damage) which typically means that there is a risk of cracks occurring of the order of between 1 and 5mm.</p> <p><b>[Post Meeting note:</b> There was unfortunately an error in the initial draft settlement assessment. On further examination the predicted Damage Risk Category has been confirmed as 3, or Moderate damage, which means there is risk of cracks typically of the order of between 5 and 10mm. If there is further cracking it is likely to occur in the location of existing cracks or in structural joints or in areas of structural weakness.]</p> <p>KS explained Arup are looking at mitigation and it is considered it would be best to monitor the building during the works and to repair any damage that occurs later with materials to match the existing finishes, such as with new glazed bricks. This is considered preferable to mitigation measures such as grouting, which has been found in recent projects to cause heave of a similar magnitude of movement to the ground movement predicted to be caused by the settlement at Lots Road. Heave produced by grouting could therefore cause damage to the building, of a similar order to that predicted by the settlement.</p> <p>RC raised issue of internal tiling. KS this would also be repaired / replaced if damaged.</p> <p>RC questioned what if the glass shatters and is it critical. KS said it is not likely that the glass will shatter <b>[Post meeting note:</b> this remains the case] and the windows are iron framed. RC requested TW get suppliers lined up who can replace the windows.</p> <p>RC suggested the settlement survey could be used as a baseline for RBKC. KS explained that the listed structures would be monitored and RC queried whether this would be run by the Council. JP stated that the method statement and materials could be agreed with the borough through the Other Consents process and could also be wrapped up in the Statement of Common Ground.</p>		
4.3	<p><i>Lots Road Pumping Station improvements</i></p> <p>RC asked about other improvements to the building, the existing vent in particular and is there not an alternative as it is a significant facade. It probably was once a standard pipe but now boxed in.</p> <p>CC said this is something to bear in mind. Enhancement measures can be considered as mitigation measure. Greenwich Pumping Station and Abbey Mills were used as examples to show the TW estate is not in a good condition. Project should be looking at sustainable inclusion of the historic environment.</p>		

	<p>JP said that the vent is within the red line boundary so TW could do something about it. It could be clad but RC considered this would look as bad. Need to take off concrete and see what's behind.</p> <p>CD said that TW will consider this further.</p> <p>RC also asked whether there could be a more aesthetically pleasing alternative to the current security grilles. CC said there are similarities with Abbey Mills and Greenwich Pumping Station. English Heritage do have issues with grilles. Could there be a greater degree of internal safety grilles?</p> <p>RC explained that the site will become more of a public asset in the future and it needs to be considered with this in mind.</p> <p>RC said that TW should make sure that it is made clear in the TT reports that the infrastructure is being designed at the least damaging angle to the pumping station.</p> <p>SD stated that the position of the shaft is consistent with the residential development scheme. TW will submit drawings with a wide limit of deviation due to uncertainty with the resi scheme and Counters Creek.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> KS will ensure that the settlement report is shared with RBKC when it has been signed off.</p>	KS	
<b>5</b>	<b>Chelsea Embankment</b>		
5.1	<p>PC explained that the Exec Director of Planning and Conservation at RBKC prefers the design with more accessible terraces for Chelsea.</p> <p>JP said that the river wall layout will be the same for both and everything else will now be fairly illustrative. The design principles should now be used to guide the final design.</p>		
<b>6</b>	<b>Design Principles</b>		
6.1	<p>JP thanked RBKC for their comments on the Design Principles. It was explained that the Design Principles are now going in to the Section 48 (of the 2008 Planning Act) publicity and therefore there is unlikely to be time to take on all comments received in time for S48 but they will be taken account following S48, prior to DCO submission.</p> <p>CD said there have been some minor changes to the principles following legal review and comments from Ecology.</p> <p>RC questioned who judges which principles area more important than others – heritage over access for example. JP said it may come down to who discharges the conditions (requirements). It may be PINs in consultation with the LPA and EH.</p> <p>CD explained that the site specific principles can override the generic principles so long as it is stated in the documentation.</p> <p>CC referred to English Heritage's award winning public realm guidance and suggested it may be useful for TT.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> CC to provide link to document</p> <p>Post Meeting Note: Website from CC - <a href="http://www.helm.org.uk/upload/pdf/E AHL_tagged.pdf?1351272688">http://www.helm.org.uk/upload/pdf/E AHL_tagged.pdf?1351272688</a></p>	CC	
6.2	<i>Comments on specific principles</i>		
6.3	A general comment RC had was that nowhere is there a principle about the design actually being attractive.		
6.4	LSCP.06 (design and security) - RC said no need to be so prescriptive to Secured by Design and other guidance may be relevant.		
6.5	LSCP.08 (walkways) – need to allow for 2m walkways rather than 1.8m (RC)		

6.6	LSCP.10 (materials). SD commented that natural stone is not suitable everywhere.		
6.7	LSCP.13 (sub surfaces) – need appropriate surfaces to take cranes onto the site for maintenance. SD explained this is discussed in the engineering reports.		
6.8	Section 3.3. Para 3.3.1 should say “These principles apply to all sites unless stated otherwise <i>in the site specific section</i> ”.		
6.9	RC commented on the statement / signature structures. RBKC happy with the signature structures but were worried about the small diameter 6m columns. CD explained that the signature column shown will be 4m minimum. RC suggested a new principle to reduce visual clutter. JP said TW can look to incorporate that principle at Chelsea RC asked about the pedestrian crossing at Chelsea Embankment. It could be improved – there is no need to put everything back.		
6.10	HRTG.02 - All agreed that the sentence should read “Placing excessive strains on historic structures from the operation of the tunnel <i>must be avoided in the design where possible.</i> ”		
6.11	HRTG.03 - RC stated that this principle should refer to safe storage of historic fabric which is temporarily removed.		
6.12	HRTG.12 – RC said that information boards should be subtle.		
6.13	LTNG.10 – Principle regarding localised lighting. RC said don’t want spot lighting on features which will detract from buildings. JP said all lighting will be low level. CD explained that maintenance is a big issue in the selection of light fittings. There will only be more than low level lighting at the Victoria and Blackfriars sites.		
6.14	CD explained that a lot of the heritage principles have been moved out into the CoCP as they are to do with construction.		
6.15	CC asked if the project had considered working with the Museum of London (MoL).Where does the historic material go after its removal? KS explained firstly the project will try and reuse it. Info will go in the heritage statement regarding where it will go if it can’t be reused. RC said there is a Bazelgette section at the MoL Docklands. CC said that the Heritage Lottery Fund worked with TW Comms team on a John Snow project. <b>Post Meeting Note:</b> Website: <a href="http://www.choleraandthethames.co.uk/">http://www.choleraandthethames.co.uk/</a>		
6.16	<i>Site specific principles – Cremorne</i> PKC3X.6 (equipment) - RBKC had changed this to state all equipment will be located within the pumping station. SD explained that this isn’t possible. The local control pillar need to be outside to enable communication between the person opening and closing the penstock and someone who can see what is happening. CD stated that it could look like the stainless steel control column adjacent to the Heatherwick bridge in Paddington Basin. RC said this hadn’t been noticed on the drawings before, JP asked whether this needs to be picked up in the DAS? SD said the dimensions will be seen on the drawings. PC asked if it will be shown on the S48 drawings. <b>Action:</b> JP/SD to review.	JP/SD	
6.17	PKC3X.3 (vehicular maintenance access) – PC said that James McCool		

	(RBKC Highways) had commented that access should be one way through the site.		
6.18	PKC3X.7 (biodiverse roof) – JP said it depends on whether TW put a depot on the site or not. ZM said the comment needs to be succinct. Could say ‘a <i>biodiverse roof should be established</i> ’. CD said that a comment from legal is that TW wouldn’t own the building – to put a biodiverse roof on. PC/RC said that Saskie Laing (RBKC Ecology) would like it.		
6.19	CC raised question of vulnerability to metal theft which is a problem across the TW estate. PC said this is a good point. JP said an extra principle can be added to address this.		
6.20	<i>Chelsea Embankment Foreshore</i> JP stated that the site is described as being a non-heritage site because it is not directly affecting a heritage structure. RC question heritage principles then but JP confirmed it is generally considered a heritage site because its location close to the Royal Hospital Chelsea. KS explained that the listed embankment wall ends about 15m away from the TW site beyond Grosvenor College Stairs. .		
6.21	PKC4X.4 (bus/coach drop off) – RBKC had changed principle to say dropping off will be prevented. CD said not sure if it can be prevented/ ZM said maybe ‘discourage’ is more realistic. PC said this could be raised at the Other Consents meeting. JP asked whether TW would be able to prevent TfL from allowing temporary parking. CC said happy for EH to assist on matters like this. A covenant or something of that nature would be good. Action: To be raised at next Environment meeting with EH and Jane Cassidy.		
6.22	PKC4X.17 (trees) – RC noted that willows had been dropped from the specification of trees. CD explained this principle relates to the smaller site in Ranelagh Gardens rather than the foreshore site. ZM was unsure about a willow for the foreshore site but would be happy to consider if something RBKC would like.		
<b>7</b>	<b>A.O.B</b>		
7.1	PC asked about the intertidal habitat design. CD said currently working on drawings and will be ready for next meeting in July.		
7.2	CC checked whether EH need to attend Other Consents meetings? JP, not at this stage.		
7.3	PC asked about an action from previous meeting regarding the double door identified on the pumping station drawings. SD confirmed not required. RC said that the existing equipment is out in the open rather than in cabinets. Why is there need for cabinets? SD agreed.		
7.4	JP said useful to have another meeting before the end of the July. Taking forward the design principles. <b>Action:</b> PC to send dates to ZC to arrange.	PC/ZC	
7.5	ZC asked about the Waste DPD. PC said no work commenced yet.		

<b>Next meeting (date, time, location):</b>	TBC (Other Consents Meeting 19 <sup>th</sup> June 2012 – 2-4pm)
<b>Next minute taker:</b>	ZC