

RBKC/THAMES WATER MEETING – 26.01.11

THAMES TUNNEL DEVELOPMENTS AT CREMORNE WHARF AND CHELSEA

AGREED MINUTES

1. Present

RBKC: Peter Ramage (Waste, Culture, and Leisure), Neil Dadswell (Property), Patricia Cuervo (Planning), David McDonald (Planning), Richard Craig (Planning), Becky Brown (Environmental Health), Geoff Burrage (Transportation), Adam Bassi (Property)

TW: David Dolan, Liz Sale, Colin Turnbull, John Pearson, Mark Job, Dermot Scanlon, Clare Donnelly,

2. Minutes of last meeting.

The minutes of the meetings held on 23 November 2010 were agreed, and could now be posted on the Council's website.

3. Consultations with statutory bodies

TW said GLA, Port of London Authority, English Heritage, and Environment Agency had all responded to the consultation. The GLA had no objections. They wanted to explore the use of the waste transfer station for access. The PLA had pointed out the Mayor's policy on safeguarded wharves. The EA needed justification, but this was not likely to cause any difficulty. English Heritage had no objection to development at Cremorne, but were concerned about the impact on listed structures at Chelsea Embankment.

TW believed that the EA and PLA would tolerate use of the foreshore. All statutory agencies wanted to safeguard the wharf. The PLA were saying that their design criterion for safeguarding meant there should be a capacity to moor a 1000 tonne barge at the redeveloped Cremorne site. The meeting discussed whether continuing use as a wharf was consistent with aspirations to extend the Thames Path at Cremorne. RBKC confirmed the two could coexist.

The EA did not want piecemeal ecological mitigation. It seemed they wanted no more encroachment on the river even to provide mitigation. PR would brief the Council's Ecology Officer. One option might be to refocus on improving Chelsea Creek. Agreed to put ecology on agenda of next meeting.

4. Accessing the foreshore at Cremorne

JP said that TW's current appraisal was based on access to the foreshore through the wharf. They were reviewing alternative sites for the Borough's rock salt store and cleansing operation.

DD said TW would be able to access the foreshore if they took down part of the Council's current 'shed'. There was still scope for joint use by TW and the Borough, assuming a failure to find alternative sites. DD tabled an outline chart showing joint use of the wharf. It would be a lot better for TW if the council was not on-site, but it was possible to accommodate both uses. TW asked PR to provide details of current welfare facilities for the contractor's staff on site.

PR said the Council's default position would ultimately be reinstatement with TW having a right of access to their facility.

5. Ventilation strategy

TW were reviewing their ventilation strategy with a view to minimising the size of the structures required. PC and RC would give TW feedback on the proposed revised structures in form of comments on the view points, and respond to the paper on Good Design. CD said TW had taken out the ventilation buildings as part of the ventilation strategy, leaving only stacks that were approximately 2.5 metres by 2.5 metres wide and three metres high. The top of the Cremorne shaft was now a large manhole cover, which could be paved.

Mechanical ventilation could be at both ends of the tunnel, and a daily air change done at both ends. Air displaced when the tunnel filled would be pushed through passive filters.

6. Townscape

MJ presented for TW. They had established a robust assessment area. They were modelling the scheme that went out for consultation at phase 1, while trying to reduce the planned scale of the structures. Residential and tourist receptors were a priority. TW would also assess impacts from transport routes. TW would do winter and summer assessments.

TW would provide photo montages of views of Cremorne and Chelsea as part of the visual assessment.

TW welcomed the Council's views on assessing views from the Royal Hospital Grounds and Chelsea Bridge (one north, one south). Views from Battersea Park will be included. The modelling will include the removal of vegetation, and look at impacts on the wall, river, and bridge.

PC had a copy of the methodology. She would assess and reply. RC agreed the Council could exchange emails and photos with TW to reach agreement.

7. EIA

DS said EIA papers were due by the end of January. The scoping report was due in February [NB eventually became available in early March], and would be based on the 'preferred' scheme, ie the one that went out for consultation.

PR strongly urged that TW prepare two scoping exercises, one for the preferred scheme and one with access to Cremorne through the Wharf, not the Gardens. [NB this proved impossible subsequently, for legal reasons. TW were obliged to produce one exercise only relating to the preferred scheme.]

DS would get transportation comments through PC. [NB Meeting 8 March at sub regional level to assess the beginning of their Transport Assessment. GB and PC attended the meeting.]

GB pointed out the risk of criticism on traffic survey data because of the impact of the recent removal of the Western Extension of the congestion charge zone. Noted.

DS assured BB that the Env. Health Forum on 11 February would consider air quality and noise modelling.

DD undertook to come back to the Council on how TW would use the river during construction.

8. Chelsea Embankment

CD outlined TW's analysis of the options. CD and RC agreed there was a complex set of relationships between the trees, the ecology, the path, and the road. RC would prefer the new works to start at the limit of the Bazalgette structure. English Heritage would need to be closely involved. Agreed that ongoing discussions should optimise design and seek consensus.

TW were confident that satisfactory public open space could be created on the area, mixing hard and soft landscaping.

9. Date of next meeting

Provisionally set for mid-March. [Subsequently rearranged to 12 April]

PR