

RBKC/THAMES WATER MEETING – 27 March 2012

THAMES TUNNEL DEVELOPMENTS AT CREMORNE WHARF AND CHELSEA EMBANKMENT

DRAFT MINUTES

1. Present / Introductions

RBKC: Jonathan Wade (Planning), Patricia Cuervo (Planning)

TW: Clare Donnelly (Architect), Sarah Dye (Engineering Manager), John Pearson (Planning Manager), Alana Jelfs (Planning Assistant), Alex Gilmour (Engineer)

English Heritage:

Claire Craig (Planning Adviser – London)

2. Minutes of previous meetings

Minutes were reviewed.

Outstanding actions:

PC to check what information on the layout of the buildings next to Cremorne is available.

JP to send design principles once finalised

3. Chelsea Embankment Foreshore Design

CC provided a brief review of the previous meeting, where SD presented an overview of the constraints on the alignment of the main tunnel at Chelsea Embankment Foreshore (CEF). These included the engineering constraints (through Lambeth sands) and potential health and safety risks. CC said that English Heritage is still considering the Ranelagh Gardens option as they are not persuaded on the magnitude of the temporary effects versus the long-term effects. She said that they understood the concerns related to the Lambeth beds, the constraints to realign the tunnel and safety considerations. However, English Heritage's preferred option was still Ranelagh Gardens, depending on the outcome of their review of the engineering constraints. CC noted that without prejudice, EH are happy to discuss proposals within the Foreshore with RBKC and Thames Water.

CD explained that the design takes into account comments from Richard Craig (RBKC) to reduce visual clutter by relocating the pedestrian refugees, locating the kiosks as part of the river wall and including bold paving patterns in cream and grey. CD said that currently the pattern of the paving was a floral pattern reflecting the Chelsea Flower Show but, this was open to discussion. CD explained the removal of a tree along the embankment would provide a line of sight and open up views to the river from the Royal Hospital.

CD explained the need to fix the shape of the foreshore for the submission and noted that the project had some flexibility on the final form of the public realm e.g. instead of having inter-tidal terraces you could have accessible public realm comprising green terraces which could be occasionally inundated

by the river as they will be under the mean high water springs. A study is underway to get information on vehicle turning.

JP noted that future maintenance of the public realm will need to be discussed with TfL and RBKC. JW said that it was unlikely that the Council would adopt the public space but, would be happy to discuss options for how this may be done.

CC said that English Heritage's view was that they did not want to make a focal point of the structure in the foreshore. It was preferred to have two small structures rather than a big structure in which to put all the emphasis. The axis to the Royal Hospital was the most important axis. She said that there was a need for long-term maintenance support. SD explained that the location is mainly determined by location of the outfall. CD noted the option of splitting the site, however this has effect of distributing bulk across a larger area and increasing footprint and was not the preferred option of RBKC or the project.

JW explained that the Council was not worried about the emphasis on the axis but on materials and long-term maintenance of the new public open space in the foreshore. He wanted information on materials and details up front as much as possible (i.e., how will materials weather).

JP explained that the project was seeking to fix the river wall and would set-out design principles which would be discussed with EH and RBKC and could be subject of a DCO requirement (planning condition). JW noted that the discharge of planning conditions by the planning inspectorate would be considered unacceptable by RBKC and Council would likely want these to go to committee with involvement from EH as required.

- Action: JW to develop a list that includes what the Council wants to see in detail. This list will be discussed at next meeting.

JP explained that TW will not undertake night time visual assessments because there will be only low level lighting as it would otherwise disturb fish and bats. JW noted if the project can clarify low level lighting would be used, that should be fine.

4. Lots Road Pumping Station Works

JP explained that some electrical and control equipment will be located in the listed pumping station. There will probably be a connection underground with the proposed operational equipment located under Cremorne Wharf. The location of the connection will be shown in the Development Consent Order but it will not include too much detail. JP noted that they were seeking to minimise the physical effect on the listed pumping station and details of the works would be subject of a DCO requirement.

SD said that they will show in the plans the entry to the building. This will be discussed at the next meeting.

- Action: SD will send the final drawing to RC before next meeting.

5. AOB

JP noted the Counters Creek scheme was developing and may require works are Cremorne.