

RBKC/THAMES WATER MEETING – 12 April 2011

THAMES TUNNEL DEVELOPMENTS AT CREMORNE WHARF AND CHELSEA EMBANKMENT

DRAFT MINUTES

1. Present

RBKC: Peter Ramage (Waste, Culture, and Leisure), Patricia Cuervo (Planning), Richard Craig (Planning), Jonathan Wade (Planning), Saskie Laing (Ecology), Ian Hooper (Environmental Health), Geoff Burrage (Transportation), Adam Bassi (Property)

TW: David Dolan, Colin Turnbull, John Pearson, , Dermot Scanlon, Clare Donnelly, Christina Dellore

2. Minutes of last meeting.

JP undertook to come back with any amendments to the draft minutes of the meeting of 21 January. [Done 14 April – and minutes posted on website.]

3. Actions from previous meeting

TW had now received the accommodation schedule at Cremorne.

4. EIA update

PC would respond by Monday.

DS explained that, on legal advice, TW had had to stick to the scheme consulted on, and could not seek an assessment of a modified scheme as we had discussed.

PC would attend the transport meeting tomorrow.

DS had met the EHOs last Friday. He would issue a discussion draft on working hours before Easter.

Workshops with TfL scheduled for 9 and 10 May.

SL had met other borough ecologists with TW, and she was happy with progress.

Flood risk workshop due 7 June.

5. Cremorne Wharf

Response to new option tabled at short meeting on 15 March.

JP outlined a possible variant placing the shaft on the waste transfer site. Was this likely to be acceptable? DD said the possible shift resulted from a change in TW's ventilation strategy. He explained there was no need to vent the tunnel at this location except when full, and that could be done passively through carbon filters.

AB said the Council had an operational need for the site for waste and highways uses. The Council would need details about how much land was required around any shaft, eg for crane access. The precise location of the shaft would be critical. The Council was willing to look at TW's ideas to try to preserve uses and options. AB would instruct engineers and they would seek a dialogue with DD. The Council would need planning advice. AB and PC would speak outside the meeting.

Relocation of existing uses

JP said if the Council agreed the variant scheme uses on site would have to be re-located for 3 years. PR said the Council could agree in principle to relocate as follows:

1. opera storage – needed to be in reasonable drive time of Holland Park, and have suitable headroom for craning in sets etc
2. the new cleansing depot would have to be very local, as it was operationally important to minimise sweepers' walking time to their beats
3. rocksalt would be better located in the north of the borough, where winter temperatures are slightly lower and there are more hills requiring special attention

PR said the Council would expect TW to cover all reasonable costs and expenses such that the Council was not out of pocket as a result of any relocation.

DD said he thought relocation would probably be more towards the end of the programme than the beginning. Development was partly dependent on the timing of works at the former power station.

PR said there was a strong need to fix dates for residents' sake as well as the Council's.

JP said TW were seeking agreement with the Council well before June 2012, or they would have to consider using CPO/Development Consent Order powers. JP said TW would prefer to agree a memorandum of Understanding,

and not to secure a DCO, but would need to retain that as a reserve power even if it was not exercised.

PR said the Council would agree, or not, by March 2012.

DD stated tyhat a study was still being undertaken but, that spoil could still go out by river on the revised scheme where practicable and cost effective to do so.

Design development

AB asked for a plan showing over-sailing. CD agreed.

The meeting discussed shaft location options. AB said he would prefer it to go east within the site. JP said TW would need to finalise the design soon so they could show a revised scheme at consultation phase 2. The EIA team would have to have something to assess.

The Council officers attending said they would have an internal meeting before the end of the month to determine whether the Council could say something about the big picture. [See letter dated 28 April]

Brief for reinstatement

Shed - very likely. Thames Path – definite. Offices – yes. Two weighbridges – likely.

6. Chelsea Embankment

JP stated Thames had done site visits with English Heritage. EH had suggested using Ranelagh Gardens, not the foreshore. Agreed this was a dilemma involving competing interests.

PR said TW must talk urgently to the Royal Hospital to assess their response. The Council officers would consider their views and write before the end of the month.

7 Date of next meeting

Provisionally set for end May. [Subsequently rearranged to 8 June]

PR