

RBKC/THAMES WATER MEETING – 15 March 2011

THAMES TUNNEL DEVELOPMENTS AT CREMORNE WHARF AND CHELSEA EMBANKMENT

DRAFT MINUTES

1. Present

RBKC: Peter Ramage (Waste, Culture, and Leisure), Patricia Cuervo (Planning), Kathy May (Waste Management), Jonathan Wade (Planning),

TW: David Dolan, John Pearson

2. Cremorne Wharf

TW had asked for an informal meeting to discuss a possible change of design.

DD explained that it now seemed possible for the dropshaft to go 'off line' of the main Thames Tunnel. This opened up the possibility of putting the shaft within the yard of Cremorne Wharf rather than on the foreshore. TW would not touch the existing jetty on this version. But they would need the whole of the Wharf for works.

After development there would be a kiosk in line of sight to the top of the shaft, and a 3m ventilation column. The land could revert to its existing use after the works, so long as TW had occasional access for maintenance.

DD said this version of the scheme was likely to be more in conformity with planning policy, and to be preferred by the Environment Agency. On the other hand the PLA were likely to be disappointed that there would be no new jetty.

DD said the cost would be slightly cheaper. JP said TW would have to demolish and rebuild the shed.

JP said there should be no impact at all on Cremorne Gardens as access would be via the existing depot access.

KM asked about the long-term access requirement. DD said TW had to have occasional access to the shaft covers. The placing of the shaft was negotiable within limits. A 6 wheel 20t crane would be need to drop a man-rider.

JW asked about the risk of noise impacts given the greater proximity to residents. DD said TW were still investigating noise impacts; the analysis would be in the EIA.

PC asked about other impacts. DD said they would all be much less than the original scheme. There was more tunnelling but a significantly smaller footprint.

KM asked about timescale. DD said there was more flexibility. The shaft and tunnel works could be separated.

PR asked about Chelsea Embankment. DD said there was no impact. This had always been off line.

PR asked about the ventilation strategy. DD said the risks were probably reduced with an off line solution; there was less air coming out. JP said air would be carbon filtered and there would be general tunnel ventilation provided from facilities at either end of the Thames Tunnel.

JP reminded the Council to supply an accommodation schedule for the uses on the Wharf.

Consultation

PR queried TW's apparent inability to reflect the modified scheme in their response to the phase 1 consultation.

JP said that in relation to each site TW would draft a concluding paragraph, and would share that with the Council.

7 Date of next meeting

Mid April.

PR