

## **RBKC/THAMES WATER MEETING – 25 November 2011**

### **THAMES TUNNEL DEVELOPMENTS AT CREMORNE WHARF AND CHELSEA EMBANKMENT**

#### **DRAFT MINUTES**

##### **1. Present / Introductions and actions of last minutes**

**RBKC:** Jonathan Wade (Planning), Patricia Cuervo (Planning), Simon Rose (Property), Barrie Maclaurin (Leisure), James McCool (Transport), Saskie Laing (Ecology).

**TW:** Colin Turnbull (Planner), Miriam Vaux (Planner), Clare Donnelly (Architect), Sarah Dye (Engineer), Sue Hitchcock (Third Party Infrastructure Manager).

JW explained that Peter Ramage has stepped down as chairman of these meetings and will not be attending them as he will be retiring shortly and needs to focus on other urgent matters.

The minutes of last meeting were approved. Two actions were outstanding: the first one was about the level of detail in the application and the specification of finishes. Ongoing dialogue with RBKC officers is needed.

The second outstanding action was to ascertain the ownership of the jetty.

- Action: CT will gather the information on ownership of the jetty.
- Action: JW will supply Thames Water with the level of detail expected in any submission to the IPC.

##### **2. Settlement**

SH explained how TW are looking at the potential impact of settlement on the walls and buildings along the route of the Thames Tunnel. A paper on settlement is included in the phase two consultation material.

JW said that the amount of settlement seemed to be small and following earlier correspondence there had been no more concerns raised by recipients of the land referencing letters so it did not seem to be an ongoing problem. SH concurred with this view and confirmed that ongoing assessments are taking place and agreed an ongoing dialogue on this matter.

##### **3. Consultation & EIA/CoCP update**

###### **3.1 Description of Phase two consultation scope / documents / timing**

###### **3.2 Meetings and workshops**

###### **3.3 Surveys underway**

CT gave an update on the consultation process. The phase two consultation started 2 weeks ago. The website has been revamped and includes all the consultation material including information on the proposed works at each

site, different issues such as odour, settlement, public exhibitions and the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR). Deadline for responses is 5p.m. on 10 February 2012.

JW explained that RBKC's response will follow the Key Decision process and it will go to the Overview Scrutiny Committee at the end of January. He also said that colleagues from Property Services may make a separate representation.

PC explained that the exhibitions dates, places and links to the consultation documents were also on the RBKC website.

CT said that site notices had been put up and several letters were sent to residents near to the sites and to community groups identified by Thames Water and the council.

- Action: CT to send information on the different consultation letters TW have sent.

CT explained that the PEIR presents the preliminary findings of the EIA to date. It is larger and contains more detail than statutorily required. It does not, at this stage of the assessment, take into account either the results of all the surveys nor detailed mitigation measures. The full application will be accompanied by an ES. He said that if people rang about the PEIR we could point them to the Non-Technical Summary as being the summary of the preliminary findings at each site.

JW asked if the PEIR contained any information on the shortlisted site in Ranelagh Gardens that would assist the Council in deciding if it preferred this site. CT said that the PEIR covers the preferred sites only. AS part of the wider suite of surveys being undertaken in the Chelsea Embankment area surveys have been undertaken in Ranelagh Garden however, as indicated above, little survey information is reported in the PEIR.

SL said that ecological surveys needed to be undertaken next spring.

JW asked if the Council could have access to the surveys on Ranelagh Gardens as these would be needed ASAP to make an informed decision.

- Action: CT to send information available on Ranelagh and the Site Suitability Report.

BM said that the Gardens are not Council owned land although there is a lease of a patch of the South Grounds that will expire in 2013 and may then be used differently by the Royal Hospital Chelsea e.g. sports matches. He pointed out the fact that the use of the Gardens for the Thames Tunnel works could have some effect on the Chelsea Flower Show and should take care to avoid the Boer War Memorial on the roadside. CT and CD confirmed this would not be directly affected.

JW gave an update on the meeting held with Royal Hospital Chelsea, Royal Horticultural Society (RHS), English Heritage, and himself and PC, at TW's offices. The representative for Royal Hospital and the RHS were concerned with the effects on the Chelsea Flower Show. English Heritage and RBKC considered that the long-term impacts of a permanent structure on the foreshore need to be weighed against the more short-term impact on Ranelagh Gardens.

- Action: CT will provide more information on how the Flower Show could operate around the Thames Tunnel works. This will be sent to the Council to inform decision making.
- Action: PC will send information on Section 106 for a recent Royal Hospital planning permission.
- Action: JW will contact the Arboricultural team to check whether the mature tree that was felled in front of the gates of the Royal Hospital was authorised by the Council. The Council's Arboricultural team will also need to advice on the trees that may need to be felled if the site in the garden is realised.
- Action: CT will send information on the construction phases, including access and transport in the Gardens and the trees that will need to be felled.

BM pointed out the need for the Council's arboricultural team to be involved to assess the effect on trees in the Gardens.

SD explained that both the Scheme Development Report and the Site Information on Chelsea Embankment explains the information on Ranelagh Gardens. She said that the Site Suitability Report contains information at high level.

CT offered more briefings and meetings if needed in January/February.

- Action: PC to arrange internal meetings with officers and with members to discuss the information being provided about Ranelagh Gardens.
- Action: CT to arrange another meeting to discuss Ranelagh Gardens with the Royal Hospital, Royal Horticultural Society, RBKC and English Heritage.

CT explained that TW are preparing position papers on the cumulative effects. Papers will be sent next month for comment. He said that part A of the Code of Construction Practice was out for consultation and responses were sought before Christmas to enable one to one discussions in January. PC said that our response was on track and the meeting in January regarding the sites (part B) was already arranged for the 23<sup>rd</sup> January.

## **5. Chelsea Embankment Update**

### **5.1 Proposals in phase two consultation.**

CD explained that the information contained on the Site Information paper contains high level information on the design, CT explained more is in the Design Development Report and Book of Plans out for consultation. CD offered to send more information or answer questions if needed.

JW was unsure whether this was required as the Embankment foreshore may not be the Council's preferred site. JW asked JMc about the impact on transport for the Embankment and Ranelagh Gardens sites.

JMC said that the transportation impact from the excavation will be probably more or less the same for both sites. He said that the short-term impact of a potentially small amount of lorry movements would be weighted against the long-term impact of a permanent structure on the foreshore. He raised concerns on the impact on Chelsea Bridge Road for both sites – this needs to be explored.

CT explained that the connection to the Low Level Sewer would be shorter for the Embankment site but there would be a longer connection to the Thames Tunnel for the Ranelagh Gardens site. It is proposed that the material to fill the cofferdam will be transported to and from the foreshore site by barge. CT noted that there could be constraints to accessing the Gardens by road and further discussion would be needed with the Council.

SD confirmed that the number of lorries would be more or less the same if the preferred site was to be changed to Ranelagh Gardens because the volumes of incoming and outgoing materials would be roughly the same ignoring the cofferdam fill material (which is proposed to be moved by barge from the foreshore site). TW would need to reconsult if its preferred site changed.

PC asked for the timescale for this consultation. CT said that it would probably be in spring, if the site were to change.

## **4 Cremorne Update**

### **4.1 Proposals in phase two consultation**

CD explained the design of Cremorne Wharf Site, the ventilation columns and the materials of the building for the reinstated depot, which is the primary design influence. She said that the application will probably not have too much detail, e.g. outline level, reflecting the use that we are required to reinstate. CT pointed out that it follows current planning policy. There will be more detail provided for the interface with the Listed Lots Road Pumping Station. She asked if more information was needed at the moment.

CT said that comments on all aspects are welcomed, such as the location of the ventilation columns, roof, etc.

JW agreed that we will need to take into account the setting of the listed building and how the building connects with it, but an outline level of detail

may be fine. The amount of information required at this stage will depend on the future feasibility and use of the site.

SR said that Property will submit a representation on the GLA safeguarded wharf which is currently out for consultation.

- Action: JW will talk with Richard Craig about the impact on the listed building and the amount of detail required.

SL said that it is likely that bat activity was present at the pumping station and this should be taken into account.

CT said he will pass the information to their ecology team.

#### **4.2 Hutchison Whampoa development update**

PC said that we are sending comments to LBHF about the application adjoining Chelsea Creek for change in residential units.

JW said that Hutchison Whampoa are doing remedial actions but not building as this will trigger Section 106 contributions. He said he will inform TW if they commence Section 106 discussions with the Council in order that we may understand phasing for EIA cumulative effects/transport purposes. CT explained we will seek to meet them soon.

- PC to email the relevant case officer/s to update TW.

#### **6. AOB**

No other business was raised.