

RBKC/THAMES WATER MEETING – 8 September 2011

THAMES TUNNEL DEVELOPMENTS AT CREMORNE WHARF AND CHELSEA EMBANKMENT

DRAFT MINUTES

1. Present / Introductions

RBKC: Peter Ramage (Waste, Culture, and Leisure), Patricia Cuervo (Planning), Richard Craig (Planning), Jonathan Wade (Planning), Rebecca Brown (Environmental Health), Adam Bassi (Property), Barrie Maclaurin (Leisure), James McCool (Transport).

TW: David Dolan, Colin Turnbull, John Pearson, Clare Donnelly.

2. EIA update

2.1 Meetings and Workshops

CT explained that the Preliminary Environmental Report (PEIR) will be included in Phase 2 consultation. There will be an EHO forum on the 23rd September, a Health Impact Assessment workshop on the 28th September and a final transport and design workshop on the 29th September.

2.2 Surveys

CT explained that surveys were ongoing and included different issues such as noise, air quality and ecology.

- Action: PC to confirm the meetings she will attend.

Note: the order of some agenda items was change to allow some officers to arrive to the meeting.

5. Phase 2 Update

5.1 Programme and pre-brief

JP explained that Phase 2 Consultation will take place towards the end of autumn. There will be an officers and members pre-briefing. The consultation will run for 14 weeks (which will take into account two weeks of Christmas holidays).

5.2 Site Notices

JP explained that Thames Water will put up site notices to notify the public in addition to sending letters. There will be a couple of site notices per site. In areas where ownership of land could not be ascertained, a site notice will also be put up. Copies of all documents will be sent to libraries and planning offices as for Phase 1 consultation.

PC said the council will provide a direct link to the consultation website will be included on the council's Thames Tunnel website.

BM explained that site notices could also be put up in the notice board at Cremorne Gardens.

6. AOB

6.1 River wall survey

JP explained that survey work on the river wall was being carried out.

DD explained that the wall survey will be on the 25th September and it will not be intrusive.

6.3 Planning conditions (requirements)

JP explained that the project was looking at providing limits of deviation for the works and this would be backed up by requirements (as planning conditions are known in a DCO) later on. TW wants to leave some issues open to the contractors. Issues such indicative elevations could be provided but more specific details on design matters could be submitted later on.

JW agreed that something too detailed could be left to the contractors but some kind of reassurance on the final outcome was also needed. Details can be conditioned but materials need to be discussed.

JP agreed that the application may be more detailed than an outline application but, this was yet to be confirmed and TW would discuss this with the council in the future. Thames Water would like the requirements to be discussed before submitting the Development Consent Order to the IPC. There may be requirements (conditions) in terms of environmental impacts (noise, air quality).

PR said that a separate discussion on details and requirements will take place to negotiate the DCO before submitting it to the IPC.

6.4 Statement of common ground and undertakings

JP explained that TW would like to negotiate a statement of common ground (SOCG) on points that both parties agree and to highlight issues where they don't agree. This could cover issues such as materials finishing, planning policy, requirements (conditions). TW would like the Council to sign up prior to submission to the IPC. The SOCG could be site specific as the two sites have different issues. There could also be a SOCG on more general issues. There is a need for a legal undertaking or memorandum of understanding on what is included in the DCO.

4. Chelsea Embankment Update

JP explained that on Phase 2 consultation there will be information on the preferred scheme and two shortlisted sites for Chelsea Embankment so all options will be presented.

PR enquired on the preferred option.

JP explained that the preferred option is the foreshore as this was consulted on at phase one, the design has been improved subsequently and following discussions with Crossrail 2, and it has fewer amenity and open space impacts. DD explained that both foreshore and onshore would be similar in terms of construction period, and transport impacts.

DD said that people will be encouraged to give comments for all the three sites and there will be also discussions with Westminster. The Environment Agency is opposed to anything built on the river.

JP said that RBKC officers could discuss the different options with Ward members and get back to him.

PR and JM explained that the option in the gardens may have less impact on transport.

JW asked if the IPC had to agree to the whole scheme once the DCO was submitted or if the DCO could be amended after submission.

JP answered that amending the DCO would be time consuming as it has to be consulted upon, and changes of a material nature (i.e. changing location, dimensions etc) are not permitted.

RC asked if different sites could be submitted in the DCO.

JP said that Thames Water is required to have regard to the feedback they receive during Phase 2 consultation in finalising the Thames Tunnel proposals.

BM explained that Ranelagh Gardens have some use by the public – both RBKC and WCC residents - although it is a private garden.

JP suggested that in order for the project to have further discussions on the gardens option they would need a letter from the Council requesting it.

DD explained that the consultation material cannot be changed at this stage.

PR asked what would be the finished product if the works were to take place in the gardens.

CD explained that there would not be any structure in the foreshore and the end product would include landscaping and planting. The two avenues of trees would not be affected although some trees in the area immediately around the shaft would need to be felled.

PR commented that RBKC officers would need to talk to members about the different options.

RC explained that officers will need some details with the drawings, perspective, and section through to tease out the details, mainly those related to the wall.

JP added that an open space assessment will be included and that any further information the Council could give them for future discussions would be welcomed.

JW said that officers will need to look into the long-term impact and that we will get back to Thames Water on that.

- Action: RBKC officers to think about what further information TW needs to include for the site and what feedback we can give.

CD showed the current scheme on Chelsea which included the removal of a small number of trees. The proposals have an emphasis on the historic axis of the Royal Hospital (Monument Walk). The scheme presented at CABE had a cobbled finish but transport impacts changed the finishing to asphalt with pedestrian refuges to assist in crossing this wide road. A bench will allow people to look at the river views. The two kiosks will be fairly low at 1.3m in height and symmetrical, respecting the axis. The elevation will have similar mouldings and colour brick than the existing wall. The coach parking has been removed from the previous scheme.

RC asked if the kiosks' doors had to face the river (if they didn't they could also be used as information boards). He also said that both the kiosks and the materials would need to be special and the details of the stone bench should be included, along with its height, the vegetation of the intertidal area and access for maintenance purposes.

BM said that the planting in the intertidal area looked high maintenance and it needed to be low maintenance otherwise it would be a permanent source of litter. BM noted it would probably be TfL's responsibility as they have sought responsibility of assets riverward of their highway e.g. trees although should be ascertained.

CD explained that more information on the maintenance regime will be submitted.

JP explained that the east side of the terrace will have equipment underneath it but the west side is provided for symmetry.

JMc said that people do cycle on the pavement.

CD explained that the wall was built as part of the bridge and asked for information on the 1850s wall.

BM said that Local Studies in the library may have some information. (Dave Walker from Local Studies was contacted later on by PC and confirmed that they hold some information on the wall. His email address is Dave.Walker@rbkc.gov.uk and this number is 020 7361 2876)

3 Cremorne Update

3.1 Current TT proposals

CD explained the drawings. The interception of the sewer is on the east of the site but the shaft is located on the west. She also explained the layout, the location and materials of the shed (brick and metal cladding above), the possibility of storm water attenuation by having a green roof in the shed, along with a window rooflight, the possibility of the Thames Path, the weighbridge and office accommodation. She said that the level of maintenance of the green roof will have to be agreed.

BM asked how many sqm of green roof will be provided as some green could be provided on the ground and the roof could be used for photovoltaics for the future commercial benefit of the depot.

DD explained the shaft location considerations. The shaft in the preferred locations (X and D) was close to the shed and it will need maintenance every 10 years so the shed could be used normally. The other locations are not preferred due to the impacts on the wall and other boroughs. The preferred option allowed for the retention of the waste site and safeguarded Wharf. Option B will lead to work on the wall and Port of London Authority may not agree as it is a safeguarded wharf. There is little scope to move the sewer interception on the east as it is on line with the existing sewer, so this would need to be rebuilt elsewhere in the site and could impact on nearby buildings.

JP explained that TW position is that the site will go back as a safeguarded wharf and waste site as required by local and regional planning policy.

CD explained that option A may have impacts on neighbouring development.

AB said that we needed to think about what goes on our site. The preference of the options was B, C and possibly A.

JP explained that TW needed a categorical response on what the Council wants on the site before Christmas.

PR said that we will need to consider internally the responses to the options.

JP said that we needed another meeting before the public consultation in early October.

- Action: PR to organise another meeting in early October to cover Chelsea, Cremorne and settlement (Doris Cook to send invites).

RC said that he was concerned about the Thames Path as it should be facilitated and reconstructed as mitigation. He also said that he would be providing comments on the shed.

JP explained that the building line would leave space to for the future operator of the site to provide the Thames Path in the future but, currently this is not proposed as the Port of London Authority would likely object given that the site was a safeguarded wharf.

AB enquired about settlement.

DD explained that settlement would be small (up to 5mm) but it would vary. Another, more detailed meeting would be required.

PR asked if TW could check the ownership of the jetty.

JP said that he would get back to PR

- JP to check ownership of the jetty

RB asked if the environmental surveys would cover the 3 options for Chelsea Embankment.

JP said that they should do.

3.2 RBKC response on shaft options sent by TW on 29 July

- Action: AB to arrange a meeting to discuss shaft options with TW

3.3 Hutchinson Whampoa development update

There were no updates on this point.

7 Date of next meeting

Provisionally set for mid October.