

RBKC/THAMES WATER MEETING – 23.11.10

THAMES TUNNEL DEVELOPMENT AT CREMORNE FORESHORE

DRAFT MINUTES

1. Present

RBKC: Peter Ramage, Kathy May, Patricia Cuervo, David McDonald, Jonathan Wade, Paul McCarthy, Neil Dadswell

TW: John Pearson, Cristina Dellore, David Dolan

2. Terms of reference

We will jointly examine the policy and operational implications of TW's proposed use of the Cremorne foreshore to build a connection from the combined sewer overflow to the Thames Tunnel.

3. Disclosure of documents and minutes

All documents related to our discussions are disclosable. The Council will post agendas and minutes on its website.

4. Council's formal policy position

RBKC will assert its formal policy position in its response to the current consultation exercise.

5. Powers available to Thames Water

DEFRA expect to amend s.14(3) of the Planning Act 2008 to designate this as a nationally significant infrastructure project. They expect the planning application to go to the IPC. TW expect to apply to the IPC for a development consent order. This order would give TW the power to purchase land compulsorily; it could include EA and PLA consents. A CPO would have to go to a Minister.

RBKC would be consulted on this by the IPC.

Agreed in principle that we would seek as officers to achieve negotiated solutions on land use and planning conditions rather than leave such matters to be determined by the IPC alone.

JW drew attention to RBKC's stated policy in its Core Strategy.

6. Cost and funding of scheme

TW said the scheme would cost water rate payers an average of just over £1.00 a week by 2018.

7. Counters Creek and its relationship with Tideway Tunnel

TW said CC is a separate scheme with its own rationale. The scheme is 'live'. TW seek synergies between the CC scheme and the Tunnel scheme.

8. Cremorne's status as a safeguarded wharf – GLA position

JP said they had not challenged the GLA safeguarding. They believe they have permission to use the wharf temporarily, but not to extinguish its status as a wharf. TW have no proposals to reprovide the wharf elsewhere. DD said TW are revising the scheme drawings to show how the wharf can be reinstated.

Cremorne's status as a licensed waste management site – GLA position

PR set out RBKC's obligation to meet its waste apportionment to secure conformity with the London Plan. PC said RBKC were already 2.5ha below their requirement; Cremorne was 0.4ha the borough could not afford to lose. JW said RBKC needed to produce a Waste DPD in around 2012; it was unclear how the waste apportionment requirement would be enforced by the Mayor of London.

DD said TW had not talked to the GLA about this.

9. Cremorne Gardens – Council's position

PR said this was one of the Council's 'red lines'. RBKC would not consent to the use of Cremorne Gardens by TW.

10. Planning conditions on Cremorne Wharf

A maximum of 150 HGV 'movements' a day, where a 'movement' is an ingress or an egress of a vehicle. No vehicular access 17.00-07:00 Monday to Saturday. No vehicular access Sundays or Public Holidays.

RBKC undertook to send TW details of the planning history and consents.

10. Riverside Walk

The construction of a riverside walk would be a condition of development in the area. Chelsea Wharf have solved this in an interesting way. DM considered that the possible conflict of planning aspirations to safeguard the wharf and build a walkway was solvable.

11. Spoil removal by river

DD said that TW were doing a study looking at the economics of spoil removal by river, and would have early feedback by the New Year. He believed there might not be a huge cost penalty from taking spoil out by barge. There might

be a more significant cost associated with bringing materials in by river. If TW had to build a coffer dam that would imply bringing a lot of material in and then out at the end. RBKC's objection to the use of Cremorne Gardens was relevant here, as the coffer dam would be greatly reduced in size if access to the site was through Cremorne Wharf. TW commented this would significantly reduce local disturbance.

12. Access to Cremorne after works – use of crane

RBKC asked whether a permanent crane could be left on the foreshore to service the shaft, rather than having to provide an access route for a crane.

DD said what TW needed was not just a crane but a specialist vehicle. They were likely to have a very strong preference for the use of a low-loader to bring in a crane for maintenance on a roughly 10 year cycle.

Every 6 months TW would require 'white van' access for the maintenance of valves; and filter replacement around every 12-18 months. Electric fans in the structure would also require maintenance.

13. AOB

a. Noted that the current Cremorne Wharf shed might have to be modified to provide for alternative access.

b. TW vehicles would circulate through Cremorne Wharf as now rather than use the same entrance and exit.

c. RBKC asked about local amenity impacts. TW said the air in the tunnel would be changed every day; a fan would run around 8 hours a day. RBKC asked whether there were other configurations for ventilation, such as powerful fans at either end of the tunnel.

d. The meeting discussed the Code of Construction Practice. RBKC took it for granted that TW would deploy best practice in relation to noise control, hours of work, dust avoidance etc. DD said there would be no tunnelling driven from Cremorne. The works involved sinking a shaft. This could be done during normal working hours; the risk of having to extend hours was low. Spoil from the tunnel would go back to Barn Elms.

e. ND asked whether the development would create public open space on the foreshore. DD said yes, provided the outcome was not an aggregates wharf.

f. DM asked if the shape of the site was fixed. DD said no. the images on the consultation documents were simply indicative. TW were preparing new drawings showing the wharf arrangement.

14. Date of next meeting

Doris Cook to arrange in late January 2011. Aim to meet around every 6 weeks.