

RBKC/THAMES WATER MEETING – 17 February 2012

THAMES TUNNEL DEVELOPMENTS AT CREMORNE WHARF AND CHELSEA EMBANKMENT

MINUTES

1. Present / Introductions and actions of last minutes

RBKC: Patricia Cuervo (Planning), Richard Craig (Planning), James McCool (Transport), Saskie Laing (Ecology), Ian Hooper (Environmental Health).

TW: Colin Turnbull (Planner), John Pearson (Planning Manager), Clare Donnelly (Architect), Sarah Dye (Engineer), Dermot Scanlon (EIA Manager).

English Heritage: Claire Craig (CC)

The minutes of last meeting were approved. Two actions were outstanding: the first one was about information on ownership of the jetty. CT emailed PC later on the 17th to confirm that this had already been ascertained. The second action was about JW to supply Thames Water with the level of detail expected in any submission to the IPC. JW was not present so PC will remind him.

- Action: JW to supply Thames Water with the level of detail expected in any submission to the IPC.

2. EIA update

IH said that he did not pick up the document on settlement on phase two consultation.

DS said that it was a general paper and that they were looking into more detail for each specific site. The Council will not be contacted about settlement issues unless Council-owned buildings could potentially be affected.

JP talked about the development in Lots Road power station and how it is assumed based on our discussions with the developer to be occupied around 2016-2017. He asked about the details of the building layout/noise strategy submitted under conditions especially those of the building next to Cremorne Wharf. These details could help them in their noise assessment (especially during construction) as the noise baseline could potentially be higher to that of a waste transfer station.

RC explained that the Council are talking to Hutchison Whampoa Limited (HWL) about changes of uses and they are discharging conditions that prevent them from starting construction. CT said he believes the noise condition is only required to be approved prior to constructing each building so may not have been discharged yet but it would be good if this can be confirmed.

- Action: IH and PC to check what information on the layout of the buildings next to Cremorne is available.

2.1 Meetings and Workshops

DS explained that they are working on the transport strategy study which includes a construction logistics plan. There will be 2 sessions with different boroughs, the GLA, PLA and TfL. The construction logistics plan, part of this strategy study exercise, will be submitted with the Development Consent Order (DCO). The transport strategy will be the subject of a meeting on Monday 20 February and will be completed by the end of March or beginning of April.

DS said that the next EHO forum will take place on the 16th March. It will report back on the one to one meetings with the different boroughs.

A section on climate change will be included in the next Thames Tunnel forum. It will explain how climate change could potentially affect the scheme (changes in rainfall will have an effect on CSO discharges, changes in population, etc...), looking into both resilience and adaptability.

2.2 Surveys and cumulative effects identification underway

DS explained that Thames Tunnel will be issuing a position paper on cumulative effects in a week or two. This paper will be specific for each site. They will use the TfL strategic models so any major development in the London Plan will also be included. Development in the local area will also be considered. They look for a response by the end of March.

DS said that as the submission date for the DCO is November, there will be other surveys taking place in spring-summer. One of those surveys will be about river usage. Thames Water are not planning major surveys again.

2.3 Scoping and position papers

DS explained that the Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) has been sent to Local Authorities and comments are expected by the 9th March. The Health Impact Assessment (HIA) report is scheduled to be sent by the end of February. Comments should be received by the end of March. The other position paper is the paper on Cumulative effects explained earlier.

PC asked the reason why there was a difference in the number of lorry trips in the phase two consultation material as the leaflet in Cremorne Wharf showed 12 lorry trips (24 lorry movements) and the PEIR showed 15 lorry trips (30 lorry movements).

DS explained that in the PEIR the number of lorry trips was rounded to the nearest 5 in order to assess the worst case scenario. The final figure will depend on the results of the transport strategy study mentioned earlier and the phasing of the development. The final number of lorry trips would be contained in the construction logistics plan which could be referenced in the the Statement of Common Ground between the Council and Thames Water.

3. Development Consent Order

3.1 Route of consent update

JP explained that the National Policy Statement (NPS) on Wastewater had been put before Parliament. The Thames Tunnel Project is included in the NPS. The NPS will be the policy document basis for the IPC's decision. Section 14/3 order will be put forward to Parliament shortly. The DCO will be submitted in November (subject to feedback from phase two consultation).

CC explained the importance of refining the design of some of the sites along the route and the willingness of English Heritage to work with Thames Water to finalise the design.

SD and JP explained that the next step will be Section 48 publicity reporting on issues such as: where Thames Water are at, changes to the project, book of plans, and Environmental information. Section 48 will not contain the same level of information as phase two consultation. The consultation on Section 48 will last 6 weeks and is currently due to take place in June.

3.2 Other consent within the DCO requirements

JP explained that the DCO includes issues such as compulsory purchase order powers, listed building and conservation area consents, highway consents and any other consent needed to construct the project. Consents can be divided into: consents that can be included, those that need the agreement of the consent granting body, and consents that cannot be included.

PC asked for general information on the different consents Thames Water will be looking to obtain from the Council and then set up a workshop with different specialist officers. This was agreed.

- JP to send information on the different consents needed. Workshops will be set up afterwards.

JP explained that an outline level of detail is sought, but the river wall is to be fixed. Requirements (i.e. conditions) would probably be for approval by the Council rather than the IPC as the regulations say. E.g. for associated development affecting a listed building the requirement might state that information amounting to that required for a listed building consent would be submitted to the LPA for approval i.e. method statement, fixtures, that is in line with the design principles approved in the DCO. This process would be set out in the Statement of Common Ground.

RC wanted to see some detail on where the equipment will be located in the listed pumping station.

CD explained that a listed structure interface drawing was being prepared with these details.

- SD said that she will talk to the mechanical engineer and get back to RC with the details.

4 Cremorne Update

4.1 Building layout

CD explained that because a detailed brief is not available for the wharf facility, a detailed design will not be undertaken. Rather, the DCO will show both the footprint and volume of a suitable wharf building.

The design will be supported by principles which will take into account architecture and engineering issues. It will take into account changes as a result of phase two consultation to move the ventilation columns closer to the river.

SD wanted clarification on the Council's comments on setting the building back 2 metres to be able to identify the pumping station.

RC explained the Council's comment and said that he wanted to include a principle of a set back of the building 2m north-east behind the south-west end of the pumping station. SD explained that would result in a loss of floorspace so we would want to check with property dept as the landowner. RC stated he would seek this set back regardless;

- PC to talk to JW to achieve the Council's consensus on the set back.
- JP to send the principles and arrange a meeting to discuss them.

4.2 Vent columns

IH said that moving the ventilation column to the riverside could have an impact on riverwalk users. DS said this would potentially only affect transient receptors.

SD said that the ventilation system will not normally discharge unless the shaft at Cremorne Wharf is filling due to the main tunnel being full at this part of its length. The amount of hours per year in which the opening may happen is around 20-25 and in these cases, the air will go through carbon filters.

4.3 Traffic and transport

This issue was covered earlier in the meeting, under point 2.3.

4.4 Socio-economic assessment

DS explained that Thames Water has had no engagement with the Riverside Activity Centre (RAC) as they currently believe the project will not have an impact on their activity as the project is not planning for transport via barges here and this would be scoped out of the ES, although the option remains open to the contractor. However, the RAC are identified as a receptor during construction in the PEIR and if the logistics strategy changes to barge use we would consult with the RAC as appropriate and assess the likely impacts.

5. Chelsea Embankment Update

5.1 Emerging feedback from phase two consultation

JP outlined the comments they received.

SD explained that a recent third party risk review is advising they minimise the length of connection tunnel to reduce the health and safety risks associated with building the tunnel in the Lambeth beds. This was first explained by Rick Fornelli in the November meeting.

CC said that those concerns were not highlighted in the consultation material for phase two. She would like to run it past their structural engineer. It would be useful to have some material from SD outlining those risks to help English Heritage make a final opinion. She also said it would be useful to know the position of the Royal Hospital in relation to the impacts. So far nothing had been received from the Royal Hospital.

CT explained that the Royal Hospital views in the letter and in previous meetings were about impact on amenity/heritage and did not add to existing information regarding economic viability.

- Action: JW to confirm if a response from the Royal Hospital was received by the Council and, if not confidential, to share it with English Heritage.

RC asked if CABA comments on the pre phase two designs will be part of the consultation responses.

JP and CT said that CABA was a consultee and their previous comments had informed the current design and formed part of the Design Development Report in phase two consultation.

SD said that CABA provided a summary letter which Thames Water will need to respond to.

5.2 River wall shape and intertidal habitat.

CD explained that the river wall shape will need to be agreed before submitting the DCO. She said they need feedback from English Heritage about the Phase two preferred site design. With this in mind she recapped on the development of the design. CC said English Heritage would give comments within two weeks.

CC said that the design will need to sparkle. She will review the design of the foreshore. She was concerned about it being used in the future for coach parking which would obscure views of the Royal Hospital. She suggested more planting should be considered.

RC said that the Council is looking for a simple, uncluttered approach.

CD explained that the Phase two design seeks to open the view which is currently obscured by a tree (recently felled by TfL), and coaches will not have access to the foreshore structure. Intertidal terraces were useful ecologically but the Environment Agency did not want such encroachment to the river. The species recommended are salt marshes. The establishing period for the intertidal terraces is crucial. Litter is not expected to come from the river but from over the wall. A maintenance schedule has been drafted and would be for agreement. Grassing may not be feasible across most of the site due to the access hatches.

- CD will send information about the intertidal habitat and maintenance to SL.

SD said that if a terrace was not built, there will be a need to build the structure up to the flood defence level.

RC said that steps into the river could be a good idea here.

JP said that examples of steps into the river in other sites were normally not pleasant and they could potentially be a safety issue.

CD explained the different surfacing options she had researched.

CC asked for timescales for the response to Thames Water. She asked RC to have a look at the Albert Embankment Foreshore design.

JP said that they needed the response in about 3 weeks.

- JP to email CC the information she needs and will set up a meeting with RC and CC for the week of the 19th March.
- CD will email the design principles for Chelsea
- PC to talk to Saskie Laing to give feedback to Thames Water on the Council's position on intertidal terraces.

5.3 Public realm appearance and kiosk siting

This item had been covered in the discussion about item 5.2.

5.4 Riverside footway weekend opening

SD said that she would review whether this could be achieved. The likely mechanism to include this issue will be itemising it in the Code of Construction Practice.

6. AOB

No other business was raised.