



## Meeting minutes

<b>Subject:</b>	Thames Tideway Tunnel proposals in RBKC
<b>Purpose:</b>	Planning and design update for RBKC
<b>Date and time:</b>	2nd August 2012, 4- 5pm
<b>Location:</b>	Kensington Town Hall
<b>Attendees:</b>	<p><b>RBKC:</b>            Patricia Cuervo – Senior Planning Policy Officer (PC)            Richard Craig – Senior Urban Design Officer (RC)            James McCool - Transport Planner (JMc)            Jon Medlin - S106 Officer (JM)</p> <p><b>TW:</b>            Bryn Kemp (BK), John Pearson (JP), Zoe Chick (ZC)</p>
<b>Apologies</b>	TW: Clare Donnelly (CD)
<b>Minute taker:</b>	ZC
<b>Doc ref:</b>	100-OM-PNC-RBKEN-110156

Item	Action item/Notes for the record	By who	By when
<b>1</b>	<b>Introductions</b>		
<b>2</b>	<b>Highway Consents</b>		
2.1	<p>BK explained that he is seeking to find out the RBKC preferred approach to highways consents. This approach will be communicated to the Thames Tideway Tunnel (TTT) legal team to ensure the application for development consent reflects the works required. BK also needs to understand the RBKC advertising process.</p> <p>BK said that the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) will cover the initial understanding of which consents are required from whom. Each borough is different.</p> <p>JMc explained that he doesn't deal with the licences and agreed that it makes sense the SoCG includes the highways consents.</p> <p>JMc said that TfL are the highways authority for Chelsea Embankment and the Bull Ring.</p> <p>RC said that the Bull Ring island is RBKC Leisure.</p> <p>BK said he needs to know who to talk to regarding licences and Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs). Phone numbers are required so meetings can be set up. With regards to TfL, BK is looking to organise one agreement specific to coach parking and bus stops but some boroughs are approaching it as a joint process. The SoCG can be drafted to reflect these details.</p> <p>JP said it would be useful to get a definitive answer on whom to contact, for example for the stopping up of the Bull Ring for resurfacing.</p> <p>JMc suggested using the consents tracker which was provided at a previous meeting (Other Consents meeting 14<sup>th</sup> June 2012) and editing it. JP agreed.</p> <p>BK said that Section 14 (<i>Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 - Temporary prohibition or restriction of roads</i>) and TROs would be the best method for</p>		

	<p>suspending parking bays. BK also referred to Section 278 (<i>Highways Act 1980 - Agreements as to execution of works</i>). BK said he is being advised by legal team to look for more overarching consents.</p> <p>JMc explained that parking and highways are two separate teams. JP said very useful if JMc can update the highways consents table, which has been put together by a project consultant looking at all possible consents.</p> <p>JMc said he will provide names by email tomorrow.</p> <p><b>Action: Consents table to be updated by RBKC</b></p> <p><b>Post Meeting Note: JMc confirmed Bull Ring is maintained by RBKC and provided email addresses for Kirk Deane and Tony Pegrum.</b></p> <p>JMc said that it is considered there would be limited impact on the highway at Lots Road.</p> <p>BK believes the best way forward for the works under the Highways Act is to suspend the parking.</p> <p>JP said that S14 works could be included in the application for development consent as a planning condition / Requirement.</p> <p>BK said about the hoarding and temporary removal of pedestrian refuge/traffic island. JMc said this would be TFL remit.</p> <p>JMc asked how long the parking suspensions would be for. BK explained it would be for the duration of the works but trying to pin down how long the suspensions would be required for.</p> <p>JMc asked about removing the parking rather than suspending the bays. BK believes that removal and simple single yellow line restrictions during working hours should be OK for the three parking spaces on Lots Road.</p> <p>JP identified that previously the HGVs for the depot when it was a waste transfer station reversed up Ashburnham Road, –The projects proposals would avoid this manoeuvre.</p> <p>JP explained there may be some extended working hours, for example if a concrete pour has started then it needs to be finished.</p> <p>PC asked if this was in the CoCP. JP confirmed it is in the CoCP Part B.</p> <p>JMc asked whether if extended, HGVs would still be in use. JP confirmed this could be the case.</p> <p>JP said that there 24 hour working is proposed to construct the connection tunnel between the shaft and main tunnel and as with the other works these would be controlled through a Section 61 ( <i>Control of Pollution Act 1974</i> ) consent .</p>	JMc	Aug 2012
2.2	<p>SoCG</p> <p>PC asked whether RBKC would have a bespoke SoCG.</p> <p>JP said yes - ZC to produce it and PC and others will be provided with a draft for review and comment.</p> <p>JMc said transportation people will need to review it, including Slobodan Kostic.</p> <p><b>Action: ZC to send draft SoCG to PC for circulation.</b></p>	ZC	Oct 2012
3	<b>Design Update and TE2100 - RBKC Plans</b>		
3.1	<p>JP said that Clare Donnelly sends her apologies.</p> <p>JP explained the difference between indicative and illustrative design. A full explanation was available in the S48 Pre Application Publicity Report but, in brief an indicative design is a visual design principle giving a commitment as to what the design will look like. Chelsea Embankment is shown as an illustrative design because RBKC have expressed a preference for the</p>		

	<p>floodable public realm sketch. The S48 proposals show a design with intertidal terrace so the project will proceed with this an illustrative design to allow flexibility for change subject to detailed design.</p> <p>CD has some technical issues to resolve before talking RBKC through the proposals. One of the issues is looking at Thames Estuary 2100 (TE2100) requirements and how a floodable public realm design can be adapted for TE2100.</p> <p>JP explained that at Victoria Embankment Foreshore an additional floodwall can be installed with steps over it. JP asked what RBKC plans are for TE2100. Ramps and stairs may be required, which would have new maintenance issues.</p> <p>PC said she was aware of the Environment Agency (EA) consulting on the catchment area and flood defences.</p> <p>JP said that RBKC would need to approve changes to the river walls if they were raised as part of TE2100.</p> <p>JP would like to move towards an indicative design at Chelsea and will come and speak to RBKC again for an opinion on the ramps and stairs required for TE2100.</p> <p>PC asked who the EA contacts were for this.</p> <p><b>Action: ZC to provide the EA contact details</b></p> <p><b>Post Meeting Note: ZC provided 7<sup>th</sup> August 2012</b></p> <p>JP explained that the new river wall will form part of the flood defences and will be set at the same height as the existing parapet. A parapet of 1.1m above the local ground level will be provided which is an appropriate height for a safe balustrade. The structural design of the stone parapet will be developed so it can be raised to be compliant with TE2100 flood defence levels.</p> <p>PC asked whether the development will be set back from the river enough to allow maintenance of the defences and said wasn't aware of the need to raise the flood defences.</p> <p>RC asked who TE2100 is lead by and is it being designed now?</p> <p>JP explained it is being run by the EA and the raising of the wall will be required. TTT will need a steer from RBKC on this matter.</p> <p><b>Action: PC to discuss TE2100 with the EA</b></p> <p><b>Post Meeting Note: PC contacted the EA about TE2100 on the 8<sup>th</sup> August 2012.</b></p>	ZC	Aug 2012
4	<b>Draft Requirements</b>		
4.1	<p>JP explained that the 'requirements' of the development consent are similar to planning conditions but, can regard other matters, not just planning.</p> <p>The requirements would include matters such as further design details to be submitted at a later date as well as tie the project into the CoCP.</p> <p>JP showed the Site Works Parameter Plans and explained TW will be seeking development consent for the infrastructure within the zones identified on the plan. This would be similar to an outline planning application. Further details of the below ground works comprising the sewerage infrastructure would not be submitted through requirements. Details would be submitted for all of the above ground structures including the new river wall, vent columns, kiosks, landscaping and these will be submitted under Requirements. Everything will be in line with the parameter plan and the design principles.</p> <p>JP said draft requirements will be ready end of August / early September and will be provided a week in advance.</p>	PC	Aug 2012

4.2	<p><i>Chelsea Embankment</i></p> <p>RC asked about restoration of paving.  JP said details of landscaping would cover restoration.  RC referred to the traffic island being pulled out.  BK said that everything is being put back like for like.  RC said it is a shame that a fantastic new space is going to produced on either side of the road but the middle won't match up.  JP said that TfL want the road to be put back as existing.  RC said would rather not have the street furniture that is there now and can hear the beginnings of the penny pinch. This should be 'betterment' and should be as light touch as possible.  JP explained that is the reason why it is being put back as it is, as there is minimal street furniture there at present. CABE had wanted a raised platform but TfL do not.  BK said there is one point of contact at TfL and the project is not in a position to talk to other sections.  RC asked if David Ubaka was the contact.  BK explained it is Nick Blades and JP said that TfL and London Underground Limited (LUL) provide a joint response through the GLA.  RC said that RBKC need to speak with all the bodies involved as have not spoken with the EA or TfL.  JP requested that RBKC speak with TfL and feed back to TTT.</p> <p><b>Action: RBKC to discuss TTT with EA, TfL and other relevant stakeholders</b></p>	PC/RC	August 2012
4.3	<p><i>Cremerne Wharf</i></p> <p>JP talked of the listed building consent required for Lots Road Pumping Station and said that the project following RC's request is looking at improving/replacing the vent column on the south east corner. Details will be submitted subject to a DCO requirement which is currently being drafted.  JP spoke of the monitoring of listed building during the works. The provision of monitoring equipment would hopefully be covered by a compliance requirement with details of the method in the Heritage Statement to accompany the submission. If physical works are required because of settlement, TTT will need to seek approval for the works from RBKC.  RC asked if there would be pre-commencement conditions.  JP said yes - they would be attached to works numbers in order that the details were submitted prior to the actual work and not the whole development.  RC said that structural reports would be required. RBKC will have to pay for an expert to check them and wondered if this issue had already come up.  JP said as with Crossrail, the monitoring works will be non-intrusive.  RC sought confirmation that where a bridge is a RBKC bridge, there will be RBKC asset protection agreement, presuming that RBKC own the bridge where RBKC is the planning authority.  JP confirmed that RBKC where a listed bridge is within the RBKC they would examine the need for monitoring equipment but, that not all the bridges were actually owned by RBKC and an asset protection agreement would only be required where this was the case. JP thought RBKC owned Chelsea and Albert bridges.  RC expressed concern that this is not the normal way things are done. The borough does not really know what the impact is, but can understand the</p>		

	<p>reasons for having to do it this way.</p> <p>JP explained a detailed method statement will be submitted for any works affecting listed assets and this would be included in the draft requirement.</p>		
<b>5</b>	<b>S106</b>		
5.1	<p>JP explained that Thames Water are regulated by OFWAT and will be providing a piece of infrastructure included in the National Infrastructure Plan. It is not considered that the project should not be subject to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).</p> <p>JM agreed that it is not CIL is not applicable.</p> <p>JP said that that NPPF guidance sets out that S106 can apply only to mitigate the works. The maintenance of the operational sites could be covered by S106, but otherwise the project feels mitigation is incorporated by the design. A steer is needed from RBKC.</p> <p>JM said that in its own right the project is a piece of mitigation and doesn't lend itself to the SPD formula. It would be useful to quantify the impact to identify mitigation. A commitment to restore like for like in the public realm could be a possibility.</p> <p>JP thought S106 not to be the place for restoration of public realm as this would be covered in the DCO requirements.</p> <p>JM said that ordinarily RBKC would be looking for contribution / commitment to skills and construction training.</p> <p>JP provided the example of Crossrail and the Construction and Tunnelling Academy which the project already supported.</p> <p>JM said that the Economic Development team have recently started up a local supply chain programme and there might be something around this programme that could match local people up to skills. They are geared up to administer the project. The project also needs to make sure that the infrastructure is maintained.</p> <p>JP said that the structure will be maintained – be it by Thames Water or the infrastructure provider. The question is how to maintain the public realm. Perhaps RBKC would like to maintain it, or Thames Water could get someone in to maintain it.</p> <p>JM acknowledged that TTT is not going to generate population.</p> <p>JP said there will be a construction travel plan.</p> <p>JM said skilling and access to employment are likely to be the best way to go.</p> <p>JP requested links to the Economic Development initiative.</p> <p><b>Action: JM to provide information on the local procurement scheme.</b></p> <p>JM explained that Camden have been running a similar scheme for a while, matching up development contractors to the local supply chain. Will set out thoughts of mitigation of the construction rather than the project.</p> <p>JP identified the CoCP which has a requirement committing the project to mitigation through community and stakeholder liaison.</p> <p>JM said that through PC the draft Heads of Term can be discussed.</p> <p>JP thought that if a draft Heads of Term can be agreed for submission that is as far as it needs to go and can be firmed up at a later date.</p> <p><b>Action: PC to send link to S48 CoCP to JM</b></p> <p><b>Post Meeting Note: PC sent link to JM on the 8<sup>th</sup> August 2012</b></p> <p>JM said that Geoff Burrage and James McCool will need to know about the CoCP and the mechanisms for making sure the project taps into the RBKC Economic Development project.</p> <p>JM mentioned that Graham Hart has been in touch with Dermot Scanlon of</p>	<p>JM</p> <p>PC</p>	<p>Aug 2012</p> <p>Aug 2012</p>

	TTT.		
<b>6</b>	<b>AoB</b>		
6.1	<p><i>Mitigation for Trees</i></p> <p>JP said that the BS for tree mitigation cannot be applied in some instances given the limited space we have for construction.</p> <p>PC to meet with Stephen Fuller (SF) to discuss trees. SF has looked at the CoCP Part A. Comments will be provided in response to S48.</p> <p><b>Post Meeting Note: PC sent ZC the queries from Stephen Fuller on 8<sup>th</sup> August and a response email was sent on 6<sup>th</sup> September 2012.</b></p>		

<b>Next meeting (date, time, location):</b>	Friday 7 <sup>th</sup> September 2012 – 9-10am
<b>Next minute taker:</b>	ZC