



Meeting minutes

Subject:	Thames Tideway Tunnel proposals in RBKC
Purpose:	Design Meeting – Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) and Local Impact Report (LIR)
Date and time:	Friday 15th November 2013 10.00-12.00
Location:	Kensington Town Hall
Attendees:	<p>RBKC Patricia Cuervo (PC), Ashley Brooks (AB), Richard Craig (RH), Jon Wade (JW)</p> <p>HBMCE Claire Craig (CC)</p> <p>TW John Pearson (JP), Clare Donnelly (CD), Zoe Chick (ZC)</p>
Apologies:	RBKC: Kelly Gunnell (KG)
Minute taker:	ZC
Doc ref:	100-OM-PNC-RBKEN-110183

Item	Action item/Notes for the record	By who	By when
1.	Introductions / apologies		
2.	Local Impact Report (LIR) update		
2.1.	<p>JP explained that TW are preparing responses to the RBKC LIR for submission to the ExA on 2 December 2013.</p> <p>JP said that TW have been requested to have the 4 November SoCG signed by the boroughs retrospectively.</p> <p>PC said that Jonathan Bore (JB) the Director of Planning and Borough Development) would be able to sign the SoCG. And requested TW send through the sign off sheet.</p> <p>Action: TW to prep and send sign off sheet for JB to sign.</p> <p>Post meeting note: Signed off and received by TW 26 November 2013.</p>	ZC	Nov 13
2.2.	<p><i>Air quality</i></p> <p>AB said that she has wording for the CoCP regarding air quality.</p> <p>JP requested AB send the text to TW and cc PC.</p> <p>Action: AB to send proposed text for the CoCP to TW.</p> <p>PC said these air quality matters can be picked up in the next Statement of Common Ground (SoCG).</p> <p>ZC asked AB if she had reviewed the minutes from the air quality meeting on 22 October. AB to review and provide comment.</p> <p>Action: AB to review 22 October minutes and provide comment to TW</p> <p>Post Meeting Note: AB confirmed no comments on the 22 October meeting minutes.</p>	AB	Nov 13
		AB	Nov 13



2.3.	<p><i>Land quality</i></p> <p>AB confirmed happy with the land quality amendments to the CoCP.</p>		
2.4.	<p><i>Bat roost mitigation</i></p> <p>JP said TW seek to provide replacement habitat for a bat roost through three bat boxes in Cremorne Gardens. The bat roost in Cremorne Wharf Depot was identified after the application was submitted in a follow up survey and the replacement habitat would be a side agreement outside of the DCO.</p> <p>PC acknowledged that ZC will be meeting with Biodiversity Officer KG, who has replaced Leanne Brisland, on Thursday 21 November 2013 to identify suitable trees.</p> <p>JP said the bat boxes would be subject to agreement with RBKC who are the landowner.</p> <p>CD said the bat boxes could be left in the park permanently.</p> <p>PC raised the relevant design principles and said she will check them with KG and check who should be at the site visit.</p> <p>Action: PC to be in touch with KG regarding design principles and the site visit.</p> <p>Post meeting note: Site visit went ahead and three trees were identified as being suitable.</p>		
2.5.	<p><i>CoCP</i></p> <p>JP said that Ian Hooper (IH) had requested some noise and vibration changes to the CoCP. The definition of BPM (Best Practicable Means) is now included but, TW are not looking at changing 'may' to 'shall' in Para 4.4.2 of the Part A as the list of items would not be applicable to all sites.</p> <p>RC said that TW should go through the list and identify the items in the list which should be included. It could be appropriate to have two lists.</p> <p>JP said that IH will sign off the details through the Section 61 applications.</p> <p>JW suggested "shall use as appropriate".</p> <p>JP said TW will take this item away.</p> <p>Action: TW to get back to RBKC on CoCP Part A wording.</p> <p>Post Meeting Note: Para 6.42 of the CoCP Part A was updated to reflect IH requests in the 12 February version.</p> <p>PC said that Ian Hooper (IH) had said he was happy with the TTT responses to the written questions.</p>	JP/ZC	Nov 14
3.	Design matters		
3.1.	<p><i>Design Principles</i></p> <p>JP wanted to check that RBKC and EH are happy with the design principles for Chelsea Embankment Foreshore.</p> <p>CC recommended it would be useful to have from now on a list of materials which attendees would bring to meetings, to ensure everyone is prepared. All agreed.</p> <p>JP referred to comments which EH had made on the design principles for Chelsea Embankment Foreshore, regarding</p>		



	<p>the procession of spaces between the proposed new foreshore structure and the Royal Hospital Chelsea.</p> <p>CC said she thought it could be a design objective rather than a design Principle – an overall aim. It needs to be a design imperative.</p> <p>RC said he would be happy with it as a Design Principle.</p>		
3.2.	<p>CC referred to the ExA question regarding Design Principles and Requirements and whether they should be the same thing.</p> <p>JP said it had always been considered that the Design Principles would be more aspirational and loosely worded than the requirements in order to allow flexibility in bringing forward the detailed design.</p> <p>JW said they could be open to interpretation.</p> <p>JP said that the detailed design would be approved by RBKC through the DCO requirements.</p> <p>ZC noted this was a question raised by the Examination Authority in their first round of questions.</p> <p>Post meeting note: TWUL have reviewed the Design principles further in response to comments made in the examination and have tightened the wording to make them more concise. They also would direct RBKC to their response to first written question 6.80.</p>		
3.3.	<p><i>Procession of spaces</i></p> <p>CC referred to the request for recognition of the procession of designed spaces at the Royal Hospital Chelsea. These are currently;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chelsea Embankment • Bull Ring Gate • Chillianwallah Memorial • South Lawn • Southern facade of RHC <p>CC said that the proposed foreshore site cannot avoid being part of this landscape. Cannot pretend this would not be a significant change. It needs to be a continuation of this exceptional landscape.</p> <p>CD said that if EH and RBKC would like this, there could be a central feature for the space.</p> <p>RC acknowledged this but said it shouldn't be the vent columns.</p> <p>CD said that TW need to know that none of the draft Design Principles block what RBKC and EH would like to see at the site.</p> <p>RC said RBKC may want some kind of podium but that won't be known until the detailed design comes forward.</p> <p>CC said EH do not want a landing dock but there could be some ornamental features, for example garlanding sculptures around the front of the foreshore. Ornamental visual access creating a sense of arrival.</p> <p>JW said this could be a marker to the RHC.</p> <p>RC referred to the intertidal terraces.</p> <p>CD said the terraces could be stepped down more, which may help respond to the Environment Agency's concerns</p>		



	<p>regarding them being intertidal but only inundated by the river.</p> <p>JP said these matters were not covered by the current design principles and thought in some cases contradicted them. Careful thought would need to be given to review the Design Principles in order that appropriate amendments are made to achieve a design solution at this site.</p>		
3.4.	<p>CD explained the tenders to RBKC and EH. The contractor will work with the illustrative design and the design principles, they will need to go through two Design Council CABE reviews, CD will be reviewing the submissions, all put in place to safeguard the quality.</p> <p>CC asked whether TW would like EH's help with the review. RC also referred to RBKC's Design Review Panel.</p> <p>CD explained that an artist would be chosen to incorporate interpretive material. All three contracts would have artists, signature vent columns and man hole covers.</p> <p>RC referred to RBKC's artist appraisal and public art panels which meet every 3-6 months. JW said a special meeting could be called.</p> <p>CD said that perhaps CC could raise the design process at the next TTT Forum.</p> <p>CD explained that the tender process will be driven by experience in tunnelling but TW will stress how important the landscape and architecture design process is in the contract documentation.</p> <p>CC raised that who has the best relationship with stakeholders could be a deciding factor.</p> <p>CD explained that the project manager will either choose or approve the choice of artist.</p> <p>RC said the choice of artist is important.</p> <p>JW said uncertain about 'interpretation'.</p> <p>JP said that some Design Principles may now conflict with what the stakeholders want.</p> <p>CC agreed and said that the current design principles could prevent giving effect to the design objective of the site as part of the procession of spaces.</p> <p>JP said that definition of these spaces will be needed.</p>		
3.5.	<p><i>Illustrative design at Chelsea Embankment Foreshore</i></p> <p>CC asked if it would be possible for Thames to look at the design again to facilitate redrafting of the design principles.</p> <p>JP said that the scheme is illustrative and so there was no need as the design would come through via the detailed design process.</p> <p>CC said just asking for a replacement illustrative visual and said it could be taken to the top of EH. EH do not want the illustrative visual to be seen by contractors. It would be good for all parties to have a different illustrative design.</p> <p>PC said she would also discuss this with Jonathan Bore at RBKC.</p> <p>Action: CC to speak to Simon Thurley at EH and PC to</p>	CC/PC	Nov 13



	<p>speak to Jonathan Bore and have letters produced to Phil Stride.</p> <p>Post meeting note: Letters received on 19 November 2013.</p> <p>CC said she felt that due to the site selection issues at Chelsea, it had not got the design attention that Victoria Embankment Foreshore (VEF) had, and it warranted the same level of consideration. EH are happy with Victoria, Albert and Putney Foreshore sites.</p> <p>JP said the parameters cannot change and some ground rules would need to be set down.</p> <p>JP said may be told we cannot do this as the design will be lead by the parameters and Design Principles.</p> <p>CC said in that case why is the illustrative visual in the tender pack? She noted that it may give the potential Contractors the wrong idea of the level of design quality required.</p> <p>CD explained that something has to be included to enable the contractor to price something. CD said that the central tender has not gone out yet and CC said that is even more reason to address the design now.</p> <p>PC said that RBKC had raised in the LIR the concern with the quality of the design.</p> <p>CD explained though that 29 November is the tender lockdown date. Any revised drawings would need to be in a tender addendum.</p> <p>PC said that the letters to Phil Stride would be required next week then.</p>		
3.6.	<p>Ground rules</p> <p>JP explained that the changes would need to be within the parameters which have been assessed in the Environmental Statement (ES).</p> <p>RC asked what level of change would be possible.</p> <p>CD said the Townscape and Visual Assessment would not need to be redone as long as we stay within the parameters.</p> <p>CC said that the new design would be an enhancement.</p> <p>RC said it would depend. Not a pond. A fountain could be a design option but RBKC would not want to maintain it. RC confirmed he still likes the floodable public realm concept.</p> <p>CD said that TW are having floodable public realm at VEF. It should only flood a few times a year.</p> <p>CC asked about channels of water.</p> <p>DC said they could represent the channels to the water gates.</p> <p>RC referred to the Kim Wilkie design for Chelsea Barracks site, with small river cuttings running parallel to the road. This is why he doesn't want to tie the design down completely.</p> <p>CC said this is why it is important to have a visual.</p> <p>RC asked whether they could be a way water could be held back after it flooded.</p> <p>CD said there could be a feature around the edge of the foreshore structure to capture water.</p> <p>CC said this ties it back to its history as a landing point for</p>		



	<p>Charles II when he visited the Royal Hospital.</p> <p>CD said it would have to be managed with the proposed position of the Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO).</p> <p>JP said if action is taken as a result of the letters from EH and RBKC then there would have to be a workshop.</p> <p>PC suggested 22 November for a workshop.</p> <p>CD said TW would bring along Alex Gilmour and CC said EH would bring a landscape architect.</p> <p>CD explained that the Chelsea Embankment Foreshore site is packed with equipment.</p> <p>JP said the ExA have asked about the operational requirements of the foreshore sites.</p> <p>CC said that at the Deptford Church Street hearing the EA referred to the intertidal habitat compensation programme regarding the acceptability of the Phase One preferred site at Borthwick Wharf.</p>		
3.7.	<p>Revised Design Principles</p> <p>JP requested all go through the Design Principles to check people are happy with the content.</p> <p>RC requested they be rewritten at the workshop and CC agreed.</p> <p>JP explained that they are referenced throughout the Environmental Statement though. JP said that if this workshop can happen can RBKC and EH please commit to getting everything signed off in time.</p> <p>CD said that contractors do not always like the illustrative sites as there is less certainty.</p> <p>CC said the site could go indicative if all is agreed at a workshop.</p> <p>JP explained that the workshop idea may not be approved by TW though.</p> <p>CC said she is concerned if the current illustrative goes in the tender package. EH would like the design to be close enough to what they want that they can remove their objection.</p> <p>RC re-stated that RBKC would like willows at the site and suggested that even if the workshop could not go ahead could a new sketch be created which would help with rewriting the Design Principles?</p> <p>JP said that if that is the case then RC can help CD with writing a brief.</p> <p>CC said she will have a letter ready for early w/b 18 November 2013.</p> <p>Post Meeting Note: The workshop went ahead on Tuesday 10 December and a revised illustrative landscape design was submitted in the 13 January 2014 and final 12 February 2014 SoCG.</p>		
4.	<p>Summary of outstanding matters - Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) / Written Representation</p>		
4.1.	<p>JP said that it had been hoped the January SoCG would be the final version and all possible outstanding matters would have been resolved but it is considered best to aim for the</p>		



	<p>February submission.</p> <p>JP explained that by RBKC signing the SoCG it doesn't make it final. It's just acknowledging it is a fair and accurate description of where we are at in discussions.</p>		
4.2.	<p>The matters still outstanding are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Height of the vent columns at CEF - which TW and RBKC/EH agree to disagree on • Settlement - which would be covered by Requirement PW9 • The gate in the boundary of Ranelagh Gardens - TW are looking into this TBC • Requirements - Air Quality info for RBKC approval - AB to send through • Cumulative effects - PC said this was been taken out of the LIR and can be taken out of the SoCG • Transport modelling - awaiting response from TfL - James McCool (JMc) to review • Reopening of the Thames Path in working hours on a Saturday at CEF - JMc - agree to disagree • The Infrastructure Provider (IP) - PC said procurement meeting she attended was useful but keeps as an outstanding matter. • Resourcing - CD suggested PC raise resourcing at the next forum. PC said if TW could do a SoCG with all boroughs on resourcing and it would remove a lot of representations. 		
5.	AOB		
5.1.	<p><i>Section 106</i></p> <p>JP said that the solicitors are in direct communication.</p> <p>PC referred to a meeting coming up on 22 November.</p>		

Next meeting (date, time, location):	Tuesday 10 December 2013, 12-16.00, The Point, Paddington
Next minute taker:	ZC