

RBKC/THAMES WATER MEETING – 8 June 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), Saskie Laing (Ecology), Rebecca Brown (Environmental Health), Adam Bassi (Property)

TW: David Dolan, Colin Turnbull, John Pearson, Dermot Scanlon, Clare Donnelly, Alex Gilmore

2. Tunnel Alignment and Settlement Issues

JP gave an explanation of the letter sent to residents about land referencing. The letter covers the duties under section 44 of the Planning Act 2008 to undertake diligent enquiry to ensure that they consult all those who may be affected by the Thames Tunnel proposals. A precautionary approach has been taken and they have included all those properties within approximately 100 metres around the construction sites. Therefore, they will be able to consult all those with an interest in land within this boundary with respect to the Thames Tunnel proposals.

DD stated that in relation to the tunnel's effect on structures at ground level within Kensington and Chelsea, their initial assessment indicates that no properties are within the 5mm ground settlement zone for the main tunnel and therefore do not expect there to be any impact on properties in the Royal Borough as a result of settlement. The project is undertaking more detailed analysis and will carry out pre-construction condition surveys of all structures within the potential influence of the tunnel, implement a tailored monitoring plan for structures where necessary and undertake any required post-construction surveys thereafter. The project will subsequently undertake to fully remediate any directly attributable settlement related impacts that have occurred as a result of the Thames Tunnel and ensure that customers are dealt with in a fair and professional manner.

PR explained that the issues about the letter came about as the residents who got the letter did not get any background information and explanation on settlement. This is a sensitive issue for us as our residents will expect us to discuss this with TW. The risk of settlement will be treated as another negative impact of the tunnel. He requested further information and clarification about the scale and probability of settlement to respond to residents confidently. He also raised the importance on the detail on the settlement paper.

PC asked about the links to the EIA process. DS explained that the EIA will be linked to the paper on settlement and fully included in the final EIA next year.

PR asked how this would affect Cremorne Wharf and Lots Road Power Station redevelopment. DD said that the surface of the ground will be included in the 5mm contour but not the buildings

- Action: JP and DD to get back to RBKC officers with information and clarification about the scale and probability of settlement and contours.

AB asked for further clarification on why the shaft could not go in the foreshore.

DD and JP explained the local and regional planning policy constraints along with the encroachment to the river which was key for the Environment Agency.

JP explained that the emerging scheme onshore was the current proposal and reassured him that the existing facilities would be reprovided as required. The information required by property was provided and further meetings with property will take place outside this council-wide meeting.

- Action: AB to set up a separate meeting with Thames Water to discuss separate commercial matters. AB to liaise with Christina Dellore.

3. Thames Tunnel Programme

JP explained that the Phase 2 consultation will currently take place in September and will run for 12 weeks. TW will consult RBKC on the revised Statement of Community Consultation and Community Consultation Strategy. This consultation is expected in July.

PR asked what would the scheme under Phase 2 consultation be.

DD advised that there will be an explanation on how the scheme has moved forward since Phase 1 consultation.

JP explained that there will be a meeting in early July to present the emerging scheme to Lots Road and nearby residents. He also explained that the application will be publicised around February 2012 and there will be a further opportunity to comment on the scheme then.

- Action: JP to send information about the Lots Road meeting so it is publicised on the website.

4. EIA update

DS explained that the TFL workshops covered each site. There will be a session on the 1st July to wrap up all the information and actions for all the sites. The Transport Assessment Scoping Report will be issued as draft in mid-June. Other documents will be prepared to TFL. TW was happy to share those documents: traffic modelling, baseline data etc. The Transport Assessment is on track.

TW received comments on the Code of Construction Practice from Ian Hooper.

RB explained to DS that Ian Hooper was keen to get answers to the questions on the effect to the surface of connection tunnels. She also asked about how the comments were taken on board.

DS will liaise directly with Ian. He said that all the comments were taken on board. TW will have one to one meetings with Local Authorities after the draft Code of Construction Practice is issued later in June. This Code will be available at Phase 2 consultation.

In terms of cumulative effects DS explained that assumptions were needed but further information and / or clarification on nearby schemes would be welcomed.

JW talked about the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham draft South Fulham Riverside SPD. He wanted to make TW aware of this and raised concerns on the transport assessment.

DS explained that the Preliminary Environmental Information Report will be available at Phase 2 consultation as required by the IPC process. This is a work-in-progress report explaining where TW is in terms of EIA. The alternatives, logistic scenarios, effects, and mitigation measures will be included in this report. It will also include a site by site feedback exercise.

Actions:

- DS to send us the programme for the 1st July meeting on transport issues
- DS to issue a list of schemes for cumulative effects assessment which will include Lots Road Power Station Redevelopment
- PC to get back to TW with further information on the schemes in the list

5. Cremorne Wharf

JP explained that the letter received was discussed in point 2 of the meeting.

AB wanted certainty about TW's programme.

JP wanted feedback from AB on the drawings he sent.

AB said he will feedback after he meets the engineers

DD explained that they met the PLA last week and that the PLA would object if the drawings show that the Thames Path would restrain the operation of the Wharf. JP explained that TW proposed to provide a cleared strip along the riverside of Cremorne Wharf in order that the proposed works would not preclude a Thames path being provided in the future. JW/PC confirmed they understand and accept this approach and PR explained that resolution of the conflict in policies for the Thames Path and the use of Cremorne Wharf as a Safeguarded Wharf was needed.

AB explained that external planners will make representations to the forthcoming GLA consultation on Safeguarded Wharfs on behalf of Property services.

JP explained that the site has not been modified since last meeting and that a separate meeting could be take place to discuss sheds. The existing scheme is the default position.

PR explained that any modifications to the scheme would need to involve talks with AB.

Actions:

- Christina Delloro will liaise with AB directly in terms of property and commercial issues.
- AB to get back to TW after meeting the engineers.

6. Chelsea Embankment

JP explained that they met with the Royal Hospital and they do not want the use of Ranelagh Gardens as it would impact on the Chelsea Flower Show and other exhibitions. TW believe they can design a scheme on Ranelagh Gardens that could work around the Chelsea Flower Show. However, after the Council's letter they decided that they would withhold the Ranelagh Gardens option and would favour the foreshore option. To get back to the Ranelagh Gardens options, TW asked for a letter from the Council requesting them to look into that option.

JP offered to explain the scheme further to officers and Councillors it that was of help.

RC explained that the Planning Director was more comfortable with the option closer to Chelsea Bridge in terms of the foreshore. It would be useful to have the two options in Phase 2 consultation and let the public decide. Otherwise, in order to make a properly informed decision we will need a highly detailed information on both sites. He asked what would happen if English Heritage disagrees with the foreshore option.

JP and DD said that they would need to speak further with English Heritage.

PR asked TW for more information on both schemes so we can reaffirm our position.

JP will send more information with pros and cons of both options for us to present the compatible options to members.

DS explained that surveys, including bats and birds surveys, will be undertaken in and around the gardens during the summer.

RB requested that a list of the information provided by TW is sent along with the pros and cons.

Design update: CD explained the scheme presented at CABE (2 small sites intercepted with floating gardens) and the options for a site combining the shaft and the CSO in the axis of the gardens, in the foreshore. The fourth option of the site was also in the axis but with a more rounded and softer perimeter. This option will open the axis to get a view of the Royal Hospital.

PC asked for elevation to be shown in the drawing.

RC asked for a more clear drawing on the structure for the CSO for all the options.

SL explained that the fourth option was the preferable in ecological terms. She explained that Willows or native White Poplar will be preferred on the embankment.

Actions:

- Planning officers to reflect on the reasons and consequences of supporting the Ranelagh Gardens option.
- Corporate view to be given to TW
- JP to send more information with pros and cons of both options and a list with the information provided.
- CD to include elevation in the drawing of the site and a clearer view of the structure on the CSO for all the options.

7 Date of next meeting

Provisionally set for mid-July.