Appendix F – King George’s Park

F.1 Introduction
F.1.1 This appendix sets out the site selection process that we used and our rationale for identifying our preferred phase one and phase two consultation site to intercept the Frogmore Storm Relief – Buckhold Road CSO.

Type of site

F.1.2 We need a worksite to connect the local combined sewer overflow (CSO), known as the Frogmore Storm Relief – Buckhold Road CSO, to the main tunnel. To enable the connection to be made, the site needs to be as close as possible to the line of the existing sewer.

Site selection process

F.1.3 All potential worksites have been identified in accordance with our Site selection methodology paper (SSM), which involved a ‘sieving’ approach, commencing with identification of all potentially suitable areas of land (excluding concentrated residential sites and World Heritage Sites) and passing these sites through increasingly detailed levels of assessment to move from a long list to a draft short list, a final short list and finally a list of preferred sites for phase one consultation.

F.1.4 A plan showing all the sites considered for the interception of the Frogmore Storm Relief – Buckhold Road CSO and how they progressed during the site selection process can be found in Annex F.1.

Preferred site for phase one and phase two consultation

F.1.5 The table below identifies our preferred site to intercept the Frogmore Storm Relief – Buckhold Road CSO at phase one and phase two consultation. Section F.2 provides details of how we identified our preferred phase one site. Sections F.3 and F.4 provide the details of why our preferred site for phase one remains our preferred site for phase two consultation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase one consultation site:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King George’s Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase two consultation site:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King George’s Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F.2 Site selection up to phase one consultation

Assessment of the long list sites

F.2.1 The long list of potential sites to intercept the Frogmore Storm Relief - Buckhold Road CSO was created by conducting a desktop survey of the land in the vicinity of the existing sewer.
F.2.2 In total, nine sites were included on the long list. These sites were assessed having regard to the high-level considerations set out in Table 2.2 of the SSM (hereafter referred to as Table 2.2) including engineering (site size, site features, availability of jetty/wharf and access), planning and environment (heritage, landscape/townscape, open space and ecological) and community and property (neighbouring land uses, site use, Special Land/Crown Land and acquisition costs) considerations.

F.2.3 The table below provides a summary of the outcome of the Table 2.2 assessment in respect of the long list of sites considered for the interception of this CSO. Sites which were assessed as being the least constrained when considered against Table 2.2 considerations passed to the draft short list. This did not necessarily mean that these sites would ultimately be judged as suitable, but that no significant constraints were identified in relation to the high-level considerations addressed at Table 2.2. Sites that were judged to be more constrained were not recommended to be retained on the draft short list for more detailed assessment. The main rationale for the exclusion of these sites at this stage is summarised in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Site name/description</th>
<th>Recommendation and rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C07BA</td>
<td>Gardens to properties fronting Buckhold Rd</td>
<td>Recommendation: To draft shortlist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C07BB</td>
<td>Car parking to development fronting Brook Rd</td>
<td>Recommendation: Not to draft shortlist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rationale: Small site, restrictive working.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C07BC</td>
<td>Parking area fronting building</td>
<td>Recommendation: Not to draft shortlist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rationale: Small site, restrictive working.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C07BD</td>
<td>Parking to rear of properties fronting Buckhold Rd (off Broomhill Rd)</td>
<td>Recommendation: To draft shortlist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C07BE</td>
<td>Playground of school</td>
<td>Recommendation: Not to draft shortlist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rationale: Engineering connection between shaft and interception chamber long and difficult.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C07BF</td>
<td>King George’s Park</td>
<td>Recommendation: To draft shortlist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C07BG</td>
<td>Parking area behind scout hall (Buckhold Road)</td>
<td>Recommendation: To draft shortlist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C07BH</td>
<td>Car hire business (Buckhold Road)</td>
<td>Recommendation: To draft shortlist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Site ID

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Site name/description</th>
<th>Recommendation and rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| C07BJ   | Parking area fronting small business (Buckhold Road) | **Recommendation:** Not to draft shortlist  
**Rationale:** Small site, restrictive working. |

NB. The Site ID and Site name/description were used as an internal mechanism to record and describe the site but may be updated if necessary.

F.2.4 Full details are provided in the Table 2.2 assessment tables and accompanying plans.

F.2.5 Of the nine sites identified, five were assessed as potentially suitable and passed to the draft short list, while four sites were eliminated as being unsuitable.

**Assessment of draft short list sites**

F.2.6 The five draft short list sites identified for further assessment at the next stage were:

- C07BA: Gardens to properties fronting Buckhold Road
- C07BD: Parking to rear of properties fronting Buckhold Rd (off Broomhill Rd)
- C07BF: King George’s Park
- C07BG: Parking area behind Scout Hall (Buckhold Road)
- C07BH: Car hire business (Buckhold Road).

F.2.7 These sites were further assessed by the engineering, planning, environment, community and property disciplines, having regard to the considerations set out in Table 2.3 of the SSM (hereafter referred to as Table 2.3). This stage of the process built on the information gathered and assessment undertaken at long list stage but focussed on more detailed local considerations.

F.2.8 At this stage, we also consulted with each of the directly affected London local authorities and pan-London stakeholders, such as the Environment Agency and English Heritage, to seek their views on the suitability of sites for the short list.

F.2.9 The table below summarises the outcome of the Table 2.3 assessment of the draft short list of sites. Sites which were assessed as being the least constrained when considered against Table 2.3 considerations were retained on the short list to pass to the next stage of assessment. This did not necessarily mean that a site would ultimately be judged as suitable, but that no significant constraints were identified in relation to the considerations addressed at Table 2.3. Sites that were judged to be more constrained were not recommended to be retained on the short list for more detailed assessment. The main rationale for the exclusion of these sites at this stage is summarised below.
### Table F.2 Draft short list to final short list for the interception of the Frogmore Storm Relief – Buckhold Road CSO (Table 2.3 assessment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Site name/ description</th>
<th>Recommendation and rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| C07BA  | Gardens to properties fronting Buckhold Road | **Recommendation:** Not to shortlist  
**Rationale:**  
- Engineering – Steep gradient would severely hinder working.  
- Community – Loss of private gardens and impact on residential area. |
| C07BD  | Parking to rear of properties fronting Buckhold Rd (off Broomhill Rd) | **Recommendation:** Retain on short list |
| C07BF  | King George’s Park | **Recommendation:** Retain on short list |
| C07BG  | Parking area behind Scout Hall (Buckhold Road) | **Recommendation:** Not to shortlist  
**Rationale:**  
- Community – Would require removal of Scout Hut and loss of this community facility |
| C07BH  | Car hire business (Buckhold Road) | **Recommendation:** Not to shortlist  
**Rationale:**  
- Engineering – Engineering connection to sewer is potentially long and difficult given narrow constrained site.  
- Community – Loss of established business |

NB. The Site ID and Site name/description were used as an internal mechanism to record and describe the site but may be updated if necessary.

F.2.10 Full details are provided in the Table 2.3 assessment tables and accompanying plans.

F.2.11 Of the five sites on the draft short list, two were assessed as potentially suitable and passed to the final short list, while three sites did not proceed to the final short list.

### Assessment of the final short list sites

F.2.12 The two sites identified for inclusion on the final short list and assessment at the next stage were:
- C07BD: Parking to rear of properties fronting Buckhold Rd (off Broomhill Rd)
- C07BF: King George’s Park.
A site suitability report (SSR) was then prepared for each of the final shortlisted sites. These reports contained an assessment of each site’s suitability having regard to engineering, planning, environment, community and property considerations. At this stage in the process, sites were assessed in isolation without comparison to other sites or regard to tunnelling strategy. Sites were evaluated by each discipline using technical knowledge and professional judgement as appropriate and assessed as either suitable, less suitable or not suitable from that discipline’s perspective.

A summary of the conclusions of each discipline’s assessment from the site suitability reports is provided below.

**C07BD: Parking to rear of properties fronting Buckhold Rd (off Broomhill Rd)**

The proposed site would occupy the car park of 1–60 Park View Court, within the London Borough of Wandsworth. Park View Court consists of residential flats situated at the junction of Broomhill Road and Buckhold Road. Access to the car park is taken from Broomhill Road opposite the semi-detached dwellings at 9–24 Broomhill Road. The area is generally mixed, with Wandsworth Town Centre located 150m to the north.

**Engineering:** This site was assessed as less suitable as a CSO site as it would be some distance away from the interception chamber and the proposed route for the connection culvert to the drop shaft would run under the main road for approximately 85m. The shaft would be in very close proximity to residential buildings. However, the site would have good vehicular access and would be of adequate size.

**Planning:** On balance, the site was considered to be not suitable for use as a CSO site. The site is located very close to residential properties and is likely to have a detrimental impact on residential amenity that would be very difficult to mitigate. The site would also result in the loss of residents’ car parking, and it is likely to be difficult to provide alternative facilities within the locality.

**Environment:** Overall, the site was considered to be suitable for use as a CSO site. The site was suitable from the perspectives of transport, archaeology, built heritage and townscape, hydrogeology, ecology and flood risk. The site was considered less suitable from the perspectives of surface water, air quality, noise and land quality, and further investigation of possible mitigation measures would be required.

**Socio-economic and community:** From a community impacts perspective, this site appears less suitable for use as a CSO site. Use of the site appears likely to impact on residents of Park View Court due to the disturbance of the works themselves and the loss of the car parking.

The site is adjacent to and opposite further residential dwellings, as well as the Wandsworth Business Village and West Hill Primary School. These also appear likely to be affected by disruption.

**Property:** This site was considered suitable as a CSO site. Acquisition costs were considered likely to be acceptable and the site is relatively
undeveloped. However, the loss of parking and the execution of the works would create a significant amount of disruption for the occupiers of the adjoining flats.

**C07BF: King George’s Park**

F.2.22 Site C07BF would occupy the northern tip of King George’s Park, adjacent to the entrance from Buckhold Road at the junction with Neville Gill Close, and within the London Borough of Wandsworth.

F.2.23 There is a mix of land uses in the vicinity, with Wandsworth Town Centre located 100m to the north and Southside Shopping Centre to the east of the park beyond Neville Gill Close. The nearest residential properties are located approximately 30m from the working area and are separated by Buckhold Road.

F.2.24 **Engineering:** This site would be suitable as a CSO site as it has good access and is of adequate size. The storm relief sewer is in close proximity to the drop shaft and this would allow the interception chamber and connection culvert to the drop shaft to be within the same site. No demolition would be required. The site is approximately 1km away from the river and the connection from the drop shaft to the main tunnel would run under buildings. However, this cannot be improved due to the location of the outfall.

F.2.25 **Planning:** The site was considered suitable for use as a CSO site. However, potential impacts upon residential amenity and loss of open space within an area of deficiency would require appropriate mitigation. Further consideration should also be given to the detailed layout of the work areas, reinstatement of the working areas post construction and the integration of the after-use structures within the park.

F.2.26 **Environment:** Overall, the site was considered suitable as a CSO site, although mitigation would be required to enable the site to be used. The site was judged suitable from the perspective of transport, archaeology, built heritage, water resources (groundwater), flood risk, noise and land quality. The site was considered less suitable from the perspective of townscape, ecology, surface water and air quality. Overall, the site is considered suitable, subject to further investigation of whether ecology, surface water and air quality impacts can be adequately mitigated.

F.2.27 **Socio-economic and community:** This site was considered suitable for a CSO site. Use of the site would result in the temporary loss of the northernmost tip of the park. The remainder would be available for public use, although the children’s nursery and play area, bowling green and other facilities may face some disturbance. It appears possible, however, for potential impacts on park users and the surrounding properties to be mitigated. During the works, these may include measures to limit noise and visual disturbance.

F.2.28 The permanent hardstanding and associated after-use features may restrict the reinstatement of that area of the park after the works have finished.
F.2.29 **Property:** This site was considered suitable as a CSO site. The site is undeveloped and acquisition costs should be acceptable. Acquiring the site may, however, require a special parliamentary procedure.

**Identification of the preferred site**

F.2.30 Following the completion of the SSRs, a multidisciplinary workshop was held to compare the suitability of each of the shortlisted sites based on the SSR assessments and to make a recommendation on which site should be identified as the preferred site.

F.2.31 From the two shortlisted sites, King George’s Park (CO7BF) was identified as the preferred site for the following reasons:

- Site CO7BF (King George’s Park) is a level site of suitable size and was judged suitable by all disciplines. Although the site would occupy public open space, the section of the park occupied during the construction period would be a relatively small proportion of the overall park area, and was therefore judged to be acceptable. The site has the opportunity for good access during both construction and operation, and the location of pipework means that all works would be contained within the park. The proposed location for the drop shaft would be further away from residential properties than would be the case with the alternative shortlisted site C07BD (car park off Broomhill Road). It was judged that site CO7BF would facilitate an effective construction layout that allowed for provision of appropriate mitigation measures.

- Site C07BD was judged not suitable by planning and less suitable by engineering and community disciplines. The site was assessed as suitable by environment and property disciplines. Access would be along a narrow residential road. As the existing pipework is not located beneath the site, it would be necessary to construct an interception chamber at the junction of Broomhill Road and Buckhold Road, as well as a connection culvert, which would cause significant disruption. Deep and disruptive excavations would be required along the residential road. The drop shaft would need to be sited in closer proximity to residential properties than would be the case for the alternative site. It was considered that the close proximity between the construction site and residential properties would harm residential amenity and impact upon the adjacent conservation area. The loss of car parking facilities was also considered to be of concern.

**F.3 Review of site following phase one consultation**

**Phase one consultation feedback**

F.3.1 As part of the site selection methodology, all feedback received during the phase one consultation was reviewed and taken into account in the development of our scheme for phase two consultation.
F.3.2 The main issues and concerns raised during phase one consultation in relation to the King George’s Park site included:

- impact of loss of amenity space on sports and recreation activity and impact on Metropolitan Open Land
- impact of the loss of green space and local wildlife, including trees
- impact of congestion on local roads
- temporary and permanent access should be from Neville Gill Close and not Buckhold Road.

F.3.3 The main comments received in support of the preferred site included:

- most appropriate location as it offers the least disruptive and most cost-effective solution
- considered more suitable than the shortlisted site
- the landscaping proposals are good and will enhance the park.

F.3.4 More detail on the consultation responses relating to this site and our response to the comments received are provided within the Report on phase one consultation.

F.3.5 Having taken all comments received during phase one consultation into account, we still believe King George’s Park (C07BF) is the most suitable site to intercept the Frogmore Storm Relief – Buckhold Road CSO. We believe this site is most appropriate when compared to the alternatives as its use appears likely to have less impacts on local residents, avoids the need for potential disruption and the loss of private parking. We recognise the concerns that have been raised, including loss of green and amenity space and the impact on sports and recreational activity, and will take these into account when developing the project further, including measures that can be put into place to minimise potential impacts.

F.4 Site development

F.4.1 Following the selection of King George’s Park as our preferred site, further feedback from stakeholders and ongoing scheme development work have contributed to a number of refinements to the site.

Engagement with stakeholders

F.4.2 Engagement with stakeholders has been ongoing and has continued beyond the phase one consultation period. This has resulted in continual development of our proposals to take on board the comments made by stakeholders.

F.4.3 In particular, we have had regular meetings and workshops with officers from the London Borough of Wandsworth, TfL, the Environment Agency and English Heritage with respect to developing the design and construction of our works and the scope of our environmental assessments. To ensure our design process is transparent, we undertook a series of design reviews, hosted and chaired by the Design Council.
CABE (formerly the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment). The reviews for King George’s Park were attended by the London Borough of Wandsworth and our pan-London stakeholders.

**Construction layout**

F.4.4 In response to stakeholder engagement, phase one consultation responses and scheme development, the construction layout of the site has been altered to minimise impact on the local community and environment and is guided by operational and functional requirements. Particular factors at this site that have influenced the layout are as follows:

- The drop shaft has been moved further eastwards within the boundary of the site following phase one consultation to ensure the historic gates off Buckhold Road (A218) are retained and protected.
- Since phase one consultation, the temporary site footprint has been reduced in size to minimise the area needed in King George’s Park.
- The site layout ensures that the large black poplar tree on the southeast corner of the site would be retained and its roots protected during construction.
- The site layout minimises loss of and damage to the most sensitive and valuable mature trees.
- The site layout ensures the John Young Memorial Seat and Tree would be protected during construction.

F.4.5 Further information on the construction logistics and the site layouts for the construction and operational phases can be found in the *King George’s Park site information paper*.

**Design**

F.4.6 Since phase one consultation, we have also progressed the design for the permanent use and look of King George’s Park, taking into account comments made at our phase one consultation and the ongoing engagement with the London Borough of Wandsworth, the Environment Agency, English Heritage and other technical consultees.

F.4.7 Full details of design development for the King George’s Park site are provided in the *Design development report*.

**Phase two consultation**

F.5.1 A final preferred sites workshop was held in summer 2011 to verify the choice of preferred sites, having regard to the outcomes of further engagement and scheme development. The conclusion reached was that *King George’s Park (C07BF) should remain the phase two consultation preferred site for the interception of the Frogmore Storm Relief – Buckhold Road CSO*.

F.5.2 Phase two consultation will provide an opportunity for the public to comment on the further design development and additional information
available on our preferred site and revised scheme for the Thames Tunnel project, before we publicise our proposed application.
Annex F.1
This is a working draft plan which has been produced for the purpose of phase two consultation on the Thames Tunnel project. The information shown on the plan is illustrative of what will be required for the purpose of constructing and operating the Thames Tunnel project. The information shown on the plan may change as a result of Thames Water’s consideration of the responses received to phase two consultation and any further design development that is carried out.