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1 Introduction

1.1.1 This addendum to our Interim engagement report (summer 2011) has been produced to reflect additional feedback that we have received since we completed our interim engagement; and to report on the findings of further interim engagement for Kirtling Street.

1.1.2 The report sets out:

- an update on responses received in respect of Deptford Church Street; and

- a summary of comments received in relation to further interim engagement that was undertaken in October 2011 for the Kirtling Street site, following a change to the proposed site area. For this site this addendum describes the site proposals; our approach to further interim engagement; summarises the feedback received; identifies the main issues and concerns raised; and provides our responses.
2 Deptford Church Street

2.1.1 As part of the interim engagement we sought feedback on the potential use of a triangular area of land adjacent to Deptford Church Street and between Crossfield Street and Coffey Street to intercept the CSO. Drop in sessions were held on 24 and 25 June 2011 and the feedback and our responses were set out in our Interim engagement report (Summer 2011).

2.2 Additional feedback

2.2.1 We have now received an update to one of the petitions reported in our Summer 2011 report and a new petition.

2.2.2 The updated petition was from a group of residents led by Liberty Mosse. Originally this petition had 64 signatures, but the updated one added 73 signatures, so there is now a total of 137 signatures.

2.2.3 The new petition was coordinated by Liberty Mosse and has 168 signatures. This petition does not raise any new points to those set out in section 14.2 of our Summer 2011 report. All of the points were previously taken into account in considering the use of Deptford Church Street.

2.3 Update

2.3.1 The following text updates paragraph 14.1.2 of our Summer 2011 report.

2.3.2 A total of 38 feedback responses were received on the proposals presented for Deptford Church Street. This included three petitions from:

• a group of residents led by Liberty Mosse with 137 signatures;
• St Joseph’s Catholic Primary School with 64 signatures
• an online petition coordinated by Liberty Mosse with 168 signatures.

2.3.3 The following list provides an update to the number of responses received by issue, to reflect the points raised in the new petition. All of the points raised were originally recorded in Table 14.2 of the Summer 2011 report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>No. (original)</th>
<th>No. (revised)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.2.1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.2.4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.2.13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.2.14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.2.15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.2.18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.2.24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3  

**Kirtling Street**

3.1  
**Site proposals – change to interim engagement proposal**

3.1.1 At phase one consultation, we proposed to use Tideway Walk to receive the main tunnel from Barn Elms and from which to drive the main tunnel to King’s Stairs Gardens. We also proposed to use the same site to intercept two existing local CSOs, known as Heathwall Pumping Station CSO and South West Storm Relief CSO, to the main tunnel.

3.1.2 Since commencement of phase one consultation, proposals for a new residential development at the Tideway Walk site had been approved and construction work commenced on this site. The Tideway Walk site was therefore no longer a viable option for the Thames Tunnel. A site at Heathwall Pumping Station would be used to intercept the two CSOs.

3.1.3 As part of our site selection process we considered possible alternative sites. One potential alternative site was Kirtling Street, comprising of industrial warehouses on Kirtling Street and the warehouse/depot at Cringle Street. As part of our interim engagement on 15 and 16 August 2011 we held drop-in sessions to seek early feedback on the potential use of Kirtling Street.

3.1.4 As the site selection process runs in parallel with design development we continued to assess our potential site options and carry out further technical work, especially in regard to the construction layout and jetty arrangements that lead to reduced health and safety risks and less impact on the local houseboats. As part of this work we identified the opportunity to include the existing concrete batching works site to the west of Kirtling Street as part of our construction site. As such we determined that it would be appropriate to hold a further drop-in session to secure feedback on the changes to the site.

3.2  
**Approach to further interim engagement**

3.2.1 Consistent with the approach to engagement during the interim engagement, drop-in sessions were held to inform local residents of our revised proposals, and provide an opportunity to raise concerns.

3.2.2 Drop-in sessions were held on Monday 10 October and Tuesday 11 October 2011 (2pm – 8pm) at Battersea Dogs and Cats Home, 4 Battersea Park Road London, SW8 4AA.

3.2.3 Feedback could be provided via comment cards and written feedback, consistent with the approach and methodology used for the interim engagement.

3.3  
**Feedback received**

3.3.1 A total of six feedback responses were received on the proposals. This included three responses which provided only contact details, and / or requests for a further meeting.
3.4  **Site selection and construction phase: Supportive and general comments**

One supportive and general comment was provided with regard to the use of Kirtling Street. This comment and our response are set out below:

**Table 3.1 Kirtling Street – Site selection and construction phase: supportive and general comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.4.1</td>
<td>Support identification of site and proposed use.</td>
<td>CC300</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>These comments are noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5  **Site selection and construction phase: Issues**

**Table 3.2 Kirtling Street – Site selection and construction phase: issues**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site selection and alternative sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.1</td>
<td>Objection to use of site, for reasons including the availability of alternative, viable sites which should be developed in preference.</td>
<td>PC170</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Noted. In accordance with our site selection methodology, we are assessing the suitability of potential sites, taking into account engineering, planning, environmental, property and community considerations. Our phase two consultation seeks comments on our revised preferred sites and provide further information on the alternatives considered and the reasons why preferred sites were selected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Built environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.2</td>
<td>Proximity to homes and associated effects of construction should be</td>
<td>PC170</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The site selection process included an assessment of short listed sites against five 'community' considerations to help determine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Respondent ID</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Our response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>taken into account when developing proposals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>their suitability. The considerations include proximity to sensitive receptors (including residential), social economic, health and equality considerations. We are undertaking a number of studies to assess the potential impact of the project on human health and wellbeing, and possible effects within the population, including local residents and school users. The findings of our studies will inform the design and the method by which we would construct the tunnel. We will seek to reduce the effect of the works during the construction phase by adopting a Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) to limit any potential significant effects. The type of site management measures used to minimise disruption from construction activities might include noise barriers around the work, acoustic enclosures for machinery, or noise insulation to affected properties. We are also considering complete enclosures for the shaft at this site. During construction noise and dust will be monitored for compliance with the required standards. At our phase two consultation we published our initial assessment of environmental effects in our Preliminary Environmental Information Report and our CoCP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Respondent ID</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Our response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.3</td>
<td>Effect of construction programme on delivery of existing planned development/ regeneration.</td>
<td>PC170</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>We are aware of the proposals for the regeneration of the wider Vauxhall Nine Elms Battersea area and our proposals do not affect the early stages of that development, particularly at Battersea Power Station. Also, we are aware of the demolition of Nine Elms Pier and the creation of a new marina for 35 moorings. We have made a representation to Council on the original planning application and are intending to submit a further representation to Council on the revised planning application, we would continue to work with the developers and the local authority to agree a phasing programme that allows construction of the main tunnel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Property</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.4</td>
<td>Reduction in property values.</td>
<td>PC170</td>
<td></td>
<td>Land and property owners may have a statutory entitlement to claim compensation for diminution in the value of their property due to the construction or operation of the project. In addition to the statutory process we have published an exceptional hardship procedure which sets out how we will assess claims from householders who contend that they are suffering exceptional hardship as a result of being unable to sell their property because it is potentially impacted by the currently published Thames Tunnel proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Respondent ID</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Our response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Information on the EHP is available on our website or on request from 0800 0721 086.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There will be opportunities during our phase two consultation period, to discuss our proposals in more details with us. Our public exhibitions will include written information about the sites and will be staffed by our project team. We will consider individual requests for further meetings once stakeholders have had the opportunity to consider the information presented as part of our Phase two consultation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6 After use and operation: Supportive and general comments
3.6.1 In relation to after use and operation of the site, no respondents provided supportive and general comments.

3.7 After use and operation: Issues
3.7.1 In relation to after use and operation of the site, no respondents identified any issues.