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Foreword

Thank you to everyone who took the trouble and time to take part in this consultation and have their say on our proposals. We welcome the on-going dialogue with residents, community and campaign groups, businesses, organisations and boroughs. All the information received is invaluable to us as we continue to develop the design of this critical infrastructure project.

Your ideas, views and information received during our phase two consultation will support our aim to ensure the final design is the best solution to this problem, providing value for money with the least disruption to Londoners and this vibrant, world-leading city.

Importantly, we have been provided with many opportunities not only to address local groups, but also to talk to you individually about the need for the Thames Tunnel project. Finding construction sites to support the project in a densely populated city was never going to be an easy task. In the phase two consultation we were able to provide much more detailed information on our proposals and discuss how the project could affect you. We have listened and, wherever possible, we have acted on your feedback.

This report is just a summary of your feedback. Our responses to your detailed comments can be found in the Main and Supplementary reports on phase two consultation. We expect to carry out our Section 48 publicity later this year when we will publish our proposed application for development consent for the project. You will have at least six weeks to make any comments.

We welcome the support we have received for our proposals and we also understand where concerns have been raised. We know there are difficult decisions to take and we are making every effort to limit the impacts on communities and the environment as far as we can.

We are keen to keep talking to you, so if you have any questions or concerns, please get in touch.

Richard Aylard CVO
External Affairs & Sustainability Director

Phil Stride
Head of London Tideway Tunnels
1. **Introduction**

1.1 **The project**

1.1.1 The Thames Tunnel project is needed to help substantially reduce the amount of untreated sewage which enters the River Thames when the sewerage system exceeds its capacity. Projected population growth and new buildings add to the need urgently to address this problem. We are proposing to build the Thames Tunnel (the project) to capture the untreated sewage before it enters the River Thames. This will bring long-term benefits for the environment and people who use the river.

1.1.2 The project will help ensure that the UK complies with the EU Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive, and assist in meeting the objectives of the EU Water Framework Directive.

1.1.3 It is expected that the Thames Tunnel project will shortly be designated a nationally significant infrastructure project that is subject to the provisions of the Planning Act 2008. We are therefore following the requirements of this Act and associated guidance, in so far as we are able to.

1.1.4 Before we submit a Development Consent Order (DCO) application for the project, we want to understand the views of statutory consultees, local authorities, landowners and community consultees. We have carried out our phase two consultation in accordance with Sections 42 and 47 of the Planning Act 2008. Our phase two consultation, which we undertook between 4 November 2011 and 10 February 2012, provided a second opportunity for us to gather feedback. All the comments received have been carefully considered and, where possible, we will take these into account as design development for the project continues.

1.1.5 Our Report on phase two consultation sets out the process we followed in order to carry out our phase two consultation and analyse the feedback received. It sets out the feedback we received together with our response to the comments raised.

1.1.6 The Report on phase two consultation is in three parts:

- this summary report, a non-technical summary of feedback received, which identifies the main feedback raised
- the main report (including appendices), which provides an overview of the supportive and neutral feedback comments made, together with objections, issues and concerns raised, and provides our responses to these issues
- the supplementary report, which sets out comprehensively and in detail all the feedback comments received, and our responses.

1.1.7 This summary report provides an overview of the feedback received. Given the volume of responses received, each chapter within this report identifies the key or main points raised. As set out above, the Main and Supplementary reports on phase two consultation provide more detail on the feedback received and our responses to the comments made.

1.2 **Phase two consultation**

**What we consulted on**

1.2.1 During phase two consultation, we consulted on:

- the need for the project, including whether a tunnel is the most appropriate solution
- our preferred tunnel route, including the detailed alignment of the tunnel
- our preferred sites for the construction and permanent works
- detailed proposals for our preferred sites, which take into account the results of our phase one consultation and further, more detailed, technical work undertaken
- the effects of the project, as reported in our Preliminary environmental information report.

**Whom we consulted**

1.2.2 In accordance with Sections 42 and 47 of the 2008 Act, and as set out in our Statement of community consultation (SOCC), we have consulted with the following groups:

- statutory consultees
• local authorities, including potentially directly affected local authorities and authorities that are adjacent to local authorities where we propose to undertake works

• landowners, including property owners and lessees of shortlisted sites, and occupiers of properties above and adjacent to the potential tunnel routes

• community consultees, including the general public, local property owners/occupiers, local businesses, community representatives and groups.

1.2.3 In anticipation that the project will become a nationally significant infrastructure project, on 2 November 2011, we notified the Infrastructure Planning Commission of our intention to submit an application for development consent for the project and we supplied our consultation materials to the Commission as if Section 46 of the Planning Act 2008 applied. We also confirmed that we propose to provide an environmental statement in respect of the project as part of the application for development consent for the project as if Regulation 6(1)(b) of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2009 applied.

1.2.4 Before starting our phase two consultation, we re-consulted with local authorities and statutory consultees on our draft revised SOCC and Community consultation strategy. We published the SOCC in the London Evening Standard on 4 November 2011.

1.2.5 We sent out over 129,000 letters to properties located a minimum of 250m from the boundary of each preferred and shortlisted site and within a broad corridor along the preferred tunnel route. The boundary was applied flexibly, according to the scale and nature of the proposed works and taking into account the characteristics of the surrounding area. The letters set out our proposals, gave details of exhibitions and contained a language translation sheet, which provided details on the language line services.

1.2.6 To publicise our consultation we also:

• placed advertisements in local newspapers (in addition to the London Evening Standard on 4 November 2011)

• posted site notices in the vicinity of each of our preferred sites. These contained a site location map and described our proposals for the site

• distributed leaflets to all properties with a letter box (businesses and residences) within 250m of each preferred site and, where our preferred site has changed since phase one consultation, to all the shortlisted sites as well. We delivered these in advance of each local exhibition held in that area.

1.2.7 For our phase two consultation we:

• held 57 days of exhibitions at 23 venues

• provided information about our proposals on our project website (www.thamestunnelconsultation.co.uk)

• provided a free phone number (0800 0721 086) for any questions, as well as a translation service

• at the request of community groups, we attended 48 meetings to discuss our proposals

• we also produced project information papers on our proposals. These were available on our website and at exhibitions, local libraries and town halls. The project information papers covered topics such as options to reduce sewage entering the River Thames, tunnel route options and the proposed depth of the tunnel

• Site information papers were also available for our preferred sites. These set out:

  o why a worksite is needed in the proposed location

  o the shortlisted sites we have considered, including justification for our preferred site

  o activities to be undertaken at each phase of construction

  o the potential effects of our works during construction and how we propose to address them

  o the design of our permanent works

  o the potential effects of our works during operation and how we propose to address them.
1.2.8 We sought to ensure that it was equally possible for everyone to respond to our consultation and offered a range of solutions for people requiring assistance. For example, consultation information was available in large print, braille or audio format upon request. Our Customer Centre offered a telephone service to translate consultation materials into any language on request. The language line was used by those with an interest in the project to translate the consultation material into a number of languages.

1.2.9 We conducted a health and safety audit on potential exhibition venues to ensure that a suitable balance was struck between access to the buildings and proximity to the residents wishing to attend. All the exhibition locations that we used were accessible. Staff members were in attendance to facilitate access and assist the public.

1.2.10 Feedback could be submitted by means of paper or electronic feedback forms and by letter or email.

1.2.11 We have followed, and in many cases exceeded best practice, guidance and relevant legal requirements when undertaking this phase of consultation.

1.2.12 We responded to individual written queries and phone calls through phase two consultation. Our Customer Centre handled over 900 phone calls and 850 written queries, in addition to feedback forms received.

1.2.13 We were responsive to requests for additional exhibitions, holding a further seven days of exhibitions at three venues, in addition to those set out in our SOCC.

1.3 Feedback received

1.3.1 A total of 6,019 respondents provided feedback to our phase two consultation with a total of 6,553 responses received:

1.3.2 The respondents provided feedback in the following ways:

1.3.3 We anticipated that a significant amount of feedback would be submitted. As a result, we considered that a thematic approach to analysing responses would be best since it would provide a structure against which to analyse all the feedback received.
1.3.4 We have broadly analysed feedback against the questions in the feedback form. An exception to this was where it was clear that the comments made in response to a particular question actually related to another part or a question within the same part of the feedback form. This approach allowed feedback comments of a similar nature to be grouped and presented together.

1.3.5 The feedback comments were further grouped by the theme(s) that they related to, which included transport, air quality and noise and vibration themes, for example. Feedback was also categorised depending on whether the feedback raised supportive and neutral comments or objections, issues and concerns.

1.3.6 The unique ID number of each respondent was recorded with every comment; this enabled us to systematically identify when the same comment was made by more than one respondent and present the volume of feedback received on each theme.

1.3.7 We have sought to take account of all responses, whether or not they were in the minority, to ensure a fair representation of the full range of comments received. As such, we have not presented the proportions or number of respondents who made comments in favour or against a particular solution or thematic issue in this report. However, the numbers of respondents who commented on particular issues are identified in the Supplementary report on phase two consultation.

1.3.8 For further detail on how we analysed the feedback received, refer to section 3.2 of the Main report on phase two consultation.

2. Need, solution, tunnel route and alignment

2.1 Introduction

2.1.1 We asked for views on the need to reduce the amount of sewage entering the River Thames, a tunnel as the proposed solution, our preferred tunnel route and the proposed tunnel alignment.

2.2 The need to significantly reduce the amount of sewage entering the River Thames

Number of respondents

2.2.1 A total of 674 respondents provided comments on the need for the project. The respondents comprised:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key:</th>
<th>Statutory consultees</th>
<th>Local authorities</th>
<th>Landowners</th>
<th>Community consultees</th>
<th>Petitions (0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>612</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.2 Table 2.1 identifies the statutory consultees and local authorities who provided feedback on need for the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statutory consultees</th>
<th>Local authorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Council for Water Orange Telecom</td>
<td>London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London Borough of Southwark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Royal Borough of Greenwich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sevenoaks District Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1 Statutory consultees and local authorities who provided feedback on the need for the project.
Feedback comments on the need to significantly reduce the amount of sewage entering the River Thames

2.2.3 Main supportive and neutral feedback comments raised by respondents included:

- agreement that London needs to reduce the amount of untreated sewage entering the River Thames, in particular for the environmental and recreational benefits this would bring
- there is a need to update and future proof our sewerage infrastructure
- the issue should be addressed as soon as possible
- although the project was supported in principle, concerns were raised in relation to the proposed solution, tunnel route and proposed sites and the effects that will arise from addressing the problem.

2.2.4 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- disagreement that there is a need to reduce the amount of sewage entering the River Thames
- more information should be provided on the extent of the problem; the need is not sufficiently evidenced
- consider that water quality in the River Thames has already improved significantly/it is not clear that there is a problem with water quality
- whether the project is necessary given that the frequency of overflows and volume of the discharge is low
- the costs associated with addressing this problem need to be proportionate to the benefits.

2.3 The tunnel as the right solution

Number of respondents

2.3.1 A total of 2,854 respondents provided comments on a tunnel as the right solution. The respondents comprised:

2.3.2 Table 2.2 identifies the statutory consultees and local authorities who provided feedback on a tunnel as the right solution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statutory consultees</th>
<th>Local authorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Council for Water</td>
<td>London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crown Estate</td>
<td>London Borough of Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Councils</td>
<td>London Borough of Ealing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater London Authority</td>
<td>Royal Borough of Greenwich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATS En Route Safeguarding</td>
<td>London Borough of Southwark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS Barking and Dagenham</td>
<td>London Borough of Waltham Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange Telecom</td>
<td>Sevenoaks District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Highways Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2 Statutory consultees and local authorities who provided feedback on the proposed solution

Feedback comments on the tunnel as the right solution

2.3.3 The main supportive and neutral feedback comment raised by respondents included agreement that the tunnel is the right solution.

2.3.4 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- disagree that the tunnel is the right solution
- unsure whether the tunnel is the right solution, how effective it will be and whether it only treats the symptoms but not the problem itself
• concerns that once the tunnel is operational, raw sewage will still enter the River Thames, despite the huge cost and disruption
• query the reasons for choosing a tunnel as the solution and how this is evidenced, including the need for further work to demonstrate that the tunnel is the right solution
• concerns regarding the costs of the project and how it will be funded, including queries regarding the effects on customers’ bills.

2.4 Tunnel route

Number of respondents

2.4.1 A total of 268 respondents provided comments on the tunnel route. The respondents comprised:

2.4.2 Table 2.3 identifies the statutory consultees and local authorities who provided feedback on the tunnel route.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statutory consultees</th>
<th>Local authorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>London Borough of Ealing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange Telecom</td>
<td>London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.3 Statutory consultees and local authorities who provided feedback on our preference for the Abbey Mills route

Feedback comments on the tunnel route

2.4.3 Main supportive and neutral feedback comments raised by respondents included:
• support for the:
  ○ Abbey Mills route
  ○ long connection tunnel connecting Greenwich Pumping Station, Deptford Church Street and Earl Pumping Station to the main tunnel at Chambers Wharf
  ○ extension of the main tunnel to Acton Storm Tanks.
• the tunnel is the most practical and cost-effective solution
• support the tunnel route, but do not agree with proposed sites.

2.4.4 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:
• disagree with the preferred tunnel route
• cost should not be the only determining factor
• more information requested on the route
• suggested modifications to the Abbey Mills route and an independent review.

2.5 Alignment of the Abbey Mills route

2.5.1 A total of 173 respondents provided comments on the tunnel alignment. The respondents comprised:

2.4.2 Table 3 identifies the statutory consultees and local authorities who provided feedback on the tunnel route.
2.5.2 Table 2.4 identifies the local authorities who provided feedback on the tunnel alignment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local authorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Ealing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Tower Hamlets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.4 Local authorities who provided feedback on the alignment of the Abbey Mills route

Feedback comments on the tunnel alignment

2.5.3 The main supportive and neutral feedback comment raised by respondents included agreement that the proposed tunnel alignment was the least disruptive.

2.5.4 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- disagree with the preferred tunnel alignment as it affects too many residents
- more information requested on the alignment
- concerns regarding the effect on buildings and above and below ground infrastructure. Also concerns regarding the need to minimise possible settlement, subsidence, damage and construction effects associated with tunnelling under residential properties and to old and sensitive structures
- suggestions for amendments to the construction method, including fewer main tunnel drive sites and using different tunnel boring machines.

2.6 Our view of the way forward

2.6.1 We recognise that some respondents have concerns about the need for the project and whether a tunnel is the most appropriate solution. We have given careful consideration to these comments and reviewed the detailed evidence contained in the Needs report. We still believe that it is essential to reduce the amount of sewage entering the River Thames and that a tunnel represents the best way to achieve this.

2.6.2 Some of the concerns raised included detailed comments on the design and construction of the tunnel. These will, insofar as possible, be taken into account as the design of the tunnel progresses.

2.6.3 We recognise that some respondents have concerns about our preference for the Abbey Mills route and its alignment and prefer alternative routes. Having considered the comments received, we still consider that Abbey Mills remains the most appropriate route and we therefore intend to pursue this option. As the design of the tunnel progresses, we will continue to refine its alignment and will discuss this further with the relevant stakeholders.

3. Other comments

3.1.1 We also received feedback that relates to other matters not directly related to the questions in our feedback form.

3.1.2 Main supportive and neutral feedback comments raised by respondents included:

- support for the anticipated level of job creation associated with the project
- support for the revised air management strategy to avoid odour from tunnel operations and the associated reduction in the height of the ventilation columns
- support for the approach to environmental assessment, including the decision hierarchy, flood risk studies and consideration of impacts and opportunities, at individual sites and project-wide
- welcome the reduction in the number of foreshore sites with permanent structures.

3.1.3 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- the approach to environmental assessment, including the topics to be reported in the environmental statement, the level of detail to be assessed, and the need to mitigate effects
- the process that the Thames Tunnel project is following, including how the proposal will be determined and the role of local authorities
- the approach to assessing transport impacts
- the effects arising from construction of the project
- detailed comments on technical documents and the content of the proposed DCO application.
Our view of the way forward

3.1.4 We will take into account the detailed comments that have been received as the project develops. This includes reviewing the comments received on the PEIR and related documents as part of the environmental impact assessment process to ensure that, where appropriate, they are taken fully into account in the preparation of the Environmental Statement.

3.1.5 We will continue to work with stakeholders, in relation to the permanent design and appearance of our sites as part of our design development. The ideas, views and information received during our phase two consultation will help to ensure the final design is the optimum solution for each of our sites, and best meets the needs of local communities.

4. The sites

4.1.1 Most of the feedback that we received focussed on the preferred sites on the Abbey Mills route which is summarised in this report. We also received some comments regarding the shortlisted sites that we had considered. Details of the feedback received in respect of the shortlisted sites is set out in the Supplementary report on phase two consultation.

4.1.2 We sought feedback on the following matters in relation to each site:

- views on whether our preferred site is appropriate
- whether an alternative site should be used and if so, which
- whether we have identified the key issues during the construction phase and appropriate measures to address them
- our proposed design
- whether we have identified the key issues during the operational phase and appropriate measures to address them.

4.1.3 Chapters five to 30 set out who has provided feedback on our preferred sites, their views on our choice of site, and the main objections, concerns, and issues raised and supportive and neutral feedback comments received for each site. We also set out our view of the way forward. For detailed feedback comments raised in relation to each of our preferred sites, refer to the Supplementary report on phase two consultation.

4.1.4 In light of the feedback that we have received, we believe that no new information has been highlighted that would change the conclusions of our site selection process to date. The sites that we consulted on at phase two therefore remain our preferred sites to construct the Thames Tunnel.

5. Acton Storm Tanks

5.1.1 We are proposing to use parts of our existing pumping station and storm water tanks site for our construction works and to accommodate the permanent building and structures required to operate the main tunnel. The site would receive the main tunnel from Carnwath Road Riverside and connect the existing local CSO, known as the Acton Storm Relief CSO, to the main tunnel.

Number of respondents

5.1.2 A total of 37 respondents provided comments on Acton Storm Tanks. The respondents comprised:
Table 5.1 Statutory consultees and local authorities who provided feedback on Acton Storm Tanks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statutory consultees</th>
<th>Local authorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design Council CABE</td>
<td>London Borough of Ealing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Council for Water</td>
<td>London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>Greater London Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feedback on the selection and use of our preferred site

Site selection and alternative sites

5.1.3 Main supportive and neutral feedback comments raised by respondents included:

- support use of this site, including changing the use of the site since phase one consultation
- the site is more suitable than any shortlisted or alternative sites.

5.1.4 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- reasons for selecting this preferred site are flawed/questionable; the site has only been chosen because it is owned by Thames Water for the associated cost benefits, rather than being the best site from a technical point of view
- the scale of effects on the local area and community resulting from the selection of this site is unacceptable/has not been properly considered
- alternative site suggestions, included Acton Park Industrial Estate and Barn Elms.

Management of construction works

5.1.5 Main supportive and neutral feedback comments raised by respondents included:

- proposed site access and construction traffic routes, in particular use of Warple Way, Canham Road and Stanley Gardens are appropriate
- proposed working hours are reasonable.

5.1.6 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- concerns regarding the effects of construction traffic on the loss of on-street car parking at Warple Way, Stanley Gardens and Canham Road and residential amenity
- concerns regarding odour, air quality and general pollution during construction and how this would be managed in order to protect amenity
- concerns regarding the future use of the wider Acton Storm Tanks site
- concerns regarding proposed working hours, including the potential for 24-hour working, and transparency regarding extended working hours
- concerns regarding noise and vibration from construction traffic and general vibration associated with the works, including the need to provide mitigation, such as sound attenuation measures
- concern regarding the effect on quality of life and the proximity of the proposed work to residential areas.

Permanent design and appearance

5.1.7 Main supportive and neutral feedback comments raised by respondents included:

- support for decommissioning the storm tanks and filling them with construction spoil
- the proposals will allow the public footpath to be widened
- use of brick which is an appropriate and robust material that matches the main material used in the locality well.

5.1.8 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- the ventilation column(s) are too low/small and should be increased to above roof level to avoid any odour emission issues
- the permanent buildings and structures are located too close to residential properties/should not be located in residential or built up areas
- need more information on proposals, including what is proposed for the rest of the site; confirmation as to whether the public will be given access to the site; and whether the remaining storm tanks can be used for surface water storage to help alleviate associated issues in west London.
Management of operational effects

5.1.9 No main supportive and neutral feedback comments, as defined in paragraph 1.1.7, were received.

5.1.10 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

• concerns regarding the effect of odour arising from operation of the tunnel and the requirement to incorporate contingency measures in case the technology proposed does not function as stated

• require site management to control parking associated with maintenance works.

Our view of the way forward

5.1.11 We have received a range of feedback on our proposals for this site, including supportive and neutral comments and objections, issues and concerns. We have taken all comments received into account in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008.

5.1.12 In light of the feedback that we have received, we believe that no new information has been highlighted that would change the conclusions of our site selection process to date. Acton Storm Tanks therefore remains our preferred site to intercept the Acton Storm Relief CSO and receive the main tunnel from Carnwath Road Riverside. Additionally, no new information or issues have been identified that would fundamentally change our proposals for this site. Therefore we will continue to develop the proposals for this site that we published at phase two consultation.

5.1.13 The feedback we have received included detailed comments on the construction and operational effects of the proposed development and the measures we propose to reduce and manage those effects. Detailed comments were also made on our proposals for the permanent design and appearance of the site. Having regard to the feedback received we are continuing to refine our detailed proposals for this site to improve the design and reduce the impacts on the local community and environment. Currently we are considering the following changes to the layout and/or appearance of our proposals:

• replacement of the proposed ventilation building with a smaller fan structure and filters that would be located in Storm Tanks 5 and 6 with the shaft

• relocation of the ventilation column so it is adjacent to Storm Tanks 5 and 6

• widening of the footpath on the southern side of Canham Road

• options for replacement parking.

5.1.14 In our Statement of community consultation we recognised that we may need to amend our scheme following phase two consultation and that if changes came forward we would consider whether targeted consultation is appropriate. We do not consider that the degree of change in relation to this site or the effect on the local community would affect the nature of the comments received during phase two consultation in such a way as to require further consultation. On that basis, a round of targeted consultation on our proposals for this site is not considered necessary. We will progress with preparation of our application for a development consent order and will incorporate the changes referred to in paragraph 5.1.13 if further work demonstrates that this is appropriate. We intend to publicise our proposed application in accordance with Section 48 of the Planning Act 2008 later in 2012. Full details of our proposed scheme will be set out in our DCO application and accompanying documents.

6. Hammersmith Pumping Station

6.1.1 We are proposing to use part of our existing pumping station and part of a currently vacant site known as Hammersmith Embankment/Fulham Reach at the corner of Chancellor’s Road and Distillery Road for our construction works and to accommodate the permanent structures required to operate the main tunnel. The site would be used to connect the existing local CSO, known as the Hammersmith Pumping Station CSO, to the main tunnel.
A total of 36 respondents provided comments on our Hammersmith Pumping Station site. The respondents comprised:

- Design Council CABE
- Consumer Council for Water
- English Heritage
- Environment Agency
- Greater London Authority
- National Grid
- London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham

Table 6.1 Statutory consultees and local authorities who provided feedback on Hammersmith Pumping Station

Feedback on the selection and use of our preferred site

Site selection and alternative sites
6.1.3 Main supportive and neutral feedback comments raised by respondents included:

- support for the use of the preferred site; in particular the use of a land-based site on land owned by Thames Water
- the site is more suitable than any shortlisted or alternative sites because it is brownfield; it is already an operational site and it is available for development
- qualified support for the preferred site subject to appropriate assessment and mitigation and demonstration that it is necessary.

Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- there are other more suitable alternative sites available in the local area/alternative sites have not been properly explored, including St Paul’s Playing Fields across the River Thames
- site selection should avoid sites in residential or densely populated areas
- alternative site suggestions, included further upstream and south of the River Thames.

Management of construction works
6.1.5 Main supportive and neutral feedback comments raised by respondents included:

- the proposal will support redevelopment of the site and/or surrounding area
- the necessary works at this site can be coordinated with the phased mixed use development by St George plc of the Hammersmith Embankment/Fulham Reach site.

Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- construction traffic will exacerbate existing traffic congestion on Fulham Palace Road (A219) and Hammersmith Gyratory
- use the river rather than road to transport construction materials and spoil, including consolidation centres at nearby barge/rail served sites
- compatibility with existing planning permission adjacent to/in the vicinity of the site.

Permanent design and appearance
6.1.7 The main supportive and neutral feedback comment raised by respondents was that the design proposals are acceptable.

Main objection, issue and concern raised by respondents was that the proposals are unimaginative/bland, and should be environmentally friendly.

Management of operational effects
6.1.9 The main supportive and neutral feedback comment raised by respondents was that the proposals would ensure that odour is satisfactorily managed.
6.1.10 The main objection, issue and concern raised by respondents was in relation to the effect of odour arising from the operation of the tunnel and the need to monitor the effects.

Our view of the way forward

6.1.11 We have received a range of feedback on our proposals for this site, including supportive and neutral comments and objections, issues and concerns. We have taken all comments received into account in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008.

6.1.12 In light of the feedback that we have received, we believe that no new information has been highlighted that would change the conclusions of our site selection process to date. Hammersmith Pumping Station therefore remains our preferred site to intercept the Hammersmith Pumping Station CSO. Additionally, no new information or issues have been identified that would fundamentally change our proposals for this site. Therefore we will continue to develop the proposals for this site that we published at phase two consultation.

6.1.13 The feedback we have received included detailed comments on the construction and operational effects of the proposed development and the measures we propose to reduce and manage those effects. Detailed comments were also made on our proposals for the permanent design and appearance of the site. Having regard to the feedback received we are continuing to refine our detailed proposals for this site to improve the design and reduce the impacts on the local community and environment. Currently we are considering whether it is feasible to locate all above ground structures proposed at phase two consultation within the Hammersmith Pumping Station building or compound, with the exception of minor structures.

6.1.14 We will also continue to engage with the developers of Hammersmith Embankment/Fulham Reach site to ensure that our proposals can be accommodated with their proposals for this site.

6.1.15 In our Statement of community consultation we recognised that we may need to amend our scheme following phase two consultation and that if changes came forward we would consider whether targeted consultation is appropriate. We do not consider that the degree of change in relation to this site or the effect on the local community would affect the nature of the comments received during phase two consultation in such a way as to require further consultation. On that basis, a round of targeted consultation on our proposals for this site is not considered necessary. We will progress with preparation of our application for a development consent order and will incorporate the changes referred to in paragraphs 6.1.13-14 if further work demonstrates that this is appropriate. We intend to publicise our proposed application in accordance with Section 48 of the Planning Act 2008 later in 2012. Full details of our proposed scheme will be set out in our DCO application and accompanying documents.

7. Barn Elms

7.1.1 We are proposing to use the south eastern corner of the Barn Elms Schools Sports Centre for our construction works and to accommodate the permanent structures required to operate the main tunnel. The site would be used to connect the existing local CSO, known as the West Putney Storm Relief CSO, to the main tunnel.

Number of respondents

7.1.2 A total of 387 respondents provided comments on Barn Elms. The respondents comprised:
7.1.3 We note that a number of feedback comments were received in relation to the use of this site as a main tunnel drive site. These comments have been reported in chapter 11, as they refer to the use of Barn Elms as an alternative main tunnel drive site to Carnwath Road Riverside.

Feedback on the selection and use of our preferred site

Site selection and alternative sites

7.1.4 Main supportive and neutral feedback comments raised by respondents included:

- support for the use of the site
- support for the changes to the proposed use of the preferred site since phase one consultation; it would have less impact on the riverside and reduces the potential impacts on above ground heritage assets, notable views and the community
- the site is a suitable size and/or has sufficient capacity to accommodate the proposals

- support for changes to the extent of the preferred site since phase one consultation, in particular the move to locate this site away from the River Thames, resulting in a reduction of impacts on the Thames environment
- site should also be selected as a main tunnel drive site.

7.1.5 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- object to use of the site/consider that the site is unsuitable
- should use/consider an alternative site/there are other more suitable alternative sites in the local area
- unclear that clear that West Putney Storm Relief CSO needs to be connected to the main tunnel
- should not use greenfield sites/avoid sites in close proximity to sensitive receptors including the Wetlands Centre, sites of special scientific interest, primary schools and social housing. The use of brownfield sites should be prioritised
- alternative site suggestions, included Carnwath Road Riverside or alternative brownfield sites.

Table 7.1 Statutory consultees and local authorities who provided feedback on Barn Elms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statutory consultees</th>
<th>Local authorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design Council CABE</td>
<td>London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Council for Water</td>
<td>London Borough of Wandsworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>Greater London Authority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Barn Elms Exhibition
Management of construction works

7.1.6 Main supportive and neutral feedback comments raised by respondents included:

- supportive for the changes to the construction programme since phase one consultation
- support for the use of screening during construction
- temporary loss of open space is acceptable, as there would be minimal damage to the greenfield site
- the preferred site is the least disruptive option for the local community
- the proposals will ensure that the Thames Path is kept open.

7.1.7 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- concerns regarding proposed site access, including access through the sports fields and common land alongside the Beverley Brook
- provide an alternative construction traffic route to and from the site
- concerns regarding noise, vibration, dust, dirt and air pollution arising from construction activities and the effect of construction traffic emissions on air quality and amenity
- restrict or limit working hours when construction and related vehicles can access local roads including at school opening and closing times
- the construction programme is unclear, too long and concerns regarding the duration of construction. The project should minimise the extent and duration of construction works.

Permanent design and appearance

7.1.8 Main supportive and neutral feedback comments raised by respondents included:

- the design/proposals are good
- support for design proposals as limited land take, no ventilation towers, the opportunity for the structures to become objects of interest.

7.1.9 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- consideration of the site design, including the scale of the permanent buildings and structures, with a preference for a design in the form of grass mounds
- concerns regarding future maintenance of the habitat wall/use of habitat walls
- the proposals are not in keeping with the natural environment of Barn Elms and its local architecture. As currently proposed, the plans are too dominant and intrusive and should be reduced in scale. Proposals should be in keeping with and blend into the character of the local area in order to minimise visual impact
- the design should incorporate appropriate screening and landscaping.

Management of operational effects

7.1.10 Main supportive and neutral feedback comments raised by respondents included:

- the proposals will ensure that odour is satisfactorily managed and mitigation proposed to address permanent air quality and odour issues is satisfactory
- support for efforts to minimise the long-term impacts to biodiversity and secure improvements.

7.1.11 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- the proposed site access is unsuitable and an alternative could be provided, e.g Queen Elizabeth Walk, which would reduce the potential risk of vehicle accidents at this recreational site
- concerns regarding potential air quality and that odour effects will be greater than those set out in the consultation material.

Our view of the way forward

7.1.12 We have received a range of feedback on our proposals for this site, including supportive and neutral comments and objections, issues and concerns. We have taken all comments received into account in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008.

7.1.13 In light of the feedback that we have received, we believe that no new information has been highlighted that would change the conclusions of our site selection process to date. Barn Elms therefore remains our preferred site to intercept the West Putney Storm Relief CSO.
7.1.14 The feedback we have received included detailed comments on the construction and operational effects of the proposed development and the measures we propose to reduce and manage those effects. Detailed comments were also made on our proposals for the permanent design and appearance of the site. Having regard to the feedback received we are continuing to refine our detailed proposals for this site to improve the design and reduce the impacts on the local community and environment. Currently we are considering the following changes to the layout and/or appearance of our proposals:

- an alternative site access road
- amendments to the scale and design of the permanent structures.

7.1.15 In our Statement of community consultation we recognised that we may need to amend our scheme following phase two consultation and that if changes came forward we would consider whether targeted consultation is appropriate. We consider that the degree of change and the effect on the local community may affect the nature of the comments made during phase two consultation as the changes we are considering may affect a different section of the community. On that basis, a round of targeted consultation on our revised proposals for this site will begin on 6 June 2012 and close on 4 July 2012. Any comments received in response to our targeted consultation will be taken into account in preparing our application for a development consent order. We intend to publicise our proposed application in accordance with Section 48 of the Planning Act 2008 later in 2012. Full details of our proposed scheme will be set out in our DCO application and accompanying documents.

8. Putney Bridge Foreshore

8.1.1 We are proposing to use the foreshore of the River Thames, to the west of Putney Bridge, for our construction works and to accommodate the permanent structures required to operate the main tunnel. The site would be used to connect the existing local CSO, known as the Putney Bridge CSO, to the main tunnel.

8.1.2 A total of 171 respondents provided comments on Putney Bridge Foreshore. The respondents comprised:

- Statutory consultees
- Local authorities
- Landowners
- Community consultees
- Petitions (0)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statutory consultees</th>
<th>Local authorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design Council CABE</td>
<td>London Borough of Wandsworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Council for Water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater London Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port of London Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.1 Statutory consultees and local authorities who provided feedback on Putney Bridge Foreshore

Feedback on the selection and use of our preferred site

8.1.3 Main supportive and neutral feedback comments raised by respondents included:

- support for the use of the preferred site/proposed site is the most suitable location
- the preferred site is more suitable than any alternative or shortlisted sites as it would cause less disruption to the local area and has better access
- support for changes to the extent of the preferred site since phase one consultation.
8.1.4 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- opposition in principle to the use of any foreshore structures along the tidal Thames, as this is likely to lead to a number of detrimental effects of flood risk management, biodiversity and recreation
- concerns that the scale of effects on the local area and community resulting from the selection of this site is unacceptable / has not been properly considered
- site selection should avoid sites adjacent to or containing heritage assets
- do not support changes to the extent of the preferred site since phase one consultation/do not support the specific location of the site
- query why shortlisted sites have not been identified
- alternative sites suggested, including Foreshore, adjacent to Putney Bridge and St Mary’s Church and Carnwath Road Riverside.

8.1.5 Main supportive and neutral feedback comments raised by respondents included:

- it is an improvement on the site layout shown at phase one consultation
- a temporary slipway will be installed given the prominence of river use at this location
- the site is a suitable distance away from residential areas
- support for the proposed use of barges to transport materials; fewer barges will be using Putney Bridge.

8.1.6 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- the temporary slipway must be appropriate for the vessels using it and should be realigned by 180 degrees and moved eastwards of the existing hardstanding outside Chas Newen’s facility
- Putney Drawdock needs to be retained with the facility to allow vessels to load alongside during construction; the alternative of including Waterman’s Green in the site compound would minimise temporary encroachment into the River Thames
- explore alternative methods of fabrication
- the effect of construction lighting on quality of life
- concerns regarding dust, dirt, noise, vibration and general air pollution effects arising from construction activities and the effect of construction traffic emissions on air quality and residential amenity given the proximity to residential properties
- at four years, the construction programme is too long
- the effect of construction activities on local heritage and listed structures
- the effect on river navigation and recreational river users (including the impact on the boat race and other events) and the effect of barge movements on river navigation and leisure river users
- concerns regarding potential structural damage including to Putney Wharf
- use river to transport more/all construction materials and spoil.

Management of construction works

8.1.5 Main supportive and neutral feedback comments raised by respondents included:

- it is an improvement on the site layout shown at phase one consultation
- a temporary slipway will be installed given the prominence of river use at this location
- the site is a suitable distance away from residential areas
- support for the proposed use of barges to transport materials; fewer barges will be using Putney Bridge.

Permanen design and appearance

8.1.7 Main supportive and neutral feedback comments raised by respondents included:

- support for the design proposals
- there is a good appreciation of the unique character of this site and the design recognises its current role as a place of gathering
- the decision to site the promontory upstream from the bridge has allowed the slipway to be retained; support the simple, orthogonal geometry of its design
• the idea of a permanent ‘wharf’ between Putney Pier and Putney Bridge is a good one.

8.1.8 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:
• the proposals are not in keeping with/do not enhance and/or will have a negative effect on the character or appearance of the local area
• the structure(s) within the foreshore of the River Thames are too large/there should be no structures in the foreshore
• object to attaching a second column to Putney Bridge; a metre high wall juxtaposed with the slipway is unacceptable
• the size of permanent buildings and structures should be reduced.

Management of operational effects
8.1.9 The main supportive and neutral feedback comment raised by respondents was that the proposals would ensure that odour is satisfactorily managed.

8.1.10 The main objection, issue and concern raised by respondents was in relation to the effect of odour and air quality arising from the operation of the tunnel upon residential amenity.

Our view of the way forward
8.1.11 We have received a range of feedback on our proposals for this site, including supportive and neutral comments and objections, issues and concerns. We have taken all comments received into account in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008.

8.1.12 In light of the feedback that we have received, we believe that no new information has been highlighted that would change the conclusions of our site selection process to date. Putney Bridge Foreshore therefore remains our preferred site to intercept the Putney Bridge CSO.

8.1.13 The feedback we have received included detailed comments on the construction and operational effects of the proposed development and the measures we propose to reduce and manage those effects. Detailed comments were also made on our proposals for the permanent design and appearance of the site. Having regard to the feedback received we are continuing to refine our detailed proposals for this site to improve the design and reduce the impacts on the local community and environment. Currently we are considering the following changes to the layout and/or appearance of our proposals:
• improvements to the permanent design and layout of our proposals, specifically the location of the permanent works and the shape of the foreshore structure
• the nature and location of the temporary replacement slipway
• whether it would be possible to make further use of the river for the transport of shaft and short tunnel excavated materials in order to reduce the number of lorries on local roads.

8.1.14 In our Statement of community consultation we recognised that we may need to amend our scheme following phase two consultation and that if changes came forward we would consider whether targeted consultation is appropriate. We consider that the degree of change and the effect on the local community may affect the nature of the comments made during phase two consultation as the changes we are considering may affect a different section of the community. On that basis, a round of targeted consultation on our revised proposals for this site will begin on 6 June 2012 and close on 4 July 2012. Any comments received in response to our targeted consultation will be taken into account in preparing our application for a development consent order. We intend to publicise our proposed application in accordance with Section 48 of the Planning Act 2008 later in 2012. Full details of our proposed scheme will be set out in our DCO application and accompanying documents.

9. Dormay Street

9.1.1 We are proposing to use land off Dormay Street for our construction works and to accommodate the permanent structures required to operate the main tunnel. The site would be used to connect the existing local CSO, known as the Frogmore Storm Relief – Bell Lane Creek CSO, to the main tunnel. This site would also be used to drive a long
connection tunnel (known as the Frogmore connection tunnel) southwards to King George’s Park and northwards to Carnwath Road Riverside, to connect the CSOs at Dormay Street and King George’s Park to the main tunnel

Number of respondents

9.1.2 A total of 19 respondents provided comments on Dormay Street. The respondents comprised:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statutory consultees</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authorities</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community consultees</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petitions</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statutory consultees</th>
<th>Local authorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design Council CABE</td>
<td>London Borough of Wandsworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Council for Water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater London Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.1 Statutory consultees and local authorities who provided feedback on Dormay Street

Feedback on the selection and use of our preferred site

Site selection and alternative sites

9.1.3 Main supportive and neutral feedback comments raised by respondents included:

- support for the identification of a new preferred site since phase one consultation/the preferred site is more suitable than the site put forward at phase one consultation
- support for the use of site/Dormay Street is the most suitable site

- qualified support subject to suitable arrangements being put in place with the London Borough of Wandsworth to manage the impacts on the council’s depot.

9.1.4 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- One of the shortlisted sites is more suitable; qualified support for shortlisted London Borough of Wandsworth Depot (site 2); it has slightly greater archaeological potential than the preferred site, but will otherwise have a similar impact on heritage assets

Management of construction works

9.1.5 No main supportive or neutral feedback comments, as defined in paragraph 1.1.7, were received.

9.1.6 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- use the river rather than road to transport construction materials and spoil, including consolidation centres at nearby barge/rail served sites or Smugglers Way Wharf. Investigate the potential for transhipment from sites with no proposed barge movements
- proposals will result in river erosion and scour associated with any piling required to construct a Bailey Bridge to span across Bell Lane Creek
- minimise scour effects by either avoiding in-channel structures which reduce conveyance and/or adversely affect hydraulics. If this is not possible, then any structures should be minimised to reduce impact, rather than relying on mitigation through hard engineering techniques such as gabions
- need to agree modifications to the design of the Dormay Street/Armoury Way junction.

Permanent design and appearance

9.1.7 No main supportive or neutral feedback comments, as defined in paragraph 1.1.7, were received.

9.1.8 The main objection, issue and concern raised by respondents was the need to improve or create new footpaths and cycle ways as part of the design, including a new riverside walk (4m wide) on the south side of Bell Lane Creek to the Causeway Island.
Management of operational effects

9.1.9 The main supportive and neutral feedback comment raised by respondents was support for the efforts to minimise the long-term impacts to biodiversity and secure improvements.

9.1.10 No main objections, issues or concerns, as defined in paragraph 1.1.7, were received objections, issues and concerns were raised:

Our view of the way forward

9.1.11 We have received a range of feedback on our proposals for this site, including supportive and neutral comments and objections, issues and concerns. We have taken all comments received into account in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008.

9.1.12 In light of the feedback that we have received, we believe that no new information has been highlighted that would change the conclusions of our site selection process to date. Dormay Street therefore remains our preferred site to intercept the Frogmore Storm Relief – Bell Lane Creek CSO and drive the Frogmore connection tunnel southwards to King George’s Park and northwards to Carnwath Road Riverside, to connect the CSOs at Dormay Street and King George’s Park to the main tunnel. Additionally, no new information or issues have been identified that would fundamentally change our proposals for this site. Therefore we will continue to develop the proposals for this site that we published at phase two consultation.

9.1.13 The feedback we have received included detailed comments on the construction and operational effects of the proposed development and the measures we propose to reduce and manage those effects. Detailed comments were also made on our proposals for the permanent design and appearance of the site. Having regard to the feedback received we are continuing to refine our detailed proposals for this site to improve the design and reduce the impacts on the local community and environment. Currently we are considering the following changes to the layout and/or appearance of our proposals:

- relocating our permanent works, so that they are set by back 4m from Bell Lane Creek. This means that our proposals do not prejudice the potential future development of a riverside walkway
- redesigning our temporary bridge to remove the piles or supports in the Creek, so the bridge will now have a clear span
- temporary junction improvements at Armoury Way, Dormay Street and The Causeway to accommodate construction traffic.

9.1.14 In our Statement of community consultation we recognised that we may need to amend our scheme following phase two consultation and that if changes came forward we would consider whether targeted consultation is appropriate. We do not consider that the degree of change in relation to this site or the effect on the local community would affect the nature of the comments received during phase two consultation in such a way as to require further consultation. On that basis, a round of targeted consultation on our proposals for this site is not considered necessary. We will progress with preparation of our application for a development consent order and will incorporate the changes referred to in paragraph 9.1.13 if further work demonstrates that this is appropriate. We intend to publicise our proposed application in accordance with Section 48 of the Planning Act 2008 later in 2012. Full details of our proposed scheme will be set out in our DCO application and accompanying documents.

10. King George’s Park

10.1.1 We are proposing to use the northern corner of King George’s Park for our construction works and to accommodate the permanent structures required to operate the main tunnel. The site would be used to connect the existing local CSO, known as Frogmore Storm Relief – Buckhold Road CSO, to the main tunnel via a long connection tunnel, known as the Frogmore connection tunnel. We would need a worksite to receive the Frogmore connection tunnel, which would be driven from Dormay Street.
Number of respondents

10.1.2 A total of 40 respondents provided comments on King George’s Park. The respondents comprised:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key:</th>
<th>Statutory consultees</th>
<th>Local authorities</th>
<th>Landowners</th>
<th>Community consultees</th>
<th>Petitions (0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local authorities</td>
<td>London Borough of Wandsworth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10.1 Statutory consultees and local authorities commenting on King George’s Park

Feedback on the selection and use of our preferred site

Site selection and alternative sites

10.1.3 Main supportive and neutral feedback comments raised by respondents included:

- support for the use of site/consider that King George’s Park is the most suitable site and reception site
- support for changes to the extent of the preferred site since phase one consultation; the construction impact on the park has been reduced.

10.1.4 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- object to the use of the site/consider that site is unsuitable
- query why shortlisted sites have not been identified
- site selection should use/prioritise brownfield sites/avoid greenfield sites and avoid sites in residential and/or densely populated areas
- alternative site suggestions, included Kimber Road playing fields and Dormay Street.

Management of construction works

10.1.5 Main supportive and neutral feedback comments raised by respondents included:

- support for the retention and replacement of trees; pleased that the black poplar will be preserved
- the temporary loss of open space is acceptable.

10.1.6 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- concerns regarding overnight/weekend/24-hour working hours/ construction seven days a week and the effect on quality of life
- concerns regarding dust, dirt, noise, vibration arising from construction activities and construction traffic and the effect on quality of life and residential amenity
- concerns regarding the temporary loss of public open space, which is a valuable recreational amenity and is designated as Metropolitan Open Land, in an area that has a shortage of public open space and private gardens.

Permanent design and appearance

10.1.7 No main supportive or neutral feedback comments, as defined in paragraph 1.1.7, were received.

10.1.8 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- investigate the potential impacts on flood storage in the park
- historic gates and railings should be protected, preserved and re-used in the park
- discussions need to take place regarding the potential relocation of the park entrance to the corner of Buckhold Road and Neville Gill Close. The design team should anticipate how the proposals could accommodate such a move.
Management of operational effects

10.1.9 The main supportive and neutral feedback comment raised by respondents was support for the efforts to minimise the long-term impacts to biodiversity and secure improvements.

10.1.10 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- access will be required to the lake outflow for weekly maintenance
- require level for level and volume for volume compensation for any losses in the fluvial one per cent CC floodplain extent.

Our view of the way forward

10.1.11 We have received a range of feedback on our proposals for this site, including supportive and neutral comments and objections, issues and concerns. We have taken all comments received into account in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008.

10.1.12 In light of the feedback that we have received, we believe that no new information has been highlighted that would change the conclusions of our site selection process to date. King George’s Park therefore remains our preferred site to intercept the Frogmore Storm Relief – Buckhold Road CSO and receive the Frogmore connection tunnel, which would be driven from Dormay Street. Additionally, no new information or issues have been identified that would fundamentally change our proposals for this site. Therefore we will continue to develop the proposals for this site that we published at phase two consultation.

10.1.13 The feedback we have received included detailed comments on the construction and operational effects of the proposed development and the measures we propose to reduce and manage those effects. Detailed comments were also made on our proposals for the permanent design and appearance of the site. Having regard to the feedback received and taking account of ongoing technical work, we are considering our detailed design for this site which may lead to changes to the layout and/or appearance of our proposals.

These would improve the design and reduce the impacts on the local community and environment. Currently we are considering the following changes to our proposals for this site:

- incorporation of flood alleviation measures
- creating new pedestrian entrances to the north, west and/or east of our proposed site which enables us to reduce the extent of hardstanding at the existing entrance to King George’s Park and replace it with new soft landscaping
- how we can re-use the existing historic gates within the park.

10.1.14 We are also continuing to develop our detailed landscaping proposals for this site, in consultation with our stakeholders.

10.1.15 In our Statement of community consultation we recognised that we may need to amend our scheme following phase two consultation and that if changes came forward we would consider whether targeted consultation is appropriate. We do not consider that the degree of change in relation to this site or the effect on the local community would affect the nature of the comments received during phase two consultation in such a way as to require further consultation. On that basis, a round of targeted consultation on our proposals for this site is not considered necessary. We will progress with preparation of our application for a development consent order and will incorporate the changes referred to in paragraphs 10.1.13 -14, if further work demonstrates that this is appropriate. We intend to publicise our proposed application in accordance with Section 48 of the Planning Act 2008 later in 2012. Full details of our proposed scheme will be set out in our DCO application and accompanying documents.
11. Carnwath Road Riverside

11.1.1 We are proposing to use the land to the south of Carnwath Road and in the foreshore of the River Thames for our construction works and to accommodate the permanent building and structures required to operate the main tunnel. The site would be used to drive the main tunnel to Acton Storm Tanks and receive the main tunnel from Kirtling Street. We would also need a worksite to receive a long connection tunnel, which would be driven from Dormay Street and known as the Frogmore connection tunnel. This will connect the existing local CSOs at Dormay Street and King George’s Park to the main tunnel from the site at Dormay Street.

Number of respondents

11.1.2 A total of 3,138 respondents provided comments on Carnwath Road Riverside. The respondents comprised:

- **Statutory consultees**
  - Design Council CABE
  - Consumer Council for Water
  - English Heritage
  - Environment Agency
  - Greater London Authority
  - London Councils
  - Port of London Authority

- **Local authorities**
  - London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham
  - London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames
  - London Borough of Wandsworth

- **Community consultees**
  - Petitions

- **Landowners**

Table 11.1 Statutory consultees and local authorities who provided feedback on Carnwath Road Riverside

Feedback on the selection and use of our preferred site

Site selection and alternative sites

11.1.3 Main supportive and neutral feedback comments raised by respondents included:
- support for the use of the preferred site
- support for the identification of a new preferred site since phase one consultation/the preferred site is more suitable than the site put forward at phase one consultation
- the site is a brownfield site which is vacant/derelict/available for redevelopment.

11.1.4 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:
- object to the use of site/consider that the site is unsuitable
- should use/consider an alternative site. Site selection should avoid densely populated or residential areas; site is close to sensitive receptors, including schools and nurseries, commercially established areas
- selection of this preferred site has been poorly justified/inadequately explained or is flawed/questionable. Reasons included: the impact of use of this site has been underestimated and would cost too much
- the scale of effects on the local area and community resulting from the selection of this site is unacceptable
- the preferred site put forward at phase one consultation, Barn Elms, is more suitable as it would have less impact on the local area and would enable CSO interception and tunnelling activities to be undertaken at the same site. The reasons for changing the preferred site since phase one consultation are unclear
- the site is too small and does not have sufficient capacity to accommodate the proposals
- site selection has been influenced by pressure from politicians, celebrities and Non-Governmental Organisations
- alternative site suggestions, included Barn Elms and Kirtling Street/Battersea Power Station/Nine Elms/Battersea.
• impact of the proposals on the regeneration opportunity at Fulham Riverside.

Management of construction works

11.1.5 Main supportive and neutral feedback comments raised by respondents included:

• impacts on air quality will be less severe because the site is already located on a busy road
• the site will have less environmental/ecological impact and will result in few/fewer trees being lost
• the preferred site is the least disruptive option for the local community
• the impact of the effects has been properly addressed as part of the phase two consultation
• the proposals will improve the image and character of the area.

Carnwath Road Exhibition

11.1.6 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

• concerns regarding the duration of construction and working hours, including light pollution given 24-hour works at this site and the effect on residential amenity and health
• concerns regarding noise and vibration from construction works in a residential area and effects on amenity and health given the proximity of the works to neighbouring residents and schools in terms of disruption
• concerns regarding the effects on the regeneration of the local area, including the potential for redevelopment of the site and the effects on local businesses, economy and jobs
• concerns regarding potential land contamination and potential for health effects
• construction traffic will exacerbate existing congestion and affect access to amenities and residential amenity. Local roads are unsuitable for use by construction vehicles and concerns regarding the effect of traffic on residential amenity and the safety of other road users, including children, pedestrians and cyclists.

Permanent design and appearance

11.1.7 No main supportive and neutral feedback comments, as defined in paragraph 1.1.7, were received.

11.1.8 The main objection, issue and concern raised by respondents relates to the scale and design of the proposed above ground structures, including the ventilation columns, and the effect on the surrounding area.

Management of operational effects

11.1.9 Main supportive and neutral feedback comments raised by respondents included:

• the proposals will ensure that odour is satisfactorily managed and mitigation proposed to address permanent air quality and odour issues is satisfactory
• not concerned by the permanent relocation of Carnwath Road Industrial Estate
• the proposals will improve the image and character of the area.

11.1.10 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

• concerns regarding odour from the operation of the tunnel and the effect on residential amenity and quality of life
• the visual effect of permanent buildings and structures on the character of the local area and the effect on future regeneration of the wider area.

Our view of the way forward

11.1.11 We have received a range of feedback on our proposals for this site, including supportive and neutral comments and objections, issues and concerns. We have taken all comments received into account in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008.
In light of the feedback that we have received, we believe that no new information has been highlighted that would change the conclusions of our site selection process to date. Carnwath Road Riverside therefore remains our preferred site to drive the main tunnel to Acton Storm Tanks and receive the main tunnel from Kirtling Street; and to receive the Frogmore connection tunnel, driven from Dormay Street. Additionally, no new information or issues have been identified that would fundamentally change our proposals for this site. Therefore we will continue to develop the proposals for this site that we published at phase two consultation.

The feedback we have received included detailed comments on the construction and operational effects of the proposed development and the measures we propose to reduce and manage those effects. Detailed comments were also made on our proposals for the permanent design and appearance of the site. Having regard to the feedback received we are continuing to refine our detailed proposals for this site to improve the design and reduce the impacts on the local community and environment. Currently we are considering the following changes to the layout and/or appearance of our proposals:

- replacement of the proposed ventilation building with a smaller fan structure and filters
- relocation of the permanent above ground structures to the eastern side of Whiffin Wharf where they will provide a buffer to the safeguarded Hurlingham Wharf, and a reduction in the height of these buildings to approximately 3.5 metres
- relocation and redesign of the ventilation column so it is also located at the eastern edge of Whiffin Wharf and by the river
- provision of an area of landscaped open space in part of the western section of the site with a riverside walkway
- whether it would be possible to make further use of the river for the import of sand and aggregates for secondary tunnel lining in order to reduce the number of lorries on local roads.

In our Statement of community consultation we recognised that we may need to amend our scheme following phase two consultation and that if changes came forward we would consider whether targeted consultation is appropriate. We do not consider that the degree of change in relation to this site or the effect on the local community would affect the nature of the comments received during phase two consultation in such a way as to require further consultation. On that basis, a round of targeted consultation on our proposals for this site is not considered necessary. We will progress with preparation of our application for a development consent order and will incorporate the changes referred to in paragraph 11.1.13, if further work demonstrates that this is appropriate. We intend to publicise our proposed application in accordance with Section 48 of the Planning Act 2008 later in 2012. Full details of our proposed scheme will be set out in our DCO application and accompanying documents.

We are proposing to use our existing pumping station and adjacent disused toilet block for our construction works and to accommodate the permanent structures required to operate the main tunnel. The site would be used to connect the existing local CSO, known as the Falconbrook Pumping Station CSO, to the main tunnel.

A total of 22 respondents provided comments on Falconbrook Pumping Station site. The respondents comprised:
Table 12.1 Statutory consultees and local authorities who provided feedback on Falconbrook Pumping Station Riverside

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statutory consultees</th>
<th>Local authorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design Council CABE</td>
<td>London Borough of Wandsworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Council for Water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater London Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feedback on the selection and use of our preferred site

Site selection and alternative sites

12.1.3 Main supportive and neutral feedback comments raised by respondents included:

- support for the identification of a new preferred site since phase one consultation. The preferred site is more suitable because it has fewer impacts and enables the redevelopment of Bridges Court Car Park
- agree that Falconbrook Pumping Station CSO needs to be intercepted, and that the Falconbrook Pumping Station site is a suitable location from which to do so
- the site is already an operational Thames Water site/ies owned by Thames Water
- there will be no/minimal negative long-term effects on the local area.

12.1.4 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- the reasons for changing the preferred site since phase one consultation are unclear; greater weight has been given to the interests of potential future residents of the King’s Court site than those of existing residents and users of York Gardens, the library and children’s centre
- two of the shortlisted sites are more appropriate: Bridges Court Car Park (site 2) is the most suitable, followed by the Foreshore, near London Heliport (site 1)
- site selection should avoid sites close to sensitive receptors, including York Gardens Library and York Gardens adventure playground
- alternative site suggestions, included Bridges Court Car Park and Foreshore, near London Heliport, Lombard Road.

Management of construction works

12.1.5 No main supportive or neutral feedback comments, as defined in paragraph 1.1.7, were received.

12.1.6 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- concerns regarding the effects of construction on the community and social amenities such as the library, community centre, children’s club, playground, 1 o’clock club and York Gardens library
- local roads are unsuitable for use by construction vehicles and access should be restricted to left in and left out
- the proposed site access is unsuitable.

Permanent design and appearance

12.1.7 No main supportive or neutral feedback comments, as defined in paragraph 1.1.7, were received.

12.1.8 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- the design should be developed to show how this new space will be used by the community and the nature of its relationship with the busy York Road. Consideration should also be given to extending the area of this space towards the library to join with the existing York Garden; scale, placement and species of trees
- develop a landscape management strategy for York Gardens.
Management of operational effects
12.1.9 No main supportive or neutral feedback comments, as defined in paragraph 1.1.7, were received.
12.1.10 The main objection, issue and concern raised by respondents was that the proposed site access is unsuitable.

Our view of the way forward
12.1.11 We have received a range of feedback on our proposals for this site, including supportive and neutral comments and objections, issues and concerns. We have taken all comments received into account in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008.
12.1.12 In light of the feedback that we have received, we believe that no new information has been highlighted that would change the conclusions of our site selection process to date. Falconbrook Pumping Station therefore remains our preferred site to connect the Falconbrook Pumping Station CSO to the main tunnel. Additionally, no new information or issues have been identified that would fundamentally change our proposals for this site. Therefore we will continue to develop the proposals for this site that we published at phase two consultation.
12.1.13 The feedback we have received included detailed comments on the construction and operational effects of the proposed development and the measures we propose to reduce and manage those effects. Detailed comments were also made on our proposals for the permanent design and appearance of the site. Having regard to the feedback received we are continuing to refine our detailed proposals for this site to improve the design and reduce the impacts on the local community and environment. Currently we are considering the following changes to the layout and/or appearance of our proposals:
- revisions to the landscape strategy for the area around the Pumping Station, including proposals for advance planting in York Gardens that would be compatible with a Landscape Management Strategy prepared by London Borough of Wandsworth.
12.1.14 In our Statement of community consultation we recognised that we may need to amend our scheme following phase two consultation and that if changes came forward we would consider whether targeted consultation is appropriate. We do not consider that the degree of change in relation to this site or the effect on the local community would affect the nature of the comments received during phase two consultation in such a way as to require further consultation. On that basis, a round of targeted consultation on our proposals for this site is not considered necessary. We will progress with preparation of our application for a development consent order and will incorporate the changes referred to in paragraph 12.1.13 if further work demonstrates that this is appropriate. We intend to publicise our proposed scheme in accordance with Section 48 of the Planning Act 2008 later in 2012. Full details of our proposed scheme will be set out in our DCO application and accompanying documents.

13. Cremorne Wharf Depot
13.1.1 We are proposing to use the existing council depot for our construction works and to accommodate the permanent structures required to operate the main tunnel. The site would be used to connect the existing local CSO, known as the Lots Road Pumping Station CSO, to the main tunnel.

Number of respondents
13.1.2 A total of 42 respondents provided comments on our Cremorne Wharf Depot site. The respondents comprised:
Feedback on the selection and use of our preferred site

Site selection and alternative sites
13.1.3 Main supportive and neutral feedback comments raised by respondents included:

- the preferred site is more suitable than Cremorne Wharf Foreshore, which was put forward at phase one consultation
- support for the revisions to construction access since phase one consultation to avoid works taking place in Cremorne Gardens.

13.1.4 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- the preferred site is generally unsuitable
- query why shortlisted sites have not been identified
- the cost of using the site is too high/not cost-effective

- site selection should avoid sites that have been allocated for, are known to be awaiting, or have planning permission for redevelopment; in this case the Lots Road Power Station site
- alternative site suggestions, included Cremorne Wharf Foreshore and ‘a less urban site’.

Management of construction works
13.1.5 Main supportive and neutral feedback comments raised by respondents included:

- support for the low-key design approach of the new infrastructure, minimising the visual impact on the townscape and the setting of the pumping station
- the site access proposals are an improvement on those presented at phase one consultation.

13.1.6 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- concerns regarding dust, air and noise pollution from construction activities and the effect on quality of life and residential amenity
- use the river to transport more/all construction materials and spoil rather than roads. This would be compliant with Cremorne Wharf’s safeguarded status and would reduce traffic impacts on Lots Road and the wider network
- the existing and consented cargo handling capacity must either be accommodated within the worksite or relocated.

Permanent design and appearance
13.1.7 Main supportive and neutral feedback comments raised by respondents included:

- the low-key approach is supported, and the double-apex structure is an improvement in building mass compared to the existing depot facility
- support the inclusion of a biodiverse roof/habitat wall which could potentially reduce storm water runoff.

13.1.8 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- do not support the proposals for the permanent layout and design of the site. Proposals should be in keeping with and blend into the character of the local area/minimise visual impact
• the ventilation column should be moved next to the river where there would be more natural air flow and where fewer local people would be able to view it and potentially be affected by the smell.

Management of operational effects
13.1.9 No main supportive or neutral feedback comments, as defined in paragraph 1.1.7, were received.

13.1.10 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:
• the effect on air quality arising from the operation of the tunnel
• seek a guarantee that the Thames Path would be opened up for public access.

Our view of the way forward
13.1.11 We have received a range of feedback on our proposals for this site, including supportive and neutral comments and objections, issues and concerns. We have taken all comments received into account in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008.

13.1.12 In light of the feedback that we have received, we believe that no new information has been highlighted that would change the conclusions of our site selection process to date. Cremorne Wharf Depot therefore remains our preferred site to connect the Lots Road Pumping Station CSO to the main tunnel. Additionally, no new information or issues have been identified that would fundamentally change our proposals for this site. Therefore we will continue to develop the proposals for this site that we published at phase two consultation.

13.1.13 The feedback we have received included detailed comments on the construction and operational effects of the proposed development and the measures we propose to reduce and manage those effects. Detailed comments were also made on our proposals for the permanent design and appearance of the site. Having regard to the feedback received we are continuing to refine our detailed proposals for this site to improve the design and reduce the impacts on the local community and environment. Currently we are considering the following changes to the layout and/or appearance of our proposals:
• whether it would be possible to make use of the river for the transport of shaft and short tunnel excavated materials in order to reduce the number of lorries on local roads
• relocation of the ventilation column so that it is closer to the river
• amendments to the proposed replacement depot building design to set back the structure from the western elevation of the listed Lots Road Pumping Station building to protect its setting.

13.1.14 In our Statement of community consultation we recognised that we may need to amend our scheme following phase two consultation and that if changes came forward we would consider whether targeted consultation is appropriate. We do not consider that the degree of change in relation to this site or the effect on the local community would affect the nature of the comments received during phase two consultation in such a way as to require further consultation. On that basis, a round of targeted consultation on our proposals for this site is not considered necessary. We will progress with preparation of our application for a development consent order and will incorporate the changes referred to in paragraph 13.1.13 if further work demonstrates that this is appropriate. We intend to publicise our proposed application in accordance with Section 48 of the Planning Act 2008 later in 2012. Full details of our proposed scheme will be set out in our DCO application and accompanying documents.

14. Chelsea Embankment Foreshore

14.1.1 We are proposing to use the foreshore of the River Thames (opposite the Bull Ring Gates of the Royal Hospital Chelsea), a section of Chelsea Embankment (A3212) and part of the grounds of the Royal Hospital Chelsea for our construction works and to accommodate the permanent structures required to operate the main tunnel. The site would be used to intercept the existing local CSO, known as the Ranelagh CSO and to construct a connection to the northern Low Level Sewer No.1 to divert flows into the main tunnel.
Number of respondents

A total of 42 respondents provided comments on our Chelsea Embankment Foreshore site. The respondents comprised:


- **Local authorities**: Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea

- **Landowners**: (0)

- **Community consultees**: (0)

- **Petitions**: (0)

**Table 14.1 Statutory consultees and local authorities who provided feedback on Chelsea Embankment Foreshore**

Feedback on the selection and use of our preferred site

**Site selection and alternative sites**

Main supportive and neutral feedback comments raised by respondents included:

- support for the use of the preferred site/the preferred site is more suitable than the site put forward at phase one consultation because the drop shaft and interception chamber foreshore projections have been combined into a single structure and the diameter of the shaft has also been reduced, thereby reducing the overall footprint of the structure

- the preferred site is more suitable than any of the shortlisted sites - specifically Ranelagh Gardens (site 2)

- no objections in principle in terms of navigational safety.

Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- opposed in principle to the use of any foreshore structures along the tidal Thames as this is likely to lead to a number of detrimental effects of flood risk management, biodiversity and recreation

- Ranelagh Gardens (site 2) is more suitable, since it presents a better alternative in terms of impact on the historic environment

- site selection should avoid sites adjacent to or containing heritage assets

- alternative site suggestions, included Battersea Park and Royal Hospital (Chelsea) grounds.

**Management of construction works**

Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- disruption to the use of the Thames Path caused by construction works

- construction traffic will cause and exacerbate traffic congestion

- it is not clear what the scale of the effect on the historic environment will be

- the loss of trees arising from construction activities

- general noise and vibration effects arising from construction activities and the effects on the community

- disruption to the use of the Thames Path caused by construction works and need to provide suitable and safe Thames Path and footpath diversions

- use the river to transport more/all construction materials and spoil.

**Permanent design and appearance**

Main supportive and neutral feedback comments raised by respondents included:

- support for the design proposals including added visual interest from the proposed reed beds; high quality of materials; siting on the
axis with the Royal Hospital lends strength to the idea of a foreshore structure on the embankment; termination of this important link with a new space on the embankment should provide a new appreciation of the view to the hospital.

- welcomed that the project’s architects have sought to design a new public open space that is low-key and celebrates the axial alignment of the Royal Hospital and its gardens, though this must be weighed against the disruption to the characteristic linearity of the embankment wall and foreshore.

14.1.8 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- the effect on local views; the current design makes it particularly vulnerable to lapsing into use as a layover for coaches which would mean that the Royal Hospital would frequently be obscured from view
- the proposals should be in keeping with and blend into the character of the local area/ minimise visual impact
- improve or create new footpaths/the Thames Path, cycle paths and public realm.

**Management of operational effects**

14.1.9 No main supportive or neutral feedback comments, as defined in paragraph 1.1.7, were received.

14.1.10 The main objection, issue and concern raised by respondents was that the proposals should provide a suitable Thames Path on completion of the works.

**Our view of the way forward**

14.1.11 We have received a range of feedback on our proposals for this site, including supportive and neutral comments and objections, issues and concerns. We have taken all comments received into account in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008.

14.1.12 In light of the feedback that we have received, we believe that no new information has been highlighted that would change the conclusions of our site selection process to date. Chelsea Embankment Foreshore therefore remains our preferred site to intercept the existing local combined sewer overflow (CSO), known as the Ranelagh CSO and to construct a connection to the northern Low Level Sewer No.1 to divert flows into the main tunnel. Additionally, no new information or issues have been identified that would fundamentally change our proposals for this site. Therefore we will continue to develop the proposals for this site that we published at phase two consultation.

14.1.13 The feedback we have received included detailed comments on the construction and operational effects of the proposed development and the measures we propose to reduce and manage those effects. Detailed comments were also made on our proposals for the permanent design and appearance of the site. Having regard to the feedback received we are continuing to refine our detailed proposals for this site to improve the design and reduce the impacts on the local community and environment. Currently we are considering the following changes to the layout and/or appearance of our proposals:

- whether it would be possible to make further use of the river for the transport of shaft and short tunnel excavated materials in order to reduce the number of lorries on local roads
- revisions to the design of the proposed foreshore structure to incorporate design suggestions including changes to the roundabout and kerb layout in the bull ring, vent columns to be designed as public art (or incorporating public art) and incorporation of visual interpretive material
- the location of the kiosks and pedestrian refuge is being reconsidered to ensure that visual clutter is avoided.

14.1.14 In our Statement of community consultation we recognised that we may need to amend our scheme following phase two consultation and that if changes came forward we would consider whether targeted consultation is appropriate. We do not consider that the degree of change in relation to this site or the effect on the local community would affect the nature of the comments received during phase two consultation in such a way as to require further consultation.
On that basis, a round of targeted consultation on our proposals for this site is not considered necessary. We will progress with preparation of our application for a development consent order and will incorporate the changes referred to in paragraph 14.1.13 if further work demonstrates that this is appropriate. We intend to publicise our proposed application in accordance with Section 48 of the Planning Act 2008 later in 2012. Full details of our proposed scheme will be set out in our DCO application and accompanying documents.

15. Kirtling Street

15.1.1 We are proposing to use land at Kirtling Street for our construction works and to accommodate the permanent structures required to operate the main tunnel. The site would be used to drive the main tunnel in two directions: eastward to Chambers Wharf and westward to Carnwath Road Riverside.

15.1.2 A total of 35 respondents provided comments on our Kirtling Street site. The respondents comprised:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key:</th>
<th>Statutory consultees</th>
<th>Local authorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statutory consultees</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authorities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowners</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community consultees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petitions (0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15.1 Statutory consultees and local authorities who provided feedback on Kirtling Street

Feedback on the selection and use of our preferred site

Site selection and alternative sites

15.1.3 Main supportive and neutral feedback comments raised by respondents included:

- support for the identification of a new preferred site since phase one consultation/the preferred site is more suitable than the site put forward at phase one and any alternative sites
- the site is a brownfield site/in an industrial area and of limited value to the local community. Use of the site would have limited effects on the local area and community
- support for the site selection because the project needs to be undertaken.

15.1.4 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- alternative and shortlisted sites have not been properly considered
- shortlisted sites have not been properly considered in relation to Battersea Power Station (site 2) and Part of Battersea Power Station (site 3)
- site selection should avoid sites in residential and/or densely populated areas. In particular, this site would impact on the Nine Elms Pier boat community
- selection of this preferred site has been poorly justified/inadequately explained; clarification as to the need for the Kirtling Street site and an explanation as to why the Heathwall site cannot suffice for both development proposals
- alternative site suggestions, included Cringle Wharf and Battersea Power Station.
Management of construction works

15.1.5 Main supportive and neutral feedback comments raised by respondents included:

- the proposals will ensure that noise mitigation will be effective (temporary warehouse type buildings over main tunnel drive shafts)
- support for the proposed use of barges to transport materials.

15.1.6 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- provide suitable and safe footpath diversions
- use rail to transport materials given the proximity to the Stewarts Lane sidings
- concerns regarding the extent of the construction site and need for the red line to be redrawn inland as far away as possible from the riverside; the associated jetty must not impede the Nine Elms Pier
- the effect on safeguarded wharves, including Kirtling Wharf and Cringle Dock. The structure within the foreshore of the River Thames and the effect on Nine Elms Pier. Structure should be located as far westwards as possible, taking account of the workings of Cringle Dock Waste Transfer Station
- the proposals will impact on local regeneration in the Vauxhall Nine Elms Opportunity Area and conflict with the implementation of existing planning permission for the site
- the effect of construction activities on residential amenity
- the effect of transporting materials by barge on river navigation and commercial river users and river structures. Concern that the extent of the proposed jetty will have a detrimental impact on the efficient operation of the Cringle Dock Waste Transfer Station for the five years or longer
- the existing and consented cargo handling capacity must either be accommodated within the worksite or relocated.

Permanent design and appearance

15.1.7 Main supportive and neutral feedback comments raised by respondents included:

- the final area of hardstanding should be minimised as much as possible to reduce runoff rates and provide wider sustainability benefits
- support for Thames Path improvements and connectivity.

15.1.8 The main objection, issue and concern raised by respondents was that the Thames Path should be improved (6m wide) as part of the proposals.

Management of operational effects

15.1.9 No main supportive or neutral feedback comments, as defined in paragraph 1.1.7, were received.

15.1.10 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- the effect of odour arising from operation of the tunnel
- the Kirtling Wharf site must be returned to a viable working wharf.

Our view of the way forward

15.1.11 We have received a range of feedback on our proposals for this site, including supportive and neutral comments and objections, issues and concerns. We have taken all comments received into account in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008.

15.1.12 In light of the feedback that we have received, we believe that no new information has been highlighted that would change the conclusions of our site selection process to date. Kirtling Street therefore remains our preferred site to drive the main tunnel in two directions eastward to Chambers Wharf and westward to Carnwath Road Riverside. Additionally, no new information or issues have been identified that would fundamentally change our proposals for this site. Therefore we will continue to develop the proposals for this site that we published at phase two consultation.

15.1.13 The feedback we have received included detailed comments on the construction and operational effects of the proposed development and the measures we propose to reduce and manage those effects. Detailed comments were also made on our proposals for the permanent design and appearance of the site. Having regard to the feedback
received we are continuing to refine our detailed design for this site which may lead to changes to the layout and/or appearance of our proposals. Currently we are considering opportunities to make further use of the river to import sand and aggregates for secondary tunnel lining during the construction works whilst retaining the operations at the concrete batching works in order to reduce the number of lorries on the local road network.

15.1.14 In our Statement of community consultation we recognised that we may need to amend our scheme following phase two consultation and that if changes came forward we would consider whether targeted consultation is appropriate. We do not consider that the degree of change in relation to this site or the effect on the local community would affect the nature of the comments received during phase two consultation in such a way as to require further consultation. On that basis, a round of targeted consultation on our proposals for this site is not considered necessary. We will progress with preparation of our application for a development consent order and will incorporate the changes referred to in paragraph 15.1.13 if further work demonstrates that this is appropriate.

We intend to publicise our proposed application in accordance with Section 48 of the Planning Act 2008 later in 2012. Full details of our proposed scheme will be set out in our DCO application and accompanying documents.

16. Heathwall Pumping Station

16.1.1 We are proposing to use our existing pumping station and adjacent Middle Wharf for our construction works and to accommodate the permanent structures required to operate the main tunnel. The site would be used to connect two existing CSOs, known as the Heathwall Pumping Station and South West Storm Relief CSOs, to the main tunnel.

Number of respondents

16.1.2 A total of 20 respondents provided comments on our Heathwall Pumping Station site. The respondents comprised:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key:</th>
<th>Statutory consultees</th>
<th>Local authorities</th>
<th>Community consultees</th>
<th>Petitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design Council CABE</td>
<td>London Borough of</td>
<td>Consumer Council for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>Wandsworth</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td>Greater London Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Port of London Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16.1 Statutory consultees and local authorities who provided feedback on Heathwall Pumping Station

Feedback on the selection and use of our preferred site

Site selection and alternative sites

16.1.3 Main supportive and neutral feedback comments raised by respondents included:

- support for the use of the preferred site
- the preferred site is more suitable than the shortlisted site in terms of reducing the adverse impacts on archaeology
- no objection in principle in terms of navigational safety.

16.1.4 The main objection, issue and concern raised by respondents included:

- opposed in principle to the use of any foreshore structures along the tidal Thames as this is likely to lead to a number of detrimental effects of flood risk management, biodiversity and recreation.
Management of construction works
16.1.5 No main supportive or neutral feedback comments, as defined in paragraph 1.1.7, were received.

16.1.6 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:
- concerns regarding the extent of the construction site and the need for the red line (site boundary) to be redrawn inland as far away from the riverside as possible
- concerns regarding the effect on the safeguarded Middle Wharf
- the proposals will impact on local regeneration in the Vauxhall Nine Elms Opportunity Area and concerns regarding the compatibility with existing planning permissions for major redevelopment including the American Embassy and Battersea Power Station
- the detrimental effect on the business operations of the Battersea Barge
- use the river to transport more/all construction materials and spoil.

Permanent design and appearance
16.1.7 No main feedback, as defined in paragraph 1.1.7, was received.

Management of operational effects
16.1.8 No main feedback, as defined in paragraph 1.1.7, was received.

Our view of the way forward
16.1.9 We have received a range of feedback on our proposals for this site, including supportive and neutral comments and objections, issues and concerns. We have taken all comments received into account in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008.

16.1.10 In light of the feedback that we have received, we believe that no new information has been highlighted that would change the conclusions of our site selection process to date. Heathwall Pumping Station therefore remains our preferred site to connect Heathwall Pumping Station CSO and South West Storm Relief to the main tunnel. Additionally, no new information or issues have been identified that would fundamentally change our proposals for this site. Therefore we will continue to develop the proposals for this site that we published at phase two consultation.

16.1.11 The feedback we have received included detailed comments on the construction and operational effects of the proposed development and the measures we propose to reduce and manage those effects. Detailed comments were also made on our proposals for the permanent design and appearance of the site. Having regard to the feedback received we are continuing to refine our detailed proposals for this site to improve the design and reduce the impacts on the local community and environment. Currently we are considering the following changes to the layout and/or appearance of our proposals:
- whether it would be possible to make further use of the river for the transport of shaft excavated materials in order to reduce the number of lorries on local roads
- alterations to the construction barge mooring location to accommodate an enlargement of the cofferdam including moving the Battersea Barge further to the west for the duration of our construction works
- ways to incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems into our proposals
- increasing the size of the permanent platform that protrudes into the River Thames

16.1.12 We are also considering an increase in the diameter of the drop shaft from 6m to 10m in light of further engineering information.

16.1.13 In our Statement of community consultation we recognised that we may need to amend our scheme following phase two consultation and that if changes came forward we would consider whether targeted consultation is appropriate. We do not consider that the degree of change in relation to this site or the effect on the local community would affect the nature of the comments received during phase two consultation in such a way as to require further consultation. On that basis, a round of targeted consultation on our proposals for this site is not considered necessary. We will progress with preparation of our application for a development consent order and will incorporate the changes referred to in paragraphs 16.1.11-12 if further work demonstrates that this is appropriate. We intend to publicise our proposed application in accordance with Section 48 of the Planning Act 2008 later in 2012. Full details of our
proposed scheme will be set out in our DCO application and accompanying documents.

17. Albert Embankment Foreshore

17.1 We are proposing to use the foreshore of the River Thames adjacent to Albert Embankment (A3036) for our construction works and to accommodate the permanent structures required to operate the main tunnel. The site would be used to connect the existing local CSOs, known as the Clapham Storm Relief and Brixton Storm Relief CSOs, to the main tunnel.

Number of respondents

17.1.2 A total of 27 respondents provided comments on Albert Embankment Foreshore. The respondents comprised:

- 17 Statutory consultees
- 6 Local authorities
- 3 Landowners
- 1 Community consultees
- 0 Petitions

Feedback on the selection and use of our preferred site

17.1.3 Main supportive and neutral feedback comments raised by respondents included:

- support for the use of the preferred site
- the site is sufficiently far away from residential areas/is not a residential area
- qualified support for the preferred site included:
  - the site is generally in the right location, although the structure in the River Thames has not been designed to take account of navigational risk
  - accept necessity of using this site on the basis that adverse impacts on this site and on heritage assets across the project are properly mitigated.

17.1.4 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- opposed in principle to the use of any foreshore structures along the tidal River Thames, as this is likely to lead to a number of detrimental effects of flood risk management, biodiversity and recreation
- query why shortlisted sites have not been identified
- do not support changes to the extent of preferred site since phase one consultation/do not support the specific location of the site
- alternative site suggestions, included Foreshore, adjacent to MI6/SIS Building and Vauxhall Bridge.

Management of construction works

17.1.5 The main supportive and neutral feedback comment raised by respondents was support for the use of the river to move materials and the construction transport route.

17.1.6 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- concerns regarding dust, air and noise pollution from construction activities
- the proposed site access is unsuitable and is not designed for heavy goods traffic
- no consultation on tidal flow analysis has taken place

Statutory consultees
- Design Council CABE
- Consumer Council for Water
- English Heritage
- Environment Agency
- Greater London Authority
- Port of London Authority

Local authorities
- London Borough of Lambeth

Table 17.1 Statutory consultees and local authorities who provided feedback on Albert Embankment Foreshore
• the location of the (drop) shaft would risk undermining the piled foundations of Camelford House. General concerns regarding the effects of works on structures

• the effect of construction activities on listed building(s) or structure(s) including the Grade II* Vauxhall Bridge and Grade II embankment wall and the need for further information on mitigation measures

• use the river to transport more/all construction materials and spoil

• ensure the design does not cause siltation, erosion or other hydrological impacts.

17.1.7 Feedback from phase two consultation has been received from the occupants of Vauxhall Cross, the details of which cannot be made public because they encompass security issues. However, these issues mainly relate to the means of achieving the construction rather than the fundamental content of the construction works itself.

Permanent design and appearance

17.1.8 The main supportive and neutral feedback comment raised by respondents was support for specific design features, including the creation of new open space and reducing the effect on Grade II* listed Vauxhall Bridge.

17.1.9 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

• suggested amendments to the design that would relocate the proposed shaft and/or alter the proposed foreshore structure

• do not support the creation of new open space as this will create a security risk

• the effect of the permanent design and layout on river navigation, commercial and recreational river users.

Management of operational effects

17.1.10 No main supportive or neutral feedback comments, as defined in paragraph 1.1.7, were received.

17.1.11 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

• the Environmental statement should consider the option for maintenance vehicles to pass over the natural foreshore in place of the permanent habitat loss of the proposed track-way

• the proposals will result in river erosion and scour; designs should minimise siltation, erosion or other hydrological impacts through monitoring via foreshore walking.

Our view of the way forward

17.1.12 We have received a range of feedback on our proposals for this site, including supportive and neutral comments and objections, issues and concerns. We have taken all comments received into account in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008.

17.1.13 In light of the feedback that we have received, we believe that no new information has been highlighted that would change the conclusions of our site selection process to date. Albert Embankment Foreshore therefore remains our preferred site to connect the Clapham Storm Relief CSO and Brixton Storm Relief CSO to the main tunnel. Additionally, no new information or issues have been identified that would fundamentally change our proposals for this site. Therefore we will continue to develop the proposals for this site that we published at phase two consultation.

17.1.14 The feedback we have received included detailed comments on the construction and operational effects of the proposed development and the measures we propose to reduce and manage those effects. Detailed comments were also made on our proposals for the permanent design and appearance of the site. Having regard to the feedback received we are continuing to refine our detailed proposals for this site to improve the design and reduce the impacts on the local community and environment. Currently we are considering the following changes to the layout and/or appearance of our proposals:

• alternative construction access between Camelford and Tintagel Houses

• whether it would be possible to make further use of the river for the transport of shaft and short tunnel excavated materials in order to reduce the number of lorries on local roads

• amendments to the shape of the permanent structure to address navigational safety issues

• detailed amendments to the design of the permanent works.
17.1.15 In our *Statement of community consultation* we recognised that we may need to amend our scheme following phase two consultation and that if changes came forward we would consider whether targeted consultation is appropriate. We consider that the degree of change and the effect on the local community may affect the nature of the comments made during phase two consultation as the changes we are considering may affect a different section of the community. On that basis, a round of targeted consultation on our revised proposals for this site will begin on 6 June 2012 and close on 4 July 2012. Any comments received in response to our targeted consultation will be taken into account in preparing our application for a development consent order. We intend to publicise our proposed application in accordance with Section 48 of the Planning Act 2008 later in 2012. Full details of our proposed scheme will be set out in our DCO application and accompanying documents.

18. **Victoria Embankment Foreshore**

18.1.1 We are proposing to use the foreshore of the River Thames, south of Victoria Embankment (A3211), for our construction works and to accommodate the permanent structures required to operate the main tunnel. The site would be used to control the existing local CSO, known as the Regent Street CSO, by connecting the northern Low Level Sewer No.1 to the main tunnel.

**Number of respondents**

18.1.2 A total of 22 respondents provided comments on our Victoria Embankment Foreshore site. The respondents comprised:

**Table 18.1** Statutory consultees and local authorities who provided feedback on Victoria Embankment Foreshore

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statutory consultees</th>
<th>Local authorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design Council CABE</td>
<td>City of Westminster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Council for Water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater London Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port of London Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Feedback on the selection and use of our preferred site**

**Site selection and alternative sites**

18.1.3 Main supportive and neutral feedback comments raised by respondents included:

- support for the use of the preferred site
- qualified support for the preferred site, including that the site is generally in the right location, although the structure in the River Thames has not been designed to take account of navigational risk; further work should be undertaken to ensure that the site can be delivered in an acceptable way.

18.1.4 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- opposed in principle to the use of any foreshore structures along the tidal Thames as this is likely to lead to a number of detrimental effects of flood risk management, biodiversity and recreation
• query why shortlisted sites have not been identified
• do not support changes to the extent of preferred site since phase one consultation, as it would encourage a reduction in site footprint to minimise projection into the river; and the Tattershall Castle will not be able to remain in its current location.

Management of construction works

18.1.5 No main supportive or neutral feedback comments, as defined in paragraph 1.1.7, were received.

18.1.6 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:
• the effect of construction activities on archaeology, listed buildings or structures including the Embankment and the Whitehall Conservation Area and the need to provide suitable protection for listed structures during construction
• the effect of construction activities and structures, including the relocation of Tattershall Castle on London View Management Framework views
• the effect of permanent and temporary business relocations including the detrimental effect on business operations of the Hispaniola and Tattershall Castle
• the disruption to the use of the Thames Path caused by construction works or diversion
• undertake navigational assessment to identify potential effects of river transport on river users and structures
• use the river to transport more/all construction materials and spoil to avoid additional traffic on the road network.

Permanenent design and appearance

18.1.7 The main supportive and neutral feedback comment raised by respondents was support for the design proposals.

18.1.8 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:
• the proposals should be in keeping with and blend into the character of the local area/ minimise visual impact having regard to the civic environment and the world heritage site. Concerns regarding the effects on heritage assets
• further consideration of the foreshore structure is required including reducing the size of the structures within the foreshore of the River Thames.

Management of operational effects

18.1.9 No main supportive or neutral feedback comments, as defined in paragraph 1.1.7, were received.

18.1.10 The main objection, issue and concern raised by respondents was in relation to the permanent business relocation of the Tattershall Castle and the associated effects, including the need to provide alternative mooring.

Our view of the way forward

18.1.11 We have received a range of feedback on our proposals for this site, including supportive and neutral comments and objections, issues and concerns. We have taken all comments received into account in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008.

18.1.12 In light of the feedback that we have received, we believe that no new information has been highlighted that would change the conclusions of our site selection process to date. Victoria Embankment Foreshore therefore remains our preferred site to control the existing CSO, known as the Regent Street CSO by connecting the northern Low Level Sewer No.1 to the main tunnel. Additionally, no new information or issues have been identified that would fundamentally change our proposals for this site. Therefore we will continue to develop the proposals for this site that we published at phase two consultation.

18.1.13 The feedback we have received included detailed comments on the construction and operational effects of the proposed development and the measures we propose to reduce and manage those effects. Detailed comments were also made on our proposals for the permanent design and appearance of the site. Having regard to the feedback received we are continuing to refine our detailed proposals for this site to improve the design and reduce the impacts on the local community and environment. Currently we are considering the following changes to the layout and/or appearance of our proposals:
• amendments to the layout and shape of our permanent structures to reduce their footprint and visual bulk in the river, improve their relationship with the listed embankment wall and reduce the effect on views along the river towards the world heritage site
• increased use of the river to transport shaft excavated materials to reduce lorry movements on local roads
• reviewing the method for constructing the cofferdam
• the orientation of the moored barge to address navigational safety.

18.1.14 In our Statement of community consultation we recognised that we may need to amend our scheme following phase two consultation and that if changes came forward we would consider whether targeted consultation is appropriate. We consider that the degree of change in relation to this site would affect the nature of the comments received during phase two consultation as there are a range of protected heritage assets nearby which may be affected by our proposals, including Victoria Embankment, which is a listed structure. On that basis, a round of targeted consultation on our revised proposals for this site will begin on 6 June 2012 and close on 4 July 2012. Any comments received in response to our targeted consultation will be taken into account in preparing our application for a development consent order. We intend to publicise our proposed application in accordance with Section 48 of the Planning Act 2008 later in 2012. Full details of our proposed scheme will be set out in our DCO application and accompanying documents.

19. Blackfriars Bridge Foreshore

19.1.1 We are proposing to reclaim an area of the River Thames, adjacent to Blackfriars Bridge for our construction works and to accommodate the permanent structures required to operate the main tunnel. The site would be used to intercept the existing local CSO, known as the Fleet Main CSO, and connect to the northern Low Level Sewer No.1 in order to divert flows to the main tunnel.

19.1.2 A total of 27 respondents provided comments on Blackfriars Bridge Foreshore. The respondents comprised:

Table 19.1 Statutory consultees and local authorities who provided feedback on Blackfriars Bridge Foreshore

Feedback on the selection and use of our preferred site

19.1.3 The main supportive and neutral feedback comment raised by respondents was support for the use of the preferred site which is considered more suitable than any alternative sites.

19.1.4 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:
• object to the use of this preferred site in particular:
  • although there does not appear to be any realistic alternative to this site, there are significant concerns about the site construction proposals and the likely impacts on highway capacity and road users in this area
opposed in principle to the use of any foreshore sites.

this preferred site is generally unsuitable; fundamental concerns on the implications of the site for navigational safety, flood risk management, biodiversity, recreation and effects on highway capacity and road users in this area

existing uses of the site present development constraints

site selection should avoid sites adjacent to or containing heritage assets; the Grade II listed Carmelite is located directly opposite the proposed site, and is within the Whitefriars Conservation Area

query why shortlisted sites have not been identified

alternative site suggestions, included: the foreshore in front of Inner Temple Gardens.

Management of construction works

No main supportive or neutral feedback comments, as defined in paragraph 1.1.7, were received.

Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

the site layout is unsuitable and closure of the westbound slip road is unacceptable. Alternative working arrangements are required

disruption to the use of the Thames Path caused by construction works or diversion and need to provide a suitable and safe Thames Path diversion with carefully designed pedestrian crossings and diversionary signage

effect on foreshore habitat(s), including from the effects of relocation of the President and construction of a new passenger jetty and associated dredging requirements

detrimental effect on business operations due to Blackfriars Millennium Pier relocation

effect on local views

conscerns regarding the effect of transporting material by barge on river navigation and commercial river uses. There is a need to undertake a navigational assessment.

Permanent design and appearance

Main supportive and neutral feedback comments raised by respondents included:

support for the design proposals

selective use of trees within the space could reinforce the linearity of the structure and frame vistas of the River Thames

support for detailed design suggestions such as incorporation of a diagrammatic plan of the River Thames within the paving design and the opportunity to reuse the area under and beside the bridge for retail uses

qualified support for the proposed design subject to it not increasing scour that would place the archaeology of the river at risk.

Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

the structure in the foreshore is too large/there should be no structures in the river

the design should provide landscaping and planting including elements to encourage biodiversity

design should include areas for play and seating and shelter areas

concerns regarding the effect of the permanent design on nearby listed buildings and conservation area

improved Thames Path and imaginative public realm proposals are welcomed but require more detailed agreement with stakeholders

Management of operational effects

No main supportive or neutral feedback comments, as defined in paragraph 1.1.7, were received.

The main objection, issue and concern raised by respondents was the effect of odour arising from the operation of the tunnel, and particular concerns given odour from existing sewer vents.

Our view of the way forward

We have received a range of feedback on our proposals for this site, including supportive and neutral comments and objections, issues and concerns. We have taken all comments received into account in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008.
19.1.12 In light of the feedback that we have received, we believe that no new information has been highlighted that would change the conclusions of our site selection process to date. Blackfriars Bridge Foreshore therefore remains our preferred site to intercept the Fleet Main CSO, and connect to the northern Low Level Sewer No.1 to divert flows to the main tunnel. Additionally, no new information or issues have been identified that would fundamentally change our proposals for this site. Therefore we will continue to develop the proposals for this site that we published at phase two consultation.

19.1.13 The feedback we have received included detailed comments on the construction and operational effects of the proposed development and the measures we propose to reduce and manage those effects. Detailed comments were also made on our proposals for the permanent design and appearance of the site. Having regard to the feedback received we are continuing to refine our detailed proposals for this site to improve the design and reduce the impacts on the local community and environment. Currently we are considering the following changes to the layout and/or appearance of our proposals:

• amendments to the design of our foreshore structure to introduce opportunities for play
• the introduction of more planting
• inclusion of water feature and canopies for shade
• amendments to address navigational safety issues with respect to the foreshore structure and the relocated Blackfriars Millennium Pier
• further changes to address the transport effects of temporary works
• opportunities to make further use of the river to transport shaft and other excavated materials to reduce the number of lorries on local roads
• how we can programme our works so they do not clash with the works required to Blackfriars bridgehead structure.

19.1.14 In our Statement of community consultation we recognised that we may need to amend our scheme following phase two consultation and that if changes came forward we would consider whether targeted consultation is appropriate. We do not consider that the degree of change in relation to this site or the effect on the local community would affect the nature of the comments received during phase two consultation in such a way as to require further consultation. On that basis, a round of targeted consultation on our proposals for this site is not considered necessary. We will progress with preparation of our application for a development consent order and will incorporate the changes referred to in paragraph 19.1.13 if further work demonstrates that this is appropriate. We intend to publicise our proposed application in accordance with Section 48 of the Planning Act 2008 later in 2012. Full details of our proposed scheme will be set out in our DCO application and accompanying documents.

20. Shad Thames Pumping Station

20.1.1 We would seek to control the existing CSO, known as the Shad Thames Pumping Station CSO, which would not be intercepted by the main tunnel. The site would control the existing local CSO, known as the Shad Thames Pumping Station CSO.

Number of respondents

20.1.2 A total of 37 respondents provided comments on our Shad Thames Pumping Station site. The respondents comprised:

Key:
- Statutory consultees
- Local authorities
- Landowners
- Community consultees
- Petitions (0)

30
1
3
Feedback on the selection and use of our preferred site

Site selection and alternative sites

20.1.3 Main supportive and neutral feedback comments raised by respondents included:

- support for the use of the preferred site and changes to the proposed use of the preferred site since phase one consultation
- the preferred site is considered more suitable than the site put forward at phase one consultation; in particular it avoids significant archaeological impacts at Druid Street.
- qualified support subject to re-assurance regarding the number of expected spills at this CSO.

20.1.4 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- the reasons for changing proposals relating to the interception of the Shad Thames Pumping Station CSO are unclear
- the preferred site put forward at phase one consultation, Druid Street, is more suitable because the new site location and strategy appears to downgrade the usefulness of the CSO system in this area, with the result that more sewage overflow into the River Thames will occur than would have been the case at Druid Street. Storing sewage in the existing sewer will also cause heavy siltation, leading to heavy maintenance problems
- alternative site suggestions, included Druid Street.

Permanent design and appearance

20.1.7 No main supportive or neutral feedback comments, as defined in paragraph 1.1.7, were received.

20.1.8 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- specific suggested design amendments, including no windows on the facade facing Wheat Wharf, use dark brickwork on the Wheat Wharf side to minimise maintenance, retain the Victorian façade
- reduce the height of the buildings.

Management of operational effects

20.1.9 No main supportive or neutral feedback comments, as defined in paragraph 1.1.7, were received.

20.1.10 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- the general noise and vibration effects arising from the operation of the tunnel
- the effect on the flood risk; assess the risk of surface water flooding from run-off.

Our view of the way forward

20.1.11 We have received a range of feedback on our proposals for this site, including supportive and neutral comments and objections, issues and concerns. We have taken all comments received into account in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008.

20.1.12 In light of the feedback that we have received, we believe that no new information has been highlighted that would change our decision to use Shad Thames Pumping Station to control the Shad Thames Pumping Station CSO.
Additionally, no new information or issues have been identified that would fundamentally change our proposals for this site. Therefore we will continue to develop the proposals for this site that we published at phase two consultation.

20.1.13 The feedback we have received included detailed comments on the construction and operational effects of the proposed development and the measures we propose to reduce and manage those effects. Detailed comments were also made on our proposals for the permanent design and appearance of the site. Having regard to the feedback we have decided to change our proposals for this site by reducing the height of the replacement building to the rear of the site and minimising the number of openings in the replacement building. These changes will improve the design of our proposals and reduce the impacts on the local community and environment.

20.1.14 In our Statement of community consultation we recognised that we may need to amend our scheme following phase two consultation and that if changes came forward we would consider whether targeted consultation is appropriate. We do not consider that the degree of change in relation to this site or the effect on the local community would affect the nature of the comments received during phase two consultation in such a way as to require further consultation. On that basis, a round of targeted consultation on our proposals for this site is not considered necessary. We will progress with preparation of our application for a development consent order and will incorporate the changes referred to in paragraph 20.1.13. We intend to publicise our proposed application in accordance with Section 48 of the Planning Act 2008 later in 2012. Full details of our proposed scheme will be set out in our DCO application and accompanying documents.

21. Chambers Wharf

21.1 We are proposing to use Chambers Wharf for our construction works and to accommodate the permanent structures required to operate the main tunnel. The site would be used to drive the main tunnel to Abbey Mills Pumping Station and receive the main tunnel from Kirtling Street. It would also receive the Greenwich connection tunnel, which would intercept the three CSOs, known as Greenwich Pumping Station, Deptford Church Street and Earl Pumping Station.

Number of respondents

21.1.2 A total of 639 respondents provided comments on our Chambers Wharf site. The respondents comprised:

![Bar chart showing the distribution of respondents.]

Key:
- **Statutory consultees**
- **Local authorities**
- **Landowners**
- **Community consultees**
- **Petitions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statutory consultees</th>
<th>Local authorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design Council CABE</td>
<td>London Borough of Southwark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Council for Water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater London Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Councils</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port of London Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21.1 Statutory consultees and local authorities who provided feedback on Chambers Wharf

Feedback on the selection and use of our preferred site

Site selection and alternative sites

21.1.3 Main supportive and neutral feedback comments raised by respondents included:

- support for the use of the preferred site since phase one consultation. The site is more suitable than the shortlisted site King’s Stairs Gardens (site 1)
• the physical characteristics of the site make it suitable: it is currently vacant and available for redevelopment; it is a brownfield site; it has good access to the road and the River Thames; no trees would be removed.

21.1.4 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

• object to the use of this preferred site
• the reasons for selecting this preferred site are flawed/questionable; should avoid sites in residential and/or densely populated areas and sites that are close to sensitive receptors, including schools (St Michael’s School and Riverside Primary School)
• the site is too small and does not have sufficient capacity for the works and would need to be extended 50m into the River Thames in order to accommodate the proposals
• alternative site suggestions, included King’s Stairs Gardens and Abbey Mills Pumping Station.

Management of construction works

21.1.5 Main supportive and neutral feedback comments raised by respondents included:

• the proposals will support the redevelopment of the site and/or surrounding area; resultant development site can be used for residential purposes and the provision of a riverside path; the work will open up the Thames Path and pave the way for the high-quality residential development
• support for the proposed site access and use of barges to transport materials as this will reduce the noise and disturbance experienced by residents living nearby
• the proposals will ensure that odour is managed satisfactorily.

21.1.6 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

• concerns regarding the effects of noise, dust and dirt from construction, construction traffic and plant on residential amenity
• concerns regarding working hours including 24-hour working and the duration of works and the effects of associated noise and vibration on residential amenity, sensitive receptors and building structures
• concerns regarding the conflict with emerging regeneration proposals/future developments and adopted planning policy for the site
• the effect of construction activities and structures on character of riverside/river frontage, and river views, specifically Tower Bridge and the Tower of London, a world heritage site
• local roads are unsuitable for construction traffic and concerns regarding the effects of construction traffic on residential amenity, pedestrian and cyclist safety, and access to amenities
• use the river to transport more/all construction materials and spoil
• the disruption to the use of the Thames Path caused by construction works or diversion
• the effect of temporary structures within the river on river flows and currents.

Permanent design and appearance

21.1.7 Main supportive and neutral feedback comments raised by respondents included:

• support for the design including:
  • removal of the projecting wharf and reinstatement of the river edge
  • design and layout of the completed works will enable residential development on the site
• support design for reasons including: the scale of the vents compared to the proposed site development.

21.1.8 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

• object to proposed design for reasons including the effect on the riverside and character of the riverside; the effect on open space; the proximity to residential areas; the scale of proposed development; the relationship to proposed redevelopment for the area
• further consideration should be given to layout so it is compatible with regeneration proposals.
• This should read ‘No main objections, issues and concerns were raised.'
Management of operational effects

21.1.9 The main supportive and neutral feedback comment raised by respondents was that the proposals would ensure that odour is managed; also the requirements for a ventilation shaft plus occasional access for maintenance could be satisfactorily integrated into the new housing development.

21.1.10 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:
- the effect of odour and noise arising from operation of the tunnel and the effect on residential amenity
- concerns regarding the effect of site maintenance and operation on the local community, including the effects of maintenance traffic
- the visual effect of permanent buildings and structures.

Our view of the way forward

21.1.11 We have received a range of feedback on our proposals for this site, including supportive and neutral comments and objections, issues and concerns. We have taken all comments received into account in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008.

21.1.12 In light of the feedback that we have received, we believe that no new information has been identified that would fundamentally change our proposals for this site. Therefore we will continue to develop the proposals for this site that we published at phase two consultation.

21.1.13 The feedback we have received included detailed comments on the construction and operational effects of the proposed development and the measures we propose to reduce and manage those effects. Detailed comments were also made on our proposals for the permanent design and appearance of the site. Having regard to the feedback received we are continuing to refine our detailed proposals for this site to improve the design and reduce the impacts on the local community and environment. Currently we are considering the following changes to the layout and/or appearance of our proposals:
- reviewing the raised ventilation structure previously proposed to abut the river wall to minimise the effect on the future new public realm
- additional noise attenuation measures during construction
- providing a pedestrian crossing near Riverside Primary School
- opportunities to make further use of the river to transport shaft, other excavated materials and sand and aggregates for secondary tunnel linings to reduce the number of lorries on local roads
- appropriate arrangements for cross borough monitoring of the construction phases where relevant in the Code of construction practice.

21.1.14 We are also in discussions with London Borough of Southwark and St James regarding the need for minor amendments to the planning permission for redevelopment of this site for housing and other uses.

21.1.15 In our Statement of community consultation we recognised that we may need to amend our scheme following phase two consultation and that if changes came forward we would consider whether targeted consultation is appropriate. We do not consider that the degree of change in relation to this site or the effect on the local community would affect the nature of the comments received during
Phase two consultation

In such a way as to require further consultation. On that basis, a round of targeted consultation on our proposals for this site is not considered necessary. We will progress with preparation of our application for a development consent order and will incorporate the changes referred to in paragraphs 21.1.13-14 if further work demonstrates that this is appropriate. We intend to publicise our proposed application in accordance with Section 48 of the Planning Act 2008 later in 2012. Full details of our proposed scheme will be set out in our DCO application and accompanying documents.

22. Earl Pumping Station

22.1.1 We are proposing to use our existing pumping station and adjacent industrial land for our construction works and to accommodate the permanent structures required to operate the main tunnel. The site would be used to connect the existing local CSO, known as the Earl Pumping Station CSO, to the main tunnel via a long connection tunnel, known as the Greenwich connection tunnel.

Number of respondents

22.1.2 A total of 18 respondents provided comments on our Earl Pumping Station site. The respondents comprised:

- Statutory consultees
- Local authorities
- Community consultees
- Petitions

Table 22.1 Statutory consultees and local authorities who provided feedback on Earl Pumping Station

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statutory consultees</th>
<th>Local authorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design Council CABE</td>
<td>London Borough of Lewisham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Council for Water</td>
<td>London Borough of Southwark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater London Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feedback on the selection and use of our preferred site

Site selection and alternative sites

22.1.3 Main supportive and neutral feedback comments raised by respondents included:
- support for the use of the preferred site
- the preferred site is more suitable than any of the shortlisted site(s); it is an industrial site and its use would have limited effects on the local area and community
- the site is already owned by Thames Water, which will allow Thames Water to make some cost savings.

22.1.4 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:
- object to the use of this preferred site
- one of the shortlisted sites, foreshore adjacent to the boat yard and St George’s square is more suitable
- site selection needs to be reconsidered
- alternative site suggestions included a brownfield site in Surrey Quays.

Management of construction works

22.1.5 No main supportive and neutral feedback comments, as defined in paragraph 1.1.7, were received

22.1.6 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:
- concerns regarding the effects of construction and construction traffic on air quality and odour
- concerns regarding noise and vibration and the need for more information on working methods
- the effect of works and temporary relocation on businesses; and the requirement for alternative premises
- concerns regarding the effects of construction transport.
Permanent design and appearance

22.1.7 The main supportive and neutral feedback comment raised by respondents was support for the proposed design, including the biodiverse roof and comparison to the existing site.

22.1.8 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- specific design amendments, including integrating the existing building into the design because of its historic value
- other design mitigation suggestions included ensuring that the location and design of the ventilation plant should minimise any noise/odour impacts upon nearby residents
- the proposals should be in keeping with and blend into the character of the local area/minimise visual impact.

Management of operational effects

22.1.9 The main supportive and neutral feedback comment raised by respondents was that the proposals would ensure that odour is managed; also the requirements for a ventilation shaft plus occasional access for maintenance could be satisfactorily integrated into the new housing development.

22.1.10 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- the effect of odour, dust, dirt, noise and vibration arising from operation of the tunnel
- the effect on the flood risk, in particular surface water flooding from run-off.

Our view of the way forward

22.1.11 We have received a range of feedback on our proposals for this site, including supportive and neutral comments and objections, issues and concerns. We have taken all comments received into account in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008.

22.1.12 In light of the feedback that we have received, we believe that no new information has been highlighted that would change the conclusions of our site selection process to date Earl Pumping Station therefore remains our preferred site to connect Earl Pumping Station CSO, to the main tunnel via the Greenwich connection tunnel. Additionally no new information or issues have been identified that would fundamentally change our use or design of this site. Additionally, no new information or issues have been identified that would fundamentally change our proposals for this site. Therefore we will continue to develop the proposals for this site that we published at phase two consultation.

22.1.13 The feedback we have received included detailed comments on the construction and operational effects of the proposed development and the measures we propose to reduce and manage those effects. Detailed comments were also made on our proposals for the permanent design and appearance of the site. Having regard to the feedback received and taking account of ongoing technical work, we are considering a number of detailed changes to the layout and appearance of our proposals which will improve the design and reduce the impacts on the local community and environment. The form of the proposed CSO drop shaft has changed to meet technical requirements and we are therefore considering changing the built form of the above ground part of the proposed shaft to provide an improved streetscape. Due to the level of uncertainty concerning any proposed future development of the current industrial site we are also considering changing the gated arrangement to the operational maintenance area to enable us to secure our site before any future redevelopment on the remainder of the site.

22.1.14 In our Statement of community consultation we recognised that we may need to amend our scheme following phase two consultation and that if changes came forward we would consider whether targeted consultation is appropriate. We do not consider that the degree of change in relation to this site or the effect on the local community would affect the nature of the comments received during phase two consultation in such a way as to require further consultation. On that basis, a round of targeted consultation on our proposals for this site is not considered necessary. We will progress with preparation of our application for a development consent order and will incorporate the changes referred to in paragraph 22.1.13 if further work demonstrates that this is appropriate. We intend to publicise our proposed application in accordance with Section 48 of the Planning
Phase two consultation / Summary report

Act 2008 later in 2012. Full details of our proposed scheme will be set out in our DCO application and accompanying documents.

23. Deptford Church Street

23.1.1 We are proposing to use a site at Deptford Church Street for our construction works and to accommodate the permanent structures required to operate the main tunnel. The site would be used to connect the existing local CSO, known as the Deptford Storm Relief CSO, to the main tunnel via a long connection tunnel, known as the Greenwich connection tunnel.

Number of respondents

23.1.2 A total of 217 respondents provided comments on our Deptford Church Street site. The respondents comprised:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statutory consultees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community consultees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petitions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feedback on the selection and use of our preferred site

Site selection and alternative sites

23.1.3 Main supportive and neutral feedback comments raised by respondents included:

- support for the use of the preferred site because:
  - it will provide an improved public space upon completion which should enhance an area in need of regeneration
  - the physical characteristics of the site make it suitable, including the distance from residential areas; it is not a residential area and so works would have limited effects
  - good local road infrastructure and capacity; good road links and site access.

- support for the identification of a new preferred site since phase one consultation; the preferred site is more suitable than the site put forward at phase one.

23.1.4 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- object to the use of the preferred site; preferred site is considered generally unsuitable
- the reasons for selecting the site are poorly justified/flawed as are the reasons for changing the preferred site since phase one consultation
- site selection should avoid greenfield sites, open space, commercially established areas, sites adjacent to or containing heritage assets, residential and/or densely populated areas
- the scale of effects on the local area and community resulting from the selection of this site is unacceptable; has not been properly considered
- alternative site suggestions, included Convoys Wharf and Borthwick Wharf Foreshore.

Management of construction works

23.1.5 Main supportive and neutral feedback comments raised by respondents included:

- welcome the proposal to enhance other open spaces during the works
- support for the proposed site access and site access routes.
23.1.6 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- concerns regarding the effects on air quality, dust, odour and noise from construction in particular on St Joseph’s Primary School
- concerns that the construction programme is too long
- concerns regarding the effect of the proposed construction works on local heritage assets, including St Paul’s Conservation Area, St Paul’s Church and other listed assets
- conflict with emerging regeneration/ future developments; the local community have plans for a community garden on the site
- the loss of existing mature trees and other vegetation and the effect on the Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) and the local nature reserve
- the temporary loss of public open space is unacceptable, particularly as there is a shortage of public open space in the local area; it is an area that provides a valuable recreational amenity for the community for exercising and dog-walking
- the effect on quality of life and disruption to children’s education due to the proximity to residential areas and local amenities such as St Joseph’s School
- construction will cause/exacerbate traffic congestion along Deptford High Street/the A2209 and affect access to the local area
- the loss of car parking will affect the accessibility of the local area and increase parking pressures, particularly for the commercial units on Crossfield Street in terms of deliveries and servicing, as well as the parking for parishioners at St Paul’s Church and drop off and collection associated with St Joseph’s Primary School.

Permanent design and appearance
23.1.7 The main supportive and neutral feedback comment raised by respondents was support for the design proposals.

23.1.8 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- object to the proposed design as it is not in keeping with and will have a negative effect on the character and appearance of the local area, which is a conservation area, and the setting of St Paul’s Church
- concerns regarding the scale of the proposed ventilation columns
- Design should incorporate tree planting.

Management of operational effects
23.1.9 No main supportive or neutral feedback comments, as defined in paragraph 1.1.7, were received.

23.1.10 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- concerns regarding the potential effects on air quality and odour during operation and the effects on amenity and health
- the permanent loss of open space is unacceptable
- the proposals will impact on local regeneration due to the effects of the permanent structures on views and the character of the local area as well as the loss of open space.

Our view of the way forward
23.1.11 We have received a range of feedback on our proposals for this site, including supportive and neutral comments and objections, issues and concerns. We have taken all comments received into account in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008.

23.1.12 In light of the feedback that we have received, we believe that no new information has been highlighted that would change the conclusions of our site selection process to date. Deptford Church Street therefore remains our preferred site to connect Deptford Storm Relief CSO, to the main tunnel via the Greenwich connection tunnel. Additionally, no new information or issues have been identified that would fundamentally change our proposals for this site. Therefore we will continue to develop the proposals for this site that we published at phase two consultation.

23.1.13 The feedback we have received included detailed comments on the construction and operational effects of the proposed development and the measures we propose to reduce and manage those effects. Detailed comments were also made on our proposals.
for the permanent design and appearance of the site. Having regard to the feedback received we are continuing to refine our detailed proposals for this site to improve the design and reduce the impacts on the local community and environment. Currently we are considering the following changes to the layout and/or appearance of our proposals:

- identification of alternative fire assembly points for St Joseph’s Catholic Primary School. Discussions are on-going with the London Borough of Lewisham and St Joseph’s regarding the suitability of the proposed alternatives
- the use of semi-mature trees in our landscaping, which we will discuss with our stakeholders.

23.1.14 Should our transport assessment conclude that the temporary closure of the northbound carriageways of Deptford Church Street (putting north and southbound traffic onto the existing southbound lanes) will result in unacceptable impacts we will consider options that could maintain a single northbound carriageway through our proposed site for the period required to do the works to intercept the sewer under the road. No changes would be required to either of the southbound carriageways.

23.1.15 In our Statement of community consultation we recognised that we may need to amend our scheme following phase two consultation and that if changes came forward we would consider whether targeted consultation is appropriate. We do not consider that the degree of change in relation to this site or the effect on the local community would affect the nature of the comments received during phase two consultation in such a way as to require further consultation. On that basis, a round of targeted consultation on our proposals for this site is not considered necessary. We will progress with preparation of our application for a development consent order and will incorporate the changes referred to in paragraphs 23.1.13-14. We intend to publicise our proposed application in accordance with Section 48 of the Planning Act 2008 later in 2012. Full details of our proposed scheme will be set out in our DCO application and accompanying documents.

24. Greenwich Pumping Station

24.1.1 We are proposing to use the site of our existing pumping station for our construction works and to accommodate the permanent structures required to operate the main tunnel. The site would be used to connect the existing local CSO, known as the Greenwich Pumping Station CSO, to the Greenwich connection tunnel, which would direct flows into the main tunnel. The site would also be used to drive the Greenwich connection tunnel.

Number of respondents

24.1.2 A total of 44 respondents provided comments on our Greenwich Pumping Station site. The respondents comprised:

- 33 statutory consultees
- 3 local authorities
- 7 community consultees
- 0 petitions

### Statutory consultees
- Design Council CABE
- Consumer Council for Water
- English Heritage
- Environment Agency
- Greater London Authority
- London Councils
- Port of London Authority

### Local authorities
- Royal Borough of Greenwich

Table 24.1 Statutory consultees and local authorities who provided feedback on Greenwich Pumping Station
Feedback on the selection and use of our preferred site

**Site selection and alternative sites**

24.1.3 Main supportive and neutral feedback comments raised by respondents included:

- support for the use of the preferred site
- support for the changes to the proposed use of the preferred site since phase one consultation
- the site is already an operational Thames Water site/is owned by Thames Water
- with reluctance, the Royal Borough of Greenwich accepts use of site as a main tunnel drive site
- qualified support for the preferred site included:
  - the proposal must guarantee the legacy of the area, including nearby listed structures and the Creekside Walkway
  - concerns regarding inconvenience during construction.

Management of construction works

24.1.5 No main supportive or neutral feedback comments, as defined in paragraph 1.1.7, were received.

24.1.6 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- the site layout appears to be unsuitable; the CSO shaft is too close to the DLR viaduct, and the associated impacts are unacceptable, unless this can be resolved
- the location of site support/welfare; cannot accept the proposed dismantling and re-erection of the old coal sheds
- the effect of construction activities including construction traffic on residential amenity and quality of life. The creek should be used to transport materials rather than roads.

Permanent design and appearance

24.1.7 The main supportive and neutral feedback comment raised by respondents was support for the design proposals.

24.1.8 The main objection, issue and concern raised by respondents included:

- Effect of design proposals on listed building(s) and/or the setting of the listed building(s).

Management of operational effects

24.1.9 No main supportive or neutral feedback comments, as defined in paragraph 1.1.7, were received.

24.1.10 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- the effect of odour from operation of the tunnel
- the permanent effect on listed buildings or structures including concerns regarding the legacy for the listed buildings
• the provision of compensation habitat, including consideration of restoration of Deptford Creek and the creation of a living wall.

**Our view of the way forward**

24.1.11 We have received a range of feedback on our proposals for this site, including supportive and neutral comments and objections, issues and concerns. We have taken all comments received into account in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008.

24.1.12 In light of the feedback that we have received, we believe that no new information has been highlighted that would change the conclusions of our site selection process to date. Greenwich Pumping Station therefore remains our preferred site to connect the Greenwich Pumping Station CSO to the Greenwich connection tunnel and to drive the Greenwich connection tunnel. Additionally, no new information or issues have been identified that would fundamentally change our proposals for this site. Therefore we will continue to develop the proposals for this site that we published at phase two consultation.

24.1.13 The feedback we have received included detailed comments on the construction and operational effects of the proposed development and the measures we propose to reduce and manage those effects. Detailed comments were also made on our proposals for the permanent design and appearance of the site. Having regard to the feedback received and taking account of ongoing technical work we are looking at options for use of the site during construction that could enable us to not have to dismantle, store and reinstate the listed coal sheds, which would reduce the impacts on the local community and environment.

24.1.14 In our Statement of community consultation we recognised that we may need to amend our scheme following phase two consultation and that if changes came forward we would consider whether targeted consultation is appropriate. We do not consider that the degree of change in relation to this site or the effect on the local community would affect the nature of the comments received during phase two consultation in such a way as to require further consultation. On that basis, a round of targeted consultation on our proposals for this site is not considered necessary. We will progress with preparation of our application for a development consent order and will incorporate the changes referred to in paragraph 24.1.13 if further work demonstrates that this is appropriate. We intend to publicise our proposed application in accordance with Section 48 of the Planning Act 2008 later in 2012. Full details of our proposed scheme will be set out in our DCO application and accompanying documents.

### 25. King Edward Memorial Park Foreshore

25.1.1 We are proposing to use the foreshore of the River Thames adjacent to King Edward Memorial Park for our construction works, and to accommodate the permanent structures required to operate the main tunnel. The site would be used to connect the existing local CSO, known as the North East Storm Relief CSO, to the main tunnel.

**Number of respondents**

25.1.2 A total of 1,519 respondents provided comments on our King Edward Memorial Park Foreshore site. The respondents comprised:

![Number of respondents chart]

Key:
- Statutory consultees
- Local authorities
- Landowners
- Community consultees
- Petitions

1,501
Table 25.1 Statutory consultees and local authorities who provided feedback on King Edward Memorial Park Foreshore

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statutory consultees</th>
<th>Local authorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design Council CABE</td>
<td>London Borough of Tower Hamlets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Council for Water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater London Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port of London Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feedback on the selection and use of our preferred site

Site selection and alternative sites

25.1.3 Main supportive and neutral feedback comments raised by respondents included:

- support for the use of the preferred site which is considered more suitable than any of the shortlisted site(s)
- the physical characteristics of the site make it suitable, including opportunity to transport materials by barge
- use of the site would have limited effects on the local area and community.

25.1.4 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- opposition to the use of foreshore sites
- a full explanation has not been given as to why Heckford Street is not a viable alternative
- the site selection methodology has not been followed and the cheapest, most profitable option has been selected
- site selection has not incorporated comments and objections from phase one consultation or interim engagement

- insufficient information has been provided on shortlisted sites
- site selection should use/prioritise brownfield sites
- alternative site suggestions, included Heckford Street (to be used in conjunction with King Edward Memorial Park); Heckford Street (to be used alone); a brownfield site.

Management of construction works

25.1.5 Main supportive and neutral feedback comments raised by respondents included:

- mitigation to address air quality and open space and recreation issues and effects on the natural environment is satisfactory. The proposals will allow the local community to continue to use the majority of the park during construction
- the use of open space is preferable to sites located in more built-up areas; the proposals will also deliver long-term benefits for the park
- support for the proposed construction traffic routes, site access and use of river transport
- the effects on local footpaths (specifically the Thames Path) and associated mitigation are satisfactory.

25.1.6 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- concerns regarding the use of the park in an area where there is a general shortage of open space and recreational provision; the park is of great recreational value to the local community and should be protected
- concerns regarding disruption to local pedestrian and cycle routes and the use of the Thames Path due to the diversion
- concerns regarding the effect on air quality, noise, vibration and pollution, including construction transport emissions and the effect on the amenity of park users and nearby residents and their quality of life and health. There is a need to ensure that best practice is enforced though the Code of construction practice
- concerns regarding the duration of the construction programme and whether it will be extended
• concerns regarding the existence of the cofferdam and other structures within the foreshore, and their potential effects on river use, safety and navigation as well as habitats on the foreshore and in the River Thames
• the effect of river transport on commercial and recreational river navigation. Fluvial modelling and a navigational risk assessment must be undertaken
• works should be undertaken so that they minimise the effects on heritage features
• concerns regarding the loss of trees and the general effect on local wildlife and habitats and the impact on the King Edward Memorial Park Site of Importance for Nature Conservation
• concerns regarding the temporary loss of open space, sports facilities, children’s play facilities and opportunities for informal recreation
• need to undertake protection works to the Rotherhithe Tunnel
• effect of construction activities on the character of the riverside and park on local views, including river views
• disruption to the use of the Thames Path due to the diversion.

Permanent design and appearance

25.1.7 Main supportive and neutral feedback comments raised by respondents included:
• general support for the proposals in terms of the permanent layout and design of the site, which will enhance the park and local area and provide some public benefit
• support for the creation of a new area of public open space within the foreshore.

25.1.8 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:
• objection to the proposed design and the size and effects of permanent buildings and structures. Designs must be supported by a compelling vision for the future of the park and reflect its setting
• further consideration should be given to reducing the area of hardstanding and ensuring that surface finishes are appropriate and enhance the design.

Management of operational effects

25.1.9 The main supportive and neutral feedback comment raised by respondents was that mitigation proposed to address open space and recreation issues is satisfactory.

25.1.10 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:
• the effect of reduced air quality odour arising from operation of the tunnel on health and residential amenity and the need for more information. Concerns that the mitigation technology will not operate as expected
• concerns regarding the loss of open space and sports facilities and the impact on the well-being of the community arising from the loss of this valuable local resource
• the effect on river navigation and recreational river users
• the visual impact of permanent buildings and structures on local and riverside views and disruption to the Thames Path
• concerns regarding disruption arising from maintenance; object to permanent site access.

Our view of the way forward

25.1.11 We have received a range of feedback on our proposals for this site, including supportive and neutral comments and objections, issues and concerns. We have taken all comments received into account in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008.

25.1.12 In light of the feedback that we have received, we believe that no new information has been highlighted that would change the conclusions of our site selection process to date. King Edward Memorial Park Foreshore therefore remains our preferred site for connecting the North East Storm Relief CSO to the main tunnel. Additionally, no new information or issues have been identified that would fundamentally change our proposals for this site. Therefore we will continue to develop the proposals for this site that we published at phase two consultation.

25.1.13 The feedback we have received included detailed comments on the construction and operational effects of the proposed development and the measures we propose to reduce and manage those effects. Detailed
comments were also made on our proposals for the permanent design and appearance of the site. Having regard to the feedback received we are continuing to refine our detailed proposals for this site to improve the design and reduce the impacts on the local community and environment. Currently we are considering the following changes to the layout and/or appearance of our proposals:

- whether we can locate any construction site facilities off-site to reduce the effects on the recreational facilities at the western end of the Park
- whether we can introduce any further noise attenuation measures to address noise generated during construction.
- providing a steel open mesh fencing, or similar, along the full extent of our proposed access route off Glamis Road to allow views through to the river and foreshore. A gated access would also be provided across the proposed access road that will only be closed during vehicle movements accessing the site and this will be controlled by traffic marshals to ensure safe movement of traffic and public crossing during construction. When the gates are closed an alternative path to the north of the bowling green will still be open. These requirements will be commitments in our CoCP.
- junction improvements to the Glamis Road and The Highway junction to facilitate a safer access for vehicles.

25.1.14 In our Statement of community consultation we recognised that we may need to amend our scheme following phase two consultation and that if changes came forward we would consider whether targeted consultation is appropriate. We do not consider that the degree of change in relation to this site or the effect on the local community would affect the nature of the comments received during phase two consultation in such a way as to require further consultation. On that basis, a round of targeted consultation on our proposals for this site is not considered necessary. We will progress with preparation of our application for a development consent order and will incorporate the changes referred to in paragraph 25.1.13 if further work demonstrates that this is appropriate. We intend to publicise our proposed application in accordance with Section 48 of the Planning Act 2008 later in 2012. Full details of our proposed scheme will be set out in our DCO application and accompanying documents.

### 26. Bekesbourne Street

26.1.1 We would seek to control the existing local CSO, known as the Holloway Storm Relief CSO, which will not be intercepted by the main tunnel. The site would be used to control the existing local CSO, known as the Holloway Storm Relief CSO.

#### Number of respondents

26.1.2 A total of 12 respondents provided comments on our Bekesbourne Street site. The respondents comprised:

26.1.3 The main supportive and neutral feedback comment raised by respondents included support for the use of the preferred site/most suitable site to undertake the works.
26.1.4 Main objections, issues and concerns raised included:

- the site is unsuitable because: it is a residential area; building will be disruptive for the local community, both during construction and afterwards
- alternative sites have not been properly considered

**Management of construction works**

26.1.5 The main supportive and neutral feedback comment raised by respondents was that the proposals are unlikely to have an impact on the setting of adjacent heritage assets.

26.1.6 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- concerns regarding the effect of construction on air quality, dust, dirt, noise and vibration arising from construction activities and the effect on residential amenity
- the effect of construction activities on archaeology
- concerns regarding construction traffic and the effects on residential amenity and other road users.

**Management of operational effects**

26.1.7 The main supportive and neutral feedback comment raised by respondents was that the proposed working hours are reasonable.

26.1.8 The main objection, issue and concern raised by respondents was the potential health effects of the proposed works on the local population, in particular on children, given the proximity to homes.

**Our view of the way forward**

26.1.9 We have received a range of feedback on our proposals for this site, including supportive and neutral comments and objections, issues and concerns. We have taken all comments received into account in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008.

26.1.10 In light of the feedback that we have received, we believe that no new information has been highlighted that would change our decision to use Bekesbourne Street to control the Holloway Storm Relief CSO. Additionally, no new information or issues have been identified that would fundamentally change our proposals for this site. Therefore we will continue to develop the proposals for this site that we published at phase two consultation.

26.1.11 The feedback we have received included detailed comments on the construction and operational effects of the proposed development and the measures we propose to reduce and manage those effects. Detailed comments were also made on our proposals for the permanent design and appearance of the site. Having regard to the feedback received and taking account of ongoing technical work, we are considering our detailed design for this site which may lead to changes to the layout and/or appearance of our proposals. Currently we are looking at the possibility of relocating the kiosk away from DLR owned land.

26.1.12 In our Statement of community consultation we recognised that we may need to amend our scheme following phase two consultation and that if changes came forward we would consider whether targeted consultation is appropriate. We do not consider that the degree of change in relation to this site or the effect on the local community would affect the nature of the comments received during phase two consultation in such a way as to require further consultation. On that basis a further round of consultation on our proposals for this site is not considered necessary. We will progress with preparation of our application for a development consent order and will incorporate the changes referred to in paragraph 26.1.10.

We intend to publicise our proposed application in accordance with Section 48 of the Planning Act 2008 later in 2012. Full details of our proposed scheme will be set out in our DCO application and accompanying documents.
27. Abbey Mills Pumping Station

27.1.1 We are proposing to use the southern and western part of our existing Abbey Mills Pumping Station site for construction works. The site would receive the main tunnel from Chambers Wharf and connect the main tunnel to the Lee Tunnel, which would transfer the flow of sewage to Beckton Sewage Treatment Works.

Number of respondents

27.1.2 A total of 29 respondents provided comments on our Abbey Mills Pumping Station site. The respondents comprised:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statutory consultees</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authorities</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowners</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community consultees</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petitions (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27.1 Statutory consultees and local authorities who provided feedback on Abbey Mills Pumping Station

Feedback on selection and use of the preferred site

27.1.3 Main supportive and neutral feedback comments raised by respondents included:

- support for the use of the site/support the changes to the proposed use of the preferred site since phase one consultation
- the site is a suitable size and/or has sufficient capacity to accommodate the proposals
- the site is already an operational Thames Water site/is owned by Thames Water
- the effects associated with selection of this site can be managed through mitigation
- the site should also be used as a main tunnel drive site; specifically instead of Chambers wharf
- qualified support subject to clarification being provided as to why the Lee Tunnel shaft cannot be used as the reception shaft instead of constructing a new shaft.

27.1.4 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- object to the use of this preferred site and changes to the proposed use of the preferred site since phase one consultation
- query why shortlisted sites have not been identified
- site selection should avoid sites in residential and/or densely populated areas/ the scale of effects on the local area and community resulting from the selection of this site is unacceptable/has not been properly considered
- the drive strategy and associated use of this site needs to be reconsidered
- the reasons for selecting this preferred site are flawed/questionable.

Management of construction works

27.1.5 No main supportive or neutral feedback comments, as defined in paragraph 1.1.7, were received.
27.1.6 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- use the river rather than roads to transport construction materials and spoil and undertake further viability work to assess feasibility
- concerns regarding the extent of the construction site
- the risk of subsidence associated with tunnelling
- concerns regarding effects of construction traffic on road safety.

**Permanent design and appearance**

27.1.7 The main supportive and neutral feedback comment raised by respondents was support for the design proposals.

27.1.8 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- minimise the area of the permanent site and area of hardstanding
- the proposals should incorporate open space and any residual land not required should be retained as open space.

**Management of operational effects**

27.1.9 The main supportive and neutral feedback comment raised by respondents was that the proposals would ensure that odour is effectively managed.

27.1.10 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- the effect of odour rising from operation of the tunnel
- the permanent building should be sensitive to its local setting and the character of the area.

**Our view of the way forward**

27.1.11 We have received a range of feedback on our proposals for this site, including supportive and neutral comments and objections, issues and concerns. We have taken all comments received into account in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008.

27.1.12 In light of the feedback that we have received, we believe that no new information has been highlighted that would change the conclusions of our site selection process to date. Abbey Mills Pumping Station therefore remains our preferred site to receive the main tunnel from Chambers Wharf and to connect the main tunnel to the Lee Tunnel. Additionally, no new information or issues have been identified that would fundamentally change our proposals for this site. Therefore we will continue to develop the proposals for this site that we published at phase two consultation.

27.1.13 The feedback we have received included detailed comments on the construction and operational effects of the proposed development and the measures we propose to reduce and manage those effects. Detailed comments were also made on our proposals for the permanent design and appearance of the site. Having regard to the feedback received and taking account of ongoing technical work, we are looking at the possible use of barges on the River Lee via Bow Creek to export materials from the proposed shaft construction, if the Lee Tunnel works demonstrate that this is feasible and efficient. Our proposed site plan has been changed to include this possibility.

27.1.14 In our *Statement of community consultation* we recognised that we may need to amend our scheme following phase two consultation and that if changes came forward we would consider whether targeted consultation is appropriate. We do not consider that the degree of change in relation to this site or the effect on the local community would affect the nature of the comments received during phase two consultation in such a way as to require further consultation. On that basis, a round of targeted consultation on our proposals for this site is not considered necessary. We will progress with preparation of our application for a development consent order and will incorporate the changes referred to in paragraph 27.1.13 if further work demonstrates that this is appropriate. We intend to publicise our proposed application in accordance with Section 48 of the Planning Act 2008 later in 2012. Full details of our proposed scheme will be set out in our DCO application and accompanying documents.
28. Beckton Sewage Treatment Works

28.1.1 Our preferred route for the main tunnel ends at Abbey Mills Pumping Station where it would connect with the Lee Tunnel. The Lee Tunnel would then transfer flows captured by the main tunnel from Abbey Mills Pumping Station to Beckton Sewage Treatment Works for treatment.

Number of respondents

28.1.2 A total of nine respondents provided comments on our Beckton Sewage Treatment Works site. The respondents comprised:

- 5 statutory consultees
- 3 local authorities
- 1 English Heritage
- 1 Greater London Authority
- 1 Port of London Authority
- 0 landowners
- 0 community consultees
- 0 petitions

Table 28.1 Statutory consultees and local authorities who provided feedback on Beckton Sewage Treatment Works

Feedback on selection and use of the preferred site

Site selection and alternative sites

28.1.3 Main supportive and neutral feedback comments raised by respondents included:
- support for the use of the preferred site
- no alternative sites were suggested.

28.1.4 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:
- query why shortlisted sites have not been identified
- whether Beckton Sewage Treatment plant is being upgraded to have capacity for the extra sewage it will receive from the main tunnel.

Management of construction works

28.1.5 Main supportive and neutral feedback comments raised by respondents included:
- the potential effects have been minimised by confining the works to the existing pumping station site
- support for the proposed site access
- unlikely to have a detrimental impact on the setting of the reinstated Bazalgette chimney.

28.1.6 The main objection, issue and concern raised by respondents was to use the river rather than roads to transport construction material and spoil.

Permanent design and appearance

28.1.7 The main supportive and neutral feedback comment raised by respondents was support for the design proposals.

28.1.8 No main objections, issues and concerns, as defined in paragraph 1.1.7, were raised.

Management of operational effects

28.1.9 No main supportive and neutral feedback comments, as defined in paragraph 1.1.7, were received.

28.1.10 The main objection, issue and concern raised by respondents was the effect of operational odour; opportunities to further reduce odour nuisance should be taken.

Our view of the way forward

28.1.11 We have received a range of feedback on our proposals for this site, including supportive and neutral comments and objections, issues and concerns. We have taken all comments received into account in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008.

28.1.12 In light of the feedback that we have received, we believe that no new information has been highlighted that would change the conclusions of our site selection process to date. Beckton Sewage Treatment Works therefore remains
our preferred site for treating flows. Additionally, no new information or issues have been identified that would fundamentally change our proposals for this site. Therefore we will continue to develop the proposals for this site that we published at phase two consultation.

28.1.13 The feedback we have received included detailed comments on the construction and operational effects of the proposed development and the measures we propose to reduce and manage those effects. Detailed comments were also made on our proposals for the permanent design and appearance of the site. Having regard to the feedback received and taking account of ongoing technical work, no further changes are proposed to the proposals that were set out at phase two consultation.

28.1.14 In our Statement of community consultation we recognised that we may need to amend our scheme following phase two consultation and that if changes came forward we would consider whether targeted consultation is appropriate. As no changes are proposed at this site a round of targeted consultation on our proposals for this site is not considered necessary. We intend to publicise our proposed application in accordance with Section 48 of the Planning Act 2008 later in 2012. Full details of our proposed scheme will be set out in our DCO application and accompanying documents.

29. Jews Row

29.1.1 At phase one consultation, we identified the need to connect the existing local CSOs, known as Jews Row – Wandle Valley Storm Relief and Jews Row – Falconbrook Storm Relief CSOs, to the main tunnel. We proposed to use the concrete batching plant at Piers Terrace, off Jews Row, for this construction work and to accommodate the permanent structures required to operate the main tunnel.

29.1.2 Since phase one consultation, we have undertaken modifications to the sewage system. Further modelling has established that these changes are sufficient to address the sewage spills at this location.

Therefore, no works are currently proposed at Jews Row.

Number of respondents

29.1.3 A total of seven respondents provided comments Jews Row. The respondents comprised:

![Key: Statutory consultees - Local authorities (0) Landowners (0) Community consultees - Petitions (0)](image)

Feedback on Jews Row

29.1.4 The main supportive and neutral feedback comment raised by respondents was support for changes since phase one consultation which have removed this site from the proposed works.

29.1.5 A number of other comments were received which relate to the use of the site. As we do not propose any works at this site, these comments are not repeated here.

Our view of the way forward

29.1.6 We can confirm that we are no longer proposing to undertake any works at Jews Row as part of the Thames Tunnel project.

30. Other works

30.1.1 In addition to the proposals set out in chapters five to 29 of this report, other works may be required in association with the project. These include minor system modifications, construction support sites and compensatory land.
Number of respondents

30.1.2 A total of three respondents provided comments on other works.

30.1.3 The respondents comprised:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key:</th>
<th>Statutory consultees</th>
<th>Local authorities (0)</th>
<th>Landowners (0)</th>
<th>Community consultees</th>
<th>Petitions (0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statutory consultees</td>
<td>Greater London Authority</td>
<td>Orange Telecom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 30.1 Statutory consultees who provided feedback on Other works

Feedback on our works

30.1.4 Feedback received in relation to other works included:

- understand that no works are proposed to the Charlton Storm Relief CSO as part of the Thames Tunnel project. Should this change and works are planned near Greenwich switch facility, details should be provided

- the combined impact of construction activity needs to be examined in order to assess any impacts/risk, and any impacts/risks must be clearly set out.

Our view of the way forward

30.1.5 We will take into account the detailed comments received as the project develops.

31. Consultation process

31.1 Introduction

31.1.1 Our phase two consultation asked for feedback in relation to the information provided and consultation process adopted. We also asked respondents to confirm whether they had attended our phase two consultation exhibitions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent type</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory consultees</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authorities</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowners</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community consultees</td>
<td>1,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petitions</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,074</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 31.1 Attendance at exhibitions during phase two consultation (question 15)
31.3 Feedback on consultation information

31.3.1 Table 31.2 sets out details of the different groups who responded to confirm whether enough information had been provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent type</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory consultees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authorities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowners</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community consultees</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petitions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 31.2 Do you think you have been provided with enough information and consultation material on the project to enable you to comment? (question 16)

31.3.2 Main supportive and neutral feedback comments raised by respondents included:

- Local residents were provided with enough comprehensible information to respond to phase two consultation
- Leaflets about Thames Water’s drop-in days/exhibitions were delivered directly to local residents
- Consultation documents were delivered directly to local residents’ homes
- Consultation information and material was accessible; easy to read and understand; helpful and informative; comprehensive; and good quality
- Thames Water staff members were well informed and knowledgeable
- Local residents were aware that Thames Water offered language services as part of the consultation process.

31.3.3 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- Local residents were not provided with enough comprehensible information to respond to phase two consultation
- Consultation documents and information were not delivered directly to local residents’ homes
- Leaflets about Thames Water’s drop-in days/exhibitions were not delivered directly to local residents
- Thames Water staff members who attended exhibitions were poorly informed
- It was difficult to access and find documents on the consultation website and the format of the documents on the website was not easy to read. Local residents were not aware that Thames Water offered a language service as part of the consultation process
- Comments in relation to the accuracy of the information provided, including at the exhibitions. Consultation information and material was biased and did not present a balanced view.

31.4 Feedback on the consultation process

31.4.1 Table 31.3 sets out details of the different groups who responded to confirm they had comments on the consultation process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent type</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory consultees</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authorities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowners</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community consultees</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petitions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,556</td>
<td>1,715</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 31.3 Other comments on the Thames Tunnel project consultation process (question 17)

31.4.2 Main supportive and neutral feedback comments raised by respondents included:

- The overall consultation process during phase two consultation was good and transparent
- Thames Water staff members were very helpful; responded promptly to enquiries; and at exhibitions staff members were very approachable
- Thames Water has given people sufficient time and opportunity to submit their comments
- Thames Water has taken on board and responded to feedback provided at phase one consultation
- The consultation website was useful and phase two consultation was well organised
the quality of the exhibitions during phase two consultation was good, as were the presentations

the feedback form was easy to complete.

31.4.3 Main objections, issues and concerns raised by respondents included:

- the consultation period was too short, particularly compared to the duration of phase one consultation
- phase two consultation has not fulfilled the pre-application consultation requirements of the Planning Act 2008
- the overall consultation process was poor. Thames Water has not properly catered for those without access to the internet
- publicity for phase two consultation was poor
- consultation is meaningless since it is a ‘fait accompli’; consultation comments will not be taken into account
- Thames Water must consider the views of local people; this must be documented in a transparent way
- the preferred site was not consulted on at phase one consultation, so phase two consultation is the first opportunity to comment on the suitability of the site, which is not fair
- not every affected person has been directly consulted and some people were only informed about phase two consultation very late in the process
- concerns that the exhibitions were poor quality, badly organised and needed to be open for longer hours in more accessible locations. More Thames Water staff members should have attended
- concerns that the website was not user friendly and problems with operation and functionality
- the feedback form was too complex and not easy to complete
- more effort should have been made to reach hard-to-reach groups including those who speak different languages
- suggestions were received regarding improvements for future engagement/consultation events.

31.5 Our view of the way forward

31.5.1 We have considered the comments received and are confident that we have undertaken a comprehensive consultation exercise. Following comments received at phase two consultation, we will be undertaking targeted consultation at Barn Elms, Putney Bridge Foreshore, Albert Embankment Foreshore and Victoria Embankment Foreshore. This is because the degree of change we are considering and the effect on the local community may affect the nature of the feedback made during phase two consultation.

31.5.2 Feedback comments received at phase two consultation relating to suggestions for future engagement and improvements to the consultation process will be taken into account for future consultation and engagement, subject to compliance with our Statement of community consultation, Community consultation strategy and other considerations, such as cost.

32 Conclusions and next steps

32.1 Introduction

32.1.1 This chapter sets out the key findings and project changes that will be taken forward as a result of the various concerns and comments raised by the phase two consultation. It also provides a summary of our next steps.

32.2 The need, solution, tunnel route and alignment

32.2.1 We recognise that some respondents have concerns about the need for the project and whether a tunnel is the most appropriate solution. We have given careful consideration to these comments and reviewed the detailed evidence contained in the Needs report. Having done so, we still believe that it is essential to reduce the amount of sewage entering the River Thames and that a tunnel represents the best way to achieve this aim.
32.2.2 We recognise that some respondents also have concerns about our preferred tunnel route (Abbey Mills) and its alignment, and would prefer alternative routes. Having considered the comments we have received and weighed them against the other routes, we consider that Abbey Mills remains the most appropriate route, and therefore intend to pursue this option.

32.3 Outcomes for the preferred sites

32.3.1 We have received a range of feedback on our proposals for our preferred sites, including supportive and neutral comments and objections, issues and concerns. We have taken all comments received into account in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008.

32.3.2 In light of the feedback that we have received, we believe that no new information has been brought to our attention that would change the conclusions of our site selection process to date. The sites proposed at phase two consultation therefore remain our preferred sites to construct the Thames Tunnel. As such we will continue with the development of the proposals that we published at phase two consultation for our preferred sites.

32.3.3 The feedback we have received included detailed comments on the construction and operational effects of the proposed development and the measures we propose to reduce and manage those effects. Detailed comments were also been made on our proposals for the permanent design and appearance of our preferred sites.

32.3.4 Having regard to the feedback received we are continuing to refine our detailed proposals for our preferred sites to improve the design and reduce the impacts on the local community and environment. Currently we:

- are considering changes to our proposals for the following sites: Barn Elms, Putney Bridge Foreshore, Albert Embankment Foreshore and Victoria Embankment Foreshore. The changes that we propose at each site are summarised at the end of each site specific chapter. In line with our Statement of community consultation at these sites we will carry out targeted consultation to secure feedback on our proposed revisions. Any comments received in response to our targeted consultation will be taken into account in preparing our development consent order application.

- are considering changes to our proposals for the following sites: Acton Storm Tanks, Hammersmith Pumping Station, Dormay Street, King George’s Park, Carnwath Road Riverside, Falconbrook Pumping Station, Cremorne Wharf Depot, Chelsea Embankment Foreshore, Kirtling Street, Heathwall Pumping Station, Blackfriars Bridge Foreshore, Shad Thames Pumping Station, Chambers Wharf, Earl Pumping Station, Deptford Church Street, Greenwich Pumping Station, Bekesbourne Street King Edward Memorial Park Foreshore and Abbey Mills Pumping Station. The changes that we propose at each site are summarised at the end of each site specific chapter. At these sites we will progress with our application for a development consent order and will incorporate the changes identified if further work demonstrates that this is appropriate. At the listed sites we do not consider that the degree of change in relation to these sites or the effect on the community would affect the nature of comments received during phase two consultation. On that basis a further round of targeted consultation on our proposals for these sites is not considered to be necessary.

32.3.5 No new information or issues have been identified that would fundamentally change our proposals at Beckton Sewage Treatment Works. As such we will continue with the development of our proposals that we published at phase two consultation.

32.4 Next steps

32.4.1 We propose to develop our draft development consent order application scheme based on the outcomes set out in section 32.3. We value the feedback we have received to date and will continue the ongoing dialogue with local communities and stakeholders throughout this process. In finalising our plans and ultimately implementing this project we will make every effort to limit and manage impacts on local communities and the environment as far as we can.
32.4.2 We will also carry out targeted consultation for a number of sites. Our targeted consultation will last for a period of 28 days and will be publicised in line with the approach set out in our *Statement of community consultation*. Following these targeted consultations, we will publicise our proposed application in accordance with the requirements of Section 48 of the Planning Act 2008.

32.4.3 The application for development consent will be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate, where it will be examined in detail by a panel of independent, specialist planning inspectors. User friendly advice notes are available from the National Infrastructure Directorate of the Planning Inspectorate. There are further opportunities to be involved in the process by making relevant representations and submitting written statements so that the Inspectors are aware of all views received. There may also be open floor hearings and Councils will be able to submit Local Impact Reports.

32.4.4 Once the Inspectors have considered all the evidence, they will prepare a detailed report, recommending whether or not to issue the development consent order. This recommendation will be considered and the decision to grant or refuse consent will ultimately be taken jointly by the Secretaries of State at the Department for Communities and Local Government (CLG) and Department of Environment, Food, and Rural Affairs (Defra).