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16 Albert Embankment Foreshore

16.1 Introduction

16.1.1 This chapter covers the feedback comments received during phase two consultation regarding our preferred site Albert Embankment Foreshore. This site would be used to connect the existing local combined sewer overflows (CSOs), known as the Clapham Storm Relief CSO and the Brixton Storm Relief CSO, to the main tunnel. Albert Embankment Foreshore was also our preferred site to intercept the Clapham Storm Relief CSO and the Brixton Storm Relief CSO at phase one consultation. In response to stakeholder engagement, phase one consultation responses and scheme development, the extent and construction layout of the site were altered at phase two consultation to minimise the impact on the local community and the environment. For further information regarding the proposals for this site at phase two consultation, refer to the Albert Embankment Foreshore site information paper.

Structure of this chapter

16.1.2 This chapter is organised as listed below, which reflects the structure of the phase two consultation feedback form:

- section 16.2 – Number of respondents
- section 16.3 – Site selection
- section 16.4 – Alternative sites
- section 16.5 – Management of construction works
- section 16.6 – Permanent design and appearance
- section 16.7 – Management of operational effects
- section 16.8 – Our view of the way forward.

16.1.3 In sections 16.3 to 16.7 we present details of the feedback comments raised, the types and total number of respondents, and our response to feedback comments. Where specific objections, issues or concerns have been raised, the final column of the tables indicates whether, in response to the feedback received:

- C – we are considering or proposing change or additional mitigation\(^1\) to that set out in our phase two consultation material
- N – we do not propose to amend our proposals. A full list of the phase two consultation material is set out in Annex A to this report.

16.1.4 Where a response contains a reference to our website, go to [www.thamestunnelconsultation.co.uk](http://www.thamestunnelconsultation.co.uk) for further information, or to access the documents referenced.

---

\(^1\) Mitigation here refers to a wide range of measures set out in our phase two consultation proposals including for example, the Air management plan and other documents as well as those mitigation measures set out in the PEIR.
16.2 Number of respondents

16.2.1 A total of 27 respondents provided feedback on Albert Embankment Foreshore, of which seven were received after the close of phase two consultation. Table 16.2.1 sets out the different groups who provided feedback for this site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statutory consultees</th>
<th>Local authorities</th>
<th>Landowners</th>
<th>Community consultees</th>
<th>Petitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 respondents</td>
<td>1 respondent</td>
<td>3 respondents</td>
<td>17 respondents</td>
<td>0 petitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Design Council CABE (CABE)</td>
<td>- London Borough of Lambeth (LBLam)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Consumer Council for Water (CCW)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- English Heritage (EH)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Environment Agency (EA)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Greater London Authority (GLA)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Port of London Authority (PLA)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16.2.2 Feedback on this site was received in a number of forms, including feedback forms and correspondence (emails and letters).

16.3 Site selection

16.3.1 A series of sites is required in order to build and operate the Thames Tunnel project. To determine our preferred scheme, we are undertaking a site selection process, using a methodology that was adopted after consultation with the relevant local authorities and statutory consultees. For further information on our methodology and process, refer to:

- Site selection project information paper, which sets out the process we followed to find and select our preferred sites
- Site selection methodology paper, which details the methodology used to select construction sites along the route of the main tunnel
- Site selection background technical paper, which provides supporting technical information to the Site selection methodology paper such as the engineering requirements for the size of construction sites.

16.3.2 The results of the site selection process up to phase two consultation are set out in:

- Site information papers, which provide summary information on each of our preferred sites, including the reasons for selecting them
- Phase two scheme development report, which describes how our proposals for the Thames Tunnel project have evolved and provides a detailed account of the site selection process for each of the preferred sites.

16.3.3 In this section, we set out the feedback comments received in relation to the selection of Albert Embankment Foreshore as our preferred site, together with our responses. Our responses provide relevant details of the site selection process and its findings up to phase two consultation. Where appropriate we have also identified further work that we have undertaken in relation to our preferred site, such as the preparation of our Preliminary environmental information report (PEIR). As part of the project design development process, we continue to assess how the effects arising from the proposed development can be addressed. The output of our assessment up to phase two consultation is contained in appendix N of the Design development report and our PEIR (volume 19).

16.3.4 Where respondents commented on matters in relation to management of construction works, permanent design and appearance or the management of operational effects at Albert Embankment Foreshore, these comments are reported in sections 16.5 to 16.7.

Number of respondents

16.3.5 During phase two consultation, respondents were asked to comment on the decision to select Albert Embankment Foreshore as the preferred site to intercept the Clapham Storm Relief and Brixton Storm Relief CSOs (see question 2 of the phase two consultation feedback form, provided in appendix M of the Main report on phase two consultation). Table 16.3.1 sets out details of the different groups who responded and were asked to select ‘supportive’, ‘opposed/concerned’ or ‘don’t know/unsure’. Tables 16.3.2 and 16.3.3 then detail the feedback comments received in relation to this site. It should be noted that not all respondents who provided feedback comments selected ‘supportive’, ‘opposed/concerned’ or ‘don’t know/unsure’.
Table 16.3.1 Views on whether Albert Embankment Foreshore should be our preferred site (Q2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent type</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Supportive</th>
<th>Opposed/concerned</th>
<th>Don't know/unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statutory consultees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authorities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowners</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community consultees</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petitions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supportive and neutral comments in relation to our preferred site

Table 16.3.2 Supportive and neutral comments in relation to the selection of our preferred site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Supportive and neutral comments</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.3.6</td>
<td>Support the use of the preferred site.</td>
<td>GLA, 7484, LR9447</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Your support is noted and welcomed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.3.7</td>
<td>The site is sufficiently far away from residential areas/is not a residential area.</td>
<td>7484</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Noted. We took effects on residents into account as part of our site selection process as well as the ability to mitigate any likely significant effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.3.8</td>
<td>Qualified support for the preferred site included:</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Refer to paragraph 16.5.22, for response to navigational risk assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As English Heritage is aware, we are undertaking a historic environment assessment, which will assess likely significant effects on the setting of adjacent heritage assets, as part of our environmental impact assessment. This will identify any likely significant effects during construction and any mitigation required in order to address them. We consider that it would be possible to appropriately mitigate any adverse effects on surrounding heritage assets, in particular the Grade II listed Vauxhall Bridge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- English Heritage has accepted the necessity of using this site provided that adverse impacts on this site and on heritage assets across the project are properly mitigated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objections, issues and concerns in relation to our preferred site

Table 16.3.3 Objections, issues and concerns in relation to selection of our preferred site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Objections, issues and concerns</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.3.9</td>
<td>Object to the use of this preferred site; opposed in principle to the use of any foreshore sites along the Thames tideway as this is likely to lead to a number of</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The sites that we consulted on at phase two consultation have been identified through an extensive site selection process (see our Site selection methodology paper on our website). We consulted on and agreed the methodology with key stakeholders including potentially</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Objections, issues and concerns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Objections, issues and concerns</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.3.10</td>
<td>This preferred site is generally unsuitable because it will permanently displace London Duck Tours’ (LDT) operations, increase operational risk unnecessarily, devalue nearby residential and office premises and negatively affect the local environment and general ambience.</td>
<td>9287LO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Directly affected local authorities and utilised a multidisciplinary approach to assess potential CSO against engineering, planning, environmental, property and community considerations. We recognise that, given the locations where we are seeking to construct and operate the tunnel, many of the shortlisted sites are constrained. However, based on our assessment we consider that, on balance, Albert Embankment Foreshore is the most suitable site. This is because it would allow both CSOs to be intercepted at one site rather than two separate sites and would have less effect than the other shortlisted sites. For further details on the results of the site selection process, including our assessment of shortlisted sites, refer to appendix N of the Phase two scheme development report. Since selecting Albert Embankment Foreshore as our preferred site, we have continued to review how our proposals would affect LDT’s operations. Refer to paragraphs 16.5.53 and 16.5.58 for further details.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.3.11</td>
<td>Site selection has not incorporated comments and objections from phase one consultation or interim engagement, in particular that the foreshore, adjacent to MI6/SIS Building and Vauxhall Bridge is more appropriate.</td>
<td>9287LO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Following phase one consultation, we considered the comments we received, along with feedback from on-going engagement and new information. We also undertook further technical work. As a result of this review, we still consider Albert Embankment Foreshore to be the most appropriate site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.3.12</td>
<td>Query why shortlisted sites have not been identified.</td>
<td>EH, GLA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The shortlisted sites were listed in the Albert Embankment Foreshore site information paper. Appendix N of the Phase two scheme development report sets out all the sites assessed as part of the site selection process including the shortlisted sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.3.13</td>
<td>Site selection should not use sites in the River Thames foreshore.</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CSOs need to be intercepted along the line of the existing sewer that flows into the River Thames. CSO interception sites need to be as close to the line of the sewer as practicable so there are few options and a more localised approach is required. In the case of the Clapham Storm Relief CSO and the Brixton Storm Relief CSO, the overflow points are located under Vauxhall Bridge, which means it is not possible to avoid the foreshore of the River Thames.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.3.14</td>
<td>The cost of using the site is too high/not cost-effective.</td>
<td>8402</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cost is one of the considerations that inform site assessments, but it is not an overriding factor that outweighs all other engineering, planning, environmental, community, property and wider economic considerations. High acquisition costs alone would not outweigh positive considerations such as use of brownfield land, conformity with planning policy, and ability to construct/operate the proposed works on the site. Equally, a low value site would not become our preferred site if there were significant planning, environmental or community concerns associated with its use. In determining our preferred site, we made a balanced judgement, taking planning, environment, engineering, property and community considerations into account.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.3.15</td>
<td>Do not support changes to the extent of the preferred site since phase one.</td>
<td>LR9292LO, 7453</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>At phase one consultation, we proposed that the construction access would be along the foreshore of the River Thames via Albert Embankment. The limited extent of the site proposed at the time of the consultation was to provide works to intercept CSOs along the Albert Embankment Foreshore. We have now decided that the construction access should be extended to include the foreshore of the River Thames. This will ensure that the works are more effective in intercepting CSOs. We have also identified that the extent of the site required to achieve this objective is consistent with the site data made publicly available by Environment Agency. Further details are provided in section 16.3.11.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Supplementary report on phase two consultation**
Albert Embankment Foreshore

**Ref**

**Objections, issues and concerns**

consultation do not support the specific location of the site. Specifically, use of the foreshore will blight the buildings behind it.

**Respondent ID**

**No.**

**Our response**

Embankment Gardens. Following feedback from phase one consultation, we have amended the proposed site access to be via Lack’s Dock and presented this proposal at phase two consultation. This layout eliminates the potential effect on Albert Embankment Gardens and the listed embankment wall and would reduce the potential likely significant effects on nearby residential properties at Peninsula Heights. As a result of phase two consultation feedback we are considering an alternative construction access between Camelford and Tintagel Houses. This will be the subject of targeted consultation.

We do not expect that the use of the foreshore in this location would lead to planning blight. We consider that our proposals for the permanent layout and design of the site would enhance the riverside.

**Shortlisted sites**

16.3.16

No feedback comments were received in relation to the shortlisted sites.

16.4 **Alternative sites**

16.4.1 During phase two consultation, respondents were invited to suggest alternative sites that they thought should be used to intercept the Clapham Storm Relief and Brixton Storm Relief CSOs instead of Albert Embankment Foreshore (see question 3 of the phase two consultation feedback form, provided in appendix M of the Main report on phase two consultation). The following sites were put forward as possible alternatives:

**Table 16.4.1 Suggested alternative sites to Albert Embankment Foreshore**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Alternative site suggestions</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.4.2</td>
<td>Foreshore, adjacent to MI6/SIS Building and Vauxhall Bridge.</td>
<td>Site would be less intrusive, would have lower construction costs and would have reduced security risks since the site would only have one point of egress. Effects of vibration, noise, air quality and on the foreshore habitat, local residents, and river navigational safety will be less in comparison to the preferred site. Since there will be a CSO interception at this site anyway, should undertake all works at this site. Works would not affect arch 2 of Vauxhall Bridge.</td>
<td>9287LO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>We did identify and consider this site. It is a shortlisted site that we consider less suitable than our preferred site because there is no road access. Temporary access could be created but no permanent access would be available for large vehicles and cranes for operational use. This location is also quite prominent – immediately downstream of Vauxhall Bridge – and the large shaft structure would have more of an effect on the setting of the listed bridge than the interception structure. The location would also be likely to have a greater impact on navigation and the flow of the river than our preferred site because it projects further into the River Thames. As noted in our Phase two scheme development report, we would still require a CSO interception chamber at this location as part of our preferred site. For further details on the results of the site selection process, refer to appendix N of the Phase two scheme development report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16.4.3 Respondents also made the following comments in relation to the availability and identification of alternative sites:
Supportive and neutral feedback comments

Table 16.4.2 Supportive and neutral comments in relation to the availability and identification of alternative sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Supportive and neutral comments</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.4.4</td>
<td>No alternative site is available; Thames Water has done its best to survey alternative sites.</td>
<td>7404,</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Your support is welcomed and noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objections, issues and concerns

16.4.5 No objections, issues and concerns were raised in relation to the availability and identification of alternative sites.

16.5 Management of construction works

16.5.1 This section sets out feedback comments received during phase two consultation in relation to the management of construction works at Albert Embankment Foreshore. This includes the identification of site specific issues affecting construction activities and proposals in relation to the measures proposed to address these issues.

16.5.2 During phase two consultation, respondents were asked whether the site information paper had identified the right key issues associated with Albert Embankment Foreshore during construction and the ways to address these issues (see questions 4a and 4b of the phase two consultation feedback form, provided in appendix M of the Main report on phase two consultation). The first part of question 4a and 4b asked respondents to select ‘agree’, ‘disagree’ or ‘don’t know/unsure’. Where respondents completed this part of the question, the results are set out in tables 16.5.1 and 16.5.2. Tables 16.5.3 to 16.5.26 detail the feedback comments received in relation to this site. It should be noted that not all respondents who provided feedback comments confirmed whether the right issues and the ways to address those issues had been identified.

Table 16.5.1 Do you agree that we have identified the right key issues in the site information paper? (Q4a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent type</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know/unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statutory consultees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authorities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowners</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community consultees</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petitions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16.5.2 Do you agree that we have identified the right way to address the key issues? (Q4b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent type</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know/unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statutory consultees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authorities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowners</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community consultees</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petitions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16.5.3 The following sections set out the feedback comments received from respondents in connection with the identification of key issues associated with Albert Embankment Foreshore during construction and proposals to address these issues. Feedback comments are organised under common themes. The themes are:

**General themes:**
- General feedback comments on key issues
- General feedback comments measures to address the key issues

**Topic-based themes**
- Air quality and odour
- Construction working hours and programme
- Construction site design and layout
- Historic environment
- Land quality and contamination
- Lighting
- Natural environment (aquatic)
- Natural environment (terrestrial)
- Noise and vibration
- Open space and recreation
- Planning and development
- Socio-economic
- Structures and utilities
- Townscape and visual
- Transport and access
- Water and flood risk

**General feedback comments on the identified key issues**

**Supportive and neutral feedback comments in relation to the identified key issues**

16.5.4 No supportive or neutral feedback comments were received in relation to general comments on the identified key issues during construction.

**Objections, issues and concerns in relation to the identified key issues**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Objections, issues and concerns</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.5.5</td>
<td>Information provided on the key issues is misleading/insufficient/flawed.</td>
<td>8402</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>It was imperative to provide a balanced analysis in our consultation material and we do not agree that the material was inaccurate, misleading or biased in our favour. All the material presented contained necessary information for consultees to understand our proposals and make their own judgements.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5.6</td>
<td>Lack of a joined-up approach has meant that a best practice solution for the area and the interests of various parties has not been achieved.</td>
<td>9287LO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>We are discussing our proposals on how to carry out our works at Albert Embankment Foreshore with all the relevant local stakeholders including local business, landowners, the LBLam, the PLA, English Heritage and the Environment Agency to ensure that we take their concerns on board. We are seeking to undertake our works in a manner that would limit the potential effect on local residents, businesses, navigational safety, security and the wider environment. We are developing a Code of construction practice (CoCP) that will set out how we would manage our construction sites in order to minimise disruption to nearby communities. During construction, we would require all contractors to be fully</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16.5.7 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.

Table 16.5.4 Supportive and neutral comments in relation to the measures proposed to address key issues during construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Supportive and neutral comments</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.5.8</td>
<td>Measures to address potential issues are satisfactory.</td>
<td>9287LO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Your comment is noted and welcomed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objections, issues and concerns in relation to the measures proposed to address key issues during construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Objections, issues and concerns</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.5.9</td>
<td>Construction impacts must be minimised at every stage of construction.</td>
<td>GLA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>We have sought to avoid or eliminate potential likely significant effects wherever possible, both by developing robust technical solutions to potential issues such as odour, and through our proposals for the permanent site design and layout. We are also developing a CoCP that will set out how we would manage our construction sites in order to minimise disruption to nearby communities. Measures proposed to address potential likely significant effects are being further developed and considered as part of the environmental impact assessment. The findings of the assessment, together with any recommendations for mitigation, will be available as a part of the Environmental statement that will be submitted with our DCO application.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Air quality and odour

Supportive and neutral feedback comments in relation to air quality and odour

16.5.10 No supportive or neutral feedback comments were received in relation to air quality and odour during construction.

Certified under the Considerate Contractors Scheme. These measures would allow us to identify any unforeseen effects arising from construction and put suitable measures in place to manage them.
Objections, issues and concerns in relation to air quality and odour

Table 16.5.6 Objections, issues and concerns in relation to air quality and odour during construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Objections, issues and concerns</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.5.11</td>
<td>Dust and dirt arising from construction activities.</td>
<td>LR9292LO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Our Managing construction project information paper and draft CoCP set out how dust control measures and dust monitoring equipment would be put in place to minimise likely significant effects of dust from construction activities. Our draft CoCP confirms that an Air management plan would be prepared and implemented for each site to control dust emissions, and proposed techniques would be in line with best practice guidelines. Our preliminary assessment of likely significant air quality effects was reported in our PEIR (volume 19, section 4). Further assessment of nearby properties will be undertaken as part of our on-going environmental impact assessment work and this will be reported in the Environmental statement to be submitted with our DCO application.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5.12</td>
<td>General air pollution effects arising from construction activities.</td>
<td>LR9292LO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supportive and neutral feedback comments in relation to the measures proposed to address key issues

16.5.13 No supportive or neutral feedback comments were received in relation to the measures proposed to address air quality and odour during construction.

Objections, issues and concerns in relation to the measures proposed to address key issues

Table 16.5.7 Objections, issues and concerns in relation to the measures proposed to address air quality and odour during construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Objections, issues and concerns</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.5.14</td>
<td>The GLA and London Council’s Best Practice Guidance (BPG) “The control of dust and emissions from construction and demolition” should be implemented.</td>
<td>GLA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>We can confirm that “The control of dust and emissions from construction and demolition” - Best Practice Guidance 2008 has been taken into account in developing our proposals for this site and details are set out in our draft CoCP.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Construction working hours and programme

Supportive and neutral feedback comments in relation to construction working hours and programme

16.5.15 No supportive or neutral feedback comments were received in relation to construction working hours and programme.

Objections, issues and concerns in relation to construction working hours and programme

Table 16.5.8 Objections, issues and concerns in relation to construction working hours and programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Objections, issues and concerns</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.5.16</td>
<td>The construction programme is too long/concerned about the duration of construction.</td>
<td>8047</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The programming of works at all sites would be configured to minimise the duration of works and associated disruption to the local area where possible. The length of the construction period in the consultation documents comes from the PEIR (volume 19) and we anticipate that in many cases there would be periods during which there would be no or less intensive activity on some sites.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5.17</td>
<td>Other construction programme issue: the volume of tunnel-related construction</td>
<td>8047</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Your comments are noted. Our works have been phased to deliver the tunnel in line with regulatory requirements. Our</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ref | Objections, issues and concerns | Respondent ID | No. | Our response |
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
 | undertaken over the same seven-year period at several sites in the same area. | | | | Environmental statement will assess the cumulative effects of the scheme and at each site. Where significant effects are identified, appropriate mitigation measures will be proposed.

Supportive and neutral feedback comments in relation to the measures proposed to address construction working hours and programme

16.5.18 No supportive or neutral feedback comments were received in relation to the measures proposed to address construction working hours and programme.

Objections, issues and concerns in relation to the measures proposed to address construction working hours and programme

16.5.19 No objective, issues, concerns or suggestions were received in relation to the measures proposed to address construction working hours and programme.

**Construction site design and layout**

Supportive and neutral feedback comments in relation to construction site design and layout

16.5.20 No supportive or neutral feedback comments were received in relation to construction site design and layout.

Objections, issues and concerns in relation to construction site design and layout

Table 16.5.9 Objections, issues and concerns in relation to construction site design and layout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Objections, issues and concerns</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.5.21</td>
<td>Location of the (drop) shaft would risk undermining the piled foundations of Camelford House (which are thought to be up to 30m deep) and the drop shaft would be in excess of 50m deep. Excavation in such conditions is unpredictable and may encounter sands and running water which in turn could undermine the soil beneath the piles.</td>
<td>LR9292LO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Our Settlement project information paper provides information on our approach to protection against the effects of settlement associated with construction of the tunnel. It is acknowledged that construction of the tunnel would cause some small movements in the ground, the level of which would depend on a range of factors including the size and depth of construction works as well as existing ground conditions. We propose to use diaphragm walls to construct the drop shaft at this site to minimise the likelihood of any potential ground movement. Our draft CoCP sets out a range of measures that would be adopted to control and limit the risk of subsidence from the tunnelling and construction works. This includes assessing potential likely significant effects of ground movement in advance and, where necessary, carrying out protective measures. We would monitor actual ground movement during and after tunnelling to check that the ground is reacting as predicted. We would also carry out a defects survey on buildings located over, or close to, our tunnels and worksites where we consider this necessary. These measures are in line with best practice guidelines and details will be set out in the CoCP that we will submit with our DCO application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5.22</td>
<td>Structures in the foreshore of the River Thames are generally in the correct location but the detail of the structure in the river does not appear to have been designed to take account of the navigational risk it creates.</td>
<td>8853</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Our preliminary modelling has indicated that the proposed design is acceptable in terms of flow and scour in the river. We are preparing a Navigational risk assessment as part of our DCO application, the approach to which is being discussed with the PLA. Preliminary discussions with the PLA have informed the design of the site. We are also</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supplementary report on phase two consultation
**Suggestions for construction site design and layout**

16.5.23 No suggestions for site design and layout were received in relation to construction site design and layout during construction.

**Historic environment**

### Supportive and neutral feedback comments in relation to the historic environment

16.5.24 No supportive or neutral feedback comments were received in relation to the historic environment during construction.

**Objections, issues and concerns in relation to the historic environment**

### Table 16.5.10 Objections, issues and concerns in relation to the historic environment during construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Objections, issues and concerns</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.5.25</td>
<td>Effect of construction activities on listed building(s) or structure(s) including the Grade II* Vauxhall Bridge and Grade II Embankment wall.</td>
<td>GLA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Our draft CoCP (provided at phase two consultation) has identified that works to listed buildings would be undertaken in accordance with all required consents and licences and that protection measures would be put in place at the start of the works. We would also notify English Heritage and the LBLam prior to undertaking works.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5.26</td>
<td>Effect of construction activities on archaeology from construction works and dredging.</td>
<td>EH, 8797</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>We recognise that the eastern part of the site lies within the North Lambeth and Lambeth Palace Archaeological Priority Area. Our phase two consultation material included a preliminary assessment of likely significant archaeological effects, as detailed in the PEIR (volume 19, section 7). Our preliminary assessment identified that the site’s main archaeological potential would be for prehistoric remains on the foreshore. A prehistoric Mesolithic timber structure was recently exposed by river scour. There is also potential for remains of a medieval jetty or wharf and post-medieval industrial remains. The desk-based study of the site suggests that we do not anticipate finds of any buried heritage assets of very high significance that might merit a mitigation strategy of permanent preservation in situ. An assessment of the likely significant effects on the historic environment is being completed as a part of our environmental impact assessment. We are consulting with English Heritage as a part of this process. Our draft CoCP sets out a range of measures that would be adopted by our contractor in respect of archaeology and a full assessment of the likely significant effects of the scheme on the historic environment, together with any recommendations for mitigation, will be set out in the Environmental statement that will be submitted with our DCO application. As set out in our draft CoCP, we would put procedures in place to ensure construction works are</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supportive and neutral feedback comments in relation to the measures proposed to address the effects on the historic environment

16.5.27 No supportive or neutral feedback comments were received in relation to the measures proposed to address the effects on the historic environment during construction.

Table 16.5.11 Objections, issues and concerns in relation to the measures proposed to address the effects on the historic environment during construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Objections, issues and concerns</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 16.5.28 | More information is needed on historic environment mitigation.                                 | EH            | 1   | An assessment of the likely significant effects on the historic environment is being completed as a part of our environmental impact assessment. We are consulting with English Heritage as a part of this process. The findings of the assessment, together with any recommendations for mitigation, will be available as a part of the Environmental statement that will be submitted with our DCO application.  
Additionally, our draft CoCP (provided at phase two consultation) sets out a range of measures to safeguard the historic environment during construction. Such measures include confirmation that works close to listed buildings would be undertaken in accordance with all requirements set out in the DCO and that protection measures, as required, would be put in place at the start of the works. We would also notify English Heritage and the LBLam prior to undertaking works and would continue to engage with them closely on the planning of the works. | N       |
| 16.5.29 | Other heritage mitigation, including minimising impacts on historic structures.                 | GLA           | 1   |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | N       |
| 16.5.30 | Undertake archaeological site survey and excavation.                                           | EH, 8797      | 2   | Our phase two consultation material included a preliminary assessment of likely significant archaeological effects as detailed in the PEIR (volume 19, section 7). An assessment of the effects on the historic environment is being completed as a part of our environmental impact assessment. We are consulting with English Heritage as a part of this process. The findings of the assessment, together with any recommendations for mitigation, will be available as a part of the Environmental statement that will be submitted with our DCO application.  
As set out in our draft CoCP, we would put procedures in place to ensure that construction works are appropriately monitored in order to identify and record any archaeological finds. | N       |
| 16.5.31 | Consult with EH.                                                                                | 8797          | 1   | We will continue to consult with English Heritage in developing our proposals.                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | N       |

Land quality and contamination

16.5.32 No feedback comments were received in relation to land quality and contamination during construction.
Lighting

16.5.33 No feedback comments were received in relation to lighting during construction.

Natural environment (aquatic)

Supportive and neutral feedback comments in relation to the natural environment (aquatic)

16.5.34 No supportive or neutral feedback comments were received in relation to the natural environment (aquatic) during construction.

Objections, issues and concerns in relation to the natural environment (aquatic)

16.5.35 Effect on foreshore habitat(s), although of poor species diversity.

Effect on foreshore habitat(s), although of poor species diversity.

GLA, LR9491

2

As part of our PEIR (volume 19, section 5) we assessed the likely significant construction effects of the proposed development on aquatic ecology, including the foreshore habitat. The PEIR considered the likely significant effects on the foreshore and River Thames and recognised a number of impacts, including those associated with a new cofferdam mooring and any necessary channel reshaping or dredging. Many of the effects would be controlled through the measures set out in our CoCP. We also note that many effects would be temporary and the habitat would recover following removal of the temporary structures. We acknowledge that this is a preliminary assessment. We are preparing a full aquatic ecology assessment for submission in the Environmental statement as part of our DCO application.

Supportive and neutral feedback comments in relation to the measures proposed to address the effects on the natural environment (aquatic)

16.5.36 No supportive or neutral feedback comments were received in relation to the measures proposed to address the effects on the natural environment (aquatic) during construction.

Objections, issues and concerns in relation to the measures proposed to address the effects on the natural environment (aquatic)

16.5.37 Provision of compensation habitat, including refuges for fish and other species.

Provision of compensation habitat, including refuges for fish and other species.

LR9491

1

Many of the effects during the construction phase would be temporary and we anticipate that the habitat would recover following removal of the temporary structures. We do not believe that it is necessary to provide any compensation habitat for the construction phase.

Natural environment (terrestrial)

Supportive and neutral feedback comments in relation to the natural environment (terrestrial)

16.5.38 No supportive or neutral feedback comments were received in relation to the natural environment (terrestrial) during construction.
Objections, issues and concerns in relation to the natural environment (terrestrial)

Table 16.5.14 Objections, issues and concerns in relation to the natural environment (terrestrial) during construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Objections, issues and concerns</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.5.39</td>
<td>More information is needed on the effect of construction activities on the natural environment.</td>
<td>LR9491</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>We consider that we have undertaken a thorough and comprehensive consultation exercise. As part of this, we carefully considered the information we made available at our phase two consultation to ensure that consultees had sufficient information to respond to the consultation. We believe that sufficient information is available regarding the construction phase in the consultation documents such as our draft CoCP and PEIR. We are confident therefore that the information we have provided is sufficient. We are undertaking an environmental impact assessment, which will include a comprehensive assessment of the likely significant effects arising from the proposals. The findings of the assessment, together with any recommendations for mitigation, will be available as a part of the Environmental statement that will be submitted with our DCO application.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5.40</td>
<td>Thames Water should consider the importance of any existing buildings for protected species.</td>
<td>LR9447</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>There are no existing buildings on the site but the significance of the effects of the development on all potential habitats will be assessed and reported in the Environmental statement that will be submitted as part of the application.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supportive and neutral feedback comments in relation to the measures proposed to address the effects the natural environment (terrestrial)

16.5.41 No supportive or neutral feedback comments were received in relation to the measures proposed to address the effects on the natural environment (terrestrial) during construction.

Objections, issues and concerns in relation to the measures proposed to address the effects the natural environment (terrestrial)

Table 16.5.15 Objections, issues and concerns in relation to the measures proposed to address the effects on the natural environment (terrestrial) during construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Objections, issues and concerns</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.5.42</td>
<td>Locate construction activities within the site to avoid sensitive and designated areas.</td>
<td>LR9491</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>All construction activities would be contained within our proposed construction site.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5.43</td>
<td>Other natural environment mitigation, including:</td>
<td>LR9447, LR9491</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>In addition to measures detailed in the CoCP, the following measures are likely to be required: mitigation of the loss of foreshore habitat for foraging wintering birds and replacement planting to mitigate shrub loss and loss of bat and bird habitats. The mitigation requirements will be examined as part of our environmental impact assessment work and this will be reported in the Environmental statement to be submitted with our DCO application.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Noise and vibration

Supportive and neutral feedback comments in relation to noise and vibration

16.5.44 No supportive or neutral feedback comments were received in relation to noise and vibration during construction.
### Objections, issues and concerns in relation to noise and vibration

#### Table 16.5.16 Objections, issues and concerns in relation to noise and vibration during construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Objections, issues and concerns</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.5.45</td>
<td>General noise effects arising from construction activities.</td>
<td>LR9292LO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>As set out in our Albert Embankment Foreshore site information paper, the contractor would be required to implement noise and vibration control measures at the site, in line with the requirements of the CoCP. The contractor would also need to gain approval from the LBLam prior to the construction work through a Section 61 application under the Control of Pollution Act which would set out specific working methods and measures to minimise noise and vibration. This would ensure that the noise levels are reasonable and the best practical means are applied. The measures would be agreed with local authority environmental health officers. Additionally we would implement best practice measures to minimise noise and vibration from plant and works including the selection of appropriate plant and equipment, siting of equipment and use of enclosures to provide acoustic screens. Full details of the measures that will be adopted for the construction will be set out in the CoCP submitted with our DCO application. Our PEIR (volume 19, section 9) sets out our preliminary qualitative assessment of noise and vibration from construction site activities, noise from construction traffic on roads outside the site, and noise and vibration from operation of the site. The proposals set out in our draft CoCP are included in the assessment. The PEIR assessment used the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs’ London noise maps. The Environmental statement that will be submitted with our DCO application will include an assessment of noise and vibration completed in line with a methodology compliant with BS4142 and agreed with the LBLam. If significant noise effects are identified at a site, we will set out mitigation measures to provide appropriate attenuation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5.46</td>
<td>General vibration effects arising from construction activities.</td>
<td>LR9292LO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5.47</td>
<td>Effect of construction vibration on Vauxhall Bridge which is a sensitive structure.</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>We did not identify Albert Embankment as a sensitive receptor in the preliminary noise and vibration assessment in our PEIR (volume 19, section 9). However, we did consider properties closer to the site and did not find any likelihood of damage. Therefore it is unlikely that the bridge would be affected by vibration. However, we would carry out a structural assessment to identify the effects of settlement below the bridge arising from the nearby works at the Albert Embankment Foreshore site and the main tunnel. If necessary, we would agree mitigation measures with the bridge’s owner.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supportive and neutral feedback comments in relation to the measures proposed to address the effects of noise and vibration

16.5.48  No supportive or neutral feedback comments were received in relation to the measures proposed to address the effects of noise and vibration during construction.

**Table 16.5.17** Objections, issues and concerns in relation to the measures proposed to address the effects of noise and vibration during construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Objections, issues and concerns</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.5.49</td>
<td>Erect site hoarding of at least 2.4m around site boundaries close to the commercial office properties.</td>
<td>GLA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Our PEIR (volume 19, section 9) sets out a preliminary assessment of likely significant noise and vibration effects which assumes the use of site enclosures and temporary stockpiles, where practicable and necessary, to provide acoustic screening. At this site we propose a site hoarding of 2.4m.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Open space and recreation

16.5.50  No feedback comments were received in relation to open space and recreation during construction.

Planning and development

16.5.51  No feedback comments were received in relation to planning and development during construction.

Socio-economic

Supportive and neutral feedback comments in relation to socio-economic effects

16.5.52  No supportive or neutral feedback comments were received in relation to socio-economic effects during construction.

**Table 16.5.18** Objections, issues and concerns in relation to socio-economic effects during construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Objections, issues and concerns</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.5.53</td>
<td>Detrimental effect on business operations.</td>
<td>GLA, LR9292LO, 9287LO</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Our proposals seek to maintain safe access for LDT during the construction and operation of the project and we would manage our works accordingly. Our proposals presented at phase two consultation identified construction of a separate access road to our site and managing the shared access onto Albert Embankment (A3036) through the Traffic management plan. As a result of phase two consultation feedback we are considering an alternative construction access between Camelford and Tintagel Houses. This will be the subject of targeted consultation. We are liaising with LDT and the PLA as part of navigational risk assessment that will inform our design development.</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5.54</td>
<td>Proposed construction work will blight the local area.</td>
<td>LR9292LO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>We do not expect that constructing the tunnel in this location would lead to planning blight. We consider that our proposals for the permanent layout and design of the site would enhance the riverside.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supportive and neutral feedback comments in relation to the measures proposed to address socio-economic effects

16.5.55  No supportive or neutral feedback comments were received in relation to the measures proposed to address socio-economic effects during construction.
### Objections, issues and concerns in relation to the measures proposed to address socio-economic effects

**Table 16.5.19 Objections, issues and concerns in relation to the measures proposed to address socio-economic effects during construction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Objections, issues and concerns</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.5.56</td>
<td>Mitigation proposed to address socio-economic effects is inadequate/insufficient.</td>
<td>9287LO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>We believe that we have set out a range of measures based on our preliminary environmental assessment that would mitigate the likely significant effects of the construction at this site. In particular, our draft CoCP identifies that our contractor would be required to implement a range of measures at the site during construction, including best practice measures to minimise noise and vibration from plant and works including the selection of appropriate plant and equipment, siting of equipment, and use of hoardings to provide acoustic screens. Additionally our PEIR assessments take into account the mitigation measures set out in the CoCP and therefore our assessment assume that the mitigation is implemented. We are continuing to develop our CoCP and Environmental statement and will submit them as part of our DCO application. This will include any further mitigation measures that are identified in the full environmental impact assessment.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5.57</td>
<td>Provide appropriate compensation.</td>
<td>LR9292LO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Landowners may have a statutory entitlement to claim compensation for the diminution of the value of their property due to the construction of the tunnel. In addition to the statutory process we have published an Exceptional hardship procedure that sets out how we would assess claims from householders who contend that they are suffering exceptional hardship as a result of being unable to sell their property because it is potentially impacted by our currently published proposals. We have also published a Guide to the Thames Tunnel compensation programme that sets out details of compensation that would be available during construction for damage or loss, required protection measures and compulsory purchase.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5.58</td>
<td>Other socio-economic mitigation comments, including confirm that the operations of LDT can be maintained during construction.</td>
<td>PLA, 9287LO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Our proposals seek to maintain safe access for LDT during construction and operation of the project and we would manage our works accordingly. Our proposals presented at phase two consultation identified construction of a separate access road to our site and managing the shared access onto Albert Embankment (A3036) through the Traffic management plan. As a result of phase two consultation feedback we are considering an alternative construction access between Camelford and Tintagel Houses. This will be the subject of targeted consultation. We are liaising with LDT and the PLA as part of a navigational risk assessment that will inform our design development.</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Structures and utilities
Supportive and neutral feedback comments in relation to structures and utilities

16.5.59 No supportive or neutral feedback comments were received in relation to structures and utilities during construction.

Objections, issues and concerns in relation to structures and utilities

Table 16.5.20 Objections, issues and concerns in relation to structures and utilities during construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Objections, issues and concerns</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.5.60</td>
<td>It is not clear what the scale of the effect on structures and utilities will be; the assessment to date is very vague, particularly in relation to the effect on Vauxhall Bridge.</td>
<td>7453</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Our PEIR (volume 19, section 9) sets out our preliminary assessment of the likely significant effects of noise and vibration. In relation to vibration the assessment considered events that have the potential to damage buildings or structures, as well as the human response to vibration, based on the ‘worst case’ conditions that may arise during vibration intense activities within the site compound. We did not identify Vauxhall Bridge as a sensitive receptor for the purposes of the preliminary noise and vibration assessment. However, we did consider properties that are closer to the site and did not find any likelihood of damage. Therefore it is unlikely that the bridge would be affected by our works. The potential effects on Camelford House are assessed in our PEIR, and we have identified significant construction vibration effects. The other properties that are assessed as part of our PEIR (volume 19, section 9) are detailed at Table 9.4.1.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5.61</td>
<td>Structural damage to Vauxhall Bridge/A202.</td>
<td>GLA, 7453</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5.62</td>
<td>Structural damage to Camelford House.</td>
<td>LR9292LO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5.63</td>
<td>Structural damage to other structures arising from construction activities.</td>
<td>LR9292LO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5.64</td>
<td>Risk of subsidence arising from tunnelling.</td>
<td>LR9292LO, 9237</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>We will undertake an assessment of the impact of our works on the stability of the river wall and flood defences and, where necessary, we would provide strengthening to ensure that the integrity of the wall is maintained. The assessment would be undertaken to meet industry best practice guidelines and the approval of the Environment Agency and other relevant stakeholders. It will be submitted as part of our DCO application. Our Settlement project information paper provides information on our approach to controlling and limiting ground movement, which can cause settlement, associated with construction of the tunnel. It is acknowledged that construction of the tunnel would cause some small movements in the ground, the level of which would depend on a range of factors including the size and depth of construction works as well as existing ground conditions. The use of modern tunnelling methods and the depth of our tunnels, which are generally much deeper than most other tunnels under London, minimise the likelihood of any potential ground movement. We are assessing the potential likely significant effects of ground movement in advance of the works and, where necessary, would carry out protective measures. We would</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5.65</td>
<td>Structural damage to residential buildings arising from tunnelling.</td>
<td>9237</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5.66</td>
<td>Structural damage to other structures arising from tunnelling.</td>
<td>LR9292LO, 9237</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5.67</td>
<td>More information is needed on structural effects and how they would be assessed, including protection of buildings near the River Thames, how “settlement” and any reparative work will be assessed.</td>
<td>7453</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5.68</td>
<td>If conventional pile driving techniques are used to construct the cofferdam in this location, the risk of shelling the brick and stone panels of Camelford House will be greatly increased.</td>
<td>LR9292LO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Objections, issues and concerns</td>
<td>Respondent ID</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Our response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>also monitor actual ground movement during and after the tunnelling to check that the ground is reacting as predicted. We would also carry out a defects survey on buildings located over, or close to, our tunnels and worksites where we consider this necessary. The method used for assessing settlement is similar to that used for the Channel Tunnel Rail Link, the Jubilee Line Extension, and Crossrail. In the unlikely event of damage occurring to property due to our construction works taking place nearby, disturbance compensation may be available as detailed in our Guide to the Thames Tunnel compensation programme.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5.69</td>
<td>Effect of construction activities on Riverside Court drainage system.</td>
<td>9237</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>We are carrying out assessments of the likely significant effects of construction on third party assets and will identify mitigation where required. However, we consider it unlikely that vibration would cause damage to a drainage system due to the depth of the tunnel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5.70</td>
<td>Effect on underground transportation lines including proximity to the Victoria Line tunnels.</td>
<td>GLA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The location of the Victoria Line tunnels is a factor that has influenced our proposals for this site and we have discussed our approach with Transport for London (TfL) as part of our design development process. We do not consider that the presence of the tunnels would preclude development at this site and would take it into account in implementing our construction works at this site. Our Settlement project information paper provides information on our approach to controlling and limiting ground movement, which can cause settlement, associated with construction of the tunnel. It is acknowledged that construction of the tunnel would cause some small movements in the ground, the level of which would depend on a range of factors including the size and depth of construction works as well as existing ground conditions. The use of modern tunnelling methods and the depth of our tunnels, which are generally much deeper than most other tunnels under London, minimise the likelihood of any potential ground movement. We are assessing the potential likely significant effects of ground movement in advance of the works and, where necessary, would carry out protective measures. We would also monitor actual ground movement during and after the tunnelling to check that the ground is reacting as predicted. We would also carry out a defects survey on buildings located over, or close to, our tunnels and worksites where we consider this necessary. The method used for assessing settlement is similar to that used for the Channel Tunnel Rail Link, the Jubilee Line Extension, and Crossrail.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supportive and neutral feedback comments in relation to the measures proposed to address the effects on structures and utilities

16.5.71 No supportive or neutral feedback comments were received in relation to the measures proposed to address the effects on structures and utilities during construction.

Objections, issues and concerns in relation to the measures proposed to address the effects on structures and utilities

Table 16.5.21 Objections, issues and concerns in relation to the measures proposed to address the effects on structures and utilities during construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Objections, issues and concerns</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.5.72</td>
<td>More information is needed on mitigation of effects on structures and utilities and how they would be assessed.</td>
<td>LR9292LO, 7453, 9237</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Our draft CoCP sets out a range of measures that would be adopted to control and limit the risk of subsidence from the tunnelling and construction works. This includes assessing potential likely significant effects of ground movement in advance and, where necessary, carrying out protective measures. Any utilities close to or within our sites would be surveyed prior to and protected during construction. We do not consider the presence of utilities to be a factor that would preclude development at this site.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5.73</td>
<td>Undertake protection works to Vauxhall Bridge and the Victoria Line tunnels.</td>
<td>GLA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Our Settlement project information paper provides information on our approach to protecting against the effects of settlement associated with the construction of the tunnel. We would undertake studies to identify any likely significant effects construction work may have on third party structures (such as buildings, bridges and tunnels). The studies may recommend particular construction methods or, in a very limited instances, protection works. These measures are in line with best practice guidelines and details will be set out in the CoCP that we will submit with our DCO application.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Townscape and visual

16.5.74 No feedback comments were received in relation to townscape and visual effects during construction.

Transport and access

Supportive and neutral feedback comments in relation to transport and access

Table 16.5.22 Supportive and neutral comments in relation to transport and access during construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Supportive and neutral comments</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.5.75</td>
<td>Proposed construction traffic route has good access to the river from nearby roads and Vauxhall Bridge.</td>
<td>7484</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Your support is noted and welcomed. However, as a result of phase two consultation feedback received, we are considering an alternative access between Camelford and Tintagel Houses, which would involve a new access being created onto the TLRN. We will liaise with the relevant highway authorities to discuss the transport effects for the TLRN.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5.76</td>
<td>Support proposed use of barges to transport materials.</td>
<td>PLA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5.77</td>
<td>Improvement compared to the access presented at phase one consultation as no additional access onto the Transport for London Route Network (TLRN) is required.</td>
<td>GLA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5.78</td>
<td>Proposals will ensure that the Thames Path is kept open.</td>
<td>GLA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The current route of the Thames Path would be closed during the works at this site. We would provide a suitable diversion, as detailed in our site information paper. The Thames Path would be restored once our works</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
are complete and enhanced with a new landscaped public area where people could enjoy the views along the River Thames.

## Objections, issues and concerns in relation to transport and access

**Table 16.5.23 Objections, issues and concerns in relation to transport and access during construction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Objections, issues and concerns</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.5.79</td>
<td>Disruption to the use of the Thames Path caused by construction works or diversion.</td>
<td>9055</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Our proposed construction site would require a temporary diversion to the Thames Path, as indicated in the site information paper, in order to maintain a safe route that accesses local amenities. This diversion would ensure that the Thames Path could remain open during construction, and would maintain a safe route. In response to phase two consultation feedback received we are considering an alternative construction access between Camelford and Tintagel Houses. This will be the subject of targeted consultation, which will include details of the Thames Path diversion route under consideration. The detailed route would be agreed with the LBLam and TfL. The proposed diversion would last for the duration of the works, after which the current Thames Path route would be reinstated along the riverfront.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 16.5.80  | Construction traffic will cause traffic congestion particularly on the A3036.                    | GLA           | 1   | At this site we propose to use barges to transport the materials used to fill the cofferdam. This is expected to reduce the number of lorry visits to/from this site by approximately 50 per cent. Road access to this site is proposed via the Albert Embankment (A3036), as illustrated in the Albert Embankment Foreshore site information paper. It is expected that at the peak of construction (years one and two), an average of 29 lorries would visit (travelling to and from) the site each working day, as indicated in the PEIR (volume 19, section 20).

We are reviewing the proposed routes that construction traffic would use as part of our transport assessment, which will also assess cumulative transport effects of traffic associated with other developments in the local area. We would agree which developments to assess with TfL and local highways authorities. If the transport assessment identifies any likely significant effects arising from congestion, we would develop mitigation measures to minimise any disruption.

We are also developing a CoCP (a draft was provided as part of our phase two consultation), which will include requirements for a Traffic management plan to ensure that construction traffic is carefully controlled to minimise any potential likely significant effects on the road network, including access to the local area, as well as setting out | N       |
## Objections, issues and concerns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Objections, issues and concerns</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>construction traffic routes, site access/egress points, signage and monitoring procedures. As part of our PEIR (volume 19, section 12) we assessed the construction transport effects on pedestrian and cycle routes; bus and other public transport routes and patronage; parking; and highway layout, operation and capacity as well as the effects on residential amenity. As part of the assessment we have considered the effects of lorry and (where applicable) barge transport, based on a methodology that has been discussed and agreed with the LBLam and TfL. The PEIR was available as part of our phase two consultation. We acknowledge that this is a preliminary assessment. We are preparing a full Transport assessment for submission as part of our DCO application. The Transport assessment will consider the cumulative effects of our works with other strategic developments in the local area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5.81</td>
<td>Proposed site access is unsuitable and is not designed for heavy goods vehicle traffic. It is not a traffic thoroughfare but gives access onto the footpath on the river embankment for maintenance and repair.</td>
<td>LR9292LO, 9390LO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>We have reviewed the proposed site access and believe that it is suitable. However, as a result of feedback received we are considering an alternative construction access between Camelford and Tintagel Houses. This will be the subject of targeted consultation. Should we retain the access proposed at phase two consultation. However, should we retain the access proposed at phase two consultation, we would carry out access improvement works, where necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5.82</td>
<td>Shared site access is unacceptable.</td>
<td>GLA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>We amended our proposals for access to the site in response to comments received at phase one consultation. We now propose shared access off Albert Embankment, with a segregated access route along Lack's Dock. We believe that we can safely share access with LDT during construction, and we recognise that this would require a high level of co-ordination with LDT. However, as a result of feedback to phase two consultation we are considering an alternative construction access between Camelford and Tintagel Houses. This will be the subject of targeted consultation. We will continue to consult with LDT and other stakeholders as our proposals develop in further detail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5.83</td>
<td>Effect of construction traffic on road safety.</td>
<td>GLA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>We would design site accesses and operate all of our construction sites to ensure that they meet design, health and safety standards. We are developing a CoCP (a draft of which was provided as part of our phase two consultation), which will include requirements for a Traffic management plan to ensure that construction traffic is carefully controlled to minimise any potential likely significant effects on the road.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
network, including access to the local area, as well as setting out construction traffic routes, site access/egress points, signage and monitoring procedures. The transport assessment will also review data in relation to recent accidents and use this to inform future mitigation measures. The proposals will be subject to independent external review by TfL and the LBLam to ensure proposed highway layouts and vehicle movement arrangements are as safe as possible.

16.5.84  Effect of structures required to enable river transport (eg cofferdams) on river navigation and commercial river users, including LDT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Objections, issues and concerns</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.5.84</td>
<td>Effect of structures required to enable river transport (eg cofferdams) on river navigation and commercial river users, including LDT.</td>
<td>8797</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The structure’s impact on navigation from Albert Embankment is the subject of on-going studies and a navigational risk assessment. Where this is shown to have an adverse effect on navigational safety, we will amend our proposals or provide appropriate mitigation in agreement with the PLA and relevant river operators.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supportive and neutral feedback comments in relation to the measures proposed to address the effects of transport and access

16.5.85  No supportive or neutral feedback comments were received in relation to the measures proposed to address the effects of transport and access during construction.

Objections, issues and concerns in relation to the measures proposed to address the effects of transport and access during construction

Table 16.5.24  Objections, issues and concerns in relation to the measures proposed to address the effects of transport and access during construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Objections, issues and concerns</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.5.86</td>
<td>Provide a suitable and safe Thames Path diversion with carefully designed pedestrian crossings and diversionary signage agreed with TfL.</td>
<td>GLA, LBLam</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Our proposed construction site would require a temporary diversion to the Thames Path, in order to maintain a safe route that accesses local amenities. In response to phase two consultation feedback received we are considering an alternative construction access between Camelford and Tintagel Houses. This will be the subject of targeted consultation, which will include details of the Thames Path diversion route under consideration. The detailed route would be agreed with the LBLam and TfL. The proposed diversion would last for the duration of the works, following which the current Thames Path route would be reinstated along the riverfront. The diversion of the Thames Path will be designed to meet all appropriate design and safety standards and will be agreed with TfL and the LBLam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5.87</td>
<td>Undertake fluvial modelling to identify potential effects of river transport and associated structures on river flows.</td>
<td>PLA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>We are undertaking fluvial modelling and preliminary findings have informed the design of the site. Further modelling will be used to refine the designs where appropriate, and will inform the Environmental statement, which will be part of our DCO application. The modelling studies will also support agreements with owners of third party assets, where relevant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5.88</td>
<td>Undertake a navigational assessment to identify the potential effect of river transport</td>
<td>PLA, 8853, LR9273</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>We will be carrying out a Navigational risk assessment for this site, which will form part of our DCO application, and we...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Objections, issues and concerns in relation to water and flood risk during construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Objections, issues and concerns</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.5.89</td>
<td>Use the river to transport more/all construction materials and spoil.</td>
<td>GLA, PLA, LBLam, 7403, LR9236</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>We intend to use the river to bring in and take away materials used to fill the cofferdam, as detailed in our site information paper. However, it is not generally practical and cost-effective to transport all materials by barge so we would still need to transport some materials by road. At this site, use of barges would remove approximately 9,000 lorries from the road during the construction. We are currently considering opportunities for increased use of the river for transportation of materials.</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5.90</td>
<td>Use the river rather than road to transport construction materials and spoil.</td>
<td>7403</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5.91</td>
<td>Other transport and access mitigation comments including: demonstrate suitable arrangements for holding/inspecting vehicles arriving at the site, without disrupting the operation of the A3036.</td>
<td>GLA,</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>If we are required to provide an area for holding/inspecting vehicles for security reasons the contractor would propose a scheme, which would be subject to consultation as part of the regular planning process with TfL and the LBLam. The location and facilities would be subject to approval by the LBLam to ensure proposed highway layouts and arrangements for vehicle movements are as safe as possible.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Water and flood risk

#### Supportive and neutral feedback comments in relation to water and flood risk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Objections, issues and concerns</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.5.92</td>
<td>Effect of flood risk in local homes.</td>
<td>9237</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Our PEIR (volume 19, section 15) sets out a preliminary assessment of likely significant effects on flood risk (level one) in line with the requirements of national policy and considers flooding from the sea (and tidal sources); rivers; land and surface water runoff; and groundwater. As set out in our PEIR, the site is in flood zone 3b where there is a high flood risk. Our modelling to date indicates that neither the temporary works nor the operational scheme would affect flood risk. A level two flood risk assessment will be presented in the Environmental statement as part of our DCO application and will identify any appropriate mitigation. As our designs develop we will review the construction effects on flood risk to determine any requirements for compensation. Our works would maintain the existing flood defences and therefore there would be no effect on flood risk to nearby areas.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Table 16.5.25 Objections, issues and concerns in relation to water and flood risk during construction**

- **Ref:** Reference number.
- **Objections, issues and concerns:** Specific concerns raised by respondents.
- **Respondent ID:** Identification of the respondent.
- **No.:** Number of respondents.
- **Our response:** Details of actions or responses taken in response to the concerns.
- **Outcome:** Outcome or status of the concern.
### Objections, issues and concerns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Objections, issues and concerns</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.5.94</td>
<td>Proposals will result in river erosion and scour.</td>
<td>8797</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>We are carrying out fluvial modelling of the temporary foreshore works to establish what likely significant effects the development would have on the river, and will discuss the findings with the PLA and Environment Agency. We are also undertaking scour modelling. Our design would incorporate mitigation measures to manage the temporary effects of our construction on the river. Where significant scour is predicted, we would carry out preventative measures (such as placing riprap on the river bed), and in all locations the riverbed would be monitored and remedial works carried out if/as required.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5.95</td>
<td>No consultation on tidal flow analysis has taken place. LDT must agree the terms of reference for the tidal flow analysis which LDT is advised is still to be undertaken.</td>
<td>9287LO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fluvial modelling results will inform the navigational risk assessment. We will consult LDT when preparing the navigational risk assessment in order to understand site-specific issues.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Supportive and neutral feedback comments in relation to the measures proposed to address the effects on water and flood risk**

16.5.96 No supportive or neutral feedback comments were received in relation to the measures proposed to address the effects on water and flood risk during construction.

### Table 16.5.26 Objections, issues and concerns in relation to the measures proposed to address the effects on water and flood risk during construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Objections, issues and concerns</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.5.97</td>
<td>More information is needed on mitigation; what plans do you have to avoid damage to Riverside Court?</td>
<td>9237</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>We are carrying out assessments of the effects of construction on third party assets and will identify mitigation where required. However, we consider it unlikely that we would damage Riverside Court with our construction works.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5.98</td>
<td>Other water mitigation, ensure that the design does not cause siltation, erosion or other hydrological impacts.</td>
<td>GLA, 9287LO, 8797</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>We have carried out fluvial modelling of the permanent and temporary foreshore works. The temporary works have been designed in such a way as to minimise scour. Where significant scour is predicted we would carry out preventative measures (such as placing riprap on the river bed), and in all locations the riverbed would be monitored and remedial works carried out if/as required. Riprap presents a change in habitat rather than a loss of habitat. This will be covered in the Environmental statement to be submitted with our DCO application.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16.6 Permanent design and appearance

16.6.1 This section sets out feedback comments received during phase two consultation in relation to proposals for the permanent design and appearance of buildings and structures at Albert Embankment Foreshore that are required for the operation of the tunnel when it is in use (the ‘operational phase’).

16.6.2 During phase two consultation, respondents were asked to give their views on the identification of site specific issues that have influenced proposals for the permanent design of Albert Embankment Foreshore (see question 5 of the phase two consultation feedback form, provided in appendix M of the Main report on phase two consultation). The first part of question 5 asked respondents to select ‘agree’, ‘disagree’ or ‘don’t know/unsure’. Where respondents completed this part of the question, the results are set out in the table below.

Table 16.6.1 Do you agree that we have identified the right issues that have influenced our permanent design for this site? (Q5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent type</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know/unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statutory consultees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authorities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowners</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community consultees</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petitions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16.6.3 As part of the phase two consultation, respondents were also asked to comment on proposals for the permanent design and appearance of the buildings and structures at Albert Embankment Foreshore (see question 6 of the phase two consultation feedback form, provided in appendix M of the Main report on phase two consultation). The first part of question 6 asked respondents to select ‘supportive’, ‘opposed’ or ‘don’t know/unsure’. Where respondents completed this part of the question, the results are set out in the table below.

Table 16.6.2 Please give us your views about our proposals for the permanent design and appearance of the site (Q6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent type</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Supportive</th>
<th>Opposed</th>
<th>Don’t know/unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statutory consultees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authorities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowners</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community consultees</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petitions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16.6.4 The following sections set out the comments received from respondents in connection with proposals for the permanent design and appearance of the buildings and structures at King Edward Memorial Park Foreshore. It should be noted that not all respondents who provided feedback comments provided feedback to the first part of questions 5 and 6.

16.6.5 Feedback comments are organised under the following sub-headings:

- supportive and neutral feedback comments
- objections, issues and concerns
- design suggestions
Where respondents commented on matters arising during the operational phase and the management of these effects (whether through design or by other means), these comments are reported in section 16.7.

Supportive and neutral comments in relation to the permanent design and appearance of the site

Table 16.6.3 Supportive and neutral comments in relation to the permanent design and appearance of the site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Supportive and neutral comments</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.6.7</td>
<td>The design is effective.</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Your comments are noted and welcomed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.6.8</td>
<td>The proposals will enhance the area through more river friendly space and views.</td>
<td>7484</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.6.9</td>
<td>Qualified other supportive comment: design of the permanent works into the river appears generally sympathetic to its location although more detailed clarification is needed.</td>
<td>GLA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 16.6.10 | Support for specific design features:  
- creation of new open space  
- welcome the way the infrastructure around the bridge has stayed clear of the bridge’s springing point  
- decision to mark the termination of the Albert Embankment with an extended river wall and area of hardstanding that is accessible to the public  
- support for the overall approach to the public realm designs  
- notion of a foreshore structure that contrasts with the listed bridge  
- support the idea of conveying the changing water levels through the architecture of the structure  
- ecological benefits of a tiered structure. | (LR)CABE, EH, GLA | 3   |                                     |
| 16.6.11 | Other supportive comment:  
- you have to do what is necessary for the benefit of all concerned. | 7404          | 1   | Your comments are noted.            |

Objections, issues and concerns in relation to the permanent design and appearance of the site

Table 16.6.4 Objections, issues and concerns in relation to the permanent design and appearance of the site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Objections, issues and concerns</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.6.12</td>
<td>Proposals are unattractive/ugly.</td>
<td>7404</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>We note your comments on the design of our proposed project. The design follows our project-wide principles and takes into account comments made at phase one consultation, on-going discussions with consultees and our design review with CABE. Our Design development report (available as part of our phase two consultation) sets out the</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Objections, issues and concerns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Objections, issues and concerns</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.6.13</td>
<td>Further consideration should be given to permanent site design and layout.</td>
<td>(LR)/CABE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Your comment is noted. We continue to develop our design proposals for this site in light of feedback from phase two consultation.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.6.14</td>
<td>Effect of the permanent design and layout on river navigation and commercial river users (Thames Clippers etc).</td>
<td>9287LO, 8853</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The impact of the permanent structure on navigation in the river is the subject of on-going studies and a navigational risk assessment, which will consider navigation of LDT and vessels that use the river past the site, such as Thames Clippers. Where it is demonstrated that this would have an adverse effect on navigational safety, we will amend our proposals or provide appropriate mitigation in agreement with the PLA.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.6.15</td>
<td>There is no guarantee that the eventual design will look like the images in the site information paper.</td>
<td>7453</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>In our site information paper we aimed to illustrate how the completed scheme could look once complete through a combination of photomontages and plans. We have to develop our final proposals in response to feedback from consultation, which means that the designs may change. If a DCO is granted we anticipate a series of conditions on the approval to control the development including on the permanent design and appearance of our proposals. We do not currently know which approval authority would discharge the conditions and be responsible for ensuring compliance.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.6.16</td>
<td>Other negative comments: - do not support creation of new open space as this will create a security risk - wider consultation and consideration of impact is necessary.</td>
<td>9390LO, 8402</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>We believe that the creation of a new area of public realm in this location would help to support active frontage uses in the future, which reflects local policy aspirations for the redevelopment of Tintagel House and Camelford House. With respect to the area near Vauxhall Bridge, we would take account of any relevant security concerns in our proposals for this site. We believe that we have undertaken an appropriate level of public consultation that has provided significant opportunity for the local community to comment on our proposals. Our staged approach to consultation has allowed us to revise our designs in response to comments and concerns.</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Design suggestions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Design suggestions</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.6.17</td>
<td>Design should incorporate tree planting.</td>
<td>7453</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The functional requirements of the tunnel and interception chamber mean that the permanent structure contains a lot of infrastructure meaning that there are very limited opportunities for planting at this site. However, we will</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Ref 16.6.18
**Design suggestions:** Final site design should be informed by local consultation/available for comment. Specifically, the design should be discussed with river users, TfL and the LBLam.

**Respondent ID:** GLA  
**No.:** 1

**Our response:** Consider your comments to see whether it is possible to include more planting as part of the scheme.

**Outcome:** N

### Ref 16.6.19
**Design suggestions:** Proposals should use high quality materials and finishes.

**Respondent ID:** LBLam  
**No.:** 1

**Our response:** Your comments are noted and will be taken into consideration where possible in developing our proposals for this site. However, we note that a number of these comments are already reflected in our proposals, such as providing an improved Thames Path, public realm and high quality materials. We will continue to discuss our proposals for this site with the LBLam, the Design Council CABE, English Heritage and other stakeholders.

**Outcome:** N

### Ref 16.6.20
**Design suggestions:** Design should include recreational facilities, including a small boat stop or ladder with vertical mooring rails in the wall.

**Respondent ID:** 8161  
**No.:** 1

**Our response:** We note that if we introduce more distance between the structure and the river wall and bridge it would encroach further into the River Thames, which we have sought to minimise as much as possible in line with comments from consultees such as the Environment Agency and PLA.

**Outcome:** N

### Ref 16.6.21
**Specific design amendments included:**
- Improved Thames Path and public realm are re-instated
- Consideration should be given to ways in which the design might be enhanced to acknowledge its relationship to the sculpture that forms part of the Grade II* listed Vauxhall Bridge
- Recommend that some thought is given to a reference to Camelford House in the design of the infrastructure east of Lack’s Dock
- Should introduce more distance between the structure and the river wall and bridge
- Should test alternative structural forms, such as a simpler drum structure to be confident that the chosen approach is the right one
- Could take advantage of the changing tide to trap water within the terraces
- Examine whether steps might be incorporated to provide access from the beach.

**Respondent ID:** (LR)CABE, EH, GLA, 8797, 8853, LR9491  
**No.:** 6

**Outcome:** N

### Ref 16.6.22
**Other design mitigation includes:**
- Discuss possible uses of the site

**Respondent ID:** GLA  
**No.:** 1

**Outcome:** N
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref 16.6.23</th>
<th>Design suggestions</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>including use as a public wharf with river users, TfL and the PLA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- some indication has been given to the after use of construction sites, these aspects should be kept under review to reflect needs and opportunities as they appear on completion of works, which in some cases will be ten years from now.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA 1</td>
<td>Reduce the size of the structures within the foreshore of the River Thames and explore the following options:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>We do not propose to reclaim more land from the foreshore than is reasonably required for our proposals. As set out in our site information paper, we propose to intercept the Clapham Storm Relief CSO and Brixton Storm Relief CSO and connect them to the main tunnel at this site. Albert Embankment Foreshore is our preferred site because it would allow us to intercept both CSOs at one site rather than two separate sites. It would have fewer effects than the other shortlisted sites. We have sought to rationalise our permanent works footprint in order to minimise the size of the structure in the foreshore and will continue to consider opportunities to further reduce the size of the permanent structure. The options suggested will be taken into consideration in developing our proposals for this site. We are currently considering the options for this site in light of comments received during our phase two consultation and will continue to discuss our proposals with stakeholders, owners, occupiers and businesses.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- intercept the north storm relief sewer on land adjacent to MI6, running the connecting culvert at a low level to the river side of the wall and to the proposed CSO drop shaft site by Camelford House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- intercept the south relief sewer and divert to the side of MI6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- move the proposed interception and valve chamber nearer to the river wall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- intercept the north and south storm relief sewers one above the other to reduce the extent to which the interception and valve chamber encroach into the river</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- run the south relief sewer connecting culvert below the foreshore to reduce the need for terracing in the river</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- move the CSO drop shaft site by Camelford House in front of MI6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- move the CSO drop shaft site by Camelford House nearer to the river wall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- move the ventilation column and passive filter chamber nearer to the river wall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- reduce the solid encroachment to the side of Lack’s Dock by cantilevering the access slab or supporting on piles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- omit the extension to the Thames Path to the north of the CSO drop shaft site at Camelford House.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16.7 Management of operational effects

16.7.1 This section sets out feedback comments received during phase two consultation in relation to the management of operational effects at Albert Embankment Foreshore. This includes the identification of site specific issues associated with the site once it is operational and proposals in relation to the measures proposed to address these issues.

16.7.2 During phase two consultation, respondents were asked whether the site information paper had identified the right key issues associated with Albert Embankment Foreshore once the site is operational and the ways to address these issues (see questions 7a and 7b of the phase two consultation feedback form, provided in appendix M of the Main report on phase two consultation). The first part of question 7a and 7b asked respondents to select ‘agree’, ‘disagree’ or ‘don’t know/unsure’. Where respondents completed this part of the question, the results are set out in tables 16.7.1 and 16.7.2. Tables 16.7.3 to 16.7.20 detail the feedback comments received in relation to this site. It should be noted that not all respondents who provided feedback comments confirmed whether the right issues and the ways to address those issues had been identified.

Table 16.7.1 Do you agree that we have identified the right key issues in the site information paper? (Q7a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent type</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know/unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statutory consultees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authorities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowners</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community consultees</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petitions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16.7.2 Do you agree that we have identified the right way to address the key issues? (Q7b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent type</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know/unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statutory consultees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authorities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowners</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community consultees</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petitions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16.7.3 The following sections set out the feedback comments received from respondents in connection with the identification of key issues associated with Albert Embankment Foreshore once the tunnel is operational. Feedback comments are organised under common themes. The themes are:

General themes:
- General feedback comments on the key issues
- General feedback comments on measures to address the key issues
### Topic-based themes

- Air quality and odour
- Historic environment
- Land quality and contamination
- Lighting
- Natural environment (aquatic)
- Natural environment (terrestrial)
- Noise and vibration
- Open space and recreation
- Planning and development
- Socio-economic
- Structures and utilities
- Townscape and visual
- Transport and access
- Water and flood risk

### General feedback comments on the key issues

#### Supportive and neutral feedback comments in relation to the identified key issues

16.7.4 No supportive or neutral feedback comments were received in relation to general comments on the key issues during operation.

#### Objections, issues and concerns in relation to the identified key issues during operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Objections, issues and concerns</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.7.5</td>
<td>The scale of potential effects has not been properly assessed and/or underestimated.</td>
<td>8402</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>We consider the issues set out in the site information paper to be the most significant issues associated with the Albert Embankment Foreshore site once the project is operational. It is not, however, an exhaustive list, and further potential issues associated with the site are set out in the PEIR (volume 19) Design development report, Phase two scheme development report, Site selection methodology paper and Site selection background technical paper. We are undertaking an environmental impact assessment, which will include a comprehensive assessment of potential likely significant effects arising from the proposals. The findings of the assessment, together with any recommendations for mitigation, will be available as a part of the Environmental statement that will be submitted with our DCO application.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.7.6</td>
<td>The wrong/none of the key issues have been identified.</td>
<td>8653</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The key issues set out in the Albert Embankment Foreshore site information paper are intended to provide a broad overview of potential effects and key issues associated with the site during construction. It is not, however, an exhaustive list. A more detailed description of possible likely significant effects and the methodology through which they have been identified is provided in other technical reports, including the PEIR (volume 19), Design development report, Phase two scheme development report, Site selection methodology paper and Site selection background technical paper. We are undertaking an environmental impact assessment, which will include a comprehensive assessment of likely significant effects arising from the proposals. The findings of the</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General comments on measures to address the key issues

Supportive and neutral feedback comments in relation to the measures proposed to address the key issues

Table 16.7.4 Supportive and neutral comments in relation to the measures proposed to address the key issues during operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Supportive and neutral comments</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.7.7</td>
<td>Measures to address potential issues are satisfactory.</td>
<td>7404</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Your comment is noted and welcomed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objections, issues and concerns in relation to the measures proposed to address the key issues

Table 16.7.5 Objections, issues and concerns in relation to the measures proposed to address the key issues during operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Objections, issues and concerns</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.7.8</td>
<td>Until the final survey reports are completed, validated and tested it will be very difficult to know if the issues have been addressed correctly.</td>
<td>8797</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>We are undertaking an environmental impact assessment, which will include a comprehensive assessment of potential effects arising from the proposals. The findings of the assessment, together with any recommendations for mitigation, will be available as a part of the Environmental statement that will be submitted with our DCO application.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Air quality and odour

Supportive and neutral feedback comments in relation to air quality and odour

Table 16.7.6 Supportive and neutral comments in relation to air quality and odour during operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Supportive and neutral comments</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.7.9</td>
<td>Proposals will ensure that odour is satisfactorily managed.</td>
<td>GLA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Your support is noted and welcomed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objections, issues and concerns in relation to air quality and odour

Table 16.7.7 Objections, issues and concerns in relation to air quality and odour during operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Objections, issues and concerns</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.7.10</td>
<td>Effect of odour arising from operation of the tunnel.</td>
<td>(LR)/CCW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Our preliminary assessment of the likely significant effects of odour associated with operation of the tunnel is contained in our PEIR (volume 19, section 4) and concludes that no significant effects are predicted in relation to odour when the tunnel is operational. The ventilation facilities would be designed to minimise the release of untreated air from the tunnel system and approximately 99 per cent of the average year, air released from the tunnel would be treated and would not have any odours. This arrangement meets the Environment Agency odour criteria. When the tunnel is empty the ventilation system would be operated so as to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outcome
Albert Embankment Foreshore
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### Table 16.7.8 Objections, issues and concerns in relation to the measures proposed to address the effects of air quality and odour during operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Objections, issues and concerns</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.7.12</td>
<td>No guarantee that the mitigation technology proposed will be delivered or function as stated and not satisfied that the proposed carbon filtering systems will work or be adequate at all times.</td>
<td>LR9292LO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The proposed odour control units would contain activated carbon filters. This is standard technology used worldwide and in the UK. For example the sewage pumping station for the Olympic Park in Stratford has just installed this type of odour control system. If a DCO is granted we anticipate a series of ‘requirements’ (conditions) that would control the development. We expect that the requirements would stipulate the mitigation measures set out in the <em>Environmental statement</em> submitted with the application be implemented. The LBLam would be responsible for ensuring that we comply with the requirements. The tunnel ventilation system would have a number of redundancies built in and work as a complete system so that, in the unlikely event of a failure at one site, the required through-put of air could be maintained by increased ventilation elsewhere on the system. The systems would be monitored and replacements for elements such as the passive filters planned in advance of their life’s end.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.7.13</td>
<td>Install equipment to monitor air quality and odour effects.</td>
<td>GLA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Use of air quality monitoring of equipment is proposed during the operation of the tunnel as set out in the <em>Air management plan</em>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Historic environment**

**Supportive and neutral feedback comments in relation to the historic environment**

16.7.14 No supportive or neutral feedback comments were received in relation to the historic environment during operation.
Objections, issues and concerns in relation to the historic environment

16.7.15 No objections, issues or concerns were received in relation to the historic environment during operation.

Supportive and neutral feedback comments in relation to the measures proposed to address the effects on the historic environment

16.7.16 No supportive or neutral feedback comments were received in relation to the measures proposed to address historic environment during operation.

Objections, issues and concerns in relation to the measures proposed to address the effects on the historic environment

16.7.17 No supportive or neutral feedback comments were received in relation to the measures proposed to address the effects on the historic environment during operation.

Land quality and contamination

Supportive and neutral feedback comments in relation to land quality and contamination

16.7.18 No supportive or neutral feedback comments were received in relation to land quality and contamination during operation.

Objections, issues and concerns in relation to land quality and contamination

Table 16.7.9 Objections, issues and concerns in relation to land quality and contamination during operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Objections, issues and concerns</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.7.19</td>
<td>There is potential for contamination within the site boundary.</td>
<td>8402</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>As set out in the PEIR (volume 19, section 8), we assessed baseline conditions at the site through analysis of available desk-based data, a site walkover and preliminary intrusive ground investigations. A preliminary assessment of the likely significant operational effects of the development determined that it is unlikely that development would result in significant effects. We also consider that due to design measures incorporated into the construction phase (investigation, soil and groundwater as necessary) as well as newly built hardstanding there would not be any impacts on the public from pre-existing contamination in the completed development.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supportive and neutral feedback comments in relation to the measures proposed to address the effects on land quality and contamination

16.7.20 No supportive or neutral feedback comments were received in relation to the measures proposed to address land quality and contamination during operation.

Objections, issues and concerns in relation to the measures proposed to address the effects on land quality and contamination

Table 16.7.10 Objections, issues and concerns in relation to the measures proposed to address the effects on land quality and contamination during operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Objections, issues and concerns</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.7.21</td>
<td>Requirements should deal with contamination.</td>
<td>8402</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Your comments are noted. We do not anticipate that there would be on-going works as part of our management of operational effects with respect to contamination.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lighting

16.7.22 No feedback comments were received in relation to lighting during operation.

Natural environment (aquatic)

Supportive and neutral feedback comments in relation to the natural environment (aquatic)

16.7.23 No supportive or neutral feedback comments were received in relation to the natural environment (aquatic) during operation.
Objections, issues and concerns in relation to the natural environment (aquatic)

Table 16.7.11 Objections, issues and concerns in relation to the natural environment (aquatic) during operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Objections, issues and concerns</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.7.24</td>
<td>Effect on foreshore habitat(s), although of poor species diversity.</td>
<td>LR9491</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Intercepting the CSO would improve water quality and the improvements to the capacity of the sewerage system would result in far fewer low dissolved oxygen events and therefore fewer mass fish mortalities. As part of our PEIR (volume 19, section 5), we assessed the likely significant operational effects of the proposed development on aquatic ecology. The PEIR considered the likely significant effects on the foreshore and River Thames, and concluded that the permanent structure would have a low negative impact given its small area and that improving water quality would be a positive effect of the project. We acknowledge that this is a preliminary assessment. We are preparing a full aquatic ecology assessment for submission in the Environmental statement as part of our DCO application, which will also consider the effects of the permanent structure on river flow and fish movements. We have sought to reduce the amount of foreshore that would be lost, but this needs to be balanced with the engineering requirements of our works and the effect on the local townscape in this location. The loss of habitat in the foreshore contributes to an overall loss across all the project’s in-river sites. We are considering compensation for loss of habitat at a project-wide level and the ecological improvement opportunities for mitigation and enhancement will be set out in the Environmental statement that will be submitted with our DCO application.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.7.25</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>We will consider this further as we undertake our environmental impact assessment and produce the Environmental statement that will be submitted with our DCO application.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supportive and neutral feedback comments in relation to the measures proposed to address the effects on the natural environment (aquatic)

No supportive or neutral feedback comments were received in relation to the measures proposed to address the effects on the natural environment (aquatic) during operation.

Objections, issues and concerns in relation to the measures proposed to address the effects on the natural environment (aquatic)

Table 16.7.12 Objections, issues and concerns in relation to the measures proposed to address the effects on the natural environment (aquatic) during operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Objections, issues and concerns</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.7.26</td>
<td>Provision of compensation habitat, including refuges for fish and other species.</td>
<td>LR9491</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Intercepting the CSO would improve water quality and the improvements to the capacity of the sewerage system would result in far fewer low dissolved oxygen events and therefore fewer mass fish mortalities.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.7.27</td>
<td>Other natural environment mitigation: accumulative land-take of a series of structures along the River Thames there</td>
<td>LR9491</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>As part of our PEIR (volume 19, section 5), we assessed the</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Natural environment (terrestrial)

Supportive and neutral comments in relation to the natural environment (terrestrial)

Table 16.7.13 Supportive and neutral comments in relation to the natural environment (terrestrial) during operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Supportive and neutral comments</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.7.28</td>
<td>Support efforts to minimise the long-term impacts on biodiversity and to secure improvements.</td>
<td>LR9491</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Your comments are noted and welcomed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objections, issues and concerns in relation to the natural environment (terrestrial)

16.7.29 No objections, issues or concerns were received in relation to the natural environment (terrestrial) during operation.

Supportive and neutral feedback comments in relation to the measures proposed to address the effects on the natural environment (terrestrial)

16.7.30 No supportive or neutral feedback comments were received in relation to the measures proposed to address the effects on the natural environment (terrestrial) during operation.

Objections, issues and concerns in relation to the measures proposed to address the effects on the natural environment (terrestrial)

Table 16.7.14 Objections, issues and concerns in relation to the measures proposed to address the effects on the natural environment (terrestrial) during operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Objections, issues and concerns</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.7.31</td>
<td>Provide compensation habitat; put nesting and roosting boxes up.</td>
<td>7404</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>As stated in para 6.1.3 of our PEIR (volume 19, section 6), significant operational effects on terrestrial ecology as a result of the tunnel operation and the infrequent maintenance visits are not anticipated therefore this has not been assessed. A full assessment will be presented in our</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.7.32</td>
<td>Maximise opportunities to enhance biodiversity through an effective mitigation package.</td>
<td>LR9491</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Objections, issues and concerns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Objections, issues and concerns</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.7.33</td>
<td>Locate permanent works within the site to avoid sensitive and designated areas.</td>
<td>LR9491</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>All permanent works would be located within the defined site boundary.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Environmental statement** that will be submitted with our DCO application. This will consider the effects of the development based on a methodology set out in our PEIR.

**Noise and vibration**

16.7.34 No feedback comments were received in relation to noise and vibration during operation.

**Open space and recreation**

16.7.35 No feedback comments were received in relation to open space and recreation during operation

**Planning and development**

16.7.36 No feedback comments were received in relation to planning and development during operation.

**Socio-economic**

Supportive and neutral feedback comments in relation to socio-economic effects

16.7.37 No supportive or neutral feedback comments were received in relation to socio-economic effects during operation.

**Objections, issues and concerns in relation to socio-economic effects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Objections, issues and concerns</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.7.38</td>
<td>Detrimental effect on business operations due to the need to share access, river scouring and visual blind spots.</td>
<td>9287LO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Our proposals seek to maintain LDT’s access to Lack’s dock. We would require access to our structures along Lack’s Dock intermittently to carry out maintenance. As set out in our site information paper, vehicles required for site maintenance would normally comprise a small van every three to six months. Periodically (approximately every ten years) there would be a more detailed site inspection, which would require more vehicles including two cranes. We are liaising with LDT and the PLA to conduct a navigational risk assessment and would implement mitigation measures identified in the assessment so as to allow the safe operation of LDT alongside the permanent works.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supportive and neutral feedback comments in relation to the measures proposed to address socio-economic effects

16.7.39 No supportive or neutral feedback comments were received in relation to the measures proposed to address socio-economic effects during operation.
Objections, issues and concerns in relation to the measures proposed to address socio-economic effects

Table 16.7.16 Objections, issues and concerns in relation to the measures proposed to address socio-economic effects during operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Objections, issues and concerns</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.7.40</td>
<td>Other socio-economic mitigation comment: confirm that LDT’s operations can be maintained permanently.</td>
<td>PLA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Our proposals seek to maintain LDT’s access to Lack’s dock. We would require access to our structures along Lack’s Dock intermittently to carry out maintenance. As set out in our site information paper, vehicles required for site maintenance would normally comprise a small van every three to six months. Periodically (approximately every ten years) there would be a more detailed site inspection, which would require more vehicles including two cranes. We are liaising with LDT and the PLA to conduct a navigational risk assessment and would implement mitigation measures identified in the assessment so as to allow the safe operation of LDT alongside the permanent works.</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Structures and utilities

16.7.41 No feedback comments were received in relation to structures and utilities during operation.

Townscape and visual

16.7.42 No feedback comments were received in relation to townscape and visual effects during operation.

Supportive and neutral feedback comments in relation to transport and access

16.7.43 No supportive or neutral feedback comments were received in relation to transport and access during operation.

Objections, issues and concerns in relation to transport and access

Table 16.7.17 Objections, issues and concerns in relation to transport and access during operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Objections, issues and concerns</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.7.44</td>
<td>Effect of traffic and vehicles required for site maintenance.</td>
<td>7403</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>As set out in our site information paper, vehicles required for site maintenance would normally comprise of a small van every three to six months. Periodically (approximately every ten years) there would be a more detailed site inspection, which would require more vehicles, including two cranes. Given the infrequency of these inspections and the low number of vehicles involved there is not considered to be a traffic effect.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supportive and neutral feedback comments in relation to the measures proposed to address the effects of transport and access

16.7.45 No supportive or neutral feedback comments were received in relation to the measures proposed to address the effects of transport and access during operation.
Objections, issues and concerns in relation to the measures proposed to address the effects of transport and access

Table 16.7.18 Objections, issues and concerns in relation to the measures proposed to address the effects of transport and access during operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Objections, issues and concerns</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.7.46</td>
<td>Provide a suitable Thames Path on completion.</td>
<td>LBLam</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Thames Path would be restored after our works are complete and would be enhanced with a new landscaped public area where people can enjoy the views along the River Thames.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Water and flood risk

Supportive and neutral feedback comments in relation to water and flood risk

16.7.47 No supportive or neutral feedback comments were received in relation to water and flood risk during operation.

Objections, issues and concerns in relation to water and flood risk

Table 16.7.19 Objections, issues and concerns in relation to water and flood risk during operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Objections, issues and concerns</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.7.48</td>
<td>Proposals will result in river erosion and scour.</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>We are carrying out fluvial modelling of the foreshore works to establish what effect the development would have on the river, and will discuss the findings with the PLA and Environment Agency. We are also undertaking scour modelling. Our design would incorporate mitigation measures to manage any permanent effects of our works on the river.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supportive and neutral feedback comments in relation to the measures proposed to address the effects on water and flood risk

16.7.49 No supportive or neutral feedback comments were received in relation to the measures proposed to address the effects on water and flood risk during operation.

Objections, issues and concerns in relation to the measures proposed to address the effects on water and flood risk

Table 16.7.20 Objections, issues and concerns in relation to the measures proposed to address the effects on water and flood risk during operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Objections, issues and concerns</th>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Our response</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.7.50</td>
<td>Suggestions for water mitigation included:</td>
<td>EH, GLA, 9287LO, 8797</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>We are undertaking fluvial modelling to determine the likely significant effects of our permanent works on the river. We are incorporating the findings of our modelling into our design development to mitigate any adverse effects. We will consider the need for foreshore walking to monitor the effects of our project.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16.8 Our view of the way forward

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

16.8.2 In light of the feedback that we 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 the 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.
The feedback we 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 will continue to refine our detailed proposals for this site to improve the design and reduce the impacts on the local community and environment. We are currently 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.

In our SOCC 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.