

Statement of Common Ground between Transport for London and London Borough of Southwark

November 2016

THIS PAGE HAS INTENTIONALLY BEEN LEFT BLANK

Silvertown Tunnel

Statement of Common Ground between Transport for London and London Borough of Southwark

TfL Document Reference: ST150030-PLN-ZZZ-ZZ-SOC-ZZ-1285

SOCG Document Reference: 015

*Author: Transport for London and London
Borough of Southwark*

Revision	Date	Description of new version
Version 1	15/11/16	Version for submission at deadline 1

Contents

1.	Introduction	5
1.1	Purpose of the document	5
1.2	Parties to this Statement of Common Ground	5
1.3	Structure of the Statement of Common Ground	5
1.4	The proposed scheme	6
1.5	Introduction to London Borough of Southwark	6
2.	Overview of key correspondence and meetings	8
2.1	Key meetings and correspondence	8
3.	Matters agreed.....	13
4.	Matters not agreed.....	15
5.	Agreement	19

1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose of the document

1.1.1 This Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) is submitted to the Examining Authority in relation to the application by Transport for London (TfL) under section 37 of the Planning Act 2008 (the Act) for an order granting development consent for the construction of the Silvertown Tunnel (“the Scheme”).

1.1.2 The Examining Authority has requested a SoCG between the two parties on three issues; 1. Air quality, 2. Traffic modelling and forecasting and 3. Traffic monitoring and mitigation.

1.1.3 The aim of this SoCG is therefore to provide an update on matters which the two parties agree and matters where agreement has not yet been met in relation to these specific issues. The statement seeks to ensure that the Examining Authority is aware of the material differences between the two parties.

1.1.4 If subsequent changes are made to the draft DCO and the scheme through the examination which affect the London Borough of Southwark’s position, further discussions may take place between the two parties and this SoCG would be updated accordingly.

1.2 Parties to this Statement of Common Ground

1.2.1 This Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) has been jointly prepared by the TfL and the London Borough of Southwark. It sets out matters which are currently agreed between both parties and matters which are not agreed.

1.3 Structure of the Statement of Common Ground

1.3.1 This SoCG comprises five sections:

Section 1 is an introduction to the SoCG and the Scheme;

Section 2 provides an overview of consultation to date between TfL and London Borough of Southwark;

Section 3 provides a list of matters agreed;

Section 4 provides a list of matters not agreed; and

Section 5 contains the parties' signatures.

1.4 The proposed scheme

- 1.4.1 The Scheme involves the construction of a twin bore road tunnel providing a new connection between the A102 Blackwall Tunnel Approach on Greenwich Peninsula (Royal Borough of Greenwich) and the Tidal Basin roundabout junction on the A1020 Lower Lea Crossing/Silvertown Way (London Borough of Newham). The Silvertown Tunnel will be approximately 1.4km long and will be able to accommodate large vehicles including double-deck buses. It will include a dedicated bus, coach and goods vehicle lane.
- 1.4.2 The Scheme also includes the introduction of free-flow user charging at both the Blackwall Tunnel (northern portal located in London Borough of Tower Hamlets) and the new Silvertown Tunnel.
- 1.4.3 On the north side, the tunnel approach road connects to the Tidal Basin Roundabout, which will be altered to create a new signal-controlled roundabout linking the Silvertown Way, Dock Road and the Lower Lea Crossing. Dock Road will be realigned to accommodate the new tunnel and approach road. On the south side, the A102 will be widened to create new slip road links to the Silvertown Tunnel. A new flyover will be built to take southbound traffic exiting the Blackwall Tunnel over the northbound approach to the Silvertown Tunnel. The Scheme includes minor changes to Tunnel Avenue including the removal of the bus-only gate allowing access for all vehicles between Blackwall Lane and Ordnance Crescent. The Boord Street footbridge over the A102 will be replaced with a pedestrian and cycle bridge.
- 1.4.4 New portal buildings will be located close to each tunnel portal to house the plant and equipment necessary to operate the tunnel.
- 1.4.5 TfL propose that the main construction works could commence in late 2018 and will last approximately 4 years with the new tunnel opening in 2022/23.

1.5 Introduction to London Borough of Southwark

- 1.5.1 The London Borough (LB) of Southwark is one of the 32 London boroughs. LB Southwark acts as a local planning authority and the local highway authority for the borough road network

Silvertown Tunnel

Statement of Common Ground between Transport for London and London Borough of Southwark

SOCG Reference: 015

- 1.5.2 LB Southwark is defined as a 'neighbouring local authority'.
- 1.5.3 LB Southwark has a significant riverfront boundary. The River Thames forms the northern boundary of the borough, and five river highway crossings are located within the borough boundary. These are (from east to west): Rotherhithe Tunnel, Tower Bridge, London Bridge, Southwark Bridge and Blackfriars Bridge).
- 1.5.4 TfL has engaged with the LB Southwark on the Scheme during the pre-application process, both in terms of informal non-statutory engagement and statutory consultation.

2. Overview of key correspondence and meetings

2.1 Key meetings and correspondence

2.1.1 A summary of the key meetings and correspondence that has taken place between TfL and LB Southwark is outlined in the table below.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key outcomes and points of discussion
05/03/2012	Letter	2012 consultation response from LB Southwark. Key issues raised; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role of Rotherhithe tunnel in movement of vehicular traffic in East London. • Concern that the study focussed only on vehicular traffic • Request for greater consideration of anticipated growth in Rotherhithe Peninsular in the study
24/01/2013	Letter	2013 consultation response from LB Southwark, in which the council; Reiterated concerns raised in 2012 consultation, being impact on Rotherhithe funnel and focus on vehicular traffic. Raised concern with the modelling approach and assumptions. Requested a coherent strategy from TfL to deal with the existing issues and growth anticipated in the Rotherhithe peninsular.
19/12/2014	Letter	2014 consultation response from LB Southwark. Key issues raised: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts on Rotherhithe Tunnel

Silvertown Tunnel

Statement of Common Ground between Transport for London and London Borough of Southwark

SOCG Reference: 015

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pedestrian and cycling provision
11/02/2015	Meeting	Effect of Silvertown on Rotherhithe
22/06/2015	Email	Provision of report providing TfL's response to issues raised in the 2014 consultation, and offering a meeting to discuss these.
22/07/2015	Meeting	User charging, traffic impacts, bus proposition
02/10/2015	Letter	Consultation letter (s42 (1)(abc)) inviting participation in consultation ¹
23/10/2015	Correspondence	Provision of full suite of hard copy consultation documents
16/11/2015	Email	Consultation reminder and offer of meeting to inform LB Southwark response.
29/11/2015	Letter	<p>Statutory consultation response from LB Southwark (pending formal sign-off). Key points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic modelling (growth assumptions) • Displacement to Rotherhithe Tunnel & Tower Bridge • Air quality impacts/mitigation
08/01/2016	Letter	<p>Ratified consultation response. Key points raised as per response of 29/11/2016:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic modelling (growth assumptions) • Displacement to Rotherhithe Tunnel

Statement of Common Ground between Transport for London and London
Borough of Southwark

SOCG Reference: 015

		<p>& Tower Bridge</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air quality impacts/mitigation
17/02/2016	Email	Update and provision of TfL board paper /decision to proceed to DCO and briefing note re responses received during statutory consultation.
11/04/2016	Email	<p>Follow up to Neighbouring Borough Update meeting on 22/03/2016² covering:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project update • Borough involvement in DCO process • Traffic modelling • Traffic impacts • Environmental impacts
13/05/2016	Email	Advertising the submission of DCO application to PINS and provision of links to documents. Included an offer of a meeting to talk through issues of interest to LB Southwark contained in the DCO documentation
19/05/2016	Email	Request to meet with LB Southwark to discuss DCO progress and any Borough concerns.
12/07/2016	Letter	Official S56 notice served to LB Southwark, alerting to process and timeframe to register as an Interested

² LB Southwark invited to 22/03/2016 Neighbouring Borough workshop by email on 29/02/2016. This invite was accepted but due to a communications failing at the venue on the day LB Southwark's representatives was unable to join the meeting upon arrival.

Silvertown Tunnel

Statement of Common Ground between Transport for London and London Borough of Southwark

SOCG Reference: 015

		Party in the Examination
13/07/2016	Email	Email advertising the commencement of the Examination registration period and detailing the opportunity to submit a relevant representation.
25/07/16	Correspondence	Update email explaining the process of SoCG's and offering a meeting to discuss LB Southwark's key issues/start formally progressing a SoCG. Included with the email was a table capturing some of LB Southwark's key issues in their consultation response and the specific TfL response to these.
26/07/2016	Email	Provision of Steer Davies Gleave (SDG) independent traffic model audit Base and Reference Case audit reports
01/08/2016	Email	Request/invite for meeting with LB Southwark to discuss the Borough's concerns
08/08/2016	Email	Invite to SDG independent traffic model audit findings workshop on 08/10/2016
10/08/2016	Email	Follow up to SDG traffic independent model audit workshop on 08/10/2016
11/08/2016	Relevant Representation	LB Southwark submitted their Relevant Representation
22/08/2016	Email	Meeting invite/agreed for 24 August to discuss Borough concerns
08/09/2016	Email	Request/invite for meeting with LB Southwark to discuss the Borough's concerns, following multiple postponements. Email also highlighted

Statement of Common Ground between Transport for London and London
Borough of Southwark

SOCG Reference: 015

		TfL's scheduled meeting with British Land
05/10/2016	Correspondence (via PINS)	LB Southwark Relevant Representation published on PINS website (submitted 11/08/2016)
14/09/2016	Email	Correspondence highlighting the release of the Rule 6 letter, and the timeframes for SoCGs etc. contained within it. A meeting was requested to discuss the issues LB Southwark referenced in their Relevant Representation.
23/09/2016	Email	Highlighting LB Southwark's identification in Rule 6 letter and request for a meeting to discuss Borough concerns and commence development of an SoCG,
28/09/2016	Call/Email	Call/email confirming LB Southwark's key concerns, Examination timetable and agreeing next steps in order to develop a SoCG.
06/10/2016	Email	Provision of Template SoCG containing first draft of Chapters 1-3. Provision of revised table detailing TfL's position on key points raised by Southwark and whether TfL understands them to be agreed/disagreed at this point.
21/10/2016	Email	Provision of full draft SoCG (v1.1) for LB Southwark comment
09/11/2016	Meetings	Meeting with Bilfinger GVA, LB Southwark and TfL to discuss the draft SoCG and updates to the next version.

3. Matters agreed

Ref	Description of matter	Details of agreement	Record of agreement
3.1 Canada Water and the wider Rotherhithe peninsula Regeneration			
3.1.1	Canada Water Masterplan	The Canada Water and the wider Rotherhithe peninsula area have significant growth potential. The area is identified in LB Southwark's Canada Water Area Action Plan as an important opportunity to contribute to a more successful town centre, and the London Plan identifies the area as an Opportunity Area.	Meeting with LB Southwark and TfL on 09/11/16.
3.1.2	Traffic conditions in the Rotherhithe area	Canada Water and the wider Rotherhithe peninsula is a busy area, with high levels of traffic flow and congestion in the peak hours. A key factor to the high levels of traffic flow and congestion is the proximity of the Rotherhithe Tunnel, which is accessed from the A200.	Meeting with LB Southwark and TfL on 09/11/16.

Statement of Common Ground between Transport for London and London Borough of Southwark

SOCG Reference: 015

<p>3.1.3</p>	<p>Transport Improvements</p>	<p>A number of transport improvements will be required in the local area to support the delivery of the planned growth at Canada Water and the wider Rotherhithe peninsula. These would be required regardless of the Silvertown Tunnel scheme. LB Southwark and other parts of TfL are working with landowners to identify and progress these transport improvements, through the planning process wherever possible. These could include amendments to the highway network, public transport improvements and improved pedestrian and cycle links, all of which are outside of the Silvertown Tunnel scheme.</p>	
--------------	-------------------------------	--	--

4. Matters not agreed

Ref	Description of stakeholder issue	Transport for London response	Current position	Record of discussions
4.1 Traffic Modelling and Forecasting				
4.1.1	<p>The model does not account for growth in the Rotherhithe/Canada Water area.</p> <p>The strategic nature of the model does not allow for the detailed consideration of specific junction / network operation. This is acknowledged by TfL in their TA and they carried out local models to address this but these were very</p>	<p>The modelling takes into account forecast growth set out in the Further Alterations to the London Plan. This includes substantial growth in the Canada Water area. A high growth scenario has also been considered, as summarised in the Transport Assessment, which assumes growth in excess of FALP projections.</p>	<p>TfL is currently undertaking further testing into the potential impacts of the indicative proposed level of growth in the Rotherhithe/Canada Water area. This is to reassure the LB Southwark that TfL's growth assumptions are robust even in a worst case scenario.</p> <p>Further discussion is required with LB Southwark to understand the growth assumptions for the Rotherhithe/Canada Water area.</p> <p>The further testing will be shared with LB Southwark when available.</p>	<p>Meeting with LB Southwark and TfL on 09/11/16.</p>

Statement of Common Ground between Transport for London and London Borough of Southwark

SOCG Reference: 015

	localised around the tunnel approaches and did not include any of the network in Southwark.		At this time LB Southwark still do not consider that the growth assumptions in the model are suitable and the additional modelling is yet to be provided to LB Southwark. Therefore the highway impact is not agreed.	
4.2 Impacts on other crossings				
4.2.1	LB Southwark consider that demand will significantly increase at the Rotherhithe Tunnel and Tower Bridge as a result of the Scheme	TfL has provided a supplementary note to LB Southwark which focuses on TfL's assessment of the scheme on adjacent crossings in more detail.	LB Southwark maintain that the current information does not adequately address this issue.	Meeting with LB Southwark and TfL on 09/11/16.
4.3 Air quality				
4.3.1	LB Southwark are concerned that the Scheme could have	TfL has assessed the air quality impacts of the Scheme as part of the	LB Southwark's view is that TfL's assertion is based on the screening-out of impacts using DMRB criteria, which LB	Meeting with LB Southwark and TfL on

	adverse impacts on air quality in the borough	Environmental Statement. Overall the Scheme is not expected to have a significant impact on air quality in the borough. The Monitoring Strategy will include consideration of the Scheme's air quality impacts, and mitigation will be developed to address any adverse impacts if necessary.	Southwark considers are unreasonable and unrealistic. Therefore, the air quality impact is not agreed. LB Southwark remain of the view that there is insufficient information presented in the Monitoring Strategy or TIMS to suggest any likely mitigation measures that might help LB Southwark achieve its air quality objectives. TfL and Southwark have discussed these points and LB Southwark remains unconvinced of the approach.	09/11/16.
4.4 Monitoring and mitigation				
4.4.1	LB Southwark consider that a detailed package of mitigation needs to be developed now as part of the Scheme	Since the statutory consultation TfL has published considerable additional information on its approach to monitoring, mitigation and user charging. This is set out in the Monitoring Strategy,	TfL and LB Southwark have discussed the proposed approach to mitigation. LB Southwark remains concerned that the mitigation proposed is not prescriptive enough at present. There is no evidence of it being implementable.	Meeting with LB Southwark and TfL on 09/11/16.

Statement of Common Ground between Transport for London and London Borough of Southwark

SOCG Reference: 015

		Traffic Impacts Mitigation Strategy and Charging Policy respectively.		
--	--	---	--	--

5. Agreement

Signed	
Name	
Position	
Company	London Borough of Southwark
Date	
Signed	
Name	
Position	
Company	Transport for London
Date	