

Statement of Common Ground between Transport for London and Historic England

September 2016

THIS PAGE HAS INTENTIONALLY BEEN LEFT BLANK

Silvertown Tunnel

Statement of Common Ground between Transport for London and Historic England

TfL Document Reference: ST150030-PLN-ZZZ-ZZ-SOC-ZZ-1291

SOCG Document Reference: SoCG019

Author: Transport for London

Revision	Date	Description of new version
1.0	August 2016	First issue for comment to stakeholder
2.0	September 2016	Revised issue to reflect Relevant Representation
3.0	November 2016	Revised issue 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 Historic England	7
2.	Record of engagement undertaken.....	8
3.	Topics contained within this SoCG	10
3.1	Topics included in SoCG.....	10
4.	Matters agreed.....	11
4.1	Assessment Methodology	11
4.2	Baseline Information	13
4.3	Environmental Design Measures and Mitigation	16
4.4	Assessment Findings and Conclusions.....	21
5.	Matters under discussion	27
5.2	Greenwich World Heritage Site Technical note.....	27
5.3	Draft DCO	27
6.	Matters not agreed.....	29
7.	Agreement	30

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 aim of this SoCG is to provide a clear record of the issues discussed and the current status of those discussions. The SoCG can be used as evidence of these discussions in representations to the Examining Authority as part of its examination of the DCO application.

1.2 Parties to this Statement of Common Ground

1.2.1 This Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) has been jointly prepared by TfL and Historic England. It sets out matters which are agreed between both parties, as well as matters which are not agreed and matters which are under discussion.

1.3 Structure of the Statement of Common Ground

1.3.1 This SoCG comprises six sections:

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

Section 2 provides an overview of consultation to date between TfL and Historic England;

Section 3 provides a summary of the main areas and topics covered by this SoCG;

Section 4 provides a list of matters agreed;

Section 5 provides a list of matters under discussion;

Section 6 provides a list of matters still not agreed; and

Section 7 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, which will enable TfL to provide additional cross-river bus routes.
- 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. This measure will play a fundamental role in managing traffic demand and supporting the financing of the construction, maintenance and operation of the 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 Main construction works could commence in late 2018 and will last approximately 4 years with the new tunnel opening in 2022/23. A Tunnel Boring Machine (TBM) will be used to bore the main tunnel sections under the river with shorter sections of cut and cover tunnel at either end linking the bored sections of the tunnel to the portals. The proposal is to erect and launch the TBM from specially constructed chambers at Silvertown and Greenwich Peninsula where the bored sections and cut and cover sections of the tunnel connect. The main construction worksite will be located at Silvertown, utilising the existing barge facilities at Thames Wharf along with a new temporary jetty for the removal of spoil and delivery of materials by river. A secondary

worksite will be located adjacent to the alignment of the proposed cut and cover tunnel on the Greenwich Peninsula.

1.5 Introduction to Historic England

- 1.5.1 At the start of April 2015, English Heritage separated into two different bodies. A new charity retaining the name English Heritage looks after the National Heritage Collection - the stone circles, castles and abbeys, historic houses and all the other sites that were previously in English Heritage's direct care. Historic England is the competent authority for managing the historic environment of England and in this case for advising on the care of the historic environment in area of the Scheme. All the DCO documents prepared after 1st April 2015 will therefore refer to Historic England as a statutory consultee.
- 1.5.2 TfL has engaged with Historic England on the Scheme during the pre-application process, including both non-statutory engagement and formal statutory consultation carried out pursuant to section 42 of the Planning Act 2008.

2. Record of engagement undertaken

2.1.1 A summary of the meetings and correspondence that has taken place between Transport for London and Historic England in relation to the Scheme is outlined below.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key outcomes and points of discussion
25/07/14	Response to Scoping Report	Points of advice provided: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stakeholder's consultation - Assessment Methodology - Data source - In-river impacts - Mitigation
09/01/15	Meeting with GLASS and EH	Meeting to discuss the scope of assessment including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Geo-archaeological model - Sensitivity of the river foreshore
12/11/15	Section 42 response letter to Statutory Consultation	Comments on the draft PEIR, covering issues including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Potential impacts from settlement - Geo-archaeological model
29/07/16	Email response to the DCO documents	Comments on the Environmental Statement (Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage and Archaeology and associated appendices): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desk Based Assessment - Geo-archaeological

		model
31/08/16	Relevant Representation	<p>Comments received on the Environmental Statement, Code of Construction Practice and Draft DCO relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DMRB methodology - Impacts on the Blackwall Tunnel Gatehouse - Mitigation measures
01/11/16	Email response to revised documentation submitted	<p>Comments received on the revised</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Code of Construction Practice - Cultural Heritage NN NPS and NPPF Compliance - Appendix 8.A Heritage Asset Gazetteer - ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage and Archaeology.
04/11/16	Email response to technical note.	<p>Comments received on the technical note prepared for potential impacts upon Greenwich World Heritage Site.</p>

2.1.2 Transport for London and Historic England have aimed to address all the points raised during consultation.

3. Topics contained within this SoCG

3.1 Topics included in SoCG

3.1.1 The following topics have been discussed with Historic England with regards to Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement (Cultural Heritage and Archaeology) and the relevant appendices:

- Assessment Methodology
- Baseline Information
- Environmental Design Measures and Mitigation
- Assessment Findings and Conclusions

4. Matters agreed

Ref	Description of matter	Details of agreement	Record of agreement
4.1 Assessment Methodology			
4.1.1	<p>Archaeological Priority Areas</p> <p>Historic England outlined in response to the scoping consultation (25 July 2014) that Archaeological Priority Areas (APAs) should be included in the Environmental Statement as key environmental receptors.</p>	<p>It is agreed that APAs have been given due consideration in the existing baseline section (paragraph 8.4.2) of Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1).</p>	<p>Agreed via email dated 1st November 2016 in responding to the revised CoCP; ES Chapter 8; Heritage Asset Gazetteer.</p>
4.1.2	<p>Historic England outlined that the correct reference for the Archaeological Priority Area in Newham is APA3.3 Royal Docks within their Relevant Representation letter dated 31st August 2016.</p>	<p>We note that we have incorrectly referred to the Royal Docks APA as the Newham APA. This is merely a transcription error and the relevant APA information was obtained during the assessment.</p>	<p>Agreed meeting 29/9/2016</p>
4.1.3	<p>3D geo-archaeological deposit model</p> <p>Historic England advised that a</p>	<p>As presented in Appendix 8.B of the ES (Document Reference 6.3.8.2), a 3D geo-archaeological deposit model has been prepared incorporating the route of the proposed tunnel, the</p>	<p>Agreed meeting 29/9/2016</p>

Ref	Description of matter	Details of agreement	Record of agreement
	<p>comprehensive 3D geo-archaeological deposit model of the site and its surroundings would be of critical importance for the assessment (as noted during the meeting on 9 January 2015).</p>	<p>tunnel construction worksites and associated highway work.</p> <p>It is agreed that the method used to depict the sub-surface arrangement of geological deposits and the study area of the model are appropriate for the purpose of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>As outlined in Table 8-2 of Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage and Archaeology of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), it is agreed that the 3D geo-archaeological model will be refined during detailed design and TfL will continue to consult with Historic England.</p>	
4.1.4	<p>Assessment of impacts on the riverbed and foreshore</p> <p>Historic England advised that assessment would also be required of scour or other impacts on the riverbed and foreshore as a result of the construction and operation of the temporary jetty. (Historic England comments on Scoping Report, 25 July 2014)</p>	<p>As noted in paragraph 8.6.6 of Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage and Archaeology of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), the potential impacts of the proposed jetty have been considered in terms of construction and operation.</p> <p>It is agreed that Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage and Archaeology of the ES (Document 6.1) adequately assesses potential impacts relating to scour and dredging.</p>	<p>Agreed via email dated 1st November 2016 in responding to the revised CoCP; ES Chapter 8; Heritage Asset Gazetteer.</p>

Ref	Description of matter	Details of agreement	Record of agreement
4.1.5	<p>Archaeological foreshore survey</p> <p>Historic England recommended a site walk over due to the nature of the foreshore and frequency / extent of exposure and the location of the Scheme and proposed jetty (as noted during the meeting on 9 January 2015).</p>	<p>As noted in Appendix 8.C Archaeological Foreshore Survey (Document Reference 6.3.8.3), a foreshore survey was undertaken in September 2015 in the area of proposed Scheme.</p> <p>It is agreed that the foreshore survey undertaken by TfL and reported in Appendix 8.C Archaeological Foreshore Survey (Document Reference 6.3.8.3) is sufficient to characterise the presence, nature and extent of any archaeologically significant features of deposits in the inter-tidal zone.</p>	<p>Agreed via email dated 1st November 2016 in responding to the revised CoCP; ES Chapter 8; Heritage Asset Gazetteer.</p>
4.1.6	<p>Overall approach</p> <p>The overall methodology adopted to undertake the assessment of effects on heritage assets and archaeology (Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.1)).</p>	<p>The overall methodology adopted to undertake the assessment presented in Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage and Archaeology of the Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.1) is agreed.</p> <p>It is agreed that the methodology reflects appropriate legislation, guidance and advice provided by Historic England during the pre-application stage.</p>	<p>Agreed via email dated 1st November 2016 in responding to the revised CoCP; ES Chapter 8; Heritage Asset Gazetteer.</p>
<p>4.2 Baseline Information</p>			

Statement of Common Ground between Transport for London and Historic England

SOCG Reference: SoCG019

Ref	Description of matter	Details of agreement	Record of agreement
4.2.1	<p>Existing and future baseline</p> <p>Historic England advised that the main impacts on the north of the river are expected to be in relation to industrial archaeology and deeply buried early prehistoric remains and south of the river in relation to deeply buried prehistoric remains only. (Historic England comments on Scoping Report, 25 July 2014)</p>	<p>Following Historic England's comments on the Scoping Report, deeply buried prehistoric remains on both sides of the river and industrial archaeology on the north side of the river have been included in section 8.4 'Description of the baseline conditions' within Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage and Archaeology of the ES (Document Reference 6.1).</p> <p>It is agreed that description of the existing and future baseline, as presented in Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage and Archaeology of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) is comprehensive and sufficient to determine the value of receptors potentially affected by the Scheme.</p>	<p>Agreed via email dated 1st November 2016 – in responding to the revised CoCP; ES Chapter 8; Heritage Asset Gazetteer.</p>
4.2.2	<p>Sources of data</p> <p>Historic England recommended inclusion of data from sources such as Greater London Historic Environment Record and Crossrail (Historic England</p>	<p>It is agreed that the sources of data to establish the baseline conditions in the study area, as outlined in paragraph 8.3.9 of Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage and Archaeology of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) are appropriate.</p>	<p>Agreed meeting 29/9/2016</p>

Ref	Description of matter	Details of agreement	Record of agreement
	comments on Scoping Report, 25 July 2014)		
4.2.3	<p>Overall approach</p> <p>The overall baseline presented within Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage and Archaeology of the ES (Document 6.1).</p>	<p>The overall baseline presented in Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage and Archaeology of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) is agreed.</p>	<p>Agreed via email dated 1st November 2016 – in responding to the revised CoCP; ES Chapter 8; Heritage Asset Gazetteer.</p>
4.2.4	<p>Overall approach</p> <p>Historic England outlined within their Relevant Representations letter (dated 31st August 2016) that the DMRB guidelines does not provide sufficient guidance for managing and assessing impacts upon heritage assets in line with the NPS or NPPF.</p>	<p>Following the submission of the NPS and NPPF technical note, we recognise the interpretation undertaken, and that the current DMRB does not reflect current best practice in the conservation and management of the historic environment. However due to the nature of the scheme being proposed and the heritage assets potentially affected we satisfied that the significance of heritage assets affected have been appropriately and proportionately considered.</p>	<p>Agreed by email on 1st of November 2016 – in responding to the NN NPS and NPPF Compliance technical note.</p>
4.2.5	<p>Additional Conservation Areas</p>	<p>The Cultural Heritage and Archaeology chapter has been updated to include both heritage assets.</p>	<p>Agreed via email dated 1st November 2016 – in</p>

Statement of Common Ground between Transport for London and Historic England

SOCG Reference: SoCG019

Ref	Description of matter	Details of agreement	Record of agreement
	Historic England noted that Coldharbour Conservation Area and the East Greenwich Conservation Area have not been identified as a heritage asset (Relevant Representation letter dated 31 st August 2016).		responding to the revised CoCP; ES Chapter 8; Heritage Asset Gazetteer.
4.2.6	<p>Blackwall Tunnel Gatehouse</p> <p>Historic England raise within their Relevant Representation letter (dated 31st August 2016) that the impacts to the Blackwall Tunnel Gatehouse are unclear for example how the proposed landscaping associated with the Scheme relates to the Gatehouse.</p>	The submission of the NPS and NPPF technical note indicates It is considered likely that any landscaping works proposed would enhance the building’s setting and would not have a negative impact on its heritage significance	Agreed by email on 1st of November 2016 – in responding to the NN NPS and NPPF Compliance technical note.
4.3 Environmental Design Measures and Mitigation			
4.3.1	<p>Approach to mitigation</p> <p>Historic England noted that</p>	Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage and Archaeology of the ES (Document 6.1) has identified that archaeological remains may be present within the	Agreed via email dated 1 st November 2016 – in responding to the revised

Ref	Description of matter	Details of agreement	Record of agreement
	<p>field evaluation works will be necessary in advance of the consented development programme (section 42 letter dated 12th November 2015).</p>	<p>Scheme footprint.</p> <p>It is agreed that the revised CoCP includes appropriate detail regarding the WSI.</p> <p>As noted in section 8.5 ‘Scheme design and mitigation’ of Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage and Archaeology (Document reference 6.1) and secured by the CoCP (Document Reference 6.10), archaeological excavations will be undertaken in advance of construction where archaeological remains that may be subject to impacts as a result of the Scheme have been identified as being present.</p> <p>It is agreed that the approach with regard to field evaluation works in advance of any consented development programme is acceptable.</p>	<p>CoCP; ES Chapter 8; Heritage Asset Gazetteer.</p>
4.3.2	<p>Monitoring and proposed mitigation measures</p>	<p>Appropriate mitigation is detailed in paragraph 6.1.7 of the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) (Document Reference 6.10) and includes monitoring of dredged material to identify and</p>	<p>Agreed via email dated 1st November 2016 – in responding to the revised CoCP; ES Chapter 8; Heritage Asset</p>

Statement of Common Ground between Transport for London and Historic England

SOCG Reference: SoCG019

Ref	Description of matter	Details of agreement	Record of agreement
		<p>record any archaeological materials.</p> <p>The approach to further work and archaeological mitigation set out in Chapter 8 of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and the revised CoCP (Document Reference 6.10) is agreed.</p>	<p>Gazetteer.</p>
4.3.3	<p>Historic England raised concerns regarding the assessment of impact to archaeology and would seek a precautionary approach in terms of mitigation. Adequate pre-construction evaluation contained within the WSI is recommended to reduce potential risk and harm of heritage assets. Contingency arrangements should be outlined in the event of an unexpected discovery.</p> <p>(Relevant Representation letter</p>	<p>We note that you acknowledge that is difficult to assign a value to currently unknown archaeological remains. In this instance, and on the basis of any evidence to the contrary, a value of medium was assigned to the relevant potential archaeological remains. It is acknowledged, however, that nationally important archaeological remains <u>could</u> be present within the Scheme area and subject to impacts from construction activities.</p> <p>We agree that any programme of archaeological works should include adequate archaeological evaluation in order to properly characterise and quantify further archaeological mitigation works. We also agree that watching briefs should only be utilised where there is considered to be low</p>	<p>Partially agreed via email dated 1st November 2016 – in responding to the revised CoCP; ES Chapter 8; Heritage Asset Gazetteer.</p> <p>And via email dated 9th November 2016 further acceptance of the changes made to the CoCP and ES to accommodate Historic England’s concerns.</p>

Silvertown Tunnel

Statement of Common Ground between Transport for London and Historic England

SOCG Reference: SoCG019

Ref	Description of matter	Details of agreement	Record of agreement
	dated 31 st August 2016).	<p>archaeological potential or other methods may be impractical. The scope and methodologies for the programme of archaeological mitigation works will be agreed with HE / GLAAS in advance of any archaeological of construction works commencing and ongoing consultations will be held during the archaeological works.</p> <p>As set out in the CoCP (Document Reference 6.10), a detailed WSI will be prepared once the detailed design of the Scheme is finalised to capture the most appropriate mitigation measures and ensure any archaeological assets are adequately protected.</p> <p>Contingency measures in the event of an unexpected discovery will be included in WSI to be prepared by the Contractor at the detailed design stage.</p> <p>TfL and Historic England agreed that the wording within the COCP would be amended and the CoCP and ES chapter has been updated.</p>	

Statement of Common Ground between Transport for London and Historic England

SOCG Reference: SoCG019

Ref	Description of matter	Details of agreement	Record of agreement
4.3.4	<p>Require the CoCP to reference a programme of archaeological evaluation as part of the advance works to inform the Archaeological Written Scheme. And consideration of preservation in situ should be considered if significant archaeological remains are found.</p> <p>(Relevant Representation letter dated 31st August 2016).</p>	<p>As noted above, we agree that any programme of archaeological works should include adequate archaeological evaluation in order to properly characterise and quantify further archaeological mitigation works. We also agree that watching briefs should only be utilised where there is considered to be low archaeological potential or other methods may be impractical. The scope and methodologies for the programme of archaeological mitigation works will be agreed with HE / GLAAS in advance of any archaeological of construction works commencing and ongoing consultations will be held during the archaeological works.</p> <p>TfL and Historic England agreed that the wording within the COCP would be amended to provide further detail about the WSI and the CoCP has been updated.</p>	<p>Partially agreed via email dated 1st November 2016 – in responding to the revised CoCP; ES Chapter 8; Heritage Asset Gazetteer.</p> <p>And via email dated 9th November 2016 further acceptance of the changes made to the CoCP and ES to accommodate Historic England’s concerns.</p>
4.3.5	<p>Historic England suggested a number of alterations to the wording within the CoCP to</p>	<p>TfL and Historic England agreed that the wording within the COCP would be amended to provide</p>	<p>Partially agreed via email dated 1st November 2016 – in responding to the</p>

Ref	Description of matter	Details of agreement	Record of agreement
	ensure the robustness of any future archaeological investigation. (Relevant Representations dated 31 st August 2016).	robustness of future archaeological investigation.	revised CoCP; ES Chapter 8; Heritage Asset Gazetteer. And via email dated 9 th November 2016 further acceptance of the changes made to the CoCP and ES to accommodate Historic England's concerns.
4.4 Assessment Findings and Conclusions			
4.4.1	<p>Heritage assets and archaeology</p> <p>Historic England outlined that the assessment of the impacts on above ground heritage assets presented in the Preliminary Environmental</p>	The conclusions of the assessment, as undertaken in Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage and Archaeology of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) are agreed; including the assessment of the impacts on above ground heritage assets and those affecting archaeology.	Agreed via email dated 1 st November 2016 – in responding to the revised CoCP; ES Chapter 8; Heritage Asset Gazetteer.

Ref	Description of matter	Details of agreement	Record of agreement
	<p>Information Report was found accurate. (section 42 letter dated 12th November 2015)</p>		
<p>4.4.2</p>	<p>Blackwall Tunnel entrance</p> <p>Historic England noted the potential impact from settlement on the listed Grade II Blackwall Tunnel entrance and agreed with the approach to develop an engineering solution following further environmental assessment. (section 42 letter dated 12th November 2015)</p>	<p>As outlined in paragraph 8.6.9 of the ES and Appendix 12.B Settlement Assessment Report (Document Reference 6.3.12.2), an assessment of the potential impacts to the Blackwall Tunnel entrance has been undertaken to identify any significant effects as a result of the Scheme. The assessment concluded that further assessment during the detailed design stage will be required to assign a damage category to the structure and an appropriate mitigation strategy undertaken.</p> <p>As per paragraph 6.1.8 of the CoCP (Document Reference 6.10), an assessment of the likely effects of settlement on the Grade II listed Blackwall Tunnel building will be undertaken prior to construction.</p> <p>It is agreed that the proposed approach with</p>	<p>Agreed via email dated 1st November 2016 – in responding to the revised CoCP; ES Chapter 8; Heritage Asset Gazetteer.</p>

Ref	Description of matter	Details of agreement	Record of agreement
		<p>regard to the intention to develop an engineering solution following further environmental assessment of potential impacts from settlement is appropriate.</p>	
4.4.3	<p>Desk Based Assessment (DBA) and geo-archaeological model</p> <p>Historic England commented on the need to provide further detail (possibly within a DBA) on how the tunnel design will affect the deposits identified in the model (email response to Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage and Archaeology 29 June 2016).</p> <p>Historic England advised that it would be beneficial to present in the geo-archaeological model each layer / deposit or area</p>	<p>Although a separate desk-based assessment appendix has not been produced for the Scheme, a desk-based assessment process was undertaken to inform the ES chapter and the results have been summarised within section 8.4 of the ES chapter (Document Reference: 6.1), supported by the appendices containing the Gazetteer (Appendix 8.A, Document Reference: 6.3.8.1), Geo-archaeological Model Report (Appendix 8.B, Document Reference: 6.3.8.2) and Foreshore Survey Report (Appendix 8.C, Document Reference: 6.3.8.3).</p> <p>Due to lack of available borehole data for the area of the cut and cover section of the tunnel located on the Greenwich Peninsula, the Geo-Archaeological Model Report (Appendix 8.B, Document Reference: 6.3.8.2) recommended that</p>	<p>Agreed meeting 29/9/2016</p>

Statement of Common Ground between Transport for London and Historic England

SOCG Reference: SoCG019

Ref	Description of matter	Details of agreement	Record of agreement
	<p>identified along with its cultural activity by period.</p>	<p><i>‘additional geo-archaeological investigations are undertaken within the southern area of the site (Greenwich Peninsula)’.</i></p> <p>As outlined in the CoCP (Document Reference 6.10), the Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for the Scheme will set out the details of a phased programme of archaeological mitigation works, the first of which will entail the updating of the Greenwich portion of the geo-archaeological model using data from newly commissioned boreholes. Additional boreholes will not be required for the Silvertown portion of the Scheme where the existing borehole data is more complete. Evaluation trenching will be utilised in areas where ‘near surface’ archaeological remains may be present. The integration of the design data, the updated geo-archaeological model and the results of the evaluation trenching will occur during an update of the WSI, which will set out the detail and methodologies for the archaeological mitigation works for the main construction phase of the Scheme. The production of the WSI, updating</p>	

Ref	Description of matter	Details of agreement	Record of agreement
		<p>of the geo-archaeological model, scope of the archaeological evaluation and design of the archaeological mitigation will be undertaken in consultation with GLAAS.</p> <p>The potential for cultural activity on the various landscape zones identified by period is presented in section Results and Interpretation of the Deposit Modelling of Appendix 8.B (Document Reference 6.3.8.2).</p> <p>It is agreed that Appendix 8.B Geo-archaeological Model (Document Reference 6.3.8.2) provides sufficient information to undertake the assessment of potential impacts of the Scheme and the level of detail is appropriate for the stage of the project.</p>	
4.4.4	<p>Overall assessment and findings</p> <p>The overall assessment and findings of the likely effects of the Scheme and the conclusions reached within</p>	<p>It is agreed that the overall assessment and findings of the likely effects of the Scheme and the conclusions reached within Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage and Archaeology of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) are robust and reflect advice provided by Historic England during the pre-</p>	<p>Agreed via email dated 1st November 2016 – in responding to the revised CoCP; ES Chapter 8; Heritage Asset Gazetteer.</p>

Statement of Common Ground between Transport for London and Historic England

SOCG Reference: SoCG019

Ref	Description of matter	Details of agreement	Record of agreement
	Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage and Archaeology of the ES (Document Reference 6.1).	application stage.	

5. Matters under discussion

5.1.1 There matters outlined in the Table below are currently under discussion with Historic England.

Ref	Description of stakeholder issue	Transport for London response	Current position	Record of discussions
5.2 Greenwich World Heritage Site Technical note				
5.2.1	Issue of potential impact on the Greenwich Maritime World Heritage Site (WHS) was raised with Historic England at the 29/09/16 meeting.	TFL prepared a technical note providing a summary of traffic impacts upon Greenwich Maritime WHS.	TFL are reviewing comments received from Historic England.	Emailed response dated 4 th November 2016 from Historic England advising further assessment of the impact of the Silvertown Tunnel proposal upon the Outstanding Universal Value of the WHS in line with the WHS management plan, NPPF and NPPG.
5.3 Draft DCO				
5.3.1	Historic England suggested that Schedule 2 of the Draft	dDCO Requirement 5 states that a Written	Draft DCO to be	Awaiting final details before confirming party

Statement of Common Ground between Transport for London and Historic England

SOCG Reference: SoCG019

Ref	Description of stakeholder issue	Transport for London response	Current position	Record of discussions
	<p>DCO should be amended to include approval of the WSI by Historic England and GLAAS.</p> <p>(Relevant Representations dated 31st August 2016).</p>	<p>Scheme of Investigation (WSI) is required as part of the CoCP, prior to commencement .</p> <p>The Code of Construction Practice and dDCO have been updated to provide for a WSI to be prepared for each work site to be approved by the relevant local planning authority (in consultation with Historic England and GLAAS) prior to commencing construction</p>	<p>submitted at Deadline 1.</p>	<p>agreement.</p>

6. Matters not agreed

6.1.1 There are no elements of the topics identified within Section 2 of this SoCG that are not agreed.

7. Agreement

Signed	
Name	David Rowe
Position	Silvertown Tunnel Project Sponsor
Company	Transport for London
Date	10th November 2016
Signed	
Name	Graham Saunders
Position	Principal Historic Environment Planning - London
Company	Historic England
Date	10 th November 2016