

From: [REDACTED]
To: silvertowntunnel
Cc: [Louise Evans](mailto:Louise.Evans)
Subject: TR010021 Application by TfL for an Order Granting Development Consent for the proposed Silvertown Tunnel
Date: 06 March 2017 23:11:37
Attachments: [Lidoka Estates Ltd Presentation for 20 January 2017 Silvertown CAH.DOCX](#)
[Lidoka Estates Ltd Presentation for 8 December 2016 Silvertown CAH.DOCX](#)

Dear Examining Authority

I have pleasure in submitting to you the further representations of Lidoka Estates Ltd to meet today's deadline. What we say should be seen in the context of our previous representations to you at the Compulsory Acquisition Hearings on 20 January 2017 and 8 December 2016, which were submitted in writing to you on 27 January 2017 and which I attach for ease of reference.

Our note to you of 27 January responded to your request for information as far as we are aware about progress with the Studio 338 planning application. This is still awaiting a decision so the position is the same as outlined in the earlier note.

Referring to Land Plans Regulation 5(2)(i) Sheet 1 of 7 – drawing no. ST150030-MCO-ZZZ-06-DR-XS-0: we have agreed in principle to provide TfL with plots 01-046 and 01-047 which TfL require on a permanent and temporary basis respectively. We are still in discussion with TfL concerning one plot of land, 01-058, which TfL are seeking to acquire permanently from us to provide a fire escape for Studio 338. We still expect to reach an agreement with them, but we are concerned that we are being asked to sacrifice some of our land for the sake of Studio 338 when it is open to them, in the present burnt-out state that their site is in, to provide for their fire escape requirements using their own land without encroaching on ours.

We also consider that the fire escape for Studio 338 is not directly related to the construction of the tunnel. We accept that Studio 338 and its site will be affected by the Silvertown Tunnel, as are many businesses along its route including ourselves. However, the need for the fire escape for Studio 338 is an indirect result of the Tunnel and is not actually required for its construction. We would therefore argue that TfL should not be seeking to acquire the land through compulsory purchase.

We hope we will have more news to report at the Compulsory Acquisition Hearing at the end of the month

Yours faithfully

Martin Crane

Martin Crane
Director
Lidoka Estates Ltd

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

Lidoka Estates Ltd Presentation for 8 December 2016 Silvertown Tunnel CAH

My name is Martin Crane, I am a director of Lidoka Estates Ltd, the owner of the freehold interest in the "lorry park" site in Boord Street next to the gas holder and Studio 338.

TfL have indicated they wish to acquire 3 parcels of land permanently or temporarily - Land Parcels 01-046, 01-047 and 01-058 on Land Plans Regulation 5(2)(i) Sheet 1 of 7 – drawing no. ST150030-MCO-ZZZ-06-DR-XS-0.

This representation is provisional, as we are waiting to examine Studio 338's planning application, which of course is subject to normal approval procedures and may well change substantially in the process.

In the meantime, we have not moved from the position in our previous representations, ie:

- Plot 01-046 the "permanent land" – we have no objection in principle to TfL acquiring this permanently, subject to normal negotiations.
- Plot 01-047 the "temporary land" – we have no objection to TfL occupying this for some 15 months to store materials while the new footbridge is being built, though we are concerned at the potential impact on one or more of the businesses using the "lorry park" as sub-tenants of the Evening Standard.
- Plot 01-058 the "fire escape land" – we are challenging TfL's need to acquire this land permanently. We are concerned that Studio 338's fire escape should still need to go over our land. We have also expressed concern over the adequacy of the proposed fire escape route in the event of a stampede of panic-stricken clubbers around a burning building. We only saw a report on fire safety within the building shortly before the fire, but noted that this did not consider how people would escape once they were outside the building. Finally on this plot - if TfL need it, our preference would for TfL to rent the land on a lease – as the rest of the site is rented - rather than acquiring it outright.

We are due to meet with TfL on 14 December, when we hope to discuss a revised draft Heads of Terms. We understand from TfL they will share some thoughts on how TfL's requirements can be met. We look forward to reaching a satisfactory solution with TfL.

However, at present we are in a state of uncertainty as it will depend on what happens with Studio 338's planning application and whether there is any need consequently for TfL to acquire our land. We expect to be able report more progress to you [ie the Inspectors] at the next CAH on 20 January.

Lidoka Estates Ltd Presentation for 20 January 2017 Silvertown Tunnel CAH

My name is Martin Crane, I am a director of Lidoka Estates Ltd, the owner of the freehold interest in the "lorry park" site in Boord Street next to the gas holder and Studio 338.

Since I last addressed you in December, we have had one meeting with TfL but we are not much further forward. TfL produced for the meeting in December a draft of Heads of Terms which amalgamated the two plots of our land they are interested in acquiring permanently, so a further draft is required that treats the two plots separately. TfL have provided us with a draft note of our meeting and we will be reverting to them on that shortly.

Looking at Land Plans Regulation 5(2)(i) Sheet 1 of 7 – drawing no. ST150030-MCO-ZZZ-06-DR-XS-0: as in December, we continue to have no objection, subject to normal negotiations, to TfL acquiring permanently Land Parcel 01-046 – although we note that Studio 338 currently use the area in the front and on the other side of the building from us for parking and deliveries. When that is no longer available, we think this area may well become the place for parking and deliveries and therefore may not provide an unobstructed fire escape route or access for the emergency services.

In an oral response to our comments about vehicular access to Studio 338, TfL responded that this would be via Boord Street and the proposed new road and turning head – the area coloured yellow on the General Arrangement Plans Sheet 1 of 3 (Application Document Reference APP-005). Control of parking on Boord St would continue to be managed by the relevant highway authority, ie the Royal Borough of Greenwich. However, if the yellow area is for access/servicing, then it cannot be used for parking. If parking on Boord Street is prevented, it is not clear where visitors to Studio 338 who arrive by car are going to park. There is a very real threat that this whole vehicular access area could become blocked, to the detriment of securing safe emergency access.

We have no objection to TfL occupying temporarily plot 01-047 to store materials while the new footbridge is being built, though we still are concerned at the potential impact on one or more of the businesses using the "lorry park" as sub-tenants of the Evening Standard.

However, this still leaves plot 01-058 the "fire escape land". We still object to Studio 338 using our land to provide their emergency fire escape and none of TfL's four proposed Non-Material Changes address our objections. Given the current state of the building, we see no reason why, if Studio 338 is rebuilt, they should not be required to make provision for fire escapes over their own land and not over other people's.

We note that the proposed fire escape complies with Approved Document B (AD B) of the Building Regulations 2010 in that the width of the proposed fire escape that goes all around the building is 6 metres. However, given the use of straw as sound insulation in the extension at the back of the building, that is where fire is likely to catch most quickly and burn most vigorously. Looking at the plan, 3000 people may have to go through plots 01-058 (a), (b) and (c) and into plot 01-058. I find it difficult to imagine 3000 people. However, I understand that the capacity of the Royal Albert Hall is almost 6000, that of the Royal Festival Hall just under 3000 and the Barbican Hall just over 3000. I find it hard to believe that once everyone had got out of these halls they could get to safety by going around the buildings though two (for the Royal Albert Hall) or one (for the Royal Festival Hall and the Barbican Hall) 6-metre-wide escape routes. People should not be made to go around the danger area but need to get away from it as fast as possible – but this will not be achievable when the proposed works cut off so much of the access to the site.

We have still to arrange a date for our next meeting with TfL but we hope to discuss a revised draft Heads of Terms with TfL shortly. We still look forward to reaching a satisfactory solution with TfL and reporting back to you in due course.

However, at present we are in a state of uncertainty as it will depend on what happens with Studio 338's planning application – which we understand may now not be decided before the end of February - and TfL's intentions for the LEL land in light of the Studio 338 rebuild proposals. We submitted our comments on the application on Wednesday 18 January 2017 and we understand they will be on the public record shortly and we have provided you with a copy.