

## Planning Act 2008 (as amended)

### TR010021 - Application by Transport for London for an Order Granting Development Consent for the Silvertown Tunnel Project

**Action Points** arising from the Issue Specific Hearing (ISH) on Outstanding Issues including Environmental matters held at the Intercontinental London, The O2 on **28.03.2017**

Action	Party	Deadline
Published:		
1	The Applicant's response to SWQ TT2.1 appears to have figures and tables which were mis-numbered. The Applicant is requested to review the response given and provide a revised response, including an interpretation of the revised and re-numbered figures, and re-issue the document.	The Applicant D6
2	The Applicant is to provide information on the proportion of trips that are currently carried out through the Blackwall Tunnel by low income groups, and what percentage of those trips would no longer be carried out if the scheme is implemented in the manner	The Applicant D6

	proposed, with charges/discounts as proposed.		
3	In respect of the Applicant's response to SWQ TT2.8, please could the Applicant provide a clarification regarding the 7% figure quoted in this answer, compared with the 30% provided verbally?	The Applicant	D6
4	Regarding SWQ TT2.4, please can the Applicant provide a comprehensive response to this SWQ to include Net Present Value (NPV) details? London Borough of Newham also asked the Applicant to provide details regarding distributional benefits of the 'no bus' strategy, which the Panel also agrees should be provided.	The Applicant and London Borough of Newham	D6
5	Please can the Applicant provide confirmation that the characteristics of noise emanating from the proposed concrete segment manufacturing plant would not cause any noise issues, together with the technical justification for this conclusion?	The Applicant	D6
6	East Greenwich Residents sought information on local monitoring plans said to be completed by Easter and No to Silvertown asked the Applicant, in respect of the Ultra Low Emission Zone (ULEZ), to clarify suggestions that the approach roads to the Blackwall Tunnel would be exempted from this designated area. Please can the Applicant provide a response to these requests?	The Applicant	D6

7	LB Newham has raised the need for air quality mitigation for flats at first floor level in the Hoola building. Please provide a justification for not undertaking any feasibility work for such mitigation.	The Applicant	D6
8	With regard to agenda item 10.3 further information was referred to (from the Centre for Fisheries and Aquaculture Science -Cefas) in the light of which the MMO indicated that they could be satisfied that condition 5 of the dDML would cover their concerns. Please clarify.	The Applicant and MMO	D6
9	With regard to agenda item 11.1 the Applicant suggested that concerns would be addressed through Protective Provisions whereas the EA suggested that the dDML conditions would provide the remedy. Please provide clarification regarding how both methods of securing the mitigation would be secured	The Applicant and EA	D6
10	Arising from the discussion regarding how to ensure that flood walls would remain "fit for purpose" at all times, it was promised that there would be a further effort to reach an agreed position but failing that there would be a clear statement of alternative means of resolving the issue for decision as to recommendation by the Panel. Please can the Applicant and the EA provide the Panel with an update as to whether agreement has been reached?	The Applicant and EA	D6
11	Whilst this point was not raised in the ISH,	The Health and Safety	D6

	<p>the Panel would be grateful if the HSE could explain why, as they state that their advice regarding the East Greenwich Gasholder (EGG) site is provided in accordance with government stated policy, (as contained in Planning Practice Guidance on hazardous substances paragraph 068), whether (a) any change to this document is likely to occur in the foreseeable future; (b) why do they consider it to be "policy" as it appears to be entitled "guidance" on the gov.uk website; and (c) as their advice is based on guidance/(policy?), not legislation, whether, in their view, in the light of the discussions that have been held at the ISHs for the Silvertown Tunnel project, they consider that their interpretation of this paragraph of the planning guidance document may be too restrictive in terms of the advice that they can offer in situations such as this?</p>	Executive	
--	---	-----------	--