

From: Jim Thomson [mailto:Jim.Thomson@richmond.gov.uk]
Sent: Friday, January 10, 2014 3:14 PM
To: Thames Tunnel
Subject: Thames Tideway Tunnel (Answers to Second Written Questions 07)

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please find attached the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames's response to the ExA's Second Written Questions. Please acknowledge receipt.

Kind regards,

Jim Thomson
East Area Planning Team
Development Control
Tel: 0208 891 1411

LONDON BOROUGH OF RICHMOND UPON THAMES

THAMES TIDEWAY TUNNEL PROJECT

**RESPONSE TO EXAMINING AUTHORITY'S
SECOND WRITTEN QUESTIONS**

(UPR LBRUT07)

The Examining Authority has issued a further round of questions, Second Written Questions, primarily addressed to the applicant, but some requiring responses from other parties.

Q34.1 relates to Transport issues:

Q.34.1 Can the Applicant and each highway authority, (jointly if possible but if not separately), provide an update on what issues now remain outstanding? For any remaining outstanding issue, where it is anticipated that the issue will in due course be resolved, provide a programme for its resolution. For any issues where it is not expected that the matter will be resolved in the near future provide a statement summarising the differences between the views taken by the highway authority and the Applicant respectively.

Response:

Two main issues remain outstanding between TWUL and LBRuT regarding the Transport Assessment, which are set out below:

Disapplication of sections 32-39 of the Traffic Management Act 2004

Schedule 19 of the draft DCO seeks to disapply the above legislation, which deals with the regulation of street works through the London Permit Scheme.

As stated in paragraph 2.27 of our LIR (LBRUT02), the Council objects to this provision on the basis that if works on the highway are required, Thames Water should comply with the permit regime as any other statutory undertaker would to ensure proper coordination of works and minimise congestion and disruption.

TWUL does not accept LBRuT's position and it is considered that the issue cannot be resolved between the parties.

As section 9.1 of our Written Representations (LBRUT03) states, the Council is the local highway authority and is best placed, through its detailed knowledge and experience of its area, to carry out this function. If the dis-application powers are allowed, there would be no coordination of street works to allow the continued functioning of the local highway network.

Awaiting TfL approval of transport modelling

In common with the other local highway authorities, LBRuT awaits the outcome of further discussions between TWUL and TfL regarding traffic modelling. The programme for resolution lies with those two parties.

Q25.8 What would be the implications for the construction programme at each site, and the overall construction programme, if Saturday working was not permitted at non-drive sites, except for any period of continuous working required for construction of the connection tunnels?

In its response to LBRuT's objection to Saturday morning working (Row 3, Table 4.1 of Initial Statement of Common Ground), TWUL suggests that its

construction team has estimated that if Saturday morning working was not allowed, the overall programme would be extended from 30 months by a further 6-8 months. No information has been submitted to support this assertion and the Council is therefore not able to test its veracity.