

**From:** SFD Tyler [mailto: ]

**Sent:** Monday, January 13, 2014 5:05 AM

**To:** Thames Tunnel

**Subject:** Submission To Planning Inspectorate Second Written Questions - Thames Tideway Tunnel

Submission To [Planning Inspectorate Second Written Questions](#) - Thames Tideway Tunnel

Regards

Stuart Tyler

This email was received from the INTERNET and scanned by the Government Secure Intranet anti-virus service supplied by Vodafone in partnership with Symantec. (CCTM Certificate Number 2009/09/0052.) In case of problems, please call your organisation's IT Helpdesk.

Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.



Planning Inspectorate,  
National Infrastructure,  
Thames Tideway Tunnel

13 January 2014

**Ref: STYLE02**

Re: Submission to **Second Written Questions**

**To Whom It May Concern**

After my review of the Second Written Questions document reference 131219 W010001 published on the infrastructure site. Could the following requests for information be included in the list of Second Written Questions:

**Chambers Wharf**

My comments relate to my property situated at no 13 Fountain Green Square (FGS).

No's 12, 13 and 14 FGS are part of a 3 level building (ground, first and second floors). Which are situated directly adjacent to the Eastern side of Chambers Wharf and directly facing the Thames River on its South Bank.

I refer to the Thames Water Thames Water's Response to Issue Specific Hearing and Written Representations Relating to Chambers Wharf and Alternative Drive Strategy Doc Ref: APP31.02:

**Noise Levels**

In all cases in this document, supporting technical information and modeling is based on the predicted noise and vibration that will be experience at Luna House even though the predicted noise and vibration at FGS will be significantly greater than experienced at Luna House, as documented and rated **as Residential Significant but not eligible for Noise Insulation.**

Figures 2.1 and 2.2 only graph noise levels at Luna House and no equivalent graphs are included for Fountain Green Square.

**Question 1**

Please provide noise level graphs for Fountain Green Square (FGS) specifically for the Thames River frontage properties (no's 12, 13 and 14) which are directly adjacent to Chambers Wharf and will be the closest to barge loading and unloading operations, Coffe Dam construction and spoil storage. These properties will be the most impacted properties.

**Tunnel Boring**

No mention is made on vibration or noise impacts or the impact to the building structure from tunnel boring operation under the properties no's 12, 13 and 14 FGS which lie directly above the

proposed tunnel route. Thames Water is proposing to assume the land under my building via subsoil rights for tunnel boring purposes. It should be noted that no's 12, 13 and 14 FGS building and foundations are built on backfill behind the Thames Wall which is on top of the old river foreshore as it was then. Consequently the land under my building may not be stable enough to support the building during tunnel boring operations.

### **Question 2**

Please provide specific comment with respect to no's 12, 13 and 14 FGS which include the expected noise and vibration levels, the geological suitability for boring operations under the building including mitigation strategy to protect the building from damage, subsidence or collapse as a result of tunnel boring operations under the building.

### **Barges**

Please refer to pictures of barges being loaded and moved in Appendix 1. River traffic noise will be the largest contributor to noise specifically at No's 12, 13 and 14 Fountain Green Square.

### **Question 3**

Please provide specific comment on the physical dimensions of the proposed barges e.g. length, width and draft when loaded, and whether the full length of the barge can be accommodated within the length of Chambers Wharf with no overhang in front of the properties no's 12, 13 and 14 FGS, when berthed at the wharf. Please include the number of tug boats which will be required to maneuver these large size barges.

### **Hoarding**

It is proposed that a 5 Meter high hoarding be erected along the eastern boundary of Chambers Wharf adjacent to no's 8 to 14 FGS to mitigate noise, vibration and light pollution emitted from the Chambers Wharf site. It should be noted that the distance between the building of no's 8 to 14 FGS and the Chambers Wharf site boundary is approximately 5 meters and less for no's 12, 13 and 14.

The erection of a 5 meter hoarding will have a huge impact on residents of no's 8 to 14 FGS due to:

- the loss of light, amenity and views across the Thames River towards Tower Bridge,
- In winter the loss of light will be pronounced due to the low trajectory of the sun across the horizon,
- Direct sunlight will not be visible during winter months and there will be a dramatic loss of direct sun light during summer months,
- Many thousands of tourists who walk the Thames Path will be denied the view they currently enjoy from the Thames path at its juncture with the Chambers Wharf site, across the Thames towards the historic Tower Bridge and its surrounds.

An example visualisation of the hoarding can be seen in vol 20 of the Environmental Statement Plate 11.5.1 Viewpoint 1.3. Unfortunately this viewpoint could not be copied into this document due to the PDF security in place.

### **Question 4**

a) Provide a plan of exactly where the Hoarding will be positioned with relation to the boundary line of Chambers Wharf and no's 8 to 14 FGS and encompassing the reduced size coffer dam.

b) Provide a visualization of the hoarding from the west facing windows and balcony at no 13 Fountain Green Square to indicate the proximity of the 5 meter hoarding.

c) Provide a visualisation based on vol 20 of the Environmental Statement Plate 7.4.3 including the proposed hoarding. This will provide a good example of how the views from the Thames Path towards Tower Bridge will be impacted.

d) How long will the 5 meter hoarding remain erected?

### **Conclusion**

**I find it amazing that we can bore a tunnel under the English Channel without having any access to the surface along its route but we cannot bore a tunnel under the River Thames without major points of land based access to the tunnel.**

I believe the noise, vibration, artificial lighting, workmen communication (shouting), machinery noise, tug boat engine noise and construction has been under estimated and quantified.

By comparison the demolition of the warehouse buildings in 2009 was minor compared to the proposed Chambers Wharf project which is magnitudes larger than the demolition project. The noise from the 2009 demolition project had a huge impact on the residents and me at Fountain Green Square. I shudder to think what the impact will be of the proposed project should it get approval to precede in its current form.

After reviewing the vol 20 - Environmental Statement and the proposed mitigation strategies contained the Chambers Wharf and Alternative Drive Strategy Doc Ref: APP31.02 I get the distinct impression that all Chamber Wharf site impacts are downplayed and/or are minimized and everything will be OK nobody will be impacted.

In some case the proposed Chambers Wharf mitigations are worse than the original proposal e.g. the erection of a 5 meter hoarding on our west face boundary and in front of our north facing balcony almost completely enclosing my flat with a 5 meter hoarding, or the reduction in size of the coffer dam bringing river traffic noise closer to my building.

There are viable alternatives to the TTT plans for Chambers Wharf which will dramatically reduce the impact on me and residents adjacent to the site E.g. do not make the Chambers Wharf site a drive site as was originally proposed for the King's Stairs Garden site (KSG). This decision was then subsequently changed when TTT dropped the KSG site in preference for the Chambers Wharf site.

Why do I have to suffer this total invasion of my rights in a democratic country and have to prove that I am financially worse off before I can get compensation or have my property purchased by Thames Water. Even though Thames Water have measured and documented the impact on our location adjacent to Chambers Wharf.

Yours Sincerely

Stuart Tyler

**Please refer to the Appendix following.**

**APPENDIX 1.**

**Picture from my apartment West facing sitting room window showing the position of Chambers Wharf in relation to my apartment and where a 5 meter Hoarding will be erected directly in front of bedroom and lounge windows and balcony along the wall at the bottom of the picture less than 5 meters from my windows.**



Picture from my apartment North/West facing balcony showing a barge being loaded. This view will be obscured by a 5 meter Hoarding on the Thames wall below and directly in front of the balcony less than 5 meters away.



Picture from my apartment West/North facing balcony showing a loaded barge being maneuvered away from the wharf. This view will be obscured by a 5 meter Hoarding on the Thames wall below and directly in front of the balcony less than 5 meters away.



Picture from my apartment West/North facing balcony showing a loaded barge being taken down river. This view will be obscured by a 5 meter Hoarding on the Thames wall below and directly in front of the balcony less than 5 meters away.

