
From: Alison MH Gorlov [mailto:agorlov@wslaw.co.uk]
Sent: Monday, January 13, 2014 6:27 PM
To: Thames Tunnel
Subject: Thames Tideway Tunnel - WW010001 - PLA URN SP00122

Dear Sirs,

Attached are the PLA's Responses to the Examining Authority's second written questions.
Please confirm receipt.

Regards,

Alison Gorlov

Alison Gorlov
Partner

T +44 (0)20 7593 5005

F +44 (0)20 7593 5199

M +44 (0)78 8449 1015

agorlov@wslaw.co.uk

www.wslaw.co.uk

Winckworth Sherwood
Minerva House | 5 Montague Close | London | SE1 9BB | DX 156810 London Bridge
6
T 020 7593 5000 | F 020 7593 5099

INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING

**THE INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING
(EXAMINATIONS PROCEDURE) RULES 2010**

**THE THAMES WATER UTILITIES LIMITED (THAMES TIDEWAY TUNNEL) DEVELOPMENT CONSENT
ORDER**

**Response of the Port of London Authority (PLA) to the Examining Authority's second Written
Questions**

Unique Reference Number	SP00122
Rule No.	8(1)(b), 17
Document Ref.	PLA2.2/ExAQ002/R
Author	Port of London Authority
Date	13 January 2014
Date of revision & version number	

Winckworth Sherwood LLP
Minerva House
5 Montague Close
London
SE1 9BB

**THE THAMES WATER UTILITIES LIMITED (THAMES TIDEWAY
TUNNEL)
DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER**



24. Design, Landscape and Visual Impact

Question

Q24.4 *In relation to Blackfriars Bridge Foreshore Note 6 to drawing DCO-PP-190016 revision 1 indicates that the means of modifying the BT cooling water tunnel is to be confirmed. How is the cooling water tunnel proposed to be modified? Has the proposed modification be agreed by BT, Transport for London (TfL) and the Port of London Authority (PLA)?*

PLA's Response

1. Currently, two engineering options for the modification of the cooling water discharge tunnel are being progressed. These are (i) that the discharge pipe remains in its current position and reduced in height above the riverbed to the same as the proposed dredge depth; or (ii) moving the discharge pipe southwards into the navigation channel. The Port of London Authority (PLA) has a preference for the latter, as with the first option water discharged from the outfall pipe will impact on vessels manoeuvring to the relocated pier at low waters, may be struck by vessels at low water when there is a cut (reduction) in the expected tides, restrict the opportunity for vessels with a deeper draught to operate to and from the pier in the future and has the potential for silt deposition under the pier which would be difficult to dredge. However, it is understood that the second option is more difficult in engineering terms.
2. The PLA has not agreed any modification to the cooling water discharge tunnel. It is understood that further feasibility work is currently being undertaken.

34. Traffic, Travel and Transportation

Question:

The answer to the ExA's Q16.1 states that the most significant requirement for barge crew is the need for 21 Tug Masters and 21 Mates to meet the predicted peak in 2018/19, within an overall need for 274 crew (Table 1.2). The training programme is a two year apprenticeship for a Boat

Master's Licence with local knowledge and towing endorsements, although the Applicant notes that there may be an option to train existing generic Boat Masters. The profile of barge demand is provided in answer to Q16.2 (Table 2.1)

Q34.7 *What does the Applicant and PLA consider would be the consequential impact of the recruitment of 42 Boat Masters on other commercial users of the Thames?*

PLA's Response

1. Most importantly, it should be noted that only the Master of a vessel requiring a Boat Masters Licence (BML) needs to be qualified, rather than both Master and Mate. As such, any question of potential impact must be considered within the context of an additional 21 BML holders. If the contract was lucrative, it would be expected that BML holders with the necessary endorsements could be recruited from other companies. However, BML holders from elsewhere in the United Kingdom could be recruited and obtain the relevant endorsements – Local Knowledge and Towing – within a timeframe of six to twelve months. This is substantially shorter than the minimum time to obtain a BML itself. As such, the PLA does not expect that the recruitment of BML holders required for this scheme will result in a deleterious effect on other commercial users of the River Thames.
2. The PLA does however acknowledge that ensuring that there is an appropriately trained workforce to meet the requirements of the Transport Strategy proposed by the Applicants is vital and is working to ensure that the appropriate training is in place to ensure competent, professional crew both for this scheme and as a legacy for the river.

Question:

The Applicant's responses relating to the drive strategy between Chambers Wharf and Abbey Mills include comments on the project risk arising from the use of barges on the River Lee (Doc APP31.02 paragraph 3.5.14). It is suggested that, in the event that river transport became unavailable, there may be difficulties in procuring sufficient vehicles in time to maintain tunnelling operation at Abbey Mills. This issue might also present a project-wide risk in that it could be possible that a river closure, for example at the Thames Barrier or due to bad weather, could prevent barging at all drive sites simultaneously.

Q34.17 *In relation to potential barging operations at Abbey Mills, can the PLA confirm its advice (as reported by the applicant that barges should not navigate the River Lee on a falling tide? Would this advice change if dredging were to be carried out as suggested in the report of Pell Frischmann (submitted with the written representation of LB Southwark)?*

PLA's Response

1. The PLA's advice is that tugs and loaded barges should not navigate on Bow Creek on an ebb tide of more than one hour after High Water. This is due to the considerable difficulties in proceeding with the tidal stream whilst manoeuvring a tug and loaded barge around tight bends on the passage to the River Thames, notably the increased risks of being set out of the channel and onto structures or the river wall.
2. This advice would not be different if dredging was undertaken on Bow Creek. It is acknowledged that dredging of the channel would provide increased water depths and furthermore enhance the amount of river available for navigation. However, dredging does nothing to ameliorate the difficulties inherent in navigating a bend on a narrow meandering river with a following tide in combination with the momentum of a laden barge.

Question:

At the IS hearing on 12 November 2013 the PLA stated that it considered that 4 barges per day could be used for disposal of excavated material from Abbey Mills.

Q34.17 *Can the PLA confirm the maximum barge capacity and number of barges in a 24 hour period that it considers could be used on the River Lee and Channelsea River, with and without dredging, for disposal of waste from a drive site at Abbey Mills?*

PLA's Response

1. The PLA considers that the maximum daily feasible volume that could be transported on Bow Creek is approximately 1,260 tonnes. This volume equates to the movement of four 350 tonne barges (two on each of the two tides per 24 hour day) laden to 90% of capacity. Additional infrastructure, including the provision of campsheds (which would require

consents) and some dredging in the Channelsea River would be needed to enable this maximum volume to be reached.

2. The PLA does not consider that substantial dredging within Bow Creek will result in any substantial increase in the maximum volume that can be transported. The constraints to navigation within the creek, as elucidated in the PLA's response to Q34.16, results in a limit on the number of barges that can be moved on each tide. Furthermore, and whilst there could be a limited increase in the draught of the barge as a result of dredging within Bow Creek, the potential to increase both the length and beam of the barge is limited by the dimensions of the waterway. As such, the additional volume of cargo that could be transported following dredging is not in the PLA's view substantial, particularly when compared against the cost of undertaking the necessary dredging.

Question:

Examining authority's request for Statements of Common Ground – responses to be received by the ExA on or before Monday 13 January 2014.

PLA's Response

1. The PLA received a further updated Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) from the Applicant on 8 January, with a request for comments and/or agreement on its contents by the end of that day. Compliance with this request was not possible and the SoCG between the PLA and the Applicants, which it is understood will be submitted, is not agreed.

40. Additional SoCG are requested as follows:

Question:

S40.1 Can LB Southwark, LB Newham, PLA and the Applicant provide a SoCG in relation to the capacity for removing spoil from Abbey Mills by river transport, in the event that Abbey Mills were to be used as a drive site?

PLA's Response

1. The PLA confirms that it received, reviewed and provided comments on a draft Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) in relation to this issue. It is understood that the SoCG will be submitted by the Applicants and the PLA can confirm that it agrees with the statement in its submitted form.

Question:

S40.2 Can the Applicant, Cory Environmental and PLA provide a SoCG relating to navigational safety at Blackfriars Bridge Foreshore?

PLA's Response

1. The PLA confirms that it received, reviewed and provided comments on a draft SoCG in relation to this issue. It is understood that this SoCG will be submitted by the Applicants and the PLA can confirm that it is not content with the statement in its submitted form and consequently that it is not agreed. Further discussions will be held with the Applicants in an effort to reach agreement on the statement and an update on the position will be provided to the ExA in due course.

Question:

S40.3 Can the Applicant, London Duck Company and PLA provide a SoCG relating to navigational safety at Albert Embankment Foreshore? (The ExA appreciates that there may be limitations in completing this SoCG insofar as it relates to the construction phase).

PLA's Response

1. The PLA confirms that it received and reviewed a draft SoCG in relation to this issue. No comments have yet been submitted. It is understood that this SoCG will be submitted by the Applicants and the PLA can confirm that it is not content with the statement in its submitted form and consequently that it is not agreed. Further discussions will be held with the parties in an effort to reach agreement on the statement and an update on the position will be provided to the ExA in due course.

