

**From:** Kevin Reid [mailto:kevin.reid@london.gov.uk]  
**Sent:** Friday, January 17, 2014 4:06 PM  
**To:** Thames Tunnel  
**Subject:** Thames Tideway Tunnel Examination clarification of ExA point regarding safeguarded wharves projections

Dear sir/madam, it has come to my attention that the GLA omitted to supply the answer to a question at one of the Examining Authority's Hearings in November.

I apologise for this oversight and trust that the attached answer covers the point in question

Best regards

**Kevin Reid**  
Principal Programme Manager  
Greater London Authority  
City Hall  
The Queens Walk  
London SE1 2AA  
Tel: +44 (0)20 7983 4991

**From:** Kevin Reid  
**Sent:** 13 January 2014 11:33  
**To:** 'ThamesTunnel@infrastructure.gsi.gov.uk'  
**Subject:** Thames Tideway Tunnel Examination submissions from Mayor of London

Please find attached the Mayor's response to relevant second round of ExA questions

Please also find attached a second revised copy of a Statement of Common Ground between Thames Water and Mayor of London. This should be the same document submitted by Thames Water. This is not yet signed and should be considered as draft at present.

I can also confirm that I would like to attend the Examination Issue Specific Hearing Sessions on 20-24<sup>th</sup> January and whilst I do not currently have any specific points to raise, as with previous sessions, may wish to contribute to the Hearing or respond to other points made.

I will also attend the Open Floor Hearings of 29 and 30<sup>th</sup> January and 3<sup>rd</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> Feb but again will not specifically be seeking to make any points unless there is something that requires a response on behalf of the Mayor of London.

Best regards

**Kevin Reid**  
Principal Programme Manager  
Greater London Authority  
City Hall  
The Queens Walk  
London SE1 2AA

Tel: +44 (0)20 7983 4991

**GREATERLONDONAUTHORITY**

**Thames Tideway Tunnel Examination  
Further Submission from Mayor of London Unique Reference No SP 00032**

**17<sup>th</sup> January 2014**

At the Examination Hearing on November 11<sup>th</sup> 2013, a question was raised regarding the extent to which materials generated by the construction of the Thames Tideway Tunnel had been factored into the river cargo projections being used in the Mayor's Report on Safeguarded Wharves.

GLA officers undertook to report back to the Examining Authority as part of the 2<sup>nd</sup> December submission on this matter. This information was missed out of that submission. GLA officers apologise for this oversight and thank LB Hammersmith & Fulham for drawing attention to this in its submission made on 13<sup>th</sup> January 2014.

The Mayor published his "Safeguarded Wharves Review – Final Recommendations" in March 2013. This document is part of a regular (approximately every 5 years) review of the wharf sites that are safeguarded by the Secretary of State specifically for river cargo handling and to which London Plan Policy 7.26 applies.

A key input to the report is the projection of demand for cargo handling capacity, which is covered in chapter 3 of the report. Three demand scenarios were used in the report, a high, medium and low forecast. The medium forecast was used as the basis for projecting the overall demand for wharf capacity.

Among a range of other projected demands, two major projects were identified as being likely to contribute additional materials to the overall demand for waterborne cargo transport, namely Crossrail and Thames Tideway Tunnel.

The relevant section of the report is copied below for ease of reference (paragraphs 3.4.6-3.4.8) and the report can be read in full via the following link:  
<http://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Annex%20a%20-%20Final%20Recommendation%20-%20March%202013.pdf>

**Alternative materials assumptions**

3.4.6

MPS1 describes alternative materials as predominantly construction and demolition waste that can be re-used for aggregates in building projects. This category can also be compared to secondary aggregates as per the SWIR definition. To set the context, according to the PLA data in 2010 200,000 tonnes of secondary aggregates were transported using GLA safeguarded wharves. MPS1 increased the national forecast for alternative materials from MPG6 by 16% mainly in light of the sustainability agenda<sup>16</sup>. Because it could be expected that much of this construction and demolition waste would be either reused at the site or transported to a nearby site by road it is necessary to make separate assumptions on what proportion of the total of 5.9 million tonnes of alternative materials per annum in London could be transported by water. These assumptions which are based on the bottom up consultation with relevant stakeholders are now discussed.

Aggregates stakeholder consultation – major projects

3.4.7

Major projects have the potential to increase projected demand for alternative materials (secondary aggregates). The major projects that have the potential to be delivered within the timeframe of this study that were investigated include; Crossrail; Thames Tideway Tunnel; Olympics Legacy; Thames Gateway Regeneration, Silvertown Crossing, HS2 and Crossrail 2. The only robust quantitative information gathered through the research was from Crossrail and Thames Tideway Tunnel. It should be noted that operators and stakeholders felt that these two projects have the greatest likelihood of increasing demand for waterborne construction materials and, as previously noted, it appears that the effect of the Lea Tunnel project on volumes of construction materials is currently being experienced at wharves in north east and south east London. The consultation with Crossrail, Thames Tideway Tunnel and relevant stakeholders suggested the following amounts of spoil would be generated and transported by water as secondary aggregates:

- **Crossrail** – approximately 4.5 to 5m tonnes in total (0.3m tonnes p.a.) to wharves in the North East region. This figure is revised downwards to 0.2m tonnes p.a. for the medium scenario and 0.1m tonnes p.a. for the low scenario to reflect the potential for optimism bias.
- **Thames Tideway Tunnel** – approximately 4m tonnes in total (0.2m tonnes p.a. high scenario, 0.15m tonnes p.a. medium, 0.05 tonnes low scenario). To and from wharves mainly in the West region but also potentially some in the South East and North East<sup>17</sup>

#### 3.4.8

Based on the information gathered in the consultation with the various stakeholders and operators, an assumption about the expected alternative materials transported by water for the other major projects listed above and other smaller projects can be made. It is assumed that approximately 0.2, 0.1 and 0.0 million tonnes of alternative materials per annum for each of the scenarios respectively could be transported by water and this is added to the overall demand figure. If all these assumptions are added together it can be assumed that approximately 0.7m, 0.5m and 0.2m tonnes of alternative materials respectively for the high, medium and low scenarios will be transported by water. These figures are then used to form the basis of an assumption on the percentage of the total MPS1 target for alternative materials in London (5.9m tonnes p.a) for the various scenarios. These percentages are shown in Table 3.20 below. To arrive at the final total estimate for alternative materials these percentages of MPS1 target assumptions are added to the known existing flow of alternative materials which is 0.2m tonnes p.a.

\*High scenario assumes 100% material transported by water, medium 80% and low 50%. It should also be noted that Thames Tideway Tunnel 1 is already underway (construction period 2010-2014) and is using the river via wharves in Barking.