Dear Sirs

PLANNING ACT 2008 THAMES WATER UTILITIES LIMITED APPLICATION FOR DEVELOPMENT CONSENT FOR THE THAMES TIDEWAY TUNNEL

Further to Thames Water (TW) response to the Examining Authorities (ExA) request for information and TW continuing proactive dialogue with Hermitage Community Moorings (HCM) we have the following final representation in relation to potential impacts from Chambers Wharf (CW).

Proximity to Chambers Wharf (3.1.2)
Contra to TW statement HCM is closer to CW than 35 Wapping High Street (CW9) Once again as TW have not shown the infrastructure of the Hermitage Wharf on their plans their statement cannot be assessed fully by the Inspectorate.

Comparison to other receptors (3.1.3)
As noted above HCM is closer to CW than CW9 and so cannot be relied upon in the assessment of HCM. Downings Road Moorings is oblique to the work site and already onsite mitigation is proposed along the side of the coffer dam. Whilst a proportion of HCM resident berths would benefit from this screen there are a number which are still in direct line of sight of the works site.

Underwater noise & vibration (3.1.6)
We feel that the ES Vol Chambers Wharf paras 9.5.62-9.2.67 still does not adequately address the issues of underwater noise as do not the previous responses to ExA. TW response to other issues, for example underwater noise from the filling of empty vessels, are not substantiated in their EA.

Assessment of Noise & Vibration effects
We note and welcome the initial assessment from TW in their response and have requested that TW provide their methodology behind the build of cumulative construction noise used to arrive at these values. We have not had a response or an opportunity to examine these conclusions in full. We welcome TW responsiveness to our concerns in relation to these issues and welcome the onsite measurement taking place currently. However without the final data and reports we, or indeed the Inspectorate, cannot reach firm conclusions on these issues and for HCM to retract our concerns relating to potential significant impacts at Chambers Wharf.
River Transport Strategy
The use of the River is welcomed as stated before and we welcome TW statement regarding use of smaller barges and restriction of movements to daytime / evenings only. We look to the ExA to safeguard this commitment within any DCO to ensure that that this commitment cannot be derogated from during construction.

Conclusion
In conclusion due to the significant level and duration of activity at CW proposed by TW we still feel that they have not suitably demonstrated that potential impacts can be mitigated in an acceptable way and encourage the Inspectorate to direct TW to reverse the tunnel direction and so reduce impact well below maximum thresholds in order that they might be able mitigate significant impacts more effectively.

We would like to that the Examining Authority for their attention to these representations.

Yours faithfully

C. McLaren

Charles McLaren - Chairman on behalf of Hermitage Community Moorings Limited
cc. Sarah O’Grady – Communication Officer, Thames Tideway Tunnel