

Your ref: Ref: WW010001

**Monday 11<sup>th</sup> November 2013-Issue Specific Hearing Agendas – Rationale for the selection of work sites and the tunnel drive strategy matters**

1. Thamesbank had asked PINS for the Examination to be delayed on a number of sound legal grounds. Why was the Examination going ahead despite this request?
2. It is important for everyone to understand that the basis of premise for the Tunnel is flawed.
3. The Barn Elms Alternatives & Putney Embankment Foreshore Alternatives are going to cause great disruptions and upset along the Embankment and Foreshore. These proposed alternatives will affect the historic and conservation importance and value of Putney. It is therefore necessary for Thamesbank to speak out and to point out the irrationality of only discussing expensive and disruptive pipes along the foreshore and yet at the same time, failing to address how smaller pipes – (the downpipes that if detached from connections to the sewers), could obviate the need for either of the bigger and more expansive pipes and CSO connection to the tunnel altogether.
4. Regarding the Barn Elms Alternatives & Putney Embankment Foreshore Alternatives, Richard Ashley in his SuDS report has said the one of the CSO's could be reduced to virtually nothing. Why was this not being considered with Integrated Water Resource Management (IWRM) with its many multi- benefits of the CSO connection to the tunnel"? Thamesbank asked for an answer but did not receive one from TW.