



Ministry of Housing,
Communities &
Local Government



Department
for Environment
Food & Rural Affairs

Liz Wood-Griffiths
Tideway
Cottons Centre
Cottons Lane
London SE1 2QG
(by email)

Your Application ref:
2530-TDWAY-TTTUN-990-ZZ-CO-700176
as revised by ref:
2530-TDWAY-TTTUN-990-ZZ-CO-700183

Date: 11 March 2020

Dear Liz

PLANNING ACT 2008 (the “2008 Act”)

Infrastructure Planning (Changes to, and Revocation of, Development Consent Orders) Regulations 2011 (the “2011 Regulations”)

THE THAMES WATER UTILITIES LIMITED (THAMES TIDEWAY TUNNEL) ORDER (SI 2014/2384) (“the 2014 Order”) AS AMENDED BY THE THAMES WATER UTILITIES LIMITED (THAMES TIDEWAY TUNNEL) (CORRECTION) ORDER (SI 2015/723), THE THAMES WATER UTILITIES LIMITED (THAMES TIDEWAY TUNNEL) (AMENDMENT) ORDER (SI 2017/659), THE THAMES WATER UTILITIES LIMITED (THAMES TIDEWAY TUNNEL) (AMENDMENT) ORDER (SI 2018/1262), AND THE NOTICE OF VARIATION No. 1 (17 MARCH 2015) AND NOTICE OF VARIATION No. 2 (17 AUGUST 2017) TO THE DEEMED MARINE LICENCE.

Application for a non-material change to realign the main tunnel in the vicinity of the King Edward Memorial Park Foreshore (KEMPF) worksite, and provide consent for the construction of a connection tunnel between KEMPF CSO drop shaft and the main tunnel.

1. We are directed by the Secretary of State for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs and the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government (the “Secretaries of State”) to notify you that consideration has been given to the application (the “Application”) which was made by Bazalgette Tunnel Limited (trading as Tideway) (the “Applicant”) on 14 August 2019 (and as revised on 17 January 2020)

for a change which is not material to the 2014 Order under paragraph 2 of Schedule 6 to the 2008 Act.

2. Under the 2008 Act changes to a development consent order may be material or non-material. The process for considering material changes is different to the process for considering non-material changes. In summary, material changes require greater prior publicity and consultation and consideration following submission. In contrast, non-material changes are subject to a simplified and expedited process. Tideway has applied on the basis that the change requested is non-material.
3. The original application for development consent under the 2008 Act was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate by Thames Water Utilities Limited on 28 February 2013 and was granted consent on 12 September 2014. Consent was granted for the construction and operation of a wastewater transfer and storage tunnel, known as the Thames Tideway Tunnel, a number of connection tunnels and other associated development and ancillary works at 24 sites in London along the route of the tunnel and works to construct interception structures at 16 combined sewage overflows.
4. The Applicant has the benefit of the 2014 Order by virtue of a transfer of powers by Thames Water Utilities Limited dated 24 August 2015 made pursuant to Article 9 of the 2014 Order.
5. The consented works at King Edward Memorial Park Foreshore are set out under Work Numbers 24a and 24b of Part 1 of Schedule 1 to the 2014 Order. Work number 24a forms part of the nationally significant infrastructure project (as defined in sections 14 and 29(1A) of the 2008 Act) and comprises the King Edward Memorial Park CSO drop shaft which will connect directly with the main tunnel (east) (authorised under Work No. 1d). Work No 24b sets out the “associated development” (as defined in section 115(2) of the 2008 Act) and comprises a range of demolition and construction activities.
6. The Applicant is seeking consent for a change to the 2014 Order to realign the main tunnel south of the KEMPF site and provide consent to construct a short connection tunnel between the CSO drop shaft and the main tunnel. The proposed amendment affects below-ground works at subsoil level only, with no additional works or impacts at ground surface level. The Applicant is seeking consent for the following amendments to the DCO:
 - a. Amendments to Article 6 – Limits of Deviation so that the limits of deviation set out in the DCO would be applied to the proposed connection tunnel between the KEMPF CSO drop shaft and the main tunnel.
 - b. The addition of a new item under Work No. 24 in Schedule 1 part 1 to provide consent for the new connection tunnel which would form part of the nationally significant infrastructure project.
 - c. Amendments to two of the Works Plans and Section drawings (Ref: DCO-WP-000-ZZZZZ-010050 and DCO-WP-000-ZZZZZ-010051) for the main tunnel. The revised drawings (Ref: DCO-WP-000-ZZZZZ-010050-rev 1 and DCO-WP-000-ZZZZZ-010051-rev 1) show the revised tunnel alignment, new

connection tunnel and associated limits of deviation (LOD) and Order limits and related revision to the plan references in the DCO.

- d. Amendments to the Land Plan (Ref: DCO-LP-000-ZZZZZ-030040-rev 2) for the specified section of the tunnel. The revised Plan (Ref: DCO-LP-000-ZZZZZ-030040-rev 4) shows the revised limits of deviation (LOD) for the main tunnel and the additional plots to be included within the Order limits and related revision to the plan reference in the DCO.
 - e. Amendments to the Book of Reference Addendum No. 1 to show Thames Water interest in the additional plots within the revised Order limits.
7. The original Application (made on 14 August 2019) included a request for compulsory purchase powers for the additional plots referred to in paragraph 6d above. However, the Applicant subsequently withdrew the compulsory purchase element of the Application by way of a letter dated 17 January 2020.
 8. The Secretaries of State have found no reason to disagree with the Applicant's rationale for applying for the changes and are content that the Application (Ref: 2530-TDWAY-TTTUN-990-ZZ-CO-700176 as revised by ref: 2530-TDWAY-TTTUN-990-ZZ-CO-700183 of 17 January 2020) meets the requirement of regulation 4 of the 2011 Regulations.

Summary of the Secretaries of State's Decision

9. The Secretaries of State are satisfied that the change requested by the Applicant is not a material one and have decided under paragraph 2(1) of Schedule 6 to the 2008 Act to make an Order amending the 2014 Order as requested in the Application. This letter is the notification of the Secretaries of State's decision in accordance with regulation 8 of the 2011 Regulations.

Consideration of the Materiality of the Proposed Changes

10. The Secretaries of State have given consideration as to whether the Application is for a material or non-material change.
11. There is no statutory definition of what constitutes a 'material' or 'non-material' change for the purposes of Schedule 6 to the 2008 Act and Part 1 of the 2011 Regulations. Paragraph 2(2) of Schedule 6 to the 2008 Act requires the Secretaries of State, when deciding whether a proposed change is material, to have regard to the effect of the change, together with any previous changes made under that paragraph, on the development consent order (DCO) as originally made. The Applicant's updated assessments confirm that the proposed change would not result in new or materially different likely significant effects to those previously assessed.

12. The Secretaries of State have considered the materiality of the change proposed in the Application against characteristics¹ that indicate a change to a consent is more likely to be treated as material, as follows:

a. *Environmental Statement – a change to a DCO requires an updated Environmental Statement to take account of new, or materially different, likely significant effects on the environment*

The Application considers the likely environmental impacts of the proposed change against the scheme assessed in the Environmental Statement which accompanied the original DCO application. The Application concludes that the amendment will not result in any new, or materially different significant effects on the environment. The Secretaries of State have considered the information provided and have no reason to disagree with the assessments and therefore conclude that no update is required to the Environmental Statement as a result of the proposed change to the 2014 Order.

b. *Habitats and Protected Species – a change to a DCO would invoke a need for a Habitats Regulations Assessment or the need for a new or additional licence in respect of European Protected Species*

The proposed change will not impact on a Natura 2000 site (i.e. a Special Area of Conservation or a Special Protection Area) nor a Ramsar site, so there is no requirement for a Habitats Regulations Assessment. The Secretaries of State note that Natural England raised no objections to the proposed change and did not advise that an Appropriate Assessment was required. The Secretaries of State also consider that there is no need for a new or additional licence in respect of any European Protected Species.

c. *Compulsory Acquisition – a change that would authorise the compulsory acquisition of any land, or an interest in or rights over land, that was not authorised through the original DCO*

The Secretaries of State note that the proposed change involves a minor extension to the approved order limits as set out in the 2014 Order and that the Applicant has acquired the additional sub-soil level land through voluntary sale from the single land interest of the Port of London Authority (PLA). The Secretaries of State note no additional compulsory acquisition powers, or powers for the acquisition of any interest in or rights over land, are being sought as part of the Application (as revised).

d. *Impact on Businesses and Residents – the potential impact of the proposed changes on local people*

The Secretaries of State also note that the proposed change does not constitute a change to the planned works and as such will not have a material effect on businesses and residents with respect to traffic and transport, air quality and odour and noise and vibration.

¹ The Department for Communities and Local Government's 'Planning Act 2008: Guidance on Changes to Development Consent Orders', published in December 2015

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/changes-to-development-consent-orders>

13. Previous applications for a non-material change to the DCO were approved in 2017 (SI 2017/659) and in 2018 (SI 2018/1262). In considering the materiality of the proposed change, the Application takes into account the effect on the DCO of the previous amendments. The Application concludes that the cumulative impact of both previous sets of amendments and this one is not considered to result in any material change to the DCO as originally made. The Secretaries of State have considered the information provided and have no reason to disagree with the assessment.
14. Following the publicity and consultation, no representations were made disputing the Applicant's position that the proposed changes are non-material in nature. The Secretaries of State have no reason to disagree with the Applicant's assessment of materiality, and having regard to the effect of the proposed change, together with the previous changes made under that paragraph, on the 2014 Order as originally made, the Secretaries of State are satisfied that the proposed change in the Application is appropriately categorised as a non-material change (for the purposes of paragraph 2 of Schedule 6 to the 2008 Act). The Application has therefore been handled in accordance with Part 1 of the 2011 Regulations.

Consultation and Responses

15. Following a request from the Applicant on 24 January 2019, on 29 March 2019 the Secretaries of State consented to allow, in accordance with regulation 7(3) of the 2011 Regulations, the Applicant to consult a more limited number of persons than would ordinarily need to be consulted under regulation 7(2). The reasons for that grant of consent are set out in the decision letter issued by the Secretaries of State on 29 March 2019.
16. In accordance with the requirements of regulation 7(1) of the 2011 Regulations specified parties were consulted about the Application by the Applicant. The consultation ran from 14 August 2019 until 20 September 2019.
17. Representations were received during the consultation period from Historic England, the Environment Agency, the Greater London Authority, the Port of London Authority, and the London Borough of Tower Hamlets.
18. In accordance with regulation 6 of the 2011 Regulations a notice of the Application was also published for two consecutive weeks in the local press, the East London Advertiser, and was made publicly available on the Planning Inspectorate's website, providing an opportunity for anyone not consulted about the Application to also submit representations to the Planning Inspectorate. No representations were received as a result of this publicity.
19. The Secretaries of State have carefully considered the representations received and note that none of them raise any objections to or make substantive comments on the Application.
20. The Secretaries of State, having carefully considered all the representations received, do not consider that any further information needs to be provided by the Applicant or that any further consultation of those already consulted or any wider consultation is necessary before determining the Application.

Environmental Impact Assessment

21. The Secretaries of State are satisfied that the information in the Application is sufficient for them to make a determination on the Application. The Secretaries of State have considered whether the Application would be likely to give rise to any new significant effects or materially different effects when compared to the effects set out in the Environmental Statement for development authorised by the 2014 Order and are content that there is no need for completion of an Environmental Impact Assessment.

The Secretaries of States' Conclusions and Decision

22. For the reasons given in this letter the Secretaries of State are satisfied that the change to the 2014 Order applied for is not material when considered in the context of development authorised by the 2014 Order and, therefore, have made an Order in the form of a statutory instrument to amend the 2014 DCO. This is substantially in the form of the draft Order submitted with the application, subject to a number of minor modifications, set out below.

Amendments to the Order

23. The following modifications have been made by the Secretaries of State to the revised draft Order suggested by the Applicant on 27 January 2020:

- a. the pre-amble is amended to reflect the Secretary of State's role in the assessment of materiality, with regard to the effect of the proposed changes when taken together with the previous changes made to the 2014 Order;
- b. the pre-amble is amended to recite the correct enabling power for the making of the Order;
- c. the Secretaries of State have also decided to make various minor drafting changes which do not materially alter the effect of the Order, including changes to conform with current practice for Statutory Instruments, changes in the interests of clarity and consistency (e.g. in relation to footnotes), and changes to ensure that the Order has the intended effect.

Challenge to Decision

24. The circumstances in which the Secretaries of State's decision may be challenged are set out in the note attached as an Annex to this letter.

Publicity for Decision

25. The Secretaries of State's decision on this Application is being notified as required by regulation 8 of the 2011 Regulations.

Richard Watson

**Ministry of Housing, Communities and
Local Government**

Mary Jeavans

**Department for Environment, Food &
Rural Affairs**

ANNEX

LEGAL CHALLENGES RELATING TO APPLICATIONS FOR DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDERS

Under section 118(5) of the Planning Act 2008, a decision under paragraph 2(1) of Schedule 6 to the Planning Act 2008 to make a change to an Order granting development consent can be challenged only by means of a claim for judicial review. The claim form must be filed before the end of the period of 6 weeks beginning with the day after the day on which the Order making the change is published. The Amending Order as made is being published on the date of this letter on the Planning Inspectorate website at the following address:

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/london/thames-tideway-tunnel/>

These notes are provided for guidance only. A person who thinks they may have grounds for challenging the decision to make the Order referred to in this letter is advised to seek legal advice before taking any action. If you require advice on the process for making any challenge you should contact the Administrative Court Office at the Royal Courts of Justice, Strand, London WC2A 2LL (020 7947 6655).