Thames Tideway Tunnel Additional Information

Air Quality

Local Air Quality - For the purposes of the local air quality assessment a preliminary qualitative assessment was undertaken in order to facilitate the site selection process. The actual environmental information and parameters used at that time to enable the preferred site selection decision has not been provided. We would like to the see the information used **at that point in time** within the site selection process for **both** sites.

Construction Dust - For the purposes of the construction dust assessment a full qualitative assessment of construction was undertaken in accordance with "Best Practice Guidance (BPG), The Control of Dust and Emissions from Construction and Demolition", published by the GLA and London Councils in November 2006 (BPG, 2006). The actual environmental information and parameters used at that time to enable the preferred site selection decision has not been provided. We would like to the see the information used **at that point in time** within the site selection process for **both** sites.

Odour - A full quantitative assessment using dispersion modelling was undertaken for the odour assessment. The actual environmental information and parameters used at that time to enable the preferred site selection decision has not been provided. We would like to see the information used **at that point in time** within the site selection process for **both** sites.

From available site selection information, it seems that these assessments were carried out, but the assessments themselves don't seem have been published therefore making it difficult to enable a completely informed opinion on the site selection results.

Noise

During the site selection process (i.e. up to and including Part 1C – creation of preferred list of sites), neither site seemed to be subject to a location specific construction noise and vibration impact assessment. Such an assessment for each site is needed in order to make a robust decision on which are the least worst locations. Such assessments should include:

Description of the works to be carried out;

Working methods and duration of the works;

Details of methods to be used to minimise noise and vibration;

Location of the noise-sensitive receivers;

Predicted noise levels (and vibration where required) for the sensitive identified receivers;

Sufficient information for the LA to validate predictions, i.e;

1. Plant: Number and types selected, sound power levels of that plant (and the source of the information, e g, BS 5228);
2. Noise source and receiver heights;
3. Information used in a BS 5228 calculation, i e, angle of view corrections, percentage on time;

4. Screening calculations;
5. Facade correction;
6. Details of activities within the start-up/close-down periods; and
7. Plan showing the working area, main plant locations and named nearby noise-sensitive receivers.

For works which occur outside of normal working hours and/or are predicted to result in noise levels in excess of the noise insulation trigger level, additional information is required, including:

1. The predicted number of households likely to be affected;
2. The number of days for which the thresholds for noise insulation/temporary re-housing are met or exceeded (see CoCP Section 6.4);
3. A detailed BPM assessment of possible quieter alternative methods and full justification of why these are not reasonably practicable;
4. Particular emphasis should be given to the consideration of specific mitigation measures over and above the general measures discussed in CoCP Section 6.4; and
5. For works proposed to be undertaken outside of normal working hours, full justification for why these works cannot be completed within normal working hours.

In general, the actual environmental information and parameters used at that time to enable the preferred site selection decision has not been provided. We would like to the see the information used **at that point in time** within the site selection process for **both** sites.

Traffic and Transportation

The actual environmental information and parameters used at the time of site selection to enable the preferred site selection decision has not been provided. We would like to the see the information used **at that point in time** within the site selection process for **both** sites.

This would apply to the following key information that would be required for a more meaningful comparison of the traffic impacts of the proposed, and which Temple would have expected to have been compiled by Thames Water:

Traffic data from the surveys identified at the time as done, but not reported – for both sites;

Data on traffic accidents at the junctions of The Highway with Glamis Road and Heckford Street;

LinSig or OSCADY modelling for the Glamis Road Junction, and PICADY modelling for the Heckford Street junction;

An indication of the outcome of any discussions with the Port of London Authority regarding the feasibility of the use of water transport for access to and from the KEMP site;

Details of original calculations regarding the total development time, un-bulked volume of export to Barge and/or road and traffic numbers (number of barges/HGVs required);

Details of how road traffic (HGV) patterns will be disrupted by availability of barges (due to turnaround times/ tides etc.);

Assessment of the effects on road safety, noise and air quality due to construction traffic for both sites;

Initial plans for potential temporary traffic management; including any discussions with the street works and traffic manager at Tfl and LBTH; any temporary traffic regulatory orders that need to be put in place/lifted (with regards to routing strategy); and any temporary construction works that would need to be put in place to facilitate traffic movement;

Details of construction traffic (import) including volume required during construction phase (of tunnels/shafts/wharf, including landscaping) and number of service vehicles and staff vehicles proposed;

Data on parking survey and outcomes;

Planned highway/utility works during the years of operation, and how this will affect other statutory bodies; and

Details of the auto track turning movement and sweep path analysis for HGVs travelling between different sites.

Landscape, Visual and Socio-Economics

The following should be provided so that a comparison can be made between the two options:

A separate assessment of the KEMP element of the Heckford option;

An assessment of the Heckford option as a whole, including a Site Suitability Report (SSR) which covers the whole option (i.e. including element within KEMP);

A comparison of the SSR for full Heckford option with the KEMP foreshore option SSR; and

A comparison of the impact of the two options on KEMP (to include townscape / visual / park users).

Most of the other information required for the townscape /visual / park users is within the documents but is hard to find and has not been presented in a comparative form.