



## MEETING MINUTES

<b>Subject:</b>	Kirtling Street and Heathwall Pumping Station Community Liaison Working Group
<b>Date and time:</b>	Thursday 7 March 2019, 6pm - 8pm
<b>Location:</b>	Tideway Information Centre, Kirtling Street, London, SW11 8BP
<b>Minute taker:</b>	Mark Walker (MW), Administrative Support, Tideway
<b>Chair:</b>	Steve Diamond, London Borough of Wandsworth

Item	Topic
1	Introduction and apologies
2	Minutes of the previous meeting
3	Actions from the previous meeting
4	Heathwall Pumping Station Progress Update
5	Kirtling Street Progress Update
6	Environmental and Noise Update
7	AOB
8	Actions Register

### Chair:

- Steve Diamond (SD) - London Borough of Wandsworth

### Project staff:

- Noel Cooper (NC) - Tunnelling Manager, Tideway/FLO
- Iram Mirza (IM) - Environmental Advisor, Tideway/FLO
- Ponciano Perez (PP) - Project Manager, Tideway/FLO
- Natasha Rudat (NR) - Head of Engagement, Tideway
- Michael Slack (MS) – Communications Officer, Tideway
- Louise Walsh (LW) - Mitigation and Compensation Lead, Tideway
- Mark Walker (MW) - Admin Support (minute-taker)
- Alick Whitfield (AW) - Community Relations Manager, Tideway/FLO

### Residents / Organisations:

Eight other attendees including residents and representatives from Nine Elms Pier, Riverlight 6, Riverlight Quay and London Borough of Wandsworth.

### Apologies:

Five apologies were received.

	Item	Action
1.0	<b>Introductions and apologies</b>	
1.1	Welcome and introduction from Steve Diamond (SD), London Borough of Wandsworth, followed by round-the-table introductions.	
1.2	Two residents asked to record tonight's meeting.	

<b>2.0</b>	<b>Minutes of the previous meeting</b>	
2.1	<p>CLlr Paula Walker (PW) asked if Riverlight management and the Battersea Power Station building can be invited to future meeting. Alick Whitfield (AW) confirmed they will be invited in future. <b>Action 1.</b></p>	<b>Tideway</b>
2.2	<p>PW asked if the Environmental Health Officer from Wandsworth can also be invited. Dianne James (DJ) confirmed they were invited but could not attend tonight.</p>	
2.3	<p>Steve Diamond (SD) confirmed the draft minutes of the previous meeting have been updated since they were published on the Tideway website. They are being presented for approval tonight and will need to be updated.</p>	
2.4	<p>SD confirmed a key task for tonight's meeting is to close off as many actions on the extensive list included within the minutes.</p>	
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Actions from the previous meeting</b>	
3.1	<p>Review of actions and key points from the previous meeting:</p> <p><b>Action 1 (point 1.3) – Completed.</b> PW asked what the timeframe is for minutes to be published and was advised that it is two weeks. SD advised the June and October minutes have been issued with amendments included as an addendum but will be reissued with amendments.</p> <p><b>Action 2 (point 4.6) – Completed.</b> NC confirmed this will be covered in main presentation.</p> <p><b>Action 3 (point 4.12) – Completed.</b> A resident confirmed the lights on the jetty that were causing a problem have been sorted out.</p> <p><b>Action 4 (point 4.19) – Completed.</b> AW confirmed request for additional signage was passed to the Riverlight management team, although no reply has been received a resident advised the problem is not so bad since parking restrictions were introduced. AW commented that Riverlight may have improved the signage without notifying the project.</p> <p><b>Action 5 (point 5.14) – Completed.</b> IM advised temporary monitors were installed. It is believed the yellow machines are segment carriers, which have now been fitted with white noise alarms.</p> <p><b>Action 6 (point 5.16) – Completed.</b> A discussion was had regarding whether noise reports could be put online as residents had previously made the request to both Tideway and the London borough of Wandsworth (LBW). Natasha Rudat (NR) advised Tideway does not publish full noise reports, which consist of mainly technical information, across the project but does provide details of exceedances at CLWGs. IM advised this data can be provided to the Independent Compensation Panel (ICP) in full if required, as there is a noise specialist on the Panel.</p> <p>A resident mentioned that at the Chambers Wharf CLWG, exceedances are shown on a slide in relation to triggering durations. NR advised the same format will be used for future CLWGs, plus an explanation of how the average is calculated over the month. <b>Action 2</b></p>	<b>Tideway</b>

	<p>PW commented that local people need to be assured the issue is being looked at and permitted levels are not exceeded. NR confirmed the presentation and minutes will be published on the Tideway website and sent out to the mailing list. PW asked if this will take place within the next two weeks. NR advised the presentation will be sent out tomorrow.</p> <p><b>Action 7 (point 5.23) – Completed.</b> AW confirmed a wider programme is included in tonight's presentation.</p> <p><b>Action 8 (point 6.6) – Completed.</b> A resident confirmed she is still awaiting an explanation about the three qualifying triggering durations for noise exceedances. IM confirmed she went back to the senior noise consultant and was told there is a third limit for forecasts but this is not something that needs to be measured by FLO on an on-going basis; this was how it was done at the forecasting stage. IM read out the information provided by the noise consultant, as follows: <b>"The third test for noise impact, as referenced in the Non-Statutory Off-site Mitigation and Compensation Policy is a significant effect identified using the assessment methodology defined in the <i>Environmental Statement</i> where the forecast noise levels exceeds the relevant day, evening or night assessment category 'C'. This refers to a 'monthly' noise level from construction activity."</b></p> <p><u>Other points from previous minutes</u></p> <p><b>Point 5.2</b> – Regarding previous issues with an air quality monitor being installed on the pier, IM confirmed the monitor has been moved to the side of Brooks Court in order for it to be more representative.</p> <p><b>Point 5.4</b> – PW asked what happens to data from monitoring carried out in relation to the houseboats at Nine Elms Pier and which committees is it submitted to. DJ confirmed that monitoring reports are issued to the Wandsworth Environmental Health Team however this data does not go to any committees. This is the normal process for Section 61 noise monitoring. If there are any breaches, they are reported at the CLWG.</p> <p><b>Point 5.5</b> – PW asked if people need to also call the Wandsworth Noise Line as well as the helpdesk. NR advised this is not necessary, as Tideway logs everything that comes through to the Helpdesk, with a monthly complaints report issued to the Council.</p> <p><b>Point 5.9</b> – A resident asked what the maximum level will be. NR advised a slide on this subject is featured in tonight's presentation.</p> <p><b>Point 5.11</b> – PW asked if residents are still concerned about Tideway surveys not being received and enquired if an additional survey could be done as an add-on. NR advised the survey will be repeated in the Summer and is planned to take place on an annual basis. If people have comments or feedback in the meantime, these can be submitted via the Helpdesk.</p> <p><b>Point 5.27</b> – Regarding a previous action for Justin Feltham (JF) to issue a summary ASAP of a river flow impact assessment, DJ advised a hydromorphic study of sediment flow analysis was carried out previously and the information made available as part of the pre-application process. NR advised a post-meeting note can be added to the minutes in order to provide an update.</p> <p><b>Action 3.</b></p>	Tideway
--	--	---------

	<p><b>Point 5.28</b> – PW highlighted the previous reference to a noise portal being made available on the Tideway website. NR confirmed Tideway has no plans to make a noise monitoring page available on its website.</p> <p><b>Point 5.29</b> – With regard to workers congregating and drinking outside of Sainsburys, PW provided an update on action taken with Wandsworth Council and noted that if anyone wants to take the matter further, they should contact PW.</p> <p>AW confirmed Tideway has investigated whenever the issue has been reported and confirmed no Tideway staff have ever been found to be involved. Staff are regularly briefed on the matter and would be disciplined if found to be involved.</p> <p><b>Point 5.30</b> – AW confirmed a quote has been received for window cleaning at Riverlight is now with senior staff for approval. <b>Action 4</b></p> <p><b>Point 5.31</b> – A resident confirmed a survey has been carried out. A resident asked if the survey will be shared, as the project has been reluctant to share settlement information. A resident advised two surveys have been carried out – one to measure the slab reinforcement and another to measure settlement. NR advised she will check and respond. <b>Action 5.</b></p>	Tideway
3.2	<p><b>Point 6.3</b> – PW asked if it is difficult to explain noise monitoring as there is so much data? IM confirmed a noise specialist did attend the last CLWG in December. SD confirmed this was the main point of the December meeting so this point can be closed off.</p>	Tideway
3.3	<p>A resident asked for an update on acoustic shielding to be installed at Brooks Court. NC advised the muck bay is now in its complete shape. The project team has tested noise levels as permitted by the Section 61 and has put noise monitors on some floors and balconies at Riverlight Six to assess how loud the noise is. There were never any plans to install acoustic shielding however the team is monitoring and doing everything possible to minimise disruption.</p> <p>SD commented that there is a shared desire to close off as many actions as possible. The minutes need to be as concise as possible, with actions closed as soon as they can be. SD would prefer a focus on what will be done, with a description of the issue discussed and the action subsequently proposed. Going forward, draft minutes will be issued two weeks after each meeting, with an email alerting people that there will be a two-week period for comments. The minutes will then be revised on the basis of the Chair's opinion of the requested modifications, with a second draft issued and considered at the following meeting, before being approved. Hopefully this will ensure minutes are an accurate record of each meeting.</p> <p>NR wants these meetings to be effective for residents, with actions resolved and updated as quickly as possible.</p> <p>PW suggested a small working group should be established. Having three months between meetings is quite frustrating. NR would prefer for actions to be closed within a two-week period in future and is more than happy for the team to meet with residents to discuss specific problems.</p> <p>AW confirmed he would be happy to brief PW once a month and PW agreed to this. PW/AW to catch up separately to CLWG.</p>	

	<p>A resident commented that having actions closed within two weeks would be a vast improvement.</p> <p>SD confirmed approval to the minutes of the previous meeting, subject to a resident confirming her comments have been accurately incorporated.</p>	
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Heathwall Pumping Station Progress Update</b>	
4.1	<u>Presentation from Ponciano Perez (PP) – Project Manager, Tideway/FLO</u>	
4.2	PP confirmed there will be two shafts at Heathwall, one 17 metres in diameter and an 11-metre diameter shaft; these will capture the flows from the Pumping Station. The cofferdam and piling works are now substantially complete.	
4.3	PP confirmed the team needs to gain some additional area in the river in the form of a cofferdam before digging commences. Construction of one of the shafts is expected to start next month.	
4.4	PP confirmed the first 30 metres of the shaft will be removed by road and the rest by barge. Barges will be loaded with an excavator rather than a conveyor belt, so this will be a different operation to Kirtling Street. A resident asked how this will impact on traffic in the area. PP confirmed there will only be four lorries per day, so there will be little impact on traffic.	
4.5	PP advised the bus lane will close and the road configuration will change. The temporary crossing by Waitrose has been moved and will be replaced by a permanent crossing. The bus lane will become a lorry holding area.	
4.6	PP advised that modelling carried out with TfL confirms the closure of the bus lane will not cause a significant impact on traffic.	
4.7	A resident commented that Nine Elms Lane carries a lot of heavy traffic and asked if the muck could be taken by river. PP confirmed muck will be removed by road for a couple of months and then by river. Muck cannot be taken by river from the outset because the necessary infrastructure is not yet completed. Tideway is committed to maximise usage of the river. A resident asked for a commitment that no heavy lorries will visit the site between 07:00 – 10:00 and 16:00 – 19:00. PP advised the team will look into this. <b>Action 6</b>	<b>Tideway</b>
4.8	PP advised the permanent crossing will be located in the same place as the temporary crossing. Work has started and PP believes this will take six weeks to complete. The work is managed by TfL.	
4.9	DJ understands this work is due to be finished by 26 March but is not sure if this includes the road crossing.	
4.10	Cllr Maurice Mcleod (MM) asked if there will be any gap between the removal of the temporary crossing and the installation of the permanent crossing. DJ confirmed there will be a gap.	
4.11	PW asked if the temporary lights can be reinstated if there is a delay to this work. PP advised work is currently taking place where the temporary lights were. He will obtain details of the timings of this work from TfL. <b>Action 7</b>	<b>Tideway</b>
4.12	A resident commented that the temporary lights have on occasion stuck on red and caused chaos. PP advised several traffic marshalls have now been trained to reboot the system.	

4.13	A resident asked about the look of the completed cofferdam. PP confirmed the cofferdam will be filled with material, with concrete cladding fixed to the outside.	
<b>5.0</b>	<b>Kirtling Street Progress Update</b>	
5.1	<u>Presentation from Noel Cooper (NC), Tunnelling Manager, Tideway/FLO</u>	
5.2	NC advised the tunnel boring machine (TBM) for 'Drive C' is expecting the first ring to be completed during the last week in March. The west bound TBM has tunnelled approx. 500m. NC advised the TBM has not passed Chelsea Bridge yet – it has just passed Grosvenor Bridge. NC advised that once the second TBM is launched at the end of March progress will be intermittent for the first 500m, after which it will increase.	
5.3	NC advised each tunnel ring is made of eight segments. These are cast on the Isle of Grain and delivered to site by barge – approximately five deliveries per week.	
5.4	NC referred to an image of the finished muck bay at Brooks Court and advised that initially, spoil was intended to drop on the floor and be pushed to the other side of the bay. However, following conversations with residents, it was found that when the level of spoil was higher, noise levels were lower. Therefore a decision was made to change the opening on the back end of the muck bay and where possible, a heap of spoil is maintained to dampen the noise.	
5.5	NC advised that as tunnelling ramps up, the project will move onto 'muck away' 24 hours a day and will try to get spoil onto one belt and then the other, in order to minimise spoil stored in the muck bay. This will not always be possible due to the huge volumes of material involved but the project will be looking to minimise the noise.	
5.6	PW asked why it is not always possible to load straight into barges at Kirtling Street. NC confirmed the issue at Kirtling Street is the level of the riverbed. At low tide and when the barges are 70% full, the loading operation has to stop until the tide rises. PP confirmed Heathwall will be doing two/three barges per week, whereas Kirtling Street is doing five barges a day.	
5.7	A resident asked if the project is in touch with any archaeologists. NC confirmed at this depth of tunnelling it is not required. PP confirmed the first ten metres at Kirtling Street was managed excavation. The same will take place at Heathwall next month.	
5.8	SD asked if the use of the muck bay is seasonal. NC confirmed the muck bay is used constantly.	
5.9	NC confirmed it is not feasible to put columns or posts within the muck bay in order to enclose the muck bay. However, the team is trying to work with operators and neighbours to make the noise of spoil falling into the muck bay as soft as possible.	
5.10	PW understands it is not possible to put posts in for an enclosure to the muck bay but is it possible to make the walls higher than the conveyor belt? NC advised there is not much difference between the two and if the walls are made bigger, there would be an issue with wind loading. The project has worked with its noise assessors and the Council and is doing checks to minimise noise as much as possible.	



5.11	<p>A resident asked if, even if there are no breaches of the Section 61 levels, does the project acknowledge the current level of disruption is unacceptable? NC advised the team has been to see residents and installed noise monitors. The project is trying to minimise, reduce and remove any elements of noise. However, there will still be “splatter” and he cannot guarantee there will not. MM asked if there has been any change to noise levels and if any feedback has been received from residents. A resident advised the situation is better but not perfect. Last night a resident could still hear the noise of the spoil dropping even though she was wearing ear plugs. PW also read out a text she had received from a local resident regarding noise disruption. MM asked if an increase in production will lead to increased noise. NC advised increased production will lead to increased volume of material being produced. He is not a noise specialist but felt that an increase in production does not mean the noise level as such will rise.</p>	Tideway
5.12	<p>Both LBW and PW confirmed Rob Streetly is happy to visit residents’ properties at night and it is worth including his contact details in the minutes. A resident commented that the difficulty with organising such a visit is that residents do not know when noise is going to occur. <b>Action 8 Robert.Streetly@merton.gov.uk</b></p>	
5.13	<p>Louise Walsh (LW) provided some information to attendees regarding the Independent Compensation Panel (ICP) If someone feels adversely affected by any part of the Tideway project, they can apply to the ICP. Different solutions will be applicable for different people. LW confirmed there is a very simple form and that she can assist any resident with the process. MM asked how residents are made aware of this process. A resident advised the relevant section on the Tideway website can be quite easily found (<a href="http://www.tideway.london/contact-us/help-advice/compensation-information">www.tideway.london/contact-us/help-advice/compensation-information</a> ). A resident understands that other residents have found it useful speaking to LW. LW explained that at an operational level the project has noise and air quality levels that must be adhered to. However if people are still affected they should contact LD. If residents contact the Helpdesk and mention mitigation, then details of their details will be passed to her. The Independent Advisory Service (IAS) can also assist on a general basis but will also refer to LW.</p>	
5.14	<p>MM asked if Tideway would consider a ‘class action’ from a number of people affected by the same issue. LW responded to advise that a special case scenario is considered on an individual rather than a property so people are encouraged to apply individually.</p>	
5.15	<p>A resident asked how residents can challenge the project’s consent. DJ advised this was set by the Development Control Order (DCO). LW advised the only way a DCO can be overturned is by judicial review.</p>	
5.16	<p>A resident understands the DCO was granted before the development was planned. DJ advised the permitted noise levels are project-wide. IM confirmed data was modelled with the specification of Riverlight in mind. If residents are still being affected, we have to start looking at this on an individual basis. IM confirmed this is why Rob Streetly has offered to visit. It may be possible to work in conjunction with the control room but it will not be possible to give advance warning of noise disruption.</p>	
5.17	<p>A resident enquired about the alarm that sounds on site. NC confirmed the alarm is a safety feature and should only be heard during daylight hours and sounds when the conveyor belt operates. After 6pm, a flashing light should</p>	

	operate rather than the alarm. NC will look to see if the alarm level can be lowered. <b>Action 9</b>	<b>Tideway</b>
5.18	A resident reiterated that noise is reduced when the muck builds up but then it is removed, so would not go as far as saying there is an improvement. NC commented that he does not want to tell people this will never happen.	
5.19	A resident requested it be noted that there is a financial impact to the disruption too, for example if she needs to take annual leave in order for the Council's environmental health officer to visit her property. DJ will ask Rob Streetly to come up with some options, as the team work out of hours. <b>Action 10</b>	<b>LBW</b>
5.20	A resident commented that the way the balconies at Riverlight have been designed has resulted in them working like a speaker in reverse, with sounds bouncing off canopies and windows. This may have confused the noise modelling. IM confirmed the project can put noise monitors on balconies, as Tideway is liable for the noise outside the building.	
5.21	PW asked if it is possible to undertake noise monitoring within properties. IM advised this is up to the Council. A resident advised this is difficult because if a council representative visits for an hour, their subjective perception is different to someone who experiences the noise for a longer period.	
5.22	MM asked if there will be some respite from noise when tunnel excavation finishes at the end of 2019. NC advised that following tunnel excavation, the next phase of work will involve casting the secondary lining, with different options of how to carry this out currently being considered. A resident asked which option has been selected. NC advised this has not yet been decided but both are of a similar duration.	
5.23	PW asked when the reinstatement of houseboats is scheduled to take place. AW confirmed this is scheduled to take place in April 2022. PW asked if Tideway has some of the boats. AW confirmed this to be correct. PW enquired where they are located. NR requested that anyone who has a query regarding the location of a specific boat contact the project.	
5.24	AW confirmed that future programme slides relating to works will be made easier to read. <b>Action 11</b>	<b>Tideway</b>

<b>6.0</b>	<b>Environmental and Noise Update</b>	
6.1	<u>Presentation from Iram Mirza (IM) - Environmental Advisor, Tideway/FLO</u>	
6.2	IM advised LBW have approved removing a noise monitor opposite Waitrose and a temporary noise monitor was installed on a resident's balcony. The monitor on the balcony was recently demobilised and the data is being analysed. A resident enquired if this data could be shared. IM advised it would be necessary to check with the resident in question but then can be discussed at the next meeting. <b>Action 12</b>	<b>Tideway</b>
6.3	A resident asked what noise limits are set out in the DCO. IM confirmed noise models were set by noise consultants at the time. IM advised that due to the technical nature of noise it can be a complex subject, when the noise consultant attended the December meeting, there were 10 different graphs displayed. A resident commented that she thinks the graphs are good.	



6.4	IM advised the project has agreed to include LAmox in future reports to the council.	Tideway
6.5	A resident requested advance notice of future concrete breaking on site. NC confirmed there are no large-scale concrete breaking works planned for the site but there may need to be some from time to time.	
6.6	A resident feels there is a lot of hiding behind legality with regard to actions permitted by the Section 61. NR confirmed the team will aim to advise people of key activities coming up by issuing info sheets by email and hard copy. It is not possible to provide updates on every occasion but the team will try to provide as much information as possible.	
6.7	A resident asked if vibrations will be experienced when the TBM passes beneath Nine Elms Pier. NC does not believe so and understands there are monitors in place for the Eastbound TBM drive	
6.8	A resident asked if tunnellers remain underground for an entire shift. NC advised there are three shifts per day and the tunnellers remain underground for their entire shift. NC commented that when both TBMs are up to full speed, the chance of them both stopping at the same time will be minimal.	
6.9	A resident commented that being underground for eight hours a day with no natural light surely must affect the health of the tunnellers. Tideway confirmed the pattern of work and air quality in the tunnel and advised that it takes the welfare of its workforce very seriously	
6.10	PW asked if the workers are part of an official union. PP advised the workers are not part of a union.	
6.11	A resident is concerned she will not be able to open her windows during the summer for the next five years.	
6.12	A resident commented that it would be nice to know what to expect, especially as the TBM will be passing through earth comprising 50% sand and 50% clay for the first time. NC does not believe there will be any vibration but will look to find out. The resident advised the piles from the jetty are situated between 12-18 metres from the crown of the tunnel and is concerned they may experience vibration. Tideway will look provide further information. <b>Action 13</b>	
6.13	A resident enquired how many complaints have been received. AW confirmed 30 noise complaints have been received.	
6.14	PW asked if the project is planning to undertake any litter-picking in the local area. AW believes litter-picking has taken place along the river shore in Battersea. AW requested the local community advise of any areas that would benefit from a litter-pick.	
6.15	PW enquired what age people need to be to qualify for work experience. AW confirmed work experience is open to individuals aged from 16 to 20 years old.	
6.16	PW asked if Tideway is planning to roll-out its reading buddy scheme to other schools, as she can think of three others that would benefit. A resident also suggested a local college. AW invited PW and the resident to provide details.	

<b>7.0</b>	<b>AOB</b>	
7.1	A resident asked if Tideway is signed up to the 'Ban The Box' campaign relating to job seekers with previous convictions. NR confirmed Tideway does.	
7.2	A resident requested details of a contact for Tideway's York Gardens (Falconbrook) site. AW confirmed he is the person to contact.	
7.3	A resident asked if there will eventually be a gate providing access through the site along the river. DJ confirmed the completed site will be gated as it will be an operational Thames Water site and the gate may need to be closed from time to time, however this area will be in the public domain. PP confirmed work at Heathwall is expected to be complete by the end of 2022.	
7.4	A resident enquired about Tideway's policy of answering questions on social media. NR advised Tideway would not respond to any questions on social media and would advise people to contact the Helpdesk instead.	
7.5	A resident asked how Tideway staff would feel if they were personally disturbed several nights a week. The resident understands the legality and necessity of the work but asked how many would accept this level of disturbance. NR advised the project understands the resident is affected and would advise affected residents to speak to LW outside of this meeting.	
7.6	A resident advised that unless she attends the CLWG, the presentation that is distributed afterwards is hard to interpret. NR advised they will consider how the presentation can be improved. <b>Action 14</b>	<b>Tideway</b>

## 8.0 Actions Register

SD ran through the current Actions Register – updated version below:

Meeting Date	Item	Action	Responsibility	Status
07/03/2019	2.1	<b>Action 1:</b> AW to ensure Riverlight management and Battersea Power Station representatives to be invited to future meetings. <b>Post-meeting update: Contacts from Riverlight management and Battersea Power Station will be invited to future CLWGs</b>	Tideway	Closed
07/03/2019	3.1	<b>Action 2:</b> Tideway to use slides used at Chambers Wharf CLWGs to show noise at future Kirtling Street CLWGs, plus an explanation of how the average is calculated over a month. <b>Post-meeting update: Tideway to include noise summary slides similar to those used for Chambers Wharf at next meeting</b>	Tideway	Closed
07/03/2019	3.1	<b>Action 3:</b> Tideway to arrange for a post-meeting note providing a summary of the river flow impact assessment is added to the minutes.	Tideway	Closed

		<b>Post-meeting update: Scour and accretion model has been carried out which show no adverse effect in the flows of the river</b>		
07/03/2019	3.1	<b>Action 4:</b> AW to check if the quote for window cleaning at Riverlight is likely to be approved or rejected.	Tideway	Open
07/03/2019	3.1	<b>Action 5:</b> NR to check and respond to two residents, to advise if the results of two surveys (slab reinforcement and settlement) can be shared. <b>Post-meeting update: Response to be sent directly to resident</b>	Tideway	Closed
07/03/2019	4.7	<b>Action 6:</b> PP to investigate whether a commitment can be made to ensure no heavy lorry movements at Heathwall Pumping Station between 07:00 – 10:00 and 16:00 – 19:00. <b>Post-meeting update: Works run from 08:00 – 18:00 and due to limited storage space on site, cannot be restricted further</b>	Tideway	Closed
07/03/2019	4.11	<b>Action 7:</b> PP to obtain timings from TfL for the work to install permanent crossing where the temporary crossing was located. <b>Post-meeting update: TfL works should be finished by late-April</b>	Tideway	Closed
07/03/2019	5.12	<b>Action 8:</b> Contact details for Rob Streetly to be included in the minutes <b>Post-meeting update:</b> <u><a href="mailto:robert.streetly@merton.gov.uk">robert.streetly@merton.gov.uk</a></u>	Tideway	Closed
07/03/2019	5.17	<b>Action 9:</b> NC to look to see if conveyor belt alarm level can be reduced <b>Post-meeting update: The safety alarm on the conveyor cannot be reduced as it would cause risk to safety of workers</b>	Tideway	Closed
07/03/2019	5.19	<b>Action 10:</b> DJ to ask Rob Streetly to come up with some options to visit local residents, as his team does work out of hours.	London Borough of Wandsworth	Open
07/03/2019	5.24	<b>Action 11:</b> AW to make the presentation slide relating to programme of works easier to read. <b>Post-meeting update: Programme slide to be revised for next meeting</b>	Tideway	Closed
07/03/2019	6.2	<b>Action 12:</b> IM to check if the noise monitoring summary from a resident's balcony can be shared at the next meeting.	Tideway	Open
07/03/2019	6.12	<b>Action 13:</b> Tideway to update whether vibration will be experienced when the TBM passes under Nine Elms Pier. <b>Post-meeting update: Project team has advised they do not believe vibration will be result as a result of the TBM passing</b>	Tideway	Closed

07/03/2019	7.6	<b>Action 14:</b> Tideway to consider how presentation can be improved for those not at CLWG <b>Post-meeting update: Presentation to be revised for next meeting</b>	Tideway	Closed
04/12/2018	1.3	<b>Action 1:</b> A resident submitted her comments for the 7 June CLWG minutes before the October CLWG and these still have not been issued. AW to check with CB on 5 December and ensure these are uploaded to the website. <b>Update:</b> AW advised changes to the minutes for June, October and December 2018 CLWGs will be updated shortly. <b>Post-meeting update: June and October CLWG minutes have been updated and added to the website</b>	Tideway	Closed
23/10/2018	3.9	<b>Action 5:</b> Regarding the studies to see how the cofferdam will be affect the tidal flow, PP advised a brief summary can be made available. <b>Post-meeting update: Scour and accretion model has been carried out which show no adverse effect in the flows of the river</b>	Tideway	Closed
23/10/2018	8.6	<b>Action 14:</b> CB to check with her team when a resident can expect a response to her settlement queries. <b>Update:</b> The resident understands a further survey may be required. NR will put the relevant contact in touch with the resident. <b>Post-meeting update: Resident to be contacted separately</b>	Tideway	Closed
16/01/2018	5.19	<b>Action 5:</b> MA to confirm when the LLAU will be removed as a technical planning restriction <b>Update:</b> A resident advised no response has been received. A resident would like to know when Tideway will no longer prevent new moorings being installed at Nine Elms Pier. SD also requested a short piece confirming when commissioning, testing and reinstatement will take place. A resident requested some leeway for slippages.  <b>Post-meeting update: The LLAU remains safeguarded until at least the completion of construction. After completion, Tideway will continue to take an interest in proposed developments within and around its safeguarded zone Commissioning, testing and reinstatement slide to be presented at next CLWG.</b>	Tideway	Closed

16/01/2018	7.6	<p><b>Action 10:</b> MA to check regarding leeway on the completion date of Tideway works, particularly with regard to 'settlement' and remedial works</p> <p><b>Update:</b> A resident is keen to know, in case settlement continues to occur once the project is complete. The resident understands monitoring must continue if settlement of more than 2mm continues to occur. Tideway will organise a future presentation slide on this subject</p> <p><b>Post-meeting update: Ground monitoring will continue for at least 2 years after the activity causing movement or until movement is less than 2mm/year, whichever is greatest</b></p>	Tideway	Closed
------------	-----	--	---------	--------

Date of next meetings

- 13 June 2019
- 5 September 2019 (provisional)
- 12 December 2019 (provisional)

Date of next meeting to be confirmed at the preceding meeting.