

Queen's Wharf and Riverside Studio's Redevelopment

Pre-Demolition Conditions Additional Information

16th September 2014

Introduction

On the 10th July 2014 information was submitted to the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham as part of discharge of condition applications in relation to condition 8 (LPA ref: 2014/03334/DET), 9 (LPA ref: 2014/03343/DET) and condition 56 (LPA ref: 2014/03344/DET) of full planning permission 2013/03799/FUL. This document has been prepared to respond to additional questions raised during the consultation period and separate consultation undertaken by Mount Anvil which included a meeting with local residents on the 3rd September.

Condition 56 - 2014/03344/DET – Strategy for maximising the use of the River Thames for transportation of construction and waste materials

Information submitted in relation to condition 56 included 'Technical Note 4' prepared by Entran, a environmental and transport consultant. The report concluded that *'the use of the River Thames in this particular location for the movement of demolition and construction material is technically feasible for certain materials but would be grossly impractical and unviable as demolition of construction methodology. The movement of material by road will be controlled and regulated by the Demolition and Construction Management Plan which will first be submitted to and approved by the Council.'*

The following comments were received during consultation on condition 56:

Concerns Raised:

A letter prepared by TPS on behalf of local residents (dated 6th August) raised the following concerns:

'It is disappointing that the River cannot be used for the import and export of materials to the site, and evidently the developers have assessed the feasibility of doing so, concluding that there is insufficient depth of water to allow this to happen.

We do not dispute the results of the assessment, but wish to make the point that as a result the disruption to residents on the surrounding road network will now be far greater, a fact that should be taken into account during the demolition and construction works and the programme adjusted accordingly to reduce the number of vehicles that have to access the site each day.

Vehicle congestion should be monitored and appropriate action taken if problems arise.'

Further representations on condition 56 included the following comments:

- *Expect a strategy paper to contain a report by an independent marine consultant with experience and a proven track record in preparing reasoned reports on the use of road and the River Thames;*
- *A methodological assessment should be submitted in consultation with road haulage companies;*
- *The river has been used for transportation for centuries and should still be able to be used;*
- *Concerns over the disruption to the road network including traffic and safety concerns;*

A residents meeting was held on the 2nd September where comments were raised in relation to Entran's report. At the meeting resident's continued to express a desire that the river should be used.

Mount Anvil Response:

Following engagement with local residents, Mount Anvil agreed to look at the feasibility of river transportation further and provide additional information from a marine engineer. Mount Anvil have instructed Beckett Rankine (Marine Consulting Engineers) to produce a further feasibility report to investigate and challenge the initial Entran report. A copy of the report is enclosed and the key conclusions are listed below:

4.1.4

Due to the ineffectiveness of the barges highlighted in Entran's report it appears that the use of barges is not suitable for this site.

3.5.3

Although vessels may be able to access an area close to the river wall this is restricted to mean high tide, when neap tides occur (approx. twice a month) the vessels may not be able to leave their berth.

4.1.2

The site has a number of constraints for vessel movements and landside loadings as listed below:

- *Adjacent foreshore to the site is dry for the majority of the tide with only 1.2m water depth at MHW*
- *Sloped foreshore towards navigational channel (levelling works would be required);*
- *Inadequate mooring points on the river frontage, with river wall structures sensitive to any further loading;*
- *Limited live load capacity landside of the river frontage.*

Also enclosed with the report is a restraints drawing produced by WSP (structural engineer) in line with investigation works completed to the river wall. This drawing further demonstrates an inability to apply loads near the river wall meaning loading barges to transport materials isn't feasible. The restraints drawing has been approved by the Environment Agency considering fully the flood defence in this location.

3.5.1 *On the Queen's Wharf and Riverside Studios site a loading restriction is specified adjacent to the river wall, due to the sensitivity of the river wall's stability. As a result this area restricts loads to 2.5kN/m² up to 10m landward from the river wall and therefore (Without further strengthening) any stockpile of material would be limited to approximately 150mm high which would be unfeasible. In addition, plant and equipment would require additional support possible via a piled foundation.*

It is also worth noting that the approved Construction Method Statement for the Fulham Reach scheme which is close to the site does not include the use of river transportation. This suggests that the same conclusions were reached regarding feasibility for demolition and construction activities on this section of River Thames.

With relation to **Condition 56 - 2014/03344/DET**, it is believed that all reasonable steps have been taken to this condition. Furthermore the conclusions from two independent consultants validate the initial report submitted.

Condition 8 - 2014/03334/DET- Construction Logistics Plan

Information submitted in relation to condition 8 included a 'Demolition and Construction Logistics Plan' prepared by Entran. This document was based on the 'Demolition and Construction Logistics Plan Framework' submitted with the full planning application and agreed with the Council's highways officer.

Formal comments have been received from the Council's highways department during the consultation period. Mount Anvil's highways consultant, Entran are in continued dialogue with the Council's highways officer to respond to the comments received and further information has been submitted to deal with these points.

The following further comments were received from local residents during consultation on condition 8:

Comments Raised:

Concerns raised regarding the following:

1. Flow of traffic to and from the development
2. Further clarity on the number of HGV's
3. Pedestrian safety considering the additional vehicles

Mount Anvil Response:

1. The flow of traffic has been a concern throughout the planning process. The Demolition and Construction Logistics Plan Framework (report dated November 2013) submitted with the planning application demonstrated how vehicle movements would be managed. This Logistics framework was agreed with the council's highways officer and acts as a guide for future logistic submissions. The Demolition and Construction Logistics Plan (submitted July 2014) has therefore been based on this approved framework.

Following consultation it became apparent that there are differing views from local residents about which way vehicles should approach and leave the site, some would prefer vehicles to enter and return via Queen Caroline Street, others would prefer an anti-clockwise route entering from Queen Caroline Street and exiting from Chancellors Road. The route considered and approved at the planning stage was the anti-clockwise route via Chancellors Road as set out in the Framework DCLP. Mount Anvil have agreed that either route would be feasible and seek clarity from LBHF as to which route is preferred. Should the council approve this condition based on the information submitted then it is taken that the anti-clockwise route is approved.

2. Mount Anvil have provided further clarity on the number of HGVs visiting the site. Below are extracts from the updated report which provide this detail:

9.2 For the duration of the demolition works the Site is expected to generate an average of 12 HGV trips per day (i.e. 6 HGVs arriving and then departing), plus a number of smaller vans or light vehicles.

9.3 Phase 2 demolition is scheduled to take 30 weeks so it is not possible to specify the size and type of vehicles on each and every day; however, the demolition programme will be sub-divided into:

- 2.1** - Soft-strip of Queen's Wharf and Riverside Studios
- 2.2** - Demolition of Queen's Wharf superstructure (14 weeks)
- 2.3** - Demolition of Riverside Studios superstructure (12 weeks)

9.4 During Phase 2.1 rigid vehicles will collect material from River Terrace. At the start of Phase 2.2 either one or two articulated semi-trailer low loaders will deliver demolition plant and machinery to River Terrace. The same vehicle type will be required to collect demolition plant and machinery at

DATE: September 2014 the end of Phase 2.3. During Phases 2.2 and 2.3 the majority of goods vehicles will be rigid open top tippers to remove material from site. Once the first element of Queens Wharf has been demolished the tippers will be able to turn on site and enter and leave in a forward gear. The swept paths of these vehicle types are contained in Appendix 2-B.

3. A plan illustrating the footways to be temporarily closed and the alternative pedestrian routes has been provided within Appendix 2-E of the Demolition and Construction Logistics Plan. This pedestrian diversion route has been subject to an independent Road safety Audit (RSA) and considers the potential safety risks. The route and RSA have been approved by the Network Enforcement Co-ordinator at LBHF and deemed acceptable. Mount Anvil will throughout the demolition phase consider further suggestions and will seek to work with the council and local residents on this matter.

The amended Construction Logistics Plan is enclosed with this report.

Condition 9- 2014/03343/DET- Demolition Method Statement and Construction Management Statement

Information submitted in relation to condition 9 included a 'Demolition Plan' prepared by Advanced Demolition Ltd.

The following comments were received during consultation on condition 9, including the residents meeting held on the 2nd September 2014:

Working Hours

Comments Raised:

Concern was raised regarding working hours and the wording within the Demolition and Construction Logistics Plan.

Mount Anvil Response:

Mount Anvil confirm that demolition works will take place Monday to Friday 8am to 18.00 – and at the request of local residents, Mount Anvil have also agreed **not** to work Saturdays throughout the demolition period.

Asbestos Notification

Comments Raised:

Requests have been made that the completed Asbestos survey is published to all residents and clearance/remove certificate is also made available to Residents.

Mount Anvil Response:

Mount Anvil agree to publish these documents, inform residents and display these documents online via a dedicated website.

Dust and Dirt

Comments Raised:

Concern was raised about excessive dust and what action would be taken if dust did migrate from the site.

Mount Anvil Response:

Mount Anvil agree to clean windows, cars, bikes etc with the owner's permission if an episode does occur – however the control measures detailed within the Demolition Plan mean this should not happen.

Excessive Noise

Comments Raised:

Concerns raised about excessive noise and what procedures would be in place.

Mount Anvil Response:

The site will be registered under the Considerate Constructors Scheme. In addition, Mount Anvil are required to comply with the Control of Pollution Act 1974. In addition, daily monitoring of noise will take place and be recorded in an on-site log book and procedures will be reviewed should there be concerns over noise.

Vermin

Comments Raised:

Concerns raised that vermin could leave the site within the demolition phase and migrate causing a problem locally to the site.

Mount Anvil Response:

Mount Anvil agree to carry out an assessment to establish the potential impact and also agree that a specialist would work with local residents to ensure migration of vermin is negated.

Demolition Operative Parking

Comments Raised:

Concerns raised about operatives parking locally and parking suspensions in general.

Mount Anvil Response:

Mount Anvil confirm that throughout the demolition phase parking will be provided onsite for Demolition operatives. In terms of parking suspension these would only be required on specific days and not for long durations throughout the Demolition Phase.

At the meeting with residents on 2nd September 2014 other issues relating to the Queen Wharf and Riverside Studio redevelopment were discussed which have been noted below. It is hoped that this demonstrates a further commitment from Mount Anvil to behave reasonably with respect to demolition and construction activities taking place.

Party Wall Matters

Comments Raised:

Concerns raised regarding party wall matters and not being consulted.

Mount Anvil Response:

Mount Anvil have engaged or have tried to make contact with residents 6m from the development. In line with the party wall act it is proposed that party wall awards are in place before piling commences.

Mount Anvil have agreed with Chancellors Wharf Residents Association that additional surveys will be completed as a good will gesture to provide confidants in the demolition/construction process.

Agreed Future Communication

Following the meeting with residents on the 2nd September 2013, it was agreed that the following lines of communication would be set up and maintained throughout the demolition and construction period.

Proposed Plan:

- Quarterly newsletter –first newsletter was issued in August 2014
- Bulletin for major events (these should be provided 7 days before the event)
- Online portal will be created for information to be displayed
- Agreed hard copies would be posted for those without access to the internet
- Residents meetings will continue to take place – it was suggested that the local community hall in the Queen Caroline Estate is used as suggested by residents moving forward, if this acceptable to the management company.
- Information will be displayed on the site hoarding, once in place.