



MEETING MINUTES

Subject:	King Edward Memorial Park Foreshore Community Liaison Working Group
Date and time:	Tuesday 31 January 2017, 7-9 pm
Location:	The Shadwell Centre, 455 The Highway, London, E1W 3HP
Minute taker:	Yvette Hewlett, Administrative Support, Tideway
Chair:	Mike Wardle

Item	Topic
1	Welcome
2	Report back on actions from previous meeting on 23 November 2016
4	Update from project team
5	AOB
6	Date of next meeting

1. Welcome

Welcome from Geoff Loader (GL), Head of Stakeholder Engagement, who explained the purpose of the CLWG meetings, for those who were not present at the November meeting.

2. Introduction of Tideway and contractor representatives

GL asked the project team to introduce themselves.

Project staff:

- Geoff Loader (GL) - Head of Stakeholder Engagement, Tideway
- Jeff Alchin (JA) - Project Manager, Tideway
- Clive Kraus (CK) - Deputy Project Manager, Tideway
- Martin Griffiths (MG) - Senior Community Relations Manager, Tideway (CVB)
- Alice Bigelow (AB) - Community Management Consultant
- Yvette Hewlett (YH) - Administrative Support, Tideway

GL then invited all other attendees to introduce themselves:

Title	First Name	Surname	Organisation
Mr	Jon	Aldenton	Turk's Head Charity
Ms	Jane	Bartlett	
Mr	Bob	Bennett	London Borough of Tower Hamlets

Title	First Name	Surname	Organisation
Ms	Alice	Bigelow	London Borough of Tower Hamlets
Ms	Penny	Bruce-Walker	Shadwell Basin Outdoor Activity Centre - Trustee / Resident
Ms	Jan	Coughlin	Shadwell Basin Outdoor Activity Centre
Mr	Carl	Dunsire	Save King Edward Memorial Park
Mr	James	Easterbrook	Shadwell Basin Fishing Club
Ms	Vickie	Flores	Resident - Wapping High Street
Mrs	Maggie	Forbes	Free Trade Wharf Management Company and resident
Mr	Mads	Jørgensen	Resident - Peartree Lane
Ms	Sheena	Kelly	Shadwell Basin Outdoor Activity Centre / Resident
Ms	Daniele	Lamarche	
Ms	Hazel	Parker-Brown	FTW Residents' Association
Mr	Peter	Smith	Tower Hamlets Tennis
Mr	Mike	Wardle	Chair - CLWG / Shadwell Basin Outdoor Activity Centre

GL mentioned it was discussed at the last meeting that the CLWG Chair would need to be agreed and he has asked for volunteers. GL met with Mike Wardle (MW), last week who had put his name forward. MW is a local resident who is heavily involved in local activities. GL asked if the group was happy for MW to be the Chair. The group agreed.

2. Report back on actions from the previous meeting on 23 November 2016

MW took over chairing the meeting and advised everybody to check / add their details to the registration list being passed around, in order to receive future minutes.

MW asked if everybody was in agreement with the minutes from the November meeting. All agreed.

MW moved on to the open actions arising from the previous minutes:

3. *Tideway to consider making project information available in a second language, to make them more accessible to the local community.*

GL advised he has been in touch with the London Sustainability Exchange (LSE), which has carried out a lot of work with the local Bengali community. GL has another meeting with the LSE next month with a view to utilising its facilities regarding this request.

MW mentioned it would be good to get other groups that use the Park to come along to the CLWGs, plus schools etc. MW advised he had asked other groups to come along.

6. *Tideway environmental expert to confirm the size of the replacement trees to be planted in the Park as part of the project.*

Jeff Alchin (JA) confirmed the girth will be 18-20cm, ie semi-mature, not saplings. The species will be decided by the master plan.

A resident advised she was aware some trees would be planted in March. JA confirmed no trees will be planted in March, with the possible exception of one in the new playground area. He is waiting for the master plan and the layout and will then commit to planting trees.

A resident asked if the Edwardian layout will be retained when planting trees. JA confirmed that it would and that this was one of the drivers in the design.

7. *Request from CD for a PDF showing a CAD version of the tree removal slide to be overlaid with relevant section of the DCO.*

To be covered in the project update (item 3).

8. *Request for further information about an ambiguous cluster of trees in the presentation.*

To be covered in the project update (item 3).

No further comments received regarding the closed action.

3. Update from the project team

JA began the presentation, which will be distributed with the minutes. **Action 1: YH.**

JA moved onto the slide containing an image of the new post-project foreshore and confirmed the cofferdam will be removed.

A resident stated the remaining structure is not very Edwardian. It is very attractive but very modern.

JA confirmed the outline of the structure is set by the Development Consent Order (DCO). JA explained the intertidal terraces are designed to keep the community as close to the river wall as possible. JA added that Tideway is still about a year away from agreeing the final design.

A resident asked if the jetty would be restored. JA confirmed it would not.

A resident mentioned the structure is an important extension to the Park and asked if it would be under the Park's or Tideway's management. The resident added it is an opportunity to make the Park connect with the river and the design does not do this and is therefore a lost opportunity. Residents have failed to stop the tunnel but could still get something worthwhile out of the project.

Carl Dunsire (CD) stated that Tideway had an opportunity to include residents' requests when designing the master plan but has not. MW asked if the final layout of the structure had been decided yet and JA confirmed it had not.

A resident commented that the projection of the structure effectively stops people walking on the foreshore, even at low tide. JA confirmed the structure has to be a particular size, to accommodate the shaft.

A resident mentioned people like to sit and see the foreshore at low tide, which is the main attraction. MW asked if this could be looked into. JA repeated that the size of the structure is restricted due to the engineering beneath it.

A resident asked if any of the Section 106 money is available to use for the restoration of the Free Trade Wharf jetty? MW asked Tideway to look into this. **Action 2: Tideway.**

Maggie Forbes (MF) advised she would like it if Tideway could do something regarding the Free Trade Wharf jetty and would welcome a discussion.

Peter Smith (PS) asked what the square meterage of the new structure is. CD asked what the full process is to get planning consent for the structure, so people know the deadline by when any objections can be put forward. **Action 3: Tideway.**

A resident asked what access will be required to the structure after the project is complete. JA advised there will be varying inspections that will need to be carried out, including quarterly,

annually and 10-yearly inspections by Thames Water. The 10-year inspections will involve two large cranes accessing the structure.

A resident asked how high the two ventilation shafts are. JA confirmed these will be a maximum of 6.5m high.

JB mentioned there were no public consultation notices put up in the area with regard to either the artwork for the hoardings or the permanent art commission.

JA advised about an upcoming meeting on Thursday 2 February regarding the art commission and asked who from the CLWG could go. The group nominated JB to attend and then provide feedback to the group at the next CLWG meeting. **Action 4: JB.**

A resident mentioned the artwork process should have been an opportunity to get the local community and schoolchildren involved. MW asked if it was too late. CK will investigate and report back to see if the shortlisted proposals could be presented to the CLWG. **Action 5: CK.**

A resident asked where the maintenance access points will be, what will be the size of the vehicles and how will it affect the Park? JA advised everything will be incorporated into the design of the access road, which is designed to take a load and will be softened in order to blend in with the Park the rest of the time.

A resident asked how big the access road will be and asked if a slide / plan could be given to show the access road in more detail. JA will add a slide to a presentation to be given at a subsequent meeting. **Action 6: JA.**

A resident asked how wide the access road will be. JA confirmed 6m.

A resident asked for assurance that the Edwardian railings and light will remain. JA confirmed they will, as there will be the Thames Path, then the existing railings, then Tideway's hoardings, then the temporary access road.

A resident asked why the crane cannot come in by river for the inspections. JA confirmed the maintenance will be carried out by Thames Water once the project has finished and Thames Water does not have the facility to use the river. MW asked if somebody from Thames Water can attend future CLWGs. JA to investigate and ask Thames Water about river access. **Action 7: JA.**

A resident asked why the vertical shaft has to be placed in the location, as per the plans. JA advised the shaft is located in the position shown to allow the storm overflows to be diverted from the North East Storm Relief Sewer and allow enough space to construct isolation chambers so the tunnel can be isolated for inspections.

A resident asked if the river will be used for removal / delivery of materials. JA advised all the materials connected with the cofferdam work will be brought in and removed by river. The access road will be used for site set-up.

Clive Krauss (CK) took over the presentation and confirmed the traffic lights at the junction of the Highway and Glamis Road will be re-phased during site set-up, to allow for vehicles turning in, ie the phasing will be longer. Transport for London will dictate the phasing and the work is scheduled for 8 February.

JB asked why these issues along with the upcoming UK Power Network work are not being notified to residents on the Information Sheets, rather than being told retrospectively. JA will take JB's comments on board.

JB asked why the Park's noticeboards are not being used by Tideway. JA asked Bob Bennett (BB) if Tideway could utilise the empty Park noticeboard. BB agreed.

CK added that Tideway has ordered some noticeboards, in order to display information.

JB asked when the master plan will be presented. Alice Bigelow (AB) confirmed the master plan has not been finalised yet and is still in the development stage, so difficult to say at this stage when it can be presented.

JB asked why the arboricultural method statement cannot be shared with the CLWG. CK advised it is a working document and that before any trees are cut down, it has to be agreed by Tower Hamlets.

JB asked how many trees will be removed. Tideway confirmed 26 will be removed and that replacement trees will be confirmed once the masterplan is finalised. JB asked if an image can be produced (showing which trees will be removed) plus the method statement. **Action 8: Tideway.**

JB asked if a hand-out showing the new playground can be produced, as the words are too small and cannot be read. **Action 9: Tideway.**

Mads Jørgensen (MJ) asked if the slide of the playground showed the whole permanent playground. JA advised the image only shows part of the playground, which will be the one available in April 2017. MJ asked if the playground will be able to sustain the same number of children as before, bearing in mind there will only be one slide rather than three. AB confirmed the image only forms a section of the eventual playground, which will form more of a long snake-like shape, with various types of play areas along the way.

AB advised she was in attendance tonight as there was a clear high level of interest in the playground at the last meeting in November.

MJ expressed his environmental concerns, with regard to heavy machinery travelling past the new playground, giving off fumes. CK confirmed this has been taken into consideration which is the whole point of removing the existing playground. The new playground will be far enough away to not be affected by such issues and there will be a hoarding between the playground and the site.

JA added there are three air quality monitors in place and if air pollution is a concern, he can obtain a hand-held monitor and take some readings once the permanent playground is up and running.

A resident asked if lighting will be installed across the new park. AB advised that trunking is currently being installed so lighting could be installed in the future, if possible, however, there are cost implications. AB will investigate. **Action 10: AB.**

DL mentioned that putting in lighting could double the usage of the tennis courts etc. PS added the use of lights drives down anti-social behaviour.

A resident suggested solar panels being installed to light up the tennis courts, which would mean no ongoing costs would be incurred. AB to investigate. **Action 11: AB.**

A resident asked if the bandstand will be replaced or just moved. It was confirmed the bandstand will just be moved.

AB advised that two 5-a-side football pitches will be installed at the Park. DL asked why a full-size pitch will not be put in. AB confirmed the reason is there is not enough room.

A resident asked if booking fees will be required. AB confirmed no booking fees will be applicable.

A resident asked how much Section 106 is available. AB confirmed £3.1m.

JB requested full disclosure of the Section 106 budget, ie where the money is going. AB advised this cannot be circulated immediately. **Action 12: Tower Hamlets.**

MW advised that Tower Hamlets must listen to the requests of local sports clubs and residents in relation to the masterplan.

AB confirmed that everything said at tonight's meeting will be taken forward and the current plan is not set in stone.

A resident asked if the bowling green is being removed completely (ie not being replaced). AB confirmed the bowling green is going, as nobody uses it anymore.

AB advised there are two separate design teams responsible for the playground and the foreshore structure. A resident asked if these two bodies can come along to the next meeting. **Action 13: Tideway.**

4. AOB

None.

5. Date of next meeting

MW suggested information sheets are sent out regularly by Tideway to notify residents of important matters and suggested that the CLWG meets every two months.

Date of next meeting: Tuesday 28 March, 7pm-9pm, The Shadwell Centre, 455 The Highway, London, E1W 3HP.

Actions Register:

1. Tideway to distribute a copy of the project update presentation with the minutes of this meeting.
ACTION: CLOSED - presentation attached.
2. Tower Hamlets to see if any of the Section 106 money is available to use for the restoration of the Free Trade Wharf jetty.
ACTION: OPEN - Tower Hamlets to report back at next CLWG.
3. Tideway to confirm the planning application process for the new structure, so people know the deadline by when any objections can be put forward.
ACTION: OPEN - further information on this to be provided at the next CLWG.
4. JB to attend the artwork meeting on 2 February and feedback to the CLWG at the March meeting.
ACTION: CLOSED - JB attended and will provide feedback at March CLWG.
5. Tideway to investigate the possibility of the shortlisted proposals for the art commission being presented to the CLWG.
ACTION: OPEN - further information on this to be provided at the next CLWG.
6. JA to add a slide / plan to the March presentation which shows the access road in more detail.
ACTION: open - further information on this to be provided at March CLWG.

7. JA to find out about Thames Water accessing the river with regard to regular inspections.
ACTION: CLOSED - POST MEETING NOTE: Once operational, regular maintenance visits will be undertaken on the new structures. This will typically comprise a team attending every 3-6 months with small number of support vehicles (vans / light good vehicles). A more detailed inspection is required of the shaft and tunnel approximately every 10 years, whereby additional supporting equipment such as cranes, skips and storage containers will be required. Access will also be required in an emergency, such as equipment failure etc. Vehicle access is required for each of these maintenance operations and consequently an access track through the park between Glamis Road and the new structures is required. Unfortunately this maintenance and the attendance of the necessary personnel, vehicles and equipment, cannot be conducted by river.
8. Tideway to share the arboricultural method statement (AMS) and produce an image showing which trees will be removed.
ACTION: CLOSED - AMS shared with MW and further information on trees to be provided at the next CLWG.
9. Tideway to produce a hand-out of the new playground with bigger writing.
ACTION: CLOSED - information sheet with image of playground distributed in early February.
10. AB to investigate if lighting can be installed across the new park.
ACTION: OPEN - further information on this to be provided at the next CLWG.
11. AB to investigate the possibility of installing solar panels to light up the tennis courts.
ACTION: OPEN - further information on this to be provided at the next CLWG.
12. Full disclosure requested regarding the Section 106 budget, ie where the money is going.
ACTION: OPEN - Tower Hamlets to provide further information on the masterplan and Section 106.
13. AB to see if the two separate design teams responsible for the playground and the foreshore structure could attend a future CLWG.
ACTION: OPEN - a separate meeting is due to be arranged and more information will be provided on this shortly.