

INQ/13

THAMES GATEWAY BRIDGE INQUIRY**Preliminary Notes for Proposed Roundtable Session on Conditions**

These notes contain the preliminary thoughts of the Inspectors on the alternative sets of draft conditions which comprise Document TFL24. The notes relate to the pages of that document.

The intention is to arrange a roundtable session within the inquiry to discuss these points and any others raised by parties to the inquiry on the conditions subject to which any planning permission might be granted.

All parties to the inquiry are welcome to take part in this session. It is clearly understood that any points raised by objectors on conditions are put forward without prejudice to their objection to the matters before the inquiry, and, in particular, to the planning applications.

Anybody unfamiliar with the drafting of conditions in relation to planning applications would no doubt find it helpful to have a look at Circular 11/95 (particularly paragraph 14) before the conditions session. This Circular comprises Document INQ12.

Page 1 – G2 – What about drawings etc (if any) which have been approved by the First Secretary of State?

Page 1 – G3 – If forthcoming? Would it be worth adding condition 79 from Appendix A to Circular 11/95? Otherwise something similar will need to be added to conditions A6, E3, A13, A7, A15, A9, A3, E7, A16, C7, E4, A24 and A4.

Page 1 – G4 (or Newham 1 page 29) – We feel that the plans finally put forward for approval should be listed.

Page 2 – We would prefer to have the Design Statement specified as TFL have done in A1. Otherwise, is there any real difference between the different versions? Re 1c – Is an underbridge a bridge?

Page 3 – Are seven and five years generally agreed between TFL and the LPAs?

Page 4 – Greenwich 3a – Can foundations and a method statement be covered by a planning condition? A2 – Where does the Design Panel come in?

Page 7/8 – Newham 9 – What does this add?

Page 9 – What is “the relevant part of the site”? We need information re CAP 680.

Page 11 – “No vehicle” rather than “no vehicles”.

Page 12 – Prefer TfL version, subject to “effect” becoming “affect” in d. What is “operation of PLA”?

Page 13 – A23 – When vibration has been monitored, what happens?

Page 14 – Greenwich 15 and 16 – These do not seem to us to be sufficiently precise. If they were given added precision, the case for them would still need to be argued.

Page 18 – D2 – Are these still the correct drawings?

Page 19 – A14 – Surely not “All external lighting” – which does it mean?
Will D7 work? How will it be ascertained?

Page 20 – A18 – Why only riverside compounds?
A11 – Does this mean D4, which deals with facing materials?

Page 22 – A22 – What does this not give to Newham compared to the version they have put forward? Newham to argue the case for their version if they wish.

Page 26 – A3 – Refer to bridge piers, and refer to location and form. Better to say cannot start until, in order to avoid an apparent commitment to approve.

Page 28 – Greenwich 33 – Agree that this is covered.

Page 29 – Newham 1 – We believe that something like this is necessary.
C7 – Is this appropriate for a condition?

Page 30 – Greenwich 18 – Condition or Section 106? “CCTV system” – not precise – for what purpose? – for how long?
Newham 18 – When it has been monitored, what happens?

Page 31 – A24 – Is this not covered by E2 on page 28?

Page 34 – Newham 39 – Does it need to refer to rivers?

Page 35 – A21 – Does this duplicate A22 on page 22? If not, can they be run together?

M Ellison
J Watson

16.9.05