

THAMES GATEWAY BRIDGE – PUBLIC INQUIRY

INSPECTOR’S QUESTIONS: 24 NOVEMBER 2005

1 Permissible Variation In Bridge Height

1.1 Attention is drawn to the following exchange, recorded on pages 94 and 95 of Day 3’s transcript (Mr Kennedy examined by the Assistant Inspector):

12 Q. Okay. At 4.3.1, you tell us that there is a permissible
13 variation of plus or minus 1 metre from the vertical
14 alignment shown on drawings.

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. What effect would that have on the ruling gradient of 5%?
17 A. That would still have to be complied with.

18 Q. So what we have got, in effect, in the drawings that you have
19 submitted is the upper limit, is it; it is the plus 1 metre
20 case?

21 A. No.

22 Q. If the bridge design ended up 1 metre higher than your
23 drawings show, then would that be able to be accommodated
24 within the CPO land?

25 A. Yes, it would. Yes, because we have checked that out and the
26 variation could be accommodated within the viaduct section,
94

1 MR KENNEDY: X Asst Insp

2 so it would not need to change the earthwork sections which
3 reflect the CPO.

4 Q. Would that be accommodated then and the 5% ruling gradient
5 would be retained?

6 A. Yes.

1.2 Figure B2 of Mr Kennedy’s evidence shows the viaduct section to the north of the Thames (that is, that part of the Scheme between the northern abutment and the vertical curve near the crest of the bridge) to be wholly at a gradient of 5%. The evidence does not show how the crest could be raised by 1 metre while retaining the 5% limiting gradient and not increasing the height of the embankment to the north of the northern abutment.

1.3 TFL are asked:

i) Either to indicate how the crest could be raised 1 metre while retaining the 5% ruling gradient and not affecting the height of the northern and southern abutments;

ii) Or to indicate how, if the height of the northern or southern abutment, or both, were raised to accommodate a 1 metre increase in the height of the bridge, the earthworks could be contained within the CPO land.

2 Cycleway Gradients

2.1 The evidence illustrates the proposed cycleway gradient where adjacent to the proposed main carriageway, and on the southern loop. To the north, the cycleway would follow the Northern Public

Transport Connection, the existing EGGS bridge and a curved ramp down to ground level. What would the gradients be on those sections of the cycleway?

3 Project Programme

- 3.1 Table 2 of Mr Clarke's evidence anticipates the conclusion of the Inquiry in July 2005 and the approval of the Secretaries of State to the Orders being given by March 2006. It is now apparent that the Inquiry is unlikely to end before the spring of 2006 and so the decisions of the Secretaries of State will also be delayed.
- 3.2 TFL is shortly to put new traffic evidence to the Inquiry. It would assist if any relevant effect of such delay to the scheme were incorporated in that new material.
- 3.3 TFL are requested to provide an update of Mr Clarke's Table 2 at the appropriate time, perhaps at the first resumption of the Inquiry in 2006.
- 3.4 How do any changes to the programme affect TFL's other evidence?

4 TFL/79

- 4.1 TFL/79 was produced in response to this question put to Mr Ellison by the Assistant Inspector on Day 3 (9 June: transcript page 164):

When
8 we are reporting this Inquiry one of the things we have to
9 cover, as you will be aware, is to indicate to the Secretary
10 of State whether there are any impediments to the scheme
11 progressing. While absolute undertakings may not be able to
12 be given in all cases, it helps us to understand the
13 Promoter's position and the reasons why the Promoter thinks
14 it is reasonable to expect the consents to be forthcoming
15 when they are asked for.

- 4.2 TFL/79 is a copy of a letter, dated 29 June 2005, from the Environment Agency.
- 4.3 In his evidence Mr Ellison refers (in paragraph 9.2.1) to the need for approvals from a Secretary of State under section 76 of the Port of London Act and (in paragraph 9.4.1) to the Scheme's need for a Marine Works Licence to be issued by the Secretary of State for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs under the Food and Environmental Protection Act. Neither of these approvals appears to be the subject of TFL/79. Why does TFL think it reasonable to expect the consents mentioned in Mr Ellison's paragraphs 9.2.1 and 9.4.1 to be forthcoming when sought?
- 4.4 TFL/79 also mentions, in conclusion, the need for the following:
 - a) A Sea Disposal Licence, issued by DEFRA or the DfT.

- b) A Drainage Outfall Licence, issued by DEFRA or the DfT.
- c) An OFCOM licence for the Marine Radar and SHF Radio Links.

4.5 Will TFL please explain each, confirming whether TFL agrees each is needed and explaining why. If needed, why is it reasonable to expect each of those licences to be forthcoming when sought?