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Thames Tunnel Consultation Submission – Barn Elms & Putney Foreshore Construction

Stop the Shaft Putney & Barnes

Stop the Shaft Putney & Barnes (“STS”) is a large group of Putney & Barnes residents who oppose the proposed Thames Tunnel building works at Barn Elms.

The membership is comprised of concerned Putney & Barnes residents opposed to the proposed construction. STS has raised a petition of over 4,700 people opposed to any construction at the Barn Elms site. This number is growing. The petition is available for inspection by Thames Water upon request to Stop the Shaft via email at tunnel.putney@gmail.com. STS notes that residents in Barnes have also raised a similar petition in addition to this one.

The fundamental objection to the proposal is that it involves a major construction on a Greenfield site as opposed to a brownfield industrial site. The proposed construction work should not proceed on the Barn Elms Greenfield site. STS strongly objects to the proposed construction works at Barn Elms.

STS is also concerned about the selection of Barn Elms as a construction site, the suitability of the proposed solution by Thames Water and the impact on the environment and local residents many of whom live within 500 metres of the proposed construction site. Similar concerns arise in relation to the proposed construction works on Putney Foreshore and Leader Gardens.

STS is also very concerned about the lack of consultation by Thames Water in relation to the proposed construction works. Indeed it is important to note that STS has identified that many local residents were not aware of the proposed construction works, and where only alerted to the proposals as a result of canvassing by STS. As a result of the lack of consultation STS asked Thames Water to deliver 10,000 consultation documents to local residents. We note for the record that Thames Water refused to do this, and so STS
asked that 10,000 leaflets be delivered to STS so that STS could itself distribute the consultation documents itself. The consultation questionnaire was only delivered to STS on 4 January just 8 business days before the end of the consultation period. This makes it very difficult for many residents to respond in time. All rights are reserved in this regard.

The Proposed Solution – Thames Tunnel

STS understands the need to reduce the amount of untreated sewage entering the Thames. However this aim needs to be carefully balanced with the impact of any building works in relation to this proposed project and in particular in relation to the proposed building on any Greenfield sites. STS strongly objects to any building on Greenfield as opposed to brownfield sites. STS objects to the proposed building works at Barn Elms and Putney Foreshore.

STS is concerned as to the suitability of the proposed solution. The construction works will be very extensive and yet the design flaw from the original sewage system will not be remedied. The proposed solution:

1. Is still a mixed system sewer
2. Only deals with approximately 30 CSO’s not all of the CSO’s and
3. Will not prevent the overflow of sewage to the Thames which will still occur with this system.

STS asks that Thames Water supply the information requested in this submission together with a summary of the pros and cons of alternative solutions including full costings and comprehensive environmental impact assessment for each solution (including details of the mitigation measures proposed to reduce each impact).

STS is unable to answer whether there is a better way of reducing the impact of sewage entering the Thames until this information is provided.

The information provided so far by Thames Water about the Thames Tunnel and the efforts to raise public awareness about this scheme, the largest of its kind in Europe, and its implications have not been sufficient. Thames Water has the opportunity to improve the efficiency of water collection, treatment and reduce sewage in the Thames, and it is essential that the best solution is selected for this task.

Financial Impact of the Thames Tunnel

STS is concerned as to how the cost of the Thames Tunnel project will be funded. STS asks Thames Water to explain:

a) Does it already have the funds to pay for the project?
b) If not how will the funds be raised, and what is the likely per household cost of such building works and over what period will this be payable?
c) Will the costs of the Tunnel works be applied equally on a per household basis or will discounts be given to those households who are affected by the building works i.e. those residents living nearby to building works?
d) Are all of the costs of the project intended to be passed onto the consumer or does Thames Water intend to use any cash reserves, or share of profits to fund the project?
e) If the project goes over budget can you confirm that these costs will be borne solely by Thames Water and will not be passed onto consumers?
f) At what cost does the Thames Tunnel become financially unviable? There are concerns about the construction costs blowing out much beyond the estimated £3.3 billion cost.

STS is concerned about the cost estimate of the proposed construction works, and that the cost information Thames Water has provided is over optimistic. STS is concerned therefore that the £3.3bn estimate could have skewed the decision to go with a tunnel
quite dramatically at the expense of other solutions (such as sewer separation estimated) that addresses the main problem that “Most of the surface water that causes the significant overflows in London comes from ground level paved areas like roads”.

The proposed construction at Barn Elms
STS objects to Thames Water’s proposal to use a Greenfield as opposed to a Brownfield site to carry out works to construct this site. Barn Elms is Metropolitan Open Land and it is fundamentally wrong to select a Greenfield site for the proposed construction and if the project is to proceed the proposed works should be carried out on a brownfield site. Thames Water has not provided any alternative options to the Barn Elms site and it is concerning that Barn Elms is being presented as a fait accompli.

Thames Water has not provided a summary of alternative solutions to proceeding with the proposed works at Barn Elms. STS asks that Thames Water supply this information together with a summary of the pros and cons of each solution including full costings, cost benefit analysis, an impact assessment for each solution and a comparison of the different solutions.

Thames Water should provide the information requested so that local residents can be given a proper opportunity to respond. This will require the consultation period to be extended once this information has been provided so that local residents can have a reasonable opportunity to respond.

Specific Concerns about the proposed construction at Barn Elms
STS strongly objects to the proposed construction works at Barn Elms. In particular the following issues in relation to the Barn Elms, and Putney Foreshore sites are of concern:

a) The extremely close proximity of the proposed building works to residential homes. The proposed construction site at Barn Elms will be only approximately 20 metres from the nearest residential properties at Horne Way. One of the areas of concern cited by Thames Water in relation to the (1) Putney Foreshore, end of Brewhouse Lane and (2) the Junction of Lower Richmond Road and Putney Embankment short listed sites is the proximity of residents to the construction works. This has been overlooked in relation to the residents effected by the Barn Elms site and the statement by Thames Water that “the preferred site is also at a distance from Leaders Gardens and residential properties located south of Beverley Brook” is misleading when it is noted that the proposed construction site will be just 20 metres away from local residential properties. It is understood from comments made by Thames Water representatives that Thames Water had understood the Ranelagh Estate to be an industrial not residential estate.

b) During the meeting with Thames Water representatives at Horne Way (13 December 2010) it was stated that a concern in relation to acquiring brownfield sites was having to acquire a brownfield site with planning permission on it. This indicates that the decision to build on a Greenfield site as opposed to a brownfield site is being driven by financial considerations, which are being given precedence over local residents who will be effected by the proposed scheme. This is not the correct methodology; the most appropriate site should be selected irrespective of whether planning permission has been provided.

c) STS has identified from CSO discharge figures given by Thames Water in the Needs Report that:

a. The 3 worst CSO’s (Abbey Mills, F and A, and Greenwich contribute to 68% of discharges
b. The 5 worst CSO’s contribute to 79.3% of discharges
c. The 18 worst CSO’s contribute to 98.7% of discharges
d. None of the CSO’s in Putney are included in the worst 18 CSO’s
e. Most of the polluting CSO’s are in East London.

Thames Water has included the CSO at Putney & Barn Elms as a reason for the construction at Barn Elms. There are large amounts of sewage discharge from Mogden which will not be addressed by the Thames Tunnel. Based on this the proposed development at Barn Elms will require residents to go through a disproportionate amount of disruption.

**d)** The plan published on the website does not properly illustrate how close the construction site is to the large number of residential properties, as the bottom point of the map is cut off at a point that fails to show how many residential homes there are. This is contrasted with the number of residential streets shown on the Northern part of the river in Fulham. Had the map published this detail it would have shown the large number of residential properties affected by the proposed development.

**e)** The local road network (which is largely single lane residential) is wholly unsuitable for the proposed work at Barn Elms. The already heavily congested road infrastructure which includes Barn Elms, Roehampton, Barnes Village, Barnes Catelnau, Hammersmith Bridge, Putney Bridge, Wandsworth, Fulham, Roehampton, and the A3 cannot cope with the increased road use capacity that will be involved with the proposed site.

**f)** Thames Water has stated on a number of occasions that it is looking at the prospect of building a road from Lower Richmond Road over Putney Common to service the Barn Elms site. This is despite Thames Water advising at the meeting at St Marys Putney on 9 December 2010 that no roadworks would be built over Putney Common, and the construction plans showing a road via Rocks Lane and not over Putney Common. Such proposal raises very real concerns as common land cannot be built on, and also it highlights STS’s concerns over the lack of proper information and transparency of this proposal from Thames Water.

**g)** A comprehensive statement is required from Thames Water which provides a realistic assessment of Thames Water’s view of the local infrastructure and how it would be effected by the proposed development. Thames Water has stated (Horne Way meeting 13 December 2010) that there will be approximately 80 heavy lorry movements per day to remove spoil to and from the Barn Elms site. This is in addition to approximately 40 heavy lorry movements to and from the Putney Foreshore site. This statement should include details of

i. the number of work related traffic movements that the project will require to and from the site during each phase of construction including truck movements, supplier and contractor movements, and how workers will travel to the site,

ii. how it will handle the number of traffic movements,

iii. what hours of the day such traffic movements will occur,

iv. the tonnage of increased traffic movements associated with servicing the site

v. how Thames Water believes the local roads will cope with the pressure,
vi. what routes will be used to travel to the site (showing full routes from start to end destination),

vii. what restrictions including weight restriction will be applied to the use of roads and bridges including Hammersmith and Putney Bridge, and whether any road strengthening works will be required and if so where and if so where and for how long.

h) There is a very real need for this statement to be provided as the number of traffic movements have varied from 8 lorries per day (Barnes public meeting in November) to now 80 lorry movements per day. Furthermore this was based on 35 tonne trucks when in fact we now understand that Thames Water may only be able to use 20 tonne trucks and so there will therefore be even more lorry movements (more than double) required to service the site each day. The lack of this level of information makes it impossible for people to provide an informed decision on the consultation.

i) The proposed construction will also cause huge disruption to local businesses due to increased traffic flow. Before any project is to proceed an independent assessment of the local economic impact on businesses should be carried out. Increased traffic in the area will have a significant impact on customers travelling to local shops, supply chains for deliveries, and visitors to Putney.

j) There seems to be no assessment/consideration of potential negative economic impact to our local area from potential loss of rowing/sailing activity. The loss or reduction of even part of our rowing heritage/events, could result in severe financial impact. Putney is an area of small business and some of the boat houses, rowing and sailing clubs could suffer drops in revenue. If people are kept away/deterred from visiting or holding events. Many of the local businesses could suffer significant revenue drops. Since this project is over such a long period, this could have far reaching economic effects in a period where many small businesses are already struggling.

k) The diverse wildlife in the area will be seriously affected by the existence of the site, building works, pollution, noise pollution, vibration, industrial access to the sites, illumination and extensive human activity at the site.

l) The loss of use of the playing fields by at least 10 local schools that use Barn Elms playing fields. The schools will be negatively impacted for at least a 7 year period whilst the construction takes place, and once the construction is completed due to a reduction in the size of the playing field area by the legacy of the permanent buildings, service road and ventilation shaft. This will also effect the large number of social sports clubs who use the Barn Elms playing fields.

m) Sport and recreational facilities have been identified as an important element of society by both the government and even formed part of the Queens Speech this year. It is wrong in these circumstances to proceed with any construction works on Barn Elms which will deprive a community of sports facilities.

n) Dredging will cause huge disruption to fish spawning grounds at Beverly Brooke.
o) The Thames wall along the towpath is its flood defences. The proposed construction works building of a jetty poses a very severe risk of making the walls unstable and damaging the flood defences.

p) The environmental issues relating to local residents as a result of work at the site and transport to service the site including:

i. Noise pollution
ii. Illumination of the site
iii. Dust from removal of tunnel spoil
iv. Dust from batching of concrete on site.
v. Odour emissions
vi. Vibration caused by shaft construction and tunnelling operations and potential subsidence
vii. The use of chemicals and toxic materials during the construction of the site and thereafter during the operation of the site
viii. CO₂ emissions

as well as the proposed use of industrial size barges to take away some of the spoil from the site. It is also a concern that disruption caused by barge movements and jetty construction work will impact on the ability of river users to use the river as they do now.

q) Construction dust could have an impact ecologically and from human Health and Safety perspective. Air quality in the local area is already falling below EU standards in many parts of the town at certain times of the year. Dust if travelling and settling, could limit plant life in surrounding areas such as the common. Also information about potential pollutants being released from this work has not been provided. This is a major concern which is exacerbated by the fact that in addition to many local residents being effected, there are a number of local schools in the area, and schools who use the playing fields. Indeed the Putney Hospital site is earmarked for development as a Primary school and this will be on the doorstep of the proposed works. Thames Water has not even supplied a brief Environmental impact assessment as part of its consultation.

r) The level of spoil that will be generated from the site is excessive and unreasonable. STS understands that for a 7 metre diameter tunnel every 1 metre of tunnel length will generate between 65 and 77 tonnes of spoil (assuming a density of 1.7 to 2.0 for London Clay). Thames Water should quantify the likely quantity of spoil that will be generated from the proposed site.

s) The section of the Thames from Barn Elms to Putney Foreshore is the home base of the South Bank Sailing Club as well as other sailing clubs, and has long been of major importance for local, national and international rowing clubs and schools. There is a heavy and continuous use of this stretch of the River for training and for competitive racing. The Thames at this point is in any case difficult to navigate, being tidal, fast flowing and subject to sudden wind shifts. Considerable additional safety concerns will arise as a result of the construction
of a jetty, the consequent diminution in the navigable area of the River and the volume of barge traffic. It is simply too dangerous for the proposed industrial work to be carried on the existing sailing and rowing activities.

t) The location of the works on this site will be a disaster for Putney and Barnes residents, as well as Fulham residents and people who use the sports grounds and the towpath. These include people who travel from all over London to visit the local area for recreation, leisure and to visit local amenities including the Wetland Centre.

u) Thames Water’s proposed use of industrial size barges to take away some of the spoil from the site poses a very real threat to the road infrastructure, as any damage caused to Putney Bridge as a result of a collision with the bridge will sever Putney’s road link with London.

v) Barge movements and jetty construction work will interfere with other existing river traffic in the form of pleasure cruises, long boats and commuter travel provided into London by river ferry from Putney Pier.

w) Severe disruption to local roads. The A3, Putney, Hammersmith, Fulham and Barnes road systems are heavily congested at the best of times, and long traffic jams can arise as a result of additional traffic. Although Thames Water has stated that it intends to use the river as much as possible for the proposed site, it cannot guarantee to use the river exclusively. Thames Water representatives have conceded at public meetings as follows:

i. River barges will not be used to transport spoil from the proposed Putney Foreshore site, and that to remove spoil will involve approximately 20 very heavy lorries a day to service this site during construction. (St Mary’s meeting 9 December 2010). This equates to 40 trips to and from this site each day.

ii. It is expected that there will be a need for around 40 heavy lorries a day to service the Barn Elms construction site (Horne Way meeting 13 December 2010). This equates to 80 trips to and from Barn Elms a day. This is in addition to the lorries servicing the Putney Foreshore site.

x) The disruption to the towpath which is designated by the Port of London Authority as A Site of Special Metropolitan Interest through either restricted/gated access or by the fact that a huge conveyor belt will be built above it. Trees will need to be felled along the towpath to construct the proposed jetty.

y) The potential disruption to an area of archaeological significance. There is evidence of both Roman and Bronze age settlements close to Beverly Brooke and the Putney embankment.

z) The impact on wildlife. The proposed construction is close to the Wetlands Centre and birds use the Barn Elms area to nest and feed including migratory Canada Geese. David Attenborough recently said London Wetlands was Sir
Peter Scott's greatest memorial and a wonder of the world. This must be protected.

aa) The construction’s impact on the Bat Corridor which is protected by law.

bb) Noise pollution (as well as other environmental concerns) is a major problem posed by the proposed construction. Noise travels far over open ground as well as over water. This can be evidenced by the fact that noise from Fulham Football club can be heard easily in Putney. The close proximity of residents to the proposed site makes this a bigger problem which is exacerbated by the fact that the Ranelagh estate is laid out in a square, the acoustics of which will increase the noise levels.

c) Apart from an outline sketch of how large the site will be during construction no illustrations have been provided of what the site may look like during construction. Thames Water is asked to provide:

i. an illustration of what the site will look like during construction,
ii. full details of operating hours during the construction phase,
iii. estimated traffic movements to and from the site,
iv. details of anticipated noise, light, vibration and chemical usage on the site during construction,
v. details of the anticipated number of construction workers working on the site,
vi. whether there will be any enforced shut down periods of the site and how long they will be for eg during the Christmas, Easter holiday period, and school holidays.

dd) The legacy of the proposed construction will be a permanent ventilation column (15 metres high) and a large building (10 metres high, 12 metres wide and 20 metres long) to ventilate and filter air. The tunnel is proposed to be ventilated daily with the risk of associated smell, and release of chemicals being released into the air. There will also be left a service road in situ over the playing fields and a fully operational site that will need to be serviced and operated constantly.

ee) The impact on people’s enjoyment of an unspoilt area of green land that provides relief from urban high density city living, both during and after construction.

ff) A diverse set of people use and value this area for cycling, walking, running, relaxing etc. The social cost of removing this is huge. Thames water has made no attempt to quantify this and should do so. This impacts on both local residents and the large number of people who travel to Putney to enjoy the green open spaces, the river and local amenities.

Lack of information provided by Thames Water in relation to alternative sites
STS is very concerned that Thames Water has not provided enough information on the alternative sites available.
The sites that have been provided (Barn Elms and Putney Foreshore) are so close together that it does not offer any real choice and none of the proposed sites are brownfield sites. STS asks Thames Water to explain in writing:

a) What alternative brownfield sites are available as alternatives to Barn Elms and Putney Foreshore

b) Why were the alternative brownfield sites not selected as the preferred site

c) Is it possible to construct the tunnel without using Barn Elms as the main drive shaft

d) What methodology was used by Thames Tunnel in assessing its sites and in particular Barn Elms as its preferred site)

STS is concerned that it appears that Thames Water has chosen Barn Elms as its preferred site and is focused on delivering a solution by a 2020 deadline and that the end solution is defining the extent and process of the consultation. This does not allow for proper consultation to take place with all stakeholders.

There is a grave concern that holding a consultation whilst a deadline is imposed and the “clock is ticking” does not enable Thames Water to consider alternative options. Thames Water should focus on considering all of the options so that the right solution is used and not just a solution that is used to adhere to an imposed deadline. If necessary Thames Water should seek an extension of the deadline from the appropriate body (whether that is the UK government, DEFRA or the European Union) to enable such consideration to be carried out.

This is especially the case when people are seeking information about the proposed development. The information sought should be provided fully in language and in a format that can be understood by lay people without a deadline hanging over them. Whilst 2020 may appear to be some time off, each step of the process is aimed towards delivering a very large project by that time, including seeking planning permission, and this process does not provide for a proper, open and fair consultation.

STS asks that that Thames Water supply this information and extend its consultation period so that residents are given a proper opportunity to respond. I have not been given any information about the consequences (if any) imposed by the EU or others if Thames Water extends the delivery of the solution beyond 2020. This deadline has been cited as one reason to pursue the option of a Maindrive shaft site at Barn Elms. If an extension of time would enable an alternative solution and or strategy to be used this should be made clear in the consultation and site selection methodology explored so that the best solution is delivered not just a solution that meets deadline.

**Alternative sites to Barn Elms and Putney Foreshore**

Thames Water has asked local residents in its consultation to identify alternative construction sites. It should not be the role of lay residents to suggest suitable sites to Thames Water. STS is aware that Thames Water has looked a large number of possible sites and STS requests that Thames Water identify the sites looked at and its assessment as to the suitability of such sites. This information should be provided to local residents and the consultation period extended so that residents are given a proper opportunity to respond.

STS is aware that at the Horne Way meeting (13 December 2010) the possibility of driving the tunnel both ways from Tideway Walk was accepted by Thames Water. STS notes that John Ramage the Chief Project Engineer has confirmed that a driving the tunnel from both directions from Tideway Walk is possible without effecting the timescale of the project. STS also understands that Nine Elms which is a brownfield site with good transport links could be used as a site to construct the main drive shaft and the ventilation tower. These areas as well as the Wandsworth Delta should be looked at carefully and would be preferable to a Greenfield site solution.

STS is unable to provide more information at this stage due to the lack of information supplied by Thames Water in relation to alternative sites and its selection process. STS
reserves its right to comment further once this information has been provided and asks that the consultation be extended so that STS can comment more fully after this information has been provided.

The Consultation Process

STS is concerned that Thames Water has not provided adequate information in its consultation. STS is also concerned that local residents and stakeholders are unaware of the proposals. As stated above many local residents were unaware of the proposed construction works until they were brought to their attention by Stop the Shaft. Stop the Shaft is also aware that Fulham residents who will be clearly be effected by the proposed developments have not been notified by Thames Water of the works. This raises serious concerns about the adequacy of the consultation.

STS asks that Thames Water to provide the information requested in this submission so that STS can be given a proper opportunity to the proposed construction work. This will require the consultation period to be extended so that stakeholders effected by the proposed works can have a reasonable opportunity to respond.

The exhibitions re Barn Elms and Putney Foreshore were not well publicised, were held mainly on work days and as such it was difficult for working residents to attend. The exhibitions could have been advertised better and should have been held on weekends so that working residents could attend.

The exhibitions did not have a lot of information available and also answers to the questions raised in this consultation document were not available. At the various meetings attended by STS (St Mary’s Church meetings and the Horne Way residents meetings) the Thames Water representatives were insufficiently briefed and could not answer most of the questions raised. The information sought in this submission has not been provided. In addition to this the information provided by Thames Water during the consultation has been inconsistent giving large potential for people to have been misled. e.g. at the public Meeting in Barnes on Thursday 17th November, Thames Water stated that there would be 8 lorry movements per day. In subsequent meetings Thames Water have increased this to 80 movements per day, and it appears that if only 20 tonne lorries can be used the level of lorry movements could almost double. Anyone who attended the Barnes public meeting and is using the information provided at this meeting as the basis for their feedback will not be aware of the true scale of the traffic impact.

The Thames Water website is difficult to navigate and the consultation form is not user friendly to fill in. The use of open questions is unfair and unreasonable especially when insufficient information has been provided. It is especially unreasonable to place the onus on the resident to explain:

- a) Whether the tunnel is the best solution
- b) What route should be used
- c) Whether Barn Elms should be used or another site

when insufficient information on these solutions has been provided by Thames Water, especially with regards to the Solution and the availability of alternative sites.

It is very confusing and unfair as residents have not been provided with sufficient information to be able to answer these questions. Thames Water has this information and it should have been provided by Thames Water together with details of alternative sites so that an informed decision could have been made.

The consultation process favours residents who have access to the internet and a computer. Many residents (particularly older residents) do not have such access and this process prejudices them. Paper questionnaires were not distributed to residents by Thames Water and this should have been done to enable all those potentially effected by the proposed construction works at Barn Elms and Putney Foreshore with the opportunity to take part in the consultation. We ask that Thames Water send a questionnaire to all residents and extend the consultation process to enable full and proper consultation on this proposed construction to take place.
Without this there is a risk that a large proportion of residents will have been denied the opportunity to provide their comments.

More notice is needed and more explicit details setting out the impact that this project will have during construction and after construction is required. The only information provided to local residents to date is a circular delivered to “The Occupier” around 13 September 2010. The circular does not stand up to scrutiny and does not provide information required. A large number of residents (at least 40% on the Ranelagh Estate) display a “No Circular” sticker on their letter boxes. This may have resulted in the circular not being delivered. Furthermore as the circular looks like junk mail it may have been easily discarded. A conscientious consultation process obliges Thames Water to personally address the consultation documents to the residents of the property by letter. Thames Water has this information in its records (e.g., when water bills are sent out). The circular also failed to set out the scale and impact to the local area requiring people to have to search out this information. The consultation papers for the relevant sites should have been distributed to all local residents to provide everyone the information on the size and scale of the proposals.

Thames Water did not properly publicise the proposed development and delivering a flyer with very little information (addressed to the Home Owner, which looks like junk mail and which can be confused as junk mail) does not constitute proper notice of this very large proposed construction which has such serious issues for residents.

If Thames Water proposes to proceed with the Barn Elms site it should ensure that proper information is provided to residents, who are all Thames Water customers, addressed to them personally by letter, or with their water bill. Such information must include the information requested in this document and residents given a proper opportunity to respond by the consultation period being extended.

The consultation fails to provide reasonable options and impact assessments on the West Putney CSO options should the main shaft site not be located at Barn Elms. Without this information it is not possible for anyone to provide considered feedback on a West Putney CSO only solution. Assuming the West Putney CSO option would be of similar impact and scale to the Putney Foreshore proposals then STS submit that Leaders Gardens, Barns Elms and the Boat Club Foreshore are all wholly unsuitable sites and proper consultation is needed on such proposals.

Summary

STS objects to the proposed construction at Barn Elms, Leader Gardens and Putney Foreshore sites. For the reasons set out herein STS asks that Thames Water confirm that it will not proceed with construction at Barn Elms, Leader Gardens or Putney Foreshore.

Yours faithfully

Louise de Silva

On behalf of

Stop the Shaft Putney & Barnes

cc Justine Greening MP
Zac Goldsmith MP
Cllr Edward Lister
Cllr James Madden
Cllr Ravi Govindia
DEFRA Caroline Spellman
GLA James Cleverly /Boris Johnson/ Kevin Reid
OFWAT.