

## Monthly Report of the Independent Compensation Panel Chair

### January 2016

The Independent Compensation Panel (the 'Panel') met on three occasions in January 2016.

#### 5 January

##### *Purpose*

To approve the proposed revised compensation packages for the owners and occupiers of the Iconoclast I and Iconoclast II houseboats at Nine Elms Pier, Kirtling Street, London SW8 5BZ

##### *Panel Members*

I was joined by two chartered surveyors.

##### *Decisions of the Panel*

**Iconoclast I** – the Panel approved the payment of the sum presented in Tideway document 2350-TDWAY-KRTST-990-ZZ-OM-1001 to enable a deposit to be paid to secure the owner's temporary accommodation to enable him to move in January, prior to Iconoclast I being removed on 1 February 2016.

**Iconoclast I and Iconoclast II** – the Panel approved the owners' current and future removal costs, based on the lowest of three quotes.

**Tenants of Iconoplast I and Iconoplast II** – the Panel approved the payment of reasonable removal costs for for all eligible tenants, based on the lowest of three quotes.

#### 13 January

##### *Purpose*

1. To approve:
  - 1.1 The proposed revised compensation packages for the tenants/licencees of the Iconoclast I and Iconoclast II houseboats at Nine Elms Pier, Kirtling Street, London SW8 5BZ
  - 1.2 The on-going payment of indicative compensation for loss of rent to the owner of Hoop Op Welvaart and Selby Richard houseboats at Nine Elms Pier, Kirtling Street, London SW8 5BZ.
2. To consider an urgent request from the owners of Kasamaja for an interim loss payment relating to the houseboat, stating that the Project's pre-condition that a survey take place before the release of funds was unreasonable.

## Monthly Report of the Independent Compensation Panel Chair

### *Panel Members*

I was joined by two chartered surveyors.

### *Decisions of the Panel*

- 1.1 The Panel determined that the revised compensation packages in Tideway document 2350-TDWAY-KRTST-990-ZZ-CB-100000 for the tenants/licencees of Iconoclast I and Iconoclast II was fair and reasonable, insofar as the Panel considered that the individuals were not being disadvantaged.

In relation to one tenant, the payment of compensation would be subject to Tideway's legal advisors being satisfied that she has a legitimate claim, evidenced by appropriate documentary evidence of her occupancy of Iconoclast II.

- 1.2 The Panel determined the continuation of the interim payment as described in Tideway document 2350-TDWAY-KRTST-990-ZZ-CB-100001 for the owner of Hoop Op Welvaart and Selby Richard houseboats until the end 31 March 2016, by which time the report from the brokerage should be available.

2. In relation to the claim from the owners of Kasamaja, the Panel determined that:

It is entirely reasonable that Thames Water Utilities Limited (TWUL) pays the Advance Payment as proposed, and

It is entirely reasonable that you, as owners, allow TWUL reasonable access to Kasamaja for the purposes of carrying out a survey to facilitate the houseboat's relocation.

### *Panel Discussion*

Following the feedback session, discussion took place with the Project on the role of the ICP where all parties agreed the compensation/mitigation package. It was clear that the *Houseboat mitigation and compensation policy* in the Tideway *Non-statutory off-site mitigation and compensation policy* needed amending to clarify the position and the Chair offered to draft a proposed amendment for consideration by the other Panel members and the Project.

## **29 January**

### *Purpose*

To ratify Trigger Action Plans (TAPs).

### *Panel Members*

I was joined by a Building Surveyor and a Noise and Vibration Specialist and a Chartered Surveyor (for the disputed TAP).

## Monthly Report of the Independent Compensation Panel Chair

### *Trigger Action Plans*

The Panel considered Trigger Action Plans for Camelford House, 1-146 Bridge House, Nine Elms Pier and Fulham Reach Development.

### *Decisions of the Panel*

All Trigger Action Plans were Approved.

### *Disputed Trigger Action Plans*

The Panel considered a case claiming loss of view and potential loss of value of a flat in Bridge House.

### *Decision of the Panel*

The claim was dismissed on the grounds that there was no demonstrable current financial loss against which a claim for compensation could be made. Should such a loss occur in the future, the claimant was advised to consider making a claim under the Project's *Exceptional Hardship Policy*, the hyperlink to which was provided by me.

### *Special Case*

The Panel considered a special case from an occupier of Hartley House on noise grounds.

### *Decision of the Panel*

The Panel considered that it had insufficient information to consider the claim. Additional information has been requested of both the claimant and the Project.

### *Request to Make a Personal Representation before the Panel*

The Panel received a request from an individual to make a personal representation.

### *Decision of the Panel*

The Panel agreed, in principle, subject to the development of a protocol which the Panel would produce.

### *Supporting Information*

The Panel is to prepare a list of information it would like provided in advance with any special case or compensation claim.