



Northern Line Extension

Battersea Community Liaison Group

Wednesday 1 February 2017
Rose Community Centre

Attendees:

Name	Organisation
Steve Diamond (SD) (Chair)	London Borough of Wandsworth
Glenn Burnell (GB)	London Borough of Wandsworth
Mikyla Davidson (MD)	London Borough of Wandsworth
Dianne James (DJ)	London Borough of Wandsworth
Carla Arnold (CA)	Ferrovial Laing O'Rourke (FLO) – NLE
Caroline Brennan (CB)	Ferrovial Laing O'Rourke (FLO) – NLE
Claudia Quitian (CQ)	Ferrovial Laing O'Rourke (FLO) – NLE
Mark O'Hare (MoH)	Ferrovial Laing O'Rourke (FLO) – NLE
Michael Tarrega (MT)	Transport for London (TfL) – NLE
Malcolm Orford (MO)	Tideway
Ponciano Perez (PP)	Ferrovial Laing O'Rourke (FLO) – Tideway Central
Ellie Brown (EB)	Ferrovial Laing O'Rourke (FLO) – Tideway Central
Georgie Bradshaw (GBr)	Ferrovial Laing O'Rourke (FLO) – Tideway Central
Jez Porter (JP)	Ferrovial Laing O'Rourke (FLO) – Tideway Central
Neil Anderson (NA)	Ferrovial Laing O'Rourke (FLO) – Tideway Central
May Hale (May H)	Nine Elms Pier
Mark Hale (Mark H)	Nine Elms Pier
Harry Goonewardene (HG)	Savona Estate
Kate Martin (KM)	Riverlight 6 Resident
Sonny Dawes (SDa)	Resident
Andrew Masters (AM)	
Steve Pinto (SP)	Wandsworth Chamber
Tim Hill (TH)	Battersea Power Station Development Company (BPSDC)
Marlene Price (MP)	Battersea Housing
Mark Walker (MW)	Admin support (minute taker)
Apologies	
Cllr Nina Nardelli	London Borough of Wandsworth
Charles Oxenham	London Underground

	Item	Action
1.0	Introductions and apologies	
1.1	Introductions made and apologies noted. SD will chair the meeting in the absence of Cllr Nardelli. No objections were raised to May H recording the meeting.	
	<i>Northern Line Extension (NLE)</i>	
2.0	Minutes of the previous meeting – actions and matters arising	
2.1	SD advised that comments received from May H relating to the minutes from the previous meeting have now been incorporated.	
2.2	May H would like to check her records to ensure that all her comments have been incorporated. SD advised that as time is short, he would like the minutes to be approved tonight.	
2.3	<p>SD invited updates on actions from the previous meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Point 2.3: With regard to the issue of vehicles stopping and deliveries in Cringle Street/Kirtling Street, GBr advised that Tideway undertook a traffic management review and there should be no further issues with Tideway deliveries. All deliveries are booked in a specific, small timeslot and if the delivery is late, the vehicle is turned away and the delivery has to be rebooked. This is an established system that Laing O'Rourke and Ferrovial already use for other projects. In addition, Tideway is using Brooks Court as a holding / storage area. - Point 5.4: GBr advised that she has liaised with Riverlight Estates and can provide an update. For the section from Riverlight to Nine Elms Pier, Riverlight Estates has applied for planning permission for the rubbish bins and bollards to be moved. The application is currently with the council planning committee and if successful, deliveries will be controlled by an intercom system, with the bollards retracting into the ground to grant access. <p>Mark H commented that it will be good if this system can be implemented soon, as the process has taken a while. GBr confirmed that she has seen the new application from Riverlight.</p>	
2.4	SD confirmed he has received the invite from TfL to view the tunnel boring machines at NLE's Battersea site.	
3.0	Progress update and presentation – Mark O'Hare (MoH)	
3.1	<p>In the absence of Ignacio Lopez, MoH gave an update presentation on NLE's works at Battersea. MoH also gave apologies on behalf of Charles Oxenham of London Underground, who is on holiday.</p> <p>MoH's presentation (attached) included the following details:</p>	

	Item	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Crossover Box – base slab completed, using 2,000m³ of concrete. Soil nailing has also been undertaken to the end of the Crossover Box, which went well - A temporary bridge from the south to the north of the site has been built - Two 80m long concrete tunnels have been constructed, in order to launch the tunnel boring machines (TBMs) - During the excavation period, work took place 24/7. MoH hopes this did not cause too much disturbance - In the Station Box, which is further west across the site, work will continue on the diaphragm wall. Down at the western end of the site, reinforced concrete construction is taking place, with works proceeding to schedule - Assembly of the TBMs has been taking place since October, following their delivery from Lyon in France. These will soon be ready to drop into the Crossover Box and when laid out within the tunnels, the TBMs will be approximately 100m long - Over the course of the next week, a 750T crane will be assembled on site to enable the TBMs to be moved. Assembly of the crane will require the delivery of 30 lorry loads of equipment - The weekend after next will see the first TBM lifted in, followed by the second TBM a few days' later - Two weeks ago on Friday, Cllr Shawcross, (Deputy Mayor, Transport) unveiled the two TBMs, which have been named <i>Amy</i> and <i>Helen</i>, after the pilot Amy Johnson and astronaut Helen Sharman - Some steel erection work has been completed for the conveyor that will take spoil away 	
3.2	<p>HG mentioned he complained three weeks ago about noise from the NLE site, which was so loud that the Helpline could not hear him properly. The noise stopped shortly after he complained but he would like to know why a site manager did not hear this noise and act upon it sooner.</p> <p>MoH responded to advise the noise was from the operation of a piling rig. A new operator was having trouble using the control levers and has since been moved to other duties.</p> <p>HG commented that when he left his house to attend this meeting, he could hear exactly the same noise again.</p> <p>MoH advised that he and/or CA will be able to help with this issue.</p>	
3.3	<p>HG also raised the issue of dust from site. The road sweeper does not appear every day and HG has seen mud on the road recently.</p> <p>MoH advised he could not comment on a specific day but could confirm that the road sweeper does clean the neighbouring roads as a gesture of goodwill, even though not all the dust in the area is caused by NLE.</p>	<p>NLE (MoH and CA)</p>

	Item	Action
3.4	<p>MoH continued his presentation with a look at forthcoming activity and confirmed the TBMs will commence operation from the eastern end of the site in March and April.</p> <p>At the very far end of the site, the reinforced concrete works will continue, with some also taking place in the middle of the site. The site will be busy with two distinct workfronts.</p>	
3.5	<p>MoH's presentation included a 'fly-through' video to show what the new tube station at Battersea will look like when complete. The station will be large and roomy, with retail space and two sets of escalators down to platform level and an exit to the Foster building.</p>	
3.6	<p>MoH invited comments on the planned tube station design. None received.</p>	
3.7	<p>MoH presented details of the environmental monitoring locations for NLE's Battersea site, including real-time noise monitoring and glass slides to monitor air quality.</p>	
3.8	<p>During the period October – December 2016, NLE has been within the noise trigger levels for the site, with no exceedances.</p>	
3.9	<p>For the same period (October – December 2016), there have been exceedances of dust levels. These were at locations right on the road and can be attributed to the cumulative effect of much construction activity in the area, rather than just NLE works. MoH confirmed further information is available on the NLE website.</p>	
3.10	<p>MoH confirmed muck is continuing to be moved away from the site by barge, with a total of 269 barge movements to date. This approach is helping to reduce the number of lorry movements by road.</p>	
4.0	Traffic Management	
4.1	<p>MoH's advised assembly of the crane that will be used to move the TBMs will involve abnormal load deliveries outside of core hours over the next few weeks.</p>	
4.2	<p>MoH advised that when the project fully enters the tunnelling mode, tunnel segments will need to be delivered to the site and concrete pours will take place until 10pm. The bentonite silos on the site will be taken away progressively and the road sweeper will operate to help keep the nearby roads clean.</p>	
4.3	<p>MoH confirmed core working hours on the site are from 8am until 6pm, Monday to Friday and from 8am to 1pm on Saturday, with a Section 61 agreement in place for extended hours if absolutely necessary.</p>	

	Item	Action
4.4	MoH advised from the middle of February, 24-hour working will come into operation from Monday to Friday and once the first TBM is working from the middle of March, 24/7 working will take place.	
4.5	<p>MoH also provided details of how NLE has acted upon feedback received from various stakeholders, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Attended a meeting of the Savona Residents' Association on 29/11/2016 - Redirected the lights around the Crossover Box to reduce light pollution for local residents. Overall site lighting is also under review - Roads sweepers are working permanently along Battersea Park Road to keep the nearby roads clean. Wheel washing is also operational on site - Engaged with local schools. This has included work experience for students from three local boroughs and also led to the names of the two TBMs being selected - Engaged with local MPs and members of the GLA. A site visit for GLA members took place on 27/10/2016 	
4.6	MoH provided a summary of project complaints received since September 2016. 332 separate cases have been raised since then, with 39 of these relating specifically to Battersea. Of these 39, 34 are resolved, with five still active. MoH confirmed when meetings take place on site, details or complaints received are provided to workers, so as to improve working practices going forward.	
4.7	CA provided an update on NLE's Skills and Employment activity. The project's Skills and Employment strategy involves the charity Second Chance, an organisation that attempts to find work/work experience placements for local people. One success story resulting from this approach involves a local man called named Gabriel Jetawo, who has gained full-time work with concrete testing specialist ESG, following a work placement arranged through Second Chance in conjunction with NLE.	
4.8	<p>CA advised that on Friday 27/1/2017, NLE staff and contractors attended the 'Construct Nine Elms' event, with NLE's SLNT (Strategic Labour Needs and Training Manager) in attendance.</p> <p>MP advised she had advertised the event extensively and asked if it was well attended? CA confirmed the event was well attended.</p>	
4.9	MoH commented that although the NLE site has an imposing white hoarding, FLO is keen to engage with local people.	
4.10	MoH invited further questions on the NLE presentation.	
4.11	With regard to light pollution, May H asked if the lights on the jetty could	NLE

	Item	Action
	be redirected. MoH confirmed he can come and have a look to see which lights are causing the problem.	(MoH)
4.12	<p>With regard to air quality, May H asked if there are different trigger levels for different pollutants.</p> <p>CQ advised that for PM1, the permitted level is 150 milligrams per cubic metre. There is a small air quality monitor at the front of the site.</p>	
4.13	May H asked if there is a trigger level for PM2. CQ confirmed that there is not.	
4.14	MT confirmed he is due to have a meeting in February with Cllr Jonathan Cook, Deputy Leader at London Borough of Wandsworth, to talk about air quality in the area. This meeting has been organised by the council.	
4.15	May H asked if the Mayor of London gets involved. MT confirmed Sadiq Khan is not involved in this meeting but he does currently have a big focus on PM10 air pollution levels, with the GLA coming down hard on TfL and other bodies in relation to this issue.	
4.16	KM asked if the operation of the TBMs will result in an increase in noise levels. MT responded to advise that the TBMs are actually less disruptive than works taking place on the surface. TBMs are generally only under a property for three/four days and residents above may hear some rumbling or vibration. MT likened the possible noise to being in the Garrick Theatre and hearing a tube train pass underneath. The expected noise levels are certainly nothing to worry about but residents should make contact if they are concerned. The project tends not to give specific dates for tunnelling underneath properties, as the TBMs often pass through without residents even noticing.	
4.17	SD checked that the noise complaint raised by HG earlier has been dealt with. CA confirmed she spoke to HG on the day of the complaint regarding the auger.	
4.18	SD requested that complaints are dealt with as consistently as possible.	NLE
4.19	MT advised he is concerned about HG's comments that the road sweeper does not operate every day. He will investigate and respond to HG as soon as possible.	NLE (MT)
	<i>Tideway – Kirtling Street Community Liaison Working Group</i>	
5.0	Minutes of the previous meeting – actions and issues arising	
5.1	SD suggested the group runs through the minutes of the previous Tideway meeting (pages 7-13). These included a lot of discussion relating to the Kirtling Street and Cringle Street area, so hopefully most key points have already been covered.	

	Item	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Point 5.9: SD asked if this previous point relating to noisy works/mitigation will be picked up tonight. EB confirmed this issue will be addressed by Tideway this evening - Point 5.12: May H asked Tideway to focus on the issue of air quality monitoring within its presentation - Point 5.14: Mark H highlighted the issue of the Nine Elms Pier reinstatement being detailed specifically within future programme updates. This is linked to Point 7.1 in the previous minutes. JP confirmed that point will be covered in Tideway's update later 	
<p>6.0</p> <p>6.1</p> <p>6.2</p> <p>6.3</p> <p>6.4</p>	<p>Tideway Presentation (attached)</p> <p>Introduction from EB, who provided a 'Who's Who' of Tideway staff.</p> <p>Project update and Information – Ponciano Perez (PP)</p> <p>PP is the Project Manager for Tideway's Kirtling Street site. PP confirmed the final layout is now complete:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The marine layout has been finalised, with the main jetty to receive the TBM. There will be a floating platform to receive concrete segments and mooring for the barges that will take muck away - There will be an acoustic shed over the shaft, so it will be fully enclosed - Tideway's main offices have already been erected in the south east corner of the site - This is the layout that will be in place when the TBMs are active <p>In terms of current activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tideway is currently using diaphragm walls to construct the main shaft. This activity commenced in mid-November 2016 and is 25% complete. Completion of the diaphragm walls is scheduled for June 2017 - Upon completion of the diaphragm walls, the next element will be the construction of the acoustic shed. This will be erected over the shaft, in order to insulate the works. The shaft will be excavated to a depth of 86 metres <p>Project Timeline:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Work on site started in 2016 - In September 2017, tunnelling is expected to start - Two small adits will need to be built in September/October 2017 - The TBMs will commence operation in mid-2018 and will dig until the end of 2019. Secondary dry-lining will then take place - All tunnelling is scheduled to be complete by the end of 2021 	

	Item	Action
6.5	<p>Project Programme</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PP advised that at the last meeting, he advised that marine works were planned to start in February 2017. These are now scheduled to start in May 2017 - PP was asked previously when the boreholes would be put back. He can now confirm this activity will take place in December 2021 	
6.6	<p>Mark H commented that at the previous meeting, he asked for more specific details regarding the reinstatement of marine infrastructure to appear on the programme but this does not seem to have changed. He would like details of the reinstatement of the mooring infrastructure for five houseboats, plus reinstatement of the houseboats themselves.</p>	
6.7	<p>JP confirmed the activity listed as reinstatement of marine infrastructure includes the reinstatement of the five houseboats. This is a very complex job with a lot of work still to do. Dates may change but Tideway is giving the best view possible at this time. By challenging itself to complete the programme two years early, Tideway has been looking very hard at the front end of the programme and is starting six months earlier than originally scheduled, which has yielded benefits already. JP appreciates Mark H would like the houseboats reinstated at the earliest possible junction, however these dates could change.</p>	
6.8	<p>Mark H appreciates that items on the programme may change but he would like more specific details to be included in the programme.</p>	
6.9	<p>PP reiterated that the date for this activity could move because it is not scheduled to take place for another four years. However, the level of detail requested by Mark H can be included within the programme going forward. SD requested this be noted in the minutes.</p>	
6.10	<p>Mark H requested that this detail is displayed on programmes presented at future meetings.</p>	
6.11	<p>SD commented that the programme is already quite crowded in its current state.</p>	
6.12	<p>MO advised that the copy of the programme distributed at these meetings is the best possible information available at the time. FLO uses a planning tool that incorporates tens of thousands of scheduled activities; MO appreciates it is not the most visually-friendly document but it provides the best possible information. MO would suggest having this item noted in the minutes and for it to also be a standard agenda item going forward.</p>	
6.13	<p>May H asked why it cannot just be stated on the programme. MO responded to advise this is how the information is best presented on a piece of paper. He would be happy to bring May H in and show her a breakdown of the sheet.</p>	

	Item	Action
6.14	<p>Mark H asked if you drill down in the system, can you see the level of detail he is requesting. MO confirmed you can. PP will email this detail to Mark H.</p>	
	<p>TAPs – Jez Porter (JP)</p>	
6.15	<p>JP is the interface for Tideway Central and partly responsible for the delivery of the TAPs.</p>	
6.16	<p>JP explained the forecast date sheet. This indicates the current view as to where the trigger dates extend to and is a bit different to what was discussed at the last meeting.</p>	
6.17	<p>JP confirmed Tideway has indicated a pre-trigger date of 15/11/16. There is a day and night trigger due to night time barging and other activities during the day. In terms of the TAPs, Tideway is sticking to the pre-trigger period of 15/11/2016 until 21/1/2020 and has taken the view to pre-trigger.</p>	
6.18	<p>PP mentioned no marine works will take place until May 2017. The reason this date has been moved back is because there is lots of work involved in the design and how this influences the marine consultation process. However, he is confident this activity will now start in May.</p>	
6.19	<p>JP advised the decision to pre-trigger is intended to provide certainty to the houseboat community.</p>	
6.20	<p>JP advised that TAPs are a key part of the DCO requirement for dealing with people who may be disturbed by noise, light, etc. As part of the Code of Construction Practice (A&B), Tideway is required to mitigate at source. Tideway has been working hard at this, with a five metre hoarding erected around the perimeter of the site. However, this will need to be moved in March/April when the acoustic enclosure is erected. Tideway has set about mitigating noise to begin with but recognises this cannot be achieved for all cases, which is why the TAPs are in place to provide the additional necessary mitigation – which in this case is the provision of alternative accommodation for people who find the disruption intolerable.</p>	
6.21	<p>JP explained that a key part of the TAPs is that access to go on board the houseboats is not removed. Therefore, the mitigation allows people to decide if they stay or go. A Section 61 agreement has been gained for marine works to take place in early February will be updated very shortly to cover the period for commencement of marine works.</p>	
6.22	<p>JP advised he has previously mentioned the reasons for pre-triggering. There are provisos in place that allow Tideway to proceed with the work if</p>	

	Item	Action
	it is not possible to reach agreement within reasonable timescales.	
6.23	<p>JP explained the flowchart slide, with activities shown in green being those that FLO undertakes; blue for applicants seeking benefit from the policy; pink for the Independent Compensation Panel and orange for the Independent Complaints Commissioner. JP is pleased to confirm Tideway has been able to progress and make offers in a large number of cases:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 8 offers ratified for owners - 3 offers ratified for 15 tenants (the remaining tenants have not responded within the timescales outlined under the policy) 	
6.24	JP advised that Tideway has already sent agreements to residents and is now in the process of sending agreements out to tenants.	
6.25	JP confirmed that for Tideway Dock, there has been little in the way of response so far. Tideway has addressed this with the ICP, which has given guidance on the process going forward. Tideway thinks it will start exceeding trigger levels in May but it could be sooner.	
6.26	May H asked for clarification of the provisos for reasonable timescales. JP believes that clause 1.1.7b of the Non-Stat Policy refers to reasonable timescales. In this case, it requires a response to an offer within 14 days.	
6.27	May H asked what happens if Tideway does not respond to queries in time. JP explained that Tideway has endeavoured to engage within reasonable timescales, especially with May H. However, Tideway has not been able to satisfy cases within reasonable timescales, these have then been passed to the ICP.	
6.28	May H asked what happens if Tideway's mitigation breaches what is suggested by the ICP. JP advised they are aligned.	
6.29	May H does not think the agreement meets the Pre-Stat, so needs to correspond with London Borough of Wandsworth to ensure the agreement agrees with DCO. She does not want to be penalised by unrealistic timescales. JP responded to advise he does think Tideway has engaged within reasonable timescales.	
6.30	May H explained that it does say each TAP will be consulted with the relevant local authority. However, according to the London Borough of Wandsworth, it has not been issued with any information by Tideway since January 2015. SD suggested this discussion is continued outside of the meeting, as it is very detailed.	
6.31	DJ requested May H sends her an email outlining her issues. May H reiterated she does not want to be penalised due to errors in Tideway's mitigation agreement.	

	Item	Action
6.32	JP offered to liaise with London Borough of Wandsworth. Tideway has been particular in pulling relevant information together and has been to the ICP a number of times.	
6.33	MA believes May H's questions should be answered offline. The project has committed to providing respite accommodation from November last year until January 2020. Notwithstanding valid questions, he believes the actions taken by FLO have been comprehensive, however he will certainly take these questions on board.	
6.34	May H believes her questions are still relevant. Tideway is not pre-triggering for the full period. MA responded to advise that the primary purpose is for individuals is take respite and the DCO is clear on this point.	
6.35	JP commented that the mitigation agreement does recognise a period after January 2020 when noise will drop below trigger levels. Tideway will be having a close look at that period with increasing accuracy as we move towards it. Tideway is not saying noise above trigger levels will end in January 2020 but this is the best current view.	
6.36	Mark H believes Tideway has introduced two big gagging clauses in the agreement. MA responded to advise there is no clause that attempts to override residents' rights as part of the DCO. May does not believe this to be true and wants to send the agreement to Wandsworth. MA stated that FLO would not be able to introduce a gagging clause if it wanted to.	
6.37	SD asked how this issue is taken forward. MA suggested a follow-up meeting. SD asked DJ to be involved.	
	Noise Assessment – Neil Anderson (NA)	
6.38	NA introduced himself as the noise and vibration lead for FLO. He is responsible for managing noise and vibration. FLO is currently working under Section 61 consent, which expires on 31/3/17. FLO is currently compiling an application for a Section 61 agreement covering the period 1/4/2017 to 30/9/2017. NA collates relevant information and runs this through a noise modelling package. This produces noise predictions and highlights sensitive properties. NA highlighted sensitive activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Diaphragm walling - Marine jetty piling - Shaft excavation 	
6.39	NA advised the main noise sources will be marine works for the jetty – primarily piling, with a particular sensitivity if there are any works outside of core hours.	
6.40	NA advised that Tideway wants to reduce noise by the best practical	

	Item	Action
	<p>means and control noise at source wherever possible, e.g. by using alternative equipment. The five metre hoarding erected around the boundary of the site has helped to reduce noise up until now and the acoustic shed will help to reduce noise substantially. The conveyors that transport muck away will also be enclosed and there is also a requirement for an acoustic barrier on the marine jetty.</p>	
6.41	<p>Mark H asked if the acoustic barrier on the jetty will wrap around the eastern end. NA advised this is currently being considered. Because the jetty is shorter than was designed previously, it is likely this could happen, however he is still waiting for final details.</p>	
6.42	<p>May H asked how the acoustic barrier will work at high tide. NA advised this is one of the complexities of this barrier. The floating segment will go up and down at high tide. Anything added to the access jetty may need something under the water line and this is currently being assessed. Having a floating jetty has removed the need for engineering tasks that work at high tide.</p>	
6.43	<p>Mark H asked how the acoustic barrier will protect against water-borne noise. NA advised there is no requirement to look at water-borne noise. May H responded to explain this is included in the Code of Construction Practice and was raised in the DCO investigation. NA responded that it does not state purely for water-borne noise.</p>	
6.44	<p>MA explained that underwater experiments have taken place. Even if a steel construction was used, it would not be effective in mitigating against water-borne noise, therefore he believes NA's assumption is correct. However, because the acoustic barrier floats, a barrier will be in place to protect against airborne noise.</p>	
6.45	<p>May H asked if clarification is needed from the Secretary of State for this issue. NA explained the Code of Construction Practice talks about a barrier for all tidal heights but definitely does not specially refer to water-borne noise.</p>	
6.46	<p>Mark H explained that for houseboats, water-borne noise is very significant. NA responded to advise that tests showed the contribution from airborne noise would be more disruptive to the houseboats. Mark H stated this did not come out of the study, as 50% of the data was dumped to produce the result that Tideway wanted.</p>	
6.47	<p>MA stated that for operation at the pier, the entire houseboat community has been pre-triggered. All houseboat residents have been offered the opportunity to live away from the noise and Tideway is still using best practice to reduce noise as much as possible.</p>	
6.48	<p>Mark H commented that what Tideway is telling the houseboat community is you will have much small accommodation that you currently</p>	

	Item	Action
	<p>have and by all means, come back to your home office to work. How does home office work in relation to this noise disturbance. MA responded to advise that in terms of applying the policy, this is set by an independent panel and if anyone believes this is incorrect, an appeal process is in place. In terms of a barrier to stop water-borne noise, this could not be installed. He has raised this specifically with an expert and was told that even if you had a row of sheet piles, it would not do the job.</p>	
6.49	<p>Mark H stated that Tideway is now telling us – here is your small alternative property but continue to use your boat as your home office. He will take this to the ICP. It is irresponsible of Tideway to confront houseboat residents with three years of trigger-level breaching noise levels.</p>	
6.50	<p>MP asked for clarification of what water-borne noise is. NA explained using the example of noise from a barge engine passing under the water to a houseboat.</p>	
6.51	<p>JP explained the project will take into account large numbers of barge movements, with five movements permitted in a 24-hour period. This may change but will be a similar sort of frequency. This is an ICP provision focused on the Riverlight. May H believes this will still be disruptive. JP responded to advise that access to the houseboats will be maintained at all times, with a provision for alternative accommodation nearby. SD commented he believes this point has been made.</p>	
6.52	<p>May H stated there are seven distinct noise trigger periods and proceeded to explain these. The Section 61 is based on forecast levels and should apply to rehousing. NA confirmed that it does. May H asked if the third period applies to houseboats for temporary rehousing. NA confirmed it does. If you have 30 days' worth of predictions and for example four days over the level, the average gets checked against the same trigger level. May H asked if for the 10-hour core period, Monday-Friday, is the average over a month based on the average period of hours. NA confirmed that every 10-hour period is logged algorithmically, with the average over the month being the average of those 10-hour periods. May H stated that when Tideway submitted its application to Wandsworth, it used the LAQ12 period. NA explained this is because daytime, evening and night time periods were used. Whether using 10 hour or 12-hour periods, the prediction should be exactly the same.</p>	
6.53	<p>SD invited any further questions.</p>	
6.54	<p>SDa explained that NA had come to look at his windows and went away to look at the Section 61. NA advised this is an issue being discussed quite a lot. Going forward, Tideway will need to revise the application. NA has looked through the monitored data and there have not been any exceedances but he will come back to SDa on this.</p>	

	Item	Action
6.55	KM explained that a large amount of dust is sticking to windows and she has raised this issue with the housing association. Could extra cleaning be provided. GBr advised she and EB will pick up this issue and come back to KM.	Tideway (GBr / EB)
6.56	May H raised one more question relating to noise. When Tideway does not have an actual measurement for ambient noise, does it use façade or free-field measurement? NA responded to advise Tideway mostly uses the façade level.	
6.57	SP would like to clarify the purpose of this group. He has every sympathy for Mark H and May H but their issues take up most of meeting SP does not think the meeting should be used for negotiations and feels these matters should be taken off line. May H apologised but explained that these issues need to be raised in the presence of London Borough of Wandsworth.	
6.58	SD thinks an alternative means of covering these issues needs to be found, perhaps by having a separate or pre-meeting. SD will take this point away for consideration. It is important that everyone has a chance to be involved.	SD
6.59	May H commented that she is not sure how else their problems can be solved and it is very hard to resolve issues by email. MA advised he cannot speak on behalf of London Borough of Wandsworth but Tideway would be happy to agree to a pre-meeting. Then May H and Mark H would have a chance to respond in the main meeting. May H commented that the Tideway Helpdesk does not respond to her queries.	
6.60	SD believes it is important to find a balance. MA believes if we are not addressing minimum content then there is a fear that the CLG is not doing what it is intended to do.	
6.61	DJ explained she is new in her post and needs to understand the group sees the Council's role.	
6.62	MP believes the Council needs to give some form of approval. DJ understands this but consideration needs to be given as to how it is done. SD asked if this can be considered in the next month or so.	
7.0	Future agenda items	
7.1	SP advised that the Chamber of Commerce has had really good engagement with FLO (NLE) and would like to ensure the same with Tideway, so as to open up the supply chain to local companies. Hopefully David Darcy (Project Director, NLE) can arrange an introduction to Tom Tragg, David's equivalent at FLO for Tideway. MA suggested that we have a more detailed section on this issue going	Tideway

	Item	Action
	forward.	
8.0	Dates of future meetings	
8.1	MP requested that a few possible meeting dates are provided for consideration going forward. SD will try to do this.	
8.2	With regard to the set-up for future dedicated meetings with Mark H and May H, SD would like to understand how issues can be resolved and will discuss with MA.	SD / MA
9.0	AOB	
9.1	Presentation from EB outlining how Tideway is responding to issues raised by the community at present, including steps taken to tackle light concerns from local residents.	
9.2	KM advised that problems with lights on site have not changed since the last meeting. EB explained she was surprised and sorry to hear this. GBr asked residents to take pictures for use as evidence. EB confirmed that all enquires and complaints are being actioned. Will provide an update on blackout blinds as soon as possible.	
9.3	EB also outlined forthcoming community events plus Tideway's Envision mentoring programme and STEM ambassador training.	

Meeting started 18.30 and closed at 20.14
Minutes drafted by MW