



Northern Line Extension

Battersea Community Liaison Group

14 March 2016
Rose Community Centre

Attendees:

Name	Organisation
Officer rep: Steve Diamond (SD) (chair)	LB Wandsworth
Adam Hutchings (AH)	LB Wandsworth
Harendra Goonewardene (HG)	Savona Estate
Tim Hill (TH)	Battersea Power Station
May Hale (May H)	Nine Elms Pier
Mark Hale (Mark H)	
Iona Ramsay (IR)	Nine Elms Pier
Gareth Chappell (GC)	Nine Elms Pier
Marlene Price (MP)	Battersea Area Housing
Mabel Aranda Garcia (MGA)	FLO
Ignacio Lopez (IL)	FLO
Katie-Jane Kyte (KK)	Transport for London
Rob Tamkin (RT)	Transport for London
Michael Appleton (MA)	Tideway
Malcolm Orford (MO)	Tideway
Adam Ferguson (AF)	TWUL
Gwyn Williams (GW)	Tideway (FLO)

Apologies: Cllr Nardelli, David Lewis, Brian Barnes, Brian Raincock

	Item	Action
1.0	Introductions and apologies	
1.1	SD advised he will be chairing the meeting as Cllr Nardelli (now Mayor of Wandsworth) has given her apologies.	
2.0	Minutes of previous meeting	
2.1	SD confirmed that the minutes are now combined as was requested at previous meetings.	
2.2	SD noted that the minutes are not agreed until signed off in the next CLG cycle. SD advised that there has been a response from May H regarding the Tideway section of the January minutes and therefore the minutes are not approved and agreed at this time.	
2.3	MP asked for her apologies to be noted on the January minutes.	
2.4	5.1 – IL noted that these works (sheet piling) are completed.	
2.5	8.1 – SD noted that this is the area of the minutes which May H's concerns relate to and clarification is required on some points, meaning the minutes cannot yet be agreed. SD advised that once the points have been clarified the minutes will be issued for comment once more to ensure all parties are happy. SD noted that it is important that the minutes are accurate and reflect all comments from residents, adding that Cllr Nardelli also feels strongly about this. SD stated that this is the aim of the CLG meetings. SD noted that the January meeting minutes will not go onto the project websites until agreed.	
	<i>Northern line extension</i>	
3.0	NLE progress update and presentation	
	MGA apologised that the presentation is being projected onto the wall and not a screen.	
3.1	IL gave a progress update and presentation including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three month lookback and three month lookahead • Battersea Power Station entrances • 'Your feedback' • Engagement Opportunities • Ways to contact us 	
3.2	IL reported that the diaphragm walling (d-wall) works will be completed in the crossover box at the end of March. IL advised that the night trial for the use of the barge was successful but for the time being barge	

	Item	Action
	<p>movements remain 07:00-19:00 with approximately three barge movements per week. The next trial will be to do two barges per tide after the Easter break.</p>	
3.3	<p>IL advised that the noise data reports have been uploaded onto the NLE website. Mark H questioned whether these are live-time reports and KK advised that the reports on the website are monthly; this has been agreed with the Local Authority as the raw data needs to be interpreted and reported in a manageable format. IL advised that the site and project team do receive real-time noise information and MGA agreed that if there is a specific concern or complaint the project can look at the real-time data.</p>	
3.4	<p>IL advised that there are to be Thames Water utility works in Kirtling Street in the near future but there are no further details at this time. IL reported that from April the number of lorry movements will grow as more concrete and steel are delivered to the site.</p>	
3.5	<p>GC queried whether the conveyor used on the NLE will be the same as the conveyor for Tideway. MO advised that the exact size is not yet confirmed but it would be the same principle. IL noted that the NLE conveyor currently moves 500/600 tonnes of spoil an hour.</p>	
3.6	<p>RT reported that the consultation sessions for the Battersea Power Station eastern entrance were very successful and outline planning consent has been granted by LB Wandsworth. RT advised that residents can still comment and will be able to do so throughout the process.</p>	
3.7	<p>MGA reported that negative feedback has been decreasing and gave a report on the school engagement programme. This included a session in February for 'Talent Match' and a visit to Griffin primary school who will be one of the schools to choose the names for the tunnel boring machines. MGA advised that additional road signage is being reviewed now that the signalised junction is in place.</p>	
3.8	<p>MGA reported on the progress with employment and skills on the NLE, including a number of work placement students from Ernest Bevin and that the majority of local work placements have been filled by local residents. MGA advised that members of the project team recently attended a careers fair at Burntwood School in Wandsworth.</p>	FLO
3.9	<p>MGA extended the offer of another site visit to view the conveyor and barge operations, noting this would be held in May and asked residents to get in touch if they would like to attend. MGA advised that this will be reiterated in the weekly email. MP asked that the email is also sent to the Battersea Power Station Community Group.</p>	
3.10	<p>HG queried what the new opening is in the hoardings and RT advised it is a secondary means of escape. This will be pedestrian escape only.</p>	

	Item	Action
3.11	SD thanked the project team for the weekly invites and advised that they were very informative and well-received by the local community. SD queried when further details will be available regarding the works in Kirtling Street and asked if these works will be disruptive. IL advised that they should not be too disruptive but he does not have any further details at this stage. AH advised that there is a meeting to discuss the Thames Water application for a worksite on Kirtling Street and timescales etc will be discussed here. This will be updated at the next meeting.	
4.0	Traffic management	
4.1	IR queried whether more barges will be used to remove spoil when the lorry deliveries become more frequent and the works become more intense. IL advised that after Easter the project will be trialling moving two barges per tide and IR questioned which jetty these will go from. RT advised that it will be the Battersea jetty and this is a permanent structure. IR questioned how many barges per day will leave the site and IL advised that the peak will be four per day as no more than two per tide can be accommodated. IR raised a concern that the barge movements past Nine Elms Pier are damaging ropes and other mechanical equipment and stated that she has spoken to the Port of London Authority (PLA) about this several times.	
	<i>Tideway</i>	
5.0	Tideway presentation	
5.1	<p>MO started talking through a PowerPoint presentation, updating the Group on Tideway's proposal for works.</p> <p>MO advised that lengthy discussions had taken place on the impact of works on Nine Elms Pier and bringing the programme forward. May Hale (MH) added she had sent in some comments for clarification, MO had accepted the comments and stated revised minutes have not been issued yet. He confirmed clarification on points were awaited, Tideway is waiting for agreement on some of these. Steve Diamond (SD) confirmed that he could not sign off the minutes until discussions have been confirmed. MO confirmed that minutes would be re-circulated, then agreed and signed off.</p> <p>SD stated that these meetings required an accurate record, which is agreed upon by all parties.</p>	
6.0	Project update	
	<i>Site preparation</i>	
6.1	MO talked through the plan for boat movements, the limit of land to be acquired and used. He stated the activity must be within, Limits of Land	

	Item	Action
6.2	<p>to be Acquired and Used (LLAU) and five vessels were within the line. Those have been re-located along with the equipment that maintained them. This has enabled access and there is a need to construct a jetty further out into the river channel.</p> <p>A question was asked about the outer line and why it could not be confirmed where the jetty will come out, how close it would be to the pier?</p> <p>MO said the project is constrained by where it can go. Cory Environmental has its operation and this causes restrictions, so the jetty has to be parallel with Nine Elms Pier. Muck away arrangements have been defined but what is yet to be confirmed, is how to bring materials in. Heavy lifting is needed to pick materials up, concrete rings which are 19 tonnes need to be suspended and carried to land, so a heavier structure solution is needed. The campshed is being looked at, possibly an underwater structure wall, but due to the depth of barges, this would mean a 1-2 metre excavation and could cause issues with the river wall, so they are looking at other options. Alternatively they could move the river wall on a temporary basis, although this also has its challenges. MO confirmed Tideway is in favour of conveyors into the river and running a gantry crane out in to the channel to bring it back in (piles would support the crane). Crossrail used a similar solution.</p>	
6.3	<p>GC raised a question - how close will the works be to the houseboats?</p> <p>MO replied it is not fixed but close. The jetty will be further away but boats will be on both sides. The jetty will be further away from the pier; all operations have to be within LLAU. MO stated the works could be 10m or less away from the houseboats.</p>	
6.4	<p>May H queried why the 5 houseboats needed to move as that area may now not be used by Tideway.</p> <p>MO answered the boats would always have needed to be moved whatever solution is adopted(?).</p>	
6.5	<p>May H asked MO when would they decide on the final site layout?</p> <p>MO said that he hoped it would be within the next six weeks.</p>	
6.6	<p>A question was raised about the proposals for the outer line. This needs a conversation, a distance of 9 metres was not the story six months ago.</p> <p>MO answered the proposal outlined six months did not guarantee both sides of the jetty would not be needed. Delivery of tunnel segments are not part of? the DCO. The DCO addressed muck away but contractors now say they can also bring in segments too. Every barge used takes 76 lorries from London roads so there are real benefits from this. It is appreciated that the impact of barges is very sensitive also.</p>	

	Item	Action
6.7	<p>May H raised a question about the campshed.</p> <p>MO answered, this needs to be looked at, they cannot rely on the tides for the full tunnelling operation.</p>	Tideway
6.8	<p>A resident asked about the revised campshed idea and how this is a worry for marine life. This is such a huge excavation, how can this be managed?</p> <p>MO stated that environmental surveys are being carried out and these will provide a better response to this question.</p> <p>It was added that several nests have moved from regular nesting places and there is a need to safeguard the Wharf.</p> <p>MO confirmed they would be undertaking sampling and there is only one facility which does tests in the UK, MO will confirm who.</p>	
6.9	<p>Mark H raised a question about the programme. If the barge step is not happening and the conveyor for the drive shaft is not happening, then will large scale works be gantry foundations?</p> <p>MO confirmed in the river, yes, the programme would start in September this year. Jetty construction, one marine package for river structures.</p>	
6.10	<p>A resident asked about the finish date.</p> <p>MO stated that tunnelling westbound to Chambers Wharf site would stop Spring 2019, and then secondary lining would run for another year. So material would still be coming / going by river but at a reduced frequency, although still marine operations. Main tunnelling is due to finish Autumn 2018, but temporary structures would still be there.</p>	
6.11	<p>A question was raised about when works on site would come to an end.</p> <p>MO answered 2020, but no de-commissioning programme yet.</p>	
6.12	<p>It was asked if slippages were built in to the timescales.</p> <p>MO stated that there are allowances for slippages; they have used conservative allowances for tunnelling rates. Crossrail tunnelling was on time,</p> <p>A resident asked further about slippages.</p> <p>MO said that generally tunnelling is predictive but cannot be guaranteed.</p> <p>A resident asked if slippages were built in.</p>	

	Item	Action
	MO added yes, slippage time is built in to the programme, allowances for maintenance etc are built in, but timescales cannot be guaranteed. If all goes to plan they should be out earlier.	
6.13	A resident asked about 88 Kirtling Street archaeology works. MO confirmed they were working with The Museum of London. Boreholes have been started but nothing has been found so far. The prospect of finding anything is unlikely. They have set sites with specific timescales for archaeology works and some are of more interest than others. Kirtling Street is not deemed to be of high archaeological interest.	
6.14	IR raised that May H had asked about the Tim Davies artwork to be changed to Nine Elms Pier. MA stated the sticker on the signage was a temporary solution and the hoarding would be replaced in two weeks.	
7.0	Site handover	
7.1	MO reported that 80 Kirtling Street has been handed over. Sheet piling around the shaft for the main tunnelling works is due to start in April.	
7.2	A resident asked if the river wall strengthening would start in April if required. MO answered, the river wall strengthening or campshed may not be required. If it is within the 16 metre limit, then they need to apply to the Environment Agency for permission. There is likely to be programme of monitoring.	
7.3	May H queried why the reasons given for clearing the site early and moving their houseboat were for river wall strengthening works and for the campshed. MO confirmed the reason was for a whole range of activities, as the layout is not fixed. If they end up doing the double jetty then the river wall works may not be carried out.	
7.4	May H asked MO if they had consent for the campshed from the Environment Agency. MO confirmed consent had not been submitted as the plans were not finalised. Once finalised, then consent would be applied for if necessary. Mark H stated then that would be at least 3 months away anyway. IR stated that meant the boats could have had 6 months before being moved.	

	Item	Action
	May H stated it didn't seem reasonable to have moved the houseboats early, after MO had explained the reasoning and programme today.	
8.0	Site works	
8.1	MO continued with his presentation. Demolition of the V&A building, Cemex North, demobilising during April and May and boreholes going on. A more active presence will be seen with sheet piling starting mid-April, then building of concrete slabs, D wall operations to create the shaft, then excavating in the middle of it.	
8.2	A question was raised about going around the outside first for the shaft. MO confirmed that individual holes are dug down, then filled with concrete and re-enforced which makes a continuous concrete wall, they then dug out from the middle, which will take a year. This process effectively makes a very big man-hole, they then drop the boring machines in, to start tunnelling.	
8.3	A resident asked about work starting on the river wall? MO confirmed that surveys and samplings for the foreshore would be undertaken, assuming they keep to the current solution, then marine structures would start in September. A question was asked about any other work being undertaken other than surveys. MO added that nothing will happen other than surveys, this is not fixed and there could be some deliveries. They could not make firm proposals for deliveries until the layout was confirmed; they are trying to balance many issues for the next three years.	
9.0	Programme	
9.1	A slide was discussed showing the latest position on tunnelling, westbound and eastbound. A resident asked if a hard copy programme can be bought next time. MO confirmed yes.	
10	Thames Water Operations	
10.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demolition of 88 Kirtling Street • Construct substation bases for TBM power supply • Handing over areas from the Thames Water side • They are generally de-mobilising areas of the site <p>A resident asked if the grey wall by St James' is staying up. It separates them from the building works; they store the bins etc there.</p>	

	Item	Action
	MO confirmed they would need to check this out.	Tideway
10.2	It was asked if a programme of works could be sent out as items were too small to see. MO confirmed yes.	
10.3	May H asked when drawings submitted to planning are marked indicative, what is the status of those drawings? May H also asked, when drawings are marked approved, what mechanism is in place to make changes to those drawings? An example of those drawings would be the site works parameter plan and the demolitions and site clearance plan. What is the process for changing plans in the DCO? MO confirmed he would check.	Tideway
10.4	It was asked if slides can be handed out in advance next time. It was agreed this would happen.	Tideway
	It was asked if the background to the timescales could be changed from blue to make them clearer. This was agreed so that text would be easier to read; next time there would be a larger screen.	Tideway
10.5	A query was raised about where noise monitoring results would be posted. It was confirmed that monthly reports similar to NLE are issued to Wandsworth and would be added to relevant section of the website, www.tideway.london , select sites and noise information can be added to relevant pages. May H asked whether MO could confirm an answer to her questions about the drawings and he confirmed yes. He was also happy to stay after the meeting to discuss anything on an individual basis.	
11	Future agenda items	
11.1	MO to bring latest layout to show the group.	Tideway
12	Next cycle of meetings	
12.1	The next meeting will be held in end of June/beginning of July.	
12.2	MO offered a separate meeting with the residents at Nine Elms Pier. May H stated that the residents in Southwark have monthly CLGs and questioned what the process would be for an emergency CLG between now and June. SD advised that a separate meeting at Nine Elms Pier	

	Item	Action
	may be more appropriate than a CLG in that instance, so long as formal meeting minutes are taken.	
13	Review of the operation of the CLGs	
13.1	KK advised that at this point in the cycle each year the groups are consulted about how the CLGs are being run e.g. presentation, timings, attendees. GC asked that a screen is used next time as it is difficult to view the presentation and MP asked that Tideway bring along paper copies of the presentation in colour not black and white.	
13.2	KK asked the group whether the meeting needed to start earlier or if it was still appropriate to be held at 19:00 after the Building Battersea meeting (where possible) HG asked that on those occasions it should start later to give residents time to move between the meetings and MP asked why the meetings could not be held at the same venue. SD stated that meetings which do not coincide with the Building Battersea cycle will start at 18:30 and this will include the next meeting. KK asked the group to email NLE@tfl.gov.uk with any further comments.	
14	AOB	
14.1	Minutes from the January cycle to be reissued to all once agreed.	Tideway
14.2	Copies of the presentations to be forwarded to the group.	Tideway / TfL

Meeting started 7.10 and closed at 8.35pm.
Minutes drafted by KK and MW