

## Northern line extension

### Kennington Green Community Liaison Group

29 June 2015  
Durning Library

#### Attendees:

Name	Organisation
Cllr rep: Jane Edbrooke (Cllr JE) - chair	LB Lambeth
Officer rep: Iago Griffiths (IG)	LB Lambeth
Marcus Lyons (ML)	Resident
Tom Bartlett (TB)	Resident
Priscilla Baines (PB)	Resident
Tristan Standish (TS) Leanne Standish (LS) Jordan Standish (JS) Harrison Standish (HS)	Residents
Nicola Fleming (NF)	Resident
Pauline Hoare (PH)	Resident
Stephen Hoare (SH)	Resident
Tahzeeb Bhagat (TBh)	Resident
Furrokh Panthakee (FP)	Resident
Annette Fowkes (AF)	Resident
Sian Cook (SC)	Resident
Marcus Tate (MT)	Resident
Frederic Antigny (FA)	Resident

Neil Collingridge (NC)	Resident
Sarah Northey (SN)	Resident
Stephen Waring (SW)	Resident
Paul Kerr (PK)	Resident
Jon Kirkup (JK)	Transport for London
Anne Potter (AP)	Transport for London
Peter Headland (PHe)	Transport for London
Katie-Jane Kyte (KK)	Transport for London
Jarad Slater (JSI)	Transport for London
Cathy Oates (CO)	Transport for London
Mabel Garcia Aranda (MGA)	Ferrovial Laing-O'Rourke (Flo)
Jez Porter (JP)	Ferrovial Laing-O'Rourke (Flo)
Rob McCarthy (RMc)	Ferrovial Laing-O'Rourke (Flo)

Apologies:

	Item	Action
1.0	<b>Membership</b>	
1.1	Cllr JE went through the membership of the Group and invited those people who are panel members to sit around the table.	
1.2	Cllr JE noted that there is not a panel member present from the Kennington business community and the group should seek a nomination from this community. Noted that there are no apologies.	<b>TfL</b>
1.3	All panel members at the table introduced themselves. JP explained who Ferrovial Laing-O'Rourke (Flo) were for those who were new to the meeting.	

	<b>Item</b>	<b>Action</b>
1.4	Cllr JE stated that it is important to get the views of all members of the community and therefore there is a diversity monitoring form that we will be asking people to fill in and return. This is voluntary.	
2.0	<b>Minutes of the previous meeting held 23 March 2015</b>	
2.1	Minutes agreed as accurate and no changes made.	
2.2	ML questioned whether the minutes go out to the group to be agreed after the meeting. Cllr JE advised that they are reviewed by her as chair. PHe confirmed that the minutes do go out to the group and KK will check that ML receives these.	<b>TfL</b>
3.0	<b>Northern line extension progress report and presentation</b>	
3.1	JP stated that the presentation has been shortened after feedback from previous meetings.	
3.2	<p>JP gave a progress update including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Summary update since the last CLG (March)</li> <li>• Lookahead summary</li> <li>• Traffic management layout</li> </ul> <p>JP advised that the current traffic management layout is set this way to allow for the complex utility diversions in the area. This includes carrying out multi-utility diversions in the same trench in order to reduce the impact as much as possible. JP stated that there are still significant diversions to occur including a three-duct crossing across Kennington Road and advised that Flo are working closely with BT and Thames Water to minimise disruption.</p> <p>JP stated that piling is due to commence in October and the permanent hoardings (2.4m high) will be erected prior to this in August/September. Flo will also be demolishing a wall near the Chivas site towards the end of August.</p> <p><i>Traffic Management</i></p>	
3.3	PB raised that there are bollards closing off Clayton Street. JP advised that Flo are working with the TfL project team and with TfL Surface Transport, who are coordinating all road projects in the area (Cycle Superhighway 5, Better Junctions, works at Elephant and Castle etc). JP added that feedback and	

	<b>Item</b>	<b>Action</b>
	<p>comments from residents are very helpful and the NLE traffic management in the area is being reviewed by the team on a daily basis. This includes how cyclists are reacting to the traffic management (e.g. weaving between the bollards).</p>	
3.4	<p>Cllr JE stated that the events of today (flooding on Kennington Park Road) have been a good example of the road system at maximum capacity and questioned whether the road will get any narrower. JP stated that the road will be maintained as two-way and will not be getting any narrower. TB questioned whether the lanes can be widened to give cyclists more space, JP advised that if too much space is created people flood into it and may take chances, reiterating that the current scheme has been agreed with TfL Surface Transport.</p>	
3.5	<p>SN stated that it is a very dangerous situation for pedestrians as cyclists are coming onto the pavements and motorcyclists are going on the inside near the pavement. LS reiterated this and that it is unsafe for people walking with children or dogs. AF added that although there are signs people do not take any notice of these. NC stated that the current solution is inadequate, there is no traffic flow just congestion and it needs a total re-think, also that cyclists are just trying to get past the congestion. AF agreed with this but stated that they should still obey the signs and should not take chances by weaving.</p>	
3.6	<p>TS stated that the road is congested until 01:00 and the removal of the right turn into Clayton Street has forced all traffic to the junction of Kennington Road and Kennington Park Road, including buses and lorries. There is therefore a lot of pollution and vibration from the vehicles at all hours. JP stated that there must be a continuous barrier in the road to stop weaving and U-turns which are very dangerous. Cllr JE questioned whether Clayton Street was ever open. JP responded that it was but this lead to people doing U-turns and turning around in that road. TS stated however that this was better as there was less congested traffic. NC stated that this has been a problem from the beginning and there needs to be a better solution. PH added that cyclists have been witnessed riding on the wrong side of the road into oncoming traffic.</p>	
3.7	<p>Cllr JE stated that enforcement is needed in this area as it is dangerous and therefore the TfL Transport police need to patrol here. MT advised that there are Transport police at Kennington Cross but not further down. JK responded that he will discuss these concerns with the Principal Network Impact Assessment Engineer in TfL Surface Transport, who coordinates all traffic management across London, and co-</p>	

	<b>Item</b>	<b>Action</b>
	<p>ordinate with the traffic police. JK added that it is ultimately the decision of the traffic police where they deploy their resources but TfL will express the need for enforcement on Kennington Road. TS stated that it is a shame someone from TfL Surface Transport is not at the meeting. LS questioned whether the right turn into Clayton Street could be reinstated for a short time to ease the congestion. JP reiterated that the layout is being reviewed on a daily basis however continuous changes frustrate road users and when the changes are reversed we may see the behaviour that people try to move bollards etc which is dangerous.</p> <p>The residents in attendance felt strongly about the traffic management problems</p>	<b>TfL</b>
3.8	<p>NC stated that there needs to be a more fundamental solution put in place as it is not working and ML agreed, adding that during the TWAO consultation period the community did raise this but TfL did not listen. AF added that road users are frustrated and asked if the signage can be more prominent as cyclists are ignoring the 'do not overtake' signs. SW stated that these signs are for cars and not cyclists.</p>	
3.9	<p>PB reiterated that it is 'hell' for pedestrians at the moment and very difficult to get around, TfL need to reduce the means for cyclists to behave badly. PB also added that at the junction of Windmill Road there is a build-up of traffic across the junction, this is also due to the works at Elephant and Castle. PH reiterated this, asking whether a yellow box junction could be put here and adding that people ignore the signs and in the whole area.</p>	
3.10	<p>TB questioned how much width there will be on the road in the long term and whether it can go to three lanes with a cycle lane through the middle. JP stated that he did not believe this would be possible as there must be a dedicated pedestrian walkaway along the side of the hoardings. TB asked whether there could be 'dead end' signs installed on Montford Place to stop people driving down here and having to turn around. JP agreed that these could be put in place.</p>	<b>Flo</b>
3.11	<p>ML stated that once the utility diversion are completed there should be a fixed plan in place however there are no proposals for a pedestrian crossing; currently people are walking across the road in between traffic. Cllr JE agreed that it is difficult to cross Kennington Road at the moment and stated that there needs to be clear actions on how these issues will be addressed.</p>	

	Item	Action
3.12	<p>Cllr JE stated that she will contact Assembly Member Val Shawcross and arrange a walkabout in this area; and JK will arrange someone senior from TfL Surface Transport who is responsible for traffic management to be present.. Cllr JE asked when the worst time would be and the group agreed either 09:00 or 17:00. Cllr JE stated she will contact Val Shawcross the next day and members of the CLG panel would be welcome to join the walkabout.</p>	<p><b>TfL</b>  <b>Cllr JE / TfL</b></p>
3.13	<p>MT raised that there was a sign on Cleaver Street stating 'No Access into Kennington Park Road' however this was knocked down and has been taken away and not replaced. PB and SW also added that bollards are being knocked down and removed in Ravensdon Street frustrating road users. PB stated that although the works in the road are also due to the Cycle Superhighway 5 works and the NLE is an unintended consequence, it is dangerous especially for cyclists due to the right turn onto Kennington Park Road.</p>	
3.14	<p>Cllr JE stated that this is a culmination of a number of issues that TfL need to take away and deal with, adding that no one wants to be the person who has to say 'I told you so'.</p>	<p><b>TfL</b></p>
3.15	<p>SH stated that he has written to TfL outlining concerns on congestion including health issues, road rage and cyclists but did not receive a satisfactory response. NF questioned whether the hospitals have been notified as ambulances could get stuck in the congestion.</p> <p><i>Noise</i></p>	
3.16	<p>AF raised a complaint that security guards have been leaving their van engines running at night. JP stated that this should not be happening and he will raise with the security company. PK reiterated that this is happening. Cllr JE stated that if residents do find this happening then be sure to take pictures and contact the NLE, KK advised that the NLE inbox email address is <a href="mailto:nle@tfl.gov.uk">nle@tfl.gov.uk</a> and ML advised that a video be taken and forwarded. AP reiterated that the project team will look into this; JP advised that there is a welfare vehicle on site but this is not outside residents properties. TS questioned why the security vans cannot be in the middle of the Green, JP advised that they are mobile units which serve two sites but either way they should not be leaving their engines on.</p>	<p><b>Flo</b></p>
3.17	<p>MT questioned what the terms 'piling mat' and 'secant piling' mean and asked if they will be noisy. JP responded that the</p>	

	<b>Item</b>	<b>Action</b>
	<p>piling rig weighs up to 100 tonnes and the piling mat is the structural base on which it sits. The secant piling is the method of piling (two overlapping circular piles) to create a continuous structural wall. JP advised that it would produce noise and these noise predictions go into the forecast to the council Environmental Health Officers and set the limits. TS questioned whether Flo will be bringing hardcore onto site. JP advised that yes they would and TS stated that this would be noisy but in a recent communication Flo stated that works 'would not be particularly noisy' therefore residents may have a different definition of what 'noisy' means.</p>	
3.18	<p>RMc presented on construction noise and environmental monitoring, advising that there has been attended monitoring (three hours a week) by an acoustic consultant to check the predictions. The predictions have been agreed with the Local Authorities and when the hoarding is erected the semi-permanent monitors can be installed to monitor the construction noise. RMc advised that lookahead predictions have flagged the need for an acoustic shed to be installed on the Green when the 24/7 tunnelling works commence. This will enclose the shaft entirely and mitigate noise disturbance, however the 2.4m high hoarding is deemed sufficient to mitigate all other construction noise. NC questioned when the hoardings will be erected as the date keeps getting pushed back and the residents are keen to see the noise mitigation measures installed as soon as possible. JP acknowledgement that the date had gone back but advised this is due to the utility diversion works being more complex and taking longer than anticipated.</p>	
3.19	<p>RMc advised that noise and dust monitoring locations are being finalised and these will be on the hoardings and in locations around the site. The dust monitoring is passive and will form slides on window sills which will then be measured and reported on. AF questioned whether this is all above ground and RMc advised that it is.</p>	
3.20	<p>RMc and JP showed the graphics of the proposed acoustic shed, advising that there will be a gantry crane inside to lift out the Tunnel Boring Machine.</p> <p><i>Trees on the Green</i></p>	
3.21	<p>RMc advised that the Gingko tree (which was incorrectly mapped on the Transport and Works Act Order (TWAO) documents) will be removed soon. AF suggested a delay in removing the tree and then transplanting it however RMc</p>	

	<b>Item</b>	<b>Action</b>
	<p>advised that the project has sought advice here and transplanting is likely to be unsuccessful. RMc also advised the T4 the Tree of Heaven will be pruned shortly (removal of one or two branches) and the arboriculture expert has advised that the tree will respond well to this. RMc raised that there are three trees in Montford Place, funded by local businesses, which are currently in the line of the hoarding alignment and piles. The arboriculture expert will look at these trees and assess. NF questioned why the trees cannot be saved and JP advised that Flo will look into this. ML stated that the trees are Hornbeam trees which were paid for by the community.</p> <p><i>Hoardings</i></p>	<b>Flo</b>
3.22	<p>RMc reported that hoardings are to be erected and will have an ivy leaf finish on them to make them more appealing and sympathetic to the surrounding area. There will also be information boards. MG reported that she has been in discussion with TfL on the Arts and Culture Strategy for the project and the ivy leaf print will be installed once the area has settled. Cllr JE asked for dates for when the hoardings will be erected and JP advised that this cannot happen until the utility diversions have been completed and this will be mid-August at the earliest. NC questioned what has changed here and JP explained that there is a complicated BT services diversion that must be completed before the hoardings can go up as well as two sensitive Thames Water trunk mains which need condition surveys done on them which is affected the timescales.</p> <p><i>Ground movement</i></p>	
3.23	<p>PH questioned whether Flo have consulted with the Georgian Society and/or the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings regarding the properties around the Green which will be affected by ground movement and vibration. MG advised that a competent surveyor has been appointed but Flo will take that back and check. PH questioned how long the 24/7 tunnelling will be going on for. JP advised it will be approximately one year but may also run into the Step Plate Junction works (works to tie the new tunnels into the existing Kennington Loop) which is scheduled for Easter 2017. MG advised that defect surveys will be done before this time however PH reiterated that a specialist needs to be consulted.</p> <p><i>Acoustic shed</i></p>	<b>Flo</b>
3.24	<p>LS questioned the height of the acoustic shed and JP advised it is currently in the design phase however the proposed height</p>	

	<b>Item</b>	<b>Action</b>
	<p>is 14m. Cllr JE questioned how long this will be up for and JP responded approximately 18 months. Cllr JE asked whether this would need to go through planning and JP advised that it can be installed under the TWAO powers. MT questioned whether 14m is the height of the crane or the building and JP advised that it is the height of the shed itself. LS raised a concern that this is the same height as some bedroom windows and asked what would stop people from looking into residents' homes from the top of the crane but AP reassured the group that the acoustic shed is enclosed so this would not happen. Cllr JE questioned when the public will get to see the designs for the acoustic shed; JP advised that there will be more information at the next CLG however Cllr JE questioned what this means i.e. does it mean there will be designs given to the group to look at. JP stated this may not be the case; the overall proportions could be shared then but not the final design. Cllr JE stated that there must be some public engagement exercise so that people have the chance to comment on this big structure. ML stated that the acoustic shed is not in the TWAO Cllr JE reiterated that even though this may not need to go through planning and therefore full consultation it does not mean that there should not be public engagement. Flo to look into this.</p>	<p><b>Flo</b></p>
<p>4.0</p> <p>4.1</p> <p>4.2</p>	<p><b>Question and answer session</b></p> <p>Cllr JE invited questions from the group which the project team then answered.</p> <p><i>Noise of piling</i></p> <p>MT questioned how noisy the piling will be and whether the noise has been calculated over a 24/7 period as this is very concerning for residents.</p> <p>RMc advised that the piling is not a 24/7 activity and will commence in advance of the acoustic shed installation and there has been baseline monitoring done several times so there is a considerable background data here which an independent consultant has also looked at. MT questioned how it can be determined that enough data is collected and RMc replied that the levels can be predicted and these are then agreed with the Local Authority. TS questioned whether the group can see the data for the attended noise monitoring and stated that Flo have not done any unattended monitoring. RMc advised that the unattended monitoring will be done when the hoardings are erected but TS questioned why this is the case and why the temporary hoardings have not have acoustic</p>	

	<b>Item</b>	<b>Action</b>
	<p>shields put on them to mitigate noise. TS stated that this is in the Section 61 and wants to see the data as he does not believe that Flo have it. RMc advised that the data ultimately belongs to TfL and TS questioned how a claim can be made against the Noise Mitigation Scheme as the residents cannot see the data. JK advised that he will take this issue back and consult with the TfL Property team to see what can be released to residents. TS read an extract from the Code of Construction Practice Part B which stated that Flo would have unattended noise monitoring which is agreed with the Local Authority; this will have an instant alert and alarms if the trigger levels are hit. TS stated that there is currently none in place and he has been requesting this from Flo for this for six months as he does not understand how Flo can monitor at all times if it is attended monitoring only.</p> <p><i>24/7 tunnelling works</i></p>	<b>TfL</b>
4.3	<p>SN questioned what will happen with spoil removal during the 24/7 tunnelling and whether there will be lorries coming and going at all hours.</p> <p>RMc advised that movement of spoil will be in core hours only and he could not see where there would be an exception to this, however if there was, then the project will notify residents.</p>	<b>Flo</b>
4.4	<p><i>Dust monitoring</i></p> <p>PK questioned when the dust monitoring will commence.</p> <p>RMc will follow this up and check the exact dates.</p>	<b>Flo</b>
4.5	<p><i>Air ventilation for the acoustic shed</i></p> <p>JS questioned how the air ventilation system and pumps will be powered for men working inside the acoustic shed.</p> <p>RMc confirmed that there will be a ventilation system and the project team are currently exploring ways to mitigate the noise and where the system will sit on the shed, reassuring that it would meet the noise requirements and would not go above them. Cllr JE stated that this is why the group needs to see more detail than just the visualisations. NC questioned whether there will be generators powering the pumps which will run all night and RMc advised that there would be but the levels would be reduced to mitigate the noise.</p> <p><i>Ginkgo tree</i></p>	<b>Flo</b>

	<b>Item</b>	<b>Action</b>
4.6	<p>TB questioned why the compensation tree cannot go in the originally plotted position.</p> <p>RMc advised that there are a lot of utilities in this area but there is the potential for a replacement Gingko tree in the permanent landscaping solution. Cllr JE questioned whether Flo have a tree management plan and RMc stated that there is an Ecology Management Plan and the report from the arboriculture expert. Cllr JE stated that as the trees are very important then this needs to be discussed in more detail at the next meeting, noting that there is very little green space in this part of the borough.</p> <p><i>State of the roads</i></p>	
4.7	<p>AF stated that there is dirt and grease on the roads from all the site vehicles.</p> <p>JP advised that Flo will look into this.</p>	<b>Flo</b>
5.0	<b>Future agenda items</b>	
5.1	<p>Cllr JE stated that there needs to be a design-focussed session as the group do not want to miss the opportunity to have their input to the final landscaping scheme. Cllr JE asked the NLE project team to think about when would be the appropriate time to discuss this. MG advised that the NLE designer is looking at this but AP advised that we will take it back and discuss.</p>	<b>TfL / Flo</b>
6.0	<b>A.O.B</b>	
6.1	<p>TS questioned whether residents can employ their own surveyor to do defect surveys rather than use the NLE one and TfL will pay for this, including listed buildings, as he understands the answer is yes. JK advised he will come back on this.</p>	<b>TfL</b>
6.2	<p>NF asked whether the group can have more frequent meetings than having to wait for three months. Cllr JE agreed that they should be more frequent, when needed, and also more 'themed' so all important issues are discussed.</p>	
6.3	<p>PB requested more information on the Step Plate Junction works, as well as clarity on what all parties will get out of entering in to a Settlement Deed.</p>	<b>TfL / Flo</b>

	<b>Item</b>	<b>Action</b>
6.4	ML stated that this is a thoughtful and diverse community who believe they have been 'shafted' through the TWAO process by TfL. He stated that they were 'buoyed' when Flo came on board and now at all points TfL and Flo are over-promising and under-delivering. The NLE project team need to think again about how they engage with the community in order to build and meaningful relationships. ML also stated that TfL need to step up in the CLG meetings and there needs to be proper representation so that decisions can be made and answers given. Cllr JE agreed, stating that the meetings do need to be more regular but it is concerning that residents feel they have to wait three months to talk to Flo and TfL as there should be an ongoing dialogue. MG advised that there was a drop in session and contact with individual residents but that she would be arranging a further meeting given the feedback here.	<b>Flo</b>
6.5	Following a heated discussion, ML praised Cllr JE for her chairing of the meeting and Cllr JE then closed the meeting.	

Meeting started 6.59 and closed at 8:33.  
 Minutes drafted by KK