

Northern line extension

Kennington Green Community Liaison Group

1 October 2015
I Due Amici cafe

Attendees:

Name	Organisation
Cllr rep: Claire Holland (Cllr CH) - chair	LB Lambeth
Officer rep: Iago Griffiths (IG)	LB Lambeth
Houman Meshkati (HM)	Kennington Business Network
Marcus Lyon (ML)	Resident
Tom Bartlett (TB)	Resident
Priscilla Baines (PB)	Resident
Tristan Standish (TS)	Resident
Annette Fowkes (AF)	Resident
James South (JS)	Resident
Marilyn Evers (ME)	Resident
Neil Collingridge (NC)	Resident
Sarah Northey (SN)	Resident
Edward Hutchinson (EH)	Resident
Graeme Tish (GT)	Business owner
Jon Kirkup (JK)	Transport for London
Michael Tarrega (MTa)	Transport for London
Katie-Jane Kyte (KK)	Transport for London

Mark Thompson (MTh)	Transport for London
Jonathan Cooper (JC)	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	Introductions and apologies	
1.1	Cllr CH noted apologies for Cllr Jane Edbrooke and advised that she would be chairing the meeting. Introductions were made and Cllr CH thanked HM for hosting the meeting. KK noted apologies from residents Paul Kerr and Ruth Baumgarten.	
2.0	Minutes of the previous meeting held 29 June 2015	
2.1	TS stated that there is an omission in the minutes in point 3.18 regarding the length of time attended noise monitoring had taken place, and he had advised Cllr Edbrooke of this. KK advised that Cllr Edbrooke had made her aware and the omission had been rectified on the most recent issue of the minutes distributed. KK to ensure any changes are highlighted in future.	TfL
3.0	Northern line extension progress report and presentation	
3.1	MTh stated that the presentation will be given by JP and JC, the project managers accountable for the works at Kennington Green, and asked that questions are held until after the presentation.	
3.2	JP gave a progress update including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft project timetable • Three month lookback and three month lookahead 	

	Item	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Temporary noise enclosure <p>JC gave an update including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'Your feedback' • Kennington Green landscaping • Engagement opportunities 	
3.3	<p>JP advised this is has been a busy period of works as there have been a lot of utility works, removal of the Gingko tree, installation of the permanent hoarding (which is ongoing) and demolition of the Chivas wall. The piling will commence in November and the rig will be similar to that in use at Kennington Park. The permanent power supply will also be installed and therefore generators will not be required.</p>	
3.4	<p>JP acknowledged that there have been utilities works outside of core hours due to network protection concerns. JP advised that the project has sought specialist arboriculturalist advice on tree T4 pruning and are awaiting approval from LB Lambeth. JP also thanked residents for their forbearance with regard to the SGN works in Montford Place and advised that these works are being done in the quickest and least disruptive way.</p>	
3.5	<p>JP advised that the installation of the acoustic enclosure in Spring 2016 will enable works to continue outside of core hours but minimise disturbance to the community.</p>	
3.6	<p>JC thanked residents for their feedback and reiterated that any communication should come through the NLE inbox (NLE@tfl.gov.uk) or the NLE 24/7 helpdesk (0343 222 2424) JC reported that there have been two drop in sessions which will continue and there is a monthly traffic management meeting. There was also a re-landscaping engagement meeting on 22 September and JC reported that community feedback has been acknowledged and the project will not be submitting the planning application to LB Lambeth in October.</p>	
3.7	<p>MG reiterated the communication tools for residents to use and asked that residents use these tools rather and coming to the site offices.</p>	
3.8	<p>KK advised that there will be a meeting to discuss Kennington Cross junction on Wednesday 7 October, meeting outside the Dog House pub. KK to follow up with an email to the group.</p> <p><i>Defect surveys</i></p>	TfL

	Item	Action
3.9	<p>NC questioned when properties at The Lycee will receive their defect surveys. MTh advised that surveys are being done in order of priority and therefore properties which may be affected by the piling works are in process now and those affected by the tunnelling works will be done later. MG advised that there is a timeline for all properties. PB questioned when the tunnelling works will commence, MTh advised an approximate date of Summer 2016 but there is a lot of work to come before this so the programme is subject change.</p> <p><i>Acoustic enclosure</i></p>	
3.10	<p>NC questioned whether the size of the acoustic enclosure has grown and if it now covers a larger area of the Green, JP advised that it has not and the team are looking at the detailed design for this.</p> <p><i>Trees on the Green</i></p>	
3.11	<p>EH raised a concern with the condition of tree T4 (the 'Tree of Heaven') at this time and also after it has been pruned, stating that now it is a visual asset but it will not be if two or three metres are cut back. EH also raised a concern that the roots under the Green will be adversely affected by the construction of the adit and questioned whether a root survey has been done. RMc advised that a specialist arboriculturalist has been engaged to look at the tree (including roots) and the project know where the roots are. EH stated that without a survey this cannot be the case and RMc advised that the project is using root protection measures. EH raised that the British Standard states a root survey must be done and this should be reflected, raising a concern that if the roots are damaged then the tree will not survive and additionally if the tree is lopped to fit the piling rig underneath then it will become unstable e.g. in high winds. EH questioned whether this information is available as part of the planning application and whether the application is on the Planning Portal for the community to comment as there is a strong feeling that the strategy is to remove the tree completely. RMc advised that he could not say if the information was on the Planning Portal but stated that this is not the project strategy. JP advised that the project are aware of the tree and are assessing the impact on it with advice from the specialist aboriculturalist. In addition the tree will be kept balanced. EH stated that stability is a key concern and TS agreed and questioned what would happen if the tree fell in high winds onto the houses opposite.</p>	<p>Flo</p>

	Item	Action
	<p>Cllr CH stated that the project need to come back with a complete answer but TS stated that the last meeting was 14 weeks ago and the residents cannot wait that long for an answer. MTa advised that all Liaison Groups are quarterly and there have been drop in sessions in between. MTh stated that the project will discuss with the arboriculturalist and come back to the group before the next meeting, JP adding that it can be resolved relatively quickly. EH asked whether it would be possible to meet the arboriculturalist and JP agreed it would and this meeting would be made public. EH questioned whether the planning application for the removal of the Hornbeam trees was on the Planning Portal and RMc responded that it is.</p> <p><i>Utility works</i></p>	<p>Flo</p>
<p>3.12</p>	<p>JS stated that the utility works have been ongoing for six months and are very noisy, asking when they will be completed. JP advised that it has been very difficult to integrate the various utility companies in the this area however the majority of the works are completed however through these works there are new utilities which have been discovered and must be dealt with, which include a gas main beneath the Chivas headwall, and advised that these utilities provide services and therefore cannot be disrupted. AF queried whether the project has plotted where the utilities have been diverted to and JP advised that 3D modelling is used.</p>	
<p>3.13</p>	<p>TB questioned whether the substation will be noisy and the timing of this. JP advised it will be relatively quiet and will be delivered next week, with the generator removed at the end of October.</p>	
<p>3.14</p>	<p>JS questioned how construction traffic will move in and out of site. JP advised they will enter to the east side of the site and exit at the north side, advising there will be approximately 30 lorries a day. JS raised a concern as the north side exit is outside his property and queried the hours of use for this exit, JP responding that the hours will vary but will be in core hours unless under exceptional circumstances. TS stated that the project would have to advise the Local Authority of any exceptional circumstances and JP agreed. AF questioned whether the paving currently being laid will form part of the final landscaping of the Green, MTh advised it would not.</p>	
<p>3.15</p>	<p>ME queried whether the project was aware of any service disruptions this week due to the utility works, as some</p>	

	Item	Action
3.16	<p>residents have had their BT services interrupted for two or three days. JP advised that if this happens residents must contact the utility companies and the project are encouraging the utility companies to notify residents if there are going to be service disruptions. TB questioned whether the current site layout is now permanent or will change again, JP advised that the site and traffic management are not yet in their permanent state as there are still utility works to be finished, notably in Montford Place where the residents have concerns about access but this should be resolved at the beginning of November. HM stated that the NLE should let residents know if there will be service disruptions and MG advised that residents could always call the project helpline if they have concerns however the utility companies are working independently, JP agreeing that the first call should be to the utility company but if residents let the project know we can also follow it up.</p> <p><i>Working hours</i></p> <p>MG acknowledged that the community has concerns regarding works outside of the core hours and advised that on some occasions works may overrun but the project will notify residents as early as possible. JC agreed and advised that during piling works there may be circumstances where the works go on after core hours however the project will be planning and managing works so this only occurs in exceptional circumstances. JP added that constructing a pile is a continuous process and to stop and then perform abortive works the next day would be more disruptive than continuing past core hours. NC questioned how long the works may go on for past 18:00, MTh advised this is an unknown element and reiterated that works will be planned so that they do not run over however there may be occasional events when they do. NC stated that he is concerned the works will run into the night when his children are trying to sleep and MTh acknowledged this concern, advising that to run over late into the night is unlikely but however long it will be the project will notify residents, reiterating that the project is planning works within core hours. Cllr CH stated that the residents must let TfL know if this is the case and if the breaches are continuous to inform the council. NC stated that there have been breaches and the residents are very resentful, reiterating that working within the core hours is very important. TS questioned how many piles will be constructed per day and asked when the project will start piling each day, MTh responded that piling is systematic and the project will use best endeavours to complete each day within the core hours,</p>	

	Item	Action
	<p>JP advising there are approximately 340 piles to complete the 24 week programme. Cllr CH stated that the conversation should be moved on however if residents would like a more technical discussion they should contact the project. HM queried how the project would contact residents if there were over-running works and MTa advised this would be by email however if there was a need to notify immediately the project could door-knock.</p>	
<p>4.0</p> <p>4.1</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>4.3</p>	<p>Traffic management</p> <p>Cllr CH reported that there had been a walkabout with Val Shawcross AM and Cllr Edbrooke which residents had also attended and there is an action plan in place. ME raised a concern regarding access into Clayton Street for cyclists from Kennington Road, JC acknowledged this and advised that the project and TfL Surface Transport would look at this and JP stated that the barriers which are seen as impeding access are there for safety purposes. AF advised that there is a tree over-hanging the bus stop at the south of Kennington Road and asked whether LB Lambeth or the project could cut this back.</p> <p>JS stated that there have been incidences of site traffic attempting to enter the site by the north side exit and having to reverse out which is both disruptive and dangerous. JC noted this and advised that subcontractors have been briefed but the project will do so again.</p> <p>NC raised a repeat concern that there appears to be little coordination of all the traffic management in this area, referring to the resurfacing works on Harleyford Street and a conversation with a member of that TfL team which cited 'Mayoral policy'. JK advised that there is a team coordinating all of these works however there are political commitments also. JS questioned why all of the works have to happen at the same time and JK advised that there is pressure to do the projects but reiterated that there is coordination and TfL are trying to minimise disruption. Cllr CH advised the group that the councillors do also raise this and HM raised a concern that is also affects the business community. TS advised the group that there is a meeting which the various projects attend and the representative from TfL Surface Transport is looking at the coordination of the projects. SN stated that due to the works at Oval the street lights have been taken and the pavements are very dark, JK advised that TfL would look at this.</p>	<p>TfL/Flo</p> <p>Flo / LB Lambeth</p> <p>Flo</p> <p>TfL</p>

	Item	Action
5.0 5.1 5.2 5.3	<p>Construction noise</p> <p>TB queried the appearance of the acoustic enclosure given its location and prominence on the Green, JP advised that it will be painted midnight green which is the colour of the hoardings.</p> <p>ME asked whether Sherwin and Hornby House are expected to feel the vibration from the piling, RMc stated that this is not anticipated however there will be vibration monitoring and advised that there is little risk of property damage due to vibration. AF raised a concern that there had been a roller vehicle on site this week which had made the windows shake, JP advised that this was a compaction vehicle which did produce occasional vibration. RMc advised the group that the piling technique is cased rotary and not percussive.</p> <p>JS stated that the utility works have been consistently noisy and this will only get works with the piling and the lorry movements. JS raised a concern that the TfL trigger levels are unrealistic, inappropriate and unacceptable and a practical solution needs to be looked at for the people living directly around the Green e.g. secondary glazing. TS advised that there is an option for secondary glazing if the thresholds are breached and asked if the council would consider a council tax rebate during the years of the NLE works, citing precedence set in Westminster for Crossrail. IG advised that LB Lambeth can look at this but he would be unable to give an answer at this time. JS stated that the council should be helping the residents more and HM stated that the residents in this area will not be benefitting from the NLE and therefore if something could be done by the council now this would be the benefit. IG stated that LB Lambeth have put strict measures on TfL from the Public Inquiry including noise levels. TS raised a concern that when representations are made to the LB Lambeth EHO regarding noise these are not followed up and Cllr CH advised that residents could contact herself or Cllr Edbrooke if there was a concern.</p>	<p>LB Lambeth</p>
6.0 6.1	<p>Re-landscaping the Green</p> <p>MTa reported that there had been an engagement session after which the project has reviewed the programme. There has been a lot of feedback from the community which the project now needs to review but we will respond. Cllr CH queried the timescales and MTA advised that the programme has been reviewed and the timescale lengthened. EH stated that the community should be given the opportunity to</p>	

	Item	Action
	<p>develop the proposal with the designers and Cllr CH stated that this is being discussed in separate meetings, which the community will continue to be a part of. HM asked what the budget is for the re-landscaping as this is important considering the disruption. MTa advised that the project is reviewing scheme costs alongside the options proposed by the community and stated that the project understands the importance of the legacy we leave behind here. Cllr CH advised the group to make any comments via the further engagement meetings and JK agreed, noting that the final proposal will be approved by LB Lambeth who have been included from the beginning.</p>	
<p>7.0 7.1 7.2</p>	<p>Settlement deeds</p> <p>PB stated that the residents are still waiting to see the updated contour maps, questioned the need for the Settlement Deeds to be reviewed as they were included in the TWAO and asked for a timeline for when the defect surveys will be undertaken on all properties. JC advised that the timeline and the contours can be made available and at the moment defect surveys are being prioritised for those properties affected by the piling works. Cllr CH stated that residents need to know when they can expect these surveys.</p> <p>TS questioned why residents cannot choose their own surveyor, to TfLs cost, and why the survey company does not take photographs as part of their report, raising a concern with this process as a whole. MG advised that there should be photographic records taken and Flo would look at this. TS reiterated that residents should be able to employ an independent surveyor, which TfL could set a budget for. JK advised that TfL would look at this however the survey company are independent. GT stated that he had also not had any photos taken at his property and MG reiterated that Flo would look into this.</p>	<p>Flo</p> <p>Flo</p> <p>TfL</p>
<p>8.0 8.1</p>	<p>Dates of future meetings</p> <p>KK advised the next cycle will be in January but there will be drop in sessions in between, TS stated that drop in sessions are not minuted and therefore there should be more Liaison Group meetings. JK advised that the drop in sessions have been well attended but the project will look at taking down the notes from these, reiterating that residents are welcome to contact the project at any time to discuss concerns. TS stated that Liaison Groups have the local councillor there too to hear concerns and Cllr CH stated that an answer cannot be given</p>	<p>Flo</p>

	Item	Action
	now but she will discuss with the other local councillors and TfL. SN stated that with the piling starting a further meeting would be useful before January. Cllr CH thanked all for attending and closed the meeting.	TfL/ LB Lambeth

Meeting started 7.00 and closed at 8:33.
Minutes drafted by KK