

Northern line extension

Kennington Green Community Liaison Group

13 January 2016

I Due Amici cafe

Attendees:

Name	Organisation
Officer rep: Iago Griffiths (IG) - chair	LB Lambeth
Houman Meshkati (HM)	Kennington Business Network
Tom Bartlett (TB)	Resident
Priscilla Baines (PB)	Resident
Tristan Standish (TS)	Residents
James South (JS)	Resident
Marilyn Evers (ME)	Resident
Neil Collingridge (NC)	Resident
Sarah Northey (SN)	Resident
Jon Kirkup (JK)	Transport for London
Katie-Jane Kyte (KK)	Transport for London
Mark Thompson (MTh)	Transport for London
Jonathan Cooper (JC)	Transport for London
Cathy Oates (CO)	Transport for London
Elizabeth Gaden (EG)	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: Cllr Jane Edbrooke, Marcus Lyon, Michael Tarrega, Chris Cossey, Ruth Crawford

	Item	Action
1.0	Introductions and apologies	
1.1	IG noted apologies for Cllr Edbrooke and advised that he will be chairing. Apologies also from those noted above and introductions were made.	
2.0	Minutes of the previous meeting held 01.10.2015	
2.1	Point 7.2 – TS advised that he had received the defect survey for his property and it did include photographs. No further points, minutes agreed as accurate.	
3.0	Northern line extension progress report and presentation	
3.1	JP gave a progress update including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three month lookback and three month lookahead • Temporary noise enclosure • Feedback • Engagement opportunities <p>JP apologised for the disruption caused to residents in 2015 and further into 2016, advising that the project and site teams are working to mitigate this disruption and empathises with those affected.</p>	
3.2	JP advised that the turning head at the end of Kennington Road (Paperlink land) has now been implemented and T4 will be removed by the end of January subject to LB Lambeth agreement, with four pear trees to be planted to give coverage at the north end of the Green. JP reported that redundant piles have been found on the head house site which require removal; the project team are working on options for removal but there will be noise. JP advised that a signalised junction will be implemented to the south of the Green.	
3.3	JP reported that although the noise created on site has not exceeded the Section 61 predictions there have been six ‘amber’ alerts where action has been taken to monitor and mitigate further where possible. There have been vibrations levels of between 1mm and 2mm which is the level at which residents must be advised that works are happening however JP advised the levels would have be over 10mm to see any cosmetic effect on properties and there are vibration monitors on properties where residents have raised concerns.	

	Item	Action
3.4	<p>JP reported that the temporary enclosure will take approximately six weeks to erect and will lead to significant noise attenuation from the excavation and tunnelling works. JP advised that the current recorded background noise level at Kennington Green is 61dBA. NC stated that noise is measured over an average time and therefore not relevant as it is the peaks which are the most disturbing and JP advised that the temporary enclosure will still give a significant reduction.</p>	
3.5	<p>JC advised that there has been a lot of feedback regarding the re-landscaping of the Green, including strong views on the legacy the NLE project leaves behind and also regarding the original consultation conducted in 2012/2013 which cannot be forgotten. JC advised that the project is finalising designs and will engage with residents again at an appropriate time.</p>	
3.6	<p>ME questioned whether the chemical content of the dust has been examined, JP advised that the dust is not examined for its chemical content but for the particulate build-up. ME raised a concern that the dust could be toxic and CO reassured that the contaminated land reports have come back negative and therefore there is little reason to be concerned, adding that the machinery Flo uses is within the Mayor of London's Low Emissions target. ME thanked CO for the reassurance and added thanks to the project and site teams for the litter-picking in Montford Place. JP advised there have been instances of fly-tipping and asked that LB Lambeth look at this as we do not want to remove this rubbish and therefore encourage more fly-tipping.</p> <p><i>Noise and the temporary enclosure</i></p>	
3.7	<p>NC reiterated that the average noise levels are irrelevant and it is the peaks which affect residents e.g. shaking the piling rig auger and working at night. RMc advised that this is the nature of piling and acknowledged that spoil removal from the auger is noisy however the 24hr tunnelling works should not involve such high peaks. TB questioned what this work is and RMc advised it will be sprayed concrete lining (SCL) of the shaft and then tunnels which is done at depth. JS raised a concern about workmen entering and exiting the site and TS agreed this will be an issue. RMc advised that the project are looking at options for direct access to the enclosure through the Chivas access corridor and emphasised that the workforce will be briefed, adding that these will be dedicated 'gangs' who will be aware of the impact on local residents.</p>	

	Item	Action
3.8	<p>NC stated that he has a video showing that the works can be done quieter i.e. removing spoil from the auger using an excavator and not shaking it, but it is not 'normal practice' and therefore the project are not mitigating the noise as they could do. JC stated that removing spoil using an excavator is both dangerous and slower and this is why it is not best practice. TS stated that it is however a lot quieter and on Crossrail this is the method used. NC added that he has witnessed the auger being shaken several times and then the excavator used, when it would have been quicker to use the excavator in the first instance. RMc emphasised that it is not in the interest of the project to make noise and disturb people but the works must be conducted safely. CO stated the project trialled the alternative method to removing spoil to check if the alternative option could be suitable. TS stated that there have been other instances where 'best practicable means' have not been used and NC agreed and added that the actions here demonstrate that Flo and TfL are not committed to mitigating the level of noise.</p>	
3.9	<p>TS questioned why the noise data has not been made available when it was requested six months ago. RMc advised that Flo and TfL have met with the Local Authority Environmental Health Officers to agree an approach to sharing this data in a manageable format; this is now agreed and once further comments from LB Southwark are addressed the data will be on the NLE website by close of business Friday 15 January. TS questioned why the raw data has not been provided and RMc advised that residents interested in the raw data have been visited but it is being shared in a more manageable, easy-to-read format.</p>	TfL/Flo
3.10	<p>NC stated that TfL and Flo are hiding behind the averages and HM agreed that it would be useful to know what the peaks are. RMc reiterated that the information will be available at the end of the week and individual residents who have expressed concerns have been visited but the raw data is complex information. TS stated that it has taken too long to supply the data and IG stated that there has been a commitment to provide the data by the end of the week.</p>	
3.11	<p>NC questioned why the hoarding is not completed and asked that the project be more proactive and not wait for complaints from residents as this suggests a lack of care and consideration. SN agreed that the peaks of the noise are very bad especially the piling. RMc advised that the piling team have been challenged to find a better, quieter way of working but the team must work safely and JP agreed that human injury</p>	

	Item	Action
	<p>must be avoided and this is why industry standards are to shake the auger and not use an excavator. JS agreed with NC that the peaks are more important than the average noise levels and it is also the loading of the lorries which is disruptive. JS stated that as the noise levels are looked at in averages residents do not qualify for secondary glazing which also suggests TfL and Flo do not care about the community. MT advised that the project does understand and empathise, adding the piling will continue for a few further weeks. JS corrected that it is months and not weeks and asked that the project is accurate. MT agreed it is months but advised that best practicable means are being followed and the piling rig is the quietest that it could be. MT acknowledged there have been some overruns but stated that piling will never take place into the night, however SCL can be noisy and this is they the acoustic enclosure is required. MT added that he appreciates the concern about the workforce entering and exiting the site, advising that they will be fully briefed and then disciplined if there are found to be disruptive.</p>	
3.12	<p>NC asked when precisely the project made the decision to use an acoustic enclosure and SN stated that at the Public Inquiry 24/7 working was not discussed. NC stated that it was argued that 373 Kennington Road would need an acoustic enclosure but not Kennington Green. JC advised that the proposal for an enclosure was in the tender documents from Flo and some drawings at the Inquiry do show the enclosure, adding that 24/7 tunnelling was discussed. SN questioned whether this included the SCL to Kennington and JK advised that it did as there is no other way of doing these works. NC quoted from the Transport and Works Act Order (TWAO) than an enclosure would be necessarily at 373 Kennington Road and questioned why the same was not said for Kennington Green. TS advised that the local residents have already been disrupted by the utility works and the Chivas works before that. NC stated that local residents have lost confidence in the TWAO process and he has written to LB Lambeth. RMc reiterated that the installation of an acoustic enclosure is best practicable means. NC stated that it was not discussed and therefore the Public Inquiry was misled which does not inspire confidence now.</p>	
3.13	<p>IG questioned what will be published on the website on Friday, RMc responded that the data will be plotted showing daily averages and he is willing to talk it through with residents and CO advised that the noise monitoring reflected British Standards.</p>	
3.14	<p>SN questioned whether the doors to the acoustic shed will be</p>	

	Item	Action
	<p>opened at night. JP responded that he cannot categorically say they will not be in case of emergencies but the intention is to keep the doors closed at night. MT acknowledged the references to 373 Kennington Road needing an acoustic enclosure, however reiterated that the project believes we are entitled to put one on the Green also and the enclosures have been used with success on other London Underground projects e.g. Bond Street. MT advised that the teams must be allowed to work efficiently and it is imperative to separate the SCL tunnel noise. MT also advised that there will be underground storage for excavated/waste material however at the start of the works it will be necessary to muckaway in the early evening for a short period of time. MT stated that although the underground tunnelling works will be 24hr it is not the intention to disrupt or disturb residents and everyone on the project does care and is committed to this. SN stated that there must not be muckaway at night and MT reassured that it would not be in the middle of the night but it may be necessary to do so in the early evening but residents will be advised of this and JP advised that the muckaway trucks will be loaded inside the acoustic enclosure and advised that the enclosure also provides mitigation against dust and light pollution.</p>	
3.15	<p>NC further questioned when the decision was made to use an acoustic enclosure and IG asked that there is a slide in the presentation in March showing the differences from the Public Inquiry to now and an explanation. JC advised that the project are also looking at shift patterns for the tunnel works to mitigate workers leaving the site in the early hours of the morning, including access to the works through the Chivas access corridor. TS questioned whether this access could be covered using sound nets and JC advised that the team are reviewing.</p>	TfL/Flo
3.16	<p>SN asked whether the removal of the piles on the head house site is new works and JP advised that there are three piles which have been found during the works, all at least 20m long and the team is reviewing removal options including 'jacking' the piles and redesign for example. JS questioned if the piles will be broken out and JP responded that there would be breaking but reiterated that the team are looking at how to do this in the most efficient but least disruptive way, advising that the residents will be kept up to date on progress.</p>	
3.17	<p>TB questioned what the lines are on the site plan in the presentation which seems to run through or under 354 Kennington Road. JP advised that it looks like a mistake but will come back and confirm.</p>	Flo

	Item	Action
3.18	JP advised that four pear trees at 6m tall are being planted at the north end of the Green; 9m tall trees would have needed guide ropes for stability. RMc stated that there is shading modelling ongoing at the moment and this will be shared when complete. NC stated that the flats on the Green will be very visually impacted by the acoustic enclosure and this is why it should have been raised at the Public Inquiry.	Flo
4.0	Traffic management	
4.1	TB stated that people continue to drive into Kennington Road at the north side of the Green and have to turn around as there is no access to Montford Place, asking whether there can be some additional signage here e.g No Access. JP advised that some of these vehicles will be Paperlink deliveries but the project can look at this. JS stated that it is also pedestrians.	Flo
4.2	ME advised that cyclists can no longer turn into Clayton Road and although the pedestrian crossing will be a benefit the road is dangerous and cyclists will only be able to cross on the signal to be safe. ME also stated that although there is signage drivers do not adhere to these. JP acknowledged this and advised that the behaviour of drivers on Kennington Road has been looked at and the traffic management design changed e.g. having a protected walkway beside the hoardings to provide a safeguard. PB stated that the signage for pedestrians is dreadful and it is not clear how to get to Montford Place. PB added that there is signage on Kennington Lane that diverts traffic but it does not say to/from where. TB agreed that the signage for pedestrians needs to be improved with way-finding signage for Tesco's, the gin distillery, etc and TC added there should be signage further down Kennington Road by the post office so that people can find their way. JP advised that the project can look at this.	TfL/Flo
4.3	TB raised a point on access into Montford Place and asked how much longer the corner will be blocked for. JP advised that the works will continue for a further six weeks but the project is looking at how this area may be affected by the acoustic enclosure e.g. plant access. TB asked if there will be any treatment for the corner e.g. planting and JP advised that this will need to be discussed with LB Lambeth but at the moment the gates are open however this is a decision made by the local authority. ME asked whether there will always be pedestrian access and JP reassured that there would be however there may be short periods where heavy lifts are required and the road is closed.	

	Item	Action
4.4	<p>SN questioned the safety of the pedestrian crossing as traffic comes around the corner very fast and may not see it. JP advised that a road safety audit has been conducted but SN stated that this is a blind corner and could be dangerous, JS agreeing that this is especially the case at night. SN asked whether there is a speed camera on the road and JP responded that the road has a 30mph speed limit and there is a camera at the south end of the Green but JK added that for a speed camera LB Lambeth would make this decision. MGA advised that the project are visiting the local primary school this month to discuss road safety and acknowledged SN's concerns about the crossing, JK agreeing that it will be discussed with TfL Surface and reviewed again.</p>	TfL/Flo
4.5	<p>TB thanked Flo for blocking off the lights on the hoardings so that they are not shining into properties but asked if there is anything the project can do to control the lights coming on on site as it is creating an unnatural environmental, JS agreeing and asking if the crane lights can be angled differently. JP stated that the team will look at this.</p>	Flo
5.0	Re-landscaping Kennington Green	
5.1	<p>TB asked what the timescales are on this process and JP advised that the project is working on the design, JC adding that an invite will be sent out to the next engagement session in the next three to four weeks. PB stated that there was a formal consultation done before the Public Inquiry which made certain commitments which cannot now be revoked and the solutions some residents have put forward do not take these into account. KK acknowledged this and advised that there are other residents who have also raised this concern and JC advised that the project are taking all of the feedback on board and looking carefully at what can and cannot be provided. PB reiterated that there are aspects in the TWAO that the project cannot go against and JC agreed that there are some proposals which cannot be taken forward.</p>	
5.2	<p>TB stated that the overall scheme has to be agreed by LB Lambeth and the designs in the TWAO are not binding, adding that the initial consultation was not sufficient in his view. HM questioned what the budget is, JC stated that there is the TWAO baseline scheme which Flo must budget for and provide as a minimum; this includes the reinstatement of all trees lost.</p>	
5.3	<p>IG read an extract from a letter sent to JK from Cllr Jane Edbrooke in which she states that she hopes TfL take the proposals by the local community seriously as people have put</p>	

	Item	Action
5.4	<p>in a lot of time and effort which should not go to waste. JK advised that the final design will be submitted to LB Lambeth and the scheme is being worked on taking into account all feedback, adding that there will be a further meeting with residents before it is submitted. ME questioned whether it will be going to the Planning Committee and JK advised that the discharge of conditions does not usually mean they go to Planning Committee. ME stated that residents will have to look out for it on the Planning Portal if they want to comment. IG stated that Cllr Edbrooke is taking this very seriously.</p> <p>SN raised a concern as to whether planting will be possible and JC advised that the utilities have been moved out of the footpath and therefore planting is possible. JP added that the concrete is approximately 800mm below the surface so there will be room to plant on the Green. MGA advised that there will be a plan to show and the engagement session in the near future.</p>	
5.5		
6.0	Hoardings	
6.1	<p>JC advised that there will be a vinyl tree wrap on the hoardings. NC questioned why the hoarding line is unfinished and JC advised that where the hoarding is incomplete there are acoustic blankets and the project is looking at Perspex panels on top of the hoardings.</p>	

	Item	Action
7.0	Future agenda items	
7.1	Two future agenda items were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifying what has changed from the Public Inquiry to now • Kennington station re-zoning (<i>Note: This was added following the meeting</i>) 	
8.0	Date of future meetings	
8.1	KK to send out date reminder. <i>Note: The next meeting is on Thursday 17 March.</i>	TfL
9.0	AOB	
9.1	PB asked if there was a deadline to send back settlement deeds, JK advised that we cannot enforce a deadline but would ask that they are sent back at residents' earliest convenience. TS asked for a receipt that his deed was received, KK to advise.	TfL
9.2	ME asked IG and LB Lambeth to collect the rubbish in Clayton Street which has been left there for more than six months.	LBL
	IG thanked everyone for attending and closed the meeting.	

Meeting started 7.00 and closed at 8:36.
 Minutes drafted by KK

Jon Kirkup
Lead Sponsor- Line Extensions
London Underground
Palestra
197 Blackfriars Road
London SE1 8NJ

13th January 2016

Dear Jon

The felling of trees at Kennington Green due to construction of the Northern Line Extension

Lambeth Council supported the decision to extend the Northern Line to Battersea, recognising this would allow the optimum development of the VNEB opportunity area, which would in turn open up an enormous range of economic benefits to the Borough's residents. As such the Council supported TfL's position at the inquiry held in 2013.

I have been pleased to see TfL honour its commitment to engagement with local residents through the community liaison groups, and as chair of the Kennington Green Liaison Group I have witnessed the development of these groups. Many of the issues which have arisen due to the construction have been dealt with promptly by TfL and FLO as the operative.

However, as chair of the group, an Oval ward councillor and as Cabinet Member with responsibility for Lambeth's parks and open spaces I have been extremely dismayed at the number of trees which have been cut down at Kennington Green. During the inquiry it was stated that to facilitate the construction of the shaft at Kennington Green eight of the trees (two of which are recognised as trees of high quality) on the green would have to be felled, and an explicit commitment made (in section 7 of the Inquiry Report) that the other three on the Green would be safeguarded. Yet these three have now been cut down. In addition a number of trees along neighbouring Montford Place, privately planted Hornbeam trees have had to be cut down. In such an urban environment, the loss of these full grown trees is extremely significant.

You will appreciate that this issue has damaged the credibility of TfL with local residents and the Council, and together with the inevitable noise and disruption of the construction has created negative feeling locally towards the project, and towards TfL's management of the project.

Whilst we have assurances that the trees on the Green and along Montford Place will be replanted, I know many residents have concerns that the ability of these new trees to grow to a significant size and flourish will be compromised by the concrete piling which will be in place under Kennington Green. I would urge you to look to ensuring your commitments around re-landscaping Kennington Green, and of re-planting trees are feasible and what can be done to ensure that Kennington Green is not merely 'made good' after construction, but left as an enhanced green space.

Lambeth Business Growth and Regeneration

Phoenix House
10 Wandsworth Road
London SW8 2LL

Telephone: 020 7926 1038
Web: www.lambeth.gov.uk
www.lambethbusinessawards.com



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

Residents have come forward with some exciting suggestions for the Green, undertaking significant research off their own back to try and proactively shape a positive outcome from the work on Kennington Green. Lambeth Council supports many elements of the ideas coming forward, and our only reservations come about from practical experience around designing out crime and also the significant on-going revenue restrictions within the parks budget, meaning we support an exceptionally high quality scheme with low on-going maintenance cost to the council. I expect to see an amended scheme come forward from TfL which takes residents suggestions and aspirations on board.

As a borough we place great emphasis on the importance of green infrastructure, and of successful place making and so feel that the effective restoration, and enhancement if possible of the Kennington Green area once construction is completed is a critical component of the NLE project.

I have to say you have lost the good will from many local Kennington residents, who feel they have benefitted little from the NLE project, suffered from overwhelming noise disturbance, loss of public green space and high levels of traffic congestion. This deviation from the assurances given during the enquiry has fundamentally broken trust with residents. I welcome a meeting to be assured you take these concerns seriously and agree a positive way forward to address these concerns and regain the trust of the residents we all serve.

Yours Sincerely

Cllr Jane Edbrooke
Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods
Oval Councillor
Chair of Kennington Green CLG

cc. Boris Johnson, London Mayor
cc. Val Shawcross, London AM