

Northern Line Extension

Kennington Green Community Liaison Group (CLG)

20 October 2016
Durning Library

Attendees:

Name	Organisation
Cllr Jane Edbrooke (Cllr JE) - chair	LB Lambeth
Iago Griffith (IG)	LB Lambeth
Marilyn Evers (ME)	Resident
Edward Hutchinson (EH)	Resident
Sian Cook (SC)	Resident
Neil Collingridge (NC)	Resident
Priscilla Baines (PB)	Resident
Tarquin Desoutter (TD)	Resident
Marcus Lyon (ML)	Resident and business owner
Tristan Standish (TS) Leanne Standish (LS)	Residents
Jon Kirkup (JK)	Transport for London
Michael Tarrega (MT)	Transport for London
Mark Thompson (MaT)	Transport for London
Olivia White (OW)	Transport for London
James Fretton (JF)	Transport for London
Rob McCarthy (RM)	Ferrovial Laing-O'Rourke (Flo)
Alejandro Vazquez (AV)	Ferrovial Laing-O'Rourke (Flo)

Carla Arnold (CA)	Ferrovial Laing-O'Rourke (Flo)
-------------------	--------------------------------

Apologies: Mabel Garcia Aranda

	Item	Action
1.0	Introductions and apologies	
1.1	Cllr JE welcomed everyone and asked if anyone had any comments on the accuracy of the minutes from the June CLG. ML said he had only seen the minutes that evening. Cllr JE asked attendees to provide any feedback via email in the next couple of weeks. MT confirmed the minutes had been circulated to the group.	All
1.2	EH queried item 2.5 which stated "LB Lambeth will undertake a full consultation through which residents can comment". IG confirmed this meant the statutory planning consultation was followed, which the Council have a legal obligation to undertake. Cllr JE clarified the statment did not mean a pre-planning consultation which many residents may recognise as a consultation period.	
1.3	ME asked about the status of cleaning of Sherwin House. ML also asked about cleaning of properties on Montford Place. Cllr JE confirmed this would be covered later in the meeting.	
2.0	Northern Line Extension progress report and presentation	
2.1	AV and RM gave a presentation which provided a progress update including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall update • Three month lookback and three month look ahead • Step plate junction • Details on lorry movements and environmental monitoring • Working hours • Kennington Green Head House • Your feedback • Engagement opportunities • Ways to contact us 	
2.2	RM advised that noise and dust monitors at site provided instantaneous alerts if work triggered noise and dust limits. The project's data reports showed, in the months since the acoustic enclosure had been completed there had been a drop in noise levels and no exceedances had been recorded.	
2.3	RM explained five dust slides were attached to nearby properties, which provided a measure of dust nuisance. RM acknowledged there had been an exceedance in July but dust levels had dropped off more	

	Item	Action
	<p>recently, largely due to the enclosure. RM explained that to deal with exceedances a window cleaning regime at nearby properties immediately around the Green was undertaken every three months. RM said the project team had agreed to undertake window cleaning at Sherwin Place as a one-off. MT explained that the project was in contact with the Sherwin House Association to confirm the date for the cleaning. RM advised that as Montford Place had not exceeded dust trigger levels, no window cleaning was planned at the location. He explained this approach was in line with set protocols. ML stressed that he thought the project could undertake the cleaning on Montford Place as a courtesy, as the building was very dirty. Cllr JE agreed an action should be taken (see below).</p>	
2.5	<p>RM said 24/7 working was taking place in the tunnel and on the surface the team were working core hours. RM explained the project had asked the Council to allow deliveries at the weekends as a contingency to maintain 24/7 tunnel working. He stated the project now had a Section 61 in place but there is no intention to undertake deliveries outside core except in urgent circumstances. RM said no deliveries had taken place at weekends since the Section 61 but there had been occasions of late deliveries.</p>	
2.6	<p>MaT stated the Kennington Green head house planning application was due in front of the LB Lambeth planning committee on 29 November. Cllr JE explained that as part of the planning consultation process for the application up to three residents could provide verbal representations at the planning committee. Each speaker would be given two minutes to present their views. Other residents could send in written evidence or comments on the proposal. In addition to the residents, slots for verbal comments would be given to councillors and the Kate Hoey MP, if requested.</p>	
2.7	<p>NC asked what the position of the councillors would be. Cllr JE confirmed Cllr Joanne Simpson has been asked to speak on behalf of the residents. Cllr Simpson is about to qualify as a planner and sits on the planning committee (although not for this meeting). Cllr JE reassured residents that Cllr Simpson will read comments from residents and will be able to present residents' views in terms of planning legislation which is what the planning committee must rule on. NC asked if Cllr Simpson will be against the planning application. Cllr JE confirmed she would.</p>	
2.8	<p>ML confirmed the residents are looking to put forward Judith Lyons, Edward Hutchinson and Susanna Dobson, a local architect, as the vocal representatives at the planning committee. ML stressed he had not made the decision independently and asked if anyone else wanted a voice to let him know. EH asked if visual presentations were permitted. Cllr JE said they were but audio visual equipment may not</p>	

	Item	Action
2.9	<p>be available to use in the room.</p> <p>ML asked if the residents can have a meeting with Cllr Simpson prior to the planning committee meeting to discuss the history of the issues and any potential conflict of interest. Cllr JE said Cllr Simpson was currently very busy with her planning masters but would be available once her dissertation was submitted.</p>	<p>ML to arrange meeting with Cllr Simpson</p>
2.10	<p>TS queried why the 'your feedback' slide in the presentation did not include all complaints, as his complaint has not been responded to for two and a half weeks. RM confirmed the slide in the presentation was not a complete list of all the complaints but a selection.</p>	
2.11	<p>MT explained that the project continues to undertake engagement work and had plans to engage schools about career in construction as part of the tunnel boring machine launch.</p>	
3.0	<p>Construction noise, dust and working hours</p>	<p>RM to talk to NC re vibration report</p>
3.1	<p>Cllr JE thanked residents for listening. She said there were various topics that she felt needed covering in the Q&A section and through discussion wanted to pick up any unresolved complaints.</p> <p><i>Noise and vibration</i> Cllr JE stated that the data reports showed that noise levels had improved but she wanted to get a better view of the 'ground experience' from residents.</p>	
3.2	<p>NC stated he still did not have a satisfactory answer regarding vibration at his property. He said it was misleading of the project to say a report had been issued as this suggests he is happy and accepts the findings, which is not the case. He explained vibration monitoring report states that some of the results are due to activity within the property which could not be the case as there was no one in the property at the time. RM explained a meeting had been offered and a further report issued. He agreed to talk to NC separately.</p>	
3.3	<p>TS confirmed the situation had improved and the noise had got better. He confirmed Juan and Mabel had made efforts to fix problems about noise late at night. Cllr JE asked if there were any other unresolved noise and vibration issues. None were provided.</p>	
3.4	<p><i>Dust</i> Cllr JE asked why Sherwin House cleaning will be treated as a one-off. MT explained that it was felt the acoustic barrier had helped suppress dust and other exceedances were not expected. ML and TS said they disagreed as there was still considerable dust created. Cllr JE asked that ME feedback at next CLG is additional cleaning at</p>	

	Item	Action
	<p>Sherwin House was required. Cllr JE asked why Montford Place would not be included in the cleaning. RM said there was a protocol which outlined when cleaning was necessary. She requested both Montford Place and Sherwin House to be cleaned and at the next CLG for residents to feedback if dust had improved. Cllr JE emphasised the issue would be included at the next CLG and she would escalate if senior project members pushed back on the request. She stressed that the project needed to concentrate on lived experience of residents rather than relying on data. TD stated that it seemed the project was hiding behind protocols and procedures and not listening to residents.</p>	<p>MT to enquire about Montford Place cleaning</p>
3.5	<p>JS queried the accuracy of the dust sides as when it rained the dust was washed away. RM explained this was reflective of real conditions. He explained there was also dust at site hoardings which monitored the dust leaving site.</p>	
3.6	<p>ML stated dirt was leaking from a machine at the south end of the site. The dirt was coming under hoardings. He said he had raised this with David Darcy and the issue had been cleaned up a couple of times but the problem continued and needed rectifying. LS stated a similar situation was occurring at the north end of the site.</p>	<p>RM to investigate</p>
3.7	<p>LS said the road resurfacing had been done but the work meant pools on water now accumulated in front Papa John's when it rained and was now an issue when trying to cross road.</p>	<p>FLO to look into</p>
3.8	<p>PB emphasised that TfL and the Council needed to take more responsibility over drains as they were not cleared. Cllr JE emphasised drains needed to be fit for purpose as the project moved into rainy season</p>	<p>NLE to look into</p>
3.9	<p><i>Hours of operation</i> Cllr JE summarised that the Section 61 was in place but had not been used but there had been occurrences of late deliveries of cement. MT confirmed that previous to the meeting there had been four late deliveries, unfortunately another late delivery occurred on 20 October. MT apologised for the occurrence when notification had not been sent to residents.</p>	
3.10	<p>TS said the Code of Construction Practice B promised the project would work 5.5days outside, this had now been increased to 7days for cement deliveries which are very noisy. He explained there was an occurrence on 12 August when residents and the Council had not been notified about late deliveries. TS said for two and a half weeks himself, James South and Judith Lyons wrote emails which were not responded too. TS requested confirmation that the three complaints from residents had gone to the Council. TS was unhappy the project</p>	

	Item	Action
	<p>had not informed residents at the last CLG that they were considering applying for a Section61 for 7day deliveries. TS also asked to see the project's complaints procedure and who they can contact in the Council about complaints. He said he spent three hours of the phone to LB Lambeth trying to get to speak to someone about the issue. He said the Environmental Health Officer had been requested to come to the CLG on many occasions but had never attended. TS stated that the project's late deliveries were against the S61 and the Council should fine the project. TS emphasised that it was unacceptable that the Council did not want to speak to those who pay council tax about concerns and requested a direct contact at the council to raise concerns to.</p>	
3.11	<p>Cllr JE queried the frequency of the late deliveries. RM explained in two months there had been five late deliveries. He advised the project endeavoured to get a notification out about delay and apologised when this did not occur. RM explained on one occasion there was a breakdown in supplier and another there was a road accident which delayed delivery. He emphasised bookings were made 24hours in advance and delays were not something that were planned. RM explained the 7day deliveries were purely contingency and not something the project hoped to use regularly. Cllr JE asked if there was anything that could be done differently to stop the frequency of late deliveries. RM stated notification of late deliveries is something the team hope to improve on. The notification also goes to the Council. TS stressed the legal requirement the project have to notify about work and deliveries. NC emphasised that too many times things had occurred out of hours and residents fund the situation unacceptable. Cllr JE asked that frequency about late deliveries is reported at future CLGs.</p>	
3.12	<p>Cllr JE stated more information was required on the penalties the Council could enforce, what was promised in the TWAO, what details were being provided to council about breaches and who was robustly reviewing this information. Cllr JE also stressed there needed to be a point of contact residents could contact about breaches.</p>	<p>IG/Cllr JE to identify the council point of contact</p>
3.13	<p>MaT explained that the concrete required for the tunnel lining was a specialist mix which was mixed together and transported from the Peak District. TS stated he understood the complexities for the project but the late deliveries had occurred to often and residents had lost patience and good-will.</p>	
3.14	<p><i>Step-plate junction</i> PB asked for more information on the step-plate junction as she believed the work would considerably affect up to 20 properties from January. PB suggested a separate meeting with these residents would be worthwhile.</p>	<p>AV to arrange meeting</p>

	Item	Action
3.15	PB asked for details of the work and when the new line meets the loop. MaT explained certain work has to be undertaken in possessions when Tubes are not running. In September/October 2017 there will be three weekend possessions. During these times the loop will be out of service and changes to Northern line services will occur. Over Christmas 2017 there will be a ten day possession of the help.	MaT to provide a written brief on work for residents
3.16	PB asked if the entire track from the junction to Kennington station is being replaced. JK confirmed as part of the project there is not a completed replacement of track but maintenance regularly replace track on the curve. MaT confirmed any new track from NLE will be low vibration track form and although there would be noise from the points where new and old track meet, the loop would be used much less frequently which should improve the noise impact on residents.	
3.17	<i>Complaints log</i> Cllr JE asked why the complaints log was no longer circulated. She explained that it would be useful to have information on the numbers of people that complained about each issue to gain insight into the strength of feeling. Cllr JE explained complaints presented to group in log should be anonymous. MT agreed a complaints log could be included in the next CLG.	MT to arrange complaints log for next CLG
3.18	TS welcomed this approach but said the complaints would often be out-of-date when raised at CLG. Cllr JE asked for clarification over how frequently LB Lambeth receive complaints log. TS said the project has a legal responsibility to inform the Council of complaints and these should be submitted within 24hours, but there was no way residents could check this. NC asked what powers LB Lambeth have regarding complaints. Cllr JE stated it would be useful to have a briefing outlining what powers the Council has and action is can and cannot take action against breaches and complaints. RM explained that all complaints should go via the helpline to ensure they are properly logged.	IG to advise
3.19	NC stated the Council had power regarding the head house. Cllr JE clarified that planning powers were quasi-judicial and very separate from enforcement powers. Planning committee members has to review applications in reference to government legislation. NC said committee members are still represent local residents. Cllr JE stressed that planning committee members sit as independent.	
4.0	Traffic management	
4.1	MT confirmed the signalised crossing was now in place south of the	

	Item	Action
	Green, signage for cyclist has moved and resurfacing of road completed.	
4.2	ML questioned why the hoarding which had been replaced had been moved further out. Between 6-12inches extra had been taken which makes the corner by Montford Place very tight, especially to larger vehicles which often now had to mount kerb. LS asked if the hoarding by their property was moved a few inches in, it would allow cars to pass each other more safely.	MT to look into the hoarding movement
4.3	ML asked what had happened to the plans for vinyl and designs on the hoardings. MT confirmed these had been rescheduled, as it couldn't go in when the traffic management was in place.	MT to provide timescales
4.4	ME confirmed the additional signage had helped the turning into Clayton Street and pedestrian crossing makes her feel safer. ME said there was still an issue of cars passing cyclists by the hoardings going north, even though there were signs stating 'no passing cyclists'. MT said the project was aware of this issue and had notified police who undertake spot checks across London but there was little additional the project could do.	
5.0	Re-landscaping of the Green	
5.1	Cllr JE explained the TWAO included information on reinstating Green but it is felt by many residents that the landscaping of the Green provided an opportunity for something positive to be created that the local residents could look forward to. Cllr JE advised she had spoken to the project and suggested another consultation to refine plans. Residents will be asked about two potential visions: the original TWAO plans and the other additional ideas. MT explained a leaflet will be produced with the two visions and explained the project will work with Cllr JE on area of distribution beyond just the CLG group. Cllr JE emphasised the options would be simple as there was no budget for activity.	
5.2	EH praised the idea and asked if there was an opportunity for residents to be involved in the consultation creation process. Cllr JE confirmed the first iteration of the leaflet could be circulated to CLG members.	MT to forward draft to members
5.3	ML asked if the option will look at road closures. Cllr JE said it would look at a number of options, including road closures. Council will also provide a Q&A on transport.	
5.4	JS stated TfL should provide an ongoing maintenance budget for the upkeep of the Green. ML asked what the cost the project had paid to	JK to provide

	Item	Action
	use the land.	figure
5.5	PB stated that it had previously been suggested that NLE provided an opportunity to review street naming and numbering.	IG to investigate
5.6	NC asked if the project has agreed to pay for all option presented in the consultation. Cllr JE confirmed both visions TfL are prepared to be pay for.	
6.0	Kennington station re-zoning	
6.1	MT said that it is our intention to make it a zone 1/2 station once the NLE opens. However, this is subject to formal from the Train Operating Companies and Secretary of State for Transport. Cllr JE asked whether this rezoning can be expedited.	TfL
7.0	Future agenda items	
7.1	Cllr JE asked for an actions and complaint log to be part of the next CLG	TfL/Flo
8.0	Dates for future meetings	
8.1	MT advised that the next CLG will be mid-January. Dates will be circulated.	

Meeting started 6.30 and closed at 8:00.
Minutes drafted by OW and MT