



Northern Line Extension

Kennington Green Community Liaison Group (CLG)

Tuesday 25 April 2017
Henry Fawcett Primary School, Kennington

Attendees:

Name	Organisation
Cllr rep: Cllr David Amos (Cllr DA) (CHAIR)	LB Lambeth
Iago Griffith (IG)	LB Lambeth
Jon Kirkup (JK)	Transport for London
Michael Tarrega (MT)	Transport for London
Mark Thompson (MTh)	Transport for London
Mabel Garcia (MGa)	Ferrovial Laing O'Rourke (FLO)
Rob McCarthy (RM)	Ferrovial Laing O'Rourke (FLO)
Alejandro Vazquez (AV)	Ferrovial Laing O'Rourke (FLO)
Sheli Barracluff (SB)	Resident
Nicolas Bratza (NB)	Resident
Sian Cook (SC)	Resident
Tarquin Desoutter (TD)	Resident
Polly Harkinson (PH)	Resident
Kirk Hendry (KH)	Resident
Edward Hutchison (EH)	Resident
Marcus Lyon (ML)	Resident (OAKRA)
Peter Laverack (PL)	Resident
Jane Leonard (JLe)	Resident
Judith Lyons (JL)	Resident
Nky Nzekwu (NN)	Resident
Sarah Northey (SN)	Resident
Penny Ritchie Calder (PRC)	Resident
Elizabeth Scott (ES)	Resident
Leanne Standish (LS)	Resident
M Summersgill (MS)	Resident
Stephen Waring (SW)	Heart of Kennington Residents' Association
Kes Young (KY)	Resident
Mark Walker (MW)	Admin support (minute taker)

Apologies: None

	Item	Action
1.0	Chairperson's introduction	
1.1	Welcome from Cllr DA. This is Cllr DA's first meeting as Chair of the Kennington Green CLG, as Cllr Edbrooke is now on maternity leave. However, Cllr DA represents nearby Princes Ward and has been co-chairing the NLE CLG for Kennington Park, so he is familiar with the project.	
1.2	One of the actions that Cllr DA will take away from this meeting is a list of issues where guidance from London Borough of Lambeth is required.	Cllr DA
2.0	Minutes of the previous meeting – accuracy and matters arising	
2.1	Cllr DA invited comments on any points of inaccuracy in the minutes of the previous meeting on Tuesday 24 January 2017.	
2.2	MT advised that some comments were received following distribution of the minutes, with changes made as necessary.	
2.3	The minutes of the previous meeting were subsequently signed off by Cllr DA as a true and accurate record.	
2.4	<p>Matters arising from the previous meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (2.2): To ensure minutes arrive as soon as possible after CLG meetings, MT confirmed there is now a designated minute taker in place. The minutes from the previous meeting were distributed within two weeks, as promised - (3.13): With regard to a complaint that lorry drivers are not turning off their engines when visiting the site, RM advised he has re-briefed the team with regard to FLO's 'no idling' policy. The only exception to this policy is concrete deliveries, where engines have to remain running. All delivery drivers have gone through FORS training but if anyone spots vehicles (other than concrete lorries) idling, please report this. FLO does also measure air quality in the area - (3.16): MT confirmed that a map showing monitoring locations was circulated with the minutes from the previous meeting - (4.3 & 4.9): MT confirmed the site hoardings have been moved back slightly and TfL is in liaison with Lambeth regarding yellow lines in the area. JL commented that there used to be resident parking bays in this area but these were removed when the hoarding was erected. Over a previous Bank Holiday weekend, some single yellow lines were replaced next to the hoarding, indicating that parking was permitted. However, with the road reduced in width from two lanes to one, if any cars do park in the area, this makes access very difficult for local residents. For as long as the hoarding is in place, JL requests that either the double- 	TfL

	Item	Action
2.5	<p>yellow lines are reinstated or the single yellow lines are removed altogether. MT confirmed LB of Lambeth is responsible for road markings, with TfL only able to make a request on behalf of local residents. Cllr DA requested a note from TfL on this issue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (4.11): MT confirmed that traffic management will be an agenda item for the regular core meetings - (5.2): MT confirmed the recent Kennington Green consultation events took place at the same location at today's meeting – Henry Fawcett Primary School - (5.17): MT confirmed that information on handmade bricks was included as part of the recent consultation exercise - (5.18): No action necessary - (5.22): MT will discuss the head house and landscaping consultation in greater detail later in today's meeting - (5.24): Cllr DA confirmed that comments made about the Head House at the previous meeting of this CLG were minuted - (5.27): MT confirmed that project architects and engineers attended the drop-in sessions that took place as part of the consultation - (7.13): MT confirmed that responsibility for issues caused by increased noise from the Kennington Loop has been taken away from this project and is being handled by a separate part of TfL - (11.2): MT confirmed that the dates for the next three Kennington Green CLGs have now been set (including this meeting) <p>Cllr DA invited residents to highlight any further matters arising from the previous meeting. No further matters were raised.</p> <p>Cllr DA suggested that when an action is complete, this action should be displayed in brackets within the relevant section of the minutes.</p>	NLE
3.0	<p>Head House and landscaping – engagement summary and current position (presentation attached)</p> <p>3.1 Additional points raised by MT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Of the three public drop-in sessions that took place at this venue as part of the engagement exercise, one was on a Saturday, to engage residents who may have been unable to attend during the week. The busiest day was the Thursday - As part of the Transport Works Act Order (TWAO), TfL has outline planning permission for the Head House, with conditions relating to its appearance and massing. This has been a much more robust programme of engagement - Although the Mystique brick type was previously rejected at Planning Committee, it was included within the engagement material as a point of reference 	

	Item	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Following this consultation, no decision has yet been reached by TfL with regard to its next planning application to LB of Lambeth. Today's presentation is just a 'download' to aid discussion - In terms of landscaping options for the southern tip of the Green, there is a clear desire to maximise the green space. Option Two includes a planted perennial bed which LB of Lambeth is happy to maintain – as long as perennials are used - The three areas where TfL feels it has a clear steer on public opinion are brick options, eastern edge of the Green, and tree options - TfL will also take note of the free comments from people as part of this exercise - With regard to the west façade of the Head House, TfL received feedback from the Georgian Group, who were happy for the options included to be put forward - A key consideration for the design of the head house is the need to minimise bare space, to reduce graffiti, etc. The images included within the presentation are indicative sketch designs but if anyone has any other suggestions, TfL is happy to explore these - With regard to 'Next steps', there is a possibility that TfL may not be allowed to submit its engagement report during the pre-election period - 67 people provided free text answers as part of the consultation exercise - TfL has a quasi-separate consultation department that will analyse the data collected as part of the consultation and prepare a report. This department is fully-registered with the Consultation Institute - The final report will be issued to this group, plus people who provided feedback. It will also be made available on-line. 	TfL
3.2	Cllr DA will clarify the process with regard to LB of Lambeth's determination.	Cllr DA
3.3	MT reiterated the fact that today's presentation includes initial raw data and can be interpreted however people wish.	
3.4	Cllr DA advised he can take feasible suggestions back to LB of Lambeth.	
3.5	JL stated that although MT advised the exercise has provided TfL with a clear steer on public preferences for a number of options, she is vehemently opposed to some of them. For example, she believes a raised kerb will encourage loitering and littering on Kennington Green. It should be recognised that local people are not collectively supportive of this proposal.	
3.6	MT responded to advise that even if the feedback has indicated a clear preference for some options, it does not necessarily mean these options	TfL

	Item	Action
	will be implemented. TfL will discuss with LB of Lambeth.	
3.7	JL highlighted that with regard to the Head House façade, 37% of respondents did not like any of the options presented. Similarly, 34% of respondents did not like any of the options presented for the west façade of the Head House. There is still very strong community opposition and a feeling that previous views raised by the community have not been listened to.	
3.8	MT fully accepts some people do not want a Head House at Kennington Green.	
3.9	JL believes it is not fair to say that local people do not want the Head House, as people do accept it is coming.	
3.10	MT acknowledged JL's comment and accepts that people understand the Head House is definitely coming. MT hopes a steer from the community is received to help inform the final designs.	
3.11	JL finds this comment from MT staggering. The community has been told at many turns that this is the best that can be provided. Therefore, JL is surprised and encouraged by this statement.	
3.12	MT responded to advise TfL feels it has exhausted all options but recognises there is still a difference between the opinions of TfL and local residents. BIM modelling has shown the constraints on design and the Planning Committee acknowledged the massing of the Head House is what it is.	
3.13	JL does not agree that the Planning Committee accepted the massing of the Head House in November. The Committee did not believe a good case had been made by TfL.	
3.14	JK read an excerpt from the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting in November, which stated the bulk and massing were acceptable.	
3.15	Cllr DA advised that he wishes to push on with the meeting and get a practical steer to take back to LB of Lambeth.	
4.0	Landscaping discussion, inc. presentation from Edward Hutchinson	
4.1	Introduction from ML. ML is a 30-year veteran of championing this corner of Kennington. Alongside the OAKRA, he has welcomed the new levels of engagement from TfL and FLO since the Planning Committee decision. Unfortunately, this increased engagement has not yet led to any significant improvement of the proposals for Kennington Green or the Head House. Therefore, a decision was taken to recommend OAKRA's membership engages as far as possible with the TfL process. A decision was also taken to create two separate petitions for the Head House and	

	Item	Action
4.2	<p>the landscaping of Kennington Green, supporting the rejection of these schemes as they stand to date. So far, these petitions have over 300 signatures each. ML then handed over to EH, to outline concerns for TfL's proposals for Kennington Green.</p> <p>EH advised he would like to highlight three key aspects of the landscaping of Kennington Green:</p> <p><u>Context:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We have seen how easy it is to transform a landscape from a Green to a building site but there is no logic to put it back as it was before, which was a pretty municipal design - The context will change considerably as further development in the area takes place. A lot of the new developments are pretty intense, meaning that green spaces at ground level are very tight, with sunshine greatly reduced. These are not landscapes for people to engage in - By contrast, Kennington Green is large and sunny in comparison and has great potential to be a very attractive public open space <p><u>Public Inquiry:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The final decision of the Secretary of State was based on material provided by TfL. TfL's Chief Designer stated it was TfL's intention to restore the landscape of the Green to a higher standard than what existed before. The loss of trees is temporary and will be mitigated - However, in reality, the design of Kennington Green is pretty dull and ignores many key aspects of landscaping and the local area - TfL has designed without a written brief, with no clear goals - 'Desire lines' are natural paths that people take from A to B, however these have been ignored - There is a complete lack of understanding of details. For example it would be impossible to cut the grass with a machine due to the presence of a raised wall. Litter will accumulate and maintenance costs will be higher, as the grass will have to be cut twice - The image used in the engagement material is accurate, because no-one will want to engage on the Green itself - The landscaping design has been led by engineers, not landscape architects <p><u>Community Plan:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In terms of the difference between his design and TfL's, in essence EH's design is ambitious and looks to the future. It treats the whole of the site as a 'homezone', with pedestrians and vehicles sharing space, similar to Lower Marsh. Also, planting very large trees – 7 to 10m tall – will recognise the vital role that trees play in cleaning the air. In the past two years – more Londoners have died from air pollution than in the great smog of 1952 	

	Item	Action
4.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Large trees are so much more effective at cleaning the air than smaller trees - All trees on Kennington Green, which were cleaning the air, were removed by TfL, which is well aware of the implications - EH's proposal has the grass raised 50cm above the ground level, with a retaining wall to protect the grass from people criss-crossing it and is flush at the top to make mowing easier. The ground is mounded to create a seat and is much nicer to sit on - This proposal could sit quite happily on top of the engineering works - EH would like to ask TfL to accept that this community is suffering worse than predicted at the Public Inquiry - EH also asks TfL to change its method of working, by putting someone in charge of landscaping who appreciates the issue <p>Commenting on EH's presentation, JL advised that when the loss of trees was discussed at the Public Inquiry, the TWAO imposed a statutory obligation to replace lost trees on a one-to-one basis. TfL's current proposals do not fulfil this obligation.</p>	
4.4	KY would like to see a nice sculpture on Kennington Green.	
5.0	<p>Head house discussion inc. presentation from Marcus Lyon</p> <p>5.1 ML made three key points in relation to the Head House:</p> <p><u>Public Inquiry:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Head House design presented at the Public Inquiry was not only considerably smaller than the existing proposal but more importantly, it was an integral piece of design - Its form and massing talked to the surrounding architecture and its hit and miss brickwork was modern but the final effect was sympathetic to the listed terraces and surrounding environment - Despite being presented as the actual Head House that would be built, this has now become a 'reference design' and the new proposals not only ignore the architectural language of the area, but in most local opinion harm it significantly in both design and massing <p><u>Present Design:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - At the LB of Lambeth meeting on 29 November 2016, the Planning Committee rejected the proposal and reported that, "<i>The proposal would have a harmful impact on the setting of the adjoining listed buildings and the character and appearance of the conservation area due to (a) external appearance and (b) external materials, which would not be outweighed by the public benefits</i>" - ML believes this was not just about detailing, plinth heights and 	

	Item	Action
	<p>bricks. TfL has subsequently offered a response that is totally unacceptable</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ML also believes the new proposals are in complete contravention of the Lambeth Local Plan – specifically Q5 (b) (i) – (v) which states “<i>Proposals will be supported where it is shown that design of development is a response to positive aspects of the local and historic character in terms of (i) space and relationship townscape/landscape; (ii) bulk, scale, height and massing and roofscapes; (iii) relationship with other buildings; (iv) materials; (v) architectural detailing</i>” - Also Q20 of the Local Plan on statutory listed buildings states “Development affecting listed buildings will be supported where it would (i) conserve and not harm the significance/special interest; (ii) not harm the significance/setting (including views to and from) listed buildings - Lastly, Policy Q22 of the plan on conservation areas, which was mentioned in the planning refusal, states “<i>development proposals affecting conservation areas will be permitted where they preserve or enhance the character or appearance of conservation areas by (i) respecting and reinforcing the established, positive characteristics of the area in terms of the building line, siting, design, height, forms, material joinery, window details, etc and (ii) protecting the setting (including views in and out of the area)</i>” <p><u>A proposal for moving forward:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Having looked at the BIM models, ML believes the exterior is simply a façade or cladding around a very large mass of empty spaces necessary for the movement of air in and out of the NLE - In engineering terms, it is between 65% and 70% empty space - The challenge is to clad it in such a way as to not impact on the surrounding terraces in a negative way - The community supports a brick building but what it does not want is one with such arrogant and aggressive massing - TfL must hear the passion and care of the neighbourhood and respond accordingly, by addressing the problems with massing and engaging genuine experts on brick facades. In reality, the community accepts the NLE – but what it will not accept is lazy design that will blight the area for generations to come 	
5.2	<p>Cllr DA would like to use the remaining time in today’s meeting to see if people support or disagree with ML’s presentation. Cllr DA invited further comment.</p>	
5.3	<p>ES would like to comment on the design of the Head House. It is totally out of sympathy with adjacent buildings. There is a very definite line of windows on two sides of the square but the design of the Head House does not relate at all. ES does not want it to look bright yellow in relation</p>	

	Item	Action
	to the adjacent buildings. ES has lived in Kennington for 60 years and is a retired architect.	
5.4	JLe asked if it would be possible for the Head House to incorporate a 'living wall'? The purpose of this would not be to conceal something ugly but as a way of breaking up the line of the Head House, if it must have a long, blank wall.	
5.5	JL commented that a living wall was proposed but was rejected as contravening Health and Safety.	
5.6	EH explained that he drew up a proposal for discussion that included Virginia Creeper. There was a spurious point about security that should be disregarded because, with regard to the issue of air passing in and out of the Head House, no plant would want to grow at that location anyway. Therefore, EH believes a living wall is possible.	
5.7	JLe mentioned that there are similar walls at Elephant & Castle and Bankside.	
5.8	JL made the point that such a wall should not just be used to conceal an ugly building.	
5.9	ML advised that Kate Hoey MP has been a great supporter of a living wall but there are issues relating to on-going maintenance which can be a problem.	
5.10	PL believes this issue is a distraction. First and foremost, the local community wants a nice building.	
5.11	JL absolutely supports what ML said about the Head House. However, she has some concerns about parking. It is vital to have at least the same amount of parking spaces reinstated that were present before work started.	
5.12	EH believes the whole process of designing the landscaping has been hit and miss, as it has not been properly commissioned. He presented a design putting back one more car space than was there previously – but does feel it would be a great shame to have cars parked in front of the Green, all the way round.	
5.13	In response, JL commented that it is important to balance the needs of local residents and businesses with the landscaping design.	
5.14	ML commented that Montford Place, which was the last unrestricted road in Central London, is now very empty. However, the views of the community are absolutely taken on board by EH's proposals.	
5.15	KY believes the only reason Montford Place is empty is because it is currently very difficult for cars to access it.	

	Item	Action
5.16	ML believes the local authority budget for maintenance of the Green is £1,000, which is very low. This is why community gardens are proposed, as an incentive for people to get involved and create a legacy for the future. There are opportunities for something far less municipal to be created.	
5.17	JLe advised that as a member of Living Streets, she has now got rid of her car, as TfL is encouraging people to do.	
5.18	SB believes the city should be less about cars.	
5.19	A local resident commented that he believes parking and landscaping are two separate issues.	
5.20	LS advised she has to use a car for business and to remove parking for local residents would be unfair.	
5.21	ML appreciates that this side of Kennington Green has borne the brunt of the disruption caused by the project.	
5.22	PRC highlighted ML's point about the failure of the TfL scheme to meet the requirement to replace the same number of trees that were removed because of the works – this is unacceptable. The equivalent amount of tree canopy should be replaced too, however TfL's scheme only provides the equivalent of 10% of the tree canopy present before the works. Tree replacement should take into account the number, type and age range of the trees present on the Green before the NLE work started.	
5.23	JL does accept it is expensive to do this. Living directly on the Green, she used to look over a beautiful green canopy. Prior to the commencement of works, an inspector came into her house to look at the view and protection orders were placed on some trees. This did not protect them from removal but it is important that TfL restores semi-mature trees to the Green.	
5.24	EH highlighted a statistic, whereby a professor in Toronto studied the effect of trees on people's wellbeing and discovered a line of street trees that people can enjoy was the equivalent of £10,000 on an individual's annual salary. Trees really are beneficial.	
5.25	JL commented that on a practical basis, trees have amazing noise reduction qualities.	
5.26	SC lives next door to JL. If trees of a more mature size were planted on the Green, they may block out certain views of the Head House. The Head House will dominate the Green, however more mature trees would break up and soften the lines of the building.	
5.27	SN believes it is important that TfL has an action to come back with a	

	Item	Action
	much better proposal and an expectation of what happens next. Residents do not want another meeting, they want an acceptable proposal. Cllr DA agrees with this point.	TfL
5.28	PL believes the questionnaire used as part of TfL's recent consultation manipulated opinions.	
5.29	With regard to the point made by SN, EH believes residents should propose what happens next, not TfL.	
5.30	ML thanked TfL and particularly Jon Tucker for endeavouring to push a higher level of engagement. However, the local community has two petitions each with 300 signatures, whereas TfL's efforts only generated 100 responses. Although there will not be full agreement, there is resident expertise in the community. People have put in many hours of their own time for free. ML urged TfL to listen to these opinions.	
5.31	Cllr DA stated that a number of issues have been covered this evening that need to be formulised. Cllr DA will take an action to finalise a list of these issues and liaise with key members of the community including ML and JL, to ensure all issues are covered. These issues will need to be provided to TfL, which is the organisation accountable for deciding what is submitted to the LB of Lambeth. Cllr DA will also put these points to LB of Lambeth, in order to obtain a steer on these issues. This information can then inform the final submission from TfL/FLO. Cllr DA believes that no planning application should be submitted before this process has taken place.	Cllr DA
5.32	JL stated that previous designs were rejected because they would cause significant harm to assets in the conservation area. There is nothing in the new design to limit this harm. Therefore, she would ask TfL to come up with something that does.	
5.33	Cllr DA advised it is at the top of his list of actions to obtain a steer from LB of Lambeth and determine if it is less prescriptive than we may have been led to believe.	Cllr DA
5.34	ES asked how long the green shed will be present on the Green. MTh advised this issue will be covered shortly.	
5.35	PL hopes we have now dealt with the creative aspects of the Head House design. He is also aware that the Head House includes a sub-station and hopes the health implications of this have been considered by TfL.	
5.36	ML believes there has been a lot of buck passing over the past four years when real issues have been pushed. He still thinks answers lie in the local community.	

	Item	Action
6.0	Presentation of community petitions on head house and landscaping plans and discussion	
6.1	Cllr DA suggested that the submission of the community petitions can be discussed separately. These can go to the full council next month.	Cllr DA / ML
7.0	NLE progress update including key 2017 dates on step plate junction works (presentation attached)	
7.1	<p>Presentation from MTh.</p> <p>Additional points raised by MTh:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tunnelling works are still proceeding to plan - Main tunnelling works from the northbound shaft at Kennington Green will be completed in approximately six weeks - Of the three possessions scheduled for September, October and November this year, the bulk of work is scheduled to take place during the first two possessions - During these possessions, work will take place 24/7. FLO will attempt to keep work underground and in the acoustic shed as much as possible but there may be occasions where residents will be aware of work taking place, because of vehicle movements, etc - Everything is working towards the 10-day Christmas blockage that will take place between 23 December 2017 and 1 January 2018. Concreting and connection work will take place during this time and will involve the breaking out of concrete and a big concrete pour. FLO will attempt to avoid these taking place over Christmas itself but all work must be complete by the end of the possession 	
7.2	SC asked what is a possession and what is a blockade. MTh advised that during a possession, FLO will take control of the line so that work can take place and trains cannot run.	
7.3	JK confirmed that during the possessions, trains will still call at Kennington but will all come from Morden.	
7.4	ES asked when the acoustic shed will come down? MTh confirmed the acoustic shed will be removed around about this time next year – April/May 2018. At this point, construction works for the basement will commence. This work will be more disruptive but is only scheduled to take place during core working hours and not at night.	
7.5	ML commented that the planned adit is now twice as deep as was specified on the TWAO. What mitigation is in place to minimise subsequent disruption?	
7.6	MTh explained that working practices will be the same as Nine Elms and Battersea, with dampening and the user of large excavators. Digging will	

	Item	Action
	not be continuous and will only be during core hours. Work will take place at the quickest possible rate.	
7.7	SW asked if these presentation slides will be made available online? MT confirmed the presentation slides will be uploaded to the NLE website and distributed to members of this group.	
7.8	MTh highlighted one final point with regard to construction. The first TBM is now moving and will reach the Kennington area in approximately six and half months, around October time. The TBMs will be removed via the acoustic shed at Kennington.	
7.9	EH asked if a site visit would be possible? MT advised that currently, a site visit would not be possible due to the work currently underway. Something may be possible in the future but only in small groups.	
7.10	AV advised that something may be possible when tunnelling works are completed but this will need to be assessed at the time.	
8.0	Construction noise, dust and working hours (<i>standing item</i>) Not discussed.	
9.0	Kennington Station re-zoning (<i>standing item</i>) Not discussed.	
10.0	Future agenda items inc. dates of next meetings	
10.1	MT advised the dates of the next two meetings have been set for Tuesday 11 July & Tuesday 10 October.	TfL
11.0	AOB	
11.1	ML asked for an update on the installation of the hoardings that were voted on at the previous meeting. MT confirmed installation will commence in two days' time.	

Meeting started at 18:30 and closed at 20:00
Minutes drafted by MW