

Northern line extension

Kennington Park and Newington Community Liaison Group

11 January 2016
St Agnes Church Hall

Attendees:

Name	Organisation
Cllr rep: David Amos (Cllr DA) - chair	LB Lambeth
Cllr rep: Eleanor Kerlake (Cllr EK)	LB Southwark
Officer rep: Iago Griffiths (IG)	LB Lambeth
Officer rep: Richard Parkins (RP)	LB Southwark
Alexandra Norrish (AN)	KWNAG
Michelle Stokes (MS)	KWNAG
John Bailey (JB)	KWNAG
Lesley Wertheimer (LW)	KWNAG/Bee Urban
Joseph May (JMa)	Kennington Park House
Gordon Johnston (GJ)	Friends of Kennington Park
Trevor Quick (TQ)	St Agnes Place resident
Mabel Garcia Aranda (MGA)	FLO
Jez Porter (JP)	FLO
Rob McCarthy (RMc)	FLO
Sian Rebourg (SR)	FLO
Emma-Jane Kirtland (EKi)	Transport for London
Katie-Jane Kyte (KK)	Transport for London
Jonathan Cooper (JC)	Transport for London
Mark Thompson (MT)	Transport for London

Apologies: Bill Legassick, Bob Lentell, Michael Tarrega, Lynda Haddock

	Item	Action
1.0	Election of Chair	
1.1	The chairing of the meeting takes place on a rotating basis between councillors representing Lambeth and Southwark.	
1.2	Cllr DA chaired this meeting.	
1.3	Introductions done with apologies from those above.	
2.0	Minutes of the previous meeting held 12 October 2015	
2.1	Point 4.1 – KK advised that there have been no further complaints about this but encouraged residents to get in contact if there is a complaint.	
2.2	Point 3.2 – AN queried whether there are windows in the hoardings on Kennington Park Place as well as within the Park, JP advised that would be too dangerous as there is no footpath but there are visual panels in the gates.	
2.3	Point 3.6 – SR updated the group on work placements, local employment and work with local primary and secondary schools. Cllr EK queried whether the project were in touch with the Construction Skills Centre in LB Southwark, SR advised that she is working with the Construction Youth Trust and is looking at outreach activities using the site facilities, including work experience opportunities. KK to e-introduce Cllr EK, Cllr DA and SR.	TfL
2.4	Point 5.5 – RP advised that LB Southwark do not intend to do own survey on Kennington Park House.	
2.5	LW noted an inaccuracy in point 9.4 and asked for the paragraph to be reworded to, ' <i>LW advised that Bee Urban have been awarded an award from Love Parks.</i> '	
2.6	Minutes agreed.	
2.7	EKi updated the group on Condition 19 regarding passenger movement monitoring at Kennington Station and advised that the draft has been issued to the local authorities and comments are being collected. KK to distribute the draft and the group was given hard copies to take away if they wished, with comments requested by mid-February. EKi advised LB Southwark will discharge the condition and it will go out for consultation and the timescale for this will be discussed with the councils.	TfL

	Item	Action
3.0	NLE progress update and presentation	
3.1	<p>JC gave a presentation on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress since last CLG and a three month lookahead • Environmental monitoring • Temporary noise enclosures • ‘You said, we did’ • Engagement opportunities and how to contact us <p>JC reported that over half the piles have been completed and the project are working to the hours set out in the Transport and Works Act Order (TWAO), Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) Part B and the Section 61, approved by LB Lambeth. This includes working hours on a Saturday of 08:00-13:00 in order to maintain the programme and ensure the best use of hours.</p> <p>JC advised that the piling will be completed mid-late February. Following this a temporary acoustic enclosure will be erected which will give a significant reduction in noise (20dba) Agreed that the Step Plate Junction works will be discussed in the March CLG meeting and KK to send invite for the traffic management meeting to the Kennington Park CLG members. JC noted that noise monitoring information will be uploaded onto the NLE website.</p> <p><i>Noise and working hours</i></p>	TfL/Flo
3.2	<p>AN thanked the project for the presentation and questioned the seven noise exceedances and how long a period this covered. RMc advised the exceedances are an average over a 10hr working day. TQ stated that this meant the works could exceed the noise limit for a solid hour but not go above the average for the day. RMc advised that the exceedances were over a period of three months and some were due to the piling works being very close to the monitor. RMc stated that the 10hr working day average is an industry-norm and complies with the noise limits set out in the NLE Construction Noise & Vibration Mitigation Scheme. RMc acknowledged that the shaking of the piling augur is noisy however this is difficult to mitigate. AN stated that there is another metal-on-metal noise which sounds like the augur knocking against a skip and TQ agreed, adding that this occurs early in the morning but not all day and therefore the noise is not the augur shaking. Cllr DA questioned what the residents are hearing and MT stated that if the augur is being hit against a skip then the project will review that as it is not best practice. Cllr DA agreed this needs an immediate review and asked that the project liaise with residents. KK asked that residents let the project know as far as possible when this is happening so that the site team can determine the source of the noise and Cllr DA asked the project to feedback to the group in a week, stating this is an urgent matter.</p>	Flo

	Item	Action
3.3	<p>TQ questioned the reduction in noise using the temporary enclosures and specifically what the 20dba is reduced from. RMc advised that figures can be provided. TQ stated that the attended noise monitoring has only been conducted once in three months on St Agnes Place and the person came at the end of the day. RMc explained that attended noise monitoring is primarily used to calibrate the unattended noise monitors and the attendees take different positions to gain a representative view of the site.</p>	Flo
3.4	<p>TQ stated that the works on a Saturday morning mean that residents are woken up six days a week which is extremely frustrating and these experiences are not reflected in the presentation. TQ questioned the provision of secondary glazing and RMc advised that residents can apply for this by emailing the NLE inbox and he would discuss this with TQ after the meeting. AN stated that she would advise this to KWNAG members and KK to email the NLE Construction Noise & Vibration Mitigation Scheme out with the minutes. Cllr EK advised TQ to discuss with the housing association also.</p>	
3.5	<p>MS stated that the seven noise exceedances are very disappointing and questioned whether the project is happy with having missed these targets. RMc advised that Best Practicable Means is being followed but acknowledged that piling is a noisy activity, however noise limits as set out in the TWAO are not being missed; the exceedances are triggers which mean the project must investigate immediately and there are thresholds in which the project can work. JC reiterated that both TfL and Flo take noise mitigation very seriously and all exceedance triggers are investigated, advising that lessons are being learnt including putting acoustic barriers around noisy jet washers (for example). TQ stated that the works are always noisiest between 08:00 and 10:00 and this does not include the rotating augur noise as previously discussed. MT reiterated that the project will review this.</p>	
3.6	<p>Cllr EK stated that it is frustrating and very disappointing that works are taking place at 08:00 on Saturday as there was a commitment not to undertake noisy works before 09:00 on Saturday mornings. JP acknowledged that this was a commitment made during the utility works however during piling the maximum time must be taken in order to complete the piling works on programme. Cllr EK stated that the group was told that everything would be done to not start noisy works before 09:00 and JP advised this is not the case for the piling works and cannot commit to this for further works as the programme and working methods are under continual reviews. Cllr EK stated that this is different to what was told previously. AN questioned whether, if there is no absolute schedule to the piling works, why Flo couldn't do one less pile on a Saturday and start therefore at 09:00 instead of 08:00. JP acknowledged the frustration of the residents but explained that the</p>	

	Item	Action
3.7	<p>piling works are behind schedule and therefore the maximum available time must be used, however AN stated this must be due to the piling machine breaking down so often and therefore the residents should not have to suffer before of technical 'glitches' on site. JP advised that there have been a higher number of breakdowns than expected but the piling works must complete on time in order to facilitate the possessions in 2017 for the tie-in to the Kennington Loop.</p> <p>AN questioned why Saturday working hours cannot be changed to 09:00-14:00 and JP explained that the industry does not work to these hours and the risks of not completing the works (for example a lack of concrete deliveries) means this is impossible. JP added that the Saturday working hours have been approved in the Section 61. AN questioned why therefore there is an agreement that the works at Elephant and Castle will not start until 09:00 on Saturdays. EKl advised that there are very different activities at Elephant and Castle and they would not be doing piling works. Cllr DA asked that the project return an answer to the group on this subject and asked that going forward the presentation shows the situation as it is at that moment for the residents. Cllr DA added that it may be the situation cannot change but advised residents that the councillors will be looking into this.</p>	TfL/Flo
3.8	<p>TQ questioned whether the next stage of works in the acoustic enclosure i.e. the works 24/7, will be noisier than the piling works. Cllr DA asked that this be explained in the noise assessment fact sheet, in an open and transparent manner. JP advised that the tunnelling works should be quieter than the piling and MT added that the temporary acoustic enclosure enables the noise levels outside the enclosure to be at an acceptable level. MT added that there will only be deliveries in core hours. AN questioned whether the excavation of the shaft will be in core hours and undertaken in the acoustic enclosure. JP responded that the excavation of the top 3m will take approximately three weeks as it will be under archaeological observation and there will then be the further excavation and the sprayed concrete lining to the bottom of the shaft, advising the total duration to take until early June. AN questioned whether the sprayed concrete lining works will be 24/7 and JP advised that the project will endeavour to do these works in core hours however they will be within the acoustic enclosure. JC advised that it is only below the top 15m that sprayed concrete is required and AN stated that these works would be loud and even the 20dB(A) reduction could be very noisy if it's from a high number.</p>	Flo
4.0	Traffic management	
4.1	<p>AN acknowledged that traffic had been a lot quieter over the Christmas period however there has been disruption from the Elephant and Castle works. AN stated that HGVs have been using quiet roads such as Delaune Street and Harmsworth Street, although not necessarily</p>	

	Item	Action
	NLE vehicles, but asked whether any further traffic-calming measures could be put into place e.g. white lines back on the speed bumps which were lost when the road was re-surfaced following the utility works, speed bumps, width restrictions. JP advised that the NLE would look at putting the white lines back on the speed bumps and Cllr EK agreed that LB Southwark would also look at this.	Flo LBS
5.0	Defect surveys, settlement deeds and monitoring	
5.1	AN asked for a list of properties that had had a defect survey as no one in KWNAG had had one yet. MT explained that this may be the case the properties will only had a survey when due and relative to the works which may affect the property. AN stated that her property is in the 1mm contour and was told previously her property would have a survey before the piling works commenced and then told this would not be the case. Cllr DA asked for residents to be given assurances as to when their surveys will be carried out and asked for a list showing this. AN stated that if St Agnes Place had been surveyed and the properties are in the same contour then this is inconsistent. JC advised that the project will look at this and to date there has been only 0.4mm movement. MGA advised that Flo keep a database and understands AN's concerns however this property is not in the zone of influence for the piling works. Cllr DA asked that more information in given so all can understand the reasoning.	Flo
5.2	AN questioned whether they contour lines have changed and KK advised that they hadn't and as AN's property is within the 1mm contour boundary it will receive a defect survey. Cllr EK asked for the broader schedule and a written explanation for AN. JB questioned why Bishops House Nursery had a survey done before the piling works and JC explained that there is an agreement with LB Southward regarding the Nursery, which included having a defects survey and was agreed some years ago. JB acknowledged this but stated it was a reasonable request and the query made by AN is also reasonable.	Flo
5.3	MS asked that the different zones of influence are fully explained and JC agreed that the project will produce a factsheet. MS asked that this also explains who will be affected in each zone.	Flo
6.0	Dust management	
6.1	TQ questioned what monitor has been attached to his property on St Agnes Place and JP advised this is a ground movement monitor. RMc advised that the dust slides are not fixed and there is also one on the property. TQ stated that the dust slide has been installed only recently and therefore Flo cannot be certain that the dust has been managed and there is no need for window cleaning. Cllr DA asked for RMc to discuss with TQ separately outside of the meeting and TQ expressed	Flo

	Item	Action
	frustration that the presentation had inaccuracies in his view regarding the dust monitoring and any potential exceedances.	
7.0	Site hoardings	
7.1	KK advised that there will be panels in the hoardings for posters, taken from the London Transport Museum from 1910s to the present day depicted flora and fauna in London. KK advised that a selection will be sent to the local residents to decide which posters they would like to see.	
7.2	LW stated that it has previously been said there will be school artwork and school engagement for the hoardings and that this would be far preferable to TfL posters. EKl advised that talks are ongoing internally in TfL but urged residents to give their feedback. KK to distribute poster selection choices.	KK
8.0	Restoration of the Park – update	
8.1	JC reported that there was an engagement session at the end of 2015 where the first draft of the design was presented and the community have provided feedback. The project is working on the final design and will discuss this further with the community before any submission to LB Lambeth.	
8.2	GN stated that the Friends of Kennington Park are very clear on their position that the restoration should not put any onerous maintenance commitments onto LB Lambeth and IG agreed that this will be taken into account. AN agreed but added that the opportunity should be taken to provide something better than was there before. TQ stated that the previous engagement session was not well advertised and KK advised that there will be email correspondence and it will be on the notice boards and the NLE website.	
8.3	LW gave feedback that there should be no London Plane trees as these are difficult to maintain and passed a list to JP of various trees and plants which would comply with the commitment and community requests. LW also gave feedback that under-planting would be a good solution as it would provide diversity and colour and would stop dogs damaging the trees.	
8.4	LW stated that during the Public Inquiry a commitment was made to look at the wider area outside the Park as well as part of the restoration. AN agreed and added that this needs to be discussed with the project and the councillors. EKl advised that the written commitment relates just to the Park and the intention is to restore the Park to an improved state. Cllr DA stated that the group can look at the area as a whole and JB stated that there is precedent within TfL, LW	

	Item	Action
	agreeing that there has been a commitment given at Battersea.	
9.0	Future agenda items	
9.1	Future agenda items are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restoration of the wider area • Step Plate Junction works • Kennington station and condition 19 	
10.0	Future meetings	
10.1	The next meeting will be held on Thursday 10 th March.	
11.0	AOB	
11.1	JM asked for the traffic on Kennington Park Road to be looked at by the councils as this is getting very bad again after the Christmas period.	LBL / LBS
11.2	The group agreed that a new venue should be sourced as the acoustics make it difficult to hear the presentation.	TfL

Meeting started 19.00 and closed at 20.32
 Minutes drafted by KK