



Northern Line Extension Kennington Park and Newington Community Liaison Group

Thursday 25 July 2019

The Royal British Legion Club, 34 Gaza Street, London, SE17 3RD

Attendees:

Name	Organisation
Carla Arnold (CA)	FLO – NLE
John Bayley (JB)	KWNAG
Matt Brinklow (MB)	FLO – NLE
Cllr James Coldwell (Cllr JC)	LB Southwark
Marietta Crichton Stuart (MCS)	Friends of Kennington Park
Michael Flynn (MF)	TfL
Liam Greaney (LG)	FLO - NLE
Linda Haddock (LH)	Resident
Troy Healey (TH)	TfL
Anna Hladkyj (AH)	TfL
John Mealey (JM)	Minute-taker

Apologies:

Name	Organisation
Cllr Eleanor Kerlake (Cllr EK)	LB Southwark
Gordon Johnston (GJ)	Friends of Kennington Park
Bob Lentell (BL)	KWNAG
Cllr Alice Macdonald (Cllr AM)	LB Southwark

Item		Action
1.0	Introductions and apologies	
1.1	Cllr James Coldwell (Cllr JC) introduced himself and explained he would be chairing tonight's meeting. Round-the-table introductions took place.	
2.0	Minutes of the previous meeting – accuracy and matters arising	
2.1	Cllr JC asked whether anyone had any comments on the minutes from the previous Community Liaison Group (CLG) on 25 April 2019.	
2.2	John Bayley (JB) advised that Bob Lentell (BL) has sent his apologies for the meeting but would like to receive an update on the programme for operational ground-borne noise during the commissioning phase of the project. JB also said BL would like a Condition 19 update on crowd monitoring at Kennington Station. Michael Flynn (MF) said updates will be provided during the meeting but he will ensure BL receives an update, as requested. Action 1: MF to provide BL with an update on the programme for operational ground-borne noise during the commissioning phase of the project, as well as a Condition 19 update on crowd monitoring at Kennington Station.	MF
2.3	Marietta Crichton Stuart (MCS) referred to point 4.8 within the previous minutes and said it was incorrect. MCS explained that the last thing Friends of Kennington Park wants is responsibility for the day-to-day running of Kennington Park.	
2.4	JB said he was trying to explain that he felt Friends of Kennington Park should have more respect. JC requested that point 4.8 from the previous minutes is amended to: JB hopes Friends of Kennington Park is seen as having an important role for the day-to-day running of Kennington Park. Action 2: TfL to amend point 4.8 in the minutes from 25 April.	TfL
2.5	Cllr JC welcomed further comments on the minutes from 25 April. No further comments received. Minutes approved, subject to 4.8 being amended, as per Action 2.	
3.0	NLE progress update and presentation including a summary of work completed since April and a look ahead to the next three months	
3.1	Progress update – presentation by Liam Greaney (LG), which provided an update on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress at Kennington Park between April-July • Work scheduled to take place between July-October • An updated works timeline for the site • Site deliveries 	
3.2	Environmental monitoring update – presentation by Matthew Brinklow (MB), which provided a monitoring update for noise and dust levels at Kennington Park.	

3.3	Complaints and enquiries update – presentation by Carla Arnold (CA), which provided a summary for Kennington Park for the period between 25 April-24 July.	
3.4	Community engagement and NLE skills and employment update – presentation by CA, which provided an update on FLO’s community engagement effort, as well as the project’s skills and employment initiatives.	
3.5	Cllr JC thanked FLO for the presentation and welcomed questions from the room.	
3.6	JB referred to an action from the previous CLG (point 3.17) and requested a groundwater levels update at Kennington Park. LG had prepared an update and explained that dewatering was basically depressurising the lower levels of the shaft and the aquifer, so excavation could be completed safely. During the excavation and tunnelling phase of the project, water pressure was lowered to 20 metres. Currently, the recovery level is 3.6 metres below the level prior to dewatering equipment being installed. This level has been stable since February. The water pressure recovered between October-February has not yet fully recovered to the same level.	
3.7	LG explained there are various reasons why the water pressure has not fully recovered. These include the Tideway project, the geological area, perhaps Kennington Park is within a faulty area or could be interlinked with other works nearby.	
3.8	LG stressed that FLO continues to take monthly water pressure readings from its three monitoring points located near the shaft. LG was happy that the levels have remained stable since February.	
3.9	MCS asked whether FLO has approached any schools in Lambeth regarding site visits. CA said yes, schools from Lambeth and Wandsworth have been approached. Although Lambeth schools have not been approached in the last quarter, they will be going forward.	
3.10	MCS asked when the monitoring equipment will be removed in Kennington Park, as there are several wooden boxes with red lids. LG explained the equipment must remain in place for a period of time when ground movement levels are less than 2mm per annum. LG said the nature of the park sees unsettlement due to seasonal variations, so the monitoring points will remain in place until levels have stabilised. LG stressed the equipment will be removed but could not commit to a date.	
3.11	JB asked whether a trench will be dug around the new head house. LG referred to the presentation and explained the concrete layer is the permanent roof of the basement. To provide a working area when tunnelling was taking place, the whole work yard was concreted. To make the roof watertight, the team had to install a membrane which overlapped the existing membrane. LG said the trench will not remove all concrete at the site, just enough to complete the lapping detail. LG	

	said this work could be noisy and an excavator will be in operation, so may potentially be disruptive.	
4.0	Kennington Park head house and park reinstatement	
4.1	MF said there is not a specific presentation on this agenda item, as it is an existing standing item. MF welcomed questions regarding the head house or park reinstatement.	
4.2	MCS said residents were promised an improved image of the approved head house design but nothing has been received. MF said the only image of the approved head house design is within the consultation report, which he sent a link to with the minutes and agenda. MF said he would resend the link. Action 3: MF to send a link to the approved Kennington Park head house consultation report, which includes an image of the design.	MF
4.3	MCS requested a copy of the full detailed condition survey and images of the site prior to NLE works taking place. MCS said if NLE is going to reinstate the park back to what it looked like prior to works, it is important residents know what it looked like. MF said he would take this away as an action. Action 4: MF to investigate whether a copy of the full detailed condition survey and images of the site prior to NLE works taking place can be provided to MCS.	MF
4.4	Anna Hladkyj (AH) said the condition survey was produced and provided to Lambeth, so it will be Lambeth who can share with the community. MCS said Friends of Kennington Park has not liaised with Lambeth Planning, it has spoken with Lambeth Parks and Environment.	
4.5	LG confirmed a series of photos and a report were provided to Lambeth but stressed the plan is not to just return Kennington Park to look like it once did, prior to works. LG said significant changes are being made to the area where the head house is situated to enhance the area, provide screening and to ensure it fits in, in line with the consultation and planning approval.	
4.6	MCS referred to the planning approval design and said the park is a dog walking area, so it makes no sense to have double gates. MCS said the approval states three species of trees will be planted, none of which have been at the site before.	
4.7	Troy Healey (TH) stressed that we are not talking about something that is being proposed, it is a design that has been approved by Lambeth. The proposal was never submitted under the agreement that the reinstatement would be like for like and it was always going to be a different design.	
4.8	TH stressed that a public consultation exercise was undertaken but ultimately approval was provided by Lambeth Parks. MCS said this was incorrect as Lambeth Planning provided approval but Lambeth Parks were part of the discussion.	

4.9	MCS said most comments provided by regular Kennington Park users were rebuffed by TfL. TH said his understanding is Lambeth Parks made some requests when the planning application was submitted and amended plans were then submitted and approved. There is no requirement for the application to go to the Planning sub-committee.	
4.10	TH explained that the Officer who dealt with the consultation is no longer working in the department. Teresa Hoy has taken over but is understandably still building up a personal level of knowledge on the project.	
4.11	JB requested a copy of the formal consultation report. Action 5: TfL to investigate whether the Kennington Park head house and park reinstatement formal consultation report can be provided to JB.	TfL
4.12	MCS asked what data the head house design and park reinstatement plans were based on. TH said drawings were submitted with the planning application, as existing data did not show any details regarding positioning of benches, gates, features. TH said TfL would want to refer back to its walking survey results prior to works taking place.	
4.13	MCS hopes that TfL's plans are not completely rigid and that there is room for movement. AH repeated that the designs have been approved and packages have been prepared, which have gone out to tender based on the planning approval. Because of this, the opportunity for change is limited due to the cost.	
4.14	MCS asked whether Trees for Cities was approached to tender. LG said no, as the landscaping package is significantly more than just trees, so it did not meet the requirements.	
4.15	MCS asked whether Lambeth was approached to tender. LG said no, as Lambeth will be consulted on regarding maintenance but not the initial reinstatement. LG said FLO can provide MCS with details for who has tendered. Action 6: FLO to provide MCS with details of those who have tendered for the reinstatement of Kennington Park.	FLO
4.16	MCS said those who put Kennington Park at the heart of what they do, feel disheartened by TfL's plans. AH appreciated MCS's comments but stressed there was a consultation process, which TfL adhered to. Cllr JC advised MCS that councillors could have easily requested the planning application went to a sub-committee and he is unsure why this did not happen.	
4.17	TH said TfL's objective was to reinstate Kennington Park to something Lambeth is happy to manage long term. Lambeth made its requests clear and if it was not happy with the plans then approval would not have been granted.	
4.18	JB said it might be useful if a mechanism was in place for FLO to speak with Friends of Kennington Park, to get a deep grasp of what is actually wanted. AH said a meeting was already held on site and the drawings were reviewed. AH also said even if Trees for Cities could tender, it	

	would be tendering based on approved drawings.	
4.19	AH advised MCS that her comments regarding tree guards have been noted and discussions will be held with the tenderers.	
4.20	MCS said Trees for Cities undertook a survey in Kennington Park and the results showed different species of trees should be planted. Therefore, Friends of Kennington Park believe the results of the survey should be investigated by TfL. AH said if MCS would like to forward on the survey results then please do but stressed TfL is not willing to start the planning application process again.	
4.21	TH explained that from a Planner's position, a set of drawings have been approved by Lambeth. Therefore, if the planning application process started again, it would cost the project money. To TfL, this option represents a step back. TH also said that although Friends of Kennington Park is a vital resource for the future of the park, ultimately the responsibility and duty of Kennington Park lies with Lambeth, which has approved the design.	
4.22	JB asked when Kennington Park reinstatement work will commence. LG said Spring 2020.	
4.23	Linda Haddock (LH) believed the head house would have a living wall. LG said a living wall was suggested and looked at, however, it was discovered that it was not a possibility as three elevations of the head house have louvers. However, the green roof is going ahead.	
4.24	MF said all comments received in planning consultation phase were captured and responded to.	
5.0	Kennington Station	
5.1	AH provided a Kennington Station cross passages update and said fit out continues.	
5.2	JB asked for an update regarding fire doors being installed at Kennington Station, as per point 4.11 at the last CLG. AH said this is a separate project but the update is intrusive surveys are currently being carried out and design work will follow. It is likely to conclude late autumn and will then go out to tender, ahead of installation next year.	
5.3	LH asked what the plans are regarding potential overcrowding at Kennington Station in the future Condition 19 – monitoring passenger movements). MF said as he understands, methodology has been submitted to Southwark to explain how monitoring will take place. TfL is awaiting a response.	
5.4	JB said BL spoke last time about ventilation and fire doors at the station, as a meeting was held with engineers. TH said he was talking to some people involved in that element of the project and the doors being spoken about are smoke doors, not fire doors. The two are very different and serve different safety functions.	

5.5	JB asked whether there are proposals for changes to the ventilation at Kennington Station. AH said once the NLE is operational, the new ventilation shafts fans will improve the overall ventilation strategy of Kennington Station but there are no other new plans.	
5.6	JB asked if there is an update regarding the Braganza Street entrance doors to Kennington Station. AH said she has checked with the LU area manager for Kennington and there is no recollection that the doors were used by customers in the last circa 20 years, as they were used by emergency services only. However, a photo was found from 1978 which showed the Braganza Street doors being used as an exit only ticket gate. The configuration of the station means that it is not possible to install ticket gate lines at the Braganza Street doors and therefore it could not be used as a general entrance or exit.	
5.7	JB referred to point 5.3 in the last minutes and asked whether there is an update regarding ground-borne noise. MF said this relates to Condition 13. Before TfL can fully discharge the condition, it needs to measure noise levels at agreed locations. The initial modelling suggests the noise levels will meet the requirements of the Condition.	
5.8	LH asked whether noise monitoring will take place in years to come. MF said yes noise monitoring will be conducted before the extension is brought into service as it is a requirement of Condition 13. Action 7: TfL to provide an explanation at the next CLG of how monitoring will be carried out when the NLE is operational	TfL
5.9	Regarding future noise monitoring once the extension is operational, TH said TfL will make submissions to relevant local authorities in specifying areas where TfL places noise monitoring equipment. Residents will then be approached and monitoring equipment placed in the properties during trial operations. The noise results would then be gathered and submitted to local authorities for analysis, which would be in the form of a public document. TH said if during monitoring, noise exceedances occurred, TfL would look into potential operational changes or additional work to resolve the issues. The documents submitted to local authorities would then be compliant.	
6.0	Future agenda items	
6.1	Cllr JC asked if anyone would like any future agenda items added.	
6.2	MCS said it is not a new agenda item but requested an update on the Kennington Park head house plans and timescales.	
7.0	Dates of future meetings	
7.1	Thursday 24 October suggested. Date TBC.	
8.0	AOB	

	<i>No AOB raised.</i>	

Meeting started at 18:30 and finished at 19:34.
Minutes drafted by JM.