

## Northern line extension

### Nine Elms and Oval Community Liaison Group

25 January 2016  
Bolney Meadow Community Centre

#### Attendees:

Name	Organisation
Officer rep: Iago Griffiths (IG) (chair)	LB Lambeth
Donald Stark (DS)	NLE Community Action
Roland Petchey (RP)	Claylands Green NLE Action Group
Frances Goodchild (FG)	Claylands Green NLE Action Group & Fentiman Rd
Charles Pender (CP)	Fentiman Rd NLE Affected Residents Group
Joolia Cappleman (JoC)	Residents Group
John J Dooley (JD)	Wyvil TRA
Lochlan Macaulay (LM)	Transport for London
Michael Tarrega (MT)	Transport for London
Richard Whitten (RW)	Transport for London
Fiona Barry (FB)	Transport for London
Carla Arnold (CA)	FLO
Mabel Garcia Aranda (MGA)	FLO
Jesus Campos (JeC)	FLO

Apologies: Cllr Claire Holland, Katie-Jane Kyte

	Item	Action
<b>1.0</b>	<b>NLE progress update and presentation</b>	
1.1	IG advised that the NLE would present first and then there would be introductions around the table.	
1.2	JeC gave a presentation on:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• overall update</li> <li>• programme of work for each site – 3 month look back and look ahead</li> <li>• ‘You said, we did’</li> <li>• Engagement opportunities and how to contact us</li> </ul>	
	<p>Jec reported that the demolished of Banhams Security Building has been completed, with piling and removal of ground obstructions continuing. JeC advised that a major site milestone was achieved when the site switched to permanent power and no longer relies on generators.</p>	
	<p>JeC confirmed that there is unattended noise monitoring and attended noise monitoring once a week, as well as dust monitoring.</p>	
1.3	<p>CP queried whether there would community involvement and local school engagement for the hoardings. MT advised that the TfL Marketing team have implemented the current hoarding graphics as they are the standard graphics. FG stated that there is not much time to implement any school engagement however MGA confirmed that the hoardings will be in-situ for the duration of the works. MGA stated that the project has been liaising with TfL Marketing and there will be a new cultural strategy implemented by TfL to ensure all sites are coherent. FG stated that therefore there is no local school engagement and MGA confirmed that the project is engaging with schools but this engagement will not influence the hoardings. CP stated that this was a specific commitment made and FG asked for confirmation of what hoardings were being discussed. MGA acknowledged CP’s concern and confirmed that this is the strategy for all of the hoardings (Wandsworth Road, Pascal Street, etc.). FG asked for confirmation of local school engagement and MGA confirmed that the project is engaging but not on the hoardings for the moment although a request has been made to TfL Marketing for this to be taken into account when the new hoardings strategy is released, however the strategy will be for all TfL projects and therefore it must be coherent. FG stated that therefore the community suggestion is being ignored and MGA advised that at the moment this is not being carried forward. MT reiterated that there is a new consistent hoarding strategy being implemented across all TfL projects and school engagement on the hoardings at the moment is not being progressed at this time. CP stated that schools will not have anything to show for the engagement the project is doing and MT stated that schools will be involved in the naming of the Tunnel</p>	

	<b>Item</b>	<b>Action</b>
	<p>Boring Machines, which is tangible. CP stated this is disappointing and stated that this is a simple point which there has not been a response on and therefore the community will query how the project will and if they can respond on more important points. CP acknowledged that there is a corporate strategy across London for the hoardings but questioned whether this is the right way to go. IG stated that this is not something that the project team here can answer but he would feed this back to Cllr Holland and MGA acknowledged the concerns and advised this would be fed back to those who have made the decision. FG stated that the residents are extremely disappointed that the school involvement in the hoardings has not been followed up and JoC added that the hoardings on Pascal Street are extremely ugly. MGA stated that there is still the opportunity for this cannot be confirmed. FG stated that this is not the case as it has been accepted that TfL will have a uniform strategy across London but DS stated that as we do not know what the strategy looks like yet, to say school engagement has been rejected is not strictly true. MGA thanked residents for their feedback.</p> <p>1.4 MGA asked the community to pass on any contacts of residents associations or groups which the NLE are not yet engaging with.</p> <p>1.5 MGA advised that there are a number of school visits and careers fairs planned for the next three months and there have been four local job starts, with two further jobs advertised to the local job brokerages and the wider TfL brokerage. FG asked how many in total and MGA confirmed there are six at this time however there is an outstanding interview with Expanded (piling contractor) and there has been further engagement with Lambeth College and South Thames College in Wandsworth. MGA advised that there are 26 trained STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Maths) ambassadors on the project and a student from St Frances Xavier Sixth Form college in Wandsworth has just completed a work experience placement in business administration. There are also future opportunities in Quantity Surveying, an Environmental Manager role, Tunnel Surveying and a Receptionist. FG asked for confirmation that these roles would go to local people and if local residents would be given preference; MGA advised that the roles are advertised internally first but following this the roles go to the local job brokerage firms, which the project has monthly meetings with. There are also apprenticeship opportunities. MGA advised there is also a pilot project coming in September 2016 and the project is engaging with schools across all three boroughs for this and the project is working with Talent Match and the charity Second Chance. FLO are also working with Tideway to integrate skills and employment opportunities across both projects and asked residents to feedback if there have any suggestions or other organisations to engage with.</p>	
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Introductions and apologies</b>	

	<b>Item</b>	<b>Action</b>
2.1	IG advised that Cllr Claire Holland has sent her apologies so he is chairing the meeting.	
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Minutes of previous meeting</b>	
3.1	2.1 – LM confirmed that the dust monitoring regime is shared with LB Lambeth.	
3.2	3.2 – FG stated that she had asked for numbers and asked for this to be confirmed. MGA advised that there are four local jobless starts with two further offers. IG confirmed that these were four local unemployed people who were given an offer and there are two further under offer. MGA agreed that this was the case and advised that there are two further interviews with Expanded. FG stated that there are therefore six and asked for regular updates on the actual numbers and IG agreed that this should be included in a table format. FG acknowledged that it is very good to hear the plans for future opportunities but the actuals are more important and asked if there is a quota. LM advised that he does not believe there is one but MGA agreed that this will be confirmed.	FLO  FLO
3.3	8.3 – LM advised this is not yet confirmed as the planning application will not be determined until March/April and therefore the numbers are under negotiation. FG stated that there was a request for numbers on both the social and affordable housing however LM advised that these cannot be provided at this time but once the numbers are set they would be fed back to the group. IG agreed and added that the planning is also subject to wider consultation.	
3.4	9.2 – IG asked for these to also be put into a table format and FG questioned whether there was an answer for this meeting. JeC advised that to date approximately 50% of the contracts have been let, related to piling across the worksites and the procurement of the Tunnel Boring Machine as well as the enabling works. FG asked if they have been let at the budget figure or less and stated that this has not been reflected in the minutes. LM advised that he did not recall this being said and advised that this is commercially sensitive data; TfL have a target price contract with FLO and FLO then procure subcontractors within that so TfL cannot produce this information. FG stated that residents were therefore misled at the Public Inquiry as residents were told there would be budget savings. LM stated that the ambition of the target price contract is to bring the target down and this action progresses over the life of a project and is not influenced solely by subcontracts. FG stated that therefore the public will not benefit if there are any savings and LM stated that this is not what has been said; if the target price comes down then this benefits TfL and the public beyond that. FG asked where the project is on contracts let versus the target with regard to price as there was a budgeted figure which went to the Public	

	<b>Item</b>	<b>Action</b>
	<p>Inquiry and the question is whether the project is on/above/below budget on this, and if those contracts are let lower than the budget price does TfL benefit. LM reiterated that TfL would benefit as it is a target price contract with a 50/50 pain/gain share but he cannot give the figures at this time as this needs to be discussed with the commercial team as the figures may be commercially sensitive but the project will look at this. CP stated that TfL must have this information and the question is whether it can be shared as there is interest about this and it was an issue on which there was community representation at the Public Inquiry. LM confirmed that the question is how much money has been spent to date versus how much was expected to be spent and all confirmed this as the question.</p>	<b>TfL/FLO</b>
<p><b>4.0</b></p> <p>4.1</p> <p>4.2</p>	<p><b>Defects surveys and monitoring</b></p> <p>MGA confirmed that the subcontractor CPM Surveys are carrying out the surveys and there have been a number of properties close to the site surveyed prior to piling; there were a small number of cases where access was not granted. There are no further surveys to be carried out until 2017 which will be prior to the tunnelling works.</p> <p>CP stated that he has raised queries on the settlement deeds which require response and wanted it noted that the document is very one-sided in TfL's favour e.g. posting. CP would like this to be discussed at the next meeting if there are any outstanding points. MT advised that these are being progressed by KK.</p>	<b>TfL</b>
<p><b>5.0</b></p> <p>5.1</p> <p>5.2</p>	<p><b>Construction noise</b></p> <p>JoC advised that the noise has been bad and sometimes there is shaking and a water tanker in her property has moved; this is now being made more stable. JoC advised that she is unsure of whether the survey team went into the roof when they came to do the defect survey and stated that today is has been very bad. CP stated that there have been overruns also and JoC advised that the concrete pours has not been noisy so the overruns are not a concern.</p> <p>JD stated that the noise is not solely down to the NLE as there are two other construction sites nearby. JD advised that the communication of delays and the updates on works are good however there has been bad management of lorry traffic; Wandsworth Road and the smaller surrounding roads are being used as car parks. JD acknowledged that this cannot be blamed on one site so therefore all the sites must come together to resolve this problem. LM advised that there is an area-wide logistics tool being developed and JD stated that this must look at the whole area. LM agreed that it would however it is in the early stages. JD advised that it should look at lorry loading and unloading and LM advised that Mace have been contracted by TfL Planning team, who</p>	

	<b>Item</b>	<b>Action</b>
	<p>are taking the lead, to look at this, including better planning of lorry holding areas. JC acknowledged that there are a lot of sites in this area but it is good that TfL are taking the lead. IG advised that the pentagonal signs are to encourage lorries to use specific routes but there is a challenge with all the projects in the areas and there is a large volume of lorries. CP advised that the council must have overall responsibility and LM advised that this piece of work is being co-funded by TfL, LB Lambeth and LB Wandsworth through the 'Nine Elms on the South Bank' body. CP stated that although this is a good plan there have been worksites in progress for some time now so this needs to be delivered quickly. JD stated that the residents are in the midst of one of the biggest regeneration areas for a generation and there has been damage caused to the roads and pavements because of all of the construction traffic. JD stated that the noise, dust and traffic is a problem and there does not seem to be coordination between all the sites. LM acknowledged this and advised that the tool being developed will provide this coordination. IG asked for a specific agenda item at the next meeting on 'Traffic Management'. JoC stated that the widths of roads have been reduced to provide lorry-standing areas and this also relates to Kennington Green.</p>	<b>TfL</b>
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Update on any issues since the last meeting which have changed from the Environmental Statement published during the Inquiry</b>	
6.1	No changes since the last meeting.	
<b>7.0</b>	<b>Track form</b>	
7.1	JeC updated that the design will be completed by October 2016 and the track will be ordered in May 2017, with installation commencing in July 2018. CP queried whether there will be a temporary track prior to this and JeC advised that there would but these are the dates for the permanent track form.	
7.2	DS queried whether the details in the Environmental Statement regarding the permanent track form can therefore be confirmed in October and LM advised that this will be the case. DS asked if this will be the final design and JeC advised that this will be the detailed design i.e. the developed design in order to procure the final track. There will be a tendering process and the subcontractor award will be in May 2017. CP asked if there will be any meaningful consultation with residents groups and if the modelling information can be made available to ensure that the residents are satisfied, and if not satisfied to give time for a legal challenge if necessary. CP stated that this is a key point for those who will be above the permanent train line and asked if there is an earlier date when the type of track form can be advised to residents. LM advised that October is the time when it can be confirmed and signed off so up until this point it could change	

	<b>Item</b>	<b>Action</b>
	<p>however CP stated that it cannot be a <i>fait accompli</i>. LM acknowledged this and advised that it is a contractual requirement for FLO to meet the noise limits in the TWAO. CP stated that those numbers are unacceptably high for residents, who want to see what the modelling numbers are now versus what was presented in the Public Inquiry. LM acknowledged this and advised that we will discuss with the Discipline Engineers. CP asked if there should be a further meeting to discuss this specifically and FG stated that there should be an update at the next meeting. IG advised that the next meeting is in March due to the Mayoral Election but the following meeting would be in June/July which may be more appropriate and CP agreed. CP added that this is the issue which is key to a lot of residents and if not done correctly there could be legal challenges about. DS advised that there is a standing agenda item regarding 'Updates to the Environmental Statement' (ES) and the numbers in the ES are below the contractual limits. CP stated that this therefore means that, if there has been no change to the ES, then TfL cannot know what the modelling is for the track form and this is the key issue as it affects people in the long term unlike hoardings which are temporary and therefore more trivial. DS stated that the ES has a series of modelling contours across the whole line and this is the basis on which the TWAO was approved and not the best endeavours of 35dBa, therefore the community requires confirmation that in all parts of the track the modelling numbers in the ES are being met.</p>	<p><b>TfL/FLO</b></p> <p><b>TfL/FLO</b></p>
<b>8.0</b>	<p><b>Over-site development</b></p> <p>8.1 LM advised that the planning application has been submitted but there will not be a decision until March/April. FG asked what the numbers for social housing were in the application. LM advised that this has been led by TfL Operational Property department however the understanding is that a number is not submitted as it's an iterative, consultative process which leads to an agreed number at the end of the process. FG questioned whether therefore the planning document does not contain any numbers and IG confirmed that there discussion is going back and forth. CP asked what the opening negotiation position was and IG stated the opening position is LB Lambeth's policy of 40% however CP asked what TfL's opening position was. LM stated that he can come back on this and FG asked for an email update before the next meeting. CP asked if TfL Operational Property is cognisant of GLA policies rather than acting like any other commercial property developer and is therefore bound by these GLA policies. LM advised that the development at Nine Elms is fairly new territory for TfL and as such was not aware of any express policy in this regard. FG reiterated that the group would like to know the opening figure from TfL and asked for an email update.</p>	<p><b>TfL</b></p>
<b>9.0</b>	<p><b>Issues raised by residents groups</b></p>	

	Item	Action
9.1	<p>FG questioned what impact the new TfL budgetary restrictions have on the Northern line signalling upgrades. MT advised that there continues to be a lot of work going on and with a new Mayor coming in it would not be appropriate to announce any changes. TfL can confirm however that the big projects will continue. FG stated that she is only interested in the Northern line upgrades but MT advised that it is very high-level and there are no details available yet e.g. which projects are impacted but a specific answer cannot be given. FG stated that there are two upgrades and TfL have previously said, although not in so many words, that they ‘do not care about Northern line over-crowding and the Victoria line must be protected from over-crowding’ therefore if the Northern line upgrades do not happen before the NLE opens then the Northern line will be severely over-crowded. LM advised that the upgrade projects are continuing to be worked on at the moment, Northern line upgrade 1 is approaching completion and Northern line upgrade 2 is in early stages of design however we cannot commit to the status of this programme in the future. FG stated that TfL need to look at what was said at the Public Inquiry regarding over-crowding and an update is required at the next meeting as she was told that there would be answers given tonight.</p>	TfL
<b>10</b>	<b>Future agenda items</b>	
10.1	<p>IG stated that traffic management will be an item.</p>	
10.2	<p>FG stated that the ‘temporary’ cones at Kennington Green need looking at as this has not been reviewed and with proper space management there could be more space given. IG stated that these are being raised in the Kennington Green CLG but FG stated that this needs to be reviewed as this is dangerous. IG stated that Cllr Edbrooke has been met on site with Val Shawcross and there have been further traffic management meetings with residents following this walkaround, and asked that FG be made aware of these meetings. FG stated that FLO should not have <i>carte blanche</i> to store their equipment in the road and IG assured that this is being looked at, MGA reiterating that there are regular traffic management meetings with residents, led by TfL Surface Transport, and the cones have been raised however they are the safest way to keep traffic segregated. LM advised that the cones will remain in place until the road layout is agreed between FLO and TfL Surface Transport for the duration of the works; this road layout will be in place in two-three months. MGA stated that there have been occasions where pedestrians are crossing the road through traffic and the cones have helped with this situation however this site is very constrained and all the space is being used as effectively as possible. FG stated that she has driven by and seen the hoardings being pushed out, MGA advised that there may have been many different engineering or safety reasons for this but all feedback is taken into account. LM advised that the hoardings should not move once the road</p>	TfL

	<b>Item</b>	<b>Action</b>
	scheme for the duration of the works is in place and MGA reiterated that the Kennington Green site is very constrained. FG asked that the road layout is looked at again including signage, perhaps advising that cyclists should not overtake cars. MGA advised that there is enforcement and LM stated it is difficult to prevent poor cyclist behaviours although regular police patrols do take place.	
<b>11</b>	<b>Dates of future meetings</b>	
11.1	IG advised it will be early in March due to the Mayoral election.	

Meeting started 7.00 and closed at 8.15  
Minutes drafted by KK