



Northern Line Extension

Nine Elms Community Liaison Group

17 January 2017
Southbank Club, 124-130 Wandsworth Road

Attendees:

Name	Organisation
Cllr rep: Claire Holland (Cllr CH) (CHAIR)	LB Lambeth
Jesus Campos (JC)	FLO
Mabel Garcia (MGa)	FLO
Carla Arnold (CA)	FLO
Danny Owens (DO)	Transport for London
Richard Whitten (RW)	Transport for London
Lochlan Macaulay (LM)	Transport for London
Eddie Gallagher (EG)	Transport for London
Roland Petchy (RP)	Claylands Green NLEAG
Charles Pender (CP)	Fentiman Road NLE affected residents
Mark Walker (MW)	Admin support

Apologies: Iago Griffiths – LB Lambeth, Michael Tarrega – TfL

	Item	Action
1.0	Introductions and apologies	
1.1	Cllr CH opened the meeting. Introductions made and apologies noted. Cllr CH advised that she has to leave at 7.30pm but the meeting can continue without her if required.	

<p>2.0 2.1 2.2 2.3</p>	<p>Minutes of previous meeting</p> <p>Cllr CH invited any comments on the minutes from the previous meeting.</p> <p>MG advised that CP has already provided some comments on the previous minutes, which have been addressed. CP confirmed that he has no further comments which cannot be addressed during the meeting.</p> <p>The minutes were therefore agreed as an accurate representation of the meeting on 17 October 2016.</p>	
<p>3.0 3.1</p>	<p>NLE progress update and presentation</p> <p>JC provided an update on progress at Nine Elms between October 2016 and January 2017, plus a look-ahead to work over the next three months, including:</p> <p>Summary update: October 2016 – January 2017:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work focused on the North West corner of the station • Capping beam practical completion • Continued with precast beams installation at ground level, including in-situ stitches (links between the beams and the columns) • Continued with excavation works to basement 1 level • Commenced reinforced concrete works to basement 1 level <p>Look ahead: January – April 2017:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuation of excavation works to basement 1 level • Construction of in-situ slabs at west end (ground level) and east end (basement 1 level) • Installation of more precast beams and construction of in-situ stitches to the columns (ground and basement 1 levels) • Operation of the gantry crane along the whole station (operational and moving along the entire footprint of the station within a few weeks) <p>Logistics: Vehicle Movements October 2016 – April 2017:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • October 2016: 680 • November 2016: 440 • December 2016: 400 • January 2017: 650 • February 2017: 800 • March 2017: 850 • April 2017: 850 	

	<p>90% of vehicle movements have been related to muck away operations and deliveries to site (concrete, rebar and precast beams). Future vehicle movements for this period will be nothing out of the ordinary compared to what has gone before.</p> <p>Environmental Monitoring: October – December 2016:</p> <p>During the last three months of monitoring, there were two noise triggers - the first on 19 October 2016 and the second on 21 November 2016. The levels exceeded were in the order of 1.9 dB and 1.1 dB respectively over the 75 dB ten hour daily average. For the rest of the monitoring period, noise levels have been within Section 61 restrictions.</p> <p>JC confirmed that when triggers occur, mitigation measures are quickly implemented to ensure noise is reduced to permitted levels. These exceedances related to pile breakdown, which has now been completed.</p> <p>JC also confirmed that air quality levels have always remained within permitted thresholds.</p> <p>3.2 CP asked what is the legal implication of breaking the noise thresholds? JC advised that if there is a breach, the first thing that happens is work is stopped. An assessment of what happened takes place and mitigation measures are implemented. If breaches keep occurring as a result of the same activity, then the process would need to be assessed. In the case of the noise exceedances discussed earlier, these were isolated occurrences.</p> <p>3.3 Environmental monitoring points and receptors. Locations:</p> <p>JC presented a slide that highlighted the location of environmental monitoring points and receptors at the Nine Elms site.</p> <p>3.4 Your Feedback:</p> <p>MGa provided an overview of public feedback received and the subsequent response, including:</p> <p>You Suggested: A request for more information regarding defect surveys (especially with regard to properties in Fentiman Road)</p> <p>We Did: As tunnelling has been delayed for a few months, information was incorporated into the December TfL newsletter, distributed across the tunnel route. This includes contact details for people with further queries.</p>	
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

	<p>You Suggested: A request for Strategic Labour Needs and Training (SLNT) activities.</p> <p>We Did: This was provided as a handout at the last CLG meeting.</p> <p>You Suggested: To refrain from breaking out between 2-3pm close to the boundary of Pascal Street.</p> <p>We Did: This was honoured over a two-week period, which was the duration of the noisy activities adjacent to the area.</p> <p>You Suggested: Integrated meetings with major developments in the area.</p> <p>We Did: The VNEB meeting joins all the major contractors together, to look at how to collaborate and reduce the impact on the community.</p> <p>You Suggested: Keep roads clean (complaint received via CCS).</p> <p>We Did: Road sweepers are now working around the site, with a 30% uplift of road sweeper presence. London Concrete has also been rebriefed to emphasise the importance of this issue.</p> <p>You Suggested: Engagement with local schools.</p> <p>We Did: We continue to host work experience students from the three Boroughs and to date have provided 320 days of placements.</p>	
3.5	<p>Engagement Opportunities</p> <p>MGa highlighted the following opportunities for engagement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• CLG meetings• One-to-one meetings• Drop-in sessions• School and youth engagement• Stakeholder activities• LEAP group meetings <p>MGa reiterated that the project is open to suggestions for other types of community engagement and urged people to get in touch with any suggestions. FLO is more than happy to meet with people who have relevant ideas.</p>	
3.6	<p>Questions</p> <p>CLr CH invited further questions. None received.</p>	

<p>3.7</p>	<p>Cllr CH advised that job opportunities for local people was due to be an agenda item for this meeting.</p> <p>MGa advised that she has a sheet which can be circulated with the minutes from this meeting. MGa provided a brief explanation of the figures, including the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SLNT points are not always translated into the same categories • One taster position would count as 1 x SLNT point. A number of hours would be required for a school visit to qualify • The sheet includes the target and actual figures • For most activities, the target figure has been exceeded • FLO is looking to carry out more education activities • FLO is happy with the current status for Year Two, with a number of further activities lined up for March to June/July 	
<p>3.8</p>	<p>Cllr CH asked if jobs are going to local people? MGa responded to advise that the figures in this respect might not be correct and need to be checked.</p>	<p>NLE</p>
<p>3.9</p>	<p>CP asked how long a project apprenticeship lasts for. MG believes it lasts for 18 months.</p>	
<p>3.10</p>	<p>CP believes that the figures and colour coding may not tally. LM suggested that this information needs to be simplified and then shared with the group</p>	
<p>3.11</p>	<p>MGa advised that at the last meeting, a local resident requested more detailed information with actual targets, which is why this information sheet has been prepared.</p>	
<p>3.12</p>	<p>CP agrees that this information needs to be explained better. MGa confirmed that a more detailed table can be produced. CH does not think that more detail is needed, just a better explanation. MGa advised that FLO is in the process of changing its SLNT targets, so asked for the group to bear this in mind if targets have changed for the next meeting.</p>	<p>NLE</p>
<p>3.13</p>	<p>Cllr CH believes people would be interested to know of the job offers made, how many of these have been to local people – and how does FLO define ‘local’. Also, is this on target or is more effort required? MGa advised that of 27 vacancies advertised through the local job brokerage, eight have been filled.</p>	
<p>3.14</p>	<p>Cllr CH invited further questions. RP asked if his understanding of the colour coding is correct, with green for ‘on target’, yellow for ‘just below target’ and red for ‘below target’. MGa confirmed this to be correct and confirmed that an improved sheet incorporating a key/legend will be uploaded.</p>	<p>NLE</p>

<p>3.15</p> <p>3.16</p> <p>3.17</p>	<p>MGa advised that the latest NLE newsletter focused on SLNT and incorporated a case study on a local employee – Gabriel – who came to work on the project via a ‘second chance’ charity, initially on a four-week work placement. The contractor was satisfied with his work and Gabriel has now secured a permanent position.</p> <p>CP thought the most recent newsletter was very good and emailed to say so.</p> <p>Cllr CH invited further questions. None received.</p>	
<p>4.0</p> <p>4.1</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>4.3</p> <p>4.4</p> <p>4.5</p>	<p>Settlement Deeds</p> <p>LM advised that he has no specific update to provide in relation to Settlement Deeds.</p> <p>CP confirmed that he received a response to an outstanding query within a week or so of the last meeting. He received undertakings on how things will be operated, although this could not be incorporated in the deed itself. Other people who have not yet applied for a deed may want to sign up for the slightly revised deed that he has received.</p> <p>LM confirmed that grammatical errors and numbering issues previously contained within the standard Settlement Deed have now been corrected.</p> <p>CP would not expect people who have already applied for a Settlement Deed to receive a revised version. However, if they specifically applied for the revised version, would they receive it?</p> <p>LM confirmed that if people requested a revised version of the Settlement Deed, they would receive the same treatment.</p>	
<p>5.0</p> <p>5.1</p> <p>5.2</p> <p>5.3</p>	<p>Defect Surveys and Monitoring</p> <p>MGa confirmed a general letter will be going out in the next few weeks, advising of the installation of monitoring equipment and the undertaking of defect surveys, in advance of TBM operation. The period of contacting residents has been extended from a maximum of 12 weeks before tunnelling in the area, to a new maximum of 16 weeks beforehand. Queries are being treated on a case by case basis, with details included in the most recent NLE newsletter.</p> <p>CP queried how the 16 week notice period works. MGa confirmed that local residents are contacted between 16 and 4 weeks before tunnelling is due in a particular area. This timeframe ensures the survey remains relevant.</p> <p>CP requested further clarification of the minimum notice people receive prior to a survey. CA confirmed that people will receive a letter from TfL</p>	

	first, followed by a further letter from CPM Surveys. The letter from CPM Surveys will include contact details to allow people to make contact and arrange a convenient date for a survey to take place.	
5.4	RP advised that he has not systematically canvassed residents on this issue but those he has spoken to have found the newsletter article relevant.	
5.5	CP asked if some surveys have been done yet? MGa advised that there are not many properties at Battersea within the 1 mm contour. However, when tunnelling reaches Nine Elms, more properties will be affected.	
5.6	CP asked if there is an approximate timeframe for when tunnelling will reach Nine Elms? JC advised that the TBMs will be in the Nine Elms area around June/July 2017 and will reach Nine Elms a month apart from each other.	
5.7	CP asked if this timeframe means local people will start receiving letters soon regarding defect surveys? CA confirmed that people will start being contacted from the second week of March 2017 onwards. MGa advised that a balance has to be struck so that people are not contacted too far ahead of tunnelling in the area.	
5.8	Cllr CH wonders if the defect survey letters are too long for people to fully digest? MGa confirmed that the letters are only a single page.	
5.9	Cllr CH invited more questions on defect surveys and monitoring. None received.	
6.0	Construction Noise	
6.1	Nothing further to discuss in addition to the information contained in the presentation given by JC earlier in the meeting.	
7.0	Traffic Management	
7.1	Nothing further to discuss in addition to the information contained in the presentation given by JC earlier in the meeting.	
8.0	Environmental Statement	
8.1	Nothing further to discuss in addition to the information contained in the presentation given by JC earlier in the meeting.	
9.0	Track Form	
9.1	LM confirmed that he is still unable to confirm the track form. This moves around in the contractor's programme and as yet is unconfirmed. However, there is a condition within the Transport and Works Act that the track form must be shared publically, so TfL will absolutely be sharing this	

	when in a position to do so.	
9.2	Cllr CH asked if LM has any idea when this will be? LM confirmed he is wary to commit to an exact date.	
9.3	CP highlighted the fact that this issue was discussed three months ago but there is still no confirmation in terms of timescale.	
9.4	LM confirmed that this information will be available in months rather than years – but he cannot yet confirm if it will be available for the next CLG.	
9.5	CP believes that the point of sharing the track form is so this could be challenged if people disagree. CP believes there is a danger of people being unable to challenge the track form decision if there is a continued delay in confirming this information. Will TfL only share this information at the next scheduled CLG after the information is confirmed, or could a special meeting be arranged?	
9.6	LM confirmed that it would be possible to look at organising a special meeting if the confirmation of the track form does not land conveniently near to a scheduled CLG.	NLE
9.7	CP appreciates that sharing the analysis of the track form decision might not be a five minute job, so a special meeting might be a good idea.	
9.8	LM confirmed that this can definitely be considered. The track form will be shared in enough time to allow people to review and provide feedback.	
9.9	CP believes that until the track form is confirmed, there is an element of blight on affected properties. This makes it difficult for people looking to sell or rent out their properties. This is causing a degree of anxiety, especially as people have been waiting years for a decision. From the point of view of managing the project, CP believes that TfL should regard this issue as a key consideration. LM confirmed he will take this feedback away from the meeting.	NLE
10.0	Subsoil acquisition for tunnelling works	
10.1	CP confirmed he has received letters offering £50 compensation for subsoil acquisition.	
11.0	Nine Elms Station over-site development	
11.1	LM confirmed he has no further information to add at this point. TfL is currently considering how to develop and take forward.	
11.2	CP asked if there will be residential properties above the station? LM confirmed this to be the case. Cllr CH advised that the CLG has previously received presentations on this issue.	

12.0	Issues raised by residents and community groups	
12.1	MGa advised that this point is linked to what has already been discussed in relation to the 'Your Feedback' presentation slide shown earlier in the meeting. At the moment, the team is particularly focused on the Kennington area, especially in relation to the Step Plate Junction and future landscaping for both Kennington sites. Wherever possible, the team attempts to engage on a one-to-one basis.	
12.2	Cllr CH invited further questions. None received.	
13.0	Future agenda items	
13.1	Cllr CH asked if the agenda items used today should remain as standing items for future meetings. CP asked if the confirmation of the track form does coincide with a regular meeting, can this be made clear in advance of the meeting please. LM confirmed that this can be done.	NLE
13.2	Cllr CH asked why the venue has changed from Bolney Meadow? MG believes this is because Bolney Meadow may have been unavailable. LM advised that a request was received to hold meetings closer to the site. CA advised that a resident from the Wyvil Estate did attend the last meeting. CP feels it would be better if more people were engaged but if they are not by now, they probably never will. Cllr CH believes that once people's immediate concerns are addressed, they are unlikely to return to future meetings.	
14.0	Dates of future meetings	
14.1	Cllr CH confirmed that the next meeting will be in April and should be scheduled to avoid Easter. Cllr CH also asked if the dates for the next two meetings could be confirmed at the same time. MGa confirmed that this can be done.	NLE
14.2	Cllr CH confirmed the next meeting will be a 6.30pm start, at the Southbank Club or Bolney Meadow.	
15.0	A.O.B	
	MGa confirmed that the names of the two TBMS will be unveiled this week, following a competition in partnership with local schools. Someone from the Mayor's office will attend the unveiling.	

Meeting started at 18.32 and closed at 19.24.
Minutes drafted by MW.