



Northern Line Extension Nine Elms Community Liaison Group

Thursday 11 October 2018
Southbank Club, 124-130 Wandsworth Road, London, SW8 2LD

Attendees:

Name	Organisation
Carla Arnold (CA)	FLO – NLE
Matt Brinklow (MB)	FLO – NLE
Cllr Lucy Caldicott (LC)	LB Lambeth (Stockwell ward)
Will Crafter (WC)	TfL
Hugo Cuesta (HC)	FLO – NLE
Michael Flynn (MF)	TfL
Dr. Mahamed Hashi (MH)	LB Lambeth (Stockwell ward)
Diana McCormick (DM)	Nine Elms Point
Daniel Owens (DO)	TfL
Charles Pender (CP)	Resident
Roland Petchey (RP)	Resident – Claylands Green
Mark Walker (MW)	Minute-taker

	Item	Action
1.0	Introductions and apologies	
1.1	Welcome from Michael Flynn (MF), followed by introductions from all attendees.	
1.2	MF is grateful for the attendance of local councillors from LB Lambeth. MF will chair tonight's meeting as the councillors need to leave early, however it is hoped a Stockwell ward councillor will chair future meetings.	

2.0	Minutes of previous meeting – accuracy and matters arising	
2.1	MF invited comments on the minutes of the previous meeting – none received.	
2.2	MF advised holding the CLG on the second Thursday of the month is not going to be convenient for local councillors.	
3.0	NLE Progress update and presentation	
3.1	Presentation by Hugo Cuesta (HC) provided an update on progress at Nine Elms.	
3.2	Roland Petchey (RP) asked if the start of work above ground will have any implications for the number of vehicle movements. HC advised it should not. There was a peak of vehicle movements during the excavation phase. In terms of the number of concrete and material deliveries, the level of vehicle movements should remain about the same. Fit out works will ramp up when structural works finish in the spring, however HC expects vehicle movements to remain fairly constant.	
3.3	Presentation by Matt Brinklow (MB) provided an update on environmental monitoring.	
3.4	MB referred to high noise levels recorded in July when a crane was installed next to a noise monitor. Dr Mahamed Hashi (MH) asked if the sensor could have been moved while the crane was installed. MB advised quite a lot of effort is required to move the monitors, so it was best to leave it in place during the crane installation.	
3.5	RP asked if residents can expect noise levels to be higher due to more work taking place at ground level. MB advised noise levels will be higher but will be similar to noise levels from other construction projects in the area.	
3.6	Charles Pender (CP) asked if peaks in noise levels are measured. MB confirmed average and peak levels are measured, however the limits FLO works to are those stipulated by the local authority.	
3.7	CP believes that actual noise levels are more important to local people and asked if it would be possible for this information be provided at future meetings. MB responded to advise it will not be realistic to show peak levels at CLG meetings.	
3.8	CP believes it would be useful to show peak noise levels, otherwise he feels the information is not useful and FLO is just producing figures for the sake of it. If he lived nearby, CP would be concerned about peak noise levels, as they are a lot more relevant. It would be useful to demonstrate what some of the peaks are. MB confirmed noise above a	

	<p>certain level is recorded. However, this is more for FLO's own management purposes.</p>	
3.9	<p>CP commented that if the noise most likely to disturb people is not being measured then this is of limited use.</p>	
3.10	<p>MB confirmed this process was agreed with the local authority.</p>	
3.11	<p>Cllr Lucy Caldicott (LC) introduced herself.</p>	
3.12	<p>CP commented that the council has disrupted the frequency of this CLG due to local elections. LC responded to advise local councillors did not know about the CLG until recently.</p>	
3.13	<p>CP commented that it would be good to feature some detail on peak noise levels in the future. MB confirmed noise levels are measured every 15 minutes. CP is not asking for lot of extra data gathering, just perhaps the peak level per hour. This would be useful to know. CP is not saying average noise levels are totally useless but it would be interesting to know why the average is increasing.</p>	
3.14	<p>MB advised that FLO reports night time noise peaks, as this is a more sensitive period.</p>	
3.15	<p>LC wonders if more can be done in terms of predicting peak noise levels. LC explained that local councillors hold the council to account and can assist with any problems.</p>	
3.16	<p>MH commented that he agrees with CP. It would be useful to see this information and if it is already being captured, then it should be easy to present.</p>	
3.17	<p>HC explained that there are many occasions when noise monitoring records loud noise unrelated to the site, i.e. a police siren. However, in terms of disturbance experienced by our neighbours, we have only had one or two complaints in the past month.</p>	
3.18	<p>Carla Arnold (CA) explained that the team normally deals with complaints on a case-by-case basis. Local residents know to contact her or the NLE Helpdesk if they have any problems. There are many ways for the local community to make contact and people do use these channels.</p>	
3.19	<p>MH suggested that if the night time peaks are recorded, then it should be possible to capture this information for the daytime too. It would be helpful to see this information. It may be the case that not all residents who have issues with the project make complaints.</p>	
3.20	<p>CP suggested that perhaps a peak could be defined as four quarters of an hour that have the highest reading. It would be interesting to see this information.</p>	

<p>3.21</p> <p>3.22</p> <p>3.23</p>	<p>MB confirmed he will take this request on board and will need to think about the best way to present peak noise levels in the future. Average noise levels will not be presented at future CLG meetings.</p> <p>CP commented that he is not asking for average noise levels to be removed altogether from future presentations. Action 1: MF confirmed the team will take this request away and consider the best way to present peak noise levels at future CLG meetings.</p> <p>MH asked what is meant by unattended monitoring. MB confirmed this is where monitors are in place but are not manned.</p>	<p>NLE</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>4.6</p> <p>4.7</p> <p>4.8</p> <p>4.9</p>	<p>Noise and vibration modelling (Condition 13)</p> <p>MF confirmed a request was received for this item to appear on the agenda for this meeting.</p> <p>CP commented that following the last CLG meeting, things were dealt with quickly and he had a useful meeting with TfL which was quite reassuring in terms of the most likely noise levels once the NLE is operational, with some of the worst-case scenario data taken out. CP expressed his thanks for the meeting being arranged.</p> <p>MF explained that Condition 13 of the Transport Works Act Order (TWAO) states ground borne noise from trains operating on the NLE will not exceed 35dB. Models were run at the outset that showed noise levels would be within these parameters. However, it was felt by some members of this group that this modelling was not realistic. Therefore, some further modelling was undertaken that involved taking out some of the worst-case assumptions and this came up with a different result in terms of anticipated noise levels.</p> <p>MF confirmed he is happy to share a paper copy of the second model.</p> <p>CP commented that this model is already in the public domain and again, the project is focusing on its statutory obligations.</p> <p>MF responded to advise the project is trying to be responsible by not releasing this information without the necessary caveats.</p> <p>MF confirmed the levels on this model are within the 20-30 DB range, which are typical noise levels for an urban area.</p> <p>CP asked if the model provided in the pack of paperwork provided to attendees of this meeting is TfL's statutory model, which has been released previously. MF confirmed this to be correct.</p> <p>CP commented that the revised modelling he has seen showed noise levels much nearer to 20dB than 30dB at the deeper part of the line</p>	

	<p>around the Fentiman Road area. A graph showed it to be higher – an extra three or four decibels – when trains pass each other, however CP understands this is not necessarily that likely.</p>	
4.10	<p>CP believes the methodology for the revised modelling is much more advanced and nearer the original figures put forward at inquiry and on a leaflet provided to the public. It also showed the expectation has not got any worse in terms of likely noise levels. From his point of view, CP believes this to be reassuring and if he was selling his house, he would provide this information to the buyer, along with the necessary caveats.</p>	
4.11	<p>MF confirmed that this modelling alone will not allow TfL to discharge this condition.</p>	
4.12	<p>RP asked when testing is expected to take place. MF is not sure when this will happen.</p>	
4.13	<p>RP assumes the testing will include the ‘trains passing’ scenario. CP assumes the testing will be done when the line is nearly for use. MF confirmed this to be the case.</p>	
5.0	<p>Complaints and enquiries</p>	
5.1	<p>CA provided an update on complaints and enquiries received in relation to the Nine Elms site.</p>	
5.2	<p>CA referred to a complaint received in relation to property damage. CP asked where this property is located. CP confirmed the property is in Pascal Street, close to the site.</p>	
5.3	<p>CA confirmed all properties along the tunnel route have had a pre-construction defect survey and if requested by the property owner, a post-construction survey will also be carried out.</p>	
5.4	<p>CP asked if post-construction surveys require property owners to request one. CA confirmed this to be the case.</p>	
5.5	<p>CP asked if there is a timeline for homeowners to report issues and request a post-construction survey. CA advised that within reason, i.e. before the end of the project, there is no strict timeline.</p>	
5.6	<p>CA provided an update of various community engagement activities undertaken by FLO, including a new ‘retraining’ scheme starting on 24 October, which offers a two-week college course followed by a two-week placement. CA advised lots of contractors are participating, including FLO. CA has copies of flyers with further details with her today and can circulate this if anyone is interested.</p>	
	<p>CP asked where this flyer has been circulated. CA advised it has been</p>	

	circulated in Lambeth and Wandsworth. CP asked how it has been distributed. CA advised it has been displayed on noticeboards in housing developments and publicised at schools, community centres and forums such as this CLG. It has also been mentioned at other NLE CLGs. CP asked if the scheme is still open to new applicants. CA advised it is and will circulate details. Action 2: CA to circulate details of the retraining scheme to members of the CLG.	NLE
6.0	Future agenda items	
6.1	MF requested suggestions for future agenda items. None received.	
7.0	Dates of future meetings	
7.1	MF advised the LB Lambeth councillors present at today's meeting have suggested Thursday 24 January 2019 as a suitable date for the next meeting. Action 3: MF to confirm.	NLE
8.0	A.O.B	
8.1	CP requested some changes to the minutes of the previous meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2.7: CP requested this point is corrected to state that the councillor who usually chairs the meeting is <u>now</u> a member of the Cabinet - 2.11: CP requested that this point is corrected to state that it was <u>not</u> OK to cancel the April meeting without notifying the community 	
8.2	CP commented that the minutes for the previous meeting were only distributed two days prior to tonight's meeting, which seems short notice. CP would suggest sending out a week before.	
8.3	MF understands the minutes were circulated earlier to attendees for the last meeting. MF agreed that minutes should be circulated a week in advance of future meetings.	
8.4	CP confirmed he is happy for the minutes of the previous meeting to be published with the two corrections stated earlier.	

Meeting started at 18:32 and finished at 19:23. Minutes drafted by MW.