



Northern Line Extension

Kennington Green Community Liaison Group (CLG)

Tuesday 10 October 2017

Henry Fawcett Primary School, Bowling Green Street, London, SE11 5BZ

Attendees:

Name	Organisation
Cllr rep: Cllr David Amos (Cllr DA) (CHAIR)	LB Lambeth (Prince's Ward)
Iago Griffiths (IG)	LB Lambeth
Michael Tarrega (MT)	Transport for London (TfL)
Mark Thompson (MTh)	Transport for London (TfL)
Becky Richardson (BR)	Transport for London (TfL)
Alex Peters-Day (APD)	Transport for London (TfL)
Mabel Garcia (MGa)	Ferrovial Laing O'Rourke (FLO)
Liam Greaney (LG)	Ferrovial Laing O'Rourke (FLO)
David Hannon (DH)	Ferrovial Laing O'Rourke (FLO)
Matt Brinklow (MB)	Ferrovial Laing O'Rourke (FLO)
Jose Chicharro (JC)	Ferrovial Laing O'Rourke (FLO)
Priscilla Baines (PB)	Resident / Heart of Kennington Residents' Association
David Boardman (DB)	NLE Community Action / Kennington, Oval and Vauxhall Forum (KOVF)
Neil Collingridge (NC)	Resident
Edward Hutchison (EH)	Resident – Cleaver Square
Peter Laverack (PL)	Resident
Judith Lyons (JL)	Resident
Tim Purcell (TP)	Paperlink
Graeme Tish (GT)	Paperlink
Mark Walker (MW)	Admin support (minute taker)

Apologies: Marcus Lyon; Penny Ritchie-Calder.

	Item	Action
1.0	Chairperson's introduction	
1.1	Introduction and welcome from Cllr David Amos (Cllr DA).	
1.2	Cllr DA commented that the process with regard to the planning application for the permanent Head House and associated features	

	Item	Action
1.3 1.4 1.5	<p>at Kennington Green is now underway. The application has now been submitted to Lambeth and was originally expected to go to Planning Committee on 17 October, subject to planning officer's recommending the plan for approval. The Council is now running a statutory consultation process, which started on 6 October.</p> <p>MT commented that the statutory consultation process will last for a minimum of 21 calendar days.</p> <p>Cllr DA advised it is now possible to go online and provide your views on the consultation. Initially, the online feedback process was not working but is now. Cllr DA encouraged people to give their views as part of the process.</p> <p>Cllr DA's personal estimate is that the application will most likely to go before the Planning Committee on 28 November, which is the second session scheduled for that month. Cllr DA has asked Lambeth or TfL colleagues to update him when they know more. Further details will be included in the ward newsletter when confirmed.</p>	Lambeth/NLE
2.0 2.1 2.2 2.3	<p>Minutes of the previous meeting – accuracy and matters arising</p> <p>Cllr DA advised that following the last meeting of this CLG in July, some amendments were requested to the minutes. These were all reviewed by Cllr DA and most changes made as requested.</p> <p>Cllr DA asked if any further changes are required. No further changes were requested, so Cllr DA subsequently signed off the minutes from the previous meeting.</p> <p><u>Matters arising from the previous minutes (11 July 2017):</u></p> <p>(2.2): <i>MT said Peter Laverack (PL) has requested by email information on the potential implications of living near the Head House and substation that lies within it. MT said the NLE will take an action to provide this information to CLG members.</i></p> <p>Update: MT advised it will be possible to provide data about the electromagnetic effect. The substation itself will be buried within eight inches of concrete. There are all kinds of rules and regulations and it will be possible to provide more accurate data.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PL explained that he initially raised this query two meetings ago but over the past three months, nothing has been done about it - MT responded to advise that it will be possible to provide further data but the official line has always been that this will be well within permitted standards. However, NLE will go further and provide data and a comparison with other Head Houses in operation 	

	Item	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PL responded to advise he lives immediately opposite the substation and did not know there would be one until he came across the floorplan. He would like to know if his property will be blighted - MT confirmed PL's property will not be blighted - PL asked for evidence to support this. PL believes evidence should have already been provided to him and Lambeth - MT explained this information is not for consideration by the Planning Committee. TfL already has outline planning permission for the Head House and components within it - PL commented that project drawings do not state there will be a substation - Mark Thompson (MTh) advised the main substation will be below ground, in the basement. There is a dual supply to all London Underground (LU) networks. Substations from UKPN are all installed to UKPN standards. The switch room in the basement will be built to strict standards and this will be the same for the LU system. It will be encased in a fireproof room and the electromagnetic standards are very stringent. Everything will be installed to these standards - PL advised it is reassuring to hear this, however he has received no evidence to back up these claims - MTh advised the main substation is not in the Head House, it is in the basement - Cllr DA asked what can be done to provide PL with further details - MTh advised the exact location of substations is not normally publicised for security reasons. However, EMC and noise readings can be made available - PL advised he asked for this six months ago and nothing has been provided - MTh advised the actual characteristics of the switchgear will not be known until procured by the contractor - PL responded to say he believes designers will have carried out a risk assessment already and he expects this information to be made available - MTh confirmed everything will be installed to at least minimum required standards - MT advised the project will try to be as transparent as possible - MTh advised he will take an action to talk to the project's electrical engineers, to see what information can be revealed, however some information will probably need to be confirmed at a later date. Cllr DA requested he is copied in to the response provided to PL. MT advised this deadline for this response will be two weeks from today <p>Post-meeting note: <i>There are two substations within the head</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">NLE</p>

Item	Action
<p><i>house. The first is a London Underground (LU) asset; it will be located below ground in the basement level and be surrounded by concrete.</i></p> <p><i>The second substation will be positioned at ground level and will be a UK Power Networks (UKPN) asset.</i></p> <p><i>As with all of our assets, we are unable to provide further details on the location for security reasons.</i></p> <p><i>Independent experts (the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation) set exposure limits, incorporating a safety factor, which are incorporated into UK Regulations via an EU Directive. The electricity industry assesses all operational activities and ensures they comply with these exposure limits.</i></p> <p><i>UK policy is to comply with the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection's 1998 standard. All UKPN and LU substations are compliant with this.</i></p> <p>(3:8): <i>MTh explained the Northern Line loop will be closed during the possessions and the Northern Line will be affected, however services will continue to run from Kennington. There will be approximately 10 services per hour on the Bank branch and 14 services on the Charing Cross branch. We will include service details in future communications.</i></p> <p>Update: MT confirmed a notification was provided and this action is now complete.</p> <p>(3:11): <i>PB said the work dates will need to be repeated as some residents do not take in the information. MGa said FLO is aware residents may be affected, which is why future engagement and door knocking sessions are planned.</i></p> <p>Update: MT confirmed an activity notification was issued and David Hannon (DH) is here today to talk about the works scheduled for Christmas.</p> <p>(3:19): <i>Cllr DA asked MGa to provide him with the railway possessions communications plan. Cllr DA also asked MGa to ensure the communications pack is updated when uploading online.</i></p> <p>Update: MT confirmed this was provided and also uploaded online.</p> <p>(3:22): <i>MGa stressed that during the first two weekend possessions, surface works will take place outside of core hours until 20:00, subject to approval by Lambeth. Cllr DA asked for the presentation to be updated before being distributed, to reflect the change to working hours during the first two possessions.</i></p> <p>Update: MT confirmed this action was completed.</p> <p>(3:25): <i>NC requested that going forward, the presentation has the</i></p>	

Item	Action
<p><i>word ‘complaints’ instead of ‘enquiries’, as is it untrue and misleading. NC said a complaint and an enquiry are very different.</i> Update: MT confirmed this has been done.</p> <p>(3:31): <i>PB asked for an electronic copy of the presentation to be made available to residents. MGa advised yes and informed PB the presentations will be sent out with the minutes and put on the website.</i> Update: MT confirmed this has been done.</p> <p>(3:32): <i>Cllr said he would like to receive complaint details on a monthly basis. Cllr DA said he does not need contact names or addresses, just the details. MGa advised she will ensure this happens. MGa also said she already ensures the complaints are passed to the local authority on a monthly basis.</i> Update: Cllr DA confirmed he has been receiving complaint details.</p> <p>(5:4): <i>MT said the proposal will be submitted to Lambeth next week, which will then decide the planning process it will go through. MT said Lambeth will likely do another consultation period before the proposal goes to the Planning Committee. As was done last time, MT said residents will be advised when the proposal has been submitted. At that stage, the proposal will then be out of the NLE’s control.</i> Update: MT confirmed a post-meeting note was added to the minutes of the last meeting before circulation, confirming the proposal was submitted to Lambeth on Friday 1 September.</p> <p>(5:17): <i>TS said it is a simple request for TfL to maintain the plants. TS stressed he wants to know that when TfL leaves the area, it leaves the community with something worthwhile.</i> Update: MT advised TfL is still proposing the plants as part of the application. MT has spoken to the environmental maintenance team and if residents so wish, these plants can be maintained through TfL’s standard process. MT is trying to find out what level of standard this process provides. However, if a community group wishes to maintain or provide their own plants, they would be welcome to do so.</p> <p>(5:24): <i>A resident said he lives on the corner of Montford Place and there were trees on that side of the green which are now gone. JC advised there is a large amount of concrete below ground level in the area and there is also a maintenance hatch in the green that will be opened approximately every 25 years. For those reasons, TfL needs to maintain access. TS said for this reason, it should be TfL’s responsibility to maintain the Head House and the Green.</i> Update: MT confirmed TfL will not maintain the Green. This is a Lambeth asset, unlike the plants that will be located on the TfL Head House.</p>	

	Item	Action
	<p>(5:36): <i>TS asked TfL how many of the trees in the proposal are evergreen. MT advised that the project would add a post-meeting note to the minutes.</i></p> <p>Update: MT confirmed a post-meeting note was added to the minutes of the last meeting before circulation, confirming all the trees proposed on the landscaping designs are deciduous trees.</p> <p>(5:39): <i>Cllr DA stressed that key decisions cannot be decided during the CLG. Cllr DA also said he needs to check the proposal will definitely go to the Planning Committee and he will speak to fellow councillors to ensure it does.</i></p> <p>Update: Cllr DA confirmed this was done, with a post-meeting note added to the minutes of the last meeting before circulation, confirming the application will be determined at a future Planning Committee once submitted. Cllr DA also advised the planning office recently held a technical briefing focused on the Head House and landscaping, which he attended with Cllr Holland. At this briefing, Cllr DA ran through the key issues he is aware of through his role as Chair of the CLG and he will send a note to MT for inclusion in the minutes. This is not a decision-making body but an opportunity for local councillors and the planning committee to become better informed.</p>	Cllr DA
2.4	<p>EH asked why TfL submitted a revised planning application with very little change to the Head House design since 2016, even though there was so much local dissatisfaction. This has been clearly apparent at previous CLGs and with objections received from 350 people. EH asked what gives TfL confidence in the success of the revised application.</p>	
2.5	<p>MT responded to advise that TfL is balancing lots of competing requirements and technical constraints. The previous application was not approved in 2016 by the Planning Committee for reasons that have been minuted in Lambeth's decision notice. It is correct to say that the design has not changed a great deal, which reflects the significant constraints. Lambeth will have input into the landscaping, etc. TfL is attempting to balance requests from residents with all other factors and has taken a decision that the application does this best. TfL does not feel there is anything more it can do. The landscaping scheme takes on as many elements of the community proposal as possible.</p>	
2.6	<p>Cllr DA highlighted the fact that we are now in the middle of a process.</p>	
2.7	<p>Neil Collingridge (NC) asked for it to be minuted that he believes the proposal is not balanced. He previously received a letter from Mr Wild stating that this level of objection was to be expected, so to describe the proposal as balanced is not correct.</p>	

	Item	Action
2.8	Judith Lyons (JL) commented the proposal was rejected last year on the grounds that it would cause significant demand to heritage items. So for MT to agree there has been little change to the design of the Head House is really disappointing.	
2.9	MT responded that the proposal was rejected for specific reasons. Cllr DA questioned on the key issues.	
2.10	In response, JL commented that the overriding reason was the Head House was not a suitable building for this location.	
2.11	NC commented that TfL has latched onto bricks, etc as the reason for objection from the community, however this is not correct.	
2.12	Cllr DA stated the necessary process will now produce a judgement and TfL is accountable. A statutory body will make a judgement. He is not sure how much further this subject can be discussed this evening.	
2.13	EH explained that his concern is the process itself. On the planning portal, it stated that it was not possible to give comments and there was no statutory obligation for consultation on this submission. This was the case for a period of time until residents objected but has now been put right. You never submit a planning application and prevent people from commenting on it.	
2.14	David Boardman (DB) commented that there was a mistake, which does happen sometimes on the council website.	
2.15	Cllr DA advised he has made his views known internally about this situation but genuinely does not know any more.	
2.16	<p><u>Further matters arising from the previous minutes (11 July 2017):</u></p> <p>(5:42): <i>A resident asked why they are only seeing two faces of the Head House when there should be four. MT said he will ask for all faces to be shown in the submission to Lambeth.</i></p> <p>Update: MT advised that he checked this afternoon and CGIs are now included on Lambeth’s planning portal.</p> <p>(5.44): <i>MT explained that Lambeth can extend the period of the consultation. DB said he expects the consultation to be six weeks but it could be longer. JC advised last year’s consultation was open from early July until the end of September. Cllr DA said he would check whether this will be called into Planning Committee.</i></p> <p>Update: MT confirmed a post-meeting note was added to the minutes of the last meeting before circulation, confirming the application will be determined at a future planning committee once submitted.</p>	

Item	Action
<p>(10:3): <i>PB requested that at the next meeting, please can the noise of the trains on the Kennington Loop be discussed. MT advised PB this is an on-going operational issue that is being managed by another part of the business, which is engaging with affected residents separately. MT advised he can ask the relevant team to provide an update for him to relay at future meetings.</i></p> <p>Update: MT confirmed this is an agenda item for today's meeting. PB responded to advise she is currently in correspondence with Brian Woodhead (TfL Director Customer Service) and others. The original argument was that this problem is an operational matter. However, it is becoming clear that it is not just an operational matter but is also due to the impact of NLE work on the existing track. All being well, this may improve after Christmas, however affected properties are pushing for all possible steps to be taken.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cllr DA asked if he can assist with the matter - PB responded to advise she is happy to talk to Cllr DA about this issue but would prefer to continue to liaise with the relevant contacts she is already in touch with - MTh advised it would be better for Brian Woodhead and his TfL colleagues to deal with this issue. The NLE project will change the track at Christmas and then noise levels can be measured again - DB advised that a colleague was previously experiencing noise from the Loop that was supposed to be cured by some reengineering. This has happened twice now, so it will be interesting to see if the new track will make a difference - Alex Peters-Day (APD) advised that Brian Woodhead has actually responded by email this evening - PB commented that things have got a bit out of step. It is not just her but around 10-12 properties that are affected and people are worried <p>(10.5): <i>TS said the window cleaning issue also happened at his property. TS expressed his frustration at the cleaners not learning from their mistakes. MGa advised FLO is aware there is an issue regarding the window cleaners. MGa advised she will ensure notes are put through residents' doors and will confirm the service the cleaners will provide.</i></p> <p>Update: MT confirmed window cleaning at Kennington Green happened on Friday and is scheduled for Kennington Park too. No negative feedback has been received.</p> <p>(10:6): <i>MT confirmed the next Kennington Green CLG will take place on Tuesday 10 October, 18:30-20:00 (with a public drop-in between 18:00 and 18:30). This is likely to take place again at Henry Fawcett School, Bowling Green Road. Reminder emails will be sent in advance of the meeting.</i></p> <p>Update: MT confirmed meeting dates have been set for 2018.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">NLE</p>

	Item	Action
	<p>However, Cllr DA asked if these could be reviewed, because of his commitments. MT confirmed he will come back with new dates.</p>	
<p>3.0</p> <p>3.1</p> <p>3.2</p> <p>3.3</p> <p>3.4</p> <p>3.5</p>	<p>NLE progress update (presentation attached)</p> <p><u>Presentation by Liam Greaney (LG), FLO</u></p> <p>LG provided a summary update of work completed between July and October 2017. Key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Weekend work to remove the top of the loop tunnel is now complete - Secondary lining concrete works between the shaft and the Step Plate Junction (SPJ) are also complete - All works were completed in the first two weekends, so the third weekend possession will not be required - Works were completed within a period of 52 hours - This involved taking down the existing tunnel that has been there since 1926 - These works did not cause much disturbance - The project is now gearing up to receive the two Tunnel Boring Machines (TBMs) at Kennington. These are about 400/500 metres away and should arrive in about three weeks' time. In preparation for their arrival, work is taking place in the acoustic shed and at the surface. After being dismantled, some parts of the TBMs will be transported back to the manufacturer in France, which will result in some cost savings <p>MT advised that a video of the TBM is being edited and when complete, will be distributed externally.</p> <p>LG confirmed the TBMs are expected to arrive at Kennington late October/early November 2017.</p> <p>LG also confirmed there will be some abnormal loads as a result of this work. A significant portion of the TBMs will go back through the tunnels to Battersea but some sections will be removed at Kennington.</p> <p>PL asked if the tunnel is complete. LG advised the northbound TBM is approximately 500 metres from Kennington Green, with the southbound TBM approximately 400 metres from Kennington Park. MG advised the map on page 5 of today's presentation shows the location of the two TBMs, as of Monday this week.</p>	

	Item	Action
3.6	LG advised he will be looking to communicate dates for the removal of the acoustic sheds. It is looking likely that the shed on Kennington Green will be removed in March next year. Excavation of the new basement will then commence.	
3.7	NC asked if there is any benefit to leaving the shed up. LG responded to advise the shed needs to come down in order for the next phase of works to take place.	
3.8	NC asked if residents should prepare for noise levels similar to those experienced during piling works. LG advised the next phase of works will be very different to the piling works.	
3.9	JL asked if the next phase of works will include breaking out. LG confirmed there is concrete to be broken out and this will be noisier than the current phase of works. However, the team will try to avoid using pneumatic tools where possible and cut concrete into large sections, rather than smashing it up on site.	
3.10	NC asked how long the concrete breaking will last for. LG confirmed it will take approximately two weeks to remove. Following this, excavation works will commence.	
3.11	Cllr DA requested that at the next meeting, this issue is discussed as item two on the agenda, to include timelines and relative noise levels. LG confirmed this is possible.	NLE
3.12	NC advised he is suspicious about noise levels. Permitted noise levels were set out at the planning enquiry.	
3.13	MT commented there will be noise thresholds that the project is not permitted to breach.	
3.14	NC responded to state it was admitted previously that noise levels would not have been met without putting up an acoustic shed, so the project lied to the Planning Committee.	
3.15	NC requested that when providing details at the next meeting (see 3.11 above), there is also a comparison with the noise levels predicted before the outset of the project.	
3.16	MTh advised the acoustic shed was selected as the best practicable means. Breaking out the concrete slab will take around two weeks but could take up to three weeks. The excavation phase will take longer and will take place around summer 2018.	
3.17	JL stated that going back to the public enquiry, a reason given for selecting Kennington Green as a worksite was that there would be no need for an acoustic shed. However when things actually happen on the project, it is often different to what was stated in the	

	Item	Action
3.18	public forum beforehand. JL would like the project to be honest with residents.	NLE
3.19	MTh advised it will be impossible to break out concrete without residents hearing it.	
3.20	Cllr DA believes people want to be told as accurately as possible what future noise levels will be and also what actions will be taken to mitigate the impact.	
3.21	LG advised this be communicated at the next meeting.	
3.22	NC commented that it is probably best for residents to be told the truth.	
3.23	DB asked if the TBMs have encountered any water bearing rock. MTh advised the TBMs have predominantly encountered Lambeth Clay, although they have gone lower than this at some points. Generally, progress has been good along the whole route. At Kennington Park, quite an extensive dewatering system has kept water levels under control and that dewatering system will stay active for a good part of 2018, until the basement is constructed.	
4.0	Update on step plate junction works – Christmas 2017 works	NLE
4.1	<p>LG advised there was a weekend set aside in November for further works but this is no longer needed.</p> <p><u>Presentation by David Hannon (DH), FLO</u></p> <p>DH provided a summary of forthcoming works scheduled for Christmas. Key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Christmas works will remove the third and fourth rail initially - The running rail, sleepers and drainage will also be removed - This will leave an empty track bed, which will be cleaned and tied before the new low vibration track (LVT) is installed 	
4.2	MTh advised operational noise modelling has been carried out by Mott MacDonald.	
4.3	MT advised the new track form has been a standing item on the agenda for the Nine Elms CLG for a while. TfL needs to get approval from local authorities and will not submit anything for approval until information has been presented to the community in the form of a one-pager. Once an application has been submitted, the community will be advised and the application number	

	Item	Action
	confirmed.	
4.4	DB believes local authorities have to approve the track form as a model but a condition of the TWAO is that there also has to be a satisfactory test run.	
4.5	MT confirmed that a condition placed upon TfL is that the operational NLE is no louder than 35dB in habitable rooms.	
4.6	MT confirmed the NLE will not utilise a full floating track.	
4.7	DH confirmed that LVT track with Delkor base plates will be used for the SPJ, which will tie into the existing track. A level of 30dB has been entered into the VAMPIRE model.	
4.8	DB commented that at the enquiry, there was discussion that if a level of 35dB was achieved at certain pinch points, then the operation noise level for the majority of the track was likely to be around 30dB. DH confirmed this to be correct.	
4.9	MTh commented that the key to noise levels is speed. The Central Line around Hainault is a noisy section of track where trains run at speed, however the Jubilee Line Extension is much better and the NLE will be better still.	
4.10	MTh advised a significant issue encountered by Crossrail occurred at the Barbican, where a special form of track was required to reduce noise underneath the concert hall. However, this was a special case.	
4.11	DH confirmed London Underground rerailed a section of track in July, which would have got rid of initial noise complaints. Secondary noise complaints arising from work being carried out should go after the forthcoming Christmas possession.	
4.12	MTh clarified that the whole of the Kennington Loop was not rerailed, just a section.	
4.13	DB confirmed the scheduling for the Christmas possession is as accurate as it can be at the moment. DB provided an overview of the schedule, with work commencing at 00:30 on 23/12/2017. Work will be broken into 12-hour shifts as much as possible and various stages completed prior to the end of the possession at 04:30 on 02/01/2018. (see page 13 of the presentation).	
4.14	DB confirmed concrete will not be broken with a pecker. The chosen methodology is 'coring', which fractures the concrete in order to keep noise levels to a minimum. A floor saw will be used to mitigate further.	

	Item	Action
4.15	DB confirmed the plan is not to open the acoustic shed doors on Christmas Day and Boxing Day, in order to give locals a break. However, the doors will have to be opened if anything goes wrong. Providing everything goes to plan, the doors will reopen on 27 December, when concrete installation will start. Once the concrete has set, a new conductor rail and associated cabling will be installed, prior to clean up, testing and commissioning, with test trains run by London Underground.	NLE
4.16	Cllr DA asked how this information will be communicated to the wider community. MT confirmed that Caroline Brennan has emailed residents who are expected to be directly affected. A 'door-knock' will also be carried out.	
4.17	JL asked if she responds to Caroline's email and has a meeting, will she be provided with more detail than has been provided today. MT confirmed that information more bespoke to the individual property could be provided and give resident's the opportunity to discuss any specific needs or concerns they have.	
4.18	DH confirmed the further information provided would not be more technical, however Caroline will talk through the proposed mitigation measures.	
4.19	MTh advised the people most affected by the concrete removal will be those living around the SPJ. Once these works are complete and concrete deliveries start, disruption is more likely to be experienced by those living near to the acoustic shed. The project will try to mitigate any disruption but there will still be some. Concrete trucks will enter the acoustic shed and once the concrete pour has started, there cannot be any interruptions. The doors of the shed will be closed once the trucks are inside. That is as honest a prediction as is currently possible.	
4.20	Cllr DA reiterated the opportunity for local residents to have a bespoke conversation about the Christmas possession.	
5.0	Head house and landscaping – current position Discussed earlier in the meeting.	
6.0	Operational noise and vibration on the Kennington Loop Discussed earlier in the meeting	
7.0	Construction noise, dust and working hours (<i>standing item</i>) <u>Presentation from Matt Brinklow (MB), FLO</u>	
7.1	MB highlighted the location of the monitoring points at Kennington	

	Item	Action
	Green, including the different types of receptors.	
7.2	<p>MB confirmed noise monitoring reports are made available online. MB ran through the noise trigger log for July to September 2017 (page 15 of the presentation).</p> <p>For any exceedances above the permitted level, it is possible to listen to an audio recording to check the cause. All exceedances have been at night when background noise levels drop and all except one during the period July to September 2017 were caused by sirens from emergency vehicles. The exception was caused by a running engine but was found not to be related to the NLE.</p>	
7.3	<p>In terms of dust level monitoring (see page 16 of the presentation), MB advised there has been an overall reduction in dust levels. Dust levels in the wider area are not particularly affected by dust levels from the NLE site.</p>	
7.4	<p>NC enquired as to the reason for the June exceedance. MB responded to advise this exceedance was measured by glass slide two, which is positioned low down in a resident's garden. We believe whenever this resident mows their lawn, it creates debris which causes exceedances.</p>	
7.5	<p>Cllr DA asked if NLE checks with residents when such exceedances occur. MB advised they do not, so it is a bit of an assumption. However NLE does have monitors on its site and the levels did not correlate with glass slide two.</p>	
7.6	<p>NC stated that the views of local people are well known and when NLE says its activities have no impact, this is not believed.</p>	
7.7	<p>MB agreed that the NLE may have had some impact in the local area, however NLE is not the cause of these particular exceedances.</p>	
7.8	<p>PL suggested that for dust level graphs shown at future CLGs, NLE should include a line that shows levels on the site itself, for comparison. MB confirmed he will look at doing this for the next meeting. NC agreed it would be interesting to see this. MTh confirmed NLE will take an action to do this.</p>	NLE
7.9	<p>NLE will communicate an update on site logistics in CLG's going forward, similar to that shown on slide 17 of this presentation.</p>	NLE
7.10	<p>MG provided an overview of complaints and enquiries received for Kennington Green (page 18 of the presentation).</p>	
7.11	<p>MG confirmed NLE is happy with the lack of disruption caused by the two recent possessions, with no complaints arising from the first</p>	

	Item	Action
	weekend and just one from the second.	
7.12	MG confirmed that since June, a total of 15 complaints have been received in relation to both Kennington sites. Most were noise and vibration complaints.	
7.13	MG confirmed that 99% of enquiries and complaints received have been resolved. The remainder are on-going and are in the process of being dealt with. Details of all cases are shared with local authorities.	
7.14	Cllr DA asked where these details go. Iago Griffiths (IG) confirmed they go to the council's environmental team. The council used to have a dedicated noise and pollution team but this no longer exists. Therefore cases are being looked at but not as regularly as before.	
7.15	MTh confirmed case details for the two Kennington sites are shared with the Environment Health Officer for Lambeth and Southwark.	
7.16	IG advised he had a meeting with this person's predecessor but the council does not have much internal resource.	
7.17	Cllr DA is interested in what is not going to plan, i.e. the 1% of cases that are unresolved.	
7.18	MG advised there is an on-going issue arising relating to noise from a fan in the acoustic shed at Kennington Green, however this has been mitigated by reduced the fan's power. There are other special cases for Kennington Green that are being dealt with. MG is happy to have a meeting with Cllr DA to discuss further if required.	
7.19	MG ran through recent NLE community engagement activities, including a school site visit (page 19 of presentation). With regard to Skills and Employment information, MG confirmed the Strategic Labour Needs and Training (SLNT) target for the duration of the entire project has already been met.	
8.0	Kennington Station re-zoning (<i>standing item</i>) Not discussed.	
9.0	Future agenda items inc. dates of next meetings	
9.1	PB would like to know what is going to happen with Kennington Station in the future. MT advised that when the work to increase interchange (cross passages) between the different branches of the Northern line is confirmed by the business, this will be communicated.	
9.1	MTh advised that about 7/8 methods have been proposed for	

	Item	Action
9.2	<p>building the cross-passages. This may affect the interchange between the Bank and Charing Cross branches at Kennington Station. Once this is confirmed – hopefully by the next CLG – then more detail will be provided.</p> <p>DB advised Southwark Council is due to approve the methods used for monitoring passengers at Kennington Station. Cllr DA will pick this up next week at the Kennington Park CLG.</p>	
10.0	AOB	
10.1	<p>JL asked for the dates for future CLGs to be confirmed as soon as possible please. Cllr DA advised an attempt will be made to keep these on a Tuesday if that is best for everyone. MT advised the meetings could take place on other days of the week if required (avoiding Fridays).</p> <p>Post-meeting note: The next meeting will now take place on Wednesday 10 January 2018.</p>	NLE/Cllr DA
10.2	<p>With regard to the proposal being reviewed by the Planning Committee in November, JL asked Cllr DA why he believes it is more likely to be considered at the second meeting of the month on 28 November. Cllr DA advised the first meeting on 7 November already has a packed agenda, however he will check again.</p>	Cllr DA
10.3	<p>NC asked at what point does not having approval for the Head House start to delay the project. MT responded to advise TfL already has outline approval to build the Head House, however it does need the proposal to be approved, so procurement of items inside the Head House can take place. NC asked for confirmation of a date. MT advised it would be sometime next year. NC asked again for confirmation of an exact date.</p> <p>Post-meeting note: <i>The contractual arrangements between TfL and FLO is commercially sensitive so providing a detailed breakdown of our cost and programme information is not possible.</i></p> <p><i>The head house and landscaping is an important aspect of our scheme and as such we have spent significant time and resources designing and consulting on this, despite already having Transport and Works Act Order Powers to construct one. We believe the design we have submitted to Lambeth provides the best balance between our technical requirements and the views of the community, stakeholders and Lambeth as the determining authority for planning conditions attached to the Transport and Works Act Order. We have sought to accommodate as much of the wishes of local residents as we are able to, clearly explaining our reasons when we have not taken a suggestion forward. For this reason, we do not think that any further design reviews will lead to any further improvement in the time available or be the best use of limited public resources. If the approval of detail is not granted at a</i></p>	NLE

	Item	Action
10.4	<p><i>forthcoming Planning Committee there will inevitably be an impact, and we are conscious of not wanting to delay the benefits of the scheme for thousands of people who will use the extension each day.</i></p> <p><i>Our programme remains targeted for completion in 2020. We are carefully managing all work streams to minimise the risk of changes to parts of the programme impacting our completion date.</i></p> <p>MT requested it be minuted that there is no need for rudeness at the meeting. A letter was received following the last meeting claiming project staff had been smirking and not taking these meetings seriously, which MT advised was untrue. MT had to seek the Chair's involvement to dispute these claims, as the complaint was passed to the highest levels of the organisation.</p>	
10.5	<p>NC confirmed he wrote the letter mentioned by MT and stands by it. He is happy to discuss further after this meeting. MT responded to advise the issue is now closed.</p>	
10.6	<p>Cllr DA brought the meeting to an end and thanked attendees for their participation.</p>	

Meeting started at 18:32 and closed at 20:05
 Minutes drafted by MW