

**MEETING NOTE**

<b>SUBJECT</b>	<b>South Kensington Station (SKS) redevelopment Consultative Working Group (CWG) Meeting No. 12</b>
<b>VENUE</b>	<b>Rembrandt Hotel, 11 Thurloe Place, SW7</b>
<b>DATE</b>	<b>Wednesday 24 May 2017, 3 pm – 5 pm</b>

<b>ATTENDEES</b>	<p><b>TfL Team:</b></p> <p>Dan Moor, Associate Partner, Weston Williamson + Partners (DM)  Alice Eggeling, Senior Heritage Consultant, Alan Baxter Ltd. (AE)  Richard Zavitz, Project Sponsor, TfL (RZ)  Adam Leach, External Communications, TfL(AL)  Scott Anderson, Senior Development Manager, TfL (ScottA)  Amy Thompson, Communications and Engagement Manager, TfL (AT)  Nick Sutcliffe, Director, HardHat (NS)</p> <p><b>Local Representatives:</b></p> <p>Michael Bach, Kensington Society (MB)  Amanda Frame, Kensington Society (AF)  Edward Davies-Gilbert, Knightsbridge Association (ED-G)  Sophie Andreae, Brompton Association (SA)  Jan Langmuir, Thurloe Residents Association (JL)  Guy Bondonneau, South Kensington Station tenants association (GB)  Caryl Harris, South Kensington &amp; Queens Gate Association (CH)  Viorica Bergman, South Kensington &amp; Queens Gate Association (VB)  Nicholas Gould, Pelham Residents Association (NG)  Michael Goar, Pelham Street Residents Association (MG)</p> <p><b>Apologies:</b></p> <p>Robert Berg, Pelham Residents Association  Claire Brisby, Thurloe Residents Association  Eva Skinner, Onslow Neighbourhood Association  Allan Thomson, Lead Sponsor, TfL</p>
------------------	---

## MINUTES

### 1. Welcome

NS from HardHat welcomed everyone to the meeting. Each participant around the table introduced themselves. NS explained that Weston Williamson & Partners had been appointed to work on the final proposals for the station capacity upgrade.

### 2. Minutes of the previous meeting

There were no comments on the minutes.

### 3. Station upgrade proposals

Richard Zavitz (RZ) recapped the principles behind the station capacity upgrade and the feedback previously received from the CWG.

AF asked if the design had developed in a way that addresses RBKC's suggestions though moved away from the design principles and feedback from the CWG. RZ confirmed that the design had been developed to address all the comments received, though the previous team was not able to provide an acceptable response.

RZ explained that Weston Williamson & Partners had been appointed to work on design optimisation through a process of review and suggesting changes. At this meeting WWP would review the base design and go through the proposed changes. The June meeting would look at the detailed changes proposed. It was intended to hold a public exhibition in July to present the new proposals given the extent of change since the proposals were shown to the public almost a year ago. The revised proposals would also be placed on the website ahead of the listed building application and the Royal Borough's consultation. MB said that the RBKC will not actively lead a consultation, instead only provide opportunity to receive comments.

Dan Moor (DM) from Weston Williamson & Partners explained the principles the practice would be adopting for the station upgrade. The new platform canopy would work with the full height of the revetments rather than cut across them.

The extension to the ticket hall would be simplified and reconfigured to reduce the visual impact on the heritage revetments. The proposed footprint of the extension would be reduced. The layout of the ticket hall

would be modified to place the two new lifts closer together, between the two staircases with a dedicated waiting area. This would improve flow, and allow a better line of sight from the ticket barriers to the new stairs. It would also improve the waiting zones for the lifts by having a combined waiting zone for both lifts. This is better at busy times to reduce potential conflict of flows.

NG asked if there would be two lifts from street level to the platforms. It was confirmed there would be lifts from the street to the ticket hall, and then two lifts from the ticket hall to the platforms, and one lift from the ticket hall to the subway

DM summarised that the revised design for the ticket hall extension would provide a cleaner, simpler form with a better design relationship to the listed revetments such as for the roof line of the new stair.

The design for the secondary means of escape has also been reconsidered. DM said that they have looked at minimising the impact on Thurloe Square Bridge by providing just one escape point which reuses an old access point on the bridge.

NG asked if this would be an entrance. DM confirmed it would be a fire escape only. JL asked how wide the emergency exit would be. DM said the combined width would be less than the two separate exits.

DM explained the revised approach to the canopy to make it lighter in relation to the revetments to avoid obscuring them. DM explained that when looking up at the existing island platform canopy from underneath you see up to the top of the glass pitch rather than the steel support on the edge creating a higher sense of space.

A canopy raised to the top of the revetment arches would allow them to be seen rather than compete with them. The canopy would be aligned to the top of the arches. DM confirmed the glass approach is not suitable as the angles needed for self-cleaning glass are higher than proposed. A solid canopy can reduce the maintenance need, and provide a reduced structure. Given that the previous design was lower solid canopy, this would feel quite low and intrusive. DM presented the comparative sketches showing the base scheme and the revised front section of the canopy.

AF asked if the canopy design would still have been changed if it had not been solid. DM said it wouldn't have worked anyway because the slope

was not sufficient for the self-cleaning glass to work.

AF asked where the landscaping would be incorporated as there was concern about the previous poor standard of public planting and what that looked like. The details of the drainage proposal will be explored and shared when available.

MG asked about the materials for the top of the canopy as it would be visible from Thurloe Square. Also, would the canopy be the full length of the platform? RZ said that the interchange area is not yet resolved and DM said that the new canopy could end where the Edwardian canopy ends on the island platform. DM confirmed that materials would be part of the look and feel work which still needed to happen.

MB asked if there would be seating at the back of the platform and would there be a plan for how this would be set out? DM said this would be included at the next stage along with signage and other details.

AF raised the issue of advertising and DM said this would also be covered at the next stage though gave assurances that this will be sensitively incorporated.

CH said it was really good that the design approach is now to go higher with the canopy and the layout for the ticket hall is better with the lifts. "It's a huge improvement - I can see good design and really appreciate it". SA agreed that the design was much improved and said she was pleased to see it had progressed.

AF asked about RBKC's design advice and how TfL would resist lots of changes like last time. RZ the difference this time is that the proposals will be presented as a finished whole and with reference to the support from the CWG. RZ confirmed that TfL would need to seek the Council's opinion, and hoped they would see how the proposals presented a simplified design which did not compete with heritage features.

EDG asked about the timing of the public exhibition if it was going to after the next CWG on 20 June as mid-July to early September was the cut off period for holidays. JL also pointed out that August should be avoided for the submission of the application for the same reason and MB added that there was only 21 days for the RBKC's comment period.

AF asked if security considerations were being reviewed given the status of exhibition road as a magnet for visitors and tourism. RZ said this was

kept under constant review.

#### **4. Around station development (ASD) – verbal update**

AF asked about the position with the around station development and SA asked if the station improvements would be delivered ahead of the around station redevelopment. NG asked if there would be a financial contribution from TfL towards the station improvements?

ScottA explained that the first stage of the OJEU procurement process was complete and six selected bidders are starting work on stage 2 submissions of indicative ideas and heads of terms. Their responses are expected in July. In August TfL will invite the three best bidders to prepare more detailed proposals and compete commercially as well. TfL will deliver the first phase of the station improvements ahead of the around station development. TfL will fund the station improvements.

The partner will be selected by the end of the year and the aim will be to introduce the partner to the CWG and other stakeholders early next year. No names would be revealed during the process, only the winner at the end. The selected bidder's scheme would be indicative and not a planning application ready for submission.

NG asked what would happen if the ideas received in September conflict with the brief. ScottA said that while the base scheme will inevitably change through the bidder's input and expertise, bidders' proposals won't be able to be in significant conflict with the brief as TfL wants a scheme that receives broad support.

SA asked whether the scoring criteria will include compliance with the brief and if so what proportion of the scoring? ScottA said the scoring would be 60% technical and compliance, while 40% would be commercial. SA asked where design came into this and ScottA said this was a significant part of the 60% scoring for technical.

AF said that the big fear was that the bidder responses will say it is not viable. ScottA said that the bidders' proposals will be informed by our Development Brief. JL asked if this process was bespoke to South Kensington and ScottA confirmed that this was so, as South Kensington would be an exemplar project.

VB asked who would be responsible for commercial lettings inside the station ticket hall and ScottA confirmed this would be TfL's responsibility.

RZ added that the ticket machines would be moved to their original location and operate at speed, with high functionality and occupying less space.

MB asked what the wider roles would be when the ASD is completed. ScottA said that the Joint Venture (JV) partners would co-own the retail. Outside the station the JV will be responsible for the new space and the JV partner would be expected to be a long term TfL partner as well as the developer.

ScottA explained the make up of the JV is anticipated to be 51% share for the joint venture partner and 49% for TfL. However significant JV decisions will be made on a 50/50 JV partner and TfL share of decision responsibility., Significant decisions will include planning applications and retail strategy.

MB commented that the community's concerns about retail matters have hardened since Five Guys and adds to pressure against the proposed retail approach. ScottA said TfL is looking for a partner with significant retail experience including experience of curation of a retail area.

MB asked if the CWG meeting notes are being provided to the bidders.

ScottA said that the bidders were being encouraged to review all the presentations and meeting notes, and all materials are available online.

GB asked what would happen if the developer cooked the books to win and then rowed back from commitments. ScottA said that the schemes prepared by the JV partners would be measured against a criteria of achieving 90% of the bid value. If 90% isn't achieved the JV won't be formed and the scheme won't progress. This will limit any potential risk of that developers going back on their commitments. The JV will be structured to align the interests of the partners so the partnership is sustained.

GB asked what would happen if the JV partner went bankrupt and AF asked about the takeover by another company with a different approach. ScottA said there would be alienation and other legal provisions that afford some protection for TfL.

MG asked for explanation of the 90% minimum value condition. ScottA said bidders are required to achieve 90% of the bid value to encourage bidders to propose schemes that they are confident will be successful and

viable.

VB asked if there has been interest in the Pelham Street opportunity. ScottA said that we don't yet know, but expect there will be.

#### **5. AOB**

ScottA provided an update on the arcade and roof maintenance which is nearly finished. The work on the roof over the small office behind the arcade and ticket hall is coming to an end and the scaffolding will be down by July.

SA said she was pleased to see it restored and looking very good.

MB asked if the timescale for the delivery of step free access was still the same and this was confirmed as 2022 for completion of all phases.

#### **6. Future meeting dates**

- Tuesday 20 June 2017 at 3pm in the Games Room at the Ampersand Hotel, Harrington Road.