

MEETING NOTE

SUBJECT	South Kensington Station (SKS) redevelopment Consultative Working Group (CWG) Meeting No. 6
VENUE	Radisson Edwardian Vanderbilt, 68-86 Cromwell Rd, London SW7
DATE	Wednesday 15 June 2016, 3 pm – 5 pm

ATTENDEES	<p>TfL Team: Jeremy Castle, Commercial Development, Transport for London (JC) Scott Anderson, Senior Property Development Manager, TfL (ScottA) Michael Crabtree, Lead Sponsor, Station Development, LU (MC) Richard Flindell, External Relations, Transport for London (RF) Jennifer Henderson, SCU Project Engineer, LU (JHen) Eddie Jump, Structural Engineer, Pell Frischmann (EJ) Justin Holland, BuckleyGrayYeoman (JH) Nick Sutcliffe, Director, HardHat (NS)</p> <p>Local Representatives: Amanda Frame, Kensington Society (AF) Edward Davies-Gilbert, Knightsbridge Association (ED-G) Sophie Andreae, Brompton Association (SA) Caryl Harris, South Kensington & Queens Gate Association (CH) Jan Langmuir, Thurloe Residents Association (JL)</p>
MINUTES	<p>1. Welcome</p> <p>NS from HardHat welcomed everyone to the meeting and noted the apologies from Christopher Phiniefs, Michael Bach, Robert Berg, Bob Mabon, Claire Brisby, Traci Weaver, Susanna Trostdorf and Eva Skinner.</p> <p>ScottA informed the meeting that Edward Butler-Ellis has left TfL. Richard Flindell was attending from the communications team.</p> <p>Each participant around the table introduced themselves.</p>

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

NS noted that the previous minutes and the full Q&A for the Christie's meeting has been circulated and will be placed on the website alongside the presentation. There were no matters arising and the minutes were agreed.

3. Station arcade roof repair update

ScottA informed the meeting that the works were scheduled to commence in early July and would be completed by December. The scope has already been approved by Ed Morton on behalf of the Brompton Association and he will sign off on the final specification before the works commence.

The works are external but include replacement of the glass. SA asked whether there will be internal repainting. This detail will be clarified in time for the next meeting.

4. Station upgrade proposals

MC presented a set of updated Computer Generated Images which are work in progress seeking to address the points raised in the previous meeting with the RBKC planning officers. The revised material will be completed for the next meeting with officers on 29 June.

AF asked if the Group has seen the latest pre-app response letter and MC confirmed this was the case as there is a delay in receiving letters after meetings have taken place.

MC commented that the officers appear to be placing greater emphasis on the much later Edwardian island canopy than the Victorian revetments. This view is driving the further refinement to the design of the new platform canopy which looks to take themes from the existing canopies whilst emphasising the highly significant revetments.

Alan Baxter Associates has been retained to provide supplementary specialist heritage input. .

AF asked for clarification on the different briefs for Alan Baxter Associates, BuckleyGrayYeoman and John Smith Architects. MC explained that Alan Baxter Associates' brief is to research the historical

background and support JSA on the listed building application. BGY are working on the around station proposals.

MC introduced the new CGIs showing an opaque treatment for the lift shafts in the extension to the ticket hall level. The roof structure in this area will be taken close to the revetments without fixing to it. The revetments will be exposed with a half-height glass screen and balustrade. A flashing would be installed to provide weather protection to the ticket hall extension. SA asked if the created recess would be lit and MC confirmed it would, by means of hidden strip lighting as appropriate.

AF asked what the green bands were and MC explained these were for visual contrast to meet disability legislation and can be seen on the existing island platform.

MC explained that red brick was proposed for the new build element of the ticket hall level which will help emphasis the revetments rather than try to match them as previously shown. The red takes its design theme from the high level bricks in the existing ticket all and the less detailed, red brick revetments beyond the original platform. EDG remarked that there are many different types of red brick from the routine house brick to specialist heritage bricks.

AF queried whether copying the oxblood tiles was an option but MC pointed out that these were much later (Edwardian era, circa 1907) and the Oxblood building was deliberate separate finish to match other Piccadilly line stations.

MC presented the revised canopy profile. The new canopy has a revised pitch which echoes the original as seen in the marks on the revetment return. The forward cantilever takes its datum from the island canopy. The colours on the new canopy will match the shades of yellow and green as existing on the island canopy rather than the standard Circle/District line yellow/green colours as shown in the CGI. Also the CGI has not yet achieved the desired connection between the platform canopy and the canopy over the stairs to the ticket hall.

The platform canopy will stand free of the revetments and the horizontal glass facing the island canopy will be opaque as self-cleaning glass requires a gradient.

The overbridge will also stand clear from the revetments and use redbrick but not as red as shown in the CGI. The canopy above the overbridge

will be solid not glazed.

MC explained that after the officer feedback on 29 June, a drop-in session for the public will be held in July to display the approach prior to the listed building application being made. JL and EDG asked for the date to be publicised as soon as possible.

AF said that the revisions addressed her previous concerns about the platform canopy. EDG added that he was more comfortable with the shift away from the butterfly shape. SA said she agreed. CH said she disagreed and liked the butterfly style before as it was lighter and more of the revetments could be seen. CH said it was sad that this has been ruled out as it was beautiful.

MC responded that it was also a question of the structural challenges and having to beef up certain elements. AF agreed that it had been losing its original airiness as it developed. MC added that in making the changes an over fussy approach had been avoided.

SA agreed that it was a functional canopy and its come a long way and needs to progress to the end point. AF said it would be good to see the final images when they are completed.

AF asked about the external brickwork for the extension to the ticket hall. MC replied that the previous approach had been reviewed – notably the brick colour. It was suggest that the windows need to reflect more closely those which can be seen in the 1950s photo of the old platform or still in situ at High Street Kensington in terms of size and rhythm. SA agreed this was useful as High Street Ken shares the same architecture.

5. Around station development proposals

JH & EJ presented the lead option currently being investigated in detail for the Thurloe Street building. This is for the light-touch renovation including a new station entrance accommodated in one of the existing shop units.

In order to be able to confirm whether the light touch option was technically possible a full measured survey is being conducted. The objective will be to obtain a better understanding of the different floor levels, the heritage shop fronts and the retail footprints.

EJ added that the study would help confirm whether the new station stair

and lift could be accommodated within one unit. If necessary the unit could be widened slightly by cutting into the side wall to allow the lift to fit.

AF asked if there is a floor plan for the basement but JH said this hasn't been done yet.

SA said it was very encouraging that the entire block was not being demolished. SA added that Alan Baxter's had done the study for the Brompton Association 10 years ago so it would be worth consulting them for their knowledge.

EDG asked what the next steps were and JH confirmed that further work would be undertaken to confirm whether the option was achievable based on the detail provided by the measured survey. This would be presented to a future meeting of the CWG.

JH moved onto the bullnose and said that both options are still being considered – retaining the existing height and adding a storey.

ScottA said that the retail survey will help inform this. AF queried what could be accommodated on an upper floor. ScottA suggested retail, offices or a gallery but it would come down to the commercial risk of expanding the space. JH said that there was no objection from the planning officers to an extra storey.

SA asked about the 'hidden wall' of the original station located behind the bullnose. JH said that Alan Baxter Associates were undertaking a report on the station's heritage which would include this. JC added that the purpose of this work was to assess and clarify what is of significance in relation to the listing. AF queried why this was necessary but SA said the listing statement is not clear and there is legal issue within the curtilage of the listing.

JH presented further drawings for Pelham Street. These focused on the link between the oxblood building and new development. In particular there is a challenge in respect of levels as the box containing the Piccadilly Line escalators prevents level access from the street adjacent to the oxblood building.

Three options for linking to the oxblood building were presented incorporating external or internal steps to overcome the difference in levels.

AF queried the legal position with disability access. JH explained that this would be a matter for building regulations. A shell would be provided and the imperative would be on the occupier to achieve level access. AF questioned whether planning permission would really be granted on such a basis. AF cited appeals dismissed because of access.

JL expressed concern that the Pelham Residents Association was not present at this discussion. JL said that the association has concerns about servicing adding to the problems next to the station.

JL added that another development at the other end of the street has been rejected again. There is also an ongoing problem with unloading hours for the pedestrianised section of Thurloe Street not being adhered to.

AF said there was concern among residents and councillors about retail and a residential only development would solve the level issues.

SA said that the Brompton Association study in 2005/06 supported shops. The concern now is about cafes with tables and chairs outside. It was important not to miss the opportunity completely. EDG said that the aspiration should be for something like the Cadogan development at Sloane Street / Pavilion Road. SA agreed with the quality of this scheme which improved the public realm in the vicinity of Cadogan Gardens.

AF said the shops along Holland Park Avenue are a good example of what to aim for and the early deliveries tend to work. AF said that Peter Ridge is the freeholder for most of the shops. SA said that Timothy Jones, formerly an inspector for Historic England now worked with Cadogan.

JL asked if there would be longer term leases for retailers and ScottA confirmed this would be the approach.

AF asked for an update on the position of the Mayor of London regarding affordable housing. ScottA said it was too soon to determine any conclusions for the scheme.

SA concluded that the approach for this part of Pelham Street looked very good and compared well to the Stanhope proposals which took the mansion block opposite as the starting point for height.

AF asked how the proposal will look at the rear. JH presented information showing the historic revetments below Pelham Street, which run two-thirds of the way along the cutting. In front of the revetments are original columns and heritage beams. The columns supported the original barrel vaulted ceiling. Alan Baxter Associates are looking further at this but the work is proceeding on the basis that the columns are original.

JH said a screen will be required to block views of the unsightly operational cables running along the revetments. SA asked what the screen would be made of. JH said he was interested in views on how this could be formed. It could be for advertising but this is still to be determined.

JH explained that the additional new structural columns would match the revetment spacing. AF asked for clarification of the white boxes shown. JH said that at platform level these are signalling equipment and above is for a lift pit for the new residential.

AF suggested a different type of lift be used, queried the acoustic considerations for new residential and requested indicative detailing for the new build elevations as seen from inside the station. JH said that further detail would be provided but not in the form of a finished façade.

6. Programme timeline

JC circulated the scope for the development brief which will be discussed with the officers at the next meeting. The brief will be circulated among the group for comment in August / September. The Council will be asked to provide a formal written opinion in September.

JC explained that ideally TfL would like the CWG to prepare its own written comments / observations on the brief as an outcome from these meetings.

AF said that the biggest concern was how flexible it would be to allow developers to change it. ScottA said the aim was to allow developers to add their expertise rather than change it as the brief would constrain the scope for change.

EDG said that previously TfL as landlord has had very limited control and suggested that this needs to change. He also observed that TfL is clearly more proactive than in the past. AF asked about the retention of the architect as part of the brief to avoid the big fear of starting all over again.

CH said there was still a fear from the Pelham residents in Malvern Court about the proposed retail. ScottA said there would be more detail to share in July.

AF highlighted the need to avoid a repeat of the Newcombe House planning application where the opposition arose at the eleventh hour. Concerns need to be addressed head on. JL highlighted the ongoing confusion among some residents over the fire exit even when it is explained they don't always understand.

7. Future meeting dates

NS reiterated forthcoming meeting dates which are 6 July, 14 September and 16 November.