

MEETING NOTE

SUBJECT	South Kensington Station (SKS) redevelopment Consultative Working Group (CWG) Meeting No. 9
VENUE	Ampersand Hotel, Harrington Road, SW7
DATE	Wednesday 14 September 2016, 3 pm – 5 pm

ATTENDEES	<p>TfL Team: Jeremy Castle, Director – Central London Planning, Deloitte Real Estate (JC) Scott Anderson, Senior Property Development Manager, TfL Property (ScottA) Christopher Phiniefs, Principal Project Sponsor, London Underground (CP) Richard Zavitz, Project Sponsor, Station & Interchange Development (RZ) Amy Thompson, Communications and Engagement Manager, TfL (AT) Justin Holland, Buckley Gray Yeoman (JH) Nick Sutcliffe, Director, HardHat (NS) Georgina Garland, Account Manager, HardHat (GG)</p> <p>Local Representatives: Amanda Frame, Kensington Society (AF) Edward Davies-Gilbert, Knightsbridge Association (ED-G) Sophie Andrae, Brompton Association (SA) Jan Langmuir, Thurloe Residents Association (JL) Claire Brisby, Thurloe Residents Association (CB) Robert Berg, Pelham Residents Association (RB) Vioraca Bergman, South Kensington & Queens Gate Association (VB) Eva Skinner, Onslow Neighbourhood Association (ES) Caryl Harris, South Kensington & Queens Gate Association (CH) Guy Bondonneau, South Kensington Station tenants association (GB)</p> <p>Apologies: Susanna Trostdorf, Onslow Neighbourhood Association</p>
------------------	--

MINUTES

1. Welcome

NS from HardHat welcomed everyone to the meeting and noted the apologies from Susanna Trostdorf and Matt Yeoman.

NS introduced Amy Thompson, Communications & Engagement Manager at TfL.

Each participant around the table introduced themselves.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

There were no matters arising from the minutes and they were agreed.

3. Station arcade roof repair update

AT gave an update presentation on the latest works of the roof repair. AT visited the site that morning and reported that the protective crash deck is installed and the clear glass replacement works is on-going.

The team has carried out a full survey of the plasterwork and found it was defective, and in some areas detached from the brickwork. Where possible the original plaster is being retained. A detailed study was carried out on the paint work layers across the arcade and based on this the arcade will be painted cream. This will be a match for the original colour. Copies of the paint analysis are available for request.

The rotten sections of the rafters have been removed and replaced with new timber for stability. The steel works are causing delay to the programme due to the need to find a solution acceptable on heritage grounds. The wall has moved slightly and stabilising works are required. Steel wire 10 mm thick will be used. Phase 2 of works begin end at the end of the month. Representatives are invited to arrange to visit the site if they would like to see the repairs.

SA added that Ed Morton kindly engaged in finding the right solution for the stabilisation and avoiding crisscross wire stabilisers all the way down the arcade which would have been more intrusive. Ed Morton advised that the steel wires would only be required at each end of the roof structure helping reach agreement with the Council.

4. Around station development (ASD)

ScottA introduced the update to ASD and stated that TfL are aiming to settle on a proposed base scheme shaped by the on-going consultation. The next step is to procure a development partner for delivery of the subsequent stages of design through to delivery. As it is now, this is not the proposed finalised scheme. The partner will also bring additional ideas and expertise.

JH gave a presentation on the design proposals for each element of the ASD. JH said the summary of the main elements of the scheme have been sent to RBKC for comment. NS added that there are two copies of this report in the room and that soft copies were circulated on Monday.

CB asked for clarification that it has been given to RBKC for comment? AF asked who at RBKC as there are two elements to RBKC – councillors and planning team (case officer). JH confirmed that it has been sent to the case officer for comment.

JH continued with the presentation and provided background to how the station has evolved over time.

Pelham Street

JH discussed the options considered for Pelham Street, and outlined how the base case was chosen. For example, with Option 2 (town houses) the plot is narrow and has no space for a buffer to the Pelham Street pavement edge.

JH showed the sketch of how Pelham Street might look if developed with the base scheme option. This image has been adjusted marginally so it is to scale with the recently completed survey of the street. JH explained the set back elements are important as well as the Oxblood interface to create a smaller transition link.

In respect of the supporting structure beneath ground level, JH said that there would be a rhythm to existing historic and additional new columns, aligned to the revetments. RBKC preference regarding the view from the island platform is that it is better to accept this is as a working station and leave everything open rather cover up cables and operational equipment.

SA said that the design approach just shown for Pelham Street is a big change to what has previously been shown as it is proposed to have retail

all the way down the street. JH and ScottA said that they thought retail was presented previously, and that the last few units further from the station were proposed as retail or office, so there is opportunity for some offices. They added that they are aware the corner is a concern to Pelham Residents Association and will return to this point later on at the meeting.

RB said this information is important to Pelham Residents Association, especially the height and added that he believes the base scheme is too high. Pelham Street is proposed at four storeys, not the preferred two. Residents are also concerned of the effect of retail on Pelham Street after 5 – 10 years has elapsed and change of use creeps in. RB added that to have retail all the way down Pelham Street is regarded with some trepidation.

AF asked RB if Pelham Residents Association would prefer to have offices at Pelham Street. RB said yes, a mix of office and residential would be preferable. RB added that Nicholas Gould as a lawyer is concerned about the difficulty with enforcing restrictive covenants or resisting change of use in the long term.

SA said that she hadn't seen retail proposed at the corner of Pelham Street previously. CH added that she feels RB is correct and it's a horrific thought to have cafes lining the street. AF added that it would be equally negative to have a mini Sainsbury's.

ES said that if offices or retailers are unable to pay rent, then it may end up being a café or fast food. ScottA said the retail strategy suggests there is a place making opportunity for niche food and beverage sales to residents, which will animate the street and be of a manageable scale.

RB said that he had mentioned the example of the V&A bookshop at the previous meeting. SA added that in the area it has been noted that A1 use always gets changed to A3 at a later date. AF said this was the case with Natwest and Pizza Express. SA added that the extent of change of use is now a very sensitive issue locally. JL said that the new burger establishment letting has had a negative impact on the area.

SA stated that all residents agree that they do not want the whole of Pelham Street as retail and this matter has been previously fought with TfL on earlier applications. SA added that retail at the station end of Pelham Street is fine, but not on the corner of Pelham Street and Thurloe Square Bridge. CB stated she supports not having the whole of Pelham

Street as retail, and ideally would prefer residential.

ScottA said residential at ground floor creates a problem because of its proximity to the railway line. CB asked why? JH explained that the limited depth from street was challenging because a residential entrance would normally be set back from the street.

ES stated that it can also be difficult to put residential at ground floor as people do not like being overlooked from the street. As such, can offices be put in place? ScottA confirmed TfL would look into office use on parts of Pelham Street.

AF asked what was meant by saying the proposals would like to 'celebrate the corner'? Is it being celebrated by putting a penthouse on top? The design has poor elevations on the corner and this element should break from the 'line'.

RB said there is an opportunity on the corner and it is disappointing if the plans go forward without further thought. Time is needed to think about this as there are flaws in the scheme, which will cause undue confrontation with the residents associations.

JC returned to SA's point regarding the Wellcome Trust on the width of the street. JC said that the proposed pavement at Pelham Street is a wider than that at the Wellcome Trust.

JL asked if the new frontage of Pelham Street is one storey higher? JH said yes it is. ScottA said the plans are not set in stone and they are still consulting and will take views on this.

ES said she understands that the Council didn't like retail here. ScottA said this view has not been given to TfL by the officers.

RB said that it is a fair comment regarding residential at lowest level but little investigatory work has been done on the feasibility of offices. RB urged that TfL need to pause and look into this. ScottA reiterated that TfL will look into office use on Pelham Street.

VB suggested putting storage or garage space at the lower floor. JH said planning does not look upon that approach favourably. JC added that the area needs an active frontage.

ScottA said the team will pause and consider feedback. TfL will

endeavour to respond to these comments in the final version of the development brief.

ScottA said he would like to have responses to the draft in two weeks after which he would reissue a final document for the group's final views. AF asked if it is to go to officers or councillors? ScottA said to the officers and they consult with the councillors.

AF pointed out that the Council are currently consulting on health and wellbeing in the area, including air quality and fast food. The Council want to reduce fast food in the Borough and as such AF states that fast food should not be implemented at Pelham Street. RB added that in five years time TfL will have lost control of the unit uses.

ScottA said that he thought the retail proposals for Pelham Street were shown at the previous meeting. NS added that there was an extensive discussion of the comparative examples of localised retail at the last meeting. CP added that the discussions have been about the quality of retail.

JL responded that she could remember the presentation on retail and that the response was that the group do not want too much retail as part of the proposals, and as such TfL should not be surprised that the group isn't happy.

VB said the example streets (e.g. Store Street) in the previous meeting's presentation are different to that at Pelham because they are wider streets with parking on both sides or one-way, etc. AF said that something needs to be worked out that can address the group's fear about having changes to use of units in five years. SA added that the Brompton Association prepared drawings on how they believe the corner should be presented and that it showed residential not retail. CB suggested that the crossroad could be celebrated as a creative feature.

Thurloe Street

In respect of Thurloe Street, AF asked about the achievement of the shop front changes with the various length of leases? ScottA added that they can be done when the leases expire. AF asked if TfL can tell the group which leases are long and may not be able to change shop frontage soon? ES asked if they've recently given a 6 year lease to the new burger establishment? ScottA said yes this is the case. ES asked if they will have to wait that long for a façade update? ScottA said yes, it will take

until 2022 to be changed, which is when the station upgrades are anticipated to be finished.

Bullnose

AF and ES asked if an extra floor is being put in the bullnose, and at what height. ScottA confirmed that an extra storey was in the proposals, and that drawings were just indicative at this stage, and exact height would be confirmed once more detailed plans were drawn up.

AF asked about the proposed use, which will be restaurant or gallery use. AF asked if outdoor seating will be in place? JH said terrace is part of the current proposals. AF, ES and JL responded that their associations will oppose having tables and chairs outside on grounds of visual impact and impact on residential amenity. JH said that they were also considering a winter garden so it will be partly enclosed. AF said they will have to have this far set back because of the length of view from street level. AF, JL, ES and CB said they will be opposed to outdoor terrace space because it will cause noise and nuisance. AF said that they have had the same issue at Notting Hill. AF added that plant should not be placed on the roof.

ScottA said that the views have been heard and the open terrace on the bullnose will be removed from the brief.

JL asked if the arcade shop frontages will be replaced? JH said the original frontages will be upgraded. VB asked where the staircase up to the second level of the bullnose will be, and it was shown where the entrance would be from an opening on Thurloe Street.

ScottA asked if the group was otherwise happy with the bullnose. AF said they want to see all the detail. JC pointed out that they are consulting now so development partners can see the group's comments before taking the design evolution further. The brief will have both RBKC and CWG comments included.

RB questioned the change in timescales for comments and the development brief to procure a partner. ScottA said comments from group will be needed for the development brief at the end of Septmeber. CH said that TfL are not meeting her association until the 5th October. RB reiterated the need for a deadline for comments, rather than saying 'in two weeks'. Representatives need time to consult with their members. ES said that her association will be against massing and terrace on bullnose as it changes the view.

AF reiterated the need for a deadline for comment and added that the group would like to give a joined up response, but two weeks from today is not long enough. More for warning is required because they have other consultations on at the same time.

ScottA said he will check the timescale and respond with a definitive deadline by email. RB suggested setting up a diary invite to circulate as a deadline for comments with a reasonable timescale.

VB asked about the servicing needs of the shops at Pelham. JH said everything will be from the front. CB said her association will oppose servicing from Thurloe Square.

5. Station upgrade proposals

CP gave an update on the station upgrade proposals and thanked AF for her formal comments sent to RBKC on behalf of the Kensington Society. The letter prompted RBKC officers to request a meeting with the TfL team to review the design of the proposal and way forward for the listed building consent application.

CP explained that the costs of the station upgrade has increased since the original cost estimate. The increase in cost is attributed to the need to demolish and rebuild the dis-used eastbound platform, the addition of the interchange overbridge, and the construction challenges of the emergency walkway.

It is proposed to delay the delivery of the interchange overbridge to the mid 2020s when the station demand will require the additional infrastructure. As a result, the design can be updated to take advantage of the removal of the operational units on the platform. This will enable a cleaner design and more direct passenger routes.

A secondary means of escape is still required for the new eastbound platform and is proposed to be a staircase from the platform directly to Thurloe Square bridge. The structure will be of a high quality design. A similar escape stair will be provided on the westbound platform during a later stage. The two emergency staircases will be smaller structures than the combined emergency walkway and will provide direct access to street in the case of an emergency.

CB asked if the new eastbound emergency exit will need a new doorway to Thurloe Bridge. CP said there will be a new opening made. AF suggested a connecting link could be added between the two stairs running alongside Thurloe Bridge parapet to achieve the over bridge in a much simpler form. There was some discussion about the extra distance involved, though the proposal will be investigated as part of the next stage of design.

Turning to the platform canopy, CP said the design of the columns is being addressed with the help of specialist heritage input. The exterior of the extension to the ticket hall was shown, with longer narrower windows to match the historic style. The design of station upgrades is being developed in more detail during September. AF asked if in conclusion today's presentation is to update on changes to the over bridge and the emergency exit, canopy and the ticket hall. CP confirmed this was correct.

CP finished on the point that all TfL projects are currently being reviewed due to the current financial position. Although additional funding was approved, cost savings are required to continue with the proposed Phase One works.

6. Future meeting date

Wednesday 12th October 2016 at 3 pm.