

MEETING NOTE

SUBJECT	South Kensington Station (SKS) redevelopment Consultative Working Group (CWG) Meeting No. 3
VENUE	Games Room, Ampersand Hotel, Harrington Road
DATE	Wednesday 9 December 2015, 3 pm – 5 pm

ATTENDEES	<p>TfL Team: Jeremy Castle, Commercial Development, Transport for London (JC) Scott Anderson, Senior Property Development Manager, TfL (ScoA) Christopher Phiniefs, Principal Project Sponsor, LUL (CP) Richard Zavitz, Project Sponsor, Station & Interchange Development (RZ) Edward Butler-Ellis, Strategic Communications, TfL (EB) Dominic Synnott, Senior Building Surveyor, Group Property, TfL (DS) Mike Ashworth, Design & Heritage Manager, Transport for London (MA) Matt Yeoman, Director, Buckley Gray Yeoman (MY) Justin Holland, Associate, Buckley Gray Yeoman (JH) Nick Sutcliffe, Director, HardHat (NS) Georgina Garland, Account Manager, HardHat (GG)</p> <p>Local Representatives: Amanda Frame, Kensington Society (AF) Michael Bach, Kensington Society (MB) Edward Davies-Gilbert, Knightsbridge Association (ED-G) Caryl Harris, South Kensington & Queens Gate Association (CH) Sophie Andreae, Brompton Association (SA) Jan Langmuir, Thurloe Residents Association (JL) Eva Skinner, Onslow Neighbourhood Association (ES) Robert Berg, Pelham Residents Association (RB) Susanna Trostdorf Onslow Neighbourhood Association (ST)</p>
MINUTES	<p>1. Welcome</p> <p>NS from HardHat welcomed everyone to the meeting and noted the</p>

apology from Traci Weaver and that Susanna Trostdorf (ST) is attending instead for the ONA. NS added that Mr Berg (RB) hoped to join the group for the second half of the agenda. Amanda Frame (AF) added that Michael Bach (MB) would be late. Each participant around the table then introduced themselves. Jan Langmuir also joined the meeting at the start of Item 4.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

Minutes were reviewed and agreed with the exception of item 4, page 3, paragraph 6 where EB requested to clarify that there will be a non-stopping service of the Piccadilly Line as part of station upgrade, not line or station closure. NS noted that this error had been carried into the planning item on the station published in the Knightsbridge Association's latest annual report.

3. Confirmation of 2016 meeting dates

It was agreed that forthcoming meetings will be held on the second Wednesday of each month. Next meeting is scheduled for 3pm-5pm Wednesday 14th January 2016. The venues will be advised once forward bookings are confirmed.

4. Station maintenance programme – scaffold and arcade roof repairs

DS explained the programme of maintenance work required for the arcade:

Reason For Maintenance Works

- The roof has moved by approximately 40mm across the whole span which has displaced leadwork on roof trusses leading to wetrot on the timbers which has caused a number of roof timbers to twist & split causing the glass to break. We now have in excess of 20 cracked panes which urgently need to be replace.
- We also have have cracks that have appeared internally on the gable ends of the roof which also need to be addressed.

Access to roof and protection to the general public

- Before any works can start we need to construct some temporary scaffolding.

- One being a crash deck to the underside of the glass roof, this will protect the general public.
- We need an access gantry from Thurloe Street up to the roof positioned outside Millies Cookies.
- We need a scaffold to enable the actual roof maintenance works to take place.
- The two gable ends to the roof require temporary supports to prevent any further movement.

Actual maintenance works

- The existing glass is Georgian Wire Cast and it is to be replaced on a like for like basis using Georgian wired cast safety glass.
- The defective roof timbers and deteriorated lead work needs to be replaced.
- The cracked plaster at high level at each end of the roof on the inside needs work. This will be inspected when access is available and it will be either repaired or replaced as deemed necessary. It will look identical when complete.
- The Arcade will also be repainted and we will seek advice from RBKC listed building officer on colours.

DS explained maintenance works to replace the glass will be undertaken during engineering hours and crash deck will be erected above the shop fronts to protect the general public.

Sophie Andreae (SA) reiterated her previous concern about the scale of the works and having carried out a review of a previous structural report. SA suggested this was potentially excessive and the perception arose that claims of structural issues suited the case for wholesale re-development.

DS said that 20 panes of glass have broken and it has become a risk to the general public. The replacement glass will be like for like as it is manufactured in the same process as the Georgian glass currently in the arcade roof.

SA asked how many panes of glass are in the arcade. DS said he was not certain of the exact number but stated there are around 50 on each side. AF added that the glass is not going to be like for like because replacement cannot be the same as the listed glass. Historic England

had just issued guidance on listed glass and they don't allow replacement and everything present at the time of Listing is covered. SA stated that she would like Edward Morton of the Edward Morton Partnership to offer an opinion on the proposed works and their rationale.

NS added that the replacement is urgent and something that TfL has needed to do for many months. DS agreed and said works need doing immediately for public safety and will take 12-16 weeks with crash deck removed once the glass is replaced.

At this point, NS introduced MA who is the Design and Heritage Manager at TfL. MA explained that the listing is being taken seriously and he will review all the technical documents. NS confirmed that TfL is very willing to meet Edward Morton on site to inspect the roof, share information and photographs, and review the works in light of Edward's input. SA expressed her satisfaction with this and it was agreed that this would be arranged via ScotA. Progress and information will be reported back to the next CWG.

5. Station upgrade proposals – new platform canopy and new over bridge

CP gave a presentation to refresh the background to the station upgrade proposals and provided an update. MB asked about the delivery timeline for the lifts. CP explained that work is on-going as part of the concept design to assess the phasing and delivery programme with the possible acceleration of the lifts. The concept design is a third of the way through. AF asked when it will be discussed again by the group. CP said that concept design is scheduled for completion at the end of January so the lifts can be discussed at the February CWG meeting.

CP explained the additional challenges to the programme including the need to rebuild the entire platform structure due to the poor condition of the existing structure and the operational need for an overbridge. CP went on to explain that available investment money at TfL has been reduced as a result of the 2015 Autumn Statement. As a result of the spending review, TfL are challenged to maximise the value for money and may affect the prioritisation of providing lifts that only provide access between ticket hall and platform levels. NS added that the works programme has also expanded to include a new overbridge.

MB stated that there needed to be time to take on board the groups comments on the evolving design. ES asked if there would be a public exit from the overbridge to Thurloe Square. It was confirmed that there would not be a public exit.

RZ stated that the focus of the design for the features at platform level (e.g., platform, canopy, stairs, overbridge) is to enhance the views of the revetments and to keep them integral to the design. In addition, the design will be continuous across all features, be of an appropriate scale for the operational need, and be lightweight to reduce visual impact on heritage features.

RZ suggested that it was not desirable to copy the island canopy because it is a very heavy structure with limited transparency. This type of structure would mask the revetments. Instead, it is proposed to take a modern design approach with transparent features and open concept. Through this, the new canopy will enhance the views of revetments.

MA endorsed this approach and confirmed that the existing canopy is a collection of design interventions and does not form part of a consistent historical period. MA added that a major driver in the design principles is heritage so they are designing a free standing structure that does not need to tie into the revetments for structural support. MA said that there will be continuity in design throughout the new installments. MA said that there is opportunity to bring all the new elements together in a design with continuity including the stairs and overbridge. MA went on to explain that they are currently at concept stage and have learnt from other projects such as Paddington Station upgrade to ensure that the revetments will be accessible for maintenance works and carrying services.

EB asked for thoughts on the design choice between pastiche versus contemporary. SA said it is not a case of being contemporary or not, it is about the quality of the design and build.

MB asked if the overbridge will be similar to the one at Gloucester Road which seemed poorly used. MA said it will be similar in the sense of it providing a link and also a means of escape as was the case at Gloucester Road.

AF asked if following the pattern of the existing platform columns had been looked at as an alternative form of alignment. SA disagreed and stated that they should be aligned to the revetment arches. AF added that it should be allowed to not be tied and should act as almost an alien structure. MA said that he has sketched such a structure and felt it was too strong for the station which needs to be refined and more respectful to the existing heritage.

MA said there is a challenge in ensuring design language is carried over to the overbridge. The chosen approach is to ensure appropriate height of overbridge and escape whilst minimizing visual impact of the bridge and

using a design language respectful of the context of the listed building. An update on progress will be delivered at the next meeting.

AF asked how the stairs would be covered and drew attention to the dog leg in the stair on the new platform which did not seem optimal to continue the design of the canopy across the over-bridge. MA said the layout is work in progress but a straight stair would extend further along the platform and affect the view of the revetments. MB asked if the whole overbridge would be covered, which MA confirmed was the intention for the operational component. The emergency route to Thurloe Square may be uncovered. CP said he hoped there would be some 3D images available for the January meeting.

NS concluded the discussion by welcoming the helpful steer that a high quality contemporary design could be acceptable.

6. Buckley Gray Yeoman presentation and Q&A

NS introduced Matt Yeoman (MY). Jeremy Castle (JC) explained the reasons for inviting BGY to present directly to the group to hear the views and address the questions. This was ahead of their further work so the content of the presentation would not be new for everyone as various presentations have been made before.

MY began his presentation by stating that he wanted to hear thoughts on the architecture of the around station development. He provided BuckleyGrayYeoman's (BGY) credentials and stated they were chosen for South Kensington project because of their experience with grade II listed buildings such as the Crown Estate on Regent Street. MY also added that they worked on the pilot study for South Kensington Station and understand the context as being a global destination with a village feel. There were three elements to the work – the arcade, Thurloe Street and Pelham Street.

SA asked if a survey had been carried out on the arcade shop fronts. MY said there has been and not all shop fronts are the same. MY explained that Heritage England have been consulted about the concept design and showed early in-house visuals of how the shop fronts could come together with a double floor.

SA queried that the material had been shown before and JC restated that he had explained at the start that this was not new work. AF said that this had been objected to previously. MB said that not everyone had seen it.

RB asked about what input is being obtained in respect of security advice for the station proposals in light of recent events. RZ said that TfL had a specialist team to review security arrangements.

Edward Davies-Gilbert (ED-G) said that there had been particular objection to the terrace at first floor level because of the potential noise impact. ED-G added that local people do not wish to have more restaurants.

SA pointed out that the buildings are listed which occurred following the 2004 submission by the Brompton Association. The wording in the listing was limited in scope but this was a reflection of TfL's pressure at the time to limit the extent of listing. SA said that not raising the roof was critical.

MB asked if the bullnose is appropriate for two storeys and AF said it was not suitable for a mega Waitrose. AF asked if the brief is to increase the retail. MY replied that it was to *improve* the retail and added that the listed building can be worked with to create an appropriate design, for example the vent is no longer required and can make way for more retail without raising the roof.

RB asked what can be done about the short term leases which at present limit investment by the retail occupiers. EB stated that TfL are currently looking at their lease portfolio across the group and are looking to improve the present mix at South Kensington. Scott Anderson (ScoA) acknowledged RB's point that longer leases could encourage greater retailer investment and suggested retail could be discussed at a subsequent meeting.

ED-G asked how much liaison TfL have with South Kensington Estates. ScoA confirmed that TfL is in contact with South Kensington Estates. SA stated South Kensington Estate have a proposal for a mansard expansion on Thurloe Street. SA said that the TfL terrace makes a positive contribution, is well built and TfL should look at refurbishment rather than a façade retention. SA shared the Thurloe Street shopfront drawings. JC said that the design brief has been amended to require full retention to be examined along side the façade retention option.

RB said that SKE isn't interested in curating their portfolio, they are in the business of maximising rents. ScoA suggested that the type of occupiers are a response to demand in the area. Eva Skinner (ES) and Suzanna Trostdorf (ST) added that restaurants are a product of demand from tourists, not those who live in the area. Local representatives agreed that

they do not want any more food establishments. EB said that TfL are dependent on the bids that come through for the units. RB said that non-food retailers need to be encouraged. EB said that this could be discussed at a later meeting when the plans for around station have progressed.

ES asked MY if he was briefed to provide a click and collect at the station as it was previously proposed. MY said the brief does not extend that far.

MY continued by stating that Pelham Street has the potential for 3 storeys and that a break is needed between the old and new buildings which could be formed by a retail unit followed by the series of town houses down the street. There could be 4 or 5 stories at the end.

RB commented that 4 to 5 stories would over dominate Pelham Place and the incremental value would not be worth the battle for TfL. RB observed that the properties opposite were just cottages and at a pinch point.

AF summed up that the proportion of development overall has decreased but there are some sacred cows such as the bullnose.

MY summarised the feedback he felt had been received at this CWG which includes: the arcade roof to stay low, a mansard to Thurloe Street but try to work with the building as is, Pelham Street approach is acceptable. MY asked about more retail along Pelham Street? Caryl Harris (CH) said the street is narrow and there have been objections to offering retail opposite the station because the capacity for footfall is not good. SA referenced 45 Pelham Street and the Cluttons office opposite site towards the Fulham Road.

AF returned to the proposed town houses and said she would prefer to see lateral flats and SA said the key thing is that the architecture is right.

ES added that the bullnose is important. MY said that the arcade was originally built as a commercial development. AF said it didn't have to stay that way. ED-G asked if it was possible to get a heritage lottery fund grant for the maintenance and refurbishment as it is listed.

ScoA reiterated TfL's plan to progress the scope and design of the development with thorough consultation with local stakeholders. ScoA asked for all the groups participating in the CWG to send through any other background papers and previous reports which they wish TfL to consider as part of the development of the latest proposals. ScoA

requested this be supplied prior to or at the January meeting so that it could be taken into account as the design development continued.

RB said that he felt there is a lot of common ground between TfL and the associations. MY asked if in the local representatives' view, the building could go up to four floors. AF said that it couldn't go straight up as four floors but potentially with the top floor being a mansard. MB added that providing non-restaurant, good quality retail offer would be good for the station and the area.

The meeting closed at 5 pm.

7. Date of next meeting

Wednesday 13 January 2016 at 3 pm at the Rembrandt Hotel, Thurloe Place SW7 2RS.