

Metropolitan Line Extension (MLX) Community Liaison Group Three Rivers

Wednesday 5 October 2016
TS Renown, Cassio Bridge, Watford Road, WD3 3DG

Attendees

Name	Organisation
Cllr Philip Brading (PB) – Chair	Three Rivers District Council
Paul Judge (PJ)	Transport for London
Olivia White (OW)	Transport for London
Paul Lambe (PL)	Transport for London
Carlo De Napoli (CdN)	Transport for London
Alan Cartwright (AC)	Transport for London
Paulo Lotter (PLo)	Taylor Woodrow
Cllr Chris Lloyd (CL)	Three Rivers District Council
Cllr Alison Wall (AW)	Three Rivers District Council
Cllr Rupert Barnes (RB)	Three Rivers District Council
Helen McCormick (HM)	Hertfordshire County Council
Cllr Andrew Hobbs (AH)	Croxley Green Parish Council
Doug Brodie (DB)	Representing Croxley Green Business Park
Linda Field (LF)	Owner Croxley Cars site
Matthew Scott (MS)	Croxley Cars

Apologies

Name	Organisation
Cllr Steve Drury	Three Rivers District Council & Hertfordshire County Council
Cllr Peter Getkahn	Three Rivers District Council
Cllr Jeremy Hollands	Croxley Green Parish Council
Barry Grant	Croxley Green Residents Association
Ann MacDonald	Cassiowharf
Tony Walker	Croxley Hardware
Steven Hancox	Workman LLP, on behalf of Columbia Threadneedle (Croxley Green Business Park)

	Item	Action
1.0	Welcome and introductions	
1.1	Glenn Keelan the MLX previous Programme Director has now left TfL. Paul Judge is now acting lead for the project.	
2.0	Review of previous meeting minutes	
2.1	Minutes from the meeting on 15.06.16 were agreed by the group to be accurate and no changes suggested.	
3.0	Update on project	
3.1	<i>The presentation given at the meeting has been uploaded to Metropolitan Line Extension (MLX) webpage.</i>	
3.2	PJ presented an update on the project since the last Community Liaison Group (CLG) meeting on 15 June.	

3.3	PJ explained the extra train purchased as part of MLX has arrived in London after testing in Derby and is due into service at the end of October. PJ confirmed the train has no additional features which will identify it from the other new trains on the line.	
3.4	PJ provided an update on the design work. He explained each design package requires formal London Underground approval, before being officially complete. The first designs have now been signed off internally. The Network Rail design work is less mature than the civils section, but are still progressing well.	
4.0	Update on enabling work	
4.1	PLo presented an update on the current and upcoming utility diversion work.	
4.2	PLo explained Baldwins Lane sewer diversion work is currently taking place and is on schedule to be completed on 22 October. There is another sewer diversion needed ahead of the viaduct construction on Watford Road. This is planned to take place in January and February after the Christmas embargo on highways work. The team are working with Hertfordshire Highways on approvals for the work.	
5.0	Noise assessment and mitigation	
5.1	PL and CdN presented an overview of the noise assessments undertaken for the project and the mitigations for construction and operational noise.	
5.2	It was requested that the list of areas where baseline noise monitoring has taken place in Three Rivers and noise levels is circulated with the minutes.	OW to send with minutes
5.3	Post meeting note: the attached note provides an overview of the baseline noise readings produced for the project.	
6.0	Questions	
6.1	Cllr Wall (AW) asked if the Code of Construction Practice and Section 61 submissions required sign off by both Watford (WBC) and Three Rivers (TRDC) councils. OW explained that the project team has already met officers from TRDC and WBC to discuss submissions. For the viaduct, which spans both authorities, it was agreed that the organisations would work together to ensure there are not differences in the Section 61s placed on the project by the two councils.	
6.2	Cllr Hobbs (AH) asked if TfL is looking to set up an office on site and if so where. PJ said the project office location was still to be decided, the team were exploring a variety of options including co-locating with the main works contractor.	
6.3	AH asked if the outcome of the value engineering work discussed at the last CLG meeting would create substantial changes to the project. PJ explained that the project must remain within the conditions of the Transport and Works Act Order and the requirements of the project scope, set by the funders and the promoter of the scheme (HCC).	

6.4	<p>AH asked what the main risks were in relation to environment. PL said the project faced normal construction risks as expected on a job such as MLX.</p>	
6.5	<p>DB asked what timescales the project was working towards. PJ said that TfL wanted to be on site as soon as possible but the project team need to undertake further work on the procurement plans before a start on site date can be committed to. PJ stressed that the priority for the project is developing the procurement plans and taking them through the internal approval process.</p>	
6.6	<p>Cllr Brading (PB) said that at the last Community Liaison Group Glenn Keelan had said the expectation was to appoint Taylor Woodrow as the main works contractors. He asked what the impact of not going down this route was. PJ said that when the project was transferred over to Transport for London from Hertfordshire County Council so was the two stage design and build contractor. Since taking over delivery of the project, TfL has developed the project as Hertfordshire County Council intended, which included using Taylor Woodrow for the design and enabling works (stage one) and main civil work (stage two). This procurement set-up has not proved value for money and further work is being undertaken on an alternative procurement plan. TfL was therefore unable to confirm the start on site date until this work has been done.</p>	
6.7	<p>LF explained that the situation was difficult for landowners such as herself or her tenants who are trying to run businesses without knowing when they will be asked to move out. LF explained that having received the Notice of Intent to compulsory purchase land, she is aware that with three weeks notice she could be asked to move tenants off land. LF asked why TfL sent out the Notice of Intent when the project start on site was not confirmed. LF said communications could have been better with landowners.</p>	
	<p>PJ responded that he understood this was a difficult situation for landowners. The Notice of Intent was sent when it was envisaged work would start in summer 2016 and the strict compulsory purchase timetable meant sending the Notice of Intent out provided the project with flexibility.</p>	
	<p>PJ said the team needed to fully explore the procurement strategy prior to awarding the civils and structures main work contracts. The land purchase will only commence when the main work contractor in place. PJ confirmed no land will be acquired under the Order this year. OW said that the Transport and Works Act requires TfL to have taken possession of land for the project by July 2018. PJ committed to ensuring more regular communications with LF through the property team, even if no certainty of timescales were available.</p>	<p>OW to organise with property manager</p>
6.8	<p>MS asked if any indication of the start on site programme could be provided. PJ re-emphasised that the project's priority was developing a procurement strategy which provided value for money. Until this work has been done, TfL is unable to confirm when land will be acquired and a start on site. PJ said once the details of the procurement route was confirmed, TfL would communicate this to the local community.</p>	
6.9	<p>Cllr Lloyd (CL) said the communications around utilities works had been good but greater communications is needed to communicate the current status of the project.</p>	
6.10	<p>AW stressed her sympathy for landowners such as Linda Field. AW asked</p>	

	<p>if there will be consistency with the Programme Manager as there seemed to be a tendency for TfL Programme Managers to move roles a lot. PJ said the duration of a Programme Manager can vary but that he had no intention to move off the programme. He had been with the team approximately two years.</p>	
6.11	<p>AW asked if there was a chance that the project was going to miss the July 2018 date to acquire land and therefore the project could not happen. PJ reiterated that the focus for the project team was to work through the procurement plan. Whilst the team are keen to get on site, TfL has a duty of care to ensure the project is delivered for best value especially as the majority of money is third party or taxpayer funded. PJ also said the MLX has significant local political support, will help realise significant economic growth locally and is supported by a Mayoral decision.</p>	
6.12	<p>PB asked if there had been any change in thinking about the project centrally now a new Mayor had settled into post. PJ said that the Mayor's Transport Strategy will be announced later this year and will provide more direction over the priorities during the Mayor's term. PB said that TRDC would be happy to welcome the London Mayor to the area to help inform his understanding of the challenges and benefits which the project would bring to the local area.</p>	
6.13	<p>A local resident who is new to the area asked where more information can be found about the project. OW explained that background information and a historic overview of the project can be found on the Croxley Rail Link website www.croxleyrailink.com. This covers activity up to August 2015. More up to date information can be found at tfl.gov.uk/met-line-extension. Any specific enquiries can be sent to MLX@tfl.gov.uk</p>	
6.14	<p>A question was raised about the June CLG minutes 3.15 post meeting note. The resident queried that there will be a reduced frequency for passengers. PJ said that there will be capacity on the Metropolitan Line for 10tph to Croxley, with capacity for 6tph from Croxley to Watford Junction from the Metropolitan Line Extension and 4tph turned around at Watford Met and directed back onto the main branch of the Metropolitan Line to maintain the 10tph capacity.</p>	
6.15	<p>Mrs Scleater (local resident) said there was considerable local support for keeping Watford Met station open. She asked what the business case for closing the station was if empty trains would be reversing there. PJ said that the closure of the station is part of the agreed scope of the MLX project that was included in the Transport and Works Act Order. The rationale for the closure has been documented in reports from the London Transport Users' Committee (London TravelWatch) and the TWAO Public Inquiry. PJ explained keeping the station open would increase MLX delivery and operating costs.</p>	
6.16	<p>Michael Fish (local resident) said that at the Public Inquiry the quoted figure for the MLX was £120m this has now risen considerably which would affect the business case for closing Watford Met station. PJ stressed that the business case remains that it would not be cost efficient to keep Watford Met open to passengers. The issue has been raised at the MLX strategic board and it was agreed with there is no appetite to change the scope of the MLX for this issue.</p>	
6.17	<p>Michael Fish also asked about the safety on the live line up to Croxley. He</p>	

	<p>believed there will be substantial times when no trains are running, which will provide an increased safety risk to trespassers. He said TfL had a safety obligation to reduce the risk of trespasser. PJ confirmed prior to bringing the scheme into use the project would need to produce a Safety Case and demonstrate that all safety hazards, including those to the public had been removed, reduced or mitigated and were ALARP (As Low As Reasonably Practicable). The project was confident this will be achieved. Furthermore the project continues to engage with the Office of Rail and Road (ORR) regarding its safety management approach.</p>	
6.18	<p>Fabian Hiscock (TS Renown) said that over the last 8-9 months the sea cadets and Morris Minors had noticed a considerable increase in flooding near the entrance to the carpark. He queried if it was a result of the utilities works on Baldwins Lane and tree removal in the car park. PLo said this was unlikely to be due to the utilities works.</p>	
6.19	<p>Fabian Hiscock also asked about the Thames Water diversion on TRDC playground. OW said the project team were aware of the expectations from the TS Renown tenants and TRDC that the playzone is moved prior to any significant sewer diversions work. OW explained that a meeting had recently taken place with Three Rivers District Council and Hertfordshire County Council about the land and further conversations were needed with Network Rail. As these discussions were still ongoing, TfL had put the Thames Water work on hold. OW committed to keep Fabian Hiscock and Mick Morris updated on progress.</p>	
6.20	<p>A resident asked how many car parking spaces would be available at Cassiobridge. OW confirmed at Cassiobridge station there will be a car park with 146 standard spaces plus 10 disabled parking spaces.</p>	
6.21	<p>A resident commented that the project team needed to be aware of the impact work would have on local residents and needed to be considerate in the timing and information provided. PJ agreed communications was very important but at the moment the project was limited in the detail it could provide, especially around timings.</p>	
7.0	<p>Croxley station name</p>	
7.1	<p>OW provided an update on requests to rename Croxley station Croxley Green station.</p>	
7.2	<p>CL stressed there was more than 'some local ambition' for the name to be changed to Croxley Green station. The station had been called Croxley Green previously and reflected the name of the town.</p>	
7.3	<p>Ross Humphries (local resident) said that he had previously been told by TfL that the signs were all that would need changing. He made the offer on behalf of the Croxley Green History Project to start the local funding of renaming the tube station back to its original name with an offer of £500.</p>	
7.4	<p>OW said TfL understood that the MLX offers a potential opportunity to change the station name, as maps will be changing anyway for the two new station. TfL currently believed there may be other charges as well as station signage and as such had committed to undertaking a complete review of costs by Q4 2016. OW stressed that there was currently no budget as part of MLX or within TfL for changing the station name.</p>	

8.0	Croxley step free access	
8.1	OW presented an update on the potential use of match-funding for step free access at Croxley station.	
8.2	OW suggested the step-free access team update at the next meeting once the feasibility study had been completed.	OW to add to next agenda
9.0	AOB	
	n/a	
10.0	Next meeting	
10.1	MLX team to suggest the next meeting date.	

Meeting started 18.30 and finished 20.00

Minutes drafted by OW

Minutes distribution list

The minutes will be distributed to CLG members and attendees and put up on the MLX webpage on the TfL website. In addition they will be circulated to the below people and those signed up for the MLX updates:

- Peter Simons, Three Rivers District Council
- Helen McCormick, Hertfordshire County Council
- Andy Smith, Watford Borough Council
- Kathryn Robson, Watford Borough Council
- Lucy Gravatt, Hertfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership
- Councillor Stephen Giles-Medhurst,
- Councillor Martin Trevett
- Councillor Terry Douris
- Councillor Ralph Sangster
- Councillor Nigel Bell
- Cllr. Ann Shaw
- Mike Morris, Morris Minors
- Fabian Hiscock, Rickmansworth & Watford Sea Cadets