



## Northern Line Extension

### Kennington Green Community Liaison Group (CLG)

Tuesday 24 January 2017  
Durning Library, Kennington

#### Attendees:

Name	Organisation
Cllr rep: Claire Holland (Cllr CH) (CHAIR)	LB Lambeth
Jon Kirkup (JK)	Transport for London
Melanie Barker (MB)	Transport for London
Michael Tarrega (MT)	Transport for London
John Tucker (JT)	Transport for London
Mabel Garcia (MGa)	Ferrovial Laing O'Rourke (FLO)
Carla Arnold (CA)	Ferrovial Laing O'Rourke (FLO)
Rob McCarthy (RM)	Ferrovial Laing O'Rourke (FLO)
Marcus Lyon (ML)	Resident and business owner
Tristan Standish (TS)	Resident
Leanne Standish (LS)	Resident
Priscilla Baines (PB)	Resident / Heart of Kennington Residents' Association
Neil Collingridge (NC)	Resident
Sarah Northey (SN)	Resident
Edward Hutchison (EH)	Resident
Polly Hutchison (PH)	Resident
Judith Lyons (JL)	Resident
Joshua Rennie (JR)	Resident
Tim Purcell (TP)	Paperlink
Annette Fowkes (AF)	Resident
David Harkness (DH)	Resident
Peter Laverack (PL)	Resident
Julie Page (JP)	Resident
Pauline Hoare (PHo)	Resident
Chris Cossey (CC)	Resident
Dilys Cossey (DC)	Resident
Galem Jabbar (GJ)	Resident
Daire Wheeler (DW)	Resident
Susanna Dobson (SD)	Resident
M. Evers (ME)	Resident

Penny Calder (PC)	Resident
Ritchie Calder (RC)	Resident
Bridget Bell (BB)	Resident
Sandrina Carosso (SC)	Resident
Martin Summersgill (MS)	Resident
Michael Poole-Wilson (MPW)	Resident
Kate Hoey MP (KH)	Member of Parliament for Vauxhall
Steven Hoare (SH)	Resident & Member of The Georgian Group
Mark Walker (MW)	Admin support (minute taker)

Apologies: None

	Item	Action
1.0	<p><b>Introductions and apologies</b></p> <p>1.1 Cllr CH opened the meeting and explained that she will be standing in for Cllr Jane Edbrooke as Chair this evening. Due to the high number of attendees, Cllr CH suggested that rather than everyone introducing themselves now, it would be better if people state their name before addressing the meeting. Cllr CH has to leave promptly at 8.00pm.</p> <p>1.2 With regard to item 6 on the agenda (<i>‘Re-landscaping the green, including a proposal from Edward Hutchinson’</i>), Cllr CH suggested that this should be discussed at the end of the meeting..</p>	
2.0	<p><b>Minutes of the previous meeting</b></p> <p>2.1 Cllr CH asked if everyone has a copy of the minutes from the previous meeting and invited comments on any accuracy issues. No comments received.</p> <p>2.2 ML commented that as the minutes often arrive so long after the meeting has taken place, it is difficult to comment on their accuracy. ML asked if minutes could arrive no later than ten days after a meeting. MT agreed that minutes of meetings will be made available within two weeks of a meeting taking place.</p> <p>2.3 The minutes from the CLG on 20 October 2016 were agreed as a true and accurate record of the meeting.</p>	TFL
3.0	<p><b>Northern Line Extension progress update and presentation (attached)</b></p> <p>3.1 MB gave a presentation which focused on the SCL tunnelling works and step plate junction and included the following detail:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Update on progress of tunnelling – Sprayed Concrete Lining (SCL) and Step Plate Junction (SPJ)</li> <li>• Timber headings underneath the Kennington Loop</li> <li>• Pilot tunnel</li> <li>• Overdig tunnel</li> <li>• Installation of props to protect ‘live’ TfL asset</li> <li>• SCL invert tunnel</li> <li>• Kennington Green SPJ look ahead</li> <li>• Kennington Green possessions (<b>NB:</b> subject to change for LU operation reasons)</li> <li>• Kennington site logistics</li> </ul> <p>3.2 RM gave a presentation which focused on the environmental monitoring carried out as part of the project, including:</p>	

	Item	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise monitoring (red line on graph highlights trigger levels, green line shows predictions from noise experts):               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Monitoring locations around Kennington Green</li> <li>- Two exceedances in October</li> <li>- Night-time triggers have all been due to emergency vehicle sirens and not NLE works</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Air quality monitoring:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Off-site activities led to higher readings in October. However, the acoustic enclosure has helped to reduce dust and noise levels</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
3.3	<p>MB provided more information on the ground and settlement monitoring currently being carried out in the Kennington Green area. This is a combination of manual and automated monitoring, with two Automatic Total Stations (ATS) installed on lamp posts on Methley Street and Ravensdon Street. These will remain in place until the completion of tunnelling in 2017.</p>	
3.4	<p>MB confirmed the working hours for the Kennington Green site. NLE has applied to Lambeth Council to allow for cement deliveries over the weekend, as a contingency measure.</p>	
3.5	<p>MG provided an update on how NLE has reacted to external feedback received.</p>	
3.6	<p>MG confirmed that three different options for the artwork to appear on the site hoardings have now been received. A final decision is yet to be made and if anyone wants to input into this process, their views will be considered.</p>	
3.7	<p>MG provided a summary of complaints received in relation to the project. A full list is provided to local authorities on a monthly basis, with names and contact details removed in accordance with Data Protection requirements. To date, over 600 cases have been resolved, with approximately 90 on-going. Since September 2016, 380 separate cases have been logged, including 39 active cases and 85 active enquiries.</p>	
3.8	<p>MG outlined the various engagement activities carried out in connection with the project. This included a visit to Kennington Park Academy, which led to the pupils providing a name for a TBM.</p>	
3.9	<p>MG outlined the various skills and employment activities being undertaken in relation to the project, including a schedule of Socially Necessary Labour Time (SNLT) in conjunction with TfL. 27 vacant positions have been advertised via local job brokerages, with 8 positions filled by local people. MG highlighted the case of Gabriel Jetawo, a local person who has recently secured a permanent role with an NLE contractor via the Second Chance charity. NLE has also committed to a series of five workshops with Sacred Heart School in Kennington as part</p>	

	Item	Action
	of the Foundations for the Future initiative, with one workshop having taken place already.	
3.10	MG asked that rather than contact her or other project staff directly, people make contact with the project via the NLE 24/7 Helpline (0343 222 2424 – Option 1) or dedicated email address ( <a href="mailto:nle@tfl.gov.uk">nle@tfl.gov.uk</a> ).	
3.11	Cllr CH asked for any questions arising as a result of the update presentation.	
3.12	JL asked if anyone could provide an update on the structure that is scheduled to be erected at NLE’s Montford Place site. MB responded to advise a tent is being erected on the far side of the site, near the Chivas Distillery. This will be used to store spare parts for the TBMs until the end of the tunnelling process. It is not an acoustic shed and its construction will only take place during normal core hours.	
3.13	TS still does not think that lorry drivers are turning off their engines. This is causing a pollution problem and site foremen need to be more severe with offending drivers. RM advised that the project takes this issue very seriously and he will look into this problem. TS responded to advise that this issue has been a problem for the past two years and the situation is not good enough. Cllr CH highlighted the Council’s ‘no idling’ policy.	<b>RM (FLO)</b>
3.14	JR asked for more details of NLE’s engagement with Sacred Heart school, as mentioned earlier. MG responded to advise that as part of the Foundation for the Future initiative, NLE is continuing engagement with a school to establish an on-going relationship and promote STEM. Five workshops will take place over the course of a year, including site visits. One workshop has already taken place, with four more scheduled. If JR requires further details, MG is happy to discuss further outside of the meeting.	
3.15	TS advised that at the previous CLG, he requested the site hoardings be moved back, however this was not included within the minutes of the meeting. TS reiterated his request for TfL to give residents a two-way street back. He has spoken to David Darcy of FLO about this issue, as well as Michael Barrett of TfL, who agreed with TS. Local people should have access to their homes and properties. MG responded to advise that she has discussed this issue with David Darcy and there is no space to move the hoardings at present, however they will be moved back as soon as possible. MG highlighted the fact that all the necessary permissions are in place for this work to be carried out.	
3.16	ML requested information on monitoring for properties in this community. MG responded to advise that she has compiled a dossier on this subject. ML requested a diagram to be made available at the next CLG. MB responded to advise that automatic monitoring of settlement resulting from TBM operation might not be appropriate but this can be covered at	<b>TfL/FLO</b>

	<b>Item</b>	<b>Action</b>
	the next CLG. ML believes this to be an important issue.	
3.17	ML believes this is the best attended Kennington Green CLG to date. He welcomes the fact that the local community is being listened to and asked if it would be possible for the meeting to vote on the three different hoarding design options presented earlier by MG. MG confirmed this to be acceptable. Subsequently, a show of hands indicated Option C to be the overwhelming preference of the attendees at the meeting.	
3.18	Cllr CH invited any further comments arising from the update presentation. No further comments received.	
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Traffic Management</b>	
4.1	MT confirmed that this is a standing agenda item if anyone has related comments.	
4.2	Cllr CH invited additional comments and acknowledged the earlier comments from TS relating to vehicle idling.	
4.3	TP requested that the turning area is yellow-lined, so that no-one parks there. MT confirmed that TfL will liaise with Lambeth Council about this issue in advance of the next CLG, to see if this request is possible.	<b>TfL</b>
4.4	JL explained that her property sustained damage as a result of someone driving into her wall. The one-wall street makes it very difficult for drivers.	
4.5	AF has noticed that for drivers travelling up Kennington Road from the south, there is no signage indicating that Kennington Road splits and continues with further properties on the left. This is causing confusion, especially for delivery partners, as the current signage indicates that these three houses are in Montford Place, when in fact these are in Kennington Road.	
4.6	DH advised that lots of drivers are heading up to 350/352 Kennington Road and then turning round because they have gone the wrong way. He agrees that clearer signage would definitely be beneficial.	
4.7	LS recently had to tell some workers which road they were in, so believes FLO needs to better educate its workforce.	
4.8	PL has seen HGVs drive into Montford Place and then get into difficulty on the narrow stretch between the site hoardings and houses. He believes there needs to be some sort of indication/signage stating that this part of the road is not suitable for HGVs.	
4.9	MB confirmed that this feedback relating to traffic management will be passed to Lambeth Council.	<b>NLE / TfL</b>

	<b>Item</b>	<b>Action</b>
4.10	MG advised that NLE holds monthly traffic management meetings. She is aware of a number of HGVs unrelated to the project that have got into difficulty.	<b>NLE / TfL</b>
4.11	Cllr CH believes that these issues should be brought up at the joint meetings.	
4.12	AF has seen six-axle vehicles get into difficulty, so signage definitely needs to be clearer.	
<b>5.0</b>	<b>Head House engagement proposals</b>	
5.1	JK explained that copies of the proposed engagement plan for the Kennington Green Head House have been circulated at this meeting. A previous application was submitted to Lambeth Council and was refused on the grounds of appearance and its impact on a conservation area. As a result, further engagement is proposed, with drop-in sessions scheduled for late February. These sessions will be used to capture further views from the local community, with this information used to develop proposals and produce options that will then be consulted in a more structured approach.	<b>NLE / TfL</b>
5.2	JL requested that future public consultation events take place in locations convenient to local residents, unlike last year. JL also commented that Durning Library is a good location, as is Marcus Lyon's Studio.	
5.3	KH asked if it might be helpful to have conversations with local residents about the design of the questionnaire. Also asked if TfL is engaging because it is looking to change the design of the Head House completely, or is this really a tokenistic change that will not affect the fundamentals of the design?	
5.4	JK responded to advise he is happy to discuss the questionnaire in smaller groups. In terms of the consultation, this will be around the appearance of the Head House. Not much can be done about the size of the building, or massing, and options related to that have already been carefully explored. but we are looking for views on the exterior design.	
5.5	PL challenged the statement from JK that all options with regard to massing requirements have been considered. PL would like this to be revisited.	
5.6	JK advised that this was done at a much earlier stage and we are now at a much more advanced stage. He cannot see how the massing can be reduced.	
5.7	PL commented that when doing an initial design, it is standard procedure to design something bigger than what is required, so he challenged JK's statement again. PL confirmed to the meeting that he is an engineer by	

	Item	Action
	profession.	
5.8	DH commented that a document he has seen during discussions with John Tucker (JT) at TfL suggested that that the massing could be changed.	
5.9	JK responded to state that the documents are clear. Lots of work has been done to look at all the different options but the design cannot be done differently.	
5.10	JT responded to advise that the document referred to by DH was put together to challenge initial assumptions around Head House. It outlined assumptions that had not been tested at that stage, so in isolation, the document could have given the impression that the massing of the Head House could be altered. However, JT is comfortable with the significant review that has since taken place.	
5.11	Neil Collingridge commented that it is quite clear that the majority of people believe the Head House is going to be a monstrosity. The design needs to be looked at again, otherwise TfL runs a real risk of losing the planning committee again.	
5.12	SH introduced himself as a local resident and a member of the Georgian Group. He asked if anyone from the project has met with the Georgian Group, as stated in the proposed engagement plan for the Kennington Green Head House. SH also stated that the Georgian Group is incorrectly referred to as the Georgian Society in the engagement plan.	
5.13	JK apologised for the error and confirmed that a meeting with the Georgian Group would take place as per the engagement plan.	
5.14	SH advised that he was mortified when he saw the brick samples presented last year in Brixton. He has a friend who used handmade bricks for a recent project. The bricks used for the Head House need to reflect the local buildings (1785-1810).	
5.15	TS advised that he has been in touch with David McKinstry, Secretary of the Georgian Group. TS understands that the small samples previously presented as options for the Head House came from TDM, a manufacturer in Holland. TS would like TfL to consider a local brick (e.g. Lambeth Stock) and consider a bigger sample board.	
5.16	JK confirmed that it is TfL's intention to talk to the Georgian Group. He also pointed out that there are certain engineering standards to be met, which will influence the final choice of brick type. A larger brick sample set would be displayed at Montford Place.	
5.17	SH advised that he is happy to provide information on handmade bricks.	TfL



	<b>Item</b>	<b>Action</b>
	JK requested that SH sends this information to the general NLE email address.	
5.18	TS stated that at the recent planning committee meeting attended by Jonathan Cooper of London Underground, the current Head House architects did a very poor job of making NLE's case – even with the support of planners from Lambeth Council. TS wonders why they are still working on the project.	<b>SH</b>
5.19	JL had hoped for the beginning of a new chapter, so she is very disappointed with what JK has said in relation to the design of the Head House. If you want planning permission, you need to take all of these comments on board.	
5.20	JK reiterated that the size of the Head House will be difficult to change but the appearance can be reconsidered.	
5.21	JL believes that the whole design needs to be looked at, not just the external appearance.	
5.22	EH made the following comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is very important that comments made at the forthcoming drop-in sessions are recorded. EH suggested a synopsis of all points made, to ensure the community is properly represented. JK confirmed that all points made at the drop-ins will be recorded and circulated</li> <li>In the planning application for the Head House, there is only a plan for the top level, so it is unclear what happens on the other three floors. JK advised that a previous presentation about the appearance of the Head House included diagrams for each floor. EH responded to state he considers that detailed plans of each level of the Head House (not diagrams) should be included in the Planning Application, a requirement made by Lambeth on any other developer. JK confirmed he would take this comment away for consideration.</li> </ul>	<b>NLE / TfL</b>  <b>JK (TfL)</b>
5.23	ML commented that with regard to the massing, the difference of 53m <sup>2</sup> is absolutely key. It is such a small amount of space – probably equivalent to half the size of the room this meeting is currently taking place in. If this could be placed underground, it is unlikely that anyone would object to the Head House being built.	
5.24	Cllr CH advised that all comments made today about the Head House will be minuted.	<b>NLE / TfL</b>
5.25	MG thanked everyone for attending today and asked people to leave their names before leaving.	

	<b>Item</b>	<b>Action</b>
5.26	KH commented that it is obviously clear now that there is a great deal of expertise in this room, yet the project architects do not seem to have engaged with the local community. Would it be possible to get a small meeting with them?	<b>NLE / TfL</b>
5.27	JK confirmed that the project architects and engineers will attend the drop-in sessions. If you want to have smaller meetings with them, this can be done but the views of the entire community must be captured.	
5.28	Cllr CH suggested that smaller meetings with the project architects and engineers could take place at the beginning or end of the proposed drop-in sessions.	
5.29	JL stated that with regard to the previous Head House application, TfL knew the residents would not like the plans but decided to proceed anyway. Can you please confirm that you will not do the same again? JK responded to advise he did not agree with this statement. JL stated that Mark Wild of London Underground confirmed this was the case. JK advised that some things will not be possible but TfL will listen and respond.	
5.30	NC requested it be minuted that the general consensus of today's meeting was that local residents do not like the House Head proposal and want something different.	
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Re-landscaping the green, including a proposal from Edward Hutchinson (EH)</b>	
6.1	To be discussed at the end of the meeting (see section 13.0)	
<b>7.0</b>	<b>Kennington Loop noise</b>	
7.1	PB explained that residents with the Kennington Loop running beneath their properties have been experiencing significantly increased noise levels in the past 3-4 weeks. She has been liaising with TfL and this issue was first raised during the NLE consultation process. She cannot put up with the increased level of ground-borne noise she is experiencing at present and something must be done. It disturbs her even when she is not wearing her hearing aids.	<b>PB / RM (FLO)</b>
7.2	In response, JK suggested a separate meeting between PB, RM and other affected residents.	
7.3	Cllr CH checked with other affected residents present, who indicated they would be happy for such a meeting to take place. PB will coordinate. RM confirmed this meeting could take place in the next two weeks.	

	<b>Item</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>8.0</b>	<b>Construction noise, dust and working hours</b>	
8.1	Nothing further to be added (standard agenda item).	
<b>9.0</b>	<b>Kennington Station re-zoning</b>	
9.1	Nothing further to be added (standard agenda item).	
<b>10.0</b>	<b>Future agenda items</b>	
10.1	Cllr CH invited suggestions for future agenda items.	
10.2	ML suggested a dedicated CLG focused just on the Head House and the landscaping of Kennington Green – or possibly one for each. This may work best at the end of the consultation process.	
10.3	Cllr CH asked if the approach suggested by ML would work? JT asked ML for his opinion. ML believes that TfL are the experts on this sort of process.	
10.4	SD suggested that residents become involved with briefing the project engineers and architects – not in a formal sense but to input into the brief. This will ensure concerns such as local house design and the conservation area are considered.	
10.5	Chair CH highlighted that a meeting with project engineers and architects has already been agreed. Thought needs to be given as to how this could work.	<b>NLE / TfL</b>
<b>11.0</b>	<b>Dates of future meetings</b>	
11.1	MT advised that the date of the next meeting is not yet fixed but will be in April.	<b>MT (TfL)</b>
11.2	Cllr CH believes it is important to be mindful of Easter and also the school holidays taking place in April. Also suggested setting the dates of the next two meetings at the same time.	<b>MT (TfL)</b>
<b>12.0</b>	<b>AOB</b>	
12.1	No further issues raised.	

13.0	<b>Re-landscaping the green - a proposal from Edward Hutchinson (EH)</b>	
13.1	<p>EH explained that he has been a landscape architect for 45 years and lives locally. He has developed some ideas for the future landscaping of Kennington Green, which were presented to the meeting, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• History of the site:           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 1831: interesting spatial arrangements</li> <li>- 1916 demolished houses and garage</li> <li>- 1945: bomb damage map</li> <li>- 2014: before the project started</li> </ul> </li> <li>• 2025:           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Important to recognise what will happen in the area in the future</li> <li>- Highlighted current proposals from Barclay Homes</li> <li>- Kennington Green has always been a large significant space and will become an even more significant area of green space in Kennington</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Community principles developed 18 months ago, to look at how to develop the site</li> <li>• EH believes this should be a shared space – not road and pavement</li> <li>• TfL is committed to replanting trees on Kennington Road</li> <li>• Visual illustration of how trees are moved. EH is concerned there is not enough space for route growth</li> <li>• Cannot have new trees on the west side of the Green. However, grass is one element that can feature in large quantities</li> <li>• There is an issue of the Green being next to a road</li> <li>• EH ran through some possible design options. Different design elements featured including – maximised use of grass to make soft shapes; protected grass border area; a garden in front of the Head House to soften this area; and mounding rather than totally flat grass</li> <li>• EH sees this is a simple, low maintenance scheme that attempts to coordinate the space available</li> </ul>	
13.2	<p>ML and Cllr CH thanked EH for his work and for sharing his vision. EH stated there is a lot more he can share, given more time. Cllr CH mentioned that ML has already made a suggestion that a separate meeting is needed on this subject.</p>	
13.3	<p>Cllr CH thanked everyone for their attendance and closed the meeting.</p>	

Meeting started at 18:32 and closed at 20:02  
 Minutes drafted by MW