



VICTORIA STATION UPGRADE PROJECT

Shadow Community Liaison Group

Date: 13 July 2009

Time: 17.00

Location: Grosvenor Victoria, Bessborough Room

Attendees: Cllr Nicola Aiken (NA), Chair
Graham King (GK), Westminster Council
Stuart Carr (SCarr), Westminster Council
Don Murchie (DM), Westminster Council
Pascal Bates (PB), VIG
Mary Regnier-Leigh (MR-L), VIG
Brian Miller (BM), VIG
Susanna Care (SC), Victoria Palace
Caroline Hanson (CH), Victoria Palace
Ben Phillips (BP), Victoria Apollo
Nick Salmon (NSa), Act Productions (Apollo)
Jay Patel (JP), Network Rail
James Waite (JW), Land Securities
Peter Lynch (PL), Project Director, LU
Nicholas Street (NS), Consents & Environment Manager, LU
Kirsteen Dickson (KD), Stakeholder Communications Exec, LU
Rob Evans (RE), Environmental Project Manager, LU
Nigel Downing (ND), Traffic Manager, LU
David Smith (DS), Construction Manager, LU
Oliver Chew (OC), Birse Metro
Adrian Clark (AC), Birse Metro

Distribution: All attendees



Item		Action
1	Actions from last meeting	
1.1	No outstanding actions.	
2	Key Issues	
	<u>Traffic Management – Victoria Street contraflow bus lane</u>	
2.1	ND tabled two draft plans (enclosed in LU e-mail of 10/07 to all attendees) showing the proposed contraflow bus lane in Victoria Street.	
2.2	ND explained that the original intention was to introduce a contraflow for a 15 month period when the main works necessitated a closure of Allington Street. He said that, subject to performance, this may remain in place throughout the remainder of the project. He confirmed that this was the proposal put before the public inquiry.	
2.3	ND said that LU had looked at other possibilities during the main works but the alternative would be a lengthy bus diversion taking an extra 5-10 minutes to get passengers back to where they started. The extra buses and drivers required to maintain existing levels of service would make the cost prohibitive.	
2.4	<p>Since the inquiry further discussions with Thames Water have resulted in the need to close Allington Street to carry out the water and sewer diversions for a period of approx three months (early October 2009 – early January 2010).</p> <p>LU therefore proposes to introduce the bus contraflow in early October for the period of the water and sewer diversions. Subject to performance, the contraflow could remain in place to 'join up' with the 15 month period required for the main works.</p> <p>ND stated that once a contraflow is put in safety reasons mean that it is not advisable to take it out only to put it back a few months later. He explained that keeping the change in place is a safer option as pedestrians and drivers get used to the new traffic arrangements.</p>	
2.5	BM asked why the work could not be carried out when Allington Street is closed for jet grouting during the main works.	



2.6	DS said that one of the main reasons for moving the utilities was to allow for the jet grouting. PL added that the principle of carrying out enabling works now was to avoid the impact on the works programme.	
2.7	BM appreciated the principle of the enabling works but asked, as this was an unforeseen work, whether LU had considered adding it to the main works contract.	see 2.20
2.8	NA pointed out that part of the Mayor's plan was to avoid continually opening up the road.	
2.9	PL stated that, to avoid delay to the overall scheme, this was considered to be the optimum solution.	
2.10	<p>PB asked if the contraflow would be effected under TfL powers.</p> <p>ND said that there has been extensive discussion with TfL and that the contraflow would probably be implemented initially under a temporary traffic regulation order.</p> <p>NA asked about the length of consultation for a temporary traffic regulation order. ND said that he believed it was 28 days.</p>	
2.11	<p>NA asked for DM's view.</p> <p>DM said that he had received the safety audit and the proposal was still being assessed. He said that safety was the City Council's biggest concern. As yet they hadn't taken a view on whether the contraflow should remain in place or come out after the three months. He added that the proposal for the pedestrian island was a particular concern.</p> <p>DM said that as TfL was responsible for the road it would ultimately be their decision.</p>	See 2.20
2.12	PB stated that VIG had a fundamental objection to the proposed contraflow as it was, in their opinion, inherently dangerous and should be restricted to as short a period as possible. He said that VIG had objected to the contraflow proposed for the main works at the public inquiry. He said that they awaited the inquiry inspector's view and considered LU to be 'jumping the gun'.	
2.13	<p>NA asked when the decision was expected.</p> <p>PL said that the Secretary of State's decision was expected late Summer 09 with an Order made in January 2010.</p>	



2.14	<p>PB ran through a number of points of concern, referring in particular to what he believes represents a 3 stage crossing which he believes to be unsafe.</p>	
2.15	<p>GK said that CoW was initially concerned about safety and servicing issues and, following receipt of the safety audit, there would be further discussions amongst his colleagues, with this group advised of the outcome.</p> <p>He did, however, agree with LU that it was better to leave in once in place rather than take it away only to reinsert it later in the works.</p>	
2.16	<p>NA asked whether this proposal had been considered in the light of the Olympics.</p> <p>GK said that the Olympics were a factor to be considered alongside other projects and events in the area.</p>	
2.17	<p>SC was asked for Victoria Palace’s view on the proposals. She said that they had a number of concerns relating to access for people with restricted mobility and access for emergency services. They were also concerned that the reduction in the depth of the footpath, as a result of the proposed railing, would cause problems with pedestrian flow when patrons entered or exited the theatre.</p>	
2.18	<p>PL said that LU would look at the commitments given to Victoria Palace regarding access and seek to ensure that those commitments are upheld. LU to arrange further meeting with VPT.</p>	LU
2.19	<p>NA asked DM to comment on the introduction of a guard rail.</p> <p>DM said that although there was no hard and fast rule CoW tends to take out pedestrian guard rails. However in this particular location they may be necessary.</p>	
2.20	<p>To note:</p> <p>The proposed early introduction of a bus contraflow lane on Victoria Street is of great concern to residents and Victoria Palace Theatre.</p> <p>The safety audit report will be sent out with the draft minutes</p> <p>The Inspector’s report and SoS judgement are awaited as are CoW’s recommendations following scrutiny of the safety audit and detailed proposals.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">To note</p> <p style="text-align: center;">LU</p> <p style="text-align: center;">To note</p>



	An update on the progress and status of the contra-flow proposal, including information on the implications of adding the Allington Street works to the main works contract, will be provided to SCLG members prior to the next meeting.	LU / CoW
	<u>Pedestrians</u>	
2.21	Nothing further to add.	
	<u>Noise</u>	
2.22	KD said that the noise complaints made to CoW about the disturbance from the utilities work had now been entered onto the enquiries and complaints log. Future correspondence to large office blocks would include a request to cascade the information (including the helpline number) to all staff.	LU to note
2.23	<p>PB asked, in relation to noise and air quality, how long the works on Victoria Street would last.</p> <p>OC said that they were starting to backfill on Victoria St and should be complete by the end of the week.</p>	
2.24	<p>PB asked whether any further work was planned on Victoria Street (east of Vauxhall Bridge Road).</p> <p>OC said that, in addition to the work on Little Ben Island, they would have to return to carry out some minor works e.g. cable pulling and gas connections. He confirmed that this would not entail closures on Victoria Street.</p>	
2.25	<p>BM asked why the potential mitigation outlined in BS5228 could not be employed to mitigate the noise.</p> <p>OC said that the work site was lined with acoustic screens but introduction of further screening has implications for health and safety of the site workers, is limited by available working space and could restrict working efficiency.</p> <p>He explained that most of the breakers are mounted on backhoes (machines) which makes screening difficult and the use of hand held breakers (where screening may be possible) has health and safety implications for site workers (primarily as a result of vibration effects).</p> <p>AC said that their first choice for breaking out is a road planer which is much quicker than traditional methods. However this method cannot be used in all locations.</p>	See 2.27



2.26	<p>NA asked whether CoW had taken any noise measurements.</p> <p>GK said that they had not. He said that CoW recognised the difficulties with breaking out and the problem is best dealt with as quickly as possible. He was not aware that a satisfactory solution had been found to address such issues for these kind of roadworks.</p>	
2.27	<p>To note:</p> <p>RE agreed to provide VIG with a review of the mitigation measures in BS5228 explaining why the measures have not been implemented and, if appropriate, highlighting any measures that have been missed that could be considered.</p>	RE
	<u>Air Quality</u>	
2.28	Nothing further to add.	
3	Terms of Reference (ToR)	
3.1	Victoria Palace and Land Securities confirmed that they had no further comments on VIG's revision of the ToR (Version 3).	
3.2	PL said that LUL had no major problems with VIG's suggested changes.	
3.3	<p>To note:</p> <p>LU to incorporate VIG's amendments into the ToR and send Version 4 to PB and NA for review.</p> <p>Once settled, the revised ToR will be sent to all attendees to agree at the September SCLG.</p>	<p>LU</p> <p>LU</p>
4	VSU Project / works update	
	<u>Funding</u>	
4.1	<p>PL explained the current position</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VSU Budget is £695m • Project funding comes from TfL • VSU to go to the TfL Board (29 July) to draw down on budget and secure funding for the remaining work, and seek authority to award the main works contract. 	
4.2	PB asked PL to explain the increase in the budget since the	



	<p>inquiry.</p> <p>PL replied that there is no increase to the budget that was presented at the public inquiry. The cost estimate presented at the inquiry was of the work to go once the TWAO is made. All current work is budgeted and authorised, including the utilities works. PL stated that the £695m relates to the overall programme of work at Victoria, not just the cost of congestion relief scheme element presented at the inquiry.</p>	
4.3	<p>To note:</p> <p>LU to report on outcome of any funding decision at Board meeting on 29 July after that meeting has taken place.</p> <p>Post Meeting Note:</p> <p>As funding has been deferred to an autumn sitting of the Board (rather than determined at the 29 July sitting), LU will instead report on funding at the September SCLG meeting</p>	LU
	<p><u>Delays to utilities work</u></p>	
4.4	<p>OC reported that</p> <p>Stage 2 works on Victoria Street should be complete by end of week. Delays had occurred due to procurement of couplings by National Grid Gas. This problem had arisen due to numerous failings of couplers provided by one of their suppliers.</p> <p>Stage 3 works – Birse seeking a solution to repair the damaged bridge structure (referred to in LU’s July report) on Bressenden Place. Current estimate for completion is Oct / Nov this year.</p>	
4.5	<p>DS said that, to avoid a lengthy delay to completion, LU is attempting to resolve the problem with the structure owner who will then seek to recover cost from the utilities companies responsible for the damage.</p>	
5	<p>Updates from other agencies</p>	
5.1	<p>No further updates.</p>	
6	<p>Victoria Construction Management Forum (VCMF) update</p>	
6.1	<p>GK confirmed that there had been no meeting of the VCMF since the last SCLG meeting as no other projects were about</p>	



	to start. He said that the next meeting would be likely to be at the end of the Summer break depending on issues arising.	
6.2	<p>Referring to VIG's letter of 08 July, DS explained that CoW ran the VCMF so LU was not in a position to "unilaterally" exclude local residents and businesses.</p> <p>He said that the Traffic Management Liaison Group was an internal, technical meeting dealing with day to day issues and it would be inappropriate for local residents /businesses to be invited. He added that, in accordance with the Code of Construction Practice representatives from that meeting were in attendance at SCLG, i.e. ND & DS.</p>	
7	Agenda Items for the next meeting	
7.1	GK said that, at the September meeting, CoW should be in a position to report on the VAPB in the light of the Inspector's report and progress on VT12. He confirmed that a revised draft of the VAPB would not be produced until after the decision on VSU.	
7.2	<p>To note – additional items for September agenda</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LU funding update • CoW update on position re. contraflow and VAPB • Secretary of State's decision • Stage 5 works • LU report on contraflow and noise mitigation <p>KD to add to agenda</p>	KD
8	A.O.B	
8.1	<p>NSa asked when information on the Stage 5 works would be available. ND said that a meeting with TfL had been arranged for 23/07 and more information would be available after that.</p> <p>ND to arrange a meeting with Apollo to provide an update on Stage 5 / Wilton Road works.</p>	ND
	BM asked whether there was a proposal to move more buses from the bus station out onto the streets.	
	PL said that he was not aware of any proposals and NS confirmed that there were no plans under VSU to move additional services onto the streets.	



9	Date of next meeting	
9.1	7th September at 5pm in Grosvenor Victoria - Bessborough Room	
9.2	LU report to be sent to all attendees 28/08/09 Additional issues to be raised to be sent to CoW by 02/09/09	