



Northern line extension

Battersea Community Liaison Group

18 January 2016
Rose Community Centre

Attendees:

Name	Organisation
Officer rep: Steve Diamond (SD) (chair)	LB Wandsworth
John Stone (JS)	LB Wandsworth
Adam Hutchings (AH)	LB Wandsworth
Harendra Goonewardene (HG)	Savona Estate
Tim Hill (TH)	Battersea Power Station
May Hale (May H)	Nine Elms Pier
Mark Hale (Mark H)	
David Lewis (DL)	Battersea Society
Brian Raincock (BR)	Viridian
Mabel Aranda Garcia (MGA)	FLO
Carla Arnold (CA)	FLO
Sian Rebourg (SR)	FLO
Ignacio Lopez (IL)	FLO
Derek Weller (DW)	FLO
Emma-Jane Kirtland (EK)	Transport for London
Katie-Jane Kyte (KK)	Transport for London
Michael Tarrega (MT)	Transport for London

Rob Tamkin (RT)	Transport for London
Charles Oxenham (CO)	Transport for London
Michael Appleton (MA)	Tideway
Malcolm Orford (MO)	Tideway
Janet Greenwood (JG)	Tideway
Gwyn Williams (GW)	Tideway (FLO)
Harriet Cheaney (HC)	Tideway
Mark Walker (MW)	Tideway
Miles Evans (ME)	Thames Water

Apologies: Cllr Nardelli, Liz Watson, Jeremy Wilkins, Sarah Banham, Brian Barnes

	Item	Action
1.0	Introductions and apologies	
1.1	SD advised he will be chairing the meeting as Cllr Nardelli (now Mayor of Wandsworth) has given her apologies.	
1.2	KK noted that the first half of this meeting will focus on the NLE and the second half will feature a presentation from Tideway.	
2.0	Minutes of previous meeting	
2.1	SD confirmed that the minutes are now combined as was requested at the last meeting. Minutes agreed as accurate.	
	<i>Northern line extension</i>	
3.0	NLE progress update and presentation	
3.1	IL gave a progress update and presentation including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three month lookback and three month lookahead • An animation explaining diaphragm walling • Battersea Power Station entrances • 'Your feedback' • Engagement Opportunities • Ways to contact us 	
3.2	IL advised that the diaphragm walling works in the crossover	

	Item	Action
	<p>box are approximately 30% completed and the new entrance works are completed and the junction will be commissioned by the end of January.</p>	
3.3	<p>CO presented an animation explaining the diaphragm walling works, which involves 42 guide walls being excavated (up to 60m deep) which are then filled with concrete. CO explained that some of the panels are larger than others and the concreting operation must be done in one go to ensure the quality of the concrete and therefore extended working hours have been granted by LB Wandsworth; on up to 12 occasions these could run up until 22:00. CO advised that during the concrete pours there will be traffic coming to and from site but there should not be undue noise disturbance.</p>	
3.4	<p>IL reported that, in November and December, the conveyor took 13,000 tonnes of spoil from the site which equates to removing 300 lorries from the roads. The loading hours have been between 07:00 and 19:00. In 2016 the project is targeting the removal of 160,000 tonnes of spoil.</p>	
3.5	<p>EK advised that there has been further design work on the Battersea Power Station entrances and there is now a western entrance in the Fosters Building and an eastern entrance in Prospect Park. The eastern entrance falls outside of the TWAO powers and therefore a planning application has been submitted to LB Wandsworth, with determination planned for March. There will be two open days (Saturday 6th February 10:00-14:00 and Tuesday 9th February 16:00-17:00) for the community to come to the Battersea site and discuss the designs, the overall project and to see the site from the viewing platform.</p>	
3.6	<p>IL reported that the diaphragm walling works in the crossover box will be completed by April 2016 and during this time there will be six big pours (up to 12 hours duration) which will be notified in advance.</p>	
3.7	<p>SR updated the group on work placements, local employment and work with local primary and secondary schools. SR advised that the project will be advertising for Quantity Surveyor roles and a receptionist soon and she is liaising with Talent Match and Brixton Prison for a temporary release on licence work opportunity.</p>	
3.8	<p>MGA reported that the Section 61 has been revised and working hours have been extended to 07:00-19:00 and further extended hours for long pours. MGA advised that the long pours would be notified to residents in advance. MGA</p>	

	Item	Action
	<p>stated that barge loading will move to 24 hours in the next six months. SD asked whether there have already been any extended pours and IL advised that there was one in December.</p>	
3.9	MGA advised the Group that there is the opportunity for a site visit on Tuesday 26 th January and asked the Group to let her know if they are interested.	
3.10	<p>HG stated that communication has been a lot better and there has not been too much disruption. HG questioned vibration on a Sunday morning in December and whether this was due to the NLE works, CO advised that the site logs have been checked and there were no works at this time which would have caused this vibration, only works to refill the Bentonite plant. IL advised that the project would check again to be sure. <i>Post meeting note: IL confirms that there was no work at all on this date; all security logs are empty and the system did not register any clock ins/outs.</i></p>	Flo
4.0	Traffic management	
4.1	HG questioned whether the commissioning of the new site entrance means that vehicles can turn both left and right into/out of site. IL confirmed that this is the case. HG raised a concern that people will be using the crossing and it may be dangerous if vehicles are turning into/out of site, as both parties may not be aware of the other and asked that the traffic marshals are there at least at first.	
5.0	Construction noise and vibration	
5.1	HG questioned when the sheet piling will be starting in the station box. IL advised this will be in February/March but the project has learnt lessons from the sheet piling in the crossover box and a different technique and piling rig is being used, which will not be as disruptive. CO confirmed that there will be pre-augering to soften the soil and then the piles will be put in using a hydro press rather than the vibration technique used in the crossover box. HG asked if there will be screening and IL advised these could be used if required. HG asked for residents to be notified before these works start.	Flo
5.2	HG asked for more information about the site visit on Tuesday 26 th January. MGA advised that she would send an email out but it will be 10:00 meet at the site security office but we cannot take large numbers. HG asked if there will be any drop in sessions and KK confirmed there will be one	

	Item	Action
	before the next CLG.	
5.3	SD stated that it is a good sign that there has been little disruption with the diaphragm walling works and asked if there will be any further works outside of the site. CO confirmed that all works are now within the site hoardings.	
5.4	MGA advised that there have been no noise exceedances since the last CLG. There was a trigger alert on a dust monitor near Battersea Park Road but this may have been due to the road itself. There is no vibration monitoring but if residents are concerned about vibration they may contact the project to discuss.	
6.0	Defect surveys	
6.1	MGA advised that there are no properties in the 'zone of influence' for the piling works so surveys have not yet been conducted, however properties will start to receive letters with regard to the main excavation. HG asked whether the Savona Estate is affected and MGA advised that she will come back to HG on this. SD stated that he believes it only to be properties on Battersea Park Road but it may touch the Viridian slightly.	Flo
	<i>Tideway</i>	
7.0	Project Update	
7.1	<p>MO outlined Tideway's proposal for development of the site and provided details of imminent work plus work already underway:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brooks Court consists of commercial properties that were going to be demolished but these will now be retained and utilised by Tideway as site offices. Work has commenced with surveys and designs • A programme of borehole work on the site is underway • In February, a number of houseboats will be relocated and Tideway will start mobilising for construction of the shaft. The principal construction technique that will be utilised is diaphragm walling and is in fact very similar to the technique described by NLE earlier in the meeting, although Tideway will be going slightly deeper. Sheet piling will start in March, with work on the ring beam and drive wall taking place from May to October 2016 • Tideway has challenged the main contractor, FLO, to maximise usage of the river and to utilise this method 	

	Item	Action
	<p>of transport more than was originally planned. As a result, concrete rings will now also be transported to site this way Tideway acknowledge local specific disruption associated with bringing materials in but believes it is an efficient way of using the river.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In terms of unloading concrete from the barges, the proposal has not been finalised and different approaches are currently being considered. The option shown shows a campshed, a flat area on the river bed for the barges to be floated on. It may be necessary for strengthening works to be carried out on the river wall during April and May 2016 • Cemex will have totally vacated its facility by May 2016 • Demolition of 88 Kirtling Street is underway. • Section of Kirtling Street will be stopped up in July to enable Tideway to fully use the site, with primary site set-up activities taking place from August onwards. This will include piling for cranes, conveyors and the marine operation 	
7.2	<p>MO confirmed that Health and Safety is hugely important to Tideway and utilising the river as much as possible will ensure the removal of HGVs from London's roads. All workers on site will receive EPIC Safety training.</p>	
7.3	<p>With regard to the 'Strategic Target Schedule' or STS programme, which is designed to speed up construction, Tideway is very mindful of disruption caused and this is why the team has been challenged to deliver the project sooner. However, this does not undermine Tideway's commitment to achieve all deliverables.</p>	
7.4	<p>ME provided an update on behalf of Thames Water, which is also doing work to set-up on site.</p>	
7.5	<p>Preparatory work includes trial trenches – a number have been undertaken already, with more to follow. Boreholes at 28, 80 and 88 Kirtling Street will be used to check soil composition, check for archaeological finds, etc. Cabins: demolition work at 88 Kirtling Street has required a cabin for the demolition team. More cabins may be required at 28 Kirtling Street for Browns (contractor).</p>	
7.6	<p>Tideway continues to monitor for noise and air quality.</p>	
7.7	<p>Power supplies are coming to site. This could lead to some utility infrastructure being strengthened, including Thames Water infrastructure.</p>	

	Item	Action
7.8	Attendees were asked to complete a survey from Tideway, which will help to measure and improve the effectiveness of CLG going forward.	
8.0	Questions and discussion	
8.1	BR asked if MO receives a bonus if the project is delivered ahead of schedule. MO confirmed that 70% of all cost savings are passed back to the bill payer – this is regulated by Ofwat. MO confirmed that a proportion of the savings would be returned to the investors. HG asked if he could be sent a copy of MO's presentation. MO confirmed that this would be done.	Tideway
8.2	May H requested clarification about the programme of activity for the Campshed. MO advised that Tideway are looking at different options. If the campshed option is implemented, these works cannot take place until the river wall is strengthened and completed taking them into June, July, August. MO advised that Tideway is still working through what is required. The campshed works will likely take place after June, following river wall strengthening works in April and May should they be required. MO stated there may also be some preparatory works within the LLAU. May H responded to ask why – in light of the timescale outlined by MO – houseboats are required to leave by the end of February. MO explained that there is a programme of site clearance; boats moving off in February, then removal of brows and a number of structures such as king piles. Then there is the river wall strengthening works and MO does not know the exact nature of all of these works. MO reiterated the campshed is an option and they are looking at other options. May H asked if Tideway were planning to clear the mooring infrastructure in February. MO does not have an exact date for the when the mooring infrastructure will be moved but the houseboats will be required to move before this can take place. May H asked if MO agreed that to remove all the mooring infrastructure and the boats is marine based works. MO advised that he does not see the required work as development work, but this would need to be discussed further with the planning authority. MO said that disconnecting and floating off floating structures, which by default boats and brows are, is not development, as in his opinion as a non-planner, development was more of a construction activity and therefore relocating the 5 boats was not development. Tideway will not do anything without receiving the necessary consents.	

	Item	Action
8.3	<p>May H advised that she had been served with effectively an eviction notice under Article 35 and that was according to the authorised project and demolitions and site clearance. May H stated that the authorised project is development work which would imply that Tideway could not do any of the marine based activities until PW17 is discharged. MO stated he did not agree entirely but that it is a planning authority decision rather than a lawyer led decision. May H stated she appreciated Tideway are trying to speed up the delivery of the project, but that the Project also committed to reducing the impact on residents, yet the impact was increasing on them rather than reducing. May H reported she was only given 3 months notice when Tideway promised to give 6 months notice, the notice period being stretched over Xmas, so effectively only 2.5 months notice and Tideway were trying to push them off by 1 February. May H said she does not feel they have received enough notice and wants to ensure her boat can return to its current location but can't seem to get that guarantee from the Project. MO explained that any assurances given regarding 6 month notice previously were always caveated, and that the 3 month notice given was significantly in excess of the minimum period defined in the DCO. May H disagreed that the 6 month notice was caveated. MO stated Tideway does take the impact of the project very seriously and still wants to work with five affected boats owners and the local community to minimise the impact of the scheme. May H responded to say that she feels it is unreasonable to push people off the site if the site layout is not yet confirmed. MO acknowledged that the site layout is not yet confirmed but confirmed that there is no way these vessels can stay in their current positions.</p>	
8.4	<p>May H stated if Tideway does not need a barge step, there may be no need for navigational access where the boats are moored. May H asked that if Tideway was just operating from a temporary jetty, would this reduce the need to remove the houseboats. MO advised that the heavy-lifting gear needed requires a structure that can support it. MO acknowledges that such a structure will have an impact on the local community but feels this is the best way forward for the project to remove vehicles off London's roads. SD summarised to say there was an issue to make sure the consents to do this is properly considered and noted the concerns over the impact of doing this so quickly. SD stated that it is important that an appropriate mechanism is put in place to ensure these sorts of issues are resolved. MO explained that he has met previously with May H and Nine Elms Pier. Tideway has an 'open door' policy and has funded the appointment of independent specialists. There is</p>	<p>Tideway</p>

	Item	Action
	<p>also an independently-chaired panel. Tideway hopes that all of this will help to give confidence to public. However, Tideway does not have legislative powers to guarantee that a vessel can return to its previous location once work has been undertaken and recognised May H's genuine concerns. MO agreed it was right and fair that May H should be able to bring back her boat and Tideway would do all it could to bring back the boat. MO stated to May H that should the boat not be able to return and there is a financial loss, Tideway would be liable for that. SD concluded that it was important that issues raised here were noted as a key factors in how the project will be implemented with due regard to the local community and suggested that all avenues to be explored.</p>	
8.5	<p>Mark H asked what other options exist, other than the barge step? MO explained that use of the existing Cemex jetty has been considered. However, its location of very limiting for Tideway. It may be possible for this jetty to play a part but it is not likely to provide a total solution. There is also the possibility of having a structure further out into river, or a second pier setup. A number of options are currently being considered by Tideway. Mark H asked when a final decision will be taken on the logistics route. MO advised that this will probably be confirmed within 4-8 weeks.</p>	Tideway
8.6	<p>May H asked if Tideway could refrain from threatening to tow their houseboat away without their consent. MO responded to advise that Tideway absolutely does not want to have houseboats towed away – but does have an obligation to deliver the project.</p>	
8.7	<p>DL requested further detail on community liaison plans. MO advised that with regard to a specific small parcel of work, the core content on how Tideway interacts with the community was documented and written in a Construction Environmental Management Plan. For the main works a separate plan has been produced and is with the planning authority for review. AH advised that for the main works, this is currently under consultation until 2 February. SD requested that he receive a link to this consultation so he could send it out to the group. LB Wandsworth contact confirmed that the relevant application number on the council website is 2015/7219. AH stated if anyone wanted to see any of TTT's applications on LBW's website, this can be accessed via a dedicated TTT section – go to application type under planning explorer and search for TTT. All applications that have been or are being considered can be seen here.</p>	LBW

	Item	Action
8.8	May H asked if the barge step goes ahead, how frequently will this be used? MO advised that for the delivery of concrete segments, this is likely to be one barge per day. However, Tideway is also looking at bringing more materials to site by barge (e.g. PPE etc) and may possibly containerise items. This could result in an additional one or two more barges per day. Delivery of concrete segments for the tunnelling phase and 'muck away' will last for approximately two and a half years; MO will confirm this timeframe and produce a one-page summary document to be circulated with the minutes from this meeting.	
8.9	Mark H asked if the barge step will remain once the project is complete? MO advised that the barge step is planned to be temporary and Tideway will look to return the area to exactly as it was before work started. Tideway aims to return the five houseboats to their current position but stressed that authority to do this is with the Port of London Authority (PLA) and not Tideway. Mark H requested that when Tideway submits its application for consent for the barge step, could it also look to lock-in consents for the reinstatement work? MO explained that Tideway does not have the necessary powers to enforce. The PLA will say that Tideway is unable to assess the navigation risks in 2021. However, Tideway will continue to liaise with the PLA on this matter.	
8.10	May H highlighted that the artwork by Tim Davies around the site is credited incorrectly and had asked Tideway to correct this back in September. Credits went to Tideway Village instead of Nine Elms Pier. MO apologised and advised that this should have been corrected. MA confirmed that he will ensure this is done.	
8.11	May H explained that the community at Nine Elms Pier has been there since 1985 and it is a unique place to live and a unique community. She would like to see this protected.	
9.0	Future agenda items	
9.1	Tideway to share the findings of the survey and a review of the CLG to be undertaken with the Group.	
10	Next cycle of meetings	
10.1	The next meeting will be held on Monday 14th March.	

Meeting started 7.10 and closed at 8.30pm.
Minutes drafted by KK and MW

Post Meeting Note

8.2

Following discussions with the consenting body, the London Borough of Wandsworth has agreed that the works planned in the river foreshore do not constitute development. These are ancillary works under paragraph (h) of Part 2 of Schedule 1 of the Development Consent Order (DCO) and fall within the remit of Article 35 of the DCO; those rights provide for the taking of temporary possession of land for the purpose of the authorised project.

Tideway will continue to work with the consenting body to ensure that all works have the correct consent ahead of any works that commence on site or as part of the enabling or supporting works.

8.3

The Development Consent Order requires Tideway as the scheme's proposer to provide residents with 14 days' notice prior to removal.

The notice of temporary possession of land was served under article 35 of the DCO and is not an 'eviction' notice.

8.4

Tideway has confirmed to Mrs Hale that she will be compensated for financial losses incurred as a result of the Thames Tideway Tunnel project.