



**Northern Line Extension  
Kennington Green Community Liaison Group**

Monday 8 April 2019

Venue: Henry Fawcett Primary School, Bowling Green Street, London, SE11 5BZ

**Attendees:**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
Carla Arnold (CA)	Ferrovial Laing O'Rourke (FLO)
Priscilla Baines (PB)	Heart of Kennington Residents' Association
Marilyn Evers (ME)	Kennington Park Estate Tenants and Residents' Association (KPETA)
Michael Flynn (MF)	Transport for London (TfL)
Liam Greaney (LG)	Ferrovial Laing O'Rourke (FLO)
CHAIR: Cllr Philip Normal (PN)	London Borough of Lambeth (Oval Ward)
Andrew Roberts (AR)	Heart of Kennington Residents' Association
Mark Thompson (MT)	Transport for London (TfL)
Mark Walker (MW)	Admin support (minute taker)

**Apologies:**

Matthew Brinklow – Ferrovial Laing O'Rourke (FLO)

	<b>Item</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>1.0</b>	<b>Chairperson's introduction</b>	
1.1	Welcome and introduction from Councillor Philip Normal (PN).	
1.2	Priscilla Baines (PB) commented on issues which she believes are currently causing concern amongst local residents – the fact that property repair bills are taking a long time to be paid and that some residents are being refused a second survey of their property, with people being told dry weather has caused some damage, rather than the NLE.	
1.3	Round-table introductions from all attendees.	
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Minutes of the previous meeting – accuracy and matters arising</b>	
2.1	PN invited attendees to comment on any matters arising from the minutes of the previous meeting.	
2.2	Marilyn Evers (ME) noted that noise and dust appears on the agenda for today's meeting.	
2.3	ME commented that the road surface in Montford Place has not been repaired, however some patches of Kennington Road have been repaired and it is much nicer as a result.	
2.4	PB explained that with regard to noise from trains using the Kennington Loop, local residents had a meeting with TfL 10 days ago. The situation remains the same and therefore residents are considering their position.	

3.0	<b>NLE progress update</b>	
3.1	Liam Greaney (LG) provided an update on progress at Kennington Green and also work at Kennington Station. A copy of the progress update presentation will be circulated alongside the minutes from this meeting. <b>Action 1: Electronic copy of presentation to be distributed with the meeting minutes.</b>	TfL
3.2	ME enquired how trains will turn around and come back when they get to Nine Elms. LG explained that all trains will pass through Nine Elms to Battersea, where there is a 'crossover box' that enables them to change direction and return back up the line. Mark Thompson advised the crossover box is in the shape of a figure of eight. LG confirmed this consists of a series of points that moves the trains as necessary. MT advised the same technique is used at Elephant & Castle and Brixton, allowing trains to switch to the correct running track. Trains will be able to leave Battersea and travel north from either platform. Trains can also arrive at Battersea on either platform. There is a lot of work taking place at Battersea at the moment to install the necessary equipment.	
3.3	With reference to LG's presentation, Andrew Roberts (AR) asked if the Head House cladding will be installed this year or next year. LG confirmed this work will take place in April/May 2019.	
3.4	AR asked if landscaping will also be taking place this year. LG advised this is a possibility but is likely to run into next year. LG reconfirmed the brickwork façade will be fixed to the concrete structure of the Head House in April/May 2019.	
3.5	Carla Arnold (CA) provided an update on enquiries and complaints received since the last meeting.	
3.6	AR asked if the open cases have been open a long time. CA confirmed these cases have only been open for around a week. The team looks to acknowledge a complaint or enquiry on the day it is received and then close out within five days. However, sometimes it is necessary to provide more data and this can take a little longer to compile.	
3.7	On behalf of her colleague Sophie Boyle, CA provided an update on FLO's community engagement activity.	
3.8	With regard to FLO's efforts to encourage females to consider a career in construction, PN commented this is something he and ME have raised before.	
3.9	PN asked if any of FLO's community engagement activity has taken place in Wandsworth. MT explained that community engagement activity has always taken place across all three boroughs relevant to the project.	
3.10	CA advised there was a recruitment event at Lambeth College on 09/11/2018 that FLO attended. This was focused on recruitment for electrical installers (level three) and CA will check if this opportunity is still available. <b>Action 2: CA to advise is the opportunity for electrical installers (level three) is still available.</b>	CA
3.11	PN requested he be kept updated on any community engagement activities taking place in Lambeth. <b>Action 3: CA to keep PN updated on any community engagement activities taking place in Lambeth.</b> PB thinks it is important to get girls involved in the industry at a young age, when	CA

3.12	they start picking role models. It is also important to help them to enjoy maths.	
3.13	CA agrees it is important to ensure outreach across all three boroughs and advised there is lots of good work taking place to achieve this.	
3.14	LG provided an environmental update, in the absence of Matt Brinklow (MB).	
3.15	AR advised he lives in Stannary Street and does not hear any noise from the Kennington Green site.	
3.16	ME commented that she cannot see Kennington Green from her property but can hear occasional loud noises during the daytime, which sound like something being dropped or banged.	
3.17	PB commented that occasional noises can be heard when walking past either site, however these do not occur regularly and there is no pattern to them. PB is unsure whether other people are disturbed by these noises.	
3.18	ME asked what the dust picked up by FLO's monitoring consists of. LG is not sure but can find out. ME advised this would be useful to know for the next meeting, as she would be interested to know if this material makes any contribution to NOx or PM10 levels in the area.	
3.19	MT advised the material picked up by FLO's dust monitoring would not contribute to NOx or PM10 levels. The material found on the slides will be coarse dust above five microns and probably closer to 20 microns. Particles smaller than five microns tend to stay airborne. This will be 'nuisance dust' and is too big to get into people's lungs and cause injury. It is not respirable dust and is likely to be standard materials such as silica etc that would be present in the area anyway, although the project will add to the levels. The next set of dust slides can be analysed and the results provided to the CLG. ME advised this this would be appreciated. <b>Action 4: Dust slides to be analysed and findings provided at the next CLG.</b>	FLO
3.20	MT explained that TfL has a lot of sites across London where air quality is monitored for harmful pollutants and details of these can be found on the internet. MT also explained the Ultra-Low Emissions Zone (ULEZ) came into effect today.	
3.21	PB commented that Brixton town centre is notorious for high levels of pollution. MT commented that there are a lot of locations in London that are notorious for pollution.	
3.22	ME stated that the only air quality monitoring point in Lambeth that she is aware of is located at Vauxhall bus station.	
3.23	MT is unsure of the location of monitoring points in Lambeth but believes this information will be available online. There will also be a contact within TfL Streets who will be able to assist. MF will check and confirm who this contact is. <b>Action 5: MF to confirm the relevant contact within TfL Streets who can advise regarding air quality monitoring in Lambeth.</b>	MF
3.24	MT commented that air quality monitoring is not an exact science and is affected by many factors such as time of day, weather etc. ME advised she is trying to make sure there is lots of green infrastructure in place in the local area. CA confirmed the various ways people can contact the project.	

3.25	ME advised that Berkeley Homes has now still work on its site near to the NLE site. ME asked if the NLE team is liaising with Berkeley Homes regarding daily movements of heavy transport vehicles. LG confirmed that FLO's logistics team is liaising with Berkeley Homes. There is a system in place where deliveries are booked in advance and Montford Place is used as a holding area where several deliveries can be kept off the road before delivering to Kennington Green and Kennington Place. FLO's logistics team are in discussions with the Berkeley Homes team that has just started mobilising in the Tesco car park and will continue to work with them.	
3.26		
3.27	PN requested that FLO keeps this group updated with regard to how it is liaising with Berkeley Homes. <b>Action 6: FLO to provide future updates to the CLG regarding how it is liaising with Berkeley Homes.</b>	FLO
3.28	PB advised that use of both parts of Montford Place is a worry for pedestrians. ME explained that Berkeley Homes started digging up the car park in mid-March with no prior warning.	
3.29	MT commented that projects of this type generally take a while to build up speed. Although he cannot speak for them, MT believes Berkeley Homes' sites are generally well run and therefore should be good neighbours.	
3.30	PN has not received any reports of anti-social behaviour in the area for a while and asked if things have improved.	
3.31	LG advised that FLO continues to cooperate with the police and the council on this matter wherever possible and has shared CCTV footage with the police on numerous occasions. Some FLO staff have also received 'sharps' training that enables them to dispose of drug paraphernalia that is discarded in the street. FLO has also cleaned up several incidences of fly-tipping since the last meeting.	
3.32	PN is very pleased FLO can assist with CCTV footage where possible.	
3.33	AR commented that lots of ventilation shafts end up being graffitied. Will there be any measures in place to stop this happening to the Kennington Green Head House? LG advised an anti-graffiti coating will be applied, which will make it easier to remove any graffiti.	
3.34	AR asked if CCTV cameras will remain in place to monitor the Head House once it is built and operational. MT advised there will be a lot of security in place to protect the Head House, although cameras can be a sensitive issue in a residential area, as can lighting.	
3.35	AR asked if nice lighting can be put in place, to discourage people from congregating in the area.	
3.36	PN asked if this is a discussion that should be taking place between TfL and the Council, rather than with FLO.	
3.37	MT advised TfL can take this away as an action point. However, the security measures will be discrete. <b>Action 7: TfL to present a presentation slide at the next meeting focused on proposed security measures for the Kennington Green Head House.</b> PN requested this issue is also added as a future agenda item. <b>Action 8:</b>	TfL

3.38	<b>Kennington Green Head House security to be added as a future agenda item.</b>	TfL
3.39	AR enquired about the plans for tree planting on the Green, once the NLE work is complete. LG advised this information can be provided at the next meeting.	
	<b>Action 9: Information on tree planting/landscaping on Kennington Green once work is complete to be provided at the next meeting.</b>	
3.40	PB commented that she liked TfL's suggestions for the Green, so any update on tree planting would be welcome.	TfL / FLO
3.41	AR commented that he likes green walls, like the one in place at Elephant & Castle. MT responded to explain there has been much discussion previously about the possibility of a green wall for the Head House. However, the Head House needs to be able to push and pull air to the location of a potential fire on the network, so there cannot be anything attached to the Head House that could be ignited by this process. In hot weather, a living wall can become a fire risk and this would pose an unacceptable risk to tube passengers.	
3.42	MT advised that a lot of opinions about the Head House have been expressed in the past. TfL has tried to come to a consensus and create a building that is maintainable by Lambeth Council.	
3.43	MF offered to send the Kennington Green Head House consultation report to AR. <b>Action 10: MF to send the Kennington Green Head House consultation report to AR.</b>	MF
3.44	AR reiterated his interest in lighting for the Head House that would promote security. PB also commented that lighting and anti-social behaviour in the area has always been a problem, so anything that the project can do to assist would be beneficial. PN commented that good lighting is always a good crime deterrent.	
3.45	PN invited any questions on working hours. LG advised the site is still working to its core hours but will always try to advise of any deviation in CA's weekly update email.	
3.46	PN commented that there seem to be fewer overruns now. MT advised that very complex work was taking place and overruns were almost inevitable, as the site was at the mercy of concrete batching plants.	
3.47	PB agrees that overruns do not seem to happen that often at present. CA advised that LG is great at advising her when overruns are going to occur, so that she can issue a notification to local residents. MT believes people now appreciate the need to finish a concrete pour, especially as this reduces the need to break-out sub-standard concrete at a later date. PB believes this side of things has improved in the past six/nine months.	
3.48	PN asked whether there is any pattern around the complaints and enquiries received by the project, or are these very random. CA advised complaints tend to relate to noise and vibration. Enquiries can be a range of issues and these are normally addressed by CA or MF, with a pretty quick response time. The trend is moving towards liaising with residents about cracks in their properties and ground movement issues, etc. Becky Richardson is the relevant contact at TfL and CA liaises closely with her.	

3.49	<p>PB believes there are still people who have not contacted Becky or have not had a second survey done. PB appreciates it is not possible to force people to do it but believes it might be useful if a reminder could be issued, advising of the timescales involved.</p>	
3.50	<p>CA advised this is not really a timescale issue and some properties are not affected. The project is happy to instruct post-construction surveys if necessary.</p>	
3.51	<p>MT commented that surveys needs to be within the area affected by ground movement, i.e. the settlement zone. The project has undertaken extensive monitoring and knows exactly which areas were affected.</p>	
3.52	<p>PB believes a reminder to local residents would be useful. CA explained that people need to have had an initial pre-construction survey.</p>	
3.53	<p>PB is aware of a problem with tenanted properties but if the managing agents have not contacted the owners, there is nothing that can be done about this. CA advised that where relevant, the project normally corresponds with owners and managing agents.</p>	
3.54	<p>PB knows of properties that must have been affected but appreciates she cannot take up the offer of a second survey on their behalf. CA confirmed it is up to residents to contact the project. Lots of tenants have advised their landlords and there are quite a few ongoing cases.</p>	
3.55	<p>PB feels it is odd that a few properties in Methley Street have experienced awful cracks yet properties seemingly nearer have had no problems. MT advised that terraced properties often demonstrate strange behaviour, due to their interconnected nature.</p>	
3.56	<p>PB feels it would do no harm to remind people they need to get on with contacting the project about this issue. CA will relay this suggestion to the team. PB feels it would be a good idea to include a reminder within one of the weekly update emails, which PB forwards on. CA advised such a reminder would need to come from TfL. <b>Action 11: CA to suggest to the relevant TfL team that a reminder email be issued to local residents regarding property defects.</b></p>	
3.57	<p>CA confirmed the team is in touch with a lot of people about this issue and most affected properties are being dealt with, with Becky and the team getting back in touch to advise ground movement has now settled and appointing second surveys.</p>	CA
3.58	<p>AR asked how many residents are currently involved in this process. CA advised there are about 30 at present.</p>	
3.59	<p>MT explained that the issue is compounded by how the new tunnels were formed. The vast majority of properties are situated above tunnels constructed by a TBM, where settlement is virtually nil. These properties are unlikely to know we had tunnelled beneath them and our monitoring supports this.</p>	
	<p>MT advised approximately 90% of relevant properties took up the offer of a pre-construction survey. The project is confident it is doing the right thing in relation to this issue.</p>	

3.60		
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Future agenda items including dates of next meetings</b>	
4.1	PN requested that community safety, lighting and tree planting on the Green are included as future agenda items.	
4.2	PB asked if it is necessary to meet every three months, as there do not seem to be any big issues at present. Maybe every four – six months may be enough, on the understanding that if significant issues arise, meetings could be more regular.	
4.3	MF advised he is prepared to take a common sense view on this, although such a suggestion has been met with objections before. The Terms of Reference can be viewed.	
4.4	MT suggested the meetings for Kennington Green and Park could be combined.	
4.5	PB appreciates this is not a decision that can be decided now but she would not object if the meetings were less frequent.	
4.6	CA suggested that if members of the Kennington Park CLG are happy with this suggestion, it could be introduced.	
4.7	MF advised that the series of meetings scheduled for July are often less well-attended anyway.	
4.8	AR asked how long the meetings will continue for. MF believes TfL is committed to holding the meetings while the work sites are active.	
4.9	ME believes people will have lots to say when the Green is being tidied up.	
4.10	PN is not going to express an opinion about the frequency of these meetings. However, he is not sure if it is a good idea to combine the meetings.	
4.11	PB explained the suggestion is to just combine the two Kennington CLGs, not all meetings into one.	
4.12	MF advised he will need to check TfL's commitment under the Transport and Works Act Order (TWAo). <b>Action 12: MF to check TfL's commitment to the regular CLG meetings under the TWAo before raising the issue at the forthcoming Kennington Park CLG.</b>	<b>MF</b>
4.13	PB explained that for her Residents' Association, things have calmed down compared to the emotive meetings of a couple of years ago. If people cannot be bothered to attend, are the meetings serving a purpose?	
4.14	CA advised that a lot of people affected by the project now have her and MF's contact details and often liaise directly.	
4.15	PN closed the meeting.	

Meeting started at 18:35 and finished at 19:38. Minutes drafted by MW.