

**MEETING NOTE**

<b>SUBJECT</b>	<b>South Kensington Station (SKS) redevelopment Consultative Working Group (CWG) Meeting No. 10</b>
<b>VENUE</b>	<b>Ampersand Hotel, Harrington Road, SW7</b>
<b>DATE</b>	Wednesday 12 October 2016, 3 pm – 5.30 pm

<b>ATTENDEES</b>	<p><b>TfL Team:</b>  Jeremy Castle Director Central London Planning Deloitte Real Estate (JC)  Scott Anderson, Senior Property Development Manager, TfL Property (ScottA)  Richard Zavitz, Project Sponsor, Station &amp; Interchange Development (RZ)  Amy Thompson, Communications and Engagement Manager, TfL (AT)  Susanne Maguire, Project Manager, TfL (SM)  Matt Yeoman, Buckley Gray Yeoman (MY)  Justin Holland, Buckley Gray Yeoman (JH)  Nick Sutcliffe, Director, HardHat (NS)  Georgina Garland, Account Manager, HardHat (GG)</p> <p><b>Local Representatives:</b>  Edward Davies-Gilbert, Knightsbridge Association (ED-G)  Sophie Andrae, Brompton Association (SA)  Jan Langmuir, Thurloe Residents Association (JL)  Claire Brisby, Thurloe Residents Association (CB)  Guy Bondonneau, South Kensington Station tenants association (GB)  Amanda Frame, Kensington Society (AF)  Michael Bach, Kensington Society (MB)  Nicholas Gould, Pelham Residents Association (NG)  Gillian Berg, Pelham Residents Association (GB)</p> <p><b>Apologies:</b>  Robert Berg, Pelham Residents Association  Caryl Harris, South Kensington &amp; Queens Gate Association  Viorica Bergman, South Kensington &amp; Queens Gate Association  Susanna Trostorf, Onslow Neighbourhood Association  Eva Skinner, Onslow Neighbourhood Association</p>
------------------	---

## MINUTES

### 1. Welcome

NS from HardHat welcomed everyone to the meeting. Each participant around the table introduced themselves.

### 2. Minutes of the previous meeting

NS asked if there were any matters arising from the minutes.

SA referred to the discussion of retail at Pelham Street on page 3. SA re-stated that details of proposing retail along the full length of Pelham Street were not shown in earlier CWG meetings. NS said this point will be noted.

### 3. Arcade roof repair & other station works

AT gave an update on the arcade roof repair works. Most of the lower glazing is complete with all glazing installation expected in the next two weeks. SA complimented the clear glass and stated the arcade will look good once the scaffolding is down.

### 4. Station upgrade proposals

RZ gave an update on the programme and proposals for the station upgrades. The escalators from the ticket hall down to the Piccadilly line will require essential works. This will be carried out in the week after school half term (30 Oct). This will mean that one escalator from the ticket hall will be in operation during these works and a one-way system will be implemented.

The costs of the initial phase of the station capacity upgrade have been reviewed and are higher than forecasted in 2014 due to additional scope items (e.g. interchange overbridge) and increased construction costs (e.g. need to demolish existing platform). A re-phasing exercise has been carried out to identify potential opportunities to reduce the cost and programme of the Phase One capacity works. As a consequence, the delivery of the interchange bridge has been delayed until the mid 2020's.

Also the ticket machines will stay where they are for now until the new station entrance providing the lift access to the ticket hall is installed. Additional funding has also been requested as granted to carry out the Phase One works.

SA asked for clarification on whether the overbridge will be part of the listed building application. RZ confirmed that it will form part of a subsequent application.

ED-G asked if by delaying the overbridge it could cause later complications? RZ said no as the canopy is being designed with the overbridge in mind. There will be design opportunities by delaying the delivery of the overbridge as some of the conflicting rooms on the platform will be removed in advance.

SA asked of the timing of the listing building application. RZ said it will be early 2017 and TfL will present the final proposals to CWG for final comment before submission.

Regarding the emergency exit, RZ said that there will be a second, smaller structure separate to the one proposed for emergency exit on the eastbound line to Thurloe Square. The second exit will be delivered in 2025 after the removal of the plant from this platform.

MB asked of the size of the emergency exit? RZ said it will be a walkway likely between 2m and 2.5m wide.

NB asked where on Thurloe Square bridge will the new emergency exit emerge? RZ confirmed that it will be close to the north end of the bridge and will require adjustments to the flow planters. Plans and drawings of the emergency structure will be shared at the next meeting.

MB asked for the timescale. RZ said the escalator works will follow on from bringing the new platform into use, though some work in the ticket hall will remain to be completed while the escalators are being used. The escalator replacement works are expected to be carried out over a 10-month period.

CB stated that she had requested the evacuation regulations for the station. ScottA asked for clarification as to whether this is the request for the fire engineers report. CB confirmed so. RZ said this report is still being developed and will be shared once completed. An initial note will be circulated with the minutes clarifying the need for a secondary means of escape for the new platform.

CB asked if the number of ticket barriers will be increased. RZ said the line of ticket barriers will be reconfigured with new ones added all in a straight line. In total there will be more gates.

## **5. Around station development (ASD)**

### **Revised Development Brief**

ScottA gave a presentation on the updated proposals for ASD. ScottA and JC thanked members of the group for their helpful comments on the draft Development Brief, as presented at the previous meeting.

ScottA reiterated the objective for a high quality ASD development.

Following receipt of comments on the draft Development Brief, TfL are closer to presenting the brief to developers to select a development partner. Throughout this process, TfL look to jointly work with CWG.

ScottA said the development brief has been altered in light of feedback from the CWG and the revised brief is intended to create a broad consensus between parties. This revised brief will be presented to prospective developers.

JC added that the Development Brief reflects the year of engagement with the CWG and TfL are encouraged by the responses, as there is a clear direction on which to go forward.

JC said the Development Brief is a document that summarises TfL's proposals for the site. This will be finalised in the next couple of days and the CWG members will be asked to submit their formal responses to the document. This will then form part of the appendices. JC stated that the document is owned by TfL, and is not an RBKC planning document.

MB followed on from JC and said that when he spoke to JC that morning, that he stated that the brief should state the constraints and expectations of the CWG so that the development partner will be under no illusion.

SA added that the non-negotiable elements of the brief should be put upfront and not disguised so prospective development partners know what to expect. MB added that the aim is to find a development partner that will do what is best for the station.

NG added that he agreed that the document should make clear what has been agreed with the CWG upfront.

ScottA said that the revised Development Brief hopes to address all

concerns put forward so that CWG members are able to write a supportive response with any additional issues they may have.

NG asked ScottA, 'what am I as a developer to do with this document?' ScottA said that the Development Brief is intended to provide a good sense of the key principles feeding into the design evolution thus far - informed by TfL and the additional comments from CWG members and RBKC.

SA noted that the wrong image is used in the presentation regarding Brompton Association's proposals in early 2000's. ScottA apologised and noted that it is merely to illustrate the history of proposals.

MB queried what the Council have said about the proposals. JC said that TfL have held a couple of meeting with officers since July and their comments have been worked into the Development Brief in the same way as with the CWG informing the design approach.

AF suggested making reference to the CWG's formal comments in the appendices and that the design has been informed by CWG's comments on the opening page. JC said yes, can refer to the appendices. AF added that by doing so it will force developers to go to that section of the document.

NG applauded TfL for their efforts to record all the views of CWG members. NG reiterated that he has trouble working out what the developer will make of the document. ScottA said that TfL will be working in partnership with the development partner so it is important that the developer understands the principles important to the development that will inform future design development, leading to a planning application.

JC presented the revisions made to the Development Brief. The revised copy will go to both the CWG and RBKC for their formal comment at the same time and then everything will be issued to the potential development partners.

NG asked if TfL will imply in the document that the CWG have signed off the revised Development Brief. SA responded that their comments will be submitted to the developer as appendices. JC confirmed.

#### **Development brief objectives**

SA asked that the SFA plans be extended to include the illustration of the

proposed SFA relative to the arcade for ease of reference.

CB asked if the Development Brief is being updated, does it impact the operations of the station upgrade? ScottA explained the intention is to coordinate the development and delivery of the two projects and that the Thurloe Street refurbishment will enable the delivery of SFA into the ticket hall. AF and MB suggested that a clear description of the interface and timetable for both streams should be presented in the brief. JC agreed with this suggestion.

ScottA then explained the revisions to the design in the Development Brief:

*Pelham Street*

ScottA explained the concerns that had been submitted regarding height on Pelham Street. In response, TfL have removed a floor from the entire length of Pelham Street, thus reducing the overall height.

With regards to issues with retail along the full length of Pelham Street to the corner, ScottA stated that the four storey retail units and the residential use above them at the corner have been removed and replaced with a multi-storey office building.

CB asked if the proposal is for one office unit? ScottA said yes but the space could be subdivided.

NG was concerned that the development brief was unbalanced as it was based on research for only retail use, and did not include any research into residential or office use. SA highlighted that retail already made up a large proportion of the around station buildings (Thurloe St, Arcade, and Bullnose) and it was clear that this was this needed to be looked at in detail, moreover the retail units around the station were often the first thing people see in South Kensington so it is vitally important to the 'arrival experience'. SA explained the project team already established have significant experience in residential and office uses, but did not have specific expertise in retail so TfL commissioned an independent group to assess the retail risks and opportunities. NG re-stated that the PRA would like to see research into different uses, and that this was necessary to make an informed decision.

In respect to retail units, ScottA said A3 had been removed. NG commented that TfL would have no control over the future change of the

units from A1 to A3 class. ScottA confirmed that TfL were looking into legal ways to restrict uses, and had discussed this issue with RBKC officers.

ScottA turned to discussing proposals for the pavement at Pelham Street. ED-G asked if the width is the same all along as it curves. ScottA said 2.8m is the average width.

GB asked if the proposals take account of impact on transport. ScottA said that traffic assessment does not form part of the Development Brief stage, but will form part of the preparation of a planning application. Steer Davies Gleave has provided transport advice to inform the brief.

AF questioned the stage in which the transport assessment is carried out. ScottA reiterated and explained that it forms part of preparing a planning application along with other technical assessments such as daylight and sunlight. RBKC will respond to the Development Brief at this stage without these assessments.

In response, SA asked for assurance that TfL will be given pre app advice as to what assessments are required by the Council. ScottA confirmed this.

CB requested clarification for the term 'vehicle crossover' in respect of the location of a loading bay at Thurloe Bridge. ScottA explained it is a single loading bay for servicing replacing section of the drop kerb. CB suggested this is clarified in the brief.

### *Bullnose*

ScottA addressed the concerns raised regarding the impact of a terrace on the bullnose. ScottA stated that as a consequence, the proposal for a roof top terrace has been removed. It will instead be an enclosed restaurant.

ED-G stated that they do not want to see folding doors onto a terrace so that it can be open to the elements and be used as a terrace. ScottA confirmed that it will be an enclosed space and set back slightly from the existing edge of the bullnose.

AF questioned the overall proposed height of the upper storey. JH confirmed the first floor will be 4m floor to ceiling. Concerned with the impression of height on the drawings, AF suggested that the

Development Brief is clearer about height. It was agreed that the upper floor height should be reduced in height so that it is not as tall as the existing ground floor bullnose height.

#### *Daylight / sunlight assessments*

NG asked why TfL are not consulting the CWG on rights of light? ScottA stated that it is a discussion to be had with those properties, which may be affected individually. This was not a planning or public consideration. However, daylight and sunlight is a public matter and TfL plans to consult on this when the assessment is prepared for the proposed scheme. The Pelham Street residents' membership of the various associations was discussed.

GB stated that TfL have a lot of information on rights of light from previous proposed developments, but do not intend to approach those affected despite having this information. ScottA said that it is because at this stage of design, TfL do not know the actual height of the development so cannot have accurate discussions about the matter.

NS added that a full set of technical assessments will be prepared for planning application.

#### **Design**

JH presented the design for the latest ASD proposals.

In respect of Pelham Street, CB noted from the presentation that the office does not seem to be set back. JH said this is correct but added that the view contained in the image doesn't illustrate the upper floor of the office which is set back. AF asked if the office will be four storeys. JH confirmed that it will be three and four storeys including ground level.

AF asked if there will be additional roof top plant. JH and MY confirmed that there will not be a plant on top of the residential and for the office.

AF asked if the facia of Thurloe Street shops can be upgraded as part of the proposals. MB added that some control is required on what type of facias are put in under future leases. SA agreed. ED-G added the same for the bullnose too.

Referring to the drawing of the bullnose on the presentation, AF suggested the image is changed in the Development Brief because the

additional floor on the plan without detail dominates the bullnose.

Discussions turned to the function of the bullnose and the proposed entrance and exit to the first floor.

AF asked if the original walls could be exposed? JH said yes, they could as it will celebrate the history of the station. AF added that she feels the height of the bullnose is too high and asked what the officers have said. Added that what is missing from the drawing is the proportion of the glazed front to the rest of the frontage.

Referring to comparison plans showing the previous schemes; SA advised that all the plans should be the same size in the Development Brief so that the massing of the proposed scheme is not misread. ScottA confirmed this would be done before the presentation is issued and made available on the website.

AF asked how the wider local community will know of the development proposals. ScottA said that the intention is to hold another public consultation drop-in event in November to update the local community.

NG asked for clarification on who will be the applicant for the planning proposals? ScottA confirmed the developer will be a Joint Venture, working in partnership with TfL; and the Joint Venture entity will make the application.

ScottA added that TfL will soon begin informal discussions with the developers to begin the selection process. SA asked when the informal discussions will end. ScottA said there is also a formal process but TfL are not bound to use any of those on the current framework list. TfL will keep CWG members updated throughout.

MB asked what role TfL foresees CWG members to have going forward? ScottA replied that it will continue consulting but not on a monthly basis. There will not be a November meeting as the Development Brief will be finalised and the selection stage will have commenced. Intend to meet in the New Year to update on the process.

AF suggested replacing the November CWG date with the public consultation drop-in event.

**5. Programme timeline**

Development Brief to be finalised and issued w/c 17 October 2016.

CWG response or responses to the finalised Development Brief are requested by 6 November 2016.

Likely to be a public exhibition on ASD Development Brief proposals and public feedback could be appended to the Development Brief as well.

**6. Future meeting date**

November 16 meeting postponed to January 2016 TBC