



HOUSING, ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT AND COMMUNITY SAFETY SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the Housing, Environment, Transport and Community Safety Scrutiny Sub-Committee held on Wednesday 1 May 2013 at 7.00 pm at Ground Floor Meeting Room G02A - 160 Tooley Street, London SE1 2QH

PRESENT: Councillor Gavin Edwards (Chair)
Councillor Graham Neale (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Chris Brown
Councillor Michael Bukola
Councillor Lorraine Lauder MBE
Councillor Martin Seaton
Councillor Catherine Bowman

**OTHER MEMBERS
PRESENT:** Councillor Catherine Bowman

**OFFICER
SUPPORT:** Shelley Burke – Head of Overview & Scrutiny
Tim Gould - Development Control & Strategic Projects
Fitzroy Williams – Scrutiny Project Assistant

**GROUP
REPRESENTATIVES** Bob Lentell - Kennington and Walworth Neighbourhood Action Group
Sean Maker - Kennington and Walworth Neighbourhood Action Group
Michelle Stokes - Kennington and Walworth Neighbourhood Action Group
Lesley Walker - Kennington and Walworth Neighbourhood Action Group

1. APOLOGIES

1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Tim McNally.

2. NOTIFICATION OF ANY ITEMS OF BUSINESS WHICH THE CHAIR DEEMS URGENT

2.1 The Chair agreed to accept additional documents in relation to the Northern Line Extension from the Kennington and Walworth Neighbourhood Action Group.

3. DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS

- 3.1 Councillor Graham Neale, vice-chair made a disclosure of interest as a council tenant and a resident of Draper House. Councillors Michael Bukola and Lorraine Lauder also disclosed that they were council tenants.

4. MINUTES

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the sub-committee held on 25 March 2013 be agreed as a true and accurate record.

5. THE NORTHERN LINE EXTENSION

- 5.1 The chair welcomed the representatives of the Kennington and Walworth Neighbourhood Action Group (KWNAG) to the meeting and thanked them for supplying the sub-committee with a list of questions that they had submitted to officers prior to the meeting.
- 5.2 A representative stated that the group involves residents from both Southwark and Lambeth and reported that this initially started as a privately promoted scheme with little consultation and had now developed into a public scheme.
- 5.3 There were some concerns, the first being the design and impact of the scheme on local residents and the fact that an underground cavern would be required, raised questions regarding risk assessment information being made available to the public. It was reported that the group had to use the Freedom of Information Act to gain sight of the risk assessment carried out by the original promoters of the scheme.
- 5.4 The fact that ground stabilisation had also been suggested by Transport for London (TfL) who had put forward two methods of stabilising the ground around the step plate junction. They have stated that the contractor in consultation with TfL will decide the method deployed. The two alternatives for ground stabilisation have major consequences for noise, vibration, ground water management, movement of heavy lorries and changes to on-street parking to be endured by Southwark residents and children at Bishops House and Keyworth School, during the construction of the Northern Line Extension (NLE). Residents have not been consulted about these disruptions.
- 5.5 The sub-committee were informed that Kennington Station was already crowded at peak times, after two NLE consultations no upgrade had been proposed for Kennington Station but TfL confirmed that NLE will increase passengers through Kennington station by 10,000 during the rush hour. The group had also become aware that a suggestion of the station becoming an "exit only" station in the

morning peak hours and thus inaccessible to Southwark residents.

- 5.6 Following the publication of the TfL architect's drawings for the NLE Vent Shaft in the corner of the Park adjacent to Kennington Park Place and St Agnes Place. The location of the shaft would create a big impact on traffic, local schools and Southwark residents. There were also Town Planning issues regarding Listed Buildings and Conservation Area which needed to be addressed.
- 5.7 Questions 12 to 19 regarded planning and consultation, representatives stated it looked like the council was not actively participating in this process and felt that Southwark residents indeed felt abandoned. As it stands there did not seem to be any benefit to Southwark residents for this scheme, apart from if they wished to travel to Battersea.
- 5.8 Major changes would take place in this area such as demolishing the park keepers' lodge and replacing with a less appropriate building in scale and relationship to other buildings. There is a large council estate located very close to this area who knew nothing about the NLE plans.
- 5.9 Concerns were expressed by residents regarding soil condition and the ground not being sufficiently stabilised which could affect surrounding buildings and ground water management of the area which may not be able to be discharged.
- 5.10 The Kennington and Walworth Neighbourhood Action Group wanted the council to make representations to TfL and if they were rejected, officers should engage and support community groups. A lead officer should be highlighted to help groups raise any objections.
- 5.11 The area of consultation seemed to be quite small and started at the Kennington Park and included one or two streets down to the underground station, the last consultation poster was placed on the stairs leading down to the platform of the station.
- 5.12 In response to the chair's question, representatives reported that they represented over 40 people who attended their meeting last week regarding the proposed NLE plans, our real concerns are that so little consultation has been undertaken by TfL with local residents.
- 5.13 At this point the chair introduced the Tim Gould, Group Manager (Development Control & Strategic Projects) in the Transport Planning Service who had provided answers to the questions raised by representatives prior to the meeting.
- 5.14 Tim Gould introduced himself to the representatives and members of the sub-committee, he stated that he would be responsible for transport planning matters such as passenger numbers, crowding, and the need for works to the station and service disruption during construction.
- 5.15 Bill Legassick, Principal Environmental Health Officer in the Council's Environmental Protection Team would cover issues around the noise, vibration and pollution caused by construction activities, and operational noise and vibration.

Members were informed that the officer was not available to attend this meeting.

- 5.16 The group manager reported that the promoter of the scheme was responsible for the consultation of local residents, points had been raised to the cabinet member councillor Barrie Hargrove to pass onto TfL.
- 5.17 The officer reported that the documents submitted would be assessed thoroughly and work would continue with officers from the London Borough of Lambeth, as the proposals affected both Lambeth and Southwark residents.
- 5.18 The sub-committee were informed that there would be impacts to residents and officers intended to minimise this as much as possible. Increase in passengers would be on platform movement using the new crossing passages to get to another platform, and not increasing movement at ticket, staircase or upper level.
- 5.19 Officers had not received any information regarding 'exit only' from the station and reported this would not be acceptable to the council.
- 5.20 Members were also informed that the Prince Albert Old Lodge was indeed outside of this borough and in the London Borough of Lambeth and officers would need to recommend a planning application and pass to the Government – Secretary of State for consideration.
- 5.21 Representatives stated again that there were no benefits to residents of the London Borough of Southwark and residents will suffer through noise and disruption, the planning process only compensates on a limited basis and that is the nature of this process.
- 5.22 A member of the sub-committee stated that in the interest of fairness of this scheme, it is part of the major transport infrastructure which is needed and it is understood that the council is also lobbying for public investment in Camberwell, Peckham and Elephant & Castle for proposed schemes.
- 5.23 The chair of Overview & Scrutiny stated that the council need to up its game, Lambeth appear to be benefiting from this deal. The locating of the worksites in Southwark is not a good deal for local residents.
- 5.24 The level of business through the station (18,000 people per hour) and development controls shows residents are paying a high price, we have to represent our residents more strongly as we have a duty of care, and need to do much more to compensate residents.
- 5.25 The officer pointed out that now was the time to raise any objections and reported that the council had passed on their concerns regarding the impact of the shaft on local residents.
- 5.26 A representative stated that the main problem was that the plans they had accessed were impossible and were not properly thought out, there were 2 other locations which had been suggested. Southwark needed to stand up for residents, children are taken to the lodge and park, now it will be too dangerous. There was

also a risk of flooding, by pumping cement into the subsoil to stabilise the ground before construction.

- 5.27 The representative enquired what plans and proof TfL had provided that this was the best way forward and stated that the council should be asking hard questions of TfL.
- 5.28 The officer stated that the report had been made available from last night and questions can now be asked of TfL, he stressed that officers needed to read through all the documentations before asking questions and informed the sub-committee that the deadline for this would be the 18th June 2013.
- 5.29 The chair requested that officers take on board points raised at this meeting when asking questions of TfL.
- 5.30 A member of the sub-committee stated that there was presently not enough data available to answer all the questions raised by KWNAG and a time line would be required.
- 5.31 The officer reported objections would be required by 18th June 2013 and passed to the Secretary of State, officers would review all documentation and identify any raised objections and discuss with colleagues in the London Borough of Lambeth and London Borough of Wandsworth with regards to settlement.
- 5.32 Members were also informed that officers from the London Borough of Lambeth were happy to continue working with the present consultants and share information, reports and or any investigation that may be required.
- 5.33 The chair asked when will the council representations be ready?
- 5.34 The officer replied that council representations would be completed in time for the cabinet member councillor Hargrove to submit to the Secretary of State for Transport on the 18th June 2013.
- 5.35 A member of the sub-committee asked whether there would be an opportunity to scrutinise the report? And were there any public meetings planned?
- 5.36 A representative reported that a public meeting was planned for 8th May 2013 at Kennington Park House and undertook to e-mail the details through to members.
- 5.37 The chair with the agreement of the sub-committee undertook to receive a report back on this item as the views of residents were very important and it was felt that this item should be visited again. When revisiting this item the following people should be invited to attend the meeting:-
- A representative from TfL
 - The cabinet member (Councillor Barrie Hargrove)
 - Group Manager (Development Control & Strategic Projects)
 - Principal Environmental Health Officer in the Council's Environmental Protection Team

5.38 The sub-committee agreed that the officer should take onboard the following points raised at this meeting, which residents were concerned about:-

- Vent location at Bishops House
- Number of people going through Kennington Station
- Operational Noise
- Noise from Construction.

5.39 The chair gave representatives the opportunity to make their closing comments.

5.40 The representative stated that it was felt that the right way forward would be for a public enquiry, as TfL appeared to be under prepared and were very unhelpful with answering any questions raised to them. The only way residents were supplied with any information was through the Freedom of Information Act i.e. Kennington Station was not included in the consultation and now it is included in the scheme.

5.41 The chair thanked representatives for their contribution to the meeting and stated that in the next few weeks a more proactive stance would be provided for residents.

6. DRAPER HOUSE - REPORT

6.1 The chair introduced the report and went through the recommendations with the sub-committee. He further suggested that the termination at will clause should have been included in the initial contract.

6.2 A member of the sub-committee asked what were the chances of these recommendations being agreed?

6.3 The chair reported that he would be attending the meeting to promote the report to the Cabinet and was confident the recommendations would be agreed and passed to the Director for action.

6.4 The chair of Overview & Scrutiny Committee congratulated the sub-committee for an excellent report and stated that she would endorse the report and recommendations.

6.5 Members discussed recommendation 4 of the report which recommends that the conclusions be kept at the forefront of officers' minds in considering these future bids.

6.6 The sub-committee expressed concern regarding recommendation 6, shifting the cost from leaseholders to council tenants. The chair of Overview & Scrutiny Committee advised the sub-committee that the recommendation was good and the finance would not be deducted from the Housing Revenue Account (HRA).

6.7 The chair moved that the report be agreed and passed to the Cabinet for consideration.

RESOLVED:

That the scrutiny report Major Works at Draper House be submitted to the Cabinet for consideration via the Overview & Scrutiny Committee.

7. CLOSED MINUTES

- 7.1 The closed minutes of the meeting of the sub-committee held on 25 March 2013 were agreed as a true and accurate record.
- 7.2 Councillor Graham Neale stated that refreshments had been made available to sub-committee members, but as a vegan nothing had been provided for him and this was not the first time that this had happened.

The meeting ended at 8.31 p.m.