

COUNCIL ASSEMBLY
(ORDINARY MEETING)
WEDNESDAY 16 OCTOBER
QUESTIONS ON REPORTS

Item 8.1: Representation to proposed Northern Line Extension

1. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, ENVIRONMENT AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR CATHERINE BOWMAN

The report states that the council will provide oral evidence at the public inquiry if TfL fails to address its concerns about the project. Specifically which of the council's requirements must be met to avoid this scenario? Does the council demand that a certain maximum noise level must be agreed not to be surpassed by the construction work, and if so, what is that level?

RESPONSE

The council maintains concerns with the dis-application of sections 56, 56A, 58, 58, 73A, 73B 73C and 78A and Schedule 3A of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991. This would compromise the council's ability to perform its duty under the Traffic Management Act 2004 work and fulfil its duty under the Highways Act 1980 without incurring additional cost.

Regarding the noise of construction works, the work site for the ventilation shaft is in the London Borough of Lambeth, who will be responsible authority to issue the section 61 Control of Pollution Act 1974. Discussion will need to be undertaken how the work in practice with LB Lambeth and TfL to ensure that the noise levels are acceptable to the residents within the borough, through an agreement.

2. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, ENVIRONMENT AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR ANOOD AL-SAMERAI

What is the council doing to ensure that the proposals offer benefits to local residents, rather than just the inconvenience associated with the construction work? Is the council calling for compensation to be offered to residents whose houses and living conditions are likely to be affected by the proposed works?

RESPONSE

The authority has raised concerns with the impact of construction in the amenity (specifically the environmental impacts) of residents, workers and visitors to the area. A letter from Transport of London dated 22 August 2013 TfL states that the "Construction Noise and Vibration Mitigation Scheme" will be applied sympathetically and having regard to the merits of individual cases. The "Construction Noise and Vibration Mitigation Scheme" is included as a planning condition. This includes items such as assessment and monitoring, and where necessary appropriate compensation. These management controls are consistent with other TfL schemes such as Crossrail.

3. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, ENVIRONMENT AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR GRAHAM NEALE

Does the council support TfL's proposal for the location of the permanent shaft, or is the council seeking further justification from TfL on the matter? Has the council challenged TfL's assertions that moving the permanent shaft would require sharp turns for trains and would also remove the option of using gallery tunnels to reinforce the ground in the Kennington area?

RESPONSE

The permanent ventilation and intervention shafts are provided to ensure safety and comfort within tunnels once the underground railway is operating. The office of Rail regulation Railway safety Principles and Guidance Part 2a indicates that an intervention and access point should usually be provided every kilometre along an underground railway.

The function of the particular shafts drives the broad location of each shaft. At each of the proposed sites and alternative site locations which were identified, they were appraised in terms of a number of criteria, to establish the preferred sites. The criteria include:

- Constructability and availability of a suitable worksite;
- Efficiency of ventilation and distance of the shaft from centre line of route alignment;
- Acceptability to the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority (LFEPA) in terms of the distance between the above – ground access at the shafts to the running tunnels;
- Amount of temporary or permanent land take and property acquisition
- Amount of disruption to trees and ecology;
- Distance to the closest sensitive receptors (e.g. residential properties) to avoid construction and operational air quality and noise impacts
- The presence of heritage and townscape constraints; and
- Suitable parking space in proximity for maintenance and emergency vehicle parking.

The council has considered the information presented by TfL regarding the location for the permanent shaft and the work by Ramboll Ltd, Lambeth Council's adviser on technical matters which considered a similar situation for the permanent shaft in Kennington Green.

Having reviewed both sets of information the council does not think that there is any further progress that can be made in challenging TfL's decision to site the permanent shaft at this location.

4. QUESTION TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, ENVIRONMENT AND RECYCLING FROM COUNCILLOR GEOFFREY THORNTON

Is the council privy to the views of Ramboll Ltd, Lambeth Council's adviser on technical matters, on the perceived need to locate the permanent shaft at Kennington Park House, and if so, what is Ramboll's view? Has Southwark Council considered commissioning its own technical advisers?

RESPONSE

The Ramboll Ltd reports are available via Lambeth council's website. Officers from both councils have been working closely and having considered the technical requirements, including safety, planning, transport and environmental (including the facilitation of gallery tunnelling to remove the requirement for the construction of a tunnel in Harmsworth Street) considerations, have concluded that the location of the permanent shaft is the most appropriate taking all things into consideration. Given the level of close working with Lambeth Council and the technical expertise available it was not considered necessary to commission further technical advice.