

MEETING MINUTES

Mount Anvil - CWG Meeting #3 21st June 2016

Attendees:

Mari Chisholm (MC) – MA Community Liaison Officer - **Chair & Minutes**
Richard Chalmers (RC) – MA Project Manager

Cllr Gio Spinella (GS) – LB Camden
Nancy Mayo (NM) – Secretary, Red Frog
Emily Brettle (EB) – Red Frog Platt's Lane & Community Co-Chair
Adrian Barrett (AB) - Vice Chair of Governors, St. Luke's School
Rupert Terry (RT) – Ferncroft Avenue
Simon Heather (SH) – Ferncroft Avenue
Jane Craxton (JC) – Craxton Studios
Mark Webster (MW) – St Margaret's School
Alan Sanders (AS) – Westfield Apartments
Hazel Finn (HF) – Heath Drive (Substitute)
Penny Davis (PD) - Heath and Hampstead Society

Derek Griffiths (DG) – Momentum Transport
Tony Allen (TA) – Community Consultant

Apologies:

Reverend Alistair Tresidder, Isabel Langtry, Samantha Beschizza, Moira Duncan,
Dr Sultan Gangji, Maryam Alaghband, Susan Reizenstein, Neil Lawson-May

Distribution:

All above plus
Those on the e-mail distribution list

	Item	Action	Date
1.	Introductions and Welcomes		
	Derek Griffiths introduced himself as the individual looking after this project on behalf of MA's transport consultants, Momentum Transport after Allan Trulock moved on.		
	Tony Allen introduced himself as the CWG's community consultant appointed on behalf of local residents and stakeholders, for assisting with technical support and advice relating the project as per the section 106 agreement between LB Camden and Mount Anvil.		
2.	Apologies of Absence		
	As above		

3.	Traffic Management Plan		
	<p>DG opened the discussion by talking through the process in which it has taken to get to the point we are currently in with regards to the TMP.</p> <p>DG explained that LB Camden asked Momentum Transport (on behalf of MA) to conduct surveys to feed into a proposal for the management of traffic.</p> <p>Momentum drafted a number of proposals for LB Camden. LB Camden then chose the plan they felt most supported the safe movement and control of traffic. The plan chosen would include the following being implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A partial closure along Kidderpore Avenue allowing local access only - No left turn left turn from Finchley Road into Platt's Lane - An anti-clockwise gyratory biasing traffic to utilise Finchley instead of the residential highway network and control external vehicle movements in the area - Banned turns, in order to reduce/bias the flow of traffic to travel in a western direction along Ferncroft Avenue and other local roads - No southbound turn into Ferncroft Avenue from Platt's Lane <p>DG also explained that there is no intention to change the direction of traffic along local roads and that the implementation of this plan would effectively reduce the 'rat run' on the local highway network</p> <p>A number of these assumptions and proposals were challenged by members of the CWG. EB asked Momentum to reconsider in view of the onerous nature of these proposals on many local residents.</p>		
	<p>GS – LB Camden have already consulted with local residents about the external traffic mitigation measures along Briardale Gardens. Has this been taken into account? DG confirmed he had been unaware of this proposal.</p> <p>RC – That proposal could ease congestion of external traffic in the area and possibly decrease the number of banned turns in the local area, this will be raised with LB Camden's Highways team</p> <p>GS – That is a separate highway issue whereas the proposed TMP is a temporary measure, albeit to the end of 2018. The two will be looked at independently</p>	<p>MA, TA and DG met with highway officers from LB Camden to discuss local resident feedback on 28/06/16.</p> <p>A number of suggestions were made and local resident feedback given to help formulate a more co-operative plan</p> <p>No final decision has been made as yet</p>	
	<p>EB – This plan will decrease the amount of commuter traffic in the area however it will force residents from Platt's Lane, Briardale Gardens and Clorane Gardens down Finchley Road which is always heavily congested</p>		
	<p>NM – Speeds of up to 60 mph have been recorded along Redington road this should be taken into consideration</p>		

	DG – The plan intends to slow drivers in the local area and bias them to use the Finchley Road instead of local residential streets		
	PD – Does the TMP take into consideration building works along Platt's Lane? DG – we are aware and are attempting to manage and control the wider highway network with this plan		
	SH – How will the gyratory system be enforced?		
	AS – Are these bans permanent and will they be in place 24/7 DG – These plans will be part of a temporary traffic order and will be in place for around 2 years, they will be in place for the duration of the 2 years		
	PD – Will there be a wider consultation on this proposal? AB – Will works start on site before a consultation takes place? DG – This will be decided by LB Camden we will update you as soon as we are clear on this		
	GS – Have Barratt's been consulted on this proposal RC – We have engaged with Barratt's with regards to our proposed TMP's however this gyratory plan will avoid vehicle interface from both sites as they are completely separate		
	JC – How will visitors to Kidderpore Avenue be affected? RC – Access for visitors and deliveries will still be granted		
	AS – Kidderpore Avenue is heavily congested with parking over the weekend and sub-contractors parking during the week. RC – MA hope this this proposal will ultimately deny access for sub-contractors and tackle the parking issue		
	JC – Sub-contractors usually pool cars to get into work RC – MA are meeting with Barratt's on 24/06/16 to discuss this		
	PD – What happened with licence plate numbers given to MA at the last meeting? MC – During staff briefings the site team raised this issue with sub-contractors all of which denied the cars belonging to them		
	AB – Will a holding bay still be positioned at the junction of Heath Drive and Kidderpore Avenue?		

	RC – No, MA are tendering with a number of logistics companies and are in talks with City Basements who have holdings points outside of the local area		
	RC – 21 parking bays will now be suspended instead of the previous 49 if this plan goes ahead, these will be in place between Kidderpore Gardens and Westfield to allow swept path movements		
	AS – Will parking bays still be suspended outside of site working hours? RC – more than likely but MA will double check with LB Camden		
	AS – Signage must be clear as residents have been ticketed due to confusing signage RC – MA will work with LB Camden to ensure all sign are clear		
	AS – Residents at Westfield often have removals or have work done to their homes so the bays outside of the complex are suspended during those times, this needs to be taken into consideration RC –MA will work closely with the Westfield concierge team to avoid clashes		
	JC – asked whether traffic marshals will be put in place, Mount Anvil confirmed that up to 8 marshals will be deployed along Kidderpore Avenue including a lollypop person presence to help school children and pedestrians across roads safely and marshals at gates in use and at road junctions accordingly		
	RC – Site working hours will be between 8am-6pm		
	EB – What is the consultation process with the schools in terms of restricted hours (for vehicle delivery), it is important that schools are consulted on this RC - Vehicle delivery times will ultimately be decided by LB Camden due to the sites close proximity to schools. Restricted hours to aid child and pedestrian safety would see vehicle movements between 9:30am -3:00pm. MA have been consulting with St Margaret's and St Luke's Schools to discuss the proposal	MA met with SLS & SMS on 05/07/16 to discuss the proposed TMP and safety measure that would need to be implemented SLS would like to share the final plan with school governors before agreeing to longer or restricted vehicle movements	
	AS – If restricted hours are enforced will this impact on restricted hours of parking?		
	RT – Momentum need to take into account cyclist movements		
4.	CMP		

	The draft CMP is still currently with LB Camden for comment, once comments are received MA will apply these to the plan and then share with the CWG before re-submitting to LB Camden	Comments have been sent back to MA, most comments relate to the TMP Once the TMP has been agreed MA will then update the CMP accordingly	
5.	Environment and Trees		
	RC – Demolition and earthworks will be the noisiest parts of the redevelopment. Scaffold and monarflex, as well as dampening down will be used to encase buildings during demolition and suppress dust and noise RC – QMH will be the first building to be demolished which is anticipated to take 4 weeks. The roof will be rebuilt by hand. MA are hoping to get conditions signed off imminently so that the bulk of demolition can commence within the summer holidays		
	EB – What form of noise monitoring will be used? RC – live monitoring will be used with reports regularly shared with LB Camden. Should works exceed 75 decibels works will be stopped on site and the method of work reviewed		
	NM – There will be repercussions for WHLTC due to the noise of demolition RC – MA will use best endeavours and best practice to ensure that noise is controlled as best as possible as set out above		
	EB – What decibel level is acceptable for children playing on WHLTC? RC - 85 decibels which is the average reading taken from a school playground		
	JC – BA stopped demolition works to accommodate a recording session at Craxton Studios RC – MA will halt demo works accordingly where necessary and practical		
	EB – School children using the tennis courts needs to be taken into consideration		

	RC – MA will use best endeavours and best practice to ensure that dust is controlled as best as possible as set out above		
	NM – Will MA be working with ecologists to mitigate dust for bats? PD – How will dust be considered for the bats at SLC?	MC to send details of bats specialist/ecologist to NM	
	NM – What is the dust particulate matter expected? RC – MA will look into this and update all at the next meeting		
	PD – What will happen to the trees along local roads that overhang? RC – MA will work with the LB Camden tree officer to maintenance if applicable		
	NM – Trees backing onto SLC are in bat flight paths or roosting areas will these be replaced?		
	NM – Concrete pond is of no added value to the ecology or bio-diversity on site		
	NM – Root protection zones are being re-reviewed in terms of planning conditions can you please explain why? RC – MA are air spading drainage roots in order to expose tree roots for deeper investigation. Air spading is particularly useful for root investigation and excavations or when working in areas containing services or tree roots, which could be damaged by conventional digging. Using compressed air, we can expose roots and services without damage, so that they can be located, inspected and bypassed.		
	RT – Slow worms should be looked into on site also		
	EB – Top soil should be relocated to a local park if possible RC – Soil will be graded and then sold, this forms part of the groundworks package		
	PD – Parking on SINC will be damaging soil what is being done to protect trees? RC – we have not been able to lay our root protection zones down due to planning conditions as yet, once these are in place we will implement		
	EB – Do any trees along Croft way need to be pruned/ removed?		

	<p>RC – Yes due to access constraints</p> <p>EB - MA should provide details of any trees to be removed outside of the site boundary. EB emphasised that this is a well used pedestrian access route and features like trees and the wall are of high conservation/local character value.</p>		
	<p>EB – Wall along Croft Way will be kept where possible, it is important that like for like imperial bricks be used if unsalvageable</p>		
	<p>EB – Will Croft Way be closed off at all?</p> <p>RC – No, but sections of it may be cordoned off</p>		
	<p>RC – The wall is in bad condition currently and is unstable</p> <p>SH – Adequate signage and protection needs to be put in place ASAP</p>	<p>MA have protected the wall using heras fencing and adequate signage</p>	
	<p>Notes</p>		
	<p>RC proposed to hold weekly CWG meetings after the suggestion was made by EB.</p> <p>CWG members felt that they are already committing considerable time and suggested the monthly CWG should continue</p>		
	<p>MA to organise a separate meeting to discuss community contribution with community members who want to get involved</p>	<p>MC to organise accordingly</p>	
	<p>MA to invite Thames water to attend future CWG meetings as a stakeholder due to close proximity to site</p>	<p>TW have been invited to attend on the 21st June which was declined and the 26th July, awaiting response</p>	
	<p>Detailed Basement Construction not discussed as plan is yet to be finalised</p>	<p>Once finalised Mount Anvil will circulate to the CWG for information due imminently</p>	
	<p>EB stressed importance of keeping all residents (not just the CWG) informed and suggested presentations and drop in sessions for residents</p>	<p>Mount Anvil had intended to host drop in sessions and will advertise them via newsletters and website</p>	
	<p>SH – comments were made on the newsletter. Members felt it was very dense and content heavy. MA to review ahead of next letter drop</p>	<p>MC to send newsletter to SH and NLM for review ahead of circulation to the community</p>	

	<p>HF – Size of the image used in the newsletter was too small, circulation not reaching all local residents many complained that they did not receive copies</p> <p>AB – newsletter wording needs to be refined as wording can seem misleading</p> <p>TA – MA need to be clear on number of vehicle movements expected</p> <p>EB – Barratt’s send newsletters to residents by post, this may want to be looked into for MA as well.</p>	<p>This will not happen again</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Once TMO is approved MA can confirm anticipated figures MA reviewing circulation options</p>	
	<p>CWG members expressed their concern at the use of the Hampstead Manor title. This is not historically accurate. MA took on board these comments and agreed to discuss this with the MA marketing department.</p>	<p>This has been discussed internally with the MAS Marketing team and the name of the development will not change</p>	
	<p>AM – Important information to be displayed on site hording and via correspondence to local residents</p>	<p>MA agree</p>	
	<p>Community Website to go live in July</p>		
	<p>CWG meeting to be brought forward as many find the after 9pm finishes difficult especially for members who do not live in the area</p>	<p>CWG to trial 18:30-20:00 meetings</p>	
	<p>Date of the next meeting 26th July 2016 – 18:30-20:00 @ HSOA</p>		