



MEETING MINUTES

Subject:	Chambers Wharf Community Liaison Working Group
Date and time:	Wednesday 28 July 2021, 5:30pm – 7:00pm
Location:	Virtual – via Microsoft Teams
Chair and minute taker:	Chair – Patricia Brown Minute taker – Emily Black

Item	Topic	Lead
1	Welcome, introductions and apologies	PB
2	Actions from last meeting	PB
3	Updates from project team <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction update and future programme • Noise and air quality • Legacy and Community Investment • Mitigation 	Tideway East team
4	Community Enhancement Fund and Section 106 projects update	Southwark Council
5	Feedback	All
6	Any other business	PB

Chair

- Patricia Brown (PB)

Attendees

- Two residents, including one from the Wrayburn Community Organisation

Tideway and Main Works Contractor - CVB

- Nick Lock (NL), Tunnel Agent
- Gareth Howells (GH), Chambers Wharf and Main Tunnel D Project Manager
- Allen Summerskill (AS), Stakeholder and Consents Manager
- Joseph de la Fuente (JF), Graduate Environmental Advisor
- Rebecca Oyibo (RO), Community Relations Officer
- Louise Walsh (LW), Mitigation and Compensation Lead
- Martin Griffiths (MG), Senior Community Relations Manager
- Emily Black (EB), Engagement Manager

London Borough of Southwark

- Jacqueline Christie (JC), Senior Planning Officer
- Dan Taylor (DT), Programme Manager
- Roger Taylor (RT)
- Richard Earis (RE)

Thames Water Integration Group

- Demi Dean (DD), Technical Administrator, Communications & Stakeholder Liaison

	Item	Action
1.0	<p>Welcome, introductions and apologies</p> <p>PB welcomed the attendees and ran through the agenda.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There were two residents in attendance though 10 had confirmed attendance prior to the meeting. 	
1.1	<p>A resident noted that the copy of the previous minutes circulated did not include names of individuals and was anonymised. The resident also noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • there was a low turnout of residents (two residents) and a high contingent of staff present • short notice was provided for the meeting (8 days) • the normal meeting day of a Monday had been changed to a Wednesday • the draft date for next meeting should be agreed at current meeting • names should be included on the minutes to accurately represent what was said <p>AS noted that historically there has been two set of minutes produced, one with names included that has been emailed to members of the CLWG mailing list and another that has been anonymised for the website. The anonymised version link was shared with the meeting invite in error and was not meant to be standard practice though at some sites we have moved to produce one set of minutes for efficiency. All versions of minutes are kept for record.</p> <p>A resident noted he was unaware that two sets of minutes had been produced historically and this was of concern to him. The resident noted members of CLWG should have been made aware of the two sets of minutes and should have been asked about this.</p> <p>It was emphasised that the content of both versions are the same, except the website version has the personal name of the resident removed and replaced with 'a resident' eg AA asked when the work would be completed would be replaced with 'A resident' asked when the work would be completed etc.</p> <p>PB noted that the day change was at her request to ensure key staff were available and the timings of the meeting tried to balance/avoid cutting into evenings and avoid school pick-up times.</p> <p>PB asked if residents still agree to names being included on the version of the minutes circulated to CLWG. Residents present at the meeting agreed.</p> <p>PB noted that the next meeting will aim to take place in person and will be in the Autumn. This is subject to current Government guidance regarding the pandemic.</p> <p>A resident noted that she was here to keep up to date with the project and has currently moved away from the area during the construction period.</p> <p>Action 1 – Names to be included on minutes that are circulated to CLWG members.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Action 1</p>

	<p>Action 2 – Next CLWG to be in autumn, on a Monday and face to face if possible. Date to be circulated well ahead of meeting.</p> <p>Post meeting note: Proposed dates for upcoming meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monday 27 September 2021 (6.30pm-8pm), will be held virtually 	<p>Action 2</p>
<p>2.0</p>	<p>Actions from last meeting</p> <p>Actions from last meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Previous action 1: Tideway to provide a full-scale timetable of the works in a post-meeting note, supplied as soon as possible and for the full-scale timetable to be included in any further meetings. Action closed - programme was included as a post meeting note and is included in today's presentation and will be included in future presentations. Previous action 2: At the next meeting, a substantive agenda item to focus on, and allow discussion on the details of the full-scale timetable. Action closed - included in today's presentation. Previous action 3: Tideway to come back to the with an update on covering the tanks within a two-week period of the meeting. The resident was fully informed of the actions and an update has been included in today's presentation. 	<p>Closed</p> <p>Closed</p> <p>Closed</p>
<p>3.0</p>	<p>Updates from project team</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction update and future programme Noise and air quality Legacy and Community Investment Mitigation 	
<p>3.1</p>	<p>Construction Update</p> <p>NL provided an update on construction.</p> <p>Tunnel Boring Machine (TBM) 'Selina' is tunnelling from Chambers Wharf to Abbey Mills Pumping Station. She is currently under the River Thames.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 292 tunnel segment rings have been constructed 548m of tunnel has been excavated Current production is 5 rings per day (or 9m of tunnel excavation), this is expected to slowly increase to 10 rings per day (or 19m of tunnel excavation) and will eventually rise to around 40m of tunnel excavation per day. <p>At ground level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We are installing acoustic panels to the slurry pipe bridge. 80% of cladding has been installed. We are receiving ring segment deliveries by barge We are undertaking muck away activities to support tunnelling operations. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 42,000 tonnes of excavated material have been removed from site by barge since the last meeting. <p>Update on tanks and noise mitigation measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NL noted that there has been an improvement with the tanks. Noise levels have been reduced as we have changed the levels of liquid above the agitators. Mock-up trials are being looked at to see whether a floating noise ‘roof’ will help reduce noise further. <p>PB noted concerns that a floating roof may cause more noise if a drum-effect is created.</p> <p>A resident asked whether the resident who had-raised concerns about the tanks has been updated and whether we can ask her and other residents of Luna House if the situation has improved.</p> <p>AS confirmed that he’d provided an update and a new noise monitor has been added to specifically to monitor the tanks and following the change of the level and density of liquid there has been an improvement.</p> <p>Action 3 – Tideway to contact resident of Luna House to see if the noise levels have got quieter.</p> <p>A resident referred to the presentation and asked whether it was oil you could see in the Thames. AS assured her that this has been checked, and it is not oil. It is likely to be just a reflection in the water when the aerial photograph was taken.</p>	<p>Action 3</p>																																																																																																																							
<p>3.2</p>	<p>Programme</p> <p>NL presented the timetable for the remaining period of construction, summarised in the table below:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="268 1346 1273 1563"> <thead> <tr> <th>Chambers Wharf</th> <th colspan="4">2021</th> <th colspan="4">2022</th> <th colspan="4">2023</th> <th colspan="4">2024</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Construction Activity</th> <th>Q1</th> <th>Q2</th> <th>Q3</th> <th>Q4</th> <th>Q1</th> <th>Q2</th> <th>Q3</th> <th>Q4</th> <th>Q1</th> <th>Q2</th> <th>Q3</th> <th>Q4</th> <th>Q1</th> <th>Q2</th> <th>Q3</th> <th>Q4</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Tunnelling</td> <td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>◆</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Secondary Lining</td> <td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>◆</td><td></td><td>◆</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cofferdam Removal</td> <td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>◆</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>◆</td><td></td><td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Start Commissioning</td> <td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>◆</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vacate site</td> <td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>◆</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Chambers Wharf	2021				2022				2023				2024				Construction Activity	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Tunnelling						◆											Secondary Lining							◆		◆								Cofferdam Removal										◆				◆			Start Commissioning									◆								Vacate site																◆	
Chambers Wharf	2021				2022				2023				2024																																																																																																												
Construction Activity	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4																																																																																																									
Tunnelling						◆																																																																																																																			
Secondary Lining							◆		◆																																																																																																																
Cofferdam Removal										◆				◆																																																																																																											
Start Commissioning									◆																																																																																																																
Vacate site																◆																																																																																																									
<p>3.3</p>	<p>Working Hours</p> <p>JF provided an update on the current working hours, which can be found on page 8 of the slide pack sent with these minutes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tunnelling will be a continuous activity: 24 hours / 7 days a week The slurry treatment plant will also run continuously to support tunnelling activities Ring delivery and spoil loading by river will take place during core and extended hours Crane movements to supply rings and equipment into the acoustic enclosure will take place during core hours 																																																																																																																								

<p>3.4</p>	<p>JF provided an update on noise and air quality monitoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tideway aims to limit the noise we make, and we always aim to stay within permitted limits. • There have been zero noise exceedances in April, May, June • There have been zero air quality level exceedances in April, May, June • There have been zero air alerts in the last 12 months <p>PB asked whether the Section 61 agreement was now approved by London Borough of Southwark and RE confirmed it had been on 21 June and also that the previous consent covered tunnelling activities.</p> <p>A resident asked whether Tideway have received many complaints or comments about noise on site. AS confirmed that we have had comments and complaints from residents, each one is taken seriously and is sent to the site team to investigate. AS also noted that for current phase of works a lot of the activity will take place in the tunnel and in the noise enclosures.</p> <p>RE noted that the level of complaint to LB Southwark has been generally low and has been around items such as the movement of material, the tanks and the pipe bridge. JC noted that she has been assisting some Independent Compensation Panel claimants. LW confirmed that some residents have been through the Independent Compensation Panel process and reiterated that residents are still able to apply.</p> <p>A resident queried whether there had been issues regarding flood lights. RO confirmed any issues with lighting have been resolved with the site team.</p> <p>Action 4 – Tideway to provide a breakdown of the comments / complaints received since last CLWG and report this at each meeting</p> <p>Post meeting note - In the period between CLWG meetings (26 April to 28 July) there have been:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 102 queries, comments and complaints • Of these 45 have been general enquiries, 56 have been complaints, 1 miscellaneous • 54 pieces of correspondence were regarding noise/vibration 	<p>Action 4</p>
<p>3.5</p>	<p>Legacy / Community Investment</p> <p>RO presented slides on legacy and community investment activities.</p> <p>Staff working on the Tideway project volunteer their time to support good causes across London. This has included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working with 37 organisations • 1022 hours have been spent volunteering across 12 London boroughs • 180 people have volunteered • 1340 people have been supported <p>Employment initiatives are also taking place these include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local recruitment - 108 people from the London Borough of Southwark have been employed since the start of the pandemic. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 Tunnelling apprentice from Southwark and 4 Apprentices from LB Southwark • Supporting women in construction through virtual mentoring • Kickstart scheme – 5 paid placements across the Eastern Tideway sites • Science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) activities 	
4.0	<p>Community Enhancement Fund and Section 106 projects update</p> <p>DT updated on the Section 106 agreement and fund. DT reminded us that this funds two programmes (1) a set of agreed infrastructure projects, which were defined under the S106 legal agreement and (2) the Community Enhancement Fund. The agreement was originally between the London Borough of Southwark and Thames Water (Tideway was yet to be formed).</p> <p>The total amount of funding is just over £6 million to be spent on projects in the local area, with the £1m Community Enhancement Fund spent specifically in the Chambers Wharf site agreed impact area to provide specific measures to mitigate the potential effect of the site, and improve the lives of local residents. Applications outside of the red line area are allowed, on the strict basis that local residents from within the red line area can benefit from the project.</p> <p>Examples of projects include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure projects - Chambers Street footpath, Riverside quiet-way (renamed cycleway 4), safer routes to school, Jamaica Road crossing, Lower Road Gyratory • Thames Path landscaping improvements • <i>George Row play space</i> - George Row Playground Consultation - YouTube • Play space for teens <p>JC noted approximately £335,000 has been committed but there is money still available and the Council would like to see more applications come in. The next voting round is scheduled for the end of August 2021. A map of projects shows there is a good geographic spread of projects across the red line area.</p> <p>A resident noted that the information JC presented regarding the community magazine was incorrect. JC clarified that it was the 2020 magazine edition that was suspended not the 2019 edition as she stated.</p> <p>JC noted that the community enhancement fund projects that had been approved in 2020 were on hold due to the pandemic.</p> <p>A resident noted that Fountain Green Square looked quite neglected and questioned whether anything had been done to improve it.</p> <p>JC noted one bid had come in regarding the actual fountain and that had been sent to the housing / heritage team. JC noted that the community could put forward other bids to improve the area.</p> <p>A resident raised safety concerns for the crossing point on the Jamaica Road cycle path. Could it be made more obvious with for example a coloured surface,</p>	

<p>eg. Tower Hamlets is blue? Another resident agreed that there was no visible way to cross cycle path.</p> <p>RT noted that the route is a Transport for London route and there are controlled crossing points, but will look into it.</p> <p>Action 5 Southwark Council staff to look into safety of crossing point on Jamaica Road and liaise with Transport for London if necessary.</p> <p>A resident noted that he had not seen the plan for the play scheme at George Row, and JC explained that there had been three rounds of consultation. Details were included on LB Southwark’s website and letters written to nearby residents and school children engaged with at schools. The project video can be viewed on YouTube - George Row Playground Consultation - YouTube.</p> <p>A resident asked whether the plans were approved. JC noted that they were approved with comments.</p> <p>A resident requested a dedicated meeting on the legal agreement funding and questioned:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If LB Southwark are happy with the Community Enhancement Fund? • Who the panel is accountable to? • Whether LB Southwark will take on the resident’s suggestions regarding the process? • Whether LB Southwark will look at improvements to Llewellyn Street? • Whether LB Southwark will meet the resident on site? • Why residents weren’t involved in the allocation of the Section 106 funds? <p>DT noted that LB Southwark are always looking for ways to improve the scheme and noted the resident had made suggestions that are being looked into by officers. DT is willing to meet residents for a site visit.</p> <p>JC noted that LB Southwark is adhering to the legal agreement and LB Southwark remains the accountable body. JC also noted that the Council is listening to concerns and improving the process after each voting round where possible.</p> <p>AS noted that Tideway staff and LB Southwark officers are meeting to discuss the Community Enhancement Fund process and are also looking at ways to promote the fund more widely.</p> <p>AS noted that the Section 106 funds for the infrastructure improvements had already been allocated under the S106 agreement and could not be diverted. However, a large amount of the Community Enhancement Fund has not been allocated and is the opportunity for local residents and business to put forward community initiatives.</p> <p>PB thanked Southwark for the helpful presentation and while it included the location and process for the Section 106 funding that we need to move forward more strategically to ensure it works as well as possible for local residents.</p> <p>Action 6 – LB Southwark officer to meet the resident for a site visit</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Action 5</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Action 6</p>
---	---

	Action 7 – an extra CLWG to be held solely focussing on the Section 106 and Community Enhancement Fund process.	Action 7
5.0	PB closed the meeting and thanked residents and officers for attending.	

Actions Register:

Meeting Date	Item	Action	Responsibility	Status
28/07/2021	1.1	Action 1: Names to be included on minutes that are circulated to CLWG members.	Emily Black	Closed
28/07/2021	1.1	Action 2: Next CLWG to be in autumn, on a Monday and face to face if possible. Date to be circulated well ahead of meeting.	Emily Black	Closed – next meeting will be held on 27 September but will be via Teams
28/07/2021	3.1	Action 3 – Tideway to contact resident of Luna House to see if the noise levels have got quieter.	Allen Summerskill	Open
28/07/2021	3.4	Action 4 – Tideway to provide a breakdown of the comments / complaints received since last CLWG.	Emily Black	Closed as post meeting note and will be included on meetings going forward
28/07/2021	4.0	Action 5 Southwark Council staff to look into safety of crossing point on Jamaica Road and liaise with Transport for London if necessary.	Southwark officers	Open
28/07/2021	4.0	Action 6 – LB Southwark officer to meet the resident for a site visit	Southwark officer – Dan Taylor	Open
28/07/2021	4.0	Action 7 – CLWG to be held focussing on the Section 106 and Community Enhancement Fund process.	Tideway and Southwark	Closed – meeting scheduled for 27 September