

Haringey Heartlands Residents and Business Liaison Group

Minutes - 07 December 2015

Venue: Grace Baptist Church, 48-50 Park Ridings, N8 0LD

Time: 7pm

Attendees

Abbas Raza (Local Dialogue) - AR
Gabriella Ross (Local Dialogue) - GR
Keith Johnston (National Grid) - NG
Steve Maggs (National Grid) - SM
Paul Cooper (Coleman and Company) - PC
Paul Greatorex (Atkins) - PG
Leonie Oliva (Deloitte) - LO
Adam Donovan (Deloitte) - LO

John Miles - JM
Kate Glensman - KG
Jane Godber - JG
Bill Godber - BG
Ian Robinson - IR
Ryan King - RK
Cllr Stephen Mann - SM
Cllr Peray Ahmet - PA

Apologies

Marcus Ballard

1. Introductions

Introductions were made.

2. Programme update

PC stated that Coleman and Company have been mobilised on site since 30th November and have been carrying out work to upgrade the portacabins on site for their usage. He stated that before Christmas they would carry out low-key work such as measuring up for the hoardings and Japanese Knotweed treatment. He added that they would also be taking baseline noise readings during this time to use for future comparisons but stated that the dewatering would not begin on site until the New Year and run until February.

JM questioned the security of the earth bund on site due to the short fence and asked whether they would be using razorwire for the replacement fence. **PG** stated that he and **PC** would be meeting on Wednesday to discuss this, as they may have to take some fence down to make way for the

rubbish clearance. **KJ** added that Coleman and Company were not responsible for the security of the whole site. **JM** stated that the hoardings were still loose by the car park.

AR explained that a presentation would now be given by **AD** and **LO** about the relocation of the Pressure Reduction Station (PRS) on the site.

AD explained that the presentation was intended to introduce the PRS and explain the reasons for the relocation of the equipment and what is planned for this. He stated that a PRS is essentially gas equipment that lowers the pressure of gas to be used in homes and that they consist of underground pipes and over-ground kiosks, surrounded by a compound wall. **KJ** added that it is important to note that PRS' are very standard and suitable for residential areas.

AD showed a plan of the existing PRS location on site and a picture of the above ground pipework, stating that this was not what the new PRS would look like.

LO explained that the new PRS would consist of two main elements; an above ground kiosk and a compound wall and showed examples of other PRS designs. She stated that the kiosk would sit within the walled compound and surround the pipework to eliminate any noise impact.

LO explained that as part of the 2012 consent, the PRS was to be relocated to two areas of the site. She continued that since this time, there have been technical developments and it is now apparent that the PRS would be better located in close proximity to the major gas mains on site. She showed a plan of the two previously proposed PRS locations and a plan of the new proposed PRS location. She explained that the new proposed PRS compound was in a single location but was slightly larger than the two previously proposed PRS compounds.

LO explained that under the previous consent, the location for the new PRS compound consisted of two rows of mews houses and a vehicular access road to the rest of the site onto Hornsey Park Road. She continued that given the new proposed PRS location and the nearby lime trees, a pocket park would be provided instead of the mews.

LO presented an image of the previously proposed mews and an image of the new proposed PRS location. She added that there would no longer be a vehicular access point and this area of the site would only have pedestrian access, she explained this would create a lot less traffic for immediate neighbours.

LO stated that it was necessary to submit a Section 73 application for the relocation of the new PRS to Haringey Council. She added that this would be beneficial to existing residents because the new PRS would enable the provision of the park, protect the existing lime trees, replace the planned

mews houses, reduce traffic to this area and ensure gas can be supplied to local homes and businesses long into the future.

LO asked the group if they had any questions. **PA** asked how far along the process was for the Section 73 submission. **LO** confirmed that the application had not yet been submitted. **PA** questioned whether there were any disadvantages of the relocation of the PRS for local residents. **LO** reiterated that at the new location of the PRS would be beneficial for residents.

AR stated that a letter would be sent to residents explaining the PRS application and information surrounding this would be supplied in addition to general information about the works at the information events on the 16th December and 13th January.

BG asked for confirmation that the mews would be removed from the outline plan. **KJ** confirmed that they had been sacrificed from the plan.

JM stated that in terms of the PMRA, the proposals for the pocket park and removal of the mews from the proposals was tremendously welcomed. He stated that residents had not been happy with the plans for the mews and the park would be an enormous move towards the works contributing something positive for existing residents of the area. He continued that it had been helpful to see the example images of PRS' in the presentation.

JM stated that the next priority would be working out the management of the park and that this would be of great interest local residents. He had been considering the formation of a local community group responsible for managing the park.

KG asked whether the park would be public realm or privately owned. **LO** stated that the developer would be responsible for the park and that once the chosen developer had been introduced to the RBLG in the New Year, more consultation could be held on the pocket park space. She added that it would not be in the developer's interest to let the park fall into disrepair.

KG asked whether the park would be open at night. **KJ** responded that due to the fact the park would be accessed through the lime trees, it would be open at all times. **KG** stated that she was concerned for the people living immediately around the park if it was to be open at night but added that she felt the park was a massive improvement on the original proposals for that area of the site.

KG questioned whether there would be a push for additional height in the proposals for the rest of the site due to the loss of the mews. **LO** responded that there were no additional planned changes to the parameters of the plans.

JM stated that he would want to see the park as something that the developer would work with residents on, adding he felt trust with the developer would depend on this.

AR asked **SM** to confirm that the old PRS equipment would continue to be operational whilst the new PRS infrastructure was installed. **SM** confirmed that this was the case.

KG asked whether the new PRS would be the only gas infrastructure left on the site once the works had been completed. **SM** confirmed this.

JM asked what happened to the current PRS equipment and above ground pipes. **SM** stated that this would be removed from the site and the new PRS would only consist of a kiosk above ground and pipework underground.

JM asked how many times per year maintenance visits would be made to the new PRS site. **SM** stated that maintenance visits would only have to be made about twice a year and added that the PRS would generally be controlled from the central control point in Hinckley. **JM** asked how wide an area that the new PRS would serve. **SM** stated that the new PRS would serve a large part of north London.

PA stated that one of the issues was the proximity of the new PRS to the residential properties and asked whether there were any options around the way that the PRS would look.

LO explained that there always was one PRS compound proposed for this part of the site, although it was smaller. She stated that generally the compounds are sensitively designed for example the new proposed PRS on the Battersea site which sits in a conservation area.

SM stated that National Grid Gas has previously put palisade fencing around new PRS' but that the developer works with the community and they suggest putting various things around the PRS compound to make it fit in better.

AD stated that the application due to be submitted before Christmas does not deal with design details. He reiterated that it was simply a change of parameter plan and that the details design of what it would like would come in due course.

JM asked whether the option of palisade fencing instead of a brick wall was possible. **LO** responded that they were already advising that on a brick wall to surround the new PRS as this would be in a residential area where a more official compound boundary was needed.

JM asked whether a hedge could surround the PRS equipment instead. **KJ** stated that this was not possible for security reasons. He also stated that a wall would be much more successful in concealing the PRS equipment than

palisade fencing. He mentioned that the designs and colours of these walls could vary.

AR reiterated that there would be a letter sent to the most immediate residents on Hornsey Park Road but the RBLG mailing list will also be notified. He went on to state that the event to be held on the 16th December will provide more information on the PRS relocation.

JM asked whether the PRS application formed a big part of the information events. **AR** stated that the information events would be providing information about the project as a whole and a large part of the information provided would cover the programme and actual approach to the works. He stated that due to the PRS' size and location, it would be preferred to hold detailed discussions with individuals that live in the closest proximity to the proposed PRS location about the plans. However, he confirmed that the information surrounding the PRS relocation provided in the presentation would be provided in banners at the events.

PA questioned whether it would be helpful to have planning officers on hand at the events and stated that they would be unable to attend the event on the 16th December.

AR stated that he did not feel it be necessary to have planning officers at the two information events. **LO** added that it was normal practice to invite the planning officers to such events but if they were able to attend the event on 13th January, this could be arranged at a later date.

LO stated that there would also be minor changes to the Section 73 application in terms of condition wording for aspects such as shop-front details and where CCTV cameras will be located. She continued that the developer would like these details moved back to a later date than the submission of the reserve matters but before development commences.

AR stated that he proposed that the group move on to discuss the other items in the agenda.

3. Japanese Knotweed update

PG stated that there had not been a notification sent out regarding the Japanese Knotweed treatment and they were still trying to firm up details such as the contractor and timings before Christmas. He advised that the Japanese Knotweed treatment was likely to begin in the New Year and that this would allow time for consultation, particularly with 123 Hornsey Park Road.

4. Traffic update

PG stated that there was little change regarding traffic updates from the last RBLG meeting. He stated that the traffic information has been sent to TfL and that he was still waiting for their comments back on the phasing of

the lights and road works. He added that he would speak to Haringey's highways team regarding road-monitoring equipment **JM** had raised at an earlier point in the meeting.

IR asked whether waiting for TfL would cause a delays and affect deliveries to and from the site. **PG** advised that although there were currently some smaller deliveries to site, heavy deliveries would not be an issue until March/April 2016 and so there was a few months still to try and sort the traffic flow issues. He added that it was largely down to TfL at this point in terms of the overall traffic flows on the Turnpike Lane/Hornsey Park Road junction.

AR asked **IR** whether this could be taken as a concern in terms of the GLA. **IR** confirmed this.

5. Air & Dust

AR asked **PC** and **PG** to give an update on where they were with installing monitoring equipment. **PG** stated that they were looking to install some background monitoring equipment before Christmas, probably consisting of a two-day visit to the same points on site as some of the previous reports. He added that this would include taking background noise levels and dust levels around the site and that the main noise/dust monitoring would start when the main works begin in February.

KG asked how long the monitoring equipment would be left to record the levels during the pre-Christmas monitoring. **PG** stated that the monitoring would take place during the working hours, 8:00am-6:00pm on weekdays.

6. Communications update

AR stated that off the back of the last RBLG meeting, Local Dialogue extended the area to which we were providing information and had organised a mailout of letters and an enclosed leaflet last week to just over 700 addresses. The letter and leaflet provided a very general summary of the works.

JG asked when these were sent out. **AR** confirmed that the letters had been posted on the 3rd December, to give two weeks notice before the first information event on the 16th December. He added that this also allows people who cannot attend the event in December to be aware of the event that will be held in January.

KG asked what times the events would be running between. **AR** confirmed that the events would be running from 4pm-8pm in order to allow people to attend after work. He added that the event would be hosted by Local Dialogue and held at the Grace Baptist Church.

AR stated that the Haringey Heartlands website had been updated to reflect new information and would continue to be updated as the project

progresses. He added that any letters that were sent to residents would be posted as a news update on the website.

AR said that a letter would be sent out regarding the PRS to let them know that the application was going to be submitted by National Grid and that they were happy to meet with residents to discuss any issues surrounding this that they may have.

AR asked the group if the planned communication surrounding the PRS application sounded appropriate. **JM** asked for more information about the method for communicating with the immediate neighbours. **AR** answered that it was an on-going process and in terms of the approach, it was decided that the best method was to send the letters out to residents via Royal Mail, including standard contact details and a request to meet.

AR stated that beyond this, the RBLG mailing list would also be updated on the plans and once the PRS application was in, the Council would be writing to residents to make sure that they are ready to provide any feedback that they may have.

IR asked whether the correspondence surrounding the PRS would be addressed or delivered via door-drop. **AR** confirmed that letters would be addressed.

JM asked whether meetings with residents about the PRS application would be triggered by the resident getting in touch to arrange a meeting and whether door-knocking would be used to target immediate residents that did not want to meet. **AR** said that door-knocking had not been proposed but that he would suggest this to the project team. He added that beyond the wall, The PRS will have little impact on residents.

7. RBLG Council liaison

AR stated that Emma Williamson and Aaron Lau had been invited to the meeting but had been unable to attend and that they would be invited again to the next meeting in January. He asked the group if they were still happy with meeting on a monthly business and proposed setting a date for the February meeting.

It was agreed that the meeting would be held on the 8th February.

JM asked when the letter regarding the PRS application would be sent out to residents. **AR** answered that this would be sent on Wednesday 9th December.

8. Any other business

AR asked whether members had any other points to raise.

PA stated that she and **SM** would be unable to attend the meeting on the 12th January.

ENDS