

Construction Management Plan



Charlie Ratchford Extra Care

Revision 14; 12/11/2018

Contents

| | |
|--------------------------|------------|
| Revisions | 3 |
| Introduction | 28 |
| Timeframe | 29 |
| Contact | 36 |
| Site | 30 |
| Community liaison | 57 |
| Transport | 76 |
| Environment | 98 |
| Agreement | 113 |

Revisions & additional material

| Date | Version | Produced by |
|------------|---------|---|
| 30/01/2018 | 1 | ██████████: Site Manager: Galliford Try Partnerships |
| 07/03/18 | 2 | ██████████: Site Manager: Galliford Try Partnerships (incorporating comments received) |
| 08/03/18 | 3 | ██████████: Site Manager: Further update (Noise)/ Community Engagement |
| 09/03/18 | 4 | ██████████: Site Manager: Further update: Additional sheets |
| 12/03/18 | 5 | ██████████: Site Manager: Further update: Appendices and Crane Details added. |
| 16/03/18 | 6 | ██████████: Logistics and Traffic Management Plans Added |
| 09/04/18 | 7 | Feedback comments and updates following CMP Review Meeting with ██████████ (Camden) & ██████████ (Camden) included. |

| | | |
|----------|----|--|
| 23/04/18 | 8 | Feedback comments and updates following CMP Review by GTP Environmental Advisor |
| 23/04/18 | 9 | Feedback comments and updates following CMP Review with [REDACTED] (Camden), [REDACTED] (Camden) and Camden Traffic Management Representatives -13/04.18Update also further to Meeting 2 With Bellis Homes Tuesday 17 th April. |
| 03/05/18 | 10 | Updated following Meeting with [REDACTED] (Camden) and [REDACTED] (Camden and Kings Cross Construction Skills Centre): Regarding Section 106 Obligations and submission of ESSP |
| 09/05/18 | 11 | Updated following Camden Environmental Review Forwarded from [REDACTED] (Arcadis), Review by [REDACTED] (Camden)- Guidance included |
| 25/10/18 | 12 | Updated following Community Drop in Session 1: 03/10/18, updated following comments received regarding content and improvements. Rodent Management Plan added as Appendix 17, Hauliers Information Appendix 18, CEMP Appendix 19 |
| 12/11/18 | 13 | Inclusion of recorded meeting minutes following community consultation, Portal feedback only in response to CMP and Inclusion of Consultation Timeline |
| 12/11/18 | 14 | Following CWG Meeting 1: Additional CMP received added as requested by CWG Members. Format check prior to planning submission. Community Liaison section updated. |

Additional sheets

| Date | Version | Produced by |
|----------|---------|---|
| 02/03/18 | 1 | [REDACTED] Appendix 1: Site Study |
| 09/03/18 | 4 | Appendix 2: Zetica UXO Extract |
| | | Appendix 3: Greengage AMS |
| | | Appendix 4: Nuisance Management |
| | | Appendix 5: Access/ Egress |
| | | Appendix 6: Swept Path Analysis |
| | | Appendix 7: CCS Registration |
| | | Appendix 8: Logistics Provisional |
| | | Appendix 9: Logistics Provisional |
| | | Appendix 10: Tower Crane O/S |
| | | Appendix 11: Tower Crane Plan |
| | | Appendix 12: Logistics and Traffic Management Plans |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | Appendix 13: Logistics Detailing |
| | | Appendix 14: Vehicle Movement Analysis |
| | | Appendix 15: Logistics and Traffic Management Plans- Potential Zebra Crossing, dropped kerb and hoarding Line |
| | | Appendix 16: Environmental commitment Statement/Appendix 17: RMP/ Appendix 18: L02-06/ Appendix 19: CEMP |

Comments and Review

Comments Received in relation to draft CMP Version 1 below;

Charlie Ratchford – Construction Management Plan

Comments on Galliford Try draft, 01/03/18

- **UXO monitoring** – no mention of this - **Actioned**
- **Diagrams** – many of these are difficult to read - **Actioned and Appendices added**
- **Section 9 of the** - company’s procedures referenced but no details included - **Actioned and evident within Appendices Section**
- **Noise monitoring** – further detail required - **Actioned**
- **Delivery times** – please review in respect of Camden guidance- **Actioned**
- **Pest control measures** – further detail required - **Actioned**
- **Community engagement** – section mentions the local MP, but no mention of local councillors (not strictly required maybe, but I’m sure there will be communication and engagement required as we are the client and it is good to demonstrate an awareness) **Included**



- **Local community** – there wasn't any consultation/ meeting carried out which is the primary requirement of the CMP. The CMP requires the consultation with all the local community, residents/ business impacted and nearby site. *commenced*
 - **Environment** – noise and dust control is also another key in CMP which is currently only very limited in their CMP. There is a large section in LBC template. *Actioned*
 - **Working times** – please provide the standard working hours. *Actioned*
 - **Parking bay** – GT has proposed the suspending the parking bay for unloading the material. They might need to obtain a Temporary Traffic Order. *Noted. Contact Made with Highways and Licensing however advised CMP approval required before meeting can be arranged.*
 - Can we suggest that you refer to the following guidance?
 - <https://www.camden.gov.uk/ccm/content/environment/planning-and-built-environment/two/planning-applications/making-an-application/supporting-documentation/construction-management-plans.en> *Actioned*
 - And use the attached template. *Actioned, template content included and will be removed upon approval if required by Camden*
-

Comments Received in relation to CMP Version 6 below;

CMP review meeting held 29th March with [REDACTED] (Principal Transport Planner-Camden) and [REDACTED] (Senior Development Manager-Camden). [REDACTED] (Contracts Manager GTP and [REDACTED] GTP)

Formal comments issued by [REDACTED] listed below and GTP action points against these items indicated.

1. Page 34. Consultation. Developers/ contractors must consult with the local community around a site before submitting a draft Construction Management Plan (CMP) to the Council for approval. Please see the guidance note on our CMP webpage for more information.
<https://www.camden.gov.uk/ccm/content/environment/planning-and-built-environment/two/planning-applications/making-an-application/supporting-documentation/construction-management-plans.en>

This action can wait until the CMP and highway licence requirements have been discussed with Highways.

Noted. Local community and Local Dialogue meetings yet to commence (planned/provisional dates as follows: CR CG Meeting No 1: 21/05/18, CR CG Meeting No 2: 18/06/18. Meetings have been held with; Haverstock School/ Marine Ices Construction Project Crogsland Road.

2. Pages 34 & 35. Construction Working Group. This should be formed ahead of the CMP being approved by the Council. The group will need to consist of representatives from the developer, contractor, ward councillors, residents, businesses and the neighbouring school. The developer and contractor for the Marine Ices development nearby should also be invited to join the group. This action can wait until the CMP consultation exercise has been completed.

Noted. Bellis Homes Representation for CWG invited by [REDACTED] via e-mail April 09th and meeting request send to [REDACTED] (Senior Development Manager). Meeting two booked for 17th April @10.30am.

Meeting Two with [REDACTED] 17th April very positive in terms of information exchange. Bellis Homes confirmed via e-mail that;

'The gates are controlled by the Management of the School and open between 8 to 8-30 am and 15 to 15-30 afternoon, during the term.'

3. Page 46. The contractor will need to liaise with the contractor for the Marine Ices development nearby to ensure that cumulative impacts of both developments are mitigated. I appreciate discussions have already been initiated.
First Meeting held with Senior Project Manager [REDACTED] Monday 26th March 2018.
4. Pages 48-51. CLOCS. I have asked my colleague [REDACTED] to review this section of the CMP. I will pass his comments on once received.
5. Page 69. Please be mindful that Crogsland Road is a two-way street, albeit motor vehicles can only enter from Prince of Wales Road. Crogsland Road is also a local cycle route in both directions and cyclists can enter from Chalk Farm Road / Haverstock Hill and Prince of Wales Road.
Noted. Page 69 Edited to reflect the above details.
6. Transport section. Construction vehicle arrivals and departures will need to be scheduled to avoid the morning and afternoon/evening peak periods. The site is located directly adjacent to a school. Construction vehicle arrivals and departures will therefore need to be scheduled to take place between 0930 and 1530 hours on weekdays and between 0800 and 1300 hours on Saturdays during school term time. During school holidays, construction vehicle arrivals and departures will need to be scheduled to take place between 0930 and 1630 hours on weekdays and between 0800 and 1300 hours on Saturdays. Please note that the contractor for the Marine Ices development nearby is working to these hours. Any proposed deviation from these hours will need further discussion with officers and the neighbouring school. *Noted. Page 27 Edited to reflect the above guidelines.*

7. Transport section. Please provide details of the typical types/sizes of all vehicles and the approximate frequency and times of day when they will need access to the site, for each phase of construction. You should estimate the average daily number of vehicles during each major phase of the work, including their dwell time at the site. High numbers of vehicles per day and/or long dwell times may require vehicle holding procedures. *Noted. Please see Appendix 13-Early Vehicle Movement Assessment Edited to reflect the above guidelines and provide more detail.*
 8. Transport section. Please provide accurate scaled drawings of any highway works necessary to enable construction to take place (e.g. construction of any permanent and temporary vehicular accesses, and dropped kerbs for pedestrian diversion routes at each end of the proposed footway closure). *Please see Appendix 13*
 9. Transport section. Please provide a drawing showing the proposed extent of footway closure and pedestrian diversion route signing at each end. *Please see Appendix 13*
 10. Transport section. Please provide details describing how pedestrian and cyclist safety will be maintained, including any proposed pedestrian diversions, and the provision of banksmen and traffic marshals. *Please see Appendix 13. Also, refer to pgs. 27,56,57,64,71. A logistics team will manage the gate, the perimeter and banksmen will control vehicle movements. This will be manned always and assisted by representatives of the respective subcontractor and their respective deliveries alongside the GTP team. GTP are aware that this is a prominent cycle route and additional signage specifically for cyclists will be displayed at pedestrian diversion points and along hoarding to ensure all deliveries are aware. As indicated all vehicles will be controlled and GTP plan to bring into enclosed off-road area.*
 11. Transport section. Please provide a drawing showing the proposed hoarding layout on the footway adjacent to the site. *Please see Appendix 13*
 12. Environment section. This should be discussed separately with my colleague Mario Houska in the Noise and Licencing team. *Could Camden provide contact details for [REDACTED] so GTP can issue copy of CMP?*
 13. Page 83. This page should be signed and dated by the person responsible for preparing the CMP.
This action can wait until the Construction Working Group has been formed and an updated version of the CMP has been prepared. *Noted.*
-

Meeting with [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] (Camden) 26th April 2018

Meeting Located at the Kings Cross Construction Skills Centre in Kings Cross to discuss S106 Obligations in association with the Charlie Ratchford Extra Care scheme. Please see following summary e-mail by [REDACTED] (GTP) in relation to topics and content of meeting;

From: [REDACTED] (Galliford Try) [REDACTED]
Sent: 27 April 2018 13:39
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Charlie Ratchford Extra Care Facility: September Start, ESSP and Section 106: Galliford Try Partnerships

[REDACTED]

It was a pleasure meeting you both at the Kings Cross Construction Skills Centre, it was very useful to see and discuss what the centre has to offer and how we can work together to fulfil our S106 requirements.

Please see below a summary of what we discussed, any agreed action points and my understanding of a forward plan.

If you would like to add anything or believe I have misinterpreted any points please feel free to amend by return.

The Facility/ Centre:

- The KXCSC is a registered Training provider and provides onsite training, employment and apprenticeship opportunities. Courses include City and Guilds Multi Skills, and Level 1 and 2 diplomas.
- The Centre works with 4 schools in Camden and Islington , and are currently working with 60 active sites in Camden.
- The centre offer a job brokerage services and work closely with schools, connexions, jobcentre plus and labour agencies/ training agencies. The centre is also a registered CSCS test centre and has over 1000 individuals on the books
- The centre offers subcontractors talks and meetings, and would provide vacancy templates, submit prospective candidate CVS, job match and potentially work with one of our existing preferred labour /trade supply agencies.

Apprenticeships/ Work experience:

- It was discussed that potential apprenticeship placements are sourced from both Camden and Islington for positions and that any individual employed would be for a target minimum period of 5-6months and receive the higher end of National minimum wage whether that by

direct employment or ATA and would seek assurances that any successful placement would require a commitment to further training and development during the working period.

- KC offer support and administration services in order to achieve placements.
- Reach out recruitment was identified could you provide more details?
- It was indicated that KC were interested in placing individuals in both trade/ logistics and management roles and that Logistics role suitability and candidate training for such are currently being driven.

The following topics were also covered;

- A summary of Charlie Ratchford Programme and start dates durations of packages potentially appropriate to training and placement opportunities.
- Section 106: It was clarified that Camden require 20% at peak in terms of local employment on the scheme and that could potentially equate to approx. 15 individuals from the borough of Camden. GTP advised that this would be extremely difficult to achieve even with best endeavours of all parties and were advised that potentially such targets could be supplemented by other commitments Inc. School visits/workshops, investment in local businesses, local supply chain incorporation and work experience to release the condition.
- It was advised by Camden that there is not currently a supply chain guide or list that can be issued and that GTP to explore this further independently.
- It was discussed that KXCSC would send over some documentation to GTP to clarify procedures, requirements and clarify process further.
- GTP to submit formal project specific ESSP and Method Statement for its implementation. It was suggested that Camden would assist with its conformity after GTP submit initial draft. ESSP to be updated on a monthly basis and works cannot commence until that this has been accepted.
- Obligations of the 106 agreement were identified as a minimum of 5 apprenticeship positions for a period of approximately 12 months. GTP did advise that apprenticeship provision is currently exercised in GTP orders to larger trades it would be unlikely that the programme and Contract Value of the project did not support such durations. It was suggested that the relocation to other projects and boroughs would be deemed acceptable, and that any shortfall in meeting this requirement could again be supplemented by enhancing commitment to other non-penalty related targets within the ESSP.
- A figure of approx. £7000 was referenced in terms of failing to meet the 106 targets for each apprentice placed on the project.

█, would it be possible to send over the information discussed and please add detail to anything missed above.

█, would you kindly confirm in a brief summary the S106 obligations and costs related for clarity. From our meeting I believe it to be as stated above (Apprentices) plus 5 number min 2 week work experience placements but if you could summarise /differentiate between the compulsory and ancillary/value added commitments I believe this would help us submit a more accurate ESSP.

Further no issue was raised in relation to the meetings inclusion within the development of the GTP CMP for submission to Camden.



Again it was a pleasure to attend the Centre.

Best Regards

██████████
Site Manager
Galliford Try

Please see following response from ██████████ (Camden) in response which clarified S106 requirements.

Hi ██████████

Likewise it was great to meet you and we appreciate you taking the time to come down to the centre. Apologies again for having to leave earlier than expected. Just to clarify a couple of points regarding your email; we expect apprentices to be taken on for a target period of at least 12 months, as opposed to 6. You're correct that apprentices can be moved to other sites/boroughs though. With regards to the ESSP - this does not be updated monthly, but we do ask that employment/apprentice updates are provided monthly. For local procurement, it's quarterly.

With regards to the S.106 obligations, there is a requirement to deliver:

- 5 apprenticeships. A 'support contribution' of £1500 will need to be paid upon each apprentice starting
- 5 work experience placements of at least a 2 week duration
- 20% local labour target
- 10% local procurement

All of the above are compulsory requirements as part of the S.106 agreement. However, during the meeting we referred to offering a more flexible approach with regards to local labour. By which I primarily mean we may be able to take Islington residents into account towards the local labour target, especially if they have been recruited via the Kings Cross Construction and Skills Centre.

As the project draws to an end, we should have a clear indication as to how closely you have come to hitting or exceeding the 20% local labour target. If the 20% target has not been met, then we may be able to take other elements of employment and training into account, depending on how close to the target you have come. For example, if the work placement target has been exceeded and if multiple school/site visits have taken place, then potentially we could look to offset these against the local labour.

The S.106 agreement is itself a legal document, so ultimately we will need to see that the employment/procurement targets within it are taken seriously and best endeavours have been made to recruit locally wherever possible. Likewise for local procurement, we will need to see that Camden suppliers have been taken into account and offered opportunities to bid for work related to this project.

When we've received an updated ESSP from you, I will be able to request discharge of the initial local employment and procurement obligations which will allow work on site to begin. I understand we didn't get a chance to fully cover the ESSP, so I'm happy to discuss over the phone before this is submitted if you wish.

Please let me know if you have any outstanding queries.

Thanks,

[REDACTED]

Economic Development Officer

Telephone: [REDACTED]

CMP related comments- Updated 22.10.18

Received: 3/10/2018 (Meet the Contractor event)

GTP Comments in Blue

Name: [REDACTED] (Director of Finance and Operations)

Address: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]@haverstock.camden.sch.uk

Number: 020 7267 0975

Comments: As a representative of the school I am interested to know if, when a crane is installed on site to deliver the construction, will the crane over sail the school site at any time?

Interested in joining CWG: Yes



GTP Comments: Please refer to Crane Over Sail Drawing within CMP. Counter weights will over sail western boundary as indicated on radius plan. Out of hours' radius indicated is a safety feature that means the jib and hook will rotate to accommodate wind loadings when Crane is not in operation.

Crane will never lift anything over the western boundary (above school grounds) and limiters will be in place to ensure compliance.

Name: [REDACTED]

Address: [REDACTED]

Comments:

- Concerns regarding the suspension of parking and creation of a zebra crossing. As an elderly woman I am concerned about my safety if I have to park in another street when I come back late at night.
- Concerns regarding access to the rear of our building: We need access across the site from time to time for scaffolding when carrying out routine repair and maintenance to the rear of the building.
- Also, access is required to regular tree pruning of the trees in the rear garden.

Interested in joining CWG: Yes

GTP Comments: The Parking Bay removal and zebra Crossing are part of a TTRO with Camden to ensure pedestrian safety. We are working with Camden to find a solution where Parking bays removed as a result of this order are relocated further to the South, possibly in place of current Pay and Display parking.

In terms of access to the rear gardens via the North of the new Building. There is currently no provision for shared access. Please approach Camden regarding this matter.

Name: [REDACTED] (landlord to the [REDACTED])

Address: [REDACTED]

Comments: 8am – 6pm Mon – Fri is acceptable, but Saturday 1 weekend working will seriously affect quality of life. Please keep to Mon – Fri.

Interested in joining CWG: Yes



Received: 9/10/2018 6:04 PM (Website feedback entry)

GTP Comments: Camden guidance on working hours for Construction sites is currently indicated as 8-6pm Mon-Friday and 8am -1pm on Saturdays. Please note that these are available working hours.

GTP will endeavour to minimise impact on the immediate and wider environment with our construction activities as far as is reasonably practicable. It is not the current intention to utilise Saturday working regularly unless it is required. Noisier activities will also be reduced as the envelope is completed and internal activities enclosed. GTP will as standard issue a monthly newsletter to inform local residents of upcoming activities and will maintain open lines of communication via the CWG.

Crogsland Road is a major route for cyclists. My impression is that despite Camden’s comments GTP have treated Crogsland Rd as a one-way street north to south. A cyclist entering from Chalk Fm Rd is likely to encounter large/wide lorries in a narrow space between parked cars; and these lorries will be crossing from (their) left to right to access the unloading bay, assuming that nothing will be coming toward them, or immediately following them. (And subsequently departing right to left). If a lorry stops, say awaiting instructions from a banksperson, a cyclist might pass on either side and be crushed when the lorry moves. I think many more parking bays should be suspended to allow cyclists more passing space. From whichever way lorries approach along PoWRd, they will cross the proposed westbound cycle track. My experience is that they give way to motor vehicles but are unaware of cyclists on the cycle track. If the cycle track is not in place, it is even more important that a cyclist holds the lane approaching the pedestrian islands when being followed by a construction lorry. GTP told me that the exit route would be Chalk Fm Rd southbound, left turn into Malden Rd, then unknown. How to access the A41? Alternatively, south to Camden St and left on to CamdenRd? I don’t think this has been thought through.

GTP / Camden are aware of Crogslands Road’s importance to cyclists. It is currently considered that encouraging vehicles and construction traffic to travel in one direction and to avoid turning in Crogsland Road would be a positive step towards cyclist safety. We are happy to discuss this further at CWG Meeting No.1.

Please note that part of GTPs commitment to CLOCS is vehicle compliance and standards including improved vehicle safety features thus reducing the collision risks outlined above.

Parking bay suspensions are currently being discussed with Camden. Vehicle Routing as outlined is planned egress from Crogsland Road to the south. The current road network dictates a left turn onto Chalk Farm Road. The B517 Represents an option for HGVs to route towards swiss cottage , alternatively utilising the wider road network via Kentish Town West / Camden Town.

.....



Dear [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]

I am coordinator of Camden Cycling Campaign, the local branch of London Cycling Campaign, We are statutory consultees on transport matters in Camden and also get involved in major construction projects. I am copying other members of our committee as well as [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] at Camden who I understand have reviewed earlier drafts.

Councillor Pearson has brought the project to my attention; we were unaware of it hence we were not at your Meet the Contractor event. I have reviewed the draft CMP as downloaded from your website and have a number of questions; rather than post these as comments I hope you will be able to answer them directly. Our main concern is the safety of cyclists and we see a number of issues that do not appear to be dealt with in the draft. I should also like to comment that the resolution of the CMP as downloaded is rather poor; hence a number of the diagrams are not very legible; it would be helpful to have a high-resolution version.

The immediate questions I have are as follows:

1. Vehicle routing to site - Page 34 Figure 8 shows vehicles approaching from both directions on Prince of Wales Road whereas on page 59 routing is shown as eastbound only on this road, turning right into Crogsland Road. Left-hook collisions are a major cause of death and injury for cyclists so it is best to minimise such turns, especially from major to minor roads. Also, the tracking diagrams show that left turning vehicles would encroach into the northbound lane on Crogsland Road, with potential danger to oncoming cyclists. The right turn would not do this. Can you confirm what your instructions to drivers will state about approach routes?
2. Vehicle routing from site - it is unclear what route vehicles will take to get back onto the strategic road network after they turn into Chalk Farm Road. Please can you clarify this.
3. Width of Crogsland Road - this is a narrow two-way road with motor traffic predominantly north to south but, critically, with cycle traffic equal in both directions and with a dedicated signalised cycle crossing of Chalk Farm Road at the south end. Your plans show parking bay suspensions adjacent to the construction site but it is clear that the road width on the approach to Chalk Farm Road will not be sufficient to allow northbound cyclists to safely pass oncoming HGVs, and they will not be able to wait in Chalk Farm Road. This would create a potentially dangerous situation. What are your plans to request a more extensive suspension of parking along the whole street? Diagrams showing available road width would be very useful.
4. Diversions during road closure - Crogsland Road will need to be closed to motor vehicles on occasion, specifically for erection and removal of the tower crane. Ideally it would remain open for cyclists as well as pedestrians. Can you confirm whether this will be possible and, if not, what your proposed diversion routes are?

It might be easier to meet to discuss the plans and I would be happy to do so whenever is convenient. Finally, we would like to be included in the CWG.

Thank you and I look forward to hearing from you.

--

Regards

[REDACTED]
Coordinator
Camden Cycling Campaign

W: [REDACTED]

E: [REDACTED]

T: + [REDACTED]

M: + [REDACTED]

GTP Response:

Hi John

Good to hear from you in relation to the upcoming Extra Care scheme in Camden. I have no issues responding directly and welcome the interaction with the local community and encourage your feedback.

Responses below; in **Green**.

Best Regards

From: John Chamberlain [REDACTED]

Sent: 08 October 2018 18:53

To: Jonathon Hale (Galliford Try) <[REDACTED]>

Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: Charlie Ratchford Centre - CMP

Dear [REDACTED]

I am coordinator of Camden Cycling Campaign, the local branch of London Cycling Campaign, We are statutory consultees on transport matters in Camden and also get involved in major construction projects. I am copying other members of our committee as well as Steve Cardno and Max Lyne at Camden who I understand have reviewed earlier drafts. **This early consultation did take place as you have stated and the CMP has been developed in line with this review process with Camden.**



Councillor [REDACTED] has brought the project to my attention; we were unaware of it hence we were not at your Meet the Contractor event. I have reviewed the draft CMP as downloaded from your website and have a number of questions; rather than post these as comments I hope you will be able to answer them directly. Our main concern is the safety of cyclists and we see a number of issues that do not appear to be dealt with in the draft. I should also like to comment that the resolution of the CMP as downloaded is rather poor; hence a number of the diagrams are not very legible; it would be helpful to have a high-resolution version. **Noted. Quality of images affected will be replaced/improved in preparation for CWG Meeting No.1.** I have cc'd our Resident engagement Consultant and the invite to join the CWG will be extended formally to you.

Please note that the safety of cyclists is of Paramount importance to GTP. GTP are a registered CLOCS Champion and I am personally a designated CLOCS Project co-ordinator. Our projects are planned with cycle safety in mind and we have procedures in place to demonstrate this commitment which I would be happy to discuss further at CWG 1 with you.

The immediate questions I have are as follows:

1. Vehicle routing to site - Page 34 Figure 8 shows vehicles approaching from both directions on Prince of Wales Road whereas on page 59 routing is shown as eastbound only on this road, turning right into Crogsland Road. Left-hook collisions are a major cause of death and injury for cyclists so it is best to minimise such turns, especially from major to minor roads. Also, the tracking diagrams show that left turning vehicles would encroach into the northbound lane on Crogsland Road, with potential danger to oncoming cyclists. The right turn would not do this. Can you confirm what your instructions to drivers will state about approach routes?

Noted. Conflicting traffic route data is contained in the CMP and will be changed. This is due to a tender stage logistics diagram being included in error. All orders placed with subcontractors and material suppliers will include a document that outlines our preferred route to site and strict guidelines in relation to the health and safety standards/performance/checking criteria of road vehicles. As stated our requested route will be access via Right Turn from Prince of Wales and egress via Haverstock Hill/ Chalk Farm Road to the South.

Vehicle routing from site - it is unclear what route vehicles will take to get back onto the strategic road network after they turn into Chalk Farm Road. Please can you clarify this.

As above Egress is left turn only onto Haverstock Hill/ Chalk Farm Road towards Camden. Guidelines to utilise wider road network only and avoid smaller residential roads/ routes at all times where possible.

2. Width of Crogsland Road - this is a narrow two-way road with motor traffic predominantly north to south but, critically, with cycle traffic equal in both directions and with a dedicated signalised cycle crossing of Chalk Farm Road at the south end.



Your plans show parking bay suspensions adjacent to the construction site but it is clear that the road width on the approach to Chalk Farm Road will not be sufficient to allow northbound cyclists to safely pass oncoming HGVs, and they will not be able to wait in Chalk Farm Road. This would create a potentially dangerous situation. What are your plans to request a more extensive suspension of parking along the whole street? Diagrams showing available road width would be very useful.

We are currently exploring possibilities of parking suspensions/ zebra crossings/ one way system to ensure impact of construction activities are mitigated as much as possible/reasonably practicable.

3. Diversions during road closure - Crogsland Road will need to be closed to motor vehicles on occasion, specifically for erection and removal of the tower crane. Ideally it would remain open for cyclists as well as pedestrians. Can you confirm whether this will be possible and, if not, what your proposed diversion routes are?

This is currently being looked into in more detail. As mentioned below this would be better discussed in person. Given the choice I would not permit cyclists access in the event of road closure for safety reasons however no decision /action would be made without provision for diversion in place.

It might be easier to meet to discuss the plans and I would be happy to do so whenever is convenient. Finally, we would like to be included in the CWG.

Thank you and I look forward to hearing from you

.....
Dear [REDACTED],

You probably noticed our flank wall render facing the car park has cracks so its an existing defect. My own flat (above Mr [REDACTED]) on the first floor in the front has dry cracks almost exactly where this cracked render is which you can look at when you come round or Mr [REDACTED]

The other room facing your development is my bathroom which is tiled and so nothing can be seen. My rear study bedroom is not accessible as its used as a store and I am intending to strip off the old plaster and re-coat with lime at my own expense as the existing plaster was apparently the wrong type for solid brick.

[REDACTED]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: [REDACTED] >
Date: Mon, 5 Nov 2018 at 17:13
Subject: Fw: Charlie Ratchford and 1-11 Crogsland Road
To: Info <[REDACTED]>

Dear All,

As you are aware the vacant land next door is being developed .

I have been in contact with Joe Abel of local dialogue, and has requested that a full survey of your building is carried out priory to the works commencing, so that in the event of any cracks appearing to the building we have a survey of condition to refer too.

Joe has passed on my request to [REDACTED] of Galliford Try who has responded below.

In order that they do carry out a full survey of your building we should all pursue [REDACTED] to ensure they comply.

[REDACTED] would like to inspect the boundary wall so if the garden flat owners could advise if they are willing to allow him access that would be appreciated.

Please let me know if you have any questions .

Kind regards

.....

Dear [REDACTED],

