



MEETING MINUTES

Elleray Hall
Community Engagement 04

Meeting Title: Elleray Hall – Early Community Engagement – 04 **Project:** Elleray Hall

Meeting Date: 28th May 2024 **Location:** Elleray Hall

Issue Date: 3rd June 2024 **Engagement No:** 04

Confidential For Information For Review For Action

Attendees:

London Borough of Richmond

LBR

Beard Construction

BC

Charles Booth

CB

London Borough of Richmond – Assistant Director of Programme Management Office PMO

Alfred Akpo-Teye

AA

London Borough of Richmond - Project Manager – PMO

Cllr. Richard Baker
Cllr. Phil Giesler

London Borough of Richmond– Business and Growth Lead Member

Simon Webster

SW

Beard Construction - Contracts Manager

Nicky Forrest

NF

Beard Construction – Resident Liaison Officer

Simon Hayes

SH

McBains – Senior Project Manager



MEETING MINUTES

Distribution: All the above

Item	Description	Action
1.0	<p>Introductions</p> <p>Introductions were made.</p>	
1.1	<p>Community Engagement</p>	
	<p>The London Borough of Richmond (LBR) welcomed everyone to the fourth community engagement meeting. LBR mentioned the team includes project managers and a programme manager for the construction projects across the council.</p> <p>LBR reiterated that the purpose of these meetings is to update on the pre-construction works, and associated site activities/logistics during the construction phase and not to address other non-construction related items of the project.</p> <p>Points related to anything else would not be discussed or recorded within minutes.</p>	
1.2	<p>Previous minutes</p>	
	<p>LBR confirmed the previous set of minutes have been published on the Council Web page for the public, and feedback is welcome.</p> <p>A local resident specified they did not agree to the previous set of minutes.</p> <p>A local resident confirmed that TRANEH had recorded and updated their version of the minutes themselves. This will be published separately by TRANEH, as they felt these reflected a more accurate set of minutes.</p> <p>A resident requested for the community engagement to be recorded. LBR confirmed that this public community engagement cannot be recorded, but meeting minutes will be published on the website.</p> <p>LBR confirmed that the updated community engagement schedule is for every month, and will be published every month until next year, alternating between lunchtime and evening engagements. The monthly meeting schedule will continue to be reviewed.</p> <p>All agreed no further comments would be made.</p>	

2.0	Beard Introduction	
2.1	Beard introduction of the site team	
	<p>BC provided a brief introduction about BC and the type of projects they undertaken.</p> <p>BC introduced the construction team, and this includes: Simon Webster - Contracts Manager Matt Siddall – Project Manager Jack Mitchell – Site Manager Joshua Southall – Quantity Surveyor Nicky Forrest - Resident Liaison (Main point of contact for residents) Supply Chain – Consultants, Sub Consultants and Suppliers</p>	
2.2	Beard Update on Planning Process	
	<p>BC continue to undertake the discharge of the planning conditions (priority being the pre-commencement conditions) In order to fulfil specific conditions, various specialist consultants have been engaged to assist in formalising reports. These consultants include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecologist • Arborist • Transport • Ground remediation consultant. • Dust management specialist. <p>BC emphasised that other specialist consultants would be engaged as they for relevant aspects of the conditions discharge and other building issues.</p> <p>BC confirmed that the planning process involves the submission of individual conditions to the Local Planning Authority (LPA) online planning portal by their appointed planning consultant when the reports are ready. Following submission, there is an 8-week discharge and consultation period with various stakeholders, where there may be the request from the LPA for further information or clarification. At this point each planning condition is also available to by the public for comments.</p> <p>If the submission is successful and approved, the details relating to the planning conditions will become available on the planning portal. The approved decision can also be viewed by the public.</p> <p>BC confirmed that they have submitted all pre-commencement conditions to be discharged for the new community hall.</p>	

	<p>A resident raised concerns about the following two planning conditions and believe that have not been discharged:</p> <p>NS 41 – Energy Reduction NS 83 – Highways Works for Community Hall</p> <p>BC mentioned that will come back to questions regarding planning conditions towards the end to go through the planning condition tracker. BC also confirmed that the pre commencement conditions and relevant party wall issues determine the start on site date.</p> <p>BC confirmed they can not comment on any of the planning conditions and members of the public can make comments to the LPA through the planning portal.</p>	
2.3	<p>Beard general progress update.</p>	
	<p>BC provided a brief background the three phases of the construction programme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phase 1 – Construction of the new community hall – Tentative date is 10th of June 2024, where BC will start meaningful works. Construction duration is expected to be for 12 months. • Phase 2 – Decant of the current hall, and demolition of the hall and concrete slab, expected to occur from June 2025 • Phase 3 - The residential development, which BC is not involved in, and will be delivered by a different developer/contractor. <p>BC expressed their commitment to keeping the community informed and will provide updates through various channels, including newsletters, letter drops, and the site notice board once construction starts on site. Meeting minutes and general updates will also be posted on the council's Elleray Hall website.</p> <p>BC confirmed that the engagement meeting schedule has been updated to a monthly meeting alternating between a lunch time /evening meeting. Th revised schedule is available on the Elleray Hall website and hard copies are available for residents at this meeting.</p>	
2.4	<p>Beard update on party wall matters.</p>	
	<p>BC confirmed that the council had appointed party wall surveyor to individually contact property owners/occupants that may be affected by the construction of the of the new hall.</p> <p>The Party Wall Surveyor details are:</p>	

	<p>Andy Adow Senior Party Wall Surveyor, Stace LLP 273 High Street, Epping, Essex, CM16 4DA E: a.adow@stace.co.uk MB: 07872 858476</p> <p>BC introduced Mabey Hire who provided an overview of the monitoring system that will be used on the scheme.</p>	
3.0	Presentation from Mabey Hire – Monitoring system	
	<p>MH confirmed that it is a proactive system and the data is fed directly to the contractor. MH sets up the parameters within regulations, the machine monitors and records that information. If there is a breach, a notification is raised, and the contractor will proactively rectify the concerns.</p> <p>A resident raised a question about who receives the data and raised concerns about the previous vibration that occurred during the trial holes survey, and that residents would like to have access to the data.</p> <p>MB confirmed that it is a proactive system and they are contracted to instantly provide the data to the contractor if the dust, noise, or vibration levels are breached.</p> <p>BC explained that the monitoring system thresholds may only affect a small handful of properties. BC are happy to show residents the system to ensure that they are under the set parameters.</p> <p>A resident raised that even though BC may be under the legal thresholds of the monitoring, they are still concerned about noise and vibration. However, they understand this is part of construction.</p> <p>LBR confirmed the parameters have been submitted to the planning case officer to ensure the requirements are met, and consider that there is less risk of exceeding the legal threshold. LBR confirmed this is a method of proactive monitoring, and if it triggers, the works will stop immediately to assess and reevaluate the situation and determine what needs to be done differently.</p> <p>A resident raised a concern about construction workers making noise during their tea and lunch breaks. BC confirmed there is an induction for all employees on site to</p>	

	<p>ensure they respect the surrounding neighbours and monitor unacceptable/antisocial behaviour, etc.</p> <p>A resident raised concerns about waking up to strong swearing when the existing hoarding was erected and would like BC to be reminded.</p> <p>BC is a construction management agency and understands and respects the residents' wishes.</p> <p>MH provides reassurance to protect all parties.</p> <p>A resident raised questions about whether all the monitoring machines are currently in place.</p> <p>MH confirmed all the monitoring is currently live and has been installed today. LBR also noted that the early installation of the monitoring system ensures that there is a baseline to record existing conditions prior to start of construction.</p> <p>MH provided previous case studies explaining areas of noise, dust, and vibration monitoring in areas of high foot traffic, e.g., a university, Midlands, and power station.</p>	
4.0	Questions	
4.1	Question from resident.	
	<p>A resident is concerned about obtaining the contact details of the site manager. BC has confirmed that the BC team details will be published. Relevant site personnel contact details will be available on the notice board.</p> <p>BC confirmed that the first point of contact is Nicky Forrest, the Resident Liaison Officer. Any enquiries should be directed to Nicky in the first instance, who will then forward the information to the relevant party.</p> <p>A resident requested the details of the site manager in case of an urgent concern about the site, for example if someone parks along the double yellow lines outside. The resident would like the details of BC site team to contact someone immediately.</p> <p>BC confirmed that the site team details will be available.</p>	
4.2	Questions from resident	

	<p>A resident requested for an update with the party wall agreements and if the process has now been completed, as construction cannot commence until all the agreements are in place.</p> <p>LBR confirmed that most party walls notices have been awarded, there are 8 notices issued initially with 7 requiring action; 4 have been awarded and 3 are expected to be completed within the next few days, and in time for the commencement of construction on site.</p>	
<p>4.3</p>	<p>Questions from resident</p>	
	<p>A resident raised a query regarding the visit from the structural engineer and requested an update on the outcome of the visit concerning the garden boundary wall.</p> <p>LBR responded that the structural engineer and party wall surveyor had visited site to investigate various garden/boundary wall conditions. They have been reviewing these conditions and incorporating this information into the BC design.</p> <p>LBR confirmed that the main party wall notices have been served including the garden/boundary wall issues where necessary. Notices for PW Section 3 and Section 6 (distances) have been served to the relevant parties.</p> <p>The resident raised a question about the redesign of the foundation works and the boundary edges (e.g., 21 North Lane).</p> <p>The resident also raised concerns about the boundary wall, specifically involving Section 3 for the party wall. LBR confirmed that they are reviewing the resident's concerns about the height of the boundary wall in line with the structural engineer's report.</p> <p>BC confirmed that the report was issued to LBR on Friday, 24th May 2024, and LBR is reviewing for a practical solution.</p> <p>LBR confirmed that the party wall and boundary issues are dealt with on a case-by-case basis. The party wall surveyor will be in contact.</p> <p>A resident raised a concern about the height of the tarmacking and the height of the fence being changed at the rear of the boundary wall. BC confirmed that they are working through and providing a solution for each affected individual.</p>	

	<p>LBR reassured the resident that it is in the interest of both the adjoining owner and the Council (developer) to avoid altering existing fence boundaries where possible. LBR will take the necessary action based on an acceptable BC design solution, and the party wall surveyor's recommendation.</p>	
4.4	Questions from resident	
	<p>Residents are concerned about the following pre-commencement conditions:</p> <p>NS28 – Noise Insulation (Prior to commencement of any superstructure works)</p> <p>BC confirmed that this is not a pre-commencement condition.</p> <p>BC explained that once the slab of the foundation is completed, anything above that is considered superstructure works.</p> <p>NS48 – Fire Safety (Prior to commencement of above-ground works of the community centre)</p> <p>BC confirmed that this condition is not pre-commencement and is a prior to occupation condition.</p> <p>LBR has confirmed that all pre-commencement conditions have been submitted and due for discharge. LBR explained the process of the planning condition. The discharge decision will be made by the case officer. LBR expect all the pre commencement conditions will be discharged by the end of the week.</p>	
4.5	Queries raised from a resident.	
	<p>A resident raised a query about the detailed drainage plans. The resident believes it does not look like there are any soakaway provisions on the site, but there does seem to be an attenuation tank. They are expecting this to act as a soakaway as opposed to a reservoir and suggest that this is something the trustees have raised concerns about.</p> <p>BC and LBR confirmed that there is an attenuation tank on site.</p> <p>LBR explained that the attenuation tank acts as a holding tank for surface water. This is a large underground tank that holds all the water and releases it back into the rainwater system. It is designed to prevent the development from flooding and to avoid holding excess water.</p>	

LBR confirmed that the information provided by BC, along with the calculations, has been sent to the flood risk assessor (LLFA) for comments. These comments were then forwarded to the case officer to ensure they are satisfied with the proposed plans.

The resident raised a point about the overload on the town's water system in terms of sewerage release. During heavy rain, they expected the council would want to attenuate that overload and were surprised that this was not in the plan and that the water will be pumped into the storm water system.

LBR confirmed that the water does not get pumped but goes into an attenuation tank, which fills up to a certain level before gradually discharging into the main system.

LBR confirmed that the calculations have been provided to the flood risk officer to see if what has been proposed is acceptable.

A resident is concerned that the calculation is based on a 100-year storm and believes that this data is incorrect and outdated.

BC confirmed they design everything according to the regulations and planning conditions. They advised the residents to get in touch with the LPA if they have concerns about the calculations.

The resident stated that the calculation sheets mention 0.95, which is not reflected in the plans. The plans specify that there is an attenuation tank with a 6cm diameter, the rest of which is filled with gravel. As a material scientist, they cannot imagine that it has been cross-fed as 0.95. They questioned whether the calculations have been checked.

LBR confirmed that the drainage calculations have been checked with the LFFA (Lead Local Flood Authorities).

LBR confirmed that the drainage design and calculations have been developed by the BC civil and drainage engineers which has been passed to the LPA under the SUDS condition and has been checked by the LFFA officer.

A resident raised a query about the location of the tank.

BC confirmed the tank will be located near the existing entrance.

The resident expressed concerns to LBR regarding the drainage calculations and requested LBR to check.

	<p>The resident mentioned that they have emailed the LPA regarding this concern.</p> <p>LBR confirmed the LFFA has received these comments and LBR will check with the case officer on the drainage calculations.</p>	
4.6	Queries raised from a resident.	
	<p>A resident raised the concern about how the attenuation tank will be protected during construction.</p> <p>BC confirmed that the attenuation crates is reinforced, to withstand construction activity (vehicle movement etc.).</p> <p>BC will confirm if this is annotated on the drawings.</p> <p>The resident is concerned that the attenuation tank will be damaged during construction and will need protecting.</p>	
4.7	Resident raised another query.	
	<p>A resident raised a query about N85: Energy and reducing the carbon emissions on site.</p> <p>BC confirmed the council has elected to progress with the carbon offset fee.</p> <p>A resident raised concerns that the council and BC have not put any additional measures in place and have not tried to maximize carbon savings on site.</p> <p>BC confirmed they have met the design requirements of Stage 3, which has progressed to Stage 4, and this is part of the tender process for the Design and Build contract.</p> <p>A resident mentioned that they have had conversations in the past with LBR about higher insulation levels. They are concerned and would like to know why this has not been done to deliver sustainable material carbon emissions.</p> <p>LBR recalled that the resident sent an email to LBR regarding a manufacturer from an insulation company they had recommended. LBR checked the specification in the tender documents, and confirmed that this is what has been specified. LBR confirmed they will go back and check the details on the insulation.</p>	

	<p>The resident suggested they will provide a contact for the insulation manufacturers as they believe LBR should have tried to maximize carbon emissions reductions before going through the process of offsetting the carbon.</p> <p>LBR is happy to have a conversation with the contact provided by the resident. However, changing the design for Elleray Hall is unlikely to happen as construction is about to commence.</p> <p>The resident established that LBR needs to understand the position of the GLA and the regulations.</p> <p>LBR confirmed that the planners are aware of the GLA considerations.</p>	
<p>4.8</p>	<p>Resident raised another query.</p>	
	<p>The resident raised that McBains did a study of energy use, which was the first step to getting through N85. The report shows the different use of energy by the various types of buildings, indicating that it is all electric. This includes electric cooking, heating, lighting, etc.</p> <p>In addition, it shows very high levels of cooking energy required, equating to £15,000 a year based on McBains' calculations. As electricity is five times more expensive than gas, the planned cooking costs for providing lunches for the users are significantly higher compared to today's cost of £3,000. The resident questioned if the trustees are aware of these electricity costs.</p> <p>A discussion ensued between a council member and the resident about estimated annual electricity costs for cooking, and potential increased costs.</p> <p>LBR clarified that the resident is correct in saying the building is designed to run entirely on electricity and not gas, as this is a requirement for the building. The building will also run on an Air Source Heat Pump.</p> <p>LBR confirmed that while Air Source Heat Pumps reduce the amount of carbon.</p> <p>The resident emphasized that LBR needs to review the energy use report and consider that there could be more energy savings to be made.</p>	
<p>4.9</p>	<p>Question from a resident.</p>	
	<p>A resident is concerned about the demolition for Phase 2 and the related planning requirements, specifically regarding dust management, noise management, and</p>	

vibration management. There are also concerns about the oak tree on the existing site, which is 1 meter away from the existing hall. The resident would like to know how the tree will be protected.

BC confirmed that the planning conditions are split into three phases and that the demolition of the existing Elleray Hall is BC's responsibility. A different developer/contractor will be responsible for the discharge of related conditions for the Phase 3 residential block.

A resident raised that to be able to demolish the hall, there are planning requirements that must be met, and questioned how LBR and BC plan to discharge the planning conditions, as they believe this is all integrated under one condition.

BC confirmed they will meet the specific requirements for the demolition and the conditions for the phase.

BC is currently focusing mainly on the construction of the new Elleray Hall. The demolition planning conditions will be addressed prior to the commencement of the demolition.

The resident enquired about the asbestos and dust management process.

BC explained the process, stating that a refurbishment and demolition survey will be completed prior to the demolition of the existing hall. The outcome of the survey will determine the methodology that BC will use to safely remove the asbestos and then fully demolish the existing building. Until the R&D survey is completed, the methodology for the demolition of the existing hall has not been defined.

The resident raised another question about the planning process, suggesting that the residential building and demolition are integrated under the same planning condition.

BC confirmed that the residential building is not part of their discharge of planning conditions.

LBR clarified that the planning conditions are split into three phases:

- Phase 1 – New hall
- Phase 2 – Demolition of existing hall
- Phase 3 – New residential building, completed by another contractor.

The resident would like reassurance that during the planning process, people will be protected.

	LBR will check if the planning conditions are separate or integrated.	
5.0	Actions	
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. LBR confirmed that they will review the structural report and provide solutions for the boundary wall concerns. This will require input from the party wall surveyor, structural engineer, and BC design team. 2. LBR confirmed that the LFFA has received these comments and that they will check with the case officer regarding the drainage calculations. 3. BC will check how the attenuation crates are protected during construction and confirm the information that has been issued. 4. LBR confirmed they will review the details on the insulation. 5. LBR will check if the planning conditions are separate or integrated. 	
6.0	Next Community Engagement Meeting	
	<p>Additional information/updates will be provided on the Elleray Hall website.</p> <p>Community engagement will take place monthly.</p> <p>The next meeting is scheduled for:</p> <p>Wednesday 26th June 2024 12:30pm Teddington Baptist Church</p>	