



# MEETING MINUTES

Elleray Hall  
**Community Engagement 03**

**Meeting Title:** Elleray Hall – Early Community Engagement – 03      **Project:** Elleray Hall

**Meeting Date:** 27<sup>th</sup> March 2024      **Location:** Elleray Hall

**Issue Date:** 4<sup>th</sup> April 2024      **Engagement No:** 03

Confidential     
  For Information     
  For Review     
  For Action

Attendees:		
<b>London Borough of Richmond</b>	<b>LBR</b>	
<b>Beard Construction</b>	<b>BC</b>	
<b>Charles Booth</b>	<b>CB</b>	London Borough of Richmond - Head of Programme Management Office PMO
<b>Alfred Akpo-Teye</b>	<b>AA</b>	London Borough of Richmond - Project Manager – PMO
<b>Councillor Richard Baker</b>		London Borough of Richmond – Teddington Ward
<b>Simon Webster</b>	<b>SW</b>	Beard Construction - Contracts Manager
<b>Nicky Forrest</b>	<b>NF</b>	Beard Construction – Resident Liaison Officer
<b>Simon Hayes</b>	<b>SH</b>	McBains – Senior Project Manager



# MEETING MINUTES

**Distribution:** All the above

---

Item	Description	Action
1.0	<p><b>Introductions</b></p> <p>Introductions were made.</p>	
1.1	<p><b>Community Engagement</b></p>	
	<p>The London Borough of Richmond (LBR) provided an update to community members who were unable to attend the previous community engagement meetings.</p> <p>LBR reiterated that the previous contractor had withdrawn from the project, and Beard Construction has been awarded the contract to build the new Elleray Hall and demolish the original hall.</p> <p>LBR confirmed to all that the purpose of these meetings were to update on the construction works and site activities and not to address other items such as the viability of the project or the further residential scheme that will follow.</p> <p>All parties were made aware that any points related to anything else would not be discussed or recorded within minutes.</p>	
1.2	<p><b>Previous minutes</b></p>	
	<p>LBR discussed the previous set of minutes which have been published on the Council Web page for the public to view, and advised any feedback is welcome.</p> <p>A local resident specified the previous set of minutes had been separately updated by themselves and separately published as they felt these reflected a more accurate record.</p> <p>No further comments on the accuracy of previous minutes.</p>	

<b>2.0</b>	<b>Beard Introduction</b>	
<b>2.1</b>	<b>Introduction to Beard for new attendees and overview</b>	
	<p>BC provided a brief introduction about BC and the type of projects they have undertaken previously.</p> <p>BC confirmed they are pleased to be awarded this project and to be working with LBR.</p> <p>BC provided information about the three phases of construction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Phase 1 – Construction of the new community hall – end of April / early May 2024 to beginning April 2025</li> <li>• Phase 2 – Decant of the current hall and demolition of the hall and concrete slab, expected to occur from April 2025 to June 2025</li> <li>• Phase 3 - The residential development, which BC is not involved in, and this will be delivered by another contractor.</li> </ul>	
<b>2.2</b>	<b>Beard Update on Planning Process</b>	
	<p>BC informed the meeting that they continue to undertake the discharging of the planning process and to fulfil specific conditions, with various specialist consultants engaged to assist in formalising reports. These consultants include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ecologist</li> <li>• Arborist</li> <li>• Transport</li> <li>• Ground remediation consultants.</li> <li>• Dust management specialist</li> </ul> <p>BC emphasised that the list of specialists would continue beyond these examples, as each condition was sequenced on priority.</p> <p>BC confirmed that the planning process involves the submission of individual conditions to the Local Planning Authority's (LPA) online planning portal by their appointed planning consultant when each is 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 to be discharged is available for viewing and comment by the public.</p> <p>Following this, If the submission is successful and approved, the associated details relating to the planning conditions will also become available on the planning portal.</p>	

	<p>At this milestone, the approval information can also be viewed by the public.</p> <p>BC also informed the community members present that once all the pre-commencement conditions are discharged and any associated party wall matters are in place, BC will be prepared to commence the works on the site.</p> <p>BC informed there are 2 remaining pre-commencement conditions to submit, which will be ready to be sent by next week:</p> <p>NS 41 – Energy Reduction NS 83 – Highways Works for Community Hall</p> <p>BC confirmed they can not comment on any of the specifics of the planning conditions and should members of the public have a comment, these should be forwarded to the LPA.</p>	
<p><b>2.3</b></p>	<p><b>Beard general progress update.</b></p>	
	<p>BC confirmed that the archaeology work was completed in Dec 2023, and no significant findings were discovered.</p> <p>BC also stated their intention to engage with the community to gather historical survey information about the existing Elleray Hall, with the specific dates to be determined, but targeted for early 2025.</p> <p>BC expressed their commitment to keeping the community informed and providing updates through various channels, including newsletters, letter drops. Additionally, BC confirmed that meeting minutes and general updates will be posted on the Council's Elleray Hall website.</p> <p>BC informed attendees that the engagement meeting schedule was printed and available for residents to take copy.</p> <p>Once on-site works commenced a notice board would be set up on the left-hand side of the new hoarding at the entrance, to keep local residents informed and updated at regular intervals, or when necessary.</p>	

<b>2.4</b>	<b>Beard update on party wall matters.</b>	
	<p>BC confirmed that the council had appointed party wall surveyor to individual contact properties for condition surveys for those that may be affected by the construction of the new Elleray Hall.</p> <p>BC confirmed that further trial hole investigations had been undertaken this week and that the results obtained would be shared with the party wall surveyor and the design teams for further evaluation.</p> <p>LRB and BC clarified that the party wall surveyor and planning conditions are being actively addressed, with ongoing communication with individual affected properties. These issues would be resolved separately and privately on a case-by-case basis with the assistance of the specialist party wall surveyor and engineers.</p>	
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Questions from the public / residents</b>	
<b>3.1</b>	<b>Question from a resident.</b>	

	<p>A resident raised a question regarding the timing of the party wall notifications, as the party wall surveyor had stated he was awaiting information before he could proceed further.</p> <p>BC advised this was correct and was in reference to the current design works being considered due to the proximity of the boundary walls and that this was also associated with recent trial holes undertaken. It was likely that this information would be made available to the surveyor next week.</p> <p>The resident requested how to view this updated design information. BC advised the party wall surveyor would have sight of the completed design and assumed this could be issued to the individual property owners.</p> <p>The resident expressed concern as to age and fragility of their homes and noted during the on-site works undertaken on the 04 December 2023 vibrations were felt within a property on Ellery Rd.</p> <p>BC confirmed that the works were localised on this occasion and alternative methods would be considered going forward for the removal of the tarmac.</p> <p>LBR also reiterated they were aware of this specific method and the type of plant used may have been the contributing factor and reiterated that Beards are aware for the wider excavation works that will be undertaken on-site.</p>	
<p><b>3.2</b></p>	<p><b>Questions from resident</b></p>	
	<p>A resident raised a question regarding the trial holes undertaken and if these were next to no. 21 North Lane, as the documents on the portal do not detail the new extension.</p> <p>BC confirmed that they were aware of the extension, since being appointed and previous investigations have already been undertaken next to the new extension and the design amended to suit.</p> <p>LBR also advised that the party wall surveyor has been in contact with the new owner of 21 North Lane regarding the scheme and the design.</p>	

<b>3.3</b>	<b>Questions from resident</b>	
	<p>A resident raised a question regarding the landscaping and would this be undertaken within the proposed one-year construction timeframe, whilst particularly requesting the type of hedge to installed.</p> <p>BC confirmed the landscaping was included within the current construction timeframe, similarly this was a planning condition to be submitted and available to be reviewed by all. The detail of the proposed hedge and other soft landscaping will be available in the planning discharge for landscaping.</p>	
<b>3.4</b>	<b>Queries raised from a resident.</b>	
	<p>A resident asked a question regarding the proposed methods of communication and noting that the Construction Management Scheme (CMS) details that these will be monthly, requesting when these monthly meetings would commence.</p> <p>BC reiterated that it had since been established that these bi-monthly community meetings would continue as per the issued meeting schedule, which included once the on-site construction had commenced. LBR also confirmed there are currently several forms of communication:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information Notice Board on the site gates (once construction commences)</li> <li>• Current Newsletter produced by Beards will continue.</li> <li>• Current community Engagement meetings will continue.</li> </ul> <p>Stating all of which provide a wide range of communication for the local residents to be well informed. It is not envisaged that there is a requirement to undertake a monthly meeting at this stage.</p>	
<b>3.5</b>	<b>Queries raised from a resident.</b>	
	<p>A resident asked a question regarding parking for construction vehicles in the immediate area.</p> <p>BC advised that this is under review and the ideal situation would be to recommend that as many workers as possible use public transport. BC are also engaging with local unoccupied building owners to consider available space for alternative construction parking.</p>	



	<p>The resident accepted these plans were for the construction workers, but asked how the site deliveries would also be undertaken.</p> <p>BC and LBR confirmed this information is detailed with the CMS, providing swept path analysis for the deliveries to inside the current hoardings and the site logistics within the area</p> <p>A resident raised a request that the site team would liaise with the Tesco store who are already blocking traffic pinch points with their deliveries.</p> <p>BC confirmed that this would be the case as well as a banksman used for the on-site deliveries.</p> <p>Cllr. Baker confirmed this would also be beneficial to coordinate the site deliveries with Tesco.</p>	
3.6	<b>Question from a resident.</b>	
	<p>A resident raised a question regarding CMS which seems to be different to the items discussed within the meetings. Specifically, the working hours that were stated within the meeting as Mon.– Fri: 08:00 – 17:00 and no works envisaged on a Sat. However, the CMS states Mon. – Fri 08:00 – 18:00 and 08:00 – 13:00.</p> <p>BC and LBR confirmed that the hours stated in the CMS are the allowable working hours as established by the LPA.</p> <p>BC confirmed the hours previously stated would be the proposed regular site hours and they may choose to work outside of these, but within the allowable hours as and when required based on the programme constraints.</p>	
3.7	<b>Resident query.</b>	
	<p>The resident also stated there is a discrepancy that a crane would not be used whilst a 40 Tonne crane is mentioned within the CMS.</p>	

	<p>BC confirmed a mobile crane would have always been required and used as normal within many construction activities.</p> <p>LBR stated the confusion may have arisen around the perception of a static tower crane, which would not be used and that a 40 Tonne crane was a regular construction requirement, and this would sit comfortably within the site curtilage.</p>	
<b>3.8</b>	<b>Resident query.</b>	
	<p>The resident also stated that workers would park in the road and that may limit their use of parking as per the T2 permit. Another resident stated that the T2 permit was not mentioned within the CMS and the current speed limit was 20mph and not as stated at 30mph. A request was made by the other resident that this was amended whilst also establishing that the T2 was regularly and easily enforceable using the known 24hr contact numbers. However, should any construction operatives choose to park and unload, this is not dissimilar to current delivery vehicles within the road.</p> <p>Similarly, BC stated that they could only advise and discourage workers where not to park and could not enforce this.</p> <p>The resident requested that the council should place a temporary parking restriction to stop operatives from parking as they expected a reasonable quality of life.</p> <p>Cllr. Baker stated that this could not be applied, parking could not be undertaken in the T2 parking area as the current restrictions.</p> <p>LBR thanked the resident for the due diligence regarding the correct mph and stated any further parking comments could be provided to the LPA.</p>	
<b>3.9</b>	<b>Resident query.</b>	
	<p>The resident also requested when the final specifications would be issued to the residents, as these were not known.</p> <p>BC and LBR stated that the LPA has approved the planning application. Any further internal or specification design developed with the end users would not be issued, as long as the design development did not affect the planning. There were currently no design changes that may constitute an application for a Minor Works Amendment (NMA) to the current planning.</p>	

<b>3.10</b>	<b>Question from a resident.</b>	
	<p>A resident asked a question regarding the extensive excavations taking place across the site and that the CMS did not state anything regarding the known contamination.</p> <p>BC and LBR stated that there was a specific separate planning condition to be submitted and discharged alongside the established remediation strategy to the LPA which would cover this.</p> <p>The resident was advised to contact the LPA if they had further comment regarding this.</p>	
<b>3.11</b>	<b>Question from a resident.</b>	
	<p>A resident asked who they would contact if they which to raise an immediate concern with the works.</p> <p>BC advised this has been communicated within the issued letters and this will also be provided on the site notice board once the works commenced.</p>	
<b>3.12</b>	<b>Question from a resident.</b>	
	<p>A resident requested if the meetings could be more flexible as the timing of this meeting was not suitable to all.</p> <p>LBR confirmed that the proposed schedule had established this flexibility with alternating meetings between the day (12:30) and evenings (18:30).</p>	
<b>3.13</b>	<b>Resident raised another query.</b>	
	<p>A resident questioned the statement that noisy demolition works will be undertaken at times causing least disturbance, whilst it did not state when these hours would actually be.</p>	

	<p>BC stated that these could not be confirmed and that they would attempt to stay away from early mornings, but that times could and would differ.</p> <p>LBR advised as these demolition activities were over a year away and that nearer the time a better understanding could be gained.</p>	
<b>3.14</b>	<b>Resident query.</b>	
	<p>A resident referenced the highways and footpath condition survey that has been undertaken in and around the area and requested when remedial works would be completed as part of the project.</p> <p>Cllr. Baker thanked the resident and confirmed the report would be provided to the highways department.</p> <p>LBR action to forward the condition survey on to colleagues in the Highways department for consideration. Remedial works to pavements, kerbs, street furniture etc. are outside the scope of this project.</p> <p>BC also advised that comments could also be provided to the LPA.</p>	
<b>3.15</b>	<b>Resident raised another query.</b>	
	<p>A resident asked a query founded on the current rainfall and the fact that there are excavations being undertaken on the new site, stating this would only lead to a new lake in Teddington or flooding.</p> <p>BC confirmed that the scheme had been designed by a professional civils engineer to accommodate the anticipated peak rainfall events.</p>	

<b>4.0</b>	<p>Additional information/updates will be provided on the Elleray Hall website.</p> <p>Community engagement will take place on a bi-monthly basis.</p> <p>The next meeting is scheduled for:</p> <p><b>Wednesday 28<sup>th</sup> May 2024 18:30 noon</b> <b>Teddington Baptist Church</b></p>	
------------	---	--