



Brixton Neighbourhood Construction Forum (BNCF) meeting note

Public

Monday 15 June 2020, 7pm – 9pm – Zoom online meeting

Attendees

Councillor Martin Tiedemann (MT) – Chair
Councillor Adrian Garden (AG) - ward councillor

YNTH Project Team

- Andrew Boyle (AB) - Muse Developments
- Jo Sintern (JS) – GL Hearn – Co-Chair (technical)
- Asha Saroy (AS) – GL Hearn
- Sandra Roebuck (SR) – Lambeth Council
- Brian Brady (BB) – Lambeth Council
- Dave Foley (DF) – O’Keefe
- Stephen McGinty (SM) – McAleer Rushe
- Ryan McShane (RS) – McAleer Rushe
- Jonathan O’Neill (JO) – McAleer Rushe

Councillor Maria Kay (MK) - ward councillor – apologies

Total number of local residents: seven

1. Introductions

MT welcomed everyone and explained that he would be chairing the meeting having switched roles with AG. MT introduced the project team and registered the attendees. MT listed the agenda items and explained how the meeting would be chaired.

2. Agenda, housekeeping & minutes of April BNCF

JS explained:

- How the chatroom function in Zoom would be open for all to view and that she would be monitoring written questions.
- If anyone had a question or comment, they could raise their hand on screen or via Zoom and MT would manage/ direct the questions.



- The meeting would be recorded and that if anyone had an issue with this, they could switch off their video or inform JS by raising their hand. No objections were raised.

MT explained that the minutes of the last meeting had been updated following suggested amendments from one resident. Nobody had any further comments on the April BNCF minutes.

3. Muse/ O’Keefe update (PRE-RECORDED BY AB)

JS played the presentation. Key points were:

- Declan Kelly, previous site manager had left the project due to personal commitments. Jason Beard had been appointed as site manager.
- McAleer Rushe (MAR) had been appointed as the main contractor, and O’Keefe would be retained to complete the demolition of the basement.
- Summary of works:
 - Hoarding had been installed but there was a delay to the start due to TfL staff not being available.
 - Scaffolding was nearing completion, with main frame demolition due to start on 29 June. Ahead of this, a crane, similar to what was used in May, would be on site to lift the machines onto the roof of the site.
 - The operatives were working to the CLC’s guidelines version 4, which provided more scope with regards to social distancing. At that point, only 12 operatives were working on site.
 - Current activities: soft strip and removal of low-level asbestos near completion.
 - Main frame demolition, as per the CEMP, would take place from the top-down, with debris placed into skips via lift shafts. This process would be noisy, and the team could not place any material at the base of the skips due to risk of cross-contamination (post-meeting note: certain materials that are to be disposed of are loaded into the appropriate skips to help with recycling/waste management. The team cannot place other materials into skips beforehand as there would be a risk of cross-contamination. Waste and debris are placed into the skips via lift shafts from the various floor levels as the building is being cleared and demolished).
 - The “noisy works” approach would be “3hours on/2hours off” rather than “2hrs on/2hrs off” - 8.30am-11.30am (3hours on), a break from 11.30am-1.30pm, with work to resume 1.30pm-4.30pm (post-meeting note, these hours were proposed by the new site manager due to previous experience on similar projects. The team is happy to take feedback on the hours and re-evaluate this if residents would prefer to have 2hrs on, 2hrs off).
 - Respite spaces – Muse and Lambeth Council were still in discussions and the team would update residents on this in due course
 - Vehicle movements – there had been difficulties in exiting the site, and so the team suspended the parking bays on Hayter Road. The suspension would be until August but could be extended if the new contractor believed it would help the next stage of



works. The team did not want to use Beverstone Road for vehicles but would be allowed to do so if needed as per the CEMP. No footpaths would be closed.

- The security team would wear GoPro cameras to record interactions with the public.
- Communications – the team had listened to residents, and O’Keefe now produced 2-week “look ahead” newsletters. The information was, and would continue to be, provided to residents who had registered for updates; all newsletters would also be uploaded onto the website. AB encouraged residents to log queries with GL Hearn.

4. Issues & action tracker

AS presented this item, highlighting the key issues that had been reported. It was explained that as per the CEMP, operatives could be on site before the site officially opened for work i.e., they were allowed to arrive at 7.30am, and leave at 6.30pm. AS also discussed the access/traffic management issues and the actions taken to date.

AS explained that the team was listening, recording, investigating and responding to issues and that the team used this tracker to deal with enquiries. As a result of feedback from Friday’s forum, the team would be putting a version of the tracker onto the website. AS encouraged residents to register for updates via the project email address, and to contact the GL Hearn team with their concerns in the first instance, with the secondary option to contact JB if required.

5. Community issues & questions

A resident asked about traffic and vehicle movements as traffic during the school rush-hour was a key concern. She also asked what steps had been taken to engage schools.

AS explained that contact via phone and email had been made with three local schools on Monday, as it was an agreed action from Friday’s forum. This was to start a dialogue with the schools and provide/help to cascade information. JS added that the initial contact was to enable the team to pick up more detailed discussions about the plans and explore options of support e.g. a lollipop person or other measures – subject to the schools’ concerns/ needs. Contact had previously been made with the schools, but there had been no response, presumably due to more pressing Covid-19 matters/ priorities at that time. (Post-meeting note: contact has been made with three local schools and the team will continue to engage them).

MT confirmed that his ward colleague, Cllr Maria Kay, had reached out to local schools in the ward recently to offer support during lockdown, and not had much response. MT suggested that he would ask Maria for an update. Also, the ward councillors had been lobbying the School Streets Initiative to help improve the area outside the schools.

Another resident re-iterated her:

- Dissatisfaction with the team’s attempts to engage schools.



- Concern about the A23 and road safety, highlighting that the local schools were attended by children on the other side of the A23, and those children used the crossing. She asked why contact with the school had been, in her opinion, late.
- Issues with vehicle management on site and their thoughts on the CEMP.

JS explained that as the pit lane and the closure of the crossing would not happen until later in the year, the team had adequate time to speak to the schools to understand their needs and progress the discussions. MT read from the chatroom that a resident had written “no contact had been made with Sudbourne Primary School until this week” and that “SR had offered to contact the Director of Education to help in “doubling down” efforts to contact the local schools.”

MT explained his thoughts about the A23 and crossing closure, stating that:

- the A23 was a TfL road and with that in mind, whilst the Council could lobby TfL for changes, ultimately it was the Mayor of London/TfL’s responsibility and decision – and they were particularly conservative when it came to decisions that would slow traffic and buses. He confirmed that he had raised this with Assembly Member, Flo Eshalomi, and would raise it again. He was keen to resolve this – whether with a replacement permanent or temporary crossing.
- It had previously been suggested that TfL would move the crossing to the main body of schools, but it was now considered too close to other crossings.

A resident asked whether the closure of the crossing was definitely happening. AB responded that:

- he had spoken to TfL about this as he was also concerned about health and safety aspects. He had requested that the crossing be replaced further up or down the road, but TfL rejected this because the distance between any replacement and the other two permanent crossings would be close and would impact negatively on the wider traffic network.
- he would continue to have discussions with TfL but if the clear position of the latter remained as outlined, the team would need to close the crossing in response to this.

MT suggested that AB should include ward councillors, and AM Flo Eshalomi to aid discussions with TfL.

A resident suggested that the team should petition TfL to re-evaluate the other crossing timings, as they took too long to change, which often made pedestrians impatiently cross before the green light. AB confirmed that safety was of paramount importance to him and said that he would discuss it with TfL again. JS added that the team would continue to push for engagement with the schools to press upon parents/the children/staff the significant changes but also to identify how they could work together.

MT explained that he had previously tried to negotiate with TfL about the crossing timings and that TfL needed to help to make the situation less dangerous.



A resident asked if the closure of the crossing was definitely happening or whether it was to be discussed and then decided. AB reconfirmed that it was the team's intention to have the pit lane and therefore, due to TfL's response, the crossing needed to be closed. AB stated that as a minimum, the contractors would divert people to use other crossings and signs would be placed around the site.

The resident asked if the council felt that that was satisfactory. MT responded that he was not satisfied with no crossing replacement and that there had been a number of suggestions that needed to be explored with TfL, with extra weight being thrown in by the councillors and Flo Eshalomi as previously stated. He was keen to resolve this – whether with a permanent or temporary crossing.

A resident explained her concerns on whether it would actually be possible to educate the children in good time about road safety before the crossing closure. She argued for practical solutions to prevent accidents, which the council needed to support. AB explained about the work the team would do with the schools and that it is usually parents that educate children about road safety. MT explained that commitments had been made by the team to explore this issue and report back, including improved communications with the schools.

Another resident raised a question about the noisy work hours that were now to be 3hrs on/2hrs off. He asked whether this worked for the local residents, and if the team could consider asking residents which hours were preferred.

The resident was asked by MT and AB if he had a preference and to discuss this on the Forum. The resident explained that he did not wish to discuss the issue at that point, on behalf of others, but suggested the team had this conversation more widely with residents. AB explained that:

- the team had been communicating with residents via email/phone since the works started (post-meeting note: e.g. various queries about the work programme and noisy works) but not all responded back.
- this particular matter was discussed at the Friday forum, and it was agreed to see how it worked, and to review if residents were unhappy with the proposed programme.
- he was happy for residents to discuss and debate the options.

AG suggested that the preferred hours should be listed in the next O'Keefe newsletter, with residents asked for their thoughts on this. AB confirmed that the team would add this into to the communications.

(Post meeting note: any responses on this point would need to come from individuals rather than individuals representing a number of people).

A resident explained that the suggested work hours would not work for everyone as residents would have differing priorities. She highlighted that these works were going on during lockdown and the summer holidays, and that she was frustrated at Lambeth Council for not keeping to the original schedule. AB confirmed that the team were permitted to work 8am-6pm, and that in response to the difficult circumstances and to be helpful, the developer had imposed working restrictions on the



contractors. He added that the hours could be amended but that he was trying to accommodate as many residents as possible – if the 3hours on/2hrs off does not work, he would review again with the potential to convert to a 2hrs on/2hrs off programme.

MT acknowledged the difficulties with this and that residents could express their preference directly to GL Hearn if they wished. He added that it was positive that the team were looking at respite services to help.

Another resident explained that she wanted the team to be clear on the works and asked that the council work with residents to support them when needed. AB confirmed that the contractors can have noisy works for six hours within the permitted hours, and the team will communicate with residents.

JS stated that GL Hearn has been updating those residents that registered for updates, but that those residents are not representative of the area. JS suggested the team could send out a one-page letter, asking residents to contact/email with their thoughts on the hours.

A resident asked whether, if options were to be listed in the newsletter for residents to identify a preference, could the team also provide a further option for feedback of whole days off/on for noisy works. Another resident asked whether, if there was any slippage in the programme/timetable, there would be increased working hours. AB confirmed that this would not happen, and that if there was a delay, the works between the two contractors would overlap. He added that he had already been asked by the contractors if they could work on Saturdays, which he had refused.

Another resident highlighted her recent experience with dust from the building and her concerns with how it had been recorded on the issues tracker. She had seen dust leave the building and was originally told it was exhaust fumes from vehicles. When she enquired further from the site manager, she was informed that it was dust, and she was concerned about dust in her home/no containment measures were being used. She suggested the tracker should be a live document on the website for all residents to see.

AB asked if other residents had experienced more dust in the area. Others agreed, with one suggesting the dust was whiter than usual. AB agreed to make the Issues Tracker accessible on the website with regular updates to this for transparency.

6. Introducing the main contractor (PRE-RECORDED)

JS played the presentation which had been pre-recorded by AB. Key points covered:

- The new contractor appointment, with MAR working behind scenes on the logistics.
- Programme of works.
- Early September detailed works, including the gantry structure.
- Noise and vibration monitoring and locations.
- Noise mitigation measures.



- Communication commitments.
- Site contact details and operating hours.
- Pit lane management.

JS explained that the programme of works would be outlined in more detail in the next BNCF. AB introduced the MAR team on the call.

MT asked if there were any questions on the presentation. No questions were asked.

7. Terms of Reference

JS explained that the team had reviewed the Terms of Reference (ToR) and its relevance now for the Olive Morris House works. The team felt that it was now too focused on the “Triangle” site as it was produced some years ago in consultation with residents. The team proposed to make some suggested amendments for residents to comment on. This would be completed outside of the Forum and be discussed at the next meeting.

No issues were raised with this suggestion.

8. Date of next meeting/ AOB

JS and AB explained that the next meeting would take place after the August bank holiday/in September. MT moved to AOB.

A resident raised their concerns with vehicle movements, and that the CEMP described works that would be done to mitigate noise e.g. temporary barriers and acoustic screening. He asked what screening had been done to date and what was planned in the future to help mitigate noisy works. He also asked for the views from the council/councillors on these points.

AB explained that acoustic screens would be placed in the building and confirmed that no acoustic screening had been used to date as they had not started the significant noisy works. Screens would be used, and noise monitored. AB introduced DF, who explained that when the scaffolding is completed, internal acoustic blankets would be placed and localised around the site as the works progressed.

AB confirmed that photos of the barriers/screenings would be put onto the website. He also explained that he was in regular contact with the Council about the barriers/screens to ensure it was carried out safely.

AB read a message from the chatroom about a skip along the slip road and added that he would be on site in the week ahead and would take up these issues with the contractor.



AG explained how he had pushed for modern techniques to be used on previous schemes to minimise noise impacts. He stated that he had always asked about equipment used on sites and confirmed that Muse and Lambeth were committed to ensuring that best practice is sought. He added that he found it unacceptable that poor traffic management on site was still being experienced and reported. AB confirmed again that he would be on site to take up issues with the contractor.

MT read a message from SR on the chatroom where she confirmed that the Council approved the CEMP and it was their role to monitor its implementation. SR stated that the Council always looked for best practice and would push for Muse to “do better than the CEMP”.

MT read from the chatroom that a resident was grateful for what had been done to date and asked if extra measures could be in place to consider lockdown living (e.g. noisy works all day some days, with other days with no noisy works). AB confirmed that the team would always go above and beyond best practice.

AB suggested that to reduce noise during especially noisy periods, residents may wish to keep windows shut, for a short period, and use fans. This was briefly debated between residents and AB, as many residents explained that they thought this suggestion was unacceptable.

MT noted that best practice would be sought, and this was reconfirmed by AB and DF, who reiterated the purpose of the noise, dust, vibration monitors, and outlined the noisy works timetable. MT noted this, that the timetable was subject to feedback from residents (re 3hrs on/ 2hr off versus 2hrs on/ 2hrs off), and that the team were still looking into respite solutions.

A resident suggested that there should be more discussion with residents on how to achieve best practice. AB outlined what the CEMP stated on vehicle management, and how the contractors had been asked to be considerate of the area. AB confirmed that there had been no breaches of the CEMP. However, some residents disagreed with this point.

MT concluded the meeting saying:

- The next meeting in September seemed correct in light of the works programme but if there was a need to meet earlier, this would be considered.
- Residents were to continue to feedback to GL Hearn to enable the team to look into issues and action accordingly. The team would improve the issues tracker and make this accessible to residents.
- SR suggested that residents could also report back direct to the council.
- Issues about the skip in the slip road (raised via chatroom) would be picked up outside of the Forum.

MT closed meeting at 20.58.