



# Brixton Neighbourhood Construction Forum (BNCF) meeting note

Public

**Friday 12 June 2020, 10am – 12pm – Zoom online meeting**

## **Attendees**

Councillor Adrian Garden (AG) – Co-chair (and ward councillor)  
Councillor Maria Kay (MK) - ward councillor

YNTH Project Team:

- Andrew Boyle (AB) - Muse Developments
- Jo Sintern (JS) – GL Hearn – Technical-Chair
- Asha Saroy (AS) – GL Hearn
- Sandra Roebuck (SR) – Lambeth Council
- Brian Brady (BB) – Lambeth Council
- Jason Beard (JB) – O'Keefe
- Stephen McGinty (SM) – McAleer Rushe
- Ryan McShane (RS) – McAleer Rushe
- Jonathan O'Neill (JO) – McAleer Rushe

Apologies: Councillor Martin Tiedemann (MT) - ward councillor

Total number of local residents: Nine

## **1. Introductions**

AG welcomed everyone to the forum and introduced the project team.

## **2. Agenda, housekeeping & minutes of April BNCF**

AG ran through the meeting agenda and explained that JS would be co-chairing with him but would focus on the technology aspect of the meeting. JS explained how the chatroom function would be open for all to view, and that she would be monitoring written questions. If anyone had a question, they could raise their hand on screen or via Zoom.



### 3. Muse/ O'Keefe update (PRE-RECORDED)

Due to some technical issues, JS was unable to play the presentation. Instead AB presented, highlighting key points:

- Declan Kelly had left the project due to personal commitments. Jason Beard had been appointed as site manager.
- McAleer Rushe (MAR) was the main contractor.
- Summary of works:
  - Hoarding had been installed but there was a delay to the start of this
  - Scaffolding was still to be completed, 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. Currently on site there were 12 operatives.
  - Current activities: soft strip and removal of low-level asbestos near completion.
  - Main frame demolition, as per the 'Construction and Environmental Management Plan' (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.
  - Respite spaces – Muse and Lambeth Council were still in discussions. 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 may 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 able to do so if they needed to as permitted by the CEMP. No footpaths would be closed.
  - Communications – the team had listened to residents, and O'Keefe now produces 2-week "look ahead" newsletters. The information had been, and would be, provided to residents who have registered for updates; the newsletters are all also uploaded onto the website.

### 4. Issues & action tracker

- AS and AB 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 could arrive at 7.30am, and leave at 6.30pm.
- AS explained that the team was listening, recording, investigating and responding to issues.
- AS encouraged residents to register for updates and to contact the GL Hearn team with their concerns in the first instance, with the option to contact JB if required.

### 5. Community issues & questions

AG experienced technical issues at this point and dropped out of the meeting. Various questions were asked by residents.



A resident explained:

- that they were pleased with the meetings and communications.
- how they felt about the context of when the works were taking place i.e. during lockdown, and despite easing of restrictions for some, there are still some residents that have to remain “locked-down” e.g. the elderly, some disabled, some shielding. Although some residents adapted to different challenges e.g. home-schooling, there was heightened anxiety in the community. The residents were stressed about the challenges, but felt more distressed because of the building works, which is having an impact on mental health for some residents.
- that when they reported issues about on-site activities not following the CEMP, residents were told that “there are exceptions” and this had left some residents feeling “powerless”.
- there had been issues with vehicles entering and exiting the site/ traffic management, as well as “intense noise”.
- That residents were previously told the noisy work timetable would be “hrs on/2hrs off and asked why this had changed.

AB responded:

- the team had done as much as possible to reduce noise, but it would be noisy due to demolition works - something that could not always, unfortunately, be helped. Advised residents to close windows during the noisy works.
- the “really noisy works” were to be programmed so it would be 2hrs on, 2hrs off. However, the new site manager, JB, had suggested an alternative: 3hrs on, 2 hrs off to accommodate more “quiet time” during key parts of the day. The team could re-evaluate this if residents would prefer to have 2hrs on, 2hrs off.

Due to AG dropping out of the call, MK became Chair. MK asked AB for clarification of the noisy works programme and its duration. AB confirmed the times as: 8.30am-11.30am (3hours on), a break from 11.30am-1.30pm, with work to resume 1.30pm-4.30pm. This would take place until November/December.

A resident said he:

- appreciated that respite services were being looked into.
- felt when residents looked at the CEMP and raised issues, they were made to feel that “they are not considering the project and what the impact on it could be.”
- He was concerned that the issues tracker only detailed the behavioural incident with a resident and O’Keefe; he asked for “an aggressive tone” during a previous call with AB in May to be acknowledged.

AB responded to say that he did not agree that he had been aggressive on the call. MK noted that the issues had been raised and discussed.



The resident asked AB about an email that was sent which the local residents' group were mistakenly copied into, as he wanted recognition for the language used and upset caused. JS responded on this and explained that GL Hearn was there to take questions and reduce any confrontation between parties. JS explained that the wording "intrusive behaviour" in the email reflected what was being reported by the operatives on site, as the scaffolders felt this was the case when they were being photographed when working.

The resident asked AB if there would be an apology for the "offensive email". AB explained his thoughts that it was not an offensive email, as it reflected what was being reported by the operatives.

Another resident stated that:

- they were offended by the email and had said so at the time.
- the noisy works revised programme had resulted in increased "noisy work hours".

AG returned as Chair and noted the issue over behaviour had been discussed. He asked AB to confirm if the hours had increased. AB confirmed the noisy work hours had not increased, with the initial programme being 8am-10am, 12pm-2pm, 4pm-6pm, and the revised programme being 8.30am-11.30am (3hours on), 11.30am-1.30pm (a break), with work to resume 1.30pm-4.30pm. The total hours of noisy works for both was six hours.

Another resident raised an issue about noise as she found the offloading of material outside of the site quite challenging. She found the communications of late to be helpful but wanted to know more about the noisy works that would take place in AND outside of the building. AB confirmed that the team would continue to communicate as much as possible about the works.

Another resident asked about cameras on site. He explained how he had requested cameras to be installed on Sudbourne Road and Hayter Road to mitigate issues and disputes about behaviour/working practices. AG asked who would install, access and use the cameras if they were to be put in place. AB answered:

- security cameras would be installed by MAR focusing on the site entrances/security gates.
- the cameras would not cover the streets, due to concerns around data protection and privacy i.e. the team is not allowed to use cameras to monitor roads without permission - they would have to apply to Lambeth Council.

BB confirmed that he would look into whether cameras could be installed, what the process was and said that he would report back on this. SR added that any footage recorded, if cameras were to be installed, would not be publicly available. The Council monitored the CEMP and it was their obligation to look into any breaches. If cameras were to be installed, it would be council's decision on what action would be taken, as it would only be used for monitoring and enforcement reasons.

A resident explained that they had requested cameras to be installed via an email to Muse, with the Lambeth team and ward councillors copied in. SR answered that she had not received a specific request directly to the Council, and that she would look into the camera request now this



had been made directly. AB added that the original question was whether the contractor could install cameras, which was answered. He clarified that it was different to make the request directly and formally to the council.

A resident explained that she had recently been taking photos to show what was happening on site. AB said that he was not discouraging people taking photos, but that it had been found that some photo-taking and filming had recently upset the operatives as they were being distracted whilst doing potentially dangerous jobs that required complete attention.

A resident asked if the team could clarify their working relationships and who she should contact if she had an issue that the Council should address – officers or councillors? AG responded with:

- If there was an issue about the project, residents should write to GL Hearn. If he was only copied in, he would assume it would be dealt with by others.
- If residents wrote directly to him, he would pick up the issues on the resident's behalf. He apologised if this had not happened so far.

SR confirmed that:

- GL Hearn was appointed by Muse in response to the condition in the planning permission to carry out engagement with immediate neighbours as demolition works take place.
- if there were issues for the council to consider, residents could email her directly, and she would discuss this with councillors.
- GL Hearn responded to queries, as often, they were technical in nature which were better answered by Muse (who were responsible for the process and contractors).

JS added that GL Hearn channelled questions to the appropriate team. On the request for cameras, which was made to Muse, the query was responded to recently.

The resident explained that they had raised questions with councillors but felt it had been met with "limited support". AG explained the various roles of a councillor i.e. representing local residents in a ward, but also representing the council and being committed to council policies, which they were also obliged to do.

A resident asked for clarification on the role Lambeth Council had on the project – who was accountable for the delivery of the CEMP (i.e. the technical and legal aspects).

SR explained her role as the client interface with Muse to ensure the building was delivered. If there were concerns about the regulatory position of the CEMP, it was for the planning authority i.e. Lambeth Council to regulate. JS added that there was a link on the project website through which residents could submit a formal query to the council as the regulatory body monitoring the planning conditions.

AG reconfirmed the roles and how residents could raise queries with GL Hearn/Muse, the council or with the ward councillors. AB said it was his role to ensure the project was delivered as per the



CEMP. Residents could raise concerns with the CEMP with the planning officer – and the team would make this clear on the website.

Another resident asked how AB was connecting with other building projects in the area, and about the contact with local schools. AB confirmed that:

- under planning conditions, within three months of starting works, a Brixton Construction Forum had to be set up to liaise with other developers, contractors and utility companies.
- Muse had asked planning officers for confirmation of who they needed to engage and would be following up on this.
- Muse were unaware of the works at Brixton Hill Court or the small works project along Hayter Road.

AS explained that leaflets had been sent to the local schools and contact made via phone and email about the Forum. JS added that the team would continue to follow up and chase the schools so lines of formal consultation could be opened up.

A resident said she was concerned about local school children and the timing/impact of large vehicles coming and going from the site. She asked what could be done to reassure residents about children's safety and the local schools. She asked the team, when they were liaising with the schools, to compare schedules and ask for their suggestions.

AB explained that vehicle movements were detailed in the CEMP, and how each entrance and exit would have security and Banksmen available to stop pedestrians crossing the paths. Vehicles would be guided onto site, and the site manager would know when the vehicles were due to arrive. JS added that the team had contacted schools but there had been limited staff available to date. She confirmed that they would will continue to push for contact with the schools on Monday and throughout the week. SR confirmed that her council officers would also assist with contacting the headteachers.

Another resident stated that there were a number of children from the St. Matthews Estate, who used the crossing in front of OMH. AB explained that this would be discussed in more detail as part of the next BNCF presentation.

Another resident asked how the section 106s monies were being distributed. SR answered:

- that the Council were in active discussions with the Olive Morris Collective, and Councillor Winifred at Lambeth Council was directly liaising with Olive's family.
- Muse had paid £50,000 for commemorative works. The OMH Collective was aiming to republish the book and establish bursaries. The letters that were on the building would be used by the Collective.
- Muse had agreed to fund a cornerstone that would be part of the new building and commemorative wording would be agreed by Olive's family and the OMH Collective.
- Muse submitted a change of use planning application for the ground floor and basement of the building to be used for Lambeth Archives.



- the team would provide more information on this on the project website.

A resident asked about the name of the building - if Olive Morris House would be kept given Olive's importance. SR said that Muse had just taken the letters off the building and that the name was a point of discussion – SR would discuss further with Cllr Winifred. AG said that he was aware that Olive's family were not keen for her name to be used on the new building, but discussions had been taking place with the family since the start of the project and a resolution, satisfactory both to the family and residents, would be secured.

## **6. Introducing the main contractor (PRE-RECORDED)**

JS played the presentation 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.

AG said questions on this item would take place under AOB.

## **7. Terms of Reference**

JS explained that the Terms of Reference (ToR) was produced years ago in consultation with residents and that it could be found on the website. The team had reviewed the ToR and its relevance, and it was felt that it was too focused on the "Triangle" site. The team would like to propose some suggested amendments for comment. This would be completed outside of the Forum and be discussed at the next meeting.

## **8. Date of next BNCF/ AOB**

There was some discussion about the next meeting date being held at the end of August/beginning of September, when the changeover of contractors was scheduled to take place. AB suggested that the meeting would take place before mid-September but that a date had not yet been confirmed. A resident asked if another meeting could take place in between the Forum meetings; JS and AB suggested that the team could review this if it was considered needed by residents and/ or the contractors/ Muse.

A resident agreed that the pit lane was a good idea but was concerned about the clash of finishing times at 4pm with local school children walking home/ using the crossing that was due to be closed.



She stressed the importance of the team's discussions with the schools and parent groups. AB confirmed:

- the crossing would be closed for the duration of project, but pedestrians would be diverted to the other two crossings close by.
- TfL deemed the crossing would be too dangerous to be kept open and believed it would interfere with the pit lane, which was being set up to take traffic from Sudbourne Road and Hayter Road.

Another resident asked if the other crossings could be looked at by TfL due to the long duration the lights took to change. They added that if a crossing was removed, TfL would need to consider other crossings in the area and evaluate the timings to ensure pedestrians have adequate time to wait and cross the road.

Another resident asked if the crossing could be replaced further up the road, and whether this could be raised/ pushed with TfL. AG suggested that that might involve costs of up to £50k. AB confirmed that he had discussed this with TfL as that had been their preference/ request, but that the idea was rejected by TfL as, they stated, it would have traffic impacts on the surrounding area. The team reiterated that they would talk to the schools and parents to work on a solution.

AB asked how residents would feel if, when the gantry was being erected/removed, pedestrians were redirected via Beverstone Road instead. One resident agreed it was a solution and suggested it would help manage expectations if the timescales were explained to pedestrians in advance and during the time they were being diverted.

Another resident suggested that it would be good to communicate to residents about the proposed works as much as possible. AB confirmed that the team would provide plenty of notice. AB introduced SM as part of the MAR team, whilst confirming that the gantry would not be erected until November/December.

One resident asked who had access to the issues tracker. JS confirmed that it was GL Hearn and that the issues and actions tracker was a live, large excel database with a lot of information. JS confirmed that the team would put a version of it (removing personal information) on the website.

AS asked residents to register for mailing updates, and to encourage others to do so. AB added that noticeboards would be placed onto the hoarding, and residents could also read the updates there. AB confirmed that he was still committed to funding a street party when appropriate.

A resident asked the team to engage with Effra Court and Brixton Hill Court. AB confirmed that the team had contacted them via the leaflets. JS asked the resident to encourage other residents that she knew on Effra Court and Brixton Hill Court to register to receive updates.

AG closed the meeting at 12.03pm.