



Brixton Neighbourhood Construction Forum (BNCF) meeting note

Public

Monday 27 April 2020, 7pm – 9.30pm Zoom online meeting

Attendees

Councillor Adrian Garden (AG) – Co-chair

YNTH Project Team

- Andrew Boyle (AB) - Muse Developments
- Jo Sintern (JS) – GL Hearn – Co-Chair
- Asha Saroy (AS) – GL Hearn
- Sandra Roebuck (SR) – Lambeth Council
- Brian Brady (BB) – Lambeth Council
- Declan Kelly (DK) – O’Keefe
- Dave Foley (DF) – O’Keefe

Councillor Martin Tiedemann (MT) - ward councillor

Councillor Maria Kay (MK) - ward councillor

Total number of local residents: Thirteen

1. Introductions

AG opened the meeting and introduced the project team. He explained that he was co-chairing the meeting as an independent party, and that JS was co-chairing with him to help manage the Zoom technology part of the call and questions. He introduced the project team and listed the “rules of engagement” (as outlined in the Terms of Reference for the Forum).

A resident requested to address the team and attendees, which was accepted. The resident read out a poem that they had written in relation to the demolition works.

2. Running this BNCF Session

JS explained that the online meeting was to be recorded and asked attendees if they were comfortable with this, and to turn off their screens if they were not. JS explained the technical aspects of the meeting; she would note all questions being asked on the “chat” function, which was visible to all, and that should anyone want to speak, they could ask to speak via the “chat” function and where



possible, the questions would be raised during the session. She outlined that to maintain the sound quality of the session, when people were not speaking, they would be muted.

3. Recent Comms Issues - Community Questions

JS explained that the team was aware of a number of issues in relation to recent communications activities and wanted to address these points to help give confidence to residents. JS explained the following:

- *Delay in issuing the newsletter and flyer* - the start date for the works was reliant on Lambeth Council and Muse making decisions in light of government advice in relation to COVID-19 and the communications had to move quickly in response to what is not a normal working environment
- *Language used in the flyer* - the first six weeks of work are, in reality, “enabling works” not demolition works, and JS acknowledged that we should have been clearer on this in recent communications. It was noted that as a result of this, we do have time to raise more awareness about the works, before these become more significant, for those that may have missed out on recent communications
- *Leaflet distribution issues* – JS expressed the team’s frustration with the third-party supplier, London Letterbox, and their concerns with inaccurate post-delivery reports, which was not acceptable for residents or the team. She confirmed that the team would be issuing another leaflet to those missed properties
(Post meeting note: these will now be used to promote the next round of BNCF as it was discussed in the session that this should be earlier than in two month’s time)
- *Forums not the only way of getting involved* – JS stated that there were multiple ways of receiving information about this project and various methods of communicating with the team for those who didn’t attend one of the BNCFs – including email and phone.
- *Email communications* – JS acknowledged that there needed to be some improvements made to ensure that no email enquiries were missed however, there was a great deal of interest in the project at the moment and she confirmed that responses are being issued as quickly as possible with information provided as GL Hearn received this from the team. Queries should continue to be raised with the GL Hearn team.

JS asked AG how he would like to deal with the questions that were asked. AG had temporarily “dropped off” the call due to technology difficulties.

One resident raised her concerns with regards to the delivery of the recent newsletter and leaflet in relation to access to Brixton Hill Court. JS explained to everyone that they were aware of these particular concerns as the team had been liaising with the resident. The resident explained how she had been in contact with GL Hearn and highlighted the difference in the reports provided by London Letterbox to GL Hearn, and what the building’s caretaker had described with regards to access. The resident asked for clarification on the order of events following her recent enquires. JS explained that London Letterbox had only reported the issues in accessing Brixton Hill Court once her team had pressed the distributor for more information.



JS reiterated that London Letterbox would not be used on the project again (except to provide a compensatory free flyer drop to Brixton Hill Court and Effra Court), and the team would be sending a further flyer to those missed properties.

AG re-joined the call and concluded that discussion, noting that everyone wanted to make sure communications improved.

Another resident stated that he was representing just over forty residents and echoed the previous resident's comments. He added that the lack of communications and engagement with regards to the start date had led to a lack of trust and respect, which had been made worse due to heightened anxiety in relation to COVID-19. AB accepted there were mistakes in the communications, apologised for the delays and shortcomings, and explained that the team was working hard to rectify the issue and gain trust from the community. AB said he took full responsibility for this and would ensure improved communications going forward. AG noted and accepted the comments.

A resident said that they found it unfair that two residents who actively attended Friday's call were not allowed to be on this call. AB explained that this was a collective decision on the basis that residents were invited to join one or the other session, to manage numbers and ensure everyone had the opportunity to speak. AG agreed with this point. AB added to this following a query raised in the "chat" about one resident having attended both sessions - it was explained that this resident joined both calls as she could only make half of each session due to work and childcare commitments and that this was agreed in advance by the project team and Chair.

A resident raised a question about the blocking of the pavement on one side of Sudbourne Road and Hayter Road. AG explained that this would be covered as part of the presentation and subsequent questions.

4. About this Brixton Neighbourhood Construction Forum (BNCF)

It was agreed to not run through this slide to save more time for questions.

5. Olive Morris House – Part of your New Town Hall

AB went through this item and explained the following in addition to the slide information:

- the Olive Morris House (OMH) project is the last phase/building of the *Your New Town Hall* project to deliver new homes, with 40% affordable being provided
- the council had to vacate the OMH building and search for more suitable accommodation which led to some delays. In addition to this, there were delays when negotiating and liaising with Thames Water due to the storm-relief channel under the building
- the basement will be removed, but as part of later works (commencing in autumn) rather than the current demolition works
- the selection of building materials responded to findings of the Grenfell fire report and so there will be no combustible materials used in the façade and the building will have sprinklers on every floor



6. Olive Morris House – Commencement of Works

AB explained why there were delays to starting on site, including the Thames Water legal negotiations and agreement. The discussions with Thames Water have led to Muse needing to undertake another sewer survey (that will take place within the next two weeks).

AB also explained that:

- AS had booked and started to arrange for the public meeting to take place in March but due to the changing picture of COVID-19, the public meeting was postponed on health and safety grounds
- discussions have been ongoing between the construction industry and Government on how the sector could continue as the Government sees the construction industry as important to the economy. It was agreed that construction could continue but that the industry needed to follow the guidelines as set by the Construction Leadership Council (CLC)
- work was due to start on 16 March, but this was postponed allowing the contractors time to review and commit to the new working practices as set by the CLC. O’Keefe advised 20 April as a start date and assured the team that activities on site would be minimal in the first 4-6 weeks (and accommodation was set up in line with COVID-19 regulations)
- a health and safety survey would be carried out w/c 27 April
- if there is a further lockdown period announced, then O’Keefe will change/ adapt their working practices accordingly – the situation will continue to be monitored

A question was raised by a resident on the Zoom “chat” about commitments to the business operatives on site. AB said there had been no pressure on anyone to come to site and that it was the workers’ decision whether they wanted to work there.

JS suggested that AB explain how the contractors have responded to the COVID-19 CLC guidelines in terms of protecting their operatives. AB explained that:

- there would be a small number of operatives on site – a maximum of/fewer than 10 people during the initial 6-week period with a maximum of 17 operatives towards the later part of demolition
- space for welfare and handwashing facilities setup around the site have doubled in size and number
- operatives would not be coming to work via public transport, but using their own vehicles or walking
- the contractor had been able to select family members (e.g. fathers and sons, and brothers) to help with the number of people driving to site, and those that could work close together
- CLC guidelines outlined that the 2m social distancing rule on construction site had been relaxed- if workers had to do a task then they could be within 2m of one another but with this being restricted to 15 minutes
- there would be a weekly health and safety inspection and the team would be happy to post the checklist on the project website



AB went through the remainder of the presentation, highlighting the following:

- site opening hours: under the planning permission the team *could* work between 8am-6pm Monday-Friday, also Saturdays 8am-1pm (if required for emergency purposes) but not on Sundays or Bank Holidays. The site will open at 8am and close at 6pm Monday-Friday and Saturday working would only happen in the case of emergency works, which could include, for example, if someone has broken into the site, if there is a structural/ safety issue or if low-level, low noise preparatory works needed to be undertaken urgently.
- over first two weeks, the team would be installing environmental monitoring systems and then the “soft strip” works would start
- there is asbestos (low grade crystallite), within the putty that holds the glass in the windows and under the tiles/patio on the fifth floor. The removal of this would be undertaken within a strictly controlled environment and carried out by a licensed asbestos contractor behind a tent, with the air quality being monitored continuously. The process of removing asbestos was explained further.
- scaffolding would be erected and the building fully sheeted. The demolition would be carried out from within the building, floor by floor for minimum impact.
- the main contractor is due to start on site in late August/early September 2020
- as part of planning conditions, the hoarding will include a community exhibition space section that will be designed by the community. The hoarding will be maintained and lit.
- the removal of the link building abutting one neighbouring property has already been undertaken, with the other to be removed in due course.
- no commercial vehicles are to be parked on adjacent streets or left idling; vehicle access would be booked in advance and managed by a permanent on-site banksman. Vehicles will access the site via Sudbourne Road and leave via Hayter Road.
- no road closures are planned. The footpath at the end of Sudbourne Road and Hayter Road close to the site would be temporarily closed off, which is normal practice for public health and safety reasons.
- with regards to complaints, residents could reach out to DK, the site manager, GL Hearn, or AB, who provided his mobile number.

7. Questions

AG explained there were three sets of questions: 1) Pre-submitted questions, 2) Chat room questions and 3) Any further ‘hands up’ questions.

Pre-submitted questions

AG explained that there were five key sections as part of the pre-submitted questions and that section one and two had been covered from earlier points in the meeting. The third would be covered later, and so asked the following questions (in bold).

- **What is the offer of a pre-demolition condition survey? This was offered to YNTH previously so what is the situation here now<**

AB explained:



- pre-condition surveys for neighbouring properties had already been carried out on a couple of properties due to the way they were/are linked to OMH
- the methodology that had been chosen to carry out the demolition of OMH, and the fact that the building would only be taken down to ground floor at that point, meant that this would not be a 'vibration heavy' stage of works

AG noted this and asked why the surveys had not been extended to more homes than currently proposed.

AB confirmed that:

- they could not offer to do this for all properties in the immediate area and did not feel it necessary due to the reasons already outlined
- however, if a resident noticed any changes to their home and believed it to be in relation to the OMH demolition works, they should contact Muse Developments to discuss the changes and a surveyor could be appointed to review this
- If a resident had any issues with the results of the survey, they could appoint their own surveyor and if there were any damages found to be in connection specifically with OMH works, the appropriate action would be taken and repairs covered by insurance. In that case, the surveyor would be paid for by Muse but if damages found were not considered to be related to these works, the resident would cover their own costs and those of Muse.

AG asked whose insurance would cover works. AB explained that:

- Muse's insurance would pay to repair damages acknowledged to be as a result of OMH demolition works, and that they would have to discuss this with the homeowner's insurance company – there would be no liability for residents, and premiums would not increase
- there would be vibration monitors at the boundary of the site, providing computer data which would be monitored daily. The team fully understands the acceptable parameters for vibration during the works and where any reaching of the threshold may potentially cause structural damage – if at any point works near this threshold, the team can pause and assess their work.

A point was raised in the chatroom that potential structural damage might differ for those in houses as opposed to those in flats. It was asked whether Muse would commit in writing to the above about structural damages, surveys and covering repairs through the developer's insurance. AG agreed, stating that "this is something people would want documented, not just said." AB committed to doing this, adding the caveat that if it was found that structural damages had nothing to do with the demolition, then Muse would not cover costs.

(Post meeting note: these meeting notes stand as Muse's commitment in writing in relation to covering structural repairs, if it is proven that damages have been caused by OMH demolition works.)

- **Rights of light – please can you provide a list of all properties which are entitled to a Rights for Light survey as not all residents have received your Rights for Light letter? We also understand that on top of your Rights for Light survey, we are**



entitled to have our own independent Rights for Light survey that is paid for by the developer? Please can you confirm this?

AB explained:

- the list cannot be disclosed due to Data Protection, but we can show the methodology behind the workings
(Post meeting note: this can only be done on a case by case basis so if a resident wants to see this for their own property then please make contact with Muse/ Chancery Group directly).
- the Rights to Light (RtL) consultants (Chancery Group) use a standard methodology to carry out their assessments and have written to those residents that have been found to be “injured” by the building in terms of light levels
- the RtL consultants have contacted residents 2-3 times with some not responding and so another round of communications will take place in due course
- if a resident has received a letter and the survey has been carried out, they will be contacted to confirm if compensation will be offered. If the compensation position is not acceptable and they believe they have been “injured”, the resident can appoint their own surveyor
- if a resident has received a letter confirming there is an injury and have been offered compensation (post the survey being carried out) they will be given the opportunity to appoint a surveyor to act for them (at Muse’s cost)
- if a resident has not received a letter, it is because there is no “injury.” If the resident thinks otherwise, then they should contact Muse to discuss, and can appoint their own surveyor. If the surveyor comes to the same conclusion, Muse will not pay for the surveyor. If the surveyor concludes differently and this is agreed to by Muse, then Muse will pay for the surveyor
(Post-meeting note: If a resident disagrees with the view that they will not be affected, they are within their rights to challenge and appoint their own surveyor to review this, however this will be at their own cost. If their results differ to what is outlined by our surveyor and we agree to pay significant compensation, then the costs for that surveyor will be met by Muse.)
- some residents said that they had had the survey but had not received the results. AB said he would raise this with the Development Manager to discuss with Muse’s RtL surveyor.
(Post meeting note: Letters will be issued over the next week)
- **Prior testing to gauge baseline noise, dust and vibration levels etc – has this been done?**

AB explained that the development is subject to Environmental Health and monitoring stations will be placed around the site. If the levels are exceeded, the site will close, and the team will evaluate and find a different approach to the works. The guidelines/baseline can be posted online. AB advised that if a resident is unhappy with the levels, they can contact the Environmental Health officer to discuss.

(Post meeting note: an extract from Lambeth Council Building Control FAQs: “Whilst it is appreciated that more people are working from home under the current advice, it should be



remembered that audible building works are allowed to take place Monday to Friday between the hours of 8am and 6pm, and on Saturdays between 9am and 1pm and that a reasonable level of certain conditions such as site generated noise, dust and odours may prevail during this time. Breaches of these restrictions or concerns of excessive nuisances, can be reported to our Environmental Health Team on line via <https://www.lambeth.gov.uk/noise-nuisance-pollution-and-anti-social-behaviour>

- **Crane licences - are they needed for this work and will any cranes be overhanging neighbouring properties?**

AB confirmed that for the demolition works, there will be no static cranes on site. Luffing Cranes will be used during the main construction, but the relevant licenses will be applied for from Lambeth Highways and TfL.

(Post meeting note: there will need to be a mobile crane used to lift demolition machinery onto the roof. However, this will not over sail beyond the perimeter of the site.)

- **S106 - We would like to understand what S106 requirements there are for the local area? What funding is earmarked for community development and/or community projects? Do we have any ability to influence how any of this money is spent and can we work with you on this? We also understand there is money set aside for a tribute to Olive Morris – is this still the case?**

SR answered this and it was agreed that the team would post the s106 information on the website as it was quite extensive and covers a broad range of issues from the setting up of the Forum to the legacy works. SR confirmed that the s106s monies would be paid in stages.

SR stated that specifically, in relation to the legacy works, Muse Developments and Lambeth Council had been working with the Olive Morris Collective – an organisation looking into ideas for tribute works at Olive Morris House - to determine an appropriate memorial for the site. Part of the s.106 monies, £50,000, would be donated to the Olive Morris Collective and Lambeth Council and Muse Developments have just issued a grant agreement for the first £25k of the funding.

The team has been working on the Employment and Skills Plan to ensure local residents have an opportunity to work on the site where possible.

- **Covid-19 Staff behaviour, working arrangements – How will you specifically enforce Covid-19 social distancing safety procedures to minimise risk of spreading virus. The guidance also specifies your workforce is required to stay on site once they've entered it and staff can't use local shops – How will you enforce this? How will your staff eat, take breaks, smoke, maintain hygiene etc.**

AB explained that this was previously covered in the presentation, adding that:

- the staff/welfare facilities on site was much bigger that would ordinarily be the case
- there were not many operatives on site yet and that the few there were working across the vast building



- the basement had been cleared and O’Keefe had a smoking area in there
- no activities were to take place outside of the site (e.g. smoking/eating)
- DK had been able to select family members (e.g. fathers and sons, and brothers) as part of his team which helped with the number of people driving to site, and those that could work closely together
- if the contractors had to do a task, they would work within 2m of one another but that this was restricted to 15 minutes. However workers on site that were from the same (living together) family could be close to one another to carry out certain jobs.

Two residents referred to the CLC guidance which stated that operatives should stay on site and avoid using local shops. AB said that he would work with O’Keefe to ensure that this was followed and DK said that the team would be briefed to bring their own food to work.

A question was asked about regular temperature checks for the staff. AB said that if anyone was ill, they would be sent home and not allowed on site for 14 days. DK said that there was no temperature checking but that health issues would be discussed with his staff during their safety briefing every morning.

Residents and AB asked DK what financial support there would be if workers were sick as some residents were concerned that no support would lead to workers staying at work instead of self-isolating. DK said that if a member of staff member is ill, they would be sent home and O’Keefe would seek guidance from the government. AB confirmed that there are no zero hours contracts. Residents felt that O’Keefe could do more to protect their operatives financially to prevent them working if they shouldn’t be.

- **Asbestos removal - Is there a possibility that removal will cause asbestos spores to be released into the air affecting residents? What other fabrics been removed/have they been tested?**

AB said that there had been a full survey of building materials before demolition, and that this identified that asbestos was present. As previously outlined, removal would be dealt with in a strictly controlled manner. In the event of any issues regarding removal, there would be standard mitigation plans followed and, if necessary, the site would be shut until the issue was been sorted.

A question was asked via the “chat” function: is there advice, for when asbestos is being removed? e.g. should residents close their windows? AB responded to say “no, residents do not have to close their windows as the works will take place in a professional and controlled manner”.

- **Demolition Working Hours - March newsletter stated 8.30am to 5.30pm, planning docs say 8-6pm – please clarify, including weekend working.**

AB explained that the site operating hours would be 8am-6pm Monday to Friday. The reason for the discrepancy in the newsletter was that this was referring to the fact that no noisy works would take place before 8.30am or after 5.30pm – and this was confirmed by DK. If work needed to be carried



out at weekends, this would only be in the case of emergency, safety, or low-noise preparatory works.

- **How will you enforce this and deal with those who breach it?**

AB explained that no-one would be let on site before 750am for starting work at 8am. Workers would be met by a security guard and have been told to park away from the immediate vicinity if they arrive early.

- **Vehicles, traffic management and parking – We are concerned by the impact on parking spaces, noise pollution, risk of virus spread etc from construction vehicles. Please provide your plans, specifically addressing how you will ensure no commercial vehicles are to be parked on adjacent streets or left idling?**

AB explained that O’Keefe’s delivery vehicle drivers have been briefed to call ahead when they were one mile away. There would be no idling.

(Post meeting note: we are aware of some early ‘teething’ issues regarding commercial delivery vehicles and workers parking on local roads but this has been addressed with O’Keefe and the team stands by its policy as outlined.)

- **There will be no on-site or street parking use by operatives for the duration of the demolition works. Please confirm how you will enforce this given that cars were parked on the street on day 1?**

AB explained that the team could drive into the site (and park in the basement). The agreed measures were not in place on the first day and some workers arrived too early for which he apologised, adding that the issue should now have been addressed.

- **The proposed demolition works will not impact the peak hours bus lane in operation between 07:00 and 10:00 and between 16:00 and 19:00. Is this still the case?**

AB explained that he was in dialogue with TfL and confirmed that bus lanes would not be impacted by the demolition phase. He stated that when the main build happens, there would be a pit lane between 10am and 4pm which would be opened up again for bus routes. This would be enforced by TfL.

- **Do you plan to suspend parking bays? Are you intending to apply to suspend parking bays? It says somewhere in the planning documents that you were going to ask for 15 bays to be suspended on Hayter/Sudbourne road nearest OMH... We are deeply concerned by the impact this will have on already minimal parking spaces and on elderly and infirm residents.**

AB said that there was no intention at the moment to suspend parking bays.

(Post meeting note: AB would like to confirm that if this did need to happen, it would likely be related the three bays linked to the pay and display.)

- **How will you manage the impacts to young people e.g. school children that may walk in the area?**



AB said that there would be banksman on each gate who would check for pedestrians and ensure access to the site was arranged properly. AB added that there would be no pavement bounding the site on Sudbourne and Hayter Road and that pedestrians etc would be asked to cross over the road to ensure no contact with vehicles. AB stated that this was normal practice around building sites.

- **Is the way that you set up the monitors affected by COVID-19 restrictions?**

AB said that Covid-19 did not affect the way that monitors were to be set up as these would be linked to a computer. Muse would receive weekly copies of the reports and if any levels were to be breached, Muse would report this to Environment officers.

- **Please outline your procedure for wetting down. We understand that respirable carcinogenic crystalline silica is released when demolishing – how will you manage this safely?**

AB had originally covered this during the presentation but returned to it to provide further reassurance – he confirmed that the approach was dust suppression with the enclosed building “wetted down”/sprayed with water, with dust monitors used throughout to monitor and protect. If a resident considered that their windows had been made dirty by the works, AB said that the team would allow payments for window cleaning.

Chat room questions

- **A resident asked about the monitoring of the site given the Environmental Officers are not allowed out due to COVID-19.**

AB said that the data would be sent to Lambeth by the team. If there were a breach, a risk assessment would be needed, and officers would come out to site to carry this out.

- **Question: Blocking of pavements – when will this happen?**

*This was covered in the presentation.

- **Communications – if the scaffolding is alarmed, will residents hear it? Who will attend to it? How will the team manage communications over weekends (the resident said there was an issue previously in trying to speak to someone about the safety lights going off).**

AB said that the hoarding safety lights would stay on permanently and that there would be no issues with crane lights as no static cranes would be used for this demolition stage. In relation to the scaffolding alarm, DK said that any alarm alerts would come through to him directly so he could address this rapidly; however his contact details would also be on a site notice board. DK confirmed that if he was not able to make it to site, he would send another site manager however there would also be a security guard on site. AB offered his mobile number and explained residents could also contact him if there were issues on the site. JS shared AB’s number in the group chat.

Any further ‘hands up’ questions.



No further questions.

8. Ongoing Community Engagement

JS went through this item and explained:

- the team recognised there were improvements needed in communications and engagement
- as with previous stages of YNTH, there was to be a BNCF every couple of months as a minimum
- the team was discussing how to change/improve engagement e.g. rotate chair, agreeing agenda or co-chair, and also engagement with residents between Forums
- website updates were underway
- there were a number of questions submitted which the team was working through
- O'Keefe would issue regular newsletters and send letters to impacted parties on specific aspects of works
- stakeholder engagement is to be carried out in summer 2020 (as allowed/ appropriate) on community arts project for hoardings
- key documents were available online, including the Construction and Environment Management Plan and its summary

9. AOB and next BNCF

AG confirmed that the Forums were to be held every few months and the next one should be within two months due to particular works starting. Under AOB, there were more questions:

- **With the changing COVID-19 situation, should we meet more frequently?**

AB said that there would be regular updates on the website and advised residents to use that as an 'in between' channel of communication.

- **Is there a specific OMH manager at Lambeth Council?**

SR confirmed that currently, it was her.

- **Will the site be lit at night?**

AB confirmed that the only light would be from security lights around the hoarding at street level (white and red) for safety purposes – no other lights would be lit during this phase of works.

- **A resident said he felt more communications were needed to help build trust and he offered to communicate on the team's behalf. He was happy to share his details.**

JS explained that the team was committed to looking at ways of working with the community and to exploring how best to do this to ensure it is fair and democratic. JS added that her team would be liaising with the contacts at Brixton Hill Court and Effra Court when the leaflets are re-issued.



- **Will the demolition in September be very noisy due to the removal of the basement?**

AB confirmed that this would be noisy works but that this would be communicated in good time and that O'Keefe had agreed to a '2 hours on, 2 hours off' approach to this to allow some respite for local people. The team is also looking into further respite options for the especially vulnerable (e.g. elderly, infirm or home workers), as we did on other projects, and will keep monitoring the Covid-19 situation over the next few months in the light of lockdown and, if this is lifted or relaxed, how we might progress with this provision.

There was some discussion with regards to the date of the next meeting – the period around Tuesday 26 May was tabled as a possible date. It was agreed that two sessions during different times of the day worked well and that if we could not meet face-to-face due to COVID-19 restrictions, then we would hold online sessions again. AB advised that he hoped to be able to confirm the main contractor at the next meeting and discuss next stage site logistics.

(Post meeting note: the dates for the next BNCFs have been discussed further internally and it was agreed that late May is not appropriate as it does not allow sufficient lead in time for communications (eg event notifications/ registration and consultation with residents on agenda etc) – something which was heavily criticised for the April BNCFs. Instead the dates of Friday 12 June (morning) and Monday 15 June (evening) are now being considered which will allow for adequate 'mopping up' actions from the April BNCFs before preparations begin for the next sessions. This timing would also allow for 'live' issues to be discussed in relation to works commencing on the main frame demolition that week.)

AG dropped off the call and MT concluded the meeting, stating that he was grateful for two sessions and that the ward councillors would be taking up key points with the team.

MT thanked everyone and closed the meeting.

(Post meeting note: This meeting note details the key points raised on the online Q&A online session held on Monday 27 April 2020.

The meeting was conducted on Zoom rather than Microsoft Teams, as originally advertised, as Zoom was specifically requested as the platform to be used by several residents as they were more accustomed to it.

We have issued a first set of FAQs on our website: <http://yournewtownhall.org/> and will be posting another set of FAQs in due course. We have also now responded to questions that were sent in as a separate list by residents.

The project website has been updated to provide (largely) all the additional information requested and we will continue to add further documents as requested.

We recorded the meeting once the principle of this had been agreed by all participants and have reviewed the video to ensure we comply with GDPR (General Data Protection Regulation) May 2018.

Your New
Town Hall



Where specific names and addresses have been mentioned, this part of the recording has been redacted in line with GDPR requirements so that, when we have ALL participants' approval, we can issue the recording to everyone.)