



MEETING MINUTES

Elleray Hall Community Engagement 08

Meeting Title: Elleray Hall – Early Community Engagement – 08 **Project:** Elleray Hall

Meeting Date: Tuesday 24th September **Location:** Teddington Baptist Church

Issue Date: Friday 27th September **Engagement No:** 08

Confidential For Information For Review For Action

Attendees:

London Borough of Richmond	LBR	
Beard Construction	BC	
Charles Booth	CB	London Borough of Richmond - Head of Programme Management Office PMO
Simon Webster	SW	Beard Construction - Contracts Manager
Nicky Forrest	NF	Beard Construction – Resident Liaison Officer
Simon Hayes	SH	McBains – Senior Project Manager
Jennifer Mai	JM	McBains – Assistant Project Manager
Apologies	Alfred Akpo-Teye	AA London Borough of Richmond - Project Manager – PMO



MEETING MINUTES

Distribution: All the above

<u>Item</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Action / Item</u>
1.0	Introductions	
1.0.1	Introductions were made.	
1.0.2	Apologies to whom cannot attend today.	
<u>2.0</u>	<u>Actions from the previous meeting was addressed</u>	
2.0.1	LBR touched on the previous meeting minutes and discussed the following action.	
2.0.2	Attendees or prior comments provided regarding the previous meeting minutes.	
2.0.3	LBR confirmed that all BC disconnection is completed for UKPN.	
<u>3.0</u>	<u>Beard (Contractor's Update)</u>	
3.0.1	Beard's on-site progress in the last 4 -5 weeks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Trenches building footprint - Install of King post wall to the Southern elevation commenced. - King post system Middle Lane commenced. - Excavations for site foundations - Excavations for slab foundation. - Carpentry and steelwork for slab formation. 	
3.0.2	Beard's 4 week look ahead <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ground floor slab to pour / cure. - Steel frame and column installation - Retaining wall for the rear garden area - Complete reduced level dig to south wing. - Complete kingpost wall along Middle Lane. - Start install of drainage. - Excavate lift pit. 	
3.0.3	LBR stated that the noise level should gradually come to an end. BC confirmed attempts to mitigate the noise by implementing sequenced 30-minute noise intervals.	
3.0.4	LBR reported that services were found underground, causing a slight delay in the programme. However, this issue has been resolved, and the programme will be progressing.	

<u>4.0</u>	<u>Query 2 from a resident – Retaining wall for the rear garden / Party Wall</u>	
4.0.1	A resident raised a query regarding the location of the rear garden and boundary wall mentioned in the look ahead.	
4.0.2	BC mentioned that the retaining wall will be installed 3-meters away from properties 16 and 14, alongside a footpath located between the rear of the new building's ramp into the garden area.	
4.0.3	The resident questioned the retaining wall in the rear garden area and why they had not been previously informed.	
4.0.4	BC stated that the party wall surveyor would provide any relevant drawings for this wall and rear garden and boundary. However, the party wall surveyor is unavailable until the 8th of October.	
4.0.5	It was also explained to the resident that as the retaining wall was of sufficient distance away from their boundary, then no party wall agreement or notification of the retaining wall would have been deemed necessary, but the party wall survey could confirm this.	
<u>5.0</u>	<u>Query 3 – proposed shed to garden</u>	
5.0.1	A resident raised a concern about the garden shed in the corner behind 14 and 16 Elleray Road, expressing their concern about the possibility of people climbing over it.	
5.0.2	BC confirmed that the garden shed has a green roof, was at the rear of hall with no clear access routes other than through side gate or the new building, both of which would potentially be more secure than the previous car park.	
<u>6.0</u>	<u>Query 4 from a resident – Removal of LBR Wall on Boundary</u>	
6.0.1	The resident raised a query regarding the work adjacent the back garden, questioning when it would happen and expressing concerns about the timescale for the proposed boundary wall's completion.	
6.0.2	BC confirmed the party wall proposals had been offered by LBR and informed the residents a lead time for delivery of 4–5 weeks for the king post and infill panels would be required. They also confirmed that once boundary works are awarded, they will prioritise completing them promptly.	

6.0.3	A resident expressed concern, noting their wife's upset over their 15-year effort in cultivating mature plants in their garden.	
6.0.4	LBR & BC pointed out that the king post system would be the least disruptive option for the garden, but as the existing boundary wall had to be removed this would be completed safely and in a controlled manner. The whole process will be fully explained by the party wall surveyor.	
6.0.5	The resident emphasised the need to protect these mature plants, highlighting potential damage to the area and the resident suggested compensation for any damage to the gardens.	
6.0.6	LBR expressed that they would replace any plants if damaged and advised the record the proposal to be appended to the award made by the party wall surveyor.	
6.0.7	The resident agreed to discuss this further with their party wall surveyor and would include within his response to LBR party wall surveyor (Andy).	
6.0.8	LBR confirmed that an agreement to the proposal is being sought from each resident in an attempt to unify the process regarding the Council's intention to remove the wall.	
6.0.9	The resident expressed a desire to present their views at a community engagement meeting to reach an agreement on the boundary wall and any party wall agreements required.	
6.0.10	LBR emphasised the need for a common agreement that is acceptable to all parties and the residents would be welcome to discuss and agree amongst themselves from the 2no. height proposals put forward and offered to be funded fully by LBR.	
6.0.11	A resident stated they had not received a table of options and have been receiving information only every couple of months. They noted that the original letter did not provide an adequate solution with sufficient information.	
6.0.12	LBR confirmed that the original letter offered 2no. options; a timber panel fence or the king post system. The king post system is now the proposed design, over that of a timber fence panel based on the responses received and the design, and the current detail issued had improved and was sufficient for a decision.	
6.0.13	LBR explained that there are no other options available or possible that would not have a significant impact on the residents' gardens and be much more of an inconvenience.	

6.0.14	LBR explained the party wall surveyor process, noting that if the residents had appointed a party wall surveyor, they would need to communicate with LBR party wall surveyor.	
<u>7.0</u>	<u>Query 5 from a resident – Visuals of king post system also used at Middle Lane</u>	
7.0.1	A resident raised a query regarding the look king post system.	
7.0.2	BC explained the king post system and how it would look visually, assuring that the king post system will not be visible at this elevation.	
7.0.3	BC also mentioned that there will eventually be a hedge placed along here with black metal railings.	
7.0.4	The resident expressed concern about losing some sunlight if this was to be the same height of the hoarding.	
7.0.5	BC confirmed this would not be the case, and both the hedge (to be confirmed when landscaping plan established) and fence would be lower than the current hoarding.	
<u>8.0</u>	<u>Query 6 from a resident – Footpath</u>	
8.0.1	A query was raised regarding the footpath, and would the council be resurfacing the footpath, or would this be handled separately from this project.	
8.0.2	LBR mentioned the residents could report this to Highways Department to address the issue as part of the budgetary works.	
8.0.3	The resident stated they had already raised this with the Council but had not received a response.	
<u>9.0</u>	<u>Query 7 from a resident – North Lane boundary</u>	
9.0.1	A resident raised a concern about people jumping over the hedges into the Elleray Hall car park or even the rear garden area and questioned how secure the area will be.	
9.0.2	It was mentioned that as part of the construction of the hall there will be external CCTV around the hall, and security lighting. There will also be an alarm system on the hall.	

<p>9.0.3</p> <p>9.0.4</p>	<p>LBR confirmed, however, there is no high external fence around the hall, as this may not appear welcoming.</p> <p>This would also become an operational matter for the Elleray Hall team who would manage and have processes in place.</p>	
<p>10.0</p> <p>10.0.1</p> <p>10.0.2</p> <p>10.0.3</p>	<p>LBR raised the concern of continuing with the monthly meeting due to constant low attendance levels noted and recorded at these community engagement meetings and raised the suggestion of moving these back to the previous by-monthly timeframe.</p> <p>Concluding that the planning is already approved and once the party wall matters were concluded, the effective communication route had already been established with any concerns to brought to the attention of the site team or the appointed community liaison manager.</p> <p>A resident stated that there are more items to discuss and that it would be preferred to keep to a monthly timeframe.</p> <p>LBR agreed to review and confirm.</p>	
<p><u>11.0</u></p>	<p><u>Next Community Engagement Meeting</u></p>	
<p>11.0.1</p>	<p>Additional information/updates will be provided on the Elleray Hall website. Community engagement will take place monthly basis. The next meeting is scheduled for:</p> <p>Wednesday 30th October 12:30 – 14:30 Teddington Baptist Church</p>	