

Minutes of Pears Building Principals' Meeting held on Monday 18 September 2017 with HGNG

Present: Peter Owens (PO), Royal Free Charity, Chair
Chris Fagg (CF) HGNG
Jeff Gold (JG) HGNG
Gerry Ackerman, Royal Free Charity
Andrew Panniker (AP), Royal Free London NHS Trust

1. Pears Building: Project Update

PO updated the meeting on the current situation of the project.

- The Construction Management Plan (CMP) had been approved by Camden Council and was in the public domain via the Council's website.
- The Detailed Basement Construction Plan (DBCP) would be submitted to the Council early October '17. A key issue was implementation and completion to the Alternative Strategy following SSRPT reneging on the agreement to install the nine boreholes and associated monitoring within the curtilage of St Stephen's. This was now complete outside the boundary of St Stephen's and accurate information was now being collated from a range of monitors. The geo-technical design report (GDR) was now complete and information is being fed into the next iteration of the ground movement assessment model. PO said that the Alternative Strategy has benefitted from the creation of an 'early warning' system identifying any problems in advance of heading towards St Stephen's, the School or indeed the properties along Pond St. In this regard the Charity was confident that no harm would come to neighbouring properties, inclusive of the Royal Free Hospital.

DBCP: PO advised that 2 lots of independent certified engineers will scrutinise the DBCP prior to its release to the Council following which the Council will appoint a separate independent certifying engineer to review the DBCP.

- Party Wall Agreement: the remaining agreement to be concluded was the PWA between the Charity and the School.
- Camden Council: PO confirmed he had been in contact with Charles Thuaire, Senior Planning Officer, to whom the DBCP would be formally submitted to during the early part of October '17. Once submitted, PO advised that the DBCP would be circulated to HGNG and SSRPT.

CF asked whether there would be a further public consultation, as he had been advised that not much information was being communicated to SSRPT's technical team. This was not the Charity's understanding as numerous technical meetings had taken place over the course of the past months, represented by both lots of technical consultants. It was the

Charity's understanding that the s106 Agreement does not call for any further consultations post submission of the DBCP but agreed to check.

ACTION: PO

GA advised that the GDR would be circulated to Michael Taylor and Michael Bye for information once it was completed. **ACTION: PO**

PO added that an intrusive survey of the Car Park would be carried out shortly now that the Car Park was closed; likely to be at the beginning of October.

2. Outstanding Issues

A further condition survey of St Stephen's and the School would be carried out over the autumn. The timescale for this will be arranged with Michael Taylor. AP asked when the deadline was for this information. PO said it needed to be carried out before work starts on the Pears Building.

CF asked what the situation was if permission to carry out the condition survey was not given. PO said that Michael Bye had strongly recommended to Michael Taylor to organise the survey and was confident it would go ahead mindful of the Diocese of London being the landowner. AP added that it was in St Stephen's interest to organise as their current survey was now out of date following maintenance works having recently been carried out to the former church.

PO explained that the most sensitive time for the project would be during the excavation/demolition works, during which it would be vital for the project team to be in touch with local groups. He added that the noise and pollution would be the main factors perhaps affecting the school. An acoustic barrier was going to be erected between the site and the School/St Stephen's with PO asking for representatives of St Stephen's and the School to form part of the Community Liaison Group which formed an integral part of the CMP.

3. Pond Street

JG said that the properties on Pond St were under an ongoing level of stress and was keen to clarify how the project will not add to this level of stress. He was still awaiting a response from Camden Council following the Charity advising that structural assessments would not be carried out between 7 and 21 Pond St. PO reiterated the reason behind this being the damage being inflicted on the properties by traffic traversing Pond St, which had not been created by the Pears Building project. JG mentioned that he had received independent advice that the condition survey should be more comprehensive than that carried out and should cover the back of the buildings on Pond St too. He had also received advice that the 'early warning' system could not be guaranteed. Ian Stevenson would be discussing these issues at the next meeting of the technical consultants. PO informed JG that he had requested Ian Stephenson to attend the Principal's Meeting not the technical meeting. Notwithstanding this, AP agreed that PD was entitled to obtain independent advice.

4. **Damage to Properties on Pond St and Insurance**

JG queried why there was no mention of 'blame' in the insurance section of the main contract. PO said that it needed to be demonstrated who would be held accountable for causing damage. As mentioned previously the Charity was not in a position to enter into a Party Wall Award with the proprietors along Pond St due to the physical distance between the Pears Building site and the properties on Pond St, stating that 'causation' would be an influencing factor. This was going to be difficult mindful of Pond St being the main thoroughfare between the properties on Pond St and the development site, which is the most likely cause of damage. JG asked who such a claim would be made against. PO said this would depend on the cause but in most cases would be lodged against Willmott Dixon if it could be demonstrated that WD's construction activities was the reason for damage.

That said PO reiterated that non negligent insurance has been allowed for in the main contract

5. **Condition Surveys, Pond St**

JG asked about the status of the condition surveys. PO said these had been completed and circulated by email as well as hard copies to all of the proprietors and managing agents between 7 and 21 Pond St and agreed to chase Joan Hathaway, Hathaway's to ensure she had sent them to individual leaseholders residing within 21 Pond St.

6. **Environment Liaison Meeting, 14 November 2017**

JG asked whether pollution issues were on the agenda for this meeting as there were concerns among local residents about the Pears Building adding to the current concerns of pollution levels. AP advised that he had invited the Charity to attend the next meeting. In the interim PO advised that environmental monitors had already been installed around the perimeter of the Pears Building site and were operational. He made reference to the Monitoring Action Plan contained within the DBCP which indicated the location of the environmental monitors and their purpose.

7. **Any Other Business**

6.1 Public Footpath: PO advised that the Non Material Amendment specific to the footpath has been granted by the Council, with the Council's Report to the Mayor of London regarding the (Stopping Up Order) footpath going back to a width of circa 4m. due to be released shortly, thereby addressing the objections raised by the local residents.

6.2 Meeting dates: FD will circulate suggested dates for meetings in the next 6 months.

8. **Date of Next Meeting**

Tuesday 10 October, 11.30am – 12.30pm. Venue: TBA