**PEARS BUILDING CONSTRUCTION WORKING GROUP**

**NOTES OF MEETING HELD ON 14 JANUARY 2020**

**PRESENT**Rob Leak (RL)(chair) RFC trustee

Chris Burghes (CB) Royal Free Charity (RFC)  
Hugo Dring (HD) Buro 4 Project Management (B4)  
Linda Chung (LC) Hampstead Gn Neighbourhood Gp (HGNG)   
Linda Grove (LG) Local resident   
Cllr Maria Higson (MH) Hampstead Town ward

Philippa Hutchinson (PH) (meeting notes) RFC, RFL  
Peter Owens (PO) RFC

Celia Trenton Schapira (CTS) Hampstead Hill School (HHS) & St Stephen’s

**APOLOGIES**

Matt Adams (MA) WD  
Tanya Brandon (TB) Local resident

Roy Conway (RC) Willmott Dixon (WD)

Jeffrey Gold (JG) HGNG  
Nigel Steward (NS) Local resident

**APOLOGIES NOT RECEIVED FROM**

Phoebe Braithwaite (PB) Royal Free London NHSFT (RFL)  
Keith Davis (KD) Buro 4   
Cllr Stephen Stark (SS) Hampstead Town ward

John Stockdale (JS) HHS

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **ITEM NO** | **ITEM** | **ACTION** |
| **1** | **Welcome and apologies** – see above. |  |
| **2** | **Previous meeting notes**  Minutes of the meeting held on 7 October 2019 were approved without amendment. |  |
| **3** | **Matters arising**  -School fire assessment still not received. PO to follow up with JS.  -A date for Linda Chung and a colleague (Eleanor) to hear more about landscaping plans to be arranged for 21 Jan.  -Crane movements: dates for these will be changed. PO to advise CTS of new dates.  -Parking leaflets: uncertainty as to whether or not they are being used. PO to check.  -PO reported that the school boundary wall party wall agreement was now concluded. CTS said it had been decided to put the issue on hold until all works were concluded so they could work out what the problem was. She mentioned cracking in one classroom. She said she had stopped receiving the data about the effects of the work on the surrounding area and PO agreed to ensure reports were resumed (see point 5 below.)  -Trip hazards caused by paving stones on path: Camden had done some remedial works. PO asked everyone to report any further issues.  -PO reported that the landscaping irrigation system could be extended to Nazanin’s garden but would seek the trust’s view as it owned the land. He would also ask the trust if it was feasible to install a standpipe in the trust-owned triangle of land to serve the triangle and Hampstead Green, so both could be watered.  -LG reported some shrubbery that needed pruning in the garden could be attended to. PO to follow up with trust.  -CTS reported that there had been no progress on the relocation of the path benches. MH agreed to follow up.  -Tree near Pond St exit: it was agreed this needed a regular pruning regime. PO to follow up with the trust.  -Refurbishment of path: RFC had offered to do this work as part of the Pears Building work but Camden had said this was not permitted as it owned it. Instead, RFC had made a contribution to the cost of the upgrade. PH reported that Camden had emailed saying it needed two months’ notice to start the work and would liaise with PO re the best time to do it.  -Fencing adjacent to path: LC said that WD had promised to paint this: PO to liaise re this and a request from LG that the fencing around the triangle be included – PO said he would look into it. | PO  PO, LC  PO  PO  PO  PO  PO  MH  PO  PO  PO |
| **4**  4.1  4.2  4.3  4.4 | **Concerns and questions from neighbours and residents**  CTS reported that a large articulated lorry had tried to do a three-point turn in Pond St the day before at 7.45am and at one point had blocked the school’s drive. She agreed to supply the registration number to PO so he could investigate whether or not this was visiting the PB site or the Trust’s MRI site.  CTS also asked whether or not the building was on schedule. PO reported that although the work was about four weeks behind what had been timetabled, WD was still predicting it would deliver practical completion on 1 September 2020, which would include the gardens and works to the public footpath adjacent to Hampstead Green, the latter to be carried out by the council. PO reported that there had been two independent reviews of the situation. CTS commented that a delay of a four weeks would not be significant in a project of this size.  LC reported that she thought JG had complained via PH re out-of-hours working on the site. PH said she had been back to him to explain that the work concerned the trust’s work on the MRI site, which was subject to different rules governing hours of working from those on the PB site. What still was not clear was whether the noise regulations had been breached because there were different opinions. PH suggested that JG might like to bring it up at the next meeting of the trust’s environmental liaison group. MH and PO reported that no other issues had been brought to their attention.  MH asked whether any more dates for crane movements had been circulated to ensure that they would not interfere with weddings planned at the church. CTS said she would provide a schedule and PO would liaise with WD to ensure it planned around them. RL commented that it would be helpful if WD reps attended each meeting and PO agreed to liaise with them. | CTS, PO  CTS, PO |
| **5** | **Monitoring of construction impact**  RL commented that WD was no longer providing the monitoring data on paper, although information was available electronically for viewing 24/7 via the central system. It was agreed to resume providing hard copy reports to PH so they could be uploaded on to RFC’s website. It was reported that all measurements remained within tolerances. | PO, WD, PH |
| **6** | **Traffic management**  LC complained that WD traffic marshals were constantly on their phones and not paying attention. PO disagreed, saying that they were monitoring deliveries to the site in order to minimise disruption. Fewer lorry movements had recently been observed due to below ground and main construction works having been completed but still needed marshals to be present at all times during the working day. There was a discussion concerning the different responsibilities of WD’s and the trust’s marshals and the fact that it was not clear who belonged to which organisation. PO said that that orange ‘high viz’ overalls indicated staff working for WD and yellow ‘high viz’ overalls indicated trust marshals. There was consensus that being on their phones did not create a good impression and PO agreed to feed the comments back to WD. | PO |
| **7** | **Key dates and activities over the next 12 weeks**  PO said he would inform the CWG when the next crane was scheduled for removal and commented that WD also did its own communications about crane movements to local residents. In the interim PO advised that WD would, during the next quarter, be progressing the internal fit-out works. PO would check with the council re when the path refurbishment would take place but this was expected to be carried out during the 2020 summer school holidays.  There was a brief discussion about who might open the building, which CB said would be likely to be in the spring of 2021. MH asked if local people could be invited to any opening, given tours and given the opportunity to hear about the benefits of the research. PH confirmed these comments would be considered in the planning.  RL asked if it had been decided to use the hoardings in the car park and CB confirmed that this was being explored at the moment. | PO  PH |
| **8** | **Any other business**  PO confirmed that the plaque commemorating Sir Rowland Hill which was on the wall of the old car park would be restored. |  |
| **9** | **Future meetings**  Tuesday 14 April 2020  **Tuesday 21 July 2020 – please note new date**  Tuesday 13 October 2020 |  |