



Minutes

Royal Brompton and Harefield NHS Foundation Trust Community Liaison Group

Meeting 6

Date: 23rd January, 2018, 6.30pm – 8.00pm
Location: Seminar Room 2, Hospital Reception,
Sydney Street, London SW3 6NP

Chair: Steve McAdam

Catherine	Hall	CH	Dovehouse Street Resident
Laura	Carrara-Cagni	LCC	The Chelsea Society/ Sydney Street Residents Association
Lindsey	Brock	LB	Dovehouse Street Residents Association
Martin	Hedley	MH	Dovehouse Street Resident
Helen	Morgan-Edwards	HM-E	Astell Street Residents Association Kings Road Association of Chelsea Residents (& Globe Place + Bramerton Street Residents Association)
Richard	Burgess	RB	Dovehouse Street Residents Association
Gillespie	Robertson	GR	Jubilee Place Residents Association
Patricia	Lever	PL	Onslow Neighbourhood Association
Richard	Skinner	RS	Chelsea Square Residents Association
Kate	Agius	KA	Chelsea Society
Michael	Stephen	MS	CRACR/ Oakley Street Residents Association
Chris	Lenon	CL	Chelsea Square Gardens
Nigel	Rich	NR	Dovehouse Street Residents Association/ Chelsea Society
Jane	Dorrell	JD	Astell Street et Al Residents Association
Roger	Reed	RR	-
Nicole	Canbowan	NC	-
Apologies (TBC):	Susan	SS	Sydney Street Residents' Association
RBH team:	Richard	RP	RBHT Associate Chief Executive - Finance
	Jeremy	JT	RBHT Property Advisor
	James	JP	Murphy Philipps
	Chris	CB	DP9
	Chris	CG	WSP
	Emily	EB	WSP Transport
	Martin	MC	Arcadis
	Steve	SM	Soundings
	Lizzie	LB	Soundings

Agenda:

1.00	Introductions
2.00	Project update
3.00	Design update/ Q&As
4.00	Transport & Access update/ Q&As
5.00	AOB
6.00	Close

1.0 Introductions

1.1 SM reviewed the agenda for the evening and introduced the team.

2.0 Project update

2.1 JT provided an update on the project over the last year including planning permission being granted by RBKC for the Sydney wing extension, Imaging Centre and Chelsea Farmers Market site in June 2017. JT also outlined proposed changes to the proposals for the Imaging Centre arising out of a review of clinical accommodation at Royal Brompton Hospital.

3.0 Design Update

3.1 JP provided an update on the design of the imaging centre since the planning application was approved in June 2017. JP provided an overview of the location of the Imaging Centre and current facilities.

JP explained the revisions proposed and rationale for these revisions. JP outlined the increased need for space and the extra floor in addition to the building currently granted planning permission. JP set out that RBHT are planning to submit an application for a minor amendment to the planning application – to include the additional floor.

JP outlined the proposed facilities to be housed in the redesigned imaging centre and floor plans for each level. JP also set out the proposed elevations for the revised imaging centre from Dovehouse Street and the service ramp. JP set out the plan to retain the existing cherry trees. JP highlighted that plans were a working progress and details are to be added as the design evolve.

JP also set out the work undertaken to complete BRE testing to ensure there would be no adverse loss of light as current revisions to the design sit within 25 degrees.

3.2 Q&A session

Q: Clarification sought on the plans shown.

A: JP clarified the views shown on the elevations of the Imaging Centre. He set out that there is more work to do on the detail of the building design but this sets out the principle of the massing.

Q: Concern expressed about the external appearance/ design quality/ architecture quality of the proposed imaging centre. Suggested there should be detail added to the façade – show overhang/ cupping.

A: JP clarified that the proposed elevation is diagrammatic and there is more work to do on the detail of the building design but this sets out the principle of the massing.

Q: It was suggested it would be useful to understand more about how elevation/design connects with neighbours and to understand more about why the window/ floor lines are not designed to be in line. A redesign of the elevation was suggested.

A: A meeting between the Chelsea Society and the Trust's advisors is to be arranged.

Q: Is it likely that the proposed move to St Thomas' will go ahead? If so, why is the Trust proposing to build new facilities?

RP acknowledged this has been a point of discussion but the Trust needed to look towards the future especially with the pressure from NHS England in relation to its congenital heart disease service.. The Trust has undertaken to look at options with King's Health Partners on the St Thomas' site, initially in a feasibility study to be reported on by June 2018. Any move to the 'St Thomas' site would depend on a number of factors including finances, politics and planning, and might take ten years and possibly even more.

Currently the quality and configuration of imaging facilities at RBH are sub-optimal and improvements can't be delayed for such a lengthy period, especially with no guarantee that a move will ultimately be achieved. The build period for the proposed imaging centre is c.18 months so it should be available by mid-2020. The life of imaging equipment is typically some 7 years. The Trust's decision is therefore to press ahead with Phase 1, the proposed new imaging centre.

Q: Has the hospital got the funding for the works?

A: RP confirmed that the extension and new facilities for the hospital will be funded by the sale of the

Chelsea Farmers Market site (which RBHT has gained planning permission for).

Q. Suggestion that the larger extra storey is a surprise and it's difficult to understand how the hospital needs for space have changed since the planning application was submitted.

A: RP set out that the existing imaging facilities are currently suboptimal – difficult for patients and staff and there is an opportunity to address this and improve facilities. JP set out that when detailed configuration of the equipment was explored it was realised that it an additional floor would bring a number of advantages to how the facilities can be arranged internally. 3m are needed for the floor to ceiling heights in addition to the 900m for the ceiling void which is why the floors are larger than those in the adjoin period buildings.

Q. Will there be staff car parking provision for the Imaging Centre?

A: JP confirmed parking spaces for consultants will be removed from the Imaging Centre. It's a decision the hospital have made but there are no plans for any visitor car parking spaces to be removed.

Q. Concern about the increase in floor and whether it is necessary to provide the facilities needed within the imaging suite - could the configuration not be adjusted to modify the layout? Also concern was raised about the plans for photo-voltaic panels on the roof – not convinced the location proposed will provide enough solar power because an angle of 30 degrees is not being proposed and they will not be facing south.

A: JP set out that in order to provide enough space for the equipment and to encourage natural light in consultation rooms as much as possible it is felt the additional floor is essential. The photo-voltaic panels are a requirement of RBKC and GLA and have been designed to their requirements

Q. Living directly opposite to the imaging suite what will be the impact of light pollution? What will the glazing of the windows?

A: In addition the Trust are not proposing any additional lights on the roof of the hospital. The imaging suite will be designed with blinds to block out light pollution. JP confirmed there might be some light pollution, but this would be mitigated at night time.

Q. What is the status of Chelsea Farmers Market and safeguarding for Crossrail 2? .

A. RBHT understand that a decision will be made at the end of this year. RBHT ideally don't want to sell the Chelsea Farmers Market site until the decision around safeguarding is made – to ensure the value of the land is maximised. There are plans that new homes are built on the Chelsea Farmers market site with additional retail at ground and lower ground level as well as a new public square.

Q. Concern was expressed about the increase in massing and uncertainty about the level of detail, architecture and articulation on the elevation.

A: JP confirmed these are initial elevations and the plan is to work out the detail of the elevation. The plan is to revisit with residents as the detail is developed.

4.0 Transport & Access update

4.1 CG provided a transport and access update covering parking and servicing and construction. CG set out that the option to remove 17 parking spaces accessed via Dovehouse Street (Consultant car parking spaces). However CG confirmed that all other parking and servicing arrangements remain unchanged for this phase of works.

In terms of construction CG set out that RBHT are proposing removal of 17 parking spaces accessed via Dovehouse Street and 5 via Sydney Street. Other on-site parking and servicing arrangements remain unchanged for this phase of works. Suspension of up to 4 residential parking bays will be required on Dovehouse Street.

CG also set out that RBHT has been considering how best to work in the context of other construction traffic and had tried to come up with the best solution for RBHT construction traffic and Auriens site traffic in the context of mitigating as far as possible the impact on local residents. The Auriens development will generate considerably more construction traffic. CG set out that as set out in the planning consent the Imaging Centre construction traffic will be via Britten Street. However, looking closer CG have recommended that there could be a significant reduction in construction traffic on Dovehouse Street by keeping Britten Street open for use by Auriens site traffic and allowing the Imaging Centre construction traffic to relocate to Dovehouse Street.

4.2

Q&A Session

Q. What is the overlap of the Auriens and RBHT construction traffic?

A: CG confirmed that both construction periods run in parallel. RBHT would be looking to start site

preparation at the end of 2018.

Q. Can Auriens go ahead with funding – caution is needed on their very optimistic plans as not convinced sales will be possible.

A: CG outlined this is something RBHT is not in a position to be able to comment on. CG set out that they have to work with the programme they are given.

Q. When the lorries get to Britten Street which direction are they turning?

A: CG set out they would go north up Sydney Street, turn left onto Fulham Road. In terms of getting onto the strategic highway network is not that helpful so actually more likely to turn right towards King's Road.

Q. Different proposal to the ones you've just set out – this will mean all traffic is directed to the Kings Road. Previously all your traffic heading to the Fulham Road. So RBHT are proposing to reroute Auriens traffic to Kings Road.

A: CG set out that the proposal is to work with Auriens to move as much construction traffic from Dovehouse Street as possible. The proposal is for Auriens traffic to travel down Britten Street to the King's Road (Post Meeting Note: traffic will travel north to the Fulham Road on exiting the Auriens site). RBHT construction traffic would access and egress the site north up Dovehouse Street.

Q. Concern raised about the north of Dovehouse Street – its wide up to the point where you get to the junction with South Parade and then it narrows. Its blocked with the Marsden Ambulances because they have nowhere else to go – you can't get lots of construction traffic along there.

A: JT clarified that the proposal here was to try and help the situation. The Trust can leave the situation as it is – with Auriens plan to have 60 lorries going up Dovehouse Street. By allowing Auriens site traffic to re-route along Britten Street and for the Imaging Centre to be serviced from Dovehouse Street the Trust are simply trying to minimise the impact to residents on Dovehouse Street by 90%.

Q. Will Britten Street remain open for the public to use?

A: JT confirmed this was now proposed to be the case. CG confirmed that it is a change to what is currently consented whereby Britten Street was going to be closed for the duration of the construction period.

Q. Where will construction traffic be going? Will this be established as part of appointing contractors?

A. CG identified this is difficult as it depends on the identity of the contractors and sub-contractors. RBHT Will endeavour to influence the traffic arrangements however this will be a matter for the contractor to agree with RBKC Highways.

Q. Can you use the river/ barges?

A: Confirmed there is no pier or loading facility.

Q. Highlighted that if they come down Oakley Street that will be a serious problem. There should not be any HGVs on Oakley Street so if any of this leads to HGVs on Oakley Street we will oppose it. We want guarantees there will be no HGVs on Oakley Street.

A: JT confirmed that the plan is to open Britten Street for construction traffic.

Q. CMTP's aren't enforced by RBKC and there's wider issue in the local area. CLG acknowledged that RBHT should be given some credit for trying to come up with a better situation.

5.0 AOB

6.1 No further business was raised.

6.0 Closing comments

6.1 SM brought the meeting to a close and thanked all for their attendance.