

Children's Cancer Centre Construction Working Group
7th February 2024
5:30pm-7pm
Charles West Board Room
Weston House Seminar Room 2 & 3

Attendees	<p>Great Ormond Street Hospital Chair: Zoe Ward, Head of Communications and Engagement, Children's Cancer Centre James Deady, Programme Officer</p> <p>Sisk Nick Fitzgerald, Project Manager Patsy Evans, Project Liaison Manager</p> <p>John Chamberlain, Camden Cycling Campaign Gordon Adgey, Resident Harriet Tupper, Resident Wen Quek Allen Gillespie LBC (Allen.Gillespie@Camden.gov.uk) Gillian Mosely, Resident Alec Foreshaw, Resident Nicholas Zivkovic Tybalds Ed Sneerman Tybalds Stuart Woods, Corams Fields Ben Paul Emel Kus, University of London</p>
Apologies	<p>Children's Acute Transport Service LAS UCLH Max Tolhurst UCLH</p>
Attachments	<p>Slide deck</p>

1. Welcome and introductions

1.1. ZW welcomed everyone at the meeting and via Teams. Apologies were noted.

2. Minutes previous meetings.

2.1. ZW asked the group to review the minutes. No other comments were raised and the minutes were agreed.

2.2. Gm asked if it would be possible for the residents to meet with CATs at some stage. ZW responded that she would try to facilitate this.

3. Actions from last meeting

3.1. ZW & NF provided an update on the current Construction Working Group Actions:

3.2. **Action 1: GOSH to follow up with NCP re local community and parking at Bloomsbury.** ZW reported that there are offers available for local residents and people who would park there regularly. ZW said that she would pass on these

details from NCP. AF suggested if the Imperial Hotel underground car park could be explored too. ZW said that alternative parking locations could be promoted. BP asked for clarification if this was parking for patients and families visiting GOSH or was this for residents also. ZW clarified that GOSH are already working with NCP/car parks on patient/family parking, but this further investigation was into parking for local residents as well.

- 3.3. GM asked if the research that she shared has been looked at. NF answered that this has been passed on to Camden following last month's Constriction working group but have yet to receive a response on that specifically.
- 3.4. **Action 2: Sisk to scrutinise delivery management system to ensure mitigations to prevent delivery vehicles to queuing or waiting in the nearby are robust.** NF provided a breakdown of Msite delivery management process to alleviate the concern of residents that there will be a backlog of HGV in the close proximity to site. NF reported that weekly logistic meetings are held with all suppliers to ascertain that their vehicles meet regulations. There are also daily meetings that SISK hold to ensure that all deliveries can be received and that there is appropriate resource on site. Each delivery is given appropriate time to complete and unload the delivery which is dependent on the materials being delivered- this also contains a buffer for each delivery. If resources are not available to allow the delivery to take place in the pre-approved timescale, then this delivery can be amended or cancelled.
- 3.5. ES asked what is the peak number of deliveries per day? NF replied that there will be a peak of 35 deliveries on one day. ES continued by saying that there are multiple factors such as traffic which may cause issues for the process that NF has explained.
- 3.6. GM raised that whilst she believes the management system that SISK are using will work 95% of the time, the fear she has is the unpredictable traffic which may mean that delivery vehicles will arrive early to ensure they meet their slot.
- 3.7. NF said that this system runs on a 'just in time' delivery slot which all delivery vehicles in SISK's supply chain are aware of and will adhere to. If the delivery vehicle turns up early, it will not be permitted onto the site to complete the delivery and it will be sent away. NF explained that the delivery vehicle will not just be completing a delivery at this site but will be completing multiple deliveries at other sites around London during the day.
- 3.8. GM raised concern that there will be a number of HGV's who will be parked up near to site (in the neighbourhood) waiting for their delivery slot. AF added that there needs to be co-ordination done with the other business in the area who have delivery vehicles such as the Lamb Pub on Lambs conduit street and the Perseverance pub. AF also added that he believes Guilford street will have increased traffic due to the main entrance of the hospital moving to Guilford street and the ambulances parking in that area.
- 3.9. HT raised the problem that could arise in the event that the utility companies decide to complete works on the roads, which will cause an issue for deliveries coming to site or increased traffic due to diversions.
- 3.10. GM raised that the fear wasn't around the management system but vehicles arriving early and blocking up the local area and feels that there needs to be a contingency plan in this event where something goes wrong. She also raised that Traffic in this area is very unpredictable and can cause disruption to this

delivery plan. NZ added that he found it unlikely that SISK would turn a delivery vehicle away if there were late or too early for their delivery slot, which he believes will lead to delivery vehicles waiting in the local area.

- 3.11. NF answered that it is part of their contract that the deliveries will arrive on time, not early or late.
- 3.12. SW said that a contingency plan needs to be considered if vehicles are not able to meet their delivery slot and are in fact early or late. SW asked if there is a location that delivery vehicles can wait and then be told to come to site, making their arrival time more predictable.
- 3.13. NF said that If a vehicle arrives early and is idling in the local area, then the supplier will be called and given a strike as they will be in breach of their contract and the site rules. NF continued by saying that there have been lessons learned from previous SISK projects in highly congested site, which SISK have a successful track record on. NF said that he will look at comparable examples of SISK sites and bring them to the next meeting.
- 3.14. GM again highlighted the unpredictability of the traffic in this area.
- 3.15. NF said that he completely accepts the logistical risks that this project imposes and understands why there cannot be delivery vehicles idling in the local area. NF also described that when works start on site, it will be a gradual increase allowing continued assessment and monitoring which will allow feedback to be provided to construction working group.
- 3.16. ES added that it is also important that residents/local community feedback is listen to also. ZW and NF both agreed with this point.
- 3.17. **Action 3:** GOSH will circulate a written copy of the meetings terms of reference.
- 3.18. **Action 4: Minutes and slides to be uploaded to website.** NF reported that the Project website updates are underway and will be published live upon completion – aimed completion beginning of March 2024. ZW reported that on the GOSH hospital website there is information for patients and families who are travelling to GOSH. ZW asked for the group to provide feedback if anything on the hospital page would be useful to include on the local community information page.
- 3.19. **Action 5: Sisk to discuss with Camden if there is anything further that can be done on cycle provision and safety.** NF reported that ongoing discussions between Sisk, GOSH and LB Camden to identify opportunity to relocate lost cycle parking facilities on Great Ormond Street East and Santander cycle on Guilford Street. The Temporary Traffic Restriction (TTR) has been submitted to London Borough of Camden. Discussions will continue post implementation of highway alterations regarding a suitable location for the reinstatement of the lost cycle parking ‘hoops’ outside the OBW building on the eastern end of Great Ormond Street. NF assured the group that ongoing highway layout assessments on safety and efficiency are carried out throughout the project.
- 3.20. JC asked who used these cycle parking hoops?

3.21. NF answered that transport and highway assessment have been carried to work out the frequency of cyclists and usage of cycling parking along Great Ormond Street. The majority of cyclists that use Great Ormond Street and use these parking hoops are GOSH staff. The Hospital has provided supplementary cycle parking elsewhere within the campus. But these hoops were still used by members of the public which is why work is being done to mitigate the loss of cycle parking to local residents and members of the public. ZW added that there had been previous conversations around the safety of cyclists using Lambs conduit street up through Guilford place. The implementation of the traffic marshals etc are intended to manage that risk around this area.

4. Terms of Reference for the CWG

- 4.1. ZW reported that the Terms of reference were spoken through during last months Constriction working group and were circulated following that meeting. ZW asked the group if there were any further comments around the terms of reference for the CWG. ZW said that the intention of these meetings are to fulfil the obligations that were set out in the Section 106 and to maintain transparency with the local community by listening and engaging with them. ZW asked if the terms of reference can be moved from being 'draft' to actual?
- 4.2. GM raised that residents feel that they are being talked at and not meaningfully consulted or engaged with. GM continued that she would not be happy for these to be approved as she believes it should say that the CWG will meaningfully work together to come up with optimal solutions.
- 4.3. ZW responded that she feels that the terms of reference do say this. ZW explained that it describes minimising unreasonable disruption, being mindful of impacts on the local community and taking on board and responding to suggestions.
- 4.4. HT highlighted that the wording around 'listened to issues and concerns from attendees' should include an addition of 'and act upon them'.
- 4.5. ZW answered that the section includes that the group can make recommendation to GOSH and SISK about how to manage the construction stage. It continues by detailing that if GOSH or SISK cannot meet these recommendations, a full written explanation will be provided.
- 4.6. GM raised that she would like to see GOSH repairing relationships with the local community, and the onus is on GOSH to go above and beyond whatever is stipulated.
- 4.7. ZW said that this section can be reviewed and said that she did not want to make full promises on what GOSH are able to do. ZW feels that GOSH are trying to go above the minimum requirement but will continue to work harder to do more.
- 4.8. HT raised that if it is Camden that are the ones to say no to certain suggestions, then a reasonable explanation is needed from Camden.
- 4.9. NF summarised that the key message is that this forum is utilised to identify concerns, which will lead to GOSH and SISK carrying out suitable investigations and then re-presenting the journey of those investigations to the group in a clear and detailed manner.
- 4.10. GM raised that there is an opportunity for relationship building between GOSH and the local community and feels that a better president should be set within this project and moving forward.

5. Update from Sisk – what to expect in February & March 2024

- 5.1. NF reported to the group that the main entrance of the hospital will be relocated on February 19th 2024. Following the switch over of the main entrance, UKPN will commence work on diverting the existing high voltage cable underneath the footpath on Great Ormond Street. Additionally in February, the environmental Monitors will be installed internally and externally. NF reported that in March SISK will be carrying out the removal of existing main entrance canopy. NF reported that this would be a weekend operation.
- 5.2. GM asked why this need to be carried out on a weekend?
- 5.3. NF answered that a weekend will see reduced footfall in this area and is felt that this is safer due to part of the canopy hangs over the footpath.
- 5.4. NF continued by saying that in March the highway alterations to Guilford Street / Guilford Place will be commencing. This will include the moving of the zebra crossing in this area, further east.
- 5.5. AF asked if the dates of the works could be provided to the residents.
- 5.6. NF agreed that the dates of the works items could be added to the presentation that will be shared with residents.
- 5.7. SW said that sharing the dates for the highway alterations and particularly the Zebra crossing move would be really helpful as this would be shared with the people that use Corams fields.
- 5.8. HT also asked could notices be put up around the local community to inform all of the residents. NF also agreed that this is a good idea and explained that there is currently a plan to create newsletters to be shared around the local community.
- 5.9. ES asked if the residents would have access to the environmental monitor reports.
- 5.10. NF said that these reports are sent to Camden and then Camden are able to publicise these reports and the reports can also be shared at the CWG.
- 5.11. NF also explained that this is an Environmental monitor from 'Clean Air London' which is a public database.
- 5.12. GA said that he would get in touch with the Imperial College London to ask to see if there could be more environmental monitors being added to the area around site.

6. DCMP amendments

- 6.1. NF reported on the latest DCMP amendments (Revision 05), following the recent discussions with Camden.
- 6.2. Item 1 was the update to the Traffic marshal regime. NF reported that a slight change has been made at the junction of Guilford street to Guilford place where there will be 2 traffic marshals. 1 traffic marshal will ensure that vehicles are not undertaking HGV's as they make the turn at this junction.
- 6.3. Item 2- HGV delivery times amendment. NF reported that the delivery restriction has increased in the morning (8am-9:30am) which will better the safety of the increased public footpath users.
- 6.4. ES asked if this now means that there will be increased 'ultra early' delivers before this period of restriction?
- 6.5. NF confirms that this will not be the case and the ultra-early deliveries are specialist events that need to be carried out during the early hours.
- 6.6. ES asked if notice could be provided to local resident when ultra-early delivers are due to take place.
- 6.7. ZW and NF explained that this comes under the section 61 procedure and would need to be applied with 29 days' notice.
- 6.8. Item 3- NF explains that a diversion plan added to the latest version of the DCMP. NF reported that these will be fixed signs in place throughout the entire project for those vehicles wanting to use Great Ormond Street and the surrounding area.

- 6.9. Item 4- NF reported that there has been an updated traffic layout added to the report.
- 6.10. Item 5 NF reported that dates of the upcoming CWG meetings until October have been added into the DCMP.
- 6.11. Item 6- NF explained that Patsy Evans has joined the SISK team as Community Liaison Manager. PE formally introduced herself and explained that she is available for people to come and talk to and go through different items. Patsy's email has been added to the minutes for the benefit of the local community: patsyevans@sisk.co.uk.
- 6.12. AF raised that on the independent safety audit in the DCMP (Page 66) the company that completed the audit on 10am-13:30pm on Friday 22 September 2023. AF said that this date was the GOSH play-street day. AF felt that this did not reflect the true nature of the traffic around this area.
- 6.13. NF reported that SISK assigned a consultant, who then chose an independent road safety audit company to complete the safety audit. The auditors assess the current real and what the proposed highway alterations to highlight the potential risks and issues.
- 6.14. ES asked if it was the independent subcontractor who chose the date are was it SISK?
- 6.15. NF explained that SISK would not know when the audit was being carried out and that the independent auditor would choose the date and time of audit. NF added that whilst this is an unfortunate coincidence, there are multiple phases and revisions of audits/plans that are ongoing to evaluate the safety of the roads around the site.
- 6.16. SW said that this feels like this was carried out with an agenda and is hard to believe that it was just a coincidence.
- 6.17. AF raised that some of the buildings in the 'receptors' area of the DCMP are labelled as commercial but are instead a joint commercial and residential buildings.
- 6.18. NF said that the reason for this is because it is a street level traffic assessment and will not need to take into account what is higher up within buildings. NF continued by saying that this document has been updated many times following comments, but this section can be reviewed again.
- 6.19. GM raised that there have been walking tours completing in the past and suggested that this could be done for a future CWG meeting.
- 6.20. ZW agreed with this idea and suggested that this could be completed by a smaller subgroup.
- 6.21. AF raised an issue around the 54 times that Great Ormond Street may be closed. The report says that it needs to ensure that emergency vehicles can still get to properties on the south side of Great Ormond Street.
- 6.22. NF explained that the road closure would be from the eastern end of Great Ormond Street up until Barbon Close. The DCMP has been shared with London Fire Brigade and they have not raised any concerns about the planned road closures or logistics around completing their role if needed. ZW added that there is ongoing contact with London Ambulance Service about the changes in there area and they are conformable with the planned closures/alternative routes.
- 6.23. AF asked if the moving of the 3 lampposts on the north site to the south side of GOS has investigated by Camden.
- 6.24. AG replied that he was not sure but can chase this up.

7. Any other Business

No other business was raised.

8. Dates of next meetings

- Wednesday 6 March 2024

Drop-in sessions

- Wednesday 21 Feb 2024

DRAFT