



HISTORIC ROYAL PALACES

Minutes

Meeting name: Tower Education DTM – Reveller

Time and date of meeting: 10:30 – 12:30; 07.05.25

Location: Microsoft Teams

Attendees:

Historic Royal Palaces

Rose Blezard (RB)
Mia Bundfuss-Taylor (MBT)
Rhiannon Goddard (RG)
Ben Howard (BH)
Sara Nabulsi (SN)

Jamie Fobert Architects

Tom Clark (TC)
Olivia Holt (OH)
Nicholas Ivanov (NI)
Morgan Williams Parnell (MWP) (Chair)

Hockley & Dawson

Clive Dawson (CD)

Chris Lewis Smart Home

Richard Boodell (RBo)

Harley Haddow

Craig Boubert (CB)
James Harding (JH)
James Rathband (JR)

Ridge & Partners (QS)

Sabrina Angelini (SA)

Purcell

Kit Stiby Harris (KSH)

Sykes & Son

Nick McLaughlin (NM)

Apologies:

Historic Royal Palaces: Janet McDougall (JMc), Mark Rees (MR), Sahar Tousi (ST), Christopher Warwick (CW).

Jamie Fobert Architects: Tara Alizadeh Irani (TAI), Jamie Fobert (JF), Toby Prest (TP), Hellen Siu (HS).

Harley Haddow: Joshua Green (JG)

Purcell: Elizabeth Smith (ES)

Hockley & Dawson: Kate Buxton (KB)

Ridge & Partners: Lucy Reed (LR)

Sweco: Michael Wadood (MWa)

The Planning Lab: Vicky Cartwright (VC), Lindsay Egner (LE).

EEC: David Fernleigh (DF)

Grant Associates: James Clarke (JC)

PJC Light Studio: Phil Caton (PC), Alan Lam (AL).

Biodiversity By Design: Mike Wells (MW)



HISTORIC ROYAL PALACES

	Description/Action	Actioned by	Delivery
1.	Sykes Opening Up Works - Blinds		
1.1	<p>MWP presented pictures of the existing blind system and reported that they appear to still be in good working order. As such, JFA are proposing to keep the existing blind system although some of the blinds may require cleaning/replacing.</p> <p>MWP to produce pack of images for RB to circulate to the education team.</p>	MWP	09/05/25
1.2	<p>MWP queried how the blinds were controlled.</p> <p>RBo advised that the electronic controller for the blinds and the external awnings are in the cupboard behind the old bar area.</p>	To Note	
2.0	Sykes Opening Up Works - Waterproofing		
2.1	<p>MWP presented pictures from ceiling sections that were accessed and the existing drip trays that are in place.</p> <p>MWP advised that KSH and Purcell are keep to remove the drip trays however, JFA are concerned that this could create a future problems and that we know understand whether the drip trays are there for a previous problem that has since been resolved or for future proofing against water ingress.</p> <p>MWP advised that the risk of future water egress due to works on Tower Bridge remained.</p>	To Note	
2.2	<p>MWP asked KSH what the key concerns/issues from Purcell would be if they proposed to install a cavity membrane throughout.</p> <p>KSH advised that firstly they would need to understand what the fabric is doing at the moment. The removal of the ceiling tiles has</p>	To Note	



HISTORIC ROYAL PALACES

	<p>allowed access to the soffits, but they would want to understand what is happening with the existing membrane. In terms of understanding what (if any) issues are being masked by the existing membrane.</p> <p>KSH advised that they can see a benefit to installing/re-installing a membrane given that any repairs to resolve water ingress issues are at the behest of the City of London and are ultimately outside of HRPs control.</p> <p>As such, KSH accepted that whilst there may be an operational/future viability issue as well as the historic fabric ones.</p>		
2.3	<p>MWP asked if RB can provide a steer in terms of HRPs desire to protect the historic fabric vs. the need to protect against water ingress.</p> <p>RB advised that there are a number of factors HRP would need to consider / want further information on, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Where would the water drain to?- How would we know that we're not causing damage / creating an issue in a different area?- Wherever the cavity drain drains to would need be accessible and constantly monitored.- What impact installing a cavity membrane will have on other elements of the scheme such as floor-build-up/screed level & lift level etc. <p>MWP will produce a brief study to address these points.</p>	MWP	16/05/25
2.4	<p>MWP asked NM whether there is a contractor that the team can speak to regarding available solutions and suggested contacting Newton Waterproofing as JFA have worked with them in the past. NM advised that they don't have a preferred supplier/fitter as it depended on the specific situation.</p>	To Note	



HISTORIC ROYAL PALACES

	<p>RB asked NM who Sykes would suggest for this system. NM advised that it depended on the type of system they required. NM advised that they do install a lot of drip trays and that they have previously installed systems that included some form of monitoring.</p> <p>MWP queried whether it is possible to get see-through drip trays. NM advised that if they are not commercially available then they could be sourced/made to order.</p> <p>NM advised that it is important to establish why they were installed in the first place whether it was to address to an pre-existing issue or for future proofing.</p> <p>MWP flagged that the existing ones are either slightly transparent or just made to match the existing ceiling.</p>		
2.5	<p>MWP presented pictures of an existing water damaged section of the ceiling.</p> <p>MWP advised that it appears to be a historic issue that caused the damage as it appears to be dry and that the ceiling tiles below it were also dry.</p> <p>MWP asked RB whether a survey can be carried out to remove a section of the existing waterproof cavity.</p> <p>RB thinks this would be doable.</p>	To Note	
2.6	<p>TC asked whether NM have a preferred contractor that they would use. NM advised that it depends on the system being proposed.</p> <p>TC advised that it would be beneficial to speak to a supplier/installer to gain their feedback/suggestions.</p> <p>NM stated that it would really depend on the type of system being proposed.</p>	To Note	



HISTORIC ROYAL PALACES

	<p>MWP advised currently they are proposing a cavity system on the soffits that they drains to a drip tray.</p> <p>RB advised that RIW Limited provided the existing system.</p> <p>TC advised that it looks like a 'fairly standard' system.</p> <p>NM flagged that anyone that is brought into install the system must be an authorised installer in order to ensure the warranty is robust.</p>		
2.7	<p>TC asked CB whether there is any indication as to where the existing drip-tray drain to? CB to review</p>	CB	09/05/25
3.0	Sykes Opening Up Works - Ceiling		
3.1	<p>MWP presented pictures form the opening up works of the ply-wood practicing and metal stud work.</p> <p>MWP advised that they are currently proposing to replicate this system, however, at first glance the existing system appears to be in good order, so therefore JFA are proposing to keep this system.</p> <p>MWP advised that in addition to a potential cost saving, it is also beneficial to the historic fabric as it means the existing fixtures can be retained and no new holes need to be made.</p> <p>However, MWP cautioned that they won't fully understand the condition until the strip-out has taken place. Therefore, some cost provision for this element will need to be retained until the condition is fully understood.</p>	To Note	
	<p>RB advised that HRP are happy to proceed with retaining the existing system. Though cautioned that MWP must ensure this is flagged in the demolition schedule as an item to be retained as it could end up in the skip.</p>	MWP	On-going



HISTORIC ROYAL PALACES

4.0	Sykes Opening Up Works – General Issues		
4.1	KSH asked MWP for an update on the cables that were found – MWP advised that there are two cables that were found in one of the arches as well as a large rain pipe which also runs through the area. MWP has taken rough dimensions of these and have added them to the drawings.	To Note	
4.2	MWP showed pictures of the existing builders works holes running across the corridor. KB confirmed she has taken dimensions. MWP will plot these on to the internal elevations.	MWP	09/05/25
4.3	MWP advised that they need to check whether the position of these holes clash with the box frames and if so, then will review options for a different structural approach. If the works holes do not clash with the box frames – then these may be able to be used rather than creating additional builders works holes. MWP is hoping to produce this by the end of the week.	MWP	09/05/25
4.4	KSH flagged that during the opening up works they identified a hairline crack. CD confirmed that he and KB are not concerned about the crack.	To Note	
4.5	RB asked CD to produce a brief update / marked-up plan showing the crack that can then be forwarded to the City of London to make them aware of the crack in case they want to assess it.	CD	20/05/25
4.6	SN raised the issue of the door lining and asked MWP whether they've had a chance to review this. MWP advised that it appears one is engaged and the other isn't. Will require some site	To Note	



HISTORIC ROYAL PALACES

	investigations to understand what is going on & why one is engaged and the other isn't.		
4.7	<p>RB asked CD whether it would require some form of propping. CD advised that it probably would require some form of propping to be safe.</p> <p>RB stressed we would need to inform the City of London before doing any work as we would ultimately be propping up their structure.</p> <p>CD advised that he thinks it would require minimal propping up.</p> <p>NM stressed that it may not be engaged at all. However, there is a risk in propping that we need to ensure that there's not too much pressure being applied.</p>		
4.8	<p>SN queried whether the stonework was doing anything structural – CD advised that he doesn't believe it is but isn't sure if it was intended to originally.</p> <p>RB asked CD whether it is possible to do the work without propping.</p> <p>CD will review and produce a method statement.</p>		
5.0	Sykes Opening Up Works – Arches		
5.1	MWP advised that during the photographic surveys on the moat arches, arches 1 & 2 were closed. RB will arrange access so these can be surveyed.	RB	09/05/25
6.0	Sykes Opening Up Works – Floor		
6.1	MWP advised that based on a trial hole, it appears the depth of the screed varies across the floor. As such, MWP asked whether it is possible to carry-out a survey of the floor or whether it is just a case that the floor isn't level.		



HISTORIC ROYAL PALACES

	NM questioned what the desired height of the floor would be – MWP to forward this information.	NM	09/05/25
6.2	<p>RB advised that on reviewing the Tony Fretton Architects drawings – they show a 75mm screed with a 10mm floor finish.</p> <p>MWP advised that upon reviewing the depth of the screed along the historic opening the Tower Bridge arches – the screed changes in thickness – so therefore is not confident that the drawings reflect what was built.</p> <p>In addition, the sample taken shows no insulation which is different to what is shown in the drawings.</p>	To Note	
6.3	<p>RB questioned whether a float screed is the right solution as it would require a specialist screed layer.</p> <p>TC advised that they thought it could go down to 50mm with reinforcement.</p> <p>RB flagged concern that this would still require a specialist installer which would limit our options as to who to use and potential significantly increase the cost.</p>	To Note	
6.4	<p>RB advised that given the importance of understanding the floor height the team should proceed with a fuller survey of the floor.</p> <p>MWP to markup where they would like samples to be taken. RB suggested that the lights in the floor could be used for a starter – as this would minimise the impact on the fabric. Additional points should be kept to a column line for neatness/ease of drawing up the levels.</p> <p>NM advised that for the previous sample they removed the top-section and put it back to reduce the visual impact from the survey and will aim to do this again.</p>	<p>To Note</p> <p>MWP</p> <p>To Note</p>	09/05/25



HISTORIC ROYAL PALACES

	<p>NM to produce a quote for RB based on MWP's marked up drawing of the required samples.</p> <p>RB to liaise with the events team to agree a suitable date for the survey to be undertaken.</p>	<p>NM</p> <p>RB</p>	<p>16/05/25</p> <p>20/05/25</p>
7.0	Lift Update		
7.1	MWP advised that there needs to be some coordination on the lift design – he has added the stage 4a information from Hockley & Dawson and Harley Haddow to the drawings.	To Note	
7.2	<p>MWP flagged that the lift put clashes with the corbel so asked whether we need to cast against it or explore moving the lift pit. MWP stressed that this is an issue as the lift is supported one of its side rather than from above.</p> <p>CD suggested this could be resolved by turning the lifting beam 90 degrees.</p> <p>MWP advised that part of the issue is that the lifting beam would cut through the line of the soffit.</p> <p>RB enquired whether the lift shaft could be moved forwards as it is a long way back – providing this allows still enough turning space in front of the lift? By bringing it forward we remove the risk of the corbel and the lifting beam at the top.</p> <p>MWP to review.</p>	MWP	16/05/25
7.3	<p>RB flagged that the current plans show half block work & half shaft wall – concern that no lift installer would want to take on a half & half solution.</p> <p>TC confirms could all be steel framed if necessary. CD confirms he has specified steel frame over blockwork to avoid damaging heritage fabric.</p>	MWP	16/05/25



HISTORIC ROYAL PALACES

	<p>RB emphasises all steelwork will need to be encased with plasterboard to create clean shaft.</p> <p>MWP to review and update.</p>		
7.4	<p>KSH advised that part of the reason the lift may have been situated so far back was to ensure that it avoided the bridge anchor cable.</p> <p>RB queried where this is shown on the plan.</p> <p>TC advised that it is not shown on the plan but it is below the line of core-bowls but the exact location is unknown.</p> <p>MWP presented a drawing from Purcell that showed the bridge anchor cables – KSH to circulate the .dwg format drawing.</p>	<p>To Note</p> <p>KSH</p>	<p>09/05/25</p>
7.5	<p>RB flagged that we need to geo-locate the anchor cables & block on the City of London model so that we can get agreement from the City of London.</p> <p>RB requested MWP to provide coordinate for where we believe them to be – if this isn't possible then to provide RB with some words as to why this not so that RB can pass this back to the City of London.</p> <p>RB may approach a surveyor to try and establish a geo-location which we can then cross reference our plans with the City of Londons model.</p> <p>MWP queried whether we absolutely need to use the City of London's model. RB confirmed that we do.</p>	<p>To Note</p> <p>MWP</p> <p>MWP</p> <p>To Note</p>	<p>20/05/25</p> <p>20/05/25</p>
7.6	<p>KSH advised that in the Poppy Office arch there is a bifold door and access ladder to the cable / block. KSH enquired what the method statement is for accessing this and is it possible to get someone to survey the space with a laser scanner.</p>	<p>To Note</p>	



HISTORIC ROYAL PALACES

	<p>RB will speak to a surveyor that we use for confined spaces. However, as well as the confined space risk, RB is also concerned about the risk of hazardous materials within space. RB to speak to Simon Price (HRPs asbestos manager) for advice.</p> <p>KSH stressed that he believes this would be beneficial and heed results but stressed that this still won't tell us where the block extends to on the northern extremity.</p>	<p>RB</p> <p>To Note</p>	20/05/25
8.0	Any Other Business		
8.1	<p>NM asked whether the moveable wall will have to be class 9 rated. MWP advised that following the advice of the fire consultant, in the event of an evacuation the wall forms a barrier between the two spaces. MWP agreed that it would make things simpler if it were class 0 – but they are currently going by the advice of the fire consultant.</p>	To Note	
8.2	<p>MWP asked KSH if he had any updated on the CDM.</p> <p>KSH replied that they are yet to receive anything back and will send out a formal reminder to the consultants.</p> <p>MWP advised that they should programme in a CDM workshop. KSH asked whether this could be done as part of a DTM? MWP advised that they would prefer not to use a DTM for this and that they believe a separate workshop would be more effective.</p> <p>KSH / MWP to schedule CDM/ Access workshop.</p>	<p>KSH / MWP</p>	ASAP
8.3	<p>KSH asked RB if there was any information on the existing access arrangements.</p> <p>RB advised that they have approach an access consultant to conduct a survey on the existing provision and advise on any additional measures/requirements.</p>	To Note	



HISTORIC ROYAL PALACES

	RB advised that they will be speaking to them today and subject to their agreed fee will liaise with KSH & MWP on potential dates for meeting them.	RB	09/05/25
8.4	RBo asked whether there was any update on the signage elements. RB will chase the education team for a response.	RB	09/05/25