



HISTORIC ROYAL PALACES

Minutes

Meeting name: Tower Education DTM

Time and date of meeting: 10:30 – 11:30; 18.06.25

Location: Microsoft Teams

Attendees:

Historic Royal Palaces

Rose Blezard (RBI)
Mia Bundfuss-Taylor (MBT)
Ben Howard (BH)
Sara Nabulsi (SN)
Janet McDougall (JMc)

Jamie Fobert Architects

Olivia Holt (OH)
Morgan Williams Parnell (MWP) (Chair)
Toby Prest (TP)

Hockley & Dawson

Clive Dawson (CD)

Harley Haddow

James Harding (JH)
James Rathband (JR)

Eckersley O'Callaghan

Oliver Rigg (OR)

Ridge & Partners (PM)

Akhil Bakhda (AB)
Eve Talty-Sanghera (ETS)
Philip Roberts (PR)

Ridge & Partners (QS)

Sabrina Angelini (SA)

Purcell

Kit Stiby Harris (KSH)

Sykes & Son

Nick McLaughlin (NM)

PJC Lighting

Alan Lam (AL)

Chris Lewis

Justin Rhodes (JRh)

Apologies:

Historic Royal Palaces: Rhiannon Goddard (RG), Mark Rees (MR), Sahar Tousi (ST), Christopher Warwick (CW).

Jamie Fobert Architects: Tara Alizadeh Irani (TAI), Tom Clark (TC), Jamie Fobert (JF), Nicholas Ivanov (NI), Hellen Siu (HS)

Harley Haddow: Craig Boubert (CB), Joshua Green (JG)

Purcell: Elizabeth Smith (ES)

Hockley & Dawson: Kate Buxton (KB)

Ridge & Partners (QS): Lucy Reed (LR)

Sweco: Michael Wadood (MWa)

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

EEC: David Fernleigh (DF)

PJC Light Studio: Phil Caton (PC).



HISTORIC ROYAL PALACES

Apologies (cont):

Biodiversity By Design: Mike Wells (MW)

Grant Associates: James Clarke (JC)

	Description/Action	Actioned by	Delivery
1.	Introductions		
1.1	SN introduced Akhil Bakhda (AB) to the Design Team. AB will be the external project manager for this project working with RB & SN. AB advised that Holly Miller would be joining the team as well but was not available for this meeting.	To Note	
1.2	SN introduced Oliver Rigg (OR) from Eckersley O'Callaghan our Access & Maintenance consultants for the project. MWP flagged that we are 4 weeks away from the end of stage 4 – so would like a CDM & Risks workshop organised as soon as possible. SN will follow up with them.	To Note SN	 ASAP
1.3	SN introduced Philip Roberts (PR) who will be overseeing the Reveller, Waterloo Block and Moat Legacy projects.	To Note	
1.4	MWP suggested that rather than reviewing all of the drawings in the meeting he would be happy to setup a session with AB to go through them. AB agreed that this would be beneficial. MWP to arrange.	MWP	ASAP
2.0	Historic England Update		
2.1	MWP advised that there was an update following there meeting yesterday 17/06/25 with Historic England.	To Note	
2.2	MWP provided background to the conversation and advised that the previous feedback from Historic England was that they had some concern that the balustrading was	To Note	



HISTORIC ROYAL PALACES

	Description/Action	Actioned by	Delivery
	blurring the lines between what were modern interventions vs. what had always been there. As such, they have worked with Hockley & Dawson to change the design to make the balustrading more transparent to address these concerns.		
2.3	MWP presented the current plans for the Moat Arches Stair. MWP noted that they had received the feedback from Hockley & Dawson, however, they are yet to 'fold this information' into the design for the stairs.	MWP	ASAP
2.4	MWP presented images showing a similar design for the balustrading from the arch's stairs into the design for the ramp. However, whilst they were open to the new design – they didn't receive firm feedback either way from Historic England on this. Therefore, MWP warned that we may not get a firm decision from Historic England on this before Stage 4.	To Note	
2.5	MWP showed designs for the tops of the balustrading one with a flat top and the other with a diamond threaded piece. MWP wants to understand from CD if the diamond threading can be removed but in a way that the balustrading is still supported. MWP advised that they would need to better understand the structural implications on the arches stairs style balustrading and what would be involved. CD asked if they are can meet with MWP later today to discuss (as CD is unable to view the screen). MWP to arrange.	To Note MWP/CD	 18/06/25
3.0	Opening-up works / Floor Substrates		
3.1	KSH updated the team on the opening-up works to the Reveller floor that took place yesterday.	To Note	



HISTORIC ROYAL PALACES

	Description/Action	Actioned by	Delivery
	<p>KSH reported that they found the following floor build-up:</p> <p>Top layer of linoleum tiling and with a 5mm underlay under them.</p> <p>30mm levelling screed</p> <p>70mm standard screed – underfloor heating pipes are within this screed</p> <p>Insulation layer of 60mm</p> <p>Finished floor level is 160mm</p> <p>Below this they found the structural slab which they believe is from the previous Fretton scheme.</p> <p>The other two investigations were cancelled due to concerns about what was within the floor given the confirmation of the underfloor heating system being present / additional electrics which may be situated within the floor.</p>		
3.2	<p>MWP advised that their initial proposal is to have a timber floor so only the tiling/levelling screed would need to be removed. However, this would require some sort of repair to the screed level and potentially the underfloor heating system which would then be left dormant. MWP stressed that this solution felt odd – leaving a dormant system behind which could not be re-used. Secondly, any repairs to the screed level (which are highly likely with the removal of the top screed level) would present warranty issues on the main screed level.</p> <p>Therefore, MWP proposes that all of the screed levels are removed down to the concrete slab and re-built-up from there.</p> <p>KSH – confirmed that there was some concern that removing the levelling screed level could cause damage to the screed below.</p>	To Note	



HISTORIC ROYAL PALACES

	Description/Action	Actioned by	Delivery
	MWP advised that for the other floors they are planning to remove everything down to the historic floor.		
3.3	MWP presented his study of the substrates / levels.	To Note	
3.4	<p>MWP advised that they have previously planned to work with the existing substrates. However, following their study, they are now proposing to remove these and build-up form the historic floor levels.</p> <p>MWP advised that given the number of adjustments required to make the floor levels work and additional works such as digging down for the box frame it makes more sense to just start again from the historic floor levels.</p> <p>MWP confirmed that this approach has been agreed with HRP.</p>	To Note	
3.5	MWP advised that whether they are using linoleum tiling or quarry tiles – they will use the same screed level.	To Note	
3.6	<p>MWP presented plans for the arches floors/stairs and stated they are moving away from the strategy of putting tiles on a mechanically fixed floor.</p> <p>KSH confirmed they support this. KSH states that they support anything that is more reversible rather than some that is very fixed.</p>	To Note	
3.7	MWP advised that the ramped up level will be formed out of tapered insulation which are considered better from a fire perspective than void formers.	To Note	
3.8	<p>MWP talked through the plans for the raised access floor in the arch spaces.</p> <p>MWP questioned the benefit of changing the system for a small area/single floor when</p>	To Note	



HISTORIC ROYAL PALACES

	Description/Action	Actioned by	Delivery
	<p>they are not reliant on a raised access floor for any of their systems maintenance.</p> <p>NM advised that they do not require it from a maintenance perspective.</p> <p>JH advised that it is the only distribution route as they are unable to go via the ceiling.</p> <p>MWP asked whether they were going to use the perimeter of the room.</p> <p>JH confirmed that at present the route is via under the floor.</p> <p>MWP asked whether they could use a screeded floor and if they did, what void space would be required.</p> <p>JR advised that they need 150mm- they can review using the perimeter but stated that going under the floor would be easier.</p> <p>SN asked if using the perimeter for the services would then require boxing-in.</p> <p>MWP advised that they are planning to build out the wall levels anyway to accommodate some of the M&E equipment.</p>		
3.9	<p>JR advised that a benefit of going up from the floor is that they can install PowerPoints wherever they want (floor boxes) which wouldn't be achievable via the perimeter.</p> <p>RB – advised that the education team have advised that they don't want floor boxes as they're not something that they use.</p> <p>JR asked whether they would want them for the banks of desks etc?</p> <p>RB – believe that the advice is that they just don't use them. If it is worth installing them for future-proofing purposes that is an option but would have to be justified.</p>	To Note	
3.10	MWP asked SA whether they will need to include a fully marked up plan or whether	MWP	ASAP



HISTORIC ROYAL PALACES

	Description/Action	Actioned by	Delivery
	<p>just more detail on the floor would be required.</p> <p>SA advised that just some detail should suffice and doesn't believe they require a marked-up plan.</p>		
3.11	MWP advised that they will do a sense-check of the electrical requirements against the proposed floor build-ups.	MWP	ASAP
3.12	<p>MWP presented the plans for the mechanical routes through the main area and asked JH if these could go through the floor. Although they had previously seen a route that went along the sides of the lunchroom.</p> <p>MWP stressed any route needs to avoid the lantern.</p> <p>JH advised that they need to remove the 'dog-leg' in the reception area.</p> <p>MWP asked JH to sketch-out this route in more detail.</p> <p>RB –asked if it would be at high or low level.</p> <p>JH advised that this would be at high level.</p> <p>RB queried whether it would be better to be at low level given that it is water being carried.</p> <p>JH advised that don't believe it is a problem.</p>	JH	ASAP
3.13	<p>KSH asked what route it would be taking.</p> <p>MWP advised that there was a route in the corner concealed behind the door. However, this route goes through a compartment line – which may be why they were looking to go through the floor. MWP will review once they have received the sketch from JH.</p>	MWP	ASAP
4.0	Access & Maintenance		
4.1	MWP stressed that they are due to submit their stage 4 drawings in 4 weeks' time. So	SN / OR	ASAP



HISTORIC ROYAL PALACES

	Description/Action	Actioned by	Delivery
	would like an Access & Maintenance focused meeting scheduled as soon as possible with Purcell on the call. SN/OR to arrange.		
5.0	M&E Update		
5.1	<p>JH presented the plans for the air circulation system within the studio space.</p> <p>JH advised that within the limits of the JFA design freeze – they are only able to provide fresh-air for 55 people in the studio space which is below the design requirement for 70 people.</p> <p>JH confirmed that following discussions with RB this level would be unacceptable.</p> <p>JH advised that they have reviewed this with MWP and JW undertook a study to understand what would be required to meet the higher level. As such they are proposing a revised system that can support 70 people. However, given the constraints of the current building, the duct sizes will need to get bigger. A result of which will be that the ceiling height in some areas will have to be lower to get around an existing steel beam and other duct work.</p> <p>MWP acknowledged that reducing floor to ceiling height isn't a great choice but that they believe it will work.</p> <p>JH advised has managed to reduce the height of one of the ducts before it hits the steel.</p>	To Note	
5.2	MWP flagged that there is a risk that if the steel isn't exactly where we are expecting it be then this could pose issues. As such, MWP asked JH how much tolerance is there between the steel and the duct.	To Note	



HISTORIC ROYAL PALACES

	Description/Action	Actioned by	Delivery
	JH advised that its 50mm out from the steel and then another 500-600mm with the blue ducts before we hit the steel. As such, MWP was content that this isn't a risk.		
5.3	MWP advised that that they are currently reviewing what the architectural implications of the lowered ceilings / larger ducts would be. MWP flagged that the moveable wall & desk etc. will need to come forward slightly to accommodate some of the ducting. Also, there is a clash with the niche/window that will need to be reviewed.	MWP To Note	ASAP
5.4	MWP asked CD to review and advise on what the implications for the structure are for example adjustments to the ceiling joists. MWP to forward CD the revised drawing. Then may require a call with MWP, JH & CD – to understand how this is working with the existing structure.	CD MWP MWP/JH/CD	ASAP ASAP ASAP
5.5	RB stressed that the primary function is that the space has to work for 70 people and if it couldn't then it absolutely has to be adjusted. RB flagged that they understand the requirements but would like a better understanding the architectural implications. RB raised concern that the moveable wall area is now getting smaller and smaller and is getting closer to the size of some double doors – though isn't suggestion at this stage that they move towards this.	MWP	ASAP
5.6	MWP advised that the plan for the acoustic louvres within the windows is to seal them up but that education team have asked for them to stay – currently proposal therefore is to keep them as a test for a year and then take a view on them. The original justification for	To Note	



HISTORIC ROYAL PALACES

	Description/Action	Actioned by	Delivery
	<p>sealing them was because of the impact on the acoustics within the space with the noise from the wharf.</p> <p>RB advised that we need a better understanding of what the impact of the noise from the wharf is.</p> <p>JH explained that the reason for keeping them is that when asked they said it made a difference to the space. However, with the ventilation systems, open the louvres would actually make the space hotter. Therefore questioned whether it actually makes them cooler or if it's a physiological affect making them feel that they've done something to make themselves cooler.</p> <p>As such, JH suggested it could be worth including a boost button that users of the space could access.</p> <p>RB queried whether the 'boost button' would actually have a significant affect or not.</p> <p>JH advised that it only boosts the system to the maximum air-rate and that it wouldn't create/add to the noise.</p>		
5.7	<p>KSH asked whether the louvres could just be sealed on the wharf side of the building.</p> <p>JH advised that if they were to be left unsealed then both sides would have to be unsealed to create a cross wind.</p>	To Note	
5.8	RB agreed to go back to the education team with the option of a boost button vs. not sealing the louvres as a trial.	RB	ASAP
6.0	Any Other Business		
6.1	RB asked that JH/JR include as part of 4B – drawings showing the trenches required in the moat on the 2 nd red-line building so that RB can make the SMC	To Note	



HISTORIC ROYAL PALACES

	Description/Action	Actioned by	Delivery
	JH advised that there is a detail on the ramp drawing and arches drawing.		
6.2	MWP asked whether the design team all have access to everyone else's drawings? MWP stressed that they would encourage everyone to upload their information to the SharePoint site.	All	On-going
6.3	SA asked MWP whether there was an update on the inter-grill query. MWP advised that the costs that came in for Inter-grill were exceptionally high so has been talking to other manufacturers to find an alternative. MWP is confident that the cost should therefore be significantly reduced.	MWP	ASAP