



Minutes

Meeting name: Tower Education DTM

Time and date of meeting: 10:30 – 11:30; 21.05.25

Location: Microsoft Teams

Attendees:

Historic Royal Palaces

Rose Blezard (RBI)
Mia Bundfuss-Taylor (MBT)
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)

Harley Haddow

Craig Boubert (CB)
James Rathband (JR)

Ridge & Partners (QS)

Sabrina Angelini (SA)

Purcell

Kit Stiby Harris (KSH)

Sykes & Son

Nick McLaughlin (NM)

PJC Lighting

Alan Lam (AL)

Apologies:

Historic Royal Palaces: Rhiannon Goddard (RG), 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: James Harding (JH), Joshua Green (JG)

Purcell: Elizabeth Smith (ES)

Hockley & Dawson: Kate Buxton (KB)

Ridge & Partners: 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).

Biodiversity By Design: Mike Wells (MW)

Grant Associates: James Clarke (JC)



HISTORIC ROYAL PALACES

	Description/Action	Actioned by	Delivery
1.	Updated CDM Lift Shaft		
1.1	MWP updated the team on the changes to the lift with the proposal from the last meeting to move the lift further into the space which avoids the corbel. TC confirmed it will still leave a large amount of space in front of the lift for a wheelchair turning circle and avoids the Tower Bridge anchoring block.	To Note	
1.2	TC advised that following feedback from RB (DTM 07/05/25 – 7.2), the structure had now been tidied up to show a single structure. TC asked CD whether he required a solid structure. CD advised that I columns can be used instead.	To Note	
1.3	KSH asked for clarification on what the curved line on the drawing (2. Lift shaft update) is and whether the lift wall will follow this line. TC advised that the design would follow the line.	To Note	
1.4	TC flagged that there was a need for a mini-upstand to hold the lift-shaft wall above the lintel. TC asked CD for guidance in designing this. CD advised that they have a similar issue for the new lift going into the Banqueting House Whitehall (BHW) and that they put in some steel to support the doors. TC/CD to review.	TC/CD	04/06/25
1.5	TC asked CD how close the lift can go to the corbel. CD advised that on lift project at the BHW they have removed a small amount of the corbel to accommodate the lift.	To Note	
2.0	Waterproofing to moat slabs		



HISTORIC ROYAL PALACES

	Description/Action	Actioned by	Delivery
2.1	<p>MWP advised that they need to look at options for the waterproofing the slabs in the moat arches. The solution should not be bound to the masonry walls around it.</p> <p>KSH advised that they would need to understand more about the make-up of the ground in the arches before they can advise.</p> <p>MWP stated that there is a substantial concrete slab within arches 1 & 2. Whereas arches 3,4,5 & 6 have a shallower slab – which they are hoping they get some insulation underneath.</p> <p>CD advised that based on a previous trial pit just outside of the moat arches, the slab most likely sits on a 100mm on sand binding and are likely to find corbels around the perimeter of the arches.</p> <p>MWP asked CD whether he is confident in the assumption or whether he would require further information.</p> <p>CD advised that the arches will almost certainly be the same as what was found in the trial pit.</p>	To Note	
2.2	<p>CD asked how important is it that the slabs don't move at all? Can what is going into the arches accommodate a little bit of movement – if so, the current make-up should be fine, if not then they would need to consider piling.</p> <p>MWP asked CD what degree of movement is he looking at. CD advised approximately 5mm. It can be spanned across but there is a low risk of significant movement in that space.</p> <p>MWP advised that his only area of concern would be where there are drainage connections for the WCs etc.</p> <p>JR to ask JH to review.</p>	<p>To Note</p> <p>JR/JH</p>	03/06/25



HISTORIC ROYAL PALACES

	Description/Action	Actioned by	Delivery
	MWP advised that he would like to avoid piling – but will await JH’s response.		
2.3	<p>MWP advised that based on discussions with Purcell, the current proposal for constructing the slab is to build up the level with sand binding. Lining the perimeter with timber shuttering (to protect the masonry walls) then infill the slab – removing the shuttering once set and filling with gravel.</p> <p>CD advised that using shuttering and then trying to remove it once set would be too optimistic. CD advised using fibreboard as a sacrificial layer.</p>	To Note	
3.0	Ramp Structure		
3.1	<p>MWP advised that the main feedback from Historic England regarding the ramp was related to the view of the balustrading/posts and that the view from the ramp (coming up from the moat) made the posts & balustrading look ‘solid’.</p> <p>TC acknowledged that they’d already been worked on previously and CD advised that they had already been made skinnier.</p> <p>MWP talked through an alternative proposal.</p> <p>CD suggested it may work if the mesh could be used to provide some stability/bracing. CD stressed that it would have to a high-quality Jakob type mesh.</p> <p>MWP advised that it would be similar mesh to the ones used on the Middle Drawbridge – which CD advised was Jakob and it was also used on the Ravens Cages.</p> <p>MWP to develop a design based on this.</p>	MWP	03/06/25



HISTORIC ROYAL PALACES

	Description/Action	Actioned by	Delivery
4.0	Builders Holes		
4.1	<p>MWP talked through the proposal for the existing builders' holes in the Reveller.</p> <p>CD queried whether any of the services running through them will still be required. MWP confirmed that they won't be.</p> <p>CD advised that they can then be filled in with a decent mortar and that this in turn would act like solid brickwork.</p> <p>KSH queried whether CD would be concerned about then drilling into part of this mortar to create new holes. CD confirmed it wouldn't be an issue providing they had gone-off properly beforehand.</p> <p>MWP queried whether they could just make the existing holes wider – CD advised that they could but based on the plans, doesn't think they are in the right place.</p>	To Note	
4.2	<p>MWP advised that the current height of the box frames is based on the heights provided by CD. MWP flagged that they would like to make them taller if there is opportunity to.</p> <p>MWP queried whether the investigations as part of the temporary works could help inform CD's view on the height of the box frames or whether this will only be known at the strip-out stage.</p> <p>CD advised that he thinks it will only be known at the strip-out stage but is confident a solution could be found.</p> <p>MWP suggested including this as part of the investigation works and reviewing the fee for it once it comes in.</p> <p>MWP asked whether NM had the relevant drawing. NM advised that he didn't – so MWP will forward a copy of the relevant drawing.</p>	MWP	23/05/25



HISTORIC ROYAL PALACES

	Description/Action	Actioned by	Delivery
4.3	<p>RB queried why they need to investigate this as part of the temporary works and fundamentally what the issue is.</p> <p>MWP advised that the proximity of the existing openings to the temporary supports going in for the portal is too close. MWP is concerned that if we were to infill the existing holes then we might not be allowed to put a new hole that close to the infilled space – however, CD is confident that it wouldn't be an issue.</p> <p>CD queried whether the holes are currently visible. MWP confirmed that they are but only by lifting the ceiling tiles. CD agreed to review on-site when at TOL on Tuesday.</p>	CD/RB	27/05/25
5.0	Moat 1 & 2		
5.1	<p>MWP presented the plans for moat arches 1 & 2 – including the plan to leave the space open so that it feels like a double height space. CD advised that he believed it should be achievable.</p>	To Note	
5.2	<p>MWP advised that the stairs are currently shown as timber but is wondering whether they should be produced in steel instead to keep the language of the space.</p> <p>CD queried what MWP was investigating when he says timber.</p> <p>MWP advised that it would be steel supports with concrete bases cast into it.</p> <p>CD advised that this would be significantly heavier and require additional supports either wall bearing or block posts to support this.</p> <p>RB queried the use of steel within the space given that it is a space for children and stated that they would prefer timber was used instead. RB flagged that there are already concerns about the metal on the</p>		



HISTORIC ROYAL PALACES

	Description/Action	Actioned by	Delivery
	walls and then this proposal would include it on the floors as well. Which could severely impact the acoustics of the space.		
5.3	TC advised that they are keen on the timber stairs but that there is a slight issue that needs to be worked through re: how to screed a timber deck and place quarried tiles on it – but is confident it can be resolved.	To Note	
6.0	Moveable Wall Queries		
6.1	MWP asked JR to share the drawing with the Design Team that JH issued this morning.	JR	23/05/25
6.2	<p>MWP advised that following design development, there appears to be a clash with the moveable wall – therefore the wall may require some additional support on the northern side.</p> <p>In addition, MWP advised that currently the structural drawings are showing the support that supports the moveable wall, running from wall to wall. But it needs to stop short of that space so that Harley Haddow can get there ducting in.</p> <p>CD advised that this should be possible but would need to review and consider how the beam can be tied in – potentially into a beam in the roof.</p> <p>CD asked MWP whether the intention would be to hide the post – MWP confirmed that ideally they would like to hide it.</p> <p>CD to review.</p>	CD	03/06/25
6.3	In addition, MWP advised that the ducting that feeds into the space will require some adaption. JH to review.	JH	03/06/25
7.0	Mechanical & Electrical Update		



HISTORIC ROYAL PALACES

	Description/Action	Actioned by	Delivery
7.1	<p>MWP asked JR for an update on where they were with the route for running power to the sentry box</p> <p>JR advised that they are now looking at taking the power supply from the arches, extending the pit to take it across to the ramp and then taking it up the ramp before it goes to the sentry box through a builder's hole or gap (to be worked through).</p> <p>MWP asked about the diameter size of the proposed cable – with a view to whether this could be accommodated along the ramp.</p> <p>JR advised that it would be approximately 25mm.</p> <p>MWP confirmed that this should be easy to accommodate within the ramp.</p> <p>JR pointed out that there is an existing requirement for power for the lights on the ramp so that could be the solution for both.</p> <p>KSH advised that this route is much more preferred to the previous solution of running it across the wall.</p>	To Note	
7.2	<p>RB & KSH stressed that they will need to see mark-ups of all the proposed trenches as part of the SMC application.</p> <p>JR to provide a marked-up drawing by Friday.</p>	JR	23/05/25
8.0	Waterproofing		
8.1	<p>MWP advised that where there are currently cavity membranes they are proposing to copy this logic/principal and propose putting a cavity membrane in the areas where there are WCs and some of the area within the community room.</p> <p>MWP flagged that where there are vaulted soffits these won't be easy to monitor.</p>	To Note	



HISTORIC ROYAL PALACES

	Description/Action	Actioned by	Delivery
	<p>Whereas other areas would be easier to monitor and any issues could be addressed more easily.</p> <p>MWP advised that JH has investigated how these could be drained, and the proposed solution is to use the dropped ceiling to drain the membrane.</p> <p>MWP advised that he and KSH have agreed the strategy for this and will put forward a proposal for HRP to review.</p> <p>RB queried what the dropped ceiling is doing to support the draining of the membrane in this scenario.</p> <p>MWP asked CB to confirm with JH what the thinking/strategy is for this.</p> <p>TC suggested that the dropped ceiling would help to hide the membrane itself.</p> <p>RB asked where the water from membrane on the walls would drain to – if nowhere, then is it worth having a membrane on the walls or a different strategy for the walls?</p> <p>In addition, RB queried whether more of a bespoke system that puts a drip tray into the roof and then drains to drain would be more appropriate?</p> <p>RB flagged concern that if the point of the system was to achieve a 25-year guarantee on the room staying dry – then we are unlikely to get this with such a bespoke system.</p>	JH/CB	04/06/2025
8.2	MWP agreed that some more specialist input would be beneficial and will speak to TC about arranging this.	MWP / TC	23/05/25
8.3	RB asked whether in terms of the height of the drains/locations there's the ability to put these are a higher level if need be.	To Note	



HISTORIC ROYAL PALACES

	Description/Action	Actioned by	Delivery
	<p>TC advised that because of the plant around the sides of the room it may not be possible to run drains around perimeter of the room.</p> <p>NM suggested using a guttering system around the walls which then drains to a drain on the ground.</p> <p>MWP believes this could work as an option. MWP flagged that will always be a certain amount of humidity within the room and with water ingress – so there needs to be a system that addresses this and prevents it from coming through the ceiling finish.</p>		
8.4	<p>RB queried whether the acoustic plaster is designed to function within this type of non-ceiled space and as such, how would it behave within the space – given the level of humidity?</p> <p>KSH asked whether there are specialist requirements for how the plaster is keyed? Will it adhere to the membrane or would another level have to be applied in between the membrane and the acoustic plaster?</p> <p>MWP will investigate it but believes there will have to be level such as curved plaster board between the membrane and acoustic plaster.</p> <p>RB flagged that we need to confirm with the waterproofing specialist that they are happy for their membrane to be punctured for the arched studwork/plasterboard.</p>	<p>To Note</p> <p>MWP</p>	<p>ASAP</p>
9.0	Client Queries		
9.1	MWP to review the questions from RB regarding the security scanner and will respond today.	MWP	21/05/25
9.2	MWP asked RB whether the proposed layout for the security scanner has been run past the security scanner company?		



HISTORIC ROYAL PALACES

	Description/Action	Actioned by	Delivery
	<p>RB queried why they would need to see it?</p> <p>MWP advised that previously there was a dashed line on the drawings which showed the clearance required for the scanner. Given the new location of the moveable metal walls – it would be good to check whether this will cause an issue for the scanners.</p> <p>RB will show the plan to the security barrier provider.</p>	RB	03/06/25
9.3	<p>RB flagged that we still need to develop a plan for the spaces between around the barriers (shown as red lines).</p> <p>MWP advised that potentially some from of socket / barrier solution could work – although its complicated by the matwell – but will review.</p> <p>SN queried how far the wall goes back.</p> <p>MWP advised that the wall on the left is fixed so is only looking for a solution for the left side.</p>	MWP	03/06/25
9.4	<p>RB advised that JR & JH had a detailed meeting with the HRP security team to review access control / security requirements and HRP fed back on what our requirements are.</p> <p>JR & JH to produce a marked up drawing showing what is required where.</p> <p>JR queried whether it is worth checking that the requirements haven't changed?</p> <p>RB confirmed that apart from the comments on Stage 4A nothing else has changed to date. Once the marked-up drawings are updated RB will go back to the security team to present the revised plans showing their comments.</p> <p>MWP flagged that the plans should also be presented to the education team to ensure</p>	<p>JR / JH</p> <p>RB</p>	<p>03/06/25</p> <p>ASAP</p>



HISTORIC ROYAL PALACES

	Description/Action	Actioned by	Delivery
	that their requirements are incorporated as well.		
9.5	<p>MWP advised that a technical review needs to be scheduled in at some point – but not until we have confirmation of the AV scheme.</p> <p>RB advised that they have just had a final re-briefing with the education team and now just waiting on their information.</p> <p>At present the solution looks like it will be a three-projector solution – but need to confirm that this will achieve what they require.</p> <p>RB flagged that they are now looking to project on to the piece of joinery in the room and as such the specification has changed slightly to include minimal handles and a plain finish that matches the walls.</p> <p>In addition, they are looking at additional requirements such as printed blinds etc.</p>	To Note	
9.6	<p>RB advised that the donor workshop has been scheduled for the 12th June which coincides with that fortnights Design Team Meeting.</p> <p>MWP will check with the team whether there is anything else that needs to be discussed at that meeting or whether the donor workshop can take the whole meeting.</p> <p>RB flagged that it was originally proposed to be a Reveller Stage 4 presentation. MWP advised that they are not sure that it is still required then.</p>	MWP	03/06/25
9.7	SN advised that they have met with a Access & Maintenance consultant and are just waiting on a quote which they should have by the end of the week.		



HISTORIC ROYAL PALACES

	Description/Action	Actioned by	Delivery
	MWP asked whether they will include their timelines within the quote. SN confirmed that this has been asked for as part of their quote.		
10.0	Any Other Business		
10.1	RB asked MWP whether he wanted a site visit on Thursday with Chris Ditton. MWP advised that he was thinking about using it for a technical review and will get back to NM.		