Great Arthur House Residents' Liaison Group (RLG) Meeting minutes

Date: Wednesday 11 February, 6.00-7.30pm

Venue: Sir Ralph Perring Centre

Attendees:

David Wong	CoL Project Manager
Bunmi Ali	CoL Project Manager (Online)
Nick Condon	Consultant Project Manager
Charlie Lovett	Concilio
Dan Bewley	Concilio (Chair)
Alison MacDonald	Tenant
Jacqueline Webster	Cripplesgate Ward Member
Graham Kern	Tenant
Sue Pearson	GLERA Chair
Ceri Wilkins	Cripplesgate Ward Member

Apologies:

Greg Wade	CoL Head of Major Works Department
John Rosbottom	Leaseholder

This is the second official meeting of the Great Arthur House Residents' Liaison Group.

Agenda:

1. Welcome & housekeeping

Welcome and introductions were made. DB confirmed that the purpose of the RLG remains to provide structured updates on the Major Works programme and to enable residents to raise concerns at an early stage.

DB explained that a slight amendment had been made to the running order, introducing a clearer separation between updates and questions to allow technical information to be presented in full before discussion.

He confirmed that the meeting was being recorded solely for the purpose of producing accurate minutes.

DB reiterated that RLG members act as representatives of the wider block and that attendance and discussion would be transparently reflected in the minutes.

2. Actions from the previous meeting

DB introduced this as a standing agenda item to ensure accountability.

Attendance and participation

Concilio confirmed that flyers had been distributed to all residents in Great Arthur House. One resident had responded expressing interest, but was unable to attend.

Door knocking is planned ahead of the next meeting. Residents advised that visits should be staggered across different times of day and potentially repeated due to shift work, vulnerability, carers and accessibility challenges within the block.

Q: What is the target number of resident representatives?

DB confirmed the aim is six regular resident members — three tenants and three leaseholders.

Action: Concilio to undertake phased door knocking before the next RLG meeting.

Organisation chart

An updated project team chart has been prepared. Residents commented that the previous version lacked sufficient substance and clarity and emphasised the importance of presenting a meaningful and credible overview of who is responsible for what within the project structure.

DB confirmed that while individual email addresses will not be published, the project email inbox operates as a managed postbox and queries will be directed to the appropriate technical lead internally.

Q (AM): How can residents without internet access submit queries?

DB acknowledged this as an important issue and confirmed it would be reviewed. The use of the ground floor post box and coffee mornings was discussed.

Action: Concilio to review alternative mechanisms for residents without IT access to submit queries. The proposed coffee drop-ins were considered to be a positive option in engaging with residents.

Programme of RLG meetings

The following dates were confirmed:

- 22 April
- 10 June
- 8 July
- 9 September
- 11 November

Lift floor numbering

Residents raised longstanding confusion regarding floor numbering following historic lift upgrades. It was explained that the original lifts served different floor groupings and numbering was not amended after replacement.

Residents suggested improved internal lift signage clearly identifying which flats correspond to each floor. This is noted, but not within the scope of the Major Works team.

Tour of Great Arthur House

A tour of the building, including four void flats has been undertaken by Concilio, including DB and NC. Access to the roof was not available at the time of the visit, but will be revisited before the next RLG meeting.

3. Programme update and scope of works

Roof project

DW confirmed that measured surveys are currently being tendered, with site visits scheduled. The project is at Stage 3 design development.

Consultation on the roofing works is anticipated mid-2026. Construction is currently forecast January–November 2028, sequenced to coordinate with the wider Major Works programme.

Q (GK): Has recent roof work already taken place?

DW confirmed that some maintenance works may have been undertaken previously, but clarified that the current project relates to a comprehensive roofing programme.

Residents raised concerns regarding:

- Ongoing water ingress on east and west elevations
- Overflow incidents from rooftop pools
- Immediate mitigation measures

Q (SP): Has the Building Safety Case been completed for Great Arthur House?

NC confirmed that a Building Safety Case has been prepared as part of the Higher-Risk Building process.

SP requested that documentation be published online.

NC explained that the HRB Gateway 2 application cannot be submitted until after the contractor appointment and planning approval. The regulator's approval process is currently taking approximately 9–12 months. The team will look into and respond on the ability to publish this document.

Fire strategy and structural investigations

NC provided a detailed update on survey work undertaken to date.

A Fire Risk Appraisal of External Walls (FRAEW) is underway. Structural slab investigations have been undertaken by Sandberg using ground-penetrating radar and intrusive inspection to assess reinforcement positioning, cover depth and fire resistance performance.

Early findings indicate that slab-to-slab fire protection is insufficient to meet current standards. Current building regulations require 120 minutes fire resistance floor-to-floor and 60 minutes flat-to-flat.

Compartmentation between stair lobbies and flats has been identified as a significant issue, with walls currently offering minimal fire resistance. Upgrading will be required.
A revised smoke extraction strategy is being developed. The original system discharged smoke into staircases via dropped glass panels; the proposed approach will extract smoke away from escape routes.

NC confirmed that sprinkler systems will be required under the HRB regime.

Q: Will sprinkler installations resemble previous installations?

NC confirmed that concealed sprinkler heads similar to those installed in modern commercial environments would be used and would not resemble prior exposed pipework.

Gas and services

NC confirmed that a specialist gas engineer has undertaken inspections across three floors, opening riser ducts and assessing installations. A formal report with recommendations is expected within 7–10 days.

Significant redundant services were identified within risers.

A comprehensive live/dead services survey is being procured.

Options under consideration include retaining and upgrading gas infrastructure or transitioning to an all-electric system.

Q: Are current gas outages part of the Major Works programme?

NC confirmed that current outages fall under Repairs & Maintenance, though the long-term strategy will be determined as part of Major Works.

Electrical and vertical risers

NC confirmed that the electrical infrastructure is outdated and full rewiring is likely required.

A secondary electrical system would be installed prior to switchover to avoid prolonged outages.

Additional vertical risers will be required for:
- Electrical containment
- Communications cabling
- Sprinkler rising main
- Potential dry/wet riser

Existing risers are insufficient. Repurposing stacked store rooms as vertical service risers is under review, subject to approvals.

Windows

The design team is reviewing refurbishment versus full replacement options.

Residents raised concerns about previous window installation experiences and stressed the need to rebuild trust and ensure clear communication prior to any future works.

Programme

NC confirmed the updated indicative programme:

- Planning submission: January 2027
- Tender: May 2027
- Contract award: November 2027
- HRB Gateway 2 submission: post-contract
- Start on site: November 2028

Construction is anticipated to take approximately three to three and a half years.

4. Expected disruption and decant strategy

NC outlined the proposed decant approach.

Approximately six flats would be decanted at a time, though sequencing remains under review. Between 12 and 14 void flats would be refurbished as temporary accommodation. The estimated decant period is 4–6 weeks per flat.

Each household will receive a detailed pre-commencement survey covering:

• Scope and timing of works
• Access arrangements
• Individual needs

Possessions will be managed across three categories:

1. Items moved to temporary accommodation
2. Items placed in secure insured storage containers
3. Items remaining in the flat, relocated and sealed for protection

Residents will retain escorted access to their flats and storage where necessary.

The City will appoint a Resident Liaison Officer and Decant Officer. The contractor will appoint two additional RLOs.

Q (SP): Are works to shared/internal walls being considered if the external wall is not being done?

NC confirmed the design is still at an early stage, surveys are ongoing and the full scope has not yet been agreed. Fire-rating between flats and corridors will be required, as none currently exists.

Q (GK): Does the proposed decant period cover the full scope of works?

NC advised a provisional 4–6 week period has been assumed, primarily based on window works and known elements. Electrical upgrades and fire-rating works may affect this and are still being defined. The intention is to complete all works in each flat during the decant period.

Q (GK): What are the outstanding technical decisions?

NC confirmed key questions remain around gas versus all-electric solutions (pending the Gas Report), installation of extract fans, and required window works.

Q (AM): How will residents with additional needs (e.g. personal alarms) be supported?

NC confirmed the team is aware of these needs and will work closely with residents to ensure appropriate support. Individual surveys will be undertaken to understand specific requirements. JW confirmed that a Resident Liaison Steering Group will bring together Adult Social Care, Children's Services and Housing teams to ensure a joined-up approach.

Q (SP): How will six flats be sequenced on floors with four per core, and would it not make more sense to do eight at a time?

NC confirmed sequencing is still under review. The preference is to work floor by floor, but this will be refined once the scope is finalised. All practical considerations, including noise impacts, will be taken into account.

Q (SP): Could vertical sequencing reduce disruption?

NC confirmed alternative sequencing approaches will be considered to minimise disturbance.

Q (AM): How will confidence be rebuilt following previous window installation issues?

NC confirmed the team is aware of past concerns and recognises the importance of rebuilding trust.

Q (GK): How will engagement be handled to address scepticism among residents?

DB confirmed consultation materials will provide detailed information for those who want it, while remaining accessible and transparent. The aim is to clearly set out who is responsible, what works are happening, when and how.

Q (GK): Could video updates help communicate proposals?

DB confirmed the team will consider the most effective communication medium to ensure clarity and accessibility.

Q (SP): When will technical proposals be available for review?

David confirmed initial planning determination is anticipated in the latter half of this year.

Q (SP): Could alternative tiling solutions (e.g. aluminium-style strips) be explored?

It was noted that while this may provide durability benefits, planning officers have previously raised concerns regarding such materials.

Q (GK): What if leaseholders object to the cost of works?

It was noted that fire safety works are mandatory. DB confirmed clarification will be sought from The City of London Corporation on cost recovery arrangements.

5. Questions

Q (CW): How will major works be clearly separated from routine repairs and maintenance, particularly regarding issues such as the roof?

NC confirmed that major works are separate from day-to-day maintenance. However, he agreed there needs to be clearer communication setting out who is responsible for maintenance works, what repairs are planned, and how these sit alongside the 2028 major works programme.

Q (CW): How will communication be improved for vulnerable residents and those without easy access to information?

It was agreed that further communication is needed to reiterate what is happening in advance of the 2028 major works, including what repairs are being prioritised and delivered in the interim.

Q (CW): How will maintenance queries be handled at coffee mornings?

DB noted that maintenance questions are likely to arise and that coffee mornings may provide a useful forum to make the distinction between Major Works and repairs.

Q (SP): Should event timings vary to maximise attendance?

It was suggested that holding sessions at different times each month may help reach a broader range of residents.

Q (AM): How can engagement reflect different working patterns?

It was noted that residents have varied schedules and this will be considered when planning engagement activity.

Q (AM): How will urgent repair issues be addressed ahead of the major works programme?

It was noted that urgent issues (e.g. water ingress) cannot wait until 2027/28 and must continue to be addressed through standard maintenance processes.

6. AOB

None

7. Date of next RLG meeting

- Wednesday 22nd April
- Wednesday 10th June
- Wednesday 8th July
- Wednesday 9th September
- Wednesday 11th November

Ends