

## MINUTES OF MEETING

Meeting	Resident Project Monitoring Committee
Date	18 <sup>th</sup> April 2018
Time	6.30pm
Venue	Boardroom

### Present

Name	Company	Initial
Peter Finnegan (Chair)	Independent Chair	PF
Cllr Pat Dunne	Dublin City Council South Central Area	PB
Bruce Philips	Dublin City Council	BP
John MacEilly	Dublin City Council	JMcE
John Pollock (in lieu of M Green)	NPHDB	JP
Rhonda Evans	NPHDB	RE
Donal Murnane (Guest)	NPHDB	DM
Billy Murphy	Community Facilitator	BMu
Daniel Watkins	Resident's Representative	DW
Cllr Tina MacVeigh	Resident's Representative	TMcV
Brenda Meehan	Deputy Resident's Representative	BMe
Garry Keegan	Community Liaison, BAM Building	GK
Howard McDonagh (Guest)	Bam Building	HMcd
Ian Byrne (Guest)	c/o Bam Building (Noise and Vibration Mitigation)	IB
Adrian McCarthy (Guest – Part)	Wildfire Films	AMcC
Elaine O'Rourke (Minutes)	NPHDB	EOR

### Apologies

George Ray	Resident's Representative
Martina Finn	Atkins Global
Jonathan Pickett	Atkins Global
Cllr Criona NíDhálaigh	Dublin City Council South Central Area
Cllr Rebecca Moynihan	Dublin City Council South Central Area
Mick Green	NPHDB

No.	ITEM	DESCRIPTION/ACTION	OWNER
1.0	<b>Apologies</b>	Apologies received as per list above.	
2.0	<b>Proposal by Wildfire Films</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AMcC of Wildfire Films briefed the committee on his proposal for producing a documentary on the construction of the NCH at the SJH site.</li> </ul>	

No.	ITEM	DESCRIPTION/ACTION	OWNER
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was noted that the production could either be 2 x 1-hour programmes or 5 ½ hour programmes</li> <li>• This documentary is an independent production and will be looking at the effects of the project on all involved parties. Wild Fire Films have met with RTE on the project.</li> <li>• AMcC briefed the committee on what he envisages the documentary will contain and what he sees as important factors, including the views of issues and the effects of construction on residents who are living with the construction of the hospital on their doorstep. The Resident Project Monitoring Committee plays an important role in this process.</li> <li>• JP noted that from an NPHDB perspective, they feel that this is a legacy project and this is our one opportunity to get it documented for the future. It should be a “warts and all piece”.</li> <li>• PD noted that when the NCH was being discussed in Council Chamber, it was the first time that film cameras were allowed into the Chamber.</li> <li>• The Community Facilitator and Residents Representatives of the committee noted on behalf of residents that there are concerns about the filming and how residents may be portrayed. AMcC noted this and looked to assure residents that their point of view for the full length of construction was important to the story of the project. The Community Facilitator agreed to take the matter back to residents and meet with AMcC again to discuss the project further.</li> <li>• AMcC then left the meeting.</li> </ul>	<b>Action 72</b>
3.0	<b>Previous Minutes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BMu raised a number of points on the previous minutes. These points were noted and the previous minutes will be updated and reissued.</li> </ul>	
4.0	<b>Matters Arising/ Actions Items</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Docklands Protocols – Action 71</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ The docklands protocols document was further discussed.</li> <li>❖ PF noted that he had reviewed the Docklands protocols. These protocols were established for particular conditions relating to the docklands area as there were many developers operating on different sites at the same time and it was necessary to put these protocols in place to ensure everyone was working to the same standard. He felt that the overall planning permission requirements and the EIS on the NCH project hold the Contractor to higher standards than the docklands protocol.</li> <li>❖ PD noted that he felt that there was nothing in the protocols that should cause issue to BAM and the NCH. JP stated many aspects of docklands protocols were not appropriate (e.g. vibration levels, types of piles, construction access points etc) and asked PD if there</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

No.	ITEM	DESCRIPTION/ACTION	OWNER
		<p>were any particular items in the protocols that he wished to highlight.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ BMu acknowledged that high standards have been implemented on the NCH site, such as all trucks that come out of the site are covered and have been through the wheel wash before exiting site and noted that this could be used as a standard for other sites around the area. Contractors on other sites and using the public roads are not adopting these controls.</li> <li>❖ JP on behalf of the NPH noted that contractually BAM are bound by the grant of planning and the associated EIS.</li> <li>❖ TMcV noted that from listening to the discussion that it may be the case that DCC Area Councillors should be recommending to the DCC executive the adoption of NCH controls as the benchmark for other contractors in the area.</li> <li>❖ The councillors appointed to the PMC agreed to take this on board and review further.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Resident Permit Parking and Traffic Study – Action 28 and 29</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ TMcV addressed the issue which has previously been brought up of the possibility of fastracking resident permit parking applications and noted that this had brought up a number of issues for local residents, especially those living in apartment blocks.</li> <li>❖ Traffic surveys had taken place and a number of residents had concerns with the plebiscite. They felt it was unfair to ask residents to vote when they were unable to see the results of the overall traffic management plan. It was noted that the results of the traffic survey will be made available by DCC next month.</li> <li>❖ DCC will take a step back and look at the overall traffic management plan for the area before going back to residents. The committee will be kept updated on progress.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• TMcV noted there had been a request from a resident in relation to dust reports as they are having dust issues. She queried how are extreme cases managed. GK noted this and requested assistances of TMcV and BM to resolve this resident's issue and also include the Independent Technical Advisor Atkins. It was also noted that the dust, noise and vibration reports are all published on the Resident Alliance website.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Action 73</b></p>
<p><b>5.0</b></p>	<p><b>Update on Linear Park</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BP updated the committee on the consultation that took place in relation to the Linear Park between DCC Park Department DCC Councillors, NPH &amp; SJH.</li> <li>• BP noted that it should be possible to include nearly all the ideas brought up at the meeting into the plan.</li> </ul>	

No.	ITEM	DESCRIPTION/ACTION	OWNER
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The possibility of widening the boundary of the Linear Park was discussed which included extending the catchment eastwards towards the Guinness Store House direction.</li> <li>• The outputs from the meeting will be correlated and DCC hope to have a presentation ready in May/June for consultation with Residents.</li> <li>• It was agreed that the Dolphins Barn and Cork Street Weaver Park model was well developed by DCC and they will apply the same standards for the Linear Park.</li> <li>• A special addition of the Connect Newsletter will be issued to residents to keep them up to date on the process.</li> </ul>	
5.0	<b>Summary of Atkins Report</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was no representative of Atkins at the meeting so BM updated the meeting on the main issues.</li> <li>• Main issues include number of breaches relating directly to the piling, the number of monitors that are down and the report being issued late.</li> <li>• It was noted that there is a perception of something being hidden when issue of the reports is delayed. NPH and BAM looked to assure the committee this is not the case and will undertake to ensure that the reports are issued to Atkins by the end of the first week of the month.</li> <li>• DW noted that on 2 days of the previous week there was a very loud noise coming from a rig on site which caused passers-by and residents some distress for the length of time it was made.</li> <li>• BAM acknowledged this noise and explained the cause. When the new rig was tested on another part of the site it did not cause the noise, but when placed by the SCR, ground conditions in this area were different and caused unexpected issues including the noise and causing damage to the motor of the rig. The rig has now been stood down for the present. BAM are looking at using alternative method to complete this work.</li> <li>• It was agreed that where BAM are aware of unique noisy elements e.g. ground anchor drilling, that the residents most impacted would be notified in advance.</li> <li>• In relation to noise breaches on the monitors, it was noted that ambient traffic is causing some of the breaches. This is happening even when there are no activities on site. There are 4 monitors which contribute to 70% of the breaches.</li> <li>• HMcD introduced IB, a noise and vibration specialist. IB has been brought in to review the consistent breaches of monitors. It was noted that traffic in the area is busier than when the tests were completed for the EIS in 2016. IB has been brought in to re-establish the baseline tolerance to stop the false alerts and distortion of the monitor results.</li> </ul>	

No.	ITEM	DESCRIPTION/ACTION	OWNER
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BP noted that due to the unexpected growth in the economy over the last couple of years there are now more cars on the road.</li> <li>DW noted that the issue of traffic had been brought up in the ABP hearing and DCC had said that they expected traffic growth in the area to stay static within the canal area so to now say there has been an unexpected growth is an issue for DCC and traffic management.</li> <li>DCC acknowledge this and confirm they are working with the NTA and other agencies to review the situation.</li> </ul>	
6.0	<b>Rodent Monitoring Report</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GK noted that BAM had received a clean report from the Rodent Monitoring company for the last month.</li> <li>It was also confirmed that they found no evidence of food being left out in back gardens this month.</li> <li>It was confirmed that rodent monitoring is completed on a site wide basis and reports are available.</li> </ul>	
7.0	<b>AOB</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>O'Reilly Avenue Window Cleaning – BAM acknowledge that this service had not yet taken place on O'Reilly Avenue. There are some issues that BAM are currently working to resolve in relation to the window cleaning and hope to have the service in operation very soon.</li> <li>BM requested that a notice of entitlement for residents is issued to confirm who is entitled to have their windows cleaned and car wash tokens and the Residents Alliance will publish this on their website.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Action 74</b></p> <p><b>Action 75</b></p>
	<b>Next Meeting</b>	The next meeting will take place on Thursday 24 <sup>th</sup> May 2018 at 6.30pm.	

**Distribution**

**Attendees**

**Apologies**

**File**