

**Ebury Bridge Community Futures Group – Meeting 17**  
12<sup>th</sup> September 2018, 6.00pm – 8.00pm  
Regeneration Base, 15 – 19 Ebury Bridge Road, Ebury Bridge Estate

---

**Members Attendance:**

- Mohammed Eisa [ME]
- Fiona Quick [FQ]
- Charlotte Pragnell [CP]
- Mike Smith [MS]
- Laura Buttigieg [LBu]
- Stephen Rusbridge [SR]

**Apologies:**

- Tammy Dowdall [TD]
- Yolande Gaston [YG]
- Rachel Riley [RR]
- Sheila Martin [SM]

**WCC Officers and Consultants:**

- Tom McGregor [TM] - Interim Chairperson
- David Thompson [DT] – Senior Regeneration Project Manager
- Martin Crank [MC] – Communications and Engagement Manager
- Gelina Menville [GM] – Ebury Bridge Community Engagement Team
- Louis Blair [LBI] – First Call Housing (Independent Resident Advisor)
- Abdel Belabbes [AB] – Ebury Bridge Community Engagement Team

Notes: *This record provides a summary of the discussions which took place during the meeting including questions and respective responses decision and actions that were raised during the session.*

**1. Welcome and Introductions from chair**

TM opened the meeting by welcoming all attendees and introduced himself as the new interim chairperson, informing attendees that Teresa Wickham [TW] has stepped down from the CFG as independent chair for personal commitments. TM stated that nevertheless, TW is very proud of the work the CFG has undertaken so far and wishes the success of the group continues.

FQ questioned how long TM will act as chair for the CFG? TM responded the timeframe given is up to a year given the importance of upcoming decisions (i.e. finalising a delivery route and securing a delivery partner).

**2. Notes of last meeting – 23<sup>rd</sup> July 2018**

The notes of the previous meeting were reviewed page by page and matters discussed. No amendments were requested, and the notes were approved by the group.

**Matters arising:**

*P.g 3* – FQ requested that the questions that arose during the cabinet’s scrutiny of Scenario 7 be disclosed and discussed.

DT summarised the questions & themes of the scrutiny discussion which included: the decision not to hold a ballot, the degree of consultation with neighbouring communities, and the affect the renewal would have on those in temporary accommodation.

MC also elaborated that GLA funding was also discussed, particularly in relation to the ratio of affordable housing stated in the cabinet paper.

LBI enquired for more information regarding the local lettings' policy as well as the decant policy. MC stated that the policy will require consultation from residents on the estate and gave Tollgate Estate as an example for this process.

MC stated that any local lettings plan, would be formed once a delivery partner is secured and a phasing plan agreed.

Both the Local lettings' plan & decant policies will continue to be discussed at future meetings with the CFG.

### **3. Action List Review**

Each item was reviewed in turn and updated on the Action Point List.

GM confirmed that *Item 6b* - gate locks changed, and keys being issued to only the four residents that have access to parking, had been completed. Noting that there has been a notable decrease in cars parking on the estate.

FQ asked what is required for people to gain access to parking space on the estate. GM clarified that only those holding a disabled badge and presenting the required paperwork to the estate office in Lupas Street, are allowed access.

SR put forward that the new locks had meant that the bins had not been collected for three weeks. GM confirmed that keys has now been passed to the refuse collection team.

FQ requested an update in *Item 4* – the production of the “Meet the Team” leaflet and whether it is on track to be circulated. MC assured that it will be produced once all changes to the team had been confirmed.

*Item 7* was discussed by LBI, asking for an update on when the meeting for leaseholders is due to take place. MC informed attendees that they will take place in October.

LB enquired about *Item 14* – asking when the decant policy will be brought forward. GM confirmed that it is being looked at by the WCC Policy Team and will be consulted on in the same way as the leasehold policy.

TM stressed the importance of pushing forward all policies.

### **4. Project Update: How we take forward the renewal (potential delivery routes)**

DT gave an update on the statues of the renewal project – stating the CFG's importance in securing a development partner.

DT presented a document that outlined the four options for securing a delivery partner and route for delivery for the regeneration. DT stated that market testing suggested that Ebury Bridge is attractive to developers before summarising the four options.

TM stated that the model presented in Option 3 affords the council full control with MC elaborating that one of the benefits is that the council will never lose its assets.

DT addressed the CFG's involvement with securing a delivery partner; stating that the brief that will be presented to potential partners, will be done through consultation of the CFG and the selection of the delivery route will be done only with the CFG's consent.

FQ put forward a request to have a brief that summarises the advantages and disadvantages of each options, with the purpose of helping to chart the residents' journey throughout the delivery. She stated that this should be from the perspectives of the all residents, including leaseholders and retailers.

CP echoed this statement, elaborating that it should be considered how these options will affect residents.

FQ stressed the importance of the community charter when selecting a delivery partner.

LBI suggested Lambeth's regeneration project could be looked at as an example, having taken option 3 as route for delivery – funding the renewal through a Wholly Owned Housing Company. He elaborated that they outsourced expertise to oversee the renewal.

DT discussed the phasing of decanting process should be looked at soon, stating that housing needs survey for secure tenants has started on the estate.

DT shared a document with the CFG breaking down the current occupancy of the blocks on the estate; it was explained that the railways blocks are nearly completely decanted, with the few residents remaining being made up of tenants, leaseholders and temporary accommodation. This was followed by a discussion of the phasing of the renewal, with the least occupied blocks could be those earmarked for demolition first.

The importance of this was stressed when securing a delivery partner, as a phasing plan could help de-risk the project. Furthermore, it was explained that demolition might not begin until 2021. DT concluded by stating that needs assessments for secure tenants will continue until November, after which an idea of the first phases of regeneration will be formed.

TM stressed the importance of the sequence of phasing.

DT commented that phasing will be one of the areas that the CFG will be consulted on and we will be presenting a document outlining the key dates for consultation with the CFG.

TM asked whether there was a timeline available for the benefit of the CFG. DT responded by saying that there was not at the moment, but one will be produced.

**ACTION:** DT to produce and distribute a timeline of development process and activity for Ebury Bridge.

FQ asked whether the meanwhile use plans fits into the phasing timeline. DT responded by stating that while meanwhile use will feed into this, phasing is part of a larger scale plan for the entire estate.

LBI brought forward that the document presents a long gap between November 2018 & March 2020. DT responded by stating that a developing a procurement brief is a long process that requires the utmost care.

#### **5. Draft Leasehold leaflet**

The draft of the Leaseholder Policy leaflet was shared, reviewed and discussed.

MC stated that the leaseholder policy renewal was imminent with GM elaborating that once the policy goes live to the public, the leaflet will be circulated to leaseholders.

FQ suggested that the leaflet might be over-complicated and preferred that the leaflet tracked the leaseholder's journey through the renewal process.

TM enquired whether leaseholders would be able to discuss their options once the leaflet has been circulated.

MC informed attendees that the main reason for the changes in the policy to favour flexibility.

TM questioned what the cause of urgency was surrounding the circulation of the leaseholder policy. MC responded by stressing the importance of keeping leaseholders informed of their options.

CP stressed the importance of the quality of the policy over the urgency of its circulation; stating that the full policy requires more scrutiny than the summary contained in the leaflet.

#### **6. Meanwhile Use**

Attendees were updated on the consultation for meanwhile uses of Edgson House space following its demolition which is anticipated in spring 2019.

MC stated that the meanwhile use of Edgson House presents an exciting opportunity. He informed members of the Summer Programme organised by the Community Engagement Team (CET) for the estate, which included a pop-up cinema and the End of Summer Party.

MC informed that attendance for the events were high and evidenced a better usage of space on the estate and that all surrounding blocks were leafleted to document feedback on meanwhile use.

GM informed that while not much formal consultation responses had been received as of yet, informal discussions were had during the Summer Programme and that there will be discussions with local community agencies and potential partners.

DT stated that the planning application for meanwhile is due within the next 10 days and that it will include wording used in the leaflet to describe the intentions for the meanwhile use.

CP asked when the demolition of Edgson House is expected to begin. DT responded by stating that it is likely to be by the end of January of 2019 and that it should take 4-6 months.

CP enquired about the removal of the debris during the demolition; whether it will be used as part of the foundation for whatever structure will be built in its place. DT responded that this is yet to be determined.

## **7. Recruitment & Membership**

A discussion on the future of the CFG and possible candidates to expand its membership was had.

GM presented a document detailing the required statistics, based on the terms of reference. This included looking at the tenure types for the group in order to represent the demographics of the estate.

GM explained further; there are currently 12 CFG spaces with two vacancies. To meet the required mix, we would need two more tenants as shown by the proportions outlined on the document. There are currently three residents in the reserve candidates of which two could be considered.

FQ posed an enquiry into the vetting process of the candidates. DT clarified that should none of the reserves be suitable/available to join the group, the roles would be open to all residents on the estate. TM questioned whether the positions are open to decanted tenants currently living off the estate, to which DT confirmed.

LBI posed a concern regarding having more leaseholders on the CFG than tenants. DT suggested a subgroup to educate any new members on the practices and roles of the CFG would help bring new members up to speed.

CP questioned how up to date the statistics presented on the document were considering the number of tenants that have moved off of the estate. GM confirmed that the statistics were based on the original make-up of the estate. This is the fairest/most consistent way to do it, considering the ever-changing number of residents and tenures across the estate.

**ACTION:** DT/TM to invite potential candidates from the CFG reserve list, to be interviewed for membership.

## **8. A.O.B**

*This item was discussed earlier in the meeting as MS had to have the meeting. MS raised several points which are recorded here:*

TM gave MS the floor to raise his concerns which he had asked to raise before the meeting started.

MS stated residents have concerns after rumours circulated that all new flat would have open plan kitchens. GM assured that these were only rumours. It is untrue as no detailed design plans have been developed yet.

DT stated that the delivery partner procurement brief will include the size of the flats to be built – the standard of space is yet to be decided. CP – the previous renewal scenario had showcased open plan kitchens and the issue had always been contentious among residents.

SR speculated that the rumour might have started after residents were presented with show flats that had open floor kitchens during the previous scheme. This led into the discussion of the pictures used during the consultation period. MC assured that any images used during the consultation were illustrative purposes only and to provide visual aide rather than examples of concept.

MS questioned the likelihood of empty flats or retail spaces being open to community use. This led to a discussion of phasing – MS asked if it was down to delivery partner to decide phasing. DT assured the group that where feasible, the council would hope to get to a position that allows for a single move so those in later phases, with possible inter-estate moves for those in a first phase. This is the ideal we would like to work towards, though it cannot be guaranteed at this stage.

MS put forward concerns that, despite this, once works start the developers/contractors will decide that they need more space. DT assured that once a delivery partner is selected, all stipulations required for the development will be put on paper.

TM summarised by re-iterating the four options for development procurement and stating that once a decision has been made a contract will be written up to protect the scheme's goals – this includes the objectives for both the Council and the community.

DT stated that there is a possibility that empty flats could be used for an inter-estate moves, but that the detail of this would require more planning.

TM discussed the importance of reassuring untrue rumours.

**ACTION:** Add standing item for rumour discussion to each CFG meeting.

FQ put forward a rumour that all tenants must move within the next two months. GM confirmed that the housing need assessment has a target date of the end of October to make sure that all residents can be registered at the same time. Once registered, secure tenants can choose to move now or wait.

GM confirmed that a workshop with all members of the community engagement team and the rehousing team was being held to ensure a consistent message was given to residents irrespective of who they spoke with about the project.

TM invited all members to bring any rumours to meetings in future to dispel any misinformation. FQ stated that the current communications leave room to be improved and provide more reassurance for residents' concerns.

TM stressed how seriously communications should be taken.

FQ suggested that the CFG could help develop an overall communications strategy and whether this is being considered. DT assured that it is, particularly during the next two years of renewal. MC assured that improvements to communications are being made, including an updated website with new information.

LBu shared a concern regarding the increased dispersal of retailers from the high street, stating that she has spoken to other retailers and there has been no contact from the Council. GM assured the group that Phil Owen [PO] has one to one meetings booked in with retailers on the 20<sup>th</sup> and 27<sup>th</sup> of September. GM reiterated that the movement of retailers has been purely coincidental and at their own personal choosing. Although shops are emptied there is currently only one retailer who has fully determined their lease, although there are other in the process of doing so. Until the empty units come back into the Council's ownership, new occupants cannot be found.

TM stressed the importance of consultation with retailers. DT responded by agreeing and adding that access to PO would be more available.

**9. Date of Next Meeting:**

2<sup>nd</sup> October 2019, **6:30pm** start