

Ebury Bridge Community Futures Group – Meeting 6

24th January 2018, 6pm – 8pm

Ebury Youth Club, Edgson House Basement, Ebury Bridge Estate

MEMBERS ATTENDANCE:

- Fiona Quick [FQ]
- Mike Smith [MS]
- Mohammed Eisa [ME]
- Rachel Riley [RR]
- Rhoda Torres [RT]
- Waleed Shaath [WS]
- Tammy Dowdall [TD]
- Stephen Rusbridge [SR]
- Sheila Martin [SM]

APOLOGIES:

- Carly Taplin [CT]

OFFICERS & CONSULTANTS:

- Tom McGregor [TM] – Director of Housing and Regeneration – Interim Chair
- Jodie McCarthy-Mills [JMc] – Senior Regeneration Manager
- Martin Crank [MC] – Ebury Bridge Community Engagement Team
- Gelina Menville [GM] - Ebury Bridge Community Engagement Team
- Sophie Camburn [SC] – Arup Consultancy Director
- Jo McCafferty [JM] – Levitt Bernstein (Architects)
- Richard Hyams [RH]– AStudio (Architects)
- Michela Packer [MP] - Arup Design Engagement Team
- Ian Simpson [IS] – First Call Housing - Independent Resident Advisor

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

Welcome and introductions

MC introduced SM to the group, followed by a welcome from TM. As this was SM first meeting a round of introductions were taken from around the table.

TM informed the group that this would be his last meeting as a permanent chairperson has now been recruited and appointed.

Review meeting notes from 10th January 2018

TM asked the group if they had read the notes from the last meeting. TM allowed some time for the group to read them.

RR asked if CT had stepped down from the group. MC confirmed that this was not the case as the team have not received notification from CT of her stepping down. MC to engage with CT regarding attendance of the CFG. A question was also raised around representation from the businesses. MC confirmed that although there had been a concentrated effort to appoint a member from the retail

units along Ebury Bridge Road to the CFG, that this had proved unsuccessful, despite asking each business being approached individually.

There had been some initial interest from a small number of the businesses but they have now confirmed that they could not commit their time.

A discussion took place about how the spaces on the CFG would be filled, due to a few vacancies that have recently become available, JMc added that the places should be filled by members of the community who are currently under represented. Not necessarily by block, but also by tenure and split between 'railway blocks' and 'previously retained' blocks. It would also be good to have another member who has been temporary rehoused away from the estate. CFG to give some thought to this process.

Following a review of each page by exception, the following amendments were agreed:

Page 1: Agreed as written

Page 2: Add discussion around the timetable and business engagement

Page 3: Use the terminology 'Best Case Scenario' for affordable housing. This based on current assumptions and is not guaranteed

Page 3: Add **Action: Arup to provide the details on comparable schemes**

Page 3: Add **Action: Assumptions to be added to RAID log**

Page 4: Amend 'this money is held by the council' and replace with 'we could possibly apply to the GLA for additional funding'

Page 4: Add **Action: Jodie to provide transaction cost sentence**

This refers to the additional costs that may be attached to investment/funding/loans sought by developers to enable construction projects to be delivered. These could include borrowing fees, interest etc

Page 5: Agreed

Page 6: Agreed

Page 7: Agreed

Update on permanent chairperson appointment

TM confirmed that a chair had been appointed to the group. RR said that Terisa Wickham had been appointed and she felt that she would be a very good Chair and would be a good fit for the group. Terisa grew up locally in Chelsea and has a wealth of experience relevant to Ebury Bridge. RR added that she came across as a people orientated person and had a strong passion for diversity and an understanding that communities require a social mix.

JMc confirmed that she is meeting the newly appointed Chair on Friday to talk through logistics around the role. JMc asked the group how they felt the Chair should be introduced to the group, whether arranging a date before the next meeting etc.

TD suggested that a drop-in at the Community Engagement Centre, would be useful to allow CFG members to drop in and meet with the new chair either individually or as small groups, but that would allow a little more flexibility to help them ensure that they could meet the new chair. This was agreed by the group.

ACTION: JMc to arrange drop-in session to allow the CFG members to introduce themselves to the newly appointed Chair.

Design Concept Workshop

SC opened the presentation and started by asking the residents who went on the tour how they found it.

RT stated that the tour was very useful and was blown away with how good the residents they were.

FQ added that they didn't pull any punches and that was great, as it worked well but there were no leaseholders on the estate and so that experience couldn't be drawn on. FQ hoped that it was the first of many, and that each visit continues to differ.

JMc confirmed that there would be a series of tours moving forward.

Action: Engagement Team to plan another visit in February

JMc introduced the idea that the St. John Hill (SJH) Residents Group have offered to spend some time to mentor the CFG members and wanted to see if the group felt that this would be useful. The group agreed that they liked the idea of this.

ACTION: MC/JMC to follow this up

FQ mentioned that the residents of SJH had said that they would write a newsletter article to share with residents. MC confirmed that this had been agreed with the residents.

TD said that the tour was positive and it was good to see a mix of social and private blocks which gave a better perspective of how this might work. It was a shame that we didn't get to see inside any of the flats. JMc confirmed that this something that can be addressed in a future visit.

FQ commented that it was good to understand how they use their Residents Association (RA) as a way of feeding into their Futures Group, and that this has been a successful way of working.

RR added that it sounds like this is how it should be able to work here on the estate.

TD asked when the next trip might be? SC confirmed that this will be arranged over the next few months.

SC proceeded with the slides of the presentation, informing the group that this is work is following on from the work that the group were shown at the last meeting. This session will look at the detail behind scenarios 4, 5 and 7.

FQ asked why we are looking at 4, 5, and 7, and why are we looking at the consented scheme again if this didn't work last time.

SC confirmed these are the three scenarios that are currently being investigated further. SC added that the scenario 1, full refurbishment has been developed already and no further design development was required.

At the last CFG meeting, scenario 5 and 7 seemed (based on the work so far) to provide the most balance solutions. The design team would however investigate further scenarios 4, 5 and 7.

The purpose of this evening's meeting was to look at the design principles that will be applied to the scenarios

RH went through a slide which showed the estate as it currently is, to explain the limitations: railway track to south, difference in ground level at Ebury Bridge to the east, the main road to the north, and the new waterside development west. The limitation was also explained using the foam model of the estate.

After explaining the limitations of the site, RH went on to share with the group the design tools that help to maximise the space to produce good quality homes, and open spaces. This included:

- Approaches to sunlight/daylight to maximise the light penetration in rooms that residents usually spend the most time using
- Spacing between buildings and orientation of blocks are articulated to maximise the opportunity for open spaces
- Efficiency in designing new homes to make sure that the space standards are met whilst maximising the footprint of the building to get better value.

RH explained that an efficiently designed building will use 80% of its overall footprint, and will provide dual aspect to negate the effect of having to build north facing. It is also worth noting that the costs of buildings increase when the wall to floor ratio increases.

RH show each of the three scenarios being discussed as 3D form models, which followed on from the financial information that was shared at the last meeting.

Scenario 4 – keeping the four northern blocks. This scenario provides a concept which is quite high and would need to provide a range of heights from 24 storeys at the south of the estate stepping down to 7 storeys. This height would be needed to achieve the required number of new homes to breakeven.

SR: How did you decide the heights of the blocks?

RH explained in this scenario we looked at the areas of the site where logically more height could be placed, taking in to consideration for example the relationship with the building next to them, based on design logic to ensure that overshadowing is minimised. Blocks casting a shadow over the railway line would be seen as ideal.

Scenario 5 – keeping Doneraile House. This scenario provides a concept based which is still has tall high-density blocks, because more new homes would need to be provided to offset the cost of retaining Doneraile.

SR: Are all the models showing the number of properties need to reach the breakeven point?

SC confirmed all the models are showing the breakeven point but do not re-provide the same number of homes in each scenario, so each concept has a different output.

FQ: Is breakeven the same as viable?

SC responded yes, that they are viable schemes from a site capacity and financial perspective.

TM explained further that they are viable scenarios that the council could take forward.

Scenario 7 – providing all new homes. This scenario provides a concept based on 24 and 14 storeys to the south, 9 storeys within the middle and 7 storeys to the north (Ebury Bridge Road).

RH explained that it was important to point out the heights of any new buildings will be directly impacted on the space available to build them.

RH stated that the feedback from residents provided at the engagement events so far, informs us that keeping green open space is a key challenge. To address this, we have looked at how we can position the blocks to reduce overshadowing from the buildings, allowing wider spaces between blocks and allowing for a mix of vehicular and pedestrian routes.

RR: Where is the car parking?

RH explained that the concepts allowed for flexibility as to the amount of car parking provided, but would depend on the planning departments requirements for the number of parking spaces. Car parking could either be provided at ground or basement level, depending on the numbers that will be required.

SM: Isn't the car parking just an income stream for the council?

SC explained that this was not the case and this is something required by planning, as they will want to know what impact any new development might have on the existing streets and parking availability in the area.

SM: The car parking is only for the 'haves' and not for the 'have nots', as those living in social housing won't be able to afford to pay for a parking space.

RH reiterated that this is something that will be driven by planning. Although the London Plan suggests that in Central London new schemes should only provide parking for disabled residents, this is not currently reflected in the Council's Planning Policy. However, if a larger number of parking spaces are required it is important that they are out of sight at street level, to ensure the estate doesn't become cluttered with cars. The cost of providing these parking spaces is also a challenge.

SM: Will there be car parking available for social tenants?

JC explained that whilst planning will set the number of spaces, they do not determine the allocation of the spaces.

JMc suggested that should the chosen scenario include parking provision, at the appropriate time the CFG could perhaps work with the Council to look at the allocation, use and management of parking spaces on the estate.

RH continued with the presentation. He explained that passive supervision over open spaces is important as well as daylight and sunlight being a key attribute. In design terms, 2 – 6 hours of daylight is required.

JC about the presented the landscape design, showing how a range of 'external rooms' could be created in between the blocks, each with a different theme. The intention was to cater for all parts of the community within these spaces, with softer edges along the railway and perhaps working with the community to look at how this might be achieved.

FQ: What about bike stores?

JC explained that integrating bike storage within the building and keeping them out of the landscape often provides a better environment for the community.

RH ended the presentation by showing the group some illustrations of each of the concepts discussed in detail at this meeting.

CFG future meeting dates

MC confirmed that the next CFG meeting date would be Wednesday 21st February.

AOB

1. Project Timetable:

TM explained that at the request of the CFG, the current project timetable for Ebury has been reviewed. JMc would discuss the revised programme with the CFG at the next meeting.

JMc explained to the group that although progress had started to be made, it was important that all residents were being engaged and understood the process that the community are undertaking with the Council. JMc said that it was important that we continue to knock on doors within the estate and take the conversation to all households. The next milestone was due to be in March when a report was to be presented to WCC Cabinet.

TM reiterated that regeneration is a fluid process and that the Council are continuously listening to what residents are saying, this was demonstrated with the initial listening period, which was extended in response to what the community was saying.

FQ: Is this an actual extension or will the programme just be condensed to make up for the additional time, effectively robbing Peter to pay Paul.

JMC stated that it was important to ensure that all residents understand the regeneration process and know how they can engage with the team to ensure that their feedback is also captured.

RR: Does that mean that the cabinet report in March will not happen?

JMc confirmed to the group that the residents need to be ready, before moving on to the next milestone, and so yes, a report will not go to WCC Cabinet in March.

TM added that it was likely to take a month or so to develop a report for cabinet, so it is likely that this report will go to cabinet sometime in June or July.

RR: When will the consultation around the leasehold policy be reported on.

MC confirmed that the policy team are collating the feedback now and are working on the report that aims to be released shortly. JMc will confirm the intended release date at the next CFG meeting.

JMc explained that the information from the leaseholder policy would inform the regeneration at Ebury so it would be good to have this before making any recommendations.

SM: What does this mean for when any work could start.

JMc confirmed that pushing the next milestone back will have a knock-on effect on the future milestones. The programme is currently under review and we will provide the CFG with feedback at the next meeting.

ACTION: JMc to revisit timeline based on different scenarios to allow the CFG to have a better understanding of timescales.

2. Unit 15 – 19 Ebury Bridge Road

MC apologies for the disruption caused by the workman undertaking work outside the agreed hours. RR informed the group that she had been disturbed by the works to the unit, and at 730pm (having had work on the unit start at 8am) had to go downstairs whilst she was ill to ask them to stop work. RR was told that they had permission to work late and that the residents should have been notified. This was not the case.

MC handed out some design ideas for the signage and window coverings for the front of the unit. He asked the group to provide feedback on what the unit should be called. 'Regeneration Base' was agreed by the group.

TM stated that it would be good to have a community space like they had at St. John's Hill, providing a space that was more accessible to all parts of the community.

3. Residents Association

JMc raised the issue of the residents' association and informed the group that currently there is no recognised group on the estate. She added that CWH were more than happy to provide support to ensure that a properly constituted group could be formed. JMc confirmed that she would be very keen to see a group that represented the needs and views of all households on the estate come together, and that from talking to residents a handful of residents, no such group (official or unofficial) existed at present.

SM stated that she felt let down by CWH as she had been trying for 18 months to get a group of the group and was grateful to RR for taking this over in October to take this forward. JMc said that we can continue this conversation outside of the meeting.

TM asked each member in turn if they had any other business to add.

4. Water issue on the estate

SM aired her frustrations about the ongoing water issue on the estate and that this problem has been happening intermittently for the past 2 years. JMc confirmed that this was Thames Water issue and the CWH been trying to resolve this with them. This will be picked up by City West Homes as this matter sat outside the remit of the CFG.

Meeting closed at 20:06.