

## HAM CLOSE REDEVELOPMENT STAKEHOLDER REFERENCE GROUP

Record of meeting held on Wednesday 21 March 2018 at Grey Court School.

### 1. WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS AND NOTES OF THE LAST MEETING

AT welcomed the group to Grey Court School and opened the meeting, thanking everyone for coming along for an earlier start time.

#### PRESENT

Maggie Bailey (Chair)	Headteacher, Grey Court School
Adam Tucker	Project Director, RHP
Sarah Filby	Programme Manager, LBRUT
Ellen Taplin (Secretary)	Project Support Officer, LBRUT
Elizabeth Blishen	Ham Close Resident
Mandy Jenkins	Ham Close Resident
Jill Lamb	Ham United Group
Cllr Loveland	Ward Councillor
Danny McBride	Ham Close Resident
Briony Rowland	Ham Close Resident
Anthony Russell	Ham Close Resident
Lorraine Russell	Ham Close Resident
Stan Shaw	Ham Parade Traders
Brian Willman	Ham and Petersham Neighbourhood Forum

#### APOLOGIES

Tracey Elliott	Development Project Manager, RHP
Mandy Skinner	Assistant Chief Executive, Customers and Partnerships, LBRUT
Cllr Frost	Ward Councillor
Cllr Tippett	Ward Councillor
Geoff Bond	Ham and Petersham Association
Petra Braun	Ashburnham Road / Ham Street Traders
Philippe D'Imperio	Ham Close Resident
Djenko Djenkov	Ham Close Resident
Amelia Forbes	Ham Close Resident
David Lamb	Friends of Ham Library
Justine Langford	Ham and Petersham Neighbourhood Forum
Marco Mapeli	Ham Close Resident
Andres Muniz-Piniella	Ham Close Resident Association Chair (and Richmond MakerLabs)
Tom Philips	Ham Close Resident
Chris Sanders	Ham Close Resident
Julia Van Den Bosch	Friends of Ham Village Green
David Williams	Ham Amenities Group

The notes from the last meeting were reviewed by the group. The following points were discussed:

- SF confirmed that ET had been in touch with colleagues at the Council regarding the CCTV on the green and by the newsagents. They have confirmed that these cameras are working.
- ET explained that a member of the group had been in touch regarding the wording of paragraph 2 on page 5 as they felt this was not clear. Proposed new wording has been included in the version of the minutes shared with the group. The group agreed to this change.

The notes from the last meeting were agreed by the group. AT handed over to MB to chair the rest of the meeting.

## **2. REDEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME UPDATE**

### **a) Programme update**

AT provided the group with a brief project update:

- Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF) application – RHP and the Council applied for £9.96 million of funding for the scheme, however they were unsuccessful. AT added that the scheme has already been successful in obtaining £12.8 million of GLA funding. The scheme is still viable without the HIF money, but the extra funding would have improved the position of the scheme. AT is committed to applying to this fund again (as well as others) so that the scheme has greater flexibility to improve the specification. AT noted that he felt that it was unlikely that further public subsidy would be received prior to a planning approval being granted.
- Heads of Terms – on the 22<sup>nd</sup> February the Council's Cabinet approved a paper on how the relationship and the land arrangements between RHP and the Council will work. This paper went to Scrutiny beforehand and was not called-in afterwards. The timetable for signing this is the end of April 2018.
- Procurement – RHP are currently out to the market (for a Joint Venture developer partner) with initial interviews being held in early April. AT confirmed that there would be involvement from residents at a later stage. A member of the group asked that assurances are made that the developers are transparent and deliver what is required in the contract.

Members of the group asked questions following the update:

- One member of the group asked if further funding into the project would make it easier to bring the number of units in the scheme down. AT explained that in theory the answer would be yes. However, this is finely balanced and market sale housing is still needed to cross-subsidise the social. AT will investigate all funding options possible to futureproof the scheme, but highlighted that he would prioritise improving quality over reducing numbers, due to the housing crisis faced across the country.

- Another member of the group asked how RHP could ensure the developer will deliver in a post-Carillion world. AT responded to say that RHP would take a rigorous and forensic approach.
- Another question was asked about when the architect would be appointed. AT confirmed that this would happen once the developer was appointed.

**b) St. Richard's school playing field consultation**

ET confirmed that the St. Richard's school playing field consultation report has been published on the Ham Close website [here](#). A link to the consultation was included in the email sent out to the group with the agenda for this meeting.

**c) Timing of Tenant Event**

AT explained that the Council have entered pre-election period (purdah), resulting in challenges to organising the Tenant Event. This is because RHP would like the Council to be involved to ensure that the event is successful. The event will now take place following the election.

**ACTIONS**

- 2.1 AT to identify a date for the Tenant Event.
- 2.2. AT to invite the final three bidders to deliver a presentation at a future Stakeholder Reference Group meeting.
- 2.3. MB asked that AT develop a simple A4 sheet to explain what RHP's commitment is to social housing now and what it will look like in the future.

**3. ENGAGEMENT ON THE RE-PROVISION OF COMMUNITY FACILITIES**

ET provided an overview of the engagement that had taken place at the recent drop-in events, including detail on the dates, times and number of attendees as well as how they were promoted.

ET invited the group to add to the list of assets and groups. ET to share the list following the meeting.

In addition to providing an overview of the information provided at the drop-in events, ET provided further details on the comments received at the drop-in events and asked the group to provide additional feedback:

**a) Health**

The group highlighted the need to be realistic and the distinction that needs to be made between physical assets and the delivery of services. This project can deliver the space, but it cannot deliver the service/s. Therefore, there is a need to ensure the commissioners of these services are involved. A member of the group noted that the Neighbourhood Plan picks up on a number of the issues raised. ET confirmed that health colleagues attended the event on 13<sup>th</sup> March and that the Council would continue to engage and feedback responses to health colleagues.

## **b) Youth**

There were a mixture of comments regarding the current offer at the youth centre and ideas for future activities as well as the need for spaces to be re-provided.

MB (speaking as a local Headteacher) suggested that there is an opportunity for a joined-up approach as Grey Court already have a number of facilities which could be used more effectively by youth services. However, she appreciated that some young people may prefer to attend activities which do not take place on a school site.

A member informed the group that the Ham & Petersham Neighbourhood Forum plan to put in a bid for Village Planning funds (for the second time) for St. Richard's Square.

## **c) Community Spaces**

ET provided an overview of the comments made regarding community spaces – key messages included accessibility and flexibility. For example, the Greenwood Centre in Hampton provides a variety of activities from one space. It was also highlighted that spaces needed to be usable and have good storage. There is not necessarily a need for lots of spaces, but flexible and well-managed spaces.

## **d) Green Spaces**

ET offered to provide copies of the Friendly Parks for All leaflets. AT explained that the buildings sit within a landscape and that the Autumn 2016 proposals show a green spine down the middle of the development. A member of the group suggested that they need something more specific to consider on the topic of green spaces. A further session focussing on landscaping to take place in summer 2018.

The group discussed greater weight being given to the views of Ham Close residents in relation to the 'green spine' and the open / green spaces within the development.

## **e) Other Comments**

A member of the group highlighted that care needs to be taken regarding the proposed multi-use games area at St. Richard's. This needs to consider noise and disturbance to residents (e.g. sound proofing).

One of the comment cards referred to potential problems with the sewerage system. A member of the group explained that there was a problem with the sewerage last year. There is a need to ensure the right infrastructure is in place to support the development.

The group agreed with RHP and the Council's proposed next steps.

## **ACTIONS**

- 3.1 ET to share the list of groups for further feedback from Stakeholder Reference Group members.
- 3.2 AT/SF to identify date(s) for landscaping session in summer 2018.

## **4. AOB**

A member of the group queried whether Ham Close residents would still be able to stay on Ham Close if the Council and RHP are not successful in gaining Secretary of State approval for the disposal of a small section of St. Richard's school playing field land.

AT explained that he believes that the risk of not getting approval is quite small. If the land cannot be disposed of, RHP would look to rearrange the scheme to ensure Ham Close residents are able to remain on the Close.

MB pointed out that there are currently 192 properties, but there will be more in the future. She asked for absolute assurance that even if the school playing field land isn't disposed of for redevelopment, existing Ham Close residents can still stay in Ham. AT gave his assurance.

#### **5. DATE, TIME AND VENUE OF NEXT MEETING**

Tuesday 5 June 2018, start time 19:00 in the Library at Grey Court School.