

## **HAM CLOSE REDEVELOPMENT STAKEHOLDER REFERENCE GROUP**

Record of meeting held on Thursday 30 November at Grey Court School.

### **PRESENT:**

Adam Tucker (Acting Chair)	Project Director, RHP
Sarah Filby	Programme Manager, LBRUT
Ellen Taplin (Secretary)	Project Support Officer, LBRUT
Elizabeth Blishen	Ham Close Resident
Councillor Penny Frost	Ward Councillor
Justine Glynn	Ham and Petersham Neighbourhood Forum
Mandy Jenkins	Ham Close Resident
David Lamb	Friends of Ham Library
Jill Lamb	Ham United Group
Councillor Jean Loveland	Ward Councillor
Briony Rowland	Ham Close Resident
Stan Shaw	Ham Parade Traders
Cllr Sarah Tippet	Ward Councillor
Julia Van Den Bosch	Friends of Ham Village Green
David Williams	Ham Amenities Group

### **APOLOGIES:**

Maggie Bailey (Chair)	Headteacher, Grey Court School
Mandy Skinner	Assistant Chief Executive, Customers and Partnerships, LBRUT
Tracey Elliott	Development Project Manager, RHP
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
Chris Sanders	Ham Close Resident
Marco Mapeli	Ham Close Resident
Danny McBride	Ham Close Resident
Andres Muniz-Piniella	Ham Close Resident Association Chair (and Richmond MakerLabs)
Tom Philips	Ham Close Resident
Lorraine Russell	Ham Close Resident
Anthony Russell	Ham Close Resident

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

AT welcomed the group to Grey Court School and opened the meeting in MB's absence. The notes from the last meeting were agreed by the group.

## **2. REDEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME UPDATE**

AT confirmed that RHP and Council are working towards a Cabinet report for January 2018. This will clarify how the scheme is procured. RHP will undertake an exercise to appoint a joint venture partner which will conclude by July 2018. It is anticipated that an architect will be appointed by August 2018. AT appreciated that there had been some slippage from the timescales communicated previously but confirmed that RHP are working towards the same start on site date (Summer 2019).

AT explained that slippage is due to RHP prudently managing its risks and abortive costs in advance of the delivery approach and collaboration arrangements being agreed by both RHP and the Council. However, the GLA has been supportive of the scheme to date, including allocating nearly £13m of funding. When asked about the Mayor's Plans, AT confirmed that the GLA do have consultative rights and could call-in a scheme such as this.

## **3. FEEDBACK**

### **a) RHP CUSTOMER DROP IN SESSIONS (18 October and 8 November)**

No residents had attended the drop-in sessions on the 18 October or 8 November. AT suggested that the sessions could move from a monthly to six-weekly cycle on the understanding that if residents require more drop-ins, a more regular cycle will be introduced. All members of the Stakeholder Reference Group in attendance agreed with this change.

### **b) LEADER'S QUESTION TIME (21 November)**

AT commented that this had been a well-attended event with approximately 120 attendees. AT spoke at the event on behalf of RHP. One thing he forgot to mention is that RHP and the Council have made an application to the Housing Infrastructure Fund to help extend the K5 and increase the frequency of the 371. The funding applied for is for a four-year period and is earmarked for Ham Close. The Council should find out in late 2017 / early 2018 whether or not they have been successful.

The presentation and video from the event have been added to the Council website and can be found [here](#) (please scroll down to 'previous events' section). Minutes will be added shortly. RHP and the Council are aware that a number of questions were asked about Ham Close and answers to these are currently being drafted.

Members of the group commented that they were pleased that the proposed redevelopment did not dominate the discussion as much as it could have done. Another remarked that they thought it was helpful that AT spoke at the event as it may have helped to diffuse some anger amongst residents.

A member of the group expressed concern that the Leader of the Council described the Ham Close regeneration as an RHP project, but it is a joint project with the Council and RHP working in partnership. This point was noted by the group. The group also noted that it was important that Ham Close is redeveloped to meet current and future needs (e.g. driverless cars).

A member of the group asked if parking proposals remain the same as shown in last year's consultation proposals. AT confirmed that all aspects remain the same currently, but that there will be detailed design consultation to develop thinking further. Another group member asked if it was true that Ham Close was only meant to be built for 30 years. AT said that this was not true and the Close was built using Wimpey no-fines method of construction.

### **ACTIONS**

3.1. ET to circulate link to Leader's Question Time presentation and video in minutes (please see link above).

3.2. Once answers have been drafted to Leader's Question Time questions, ET to ensure that these are added to the Ham Close website as well as the Council website.

3.3. AT to consider whether it is possible for the group to discuss community facilities thinking and the impact of the development on local transport at the next meeting. AT added that RHP is looking to engage further on topics such as these in February next year.

### **c) SCHOOL PLAYING FIELD CONSULTATION**

At the last meeting ET gave a brief presentation on the consultation and draft questionnaire. Since the last meeting the consultation launched (9 November). Officers held an event at the end of the school day in the playground of St. Richard's to speak to parents. They will also be holding another event at the Children's Centre next week. The consultation is now half-way through and 63 responses have been received so far.

A member of the group asked how the consultation had gone so far. ET explained that feedback had been mixed. From the event held at St. Richard's, officers found that some were supportive of the boundary change, but others were not. Some also queried why the Council was proposing to provide a MUGA as compensation rather than other improvements to the school. No analysis has been carried out so far, but will be done once the consultation closes on the 21 December.

A member of the group commented that there would be an impact to the Woodville Centre as the boundary would change there too. SF explained that there may have been some confusion around the area of the land being taken as the 2015 proposal showed the new boundary to be much closer to the Woodville Centre. SF confirmed that the Council had recently met with all the groups that use the Woodville Centre (the Guides, Ham and Petersham SOS, KISH nursery, as well as the manager of the centre). Both the KISH and the Guides are speaking to colleagues in Property about leases. The Council want to reconfigure the car park and outside space in a way that works best for all and will continue conversations. ET is currently gathering information on requirements so that this can be modelled going forward.

A member of the group asked whether the phasing plan is on the Ham Close website. AT confirmed that it is. The group member then asked if RHP had a timetable for the redevelopment if the extra land was not available. AT confirmed that he did not have a timetable for this currently.

AT clarified that any resident of Ham Close wishing to remain in the community will be able to do so and would not have to move off site as part of the redevelopment. RHP will try to ensure that residents only move once within the site where possible. AT added that RHP carried out a customer needs survey earlier this year to help model the number and type of properties that need to be provided as part of the redevelopment. RHP understands the need to plan for the future as well as current needs (e.g. increases in family sizes).

A member of the group suggested that land of the same area but reconfigured in a different way could be taken rather than what is proposed at the moment.

SF confirmed that the Council intends to hold a separate consultation for the area of land on the Woodville Centre side of the boundary. Leases are being renegotiated and the Council want to ensure that changes made work for all users of the site.

### **ACTION**

3.4 AT to show how the acquisition of the land on the western edge of the site benefits the programme and enables, where possible, one move for each resident.

### **d) HAM CLOSE WEBSITE FAQ PAGES**

At the last meeting it had been suggested that dates should be added to the Ham Close webpages, to show when they had last been updated. ET has started doing this for the most recent updates (please see the bottom left hand corner of webpages). Also, a button has been added to the homepage which lists recent updates. AT thanked ET for improving the website as a resource.

Unfortunately ET and TE have not yet had time to update the tenant section of the website but will be doing this.

### **ACTIONS**

3.6. ET and TE to update tenant section of website.

3.7. Group to further test the site and provide any feedback to ET.

## **4. COMMUNITY PROJECTS**

### **a) HAM CHRISTMAS CAROLS (7 December)**

AT commented that it had been a privilege to see the commitment and enthusiasm that had been put into organising the event and thanked everyone involved for their hard work. Flyers have been delivered to all Ham Close properties and should be on display in the entrance areas to flats. 100 carol sheets are currently being printed for next week. AT was presented with a Christmas jumper to wear at the event.

The Council is currently looking into insurance arrangements and will ensure this is resolved before the event takes place.

### **ACTIONS**

4.1. AT to ensure that flyers are also on display in the stairwells of open blocks.

4.2. If / when permission is granted for the flyer to be used on social media, ET to add to the Ham Close website.

#### **b) 'FRIENDLY PARKS FOR ALL' PROJECT**

Frances Bennett is leading a project called 'Friendly Parks for All' and will be attending a meeting (hopefully) in the New Year. The Council is working closely with the Richmond Dementia Alliance and looking at how parks can be more accessible, to help encourage different groups of people to use parks and feel confident to do so. Site visits to take place shortly. ET noted that there may be some overlap between the Community Projects identified by the Stakeholder Reference Group and the Friendly Parks for All project.

ET confirmed that the project is just focusing on Ham Village Green but that the Friendly Parks project had already been working at Barnes Green and at Heathfield Recreation Ground.

A member of the group added that the Woodville Centre are excited about the project and are considering ways to encourage their clients to visit the park (e.g. a buddy system). The group were supportive of an idea to introduce picnic tables that also double as games tables.

#### **ACTIONS**

4.2. ET to circulate information on 'Friendly Parks for All' to the group and add to the Ham Close website.

4.3. AT to consider what could be done with the green corridor to make it dementia friendly to help link the Woodville Centre to the green.

#### **5. AOB**

##### **a) UNDER-OCUPANCY**

A member of the group asked if any help was available to help people downsize in and around the Ham area. SF confirmed that the Council does have an initiative to help people downsize.

#### **ACTION**

5.1. ET to circulate information on Richmond's policies in the meeting minutes. Further information can be found [here](#).

##### **b) FLY-TIPPING**

There was a question asked at the last meeting about reporting fly-tipping and improving signage. Council colleagues have agreed to add a notice to the Woodville Centre car park. There is ongoing communication between the Council and RHP regarding fly-tipping. RHP does not have enforcement powers. If members of the group do see fly-tipping taking place (and can note down a vehicle registration number or can see that the waste is identifiable) they should report this to the Council.

#### **ACTION**

5.2. TE to follow up on introducing notices on Ham Close.

5.3. ET to circulate contact details for the Council's Enforcement Team. Their email address is: [streetsceneenforcement@richmond.gov.uk](mailto:streetsceneenforcement@richmond.gov.uk)

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

The Group agreed that the next meeting would be on Wednesday 31 January 2018 at 19.30 (in the Library at Grey Court School).