

HAM CLOSE REDEVELOPMENT STAKEHOLDER REFERENCE GROUP

Record of meeting held on Wednesday 12 October 2016 at Grey Court School.

PRESENT:

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Maggie Bailey (chair) | Headteacher, Grey Court School |
| Mandy Skinner | Assistant Chief Executive, Customers and Partnerships, LBRuT |
| Ed Barnes | Development Consultant, RHP |
| Tracey Elliott | Development Project Manager, RHP |
| Ellen Slack (secretary) | Project Support Officer, LBRuT |
| Steve Handley | Research Director, BMG |
| Petra Braun | Ashburnham Road / Ham Street Traders |
| Sarrina Burrows | Friends of Ham Village Green |
| Justine Glynn | Ham & Petersham Neighbourhood Forum |
| Mandy Jenkins | Ham Close Resident |
| David Lamb | Friends of Ham Library |
| Jill Lamb | Ham United Group |
| Danny McBride | Ham Close Resident |
| Andres Muniz-Piniella | Ham Close Resident (and founder of Richmond MakerLabs) |
| David Williams | Ham Amenities Group |

Ward Councillors

Cllr Penelope Frost
Cllr Jean Loveland
Cllr Sarah Tippett

APOLOGIES:

| | |
|---------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Geoff Bond | Ham & Petersham Association |
| Philippe D'Imperio | Ham Close Resident |
| Amelia Forbes | Ham Close Resident |
| Justine Langford | Ham & Petersham Neighbourhood Forum |
| Lorraine Russell | Ham Close Resident |
| Anthony Russell | Ham Close Resident |
| Chris Sanders | Ham Close Resident |
| Stan Shaw | Ham Parade Traders |
| Julia Van den Bosch | Friends of Ham Village Green |

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

MB welcomed the Group to Grey Court School. Those present introduced themselves and MB invited the Group to review the minutes of the last meeting.

ACTION: MB to work with the Project Team to draft a form of words for a parent email promoting the next phase of consultation, as per action in minutes from last meeting.

ACTION: SF to redistribute link to design workshops as some members of the group were unsure whether they had received a link to the material.

ACTION: ES to amend the minutes to show that Cllr Tippet was present at the last meeting. The minutes current show her as absent.

2. THE NEXT PHASE OF CONSULTATION

2.1. MEET THE CONSULTANT

Steve Handley, Associate Director from BMG Research, gave a presentation to the group to:

- explain the standards that they work to;
- give examples of previous consultations they have been involved in;
- describe how the consultation process for the new proposal on Ham Close will work.

TE informed the group that RHP would be door knocking at the start of the consultation to raise awareness about the consultation and ask residents about any additional support required. TE confirmed that RHP customers living on the Close who complete a survey will be sent a £10 voucher in the post by BMG. They will be able to spend the voucher in the local shops in Ham. RHP are also organising a visit to the new Cave Road flats on Thursday 20 October for customers to see what a new flat could look like.

A member of the group queried whether it might be confusing for Ham Close customers if RHP knock on doors at the start of the consultation process, if it is BMG that are administering the consultation. TE confirmed that if RHP's door knocking exercise at the start of the consultation period is not successful, BMG will send out a team to door knock at a later point during the consultation.

BMG confirmed that once the consultation has closed, they will provide data tables and a report based on the results received. The report will be used to provide feedback on what has been said during the consultation. Feedback will then be incorporated into a paper to go to RHP's Board in December. The Board will be asked to take a view and decide on next steps going forward.

A member of the group asked whether the research will look at the responses all as one group or if they will be able to distinguish between different stakeholders / groups. SH confirmed that the survey is open to all and no weighting is attached to particular respondents. They will look at the responses from different groups of people within the community and provide commentary. For example, BMG will be able to distinguish between tenants and leaseholders living on the Close, and also people completing the survey as part of the wider community.

SH noted that in their projects in Hackney and Wandsworth they had a 50% response rate. A member of the group asked whether BMG would be aiming to achieve a 50% response rate from residents on Ham Close. SH confirmed that they would aim for similar response rates during this consultation and they would put staff on the ground to knock on doors to remind residents and help to improve the response rate if needed.

SH also confirmed that they have support available for those who use English as their second language. If a resident rings BMG's helpline, support can be offered in a range of community languages.

A member of the group asked what would happen if a person completed a survey with illegible handwriting. SH confirmed that handwritten responses are fed into a machine and if there are any problems with handwriting, the survey will be read by a number of different members of staff.

2.2. CONSULTATION PROPOSAL AND MEASURE OF PREFERENCE

TE confirmed that RHP customers on Ham Close would receive a pack in the post containing a copy of the proposal and survey questionnaire. The roads near to the close will receive a copy of the proposal and will be provided with a link to the online survey. Those living in streets further away from Ham Close will be sent a flyer in the post. The group asked that it be made clear to residents that this is a new proposal on the future of Ham Close as members of the group raised concerns that the Council and RHP could be faced with consultation fatigue.

TE also confirmed that the pop-up exhibition will be open for three out of five weeks of the consultation. The consultation proposals will be on display for members of the public to view. They will also be able to ask any questions they have.

TE went through each of the survey questions with the group to ask for any feedback or comments. TE confirmed that respondents could use the open text boxes to make any additional comments not covered in the survey questions.

A member of the group suggested that the word 'capacity' used in Q1 might be hard to understand.

ACTION: ES to amend wording used in Q1 to ensure that Plain English is used.

A member of the group also asked that the phrase 'RHP customer' in Q2 be amended to 'RHP tenant' as a customer could be either a tenant or leaseholder.

ACTION: ES to amend 'RHP customer' phrase to 'RHP tenant'.

A member of the group asked that the phrase 'the redevelopment' in questions 4, 5 and 6 be replaced with 'a redevelopment'

ACTION: ES to amend to 'a redevelopment' in these questions.

A member of the group asked that the wording used to ask for further detail on each question should be amended to 'Please could you tell us more about your answer to the above question.'

ACTION: ES to amend wording in the survey on each of the relevant questions.

A member of the group asked that the multiple choice rating given throughout the questionnaire be amended so that the 'don't know' option is replaced with a 'neither agree nor disagree' option.

ACTION: ES to make these changes in the survey.

A member of the group asked whether both questions 8 and 9 were needed (affordable housing in Ham and in the borough overall). The group agreed that only question 8 was needed.

ACTION: ES to remove question 9.

A member of the group asked that the Ham Close site be described as a 'website' rather than 'microsite'.

ACTION: ES to amend to 'website'.

A member of the group asked that Q12 be rephrased to ask the respondent how they might like to be involved in future. They also asked that an additional question be included thanking the respondent for completing the survey and asking for any additional comments.

ACTION: ES to amend Q12 and add in a new Q13.

A member of the group asked whether any weighting would be given in the analysis to those in the community who live closest to Ham Close. SH said this was something for BMG to consider. The group agreed that if any weighting was to be added to the way the survey results were analysed, this should be towards those living on Ham Close itself.

3. ENGAGING WITH HAM CLOSE RESIDENTS

2.3. EARLY PROJECTS THAT RESIDENTS COULD GET INVOLVED WITH

TE asked the group to consider early projects that local residents and the wider community could get involved in. This could help local people to see the improvement as a wider project that could involve the community, rather than simply a development. For example, there may be an allotment which needs some new equipment, some projects that could help to maintain and improve the green.

TE suggested that members of the group to think of ideas and either bring them to the next meeting in November, or send them through to the Ham Close inbox (hamclose@rhp.org.uk)

4. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

A member of the group asked that it be noted that Ham Village Green is designated as open space.

5. DATE, TIME AND VENUE OF THE NEXT MEETING

The group agreed that the next meeting scheduled for 20 October would not be needed.

The Council and RHP invited the group to attend a preview launch of the consultation materials on Tuesday 18 October, 7.30pm-9pm.

ACTION: MS and MB to discuss a potential date for the next meeting to take place once the consultation period has closed on the 18 November.