

**Attendees:**

**LBRut:** Cllr Millard, Cllr Frieze, Cllr Frost, Anna Sadler (Programme Manager), Charles Murphy (Senior Project Officer), Emma Kettle (Project Support Officer)

**RHP and Hill:** Simon Cavanagh (Regeneration Manager), Tracey Elliott (Development Project Manager) Rob Cummins (Head of New Business and Regeneration), Chris Bath & Caroline (BPTW), Kirsty Dougan (Hill – Senior Development Manager) and Sean Weston (WR-AP - Architect) Osman Dervish (Cratus Engagement Consultant), Jon Turner, Joe Boyton, Jeremy Lord, Brett Wild (Project Assistant)

**Stakeholders:** Geoff Bond, David Williams, Marco, Petra Braun, Justine Langford

**Introduction/Welcome**

- RHP and Hill's representatives were introduced to the SRG members.

**Engagement Boards:**

- The group were taken through the engagement boards.

Masterplan and Future Homes update (Caroline and Chris - BPTW)

- The masterplan has been amended to reflect previous feedback – maximising dual aspect apartments with a variety of layouts, reduced building heights, slimmer buildings that vary in shape, all residents will have outdoor space, using materials that were most popular.
- All apartment buildings will be tenure neutral, and all apartments will meet minimum space standards.

Landscape proposals (Presented by Mark Fisk, LUC):

- Updates based on previous feedback include: more trees, additional planting, bird and bat boxes, formal play space as well as informal play space.
- Mark summarised the approach that has been taken to maximise green space which includes clusters of trees, a play route, court yards that all have similar elements and growing beds and fruit trees for community use and maintained by RHP.

Community Facilities:Youth/community centre (presented by Sean West, WA-AP Architects):

- Again, there have been updates made based on previous feedback – a lot more accessible storage, an accessible kitchen, more rooms that can be utilised by the community and more sustainable materials.
- Sean talked through the new design and explained the mass of the building has been reduced and a storey has been removed and two terraces added to break up the building. The ground floor design now uses loggias which take their inspiration from Ham House.
- Finally, Sean explained the changes to the mass of the building meant the different floors are now laid out as follows:
  - Ground floor: community lounge, reception, kitchen, hygiene facilities and blue badge bays and bike storage

- First Floor: activity hall, storage, computer room, meeting rooms
- Second Floor: music studio, art room, meeting rooms and terraces

Makerlabs:

- Sean took the stakeholders through the design for the Makerlabs explaining that the barn design draws on the heritage of the location and uses sustainable materials.

Sustainability (presented by Kirsty Dougan - Hill)

- Explained that Hill has been considering what more could be done to increase the sustainability of Ham Close to go above and beyond the standard requirements. Briefly explained the changes laid out on the slides but emphasised there will be a lot more detail in the planning application which will be available to the public.
- Also highlighted that there will be a firm commitment to providing employment for the local community.

Transport (presented by Mark and Caroline):

- There will be no vehicle movement between the north and south of Ham Close. Emergency access only.
- The basement carpark will create more space for a large and green public realm.

Future of Ham Close (presented by Kirsty Dougan - Hill):

- Highlighted that approximately 50% of the proposed housing on Ham Close will be affordable.
- The capital receipt from the land sales means that LBRut can build a MUGA at St Richard's C of E School to which there will be some public access. There here will be a social impact fund of £2m paid by Hill towards other local projects and Hill commit to employing people in the local community.
- There will also be lots of opportunities for engagement and outreach projects going forward throughout all the stages of the regeneration. Reiterated that engagement does not stop here.

**Q&A:**

**David (question):** It was noted that clearly a lot of the previous feedback has been considered. But highlighted that 2 things had not been fully addressed:

1. The issue of traffic and parking. Residents in Ham have a serious problem with access to a single main road. What is being done about this?
2. The demolition and build time and the disruption to local community. We would welcome more information on the boards on this.

**Kirsty (response):** Hill have done a lot of modelling on the traffic and capacity at junctions. The data and modelling are showing that it is not going to have a harmful impact. (The below information was presented at the SRG)

1. We have assessed the net change in traffic movements into and out of the site
  - a. That is the proposed development (fully occupied) compared to the existing homes (fully occupied).
2. We have assessed the distribution of movements based on traffic surveys so they reflect where people choose to travel.
3. The distribution reveals that there are three junctions where we need to assess impacts (because there will be more than 30 additional vehicle movements in an hour – more than one every two minutes). These junctions will see an additional 31 movements per hour in the PM peak hour. The junctions are:
  - a. Sandy Lane / Petersham Road
  - b. Sandy Lane / Ham Street
  - c. Ham Street / Wiggins Lane
4. We have undertaken junction capacity testing for the three junctions and they continue to work acceptably with the addition of Development Traffic in the future assessment year.
5. During the AM peak hour no junctions exceed the 30 movement assessment threshold.

And parking

1. The parking provided on site is sufficient to accommodate the expected parking demand from all of the apartments



Unfortunately, Velocity was not able to attend the SRG, but they will be at the engagement event on Friday and Saturday. In terms of demolition, build time and disruption to the local community, there will be a construction environmental management plan to make sure that there is limited impact on. There will be more detail on this at the next stage.

Note: The 'next steps' engagement board was updated to reflect that the construction programme is estimated to be up until 2030.

**Justine (question):** Will the sustainability steps you are taking be in keeping with the new Part L standards that are due to be published this year?

**Kirsty (response):** Whilst our planning application will be made before the 'new' part L comes into force, the design proposals satisfy the emerging Part L standards. Further information was provided on the engagement boards to confirm 'it is estimated that the proposals will achieve a total reduction in regulated CO2 emissions that is 66% over and above the target emissions rate in Approved Document Part L 2013 (building regulations). This means the proposals will comfortably exceed the emerging Part L 2021 requirements (which come into force in June 2022)'

**Geoff (question):** Can you add population increase figures to the boards?

**Kirsty (response):** We will think about how we can include a statement and what we can accurately report.

Note: The engagement boards were updated so that the Masterplan board included 'result in an increase in the population at Ham Close of approximately 550 persons' this was based on GLA population yield calculator.

**Geoff (question):** As the bus routes through ham to not service the close, will you remove/amend the board on bus services?

**Kirsty (response):** Yes, we will amend this board, so it refers to buses service Ham, rather than Ham Close.

**Geoff (question):** Will you add another board to show how the impact of construction and how this will be managed?

**Kirsty (response):** The next steps board can be amended to note that this will be managed at the next stages. Once we have firmed up the designs, a lot of thought goes into the construction phase. There will also be many more chances for engagement so stakeholders will be able to keep abreast of the construction plans in due course.

**Anna (response):** The construction phases will be closely managed. There needs to be a finalised design before we have a detailed construction plan and decide how best to approach it.

**Cllr Frost (response):** There are a lot of local concerns about cars and parking spaces and capacity. LBRut are working to get the K5 bought onto the estate. Hopefully TFL (Transport for London) can increase services in the future. Construction is a concern, but the management of construction will be rigorous and well planned. It is more important that the scheme comes to fruition.

**Marco (question):** Could there be more on the construction phasing on the boards? Presumably, there is a phased plan, school children they will not be seeing disruption for the whole 8 years.

**Anna (response):** Yes, the phasing strategy will be especially important, and we will be looking at this on approval of the planning application.

**Simon (response):** There will be 3 phases. The first 2 will ensure that the replacement homes for current residents and facilities are replaced. The third phase will be the construction of the additional new homes. A note on population – only once we have planning permission can we finalise numbers. But going forward we will try to be clearer about when we can have these conversations.

**Cllr Millard (response):** Reiterated what Marco said. Please can the phasing be made clearer? To confirm, the entire site will not be in construction for the whole 8-year period. The council is working with RHP very closely on engagement. It is also particularly important that after this period and going forward, engagement will continue to and shape this community.

Note: The engagement boards were updated to show a 3-part phasing plan on the Masterplan board.

**Cllr Frost (question):** Regarding community building, has the reduction in size meant a reduction in facilities? Are the youth centre staff and wider community happy that this will offer us what we need?

**Sean (response):** The design has not meant a loss of facilities but some of them are smaller. For instance, the activity hall, although this is not any smaller than the existing hall.

**Anna (response):** AfC (Achieving for Children) are happy. In an ideal world there would be a larger hall but are very on board with where we have landed. There is now also a community lounge which can be separated off. Youth services can be using the first and second floors at the same time the ground floor facilities are being used by the community. AfC have been positive in conversations. One of their strategies is to develop family hubs. WRAP have designed a very flexible space

**Sean (response):** The name will also be important. Giving it a name could change perception that it is solely a youth centre.