

HAM CLOSE REDEVELOPMENT STAKEHOLDER REFERENCE GROUP

Record of meeting held on Monday, 4 July 2016 at Grey Court School.

PRESENT:

Geoff Fox (chair)	Director of Development, RHP
Tracey Elliott	Development Project Manager, RHP
Mandy Skinner	Assistant Director Commissioning Corporate Policy & Strategy, LBRuT
Sarah Filby (secretary)	Programme Manager, LBRuT
Geoff Bond	Ham & Petersham Association
Petra Braun	Ashburnham Road / Ham Street Traders
David Lamb	Friends of Ham Library
Jill Lamb	Ham United Group
Justine Langford	Ham & Petersham Neighbourhood Forum
Madeline Thomas	Grey Court School
Stan Shaw	Ham Parade Traders
Julia Van den Bosch	Friends of Ham Village Green
David Williams	Ham Amenities Group
Ward Councillors	
Cllr Penelope Frost	
Cllr Sarah Tippett	

APOLOGIES:

Amelia Forbes	Ham Close Resident
Danny McBride	Ham Close Resident
Andres Muniz-Pineilla	Ham Close Resident
Cllr Jean Loveland	Ward Councillor

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

- 1.1 GF welcomed the Group to Grey Court School and the inaugural meeting of the Stakeholder Reference Group. GF noted Maggie Bailey's (Headteacher, Grey Court School) apologies, highlighting the proposal that she would chair meetings going forward.

2. REFERENCE GROUP CHAIRMAN

- 2.1 The Group unanimously agreed that Maggie Bailey would chair meetings going forward.

3. REFERENCE GROUP TERMS OF REFERENCE

- 3.1 The Group reviewed and discussed the draft Terms of Reference. TE proposed (on AM-P's behalf) the addition of 'nationality' to the final point regarding discrimination. The Group supported this addition.
ACTION: SF to amend final bullet point to include 'nationality'.
- 3.2 The Group discussed the involvement of Ham Close residents and how to support the involvement of eight to ten RHP customers (around half of the

- Group).
- 3.3 TE detailed the work she and RHP colleagues had done to promote the Group and encourage residents to get involved. TE noted that she was planning a further mail out at the end of this week to encourage residents to take part.
 - 3.4 GB offered to be as flexible as possible, in terms of the location, time and day of meetings to enable residents to attend.
 - 3.5 Following a query from the Group TE explained that some residents living on the Close were very pro-development, some would support redevelopment subject to appropriate design, whereas others do not support redevelopment and a number are uninterested – views across the breadth of the spectrum are represented.
 - 3.6 MS highlighted the demographics of Ham Close and the need to ensure residents are engaged in the wider piece.
 - 3.7 The Group reflected that there may be a degree of consultation fatigue.
 - 3.8 GF asked for the Group's support identifying and encouraging Ham Close residents to be involved. MT noted the support Grey Court School may be able to offer identifying parents that are residents of the Close. JVdB offered to put a notice up on the Friends of Ham Village Green noticeboard.
 - 3.9 Following a query from the Group GF and MS confirmed that where the draft Terms of Reference refer to working with RHP and the Council "*...to improve the housing and other services (including, but not limited to health, youth, recreational and cultural) in the local area*" this is in relation to the potential regeneration of Ham Close. MS referred to the wider 'Uplift' programme and the opportunities that redevelopment could bring and exploring what might be achievable by working together.
 - 3.10 DW requested the addition of the Ham Amenities Group to the list of members.
 - ACTION:** SF to add Ham Amenities Group to the list of key stakeholder groups and members of the Reference Group.
 - ACTION:** Cllr Frost to follow up with St Richard's regarding their representation on the Group.

4. COMMUNICATIONS AND ENGAGEMENT PROGRAMME

- 4.1 MS provided a brief overview of the engagement and consultation that had taken place since The Prince's Foundation enquiry by design process at the end of 2013 / start of 2014. MS highlighted the very detailed 'bank' of messages from previous engagement work that can now be drawn on and the opportunities to learn from what had been done previously. The key messages have included:
 - Retaining the green space and trees
 - Creating a 'heart' to Ham Close, retaining the 'village feel'
 - Concerns about the future of the library and local shops – the library and shops are not currently part of the proposed development
 - Design, density and light implications of the proposed redevelopment –

- desire to retain dual aspects
 - Home proportions, tenure, garages and storage
 - Transport and parking implications
 - Pressure on local services and infrastructure (schools, bus, medical) – ongoing conversation with health colleagues regarding the opportunities presented by redevelopment
- 4.2 In addition MS highlighted the importance of ongoing communication – with residents and the wider community – to avoid any surprises. The current series of design workshops have been designed to give everyone an opportunity to contribute on the areas that are most important to them.
 - 4.3 These messages have informed the preparation of a draft Ham Close Customer Charter, which RHP took to a Ham Close Residents Association meeting in June 2016.
 - 4.4 MS detailed the proposed phases of engagement – following the final design workshop in July 2016; all messages from the workshops will be consolidated and played back before more formal consultation in late September / October 2016. Following a query from a member of the Group GF confirmed that following the consultation in late September / October 2016 decisions will be taken in December 2016 regarding whether or not further work should proceed on the proposed redevelopment.
 - 4.5 MS responded to a query from the Group that RHP / the Council don't yet know whether the consultation in late September / October 2016 will be on more than one proposal. This will be informed by the outputs of the design workshops, particularly tomorrow's (Tuesday, 5 July 2016) Design Approach workshop.
 - 4.6 The Group discussed the design workshops to date. MS confirmed that a presentation had been delivered by WYG at the Traffic and Transport workshop (Wednesday, 29 June 2016) and that this would be made available alongside the feedback collated, such as parking spaces overstated, key 'hot spots' missed, need to apply more common sense etc. (**POST MEETING NOTE:** Due to technical difficulties the feedback collated at the first Traffic and Transport workshop has not yet been made available on the Ham Close website (www.hamclose.co.uk); however a copy has been shared with attendees. WYG have been tasked with amending their draft transport feasibility study in light of feedback.)
 - 4.7 Following a query from the Group GF and MS confirmed that the models presented at the Financial Viability workshop did include the re-provision of existing community facilities and that funding from the Council, RHP, the GLA and other sources would be applied for, for specific elements of any proposal. MS noted that it was not for BNP Paribas to comment on the level of funding RHP or the Council may be able to bring to the scheme.
 - 4.8 GF highlighted that the GLA could bring substantial funding to a scheme such as this, subject to the provision of new affordable homes. (GLA funding and the Council's Housing Capital Programme will not subsidise re-provision of the existing 192 units.). However, the level of funding that could be drawn in was uncertain as the GLA (and TfL) would not commit to funding until there's a 'deliverable' scheme with planning permission.

- 4.9 Following a query from the Group GF noted that RHP had not expected the rent reduction announced in last summer's budget, and that Housing Associations fear there will be further cuts going forward but they have no way of knowing. As a result of the cuts RHP is exploring ways it can become more efficient to address the modelled loss of almost £100 million over the next 10 years from its business plan. When RHP last looked seriously at refurbishment the cost was in the region of £8 million and in light of the current pressures on RHP's budget it was unlikely that a refurbishment option would become financially viable anytime soon.
- 4.10 GF reiterated that RHP can't draw in grant funding for the replacement of the existing 192 flats. By increasing the density of the scheme it is possible to draw in funding to help cover the costs of the replacement units.

5. FINANCIAL VIABILITY WORKSHOP AND SITE VISIT(S)

- 5.1 TE noted that that the offer of a site visit(s) had been made to residents in the hard copy newsletter delivered to RHP customers. TE highlighted that the development in question, in the London Borough of Ealing, was a similar size to Ham Close, but architecturally potentially very different. As very few residents had responded positively to the offer TE noted that she was exploring with Network Housing whether residents / others could attend a 'fun day' on Saturday 30 July 2016. Appointments could be made for residents to see the inside of flats to enable them to compare how flats built to London Housing Design Guide standards compare to what they've got now.

ACTION: TE to send flyer promoting the 'fun day' to members of the Group when she received this from Network Housing.

- 5.2 Following further discussion regarding a site visit(s) GF confirmed that there was still time in the programme to run a visit(s) further down the line.

ACTION: TE / GF to explore with the Stakeholder Reference Group and Ham Close residents the potential for running a site visit(s) early-to mid-September 2016.

- 5.3 Following a query from the Group GF confirmed that the message that the library should not be included in the redevelopment proposal had been heard loud and clear. However, the proposed development would still look to provide the other existing community facilities on the Close and it may, therefore, be worth exploring a visit to other well designed community facilities.

6. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

- 6.1 None

7. DATE, TIME AND VENUE OF FUTURE MEETINGS

- 7.1 Following discussion the Group agreed to meet again on the proposed date of Monday 18 July 2016.

ACTION: GF and the team to consider using the library for this meeting.

- 7.2 GF and DW highlighted that they both might struggle to attend a meeting on 18 July 2016.