

# HAM CLOSE REDEVELOPMENT STAKEHOLDER REFERENCE GROUP

Record of meeting held on Wednesday 30 November 2016 at Grey Court School.

## PRESENT:

Maggie Bailey (chair)	Headteacher, Grey Court School
Mandy Skinner	Assistant Chief Executive, Customers and Partnerships, LBRuT
Julia Nunes-Carvalho	Regeneration Project Director, RHP
Tracey Elliott	Development Project Manager, RHP
Ellen Slack (secretary)	Project Support Officer, LBRuT
Petra Braun	Ashburnham Road / Ham Street Traders
Sarrina Burrows	Friends of Ham Village Green
Philippe D'Imperio	Ham Close Resident
Djenko Djenkov	Ham Close Resident
Justine Glynn	Ham & Petersham Neighbourhood Forum
Mandy Jenkins	Ham Close Resident
Jill Lamb	Ham United Group
Andres Muniz-Piniella	Ham Close Resident (and founder of Richmond MakerLabs)
Lorraine Russell	Ham Close Resident
Anthony Russell	Ham Close Resident
Stan Shaw	Ham Parade Traders
David Williams	Ham Amenities Group
Nataliya Yatsenko	Ham Close Resident
Omar Zekri	Ham Close Resident

## Ward Councillors

Clr Penelope Frost  
Clr Jean Loveland  
Clr Sarah Tippett

## APOLOGIES:

Geoff Bond	Ham & Petersham Association
Sarah Filby	Programme Manager, LBRUT
Amelia Forbes	Ham Close Resident
Justine Langford	Ham & Petersham Neighbourhood Forum
David Lamb	Friends of Ham Library
Danny McBride	Ham Close Resident
Chris Sanders	Ham Close Resident
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. The minutes of the meeting on the 12 October were approved.

MB confirmed she had sent out an email to all 1200 families at Grey Court informing them that the consultation was taking place. She ensured that this update was included in each of their weekly bulletins throughout the consultation period.

ES confirmed that she had made the requested changes to the consultation survey following the group's feedback at the last meeting.

## **2. RECENT PHASE OF CONSULTATION**

### **2.1. UPDATE FROM RHP AND THE COUNCIL ON CONSULTATION ACTIVITY**

ES gave a presentation to the group summarising the recent phase of consultation that took place between 19 October and 20 November. This covered the following aspects:

- Materials received (e.g. letters, flyers) received by RHP Ham Close Customers and by the wider community
- Social media and website presence
- Pop-up exhibition attendance
- Description of other bespoke engagement activities carried out
- Number of survey responses received
- Next steps

RHP and the Council had included figures in the presentation to state that BMG Research (the company analysing the consultation responses) had received 104 responses from Ham Close RHP Customers. RHP and the Council clarified these were from 104 out of the 192 households on Ham Close. A further 202 responses were received from the wider community.

### **2.2. FEEDBACK FROM THE GROUP**

#### **a) Vouchers**

Ham Close residents received a £10 voucher to spend in local shops if they completed a copy of the consultation survey. Some members of the group informed RHP and the Council that some of the local shops had not accepted their voucher.

**ACTION:** members of the group to email TE with details of the shops which had declined their vouchers so that she can investigate further.

#### **b) Leaseholders' meeting**

A member of the group requested that RHP consider holding a meeting with Ham Close leaseholders. JNC confirmed that RHP is working on a bespoke set of FAQs for leaseholders. JNC confirmed a set of FAQs will be sent to leaseholders by the end of January.

JNC also confirmed that RHP is looking to hold a leaseholders workshop in the New Year to provide leaseholders with an opportunity to discuss bespoke FAQs further.

It was suggested that it would be useful to hold a clinic / drop-in session for leaseholders to discuss personal circumstances and further questions in a 1:1 environment. RHP to look into this further.

RHP is also working on a set of FAQs for Ham Close tenants and is looking into specific activities for this group as well.

A member of the group noted that leaseholders had been informed that they would meet with an independent financial advisor but they have not yet had the opportunity

to do this. MS explained that Newman Francis was appointed as a moderator (rather than an independent financial advisor) to work with both Ham Close tenants and leaseholders. Newman Francis was commissioned by RHP and the Council. RHP committed to providing independent mortgage advice and some leaseholders accessed this. They also had a role in moderating some earlier meetings (by acting as chair of the previous forum) and carrying out a door knocking exercise where they explained advice and took questions. The work RHP and the Council commissioned Newman Francis to do has now finished.

**ACTION:** JNC / TE to include an answer to this question in the FAQs document to be developed for leaseholders.

### **c) Consultation process**

One member of the group commented that they were glad that RHP and the Council had organised for the pop-up exhibition to take place in the Youth Centre car park and that they liked having the opportunity to see the flats at Cave Road.

Another member of the group voiced concerns that they were told that this was their 'vote' on a proposal and that they had been told at the pop-up exhibition that staff were there only to help people with the survey questions.

MS clarified that the consultation process has not been a vote. RHP has committed to measuring preference. MS expressed surprise and disappointment that the member of the group had been told that staff could only help with the survey. Ham Close RHP Customers and members of the wider community were welcome to spend as much or as little time as they wished at the pop-up exhibition. Staff were on hand to help in a variety of ways – for example to answer questions, help explain information on the boards etc.

A different member of the group expressed concern that the question around the potential locations of the community facilities could be interpreted as a vote by some members of the community.

MS explained that the purpose of this question was to help understand whether the community would like to see facilities dispersed or close together, closer to bus stops or shops etc. MS confirmed that there were be further conversations going forward on how this might work.

A member of the group queried why RHP and the Council say that 'nothing is concrete'. JNC explained that the proposals that were out for consultation during October and November are indicative and if they are supported by local people they would be subject to further consultation – i.e. they could provide a foundation on which to develop.

### **d) Survey results**

A member of the group expressed disappointment that the Stakeholder Reference Group would not be able to see the results of the consultation at this meeting. MB explained that the group had agreed at the last meeting that they would meet again once the consultation period had ended. This meeting was organised to continue ongoing conversations with different stakeholders and to provide an update on how the consultation period had gone. RHP and the Council do not yet have results from the recent consultation as they are currently being analysed by BMG Research.

### 2.3. NEXT STEPS FOR SRG

The group agreed that it would be useful to meet again in the New Year and would like to RHP and the Council to share consultation results with them at this time.

### 3. ENGAGING WITH HAM CLOSE RESIDENTS

Members of the group were asked at the last meeting (on the 12 October) to think about any early projects (social, community, physical etc.) that residents could get involved with in the area.

A member of the group suggested that a model with moveable parts is made available to help residents visualise what the potential development might look like. JNC commented that this is something that RHP would take forward and look to do in the next phase as further consultation takes place.

Another member of the group suggested that a project could link in with the potential new community facilities outlined in the proposal.

The group agreed that projects would be ongoing and were encouraged to continue to think of further ideas.

### 4. HAM CLOSE WEBSITE

RHP and the Council had recently added a new page to the Ham Close website to provide information about the Stakeholder Reference Group.

Members of the group made the following suggestions:

- The webpage is used to advertise upcoming meeting dates (rather than just list the minutes of previous meetings)
- The agenda for any upcoming meetings is also added to the webpage
- Draft minutes are added to the webpage as soon as possible after a meeting has taken place
- Each newsflash sent out highlights what information is new on which pages to make this clearer for those navigating the site
- RHP and the Council check each of the links in the FAQs are correct as not all link to the right page / document

**ACTION:** ES to make amendments to the website as discussed in the bullet points above.

A member of the group also asked if they could contact a specific person to provide comments in advance of the meeting if they are unable to attend. TE confirmed that members of the group could contact her through the [hamclose@rhp.org.uk](mailto:hamclose@rhp.org.uk) email address in advance of future meetings. She will then feed in any comments to the group.

### 5. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

A member of the group asked whether leaseholders and tenants will be in flats next door to one another, or whether leaseholders would have a separate building. RHP confirmed that is no reason why they would not mix tenants and leaseholders.

Further concerns were raised that mortgage lenders may not lend to individuals where there is a certain percentage of social housing units in the same building.

**ACTION:** JNC to look into this further.

A member of the group expressed concern that outsiders buying into the potential future development could be seen to have an advantage over those already living in the area. MB noted that those involved with the stakeholder reference group have a unique opportunity to help shape the proposals.

A member of the group read a comment from another resident to the group. The resident expressed a view to make the local environment work for everyone by considering giving up a third of the green in order to reduce the density on the remainder of the site.

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

The Group agreed that the next meeting would be Wednesday 25 January at 19:30 (the Library, Grey Court School).