# HAM CLOSE REDEVELOPMENT
# STAKEHOLDER REFERENCE GROUP SUB-GROUP

Record of meeting held on Monday 20 February 2017 at Grey Court School.

PRESENT:

| | |
|---|---|
| Maggie Bailey (chair) | Headteacher, Grey Court School |
| Tracey Elliott | Development Project Manager, RHP |
| Sarah Filby | Programme Manager, LBRuT |
| Philippe D'Imperio | Ham Close Resident |
| Mandy Jenkins | Ham Close Resident |
| Andres Muniz-Piniella | Ham Close Resident (and founder of Richmond MakerLabs) |
| Briony Rowland | Ham Close Resident |
| Chris Ruse | Ham & Petersham Neighbourhood Forum |
| Stan Shaw | Ham Parade Traders |
| Julia Van den Bosch | Friends of Ham Village Green |

**1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

MB welcomed the sub-group to Grey Court School and outlined a new minute taking procedure. MB recommended that going forward only key points and actions are recorded in the minutes; these would be agreed by the group before the meeting closes. Following discussion the sub-group agreed to this approach.

**2. FUTURE OF HAM CLOSE: RESEARCH REPORT DRAFT (BMG RESEARCH)**

The group noted and confirmed that the draft report tabled for review was being shared in confidence and would not be shared more widely. SF confirmed that following the group's feedback the full research report would be published on the Ham Close Uplift website and hard copies made available to those without internet access.

The group agreed to go through the report one page at a time and to comment on whether the report's presentation could be improved to help the reader understand the report's findings / analysis of the results.

**ACTION:** MB reiterated the need for a high level timeline to support residents' understanding of the regeneration process from start to finish; timeline to be added to a future full Stakeholder Reference Group agenda.

**ACTION:** SF to feedback comments (summarised below) to BMG research.

- Include the methodology in the Introduction (Section 1)
- Refer to "net result" rather than "net agreement" throughout the report
- 'net result' equation – use square brackets and replace " / " with "or" (throughout the report)
- Include a note to make it clear that neither agree nor disagree are not included in the net result figure (throughout the report)
- Replace "in parentheses" with "in brackets" (throughout the report)
- Figure 4 – use square brackets where the net result is shown for data excluding additional responses from another member of the household (i.e. no more than one response per household)
- Review analysis of responses by community groups / organisations (recommendation to remove Figure 5)
- Can analysis of open-ended questions include commentary by wider community and / or by RHP customers?

- Figure 5 (and subsequent figures analysing open-ended questions) – remove horizontal axis (%) and add note to highlight that the number of responses will not add up to the total number of respondents as respondents may have made more than one comment (throughout the report)
- Where example comments are used is it appropriate for the group (i.e. wider community or RHP Ham Close customer) that the respondent belongs to, to be identified?
- Figure 6 – ensure all text is visible
- Section 4 (Perceptions on aspect of the proposed design solution) – ensure that it is clear that some respondents stated that they neither agree nor disagree with specific aspects of the redevelopment proposals
- Section 5 (Location of community facilities) – what evidence is BMG able to supply that respondents did not engage with the questions, could example comments be provided? Can locations 1, 2 and 3 be more clearly identified (e.g. by including the plan showing the proposed locations / including a description of each location)?
- Delete value judgements / commentary in Section 6 (Views on affordable housing provision in the Ham area)
- Section 7 (Engagement activities) – Can the purpose of this section be more clearly articulated?
- Figure 18 – Explain the "No response" results
- Figure 20 – Would it be appropriate to look at the different methods of communication (i.e. phone vs. email) separately? What does "Negative comments" refer to? Can "Other" be broken down? Should "No particular reason" be "No particular way"?
- Section 8 (Financial / tenure concerns) – Is this section truly reflective of both homeowners' and tenants' concerns? Ensure all example comments are not personally identifiable
- Can RHP Ham Close customer response rates be added to the appendices?

In addition the sub-group highlighted the need to give further consideration to the process for capturing feedback / comments submitted by local community groups / organisations during consultation going forward.

**ACTION:** MB recognised the need for residents to clearly understand the makeup / composition (i.e. the split across different tenures) of the proposed redevelopment of Ham Close. The provision of affordable housing and how to communicate messages relating to the composition of the proposed development to be added to a future full Stakeholder Reference Group agenda.

**ACTION:** Draft report following amendments / feedback from BMG research to be shared with the sub-group prior to publication.

MB, TE and SF thanked the sub-group for their time and constructive feedback.

MB closed the sub-group meeting.