

## HAM CLOSE REDEVELOPMENT STAKEHOLDER REFERENCE GROUP

Record of meeting held on Monday 1<sup>st</sup> October 2018 at Grey Court School.

### 1. WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS AND NOTES OF THE LAST MEETING

MB welcomed the group to Grey Court School and opened the meeting.

PRESENT	
Maggie Bailey (Chair)	Headteacher, Grey Court School
Adam Tucker	Project Director, RHP
Tracey Elliott	Development Project Manager, RHP
Mandy Skinner	Assistant Chief Executive, Customers and Partnerships, LBRUT
Sarah Filby	Programme Manager, LBRUT
Charles Murphy	Project Officer, LBRUT
Cllr Liz Jaeger	Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Housing and Community Safety, LBRUT
Cllr Penelope Frost	Ward Councillor
Cllr Andrée Frieze	Ward Councillor
Cllr Gareth Richards	Ward Councillor
Jean Loveland	Ham Close Resident
Elizabeth Blishen	Ham Close Resident
Mandy Jenkins	Ham Close Resident
Jill Lamb	Ham United Group
Andres Muniz-Piniella	Ham Close Resident Association Chair (and Richmond MakerLabs)
Danny McBride	Ham Close Resident
Geoff Bond	Ham and Petersham Association
Anthony Russell	Ham Close Resident
Petra Braun	Ashburnham Road / Ham Street Traders
David Williams	Ham Amenities Group
Justine Glynn	Ham and Petersham Neighbourhood Forum
Sarah van Haeften	Friends of Ham Village Green
Lorraine Russell	Ham Close Resident
Stan Shaw	Ham Parade Traders
Tom Phillips	Ham Close Resident
Katie	Ham Close Resident
APOLOGIES	
David Lamb	Friends of Ham Library
Marco Mapeli	Ham Close Resident
Julia Van Den Bosch	Friends of Ham Village Green

The notes from the last meeting were reviewed by the group. The following points were discussed:

- The action regarding AT meeting with the Neighbourhood Forum and Council officers concerning the Liveable Neighbourhoods Programme bid to be carried forward. All other actions delivered.
- Jean Loveland commented that the desire to deliver a green and sustainable development, as seen in the previous minutes, has always been the case.

The notes from the last meeting were agreed by the group.

## **2. REDEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME UPDATE**

AT provided the group with a project update:

- AT thanked the group for their patience and explained why RHP and Council held off signing the Collaboration Agreement and Land Sale documents prior to the May 2018 Local Election.
- The work that has been carried out since was explained to the Group, including the financial modelling and unsuccessful attempt to secure additional funding. With this in mind AT explained to the Group that a scheme of 425 units was not financially viable and explained that RHP and the Council would be taking forward a scheme of circa 450 units as close to the 2016 masterplan as possible.
- AT went on to explain the timeline, which included the appointment of a developer partner in spring 2019, Planning Application in summer 2019 and start on site winter 2019. A more detailed programme will follow.

AT answered queries on the viability explaining that the circa 450 scheme was based on the existing funding. Additional funding beyond that already secured from the GLA and the Council will be applied for as the opportunity arises. AT answered queries about why the viability had changed, explaining that the viability had always been challenging on the 425 scheme and there has also been increases in construction costs and a stagnation in property values. This had been corroborated by the three developer partner bidders selected to go to stage 2 of the procurement process. Concerns were raised that the unit numbers could creep up and that the Group still did not know what and where the community facilities would be.

Questions moved to developer partner. AT mentioned that at this time he could not say the percentage of profit the JV partner would be seeking as this was commercially sensitive information. He also was unable at this time to be specific on the mix of affordable and private, as this would be finalised as the scheme was worked up for a planning application. RHP agreed to look into the warranty arrangements between leaseholders and the developer following construction and update FAQs accordingly.

A query was raised about why the Ham Village Green was not being built on. AT reiterated that they will build as quickly as possible to avoid disruption and that residents will be able to stay on Ham Close and that previous consultations identified the Green as something local residents wanted to protect. In response to further queries, AT mentioned that detail on parking will come through the planning process but that they were looking to reduce parking where possible. He also offered reassurances that the Ham Parade shops were outside the

current 'red line' of the estate and reminded the group that there is still the possibility that the some of the community facilities could be built behind the shops. The group were also informed that conversations re the clinic were ongoing.

### **ACTIONS**

- 2.1 RHP to issue a more detailed programme, also detailing decision making meetings.
- 2.2 RHP to look into warranty agreements for leaseholders and update FAQs.

### **3. ENGAGEMENT EVENTS**

AT went through the engagement events RHP were planning. These included:

- Ham Christmas event
- Events inviting residents of Ham Close to meet and interview the three shortlisted companies and visit some of the projects they have worked on previously. With a session being run in advance with those attending the interview to develop the questions to ask.

It was expressed that local residents who did not live on Ham Close might be interested to attend meetings with the shortlisted companies. Concerns were raised that a scheme of a circa 450 was being accepted as a done deal.

### **ACTIONS**

- 3.1 RHP to prepare a detailed residents engagement timeline and issue by the next SRG.

### **4. DECISION MAKING PROCESS**

MS informed the group that the Land Sale and Collaboration Agreement would go to the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Committee on the 29<sup>th</sup> October and that this was the first part of the decision making process going forward, which requires decisions from both the Council and RHP.

### **ACTIONS**

- 4.1 RHP to produce timeline of decision meetings to be produced, highlighting when people will be able to engage (where this was not covered under 3.1 above).

### **5. AOB**

The group discussed the Ham and Petersham Neighbourhood Forum Referendum and it was explained that it was not a vote on Ham Close.

Cllr Frost informed the group that the London in Bloom judges were very impressed with Ham Village Green.