

## Ledbury Estate Residents Project Group Meeting

Tuesday 18 August 2020 by Zoom

### MINUTES

Present	Initials	Present	Initials
Danielle Gregory	DG	Neal Purvis (Open Communities, Chair)	NP
Eileen Bassom	EB	Ian Simpson (Open Communities, minutes)	IS
Jeanette Mason	JM	Ferenc Morath (Southwark Council)	FM
Patrick Goode	PG	Mike Tyrell (Southwark Council)	MT
Shelene Byer	SB	Olive Green (Southwark Council)	SH
Susan Slaughter	SS	Charles Hingston (Calford Seaden)	CH
Thomas Ennis	TE	Sharon Shadbolt	SS
Toby Bull	TB		

#### 1. Apologies

- 1.1. Apologies were received from Mark Baines - Hunters, Paul Thomas and Abigail Buckingham - LBS.

#### 2. Minutes of the Estate Project Team meeting of 28 July 2020

- 2.1. The meeting accepted the minutes as accurate

#### 3. Options Appraisal

- 3.1. Neal had circulated Hunters' initial design proposal for the TRA Hall area earlier in the day, and Charles took the meeting through the key points in the design.
- 3.2. The TRA Hall would be rebuilt on the ground floor of the new block, with an increased floor area (increased from the current 323 m<sup>2</sup> to 484 m<sup>2</sup>). A podium garden would be built on the first floor, on top of the Hall.
- 3.3. The design could provide 75 flats (10 one-bed, 47 two-bed and 18 three-bed homes). Charles said this could be reduced if people felt this was too many homes. (Outline planning permission was granted for around 80 homes on the Kwik Fit site.)
- 3.4. The maximum height would be 16 stories, falling to 8 stories in places. He noted that this was a similar height to existing blocks.
- 3.5. Although there is no Energy Centre shown in the plans, he thought this might be included at a loss of one or two of the homes.
- 3.6. Shelene was concerned about over-development of the site. If this was a car free development, it might put extra pressure on parking spaces. Some green land would be lost. In addition homes would need good sound insulation on the Old Kent Road. Her own experience is that new homes don't always have good sound insulation.

- 3.7. Charles said there is no extra parking in the design, although this could be added in at the loss of some units of housing. The podium garden would be available to residents in the homes, and might potentially be open public access.
- 3.8. Danielle felt the height of the design is not acceptable.
- 3.9. Toby was worried about over shading of the podium garden from the height of the flats. Neal explained Hunters will need to carry out a daylight and shading survey later in the design process.
- 3.10. Patrick asked what the design would mean for the overall density of the estate, and how this compares with policy guidelines for the area. On parking, he wondered if coronavirus would increase future use of cars for commuting. **ACTION: check Ledbury PTAL and the densities that GLA policy would permit (Neal).**
- 3.11. Jeanette said we need more council homes. If these can be provided while keeping green space, this would be positive.
- 3.12. Thomas agreed new homes and a larger TRA Hall were positive, if homes meet modern standards and the design fits in with the area. He wondered if noise from OKR might be tackled with the winter gardens the Group had discussed in the past. Building standards are now higher than they were when Ledbury was built, and he didn't see any reason why the new homes shouldn't be built to a high quality. He noted that Hunters' plans are just an initial design, a "thought experiment".
- 3.13. Sue felt 16 stories was too high. New homes are needed, but it is also important to ensure a good quality of life for residents.
- 3.14. Danielle asked about the tenure of the new homes. Mike said after re-provision of any lost tenanted and leasehold homes, he would want to see 50% of the extra homes as council housing, with the remainder sold to finance the scheme.
- 3.15. Toby circulated two photographs of recent poor design as examples to avoid.
- 3.16. Patrick asked how changes in planning law would affect the proposal and the estate in general. **ACTION: report back to next meeting on the planning changes and invite Colin Wilson from the Old Kent Road team (Mike).**
- 3.17. Neal felt the plans would need to be adjusted before the Group could feel comfortable with them. He summarised the issues to feed back to Hunters:
- 3.17.1. Over-development and number of homes
  - 3.17.2. Loss of public green space
  - 3.17.3. Heights and over-shadowing of the podium garden
  - 3.17.4. Car parking pressures
  - 3.17.5. Mike asked that impact on other blocks be included: will the plan mean lower heights and numbers on other parts of the estate?
- ACTION: feed these comments back to Hunters for amendments (Charles / Neal).**
- 3.18. Toby said the RPG remit was originally concerned with the existing towers, and he was unsure whether it should be now be making decisions about other parts of the estate. There would certainly need to be wider consultation with residents.

3.19. Sue pointed out that all residents are welcome to join the Group, and that she would like to see more residents attending the meetings. Shelene felt the Group is a convenient forum for initial discussion before more developed plans are taken out to residents. Thomas felt it is appropriate for the RPG to have views on the scheme as in-fill is one of the Council's options to address the towers' problems.

3.20. Sue noted that the proposal would have more impact on some parts of the estate than other parts. Should all estate residents be consulted equally? Toby felt all residents should be consulted as development could have future implications for other parts of the estate – for example, would the low rise be redeveloped next?

3.21. ***ACTION: produce an options paper on possible Next Steps (Neal).***

3.22. Danielle asked if the wider consultation should start now, and the meeting voted on the best time to consult the estate:

(a) Consult now on the initial proposal: 3 votes.

(b) Consult when more detailed plans are available: 4 votes.

#### 4. **LBS update**

4.1. Mike updated the Group on the latest situation in the Towers.

4.2. There are now 179 properties vacant, and 199 offers have been refused.

4.3. There are 20 remaining leaseholders, and two others are in negotiation with LBS.

4.4. There have been 3 temporary accommodations lettings in August, compared with one each in June and July.

4.5. The Fire Brigade carried out checks on 3<sup>rd</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> August, and will simulation training exercises at Bromyard in September.

4.6. Eight leaks have been reported in August, compared with 6 in July and 7 in June. Sharon said analysis of the reports does not show a common pattern to the leaks, which are occurring for a variety of reasons. Engie will need to visit all the properties and inspect, and she should have their report in early September.

4.7. Sue expressed concern that the leaks show there are gaps in the structure. Does this mean the building is compromised for fire and smoke? Sharon said she hadn't heard any suggestions that this is an issue. PRB have been doing random checks on filling of the gaps and cracks, over the last two months, repairing as necessary, and they can visit residents' homes by appointment. ***ACTION: report back on actions to fill / repair cracks at next meeting (Sharon).***

4.8. Mike said the Homechoice Letting system may be working again at the end of September, if the Council approves this. The Council are looking at ways to carry out remote viewings.

#### 5. **Engagement Plan**

5.1. Mike has now added timetables for the new build and refurbishment options.

5.2. The Ledbury team will start phoning residents about the whittling down ballot in September.

- 5.3. He thanked Thomas for his suggestions on the whittling down booklet and asked if other **residents could let him have comments by the end of August (ACTION: ALL)**. He stressed the importance of this document in the consultation process.
- 5.4. Thomas asked if the Council would consider treating non-resident leaseholders in the blocks the same way as resident leaseholders (e.g. access to equity share) as Ledbury is recognised as an exceptional issue. **ACTION: discuss Thomas's suggestion with Michael Scorer by 21.8.20. (Mike)**

## 6. Resident Issues

- 6.1. Sue noted that rubbish is being left in recycling bins. **ACTION: include an article in this week's newsletter (Mike)**.

## 7. Matters Arising

- 7.1. Pattern of leaks (5.2) – covered in the meeting.
- 7.2. GLA ballot exemption (6.1) – Mike explained Southwark can only request this when there is a preferred option after the whittling down ballot.
- 7.3. Hunters' design (6.8) – covered in the meeting.
- 7.4. Accelerated works (6.18) – Mike explained the timetable cannot be accelerated at the moment.
- 7.5. Turnover of temporary tenants (6.19) – covered in the meeting.
- 7.6. Old Kent Road planners – covered in the meeting.
- 7.7. Employers requirements (7.3) - **ACTION: send copy to Neal (Sharon)**
- 7.8. LBS Design Standards (7.4) – Charles confirmed these have been incorporated in the Options Report.
- 7.9. Entry doors in low rise – **ACTION: check progress with Paul when he returns from leave. (Sharon)**

## 8. Any Other Business

- 8.1. Thomas suggested writing a letter to all residents explaining their Right to Return, as some people may not read the newsletters. **ACTION: write to residents explaining Right To Return (Mike)**
- 8.2. Jeanette felt Mike is owed an apology as he had not misled RPG members. Danielle responded that Mike had acknowledged clumsy wording in a newsletter. Mike said he had been upset by comments made in correspondence that he had not been copied into, as he had been following the RPG's request, not expressing his own views on the topic.

## 9. Next meeting

- 9.1. The next meeting will be held by Zoom at 6.00 p.m. on Tuesday 1 September, with future meetings taking place on the first Tuesday of every month.

The meeting ended at 7.44 p.m.