

Ledbury Estate Project Team Meeting

Tuesday, 1 June 2021 by Zoom

Present	Initials	Present	Initials
Patrick Goode	PG	Hajir Kheder (KCA, Community & Engagement)	HJ
Thomas Ennis	TE	Madeleine Lundholm (KCA, Senior Engagement Manager)	ML
Susan Slaughter	SS	Daniel Buckley (KCA, Associate)	DB
Jeanette Mason	JM	Jacqui Fogerty (Calfordseaden, Partner)	JF
Shelene Byer	SB	James Masini (LBS, Development Manager)	JaM
Nicole Bailey	NB	Modupe Somoye (LBS, Resident Services Officer)	MS
		Mike Tyrell (LBS, Director of Ledbury Team)	MT
		Olive Green (LBS, Resident Services Manager)	OG
Neal Purvis (Open Communities)	NP	Sabdat Ibn-Ibrahim (LBS, Resident Services Officer)	SI
Stephen Moore (Open Communities)	SM	Modupe Somoye (LBS, Resident Services Officer)	MS
		Patricia Lewin (LBS Project Manager)	PL
		Mark Baines (Hunters – Design Advisor)	MB

1. Introductions and apologies for absence

- 1.1. NP took the Chair and invited all participants to introduce themselves.
- 1.2. Apologies were received from Toby Bull and Eishrat Islam.

2. Minutes of Ledbury RPG meeting 4.5.21

- 2.1 The Minutes were agreed as an accurate record.

3. Introduction of selected architect

- 3.1 DB introduced Karakusevic Carson Architects (KCA) as a firm that has worked extensively on social housing projects including in Hackney, Brent and Lewisham. He talked through the presentation made to the interview panel in March that led to KCA's selection as architects for the development.

- 3.2 ML explained that she was the Senior Engagement Manager for KCA and they are looking forward to working closely with residents via the Resident Design Group (RDG) – a sub-committee of the Resident Project Group (RPG) – to develop a brief for the estate. She outlined the proposed timeline of resident engagement, running from May 2021 to early 2022 and including meeting with the RDG, RPG, study trips to other existing sites, workshops with the school, and exhibitions to illustrate the plans as they develop.
- 3.3 TE said the initial exhibition was just six weeks away, with another in mid-September – does the RPG have to decide what’s within the red line very soon, or can we push it back? JaM said they do have to make that decision at the earliest possible point.
- 3.4 TE asked if the RPG will have had enough information by mid-July to make that decision, and how widely does the estate have to be consulted (e.g. the towers residents)? JaM explained that on another estate they had worked with Commonplace (a Council computer based system) to consult the entire estate on two options, and held a survey on the two proposed options – just asking for people’s opinion. We could do something similar here. MT said a simple survey across the estate would suffice, including publicising it in the newsletter, rather than a formal ballot.
- 3.5 PG thought the early part of the consultation could be simplified; we have made it very clear what we like about our flats and we can tell you what we like, and there is no dissent among the group. PG offered KCA a guided tour of his home and DB was happy to accept.
- 3.6 JM asked KCA (1) what they had learned from mistakes they’d made in previous projects, and (2) will the reduction in the permitted height of the tower mean we have to reduce the number of new homes built?
- (1) DB said they had a post-occupation evaluation process for their projects; one of the things they’ve learned is about courtyards and keeping them open to allow for the escape of noise, and exceeding the London Plan minimum dimensions for facing apartments. Another things was window sill heights – they now do 600mm or 825mm sill heights to allow residents greater flexibility in planning their furniture.
- (2) DB said a relatively new discovery was that the Bakerloo Line Extension (BLE) meant there were restrictions to building heights on land above the proposed tunnels. This means the tall building will have to move away from Old Kent Road and the building facing Old Kent Road will be a maximum of 6-7 storeys. They have more work to do on this.
- 3.7 A resident noted DB had said it is “hoping to achieve” all requirements set out by residents – have they not achieved them all yet? DB said they hoped to hit as many requirements as possible that are relevant to the planning application stage. They need time to design based on these new constraints.
- 3.8 PG asked why KCA had designed the blocks facing onto Old Kent Road in arbitrary shapes that aren’t sensitive to their surroundings, instead of simpler rectangles like the existing blocks? DB said the flats are designed as family housing; the articulation of the blocks provides as many dual- and triple-aspect homes as possible.
- 3.9 TE said he would like to see images or videos of the communal areas of the blocks – this could help persuade some residents. DB agreed that the “entry sequence” experience of residents – the route from the outside of the building to their front

door – is very important. He offered to take residents on a site visit to the Kings Crescent estate where it is comparable to what is proposed here.

3.10 NB asked (1) for detail on the timings of decisions they will have to make, and (2) she is concerned that the Bromyard site will be low-rise; as it's the first site to be developed, those residents wanting to live in a high-rise home would have to wait longer. Why is Bromyard low-rise?

(2) DB said that to alleviate the problems caused by the BLE issue, they are looking at making Bromyard a mix of high and low-rise. They are also looking at the geometry of the Bromyard block to ensure it is done sensitively. MT added that this approach would also help on the financial side of the project, producing more homes for private sale early on, generating the income needed for the later stages of the project.

(1) DB said they would be flexible until midway through RIBA Stage 2 on the massing of the blocks. He needs more time to be able to say what month this is likely to be.

3.11 TE said he favoured having lifts in Bromyard. Could KCA prod TfL to clarify the building heights it would allow – there are tall buildings on other sites next to stations? DB said if the tunnel is 15metres underground then that will constrain the height of the buildings.

3.12 NP added that taller buildings can be built near or above stations where there are already foundations in place designed to take the weight. MB said there are other high-rise buildings with lifts on the estate – they wanted to give people the choice to live in a low-rise building without a lift and its associated high maintenance costs, where they are not needed.

3.13 SB raised concerns about security: it always seems to be an afterthought with new buildings. We, the residents, are the go-to people to ask what works and what does not in high-density blocks. For example, where she lives now, the wind causes the communal door to slam shut every time it's used. And let's avoid buildings where things need to be replaced soon after. DB said communal and security doors are very tricky, but they can pick that up and identify the product they're proposing and where it has been used before, etc.

3.14 SB said some new buildings featured ledges that attracted pigeons. DB said they can come up with appropriate designs to avoid this issue.

3.15 SS asked if the 224 homes would be replaced, plus more? MT confirmed there would be more – around 330 homes in total.

3.16 SS said deck access from communal walkways had become a nightmare on other new build schemes.

3.17 MB said if the red line is expanded to include the TRA hall, this would go some way to offsetting the pressures caused by the BLE safeguarding, as it would allow for more homes to be built on that site. TE said in both estate ballots, the least-favoured option was having no extra homes, so residents don't mind more homes being built.

3.18 PL said she would like to see Blossom Court.

3.19 PG told KCA he thought they would find themselves very constricted by the desires of the residents who want a simple, functional estate. He was also concerned about the future rise in costs of materials, and difficulty of obtaining some things that now needed certification, post-Brexit. JF said there are lots of different issues;

the UK's growth rate is going to be better than originally forecast, as will interest rates. **Jacqui to draft a Briefing Note for RPG. – ACTION (JF)**

4. Terms of Reference for Design Sub-Committee

- 4.1. NP said he had one firm volunteer, and another to be confirmed, to join the RDG sub-committee, a monthly meeting that will be solely dealing with design matters.
- 4.2. NP asked for comments on the draft Terms of Reference for the RDG sub-committee, but there were none yet.
- 4.3. TE asked if there might need to be more discussion around design issues outside the monthly RDG, whether formal or informal?
NP said the architects would find it challenging to alter their designs following feedback more often than once a month. He suggested KCA aim for completing revisions to their designs in advance of the following RDG meeting.
NP clarified that all members of the RPG will be invited to attend the RDG sub-committee meetings, alongside a representative from the school and any other residents who showed an interest. As there will be so many design matters to discuss, it made sense to form a separate sub-committee just to deal with these, rather than try to cover them in the RPG meetings alongside all the other issues. JM added that having a separate RDG sub-committee was one of the commitments made by the council in response to residents' requests.
- 4.4. **NP to set date for first RDG meeting with PL and KCA..ACTION NP.**
- 4.5. TE asked if a new TRA hall could be built between the two towers facing onto Old Kent Road? DB said that sounded like an excellent idea – the continuous operation of the TRA hall is a prerequisite of the redevelopment.
- 4.6. The RPG accepted the Terms of Reference without amendment.

5. Update from LBS –

Resident Engagement Plan

- 5.1. MT said the Resident Engagement Plan had not changed since last month. Now we have got KCA on board we will work with them on the consultation they are planning, so the newsletter will change for next month.

Update on decant

- 5.2. MT said there has been one more 'buy back' in the last month, with another expected soon, leaving 17 leaseholders. One tenant will also move by next month.
- 5.3. London Fire Brigade will carry out some more training at Bromyard next month, but no more spot checks are planned.
- 5.4. PG said a recent fire at New Providence Wharf in Blackwall was quite serious; reports suggest that while they had fire wardens, the whole system didn't work very

well. **ACTION: MT said the interim report was published today and he would download it and circulate among the group.**

- 5.5. JM asked for an update on the decant of Marie Curie House in Camberwell. MT said that last November, smoke was detected between the flats and fire wardens were brought in. Engie need to undertake a 'Type 4' invasive assessment to assess compartmentation within the block. Residents will have to move out to allow for this to be done – the work will take 12 months. We have managed to speak to most residents there and most of them want to move out permanently.
- 5.6. JM asked if there were enough vacant homes for Marie Curie House residents to move into. MT said that of the 95 people to be rehoused, 11 are leaseholders, 19 are already on the transfer list and another 11 will be put on that list this week. MT said the building would not be demolished as there are no structural defects with it. NP said more detail on that will be put in the public domain in the coming weeks.
- 5.7. PG said the Grenfell inquiry found that the fire risk assessment officer didn't have the qualifications he claimed he had, and had completely made up one of the certification bodies; do all LBS officers have their qualifications checked? **ACTION: MT said he would ask Simon Holmes.**

Leaks report

- 5.8. There were no leaks reported this month.

Door replacement works

- 5.9. OG said Engie have confirmed that door replacement is imminent, but they haven't provided a date; they were saying a delivery was due by the end of May.

6. Update on Ledbury Cabinet Report 13 July 2021

- 6.1. MT said the report is going through the council system; the recommendations are very simple, asking Cabinet to note the ballot result and the commitments in the Offer Document, approve the procurement of KCA and the contractor, approve the continued negotiation of buy-outs with leaseholders, and approve the serving of the Demolition Notice, which stops the Right To Buy temporarily.
- 6.2. The RPG will be invited to give a deputation to the Cabinet meeting.
- 6.3. SB asked if tenants' accrual of Right To Buy discount is affected by them having to move off the estate to allow for the redevelopment works. MT confirmed the accrual of the discount is continuous and unaffected by these moves.
- 6.4. PG said he thought the figure for Ledbury's redevelopment was £90 million, not £150 million? JaM said the 'all-in' cost for Ledbury is around £150 million, rather than just the cost of the building work. £150 million is a reasonably conservative estimate.

- 6.5. TE asked if these costs take account of future inflation? JF said they work out known costs at today's rates, and forecast the rise, building that into the amount they ask Cabinet to approve. In the worst-case scenario, where costs run away from beyond forecasts, we might have to come back and do 'value engineering', which is to look at how we are working, the details, and are there ways to save money somewhere.
- 6.6. TE asked if this did happen, would they look to increase the number of homes put up for private sale? JF said they don't add-in uplift in home values, so inflation increases are a two-way street. MT said the scheme will never recoup all its costs dating back to its beginnings in 2017; if we had gone for the strengthening option the council would have had to pay for some of that work anyway.
- 6.7. NP said the issues around finance will be regularly revisited, alongside discussion about the design details as the scheme progresses.
- 6.8. SS asked if the social rent levels would be linked to any potential increase in the sale values of the private homes? JaM said they would not; the Council has commitments to keeping rent levels in new homes calculated in the same way as now.
- 6.9. SS asked if the council can say what the rents will be? NP said that a starting point would be to look at the rents at Sylvan Grove, which is a new-build scheme near Ledbury. The rents are set quite late on in the process, once the buildings are very near completion. The rent is based on what the value of your home would have been in 1999.

7. Resident Issues

- 7.1. SS asked whether the works to the security doors in Sarnsfield were complete. OG replied they were not yet completed.

8. Matters Arising from the Minutes of 4.5.21

- 8.1. Issues and priorities to brief architects (3.2). NP said he had circulated RPG members with the ideas from a RPG resident only meeting.
- 8.2. Prepare briefing on the process for the RPG-only meeting (3.8).
Completed.
- 8.3. Article for the newsletter appealing for volunteers to join the RDG sub-committee (3.9). Completed
- 8.4. Prepare draft Terms of Reference for the RDG sub-committee (3.10).
Completed– attached to agenda for this meeting, for comment.
- 8.5. MT to ask duty officer to contact Leaks Above (6.2)
Completed
SS said the plumber visited but couldn't find the source of the leak and thought it may be a block issue. NP said it sounds like there are continuing communication problems with the Leaks From Above team. **ACTION: OG to take this up with Leaks From Above team.**

- 8.6. Dates for service charge refund (7.2).
Completed – NP has circulated the dates.
- 8.7. Start date for replacement of Front Entry Doors in Ledbury low-rise (7.4).
Update received tonight – OG is dealing directly with Engie on this.
- 8.8. Draft RPG response for the Area Action Plan consultation (9.4) and send other comments to NP (9.5). Completed – response was sent by NP.
- 8.9. Bins being placed near kitchen windows (11.1.2).
ACTION: MT to chase Tom Pratt.
- 8.10. Sign near bins telling what can and cannot be recycled (11.1.3)
Completed – MT has taken a photo and sent it on.
- 8.11. TE to email JM and P with his thoughts on the redevelopment (12.2).
Completed – Patricia to use that document as part of the tracker spreadsheet.
- 8.12. Newsletters requested by email rather than hard copy (12.3).
Completed.

9. Any Other Business

- 9.1. PG asked when face-to-face meetings could be resumed? MT explained they were waiting for the Government guidance to change to allow it – the next changes, if any, are expected on 21 June. MT thinks a hybrid approach will be taken in future, allowing residents to join in-person meetings virtually as well. This will help to keep numbers in the hall lower, too, and helps out residents who have childcare commitments.
- 9.2. OG confirmed the original schedule for the recommissioning of the Door Entry System was week commencing 17 May (Skenfrith House) and 24 May (Sarnsfield House). Work at Peterchurch House commencing week of May 31 for reinstating door system, landing doors and the Fire Switch override. System testing, and resolving any remaining issues across all three towers was to take place week commencing 7 June.
OG clarified that all residents will receive a new door fob; they are just waiting on delivery.

10. Date of next meeting

- 10.1. The next meeting will be held by Zoom at 6pm on Tuesday, 6 July.
ACTION: NP to schedule the date of the first RDG sub-committee.