

HAM CLOSE REDEVELOPMENT STAKEHOLDER REFERENCE GROUP

Record of meeting held on Wednesday 25 January 2017 at Grey Court School.

PRESENT:

Maggie Bailey (chair)	Headteacher, Grey Court School
Mandy Skinner	Assistant Chief Executive, Customers and Partnerships, LBRuT
Julia Nunes-Carvalho	Interim Project Director, RHP
Tracey Elliott	Development Project Manager, RHP
Sarah Filby	Programme Manager, LBRuT
Ellen Slack (secretary)	Project Support Officer, LBRuT
Elizabeth Blishen	Ham Close Resident
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
Maria Goitiandia	Ham Close Resident
Mandy Jenkins	Ham Close Resident
Jill Lamb	Ham United Group
Briony Rowland	Ham Close Resident
Lorraine Russell	Ham Close Resident
Anthony Russell	Ham Close Resident
Stan Shaw	Ham Parade Traders
David Williams	Ham Amenities Group
Omar Zekri	Ham Close Resident

Ward Councillors

Cllr Jean Loveland
Cllr Sarah Tippett

APOLOGIES:

Geoff Bond	Ham & Petersham Association
Cllr Penelope Frost	Ward Councillor
Amelia Forbes	Ham Close Resident
Justine Langford	Ham & Petersham Neighbourhood Forum
David Lamb	Friends of Ham Library
Danny McBride	Ham Close Resident
Andres Muniz-Piniella	Ham Close Resident (and founder of Richmond MakerLabs)
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 and invited the group to review the minutes of the last meeting.

TE confirmed that the issues surrounding the use of the £10 consultation vouchers had been dealt with.

JNC confirmed that an answer to the question around an independent advisor will be included in the set of leaseholder FAQs which will be issued at the end of January.

ES confirmed that she had made changes to the Ham Close website following the suggestions made at the last meeting.

At the last meeting, a member of the group raised concerns that mortgage lenders may not lend to individuals where there is a certain percentage of social housing units in the same building. JNC explained that she was aware of other examples where this had not been an issue. JNC confirmed this question was included in the leaseholder FAQ document due to be issued at the end of January.

A member of the group highlighted that they had emailed the Council and RHP with suggested amendments to the minutes of the last meeting on the 30 November 2016. MS explained that although some were suggested amendments to the minutes, other comments were wider issues to do with the project.

ACTION: MB agreed to review the member of the group's comments and would respond to the member's email directly outlining appropriate changes to be made and will ensure any outstanding issues are added to future agendas.

2. RECENT PHASE OF CONSULTATION

2.1. MORE DETAILED BREAKDOWN OF THE RESULTS FROM THE CONSULTATION

SF gave a presentation to the group providing a more detailed breakdown of the results from the recent phase of consultation (19 October – 20 November 2016). The presentation also highlighted key themes from the open-ended survey questions.

Members of the group gave the following pieces of feedback in response to the presentation:

- The terms 'net agreement' and 'net disagreement' are not clearly explained. A definition and a short piece of explanatory text should be included in the report to ensure that these terms are understood by readers.
- When referring to the term 'overcrowding' it should be clear whether this is referring to Ham Close residents who currently live in overcrowded conditions, or if it is suggesting that a redevelopment would result in too many people living in the area.
- Messages should be communicated in a straightforward way. However, the detail should still be provided so that readers can find out more if they would like to.
- The terms 'Core Group', 'Core Group – Tenants', 'Core Group – Leaseholders' should all be explained to help readers understand how the groups differ.
- Raw figures should be included so that readers can see where the graphs and tables have come from.

ACTION: ES to ensure the above comments are fed back to BMG Research and incorporated into the full consultation report.

Members of the group asked the following questions / made the following comments in response to the presentation:

- 1. Are the 115 responses from the core group from 115 different households on Ham Close, or are they from 115 people who live on Ham Close (and may live at the same address)?**

MS explained that the 115 responses are from 115 separate properties on Ham Close and are from a mixture of both tenants and leaseholders. If a property requested a second survey, this would be submitted and considered separately, rather than as part of the core group. MS confirmed that analysis had not reached a stage where these additional surveys from Ham Close households had been separated from the rest of the wider community responses.

- 2. Please could the next steps for going forward be explained (questions such as: what happens if RHP buys a property? What if the project does not go to plan? How does the CPO process work?)**

JNC explained that the FAQs document for leaseholders would be issued at the end of January and would provide answers to as many of these sorts of questions as possible. JNC also explained that RHP would be holding monthly drop-in sessions for both tenants and leaseholders. RHP will advertise the drop-in sessions through newsletters and emails. The drop-ins will alternate between an afternoon session one month and an evening session the next.

- 3. Would RHP consider holding a leaseholders' meeting?**

JNC responded that the need for a leaseholder-only event would be considered once the FAQs had been published, as agreed at the last stakeholder reference group meeting.

- 4. It can sometimes be difficult to absorb all of the information received when reading through documents individually - a meeting could be useful to hear questions that others may have.**

JNC reiterated that RHP would consider an event for leaseholders if it was felt it was still needed following the release of the FAQs. However, if an event was to be held there would need to be further discussion around what kind it would be as some leaseholders have said that they would not attend a formal meeting as they felt others tended to dominate such events.

MB understood that the leaseholders have concerns about a potential redevelopment. She asked them to look forward, rather than back. She emphasised that if the process is not made clear going forward, then she would help them to make sure that they are listened to, provided with the information they need in order to make next steps for the future.

MS stated that the Council and RHP wish to keep all information channels open, to ensure that people feel fully informed in what is going on. She acknowledged that not all information would be able to be provided at this stage and that some answers have not been fully worked out yet. A member of the group highlighted that some issues which affect leaseholders may also be relevant for tenants as well.

- 5. Did BMG Research (who were commissioned for the 'Future of Ham Close' consultation) also put together the presentation slides for the meeting?**

MS explained that RHP and Council officers drafted the slides by pulling together draft information from what has been received to date.

- 6. Could a smaller group (made up of some of the members of this group) meet to review the final report before it is published?**

MB confirmed that she would be happy for a sub-group to meet at the school in February and suggested that a couple of tenant reps and a couple of leaseholder

reps could be invited to review the report. MS confirmed that the Council and RHP would get the report ready to a standard that they are happy in time for this special meeting.

MB queried whether any photos had been taken during the meeting. A member of the group confirmed that some photos had been taken. MB reminded the group that presentations (such as the one given this evening) may provide a preview to information which has not yet been released more widely. MB asked that any photos taken during the meeting are not distributed afterwards.

3. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Members of the group asked the following questions:

1. When would RHP and the Council be able to share next steps with the group?

MS explained that RHP and the Council are working on a more detailed timetable. JNC acknowledged that the feeding back boards provided high level dates, but that a more detailed plan would need to be shared in due course. JNC confirmed that a high-level timeline could be shared at the next meeting in March.

2. When will the results of the extended traffic survey be available?

SF confirmed that a feasibility study was carried out in May which helped to inform the workshops that took place in Summer 2016. From that we learned that the Petersham Road junction should also be looked at. SF confirmed that this will be added to the website shortly.

ACTION: ES to add the traffic survey report to the Ham Close website and contact the stakeholder reference group to let them know that it has been added.

3. Could the stakeholder reference group have the opportunity to review the FAQs at the next meeting in March?

MB agreed that the FAQs could be discussed at the next meeting. She also suggested that group members should feel free to email hamclose@rhp.org.uk in the meantime with any comments or suggestions.

4. Council notices have appeared on Ham Close in recent days – are these notices to do with this project?

Other members of the group explained that these are 'Local Plan' notices. The Local Plan is a planning document put together by Richmond Council. Ham Close is one of the sites identified in the Local Plan. MB also confirmed that the Local Plan is a separate piece of work and reassured the group that the project is far from this stage. MB advised members of the group to ring the Council if they are unsure about a notice. The group agreed that if and when any notices are put up in relation to Ham Close, that the Ham Close Uplift logo is used to help differentiate between different signs. A different member of the group highlighted that the Ham and Petersham's Neighbourhood Forum have been working on a Neighbourhood Plan for the area and a consultation will launch shortly.

4. DATE, TIME AND VENUE OF THE NEXT MEETING

The Group agreed that the next meeting would be on Tuesday 7 March at 19:30 (the Library, Grey Court School).

A sub-group will also meet in advance of the next meeting to review the consultation report.

DRAFT