

HAM CLOSE REDEVELOPMENT STAKEHOLDER REFERENCE GROUP

Record of meeting held on Monday, 18 July 2016 at Grey Court School.

PRESENT:

Maggie Bailey (chair)	Headteacher, Grey Court School
Mandy Skinner	Assistant Director Commissioning Corporate Policy & Strategy, LBRuT
Sarah Filby (secretary)	Programme Manager, LBRuT
Petra Braun	Ashburnham Road / Ham Street Traders
Justine Glynn	Ham & Petersham Neighbourhood Forum
David Lamb	Friends of Ham Library
Jill Lamb	Ham United Group
Julia Van den Bosch	Friends of Ham Village Green
Andres Muniz-Piniella	Ham Close Resident (and founder of Richmond MakerLabs)
Philippe D'Imperio	Ham Close Resident (part)
David Williams	Ham Amenities Group
Ward Councillors	
Cllr Jean Loveland	

APOLOGIES:

Tracey Elliott	Development Project Manager, RHP
Geoff Fox	Director of Development, RHP
Geoff Bond	Ham & Petersham Association
Stan Shaw	Ham Parade Traders
Amelia Forbes	Ham Close Resident
Danny McBride	Ham Close Resident
Cllr Penelope Frost	Ward Councillor
Cllr Sarah Tippett	Ward Councillor

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

- 1.1 MB welcomed the Group to Grey Court School, introducing herself and apologising for not being able to make the Group's first meeting on 4th July 2016.

Those present introduced themselves.

A member of the Group highlighted that their surname had been misspelt in the minutes of 4th July 2016 meeting.

ACTION: SF to amend minutes accordingly.

MB noted that for the next meeting (in September) she would identify all the children in the school that are Ham Close residents. MB highlighted that she had also written to Meadlands and St Richard's schools asking them to do the same.

ACTION: Following a suggestion from the Group MB to contact the Russell School (in addition to Meadlands and St Richard's).

ACTION: MB to work with MS and SF to draft a form of words for a

parent mail in September promoting the next phase of consultation.

ACTION: SF to follow up with TE regarding Network Housing 'fun day' flyer. (**POST MEETING NOTE:** TE reported that despite chasing Network Housing did not respond to TE with further details regarding their 'fun day' rescinding their offer of appointments to see the inside of flats.)

All other actions were noted as complete.

The Group agreed that publishing the minutes of meetings was a good idea, but that the minutes should not make reference to individuals.

ACTION: SF to amend draft minutes of 4th July 2016 accordingly.

2. REFERENCE GROUP TERMS OF REFERENCE

- 2.1 The Group discussed the inclusion of the Ham Close Residents Association and promotion of the Stakeholder Reference Group on their website and via their communications.

The suggestion was made to take St Richard's Church off the list of members of the Stakeholder Reference Group.

ACTION: SF to remove St Richard's Church from the list of members of the Stakeholder Reference Group.

The Group discussed the timings of Stakeholder Reference Group meetings. A later start was promoted to enable more Ham Close residents to attend. The Group agreed to start its next meeting at 19:30 rather than 18:30.

MB highlighted the importance of providing a range of ways to engage, noting that some residents wouldn't feel comfortable attending a meeting.

A member of the Group highlighted that there may be a degree of consultation fatigue and scepticism. They highlighted that some residents have become disenchanted and are waiting for next proposals to come out.

The Group asked for the Terms of Reference to be amended to refer to all Ham Close residents.

ACTION: SF to amend Terms of Reference accordingly.

Subject to the amends discussed and noted above the Terms of Reference were agreed by the Group.

3. FEEDBACK FROM DESIGN WORKSHOPS

- 3.1 SF took the Group through the key themes emerging from the design workshops to date. The Group highlighted several points including:
- Traffic and Transport – the need to understand the capacity of the Petersham Rd (A307), pinch points and safety concerns, such as Wiggins Lane which does not have a pavement.
 - Design Approach – one member of the Group highlighted that some of the precedent images used at the workshops had been misleading. The images showed Accordia (a development in Cambridge), with much lower densities.

- Open Space and Landscaping – the Group discussed the retention of mature trees and their value, highlighting the need for a tree survey. The Group also discussed the need for management plans for open spaces and consideration of this as landscape proposals are developed.
- Impact of Construction – exploring innovative solutions e.g. using the River to bring in materials, enabling two-way communications.

4. NEXT STEPS – FEEDING BACK AND PREPARING FOR FURTHER ENGAGEMENT AND CONSULTATION IN THE AUTUMN

- 4.1 A member of the Group suggested producing a 3D model of proposals for consultation as this would make it easier for residents to understand what any development proposal might look like.

A member of the Group highlighted that the previous incarnation of a stakeholder group, the Ham Close Community Forum, had wanted to see a significantly smaller number of residential units / a smaller scale scheme and felt that this still needed to be addressed.

The Group discussed the financial viability workshop and how the key messages from this session are played back, and the viability of future proposals tested and presented. MS agreed that any future consultation material needs to incorporate information on the financial viability of proposals.

A member of the Group highlighted the possibility of building / encroaching on the northern part of the green and the impact this would have on financial viability and phasing. MS reiterated that the next phase of consultation needed to be clear about the parameters (and compromises) within which a proposal is being developed in addition to playing back the key messages. The Group also discussed the library and the shops and their relationship with any redevelopment.

Following a discussion regarding community facilities MB highlighted that the sports facilities and other spaces at Grey Court School could be accessed by the community outside of school hours. MB invited members of the Group to contact her directly to explore access to the school's facilities in more detail.

A member of the Group highlighted that the cost of hiring premises is often prohibitive for a lot of community groups.

MB noted that she hoped to progress a local community calendar to highlight all the activity underway in the local area.

In response to further points raised regarding financial viability MS confirmed that both RHP and the Council needed to be able to talk about ranges at the next stage and highlighted that conversations with the GLA and DCLG would be progressed, and that the Project Team would also be investigating bespoke funding streams if we're talking about specific things on the site.

The Group discussed how to ensure residents on the Close had an opportunity to have their say. MS confirmed that any communications and engagement strategy would include letter drops to everyone on the Close and that the Project Team were exploring the idea of a pop-up consultation

exhibition in a (fully accessible) portakabin on the Youth Centre car park to make it as easy as possible for Ham Close residents to drop-in.

MB noted that there may be an opportunity to work with / engage Grey Court School students and suggested thinking really broadly to ensure we capture everybody.

Members of the Group liked the portakabin idea – holding a model and drawings etc. – open early in the morning and in the evenings so that people can just drop-in. The Group also noted that there are two different groups to be consulted with – the general public, and Ham Close residents and the need to work harder to reach Ham Close residents.

A member of the Group queried how far forward proposals would be. MS responded that the Project Team hoped to have a core proposal, with opportunities to be explored, including some narrative around the compromises / choices that might require further consideration.

In response to a question from a member of the Group MS confirmed that RHP and the Council would respond to the questions raised regarding the viability of refurbishment and infill and that work to respond to the other queries raised at the financial viability workshop was underway by colleagues at RHP.

MS confirmed that there would still be scope for things to change following the next phase of consultation.

It was highlighted that the Neighbourhood Plan was now evolving quite quickly and that it would be worth having a look at what the Plan is saying to ensure consistency.

The Group discussed whether or not a large public meeting might be appropriate. MB noted problems with big meetings; certain people have a voice whereas other people can't speak up. Smaller groups enable a broader spectrum to have a say.

5. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

- 5.1 None

6. DATE, TIME AND VENUE OF NEXT MEETING

- 6.1 The Group agreed that the next meeting would be Wednesday, 7th September at 19:30 (the Library, Grey Court School). The Group agreed that agenda items should include engaging with Ham Close residents and the approach to the next phase of consultation.