

Ledbury Estate Residents Project Group Meeting

Tuesday 21st January 2021 by Zoom

MINUTES

| Present | Present |
|---------------|--|
| Nicole Bailey | Lorraine Roach (LBS, New Homes Team) |
| Patrick Goode | Mike Tyrrell (LBS, Director of Ledbury Team) |
| Shelene Byer | |
| Thomas Ennis | Neal Purvis (Open Communities) |

1. Apologies for Absence

1.1. Apologies were received from Sue Slaughter, Danielle Gregory, Toby Bull, Glenn Holmes and Jeanette Mason.

2. Issues raised by Residents

2.1. NP noted that Toby Bull was concerned that 'I really hope low rises aren't left out to dry in the tail end of this process. Lord knows its been raised often enough. We had enough time to put in measures.' MT explained that the Offer Document was for residents and former residents in the Towers, and put forward proposals only for the Towers. At the request of the RPG there was a paragraph setting out the two year programme of QHIP refurbishment works for low rise homes will take place while the works to Ledbury Towers take place and there will be due regard of the impact of works on the Towers on the Low Rise homes .

3. Draft Project Brief

- 3.1. LR explained that the project brief is one of around 20 documents that is provided to the architects as part of the process to choose an architect and it sets out what the Council and residents want from new development on Ledbury. It would be used if the Ballot votes in favour of the redevelopment option.
- 3.2. **LR to send RPG list of architects who had the expertise and capacity to carry out the next stage of Design Work and had expressed interest in Ledbury, from the Council's Framework Agreement.** RPG to be involved in Architect Selection. 11 architects had expressed interest and all must be interviewed under the terms of the framework contract. Following ballot result work could begin on this.
- 3.3. LR explained that Council also employs Employers Agents, to provide technical advice to project manage the whole process of co-ordinating consultants reports needed for the planning application, Building Control approval, managing the appointment of a contractor, and managing the contractor before, during and after the construction work. Calford Seaden are able to carry out this role. Charles Hingston is not qualified to lead in this role, but could continue as part of the Calford Seaden team. There was a discussion on whether to keep Calford Seaden or to interview other Construction Project Management organisations. Members

agreed keeping Calford Seaden would mean the knowledge they had of Ledbury Towers, and residents' aspirations would not be diluted.

- 3.4. **LR will circulate the scope of service, and information on Calford Seaden staff** and the RPG could interview to decide which Calford Seaden staff member becomes Project Manager.
- 3.5. In response to a question from PG, LR explained her background has been working in social housing for over 20 years and she is a member of the Chartered Institute of Building, and has a housing degree. She has worked in Regeneration, New Development and Asset Management.
- 3.6. LR explained that the Project Brief includes a Risk Register that records major risks that could lead to delays or problems.
- 3.7. NP noted the consultation on whether to include the TRA Hall needed to be included in the project plan and must be subject to consultation of residents across the whole of Ledbury Estate.
- 3.8. LR explained that the Council has a process called *The Charter of Principles* that sets out the approach and process to involve residents where new build homes are proposed on existing Council estates. This sets out what happens at the Design Stage and includes regular meetings with the Council and contractors while construction works are on site. This may need to be tailored to the needs of Ledbury Residents. **LR to circulate RPG with LBS Charter of Principles.**
- 3.9. LR explained that the Community Brief sets out residents aspirations for estate improvements alongside new build homes, The Offer Document included some ideas on this, and the Design Issues Log also included ideas that are relevant.
- 3.10. TE was keen for the RPG to identify what everyone likes about the Ledbury Towers, as he was very aware that the homes included some features that did not appear very often in new homes, that residents prized. PG gave the example of the original windows and the uninterrupted views with little overlooking in Ledbury Towers.
- 3.11. LR will include the ideas in the Design Issues Log in a tracker that architects proposals will be judged against. This will be part of the brief that architects receive.
- 3.12. LR asked what RPG meant with 'safe secure blocks'. TE noted that deck access blocks meant that neighbours would pass the front door and windows onto the access balcony, where there was normally a kitchen. This felt less secure than the level of privacy in the Ledbury Towers. SB noted the glass at Blossom Court at the side of the door meant someone outside could tell if there was a person at home. This did not feel secure. A fanlight over the door would be a better design. PG suggested that Ledbury Towers were a better design than the Barbican, and he hoped that the designs would lead to a supercharged Skenfrith Mark II with modern technology. PG asked what is underneath the blocks? The 3 bedroom flats proposed would have a 24% bigger floor area, it would not be possible to use the existing footprint. LR acknowledged that what was underground would need to be part of the risk register. NP noted that there had been excavation at Bromyard as

part of Arup's third report, so there was some idea of what was there. There are garages under the podium of the other three blocks.

- 3.13. There was a discussion about current homes being triple aspect. LR noted that the LBS Design Standards required mostly double aspect. There may be some issues where architects would be asked to provide options and then the RPG would consider them. There would be some areas where compromises may be necessary. **LR to include need for architects to do a workshop with RPG on options and constraints on double and triple aspect homes.**
- 3.14. LR will develop the consultation strategy that MT has reported to each RPG meeting to include how residents with a Right to Return, and those living in Ledbury Low Rise are consulted throughout the process. **NP and MT to inform LR of what methods have been effective in previous rounds of consultation.**
- 3.15. LR identified issues recorded on a spreadsheet that will be included in the Project Brief. Each tab showed where in the design development it was relevant.
- 3.16. SB explained that large windows on lower floors meant that the only way to have privacy in a home was to draw the blinds. This was also an issue looking across balconies into neighbours in a courtyard block, where it was possible to see into kitchen windows.
- 3.17. **LR will include architects to provide a workshop for the RPG on fire safety in the brief.**
- 3.18. PG noted that the existing blocks were a H plan and that meant when you come out of the lift on your floor you come into the light. Having internal lobbies could mean that the area outside the lift is dark.
- 3.19. SB raised concerns about large windows in some new homes that were impossible to clean as they opened outwards, had a low ledge and were dangerous even with a restrictor on the window it would be possible to fall out of them.
- 3.20. There was a discussion about noise nuisance and what standards there were for noise transmission and how this was tested. LR explained it was a Building Control requirement in the design, and that there was some testing during the construction phase, but not at the point of handover. NB suggested at Ledbury we should specify a higher standard than the minimum. **LR will ask architects to look at the standards, what this means in practice, and what are the options and costs of providing a higher standard.**
- 3.21. TE was interested in the Passivhaus concept of ecological design and saw this as an aspiration. **LR will ask architects to provide information on what Passivhaus means, and the different levels of Passivhaus design.**
- 3.22. There was a discussion on how to deter and keep out pigeons from roosting and nesting on new buildings.
- 3.23. LR will cross reference the RPG Design Issues to the LBS Employers Requirements (ERs). This is the contract that LBS would sign with the Contractor and sets out what is required. It is important that it is set out in the ERs as changing what is required later is always expensive.

- 3.24. LR asked about RPG desire to have letterboxes in front doors. This would mean that the building would not get full Secured by Design accreditation. The ERs must explain this.
- 3.25. PG suggested in the interview for architects, they are asked about sightlines through windows. Before the windows were replaced Skenfrith residents had a clear view of Battersea Power Station.
- 3.26. PG asked who in the Council had knowledge and experience of the demolition process. He was concerned it could be expensive contractors needed to be closely monitored. LR will raise this with Calford Seaden as the Employer's Agent.

4. Deputation to Cabinet

- 4.1. The RPG decided to make a Deputation to the Cabinet Meeting on Tuesday 2 February.
- 4.2. NP to draft ideas for the Deputation, RPG members to comment, SB will deliver the speech to the Council's Cabinet.