

**Minutes of Ledbury Estate Residents Project Group Meeting
3rd July 2018**

Attendance

RPG

Sue Slaughter	SS	Nathan Lechler	NL
Thomas Ennis	TE	Patrick Goode	PG
Jeanette Mason	JM	Eileen Bassom	EB

Observers

Toby Bull	TB	Resident
-----------	----	----------

LBS

Mike Tyrrell	MT	Abigail Buckingham	AB
Sharon Shadbolt	SSh		

Others

Mark Baines	MB	Hunters
Neal Purvis	NP	Open Communities – ITLA

Apologies for Absence: RPG Members: Shelene Byer, Serife Dervish, Glenn Holmes,
Val Taylor
LBS: Ferenc Morath

1. Introductions and update on membership

- 1.1 NP informed attendees that the meeting would be recorded.
- 1.2 NP reported that the newsletter to the Low Rise had led to 3 residents volunteering to become members of the RPG, and welcomed JM. EB and NL.
- 1.3 NP reported that Jo David a high rise leaseholder had resigned from the RPG. **NP to send a newsletter to high rise tenants, ex tenants and leaseholders to ask for a volunteer to fill the vacancy for a high rise resident.**

2. Minutes of the Meeting 1st May & Hunters Workshop 4th June 2018

- 2.1 With the correction of 'Shelene Byers' to 'Shelene Byer', the minutes of the meeting 4 June 2018 were agreed as accurate.

3. Options Appraisal (OA)

- 3.1 MB reported that since the last meeting the boundary had been set and circulated to RPG members. The ideas presented were work in progress and would move and change taking into account comments from this meeting and other information received including feedback from the questionnaires.
- 3.2 MB identified possibility for infill development. He made clear that the infill options were not for a particular tenure, and the ideas that were being presented were design led. Costs would be assessed later in the Option Appraisal Process.

- 3.3 Infill options included opposite Bromyard a 4 storey block, mews houses that would back on to Pencraig Way, and some higher blocks overlooking the Old Kent Rd.
- 3.4 MB made clear that the TRA Hall is outside the redline boundary. None of the proposals involve the TRA Hall site.
- 3.5 **MB agreed to provide information on the density of the current Ledbury Estate as a whole, and the specific density for the three distinct areas defined by the highways, existing tower blocks area within the red line, and the low rise area of the estate outside of the red line.** It is calculated in Habitable Rooms per hectare. The area with tower blocks is the densest part of the estate at present.
- 3.6 MB explained that density for planning purposes is determined by Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL), and that for Ledbury that would mean a density of up to 450 Habitable Rooms per Hectare. A habitable room is normally a bedroom or living room. In larger homes a kitchen diner could be a habitable room.
- 3.7 AB agreed that the Council were able to get Hunters to provide the density information on the current estate on the basis it was requested by the RPG.
- 3.8 MB made clear in response to a question from JM that if there were any works on the area of the football pitch, that it would be re-provided on the estate.
- 3.9 MB explained at Bromyard the proposal was 4 storeys, to reduce overshadowing, and to fit in with the buildings on the other side of Commercial Way.
- 3.10 The proposal at the rear of Pencraig Way was for two storey mews houses. Mews houses open directly onto the footpath without any front garden area with small gardens at the rear.
- 3.11 Four storeys was the maximum height next to Bromyard. Any taller would have overshadowing impact on the existing homes in the tower blocks.
- 3.12 MB highlighted extra homes would need some car parking provided, and this would take up space that could otherwise be used for green space.
- 3.13 PG raised the awkward shape of the block. MB agreed it could be rotated to reflect the orientation of the tower block.
- 3.14 TB asked about the guidance for parking. MB replied that even where there is a high PTAL there would need to be more parking. The infill would be around 73 units. Planners were likely to ask for around one third. On smaller developments they were car free. It is unlikely that this number of new homes would get planning permission car free.
- 3.15 NP asked whether Council can get number of cars registered on the estate? **MT agreed to try to find out how many cars are registered on the estate.**
- 3.16 SSh reported that on Sceaux Gardens the Council had provided car parking space for the disabled homes, and not for others in a 24 home development, with payments

for 5 years to a car pool. MT reported new estates are car free, and outside of the 8.30am to 5.30pm parking controls it is impossible to get a car parking space.

- 3.17 MB introduced the next option which looks at what can be rebuilt if all tower blocks were demolished. At Bromyard the block could be replaced with a 4 storey crescent. Opposite the school a 4 storey block of flats opposite the school, two storey mews houses between Pencraig Way and two storey mews houses at the turning the corner from Pencraig Way at the North of the site onto the Old Kent Road. A higher block on the Old Kent Road turning the corner onto Commercial Way with a green area in the middle.
- 3.16 MB showed the Old Kent Road block that would be 15 storeys on the corner, dropping, with 10 storeys on the Old Kent Road, and then dropping down as it continues along Commercial Way to 4 storeys. With 2 storey mews houses at the rear of the block.
- 3.17 Hunters want to replicate the traditional scale and type of street similar to the other side of the road.
- 3.18 MB said there would be the opportunity to build on the TRA Hall site, if the site was brought forward later on.
- 3.19 TB asked why TRA Hall site was not included. AB replied that the boundary had been set by the Councillors.
- 3.20 MB explained that the current number of homes was 222 and the newbuild option provided 242.
- 3.21 MT explained that blocks could go up to 4 storeys without a lift. He reported that experience from Sylvan Grove was that some residents wanted open plan kitchen living room, and many did not. Design details like this would be dealt with following the Option Appraisal process
- 3.22 PG was concerned about security and the light inside the garden of the block proposed on the corner of Old Kent Road. MB replied that the space had a lot of natural surveillance of the space. Much of the open space was not 'owned' by particular blocks. The other option was to break blocks apart, but that could lead to people from off the estate cutting through the space.
- 3.23 SS asked whether having 4 storey blocks without lifts would limit who could live on the estate. Many people had stayed in the towers because when they looked at other properties, there were no lifts, and this was difficult for people with mobility problems or buggies. MT suggested the mix of different size and type of flats would mean that people could choose to live in a block with a lift if they preferred.
- 3.24 NL how many homes are dual aspect? MB replied most but not all of them at present. Those that are not are mostly one bedroom, but there are some two bedrooms. Approximately 80% dual aspect. PG noted that all current flats are triple aspects.

- 3.25 PG asked about space standards. NP asked for comparisons between existing space standards in the towers and what is proposed. MB noted that one bedrooms are quite large whereas two and three bedroom homes are smaller than current space standards. **MB to provide space size comparison existing and proposed.**
- 3.26 MB made clear that all homes private and social have to meet minimum space standards. Space standards include storage, with external space, a balcony or patio on top of this.
- 3.27 A 4 storey block was proposed on the site of Sarnsfield.
- 3.28 MB the next stage was to look at how to phase the work, and how look at organizing demolishing some of the tower blocks.
- 3.29 PG asked what other options Hunters had considered. **MB agreed to show other ideas they had developed through hand drawn sketches on tracing paper.**
- 3.30 TB asked when the low rise blocks would be refurbished. AB replied that this would not be considered in this process. The Council would decide on the future of the towers. Demolition and rebuild would take longer than refurbishment. TB asked whether it would be better value for money to include refurbishment on the low rise alongside the works to the towers? NP suggested that the best point to decide on this would be when looking at procurement (tendering) after Cabinet had made a decision on the towers.
- 3.31 SS asked whether new build homes make the appearance of the low rise without any refurbishment look poor?
- 3.32 MT suggested that LBS priorities across the borough may affect what work is done when the works to the towers are complete.
- 3.33 AB confirmed that the front door replacement for some of the homes in the low rise that had not had this work was now programmed.
- 3.34 PG asked whether Hunters had considered two 40 storey towers? That would leave space for landscaping. MB replied that it would not get planning permission.
- 3.35 MB explained that the proposed high block on Old Kent Road could be built without any demolition.
- 3.36 AB made clear all ideas would presented to the RPG before Cabinet makes any decision.
- 3.37 MB explained that they had designed 15 storeys, would people be comfortable with more. There were a variety of opinions across the RPG. A common theme in the opinions that were shared was that residents were open to higher planning if it was not at the expense of the existing community, ie all those who wanted to stay in the area were able to do so. This was an underpinning qualification of a number of those who expressed an openness to in excess of 15 storeys.

- 3.38 TB asked whether Hunters would be happy to carry out 360 degree review at the end of the process. MB replied Hunters would be happy to do this.
- 3.39 TE asked about the cost of different options and the value of the buildings produced at the end of it. MB will give a build cost and number of homes. AB replied that the Council will look at the cost of the works. The financial model will set this out.
- 3.40 SS asked about the height of new blocks. MB suggested that the neighbouring blocks would have an effect on how any tower would look.
- 3.41 TE asked about access to the stairs. MB replied the tower was with a cluster around a core in the middle of the block. Each flat would be no more than 7.5m from the staircase. MB will not design the internal flats but will provide an outline of the common parts.
- 3.42 PG asked whether there would be two staircases in the block and fire safety.. MB replied that Hunters were looking at one staircase.
- 3.43 MB reported that there had been 62 returns to the questionnaire. They would be analysed and reported to the RPG.
- 3.44 MT circulated a questionnaire on refurbishment options for towers residents and former residents. It asks residents to rank the options so one of the options would go forward into the Option Appraisal.
- 3.45 RPG gave comments to MT on drafting of the questionnaire. There was a discussion on whether costs of the different options should be included. PG suggested costs should be included as choosing Option 4 would mean less money available for works on other Council homes across the borough than if Option 1,2 or 3 was chosen. AB made clear that the Council did not want to be seen to influencing residents' choices. The covering letter could refer residents to where they could find more information on the website.
- 3.46 MB explained how the responses to the questionnaire would be set out in the Option Appraisal process. Residents' views would be set out alongside the costs of the option preferred by residents for the Council's Cabinet to make a decision on.
- 3.47 SS was concerned that tenants who were still living in the tower blocks had been through a very difficult year, and that they should be given a reasonable choice without looking at the effect on the Council finances.
- 3.48 PG asked whether tenants rents would go up if Option 4 was chosen? NP asked LBS to provide clarity that the rents would not change whatever the refurbishment option was. **MT to put this in the newsletter.**
- 3.49 MB set out the next steps. Hunters would take into account comments made by the RPG, they will look at the next stage of the design, and look at phasing, and provide information on partial demolition and refurbishment. **NP to programme a date for the RPG and Hunters to meet before the August RPG meeting.**

4. Update from LBS

- 4.1 Sylvan Grove – MT gave an update on offers and acceptances: 55 households had accepted Sylvan Grove properties. LBS had offered the homes one more time since the last RPG Meeting. Next options are at Churchyard Row, newbuild at the Elephant.
- 4.2 MT will write to all resident leaseholders with valuers and floor plans with 10 days to respond.
- 4.3 TE asked whether the leaseholder had to put the full value of their existing home in as equity for the new home. MT made clear that the full value of the existing home, but not the home loss payment, had to go into new home and the minimum share for a leaseholder moving with equity share was 25%.
- 4.4 SSh reported that the Deep Clean by LBS was complete but **the programme for the Keepmoat follow up on the tower blocks would be issued on 4.7.18** and will take 6 weeks. Deep Clean on the low rise blocks will be carried out by the Council's Cleaning Contractor. Major Works had walked round the estate with TRA reps to identify what was needed on the low rise. **There would be a joint Contractor TRA Major Works meeting to agree specification in week beginning 9.7.18.**
- 4.5 SS asked whether the deep clean would be done on floor where there was no one living. AB replied they would not.
- 4.6 Management of towers with increasing numbers of voids would become more urgent as Sylvan Grove cases moved out. MT and TE inspected letterboxes, that will now be screwed up when they are void. LBS giving the post office regular updates on the void properties.
- 4.7 Fire Brigade want notices that say no one is living in a home to remain and not be removed. AB explained that Fire Brigade focused on getting residents out of occupied homes and the notices helped them.
- 4.8 MT to continue to look at ways to remove the notices on the doors of void flats.

5. Resident Issues

- 5.1 Leaseholder Right to Return if there is demolition will be on the agenda for the Leaseholder Meeting. Date to be agreed.

6.LBS Decisions

- 6.1 Cabinet Meeting to make a decision on the Option Appraisal on 30.10.18.

7.0 Matters Arising

- 7.1 (4.1) Questionnaire had been updated following RPG comments.

- 7.2 (4.8) Cover letter updated following RPG comments.
- 7.3 (4.12) Questionnaire had been updated and issued.
- 7.4 (4.19) Open Communities had doorknocked and helped residents to complete the questionnaire.
- 7.5 (5.3) Programme to be issued 4.7.18.
- 7.6 (6.1) There had not been any more examples of adults congregating on the football pitch in the evenings.
- 7.7 (6.3) Leaseholder meeting date to be set.
- 7.8 (7.1) MT to update on process of decision making to extend leasehold options.

8. Any Other Business

- 8.1 MT reported that Fire Brigade had done a fire inspection of Peterchurch and Bromyard. The only issue raised was with access to some floors with the drop key. This has been repaired and other blocks checked.
- 8.2 MT reported on the fire alarm test. The alarm worked, although there were some problems with turning the alarm off in some flats.
- 8.3 PG thanked MT and the team for providing evacuation procedures for immobile residents.

9. Date of next Meeting

- 9.1 Proposed dates for future meetings
 - a. 7 August 2018
 - b. 4 September
 - c. 9 October
 - d. 4 December

N. Purvis 6.7.18.