

**Minutes of Ledbury Estate Residents Project Group Workshop with Hunters
24th July 2018**

1.0 Attendance

RPG Members

Sue Slaughter	SS	Thomas Ennis	TE
Glenn Holmes	GH	Shelene Byer	SB
Patrick Goode	PG	Serife Dervish	SD
Eileen Bassom	EB		

Residents

Toby Bull	TB	Alex Heslop	AH
Danielle Gregory	DG		

LBS

Mike Tyrrell	MT	Abigail Buckingham	AB
Sharon Shadbolt	SSh		

Hunters

Mark Baines	MB		
-------------	----	--	--

Neal Purvis	NP	Open Communities - ITLA	
-------------	----	-------------------------	--

Apologies for Absence Val Taylor, Nathan Lechler, Jeanette Mason, Ferenc Morath

2.0 Introductions

2.1 NP welcomed all to the workshop with Hunters to see an update on proposals as par of the Option Appraisal Process for Ledbury Estate.

3. Options Appraisal (OA)

3.1 MB explained that Hunters had done some more work on options for new build and infill on the site of the towers. They had taken into account concerns raised about daylight sunlight, and have tried to design as many double aspect homes (window on two sides) as possible, with no single aspect homes with North facing windows. The only single aspect homes in this version are on the lower levels of the blocks.

3.2 Option 1 had the highest block at 18 storeys. This was a development of the design shown at the RPG meeting on 2.7.18. MB showed a drawings illustrating the amount of sunlight in the courtyard area starting at 7am in July, with a diagram for every two hours. There was lots of natural light through the core of the day. MB agreed to provide a similar drawing showing the amount of winter sunlight.

3.3 TB asked whether there was space for both a football kickabout area and landscaped gardens in the central courtyard. MB replied there was space for both. It was a large space. It would be permeable with routes through the space with lots of natural surveillance from residents.

3.4 GH asked if ground floor homes would have gardens? MB replied that ground floor homes would have either a private garden or patio. The London Plan requires all homes, at all levels to have private outside space, with enough space to sit out with a table for everyone in the household.

3.5 DG asked about the width of alleyways between blocks. MB replied they are the same width as the front of the school.

3.6 PG asked how far away the blocks on Old Kent Rd (OKR) were from the road. MB explained the blocks are onto the footpath which is 6m wide. PG commented it will be noisy in the homes on the OKR.

3.7 TE asked whether balconies would be open or closed in as winter gardens. MB replied that normally balconies on higher floors were enclosed for safety reasons. Winter gardens were more expensive to build than open balconies.

3.8 Option 2 - This design was a different idea of how to set out the corner of Peterchurch, Skenfrith and Sarnsfield. It is based on traditional streets that run North from Commercial Way. All homes are dual aspect and the streets would be car free, planted as a boulevard. The distance from the OKR to the buildings would be 8.9m. The highest point would be 18 storeys at the North end.

3.9 TB asked if there would be space on the TRA Hall site for a taller block. MB replied there was space and it could be either higher or lower than 18 storeys. TB asked about how the two options shown would fit with the rest of the estate. They were a difference size and feel to the low rise on the estate. MB replied that to carry out the Option Appraisal, Hunters would not design elevations, they would just look at bulk and height. TB was concerned that the result would be that it would look like two estates. MB noted that the Planners would take into account existing buildings when considering proposals. TB was concerned that some new building had dwarfed existing buildings, and were not sensitive to their setting.

3.10 MB noted that Option 2 provided four more homes than exist in the towers now.

3.11 Option 3 - This was close to a rebuild option with four 17 storey towers in place of the existing towers. He noted that the space around the towers at present is not well used and is not well integrated with the streetscape and has limited uses.

3.12 PG suggested new homes at the Elephant and Castle were popular with a similar design. MB suggested that there was more landscaping and a clearer management regime of the space at the foot of those towers, and there are generally less children in private sector high rise than in public sector high rise buildings..

3.13 MB explained that high blocks were relatively efficient in management terms as there was one service area with lots of homes in a block to pay for it. With fewer homes per service area the service charge costs were higher.

3.14 MT noted that when the blocks were built in 1968 there was no controls in allocation policies on young children living on higher floors. As there are high levels of

housing need in Southwark, LBS have to make use of all homes they own, particular larger homes, to let to families, even if they are on higher floors.

3.15 MB noted that the designs tried to get most of the three bedroom homes on the ground floor.

3.16 TE asked where the District Heating plant go? MB replied that it would be under the blocks along with parking.

3.17 TE asked whether a higher block could be built at Bromyard? MB replied that the overshadowing limited the option for high blocks at Bromyard.

3.18 There was a discussion about four story blocks not needing lifts and five storey blocks requiring a lift. MT explained that some landlords had four storey blocks, designated for elderly persons, and provided a lift. LBS did not have any designated elderly persons accommodation.

3.19 MB noted that all new homes are built to the equivalent of Lifetime Homes Standard. This meant they had level thresholds and were accessible to people with mobility problems. There was space to get a wheelchair into and out of a lift and space to get a wheelchair into and around a home. Four storey blocks must have an ambulant staircase which is not as steep as a traditional staircase, and has handrails on both sides.

3.20 Fire regulations require that there is no more than 7.5m from the front door of a flat to the fire escape staircase.

3.21 MB circulated a handout with information on density. Planning guidance requires a range of densities depending on the Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL). Most of Ledbury has a PTAL of 3. The density required by planners is from 55 to 145 units per Hectare. All of the Ledbury Estate, low rise and high rise, currently has a density of 110 units per Hectare. Option 1 provides 120 units per Hectare, Option 2 111 units per Hectare and Option 3 140 units per Hectare.

3.22 TB asked if planners would take into account the PTAL in the future when people were living in the homes, when there will be a new Bakerloo line. MB replied that the planners will take into account public transport now. Funding for the Bakerloo Line has not yet been agreed. The PTAL is reviewed regularly and the current version is from 2017.

3.23 NP asked whether planners have allowed developments at a higher density than the planning guidance. MB replied it was very rare, and only when all of the other planning requirements, relating to zero carbon, all dual aspect, zero car, were met. Normally planners would insist that the number of homes on the site were reduced.

3.24 MT reported the highest level of need in Southwark was for two bedroom homes. Housing managers would prefer more three bedroom homes to be built to allow those overcrowded in a two bedroom to move into a suitable home and to free up a two bedroom home.

3.25 MB handed out an analysis of the response from Hunters questionnaire. There was a 15% response rate with 41 returns completed. Among the residents wanted the towers to be retained. Among former residents 62% wanted the towers to be retained. Across the whole sample 75% of respondents wanted the towers retained.

3.26 MB suggested that the next stage of consultation will be on one refurbishment, Infill and three newbuild options. He agreed to provide the display boards to the RPG before completion so RPG can comment on the content before consultation of residents.

3.27 DG asked whether a 3D CGI could be prepared to make it easier for residents to grasp the ideas. MB agreed to consider this.

3.28 MT reported that LBS had analysed 56 returns so far on the refurbishment questionnaire, with more to be analysed. The current position was close, with residents favouring Refurbishment Option 2 and non residents favouring Refurbishment Option 3. Postal returns are still to be analysed.

3.29 TB was keen to see the effects of all the options and the need for works on the wider estate to be part of the conversation.

4.0 Next Meeting

4.1 Hunters to provide a briefing at the RPG Meeting on 7 August.

Neal Purvis 25.7.18.