

Ebury Bridge Community Futures Group – Meeting 36

7th July 2020, 6.30pm – 8.30pm

via Microsoft Teams

Members Attendance:

- Tom McGregor [TMc] – Chairperson
- George Panayioudou [GP]
- Cristina Pasantes [CPa]
- Joanna Winterbottom [JW]
- Charlotte Pragnell [CPr]
- Mohammed Eisa [ME]

Apologies:

- Fiona Quick [FQ]
- Sheila Martin [SM]
- Tammy Dowdall [TD]

WCC Officers and Consultants:

1. David Thompson [DT] – Project Director Ebury Bridge
2. Gelina Menville [GM] – Ebury Bridge Regeneration Manager
3. Martin Crank [MC] – Communications & Engagement Manager
4. Vikki Everett [VE] – Project Manager
5. Stephen Stretton [SS] – Programme Manager
6. Louis Blair [LB] – Communities First (ITLA)
7. Millie Morrissey [MM] – Project Support Officer (Meeting notes)
8. Chris Stevens [CS] – Managing Director Bouygues UK
9. Peter Doherty [PD] – Project Director Bouygues UK
10. Jeff Joseph [JJ] – Director of Corporate Social Responsibility Bouygues UK

Notes: *This document provides a summary of the discussions which took place during the meeting including questions and respective responses that were raised during the session, action points and key decisions.*

1. Welcome

TMc welcomed all members and gave apologies for FQ. TMc invited SS to introduce himself as the new Programme Manager for the existing estate.

2. CFG Standing Items

Matters Arising:

GP explained that he had been accidentally sprayed with water from the demolition site. GM suggested to take the matter offline. GM promised to email Mike Weller (Site Manager) and ask him to call GP personally to discuss any concerns or issues with the way the contractors have been working. JW asked that GM and GP update the group afterwards. GM informed the group that following the last meeting FQ raised the issue of time spent dealing with non-regeneration matters, which could potentially hinder the progress of the

group. GM explained FQ had suggested 'Estate Matters' is removed from the agenda. GM added that it was felt by FQ that the CFG were discussing and dealing with things in the absence of having a formalised Residents Association. GM invited the group to state if they would the item removed. CP explained she would remove general estate matters from the agenda. GM expanded on FQ suggestion and explained that if the Ebury RA were active they would pick those issues up. JW asked where these issues would be picked up as we currently don't have an active RA. TMc explained this is an issue for the housing team. GM suggested the item is taken off of the CFG agenda and the Housing Team can assist in finding an appropriate platform and solution.

SS offered to get someone from the Resident Engagement Team to contact a member of the CFG if reviving the RA is something that residents desire. CPa asked if the old RA weren't interested could there a new association be formed. SS confirmed that is a possible solution and asked for a member of the CFG to be the main point of contact for this action point. CPa volunteered herself.

Action: To liaise with the Housing Team about reviving the Ebury RA, giving CPa contact details to move this forward [SS].

Rumour Buster:

Nothing to raise.

3. Estate Matters

Covid-19:

Nothing to raise.

Housing/Estate Management:

Parking Update - SS updated the group on the Temporary Traffic Management Order which is effective from Thursday 9th July. SS explained that the temporary TMO enables Westminster traffic wardens to patrol the estate and can issue tickets. SS added that the full Traffic Management Order will be in place from October and the order being put in to place this month is to fast track the control and management of vehicles which are on the estate and shouldn't be.

GP asked what the process will be if a van needs to get on the estate to deliver furniture. GP explained he cannot go to Lupus Street office to collect the keys due to him being a shielded individual. SS offered to call GP offline to arrange to obtain keys.

Action: Call GP to organise vehicular access to the estate [SS]

JW asked what the difference is between the temporary TMO and the TMO that is effective from October and how will these changes be communicated to residents. SS explained that Westminster Parking Services have put notices on the website and have also issued a notice of intent. The notice of intent was published in the West London Gazette and on the inyourarea.co.uk website. SS added that when the lines are being painted around the estate on Wednesday 8th July, notices will also be put up around the estate, informing people that from 9th July there will be no parking on the estate. SS explained that the temporary TMO will suspend parking in a certain area for up to 18 months on a temporary basis, whereas a

full TMO will enable bays to be allocated, including the disabled permit holders' bays. CPa asked will disabled residents still be able to park somewhere in the meantime. SS explained that disabled residents will be able to park and there will be no changes to their arrangement.

MC added that residents have been warned about non-permitted parking in the newsletter for the last 3 months, as well as notes being placed on cars. Anyone parking on the estate will now receive a ticket under the new restrictions.

4. Project Update

Introduction to Bouygues:

TMc introduced the CFG to Bouygues UK.

CS introduced himself to the group as Managing Director for the residential section of Bouygues UK, working generally in London and the South East.

CS informed the group that BYUK have a wealth of knowledge in estate regeneration and they are a financially secure company, with this year's annual turnover estimated to be £473m. PD introduced himself as the Project Director, with vast experience in estate regeneration, commercial, sales and major projects. PD explained that he had been working with the Ebury development team during the pre-construction service agreement stage (PCSA). PD informed the group that he has pre-existing knowledge of Westminster as BYUK are working with WCC on Luton street. PD added he is aware of the constraints of the project but is bringing experience to deliver a successful scheme. PD emphasised involvement at the early stage will enable smooth delivery. PD addressed the security issues and concerns of the group raised in previous meetings and informed the group that there will be a dedicated resident liaison officer embedded in the community for all residents to approach and contact.

VE invited the group to explain what an exemplar regeneration scheme looks like. JW explained this is the only scheme she has been involved in so doesn't have anything to compare it to. CPa agreed and added she would like to see the transfer of the community spirit feeling to the new estate. CPa added she hopes that the new scheme won't alienate some members of the community. VE explained that the community and CFG have participated in the design aspects and WCC have worked hard to bring people on this journey. VE added on the ground these schemes are largely disruptive and how the scheme is delivered is just as important as what is delivered.

CS explained the CFG will be an integral cog in this entire process, BYUK joining this team and understanding the CFG feelings and thoughts is imperative.

GP explained that this process started in 2009 and a few years later the scheme was declared unviable. GP added it has been a long process and residents have been let down a few times. GP explained the team now have done a remarkable job and it feels like we are progressing at last. GP added he is encouraged by the development that is being seen and feels reassured that a company of Bouygues size is on board. TMc explained he has been involved in a number of regeneration schemes and it is important to know this scheme has a difficult history and at times some residents have felt frustrated. TMc added that this time

residents have seen finances, design options and had a large part to play in the process. TMc added the energy and opportunities is something to be excited about.

JJ introduced himself as the Director of Corporate Social Responsibility. JJ explained his remit includes resident engagement, social value and social value offer. JJ emphasised he will listen to what the CFG and residents want and will gain full knowledge of the community. JJ explained there will be satisfaction surveys, a charter and a promise to residents. JJ informed the group that BYUK will change some deliverables to suit the modern world, after Covid-19. JJ will continue to work with Judy Flight, Martin Crank and Lukas Holden and monitoring progress to ensure the promises in the bid are delivered.

PD explained the team are working to one collective goal. Within 3 months of signing the PCSA a goal will need to be agreed. PD added BYUK's intention once on site, is to work seamlessly in delivering this scheme for residents.

TMc invited the group to ask questions.

PD summarised nothing pressing from BYUK, successful meetings are being had with WCC and all is on track.

JW asked BYUK to highlight any issues which may be an obstacle as an outcome of Covid-19, for example commitments were made to local supplier who may not have survived. CS explained lots of supply chains are getting back to work and this is an interesting time that no one could have prepared for, lots of things can and will make waves, the full extent will be known after Brexit. JJ added that any events that cannot happen physically will happen virtually to maintain contact and engagement with Westminster and its residents. CS invited members to email any questions over that couldn't not be answered in the duration of the meeting.

5. Proposed Ebury Tenure Mix and Two Delivery Options

DT explained the Planning Application is submitted at the end of this week. The application is for two of the nine blocks, buildings 7 and 8. DT explained the influences include the right to return residents as well as the need to build homes for larger families.

DT outlined there are 129 social housing replacement homes, 1 social rent home, 28 intermediate affordable rent, 16 intermediate ownership & 52 open market sale. Phase 1 will deliver 226 homes. DT explained in the existing Ebury only 14% of homes were above 2 bed, 13 homes in total, here is the beginning of new distribution of 3,4 and 5 bed homes.

GP asked if these homes have already been allocated. DT explained they have not yet been allocated, the numbers are from conversations had with the people who lived on the estate about their current intentions and where they want to go. TMc added these proposals address two major concerns, overcrowding and the opportunity to return to the estate.

LB asked if the numbers of social rent homes have changed from the initial figures, as a result of conversations that have been had in the interim. DT explained that is correct, some people are happy to wait longer and be in a later phase. LB asked are the people who moved away for longer happy to do that. DT confirmed that is correct, it may suit their current circumstance, children's school or preference for location on the new Ebury. DT added some households have grown; others have shrunk therefore every 6 months Housing Needs Assessments are conducted.

GP asked when Phase 1 will be completed. DT explained between summer and early autumn of 2023.

RH presented a diagram of two 3D views of buildings 7 and 8, showing each level of the building with a key matching colour to tenure type. The diagram shows horizontal tenure split.

RH then presented a diagram of pepper pot tenure split in buildings 7 and 8 across different floors.

GP asked will these two buildings back on to the railway. RH explained they will be on the eastern side of the estate and back on to the railway line. GP asked are the rented properties short-term rent or long-term rent. DT explained all of the social rents are rents for life, the intermediate affordable rents will have different lengths of rental agreements on those, however the Council ensures that the management company offers 3 to 5-year terms.

LB asked will all tenure types share the same main entrance and lifts. RH confirmed that is correct, they will share the same main door, lifts, stairways and corridors.

JW asked what are PM4 homes. RH explained these homes are disabled homes, that can have wheelchair sized bathrooms and larger bedrooms to enable carers to move around the bed. RH added part M4 is a building regulation, at least 10% of the new development have to be PM4, Ebury has over 10% as well as having the flexibility to move them to wherever needed in the estate.

LB asked with the overall hybrid application, do we know indicative numbers for the tenure split. RH confirmed we do; we have put in the numbers for the whole development. Whilst in outline terms we don't need to be so specific, the overall numbers are available. Can follow up with a breakdown of those numbers following this meeting if desired.

Action: Circulate a breakdown of the tenure split numbers [RH]

DT added there will be a chance to review the bedroom sizes and the tenure pattern in both Phase 2a and 2b in the light of demand and household preferences.

LB asked in addition to having discussions with Westminster's planners, have discussions with the GLA begun yet. DT confirmed those discussions have been happening and the scheme has the GLA's approval on the basis that Ebury achieves 50% affordability, underneath that we're allowed great flexibility.

6. AOB

Nothing to raise.

7. Date of next CFG meeting

Tuesday 4th August 2020