

KSW Steering Group.

Meeting Date 7th Jan 2021 – 6pm - via Zoom.

Present	Initial	Present	Initial
Residents		Others	
Trina Morgan - Kedge	TM	Mynul Islam – One Housing	MI
Maureen Clayton - Kedge	MC	Emma Leigh Price – One Housing	EP
Roy Williams - Kedge	RW	Ray Coyle – Open Communities - ITLA	RC
Lubo Konstantinova - Starboard	LK	Mike Tyrrell – Residents’ Advocate	MT
Gemma Finch - Kedge	GF	Paul Handley – One Housing	PH
Marie Batchelor - Kedge	MB		
Leanne Ward - Kedge	LW		

1 Welcome

1.1 RC welcomed all to the virtual meeting.

2 Apologies

- Husnara Choudhury
- Leila Arefani

3 Minutes of meeting held on 3rd Dec 2020

3.1 Minutes were accepted as a true record of the meeting

4 Matters Arising

4.1 (6.2) Completed.

4.2 (6.6) Completed

(LK asked for information on how far the new blocks would be from one another and how many properties will be in each block. PH stated that the blocks will be 21 metres apart and that this was in excess of the 18-metre minimum distance. MI said he would get the info to LK about the number of homes in each block.

ACTION

MI to supply LK with information.

4.3 (7.3). Completed

4.4 (9.1) This was raised by **MB** in the previous meeting and related to how room sizes would pan out in the new flats and how overall increase in floor-space of a flat would affect individual rooms. **MI** said this was still outstanding and that he would update as soon as he had spoken with PRP

ACTION

MI to respond

4.5 (10.4) Completed

5 Update from One Housing

The Ballot

5.1 **PH** wished everyone a Happy New Year before going on to update on the ballot. The current national lockdown will have an effect on the timing of the ballot. One Housing (**OH**) are working on the assumption of a partial easing of the lockdown in mid-March and that, should this be the case, this would signal the start of the ballot process.

5.2 **PH** ran through how the process would run, starting with the Landlord Offer being sent out to all residents. Residents will have this for 3-4 weeks before the ballot period starts. **MT** and **RC** will be keen to answer any questions resident might have about the content of the Landlord Offer throughout the ballot period.

5.3 The ballot period will last for three weeks. If an easing of lockdown was to happen on 21st February, the next review date, the ballot period would conclude in early April. However it is unlikely that sufficient easing of lockdown will happen in Feb and that this could mean the completion of the ballot may be pushed back to May or possibly June.

5.4 **PH** said that **OH** will write to all residents outlining this information. He said that things may appear to quieten down a bit due to the delay to the ballot and that he was keen to ensure residents that things will be progressing in the background. He mentioned the continuing work on the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs), service charge estimates and utility costs and that PRP will continue with pre-ballot design work which will continue through to post ballot design work in the summer. **PH** then invited questions on ballot issues.

5.5 **PH** said that regular contact with the RSG will be maintained throughout the delay period and that **OH** will ensure contact with the wider community. **MT** said that there should be some information going out to the wider community at least once a month starting with Open Communities newsletter on week commencing 18 January. This, he said, would give the community confidence that the ballot is going ahead despite the current difficulties.

Contact with council

5.6 **PH** then updated the meeting with progress with the council. He explained the meaning and content of the 'Pre planning application' meeting (Pre-app meeting). It is an opportunity for the **OH** to show the council the plans for the development and the council can look at whether they meet the policy requirements and current legislation etc. **PH** said it was slightly unusual to have the pre-app meeting this early in the process. It would normally be around 4-6 months prior to the planning application but in this instance, it is closer to a year before the planning application is submitted, on the current time frame.

5.7 **PH** said that the council is keen to meet with **OH** prior to the ballot to ensure that proposals put to residents are realistic and deliverable. **PH** said that the first of the pre-app meeting with the council was held in December. The council asked about a perimeter block approach to the development – basically a square block which would have a frontage on Tiller street and an enclosed courtyard in the centre, instead of the 5 planned blocks.

5.8 **MT** pointed out that these types of blocks are already on the island at Union Wharf and behind Samuda House. **PH** said that **OH** will be discussing this again with the council at the next meeting with them at the end of this month. **PH** pointed out that the current plans from PRP are not complete and that further detailed design work will be ongoing up to the planning application. **PH** was keen to point out that the current designs are a work in progress and that tweaks may well be required to them.

5.9 **PH** said that the council are no longer keen on roof top gardens which have been popular across London. The council will be introducing a policy where it will be a lot more stringent on where these can be included in plans. **PH** then invited questions on contact with the council. **RC** asked if the council would push for the perimeter block design and what effect this would have on the number of properties **OH** was able to provide. **PH** said that it is a matter for **OH** to explain and justify why they have gone for the design as it stands

5.10 **PH** pointed out that tweaks had to be made to the plans at nearby Bellamy Close and Bing Street and this resulted in changes to the bin areas as well as having no residential units at ground floor level. He added that these kind of tweaks are as a result of meetings with the council.

5.11 **LK** asked what would happen if the council rejected the planning application. **PH** said that one of the reasons for engagement with the council via the pre-app meetings was to avoid any such outcome. He said that from this point on, the council will have an active part in design so that they will be aware of the detail of the application when it is made. **PH** then said that rejected planning applications can be as a result of developers not working closely with the council and then presenting plans which do not meet with council policy/legislation etc.

5.12 **PH** said that if an application is rejected an appeal can be made by the developer to the Greater London Authority which has the capacity to overturn a decision by the council. The council has to justify why it has rejected an application and provide a report on the detail of why it was refused. He said the developer could then adapt the plans to meet any objections from the council and submit a further planning application.

5.13 **MB** asked if **OH** were looking at potential tweaks to deal with issues like those at Bellamy & Bing. **PH** said that this development has no sleeping accommodation on the ground floor but that the issues with roof terraces/garden is a new development and it is not clear how this will be viewed by the council at this stage. **PH** said that there are currently a handful of consultants working on the process but this will multiply by 5 over planning permission has been secured and that **OH** will be guided by a whole range of experts in their own fields.

Utilities

5.14 **PH** said that **OH** has assessed the efficiency of brand-new buildings and found they would be much more effective than the current buildings. He said that **OH** would like to carry out a comparison analysis of this information and what residents are currently paying. This is proving difficult because currently, residents are effectively subsidised (it is unclear if this is provided to Starboard and Winch) to the tune of 75% of the cost of heating and hot water. **PH** said that this subsidy would be in place until 2025

ACTION

OH to check if the subsidy is to residents in all three blocks

5.15 **PH** said that this was an agreement as part of the stock transfer between Toynbee HA and the council. He thanked residents from Kedge House who had provided bills and asked for any residents in Winch and Starboard to provide the same so that an energy comparison can be made. **RC** asked if any bills had been provided from Starboard/Winch. **PI** said that only one or two had been provided and that this is not enough to carry out a comparative analysis. **PH** said that usage was also very low in Kedge House and that typical usage was around 9000 to 13000 units a year but currently the figures are around 5000 to 6000 units.

5.16 **MT** said that the current usage figures are even less than you would expect from new build homes and that it was puzzling why the usage is so low. **PH** said that if the current usage was for heating OR hot water that might explain it but it appears it is for heating AND hot water. **LW** said that the low costs could be down to the fact that the heating and hot water seldom works.

5.17 **RW** asked if the 75% subsidy would be in place in the flats up until 2025. **PH** said that the increase to full costs in 2025 would happen regardless of the outcome of the ballot and redevelopment. He said that it is not yet clear if **OH** will continue with the use of the Barkantine facility. He pointed out that **OH** is part of the agreement for the UK to become carbon neutral by 2050 and that the Barkantine system is carbon heavy and environmentally unfriendly. However, there is a plan in place to make the facility carbon neutral by 2029 and if this happens **OH** would continue to use the facility.

5.18 **PH** then said if the facility is not upgraded to be carbon neutral, **OH** would look at an alternative system such as an air source heat pump which generated heat through electricity. **PH** added that it is doubtful there would be new properties in place by 2025 and that we would be in the construction phase by then. **LK** asked if **OH** were considering solar panels on the roofs of blocks given the council are moving away from roof terraces/gardens. **PH** said this is very likely to be part of the design in order to reduce costs for residents.

General

5.19 **MB** asked about the possibility of having car charging points by parking spaces. **PH** said it is not something **OH** has looked at as yet on redevelopment schemes but that it will certainly become more popular in the low carbon debate. **PH** said he would look into this in more detail. **MT** asked if there was a requirement under planning guidance to provide this facility and can PRP clarify. **PH** said that **OH** is delivering another scheme on the island and this was not a requirement there.

ACTION

PH to report back

5.2o **RW** apologised and left the meeting at 6.55.

6 Any Other Business with One Housing present

6.1 None

7 Any Other Business without One Housing Group Present

7.1 **RC** suggested we continue with fortnightly meetings to look at design issues as well as progressing on the FAQs document. This was agreed.

7.2 **MT** said that the work on FAQs was important and that it should form an appendix to the main Landlord Offer. **LW** asked about residential properties on the ground floor. **MT** said that a t maisonette can be on the ground floor as long as the bedrooms are upstairs as you cannot have a bedroom on the ground floor in a floodplain.

8 Date of next Meeting

8.1 Thursday 4th February 2021

Draft