

**Minutes of a meeting of the Resident Steering Group for Alice  
Shepherd House & Oak House held on 29<sup>th</sup> March 2021  
Meeting held via Zoom**

**Residents Present:**

Habib Ahmod – Alice Shepherd House  
Cynthia Owusu – Alice Shepherd House  
Nadia Mahmoud – Alice Shepherd House  
Ashley Lowther – Alice Shepherd House  
Sameena Raouf – Alice Shepherd House  
Jane McGregor – Alice Shepherd House

**Others Present:**

Lee Page – Independent Resident Adviser – TPAS  
Mike Tyrrell – Residents Advocate  
Mynul Islam – One Housing  
Emma Leigh Price – One Housing  
Leila Arefani – One Housing  
Spyridon Katsaros – PRP Architects  
Roumpini Perakaki – PRP Architects

**Apologies:**

Darren Brown – Alice Shepherd House  
Jill Skeels – St John's TRA

**1 Welcome & Introduction**

- 1.1 The apologies that were given are noted above. AL stated that she would have to leave by 8pm due to lack of data. LA apologised that this had fallen off of the list but she would pick this up again.

**2 Notes of the Meeting held on 10<sup>th</sup> November 2020**

- 2.1 LP stated that given the full agenda and that the last meeting was over 4 months ago he wasn't proposing to spend any time on the last minutes. This was accepted.

**3 Matters Arising**

- 3.1 None

**4 Attendance**

- 4.1 No current issues.

**5 PRP Design Update**

- 5.1 LP introduced this item and passed to SK who shared a

presentation on the updated designs re the full redevelopment option (option 6).

- 5.2 SK said that the December meeting had produced two main areas for reconsideration and said that each had produced a variation.
- 5.3 First option looked at the number of blocks in the redevelopment as it had felt quite dense. The presentation showed a reduced number of blocks and what they would look like, This has increased the height of the blocks, with one on the footprint of the current Alice Shepherd House. It also increases the green space between blocks B & C (see below) and affords an opportunity to increase the parking on Stewart Street.



- 5.4 The new blocks will be higher than existing with Blocks B & C 16 storeys in height and Block A 25 storeys. In terms of flat numbers, Block A would have 140 homes and Blocks B & C 105 homes. As Block C sits on the footprint on the current Alice Shepherd House this would see a rise in flat numbers from 84 to 105. Previous block heights were 12 storeys and 20 storeys. Angling of blocks is to increase views and daylight and sunlight.
- 5.5 JM queried whether flats would be 'walkthrough' with views both north and south. SK stated that at present one flat in block C would be north facing only whilst the rest would have views both ways. However, this level of detailed design could change.
- 5.6 LA said that whilst the designs had been undertaken in

response to SG views, One Housing were concerned that this design wouldn't meet planning requirements

- 5.7 Query raised as to where the views seeking this option came from. Said that queries had come from both the SG and wider residents and had been circulated in advance to the SG. AL concern around density/space – what size flats etc? That level of detail hadn't been worked up yet. SK also said that the footprint includes the space for the old housing office and community centre. Confirmed that block A is on the site of the housing office and Stewarts Road is just above block B. Block C is on the site of the current Alice Shepherd House. The heights though will be challenging for the planning approval given that the estate falls outside the current tall building zone on the Island.
- 5.8 NM queried whether the number of units (350) was the required number. To be discussed under a later agenda item.
- 5.9 Some confusion around what is known as opposed to what isn't. LP/LA explained that this was a starting point so that we can work up the best of all options. There is still a lot of discussion to be had to get resident feedback. The process is ongoing and that there will be a joint decision. SK said that the conversation is useful to know what is important as that impacts on the design.
- 5.10 LA explained that all figures are at a 'high level' to give an estimate on the number of flats based on a number of factors. These will be refined as the project moves forward. AL explained that there is a concern over the large increase in population numbers across the Island. LA to share the high level figures from the council as to the flat sizes in a development. Hard copies of the presentation will also be circulated to the SG
- 5.11 SK spoke to a variation on the design which provided some low level to the north of Block C. JM very concerned about future management of the additional homes as the increase in people will increase social issues such as ASB. A brief discussion on current problems took place. SK said that it's useful to consider even if it was then discounted. Accepted that this wouldn't increase the level of open space. NM liked additional open space as it meant that there wouldn't be the same competition for space. This option also didn't achieve the same number of homes unless Blocks B & C were increased to 14 storeys (Block A = 25 storeys) It does increase the space between blocks from the original design (22m to 30m). A brief discussion on the impact of materials

**LA**

**OH/PRP**

and landscaping on noise transmission. Sound transmission will also be a planning issue.

5.12 Option B which looked at having an external walkway.



5.13 This kept the two blocks at the north of the site, moved the tower block to the Oak House site and created a lower level block on the site of the community centre. This could have external walkways and an enclosed external space. Heights would be 12 storeys for Blocks C & D, 20 storeys for Block B and Block A 6 – 11 storeys.

5.14 LA clarified that each flat would have a private balcony and that the Block A had a walkway outside the front door. This could also have the advantage of allowing the first building stager to create block A and then current residents can move across and allow the rest of the development to be undertaken. NM asked how the council would react? LA said that OH would allow residents to move twice if they preferred the design of other parts of the estate. It'll be dealt with on a case by case basis.

5.15 In response to NM, LA stated that some issues in other new developments were the result of design issues where OH weren't the developers.

5.16 MT asked about winter gardens, at what level would they be introduced? Walkways would be on top of each other (not over properties). Block A would have approx. 100 homes. SG felt that all of the taller part of Block A should be on the Manchester Road side of the building to create better river views. SK said winter gardens could be at any level it's a

decision to be made in the design brief.

## 6 **Project Website**

- 6.1 LP introduced this item and referred to an email sent to SG members which provided a link they could use to see the 'draft' website. He asked that SG members had a look and provided feedback on what they thought of the proposed design and information and what they thought was need in addition and what (if anything) was unnecessary.

## 7.0 **Financial Viability of Proposed Options** (*taken ahead of item 6*)

- 7.1 LA introduced this item. Essentially, any redevelopment needs to pay for improvements. Recent changes to the GLA grant funding so the aim is to put in an anonymous bid on the scheme with the most new build homes to find out what the scheme could attract. Potentially better funding opportunity.

GLA have asked for details of what development housing associations want to deliver. They want to know what is likely to be coming forward and will look at an indicative bid with no details of locations etc.

GLA are also clear that ballots need to be held but want to know what's likely to be coming forward.

- 7.2 MT asked if 2 bids could be made to see if more money could be obtained to reduced density? Grant only provided on new homes so the higher the numbers put forward then the more money can be put aside. If we need less in the future that is OK but very unlikely that we could obtain more if required.
- 7.3 Although the grant isn't thought to be 'per property built' the GLA are likely to want to see as many as they can for the grant given.
- 7.4 AL asked about the financial rating downgrade? LA said that unexpected expenditure on areas such as fire safety had impacted on cashflow which had led to the downgrading. OH think that the 350 home total provides enough scope to achieve break even. Not sure what the current figures included in terms of potential grant.
- 7.5 NM asked about impact of grant on design and planning? No, the grant doesn't impact on planning decision. JM queried if funding would impact on choice of materials? LA said that they were looking to improve the standard of homes not to

build poor housing. In terms of parking, the non-provision of car parking is a council policy. MT mentioned Island Point development as an example of where this doesn't work.

## **8.0 Consultation – emerging from lockdown**

8.1 LP introduced and referred to LA who had some proposals for consideration.

8.2 LA summarised what had happened to date and the impact of the pandemic on consultation. From the end of April door knocking can recommence (Alice Shepherd House) and, potentially, drop-in sessions under a gazebo could be held.

From 17<sup>th</sup> May there can be groups of up to 30 people outdoors.

Door knocking would be a way of bringing people up to date. Community centres would be closed until September. Post 17/5 an event for up to 30 people could be held, weather permitting, in the football area. This would be prior to exhibition 3 but hopefully would have had some feedback from GLA.

8.3 NM expressed the view that Maggie Phillips and Jill Skeels are missed as part of the SG meeting. How can we facilitate their involvement? LA said they could attend outside events.

8.4 AL wondered how many people were up to date on the proposals. A larger gathering is needed rather than 1-2-1's. LA asked if a workshop in later May would be better. JM felt it would. Door knocking could follow this.

8.5 LP said that we need to recap based on the second booklet as to where we've got to.

8.6 CO asked if a table by the car park could be established to let everyone know where we were up to?

8.7 HA felt that door knocking should take place to 'warm people up' ahead of the outdoor event. Agreed that there should be brief door knocking exercise to advertise the future event. This, together with leaflets, would be undertaken about 2 weeks ahead event.

8.8 SR asked about the future timetable. LA felt this was difficult to answer. We had an expected timeline but the need to restart has impacted on this.

8.9 LP suggested that he, MT/LA etc. would speak before the next meeting to try and set out some ideas. LA agreed but there were a number of issues 'up in the air' at present. **LP/LA/MT**

8.10 JM queried why only the full redevelopment option had been re-examined. LA felt that the current updated designs were in response to queries raised on that specific option. Happy to address any suggestions on any of the options. SK said PRP were happy to respond to suggestions on any option.

**9.0 Date of Next Meeting**

9.1 26<sup>th</sup> April 2021. HA/SR/NM happy for the meeting to proceed even though it was during Ramadan as alternatives times probably wouldn't work.

**10.0 Any Other Business with OHG Officers present**

10.1 None

**11.0 Any Other Business without OHG Officers present**

11.1 LP said he would send both electronic and hard copies of tonight's presentation to the SG. **LP**

**Meeting closed at 9.00 pm**