

**Resident Steering Group Meeting for Alice Shepherd House & Oak House**  
**Monday 28<sup>th</sup> July 2025**  
**31 Alice Shepherd House and via Zoom**

**Residents:**

Cynthia Owusu (CO)  
Jane McGregor (JM)  
Sharon Holmes (SH) via zoom  
Sasha Manley (SM)

**Riverside**

Paula Huzjak (PH)  
Isaac Amoah (IA)

**Hill**

Daniel Palman (DP)

**Resident Advocate**

Mike Tyrrell

**ITLA:**

Murselin Islam– Open  
Communities, Chair (MI)

**1. Welcome, introductions and apologies.**

1.1 MI took the Chair and welcomed attendees.

1.2 Apologies – Ray Coyle.

**2. Minutes of RSG meeting of June 2025**

2.1 These were accepted as a true record of the meeting

**3. Matters arising**

3.1 (4.2) MI to send information to SM that was presented in January meeting – Completed. Meeting agreed to share the presentation from January 2025 RSG meeting as well as the July consultation boards.

**Action – MI to share January presentation and July consultation boards. PH to send the consultation boards to MI.**

3.2 (4.6) PH to look into arranging a site visit after the event - In progress. It will be ideal to visit a project that reflects current London Space Standard as well as all updated fire regulations. JM advised DP to find properties that are of similar sizes of the proposed project so that residents can understand the comparison. DP informed all the properties will be build either to the minimum of what the current standard says or larger. Generally, the bigger homes are tends to be wheelchair units.

**Action - PH would inform the RSG if any progress made.**

3.3 (6.3) MT will follow up the issue of SH being advised by Riverside to look into only three areas for home search – MT advised this was raised with Riverside and PH said there is no limit for search areas for Riverside’s internal housing register as it is a choice based lettings system. SM said there isn’t much available from the internal bidding list and mainly it shows in Camden which she does not want and the ones that are good are already ring fenced for other regeneration projects. SH said she was asked by previous team to name three areas in Essex so that they can look into. PH said her team check the whole list every week and will advise if anything suitable accommodation comes up for SH in the areas SH has indicated which is not limited to three.

3.4 MT said residents would be interested to the list of all the areas where properties are available and then it will help them to make informed decision. IA is to discuss with the Lettings Team about the list to probably publish an article in a forthcoming newsletter with that information. PH said her team have a good understanding of where people want to move and most want to remain in Tower Hamlets.

**Action – PH has shares a list with SH of areas where Riverside properties are available. A newsletter will inform wider residents about out of Tower Hamlets where Riverside have a number of properties available.**

#### **4. Update from Riverside/ Hill**

4.1 PH informed the event was very busy and attended by 46 households with multiple people from those households. In addition a few residents from Samuda and other neighbouring homes came along. The consistent themes of feedback included wanting a timetable for the project, when actual building works will be starting, when the property layouts can be seen and when homes can be chosen by individuals.

4.2 DP echoed the same and said it was very well attended event. The information provided on the day was generally well received. It was well demonstrated that Hill have been listening to some of the key landlord requirements and commitments in terms of design. There was a lot of desire to have private balconies as currently residents don’t have balconies. Dual aspect homes, overlooking of green space, and the community centre with its own space; were all issues residents raised as important things that they wanted from their new homes. DP commented that it was good to hear from the younger residents who attended and hearing their views. PH added many residents were receptive of the community centre being street facing and few were worried about living above it.

4.3 JM said she had a long conversation with Paul Handley about management of the community centre and the risk of residents complaints if not managed properly (e.g. hours of operation, noise and crowd nuisance etc). JM felt that residents do not want the green space (court yard) to be accessed from community centre as that will give access to non residents of a secured area. JM urged that there is a need to have a bigger conversation about the community centre. SH echoed the same and said there is always the risk of users are not following restriction and ending up with loud noise and late-night parties.

- 4.4 PH and DP said the management of the community centre will be looked into when that stage comes in and also the construction process (sound insulation inside the building will aid address concerns of loud noise, alongside proper management. There will be further consultation on the issue during the landscaping consultation. Internal design/layout of the centre is still to be decided and there will be consultation on usage of the facility that will influence some aspect of the design.
- 4.5 PH informed they will be publishing more regular newsletters because issues like parking, ground floor flats and other project related issues keep coming up and residents need constant reminders so there is no confusion or concerns. Those present at the meeting agreed that more regular newsletters would be welcome.
- 4.6 SM said parking is a major problem in the area and with the new development it will add more pressure on parking. DP informed there will be few extra parking spaces for blue badge holders but no extra parking apart from re-provided parking for those who had bays at the time of the ballot.
- 4.7 PH said they have sent a letter to residents with their housing needs assessment and if they had done so, they are requested to confirm and clarify and to sign it by 12<sup>th</sup> September (if there has been no change/s since last assessment). The assessment results will be frozen by mid-September for design input for the scheme. SM asked as the project will be delivered over a number of years what happens if someone's housing need changes. PH said it is normal that some residents' housing needs change during the life of a regeneration project and that will not be an issue as there will be more homes built in phase one than needed for residents who want to be rehoused in the development. Also, in regeneration schemes PH's experience is that many residents choose to stay permanently in their temporary decant property and do not return to the new homes. There will be 74 re-provided homes in the scheme. RSG members stated that they still have concerns about the height of the tower element of the southern block which is 17 stories.
- 4.8. PH informed that they are meeting the LBTH [planners on Thursday 31<sup>st</sup> July. Planners will be shown exactly what was shown for the consultation. Feedback from the consultation is still being gathered, but not incorporated in what will be shown to LBTH as information for this meeting had to be submitted 2 weeks before the meeting. Feedback still can be shared with planners going forward. Only very high-level feedback will be reported to this planner's meeting.
- 4.9 PH said IA will be contacting the residents who did not attend the event (with the consultation event information) to get their feedback. SH suggested (for next time) to provide the information to non-attending residents following day of such events.
- 4.10 DP said this will be first of many planning meetings to share the initial design the life of the project where planners will not only be discussing the designs and changes, but also resident feedback on the designs. Issues such as landscaping location, developing ideas on play space, parking challenges etc. will be part of the discussion.

4.11 DP added there will be several more residents' consultation events on the internal layouts, external elevation, looks of the buildings, landscaping etc. What residents have seen is at the very early stage of design process.

**Action - PH will give feedback on the planning meeting at the next RSG meeting.**

4.12 SM asked does each project have a designated team of planners. DP informed they have a performance agreement that commits resources (dedicated planning officer, design officer, sustainability officer) to the project from the council.

4.13 SH inquired about the Bat Survey. DP informed it will be done at start of the season May next year due to the fact that two surveys are required with three weeks gap and it is not possible now as the season is ending soon.

4.14 SM asked what update will be reported in the next meeting. DP said it will be a feedback on the planners' meeting, an update on the proposed site visits and update on the housing needs assessment. If early progress is made for site visit residents will be notified accordingly. PH said ideally, she would like to publish a newsletter before the next meeting.

## **5. AOB with Riverside - none**

## **6. AOB without Riverside**

6.1 RSG and MT said it is important to seek answers to the issues raised today and also see the feedback from the consultation event as these events need to shape the project.

6.2 SH said she does not understand why Riverside cannot share their void list with the residents who are keen to move out of London. She is not asking for any confidential information, it is about location of properties and she doubts that Riverside is seriously looking for properties for her outside London.

6.3 MT said the information about properties outside London should have been included in the FAQs that has been sent out to residents, as it was requested by MT previously, MT is pleased that it will be included as an article for one of the upcoming newsletters that Riverside are planning.

6.4 RSG members raised concerns about planning application submission date has changed from September 2025 to Summer 2026. Residents are getting frustrated at these delays, and these delays are becoming a norm over the last 2 years. SH said she would like to see a projected timeline that RSG has been asking for a while and if any delays occurs then it can be tracked back.

6.5 RSG members are concerned about how well Riverside will consult with residents who did not manage to attend the last event as nearly 35 plus residents did not attend. MT said that it was a good turn out for such an event and MI said some of these

residents might be leaseholders and some might be not planning to come back and also some might be void. SH said everyone has the right to receive same information at the same time and the make informed decision and provide meaningful feedback.

6.6 RSG and MT keen to know the number of homes at Phase One but this figure has not been shared. This is because concerns over much taller block on site that will have many more people around and difficulties for management leading to the possible mismanagement of blocks in the future. There will be issues with parking as well. Residents also have concerns about possible increased service charges alongside the inevitable council tax band increases. MT advised at Tiller Road Riverside circulated information on service charge projections

**Action- MI to send example service charge of Tiller Road to RSG members as well as the table showing Council Tax charges by band for 2025/6 to be added to these minutes.**

Valuation band	Range of values	1 April 2025 to 31 March 2026
A	Up to and including £40,000	£1,169.71
B	£ 40,001 - £ 52,000	£1,364.67
C	£ 52,001 - £ 68,000	£1,559.61
D	£ 68,001 - £ 88,000	£1,754.57
E	£ 88,001 - £120,000	£2,144.47
F	£120,001 - £160,000	£2,534.38
G	£160,001 - £320,000	£2,924.28
H	More than £320,000	£3,509.14

## 7. Date of next meeting

Monday 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2025.