



Minutes of the 4EF Meeting

7pm on Tuesday 17th March 2026

St John's Community Centre, Glengall Grove, Cubitt Town, London E14 3NE

Present	
Residents:	Candida (Samuda), Jackie (St Johns), Daniel (Barkantine)
Advisor:	Mike Tyrrell
Riverside	Paul Handley
Apologies:	Arthur (Barkantine), Maggie (St Johns), Jill (St Johns), Tracy (Barkantine), Peter (Kingsbridge), Kim (St Johns), Peter (Kingsbridge), Lesley (Samuda)
1	Introductions and apologies
1.1	The apologies were noted.
1.2	CR welcomed PH to the meeting and asked him to address the meeting in the order as set out in the agenda.
2	Alice Shepherd House & Oak House (Stewart Street)
2.1	<p>Withdrawal of Hill</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Riverside explained that Hill withdrew due to current London market conditions, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Flat property prices. ◦ A significant reduction in sales rates across London schemes. • Comparative data was referenced: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Previous schemes (e.g. Bellamy Close and Byng Street) achieved 12–15 sales per month off-plan. ◦ Current comparable schemes are achieving 2–3 sales per month. • Hill's revised strategy focuses on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Larger schemes with greater scope for value engineering. ◦ Faster return on capital, even if overall profit is lower. • Stewart Street was considered too small to meet these strategic objectives. • It was emphasised that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ The scheme itself remained viable. ◦ Hill did not withdraw because the scheme was loss-making, but because returns would be slower.
2.2	<p>Options Going Forward</p> <p>Two options were outlined:</p> <p>Option 1 – Return to Previous Procurement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Original procurement shortlisted three developers: Hill, Countryside and Lovell. • Riverside is exploring whether one of the remaining shortlisted developers could be approached.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Legal advice is being sought to confirm compliance with procurement regulations. Indicative timescale: 3–6 months, subject to legal position and developer interest. <p>Option 2 – New Procurement Exercise</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A full re-procurement would ensure compliance and value for money. Indicative timescale: 6–12 months. This option is considered more likely, pending legal advice. 	
2.3	<p>Resident Communication</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents have been formally notified that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hill has withdrawn. The project is currently paused. Riverside remains committed to regeneration. The steering group was briefed prior to wider resident communication. Riverside intends to provide a further update to residents in April 2026, once the procurement route is confirmed. 	
2.4	<p>Maintenance Arrangements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned maintenance will continue as normal. A condition-based approach will be adopted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Components (e.g. windows) will be inspected rather than automatically replaced. Only items requiring replacement will be addressed. This approach mirrors arrangements used on other paused regeneration estates. 	
2.5	<p>Alternative / “Radical” Options Raised</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MT suggested exploring: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retention of Alice Shepherd House. Addition of a new wing to Alice Shepherd House at the same height. Smaller-scale development led directly by Riverside, potentially with a minority JV partner on Phase One at Oak House Riverside noted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any materially different option would require re-consultation and a new ballot. Given the existing ballot outcome in favour of full redevelopment, Riverside’s priority is to first test whether that option remains deliverable. 	
3	Kedge House, Starboard Way and Winch House (Tiller Road)	
3.1	<p>Planning and Legal Status</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resolution to grant planning permission was secured in November. The Section 106 agreement has now been finalised. All pre-conditions under the development agreement have been satisfied. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The contract with Mount Anvil is now unconditional and legally binding. 	
3.2	<p>Construction Progress</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site works have commenced, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hoarding installation. Groundworks. Initial demolition activity. Full construction is expected later in the year, following early works. 	
3.3	<p>Risk of Withdrawal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Riverside confirmed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mount Anvil has not expressed concern or intention to withdraw. Market slowdown acknowledged, but sales are not expected for several years. Key distinction from Stewart Street: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tiller Road is already contractually locked in. 	
3.4	<p>Phasing and Affordable Housing Delivery</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Affordable housing is delivered in early phases, not deferred. Later phases include private sale units. This structure reduces risk of later phases being abandoned. It was noted that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developers recover profit primarily through private sale phases. Having already absorbed costs in early phases, completion of later phases is highly likely. 	
3.5	<p>Construction Impact, Traffic and Resident Communication Concerns Raised by Residents</p> <p>DL raised extensive concerns regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic congestion on narrow residential roads. Lorry movements blocking access routes. Dust, noise and loss of parking. Lack of advance communication beyond immediate neighbours. Repetition of issues previously experienced at Bellamy Close, Byng Street and Cuba Street. <p>Specific Issues Highlighted</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction vehicles arriving outside agreed time windows. Conflict with school runs, refuse collection and emergency access. Knock-on congestion affecting surrounding streets. Residents often only becoming aware of disruption after it has begun. <p>Positive Practice Identified</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mount Anvil was commended for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Working with the council to temporarily create additional parking spaces. Engaging proactively with TfL and neighbouring developers. The site manager was specifically praised for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accessibility to residents. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Willingness to mitigate impacts where possible. <p>Requested Improvements</p> <p>DL requested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Earlier and wider communication from Riverside, not just developers. • Clear traffic management plans shared in advance. • Ongoing dialogue with local residents and steering groups. • Learning lessons from previous regeneration schemes. <p>Riverside Response</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Riverside acknowledged communication concerns. • Commitment made to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Engage with Mount Anvil on traffic and communication plans. ○ Review how widely information is being circulated. ○ Raise issues through the developers' forum. 	
4	Samuda Estate	
4.1	<p>DIAP Engagement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Previous discussions with DIAP indicated: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Support in principle for restarting consultation. ○ Request to revisit in the new financial year (from April). • A recent site visit by Riverside's Executive Team and Board was described as positive. 	
4.2	<p>Likelihood and Timing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restarting consultation is considered possible but not guaranteed. • Current assessment: approximately 50/50 likelihood. • Any regeneration would have a long lead-in period: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Several years before construction. • Sales potentially 7+ years away. 	
4.3	<p>Consultation vs Commitment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Riverside clarified that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Approval sought from DIAP would be for consultation and option appraisal only. ○ No commitment to regeneration is made at that stage. • Regeneration would only proceed following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Option appraisal. ○ Resident consultation. ○ Ballot (if demolition proposed). ○ Further DIAP approvals. 	
4.4	<p>Resident Concerns</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents expressed concern that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ballots may reflect short-term pressures rather than long-term community outcomes. ○ Overcrowding and poor conditions may push residents toward regeneration as their only perceived option. • Concerns raised about: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Density. ○ Infrastructure capacity. ○ Loss of green space. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Long-term quality and management of regenerated estates. 	
5	Kingsbridge Estate	
5.1	Current Position <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No material update since previous meeting. • Viability remains challenging under current market conditions. 	
5.2	Decent Homes Standard (2035) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New standards significantly increase refurbishment requirements. • Works required would be extensive, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Structural upgrades. ○ Insulation. ○ Potential lift installation. • Refurbishment costs approach those of full rebuild. 	
5.3	Options Being Considered <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full regeneration (as previously balloted). • Refurbishment to extend building life by 20–30 years. • Hybrid options (partial redevelopment funding refurbishment). • Updated viability modelling is underway 	
5.4	Next Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Riverside aims to update residents in April 2026 once viability reassessment is complete 	
6	DIAP – Role and Governance	
6.1	What DIAP Is <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An executive-level Development and Investment Approval Panel. • Comprised of Riverside’s Chief Officers and senior directors. • Responsible for approving investment and regeneration decisions. 	
6.2	How Decisions Are Made <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposals are submitted via detailed written reports. • Reports include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Financial analysis. ○ Risk assessment. ○ Resident feedback from consultations and ballots. • DIAP may: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Approve. ○ Reject. ○ Request further information. ○ Defer decisions. 	
6.3	Resident Input <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents do not sit directly on DIAP. • Input is fed through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Corporate plan consultation. ○ Regeneration consultation processes. ○ Board-level resident representatives. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns were raised about potential disconnect between reported metrics and lived resident experience. 	
7	Key Riverside Actions and Next Steps	
7.1	<p>Stewart Street:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Legal advice on procurement options to be concluded. Resident update to be issued in April 2026. <p>Tiller Road:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engagement with Mount Anvil on traffic management and communications. Review lessons learned from previous schemes on traffic management. <p>Samuda Estate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DIAP discussion to resume in the new financial year. Decision sought on restarting consultation only. <p>Kingsbridge Estate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Viability modelling to be refreshed. Resident update planned for April 2026. 	
8	Any Other Business	
8.1	As there were no items of any other business CR thanked everyone for coming and for their contributions.	