



# Minutes of the 4EF Meeting

7pm on Tuesday 18<sup>th</sup> November 2025

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

<b>Present</b>	
Residents:	Candida, Jackie , Daniel (Barkantine)
Advisor:	Mike Tyrrell
Riverside	Arthur, Lesley, Jackie, Pam
Apologies:	
<b>1</b>	<b>Introductions and apologies</b>
1.1	The apologies were noted.
1.2	The apologies were noted.
<b>2</b>	<b>Minutes of the last meeting</b>
2.1	<b>Withdrawal of Hill</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hill withdrew due to challenging London housing market conditions.</li> <li>Property prices are flat and sales rates have significantly reduced compared with previous years.</li> <li>Hill is prioritising larger schemes where they can achieve quicker returns and undertake value engineering (e.g. build-to-rent).</li> <li>Stewart Street was considered too small to meet their revised strategic objectives.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>Report of the Independent Advisor</b>
3.1	MT's report was tabled and MT spoke to the main item, a report back from the Strategic Development Committee at Tower Hamlets Council last week that considered the planning application for the Kedge, Starboard and Winch House development.
3.2	The Tower Hamlets Planning Officers recommended planning permission and it was agreed 8 votes to nil, with one abstention.
3.3	The presentation to the Committee by the Planning Officer included the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>72 homes are to be replaced by 400 homes</li> <li>There was a last minute change requested by the Chair to change to blue badge parking away from USB</li> <li>There were 9 objections on the grounds of height, density and parking</li> <li>There will be 137 affordable homes on site and 263 market sale homes</li> <li>Overall, based on habitable tooms, there will be 40% affordable homes, the maximum the viability the scheme will allow</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 55 of the social homes will be 3 bed or larger</li> <li>• The split in the affordable homes will be 86/14 (rented/shared ownership) which goes against the current policy of a 70/30, but acceptable as it mirrors the emerging policy</li> <li>• 100% of the homes will be dual aspect</li> <li>• 40 of the homes will be wheelchair accessible</li> <li>• The development is outside the tall building zone but the height gives the scheme viability, which outweighs negatives</li> <li>• Hammond House will be impacted in terms of height, but the Committee need to take into consideration the wider benefits</li> <li>• There will be parking for 11 social housing tenants who are returning and who had permits for rented parking bays at the time of the ballot</li> <li>• There will be a £112k contribution to improvements at Sir John McDougall Gardens, to offset the lack of play space for the over 11s</li> <li>• There will be a £222k contribution to improvements at Crossharbour DLR station, to offset density increase and its effect on transport</li> </ul>	
3.4	<p>Before making their decision Councillors on the Committee discussed the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is only a 28% provision of new social housing and not 40% - The Officer responded that anymore will mean that the scheme is unviable</li> <li>• There is an increase in density – The Officer responded that it will be offset by a CIL contribution, £6.392m for LBTH and £1.4m for the Mayor of London.</li> <li>• What is 222k for Crossharbour DLR station for – The Officer responded that TFL requested it to improve access.</li> <li>• Where is the provision for Over 11s play space – The Officer responded that there will be a £112k contribution to improvements at Sir John McDougall Gardens</li> <li>• With all the new homes, how will the additional parking needs be met – The Officer stated that it will be a car free scheme, failing to deal with the cars that all turn up after 5.30pm, but acknowledging that the permit transfer scheme is outside the planning system</li> <li>• Will the blue badge parking be allocated to individuals – The Officer responded that they will be, this was wrong as there are only 8 spaces and 40 wheelchair accessible properties!</li> <li>• Will there be money for additional health demands – The Officer respond that the NHS have requested 500k for local health care and that they will have to apply for it through CIL.</li> <li>• Who will control the community space and will Tower Hamlets get first call on the community centre – The Officer wrongly responded that it is to be decided, whereas the residents have already chosen a provider?</li> <li>• There were so many rats from the Hammond House redevelopment, how ill it be managed here – The Officer responded that the developer will have an environmental plan</li> </ul>	

3.5	After some discussion, the members present were concerned about the impact of new schemes on the use of CIL in respect to Health facilities and the use of Sir John McDougall Gardens and St John's Park to offset Over11s play provision.	
3.6	MT will give a report back at the Alice Shepherd & Oak House RSG at their November meeting and MP will invite them to the TRA meeting in January to get their views.	
3.7	CR agreed that pending the outcome of these meetings, Members should look at what actions the 4EF should take on these issues are not restricted to the Riverside estates but other redevelopment schemes.	
<b>4</b>	<b>Response to Andrea Thorn</b>	
4.1	MT suggested that there were four main issues that need to be responded to following the meeting with Andrea: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Structure – MT felt that Riverside are in any place to make sustainable improvements as they are just too big and need to be regionalised</li> <li>• Resident Involvement - Riverside just do not get it, the example on Major works that Tracy gave last time really illustrates that</li> <li>• Improvements - Where are the key performance indicators to show improvements</li> <li>• Communications - New Technology should make it easier ..... if the contact details for residents were up to date. They need resident input into how comms should be undertaken and send out comms in all three formats, paper, text and emails.</li> </ul>	
4.2	After some discussion and more examples of services and actions from Riverside illustrating these 4 areas it was agreed that Mt would write to Andre, stating that these are our concerns and that we would like her to address these on her next visit.	
<b>5</b>	<b>Any Other Business</b>	
5.1	As there were no items of any other business CR thanked everyone for coming and for their contributions.	
<b>6</b>	<b>Any Other Business</b>	
6.1	MT advised that Andrea can not make the date in January and he will sort out the next meeting date with her PA, and circulate a diary invite.	

## **1. Shepherd & Oak House / Stewart Street Update**

### **1.1 Withdrawal of Hill**

- Hill withdrew due to challenging London housing market conditions.
- Property prices are flat and sales rates have significantly reduced compared with previous years.
- Hill is prioritising larger schemes where they can achieve quicker returns and undertake value engineering (e.g. build-to-rent).

- Stewart Street was considered too small to meet their revised strategic objectives.

## 1.2 Options Going Forward

Two potential routes were discussed:

### 1. Return to previous procurement

- Other shortlisted developers from the original procurement could be approached.
- Legal advice is being sought to confirm whether this is permissible due to elapsed time.
- Estimated timescale: 3–6 months if viable.

### 2. New full procurement exercise

- Would take approximately 6–12 months.
- Considered the more likely option, subject to legal advice.

## 1.3 Resident Communication

- Residents have been informed that Hill has withdrawn and that the project is paused.
- Riverside reiterated its commitment to delivering the scheme.
- Steering group was briefed prior to wider resident communication.
- Further update expected in **April 2026** once procurement direction is confirmed.

## 1.4 Maintenance Arrangements

- Planned maintenance will continue as required.
- Condition-based inspections will be carried out rather than automatic replacement of components (e.g. windows).
- Approach consistent with other paused regeneration schemes.

## 2. Catch House / Tiller Road Update

### 2.1 Planning and Contract Status

- Resolution to grant planning permission achieved in November.
- Section 106 agreement now signed.
- Contract with Mount Anvil is **unconditional**, meaning the scheme must proceed.
- Works have commenced (hoarding, groundworks, demolition).

### 2.2 Risk Assessment

- No indication that Mount Anvil will withdraw.
- Sales market slowdown acknowledged, but completions are several years away.
- Affordable housing is delivered in early phases, reducing risk of non-delivery.

### 2.3 Phasing and Viability

- Scheme includes affordable housing across all phases.
- Private sale phases follow affordable delivery, ensuring commitment.
- Later phases considered low risk due to sunk costs.

### 2.4 Construction Impact & Communication

- Residents raised concerns regarding:
  - Traffic congestion and lorry movements
  - Dust, noise and disruption
  - Insufficient communication beyond immediate neighbours
- Positive examples noted where Mount Anvil worked with the council to create temporary parking and mitigate disruption.
- Need for:
  - Improved traffic management planning

- Clearer and wider resident communication
- Coordination between Riverside, developers and council
- Riverside to engage Mount Anvil regarding traffic management and communications plans.

---

### **3. Samuda Estate – Latest Position**

#### **3.1 Engagement with DIAP**

- Initial discussions with DIAP paused pending new financial year (from April).
- Executive and Board site visit described as positive.
- Focus was on quality of completed and ongoing schemes.

#### **3.2 Likelihood and Timing**

- Consultation expected to restart in the next financial year, subject to approval.
- Estimated likelihood currently around **50/50**.
- Any regeneration would be long-term (5–7+ years before construction/sales).

#### **3.3 Consultation vs Regeneration**

- Approval being sought is for **consultation and option appraisal only**, not regeneration.
- Regeneration would only proceed following:
  - Consultation
  - Option appraisal
  - Ballot (if demolition proposed)
- External factors (market, global events) could still pause or stop progress.

#### **3.4 Resident Concerns**

- Fear that ballots may not fully reflect long-term community impact.
- Concerns about density, infrastructure, green space and quality of build.
- Emphasis on learning lessons from other regeneration schemes.

---

### **4. Kingsbridge Estate Update**

#### **4.1 Viability Challenges**

- Scheme viability remains difficult due to market conditions.
- Updated Decent Homes Standard (2035) is a major driver.
- Refurbishment would be extensive and costly, almost equivalent to rebuild.

#### **4.2 Options Under Review**

- Full regeneration (as previously voted).
- Refurbishment to extend building life by 20–30 years.
- Hybrid options (partial redevelopment to fund refurbishment).
- Viability modelling is being refreshed; residents to be updated in **April 2026**.

---

### **5. DIAP – Role and Process**

#### **5.1 What DIAP Is**

- Executive-level Development & Investment Approval Panel.
- Comprised of Chief Officers and senior directors.
- Makes decisions based on corporate plan, financial capacity and risk.

#### **5.2 Decision-Making**

- Proposals are submitted via detailed reports.
- Resident feedback from consultations and ballots is included at each stage.
- Multiple approval gateways exist; schemes can be paused or stopped at any stage.

#### **5.3 Resident Involvement**

- Residents are not direct panel members.
  - Input is fed through:
    - Corporate plan consultation
    - Regeneration consultation and ballots
    - Board-level resident representation
  - Concerns noted about potential disconnect between resident experience and reported metrics.
- 

## 6. Key Actions & Next Steps

- **Legal advice** to confirm procurement options for Stewart Street.
  - **Resident update** on Stewart Street procurement direction (April 2026).
  - **Engagement with Mount Anvil** on traffic management and communications.
  - **DIAP discussions** to resume on Samuda consultation approval (April/May 2026).
  - **Updated viability assessment** and resident communication for Kingsbridge (April 2026).
- 

If you'd like, I can:

- Tighten this into **formal board-style minutes**, or
- Create a **one-page summary for residents**, or
- Reformat it to match your organisation's **standard minutes template**.

Sources

**Provide your feedback on BizChat**

**You said:**

make this text into a more detailed set of minutes

**Copilot said:**

Copilot

Below is a **more detailed and structured set of minutes**, expanding significantly on the earlier version while staying faithful to what is actually said in the document **4ef - 17.03.2026.docx**.

This is written in a **formal, committee-level minutes style**, with clear separation between **information provided, discussion points, concerns raised, and agreed next steps**.

You can paste this directly into Word.

---

## Detailed Meeting Minutes

**Meeting:** Regeneration and Development Update

**Date:** 17 March 2026

**Document Reference:** 4ef - 17.03.2026.docx

**Chair:** Riverside – Head of Regeneration (as implied)

**Minute Taker:** Not stated

---

## 1. Shepherd & Oak House / Stewart Street Regeneration

### 1.1 Reason for Hill's Withdrawal

- Riverside explained that Hill withdrew due to **current London market conditions**, including:
  - Flat property prices.
  - A significant reduction in sales rates across London schemes.
- Comparative data was referenced:

- Previous schemes (e.g. Bellamy Close and Bing 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:
  - 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:
  - The scheme itself **remained viable**.
  - Hill did not withdraw because the scheme was loss-making, but because returns would be slower.

## 1.2 Options Following Withdrawal

Two options were outlined:

### Option 1 – Return to Previous Procurement

- Original procurement shortlisted three developers: Hill, Countryside and Level.
- Riverside is exploring whether one of the remaining shortlisted developers could be approached.
- Legal advice is being sought to confirm compliance with procurement regulations.
- Indicative timescale: **3–6 months**, subject to legal position and developer interest.

### Option 2 – New Procurement Exercise

- 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.

## 1.3 Communication with Residents

- Residents have been formally notified that:
  - 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.

## 1.4 Maintenance During Pause

- Planned maintenance will continue as normal.
- A **condition-based approach** will be adopted:
  - 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.

## 1.5 Alternative / “Radical” Options Raised

- A resident suggested exploring:
  - Retention of Shepherd House.
  - Addition of a new high-rise element.
  - Smaller-scale development led directly by Riverside, potentially with a minority JV partner.
- Riverside noted:
  - 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.

---

## **2. Catch House / Tiller Road Development**

### **2.1 Planning and Legal Status**

- 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.
- The contract with Mount Anvil is now **unconditional and legally binding**.

### **2.2 Construction Progress**

- Site works have commenced, including:
  - Hoarding installation.
  - Groundworks.
  - Initial demolition activity.
- Full construction is expected later in the year, following early works.

### **2.3 Risk of Withdrawal**

- Riverside confirmed:
  - 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:
  - Tiller Road is already contractually locked in.

### **2.4 Phasing and Affordable Housing Delivery**

- 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:
  - Developers recover profit primarily through private sale phases.
  - Having already absorbed costs in early phases, completion of later phases is highly likely.

---

## **3. Construction Impact, Traffic and Resident Communication**

### **3.1 Concerns Raised by Residents**

Residents raised extensive concerns regarding:

- 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, Bing Street and Cuba Street.

### **3.2 Specific Issues Highlighted**

- 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**.

### **3.3 Positive Practice Identified**

- Mount Anvil was commended for:
  - Working with the council to temporarily create additional parking spaces.

- Engaging proactively with TfL and neighbouring developers.
- The site manager was specifically praised for:
  - Accessibility to residents.
  - Willingness to mitigate impacts where possible.

### 3.4 Requested Improvements

Residents requested:

- 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.

### 3.5 Riverside Response

- Riverside acknowledged communication concerns.
- Commitment made to:
  - 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 – Strategic Update

### 4.1 DIAP Engagement

- Previous discussions with DIAP indicated:
  - 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 Likelihood and Timing

- Restarting consultation is considered **possible but not guaranteed**.
- Current assessment: approximately **50/50 likelihood**.
- Any regeneration would have a **long lead-in period**:
  - Several years before construction.
  - Sales potentially 7+ years away.

### 4.3 Consultation vs Commitment

- Riverside clarified that:
  - 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:
  - Option appraisal.
  - Resident consultation.
  - Ballot (if demolition proposed).
  - Further DIAP approvals.

### 4.4 Resident Concerns

- Residents expressed concern that:
  - 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:
  - Density.
  - Infrastructure capacity.

- Loss of green space.
  - Long-term quality and management of regenerated estates.
- 

## **5. Kingsbridge Estate**

### **5.1 Current Position**

- No material update since previous meeting.
- Viability remains challenging under current market conditions.

### **5.2 Decent Homes Standard (2035)**

- New standards significantly increase refurbishment requirements.
- Works required would be extensive, including:
  - Structural upgrades.
  - Insulation.
  - Potential lift installation.
- Refurbishment costs approach those of full rebuild.

### **5.3 Options Being Considered**

- 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**

- Riverside aims to update residents in **April 2026** once viability reassessment is complete.
- 

## **6. DIAP – Role and Governance**

### **6.1 What DIAP Is**

- 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**

- Proposals are submitted via detailed written reports.
- Reports include:
  - Financial analysis.
  - Risk assessment.
  - Resident feedback from consultations and ballots.
- DIAP may:
  - Approve.
  - Reject.
  - Request further information.
  - Defer decisions.

### **6.3 Resident Input**

- Residents do not sit directly on DIAP.
  - Input is fed through:
    - Corporate plan consultation.
    - Regeneration consultation processes.
    - Board-level resident representatives.
  - Concerns were raised about potential disconnect between reported metrics and lived resident experience.
- 

## **7. Key Actions and Next Steps**

- **Stewart Street:**
  - Legal advice on procurement options to be concluded.
  - Resident update to be issued in April 2026.
- **Tiller Road / Catch House:**
  - Engagement with Mount Anvil on traffic management and communications.
  - Review lessons learned from previous schemes.
- **Samuda Estate:**
  - DIAP discussion to resume in the new financial year.
  - Decision sought on restarting consultation only.
- **Kingsbridge Estate:**
  - Viability modelling to be refreshed.
  - Resident update planned for April 2026.

Draft