

## York Way Estate Resident Steering (RSG) Group Meeting

Date: Tuesday 17<sup>th</sup> November, 6.15pm – 7.30pm

Location: Zoom

### ATTENDEES:

#### City of London Corporation (CoL)

[REDACTED]

#### Erect architecture

[REDACTED]

#### RSG members (names to be removed from website version)

[REDACTED]

#### Soundings

Christina Norton (CN)

Mari Chisholm (MC)

Fola Kalesanwo (FK)

#### Maccreeanor Lavington

[REDACTED]

### MINUTES:

#### 1. Welcome and introductions

1.1. CN welcomed everyone to the meeting and provided an overview of the meeting agenda:

- Welcome and introductions
- RSG Governance
- Consultation feedback
- Upcoming engagement
- ASB and Access workshop – Virtual walk and talk
- Close

1.2. [REDACTED] noted that it would have been useful for RSG members to view the presentation prior to the meeting. [REDACTED] also raised concerns around how resident's feedback is being taken onboard and urged the team to allow time for open discussion during the meeting, so they could hear directly from the residents. [REDACTED] also suggested that the RSG be appointed legal counsel, paid for by CoL.

#### 2. RSG Governance

2.1. MC welcomed [REDACTED] as a new member of the RSG

[REDACTED] provided clarifications on the roles and responsibilities of the RSG as a small group of residents who can assist the project team by sharing their ideas as representative of the Estate, and also encouraging the wider estate to get involved in consultation activities. The RSG is not intended to be a decision-making body as it

would not be appropriate for the small group of residents to make decisions which would affect the whole estate.

- 2.2. MC explained the meeting time was brought forward to ensure everyone could attend. RSG members were encouraged to get in touch with Soundings if they had any issues with meeting timings
- 2.3. ■ raised that the meeting agenda was not shared with RSG members in advance and members were unable to request agenda items. Further, the invitation to the meeting was sent with six days' notice as opposed to the ten days' notice as stated in the terms of reference. CN noted this point and assured the group that agenda items and meeting times will be sent in advance moving forward.

### **3. Consultation feedback**

- 3.1. CN provided an overview of recent exhibition consultation events and the responses from the feedback forms. Please see presentation attached for a breakdown of the responses received.
- 3.2. CN advised the group that the team would be delivering the exhibition content to each home on the estate as well as posting content online, there was strong agreement from the RSG for delivering exhibition content directly to each home.
- 3.3. ■ enquired if safety is being considered with the designs of the open and play spaces.
- 3.4. ■ explained different measures being considered such as tall planters around the eastern podium to control access. The western podium will also have tall planters but will be slightly more open as the space will cater more for older children. No additional entrances are being proposed on the estate so spaces will be contained.
- 3.5. ■ and ■ raised that some of the data results presented don't appear to correspond with the questions in the feedback form. CN explained that the information presented reflects the responses received.

### **4. Upcoming engagement**

- 4.1. CN provided an overview of upcoming engagement activities which will include an exhibition to run for three weeks in the format of a newsletter with feedback form and a project website launch.
- 4.2. The Soundings consultation team will also call residents to encourage their participation in a feedback form. All feedback received will be used to inform the final designs.
- 4.3. A resident information session will be held whilst the public exhibition is live to allow residents time to receive further information before filling out a feedback form.
- 4.4. RSG members were reminded that following this consultation process, there will be a statutory consultation with LB Islington.

## 5. ASB and Access workshop – Virtual Walk & Talk

- 5.1. MC introduced the workshop and explained that the project team have been made aware of issues and incidences of anti-social behaviour on the estate in the underground car park and by Kinefold and Lambfold House.
- 5.2. MC ran through incidences of reported anti-social behaviour on the estate between April and November 2020, it was added that some of these reports took place during lockdown periods, and also not every incident may have been reported.
- 5.3. An aerial view of the Estate was shared on the screen and identified known areas where ASB takes place asking the group to confirm these and any others.
- 5.4. It was noted that in normal circumstance the team would have conducted an on the ground walkabout, but unfortunately this was not possible due to the Lockdown
- 5.5. MC invited the group to share any additional issues.

### *Discussion notes:*

- ■ – People misuse the staircase at Penfields House and I have seen people urinating, having intercourse, prostituting and vomiting.
- ■ – This will be taken back to senior management at City of London. As part of the project, the team not only want to look into building new homes but also ways to improve security and address anti-social behaviour.
- ■ – Large gatherings take place in the entrance area at the northern end of Penfields, in the sheltered area.
- ■ – Homeless people have camped in the green area behind the community centre. Drug dealing also takes place near the underground car park, especially the covered area near Penfields House.
- ■ – The communal entrance doors to the blocks are insecure, and do not work the majority of the time
- ■ – Current maintenance is patchy at best and anti-social behaviour is not being addressed. Entrances to all blocks have been faulty from the first day the new systems were installed in 2018. CCTV has also been faulty for years now.
- CN asked if those carrying out these activities were recognised / lived on the estate. There were different views on this:
  - ■ expressed the view that he recognised many and that there were also residents.
  - ■ – We don't generally recognise the people who are conducting in anti-social behaviour, they may not be residents.
  - ■ – Please can you provide clarification on comments made around the RSG not being a decision-making body. And why was location 2 shown during the last consultation when this location was not evaluated by the group.

- ■ – The RSG is not a decision-making body as they are only a select group of residents.
- CN – The views and feedback of RSG members are being taken very seriously.
- ■ – When Soundings were first appointed to the project they went through preferred locations with RSG members, there were no other consultants involved. Once the architects were appointed technical surveys were carried out the team found that it was not possible to build on some locations and the designs evolved. An additional site was identified to deliver the amount of housing required.
- ■ requested for it to be recorded that residents are against the project and multiple petitions were created against the plans.

## 6. Accessibility

MC asked the group to share their thoughts on how accessibility could be improved on the estate, particularly around the pedestrian ramp.

### *Discussion notes:*

- ■ – The gates along the pedestrian ramp are difficult to navigate and there is no direct access from Kinefold House to the garages.
- ■ – Obstacles for mobility scooter users include entrance doors to the blocks opening in the wrong direction and being heavy and grass areas as scooters don't work on these types of surfaces
- ■ – Delivery services are often confused because flat names are not clearly signposted.
- MC – Wayfinding is something the team could look at
- ■ – Please can you justify the choices of sites?
- ■ – Firstly to clarify, the visuals shown at the last RSG meeting do not necessarily mean the buildings would take on that form but were included so the team could get a response. After hearing resident feedback throughout the consultation process, the massing has been through various iterations, and the team also went back to double check other sites which were initially ruled out due to structural or other technical constraints. At the next round of consultation, revised block designs will be presented in response to consultation findings.
- ■ confirmed that the additional location is still considered.

## 7. Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

7.1. CN explained that in addition to the exhibition in newsletter format, a separate list of FAQs will be made available to view on the project website along with summary reports of all consultation events and resident feedback.

## 8. AOB

*Summary of other comments/questions raised during the meeting:*

- [REDACTED] – Why are the buildings not being made taller?
- [REDACTED] – The RSG brief was very clear about not going taller than the existing buildings and the design team agree this would not be appropriate
  
- [REDACTED] – Given the size of Kinefold with 65 flats, I am not sure how any of the locations have the space for the 90+ that are proposed, this is what drove concern from Kinefold residents about the enclosing of our flat with proposed developments. Is there any way to address this concern?
- CN noted that changes have been made to the form, location and design of the new blocks to address residents' concerns and will be shared in the public exhibition
  
- [REDACTED] – As you now have new information and cannot provide the 90 units in the original locations suggested by residents can you give other options for creating the 90 units other than the one proposed that creates a new site next to Kinefold? Can we see other options that do not surround Kinefold on 3 sides.
- Response – There are no other feasible sites
  
- [REDACTED] – What is the website?
- CN – The website will be dedicated to this project and will be used to share the exhibition content along with: summary reports of all the consultation events, minutes from RSG meetings and a list of FAQs.
  
- [REDACTED] – Can we make buildings taller to not create site 5?
- [REDACTED] – The RSG brief was very clear about not going taller than the existing buildings and the design team agree this would not be appropriate
  
- [REDACTED] – The minutes posted on the project website should not include people's full names due to privacy concerns.
- Response - agreed
  
- [REDACTED] – The team should be aware of other plans in the area. The site where the GP is located has a proposed new building and there are proposed road changes in the area.
- Response – The team are aware of proposed changes in the area and are consulting with Islington Planners to ensure that the plans meet policy
  
- [REDACTED] – Can there be less than 90 units? We were originally told only the sites that would fit would be built.
- 90 units is the minimum requirement to fulfil our current housing need at York Way. If 90 units were provided LBI would have nomination rights to 45 of these units. (Please note these will be City of London tenants who will be managed by the City but they will be coming off LBI housing waiting list rather than the City's) The demand for housing from existing residents at York Way is over 30 and rising. It is important we satisfy this demand to maintain the excellent community spirit that exists on the estate and ensure tenants who are overcrowded or have mobility problems have these issues addressed. We can also provide some accommodation for the sons and daughters of existing tenants.

- ■ – We should consider the impact for existing residents in terms of privacy and sunlight
- Response – agreed

## **9. Close**

9.1. CN thanked everyone for attending and closed the meeting.