



RSG Meeting Minutes

York Way Consultation Phase 2

RSG Meeting

Wednesday 24th November 2021

Location: York Way Estate Community Centre

Date: Wednesday 24 November

Time: 18:00 – 19:30

Plan

18:00 – 18:30 : Informal chat and refreshments

18:30 – 19:30 : Meeting

Attendance

City of London:

Sophie Courtright

Michael Kettle

Sonia Marquis

Soundings:

Christina Norton

Jessica Cargill-Thompson

Piotr Kruk

Resident Steering Group (RSG):



AGENDA

Introductions

Feedback on recent consultation

Role of the RSG

Development update

MINUTES – Summary of discussion

1	RSG meetings
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moving forward RSG meetings should be held as hybrid events giving an option for members to attend in person or virtually.
2	Storage
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In response to feedback from the consultation re interest in bike storage, members said in general storage is limited on the estate. Feedback from consultation was that residents are interested in the provision of places to store bicycles, prams, buggies, and pushcarts. Concerns raised: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Security of the underground parking ○ Reports of vandalism to property stored there ○ Storage space on the ground floor of Penfield House facing Market Road is dark, gloomy and feels unsafe. <p>COL Clarification [provided on 26/11/21)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There will be no cycle storage in the car park (so no secure access issues). There will be free cycle storage available throughout the estate as indicated on the planning drawings. These will be open Sheffield stands and rely on owners bike locks for security. Then there will be secured internal cycle storage within each of the new blocks, accessible externally at ground floor. It is very likely (this has been the case on our other schemes) that plenty of this storage will be made available to existing residents (at a charge).
3	Main entrances
	<p>Following discussion about potential improvements to the outside of the main entrances to the existing buildings, the following issues were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of surveillance in stairwells and ASB taking place in these spaces at all times of day and night with signs of urinating, defecating and use of drugs. • Where there is surveillance, perpetrators don't care and do it anyway • Residents [leaseholders] asked about costs to residents re improvements of the building front entrances and want more information about this. • The sentiment was that if this is an obligatory planning condition imposed by Islington Council then this should be covered by COL not residents.
4	Major Works (existing buildings)
	<p>It was explained that construction comes under the auspices of a different department, but CoL acknowledged that it was of high importance to residents and that a meeting with Major Works should be arranged.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There has been no information about the plans for major works and this is the source of significant frustration amongst residents and its impact is reducing residents' quality of life.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents need to know the details of this to be able to plan their lives accordingly for this two-year period of significant disturbance. • Special meeting to be arranged with Major Works • Clarification is required concerning the temporary heating system. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Kinfold House: Resident's energy bills have spiked from £140 to £300 <p>CoL explained next steps. In particular, the desire to appoint a contractor in the Spring to begin work in the summer. The contractor will bring their own site resident liaison officer to deal with residents' everyday concerns about and during construction. There will also be a social value programme, which may include job opportunities, skills training etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarification is required concerning the phasing of the construction works. • Clarification is required concerning the relationship between the phasing of major works and phasing of infill development – this needs to be planned for minimal disturbance to residents.
5	Role of the RSG
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group keen to continue meeting and find regular updates useful • In-person meeting was appreciated. Suggested by RSG that it could be hybrid so that some could join online. CoL responded that this would need wifi / internet access in the community hall or similar venue. • No commitment or clear way forward on next steps, tasks, or responsibilities to carry out. • One resident expressed interest in potentially being involved in organising art/craft workshops for residents. • Could the RSG organise events for the new community centre once built.
6	AOB
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor response to reported damage to buildings fabric – specifically damaged windows reported in 2019 have not been repaired. • The complex progression of the development has left certain residents feeling ignored despite making the effort to comment and share their opinions. Clarification concerning the continuous design iterations should be provided. • General sentiment that many people on the estate are disinterested in sharing their opinions creates a challenging environment for the residents to engage with. • Residents congratulated the team on their efforts to engage meaningfully with the residents and expressed their appreciation for their work.

ENDS