

## Canning Town Residents' Steering Group

Thursday, 20<sup>th</sup> May 2021 @ 6.00pm via Zoom, prompt start @ 6.05pm

### AGENDA

	Item:	Item Lead:
1.	Welcome and introductions	Howard Mendick, NewmanFrancis
3.	NewmanFrancis Update	Howard Mendick, NewmanFrancis
4.	Design brief workshop	Maeve Dowling, Senior Regeneration Manager
5.	AOB	All
6.	Date of next meeting	Thursday, 17 June 2021

## NOTES OF 10<sup>th</sup> CANNING TOWN RESIDENTS' STEERING GROUP MEETING

Thursday, 20<sup>th</sup> June 2021 @ 6pm via Zoom

**Present:**

Howard Mendick (HM) – Chair

**Steering Group members:**

Lily Glasser (LG) – notes

Sheila A (SA)

Carley Blow (CB)

Mustaf M (MM)

**London Borough of Newham:**

Sade R (SR)

Algina Kamara (AK) – Resident Involvement Manager

Edward R (ER)

Santokh Kaulder (SK) – Regeneration Manager y

Helen A (HA)

Judith J (JJ)

Maeve Dowling (MD) - Senior Regeneration Manager

Ilona B (IB)

Ibironke O (IO) (observer)

**Apologies for absence:**

**NewmanFrancis:**

MD will join the meeting at 6:30pm

### 1. Welcome and introductions

- 1.1. HM led introductions around the screen, recapped and amended the agenda due to absence from the councillor. He introduced IO who joined the meeting to observe and hopefully join the group. Everyone welcomed Ibironke. HM noted that the main part of the meeting tonight is MD's design brief workshop.

### 2. NewmanFrancis Update:

- 2.1. HM noted that the outreach team has started talking to residents again via phone now that they have been provided with some contact details. They are waiting for approval from the council to start face-to-face outreach again, though there may be some hesitation due to the new Covid variant.
- 2.2. CB gave an update on the conversations that came up during outreach. The team are asking residents how they feel about the regeneration and if they have any issues. There seems to be a lot of maintenance issues (broken entry doors allowing groups to hang out in communal areas, rubbish left and an increase of rats, lots of people want a local caretaker, etc.). HM noted that AK has set up a community initiatives panel to look into these types of matters, working alongside the regeneration programme.
- 2.3. AK explained that there are currently two CTRSG members on the community initiatives panel and that it is a resident-led initiative looking at the current situation for Canning Town residents in terms of socio-economic opportunities and the current physical appearance of the estate. It will involve both the housing and regeneration teams. The panel will put together a survey to consult the wider community on how they feel about different themes, (e.g. health and wellbeing, community cohesion, the appearance of buildings, etc.). The survey is planned to go out in August and they will use the results to develop improvement plans and projects to influence the wider scheme. HM noted that residents can find it hard to think about the

regeneration project because of current housing issues – this work aims to address this. The council have written to tenants about a refurbishment programme to bring homes up to standard while they wait for the regeneration to happen. Some works have already been carried out. HM reported that he understood that internal surveys were now resuming.

- 2.4. SR said that on her block there has been works on lighting and a new car park gate. IO lives in the same block and said she doesn't understand these improvements as they are more to do with appearance, while there are other more fundamental issues (e.g. rat problems and unsafe handrails, which have now just been repainted only). SK said that council have to determine what improvements are cost effective given the time span for the homes. **ACTION: IO and SR to contact SK separately to list out the issues with the block and SK to find out who the new contact is replacing Richard Joseph – HM to forward IO's contact details to SK.** JJ said that she is happy to get involved if any extra help is needed. SA said that the rodent problem is a wider issue, so needs to be considered as such, and HM noted that there are many other blocks which have public access and probably suffer from similar issues.

### 3. Design brief workshop:

- 3.1. MD gave a presentation on the design brief. The current focus is on preparing documents to go out to procure the design team. The design team will deliver a masterplan for the area with residents. In preparing a document for the procurement, the first thing is to think about the collective vision and outcomes. The presentation will show the council's initial vision and then the group can discuss ideas. The team will then try and translate the discussions and incorporate it into the brief and will bring that back for review at the next session.
- 3.2. MD's presentation covered: setting the context of the area; what the existing area includes; what planning guidelines dictate for the area; what wider guidelines/documents the team need to work within; and ideas for 6 outcomes of the regeneration based on themes from the documents.
- 3.3. HM asked MD to clarify what 'future-proofing' means. MD explained that it means thinking/planning ahead, e.g. who's going to manage the spaces and how? It is about how to ensure systems are in place to make it work well, and make sure it is a safe place to live throughout and at the end of the project. It is a big project that will happen in phases so we have to think about the project in stages.
- 3.4. The 6 goals are: 1. Creating a neighbourhood where everybody belongs; 2. Facilitate community wealth building; 3. Support the happiness, health and wellbeing of all residents; 4. Promote best practice in design and place making; 5. Address the climate emergency; 6. Future-proof for safety, good governance and estate management.
- 3.5. MK asked for feedback on the 6 goals – do they sound right? Do you have questions about process?
- 3.6. IO asked if additional bus stops could be included in the design as currently there is awkward access across the estate from the nearby bus stops and it does not help with encouraging people not to use cars. MD clarified that they wouldn't be able to add bus stops to the existing

network but the designs would have to look at accessibility, especially for those with mobility issues and SK said that accessibility in general is essential for decreasing car use.

- 3.7. MM said that there are not a lot of shops nearby and lots of the community travel to specific places for specific foods - is there a place for cars in the designs? SK said that due to the climate emergency and planning guidance (The London Plan, Newham Local Plan), it is essential to promote sustainable transport via design. It was noted by MM that nearly all existing residents have a car and so it will be challenging. HM asked whether existing residents could be guaranteed a parking space, but MD said it would be too early to say, though if residents are requiring cars to travel for essentials, this will need to be addressed in some way.
- 3.8. MM noted that he agreed with the objective to create 'tenure blind' designs so that rented/owned properties could not be distinguished. SA asked what the mix of building types might be. MD said it is too early to tell, but site constraints will dictate building types. However, they will include family units and maisonettes. SA said that family units are more suitable at ground level or on lower floors. HM noted whether there'd be 4- or 5-bed homes if that's what residents need, and also noted how the pandemic has changed how people live and work and that this should be taken into account when it comes to designing the homes and open spaces.
- 3.9. The group talked about the need for storage and additional toilets/bathrooms for larger family homes. MD suggested that there could be a fast-track sample of what the interior of the homes would be so that residents could get an understanding from the beginning, and noted that they have to be mindful of cost when it comes to storage and study space.
- 3.10. IB said that outdoor space, communal gardens and play areas for kids are important, but that consolidating outdoor amenities in a multi-use park is more cost effective for residents' service charges, and that this could be good as existing local parks are really busy. SK noted that the requirement is that if you build over a certain amount of homes, you have to try and provide child play space around the area. MD mentioned making the space between buildings safe, usable and not just for cars. MM noted that there used to be a cage outside his house which was really fun and he played in it all the time. MD said that 'doorstep play' can be included early on in the designs; she added that there would likely need to be a mix of integrated outdoor amenities into the area along with perhaps more designated park-space, so they would instead need to focus on cost-effectiveness to keep service charges manageable.
- 3.11. IO thought it was important to press ahead with the housing needs assessment to inform the design brief. AK said that the team are actively working on it now. They are designing it and planning to have a draft finished by the end of May and start completing the survey in August. SK noted that there will be a link to the survey in the Canning Town Times. MD said that when the design team are appointed, they will be given all the information on housing needs.
- 3.12. HM led the group to recap or add any last points to the guiding principles.
- 3.13. MM said the landscaping was important in meeting diverse needs and making the area inclusive.

- 3.14. IO asked how the contractor's contributions to the local economy would be monitored? SK said that Newham will have systems in place where a certain number of jobs provided will need to go to local people. IO said that construction includes a lot of low paid work so the wealth is not necessarily kept local. SK said that Newham is a London Living Wage employer and the economic regeneration team deal with this, but this team can make sure that it is about quality not just quantity, that it is set out in the contract and that monitoring opportunities at each stage of the project is really important.
- 3.15. ER asked whether people currently living in houses will get like for like. MD said that like for like is usually associated with bedroom numbers, and people currently living in houses may not be guaranteed another house as there may be less available so that area can be built with more density, but maisonettes (multi-storey flats) will still be included.
- 3.16. HM asked whether affordable workspace could be looked into as part of the new neighbourhood. MD said that if it can't be included in this brief, it is something that they could look into in the surrounding area.
- 3.17. ER mentioned social clubs and MD asked what people feel they want and need in terms of community facilities/activities. SK noted that they would have to demonstrate a clear need if they were to provide a community centre as part of this masterplan. HA said that a community centre is really important for young people and that currently the library is well used. IB said that there are a few empty commercial units in the blocks of flats at Rathbone Market, which could be useful to the community. Trinity Centre is not being used and is run-down – it was well used in the past but it is not a good location. SK noted that some of this is beyond the scope of the design, but that it is important to note how the area is used. The library is accessed via the underpass - SA said the underpass is really scary and needs upgrading. It was agreed that linking the north and south sides of the regeneration area, across the A13 was a vital part of the design strategy.
- 3.18. The group mentioned that the project needs to be advertised, especially to older people or people who don't go out much.
- 3.19. IO said that Newham is not big on waste management – it doesn't work well and there's no place to put their orange bags and not enough bins for the amount of people there are – the community needs to see that the council is supporting the aims that they're promoting. MD said that lots of this hinges on the council's refuse collection which they cannot influence, but the designers can design to the capacity needed. **ACTION: MD to invite Faraz to come in and talk about the current recycling situation at the next meeting.** SE noticed that the new build by Morrisons has a different waste system which could perhaps be looked into.
- 3.20. MD thanked everyone for their participation and feedback and went over the next steps. The team will take notes from this session and draft a design brief. They will come back to the group in early June to talk through the draft based on this evening's discussions, and start looking at objectives and how they will be monitored. Once the brief is finalised, they can start the procurement for appointing a design team, during which time the housing needs survey can be progressed.

3.21. AK noted that there was a lot of information this evening to take on, so residents could get in touch with any further thoughts over the next week.

**4. AOB:**

4.1. AOB was skipped.

**5. Date of next meeting:**

5.1. The next meeting will be on Thursday 17 June 2021.