

Juniper Crescent Community Estate Board 33

Date: 2nd June 2026

Location: Castlehaven Community Association, 23 Castlehaven Rd, London NW1 8RU

Kitchen Classroom (Downstairs)

Time: 18:30 - 19:30

Mynul Islam (MI) Riverside	Project Manager
Holly Simpson (HS) Riverside	Senior Development Manager
Kausarbanu Fayazahmad (KF) Riverside	Property Manager
Ian Simpson (IS) Communities First	Lead Advisor
David St John (DSJ) Vistry	Project Director
Will Brown (WB) Connect PA	Public Consultation
Cllr Matt Cooper Camden Council	Ward Councillor

No	Content
1	Introductions
	- Prior to the meeting, one of the residents requested that MI get in touch with them the following morning. ACTION: MI to contact the resident. - Apologies were sent from Cllr Callaghan.
2	Update from Riverside/Countryside
	<u>HS to update on planning</u> - HS updated that Riverside are continuing to negotiate conditions on the planning application for Juniper Crescent. Whilst Riverside were hoping to have this concluded by the end of May, it is now expected to take another few weeks. Riverside are targeting conclusion by the 20th June. - A resident queried if this would result in further delays to the programme. HS confirmed that planning would not cause delays. <u>DSJ to update on site setup</u> - DSJ gave a presentation on the site setup during construction. During this presentation, the following points were noted: - DSJ set out the site access, noting that Vistry will be ensuring that construction does not disrupt resident movements - A gatehouse will be located by the main gates with a dedicated traffic marshal - Vistry will have operatives dedicated to maintaining key roadways, and will take control of the road - The site will be divided into two with an enclosed perimeter, ensuring that the construction site is completely enclosed from Phase 2 - The existing footpath will be diverted, with a footpath made along the boundary to keep residents away from construction - An escape gate is present in the event of a blockage on the road - The site itself will be serviced by three tower cranes, which will be able to turn within the site - It was requested that the presentation be uploaded to the website. ACTION: DSJ's presentation to be uploaded to the website.

- IS queried where Vistry would be storing materials. DSJ confirmed that these would be stored in the underground car park / basement on site, to be either lifted out with tower cranes or driven up by forklift. DSJ noted that Vistry may be able to use the Network Rail depot, but this is subject to ongoing discussions.
- A resident queried the access into the site, as it seemed tight. DSJ confirmed that it would remain the same as before, but it would not be two-way. The resident noted that this was their concern, and queried if there would be 24/7 support in the event of any issues.
 - DSJ noted that he would take this away, but highlighted that there would be CCTV. There was a discussion around current arrangements, and DSJ noted that Vistry could look at out-of-hours security but assumed that residents would want to maintain the security of the gate. The resident noted that the gate doesn't work anyway. DSJ noted that the gates could be removed.
 - The resident requested that DSJ attend another meeting, where more residents from Phase 2 are present. **ACTION:** DSJ to attend a later meeting to discuss work plans and mitigation with Phase 2 residents.
- Cllr Cooper queried what security there would be on the hoarding. DSJ confirmed that there would be full CCTV coverage, which would replicate the existing coverage. He noted that Vistry are well aware of the need to maintain security – as such, the CCTV will be remotely manned and Vistry can have security on site in 15 minutes. It was also noted that Vistry could share access to the CCTV with a resident liaison, or someone similar.
- Cllr Cooper queried what lighting there would be on the hoarding. DSJ confirmed that the hoarding would be fully lit all the way along.
 - Cllr Cooper noted that his concern was for the road as you come up towards the site near the roundabout. DSJ confirmed that the hoarding would be fully lit around the site perimeter.
 - A resident noted that the corner before you turn into the gates is particularly unsafe. DSJ noted that Vistry would look at this to ensure it is as well-lit as possible.
- A resident queried when Vistry expect to break ground on the development itself. DSJ stated that this would not be until Spring 2027.
- A resident queried when Vistry expect to start demolition. DSJ noted that hard demolition is due to begin in February 2027, with works to ready vacant properties for demolition starting imminently (likely in July/August 2026).
- A resident asked what employment opportunities there are for local people. DSJ confirmed that there would be around 50 – 53 apprentices under the current draft of the S106 agreement with Camden Council, and that Vistry would also be using local supply chains.
 - A resident asked what opportunities were available beyond this. DSJ noted that Vistry would be going out to subcontractors, and suggested that the biggest opportunity for local businesses is around the internal finish.
 - A resident requested that MI ensure that residents are aware of these vacancies. DSJ requested that residents share the details of those who may be able to add to the process, and it was noted that hospitality also represented an opportunity in terms of a site canteen.
- A resident asked when Vistry were expecting the works to be complete. DSJ stated that it is currently expected to be 2030.
- MI asked DSJ to explain what measures are in place to prevent dust, noting previous concerns from residents. DSJ responded that contractors would be using 'dust busters', that spray down the area to keep dust levels down. DSJ noted that information would be

shared with residents at the time, and that they are conscious that demolition will be the most disruptive. DSJ also noted that Vistry will not be using temporary roads during construction, as these generate dust, and will use tarmac roads instead.

- A resident queried if Vistry is leading the construction or if it is Countryside. DSJ confirmed that it would be Vistry.

MI to update on the progress with moves and answer any queries

- MI noted that the statistics on moves have not changed since last month, with 17 still to move, though the pending moves have gone down from 6 to 4 – two of which are waiting on internal works.
 - Internally, MI noted that there have not been many properties available in recent weeks but Riverside continues to work with A3.
 - It was noted there are fewer private rental properties available. Riverside have enquired into this and it is likely a result of the Renters' Rights Act creating hesitancy and reducing supply.
- A resident asked if this had impacted the timelines, noting that property guardians are moving back into the Estate. MI confirmed that guardians are moving back in, as they were previously given until the end of May to clear the site in line with the previous target for vacant possession. As the timeline has been delayed, Riverside have requested that guardians return in order to ensure the security of the site.
 - A resident asked if Riverside would be filling the site with guardians. MI clarified that it would not be every property, and that Riverside are aiming for a balance between allowing work to start and maintaining security – and will be getting a quote from Vistry in the coming weeks on the start of works.
- A resident asked if Riverside staff are in the hub. MI noted that Riverside are unable to use it for security reasons, but that staff can be on site if residents wish to speak with them.
- Discussing their own individual situation, a resident noted that they have sent multiple emails in relation to a number of issues with their property and no repairs have been carried out. MI noted that Riverside had come back on this and instructed the management company to sort it. The resident disputed this, stating that they had been told there was no request from Riverside, but MI noted that this was contrary to what he has seen.
- A resident noted that communication has been a long issue, and requested that MI raise this with the Regeneration Team. MI agreed that he would not expect anything less.
ACTION: MI to raise communication with the Regeneration Team
- A resident noted that they have been waiting for months for a response from MI and raised their own individual issue relating to how their private rental property and tenancy is recorded within Riverside.
 - A resident noted that this has been a stressful experience, raising their own specific issues and the difficulty that has arisen from the property and tenancy not being properly recorded within Riverside
 - IS asked MI to explain how records are kept when residents move into private accommodation. MI explained that the issue is that each unit has to be added to the system, and that the units have now been added and MI will chase up on this.
 - A resident asked when these issues are expected to be sorted, noting that nobody is holding up the bargain on Riverside's end. MI noted that the properties are now on the system, and that Riverside are now adding the tenancies.

- A resident asked if everything would be in order when those still at Juniper Crescent move. MI noted that the issue arises solely from those moving into private rental properties.
- It was noted that tenancy and repairs details should be on the system as soon the contract is signed
- A resident suggested that this should have been on the system in advance, and queried why this has taken so long. MI noted that the units are now on the system, but the tenancies have still to be added. A resident raised the stress this has caused, and that this has not been acknowledged by Riverside. It was suggested by the resident that the landlord offer has been compromised, raising their own individual situation relating to guardians being rehoused in their previous property at Juniper Crescent and Riverside suggesting that the locks to the property could be changed if the keys could not be returned. Another resident raised concerns about this, querying how Riverside could change the locks without the keys. To note, no locks were changed, and the guardians cannot occupy the property until the keys have been returned.
- A resident queried if future moves could be put on hold until the issues are sorted, and that Riverside should acknowledge the issues. MI noted that pending properties have come down since he joined, but accepted that there are issues. MI noted that he would pull up the team on the issues raised, and accepted that this needs to be handled better and that this starts with listening and communication with residents. He invited residents to drop him a line if they want to call or have a 1:1 meeting.
- A resident noted their own individual issues, to which MI noted that these had been raised immediately upon his return. Another resident noted their desire to engage solely with MI.
- A resident stated that they have not been offered any properties, and queried where they stand. MI noted that Riverside need to find them a suitable property, and they will not be forced into a property that does not meet their needs.
 - The resident stated that they were told they would be moved into a house, to which MI explained that temporary move does not have to be a house. The resident clarified that they are moving permanently, and stated that Riverside was discriminating against them.
 - MI stated that Riverside would work with them to find a suitable property, to which the resident noted their disappointment at hearing the experiences of other residents who have moved
 - MI emphasised that Riverside would work with them, and cannot force them into an unsuitable property. A resident noted that the properties they have been offered do not meet their needs. MI agreed that their needs are different, and there was a discussion between MI and the resident on their needs and the documentation of those needs.
 - MI noted that Riverside have reached out to Camden Council to use their properties, and are waiting on a signed agreement for this. A resident queried what the timescale is for this, to which MI noted that this is not yet known.
 - A resident stated that Riverside had directly discriminated against them and potentially other residents, and that the NOSP was void as nobody had sat down with them to discuss a move and their needs.
 - The resident asked IS for his thoughts on the matter. IS suggested that, with a case of discrimination, a court would be looking at comparators and it appeared to IS that others had been treated similarly. IS advised seeing a solicitor for further information, to which the resident noted that they had

	done so and were advised to make a formal complaint. The resident noted that nobody had met with them since the complaint, and they were waiting for a response. ▪ IS suggested that they could discuss further outside the meeting. The resident noted they were happy to discuss it publicly. IS suggested that it seemed unlikely that their case would be seen as discrimination – but that if they feel they can go to court, then they should. ▪ There was a discussion between IS and the resident on the matter, during which IS queried whether the solicitor would have suggested a formal complaint if a case was likely to be won. The resident explained that this was proposed as a first step. • A resident noted that their concern is not with the property, but with Riverside. It was stated that Riverside are washing their hands of those who have moved out, and queried what would happen if the existing team no longer lead on regeneration. MI noted that there is a process for this and it is being followed to add the units and tenancies to the system so that everyone in Riverside knows how to handle it, but Riverside are facing issues on this process at the moment. • A resident queried whether, as they had moved in with family rather than to a separate property, they were definitely still in the system and able to move back once construction had been completed. MI confirmed that they would still be on the system as a returning resident. • Cllr Cooper noted that it was worrying to see how residents were getting stuck in the system, and queried what needs to be done so that people's needs can be met and they do not have to deal with the admin. MI reiterated that the system is the current bottleneck, which he has now escalated high. MI noted that Riverside will put knowledge articles on the system to explain and streamline the process, but have hit a bottleneck at present. ACTION: MI to chase up PRS address and tenancy details on Riverside's database • Cllr Cooper requested that MI write this up and send to himself and Cllr Callaghan, so that they could push Riverside as an organisation on this. A resident noted that there should also be compensation. ACTION: MI to email Cllrs Callaghan and Cooper. • IS queried whether there should be additional meetings of the Estate Boards, to which a resident noted that this would not be beneficial until the issues are sorted. • A resident queried if the remaining moves could be put on hold until the issues are sorted. MI stated that he understood the reasoning, but that unfortunately this was unlikely to happen as deadlines have been passed already. ○ A resident noted that this was not their fault, as the main issue is the lack of properties and yet residents are the ones being penalised for it. MI noted that he would take this away and escalate, and suggested that he would ask Paul Handley (Head of Regeneration) to attend the next meeting. ○ A resident queried if Paul's attendance would support MI in resolving the issues, to which MI reiterated that it may help residents to get their concerns across. MI noted that, whilst he recognises that residents do not feel it, the Regeneration team are advocating for residents within Riverside. ○ Residents suggested inviting Paul Handley's superior, Robert Marcantoni (Director of Development) – whom some residents have previously met at the Planning Committee meeting for Juniper Crescent. There was a discussion around the benefits of inviting Paul and Robert to the Estate Board. MI noted that he would ask. ACTION: MI to ask Paul Handley and Robert Marcantoni to attend a meeting of the Estate Board.
--	--

	○ It was noted by a resident that the departure of Raj Mandair has had an impact. • IS set out the next steps for Riverside: to discuss with the team, email the ward councillors, and speak to an individual resident. • A resident queried if there had been a presentation within Riverside around the situation for Juniper Crescent residents. ○ MI noted that knowledge articles would be added onto the system. MI noted that this model had previously been used for the regeneration on Friars Close and worked well. ○ A resident queried why these issues are occurring if it had happened before on Friars Close. MI clarified that these specific issues had not occurred on Friars Close, but that he was referencing the principle of ensuring everyone in Riverside can help residents – but recognised that this has not been entirely set up yet. ○ A resident queried who takes responsibility for this process. MI noted that it involves several different departments, but that the overall responsibility sits with the Regeneration Team. • A resident queried if the issues have arisen from the acquisition of One Housing by Riverside. MI noted that there had recently been internal system changes, which has had an effect. • A resident noted that there should be an apology or an offer of compensation. MI noted that he understood this, which is why the Regeneration Team have been trying to be more generous with residents. A resident disputed this, and another resident noted their own issues around compensation. • IS queried if there was any way MI could share discussions on these issues ahead of the next Estate Board. MI asked IS to pass on the details of specific concerns from residents. • A resident noted that it would be good to have Robert Marcantoni at the next meeting, to which a resident noted that residents should be made aware of his attendance if he does attend the Estate Board. MI noted that he would raise it with Robert. • A resident queried if they would be taken more seriously if there was a Tenants and Residents Association (TRA). IS suggested that this would help, but that it helps when the TRA is established before the problem starts. MI suggested that this was the purpose of the Estate Board. • Residents agreed that there should be an additional meeting of the Estate Board to meet with Robert Marcantoni and discuss issues. ○ A resident noted that all residents need to be informed if this meeting takes place. It was suggested that two weeks' notice is needed, to which residents present agreed. • A resident noted to MI that the repairs for their property are urgent and should be fixed as soon as possible. ACTION: MI to get in touch with the resident.
4	AOB

Please use this link to join us online if preferred:
<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/89613369069>