

Juniper Crescent Community Estate
Board 28

Date: 20th January 2025

Location: Castlehaven Community
Association, 23 Castlehaven Rd,
London NW1 8RU
Dance Studio (Upstairs)

Time: 18:30 - 19:30

Raj Mandair (RM) Riverside	Regeneration Manager
Nnadozie Orisakwe (NO) Riverside	Regional Property Manager
Ian Simpson (IS) Communities First	Lead Advisor
Georgia Richardson (GR) Connect PA	Public Consultation
Will Brown (WB) Connect PA	Public Consultation

No	Content
1	Introductions Introductions for new joiners of the group
2	Update from Riverside/Countryside <u>RM to update on planning</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">RM noted that there were updates to the planning application submitted to Camden Council before Christmas, most of which related to providing more information and clarifications about the planning applicationRM noted that Riverside were initially targeting the 12th February for the Planning Committee meeting, but it is now looking like it will be the 26th February. RM noted that this is frustrating from a project perspective, noting that the delay was for a few reasons, including because Camden Council are still going through clarifications, and there has been a change in case officerRM noted that last week's Planning Committee meeting did not take place, which may also have a knock-on impactAs a result of the change in committee date, RM suggested that the Estate Board returns to the first Tuesday of next month (February 3rd) instead of the previously agreed date. RM noted that colleagues from Countryside and the Regeneration team will be in attendance on that date. Residents had no objection to the change in dates.A resident queried what the name of the new case officer for the application is. RM confirmed that it was David Peres da Costa.A resident asked for an explanation of the rationale behind changing the meeting schedule. RM noted that the meetings have usually been at the start of the month, but this meeting was changed when it was expected that the application would go to committee on the 12th February. We are now proposing a similar length of time between the next meeting and the committee date. <u>RM to update on the progress with moves and answer any queries</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">RM updated that, as of today, there are 20 households still to accept offers and that he expects this to be 16 by the end of the week – as there are a number of viewings taking place in the next two days.

- In terms of adult children, there are five adult children still to move.
- RM noted that significant progress had been made in terms of private rented sector housing (PRS). There is a backlog of those who have accepted and have properties secured, but some moves are delayed either due to works that need to take place within Riverside's own stock or because households didn't want to move before Christmas. RM updated that a lot of these moves will take place in February.
- A resident queried if those 20 households still to move are all in Phase One. RM confirmed that this was the case.
- RM noted that there were delays in terms of properties being accepted before Christmas, as Riverside wanted to carry out checks on individual properties and make sure that their Compliance Team were happy. Riverside are resolving that this week and booking in moves.
- In terms of adult child properties, RM noted that there have been fewer one-bedroom properties coming through. RM is looking into this and what the reason is. He noted that he is also catching up with households who have not engaged with the Regeneration Team for a while and discussing options.
- RM noted that residents will recall the NOSPs issued at the beginning of November, and noted that those have expired as of the 7th January and, as promised, no action has been taken yet. RM noted that the remaining 20 households are all still engaging, and everything is looking positive – the main challenge is finding suitable properties.
- A resident asked for an update from RM on their individual paperwork. RM noted that he provided an update earlier today, and is expecting their paperwork to be finalised by the end of the week. RM noted that there are a lot of moves taking place at the moment, and apologised for the delay on his part in terms of getting back to residents.

RM to update on repairs

- A resident noted an issue with their own repairs, highlighting their individual issues to RM
- RM noted that Kausar (Property Manager) was on the call before Christmas and felt that residents were pleasantly surprised that the actions raised in the previous Estate Board were resolved.
- A resident disagreed, noting an issue with the fob key as it does not work on the gates, and threatening legal action against Riverside. It was further noted that the ability to open the gates with your phone does not work, and it was requested that Riverside fix this – and noted that Riverside are aware of the issue already. It was noted that the system has not worked since an engineer visited in October, and that it was initially reported then.
 - NO offered apologies on behalf of Kausar, noting that she was unable to attend due to a personal matter. NO updated that, according to the last inspection on the 13th January, the gates were working.
 - However, NO noted that he has requested a meeting with E-Tech and the Compliance Team to understand why this prolonged issue has continued and get to the root of the problem. NO suggested that the gate ought to be replaced entirely, but noted that he will have further information after the internal meeting and promised to get this off the ground – as the regular inspections do not seem to be solving the issues raised in this meeting.
 - A resident requested that, when the gate is repaired, the ability to open the gate from your phone is also investigated as this does not work at present and residents have to open the gate manually.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ IS requested that the point about phones be included in the action note, and requested NO to report back on progress on the 3rd, if not before.○ ACTION: NO to report back in the next meeting on the issue with the gate, fobs, and opening the gates through a phone• A resident noted that they were without gas, resulting in no heating or hot water, for three weeks between November and December. It was noted that the resident spent twelve hours on the phone with various numbers trying to get the issue fixed, and it took three weeks for the first person to come and see it.○ It was noted that, when a technician attended, it was a sub-contractor (as the resident could not get Riverside to attend despite repeated requests) who unlocked a door that had been placed upon the gas meter without their knowledge. It was found that Riverside had placed a cap on their gas supply three weeks prior due to a clerical error.○ IS queried if this gas meter was inside or outside the flat. The resident confirmed it was outside their flat.○ The resident noted that the cap was intended to be placed on a property at Gilbeys Yard, and so it was an error from Riverside that left them without heating and hot water. The resident noted further that they were recommended to stay in their flat for a window of twelve hours, but nobody ever showed up. It was noted that the residents at Gilbeys Yard did not respond to communication received, and that communication is an issue and raised that Riverside should ensure that issues are being addressed with the correct residents.○ It was noted by the resident that they are fortunate to be an able-bodied person who can advocate for themselves, but a person in a vulnerable situation would have gone through something traumatic.○ IS queried if Riverside tried to make things right. The resident noted that they submitted a complaint, and have now requested that the complaint be moved on to Stage 2. However, no response has been received and it was criticised if this is the average experience that tenants have to go through to submit a complaint.○ RM confirmed that he will look into the issue and take it up with the complaints team to chase it up on their behalf. RM noted that he would be happy to discuss this further. RM queried if the last correspondence received was before Christmas, the resident noted that this was the case.○ The resident noted that both available phone numbers attempted to direct to each other: the out of hours number to Riverside, and Riverside to the out of hours number. It was noted that the out of hours number was previously the One Housing number, which the resident thought was not in use.○ ACTION: RM to update resident on their complaint. RM will email the resident to discuss this further after the meeting and send over the reference numbers.• A resident noted to another resident that the drains were blocked previously around October and criticised the response from Riverside. RM noted that he recalled this. It was noted by a resident that, since Riverside took over, the response to complaints is not as good.• A resident noted that they are still receiving alerts for servicing their boiler for their old flat, and requested that their number be taken off as they have moved out. ACTION: RM to action and chase this.
4	AOB

- A resident queried if RM maintains that it will be possible to live in Phase 2 whilst the Phase 1 works are being carried out. RM confirmed that he does. IS queried what mitigation would be in place. RM noted that, after the planning application is hopefully granted, there will be conditions in terms of engagement on construction. There is usually a construction working group to discuss what the plans look like and how to mitigate the impacts of construction, and RM noted that the Estate Board will likely play a role in that. RM noted that the scheme is phased because Riverside/Countryside think it is possible. RM accepted that there will be an impact but this will be mitigated, and noted that Juniper Crescent residents have lived across from the St George's Scheme and 100A Chalk Farm.
 - The resident noted that the St George's Scheme and 100A Chalk Farm were physically separate from Juniper Crescent, but the Juniper Crescent regeneration will be impacting the same building that people are currently living in and require people to live in a building that is currently being demolished. RM accepted that the impact would be different.
 - The resident queried if RM accepted that people will be living in a built environment that is the same environment that is being demolished. RM confirmed that he accepted this, and noted that these are the proposals that have been in place since 2022. RM noted that he could not answer any further questions, as he is not a construction specialist, but noted that Vistry will be in attendance on the 3rd February and offered to pass this question on to Vistry so that there is an answer prepared for it at the meeting.
 - The resident suggested that an answer also ought to be prepared for what the contingency plans, safeguards and mitigations are, in case the expectation of what the demolition process looks like does not match up to reality.
 - **ACTION: RM to pass the above queries on demolition to Vistry, to ensure an answer is prepared ahead of the meeting on the 3rd February.**
 - The resident noted that there were reassurances at the time of the ballot that residents living in Phase 2 could move out before demolition took place if they felt going through that process would be too much or did not suit them. It was queried if this was still the case, RM confirmed that Phase 2 residents can bid and some residents in Phase 2 have moved out, and this remains on the table.
 - There was a discussion around the entitlement of the individual resident. RM confirmed that intermediate rent tenants have equal entitlement to relocation properties and continue to have the option to move, and it is all subject to the availability of properties
- A resident queried if residents would be sent a link to watch the Planning Committee meeting online. RM confirmed that they will provide an update on this on the 3rd, and that usually the link for the meeting is produced a week before the meeting by Camden Council. RM confirmed that he will have a copy of it, and the team can circulate the link.
 - **ACTION: Connect to circulate the link to watch planning committee livestream, once made available by Camden Council**
- RM proposed that the next Estate Board after the 3rd February will be the 3rd March, but noted that this is a discussion point for the next meeting.
- A resident queried if anyone was aware of the situation of the St George's development, noting that they were expecting an update in the new year.
 - RM noted that he has not received any further updates, but suggested that sometimes that reports are left at the desk of the Secretary of State and so there is usually a time lag after the hearing.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ A resident noted that they read that building works would still be going on at the St George's development even after Juniper Crescent is finished. It was queried if residents would be moving back but still living adjacent to a building site. RM noted that he does not know the scheme in absolute detail, but noted that the first blocks to be delivered are on Stephenson Street – with the latter phases closer to Gilbeys Yard. RM noted that it depends on how their appeal progresses, but noted that they were looking to have some properties occupied from April to the Summer in the first three blocks. The resident noted that they were unsure if the appeal would be won.● IS reminded those present that the next meeting will be on the 3rd February, and noted that he would appreciate an update from NO at that meeting.
--	--

Please use this link to join us online if preferred:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86134814606>