

Marlowe Road Steering Group Meeting

Date: Thursday 9th March 2017
 Time: 6.30 - 8.00pm
 Venue: 168 Marlowe Rd E17 – Project Shop

AGENDA

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Introductions | Nick Powell |
| 2. Minutes of the last meeting and matters arising | Nick Powell |
| 3. Programme update – next stages | Ross Jenyon/Adam Clarke/Nicholas Clarke |
| 4. Parking Strategy Northwood Tower | Meera Kumar/Andrew Ochia |
| 5. Signage and navigation | Jan Gill |
| 6. Decant update | Jacqueline Franklin |
| 7. Resident consultation update | Bea Symington |
| 8. AOB | All |

ATTENDEES

Chair:	Nick Powell (NP)	LBWF, Head of Strategic Housing and Investment
Minute Taker	Bea Symington (BS)	LBWF, Regeneration Officer - Participation
Residents:	Lesley Pearce (LP) Fred Savill (FS) Steve Brett (SB) Winston McLeod (WM)	Keith Heavan (KH) Michelle Edwards (ME) Tracey Kemp (TK) M Mersh (MM)
Officers:	Meera Kumar (MK) Jan Gill (JG) Andrew Ochia (AO) Jacqueline Franklin (JF) Michael Douglas (MD)	LBWF, Senior Regeneration Officer LBWF, Estate Regeneration Programme Manager LBWF, Development Officer LBWF, Regeneration Officer – Decant LBWF, Housing Officer
Countryside Properties:	Ross Jenyon (RJ) Adam Clarke (AC)	Senior Construction Manager Design and Build Manager
Apologies	Kenneth Gill (KG) Nickolas Clarke (NC)	LBWF, Housing Officer Senior Development Manager (Development)

Agenda Item		Action
1.	Apologies were received from Nicholas Clarke, Kenneth Gill and Michelle Edwards who had informed the group she would be delayed. Introductions by the group.	
2.	NP checked the accuracy of the minutes for the last meeting. BS apologised for an error in the minutes of the last meeting as they were issued with the incorrect date of the 27 th February when the meeting was on the 26 th of February. <i>Post meeting note:</i> ME submitted the following amendments to the minutes of previous meetings: <i>Minutes of the meeting of Thursday 15th December 2016</i>	

Agenda item 2 ME read a prepared statement which outlined her disagreement with the Minutes of the last meeting. Made reference to the skeleton outline in respect to the parking issues. Omission of input by Norman McKenzie about removal of car parking. Minute taker – Meera Kumar (MK) marked Norman McKenzie as being absent from the meeting despite the fact that he was seated to her right. There was joint concern about pressure being applied to residents.

Point 7 – anti social behaviour, at no point did I say caretakers are not doing their jobs. I placed blame firmly with Waltham Forest Council. Conveniently, the point about receiving an email dated 28th September 2016 from Ms Jaqueline Franklin instructing me not to raise the matter of my disability discrimination and flawed disability panel decision has been omitted

Agenda item 3 ME asked why residents would now have to pay for visitors permits when they have not had to pay before and no prior reference to residents.

LP stated concern that the car park would be closed before the next steering group meeting

ME referenced Countryside promise to write regularly to residents which they have not

Minutes of meeting held on Thursday 26th January 2017

Agenda item 2 Action 5 MK to meet with the owner of the pet shop to discuss car parking - ME stated that this was not done as per her promise to do so. ME reminded MK that she had agreed to meet with the pet shop owner the following Monday. Following checks with the owner over the entire week, it was confirmed that not visit had been made. Nor any telephone contact. On 19 December 2016, ME sent an email to MK headed ‘Failure to attend Pets Corner as per Steering Group Meeting’ on 15 December 2016 and copied in NP, JG and BS (time 5.58pm). Therefore all parties knew prior to the meeting that the action had not been carried out.

Agenda item 3 ME reported that there had been issues with council employees who had attended for bookings with residents and were carrying tools but were told they couldn’t park in the car park and were unaware of their closure.

Agenda item 4 Did not say ‘whether the properties were in use by secure tenants

Did not say it was not just one address but that residents know which residences are used as temporary accommodation as they know the area – Said properties are easily identified due to the curtains put up after a decant.

Agenda item 5 Did not say that there had been consultations and promises made by the council but this had not resulted in anything for the residents – made clear promises by the Council had not been kept

Agenda item 6 ME stated that she wished to raise a somewhat unconventional point. She said that she does not expect the Council or Countryside to care about Marlowe Road residents since they return home to their properties. Therefore, they are not directly affected by the works. ME stated that she wanted it to be known that both she and other resident on the estate are aware of the real feelings towards Marlowe Road residents. That it had been spoken by parties assigned to the Council that they could not wait to clean up the estate in reference to the current occupants. JG asked for further detail. ME did not provide any names but made it clear that the parties did not include JG or BS. ME commended JG on her work since her inception. NP informed ME of the complaints procedure should she wish to engage it. ME stated that she was well aware of the complaints procedure but had no faith in it because of the clear conflict of interest in Council employees investigating

	<p>their colleagues. And, their poor track record of progressing complaints.</p> <p>NP moved the discussion to status of the actions of the last meeting Action 1 - MK to email highways regarding the lighting issue on the estate MK reported that she had reported the issues and Highways had reported that they had gone out and completed the work. RJ stated he would check that the work had been completed Action 2 - JG to check council systems for letter delivery and research and appropriate process JG informed the group that she had checked the Caretakers Job Description and that it included a paragraph which states the Council has the right to make changes and requests providing it remains in line with the grade. As a result, the council is within their rights to request letter delivery from the caretakers. Action 3 - Team to look into the issue of letter delivery and respond to the group The team are trialling the use of alternative delivery methods with the use of a private company and have used them for the last few deliveries. JG asked if all had received the minutes of the last meeting FS confirmed he had Action 4 - BS to send ME a copy of the Northwood Tower letter BS confirmed that she had Action 5 - Team to report that the ASB issue was on-going to Kenneth Gill JF confirmed that she had and that MD has taken over from Kenneth Gill. MD confirmed that he had but having started last week he was not fully briefed yet on all issues. Action 6 - Team to follow the issue of the abandoned cars with the Highways MK confirmed that the cars had gone TC stated that they had been taken away last week Action 7 – Team to check the address of the cars MK reported that the Regeneration Team had now contacted all owners. SB reported that the cars not being present has helped alleviate some of the anti-social behaviour Action 8 - JG to send ME information on residents employed as RLOs JG reported that she had undertaken research on RLOs but as this was verbal there was nothing to send across. JG reported that she would speak to ME directly but that there was no conflict of interest with an RLO on an estate being a resident of that estate. She had spoken to Paul Sweeny of Countryside and he had told her that it would actually be discriminatory if residents were not allowed to apply for these roles. LP joined the meeting Action 9 - Team to look into the erection of signs within the car park MK reported that this was all completed as the carparks had been cleared Action 10 - Team to check the ASB issue with the Neighbourhood Officer BS reported that this was completed MM joined the meeting Action 11 - JG to look into parking strategy and return to the group JG said this would be picked up within the agenda item</p>	<p>RJ to check that the lighting had been completed</p>
<p>3.</p>	<p>RJ reported to the group that the leases had all been signed and that 90% of the hoardings had been erected. Still to be completed is the removal of the wall and railings on Vallentin Road. This will be completed following the archaeological investigations on site which will take a further week. The piling for block P2 and the Co-op building will start on the 27th of March. The services</p>	

<p>works on Marlowe Road will be completed in March and following this the barriers will be removed in the interim before later works commence. Dukes Passage is currently being cleared and the hedges will be trimmed tomorrow. The hedges will be trimmed as much as possible. The area will also be cleared up and will open up to the middle of the estate. Countryside will then maintain and manage it. It will be opened on Monday. The next stage of the programme will be the foundation works which will take 6-8 weeks.</p> <p>NP asked if there were any questions</p> <p>LP asked about the boards surrounding Northwood Tower and the dog park closing. LP reported that it was scary living in the area as there is no lighting or cameras on the entryways. LP asked about the Vallentine Road entryway gate being open.</p> <p>RJ answered that the gate should be operational</p> <p>LP reported that it wasn't and that there had been a sign erected on the gate reading 'push the gate' which a resident had removed. LP reported that the gate had left residents feeling insecure. LP asked why the dog park had been closed as residents were not told this would happen and how long it would be closed for.</p> <p>AC answered that it was closed permanently</p> <p>RJ answered that they would look into the potential for erecting cameras</p> <p>MM asked why there was lighting but no cameras as there was lots of light for the Co-op.</p> <p>LP reported that it was a potential drug den and that residents were not told that the dog park would be closing.</p> <p>RJ reported that the plans with the dog park closed were displayed at consultation meetings</p> <p>MK said that there would be an internal meeting regarding the lighting and cameras</p> <p>JG reported that plans of the new lighting and cameras would be displayed internally</p> <p>AC reported that phased plans of the development which included the dog park were shown at the last consultation meeting</p> <p>LP reported that the last meeting was all about the entryways and didn't include the dog path</p> <p>RJ answered that the dog park was shown as removed in the later phases</p> <p>LP reported that promises were not kept</p> <p>NP asked what lessons could be learned</p> <p>MK reported that there would be notices erected around the estate</p> <p>LP reported that there was the need for information on access to the rubbish bins on the ground floor as residents were unaware of their ability to use the entryways at the bottom of Northwood Tower as large items do not fit down the shoot</p> <p>MK said that the team would erect a map of the access points on each floor</p> <p>RJ asked if it was needed on every floor</p> <p>LP confirmed that it was</p> <p>MK told the meeting that one of the doors was a fire escape door and shouldn't be opened. Countryside would put together a map</p> <p>BS confirmed that a letter will be sent out regarding the changed date of Thames Water's works</p> <p>RJ said that Countryside will try to erect lighting up over the next week or temporary lighting if this is not possible.</p> <p>LP reported that there was the need for cameras on the entryways</p> <p>WM joined the meeting</p>	<p>Countryside to look into the erection of cameras on the Northwood Tower entryway passages</p> <p>Team to meet and discuss the erection of lighting and cameras</p> <p>Team would erect a map of the access points for rubbish disposal on each floor of Northwood Tower</p> <p>Letter to be sent out regarding the changed date of Thames Water's works</p>
---	--

<p>4.</p>	<p>MK informed the meeting that she had met with the Highways department to look into options for Northwood drop off points on Vallentine Road. Highways are conducting a site visit on Friday the 10th to review which of the 5-6 options there are is most suitable. This will not be a quick process as they will need to write a traffic management plan which will then be approved. This will then have to be advertised in the paper. A second report will then be written including any objections which have been made. This will then be submitted for approval.</p> <p>LP asked why options on Wood Street were not being looked at. LP stated that this should have been pre-empted and put in place two years ago when the project was started.</p> <p>RJ reported that Wood Street would not be suitable as it was connected to a dry riser for a fire escape.</p> <p>MK told the group she would give an update on the outcomes of highways site visit at the next meeting</p> <p>AO reported that the team had been chasing highways for three weeks but they are incredibly busy</p> <p>JG said she would escalate the issue if necessary</p> <p>LP asked why it was Vallentine Road and if there was a possibility that it could be Wood Street</p> <p>MK answered that there was the issue of the fire access and that the report will discuss the best option</p> <p>LP asked if it would be parking bays</p> <p>RJ reported that employees of the electro Signs shop parked on the pavements and put out cones</p> <p>NP said that the team would update the group on the issue as soon as possible</p>	<p>MK to update the group on the Vallentine Road drop off points</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p>RJ showed the group plans of the sight and told the group that Countryside would be erecting signage in all major areas of the estate showing the access routes. These would be put in every location and would include a 'you are here' notation.</p> <p>JG asked whether the opening up of Dukes Passage would shorten journeys across the estate.</p> <p>RJ answered that it should</p> <p>MK confirmed that Housing Management are OK with the passage being opened</p> <p>NP said that the signs should show it as such</p> <p>LP asked whether at the end of the development there would be gates around Northwood Tower</p> <p>AC said that it would not be gated</p> <p>LP reported that residents had but in a bid to pay for the gates</p> <p>JG said the team would look again at the plans and investigate if it would be possible</p> <p>AC told the group it would not be difficult to reinstate the gates</p> <p>LP reported that people would use it as a cut through</p> <p>NP said that residents' concerns were noted and that the regeneration team would update the group on this issue in due course</p> <p>LP asked when the grounds maintenance would be removed from residents' service charge</p> <p>MK said that she now has a contact in the relevant team and that the team would investigate.</p> <p>LP asked what was included in the charge</p> <p>MK answered that she would send LP the breakdown</p> <p>RJ stated that there should be an interim reductions</p>	<p>Team to investigate the reinstatement of gates surrounding Northwood Tower on the scheme's completion</p> <p>MK to investigate Northwood Tower service charge</p> <p>MK to send LP service charge breakdown</p>

	<p>JG told the group that it was the intention that this would be amended within the charge</p> <p>RJ informed the group that the site navigation notices would be pictorial</p> <p>ME informed the group that there had been concerns from local businesses including the post office that their revenue would be reduced. The Post Office had informed ME that they had tried to get a simple matter resolved. The Post Office had purchased signs reading 'open as usual' and had been told by Countryside that they would not be able to erect them on the hoardings covering the site as it was a marketing issue.</p> <p>RJ answered that the Post Office had been told that the hoardings were Countryside's and were corporately banded and such required corporate sign off. RJ reported that he had told the Post Office that they would need to make the request through Countryside as it was owned and branded formally.</p> <p>AC reported that Countryside had reduced the extent and angle of the hording and that the Post Office could be fully viewed from Wood Street.</p> <p>ME stated that the lack of relevant communications by the Council and Countryside to businesses was an ongoing issue and that there were commercial issues as the Post Office and businesses were losing business.</p> <p>RJ answered that Countryside had had discussions with the post Office and suggested alternate signage arrangements including offering Countryside to erect and pay for signage</p> <p>NP asked if this offer had been accepted</p> <p>RJ reported that it had not</p> <p>KH joined the meeting</p> <p>MK reported that it was a highways issue to erect signage on lampposts and the pavement</p> <p>RJ answered that Countryside had offered to pay for the erecting of signage</p> <p>ME asked why the Post Office would have asked for the issue to be raised</p> <p>MK responded that she had responded via email about issues including parking</p> <p>ME asked why the Post Office would have asked for the issue to be raised</p> <p>MK answered that she didn't know</p> <p>MK said there were different options including the use of an enlarged sign of lamppost, use of vacant shops, use of the pound shop frontage and that three queries were being investigated</p> <p>NP asked if it was an ongoing dialogue</p> <p>ME requested that the team do so</p> <p>MK confirmed that they would</p> <p>NP said that the team would consider appropriate signage for the Post Office which would be fully visible from the road and not have an issue when shut</p> <p>RJ answered that if the issue could be resolved then Countryside would pay for and erect the signage</p>	
6.	<p>JF informed the group that the decanting was going very well</p> <p>28 of the 48 leaseholder buy backs had been completed and the Council was in negotiations with another 9 and the Council are in dialogue with the remaining 10. There are 107 voids on the estate and all the properties would all be used at temporary accommodation. There are an additional 7 moves in the pipeline so the decant is on track.</p> <p>NP asked if there was a focus on the next phase of the development</p> <p>JF answered that she was working with all of the residents who wished to move and that she was looking at phase 1b with all on track as 107 households had already moved</p> <p>NP asked whether the payments were on track</p> <p>JF answered that some of the payments to decanted residents were still slow</p>	

<p>and that the council was looking internally as to where this could be speeded up.</p> <p>ME told the meeting that at the last meeting it was asked whether temporary accommodation tenants were made aware of suitable conduct when they were signed up to the property</p> <p>MD answered that it was standard practice when signing up tenants to discuss conduct. It was more significant if a temporary accommodation tenant breached their tenancy conditions as they are on a licence the Council does not require a court order to evict them.</p> <p>ME responded that the anti-social behaviour on site had largely come from the temporary accommodation tenants</p> <p>JF responded that Kenneth Gill had stressed the conduct requirements and has now handed over to MD</p> <p>NP stated that MD can now take the message onto tenants and ensure when tenants are signed up the issue of acceptable behaviour is stressed.</p> <p>ME said that within the minutes it was discussed that there would be an alternative provision leaflet provided</p> <p>JG asked whether this was alternative play provision within the area</p> <p>ME answered that it was a leaflet concerning alternative car parking provision</p> <p>MK responded that an update on parking provision had been given earlier and recapped the update</p> <p>KH commented that there should have been free parking for Northwood Tower residents</p> <p>JG answered that there has been an emerging policy change within Local Authorities across London moving to 0% parking provision, the existing strategy is to move away from former parking practices. There is the need for the Council to re-educate everyone in the community to cope with the current position of reduced parking.</p> <p>KH raised the issue of the concierge which was previously provided and resulted in an additional £5 per week contribution to the service charge. This was not properly discussed with residents</p> <p>NP answered that the issue of the concierge was going back a number of years and that the service charge and rent level had been constant for a number of years.</p> <p>KH reported that they had submitted a complaint to Elaine Gosling when they were asked to pay for the concierge</p> <p>NP answered that changes to the service charge are part of a process and a separate issue from car parking. If residents feel that they are being over charged or have been in the past then there is a process to complain.</p> <p>MK reported that she would get the breakdown of the service charge</p> <p>JG reported that she would raise the issue of the service charge with colleagues</p> <p>TK asked whether the new bays would be for Northwood Tower residents only</p> <p>MK answered that parking policy would not allow for them to be blocked off. They can only be drop off bays for 20-25 minutes</p> <p>FS asked where they would be located</p> <p>MK answered that they would be located at the top end of Vallentine Road</p> <p>LP reported that residents need spaces available to carry in shopping and for vehicle access</p> <p>JG reported that a flyer similar to the alternative play area provision leaflet covering alternative car parking provision would be created and distributed to estate residents</p> <p>WM asked whether it would be drop off points</p>	<p>JG to raise the issue of Northwood Tower service charge with colleagues</p> <p>Officers to develop an newsletter outlining alternative parking within the local area and distribute it to estate residents</p>
--	---

<p>JG answered that it is not within the teams powers to confirm which type of provision will be provided and that highways were conducting a site visit on Friday to establish an outcome.</p> <p>WM reported that this should have been integral to the initial thinking</p> <p>LP answered that residents had raised it</p> <p>ME answered that residents had raised the issue before the regeneration started</p> <p>WM answered that the issue should have been picked up</p> <p>LP reported that the issue had been raised in December</p> <p>WM reported that residents were only seeing the hording. When new residents are moving in and ambulances will have issues</p> <p>MK answered that there was access behind Vallentine and on Wood Street</p> <p>WM reported that it is a transient block with people moving in and out. If residents parked on Wood Street they would get a ticket</p> <p>LP reported that new residents are not entitled to a parking permits</p> <p>JG acknowledged that it is challenging and a difficult issue and that the council wanted to minimise the impact on residents. Officers would take back these issues and they will be looked at internally. It is a new team and issues will keep being revisited until the right solution is found.</p> <p>WM asked why the issue was not part of the planning process when there are obvious points which should have been included</p> <p>LP reported that Northwood Tower was not included</p> <p>NP answered that the planning was undertaken over three years ago</p> <p>LP answered that Northwood Tower residents had only just found out</p> <p>WM asked how planning had been granted</p> <p>MK answered that a number of meetings were held with Northwood Tower residents concerning the Controlled Parking Zone. The issue of drop off points has been discussed but the bays cannot be dedicated for Northwood Tower residents only. If a blue badge holder parks in bays then they would be entitled to. There are restrictions imposed by highways</p> <p>AC informed the group that plans of the end scheme had been shown at these meetings</p> <p>WM reported that people are moving in and out of the blocks and this issue should have been integral</p> <p>MK answered that this pre dates JG but MK was there when these issues were raised</p> <p>MK answered that planning would have contacted highways</p> <p>AC answered that planning is not the issue and that planning approval had been gained at the final stage</p> <p>LP asked about visitors points</p> <p>AC answered that there would be visitors points</p> <p>WM asked how people would access on a Saturday</p> <p>NP answered that there were difficult issues and that officers would take them away are report back to the meeting regarding this issue.</p> <p>WM asked how people would get in</p> <p>LP asked about shopping deliveries</p> <p>NP answered that officers would take all of these issues away and report back. Officers would look practically about what can be done practically in the short term to make the process easier</p> <p>AC reported that these conversations have been happening and that it is a highways issue. On other sites highways issues have been pushed through on a quicker timetable</p> <p>NP answered that the issue would be escalated if necessary as had been done</p>	<p>Officers to discuss parking issues internally</p>
---	--

	<p>previously on the St Georges site where a decision was fast tracked. The issue will be escalated if not dealt with</p>	
<p>7.</p>	<p>BS provided a round up of current activities:- Steering Group minutes circulated, letters sent to residents regarding closure of Marlowe Road and to Northwood tower regarding changes to the entryways including letters and notices regarding Thames Waters works. Attendance at Wood Street First Safer Neighbourhoods Meeting, drop in session for Northwood Tower residents regarding entryway changes , Liaison with Wood Street First regarding the potential opening event for the playground, playground alternative provision leaflet. Future Activities are that the team will present at the Councillors Ward Forum, Hopefully play area event in conjunction with WSF. The Countryside Resident Liaison Officer should be coming into place imminently and residents will be notified when in place RJ informed the group that the timescale for RLO’s appointment is anticipated to be next month JG stated that the first round of interviews was unsuccessful and so they are going out again. Hoping to have somebody in post by the end of April. TK enquired whether the post could be carried out on a part time basis if an applicant already had a job. RJ confirmed that the RLO hours were likely to be 10-3 AC confirmed that the expected commitment would be 5 days a week JG advised that she could pose a question to PS regarding the level of commitment required JG reported that she had updated the meeting earlier regarding RLOs but as the research had been verbal there was nothing tangible to share. JG had spoken to the Director at Countryside regarding RLOs and he has said that it would be discriminatory and against equal opportunities if estate residents were excluded. JG informed the Group she had worked with Durkan’s previously on a large Regeneration scheme in Clapham and the RLO assigned to the role was a resident of the estate. JG told ME that although she understood where she was coming from and that there would be a code of conduct in place for when residents were visiting residents homes. This would be in the case this issue should arise. ME answered that she would not be happy for a resident to visit her home. LP answered that this should be included within the newsletter as issues keep coming up. A letter about the entryways has been sent and now there is a new date ME reported she had had a conversation with the caretaker regarding letter JG answered that she obtained a copy of the caretakers JD and at the bottom there was a point included about additional duties . JG Confident that letter delivery is within Caretaker’s capabilities. ME answered that the newsletter regarding play areas was not dated correctly. BS responded that this was due to the print timelines JG answered that the delivery is being trialled and will be changed if there is any negative feedback ME asked if the team were waiting for people to tell them there was issues NP answered that the team could only act on information received WM asked if there was a sample done BS answered that the delivery to the project shop acted at the sample NP informed the group that the team could do a spot check of 3-4 residents. The team will call Steering Group members and check if they had received. ME asked the name of the company BS answered Stand and Deliver</p>	<p>JG to discuss hours of the RLO with PS</p>

<p>8.</p>	<p>NP asked if there was any other business LP asked whether the part at the top of the estate would be getting additional fencing and what would be within the currently open area as when the development is finished a 2 year old will be a 8 year old JG answered that the team were looking into what could be provided within the spare area LP asked whether there would be fencing all the way round AO answered that there will be and a quote has been put in for fencing and games to be painted in the additional space JG answered that there would potentially be benches MK answered that it could a mulit-use area LP answered that in between the space there was nothing NP answered that the team were looking at quotes to see what could practically be achieved in 4 weeks WM asked why if it has been open 4 weeks if it was planned to move equipment up there it is empty NP answered that it had been discussed previously and it is a temporary play area aimed at younger children. Within the new scheme once complete there will be more new play areas than previously. The team are looking at the fencing to see how to extend the use. WM answered that temporary is a long time and that the older years need something NP answered that play area will be within the early phases AC answered that the plaza and public space would be within phase 1 NP answered that it would be within phase 2 WM a 3 year old would be a 5 year old by then NP answered that the scheme had to be phased for the best options WM the land up there should be turned into something for kids and that there should be something up there as there is nothing up there just a token gesture NP answered that it is a temporary facility and is being used. Although it is not the same as was previously there they had to look at it and complete for the regeneration WM when providing a play area there should be something in it JG replied the team will look at the space as it was originally identified that the top area would form the temporary play area LP answered that as the council have pulled down two parks there should be enough equipment MK answered that there issues if equipment is re-used LP in a meeting the whole area of the park is opened the equipment could be re-used as promised up there RJ answered that sometimes you can't get certificates if it is installed and then reused LP the equipment was only installed 3 years ago and it is a waste of money NP answered that the council had access to the funding from the mayor for the equipment and it was thought better to have the area for 3 years LP asked if it would be tarmacked RJ answered that it would be soft play MK told the group it would be on cost as soft play JG told the group that this is why the area would be marked LP told the group that she works in a school and that children would run out if not taught WM asked if the soft play area is for younger why the tarmac has nothing on MK answered that the team was looking at it WM asked how long it would take and why it wasn't looked at before</p>	
-----------	--	--

<p>JG answered that it only became apparent how useable the space could be once Countryside had fully opened up the area. AO is currently looking at options to monopolise upon the area. MK older children can be taken to the park. The team can see what has been done before at the site meeting and submission</p> <p>WM answered that there is not much there and space around some of the things in there</p> <p>JG answered that from a Health & Safety perspective the play provision is adequate for the size of the play area. There must be sufficient space allowed between each piece of equipment to allow children to climb on and off safely, plus allow parents/carers to assist children.</p> <p>NP answered that there is 4-5 elements in there</p> <p>RJ answered that there are prescribed areas with connected advise</p> <p>FS asked what is happening with the netball area</p> <p>MK answered that the basketball court was staying for now</p> <p>FS asked if children can still play there</p> <p>MK answered that they could</p> <p>FS reported that they play football there</p> <p>LP asked how long the dog park would be unavailable</p> <p>AC answered 6 years</p> <p>LP reported that no one told residents that</p> <p>KH reported that they were only told about the drop off</p> <p>ME asked if Countryside are on target for Stage 1A</p> <p>RJ answered that Countryside signed the lease last week and now that they have received vacant possession they are on target</p> <p>ME and RJ discussed tone</p> <p>NP told ME that before she joined the meeting the group had discussed the lease and that Countryside have possession</p> <p>WM told the group he had a number of questions: 1. What is Countryside's order of build for the enabling works. 2. The private property within the scheme what is the potential value of the sale. 3. What are the perceived values in 5 year time.</p> <p>NP answered that these are difficult to answer questions and suggested that the group come back to them within the next meeting. Countryside can provide an agenda item on the works and estimated values with better discussion to be had in the next meeting.</p> <p>ME informed the group that she had a decant question. A tenant had reported that they were unwillingly moved out and had received a distressing email claiming they had been forced to property far out of the borough</p> <p>JF answered that this person could not be a secure Council tenant and is most likely to be a homeless applicant. Secure Council tenants can only move via bidding themselves or if they receive a direct offer. There are different arrangements for homeless applicants</p> <p>ME answered that they had been forced out</p> <p>JF answered that secure tenants have to choose to decant and bid for alternative properties and thus cannot be forced out</p> <p>ME asked if JF was refuting the claim</p> <p>JF answered yes that the rules are different regarding temporary accommodation lettings.</p> <p>LP stated that information on the order of works would help and that there should be a newsletter for Northwood Tower residents</p> <p>LP asked if the recycling had been moved</p> <p>RJ responded that it had not moved yet</p>	
--	--

	<p>NP Closed the meeting BS informed the group that the date of the next meeting will be Thursday the 20th of April. NP informed the group that he was leaving his role and thanked the group for their time and contributions and wished them well in the future.</p>	
--	---	--