**Tybalds regeneration programme - Consultation report 1-9-20 V6**

**1. Consultation methodology**

**Stage 1: Ongoing engagement and informal consultation: Jan 2019 – 23 February 2020**

Including:

* 4 Drop-In events
* 3 Walkabout meetings with residents
* 2 Meetings with residents to discuss specific block issues
* 1 Design workshop
* 4 regeneration newsletters delivered to all Tybalds households
* Tybalds regeneration ‘We Are Camden’ information webpage regularly updated
* Dedicated email address and Outlook Inbox for feedback and dialogue with residents

In total, 92 estate households (25.6%) and 29 wider community members actively engaged in Stage 1 consultation. There was also extensive engagement and collaboration with the Tybalds Residents Association. Architectural and landscaping designs were consulted on and modified in an ongoing, iterative process in response to feedback.

**Stage 2: Formal consultation on buildings and programme design: 25 February – 30 June 2020**

Including:

* Consultation leaflet and survey questionnaire delivered to all Tybalds households
* Drop-In event in the TRA hall
* Webinar presentation with Q&A with architect and regeneration staff
* Dedicated formal consultation ‘We Are Camden’ information webpage regularly updated
* Architect presentation of designs in a YouTube video
* Regeneration newsletter sent to all Tybalds households

**Formal consultation response rates**

Number of respondents: 47 (including landscaping and non-resident leaseholder responses)

Including:

* 25 households (6.9% of Tybalds’ 360 households), of which, 12 households were new contactees
* 16 wider community members (3% of the contacted wider community, 550 addresses), of which three people were new contactees
* 2 stakeholder organisations (including the Tybalds RA)
* 4 anonymous responses
* 12 residents responded to the landscaping questionnaire (3.3% of Tybalds households)

The formal consultation was extended because of the social disruption caused by the Covid pandemic and lockdown. Altogether the formal consultation ran for more than four months. The concerns expressed in formal consultation feedback closely mirrored the consistent main themes of Stage 1 feedback.

**Stage 3: Further formal consultation**

**Landscaping survey: 17 June to 31 August 2020**

Mailing of landscaping survey to all Tybalds households (360) + by email to wider community (32) contacts. To supplement the main consultation with more detailed data on landscaping preferences.

Number of respondents: 12

**Consultation with non-resident leaseholders: 15 July to 31 August 2020**

Comprising:

* Mailing ofconsultation leaflet and survey questionnaire to 40 non-resident Tybalds property leaseholders

Response: One responses was received from a non-resident leaseholder.

**Stage 4:** **September 2020+** **Continuing engagement and informal consultation**

Proactive engagement and close partnership working with Tybalds residents, the Tybalds RA and with the wider local community will continue throughout the later design and the construction, handover and allocations stages of the programme.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Total households/organisations engaged in Stage 1, 2 and 3 consultation** | No. | **%** |
| Tybalds estate households (360) | 104 | 28.9 |
| Wider community households/ organisations (500 mailed) | 32 | 6.4 |

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**2. Summary of main feedback themes and concerns raised during formal consultation**

|  |
| --- |
| **2.1 Table of formal consultation responses by theme**  |
| **Theme/ issue** | **Total number** **of responses** | **Detail** | **Positive** | **Negative** |
| **Overall support for regen plans - Positive/ Negative** | 21 | Majority in favour of regeneration, but with some strong anxieties eg right to light, overlooking. | 15 broadly in favour | 6 broadly against |
| Landscaping, environment and play areas | 11 | Lots of ideas and support for planting ideas, trees and eco/sustainable features | 11 | 0 |
| Gates, fencing & security | 13 | Gated: 4Partly gated: 1Open: 6Improve block security: 2 |  |  |
| Ty Square | 10 | All in favour of improvementOption 1: 3.5Option 2: 4Option 3: 1.5Other comment: 1 | 10 | 0 |
| Right to light & overlooking issues | 8 | Critical of height and light issues for specific blocks:GOS/East mews: 2Richbell/Block D: 2Falcon/ Block D: 1Windmill sidebuild: 1Block B: 1Block C: 1 |  |  |
| New homes issues and allocations | 8 | 6: Lettings process and priorities for new homes1: How to limit misuses of social housing1: Camden Living scheme |  |  |
| Block C position / height | 7 | 4 opposed on height/ light grounds2 positive1 B & C “seem randomly placed” | 2 | 5 |
| Refuse/ waste disposal | 5 | All suggest improving waste storage and recycling facilities and to stop fly tipping/ littering. | 5 | 0 |
| Tybalds community space proposals | 7 | 3 opposed 3 in favour1 query about play area | 3 |  3 |
| Parking | 4 | 3 in favour of limiting parking1 concerned where cars will be able to park | 3 | 1 |
| Block D & Richbell | 4 | 2 concerned but not too unhappy1 strongly opposed1 asks why Block H was not developed instead. | 2 | 2 |
| Construction, noise dust and disruption | 4 | 4: Anxiety about noise, dust or disruption. | 0 | 4 |
| Land sale/ GOSH | 3 | Anxieties over sale of land and GOSH usage of sites |  |  |
| Estate management, maintenance and repair & local infrastructure | 4 | Estate maintenance & repairs concerns eg. boilers, lifts.Waste management; Estate management services. Strain on local infrastructures. |  |  |
| Consultation methodology | 3 | 2: Request for more detailed plans1: Request for more consultation post-Covid |  |  |
| North side mews development | 2 | Both generally content with current proposals. | 2 | 0 |
| Block B | 1 | Concern about ‘social apartheid’ of separate entrances for social/ Camden living flats. |  |  |
| Falcon  | Block rep response – Representing 42 residents | Block rep summary of issues eg.lifts, underbuilds, loss of sheds, courtyard improvement, laundry rooms |  |  |
| Falcon micro-workshops | 1 | Opposed on grounds of block security | 0 | 1 |
| Vehicular access | 1 | Wants to limit access  |  |  |
| Cladding | 1 | Suggests removing cladding on east wall of Blemundsbury |  |  |
| Devonshire | Block rep response – Representing 21 residents | Block rep summary:* Rough sleepers
* Why not GOSH H block?
* Shed site by Boswell Ct
 |  |  |

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**3. Analysis of main feedback themes and concerns**

NB. Many of these themes intersect so the feedback must be considered as a whole.

For example, the feedback on right to light and overlooking must be considered alongside specific feedback on the new buildings (blocks B, C, D, E and East Mews) and the sites to be offered for sale. Likewise, parking and vehicular access must be considered together.

**3.1 The Tybalds regeneration scheme as a whole**

From the beginning there was support for the current Regeneration scheme from estate residents and the wider community who recognised that new homes are needed and the estate public realm needs improvement. There was sadness but acceptance that this can only be financed by selling homes and land. Overall, people would rather that land was sold to GOSH than to a commercial developer. Cynicism and distrust of the Council were expressed by some residents, as a consequence from the previous Tybalds regeneration scheme which was cancelled in 2017.

In the formal consultation, there was a clear majority (15:6) in favour of proceeding with the regeneration scheme from the estate and the wider community who recognise that new homes and estate improvement are needed. However the Tybalds Residents Association were less positive:

*“The proposals improve the maintenance of the estate but will lead to a lot of social problems in the future because designs are inadequate because of lack of finance and piecemeal gestures are provided to seek planning approval. As it stands, the Association will be unlikely to support the redevelopment design proposals” (R32)*

For many residents, anxieties remain around:

* Impatience for the Council to ‘get on with the regeneration’.
* Fear that the scheme will be cancelled again.
* Sadness that regeneration can only be financed by selling homes and land.
* That the project should be delivered *“within budget, on time, and with excellent quality”*
* That the construction work should not take place at the same time as the planned GOSH Great Ormond Street frontage/cancer unit development
* That local infrastructure should be strengthened to support the increase in population.
* That there will not be social ‘apartheid’ in how social, Council and privately owned homes are accessed or managed/maintained.
* The longer term usage of any sites or buildings sold to GOSH. Although people support the work of the hospital, GOSH is perceived to be expansionist and careless of the needs of the local community surrounding the hospital.

**3.2 Landscaping and play areas**

Comments in the formal consultation show a strong desire to ‘green’ the estate, plant more trees and to improve play facilities. This is consistent with previous feedback.

*“The model doesn’t show much planting, mostly hard landscaping. Good and plentiful planting helps air quality, biodiversity, mental health and pleasure and pride in a neighbourhood”.(R14)*

*“More areas for children to play – 100% agree that this is necessary” (R19)*

However, most of the feedback was non-specific about what to plant and where the plants should go.To address this lack of detailed feedback on landscaping, we sent an additional questionnaire specifically about landscaping options to all residents.

**3.3 Estate security and gating proposals**

In the formal consultation, 13 people gave feedback on security and gating issues.

Some residents believe strongly that gating would help to diminish antisocial behaviour and crime on the estate. However, there is not a consensus among Tybalds residents giving feedback that the estate should be gated. Feedback from some residents and from the wider local community in Great Ormond St and Orde Hall St is that they would like the estate to be as open as possible.

**Landscaping questionnaire: Q3 Gates and fencing**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Gating and fencing options** | **No of preferences** | **Block breakdown** |
| 1: No additional gates and fences. As open as possible | 6 | Richbell: 1Chancellors: 1Windmill: 1Wider community: 3 |
| 2: Fences and gates only around Tybalds Square | 0 |  |
| 3. Kissing gates & traffic calming fences only | 1 | Babington: 1 |
| 4. High balustrade fencing. Fences & gates around the whole estate | 4 | Boswell: 1Babington: 1Chancellors: 2 |
| No option selected. Preference for improved security on block access. | 2 | Falcon: 1Boswell: 1 |

**3.4 Right to light and overlooking issues**

Respondents have highlighted concerns about loss of light and loss of privacy in five specific areas:

* Great Ormond St & East Mews
* Richbell and Block D
* Blemundsbury & New North St
* Devonshire Court
* Block C

**3.5 New homes and allocations**

Residents feel that priority for the new homes should be given to estate residents and their family members.

*“The Local lettings policy is essential to ensure that our community is not destroyed. It’s important it addresses the need and makes homes available to those that really need it. It is also important that the homes that are then left vacant are offered first to those in the community before being given to those outside of the Tybalds Estate.” (R17)*

**3.6 Block C**

A petition was received in May 2019 signed by 31 Blemundsbury residents objecting to the Block C proposal:

*“The dust and toxic material which is used will exacerbate asthma attacks… The new development of these houses will restrict the view and lighting of our current accommodations”*

Objections were also received from residents in the adjacent New North Street flats:

*“This block will significantly block the light into my apartment because it's windows*

*exclusively look out onto the north-east with this proposed block directly obstructing this*

*sunlight from this direction” (R27)*

Although the location of Block C has been altered by the architects since 2019, concerns were reiterated in the formal consultation about loss of light and privacy, noise, dust and disruption from construction, increased density of population and the potential of future flooding for the new Block C underbuild homes.

**3.7 Tybalds Square**

Throughout consultation, there has been a lack of consensus on how to remodel the Tybalds Square area between Babington and Chancellors, some people wanting a multi-use games area, others wanting a ‘London garden square’ style space for relaxation or a growing area:

* *A few benches and places to sit/ talk/ read (R39)*
* *Multi-use pitch + enhance green space including more trees would be the best given the diversity in gender/ages/ethnicities that we have in the estate (R29)*
* *Uses that bring life and activities (R16)*

The landscaping survey returned a small majority in favour of Option 2, but the lack of consensus remains evident:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Tybalds Square landscaping survey options** | **Respondents preferred options** |
| Option 1: A multi-sports pitch enclosed within a 3m-high fence within a fenced Tybalds Square, with a communal landscape around it including a lawn area with trees for residents to relax  | 3.5 |
| Option 2: A multi-use biodiverse lawn, framed by a wildflower meadow and trees, forming a central communal space in Tybalds Square for residents to use for activities and to relax | 4 |
| Option 3: An unfenced multi-use safety surface providing space for various different games whilst still being open to the rest of the fence-enclosed Tybalds Square with a lawn area and trees | 1.5 |

**3.8 Refuse and waste disposal**

In the formal consultation residents from Richbell and Falcon and Windmill reported a need for improved waste disposal facilities (bin stores, bins and chutes) and waste education. A littering problem around Chancellors was also flagged up. Issues with persistent fly-tipping at the back of Devonshire have been previously reported.

**3.9 Tybalds community hall proposals**

In the formal consultation, seven people commented on the plans for the new community facility. Three were positive, including two who offered practical suggestions for the design and layout of the new space:

*“Make sure that all room spaces have independent access to kitchen” (R9f)*

*“The hall for residents needs to be properly insulated for sound and vibration from flats above. Also it needs a hearing loop and sound facilities. The TRA could contribute finance” (R7)*

In early 2019, two regular users of Falcon hall verbally objected to the redevelopment of the Falcon hall space to build new homes. During the formal consultation these two residents expressed concern about the new community facility plans:

* *Block C should be a Residents Hall only – no higher. (R9d)*
* *We need more hall space, not less (R9e)*

The Tybalds Residents Association commented that there should continue to be two community halls on the estate:

*“We have two community tenant halls each about 100 sqm but now being proposed 150 sqm (usable hall space will be much smaller) and another 50sqm community room. The latter is clearly a piece meal to try to match existing total tenant hall space. We currently have large sections of the community separately use both our halls and sticking them together in one hall will create serious community conflict” (R32)*

**3.10 Parking and vehicular access**

The plan to maintain the same number of parking places on the estate has been popular with the minority who already have estate parking places, but some other residents would like the estate to be more pedestrianised.

There was no opposition in the formal consultation to the plans to alter parking and limit vehicle access routes on the estate. Three people were in favour of limiting parking on the estate. One resident expressed concern that the needs of Blue Badge holders to park near their homes should be considered. The wider community are supportive of the Council’s policy to issue no new parking permits and some favour reduced car parking and increased pedestrianisation.

**3.11 Block D & Richbell**

There has been concern about the height of Block D and the loss of light to some flats in Richbell and Falcon. However, although residents still have these concerns, feedback in the formal consultation has been more positive due to recent building design changes and commissioning of a new Right to Light survey:

*“I am pleased Block D is now GOSH as opposed to speculative private sale flats. The double height entrance is better” (R16)*

*“At least I am pleased that the more extensive additions to this block have been dropped” (R9a)*

The new ramp to improve access to Richbell was also welcomed:

*“I saw updated designs for accessible ramps at Richbell at a Zoom consultation meeting in June. They are very neat and clever – and will make a big difference” (R28)*

**3.12 Construction noise, dust and disruption**

People are anxious about the construction phase:

*“I am concerned about the noise. My husband works at night. He needs to sleep during the daytime and has migraine and depression. We cannot cope with noise” (R5).*

*“The estate is home to vulnerable tenants, elderly and the disabled. How will you accommodate for the increasing dust, harmful materials being used and debris for those tenants?” (R19).*

However, there is also acceptance, albeit qualified, that the regeneration needs to go ahead:

*“We do wish to support the redevelopment on the estate but only if existing residents including ourselves are treated sensitively and fairly” (R8)*

*“I’m very happy with the upgrade of Tybalds estate and the landscaping and improvement of the refuge storage is greatly needed as well as all the public realm improvements” (R35)*

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**4.Aspects of the regeneration proposals which have been significantly influenced by feedback from Tybalds estate residents and the wider community**

**4.1 Comparing old and new proposals**

**They said:** Most residents want regeneration to go forward on the estate. Feedback has consistently suggested it is popular that the proposed new programme is smaller than previous plans and that there will be no overbuilds because this is likely to cause less disruption to people’s lives:

*“Good news that the latest plan is on a much smaller scale” (DI-1, Jan 2019)*

However, people are very worried that “nothing will happen again”. They are aware that a lot of public money was spent on plans for the previous Tybalds regeneration scheme (cancelled in 2017), with no resulting benefit to the estate.

*“This was five years of awfulness – misinformation, shoddy planning and a lot of wasted public money. The toll it took on elderly residents in my block was dreadful” (DI-1)*

**We did:** In view of the high level of anxiety and cynicism, we have been careful not to make promises we may not be able to keep and to make it clear to residents that although new proposals are being developed, nothing is pre-decided. We are committed to being honest with residents, including their views in the design process, building a trusting working relationship and keeping them informed as the project develops.

We have worked hard to foster good working relationships with residents, block reps and with the Tybalds RA, providing regular updates through newsletters and webpages where all iterations of the designs are available as downloads. We have addressed requests for more detailed information through our dedicated feedback email Inbox and a FAQs document.

**4.2 Attractive, affordable and energy efficient**

**They said:** Residents have told us that any new homes should be “nice to look at”, “affordable” and “energy efficient”.

**We did:** The scheme proposals include 28 affordable housing units (18 social, 10 Camden Living). They have been designed using “fabric first” principles to be as energy efficient as possible and aiming to achieve a ‘BREEAM Excellent’ energy efficiency rating.

Plans include installation of solar panels on the roofs of three exisitng blocks to generate renewable energy.

We have also asked the architects to design green roofs for Blemundsbury and Devonshire and explored the feasibility of adding a green roof to Windmill.

**4.3 New homes and local lettings proposals**

**They said:** Residents have told us that some Tybalds residents are living in overcrowded homes or under-occupying flats and wishing to move to more suitable accommodation within the Tybalds community. This overcrowding and under-occupation is confirmed by the Housing Allocations Service.

In response to the need for new larger flats to alleviate overcrowding, the mix of flats in the current proposals include 36% 2-bed and 58% 3 and 4 bed flats. 62% of the new homes will be Council social housing or ‘Camden Living’ homes, bringing much needed affordable accommodation to a location with significant housing need.

**They said:** Throughout the consultation process people have said they wanted transparency, fairness and priority for estate residents in the allocation of the new homes.

**We did:** We have published a draft Local Lettings Plan, outlining principles for allocation of the new social housing homes, including ring fencing new social housing homes for estate households with housing and/or medical needs to move according to the Camden waiting list points system.

We have published a FAQs document, downloadable from the webpage, which includes information about draft allocations protocols and how to register on the Camden Housing Register.

**4.4 Block C**

**They said:** *“Concerned by Oliver Twist Court – Too close to Blemundsbury” (DI-1, Jan 2019).*

**We did:** In March 2019, following comments from Blemundsbury residents, early plans for a new block, Oliver Twist Court, to be sited parallel to the north of Blemundsbury, were radically reworked. The Oliver Twist Court plan was not progressed. It was replaced by Blocks B & C, located at either end with a landscaped sloping path down to the ground floor of Blemundsbury, thus preserving the open northern aspect of Blemundsbury and improving access to the ground floor and block lift.

**They said:** In May 2019, 31 Blemundsbury residents signed a petition objecting that Block C would affect the north-side view, lighting and privacy of their flats:

*“The new development of these houses will restrict the view and lighting of our current accommodations” (Blem petition, 16-5-19)*

New North Street residents also said that Block C was too tall and too close to their building:

*“This proposed new block will be directly outside my apartment at approximately 10 meters from my windows…with intrusive views directly into my apartment including my private living area, bathroom and bedrooms” (email, 6-5-19)*

**We did:** We responded by moving Block C northwards by 1.5 metres, adjusting the east-west position to increase the distance from the New north Street flats and reducing the block height from six storeys to four. We also commissioned daylight/ sunlight and right to light surveys to assess the impact of new blocks on neighbouring flats. We later adjusted the angle of Block C, further improving light for the affected Blemundsbury flats. One estate resident commented:

*“Block C west of Blemundsbury has been finally worked through, I think, to a successful four floor building on a complicated site” (R38)*

**4.5 Right to Light and overlooking concerns**

**They said:** Residents expressed concern that all the new buildings would cause loss of light, views and privacy**.**

**We did:** We commissioned right to light surveys to analyse the effects to light and window views for residents living near the new blocks. As a result, we reduced the height of Block D and changed the position of Block C. We also changed the position of windows in the Windmill sidebuild (Block E) so that residents at the west end of Windmill did not lose privacy. In June 2020, following changes to the designs for Block D, we commissioned a second sunlight/daylight survey to see how flats in Richbell and Falcon would be affected.

**4.6 Estate security and gating proposals**

**They said:** Throughout the process there has been a consistent lack of consensus on the issue of fences and gating. Views are strong and polarised.

Some residents, including the TRA, want all perimeter routes into the estate gated, arguing that this will improve security and reduce anti-social behaviour:

 *“I’ve just witnessed a man pull up in his car and dump the wood from his car. Just another reason we need to be gated” (R35)*

 Some other residents have disagreed:

*“No additional gates and fences. As open as possible” (R39)*

Members of the wider local community would like the estate to be more open and integrated with the surrounding area:

*“Integrate the estate into the surrounding urban network to diminish a sense of separation? Remove a sense of ‘estate’ entirely?(R13)*

The Camden Green Team commented on the designs:

*“Fencing (1m) was used too frequently, creating barriers and limiting movement around the estate”.*

**We did:** To probe the views of residents further we included questions about gating and fencing in the landscaping survey in June 2020. Opinions are strongly polarised but gating the estate emerged as most popular overall:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Theme/ issue** | **Responses** | **Detail** |
| Gates, fencing & security | 9 | Gated: 5Partly gated: 1Open: 3Improve block security: 1 |

We are exploring a ‘middle way’, using Secured by Design principles in buildings design and landscaping plans to improve estate security. However, it seems unlikely that final designs will be able to please everyone to resolve this issue. Additional community security initiatives are probably needed to tackle anti-social behaviour and diminish fear of crime.

**4.7 Community hall space**

**They said:** Initially, regular users of Falcon Hall objected to the plan to replace the two estate halls with one new purpose-built community centre. During the formal consultation the Tybalds RA reiterated this request to maintain two halls:

“We currently have large sections of the community seperately use both our halls and sticking them together in one hall will create serious community conflict” (R32)

Some residents have offered practical suggestions for the design and layout of the new community hall.

**We did:** In consultation with the TRA we analysed the usage of the current halls and modified the room layout options and offered room dividers to make the hall/ meeting spaces in the new community centre more flexible to accommodate all current community activities. Discussions are also ongoing with managers and Councillors about whether it is Council policy to make available more than one community hall on Camden estates.

**4.8 Devonshire court**

**They said:** Residents told us they want improved access to all the flats for disabled people and families with young children:

*“The maisonettes on the 2nd floor (of Devonshire) are 3 bedroom family homes, so a lift would have been a plus for young families with prams and buggies” (DI-1)*

**We did:** We responded to residents’ comments and asked the architect to include building a lift. The new lift would give access to all floors of Devonshire Court.

**4.9 Barbon Close**

**They said:** “There are issues being a neighbour of GOSH: Parents who sit out on the street eating, drinking and smoking late at night” (GOSH/ TRA meeting 29-7-19)

“NHS drivers do park in front of my house. The parent accommodation is really a hotel with people arriving and leaving constantly” (GOSH/ TRA meeting 29-7-19)

**We did:** In response to concerns from several residents in Barbon Close and Great Ormond Street about the impact for existing residents of planned new GOSH-C parent accommodation blocks, plans to locate a parent accommodation block along the north side of the estate were shelved in favour of building lower-level mews houses for market sale instead in this location.

\_\_\_\_\_

*Consultation report 28-9-20 V7/ VC*