

Juniper Crescent Community Estate  
Board 17  
Date: 07 January 2024  
Location: Castlehaven Community  
Association, 23 Castlehaven Rd, London  
NW1 8RU  
Time: 18:30 - 19:30

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Raj Mandair (RM)<br><b>Riverside</b>                  | Regeneration Manager                                      |
| Nnadozie Orisakwe (NO)<br><b>Riverside</b>            | Estates Manager   |
| Ian Simpson (IS)<br><b>Communities First</b>          | Lead Advisor  |
| Georgia Richardson (GR)<br><b>Connect PA</b>          | Public Consultation                                       |
| Cllr Patricia Callaghan (PC)<br><b>Camden Council</b> | Cabinet Member for Safer<br>Communities and Deputy Leader |

| No | Content   |
|----|---|
| 1  | Introductions   |
|    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>NO</b> introduced himself to the Estate Board</li> <li><b>PC</b> joined the meeting remotely</li> </ul>   |
| 2  | Update on the Planning Application and moves  |
|    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>RM</b> updated the Estate Board that the Planning Application has not yet been submitted <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The application is ready to submit, and is being held up by outstanding agreements</li> </ul> </li> <li>A resident asked if the delay in planning would impact the timeline of the moves and the regeneration. <b>RM</b> noted that there is leeway built into the planning programme to allow for this, and an October 2025 deadline is still expected.</li> <li>A resident asked if the delayed submission would impact the timeline for releasing extra internal housing stock. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>RM</b> updated that, regardless of the date of submission, they will now be seeking internal approval for this. He added that there has been internal restricting in the letting team which has delayed the process. Further, he said that there are 15 properties in the pipeline ready to be placed by the lettings team.</li> </ul> </li> <li>A resident asked if properties could be sourced independently from Riverside but still receive the same moving support, per material previously circulated. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>RM</b> said he would review the material provided to the resident.</li> </ul> </li> <li>A resident asked for the remaining number of unhoused households. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>RM</b> said there are currently 42 households, along with 16 adult children. This figure including the 3 IMR households.</li> </ul> </li> <li>A resident highlighted that the deadline for planning submission has been extended a number of times and expressed frustration. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>IS</b> urged <b>RM</b> to feedback the frustration of residents over the lack of progress in letting available properties.</li> </ul> </li> <li>A resident asked if residents would be able to turn down properties close to move deadline. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>IS</b> said that tenants can only be forced to move out through the legal process.</li> <li><b>RM</b> highlighted that Riverside had not taken any legal measures against residents on a recent successful decant project in Southwark. He emphasised that Riverside are committed to a positive transition process for all residents.</li> </ul> </li> <li>A resident asked if it is possible to hold Riverside to account over delays in the process. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>RM</b> suggested following the official complaints procedure, speaking directly to onsite staff, contributing to the Estate Board and contacting ward councillors.</li> </ul> </li> <li>A resident asked <b>PC</b> how to best hold Riverside to account over delays to the moves process. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>PC</b> suggested that Riverside improve communication with residents.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |

|          |  |
|----------|--|
|          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>RM</b> said there are regular updates to residents about moves as well as direct personal contact available with onsite Riverside staff. He added that an update on moves, and planning permission would be issued by the end of January.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>3</b> | <b>Update from the Estates team</b>  |
|          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>NO</b> updated-on repairs</li> <li>• Lights <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Said a full survey of all lights has been commissioned, although the original contractor has deferred to a new contractor for the works.</li> <li>○ <b>PC</b> asked <b>NO</b> to copy herself and Cllr Cotton into the communications with contractors.</li> <li>○ <b>NO</b> said per his previous experience with the site, it is likely that replacements need to be done on the basic electrical infrastructure.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Security gates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>NO</b> said the security gates for the site have been a historic issue with repairs for Juniper Crescent. He said there had been previous discussion about replacing the gate entirely but noted the high cost of this approach. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A resident noted the gates have been a problem for 20 years.</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ <b>PC</b> established that residents pay service charge for the security gates. She added that residents should be entitled to safety especially during the darker winter months and high crime rates in the local area.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• A resident expressed concern about the service charge, noting that they were paying for services that were not functional, and asked what can be put in place on this. It was stated by the resident that it is approaching the point at which they were considering submitting a formal complaint and expressed concerns on health and safety grounds.</li> <li>• <b>PC</b> suggested an estate walk around with residents and members of the Riverside estates team to address historic concerns. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>GR</b> agreed to organise the walkaround for the coming weeks.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• A resident noted that it appeared there has been professional building waste placed in resident waste. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>NO</b> said he would investigate this.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• A resident suggested bringing skips back to Juniper Crescent which would help speed up the moving process over the next few months.</li> </ul> |
| <b>4</b> | <b>AOB</b>   |
|          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Festive Event</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>RM</b> noted the success of the event</li> </ul> </li> <li>• A resident expressed interest in organising additional future events.</li> <li>• <b>RM</b> noted that the Hub is currently out of action, as it has been affected by electrical issues.</li> <li>• A resident asked that <b>PC</b> review the lack of security gates in the architectural designs being submitted for planning permission for the new site. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>PC</b> agreed that security is paramount for residents.</li> <li>○ <b>RM</b> said that the project team had consulted extensively with Camden Council's planning department who encouraged the lack of security gates.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>   |