

## **Haringey Leaseholders' Association Committee Meeting**

**Meeting held on Wednesday 15 October 2014 at the Civic Centre**

In attendance

### **Committee:**

Sue Brown (Chair) (SB)  
Nick Martin-Clark (Treasurer) (NMC)  
Peter Gilbert (Secretary) (PG)  
Lloyd Grandson (LG)  
Grace Lungu (GL)  
Stephanie Rice (SR)

The meeting was opened by the Chair at 7.20 pm

Sarah Lovell (SL), Head of Regeneration, LB of Haringey, attended by invitation to present an update on the Tottenham High Road West redevelopment

### **Welcome**

The Chair welcomed members and SL to the meeting.

### **Apologies**

There were no apologies.

### **Tottenham High Road West Redevelopment**

SL outlined the Tottenham High Road West redevelopment project. She said that it incorporated land west of Tottenham Hotspur (THFC) stadium, from Brereton Road in the south to the old Cannon Rubber factory in the north. It included the Love Lane Estate, which consisted of 297 properties, 78 of which were leasehold, and which was situated south of White Hart Lane. An industrial estate, the Goods Yard site, which was owned by the football club, lay north of the redevelopment area.

SL explained that the Borough of Haringey (LBH) had wanted to regenerate Northumberland Park, which was the most deprived ward in London, for some time. LBH had incorporated this as part of the Strategic Regeneration Framework that had been published in March 2014. Residents were being consulted on how people living in the area could have the same opportunities as the rest of London. The seven key priorities to underpin the overall plan included, for example, housing and health. The delivery plan for the area had been agreed in the Council's cabinet in 2014. The vision for the project fitted within the framework of the plan.

SL continued by saying that LBH had been talking to residents about change for some time. The Tottenham High Road West project was the first phase of change in the ward. THFC had planning permission for a 56,000 seat stadium as part of a project including a Sainsbury's store, a college and 285 homes. However, that project had been unable to make progress because the owner of one strategically-sited business did not want to sell and had appealed against a CPO order. LBH and THFC were waiting for the date for the hearing of the appeal. This was very frustrating.

LBH was concentrating on steaming ahead in Northumberland Park with the High Road West project. Government support had been promised, but no funding had yet been allocated. In 2013, residents had been consulted about three possible options for change, and the feedback had shown that 68% of the respondents had favoured the most comprehensive of these, which included the demolition and redevelopment of the whole of the Love Lane estate. Local businesses were by and large nervous of the proposed changes. LBH had taken the feedback on board and had held workshops with residents in 2014, further to which LBH's consultants, Arup, had come up with a vision of the future. The key principles of the vision had been incorporated into an area action plan, which had not yet been further developed into a detailed plan.

NMC asked why the plan proposed to move White Hart Lane station to the south. SL explained that this was because, on match days, passengers getting off did not use the full length of the existing platform, and the proposal was designed to ease congestion. The proposal included a new public square which would allow a link to the High Road. There would also be a number of cafes and restaurants, a community hub including a new enlarged library, leisure facilities and other community resources. SL added that this area would need a robust management plan, and LBH might look to appointing a private company to manage the community space. This would be to the south of White Hart Lane, while to the north there were proposals for a new community park, a gym and space for allotments.

SL continued that there were some 300 properties on Love Lane, including about 30 private tenancies above shops. In the redevelopment, LBH would try to provide an equal mix of privately-owned properties, privately-rented flats, which might, for example, be sold to a Housing Association or pension fund, and new affordable and social housing. There was no clear answer as to whether a shared ownership or a shared equity model would be the right solution for a particular property – it would be dependent on the leaseholder's individual circumstances. She had worked on a development in Earls Court where shared equity had been the preferred model.

LG said that each model had pros and cons, and he was concerned that a purchase might end up by paying more in a shared equity scheme as property values appreciated. SL said that as land values in Northumberland Park were low it would be necessary to subsidise the developer. Until LBH found a developer partner, it would not be possible to decide on the preferred option. She added that, although the initial idea would be to offer the new properties on a like-for-like basis, it might be reasonable to offer tenants or leaseholders whose homes would not now have the benefit of a full Decent Homes upgrade because they were scheduled for demolition a choice of a larger property. In answer to GL, SL confirmed that this might be an option, but added that the chief consideration would be what the leaseholder or tenant could afford. LBH would like HLA to help facilitate discussions with leaseholders.

NMC commented that it would be necessary to have a clear idea of the scale of the occupation. SL said that a detailed needs assessment would take place for every resident. The first phase would be for properties by the railway: tenants would be consulted in detail and the new homes would be built in accordance with the needs of the residents. She added that, if at all possible, LBH did not want to decant residents into "temporary" accommodation. It might be possible to build new homes west of the railway line in Phase 1.

SL added that although THFC wanted LBH to buy the Goods Yard site from them as part of Phase 1, LBH needed to adhere to the agreed master plan and would not let THFC make the running.

NMC said that he understood that non-resident leaseholders who went into shared equity would have their property valued at market value + 7.5%, whereas residents' properties would be valued at market value + 10%. Some 400 properties would be needed to rehouse the existing Love Lane residents, who included 38 resident leaseholders and 40 properties where the leaseholder was not an owner-occupier.

GL commented that she did not want to move further from the High Road. SL said that GL would meet a housing officer who would discuss the matter and look at her needs, but that it was not possible at this stage to make an absolute promise as to the location of her new property. There would be a number of dedicated properties for leaseholders. She added that, although a leaseholder would have to buy at least 25% of the equity of the new property, LBH was trying to find a way for leaseholders who weren't quite able to meet this criterion.

LG repeated that he had reservations about the shared equity option, as leaseholders did not know whether there would be more problems than advantages in 20 years time. SL said that LBH would do more research, including with mortgage lenders, to try to do the best they could. LG insisted that leaseholders need to think about the long term. SL said that shared equity in itself would not incur outgoings. LG said that as shared equity was a new concept he was worried that new problems might come up in later years. SL agreed to invite regeneration managers and residents from other schemes to talk to Love Lane residents. She added that it had not yet been decided whether a shared equity owner could pass on the property for one generation – this had been an allowed option in Earls Court, but afterwards the new owner would have to sell the property.

NMC asked whether, at the forthcoming HLA GM, HLA could say to leaseholders that we had met SL and had presented a number of issues to her. SL said that LBH needed to do more research on other schemes. Some properties needed to be brought up to the Decent Homes threshold on a sliding scale, and there would be negotiations on the level of work needed to meet the new standards. LG commented that in 2008-9 some residents had been forced to move out of their property as a result of the cost of Decent Homes work, and we did not want this to recur.

SL asked HLA to keep in touch with her. She was talking to Love Lane residents and would like HLA to advise leaseholders as a friend. LBH wanted to use Love Lane as a pilot for regeneration and development projects in Haringey. There were working groups involving various organisations, and she had got Love Lane Residents' Association involved in the process. She gave SB the email address of the Independent Tenant and Leaseholder Adviser (ITLA).

NMC said that he would write to all the leaseholders on Love Lane Estate to invite them to attend the GM.

SL then left the meeting.

GL and LG confirmed that most residents, except for shop-owners, were in favour of the proposals in the master plan. NMC said that it sounded as though a lot of the details of the

plan would be negotiable. It was important to make sure that LBH consulted residents and listened to them. LG said that LBH would have to listen.

#### **Draft Committee Meeting Minutes**

The draft minutes of the Committee Meeting held on Wednesday 24 September 2014 were circulated and read at the meeting and were unanimously agreed.

#### **Matters arising**

- **Website**

NMC said that the website had been transferred to one administered by Charlie Howard. The diversion of communications to the Chair was working well, but there were still problems with diverting communications to the Secretary.

- **Data Protection Act Declaration**

After the meeting, LG signed a Data Protection Act declaration.

- **Bank Account Signatory**

After the meeting, PG and the other officers completed the bank mandate.

#### **Treasurer's Report**

NMC said that he had paid the six-monthly bill for HLA's phone. It was agreed that he should be reimbursed.

#### **Response to Scrutiny Panel's Report on the HLA**

Committee members were handed a copy of the Panel's draft report to the HfH Board and of the comments that SB had drafted on behalf of HLA. They were asked to let SB know of any proposed changes to the comments by the next day so that she could send the agreed comments for the Board to consider before it met on Monday 20 October.

NMC commented that the key sub-paragraph appeared to be 4.5.2, which SB said largely related to incidents before the Code of Conduct had been introduced. SB said that her comments rebutted the allegations contained in 4.5.2.

NMC said that he had spoken to Riz Majid of Neumans, who had confirmed that NMC and SB had settled their legal action on behalf of HLA for commercial reasons. NMC added that HLA's former Treasurer had dropped her application to the court for HLA's action to be struck out.

SB said that she had been shocked at the criticism of HLA in the Scrutiny Panel's report.

NMC added that the report commented on a lot of issues, eg with regard to the advice centre, that panel members had not raised when they interviewed him and SB.

GL asked what the Board would want HLA to do once they had considered the report. SB said that it would be up to the Board to decide how to proceed. She also commented that it

was pretty good that, without any campaigning on behalf of HLA, over 30% of the respondents to the Panel's on-line survey agreed that HLA should continue to be funded.

#### **Preparation for the General Meeting on Saturday 25 October**

In reply to SR, SB said that as the Scrutiny Panel's report would affect the Board's decision on whether to recognise HLA it was essential to include it in the GM agenda. She agreed that there were other matters on which the GM should concentrate, rather than spending too much time on the report.

SB said that at the moment there was no outside speaker. She would chase the Secretary to the HfH Board to ask whether the Chair or the Director would be able to attend and speak to the meeting.

Although SL was unable to attend the GM, it was agreed that the Regeneration of High Road West should be one of the main items for discussion. SB would invite the Independent Tenant and Leaseholder Adviser. NMC should email Love Lane Estate leaseholders to invite them. In view of the importance of a large attendance, it was agreed to pay for 3 days hire of the telephone service.

PG agreed to check whether he held the minutes of the 2012 GM, and NMC would similarly check whether he had the minutes of the 2013 GM.

It was agreed that we should also take the opportunity to publicise the facility for leaseholders to attend the HLA office at Commerce Road.

The GM agenda was agreed as:

Welcome and Introductory Remarks  
Minutes of previous General Meetings  
HLA office  
Resident Scrutiny Panel report  
Tottenham High Road West Regeneration – Love Lane Estate  
Any other Business

As it was now past 9pm, when meetings at the Civic Centre have to finish, the meeting closed with a vote of thanks to the Chair.