

The Finsbury Centre Stakeholders' Group

Meeting No. 1

Date: Monday 17 July 2017

Time: 6.30 – 9.00pm

Venue: St Luke's Community Centre, 90 Central Street, EC1V 8AJ

Actions arising from the meeting

Attendees:

Chair / Executive Member for Environment & Transport, Islington Council	Councillor Claudia Webbe (CCW)
26-30 Mitchell Street residents	AM
Local business owner	AS
Local business owner	ASt
London Symphony Orchestra	AT
FLC yoga teacher	BP
Dance Square Residents' Association	DH
East Central residents	FM
Football users	GL
Burnhill House residents	HC
Burnhill House / Keniston Housing Association	JC
Finsbury Badminton Club	KPD
Roby House residents	LB
Friends of St Luke's Gardens / City Road Medical Centre	LHM
Football users	MC
32 Mitchell Street	MI
Football users	MR
Access to Sport / youth engagement	MS
OutPlay Squash	NC
Football users	RK
East Central residents	RO'C
IRB fitness users	Sue Heap
London Fencing Club	Tim Gadaski
Local business owner	VF
Council officers:	
Senior Planner, Planning Projects, Islington Council	Katarzyna Bendowska (KB)
Team Leader, Planning Projects, Islington Council	Eshwyn Prabhu (EP)
Design Team (PTE):	
Partner, Pollard Thomas Edwards Architects	Dominique Oliver (DO)

Associate, Pollard Thomas Edwards Architects	Peter Watkins (PW)
--	--------------------

Apologies:

Youth Sports Development Manager	MM
IRB fitness users	SP
EC1 Judo Zone	RLG
Islington Eyes	AG

Item	Notes	To action
1.	Welcome and introductions	
2.	Stakeholders' Group description and purpose	
2.1.	The Council (EP) provided a brief overview of 'Terms of Reference' and hard copies were handed out to all members. Councillor Webbe encouraged the members to raise any queries about Terms of Reference with EP.	
3.	Plan of Work	
3.1.	A resident (DH) asked whether the meeting documents could be shared with attendees for them to distribute to the groups they are representing. It was agreed the meeting notes and other documents would be shared.	LBI
4.	Presentation of the scheme	
4.1.	A leisure centre user (RK) raised a concern about decreased provision of football pitches during the construction of the civic building and asked whether block booking holders will be able to keep their existing bookings.	LBI
4.2.	A resident (RO'C) commented on the new civic building saying that placing the football pitches at the back of the building is leading to losing the sense of openness on Central Street. Another resident (MI) supported RO'Cs proposal to place the sports hall above two pitches in the centre of the site.	Design team
4.3.	<u>Burnhill House</u>	
4.4.	Keniston Housing Association representative (JC) appreciated the need for additional housing but was concerned about the height of St Luke's Mansions proposed in front of Burnhill House.	
4.5.	A resident (HC) commented that the proposals lack sensitivity to Burnhill House and raised concerns about distribution of building heights across the proposed redevelopment site.	
4.6.	HC pointed out that the concern of Burnhill House residents is not just the loss of views, but primarily potential loss of daylight, which could compromise living standards of its residents. D. Oliver noted these	Design team

	comments and explained that sunlight and daylight analysis will be prepared as part of the planning process.	
4.7.	HC asked about the consultation process. Councillor Webbe said there has to be a continued, separate discussion with the Burnhill House residents. Council officers and architects to organise a meeting regarding Burnhill House.	LBI/Design team
5.	Detailed descriptions	
5.1.	<u>Landscaping</u>	
5.2.	Residents (LB and MI) expressed concerns about the proposals for a running track while a leisure centre user (TG) supported the proposal as complementing the leisure centre but was concerned it could be underused.	
5.3.	A resident (FM) asked about the amount of open space. D.Oliver to present a comparison of existing and proposed open space at the next meeting.	Design team
5.4.	Community groups' representatives (LHM and AT) asked how the trees in St Luke's Gardens, which overhang FLC, will be protected and raised queries about potential loss of trees, including on Mitchell Street.	Design team
5.5.	<u>Leisure</u>	
5.6.	Queries were raised about the exact size of fitness studios and football pitches. Fitness studio users (SH and TG) were concerned that the large studios existing at FLC would not be re-provided. Another user (BP) expressed concern about storage of spinning bikes. D. Oliver to present comparison of the existing and proposed leisure floorspace at the next meeting	Design team
5.7.	A football user (GL) requested a similar comparison to be prepared for the existing and proposed football pitches.	Design team
5.8.	Fitness studio user (SH) queried whether it would be possible to add an extra floor to the leisure centre. PTE to investigate.	Design team
5.9.	A local business owner (VF) suggested that additional floorspace could be provided in a basement, either new one or by re-using the existing basement under the Finsbury Leisure Centre (FLC).	Design team
5.10.	Squash courts user (NC) commented that heating and cooling squash courts is a common issue in aging leisure facilities.	
5.11.	NC supported the proposals for the sitting area around the two sunken football pitches and suggested a temporary viewing platform for one of the squash courts.	Design team
5.12.	NC appreciated that the provision of new leisure facilities may require some increase in membership costs, but sought confirmation the cost increase would not be significant. EP to raise these concerns with Leisure and GLL.	LBI

5.13.	A leisure centre user (SH) and a resident (DH) suggested there should be proposals for more integrated use of FLC and IRB and managing the two centres as one facility would help with the effective use of the floorspace available.	LBI
5.14.	<u>Energy centre</u>	
5.15.	Residents (MI and AM) commented that adding a second floor above the one-storey energy centre would make it too big. MI criticised proposals for a community garden to be located on the roof of the energy centre.	
5.16.	A football user (RK) criticised the ambitions for the energy centre to have an educational feature as unrealistic.	
5.17.	A local business owner (VF) suggested that the energy centre could be located underground.	Design team
5.18.	<u>Residential building</u>	
5.19.	A resident (HC) raised comments on the consultation with Burnhill House residents and leisure centre users.	
5.20.	Residents (LB and HC) commented on the overall mix of uses and large amount of floorspace being proposed.	
5.21.	Leisure centre user (SH) commented that the scheme's supportability depends on amount of affordable council homes to be provided.	
5.22.	A resident (FM) requested that conclusions from the sunlight and daylight analysis should be discussed with the Stakeholder Group. Design Team to bring forward proposals for sunlight and daylight studies for discussion at the next meeting.	Design team
5.23.	A resident (AM) raised comments about residents' on-street parking.	
6.	Any other business	
6.1.	Leisure centre user (BP) asked whether it would be possible to split future meetings of the Stakeholders' Group into two workshops for leisure centre users and residents.	Design team
7.	Next meeting – date and agenda items	

End