Golden Lane Estate
Great Arthur House Residents' Liaison Group (RLG) Meeting

Date: Wednesday 29 April 2026, 6:30pm – 8:00pm

Venue: Model Room, Barbican Estate Office

Attendees:

Ikenna Nwimo (IN)	CoL Project Manager
David Wong (DW)	CoL Project Manager
Bunmi Ali (BA)	CoL Project Manager (online)
Dan Bewley (DB)	Concilio (Chair)
Salvatore Pagdades (SP')	Concilio
Dawn Frampton (DF)	Cripplegate Ward member
Sue Pearson (SP)	GLERA Chair
Kath H (KH)	Resident, Great Arthur House
Allison M (AM)	Resident, Great Arthur House
Graham K (GK)	Resident, Great Arthur House

Apologies:

Greg Wade	CoL Head of Major Works
Jacqui Webster	Cripplegate Ward member

Agenda:

1. Welcome, housekeeping and introductions
2. Actions from the previous meeting
3. Programme update
    a. Major works
    b. Roofing project
4. Decanting for the works
5. Discussion of an introductory consultation
6. Questions
7. AOB
8. Date of next RLG meeting

1. Welcome and Housekeeping

DB welcomed attendees and noted apologies from Greg Wade, who was attending a separate resident meeting, and from Jacqui Webster. Ikenna Nwimo was introduced as a newly appointed CoL Project Manager, with a specific focus on Great Arthur House.

DB outlined the following housekeeping arrangements:

- Draft minutes will be circulated to attendees within one week for comment. Finalised minutes will be published on the project website one week after that.
- All attendees are named in the minutes so that other residents know who to approach with queries.

2. Actions from Previous Meeting

Door-knocking and resident engagement

DB reported that Concilio had completed a round of door-knocking across all flats in Great Arthur House, resulting in 24 conversations with residents. Some residents expressed interest and were given leaflets with the full schedule of meetings for the year. No residents had subsequently emailed to join the group.

DF welcomed the door-knocking but noted that reaching residents who remain unaware would require ongoing effort. DB confirmed a further round would be planned for a different time of day. A second leaflet drop had also been completed, delivering the meetings schedule directly to all flats.

KH noted that residents might be more likely to engage if they had a clearer understanding of the scope of what was proposed. SP echoed this, observing that by the time statutory consultation is reached it is too late to properly prepare residents. DB confirmed that two rounds of public consultation were planned before any planning application is submitted and undertook to address this through the introductory consultation (see Section 4).

Access for residents without IT

DB confirmed that monthly in-person coffee drop-in sessions had been established as the primary mechanism for residents without internet access to engage with the project. These are open to all residents, with no prior knowledge required. The first session, held on 25 April, was attended by five residents. At that session, a simplified scope of works overview and an indicative timeline had been available for residents to view. A second session is planned for 21 May from 16:30-18:30 in the Golden Lane Community Centre.

Gas engineering report

IN confirmed that a specialist gas engineer report does exist and that it contains a recommendation. Post meeting note: Further to a review of the Gas Report executive summary, the project team can confirm that the existing gas installation is being considered for either replacement or complete removal as part of the pending works. More information will be provided on this approach at a pending consultation event in June/July.

SP asked when residents would know whether the building would be de-gassed. IN confirmed this would form part of the design discussion with Studio Partington and would be the subject of consultation with residents once a position had been reached. However, IN undertook to chase the answer to the recommendation as a priority.

GK and KH noted the practical implications for residents: both leaseholders and tenants needed to know whether to invest in replacement gas boilers. AM raised the specific question of what the position would be if a tenant's boiler failed before a decision had been reached. DB acknowledged this could not be answered at the meeting and undertook to obtain a clear response, ideally within weeks rather than months.

Cost recovery and scope of works overview

DB confirmed that the question of which works would be rechargeable to leaseholders remains under discussion as the scope has not yet been finalised. It was confirmed that fire doors and sprinkler systems would not be rechargeable. The position on other elements would be communicated as the planning process progresses.

DB noted that a scope of works overview document had been produced and shared at the coffee drop-in session. KH asked that this be sent to all residents. DB confirmed it was being finalised and would be distributed to all Great Arthur House residents and published on the project website within the next couple of weeks.

Separation between major works and routine repairs

DB confirmed that a letter to all estate residents was being prepared, explaining the distinction between the major works programme and routine repairs. In particular, the winter emergency works programme addressing priority window conditions across the estate was drawing to a close, and the letter would clarify that ongoing repairs queries should be directed to the repairs team rather than the major works team. A date for the letter had not been confirmed but it would be issued in the next few weeks.

Project team visibility and communications

DB introduced the action around communicating the structure of the project team. He explained that the approach is to set out on the website the organisations involved in the project, the City of London Corporation, architects, planners, and communications, with further detail to be added on individual blocks as consultations progress.

GK expressed strong concern that the project currently lacked a visible, named presence. He noted that communications felt diffuse and impersonal, and that residents who had had difficult prior experiences of works on the estate needed to be able to identify who was responsible for what. He questioned why senior individuals on the project were not named on the website.

AM and KH supported this view, noting that there was a general assumption that residents knew who people were within the City's structure, which was not the case. DB acknowledged this was a fair challenge and agreed that those individuals residents who represent the team at meetings and consultations could be named and identifiable. DB agreed to undertake a review with the project team on who the appropriate named face(s) of the project should be from the City side, and to reflect this in website and resident communications.

SP noted that Concilio, as communicators, were dependent on having content provided to them by the City, and that delays in that flow were an issue with the broader project structure rather than with Concilio's approach. DB agreed and noted that where Concilio had been able to propose ideas, the coffee mornings and the WhatsApp broadcast group among them, the City had been supportive and enabled these to happen.

3. Programme Update

Major works – recruitment

IN confirmed that Greg Wade was actively recruiting for a Senior Project Manager for the Great Arthur House programme. This individual would sit above IN in the project structure and would take a lead role in driving the project forward. A candidate is anticipated by June.

IN also confirmed that recruitment for two Resident Decant Officers for the Golden Lane Estate was planned, with a target start date of November. These officers would cover the whole estate rather than Great Arthur House alone.

Roofing works update

DW provided an update on the roof refurbishment programme. A Stage 3 report has been completed. Planning liaison with the local authority is anticipated to begin in the coming months, with a planning application targeted for late August and planning permission sought by November.

DW confirmed that the scope includes replacing tiles and drainage, restoring the ponds, and restoring the roof broadly to its original design. The planners are strict on maintaining the historic character of the building; the preferred approach is therefore to reinstate the roof as it was, using appropriate materials. DW noted that the original detailing would be referenced.

In response to a question from DF, DW confirmed there are discussions about potentially opening the roof to residents, most likely residents of the building or the wider estate on a

managed basis for specific events, though the logistics and management arrangements remain to be determined.

DB confirmed that whilst the roof works and the wider major works programme are being aligned in terms of delivery programme to minimise disruption, the two planning applications remain separate. Scaffolding requirements have not yet been determined. DW confirmed the roof will be the City's responsibility to maintain once works are complete.

4. Decanting

DB provided an update on the decanting approach. Greg Wade has prepared a paper on decanting which is due to go to the Disposal, Contracts and Customer Services (DCCS) Sub-Committee on 27 May.

Two Resident Decant Officers are to be recruited with a target start date of November. IN confirmed that whoever is appointed will need to have substantial relevant experience and will work closely with the contractor. DB noted that Greg Wade is personally leading on the decanting paper and the associated recruitment.

GK asked who would write the job specification for the decant officers. DB can now confirm this will be led by Greg Wade. KH noted that suitable individuals with this experience do exist and that the City should be able to source them, though GK observed that the role requires a very specific combination of skills. IN confirmed Greg Wade is closely involved in defining the requirements for the role.

5. Introductory Consultation

DB introduced the proposal for an introductory public consultation event for Great Arthur House, planned for June, the week following the June RLG meeting. This is an additional step not taken for most other blocks on the estate, and is intended to introduce residents to the project scope, timetable, and team before the detailed pre-submission consultation takes place later in the year.

DB noted that the RLG would be shown the boards and any presentation materials in advance, so that members could suggest changes before the public event. The architects (Studio Partington) would be present at the event.

SP suggested that the event should include a formal presentation that all attendees could hear together, rather than relying solely on a boards-and-conversation drop-in format, which she felt risked congestion and repetition. DB agreed and proposed a drop-in running approximately from 4.30pm to 7.30pm, with a presentation and Q&A in the middle hour, so that residents arriving at different times could benefit from individual conversations with the project team before or after the main session.

Members suggested the following:

- The boards and presentation should be shared with this RLG for review before the event.
- The presentation should be recorded and made available on the project website, so that residents unable to attend can view it. It was agreed that the recording would cover the presentation only, not the Q&A.
- The format should allow for individual conversations at the drop-in for those who prefer not to ask questions in a group setting.
- The sequencing and flow of the event should be considered carefully so that visitors arriving at different times receive a coherent experience.

6. Questions

Concilio's role

GK asked DB to explain Concilio's brief. DB described Concilio's role as facilitating and delivering resident communications on behalf of the City, chairing resident meetings, and encouraging further resident engagement. GK asked whether Concilio's approach to Great Arthur House was comparable to the level of service provided to other clients. DB confirmed that all projects are treated equally.

GK expressed the view that communications to date had been insufficiently impactful for the complexity and scale of what is being proposed, and that the project lacked the visible, named leadership that would build credibility with a resident community that had experienced significant difficulties with past works. He urged both the City and Concilio to raise their ambition. SP reiterated that Concilio's ability to communicate was dependent on having content to communicate, and that the primary constraint was the City's capacity to produce and release information.

WhatsApp group and newsletter

AM asked whether a Great Arthur House-specific WhatsApp group could be set up. DB explained that the existing estate-wide group is used as a broadcast channel only, pushing updates to residents when something relevant occurs, and that a block-specific group was unlikely to add significant value given that approach. AM suggested that the WhatsApp group could have been used to remind members of the RLG meeting on the evening in question. DB agreed this was a good idea and undertook to use the group for timely reminders.

SP noted that she had signed up for the project newsletter via the website but had not received anything, and recalled that prior to the COVID-19 pandemic a regular paper newsletter had been delivered to residents' doors. DB confirmed that a new estate-wide newsletter is being developed by the City's Corporate Communications team and that Concilio is feeding content into it. He did not have a publication date but confirmed it was in progress.

Project website

DB confirmed that a substantially updated version of the project website has been drafted by Concilio and is currently under review by the project team. It will then go to the Programme Board, of which SP is a member, before going live. DB indicated that this will be shared with the Board for review the following week.

Members asked that the website include not just what is going to be done and when, but also why, articulating the benefits and the rationale so that residents can see the positive outcome of what will be a significant programme of disruption. GK noted that the design team (Studio Partington) should be more visibly present on the website. KH observed that information currently only shared at drop-in sessions, such as the scope of works overview – should be available to all residents.

Meeting cancellation contingency

GK raised the cancellation of the previous meeting due to a tube strike, noting that the strike had been announced well in advance and a contingency should have been in place. DB explained that sufficient members of the project team had been unable to reach the venue to run the meeting in person, and that the decision had been held until the last moment in the hope the strike would be called off, as is often the case. DB also offered to explore whether an online fallback option could be agreed with members as a standing contingency, though members agreed that online meetings are generally less effective for this type of engagement and so it would not be taken up.

7. Any Other Business

DB confirmed that Greg Wade and a representative from Studio Partington will be expected to attend future RLG meetings, subject to availability, at which the introductory consultation boards will be presented to members for comment.

In response to a question from GK, IN confirmed that he would be deputising for Greg Wade and Nick Condon in their absence from meetings.

SP asked whether the gas engineer report, and author could be brought to the next meeting if a decision was imminent. IN had reviewed the gas recommendation executive summary. Ascertained that the existing installation is deemed as non-compliant and should be replaced. **Post meeting update:** ***Further to a review of the Gas Report executive summary, the project team can confirm that the existing gas installation is being considered for either replacement or complete removal as part of the pending works. More information will be provided on this approach at a pending consultation event***

In response to a question from SP, DW confirmed that a separate consultant (LDS) is engaged for the roof works. Whilst the delivery programme is being aligned with the wider major works programme, the two remain separately managed.

8. Date of Next RLG Meeting

The next Great Arthur House RLG meeting is confirmed for:

- Wednesday 10 June 2026

Full meeting dates for the year will be recirculated to all members via email and the WhatsApp group.

Ends.