



# World's End Residents' Association

---

16 Blantyre Street  
World's End Estate  
London SW10 0DS  
Tel: (020) 7795 3095  
Email: [wera@worlds-end.org.uk](mailto:wera@worlds-end.org.uk)  
Web: [www.worlds-end.org.uk](http://www.worlds-end.org.uk)

## Minutes of the WERA Committee Meeting held on Tuesday, 12<sup>th</sup> of June 2007 at 7pm in the WERA Clubroom, 16 Blantyre Street

---

<b>Present:</b>	Margaret Grayling (Chair) John Rendall (Treasurer) Eryl Humphrey Jones Marye Kenton Nigel Palmer Flora Levi	Jules Montero (Secretary) Monica Boholst Maggie Byrne Caroline Fairchild Joy Laven
<b>In Attendance:</b>	Alasdair Manson (Neighbourhood Manager South, RBKC TMO) Gary Riley (Area Housing Manager, RBKC TMO) Peter Tozer (Project Manager, Security, RBKC TMO) Police Sgt. Tim Otway Cllr. Mark Daley	
<b>Apologies:</b>	Robert Taylor	Cllr. Maighread Simmonds

---

### 1. Apologies

The above apologies were accepted.

### 2. Security

The paper on the security proposals for the estate was presented to the meeting. The following issues were noted and discussed:

- That the paper highlighted four "options". Proceeding with the existing scheme and the zoning proposals was not included as an option. There was some question as to whether the zoning that had originally been proposed was ever likely to be effective.
- That there appeared to be significant enthusiasm for some kind of door entry system amongst residents. A question was raised as to whether there might be some benefit to installing the door-entry system proposed in the current scheme in isolation, without the zoning. After clarifying what was required – the system would require visitors to use specific block entrances to access specific properties on the estate but would provide residents with full/existing access – PT concluded that it could be installed in isolation, but that it was likely to provide very little benefit without the zoning as it was likely to be easily circumvented (visitors following residents in etc.). PT also noted that there might still be issues with regards to leaseholder access rights with the installation of any new door-entry system
- That there appeared to be widespread support amongst residents for the installation of CCTV. Members generally agreed that the existing CCTV system should be upgraded as soon as possible to the latest digital/hard-drive based technology and the lift CCTV system tied into it, and additional cameras installed where appropriate. The use of portable CCTV cameras to target particular trouble-spots was also proposed. AM noted that these would require special permission but that this could be obtained to enable their use. TO was asked whether the Police would be able to make use of the CCTV cameras. TO confirmed that they would be able to make use of the recordings, but would not be able to use the cameras for surveillance.

### Actions

- Whether it would be feasible to install a manned concierge/reception in each tower block. After some discussion between AM and members it was generally concluded that this was not viable; the reasons noted included the high costs of such a service and the inherent insecurity of the staff providing such a service on the estate.
- That the existing system had now reached the end of its life and a decision needed to be taken as to what to do with it. It was noted that possibilities included replacing it with the door-entry proposed in the current scheme (as discussed above), “renovating” it and bringing it back into service with the existing functionality (i.e. as a concierge-based door-entry system), or simply switching it off. The possibility that a future concierge-based door-entry system might not be required to be manned or operational 24 hours a day was also discussed.
- That the level of policing on the estate was comparatively low in comparison to the rest of the borough given the estate’s population (estimated at 2,500-3,000 persons) and that what many residents wanted above all else was an increased and highly visible police (and/or security guard) presence on the estate. The possibility of reinstating the man-and-dog patrol was discussed. The policing provided by the Safer Neighbourhoods Team/ PCSOs was also discussed and it was noted that the ward team was currently under-staffed and that they were currently unable to provide PCSO patrols after 10pm due to a lack of funding from the Council.

It was agreed the Committee would discuss the issues further at a subsequent meeting. PT offered to attend any further meetings.

### 3. Estate Management

AM presented a paper on possible improvements to the estate’s management.

It was noted that the TMO had not agreed to provide a dedicated manager for the estate, nor provide a dedicated Customer Service representative to be based on the estate. Members stated that they believed that both were necessary for the service provided to residents to improve.

There was some discussion as to the problems with the current service. In particular with regards to the reporting and tracking of communal repairs, the lack of proper prioritisation of repairs, the lack of proper monitoring of the contractors working on the estate, the apparent lack of any written monitoring reports/records/documentation, the limited service provided from the Blantyre Centre, the actual opening hours of the Blantyre Centre, the level of staffing required at the Blantyre Centre before it could open, and the generally abysmal performance of the borough-wide Customer Service Centre.

The proposal to draft a dog policy specifically tailored to the estate was noted and received general approval from members.

AM said he wanted to receive feedback from the Committee on the proposals contained within the paper. JM said he would collate all comments/observations and send these to Ian Twyford and AM.

### 4. Any Other Business

EHJ asked whether improperly parked motorbikes and mopeds on the estate could be clamped. AM stated that the current clamping contractor was unwilling to do this and noted that none of the other contractors who had applied for the contract were able to clamp motorbikes either – there were issues with regards the effectiveness of clamps on bikes as well as questions of liability for any damage.

MB noted problems with dogs fouling at the foot of the two trees in front of the school entrance. This was brought to the attention of GR.

It was noted that the opening of the Police office on the Piazza had been further delayed.

### 5. Date of Next Meeting

The time and place of the next meeting are: Tuesday, 19<sup>th</sup> of June, at 7pm in the WERA Clubroom.

The meeting then closed

..... Chair