

FLAG Committee Meeting

Date: Tuesday 10th February 2026

Time: 18:30

Location: Estate Management Office

Present:

Members: Elise Velkeneers (EV), Kathleen Sims (KS), Lorna Reith (LR), Melissa Carames (MC), Pelagia Elefthiriades (PE), Quentin Given (QG), Sinan Fahliogullari (SF), Sylvia Morgan (SM), Suzanne Robinson (SR), Tui Lin (TL) and Vicky Ladizhinskaya (VL).

Residents: Helen Thomas (HT) and Lucas Bertholdi-Saas (LBS).

Advisers: Cany Ash (CA) and Gracia Ramirez (GR).

1. **Welcome and introductions:** LR shared apologies sent by committee members Annie Popoola, Michael Baumgartner, Paul Collier and Samar Jaber and residents Will Hayter and Annelie Kops. Attendees introduced themselves.
2. **Minutes of meeting held on November 24th.** EV requested a correction on page 1 as her name was misspelt. MC to correct and share revised document. Minutes were then agreed.
3. **Matters arising:**
 - a. **Meeting with Parking Officers 9th December:** LR reported a number of residents attended and all issues listed in the previous committee meeting's minutes were raised. FLAG has continued to send lists of abandoned cars and untaxed vehicles to the council. She will chase after the consultation is complete. In the meantime, the issue will be raised at next Police Panel meeting on Thursday 26th February; LR to inform and invite residents to join.
 - b. **WhatsApp group for Turkish speakers:** SF asked for this matter to be kept on agenda for future action.
 - c. **Litter picking:** QG asked attendees for availability to do a litter picking session before the winter ended. It was agreed to do it on Saturday 21st February at 10:00. LR to email residents and QG to share on Whatsapp. EV marked the clean-up session by Canal and River Trust which cleared all the litter on the water and trimmed branches. The red roadblock remains there.
 - d. **Lights and graffiti:** QG informed the lights on the railway bridge by Markfield Park which he reported as fused a couple of weeks back had been fixed. He also reported the lights on the other bridge, by Lock 17, as they are covered in graffiti. VL pointed out she hasn't noticed anything done on graffiti, as the bus stop on Ferry Lane (Mill Mead Road, Stop J) has had gang tags on them for a while. She had reported this. LR to follow up the graffiti tags with the council.

- e. **Cyclehoop hangar:** EV reported she is waiting for the key to the newly installed cycle storage in Armadale Close (by gate 4). There are other 3 hangars across the estate and all have waiting lists, which shows high demand. LR advised attendees to email the relevant officer with suggestion of new locations and to those believing to be on a waiting list to confirm their names were included. She mentioned the council didn't use to be involved in the hiring process, as Cyclehoop would deal with the requests directly; however, with this last 4th hangar, residents had to email the council officer instead and they are liaising with Cyclehoop.
- f. **Communal electric cupboard in blocks:** LR reported keys for these cupboards, located at the ground floor of blocks, are kept by staff at the Estate Management Office.
- g. **Paint:** LR advised there were still some tubs of paint left. QG reported 95 tins had already been given away and the remaining is mainly magnolia, white, a bit of masonry paint and adhesives and other treatments.
- h. **Grounds maintenance:** LR reported the council are now keeping FLAG informed if a scheduled visit is missed.

4. **Celebrating our estate:**

LR recalled the idea mentioned at the last committee meeting of FLAG celebrating the 50th anniversary of the first residents moving into the estate, which will coincide with Haringey holding the London Borough of Culture in 2027. Amongst the ideas brought forward is to have the estate declared a conservation area by the local authority; there are a couple of residents who are architects who are interested in helping develop this idea, but they couldn't attend this meeting. And there is also a parallel project being developed by Sinan and Gracia.

SF introduced his friend Gracia, who is also a Haringey resident. Together they are developing an idea to celebrate the estate with a photo and film exhibition. SF explained his background as a social researcher with a focus in housing and local authority, and observing how people are connected to space. He considers Ferry Lane Estate a place to be celebrated as an example of good social housing. The idea of this project stemmed from seeing the collection of photographs of the estate one of his neighbours has.

GR explained her background as an academic researcher and teaches film history and culture studies. She is also interested in how people relate to places and has made research films on those relationships with places. She is also interested in architectural history. Along with SF, they aim to organise an exhibition to look back at the history of the estate, its architectural heritage, the location and the area. She highlighted the design of the estate being in balance with the river. She is interested in the stories which residents, all the different generations, have to tell about the estate; to register the oral history, record it through the film and use those stories to celebrate the estate.

SF elaborated about the two elements of the project: an exhibition of photographs from the neighbours' personal archives and the making of a film to document the project. Both elements could be displayed in the disused boiler houses across the estate. The objective is to show the local and wider community, and the council, the value of the estate and raise its profile. Residents would be encouraged to get involved, including children. For the film they have been thinking of children to conduct interviews with adults to have an intergenerational conversation.

They have already been looking at funding sources, but the most important part is to reach out to all the different communities in the estate and have as many people involved as possible.

LR suggested to have two working groups for the two different dimensions of the celebration effort:

1) For the film and exhibition project by SF and G: Working to develop the idea and to involve residents in the project.

2) For the architectural aspect: To explore further the best way of preserving the estate (conservation status, community asset, Grade II listing).

CA (an architect involved in regeneration in London and interested in the way that this estate can evolve) suggested several institutions which could be interested in getting involved with the celebration of the estate:

- The London Festival of Architecture, held in June, which this year has belonging as its theme.
- Davidson Prize: this year it will have play as its theme. CA suggested the idea of reactivating some of the play spaces within the estate; decorating the gates to the canal to create a playful atmosphere.

CA discussed the idea of being outward-looking when thinking of the best ways to protect the estate: to building up a micro destination over a few years by making a really strong argument for the green spaces, not just for the estate but for the whole area. She suggested to contact Leo Hammond (Urban Design and Regeneration Manager at Haringey Council).

SF suggested another way to have the estate protected in the future: to have it Grade II listed by Historic England, like the Barbican and the Park Hill Estate in Sheffield.

KS pointed out leaseholders and freehold holders could feel nervous about having the Grade II listing because of the restrictions on changes to properties.

CA and VL discussed the different opportunities to have parts of the estate listed as conservation area or assets of community value.

LR highlighted the importance of capturing the experiences of long-time residents and suggested to interview the ones who moved when the estate was first opened. She also mentioned FLAG had put together a collection of pictures of the estate and youth club activities to mark the 40th anniversary of the estate.

VL mentioned a previous project which she was involved in to celebrate the diversity of cultures living in the estate. Along with a former resident, they interviewed neighbours to show their journeys and find out what made them belong to the estate.

PE suggested to draft a questionnaire for residents. She also mentioned the school has the register of the first children who enrolled the school in 1977. She will ask the headteacher if it could be shared with SF and G for the exhibition project.

GR reckoned a callout for materials that residents may have could be organised in the short term. She also elaborated on the idea of play being one of the things articulating part of the research and the storytelling of the project: how the estate green spaces have so much potential for play and enjoyment: and not only for the residents but for the entire area as they are open spaces.

LR suggested to publish that callout in the next FLAG newsletter. She pointed out there is a book about the history of the site where the estate was built written by resident Paul Collier and mentioned other local communities the project could reach out to:

- Those using the football pitch.
- The canal boat dwellers; when the estate opened in 1977, there were no boats. Now there is interaction with them.
- Hale Village residents

LR, PE and KS discussed the potential for using the Community Green Day (June 27th) to promote the project and also gather residents' photos and other resources.

CA suggested artistic ways to deal with residents' reluctance to be filmed: using a drawn portrait or caricature of the subject and playing their voice recording over or applying a cartoon filter over interviews. She also pointed out a very successful part of the Walthamstow Borough of Culture was projecting images on the Town Hall.

LR informed of Haringey Resident Engagement Team being aware and supportive of the project.

QG suggested to check the deadline for grants applications from the London Borough of Culture.

VL, PE and LR discussed the effect of murals, taking Waltham Forest as an example, and suggested to have some commissioned for the estate. PE mentioned Canal & River Trust could be interested in funding murals on the estate, as they did with the one at the school. LR to contact Canal & River Trust to explore funding or support for murals and related place-making work, and report back to the committee.

SM mentioned she had discovered areas of the estate which would need brightening up and it was agreed to do a walkaround when the weather improves and also ask residents what they would like to see improved during the Community Green Day.

SF listed the actions he was taking from this meeting to go ahead with the project:

- To write and submit a short piece about the exhibition/film project and a callout to residents to provide material for QG to include it in the next newsletter.
- To inform Haringey Housing, Placemaking and the culture CEO of the project and the support from FLAG, the school and the Residents Engagement Team.
- To form the groups and supporters.

LR will set up a follow-up meeting with CA and the small group interested in conservation/community-asset options, including Will Hayter and Annelie Kops (architects who live in the estate).

5. **Council Scrutiny Committee:**

LR informed the council had arranged a scrutiny committee to look into cycling safety across the borough. She explained QG and her had dedicated a couple of hours last year to count bicycles riding on the pavement on Ferry Lane and going through red lights at the junction with Tottenham bus station.

SF shared his experience as a cyclist and his opinion that the cycling infrastructure around Ferry Lane was very poor, with cyclists resorting to cycling on the pavement as it was safer than being on the road.

PE shared her experience with reckless cyclists riding on the pavement while taking school children on a trip to the park.

EV enquired about Lime bikes and the estate being an authorised area of them to be parked. It was agreed the Lime bikes' poor parking arrangement and the rest of the items raised by members would be submitted to the scrutiny committee.

6. Community Green Day:

LR informed attendees of the date the summer event was Saturday 27th June and that a planning meeting with the school was arranged for February 24th at 11:30. QG and her would attend and she extended the invitation to all committee members.

PE encouraged attendees to suggest ideas for activities and pointed out the event is open to the wider community, residents at other estates in Tottenham Hale.

7. Finance & Newsletter:

QG reported there was £820 in the bank. The next newsletter would be printed and delivered to residents (815 dwellings) in the next few weeks. He invited attendees to suggest news items to add before printing.

VL suggested to ask the management at the Lock 17 shop if they wanted to advertise their business on the newsletter.

SF suggested the same with the sauna at Blackhorse Road.

8. Borough wide residents' meeting 8th December:

MC reported the last RA Network meeting had 9 council officers and only 4 representatives from resident associations. The main subject was the management of void properties, which one of the RA representatives described as very poor.

LR updated that a new contractor had been hired to deal with repairs to empty properties, which the council hoped would speed up the availability of those properties for tenants.

9. Date of next meeting and AOB:

- a. **Next meeting:** It was agreed to hold it on the 23rd of April.
- b. **Dealing with antisocial behaviour (ASB):** Anti-social behavior concerns were raised, particularly regarding drug use in some blocks. LR advised to contact the housing officer, whose details are available on the FLAG website.
- c. **Summer gathering:** KS suggested to hold a summer gathering for committee members and offered to host it. A date will be fixed at the next meeting.

10. Leaseholder issues – Insurance, doors & service charges:

- a. **Service charge inaccuracies:** LR informed FLAG had submitted a formal complaint to the Housing Ombudsman. The money involved on the inaccuracies is quite small, but the point is the figures provided by the council cannot be trusted.
EV commented she had been credited for some of the inaccuracies she had challenged.
- b. **Doors replacement:** LR gave a bit of context of this issue for the new leaseholders, in particular that the council doesn't hold any records of the fire doors installed in 2013 as part of the Decent Homes programme; FLAG found this out thanks to a Freedom of Information (Fol) request logged by VL after the council announced the current door replacement programme. She informed QG had recently submitted another Fol to ask

the council if they have records of the other features included on the Decent Homes scheme, including the roofs.

QG reported the Building Research Establishment could test a door to verify compliance with regulations as long as both parties in this dispute (Council and FLAG) agreed on having it done. He also contacted the Building Safety Regulator and is waiting to hear back from them.

SF pointed out the Building Safety Regulator might not be willing to look into our dispute as we are not a high-rise building.

VL and EV pointed out the risk assessment sent by the council stated the council is responsible for proving the doors are not compliant.

SF, VL, EV and LR discussed the complaints process before an enquiry to the ombudsman could be logged. All ombudsman's forms apply to individuals, so it would be tricky to do it as FLAG.

It was decided to carry on with both FLAG's enquiries and also the individual leaseholders's enquiries on the doors replacement programme. Leaseholders were asked to keep on copying FLAG. EV's email to the Council will be used as a template and uploaded to FLAG's website.

EV to arrange an in-person viewing of the tender documentation for the door replacement procurement and VL to come along with her.

c. Insurance:

SR introduced the idea of taking the insurance charges dispute to the First-tier Housing Tribunal, explaining the role and powers of this independent legal body. She has scheduled a meeting with the local tribunal office to review which forms are required and clarify the application process next week. She outlined the issues with the council changing insurers, lack of evidence for claim increases and inconsistent valuations. She suggested asking the tribunal to order refunds, correct overcharging and establish a consistent method for future years. She mentioned the potential costs of the tribunal application and the possibility of asking the tribunal to prevent the council from seeking legal costs.

LSB, SF, EV and LR discuss the confusion over property valuation and insurance allocation, noting the council's method doesn't align with the lease agreement. LR explained the council's practice of using the reinstatement value for insurance, which should be consistent across all properties. VL highlighted the council's practice of outsourcing repairs and passing the blame to insurance providers, which complicates the issue.

EV suggested to continue to pursue copies of Zurich contract terms and evidence for the 2024/25 price increases (follow up on emails to obtain contract terms and justification for premium increases).

LR referred to the final letter to the council drafted by SR and offered to send it from FLAG, with minor tweaks, to ensure it incorporates the items raised during this meeting: request all missing insurance information, include data for 2023/24 as a baseline, and add queries about the Zurich contract/price increases; then circulate the revised draft for review.

It was agreed to proceed to prepare and submit a joint First-tier Tribunal application on the insurance charges if required (collect necessary evidence and include requests for disclosure of claims data), following the local office meeting.