



SaveEkinRoad@gmail.com  
www.SaveEkinRoad.co.uk

24<sup>th</sup> January 2024

### **Save Ekin Road response to September 2023 JLL report**

To the Cambridge City Council,

In September 2023 you released an Options Analysis report from Jones Lang LaSalle (JLL), herein referred to simply as “the report”, in which they presented their shortlist of 3 options for the Ekin Road estate.

For the avoidance of doubt, we refer to the JLL report found at the following site:

<https://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/ie/IssueDetails.aspx?IId=30854&Opt=3>

and with a direct url to the pdf of the report being this:

<https://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/documents/s63524/HSC%20Ekin%20Road%20Report%20Appendix%201%20JLL%20Report.pdf>

We have read the report, and are now in a position to provide some of our own written representations on its contents and conclusions, which we present here. We use all section numbering as per the report. In our response, we reserve the use of double quotation marks “ ” to denote quotes from the report, lifted verbatim.

We kindly request that these be passed on to JLL, and that Cambridge City Council and JLL take the full gamut of these written representations into account in the next stage of their work on this project.

At the end of this document we provide a conclusion, summarising our key concerns and laying out our requests for action by the Cambridge City Council and JLL. We kindly request written responses to all points and requests listed in the conclusion, by either the Cambridge City Council or JLL.

We again ask for the opportunity to liaise directly with JLL prior to their publication of a preferred option(s) for the estate, as we believe that would be the best way for us to communicate our concerns to them. This has been routinely denied to us in the past.

We would be happy to engage further with the Council and JLL on these matters, and can always be contacted at our main email address: [SaveEkinRoad@gmail.com](mailto:SaveEkinRoad@gmail.com) . If the Council would prefer a phone conversation to discuss this, we can arrange for our spokesperson to phone one of your representatives at a mutually convenient time.

Kind regards,  
Save Ekin Road

## List of written representations

- Our written representations regarding the September 2023 Options Analysis report from Jones Lang LaSalle (JLL), herein referred to simply as “the report”, can be found below.
- We use all section numbering as per the report. In our response, we reserve the use of double quotation marks “ ” to denote quotes from the report, lifted verbatim.
- We underline all direct requests for action, and collate these together and repeat them in the conclusion of this document.

### Section 2.1

1. In reference to the statement “However, the buildings do not meet the current standards that are applied to new developments”, there is no mention of what proportion of residential units in Cambridge **do** meet current standards. Any case for redevelopment that uses this as an argument would also apply to a vast proportion of the units in a historic city such as Cambridge.  
We ask that the Council provide statistics as to the proportion of council-owned residential units, and of all residential units, in Cambridge that do meet current standards.
2. With reference to the statement “In 2021, Cambridge City Council informed residents of a review into the condition of the Ekin Road Estate to understand the issues affecting leaseholders and tenants”, this explicitly excludes consideration of freeholders. And indeed, many freeholders on the estate report to us that they did **not** receive any such correspondence of this review in 2021.

### Section 2.4

1. In reference to the statement “an additional CSF has been added to assess the health and wellbeing improvement”, we note that no resident consultation was done by JLL or any of its representatives between the appointment of JLL in June 2023, and the publication of the report in August 2023. That is to say, this CSF was simply not considered in the shortlisting with regards to the health and wellbeing of current residents.

### Section 2.5.1

1. In reference to the statement “Each of the other partial redevelopment options (options 4-6) provide varying degrees of improvements with all having no red flags”, this supports the idea that options 4-6 are indeed **viable**, and that more, or all, of these options should have been included in the final shortlisting, especially seeing as considerations of health and wellbeing of current residents had yet to be taken into account (see comment 1 from Section 2.4 above).  
We request that Options 4 and 5 are also fully investigated by JLL as potential options for the estate.
2. In reference to the statement “Option 7 – Full Redevelopment ticks the most boxes out of the CSF’s compared to all other options with no potential red flags”, we disagree that there are no potential red flags. As is later referred to in the report, decanting residents poses various harms to them. Thus, as option 7 requires the largest decant, it poses the largest such harm. If anything,  
we propose that the CSF#11 for option 7 should be a **red flag**, given that it displaces several resident freeholders, several elderly residents, several long-term (>40 years) residents, and several disabled residents.

### Section 2.6

1. In reference to the key theme benefit “social”, we are of the opinion that this consideration has not been done properly, as it has only factored in future effect on future residents, and does not include current or future effects on current residents.  
We ask that the effects on current residents be factored in during the optioneering process.

### Section 2.7

1. In reference to the statement “Options 3-5 are not able to successfully maximise the opportunities for improved housing capacity, condition and quality of homes and estate layout

given the constraints of infill development”, no justification has been given as to **why these are the factors to maximise?** **Why is there no consideration for also maximising health and wellbeing of current residents? And why is “infill development” the only constraint mentioned, omitting other constraints such as harm to residents and the community?** This clearly demonstrates that this entire project is being viewed as a construction project, rather than a community project, reflecting our concern throughout these investigation works since 2022: no part of this project is being set up to specifically benefit the residents of Ekin Road.

2. In reference to the statement “options 6 and 7 will require decanting of the residents which may impact their health and wellbeing in terms of the stress and uncertainty associated with temporary relocation during the redevelopment”, this is a clear acknowledgement of the **harm that an unwanted decant process can do to residents**. Yet this harm is in no way measured in, let alone factored into, the shortlisting process.  
**We ask that JLL measure and factor in within the shortlisting process the harm that an unwanted decant can do to residents.**

### Section 3.1.2

1. In reference to the statement “the flat blocks require considerable investment to ensure a life span similar to those of the houses”, we see this as a strong argument towards **demolishing the flats and retaining the houses**, which we believe is what the shortlist options should have entailed. The report does not propose a single shortlist option that demolishes all the flats and retains all the houses; it is a deficient shortlist.

### Section 3.1.2.3

1. In reference to the statement “the number of dead ends and poor visibility in alleyways due to the lack of lighting”, we note that some of those alleyways, in particular the alleyway in the South East corner of the estate, is not within the redevelopment zone, so redevelopment works would not improve that aspect; it would need to be considered as a separate project. Moreover, no proposal to simply add lighting to that alleyway, or realign it so that it does not contain a ‘blind length’ (not visible from either entrance end) is included in the shortlisting options.
2. In reference to the table of crime included in this section, this table does not include any statistics for the ‘ward average’. There are approximately 10,000 residents in Abbey, approximately 250 (2.5%) of whom live on the combination of Ekin Road and Ekin Walk. Thus, one would expect the crime figures for the estate to be approximately 2.5% of all crime. Of all the categories listed, we note that when one rounds up to the nearest integer, in only 2 of the 17 categories does the estate have more than the expected 2.5% of instances of crime and these were only slight (‘robbery’, and ‘possession of drugs’, where in each case the expectation would have been 1 instance, whereas the estate reported 2 instances). For the remaining 15 categories, it is below this 2.5%, sometimes significantly. And in aggregate, of the 2376 instances of crime listed, 31 occurred on the estate, which is 1.3%. This is about half the average of the ward. It is thus completely fallacious to say that crime and antisocial behaviour is prevalent on the estate; rather, these statistics suggest that it is actually one of the safer parts of the ward, by a significant margin.
3. In reference to that same table, the boldface entries “Total Crime” and “Total Incidents” are not explained, nor do they correspond to any tallying of any column in the table.
4. In reference to the statement “more than 5 tonnes of waste were cleared on the 6th July 2023 during a recent community day. The waste collected consisted of household waste that was predominantly fly tipped”, we find this somewhat misleading, as it suggests that 5 tonnes of flytipped waste was collected. Rather, residents brought their waste out to the collection point. While there is certainly flytipping on the estate, it is not the case that on 6th July 2023 there was 5 tonnes of flytipped waste on the estate; there were 5 tonnes that residents had in their properties. To put this figure into perspective, if those 5 tonnes were all queen size mattresses (averaging 50kg each), then this would be over 100 mattresses which, if stacked up, would be over 10m high; double the height of one of the flat blocks. That much flytipped material would literally fill up all roadspace on the estate; these numbers are misleading, and overstate the problem.

#### Section 3.1.2.4

1. In reference to the statement “The current buildings were developed in the 1950s-1970s and are not aligned with the City Council’s vision of being a net zero carbon council by 2030 and delivering sustainable housing solutions.”, this is a political objective, rather than a pressing need of those most impacted by this project (the residents of the estate). And council properties account for but a tiny fraction of the housing in this historic city which, unfortunately, contains many other dwellings that are much less efficient than the housing on the estate.
2. In reference to the statement “The EPC ratings of the buildings on the estate are below the desired standard”, the EPC rating of the houses and bungalows can be improved to Band B (from Band C) by installation of PV panels, as outlined on page 5 of the Potter Raper Options Appraisals Report (August 2020).

#### Section 3.1.2.5

1. In reference to the statement “The maisonettes and flat blocks are not currently accessible to Part M4 Category 2 or above”, we note that there is no comment made about any accessibility issues relating to either the bungalows or houses; presumably this means no such issues exist. We ask JLL to clarify if there are any accessibility issues relating to either the bungalows or houses.

#### Section 3.2

1. In reference to the descriptions of options 3 and 4 in this section, we wish to point out that the housing needs in Cambridge are not just ‘more housing’, but also ‘the right type of housing’. These options might not deliver the increase in housing numbers the Council desires (in particular option 3), but it would deliver larger housing types (houses and maisonettes). Larger housing is extremely useful, as it can be used for those on the housing waitlist looking to upgrade to a larger property, thus freeing up their property for someone who is otherwise unhoused. In other words: a large maisonette, or house, serves to remove two entries from the housing waitlist, whereas a small or medium flat only removes one entry. We ask JLL to investigate what the knock-on effects on the housing waitlist would be if larger housing types (eg: houses) were built instead of smaller types (eg: flats).

#### Section 3.3.1

1. In reference to the statement “One Cambridge – Fair for All”, it hardly seems ‘fair for all’ to forcibly decant residents in perfectly good homes who strongly oppose being evicted (such as the houses and bungalows on Ekin Rd).

#### Section 3.3.2

1. In reference to the statement “accelerating housing delivery”, as the Council has set this as one of its core requirements, the report fails to outline any potential delays that the project might encounter if residents launch a legal challenge to the development which proceeds to public inquiry. Such a process would add several years to the project timeline, and potentially plunge the entire project into uncertainty. If speed of delivery is a core requirement of the project, then this should have been evaluated as part of the shortlisting process. We ask JLL to investigate what potential delays the project might encounter if residents launch a legal challenge to the development which proceeds to public inquiry, how this would affect delivery of the project, and to factor this analysis into any optioneering done.

#### Section 3.4

1. In reference to the statement “The three storey flat blocks that exist on the current site are some of the few examples of taller residential buildings located in the area”, the report fails to address the history of Ekin Rd, which we outline here. The flats are postwar (WWII) constructions; part of the ‘homes for heroes’ program. They were put up in haste, and were not intended as permanent structures. Once enough flats had been constructed on the estate, the council then started constructing the houses. Those in the flats would wait for their assigned house to be

completed, and would then move from their flat into their house. The original intention was that the flats would be taken down and replaced with more of the same houses; the fact that they still stand today is somewhat of a miracle, and their time is now well and truly up. The estate was intended as an estate of houses. Indeed, there are 72 flats which, if demolished, would make space for an additional 40 of the same houses. Those, combined with the 32 houses already built, would make up a 72-house estate. Ekin Rd was never intended to be a high-density housing estate; the flats were placed there as a temporary solution to the post-WWII housing need, to be later replaced with houses.

So the current options 6 and 7 go completely against this original plan, and it is indeed a strange and out-of-character plan to have such high-density housing in an estate that is in the middle of low-density housing area and not even on a main road, and we ask JLL to factor this into the optioneering being done.

### Section 3.5

1. In reference to the statement “The Liaison Groups meet regularly where the Council conducts resident engagement to ensure resident voices are heard throughout the process”, this is not a true reflection of how such meetings are conducted. These meetings are primarily a ‘lecture’ by council officers, with minimal opportunity for residents to make comments or ask questions. And they are often very poorly run, as residents wrote about here: [www.saveekinroad.co.uk/news/LG2023-09/](http://www.saveekinroad.co.uk/news/LG2023-09/)
2. In reference to the statement “These sessions are not decision-making groups but rather opportunities for the Council to report on progress and for residents to feedback from the information provided.”, this is not a true reflection of how such meetings are conducted. It is very difficult for residents to ‘feedback from the information provided.’ Indeed, with regards to the report, the Council ran a Liaison Group meeting on 3 September 2023 to discuss it, but residents were not provided with a copy of the (58 page) report until the start of the meeting, even though many residents had been requesting it for weeks in advance. Thus, it is incorrect to call this ‘engagement with stakeholders’; this is lecturing of stakeholders, which is a very different thing.  
We ask the Cambridge City Council to revise the way Liaison Group meetings are run, to ensure that they are genuinely interactive and give residents ample time and opportunity to voice their thoughts and concerns.
3. In reference to the statement “However, it is not known as to the extent of the membership of the “Save Ekin Road” Community Group on the estate.”, this shows either insufficient research done on the part of JLL, or insufficient communication from the Council to JLL. Save Ekin Road emailed the Council a letter of introduction in September 2022, which contained the signatures of 52 residents of the estate; the extent of the membership of Save Ekin Road is well-known, but JLL have not made sufficient efforts to discover this. Moreover, Save Ekin Road made many requests to the Council throughout July and August 2023 for the contact details of JLL, so that we might speak with them directly. These were all refused. So this statement is, ultimately, an example of willful ignorance, demonstrating the poor quality of resident engagement by the Council to date.  
We request that the Cambridge City Council and JLL actively seek engagement with Save Ekin Road as a recognised and relevant stakeholder, in all future investigatory work.

### Section 3.7

1. In reference to the statement within the CSF table (entry #11) “whilst also examining the impacts on the community.”, we wish to highlight that no community study or engagement was carried out by JLL prior to the production of the report. CSF#11 was therefore completely under-addressed in the report; JLL did not have adequate information from residents to properly understand the impacts of any of the options on the community, and we request that they acknowledge this deficiency and proceed to produce a shortlist that does address CSF#11.
2. In reference to the statement “From June 2023 to September 2023, the evaluation matrix has been used to identify the shortlist of options for the Ekin Road Estate,” this is simply false. As outlined above, CSF#11 has not in any way been adequately addressed by JLL in the production

of the report. It can't have been, because residents were not consulted, so JLL had little (if any) understanding of the impacts on residents.

#### Section 3.8.1.1

1. In reference to the table used in this section, one can clearly see that the greatest increase in number of dwellings, area, and energy intensity, all occur at the interface between options 3 and 4. That is, option 4 is the 'fundamental shift' on the estate. Thus, even in the absence of any other argument (and noting that this option has no red flags), for this reason alone option 4 should have been included in the shortlisting.
2. In reference to the statement "Breakdown by unit type available in Appendix A", we note that Appendix A contains no breakdown for option 3. It instead contains the breakdown for option 2 listed twice.

We ask that JLL provide in Appendix A the breakdown by unit type for option 3.

#### Section 3.8.1.3

1. In reference to the statement "Keeping embodied carbon low during the development phase is difficult and all of this carbon would need to be offset for a Net Zero construction", there should be more emphasis in the report on the impacts of embodied carbon during the development phase. Carbon offsetting is a very simple 'carbon bookkeeping' trick that has almost nothing to do with the carbon emissions from the project itself. This is a classic example of greenwashing, and whether or not the Council supports endeavours and activities elsewhere that are carbon-reducing does nothing to change the carbon footprint of this project.

#### Section 3.8.1.4

1. In reference to the statement "The per unit carbon performance is relatively similar across all four options [options 4-7]", this clearly shows that there is no strong environmental argument which distinguishes between options 4,5,6,7. That is, there is no good (environmental) reason to demolish any of the houses on the estate; all the environmental benefits are already gained by option 4 (another reason why it should have been shortlisted). Indeed, the later statement in this section, "Overall, redeveloping the houses will have a relatively low per unit carbon improvement due to the low number of houses on-site but redeveloping the other unit types will have a more pronounced positive effect on operational efficiency and cost reductions.", further supports this.

#### Section 3.9

1. In reference to the statement "The individual CSFs have not been weighted, with the number of flags being used as the primary assessment of whether the option meets the required standard.", this shows a clear flaw in the methodology of the report. Some of the CSFs are indeed critical, such as CSF9 (fire safety) and CSF11 (resident wellbeing). To place these in the comparison on equal footing with factors such as CSF5 (innovate and maximise resources) and CSF10 (improved resident amenities) highlights these flaws. Without proper weighing, these success factors become almost meaningless in a comparative analysis, especially for the purposes of shortlisting.

We request that JLL produce a meaningful and justified weighing of the 11 CSFs being used to evaluate and shortlist options for the estate, and then re-run the shortlisting accordingly to properly compare performance against all these (weighted) CSFs.

#### Section 3.9.1.4

1. In reference to yellow-flagged CSF#3 in the table, and the statement there of "The new buildings will be of a high standard while the retained houses will maintain their original design and quality.", there is no reason why this option could not include some sort of refurbishment of the remaining (council-owned) houses, such as the addition of PV panels (as mentioned earlier), replacement of windows to meet new regulations and new efficiency standards. Moreover, this CSF#3 is yellow-flagged in option 4, but green-flagged in options 5-7; given that option 4 already demolishes and replaces 90 of the 122 dwellings on the estate, and the potential for

minor refurbishment of the remaining 32 houses, it seems unreasonable to label this CSF#3 with a yellow flag.

We ask that JLL include potential refurbishment work to non-redeveloped council-owned dwellings in Option 4, and re-evaluate CSF#3 for that option accordingly.

2. In reference to the yellow-flagged CSF#10, and the statement there of “By only retaining the houses, new amenities can also be incorporated behind the new buildings but there is an inability to provide green space and placemaking.”, we note that there is already green space on the estate, and moreover there is significant greenspace adjacent to the estate (along Wadloes Road), extensive greenspace within 200m of the estate (eg: Dudley Rd Rec), and vast greenspace within 500m of the estate (Ditton Meadows). Thus, the inability to add more greenspace to the estate is not a significant factor; indeed, Abbey is a top-ranking ward in Cambridge for greenspace.

We ask JLL to justify why such emphasis is being placed on adding greenspace to this project, given the estate sits within the top-ranking ward in Cambridge for greenspace.

3. In reference to the yellow-flagged CSF#11, and the statement there of “Decanting will be required which will impact resident wellbeing.”, it is inconsistent to label this CSF yellow, when the same CSF#11 for options 5-7 are all labelled green. Those options require additional decanting, and not just that, they decant some of the residents least willing to go and/or most at risk from a decant (eg: the elderly, resident freeholders, etc). If anything, CSF#11 of option 4 should be green-flagged, and CSF#11 of option 7 yellow- or even red-flagged; we discuss this further later on.

We ask that JLL factor in the harm to residents caused by decanting, when evaluating CSF#11 for the various options.

#### Section 3.9.1.1 (the “option 7” version of this section, as it is repeated several times)

1. In reference to the green-flagged CSF#11, and the statement there of “Decanting will be required but the improvements will enhance long-term health and wellbeing.”, we strongly disagree with this green-flag categorisation. As already mentioned previously, this option decants some of the most vulnerable and susceptible people on the estate, and those who are least willing to go. Many of the residents in the houses have been there for over 40 years, or are resident freeholders, or are elderly, or are disabled, or have a young family (or some combination of these). We believe that this should have been given a red-flag categorisation. The reference to ‘improvements will enhance long-term health and wellbeing’ is immaterial for some of those being decanted in this option, as they will not experience any of these benefits. They are harmed, significantly, so that others in the future may benefit (but not them). This observation also applies to CSF#11 of options 5 and 6, but obviously to a lesser extent as those options demolish fewer houses; they should still have at least a yellow classification, and still quite possibly red depending on how many houses each option demolishes.

#### Section 3.10

1. In reference to the final row in the table, labelled “CSF#11”, it is simply not true to include this as a filled-in row with colour classification. Nowhere near enough resident engagement was done to warrant this, and the report should say words to that effect, and leave the row blank. Thus, the report is incomplete and cannot produce solid conclusions, as not all CSFs have been properly evaluated. It is a basic principle of optimisation that optimising first over a subset of the full parameter set will almost always negatively impact how the remaining parameters are treated. In this instance, the report excludes far too many good investigatory options, and retains a poorly-selected choice of options for further analysis.
2. In reference to the statement “While Option 5 has 8 green flags, it still has limitations as the exclusion of some of the low-density buildings and the inability to alter the estate’s layout means the housing capacity of the estate cannot be maximised.”, why is it assumed that the ‘optimal outcome’ is the one that corresponds to the ‘maximal housing’. There is a very human aspect to a regeneration project such as this, and that seems to have been completely lost in the shortlisting evaluation process. Ekin Rd is an estate with people on it; it is not (yet) a construction site, and it is wrong and downright immoral to simply treat it as such at this stage.
3. In reference to the statement “From a strategic perspective, while clearly opposed by some

residents who feel strongly that they want to remain in their current houses, Option 7 best meets the Critical Success Factors, drawn from the Council's strategic objectives.”, it would perhaps be nice if the residents of the street could be viewed as people with feelings and concerns, rather than as pawns to be strategised over and around in the Council's aims to realise its own ambitions. Of all the statements in the report, this one is the most egregious in portraying residents as some sort of opponent to be challenged and defeated, rather than the very people that should be understood and helped by this regeneration process. This statement makes it clear that the residents are ‘in the way’ of the project that the Council wants to carry out; there is nothing more dehumanising than portraying residents as opponents and enemies of the Council, and we resent such representations and language.

## Section 5.2

1. In reference to the statement “The increased number of residents from the new units may increase the reliance and expenditure on local transport.” in both the table for options 4-6, and the table for option 7, this is somewhat optimistic. The more realistic interpretation would be that the local public transport (buses) would simply become more crowded, without any corresponding increase in service frequency or capacity.

We ask that JLL fully investigate the additional pressure on local public transport services if more housing is built, and liaise with the providers of those services to see if they have any intentions of adding more capacity if there is increased demand.

2. In reference to the statement “Option 2 which could involve no decanting will preserve residents' wellbeing as there will be little disruption from relocation as a result of the need to decant”, this clearly demonstrates that there is indeed harm caused by decanting residents. Yet, at several other places in the report, this is overlooked or, more accurately, brushed aside. Decanting harms residents; this is well understood. Decanting residents from properties which are not fit for purpose and whose residents want to go is already a difficult process; decanting vulnerable residents from perfectly good properties who have expressed a strong desire to stay causes all sorts of harm, in ways that cannot be easily solved, rectified, or compensated for, if at all.

We request that the Cambridge City Council, and JLL, properly investigate and quantify the harm caused by decanting residents, the extent of such harm for each longlist option, and how much this harm is offset by later benefits for those residents being decanted.

## Section 6

1. In reference to the statement “When analysing each of the options against the 11 Critical Success Factors”, for reasons stated earlier we dispute this assertion, as not all 11 CSFs were properly investigated or considered, in particular CSF#11.
2. In reference to the statement “When assessing each of the remaining options against the CSFs, it is clear that as the level of redevelopment increases, the number of green flags associated with the CSFs increases accordingly.”, for reasons stated earlier we dispute this assertion. We have already identified CSFs which we believe get worse in latter options, and that some of these latter options have more yellow flags, and potentially some red flags (eg: CSF#11 of option 7, and potentially of options 5 and 6 also).
3. In reference to the statement “However, the preservation of most of the houses poses a constraint on the opportunity to fully maximise the development density on the estate”, for reasons stated earlier we dispute the fact that development density should be maximised on the estate. This was never intended to be a high-density estate; historically it was intended as a low-density estate, in keeping with the surrounding area. Moreover, maximising development density ignores the impact on current residents, and is a ‘businessman's objective’, rather than what should be the objectives of a city council - its residents.
4. In reference to the statement “Option 7 has increased political risk from opposing residents”, we wish to point out that ‘political risk’ is the symptom here, not the disease. What this should really say is ‘Option 7 has increased risk of harm to the wellbeing of residents on the estate, a consequence of which is that they are (quite justifiably) likely to mount political opposition to such a plan as it would be extremely detrimental to them’. Political risk does not come from



- disgruntled residents; it comes from residents who are worried and downright scared of what will happen to them as a result of option 7 (and, to a lesser extent, options 5 and 6 also).
5. In reference to the statement “To exclude either of these options [6 and 7] would hinder the opportunities on the estate to achieve significant overall estate improvements for the local community and wider benefits for Cambridge.”, though this might be true, to **include** these options completely ignores the significant harm done to some of the residents of the estate. As was said by our spokesperson at the September 2022 Housing Scrutiny Committee meeting: ‘You are making the people of Abbey pay for a Cambridge-wide problem.’ Nothing has changed since then; not the harm this project is likely to inflict on residents, nor the Council’s wilful dismissal of that harm.
  6. In reference to the statement “We understand all partial and full redevelopment options will require a level of decanting which will impact resident health and wellbeing short-term in terms of the negative associated wellbeing impacts from temporary relocation.”, we wish to point out that for the category of resident freeholders and leaseholders, this relocation will be **permanent**. The cost of newbuild flats or houses on Ekin Road will far surpass the amount of financial compensation those leaseholders and freeholders will receive; those residents will simply be priced out of their own street, never to return. For them, it is permanent. And moreover, Ekin Road has some of the cheapest housing in Cambridge, so for some, they may not even be able to afford to purchase another property. So not only will they be priced out of their own street, they may even be priced out of their own city.
  7. In reference to the statement “However, the long-term improvements across the whole estate from the short-listed options should significantly improve the general health and wellbeing of all residents long-term.”, please allow us to share with you a story of a resident on Ekin Road. They live in one of the houses, are elderly, and have been in their house for over 45 years. They are now almost totally blind, and the only way they can navigate their own home is because they have lived in it for so long and learned the layout before their eyesight deteriorated. The report says that the short-listed options should significantly improve the general health and wellbeing of **all** residents long-term. Tell us, then, how these options will improve the health and wellbeing of a blind resident who may be forced into a new home they are unfamiliar with, and will never be familiar with in the way they are with their current home?

## Conclusion

We provide here a summary of our main concerns about the report, and then a list of actions we propose that the Cambridge City Council and/or JLL carry out.

### Summary:

Overall, the report is a stark display of de-humanisation of the community on Ekin Road, viewing the project as a construction project, rather than a community project. This reflects our ongoing concerns throughout these investigation works, going back to 2022: no part of this project is being set up to specifically benefit the residents of Ekin Road. It is a building project, in its objectives, its investigations, and its desired outcomes. That some of the current residents might benefit from this project is pure luck, and it is clear that it is not being done specifically for their benefit.

The report does not propose a single shortlist option that demolishes all the flats and retains all the houses. Thus, it is a deficient shortlist, as it is manifestly obvious that those are two key outcomes that would be core to a successful implementation of this project.

The report is incomplete and cannot produce solid conclusions, as nowhere near enough resident engagement was done to properly evaluate CSF#11 (“Improve the health and wellbeing of residents”). It is a basic principle of optimisation that optimising first over a subset of the full parameter set will almost always negatively impact how the remaining parameters are treated. In this instance, the report excludes far too many good investigatory options, and retains a poorly-selected choice of options for further analysis, heavily skewed towards technical gains and to the detriment of resident wellbeing.

We remain extremely concerned that the report repeatedly suggests that the ‘optimal outcome’ for the estate is the one that corresponds to the ‘maximal housing’. There is a very human aspect to a regeneration project such as this, and that seems to have been completely lost in the shortlisting evaluation process. Ekin Rd is an estate with people on it; it is not (yet) a construction site, and it is wrong and downright immoral to simply treat it as such at this stage.

Nowhere are these concerns about the dehumanising nature of the report reflected better than in the statement “From a strategic perspective, while clearly opposed by some residents who feel strongly that they want to remain in their current houses, Option 7 best meets the Critical Success Factors, drawn from the Council’s strategic objectives.”. It would perhaps be nice if the residents of the estate could be viewed as people with feelings and concerns, rather than as pawns to be strategised over and around in the Council’s aims to realise its own ambitions. Of all the statements in the report, this one is the most egregious in portraying residents as some sort of opponent to be challenged and defeated, rather than the very people that should be understood and helped by this regeneration process. This statement makes it clear that the residents are ‘in the way’ of the project that the Council wants to carry out; there is nothing more dehumanising than portraying residents as opponents and enemies of the Council, and we resent such representations and language.

## **Actions we request:**

We collate and repeat here all direct requests for action by the Cambridge City Council and/or JLL. These were already underlined throughout the document.

1. We ask that the Council provide statistics as to the proportion of council-owned residential units, and of all residential units, in Cambridge that do meet current standards.
2. We request that Options 4 and 5 are also fully investigated by JLL as potential options for the estate.
3. We propose that the CSF#11 for option 7 should be a red flag, given that it displaces several resident freeholders, several elderly residents, several long-term (>40 years) residents, and several disabled residents.
4. We ask that the effects on current residents be factored in during the optioneering process.
5. We ask that JLL justify why “improved housing capacity, condition and quality of homes and estate layout” are the factors to maximise, and why there is no consideration for also maximising health and wellbeing of current residents? And we also ask why “infill development” is the only constraint mentioned, omitting other constraints such as harm to residents and the community?
6. We ask that JLL measure and factor in within the shortlisting process the harm that an unwanted decant can do to residents.
7. We ask JLL to clarify if there are any accessibility issues relating to either the bungalows or houses.
8. We ask JLL to investigate what the knock-on effects on the housing waitlist would be if larger housing types (eg: houses) were built instead of smaller types (eg: flats).
9. We ask JLL to investigate what potential delays the project might encounter if residents launch a legal challenge to the development which proceeds to public inquiry, how this would affect delivery of the project, and to factor this analysis into any optioneering done.
10. We ask JLL to acknowledge that the current options 6 and 7 go completely against the original 1940s intention for the estate, and it is indeed a strange and out-of-character plan to have such high-density housing in an estate that is in the middle of low-density housing area and not even on a main road. We ask JLL to factor this into the optioneering being done.
11. We ask the Cambridge City Council to revise the way Liaison Group meetings are run, to ensure that they are genuinely interactive and give residents ample time and opportunity to voice their thoughts and concerns.
12. We request that the Cambridge City Council and JLL actively seek engagement with Save Ekin Road as a recognised and relevant stakeholder, in all future investigatory work.
13. CSF#11 was completely under-addressed in the report; JLL did not have adequate information from residents to properly understand the impacts of any of the options on the community, and we request that they acknowledge this deficiency and proceed to produce a shortlist that does address CSF#11.
14. We ask that JLL provide in Appendix A the breakdown by unit type for option 3.
15. We request that JLL produce a meaningful and justified weighing of the 11 CFSs being used to evaluate and shortlist options for the estate, and then re-run the shortlisting accordingly to properly compare performance against all these (weighted) CSFs.
16. We ask that JLL include potential refurbishment work to non-redeveloped council-owned dwellings in Option 4, and re-evaluate CSF#3 for that option accordingly.
17. We ask JLL to justify why such emphasis is being placed on adding greenspace to this project, given the estate sits within the top-ranking ward in Cambridge for greenspace.
18. We ask that JLL factor in the harm to residents caused by decanting, when evaluating CSF#11 for the various options.
19. We ask that JLL fully investigate the additional pressure on local public transport services if more housing is built, and liaise with the providers of those services to see if they have any intentions of adding more capacity if there is increased demand.
20. We request that the Cambridge City Council, and JLL, properly investigate and quantify the harm caused by decanting residents, the extent of such harm for each longlist option, and how much this harm is offset by later benefits for those residents being decanted.