

Pearton, Brad

Sent: 21 August 2023 14:05
Subject: FW: Women Building Steering Group [Redacted]

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, April 12, 2023 5:22 PM
To: [Redacted]
Subject: RE: Women Building Steering Group

Hi All

Please see below action log from the Joint Steering Group meeting that was held on 28 March 2023. The next meeting will be held on 23 April at 4pm. An agenda will be circulated in due course

Women's Building Joint Steering Group Meeting – 28 March 2023

Attendees

[Redacted] (JP) – chair
[Redacted] (TP)
[Redacted] (LD)
[Redacted] (LW)
[Redacted] (SPK)
[Redacted] (PR)
[Redacted] (TW)

1.0	Introductions	Owner
1.1	LD to enquire with her contacts if there is any interest in joining the Joint Steering Group to expand its membership	LD
2.0	Inner Circle Presentation – Feasibility Study & Commissioning Plan	
2.1	Local councillors and local community groups to be included as stakeholders in future publications/slides on engagement approach	LW/SPK
2.2	Both qualitative and quantitative outcomes of services to be measured and reviewed under the feasibility study	LW/SPK
2.3	JP to provide Inner Circle with the contact details for LBI's Inclusive Economy team	JP
3.0	AHMM Presentation – Generic Fit Out Specification	
3.1	Design workshop to be arranged with the whole steering group to feed comments into the draft fit out specification	TW
4.0	Women's Building Construction Programme	
4.1	The governance process for LBI's decision for the speculative fit out option to be reviewed by LBI. TW to set out the programme for the decision for LBI review.	TW
5.0	Community Partners Reference Group	
5.1	TP to draft introductory email to the members of the Community Partners Reference Group, advising that Inner Circle will be in touch with each group after Easter as part of the commencement of the feasibility study	TP
5.2	TW to share existing stakeholder list from previous consultations with JP	TW

[Redacted] | Development

Tel: [Redacted] | Email: [Redacted]
Peabody, 45 Westminster Bridge Road, London, SE1 7JB
Web: www.peabodynewhomes.co.uk



More than just a place to live     

From: [Redacted]
Sent: 23 March 2023 13:38
To: [Redacted]
Subject: RE: Women Building Steering Group

Hi All

Ahead of next week's Joint Steering Group meeting, please see below agenda:

1. Introductions (All) – 5 mins
2. High level construction programme for the Women's Building ([Redacted]) – 10 mins
3. AHMM presentation of the fit out specification (draft spec now circulated to the Group) (AHMM – [Redacted]) – 70 mins
4. Inner Circle introduction on the feasibility study and commissioning plan (Inner Circle – [Redacted]) – 15 mins
5. Community Partners Reference Group ([Redacted]) - 10 mins
6. Fundraiser Role [Redacted] – 5 mins
7. AOB (All) – 5 mins

Thanks

[Redacted] | **Development & Sales**
Mob: [Redacted] | Email: [Redacted]
Peabody | 45 Westminster Bridge Road | London SE1 7JB

www.peabody.org.uk | Follow us on [Facebook](#), [Twitter](#) and [Instagram](#)

-----Original Appointment-----

From: [Redacted]
Sent: 01 February 2023 09:59
To: [Redacted]
Subject: Women Building Steering Group
When: 28 March 2023 16:00-18:00 (UTC+00:00) Dublin, Edinburgh, Lisbon, London.
Where: Microsoft Teams Meeting; Teams.TH.Rm2Committee

Do you know who sent this email?

This is an external email and may not be genuine. Please don't reply or click on any links in this email unless you're absolutely sure who sent the email. If you need help deciding please contact the IT Service Desk.

Committee Room 2 at Islington Town Hall has been booked for those attending in-person

Microsoft Teams meeting

Join on your computer, mobile app or room device

[Click here to join the meeting](#)

Meeting ID: 396 438 590 020

Passcode: 5HvJdU

[Download Teams](#) | [Join on the web](#)

[Learn More](#) | [Meeting options](#)

This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. If you have received it in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer. Please be aware that information in this email may be confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected.

Any views set out in this email are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of the Peabody Group. This email and any files transmitted with it may be confidential and/ or privileged and are intended solely for the use of the person to whom they are addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete the material immediately without using, forwarding or sharing it in any way, and let Peabody know by calling 020 7021 4444.

Peabody Trust, registered office 45 Westminster Bridge Road, London SE1 7JB. Peabody Trust is a charitable Community Benefit Society registered with the Financial Conduct Authority under the Co-operative and Community Benefit Societies Act 2014 (number 7741) and with the Regulator of Social Housing (number 4878). Please help us to respect the environment by not printing this e-mail. Full details of the above entities and other legal entities in the Peabody Group can be found on our web-site: <https://www.peabodygroup.org.uk/about-us>

Pearton, Brad

Sent: 21 August 2023 14:32
Subject: FW: Holloway (Joint Steering Group - Draft Agenda) _ [Redacted]

From: [Redacted]
Sent: 20 March 2023 16:12
To: Pilling2, Jodi <Jodi.Pilling2@islington.gov.uk>
Cc: [Redacted]
Subject: RE: Holloway (Joint Steering Group - Draft Agenda)

[External]

Of course, see below. I've also included 5 mins to update on the fundraiser role.

1. Introductions (All) – 5 mins
2. High level construction programme for the Women's Building ([Redacted]) – 10 mins
3. AHMM presentation of the fit out specification (draft spec now circulated to the Group) (AHMM) – 70 mins
4. Inner Circle introduction on the feasibility study and commissioning plan (Inner Circle) – 15 mins
5. Community Partners Reference Group (Jodi) - 10 mins
6. Fundraiser [Redacted] – 5 mins
7. AOB (All) – 5 mins

[Redacted] | Development & Sales
Mob: [Redacted] | Email: [Redacted]
Peabody | 45 Westminster Bridge Road | London SE1 7JB

www.peabody.org.uk | Follow us on [Facebook](#), [Twitter](#) and [Instagram](#)

From: Pilling2, Jodi <xxxx.xxxxxxxx@xxxxxxx.xxx>
Sent: 20 March 2023 10:02
To: [Redacted]
Cc: [Redacted]
Subject: [External] RE: Holloway (Joint Steering Group - Draft Agenda)

Do you know who sent this email?

This is an external email and may not be genuine. Please don't reply or click on any links in this email unless you're absolutely sure who sent the email. If you need help deciding please contact the IT Service Desk.

I would like to add ten minutes to discuss the Community Partners Reference Group – can we shave a few minutes of each item for this?

Jodi Pilling (She / Her)
Director of Strategic Commissioning and Investment
Adult's and Children's



From: [Redacted]
Sent: 20 March 2023 09:50
To: Pilling2, Jodi <Jodi.Pilling2@islington.gov.uk>
Cc: [Redacted] >
Subject: Holloway (Joint Steering Group - Draft Agenda)

[External]

Hi Jodi

Hope you had a good weekend. For next week's JSG meeting, can I suggest the following agenda:

1. Introductions – 5 mins
2. High level construction programme for the Women's Building ([Redacted]) – 15 mins
3. AHMM presentation of the fit out specification (draft spec now circulated to the Group) (AHMM) – 75 mins
4. Inner Circle introduction on the feasibility study and commissioning plan (Inner Circle) – 20 mins
5. AOB – 5 mins

Let me know your thoughts

[Redacted]

[Redacted] | **Development & Sales**

Mob: +[Redacted] | Email: [Redacted]

Peabody | 45 Westminster Bridge Road | London SE1 7JB

www.peabody.org.uk | Follow us on [Facebook](#), [Twitter](#) and [Instagram](#)

Any views set out in this email are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of the Peabody Group. This email and any files transmitted with it may be confidential and/ or privileged and are intended solely for the use of the person to whom they are addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete the material immediately without using, forwarding or sharing it in any way, and let Peabody know by calling 020 7021 4444.

Details of the main landlord entities in the Peabody Group are: Peabody Trust, registered office 45 Westminster Bridge Road, London SE1 7JB and Catalyst Housing Limited, registered office Ealing Gateway, 26 – 30 Uxbridge Road, London W5 2AU. Peabody Trust is a charitable Community Benefit Society registered with the Financial Conduct Authority under the Co-operative and Community Benefit Societies Act 2014 (number 7741) and with the Regulator of Social Housing (number 4878). Catalyst Housing Limited is a charitable Community Benefit Society registered with the Financial Conduct Authority under the Co-operative and Community Benefit Societies Act 2014 (number 16561R) and with the Regulator of Social Housing (number L0699). Connect Property Services Limited is a company registered in England (number 04721044), registered office Ealing Gateway, 26 - 30 Uxbridge Road, London W5 2AU. Please help us to respect the environment by not printing this e-mail. Full details of the above entities and other legal entities in the Peabody Group can be found on our web-site: <https://www.peabodygroup.org.uk/about-us>

This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. If you have received it in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer. Please be aware that information in this email may be confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected.

Any views set out in this email are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of the Peabody Group. This email and any files transmitted with it may be confidential and/ or privileged and are intended solely for the use of the person to whom they are addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete the material immediately without using, forwarding or sharing it in any way, and let Peabody know by calling 020 7021 4444.

Details of the main landlord entities in the Peabody Group are: Peabody Trust, registered office 45 Westminster Bridge Road, London SE1 7JB and Catalyst Housing Limited, registered office Ealing Gateway, 26 – 30 Uxbridge Road, London W5 2AU. Peabody Trust is a charitable Community Benefit Society registered with the Financial Conduct Authority under the Co-operative and Community Benefit Societies Act 2014 (number 7741) and with the Regulator of Social Housing (number 4878). Catalyst Housing Limited is a charitable Community Benefit Society registered with the Financial Conduct Authority under the Co-operative and Community Benefit Societies Act 2014 (number 16561R) and with the Regulator of Social Housing (number L0699). Connect Property Services Limited is a company registered in England (number 04721044), registered office Ealing Gateway, 26 - 30 Uxbridge Road, London W5 2AU. Please help us to respect the environment by not printing this e-mail. Full details of the above entities and other legal entities in the Peabody Group can be found on our web-site: <https://www.peabodygroup.org.uk/about-us>

Pearton, Brad

Sent: 21 August 2023 14:05
Subject: FW: Women Building Steering Group [Redacted]

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, April 12, 2023 5:22 PM
To: [Redacted]
Subject: RE: Women Building Steering Group

Hi All

Please see below action log from the Joint Steering Group meeting that was held on 28 March 2023. The next meeting will be held on 23 April at 4pm. An agenda will be circulated in due course

Women's Building Joint Steering Group Meeting – 28 March 2023

Attendees

[Redacted] (JP) – chair
[Redacted] (TP)
[Redacted] (LD)
[Redacted] (LW)
[Redacted] (SPK)
[Redacted] (PR)
[Redacted] (TW)

1.0	Introductions	Owner
1.1	LD to enquire with her contacts if there is any interest in joining the Joint Steering Group to expand its membership	LD
2.0	Inner Circle Presentation – Feasibility Study & Commissioning Plan	
2.1	Local councillors and local community groups to be included as stakeholders in future publications/slides on engagement approach	LW/SPK
2.2	Both qualitative and quantitative outcomes of services to be measured and reviewed under the feasibility study	LW/SPK
2.3	JP to provide Inner Circle with the contact details for LBI's Inclusive Economy team	JP
3.0	AHMM Presentation – Generic Fit Out Specification	
3.1	Design workshop to be arranged with the whole steering group to feed comments into the draft fit out specification	TW
4.0	Women's Building Construction Programme	
4.1	The governance process for LBI's decision for the speculative fit out option to be reviewed by LBI. TW to set out the programme for the decision for LBI review.	TW
5.0	Community Partners Reference Group	
5.1	TP to draft introductory email to the members of the Community Partners Reference Group, advising that Inner Circle will be in touch with each group after Easter as part of the commencement of the feasibility study	TP
5.2	TW to share existing stakeholder list from previous consultations with JP	TW

[Redacted] | Development

Tel: [Redacted] | Email: [Redacted]
Peabody, 45 Westminster Bridge Road, London, SE1 7JB
Web: www.peabodynewhomes.co.uk



More than just a place to live     

From: [Redacted]
Sent: 23 March 2023 13:38
To: [Redacted]
Subject: RE: Women Building Steering Group

Hi All

Ahead of next week's Joint Steering Group meeting, please see below agenda:

1. Introductions (All) – 5 mins
2. High level construction programme for the Women's Building ([Redacted]) – 10 mins
3. AHMM presentation of the fit out specification (draft spec now circulated to the Group) (AHMM – [Redacted]) – 70 mins
4. Inner Circle introduction on the feasibility study and commissioning plan (Inner Circle – [Redacted]) – 15 mins
5. Community Partners Reference Group ([Redacted]) - 10 mins
6. Fundraiser Role [Redacted] – 5 mins
7. AOB (All) – 5 mins

Thanks

[Redacted] | Development & Sales
Mob: [Redacted] | Email: [Redacted]
Peabody | 45 Westminster Bridge Road | London SE1 7JB

www.peabody.org.uk | Follow us on [Facebook](#), [Twitter](#) and [Instagram](#)

-----Original Appointment-----

From: [Redacted]
Sent: 01 February 2023 09:59
To: [Redacted]
Subject: Women Building Steering Group
When: 28 March 2023 16:00-18:00 (UTC+00:00) Dublin, Edinburgh, Lisbon, London.
Where: Microsoft Teams Meeting; Teams.TH.Rm2Committee

Do you know who sent this email?

This is an external email and may not be genuine. Please don't reply or click on any links in this email unless you're absolutely sure who sent the email. If you need help deciding please contact the IT Service Desk.

Committee Room 2 at Islington Town Hall has been booked for those attending in-person

Microsoft Teams meeting

Join on your computer, mobile app or room device

[Click here to join the meeting](#)

Meeting ID: 396 438 590 020

Passcode: 5HvJdU

[Download Teams](#) | [Join on the web](#)

[Learn More](#) | [Meeting options](#)

This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. If you have received it in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer. Please be aware that information in this email may be confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected.

Any views set out in this email are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of the Peabody Group. This email and any files transmitted with it may be confidential and/ or privileged and are intended solely for the use of the person to whom they are addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete the material immediately without using, forwarding or sharing it in any way, and let Peabody know by calling 020 7021 4444.

Peabody Trust, registered office 45 Westminster Bridge Road, London SE1 7JB. Peabody Trust is a charitable Community Benefit Society registered with the Financial Conduct Authority under the Co-operative and Community Benefit Societies Act 2014 (number 7741) and with the Regulator of Social Housing (number 4878). Please help us to respect the environment by not printing this e-mail. Full details of the above entities and other legal entities in the Peabody Group can be found on our web-site: <https://www.peabodygroup.org.uk/about-us>

Pearton, Brad

Subject: FW: CP4H involvement in the Women's Building Steering Group

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Community Engagement Plan4Holloway** <engage.plan4holl@x>

Date: Thu, Mar 9, 2023 at 3:39 PM

Subject: CP4H involvement in the Women's Building Steering Group

To:

Cc:

Dear Kaya,

We are writing to formally protest Community Plan For Holloway's exclusion from the Women's Building Steering Group.

We have corresponded both with [REDACTED] and with Cllr Ward about this, giving detailed reasons why CP4H should be part of the group, but we remain on the outside.

Below you will find a list of signatures from womens' groups, service organisations and individuals with an interest in the Women's Building, who request CP4H be included in the Steering Group.

Please heed their request.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED] Co-Chair, on behalf of the Trustees, the Community Plan for Holloway

To: Kaya Comer-Schwartz

Leader, Islington Council

Dear Ms. Comer-Schwarz,

We the undersigned support the request of the Community Plan for Holloway to be represented on the Steering Group for the Women's Building currently being planned for the former HMP Holloway site. We understand that the Steering Group currently has representation from the Council and from the developer, and will also include some as-yet unnamed individuals to be chosen by the Council.

We believe the Steering Group must include at least one formal representative to speak for women's groups and service providers, and for the wider community, which has demonstrated how much it cares about HMP's legacy since the prison was closed 7 years ago.

The Community Plan For Holloway is the right organisation to provide that representative. We therefore ask that you ensure the Steering Group provides a "place at the table" for CP4H.

Yours faithfully,

1. [REDACTED] Chair, Holloway United Therapies (HUT)
2. [REDACTED], Artistic Director, Power Play Productions
3. [REDACTED], CEO, INQUEST
4. [REDACTED] Musician Composer Educator, local resident
5. [REDACTED], teacher, journalist, author of [REDACTED] Prison.
6. [REDACTED], Head of Prison Partnerships and Participation, Women in Prison (WIP)
7. [REDACTED], Freelance Artist, local resident, working in the Criminal Justice Sector
8. [REDACTED], Assistant Professor in Sociology, Northumbria University & member of Reclaim Holloway.
9. [REDACTED], University of Westminster, local resident
10. [REDACTED], Reader in Criminology, Birkbeck, University of London & Cofounder, Bent Bars Project
11. [REDACTED], Research Fellow, Open University.
12. [REDACTED], Head of Centre, Hilldrop Area Community Association
13. [REDACTED], former Mental Health Inclusion Manager at HMP Holloway (WIP)
14. [REDACTED], CEO, Treasures Foundation
15. [REDACTED], Senior Lecturer, Kingston University
16. [REDACTED], Chair, WISH (Standing Together For Women's Mental Health)
17. [REDACTED], Senior Lecturer in Criminology, University of Kent
18. [REDACTED], former serving Prison Officer at HMP Holloway (1997-2016)
19. [REDACTED], forensic psychotherapist, co-editor of [REDACTED] local resident
20. [REDACTED], Founder & Executive Director of Middle Eastern Women and Society (MEWSo)
21. [REDACTED], MA Dip Arch RIBA MBE RDI, Director at Sarah Wigglesworth Architects, local resident

--

[REDACTED]
Community Engagement Organiser
[Community Plan For Holloway](#)

Please support us by responding as soon as possible to our emails as we have limited resources to follow up.

I work part time and my days vary. I usually work on Mondays, Tuesdays and Thursdays

Receive our [email newsletter](#) once every couple of weeks.

Follow us on [Twitter](#) [Instagram](#) or [Facebook](#) for more frequent updates.

[Tell us how you want to be kept in touch \(quick online form\)](#) on the Holloway prison redevelopment.

Pearton, Brad

Subject: FW: Holloway Women's centre/floor Steering Group - appeal

From: [REDACTED] >

Sent: 09 March 2023 10:31

To: Comer Schwartz, Kaya <Kaya.ComerSchwartz@islington.gov.uk>; O'Halloran, Una <Una.O'Halloran@islington.gov.uk>; Clarke, Tricia <Tricia.Clarke@islington.gov.uk>

Subject: Holloway Women's centre/floor Steering Group - appeal

[External]

Dear Kaya, Una and Tricia

Firstly, in the afterglow of International Women's Day I would like to thank the 3 of you for all you do to support our residents and your continued efforts to ensure diversity and equality for women in the borough. You are great leaders and role models.





Unfortunately, I've heard some concerning news that Community Plan for Holloway, who have tirelessly worked to ensure local resident views and voices are heard in the development of the Holloway Prison site; have been shut out of a steering group regarding the planned Women's Floor.

Campaigning for a Womens Centre in the development has been central to CP4H ambitions for several years, without their input there would not be a planned womens centre. So, it is odd that they have not been allowed representation in the steering group. CP4H are also a resident led group, engaged with caring for their community and supporting them through what will be huge upheaval in the coming years and an influx of approx. 3,000 new residents.

Islington council should welcome their input and inclusion in the steering group.
Best wishes

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Hilldrop Community Centre
Community Lane, Hilldrop Road, N7 0JE

 Website
 Facebook
 Instagram
 Twitter



Hilldrop Area Community Association (HACA) is a charity registered in England and Wales under number 1164597.

Ofsted Registered Childcare & Early Years provider reference: 2503947

Registered office: Hilldrop Community Centre, Hilldrop Road, London, N7 0JE, United Kingdom.

Hilldrop Area Community Association (HACA) accepts no liability for the content of this email, or for the consequences of any actions taken on the basis of the information provided, unless that information is subsequently confirmed in writing. Any views or opinions presented in this email are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of the company.

Pearton, Brad

Subject: FW: Planned Women's Building on the Site of Holloway Prison
Attachments: Emily Thornberry MP -Holloway Prison site 7.7.2021.doc

From: [REDACTED] >
Sent: 29 June 2021 15:51
To: emily.thornberry.mp@parliament.uk
Cc: [REDACTED] Ward, Diarmaid <Diarmaid.Ward@islington.gov.uk>; [REDACTED]
Subject: Planned Women's Building on the Site of Holloway Prison

[External]

Dear Emily,

I am writing to you about the planned Women's Building on the site of Holloway Prison. The current plans for the Women's Building have been deemed "insufficient to honour the history and legacy of the site" by local community groups and prominent figures in the construction industry.

I am therefore sending you the following list of asks, to be implemented on the Women's Building project as soon as possible:

1. An extensive, meaningful **public and women's sector consultation and an independent feasibility study** to determine the space requirements for the Women's Building ahead of the planning application
2. Reflection on the **history and legacy of the site** to be embedded in the design principles for the Women's Building
3. **Design options** for the Women's Building that look at different, more innovative and iconic solutions (rather than having the women's building relegated to the ground floor of a residential block)
4. **A procurement strategy that prioritises women-led businesses** from architects to construction workers all the way through to building management.

Until these asks are met, I cannot accept the direction of the development as being in the best interest of the community or women across the UK. Creating an adequately sized, equitable and iconic Women's Building is a once in a lifetime opportunity that we cannot afford to squander.

My best wishes, [REDACTED]

The University of Westminster is a charity and a company limited by guarantee. Registration number: 977818 England. Registered Office: 309 Regent Street, London W1B 2HW.

This message and its attachments are private and confidential. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender and remove it and its attachments from your system.

Pearton, Brad

Sent: 21 August 2023 19:42
Subject: FW: Women's Organisations meeting 15th June 2021_[Redacted]
Attachments: Email reply to Islington Council re WB consultation_[Redacted].docx

From: [Redacted]
Sent: 01 August 2021 12:08
To: Wilson, Sarah <xxxxx.xxxxxx@xxxxxxx.xxx.xx>; [Redacted]>; Ward, Diarmaid <Diarmaid.Ward@islington.gov.uk>; Sullivan, Karen <Karen.Sullivan@xxxxxxx.xxx.xx>
Cc: Comer Schwartz, Kaya <xxxx.xxxxxxxx@xxxxxxx.xxx.xx>; [Redacted] Community Engagement Plan For Holloway <engage.plan4xxxxxxx@xxxxxxx.xxx>; Reclaim Holloway <xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxx.xxx>; emilythornberryp@parliament.uk; [Redacted] Community Plan Directors Group <community-pan-directors-xxxxx@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx.xxx>; contact@hollowayprisonconsultation.co.uk; [Redacted]
Subject: Re: Women's Organisations meeting 15th June 2021

[External]

To Sarah Wilson and [Redacted]

Thank you for your email dated 13 July in response to my email dated 16 June 2021.

I am responding with deep concern that through your email **it is clearly evident that proper and appropriate research for the future Holloway Women's Building has NOT been undertaken or expert feedback applied by Islington Council.**

I am also submitting this email as additional feedback to Peabody's current consultation (attached as file and online link [here](#))

I have copied your comments in grey and replied in blue

I am going to attempt to address each of the points you made in your letter of objection to our Principal Design Officer [Redacted] on 16th June 2021, where feasible.

Firstly, the meeting you refer to was arranged as a targeted meeting that had been prepared specifically for the purposes of updating strategic partners about the progress of the Women's Building, and seeking their inputs. This group had previously attended and contributed their professional expertise during a lengthy and independently managed workshop back in November 2019, the findings of which significantly informed the parameters of the subsequent development brief.

These are strategic partners, yet you have only engaged once or twice in two years? Who ran this independently managed workshop, and how long was it?

Is one lengthy workshop really enough for a building of national importance?

There is no meaningful planning here that enable these strategic partners to build into their future planning any future re-location or involvement in the proposed Women's Building.

We have also participated in a separate workshop with a group of women with lived experience of the prison in January 2020, and have held meetings with smaller Islington based women's organisations in October 2020 and March 2021. And of course, CP4H has had regular meetings chaired by Cllr Ward and has expressed opinions and requirements as well. So, there are many voices to be heard and we have sought to

allow different groups their own chance to voice their opinions and ideas as each inevitably has different priorities and aspirations.

Re Women in the Criminal Justice System

I doubt that this workshop was more than 2 and a half hours as this is the timeslot that the prison regime allows for a morning or afternoon session.

I have also held a workshop with women in HMP Downview and I remember showing the attached resultant worksheets following a meeting in the Visitor's Centre. The suggestions resulting from this 2-hour workshop has more detail and ideas than the Council's current plans.

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

Working with women in the CJS needs to be approached in a very different way than normal consultation. Women in prison have had their thinking process suppressed and their relationship with the outside world severely restricted. One workshop is far from adequate and a programme should have been put in place where these important voices could have a continuous contributing presence throughout the process. When presented with such a huge and visionary project, women need time to think about what they will need, discuss it with other inmates, and be able to have a method by whereby they can continue to input their ideas through multiple workshops over time.

Why was a peer support contact inmate not allocated to reach out to more women in the prison system rather than just the few who would have managed to attend the workshop?

[Redacted]

Re: and have held meetings with smaller Islington based women's organisations in October 2020 and March 2021.

Two meetings in a year? Is this really enough to determine and educate Islington Councillors who have no experience with women's services or the Criminal Justice System?

Is this suitable engagement for the services to feel involved and incorporate the Women's Building into their future planning?

Re: And of course CP4H has had regular meetings chaired by Cllr Ward and has expressed opinions and requirements as well.

Why has this important Women's Building, of National importance, of which there is no model in the country, that will be delivering sensitive women's services, been chaired by a man whose priority is housing?

We have been informing the co-production meetings with extensive presentations and learning, yet Islington Council has chosen not to incorporate any of the suggestions, except in a tokenistic and minimal way if the idea happened to fit into the Council pre-conceived and inadequate plans. This is admitted in your Closure of Women's Building Draft Brief Document where only 4/28 respondents agree with your plans, yet you persist with them.

You cite only 3 meetings outside CP4H co-production meetings (which have been very much a one-way conversation, we inform, the Council pays little attention, then declares that 'we are all on the same page' – which we are clearly not!). These meetings have also been mostly on Zoom for about 90 mins a month.

How is this adequate for such an important and unprecedented building delivering specialist services?
There has been no outreach from the council in between these meetings to help inform the design.

Why has there been no-one appointed by the council to champion and promote the Women's Building.
The only proponent is [REDACTED] who appears to be working to instruction from Housing?

There is no evidence that the Council has thoroughly researched the services that HMP Holloway actually delivered, the assumption has been to default to MOPAC and a few local women's organisations including CRC Probation. These services were only a small fraction of the services delivered in HMP Holloway.

You query how services will be run from the Women's Building. This is to be determined. And that is in part why the spaces have been designed so flexibly – in accordance with the advice from a number of consultees. The Council does not accept your assertion that the building is not flexible. How services are run and managed is to be part of a future feasibility study, the promotion of which has been led by CP4H.

How the services will be run is FUNDAMENTAL to the design, space, layout and provision of the spaces that are going to be provided. It is completely illogical to try and apply how the building will be run at a later date to plans that do not work for them and offer insufficient space.

Why would you only propose to do a Feasibility Study AFTER the plans have been signed off?

Why has a feasibility study to determine space not been done?

Why has no Business plan been done?

The bare-room flexible space model that you are so keen to showcase in the Brickworks is completely inappropriate for the running of the Women's Building. The Brickworks is a community centre, it is not a women's building and does not deliver the same services.

Nowhere in the SPD does it state that the Women's Building should double as a Community Centre, and there is no evidence that this operating model is suitable for sensitive women's services.

We accept that rooms need to be flexible, all the dedicated spaces in HMP Holloway were flexible and used for multiple purposes, yet they still had a dedicated starting point. The bare-room flexible model that you are proposing is not suitable for the delivery of sensitive women's services, especially since these spaces are proposed in your plans to be shared with the community.

A Crèche can only be used as a crèche. A Café cannot be used to deliver services from, neither can a reception. A MPH is also not a suitable space to deliver sensitive services from, it is community and sports based. Approx. 350sqm split into 2 zones is completely inadequate to house and deliver multiple services that were lost when the prison closed.

The Council do not want to run this building, yet they are dictating what the space and the model by which they are expecting CP4H and the future governance body that we will set up to operate by. This is NOT the logical or collaborative approach required.

The governance and operating model is FUNDAMENTAL to informing the design and space required. Not something that can be fitted into a badly designed inappropriate space.

The uses are shown as indicative – it will be about identifying need, servicing need, and some prioritisation of a range of uses that could be accommodated in the building. For example, it is unlikely there would be the need for 3 crèche rooms so some of this crèche space may well be dedicated for other uses. However, given many women have stressed the importance of having a crèche within the building, and the desire to have it close to the more private suite of rooms located to the rear of the building, a crèche use has been annotated as being capable of being accommodated in this part of the building and with direct access to the dedicated garden.

Everyone agrees that there needs to be a crèche, this is not however a space that can be used to deliver women's services from. We have spent two years identifying what the women's Building NEEDS to offer, yet none of these needs are addressed in your plans. The Council can still not show any detail of the

services that will be offered or what spaces they will require. They cannot even name those services organisations that are building their proposed service delivery into their future operating models. The women's Garden is supposed to be a quiet and reflective space. It is next to and shared presumably with the creche, it receives only 1% sunlight, it is overlooked by 3 tower-blocks, it will be windy, and can be viewed from the Café and reception areas.

A number of the women's centres we spoke with or visited stated clearly how the ability to double up on spatial use was a really important matter to them. They strongly encouraged and supported generous and secure storage facilities for main rooms, and regular water and wc outlets throughout as ways of enabling them to tailor service provision in accordance with changing demands and cohorts over the course of a day/week/year.

Women's Centres are not the model for the future Holloway Women's Building. While they are a valid and important part of the input, this Women's Building will be serving women in touch with the CJS and women more generally in the community. These two groups require different services, some of which will be shared, some not. Women's Centres, especially those dealing with the CJS, often find engagement difficult, this is often because the services are prescribed. Since the beginning of this project the delivery of Probation services has changed and will offer a more holistic and wide-ranging approach. This is not reflected in your plans. There is no provision for the specific delivery of services for young women as outlined in the SPD in your plans.

Storage facilities and WC amenities should be a given in any well-designed building.

The women's centre was originally conceived as requiring up to 800sqm. Part of the GLA funding for the site is premised on the delivery of this element. However the Holloway Prison SPD promoted not just a 'women's centre' but sought provision of additional space to meet more generic, and unspecified, women's needs.

Given that service provision in HMP Holloway extended over the whole prison, where did the ill-conceived assumption that 800sqm was adequate provision?

This 800sqm appears to have come from the standard provision of a community facility on a development site of this size. There is no other community facility planned for this site.

The strategic partners, when they first met in November 2019, were presented with the concept of an 800sqm facility. They were supportive of this but encouraged a larger facility. And consultation feedback sought a single facility which would be able to accommodate both the women's centre and the more generic functions.

This has not been addressed adequately.

The building is now 1,400sqm which is a significant space, the largest community facility in the Borough by a significant margin, that is considered by many to be able to successfully accommodate a broad spectrum of uses.

The 1400sqm is dictated by the footprint of the building rather than the delivery of women's services. Just because it is the largest community facility in the area does not make it a suitable Women's Building delivering sensitive women's services, especially as it is currently doubling as a community centre.

You suggest the women's building element is confined to 300sqm. This is not the case. And while you may not support the flexible approach the Council has encouraged in the designs, this has come about through

the consultation feedback including the desire to have little obvious demarcation between the women's centre, both those using its services and those service providers, and the more generic women's facilities.

Sensitive services or offices cannot operate or deliver from a Creche, a Café, a Reception, a MPH or the corridors, that is not to say that they may not be used occasionally, but not for normal service delivery. The services required CANNOT deliver effectively from the approx. 350 sqm split into two zones.

The building has always been promoted as one for the women of Islington and north east London. It was never conceived of as a national centre. There are multiple demands on this important site for our Borough and officers are therefore trying to achieve the appropriate balance of land uses within the constraints and realities of the site capacity and site viability and in the context of delivering a scheme that for the most part adheres to the Development Plan (unless material considerations suggest otherwise).

The SPD notes that this is a building of national importance delivering services to women across North London and networking nationally.

The site is currently proposed as over the maximum scoped density proposed by the Council at the expense of a substantial Women's Building.

Every flat is a gain on this windfall site.

Community and service provision is equally as important as the actual provision of housing.

Legacy and the NEEDS of women have not been addressed as a fundamental ethos on this hugely important site with 170 years of women's history embedded in it.

With regard to the issue of legacy, the Council has been party to a brief that Peabody has subsequently used to commission experts to audit, interpret and recommend how the important and sensitive legacy of the site can be meaningfully expressed within the designs of the women's building, its dedicated garden and forecourt, and potentially the wider public realm on the site. This project is ongoing and likely to complete by the autumn. It includes a significant element of consultation with a broad range of women which will be coordinated by Peabody.

This should have influenced the whole site design from the beginning. The tokenistic inappropriate women's garden and the current trauma-inducing façade design do not appoint appropriate legacy. Islington Museum have only been brought into this by Peabody recently, which severely questions the Council's version of meaningful research and ideas around legacy.

The community has many ideas around legacy, yet they are not being engaged in this important aspect.

While I am aware that you are not satisfied with the process or the outcome, I trust the above provides some explanation as to how the design brief parameters have been arrived at. The Council regards the women's building element of the wider scheme as being extremely important to the success of the sites redevelopment and has approached its design brief very seriously and with great respect, and has managed and continues to manage the council's inputs in a highly professional and balanced way.

Thank you for your email laying out the extent of the Council's consultation process. It is clear that for such an important and unprecedented Women's Building, the Council's consultation process is far from adequate or fully informed.

The only way to resolve this is to redress the brief and have a proper brief drawn up by experts in the delivery of women's services and then engage those services and service users in the design and subsequent implementation of that brief.

The Council need to assign independent experts to work with the sectors and the community to determine this building. They are not qualified, and have not arrived at a viable solution to date.

The current Women's Building can remain as is, but with the two zones reallocated to community women-led IT and Bike Hubs, making this a really exciting Community Hub, that taps into the footfall between Holloway and Camden and provides for the local community.

The Women's Building should be placed in the stand-alone lock at the back of the park, where a truly celebratory Women's Building can deliver the much-needed specialist services and more community-based community services, a great resource for the older persons accommodation next to it.

You will note that Peabody are currently consulting on their pre-application proposals and you may wish to direct some of your comments to that consultation process for consideration also.

I have fed back extensively to this consultation and expect my and all feedback for the Women's Building be reviewed and applied appropriately, rather than watered down or ignored which has been the case to date.

Many thanks for your enthusiasm and contribution towards the women's' building and the legacy of this important site to date.

Yours sincerely

Sarah

Sarah Wilson

Head of Development Management

London Borough of Islington

Islington Town Hall

Upper Street, N1 2UD

0207 527 [Redacted]

On Tue, 13 Jul 2021 at 14:38, Wilson, Sarah <xxxxx.xxxxxx@xxxxxxxxxx.xxx.xx> wrote:

Dear [Redacted]

My sincerest apologies for the delay in responding to you. [Redacted]

I am going to attempt to address each of the points you made in your letter of objection to our Principal Design Officer [Redacted] on 16th June 2021, where feasible.

Firstly, the meeting you refer to was arranged as a targeted meeting that had been prepared specifically for the purposes of updating strategic partners about the progress of the Women's Building, and seeking their inputs. This group had previously attended and contributed their professional expertise during a lengthy and independently managed workshop back in November 2019, the findings of which significantly informed the parameters of the subsequent development brief.

We have also participated in a separate workshop with a group of women with lived experience of the prison in January 2020, and have held meetings with smaller Islington based women's organisations in October 2020 and March 2021. And of course CP4H has had regular meetings chaired by Cllr Ward and has expressed opinions and requirements as well. So there are many voices to be heard and we have sought to allow different groups their own chance to voice their opinions and ideas as each inevitably has different priorities and aspirations.

You query how services will be run from the Women's Building. This is to be determined. And that is in part why the spaces have been designed so flexibly – in accordance with the advice from a number of consultees. The Council does not accept your assertion that the building is not flexible. How services are run and managed is to be part of a future feasibility study, the promotion of which has been led by CP4H.

The uses are shown as indicative – it will be about identifying need, servicing need, and some prioritisation of a range of uses that could be accommodated in the building. For example, it is unlikely there would be the need for 3 crèche rooms so some of this crèche space may well be dedicated for other uses. However given many women have stressed the importance of having a crèche within the building, and the desire to have it close to the more private suite of rooms located to the rear of the building, a crèche use has been annotated as being capable of being accommodated in this part of the building and with direct access to the dedicated garden.

A number of the women's centres we spoke with or visited stated clearly how the ability to double up on spatial use was a really important matter to them. They strongly encouraged and supported generous and secure storage facilities for main rooms, and regular water and wc outlets throughout as ways of enabling them to tailor service provision in accordance with changing demands and cohorts over the course of a day/week/year.

The women's centre was originally conceived as requiring up to 800sqm. Part of the GLA funding for the site is premised on the delivery of this element. However the Holloway Prison SPD promoted not just a 'women's centre' but sought provision of additional space to meet more generic, and unspecified, women's needs.

The strategic partners, when they first met in November 2019, were presented with the concept of an 800sqm facility. They were supportive of this but encouraged a larger facility. And consultation feedback sought a single facility which would be able to accommodate both the women's centre and the more generic functions.

The building is now 1,400sqm which is a significant space, the largest community facility in the Borough by a significant margin, that is considered by many to be able to successfully accommodate a broad spectrum of uses.

You suggest the women's building element is confined to 300sqm. This is not the case. And while you may not support the flexible approach the Council has encouraged in the designs, this has come about through the consultation feedback including the desire to have little obvious demarcation between the women's centre, both those using its services and those service providers, and the more generic women's facilities.

The building has always been promoted as one for the women of Islington and north east London. It was never conceived of as a national centre. There are multiple demands on this important site for our Borough and officers are therefore trying to achieve the appropriate balance of land uses within the constraints and realities of the site capacity and site viability and in the context of delivering a scheme that for the most part adheres to the Development Plan (unless material considerations suggest otherwise).

With regard to the issue of legacy, the Council has been party to a brief that Peabody has subsequently used to commission experts to audit, interpret and recommend how the important and sensitive legacy of the site can be meaningfully expressed within the designs of the women's building, its dedicated garden and forecourt, and potentially the wider public realm on the site. This project is ongoing and likely to complete by the autumn. It includes a significant element of consultation with a broad range of women which will be coordinated by Peabody.

While I am aware that you are not satisfied with the process or the outcome, I trust the above provides some explanation as to how the design brief parameters have been arrived at. The Council regards the women's building element of the wider scheme as being extremely important to the success of the sites redevelopment and has approached its design brief very seriously and with great respect, and has managed and continues to manage the council's inputs in a highly professional and balanced way.

You will note that Peabody are currently consulting on their pre-application proposals and you may wish to direct some of your comments to that consultation process for consideration also.

Many thanks for your enthusiasm and contribution towards the women's' building and the legacy of this important site to date.

Yours sincerely

Sarah

Sarah Wilson

Head of Development Management

London Borough of Islington

Islington Town Hall

Upper Street, N1 2UD

0207 527 [Redacted]

From: [Redacted]**Sent:** 16 June 2021 12:19

To: [Redacted]>

Subject: Women's Organisations meeting 15th June 2021

[External]

[Redacted]

I am writing as I am deeply concerned following yesterday's meeting 15th July 2021 at 3pm.

The attendees were predominantly Criminal Justice related, and while this is an important part of the Women's Building, this is not fully representative of the services that women need when they leave prison. The services that women need when they leave prison, become much broader when reintegrating back into the community, such as housing, debt, domestic abuse, family and child services, life skills, Art creative services including art therapy, employment facilities, IT training and access, addiction services to name but a few. Could you please explain how these services will operate, and practically deliver these services in the current plans for Holloway Women's Building (HWB), and how attending these services works for the women using them?

While you proclaim that you will not be dictating how the building is run, the layout designed by AHMM, and the Council's preferred 'flexible model' absolutely dictates how the building will be run, governance is a completely separate matter. The service providers and experts that we have spoken to do not consider this model to be viable for them. Please explain the Council's reasons for adopting what is ostensibly a Community Centre model of operation for a specialist Women's Building delivering specialist services?

Please explain how an Art Department, or even Art Therapy or any creative services will be delivered from the Creche? The main criteria for delivering Art are facilities, equipment and space that is consistent and adaptable to the work being created. Art delivery is not about sitting at a table with a set of watercolour paints. This building should be about empowering women, not treating them like children, which is the message that this impractical suggestion is promoting.

Why is the council allowing these plans to go to planning when no feasibility study or business plan has been done to consider the viability of the plans? Why are Peabody still working to the original Draft brief after 2 years of consultation?

Your original Draft plans for the Women's Building as submitted to the community added up to 1250sqm. Since extensive consultation this has only increased to 1320sqm, of which only 300sqm is actually dedicated to women's services. Which services do you actually envisage being able to deliver from this space? The space has only increased by 70sqm since the consultation.

If you are building a football stadium, you do not make the pitch smaller in order to increase audience capacity. Please explain, why the needs of women in terms of service provision, on this hugely important Legacy site for women, are being reduced to 300sqm? How do you feel that this is a fitting Legacy for the prison and suitable provision for women's needs into the future for generations to come?

Neither Islington Council or Peabody are experts in Women's Services, and while appreciating that much research has been done, why is this hugely important building of National Importance being designed by Peabody's preferred Male led AHMM who are not experts in delivering Women's services? Just the fact that 800sqm (A standard Community Centre) was the original pitch for space for the HWB demonstrates the absolute underestimation and lack of understanding of the women's services needed and how they are practically delivered.

Women are often designated the left over spaces or the bare minimum, and this again, sadly, seems to be the case. Since this site is a Legacy site for women, could you please explain how these plans, which in no way can comprehensively offer transformative services for women, do not fundamentally discriminate against women?

Only a single option for the location and layout of the HWB has ever been produced, and this has changed little since your Draft brief despite 2 years of consultation and campaigning. The single floor option is one option, and just because one report you have read says that a single floor model has advantages, this does not mean that it is suitable or the only or best option for the HWB. I would be really interested to understand why this model is so favored for the HWB? Obviously, this approach is very restrictive to the size of the HWB as it restricted to the footprint of the block of flats.

I welcome any further conversation with you to aid the development of the Women's Building. As you are aware I have unique expertise and lived experience in what women need when they leave prison, what would be trauma-triggering for them and what sort of welcoming services they require. Without suggesting that the building be any particular size, surely the provision of services should be the absolute driver for determining the women's Building, not working out how they are somehow supposed to fit selective services into a limited pre-determined space?

I would also like to share a much more creative approach to the facade of any Women's Building that ends up on this site.

[Redacted]

I very much look forward to your reply

Kind regards

[Redacted]

This email is confidential and intended for recipients only.

[Redacted]

Pearton, Brad

Sent: 21 August 2023 18:55
Subject: FW: agenda attached - Women's Building Co-Production meeting_[Redacted]

From: Community Plan for Holloway <plxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxx.xxm>
Sent: 19 January 2021 16:43
To: Ward, Diarmaid <xxxxxxxx.xxxx@xxxxxxxxxx.xxx.xx>
Cc: [Redacted]
Subject: Re: agenda attached - Women's Building Co-Production meeting

In short, we regret to say we feel shut out of the coproduction process, in particular around the feasibility study.

Over a year ago we held a meeting in the visitors centre where it was agreed that a process of coproduction would be entered into. This was put off by council till summer while we waited for the council's draft brief to be written, but that itself is a process which we believe should have been collaborative. We were then able to hold a series of what felt to be very productive three-way meetings through summer into autumn. But our last coproduction meeting was on November 5th, over two and a half months ago. At that time we agreed to hold another one, 2 weeks later, to discuss the feasibility study - an idea we'd already been pushing for 3 months at that point and which felt overdue as the architects were already working to a different brief. Additionally we said we'd have another meeting to review the development of Peabody's plans 4 weeks later. Despite repeated attempts, we were not permitted to schedule another coproduction meeting. We were due to have one in mid December, but it was cancelled by Diarmaid, who said that the council were reviewing the criteria for the feasibility study. I objected saying this was something we needed to work on together and that having the meetings was the most productive forum for understanding each other and collaborating. I said waiting another month to look at this together was too long. Diarmaid said that he would not hold a December meeting, but assured me that the relevant team at the council would work with us to develop criteria for the feasibility study, so that today we could just be signing it off. This did not happen. I chased it up from the first week in January, asking to be involved in the process, but to no avail. Only late on Friday evening did it arrive with us, a fully formulated proposal with no opportunity for us to input our ideas.

Clearly Peabody and the council have been in dialogue with each other throughout the 11 week period since or last meeting. Just before Diarmaid sent us the proposal on Friday evening, he sent a message apologising for the delay saying he was 'still waiting for Peabody to get back to him'. But we have been excluded from that dialogue. This despite the fact that we represent the groups who will actually use the Women's Building and we are funding half the study. This is absolutely not "the spirit of coproduction" in which we were supposedly meeting. So much so that last Friday when I referred to today's meeting as "our upcoming coproduction meeting", [Redacted] said she thought it was "just us presenting to you".

We find this situation disappointing, but also confusing given that Peabody have said they don't feel they should be involved in designing the criteria of the feasibility study, as they don't have experience in women's services. Additionally the council have said they also lack this knowledge (From minutes of the October 28th 2019 meeting with Diarmaid, Karen Sullivan, [Redacted], a note under Council's Role states "The Council acknowledged that it does not have the expert services or knowledge in-house with regard to fully understanding needs and operational requirements associated with a women's facility on the site. It is therefore reliant on a range of partners coming forward including those groups represented at this evening's meeting and working alongside them.") Now you may only see a few faces from our side when we meet, but let me remind you of the breadth of knowledge and experience the WBWG incorporates...

As well as a number of members who have lived experience of incarceration at Holloway, the WBWG has members that work in women's health advisory services, child care work, counselling and therapy for women, social work, academia around gender, social justice consultancy, many ex-Holloway workers (from various in-prison projects, including CARAT an in-prison service for supporting women with substance dependencies), public health writing,

teaching art in prisons, anti-violence and support for women, support for prisoners & marginalized foreign nationals, physical training (specialising in marginalised LGBTQ+ clients), social enterprise consultancy, criminology and domestic violence education.

Our members represent a broad range of local community facilities and support services for marginalised women, including Solace Women's Aid, Hibiscus Initiatives, Imkaan anti-violence organisation, Minority Matters, Iranian & Kurdish Women's Rights (IKWRO), Inquest, Sisters Uncut, Penderyn Road Residents Association, Reclaim Holloway, Treasures, Holloway United Therapies, Holloway Neighbourhood Network/Old Fire Station community centre, Choices Islington, Hildrop Community Centre, the Network of Finsbury Park Women's Organisations, Maya Centre, Wish Women's Mental Health Charity, Holloway Neighbourhood Network and Women in Prison.

It is the voices and experience of these women we are bringing to the table, please value that.

We were supposed to be signing off on this study today. But clearly, because we only got sight of what you two are proposing one working day before this meeting, that will not be possible. We do however very much want to find common ground with you both and look for a way forward to truly collaborate. Time is of the essence, but nevertheless we require an opportunity to assess your proposal and discuss it amongst ourselves. We then want to meet asap to talk this through together, to produce a road map we are all willing to follow.

[Redacted]

Campaign Organiser, [Community Plan For Holloway](#)

Receive our [email newsletter](#) once every couple of weeks.

Follow us on [Twitter](#) [Instagram](#) or [Facebook](#) for more frequent updates.

[Have your say](#) on the Holloway prison redevelopment.

On Mon, 18 Jan 2021 at 22:23, Ward, Diarmaid <Diarmaid.Ward@islington.gov.uk> wrote:

My apologies – I didn't realise

Let's use the council link as it's now in the diary invite

All the best

Diarmaid

From: Community Plan for Holloway <plxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxx.xxm>

Sent: 18 January 2021 20:54

To: Ward, Diarmaid <xxxxxxxx.xxxx@xxxxxxxxx.xxx.xx>

Cc: [Redacted]

Subject: Re: agenda attached - Women's Building Co-Production meeting

I notice the link you've sent is different from the one I sent a few weeks back when we originally scheduled this meeting. Which are we going to use?

Here is the one I circulated in December

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/85613064271?pwd=TGN3N2psRzMwU0tKSxzbjJLa1hQQT09>

Meeting ID: 856 1306 4271
Passcode: 481094

[Redacted]

Campaign Organiser, [Community Plan For Holloway](#)

Receive our [email newsletter](#) once every couple of weeks.

Follow us on [Twitter](#) [Instagram](#) or [Facebook](#) for more frequent updates.

[Have your say](#) on the Holloway prison redevelopment.

On Mon, 18 Jan 2021 at 11:43, Ward, Diarmaid <Diarmaid.Ward@islington.gov.uk> wrote:

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://weareislington.zoom.us/j/99631705001?pwd=S1R3dWpWd2t6T3lPYXFpVhCUkdxQT09>

Meeting ID: 996 3170 5001
Password: 649367

Dial by your location

+44 208 080 6591 United Kingdom
+44 208 080 6592 United Kingdom
+44 330 088 5830 United Kingdom
+44 131 460 1196 United Kingdom
+44 203 481 5237 United Kingdom
+44 203 481 5240 United Kingdom
+44 203 901 7895 United Kingdom

Meeting ID: 996 3170 5001
Password: 649367

This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. If you have received it in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer. Please be aware that information in this email may be confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected.

This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. If you have received it in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer. Please be aware that information in this email may be confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected.

Pearton, Brad

Sent: 21 August 2023 19:42
Subject: FW: Women's Organisations meeting 15th June 2021_[Redacted]
Attachments: Email reply to Islington Council re WB consultation_[Redacted].docx

From: [Redacted]
Sent: 01 August 2021 12:08
To: Wilson, Sarah <xxxxx.xxxxxx@xxxxxxx.xxx.xx>; [Redacted]>; Ward, Diarmaid <Diarmaid.Ward@islington.gov.uk>; Sullivan, Karen <Karen.Sullivan@xxxxxxx.xxx.xx>
Cc: Comer Schwartz, Kaya <xxxx.xxxxxxxx@xxxxxxx.xxx.xx>; [Redacted] Community Engagement Plan For Holloway <engage.plan4xxxxxxx@xxxxxxx.xxx>; Reclaim Holloway <xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxx.xxx>; emilythornberryp@parliament.uk; [Redacted] Community Plan Directors Group <community-pan-directors-xxxxx@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx.xxx>; contact@hollowayprisonconsultation.co.uk; [Redacted]
Subject: Re: Women's Organisations meeting 15th June 2021

[External]

To Sarah Wilson and [Redacted]

Thank you for your email dated 13 July in response to my email dated 16 June 2021.

I am responding with deep concern that through your email **it is clearly evident that proper and appropriate research for the future Holloway Women's Building has NOT been undertaken or expert feedback applied by Islington Council.**

I am also submitting this email as additional feedback to Peabody's current consultation (attached as file and online link [here](#))

I have copied your comments in grey and replied in blue

I am going to attempt to address each of the points you made in your letter of objection to our Principal Design Officer [Redacted] on 16th June 2021, where feasible.

Firstly, the meeting you refer to was arranged as a targeted meeting that had been prepared specifically for the purposes of updating strategic partners about the progress of the Women's Building, and seeking their inputs. This group had previously attended and contributed their professional expertise during a lengthy and independently managed workshop back in November 2019, the findings of which significantly informed the parameters of the subsequent development brief.

These are strategic partners, yet you have only engaged once or twice in two years? Who ran this independently managed workshop, and how long was it?

Is one lengthy workshop really enough for a building of national importance?

There is no meaningful planning here that enable these strategic partners to build into their future planning any future re-location or involvement in the proposed Women's Building.

We have also participated in a separate workshop with a group of women with lived experience of the prison in January 2020, and have held meetings with smaller Islington based women's organisations in October 2020 and March 2021. And of course, CP4H has had regular meetings chaired by Cllr Ward and has expressed opinions and requirements as well. So, there are many voices to be heard and we have sought to

allow different groups their own chance to voice their opinions and ideas as each inevitably has different priorities and aspirations.

Re Women in the Criminal Justice System

I doubt that this workshop was more than 2 and a half hours as this is the timeslot that the prison regime allows for a morning or afternoon session.

I have also held a workshop with women in HMP Downview and I remember showing the attached resultant worksheets following a meeting in the Visitor's Centre. The suggestions resulting from this 2-hour workshop has more detail and ideas than the Council's current plans.

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

Working with women in the CJS needs to be approached in a very different way than normal consultation. Women in prison have had their thinking process suppressed and their relationship with the outside world severely restricted. One workshop is far from adequate and a programme should have been put in place where these important voices could have a continuous contributing presence throughout the process. When presented with such a huge and visionary project, women need time to think about what they will need, discuss it with other inmates, and be able to have a method by whereby they can continue to input their ideas through multiple workshops over time.

Why was a peer support contact inmate not allocated to reach out to more women in the prison system rather than just the few who would have managed to attend the workshop?

[Redacted]

Re: and have held meetings with smaller Islington based women's organisations in October 2020 and March 2021.

Two meetings in a year? Is this really enough to determine and educate Islington Councillors who have no experience with women's services or the Criminal Justice System?

Is this suitable engagement for the services to feel involved and incorporate the Women's Building into their future planning?

Re: And of course CP4H has had regular meetings chaired by Cllr Ward and has expressed opinions and requirements as well.

Why has this important Women's Building, of National importance, of which there is no model in the country, that will be delivering sensitive women's services, been chaired by a man whose priority is housing?

We have been informing the co-production meetings with extensive presentations and learning, yet Islington Council has chosen not to incorporate any of the suggestions, except in a tokenistic and minimal way if the idea happened to fit into the Council pre-conceived and inadequate plans. This is admitted in your Closure of Women's Building Draft Brief Document where only 4/28 respondents agree with your plans, yet you persist with them.

You cite only 3 meetings outside CP4H co-production meetings (which have been very much a one-way conversation, we inform, the Council pays little attention, then declares that 'we are all on the same page' – which we are clearly not!). These meetings have also been mostly on Zoom for about 90 mins a month.

How is this adequate for such an important and unprecedented building delivering specialist services?
There has been no outreach from the council in between these meetings to help inform the design.

Why has there been no-one appointed by the council to champion and promote the Women's Building.
The only proponent is [REDACTED] who appears to be working to instruction from Housing?

There is no evidence that the Council has thoroughly researched the services that HMP Holloway actually delivered, the assumption has been to default to MOPAC and a few local women's organisations including CRC Probation. These services were only a small fraction of the services delivered in HMP Holloway.

You query how services will be run from the Women's Building. This is to be determined. And that is in part why the spaces have been designed so flexibly – in accordance with the advice from a number of consultees. The Council does not accept your assertion that the building is not flexible. How services are run and managed is to be part of a future feasibility study, the promotion of which has been led by CP4H.

How the services will be run is FUNDAMENTAL to the design, space, layout and provision of the spaces that are going to be provided. It is completely illogical to try and apply how the building will be run at a later date to plans that do not work for them and offer insufficient space.

Why would you only propose to do a Feasibility Study AFTER the plans have been signed off?

Why has a feasibility study to determine space not been done?

Why has no Business plan been done?

The bare-room flexible space model that you are so keen to showcase in the Brickworks is completely inappropriate for the running of the Women's Building. The Brickworks is a community centre, it is not a women's building and does not deliver the same services.

Nowhere in the SPD does it state that the Women's Building should double as a Community Centre, and there is no evidence that this operating model is suitable for sensitive women's services.

We accept that rooms need to be flexible, all the dedicated spaces in HMP Holloway were flexible and used for multiple purposes, yet they still had a dedicated starting point. The bare-room flexible model that you are proposing is not suitable for the delivery of sensitive women's services, especially since these spaces are proposed in your plans to be shared with the community.

A Crèche can only be used as a crèche. A Café cannot be used to deliver services from, neither can a reception. A MPH is also not a suitable space to deliver sensitive services from, it is community and sports based. Approx. 350sqm split into 2 zones is completely inadequate to house and deliver multiple services that were lost when the prison closed.

The Council do not want to run this building, yet they are dictating what the space and the model by which they are expecting CP4H and the future governance body that we will set up to operate by. This is NOT the logical or collaborative approach required.

The governance and operating model is FUNDAMENTAL to informing the design and space required. Not something that can be fitted into a badly designed inappropriate space.

The uses are shown as indicative – it will be about identifying need, servicing need, and some prioritisation of a range of uses that could be accommodated in the building. For example, it is unlikely there would be the need for 3 crèche rooms so some of this crèche space may well be dedicated for other uses. However, given many women have stressed the importance of having a crèche within the building, and the desire to have it close to the more private suite of rooms located to the rear of the building, a crèche use has been annotated as being capable of being accommodated in this part of the building and with direct access to the dedicated garden.

Everyone agrees that there needs to be a crèche, this is not however a space that can be used to deliver women's services from. We have spent two years identifying what the women's Building NEEDS to offer, yet none of these needs are addressed in your plans. The Council can still not show any detail of the

services that will be offered or what spaces they will require. They cannot even name those services organisations that are building their proposed service delivery into their future operating models. The women's Garden is supposed to be a quiet and reflective space. It is next to and shared presumably with the creche, it receives only 1% sunlight, it is overlooked by 3 tower-blocks, it will be windy, and can be viewed from the Café and reception areas.

A number of the women's centres we spoke with or visited stated clearly how the ability to double up on spatial use was a really important matter to them. They strongly encouraged and supported generous and secure storage facilities for main rooms, and regular water and wc outlets throughout as ways of enabling them to tailor service provision in accordance with changing demands and cohorts over the course of a day/week/year.

Women's Centres are not the model for the future Holloway Women's Building. While they are a valid and important part of the input, this Women's Building will be serving women in touch with the CJS and women more generally in the community. These two groups require different services, some of which will be shared, some not. Women's Centres, especially those dealing with the CJS, often find engagement difficult, this is often because the services are prescribed. Since the beginning of this project the delivery of Probation services has changed and will offer a more holistic and wide-ranging approach. This is not reflected in your plans. There is no provision for the specific delivery of services for young women as outlined in the SPD in your plans.

Storage facilities and WC amenities should be a given in any well-designed building.

The women's centre was originally conceived as requiring up to 800sqm. Part of the GLA funding for the site is premised on the delivery of this element. However the Holloway Prison SPD promoted not just a 'women's centre' but sought provision of additional space to meet more generic, and unspecified, women's needs.

Given that service provision in HMP Holloway extended over the whole prison, where did the ill-conceived assumption that 800sqm was adequate provision?

This 800sqm appears to have come from the standard provision of a community facility on a development site of this size. There is no other community facility planned for this site.

The strategic partners, when they first met in November 2019, were presented with the concept of an 800sqm facility. They were supportive of this but encouraged a larger facility. And consultation feedback sought a single facility which would be able to accommodate both the women's centre and the more generic functions.

This has not been addressed adequately.

The building is now 1,400sqm which is a significant space, the largest community facility in the Borough by a significant margin, that is considered by many to be able to successfully accommodate a broad spectrum of uses.

The 1400sqm is dictated by the footprint of the building rather than the delivery of women's services. Just because it is the largest community facility in the area does not make it a suitable Women's Building delivering sensitive women's services, especially as it is currently doubling as a community centre.

You suggest the women's building element is confined to 300sqm. This is not the case. And while you may not support the flexible approach the Council has encouraged in the designs, this has come about through

the consultation feedback including the desire to have little obvious demarcation between the women's centre, both those using its services and those service providers, and the more generic women's facilities.

Sensitive services or offices cannot operate or deliver from a Creche, a Café, a Reception, a MPH or the corridors, that is not to say that they may not be used occasionally, but not for normal service delivery. The services required CANNOT deliver effectively from the approx. 350 sqm split into two zones.

The building has always been promoted as one for the women of Islington and north east London. It was never conceived of as a national centre. There are multiple demands on this important site for our Borough and officers are therefore trying to achieve the appropriate balance of land uses within the constraints and realities of the site capacity and site viability and in the context of delivering a scheme that for the most part adheres to the Development Plan (unless material considerations suggest otherwise).

The SPD notes that this is a building of national importance delivering services to women across North London and networking nationally.

The site is currently proposed as over the maximum scoped density proposed by the Council at the expense of a substantial Women's Building.

Every flat is a gain on this windfall site.

Community and service provision is equally as important as the actual provision of housing.

Legacy and the NEEDS of women have not been addressed as a fundamental ethos on this hugely important site with 170 years of women's history embedded in it.

With regard to the issue of legacy, the Council has been party to a brief that Peabody has subsequently used to commission experts to audit, interpret and recommend how the important and sensitive legacy of the site can be meaningfully expressed within the designs of the women's building, its dedicated garden and forecourt, and potentially the wider public realm on the site. This project is ongoing and likely to complete by the autumn. It includes a significant element of consultation with a broad range of women which will be coordinated by Peabody.

This should have influenced the whole site design from the beginning. The tokenistic inappropriate women's garden and the current trauma-inducing façade design do not appoint appropriate legacy. Islington Museum have only been brought into this by Peabody recently, which severely questions the Council's version of meaningful research and ideas around legacy.

The community has many ideas around legacy, yet they are not being engaged in this important aspect.

While I am aware that you are not satisfied with the process or the outcome, I trust the above provides some explanation as to how the design brief parameters have been arrived at. The Council regards the women's building element of the wider scheme as being extremely important to the success of the sites redevelopment and has approached its design brief very seriously and with great respect, and has managed and continues to manage the council's inputs in a highly professional and balanced way.

Thank you for your email laying out the extent of the Council's consultation process. It is clear that for such an important and unprecedented Women's Building, the Council's consultation process is far from adequate or fully informed.

The only way to resolve this is to redress the brief and have a proper brief drawn up by experts in the delivery of women's services and then engage those services and service users in the design and subsequent implementation of that brief.

The Council need to assign independent experts to work with the sectors and the community to determine this building. They are not qualified, and have not arrived at a viable solution to date.

The current Women's Building can remain as is, but with the two zones reallocated to community women-led IT and Bike Hubs, making this a really exciting Community Hub, that taps into the footfall between Holloway and Camden and provides for the local community.

The Women's Building should be placed in the stand-alone lock at the back of the park, where a truly celebratory Women's Building can deliver the much-needed specialist services and more community-based community services, a great resource for the older persons accommodation next to it.

You will note that Peabody are currently consulting on their pre-application proposals and you may wish to direct some of your comments to that consultation process for consideration also.

I have fed back extensively to this consultation and expect my and all feedback for the Women's Building be reviewed and applied appropriately, rather than watered down or ignored which has been the case to date.

Many thanks for your enthusiasm and contribution towards the women's' building and the legacy of this important site to date.

Yours sincerely

Sarah

Sarah Wilson

Head of Development Management

London Borough of Islington

Islington Town Hall

Upper Street, N1 2UD

0207 527 [Redacted]

On Tue, 13 Jul 2021 at 14:38, Wilson, Sarah <xxxxx.xxxxxx@xxxxxxxxxx.xxx.xx> wrote:

Dear [REDACTED]

My sincerest apologies for the delay in responding to you. [Redacted]

I am going to attempt to address each of the points you made in your letter of objection to our Principal Design Officer [Redacted] on 16th June 2021, where feasible.

Firstly, the meeting you refer to was arranged as a targeted meeting that had been prepared specifically for the purposes of updating strategic partners about the progress of the Women's Building, and seeking their inputs. This group had previously attended and contributed their professional expertise during a lengthy and independently managed workshop back in November 2019, the findings of which significantly informed the parameters of the subsequent development brief.

We have also participated in a separate workshop with a group of women with lived experience of the prison in January 2020, and have held meetings with smaller Islington based women's organisations in October 2020 and March 2021. And of course CP4H has had regular meetings chaired by Cllr Ward and has expressed opinions and requirements as well. So there are many voices to be heard and we have sought to allow different groups their own chance to voice their opinions and ideas as each inevitably has different priorities and aspirations.

You query how services will be run from the Women's Building. This is to be determined. And that is in part why the spaces have been designed so flexibly – in accordance with the advice from a number of consultees. The Council does not accept your assertion that the building is not flexible. How services are run and managed is to be part of a future feasibility study, the promotion of which has been led by CP4H.

The uses are shown as indicative – it will be about identifying need, servicing need, and some prioritisation of a range of uses that could be accommodated in the building. For example, it is unlikely there would be the need for 3 crèche rooms so some of this crèche space may well be dedicated for other uses. However given many women have stressed the importance of having a crèche within the building, and the desire to have it close to the more private suite of rooms located to the rear of the building, a crèche use has been annotated as being capable of being accommodated in this part of the building and with direct access to the dedicated garden.

A number of the women's centres we spoke with or visited stated clearly how the ability to double up on spatial use was a really important matter to them. They strongly encouraged and supported generous and secure storage facilities for main rooms, and regular water and wc outlets throughout as ways of enabling them to tailor service provision in accordance with changing demands and cohorts over the course of a day/week/year.

The women's centre was originally conceived as requiring up to 800sqm. Part of the GLA funding for the site is premised on the delivery of this element. However the Holloway Prison SPD promoted not just a 'women's centre' but sought provision of additional space to meet more generic, and unspecified, women's needs.

The strategic partners, when they first met in November 2019, were presented with the concept of an 800sqm facility. They were supportive of this but encouraged a larger facility. And consultation feedback sought a single facility which would be able to accommodate both the women's centre and the more generic functions.

The building is now 1,400sqm which is a significant space, the largest community facility in the Borough by a significant margin, that is considered by many to be able to successfully accommodate a broad spectrum of uses.

You suggest the women's building element is confined to 300sqm. This is not the case. And while you may not support the flexible approach the Council has encouraged in the designs, this has come about through the consultation feedback including the desire to have little obvious demarcation between the women's centre, both those using its services and those service providers, and the more generic women's facilities.

The building has always been promoted as one for the women of Islington and north east London. It was never conceived of as a national centre. There are multiple demands on this important site for our Borough and officers are therefore trying to achieve the appropriate balance of land uses within the constraints and realities of the site capacity and site viability and in the context of delivering a scheme that for the most part adheres to the Development Plan (unless material considerations suggest otherwise).

With regard to the issue of legacy, the Council has been party to a brief that Peabody has subsequently used to commission experts to audit, interpret and recommend how the important and sensitive legacy of the site can be meaningfully expressed within the designs of the women's building, its dedicated garden and forecourt, and potentially the wider public realm on the site. This project is ongoing and likely to complete by the autumn. It includes a significant element of consultation with a broad range of women which will be coordinated by Peabody.

While I am aware that you are not satisfied with the process or the outcome, I trust the above provides some explanation as to how the design brief parameters have been arrived at. The Council regards the women's building element of the wider scheme as being extremely important to the success of the sites redevelopment and has approached its design brief very seriously and with great respect, and has managed and continues to manage the council's inputs in a highly professional and balanced way.

You will note that Peabody are currently consulting on their pre-application proposals and you may wish to direct some of your comments to that consultation process for consideration also.

Many thanks for your enthusiasm and contribution towards the women's' building and the legacy of this important site to date.

Yours sincerely

Sarah

Sarah Wilson

Head of Development Management

London Borough of Islington

Islington Town Hall

Upper Street, N1 2UD

0207 527 [Redacted]

From: [Redacted]**Sent:** 16 June 2021 12:19

To: [Redacted]>

Subject: Women's Organisations meeting 15th June 2021

[External]

[Redacted]

I am writing as I am deeply concerned following yesterday's meeting 15th July 2021 at 3pm.

The attendees were predominantly Criminal Justice related, and while this is an important part of the Women's Building, this is not fully representative of the services that women need when they leave prison. The services that women need when they leave prison, become much broader when reintegrating back into the community, such as housing, debt, domestic abuse, family and child services, life skills, Art creative services including art therapy, employment facilities, IT training and access, addiction services to name but a few. Could you please explain how these services will operate, and practically deliver these services in the current plans for Holloway Women's Building (HWB), and how attending these services works for the women using them?

While you proclaim that you will not be dictating how the building is run, the layout designed by AHMM, and the Council's preferred 'flexible model' absolutely dictates how the building will be run, governance is a completely separate matter. The service providers and experts that we have spoken to do not consider this model to be viable for them. Please explain the Council's reasons for adopting what is ostensibly a Community Centre model of operation for a specialist Women's Building delivering specialist services?

Please explain how an Art Department, or even Art Therapy or any creative services will be delivered from the Creche? The main criteria for delivering Art are facilities, equipment and space that is consistent and adaptable to the work being created. Art delivery is not about sitting at a table with a set of watercolour paints. This building should be about empowering women, not treating them like children, which is the message that this impractical suggestion is promoting.

Why is the council allowing these plans to go to planning when no feasibility study or business plan has been done to consider the viability of the plans? Why are Peabody still working to the original Draft brief after 2 years of consultation?

Your original Draft plans for the Women's Building as submitted to the community added up to 1250sqm. Since extensive consultation this has only increased to 1320sqm, of which only 300sqm is actually dedicated to women's services. Which services do you actually envisage being able to deliver from this space? The space has only increased by 70sqm since the consultation.

If you are building a football stadium, you do not make the pitch smaller in order to increase audience capacity. Please explain, why the needs of women in terms of service provision, on this hugely important Legacy site for women, are being reduced to 300sqm? How do you feel that this is a fitting Legacy for the prison and suitable provision for women's needs into the future for generations to come?

Neither Islington Council or Peabody are experts in Women's Services, and while appreciating that much research has been done, why is this hugely important building of National Importance being designed by Peabody's preferred Male led AHMM who are not experts in delivering Women's services? Just the fact that 800sqm (A standard Community Centre) was the original pitch for space for the HWB demonstrates the absolute underestimation and lack of understanding of the women's services needed and how they are practically delivered.

Women are often designated the left over spaces or the bare minimum, and this again, sadly, seems to be the case. Since this site is a Legacy site for women, could you please explain how these plans, which in no way can comprehensively offer transformative services for women, do not fundamentally discriminate against women?

Only a single option for the location and layout of the HWB has ever been produced, and this has changed little since your Draft brief despite 2 years of consultation and campaigning. The single floor option is one option, and just because one report you have read says that a single floor model has advantages, this does not mean that it is suitable or the only or best option for the HWB. I would be really interested to understand why this model is so favored for the HWB? Obviously, this approach is very restrictive to the size of the HWB as it is restricted to the footprint of the block of flats.

I welcome any further conversation with you to aid the development of the Women's Building. As you are aware I have unique expertise and lived experience in what women need when they leave prison, what would be trauma-triggering for them and what sort of welcoming services they require. Without suggesting that the building be any particular size, surely the provision of services should be the absolute driver for determining the women's Building, not working out how they are somehow supposed to fit selective services into a limited pre-determined space?

I would also like to share a much more creative approach to the facade of any Women's Building that ends up on this site.

[Redacted]

I very much look forward to your reply

Kind regards

[Redacted]

This email is confidential and intended for recipients only.

[Redacted]

Pearton, Brad

Sent: 21 August 2023 18:55
Subject: FW: agenda attached - Women's Building Co-Production meeting_[Redacted]

From: Community Plan for Holloway <plxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxx.xxm>
Sent: 19 January 2021 16:43
To: Ward, Diarmaid <xxxxxxxx.xxxx@xxxxxxxxxx.xxx.xx>
Cc: [Redacted]
Subject: Re: agenda attached - Women's Building Co-Production meeting

In short, we regret to say we feel shut out of the coproduction process, in particular around the feasibility study.

Over a year ago we held a meeting in the visitors centre where it was agreed that a process of coproduction would be entered into. This was put off by council till summer while we waited for the council's draft brief to be written, but that itself is a process which we believe should have been collaborative. We were then able to hold a series of what felt to be very productive three-way meetings through summer into autumn. But our last coproduction meeting was on November 5th, over two and a half months ago. At that time we agreed to hold another one, 2 weeks later, to discuss the feasibility study - an idea we'd already been pushing for 3 months at that point and which felt overdue as the architects were already working to a different brief. Additionally we said we'd have another meeting to review the development of Peabody's plans 4 weeks later. Despite repeated attempts, we were not permitted to schedule another coproduction meeting. We were due to have one in mid December, but it was cancelled by Diarmaid, who said that the council were reviewing the criteria for the feasibility study. I objected saying this was something we needed to work on together and that having the meetings was the most productive forum for understanding each other and collaborating. I said waiting another month to look at this together was too long. Diarmaid said that he would not hold a December meeting, but assured me that the relevant team at the council would work with us to develop criteria for the feasibility study, so that today we could just be signing it off. This did not happen. I chased it up from the first week in January, asking to be involved in the process, but to no avail. Only late on Friday evening did it arrive with us, a fully formulated proposal with no opportunity for us to input our ideas.

Clearly Peabody and the council have been in dialogue with each other throughout the 11 week period since or last meeting. Just before Diarmaid sent us the proposal on Friday evening, he sent a message apologising for the delay saying he was 'still waiting for Peabody to get back to him'. But we have been excluded from that dialogue. This despite the fact that we represent the groups who will actually use the Women's Building and we are funding half the study. This is absolutely not "the spirit of coproduction" in which we were supposedly meeting. So much so that last Friday when I referred to today's meeting as "our upcoming coproduction meeting", [Redacted] said she thought it was "just us presenting to you".

We find this situation disappointing, but also confusing given that Peabody have said they don't feel they should be involved in designing the criteria of the feasibility study, as they don't have experience in women's services. Additionally the council have said they also lack this knowledge (From minutes of the October 28th 2019 meeting with Diarmaid, Karen Sullivan, [Redacted], a note under Council's Role states "The Council acknowledged that it does not have the expert services or knowledge in-house with regard to fully understanding needs and operational requirements associated with a women's facility on the site. It is therefore reliant on a range of partners coming forward including those groups represented at this evening's meeting and working alongside them.") Now you may only see a few faces from our side when we meet, but let me remind you of the breadth of knowledge and experience the WBWG incorporates...

As well as a number of members who have lived experience of incarceration at Holloway, the WBWG has members that work in women's health advisory services, child care work, counselling and therapy for women, social work, academia around gender, social justice consultancy, many ex-Holloway workers (from various in-prison projects, including CARAT an in-prison service for supporting women with substance dependencies), public health writing,

teaching art in prisons, anti-violence and support for women, support for prisoners & marginalized foreign nationals, physical training (specialising in marginalised LBTQ+ clients), social enterprise consultancy, criminology and domestic violence education.

Our members represent a broad range of local community facilities and support services for marginalised women, including Solace Women's Aid, Hibiscus Initiatives, Imkaan anti-violence organisation, Minority Matters, Iranian & Kurdish Women's Rights (IKWRO), Inquest, Sisters Uncut, Penderyn Road Residents Association, Reclaim Holloway, Treasures, Holloway United Therapies, Holloway Neighbourhood Network/Old Fire Station community centre, Choices Islington, Hildrop Community Centre, the Network of Finsbury Park Women's Organisations, Maya Centre, Wish Women's Mental Health Charity, Holloway Neighbourhood Network and Women in Prison.

It is the voices and experience of these women we are bringing to the table, please value that.

We were supposed to be signing off on this study today. But clearly, because we only got sight of what you two are proposing one working day before this meeting, that will not be possible. We do however very much want to find common ground with you both and look for a way forward to truly collaborate. Time is of the essence, but nevertheless we require an opportunity to assess your proposal and discuss it amongst ourselves. We then want to meet asap to talk this through together, to produce a road map we are all willing to follow.

[Redacted]

Campaign Organiser, [Community Plan For Holloway](#)

Receive our [email newsletter](#) once every couple of weeks.

Follow us on [Twitter](#) [Instagram](#) or [Facebook](#) for more frequent updates.

[Have your say](#) on the Holloway prison redevelopment.

On Mon, 18 Jan 2021 at 22:23, Ward, Diarmaid <Diarmaid.Ward@islington.gov.uk> wrote:

My apologies – I didn't realise

Let's use the council link as it's now in the diary invite

All the best

Diarmaid

From: Community Plan for Holloway <plxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxx.xxm>

Sent: 18 January 2021 20:54

To: Ward, Diarmaid <xxxxxxxx.xxxx@xxxxxxxxx.xxx.xx>

Cc: [Redacted]

Subject: Re: agenda attached - Women's Building Co-Production meeting

I notice the link you've sent is different from the one I sent a few weeks back when we originally scheduled this meeting. Which are we going to use?

Here is the one I circulated in December

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/85613064271?pwd=TGN3N2psRzMwU0tKSxzbjJLa1hQQT09>

Meeting ID: 856 1306 4271
Passcode: 481094

[Redacted]

Campaign Organiser, [Community Plan For Holloway](#)

Receive our [email newsletter](#) once every couple of weeks.

Follow us on [Twitter](#) [Instagram](#) or [Facebook](#) for more frequent updates.

[Have your say](#) on the Holloway prison redevelopment.

On Mon, 18 Jan 2021 at 11:43, Ward, Diarmaid <Diarmaid.Ward@islington.gov.uk> wrote:

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://weareislington.zoom.us/j/99631705001?pwd=S1R3dWpWd2t6T3lPYXFpVhCUkdxQT09>

Meeting ID: 996 3170 5001
Password: 649367

Dial by your location

+44 208 080 6591 United Kingdom
+44 208 080 6592 United Kingdom
+44 330 088 5830 United Kingdom
+44 131 460 1196 United Kingdom
+44 203 481 5237 United Kingdom
+44 203 481 5240 United Kingdom
+44 203 901 7895 United Kingdom

Meeting ID: 996 3170 5001
Password: 649367

This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. If you have received it in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer. Please be aware that information in this email may be confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected.

This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. If you have received it in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer. Please be aware that information in this email may be confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected.

Pearton, Brad

Sent: 21 August 2023 19:03
Subject: FW: Scope of feasibility study_[Redacted]
Attachments: 2021-02-17 CP4H reply to Council re Feasibility Study.pdf

From: Community Plan for Holloway <plxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxx.xxm>

Sent: 19 May 2021 19:40

To: Sullivan, Karen <xxxxx.xxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxxxx.xxx.x>; Ward, Diarmaid <xxxxxxx.xxxx@xxxxxxxxxx.xxx.xx>; Wilson, Sarah <xxxxx.xxxxxx@xxxxxxxxxx.xxx.xx>

Subject: RE: Scope of feasibility study

Hi Karen

Thanks for your message. Apologies for the slow reply - I've had some time off and just picking things back up.

See below where I've copied our response sent on Feb 18th to LBI's proposed feasibility study scope, with its relevant attachment

Best wishes - [Redacted]

Sullivan, Karen <xxxxx.xxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxxxx.xxx.x>

13 May 2021 at 15:17

To: Community Plan for Holloway <plan4holloway@gmail.com>, "Ward, Diarmaid" <Dixxxxxx.xxxx@xxxxxxxxxx.xxx.uk>

Cc: "Wilson, Sarah" <Sarah.Wixxxx@xxxxxxxxxx.xxx.xx>

Dear [Redacted],

Thank you for your email.

I would be grateful if you could send through your comments again as they appear to have been buried under a pile of other emails.

Apologies for this but I will try to respond as soon as I have seen your comments.

Regards

Karen

From: Community Plan for Holloway <plxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxx.xxm>

Sent: 10 May 2021 18:44

To: Sullivan, Karen <xxxxx.xxxxxxx@xxxxxxxxxxx.xxx.x>; Ward, Diarmaid <xxxxxxxx.xxxx@xxxxxxxxxxx.xxx.xx>

Subject: Scope of feasibility study

Dear Karen and Diarmaid

I've been asked by those attending tonight's Campaign Group meeting to write and enquire about progress with the feasibility study.

When I last spoke to Diarmaid he said the next step was for the two of you to assess our comments on your draft for the study's scope. He said he would try and look at this before the 6th, but inevitably would be pressed for time on account of the elections. [Redacted] We are wondering what is the best way to progress things? Perhaps Karen can work on it alone to move things on somewhat before Diarmaid returns to work, or perhaps Diarmaid could delegate one of his colleagues to look at it in his absence.

Apologies as I'm sure this is awkward to coordinate while Diarmaid is off, but I've been asked to write and see how best we can progress this process quickly.

All the best - [Redacted]

Campaign Organiser, [Community Plan For Holloway](#)

Receive our [email newsletter](#) once every couple of weeks.

Follow us on [Twitter](#) [Instagram](#) or [Facebook](#) for more frequent updates.

[Have your say](#) on the Holloway prison redevelopment.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: [Redacted]Community Engagement Plan4Holloway <engage.plan4holloxxx@xxxxx.xxx>

Date: Thu, 18 Feb 2021 at 09:50

Subject: CP4H response to feasibility study proposal

To: Sullivan, Karen <xxxxx.xxxxxxx@xxxxxxxxxxx.xxx.x>

Cc: Community Engagement Plan For Holloway <engage.plan4holloxxx@xxxxx.xxx>, Ward, Diarmaid <Diarmaid.Ward@islington.gov.uk>, Gill, Satnam <Satnam.Gill@islington.gov.uk>, Clarke, Tricia <Tricia.Clarke@islington.gov.uk>, Ozdemir, Gulcin <Gulcin.Ozdemir@islington.gov.uk>, Ismail, Rakhia

<Rakhia.Ismaxx@xxxxxxxxxx.xxx> Community Plan Directors Group <community-pan-directors-xxxxx@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, Community Plan for Holloway <plan4hxxxxxxx@xxxxx.xxx> [Redacted]

Dear Karen

Thank you for sending Islington council's proposal for the Women's Building feasibility study, which we welcome. Please find attached *Community Plan for Holloway's* response to this proposal. We have commented directly beneath each item, our comments highlighted in yellow. We would welcome your response to our comments and appreciate a meeting as soon as possible to discuss the issues raised.

Yours sincerely,
Community Plan for Holloway Board of Directors

Community Plan For Holloway

Receive our [email newsletter](#) once every couple of weeks.
Follow us on [Twitter](#) [Instagram](#) or [Facebook](#) for more frequent updates.
[Have your say](#) on the Holloway prison redevelopment.

Pearton, Brad

Sent: 21 August 2023 18:58
Subject: FW: Women's Building and the Coproduction Process_[Redacted]

From: [Redacted]Community Engagement Plan4Holloway <engage.p@x>
Sent: 04 May 2021 11:26
To: Ward, Diarmaid <x@xx>
Cc: [Redacted]
Subject: Women's Building and the Coproduction Process

Dear Diarmaid,

Following our April 15 meeting to discuss the Women's Building development and the future of the co-production process, we the Women's Building Working Group understand that Peabody's position is that no more space will be allocated on the site for women's services. Peabody have made it clear that this is an issue of site capacity rather than budget, which is a welcome clarification. We were originally told that the Women's Building would be **determined by the consultation process, yet Peabody are still working to Islington Council's original DRAFT brief**, and we have learned from the architects that no appraisal of site massing was conducted to see if more Women's Building space could be allocated alongside the existing housing offer. On that basis, we maintain that there is potential to provide more space for women's services.

We understand that you are only willing to continue the co-production process if this issue does not remain the main focus of our meetings. But space determines the possibilities of the Women's Building. Any conversation about space must be informed by (1) an independent feasibility study for the Women's Building and (2) an architectural investigation into the reconfiguration of the site design to allow maximum space for the Women's Building, whilst still maintaining the 60% provision of social homes. However, we are willing - given the vital role of women's service providers in shaping the inception of the Women's Building - to continue to offer our expertise and input on all aspects of the design. We propose moving forward with open, constructive discussion and urgently prioritising these two studies as a basis of those discussions.

We are passionate about the development and want to continue to engage with LBI and Peabody to ensure that the legacy of HMP Holloway is honoured through the provision of an iconic and transformative Women's Building that will not only benefit women for generations to come, but provide vital community facilities that will engage, help and empower all members of society. We will continue to publicly campaign for this, as this is an issue of national importance.

The Women's Building Working Group

--

[Community Plan For Holloway](#)

[Redacted]

--

Receive our [email newsletter](#) once every couple of weeks.
Follow us on [Twitter](#) [Instagram](#) or [Facebook](#) for more frequent updates.
[Tell us how you want to be kept in touch \(quick online form\)](#) on the Holloway prison redevelopment.

Pearton, Brad

Sent: 21 August 2023 19:03
Subject: FW: Scope of feasibility study_[Redacted]
Attachments: 2021-02-17 CP4H reply to Council re Feasibility Study.pdf

From: Community Plan for Holloway <plxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxx.xxm>

Sent: 19 May 2021 19:40

To: Sullivan, Karen <xxxxx.xxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxxxx.xxx.x>; Ward, Diarmaid <xxxxxxx.xxxx@xxxxxxxxxx.xxx.xx>; Wilson, Sarah <xxxxx.xxxxxx@xxxxxxxxxx.xxx.xx>

Subject: RE: Scope of feasibility study

Hi Karen

Thanks for your message. Apologies for the slow reply - I've had some time off and just picking things back up.

See below where I've copied our response sent on Feb 18th to LBI's proposed feasibility study scope, with its relevant attachment

Best wishes - [Redacted]

Sullivan, Karen <xxxxx.xxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxxxx.xxx.x>

13 May 2021 at 15:17

To: Community Plan for Holloway <plan4holloway@gmail.com>, "Ward, Diarmaid" <Dixxxxxx.xxxx@xxxxxxxxxx.xxx.uk>

Cc: "Wilson, Sarah" <Sarah.Wixxxx@xxxxxxxxxx.xxx.xx>

Dear [Redacted],

Thank you for your email.

I would be grateful if you could send through your comments again as they appear to have been buried under a pile of other emails.

Apologies for this but I will try to respond as soon as I have seen your comments.

Regards

Karen

From: Community Plan for Holloway <plxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxx.xxm>

Sent: 10 May 2021 18:44

To: Sullivan, Karen <xxxxx.xxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxxxxx.xxx.x>; Ward, Diarmaid <xxxxxxxx.xxxx@xxxxxxxxxxx.xxx.xx>

Subject: Scope of feasibility study

Dear Karen and Diarmaid

I've been asked by those attending tonight's Campaign Group meeting to write and enquire about progress with the feasibility study.

When I last spoke to Diarmaid he said the next step was for the two of you to assess our comments on your draft for the study's scope. He said he would try and look at this before the 6th, but inevitably would be pressed for time on account of the elections. [Redacted] We are wondering what is the best way to progress things? Perhaps Karen can work on it alone to move things on somewhat before Diarmaid returns to work, or perhaps Diarmaid could delegate one of his colleagues to look at it in his absence.

Apologies as I'm sure this is awkward to coordinate while Diarmaid is off, but I've been asked to write and see how best we can progress this process quickly.

All the best - [Redacted]

Campaign Organiser, [Community Plan For Holloway](#)

Receive our [email newsletter](#) once every couple of weeks.

Follow us on [Twitter](#) [Instagram](#) or [Facebook](#) for more frequent updates.

[Have your say](#) on the Holloway prison redevelopment.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: [Redacted]Community Engagement Plan4Holloway <engage.plan4holloxxx@xxxxx.xxx>

Date: Thu, 18 Feb 2021 at 09:50

Subject: CP4H response to feasibility study proposal

To: Sullivan, Karen <xxxxx.xxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxxxxx.xxx.x>

Cc: Community Engagement Plan For Holloway <engage.plan4holloxxx@xxxxx.xxx>, Ward, Diarmaid <Diarmaid.Ward@islington.gov.uk>, Gill, Satnam <Satnam.Gill@islington.gov.uk>, Clarke, Tricia <Tricia.Clarke@islington.gov.uk>, Ozdemir, Gulcin <Gulcin.Ozdemir@islington.gov.uk>, Ismail, Rakhia

<Rakhia.Ismaxx@xxxxxxxxxx.xxx> Community Plan Directors Group <community-pan-directors-xxxxx@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, Community Plan for Holloway <plan4hxxxxxxx@xxxxx.xxx> [Redacted]

Dear Karen

Thank you for sending Islington council's proposal for the Women's Building feasibility study, which we welcome. Please find attached *Community Plan for Holloway's* response to this proposal. We have commented directly beneath each item, our comments highlighted in yellow. We would welcome your response to our comments and appreciate a meeting as soon as possible to discuss the issues raised.

Yours sincerely,
Community Plan for Holloway Board of Directors

Community Plan For Holloway

Receive our [email newsletter](#) once every couple of weeks.
Follow us on [Twitter](#) [Instagram](#) or [Facebook](#) for more frequent updates.
[Have your say](#) on the Holloway prison redevelopment.



ISLINGTON

Emily Thornberry MP
House of Commons
London
SW1A 0AA

Development Management Service
Planning and Development
PO Box 3333
Town Hall
Upper Street
LONDON N1 1YA
F 020 7527 2731
E
karen.sullivan@planning@islington.gov.uk
W www.islington.gov.uk

Date: 22 August 2023

Dear Ms Thornberry MP,

Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (As Amended)

Re: Email received from [REDACTED] (Westminster University) regarding: Planned Women's Building on the site of the Holloway Prison

I write to provide context and a response to the email received from [REDACTED] dated 29 June 2021 received by yourself and also copied to Councillor Diarmaid Ward stating concerns regarding the emerging Women's building design as part of the redevelopment of the Holloway Prison site. I set out a reply to the main points below:

Please do let me know should you wish to discuss any element of this response or the broader initiative in general.

1. An extensive, meaningful public and women's sector consultation and an independent feasibility study to determine the space requirements for the Women's Building ahead of the planning application

A process of targeted consultation that has been deep and extensive, primarily led by LBI but with initiatives also undertaken and led by Peabody. The Council's adopted SPD for the redevelopment of the Holloway Prison Site (itself extensively consulted on) included a requirement to provide a local Women's Centre, based on the principles contained within the seminal Corston Report of 2007. Up to 800sqm was considered the necessary spatial requirement to fulfil this function. The SPD also made reference to providing additional, more generic, facilities for a wider cohort of local women. And after initial consultation, the term Women's Building was adopted on the understanding that it contained both these generic facilities alongside and integrated with a Women's Centre.

Peabody has received grant and loan funding from the GLA for the redevelopment of the whole of the site including on the basis of the delivery of a Women's Centre, together with 60% of the proposed new housing being affordable. The SPD also requires the provision of a new local park which is included in the emerging scheme designs.

The development brief for the Women's Building was informed by the Corston Report (2007) and associated research papers that followed. It was also significantly shaped following an

independently managed workshop attended by representatives of key strategic partners with long standing experience in the criminal justice system, including organisations who have specialist knowledge in assisting women associated with it. Groups represented included Ministry of Justice and MOPAC officials, to women's organisations including Hibiscus, Clinks and Advance.

A number of established UK women's centres were then interviewed and some visited. These included:

- Birmingham (Anawim)
- Brighton Women's Centre
- Cambridge Women's Centre
- Greater Manchester Women's Support Alliance (GMWSA)
- The Beth Centre, Lambeth
- Hibiscus – Holloway Road
- Advance Minerva - Hammersmith

Each was asked a series of established questions the responses to which also helped shaped the development brief.

Simultaneously, the council undertook desktop research into other relevant Centres that included:

- Hull Women's Centre (Preston Road)
- Windsor Women's Centre (Northern Ireland)
- Manor Gardens Welfare Trust
- Women's Support Centre Woking
- The LGBT+ Centre – Sidney Street, Manchester
- Coin Street Community Centre - Southwark
- Kentish Town Health Centre
- Various Maggie's Cancer Centres, UK

LBi was also involved in a further independently managed and facilitated workshop for 'Women with Lived Experience' i.e. who had spent time incarcerated in the Holloway Women's Prison. Among other issues, this examined what factors and facilities they would want to see in a new women's building and what should be included to encourage them and others to use it – e.g. hours of use, crèche facilities, public transport links, types of specialist services, general activities etc.

The advice arising from this workshop was also used to craft the development brief.

During this period Peabody managed a consultation event with CP4H and local community and resident groups about what people would wish to see of a women's building that would also contain space/facilities for a women's centre.

Arising from this extensive and diverse consultation were a set of design principles which were encapsulated within the draft development brief. They included:

- Create a multi-functional complex for a range of services for women, a beacon of women rights, and a facility for women in contact, or at risk of contact, with the criminal justice system

- Provide inspirational spaces that women feel proud of – a flagship
- Create a legible and celebratory presence onto Camden/Parkhurst Road
- Provide a safe space for all women where they are treated as individuals and their needs can be addressed holistically
- Internal design to be ‘trauma informed’
- Design a progression of spaces through the building, from public and celebratory, to increasingly private and secure
- Enable a range of functional uses to be effectively and discretely segregated
- Fully accessible – all internal and external spaces - with regard to mobility needs
- Highest sustainability and energy efficient credentials are required
- Provision of some acoustically secure rooms
- Create a discrete, anonymous, and safe means of secondary access
- Ensure high levels of safety are achieved for women arriving at, and entering, the facility including well lit arrival zones with surrounding active frontages
- Provide for a range of high quality external amenity spaces including a garden at grade
- Multi-storey (up to 3 levels) is acceptable with accessibility and legibility being key
- Generous floor to ceiling heights for some primary ground floor spaces
- Make excellent use of natural light
- Provide generous levels of built in storage
- Ensure complex is designed to be affordable to run and maintain
- Achieve outstanding architecture to celebrate and honour the history of women on the site

The draft brief was then consulted on from summer 2020 and is now drawing to an end. Consultation has been undertaken with specialist, harder to reach, women’s groups in the borough during October 2020 and March 2021 who are supportive of the proposals. The original key stakeholders have also been re-engaged with for their comments on the validity and quality of the emerging proposals and re-engagement with the original group of women with lived experience is scheduled for July 2021 to the same effect.

The draft development brief was issued to a range of community and voluntary sector representatives and uploaded onto the Council’s website. There were 28 responses. Of these 17 represented organisations ranging from Islington Green Party, the Islington Society and Community Plan for Holloway, to Sisters of Frida, Solace and the Women’s Equality Party. There were 11 individual responses.

Network Action, an American based online hosting platform, was activated by an unknown entity. It generated in excess of 250 standardised objections received from people in towns and cities across the UK, from Glasgow to Cornwall, as well as internationally from people living as far away as Nova Scotia.

The gist of this collective objection was that:

- Islington council’s consultation was faulty and unacceptable and must begin again ‘respecting the

work of community members who have put so much labour into envisioning the project'

- All responses to the consultation should be published
- Clear timelines to ongoing consultation should be published
- There should be no MOPAC involvement

Community Plan for Holloway also prepared a standardised objection format that was used by representatives/members of this group as well as by other objectors. The content of these objections was similar to those generated by Network Action above, and included:

- the council's consultation methodology which was poor
- strong objection to the involvement of MOPAC
- does not support having a 'women's centre' within the facility
- demand for feasibility studies to be prepared and/or managed by Community Plan for Holloway

Many respondents demanded a standalone building. Other than this 'in principle' demand for a separate building, there were few specific responses in relation to the spatial suggestions, or in relation to the indicative amount of floorspace being proposed within the brief which were, in effect, the essence of the brief. Only CP4H sought a more specific and enlarged floorspace which was up to 10,000sqm (similar in size to the Islington Design Centre and significantly larger than the Sobel Centre).

However many responses stated they were unable to comment on spatial issues without a full feasibility.

Simultaneously, CP4H has held a series of co-production meetings, Chaired by Cllr Ward, which have run from October 2020 through to February 2021.

The scheme has been designed with significant flexibility, as promoted through the consultation responses, to enable for multiple functions and different groups to access spaces over different times and days/evenings. This should be noted that this space would be the largest community facility space in Islington.

The Council has agreed to fund 50% of a feasibility, with Peabody funding the remainder, of a feasibility study to look at the management and functioning of this facility. This is yet to be commissioned given divergent opinions on the parameters of the study.

2. Reflection on the history and legacy of the site to be embedded in the design principles for the Women's Building

The Council assisted in the preparation of a specialist technical brief into the legacy of the site and designed to capture both the physical remains and the story of the prison, and to then memorialise its legacy within the Women's Building, the dedicated garden of the Women's Building, and possibly within the wider public realm.

In June 2021 Peabody agreed to commission and fund the study which has now commenced.

It will ensure that the legacy of the women who were incarcerated within the Holloway Women's Prison site, and important features of the prison itself, will be effectively recorded and meaningfully and respectfully reflected within the proposed redevelopment of the site.

3. Design options for the Women's Building that look at different, more innovative and iconic solutions (rather than having the women's building relegated to the ground floor of a residential block)

It is unclear just which aspects of the Design the University of Westminster objects to. However, the Council is satisfied that the proposed women's building will be an appropriately innovative and iconic facility with demonstrable potential to serve the needs of a diverse range of local

women, including those 'brushing up' against the criminal justice system. It has never been conceived of as a national or international facility but a local facility for the women of Islington and the wider north London environs to help replace some of those supportive services that took place within the prison to help women with their lives and to provide the space to accommodate additional activities and functions.

The council is minded of the need to develop scarce land in the Borough in a sustainable manner and to address the urgent housing shortage the people of Islington face. As such, the location of a community facility within a part of a large building is neither unusual nor considered to diminish the quality of the facility, or the hinder those services that are likely to be provided within it. The emerging detailed designs show a wide range of room types, generous kitchen and wc provision, excellent storage capacity, well lit spaces, a dedicated garden, and more.

Indeed the Council is confident this will be a facility that the borough will be proud of and that many women for generations ahead will benefit from.

4. A procurement strategy that prioritises women-led businesses from architects to construction workers all the way through to building management.

Discussion are ongoing with the applicant, Peabody Housing, to this effect within the parameters of the UK planning regime.

I do hope this provides some clarity as to the significant amount of thought, consultation and time that has been invested into the brief for the women's building to be delivered as part of the redevelopment of the Holloway Prison site.

Yours Sincerely

Karen Sullivan
Service Director Planning and Development
Islington Council

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Holloway - Women's Building
Date: 14 July 2023 13:17:20
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.jpg](#)

From: Ward, Diarmaid <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 13 August 2020 10:11
To: 'Community Plan for Holloway' <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Holloway - Women's Building

Hello all

In future I think we need to get an agenda agreed before the day of the meeting.

We scheduled this meeting so that Peabody could give their presentation and the group could ask questions and comment, which there wasn't time for at the last meeting – so I think this needs to take priority today.

I am happy to come onto other items as well time permitting.

All the best

Diarmaid

From: Community Plan for Holloway <[REDACTED]>

Sent: 13 August 2020 10:01

To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Subject: Re: Holloway - Women's Building

Hi all

Apologies this is last minute, but we only met to discuss as a group last night. Points we would like added to today's agenda are these...

WBWG Agenda points for the Co-Production meeting with LBI and Peabody

11-12.30 Thursday 13 August 2020

As discussed at the WBWG meeting on 12 August, we would like the following on the table at the co-production meeting on 13 August:

1. Uncouple the process of designing and constructing the Women's Building from that of the residential units. The feasibility study, genuine consultation, and an architectural competition for women-led architectural firms need to be done before design work is resumed.

2. We noted [REDACTED] comments made on 30 July about responses to her Draft Brief:

- a) There is strong desire for the Women's Building to be a stand-alone structure
- b) There is significant opposition to having a separate women's centre within the Women's Building
- c) The legacy aspect of the building is very important to people.

All three of these are parts of the WBWG vision and principles, and they should be honoured in the planning process from now on.

3. The SPD stipulates like-for-like replacement services for what was available in the prison. This should be factored into the service offerings [REDACTED] can speak to this if he attends, otherwise I would leave it out since no one else has studied this issue as he has]

4. We need an agreed road map for how our ongoing collaboration can function.

N.B. As a reminder, Diarmaid committed to three things at the July 30th meeting

a. More "consultation" [comment: this is not the same as co-production, and it is what he promised at the meeting we had with him and Karen Sullivan in October. We don't believe any real consultation has occurred so far anyway]

b. Talking further about the feasibility study [this is happening]

c. Holding a meeting at which Peabody can present its current designs for the Women's Building [That is this meeting. We are interested to see what they have in mind, but this is the cart before the horse and there is no point in their continuing to work on the design]

LINK

11am - 12.30pm

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81608971908?pwd=ZXJNSlFrbkZjNUJtdWpYWGs0NkF0Zz09>

Meeting ID: 816 0897 1908

Passcode: 729746

All the best - [REDACTED] (pronouns he/him)

Campaign Organiser, **Community Plan For Holloway**

Receive our [email newsletter](#) once every couple of weeks.

Follow us on [Twitter](#) or [Facebook](#) for more frequent updates.

On Mon, 10 Aug 2020 at 18:19, [REDACTED] > wrote:

Hi [REDACTED]

Our team can make this earlier time.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

telephone: [REDACTED]
mobile: [REDACTED]
email: [REDACTED]



Find Us : [Edinburgh](#) | [Glasgow](#) | [London](#) | [Manchester](#)

Follow us on : [Instagram](#) | [LinkedIn](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Vimeo](#) | [Ian's Blog](#)



The information transmitted, including attachments, is intended only for the person(s) or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon, his information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error please contact the sender and destroy any copies of this information. To join our mailing list please [click here](#).

From: Community Plan for Holloway <plan4holloway@gmail.com>

Sent: 10 August 2020 17:46

To: [REDACTED] Sullivan, Karen
<Karen.Sullivan@islington.gov.uk>

Cc: [REDACTED] Ward, Diarmaid
<Diarmaid.Ward@islington.gov.uk>; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Subject: Re: Holloway - Women's Building

Hi everyone

[REDACTED] has suggested **11am-12.30pm this Thursday, August 13** as a time which is suitable for Diarmaid and [REDACTED]. This time suits us at CP4H. I am CCing Karen Sullivan in the hope that this time may suit her as well. I tried calling [REDACTED] a couple of times today to check whether this time worked for her and the team, but couldn't get through – hopefully it's okay?

Topic: WB CoProd Meeting

Time: Aug 13, 2020 11:00 AM London

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81608971908?pwd=ZXJNSlFrbkZjNUJFdWpYWGs0NkF0Zz09>

Meeting ID: 816 0897 1908

Passcode: 729746

All the best - [REDACTED] (pronouns he/him)
Campaign Organiser, **Community Plan For Holloway**
Receive our [email newsletter](#) once every couple of weeks.
Follow us on [Twitter](#) or [Facebook](#) for more frequent updates.
On Mon, 10 Aug 2020 at 08:15, [REDACTED]
<Katherine.McNamara@islington.gov.uk> wrote:

Dear All, Cllr Ward is available at any other time on Thursday 13th, and on 14th at 10am as suggested. Please can all, confirm their availability for both days.
Thank you and kind regards.

[REDACTED], Executive PA to:

Cllr Diarmaid Ward, Executive Member for Housing and Development
Cllr Dave Poyser, Chair of Environment & Regeneration Scrutiny Committee
Cllr Mick O'Sullivan, Chair of Housing Scrutiny Committee
Cllr Osh Gantly, Chair of Health and Care Scrutiny Committee
Cllr Vivien Cutler, Chair of Children's Services Scrutiny Committee
Cllr Theresa Debono, Chair of Policy & Performance Scrutiny Committee
Resources Department, Democratic Services
Islington Council

Room 107

Town Hall

Upper Street

London N1 2UD

Tel: [REDACTED]

Alternative Contact: [REDACTED]

In accordance with the General Data Protection Regulations 2018, please note that any personal data you have sent to us for the purpose of assisting you with casework or an enquiry will, if necessary, be shared with colleagues in the Council to enable us to provide a reply. If the enquiry relates to casework which involves an external organisation, such as a social housing provider, we will share your data with them for the purpose of progressing your enquiry. If you wish to withdraw consent for us to hold or process your data please reply to this email address.

web: www.islington.gov.uk

Follow us on **Twitter@IslingtonBC** and **@IslingtonLife**

From: Community Plan for Holloway <plan4holloway@gmail.com>

Sent: 08 August 2020 17:13

To: [REDACTED] >

Cc: Ward, Diarmaid <Diarmaid.Ward@islington.gov.uk>; [REDACTED]

Subject: Re: Holloway - Women's Building

Hi all

Thursday or Friday (13th/14th) would suit us, because the WBWG meets on Wednesday eve.

[REDACTED] recently proposed Thursday 3-4.30pm or Friday at 10-11.30am for design workshops, but any other times on those 2 days seem free.

All the best - [REDACTED] (pronouns he/him)

Campaign Organiser, **Community Plan For Holloway**

Receive our [email newsletter](#) once every couple of weeks.

Follow us on [Twitter](#) or [Facebook](#) for more frequent updates.

On Fri, 7 Aug 2020 at 17:47, [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Hi all

I've just realised I have a call with LBI officers relating to our initial designs for the older people's housing at 3:30-4:30 next Thursday. [REDACTED] will be on that call also. Is there an alternative time that would work for the Women's Building call? I would like to be able to attend this.

[REDACTED]

From: Ward, Diarmaid <Diarmaid.Ward@islington.gov.uk>

Sent: 07 August 2020 17:14

To: Community Plan for Holloway <plan4holloway@gmail.com>

Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: [External] Re: Today's meeting

Do you know who sent this email?

This is an external email and may not be genuine. Please don't reply or click on any links in this email unless you're absolutely sure who sent the email. If you need help deciding please contact the IT Service Desk.

Hi [REDACTED]

3pm on 13th Aug is fine for me

[REDACTED], if this suits everyone, can you set it up?

Thanks

Diarmaid

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Community Plan for Holloway <plan4holloway@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, August 7, 2020 3:50:15 PM

To: Ward, Diarmaid <Diarmaid.Ward@islington.gov.uk>

Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: Re: Today's meeting

Hi Diarmaid

Wondering if you have any news on possible dates to meet next week?

For us, the 13th or 14th would work well. Perhaps we can do 3-4.30 on the Thursday again?

All the best - [REDACTED] (pronouns he/him)

Community Plan For Holloway

Receive our [email newsletter](#) once every couple of weeks.

Follow us on [Twitter](#) or [Facebook](#) for more frequent updates.

On Tue, 4 Aug 2020 at 12:14, Ward, Diarmaid <Diarmaid.Ward@islington.gov.uk> wrote:

Thanks everyone for taking part the meeting

I think we made great progress and I agree with [REDACTED] that we actually have lots in common in relation to the site

I will action the things that we talked about and look forward to seeing everyone again soon

All the best

Diarmaid

From: Community Plan for Holloway <plan4holloway@gmail.com>

Sent: 30 July 2020 17:20

To: Ward, Diarmaid <Diarmaid.Ward@islington.gov.uk>; [REDACTED]

Subject: Today's meeting

Hi all

I feel today's meeting went well and I'm glad to come away with a feeling that, essentially, our views have a lot in common. I welcome this move to better communication between us all and am writing in regards to scheduling the next meeting. I have only been able to include here those people for whom I already have an email contact – LBI and Peabody please circulate this with your colleagues, and I shall do the same with WBWG members.

Let's try and find a 1.5 hour slot, with an understanding that it will be tricky to find a moment suitable to everyone, especially as some people are (finally!) making space to get out of London and have a holiday. Karen Sullivan wrote to say that she was sorry she could not join us today, so hopefully she will be able to join us next time.

I imagine that we are probably looking at the week beginning August 10th. Perhaps if LBI can come back with a few options, we can progress from there. The WBWG meets once a fortnight and our next meeting will be in the evening on August 12th, so for us I imagine meeting on August 13th/14th would work well – perhaps we could do 3-4.30pm on Thursday (13th) again.

There are of course other discussions to be had around the best methodology for us to cooperate moving forwards, including discussing the possibility of a feasibility study, but for now let's work on getting a date booked in as a priority. I will check in with [REDACTED] and send over the feasibility study outline document as soon as possible.

All the best - [REDACTED] (pronouns he/him)

[REDACTED], **Community Plan For Holloway**

Receive our [email newsletter](#) once every couple of weeks.

Follow us on [Twitter](#) or [Facebook](#) for more frequent updates.

This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. If you have received it in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer. Please be aware that information in this email may be confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected.

This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. If you have received it in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer. Please be aware that information in this email may be confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected.

Any views set out in this email are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of the Peabody Group. This email is confidential and intended solely for the use of the person to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, please do not use or forward or share the email in any way, and let Peabody know by

calling 020 7021 4444. Details of the main landlord entities in the Peabody Group are: Peabody Trust, Peabody South East Limited: registered address: 45 Westminster Bridge Road, London SE1 7JB Exempt charities registered with the Financial Conduct Authority and the Regulator of Social Housing Full details of the above entities and other legal entities in the Peabody Group can be found on our web-site:
www.peabody.org.uk

This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. If you have received it in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer. Please be aware that information in this email may be confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Holloway - Women's Building
Date: 14 July 2023 13:18:18
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.jpg](#)

From: Ward, Diarmaid <[REDACTED]>

Sent: 13 August 2020 10:27

To: [REDACTED] Community Plan for Holloway

<[REDACTED]>

Cc: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Holloway - Women's Building

[REDACTED], yes we're happy to talk to this point at the meeting

All the best

Diarmaid

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 13 August 2020 10:26

To: Community Plan for Holloway <[REDACTED]>

Cc: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Sullivan, Karen <[REDACTED]> [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Ward, Diarmaid <[REDACTED]> [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Dear All, sorry I wasn't able to stay for yesterday's WBWG meeting (clash with another meeting). Could I add to agenda point 4. that the consultation should include local community organisations, especially those with access to women in social housing and members of marginalised communities? Thanks, [REDACTED].

On Thu, 13 Aug 2020 at 10:00, Community Plan for Holloway <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Hi all

Apologies this is last minute, but we only met to discuss as a group last night. Points we would like added to today's agenda are these...

WBWG Agenda points for the Co-Production meeting with LBI and Peabody

11-12.30 Thursday 13 August 2020

As discussed at the WBWG meeting on 12 August, we would like the following on the table at the co-production meeting on 13 August:

1. Uncouple the process of designing and constructing the Women's Building from that of the residential units. The feasibility study, genuine consultation, and an architectural competition for women-led architectural firms need to be done before design work is resumed.

2. We noted [REDACTED] comments made on 30 July about responses to her Draft Brief:

- a) There is strong desire for the Women's Building to be a stand-alone structure
- b) There is significant opposition to having a separate women's centre within the Women's Building
- c) The legacy aspect of the building is very important to people.

All three of these are parts of the WBWG vision and principles, and they should be honoured in the planning process from now on.

3. The SPD stipulates like-for-like replacement services for what was available in the prison. This should be factored into the service offerings [REDACTED] can speak to this if he attends, otherwise I would leave it out since no one else has studied this issue as he has]

4. We need an agreed road map for how our ongoing collaboration can function.

N.B. As a reminder, Diarmaid committed to three things at the July 30th meeting

a. More "consultation" [comment: this is not the same as co-production, and it is what he promised at the meeting we had with him and Karen Sullivan in October. We don't believe any real consultation has occurred so far anyway]

b. Talking further about the feasibility study [this is happening]

c. Holding a meeting at which Peabody can present its current designs for the Women's Building [That is this meeting. We are interested to see what they have in mind, but this is the cart before the horse and there is no point in their continuing to work on the design]

LINK

11am - 12.30pm

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81608971908?pwd=ZXJNSlFrbkZjNUJTdWpYWGs0NkF0Zz09>

Meeting ID: 816 0897 1908

Passcode: 729746

All the best - [REDACTED] (pronouns he/him)

[REDACTED], **Community Plan For Holloway**

Receive our [email newsletter](#) once every couple of weeks.

Follow us on [Twitter](#) or [Facebook](#) for more frequent updates.

On Mon, 10 Aug 2020 at 18:19, [REDACTED] [@iceniprojects.com](mailto:[REDACTED]@iceniprojects.com)> wrote:

Hi [REDACTED]

Our team can make this earlier time.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

telephone: [REDACTED]

mobile: [REDACTED]

email: [REDACTED]



Find Us : [Edinburgh](#) | [Glasgow](#) | [London](#) | [Manchester](#)

Follow us on : [Instagram](#) | [LinkedIn](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Vimeo](#) | [Ian's Blog](#)



The information transmitted including attachments is intended only for the person(s) or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error please contact the sender and destroy any copies of this information. To join our mailing list please [click here](#).

From: Community Plan for Holloway <plan4holloway@gmail.com>

Sent: 10 August 2020 17:46

To: [REDACTED] Sullivan, Karen
<Karen.Sullivan@islington.gov.uk>

Cc: [REDACTED] Ward, Diarmaid
<Diarmaid.Ward@islington.gov.uk>:
[REDACTED]

Subject: Re: Holloway - Women's Building

Hi everyone

[REDACTED] has suggested **11am-12.30pm this Thursday, August 13** as a time which is suitable for Diarmaid and [REDACTED]. This time suits us at CP4H. I am CC'ing Karen Sullivan in the hope that this time may suit her as well. I tried calling [REDACTED] a couple of times today to check whether this time worked for her and the team, but couldn't get through – hopefully it's okay?

Topic: WB CoProd Meeting

Time: Aug 13, 2020 11:00 AM London

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81608971908?pwd=ZXJNSlFrbkZjNUJkdWpYWGs0NkF0Zz09>

Meeting ID: 816 0897 1908

Passcode: 729746

All the best - [REDACTED] (pronouns he/him)

[REDACTED], **Community Plan For Holloway**

Receive our [email newsletter](#) once every couple of weeks.

Follow us on [Twitter](#) or [Facebook](#) for more frequent updates.

On Mon, 10 Aug 2020 at 08:15, [REDACTED]

<[REDACTED]> wrote:

Dear All, Cllr Ward is available at any other time on Thursday 13th, and on 14th at 10am as suggested. Please can all, confirm their availability for both days.

Thank you and kind regards.

[REDACTED], Executive PA to:

Cllr Diarmaid Ward, Executive Member for Housing and Development
Cllr Dave Poyser, Chair of Environment & Regeneration Scrutiny Committee
Cllr Mick O'Sullivan, Chair of Housing Scrutiny Committee
Cllr Osh Gantly, Chair of Health and Care Scrutiny Committee
Cllr Vivien Cutler, Chair of Children's Services Scrutiny Committee
Cllr Theresa Debono, Chair of Policy & Performance Scrutiny Committee
Resources Department, Democratic Services
Islington Council
Room 107
Town Hall
Upper Street
London N1 2UD

Tel: [REDACTED]

Alternative Contact: [REDACTED]

In accordance with the General Data Protection Regulations 2018, please note that any personal data you have sent to us for the purpose of assisting you with casework or an enquiry will, if necessary, be shared with colleagues in the Council to enable us to provide a reply. If the enquiry relates to casework which involves an external organisation, such as a social housing provider, we will share your data with them for the purpose of progressing your enquiry. If you wish to withdraw consent for us to hold or process your data please reply to this email address.

web: www.islington.gov.uk

Follow us on **Twitter@IslingtonBC** and **@IslingtonLife**

From: Community Plan for Holloway <[REDACTED]>

Sent: 08 August 2020 17:13

To: [REDACTED] >

Cc: Ward, Diarmaid <Diarmaid.Ward@islington.gov.uk>; [REDACTED]

<[REDACTED]>

Subject: Re: Holloway - Women's Building

Hi all

Thursday or Friday (13th/14th) would suit us, because the WBWG meets on Wednesday eve.

[REDACTED] recently proposed Thursday 3-4.30pm or Friday at 10-11.30am for design workshops, but any other times on those 2 days seem free.

All the best - [REDACTED] (pronouns he/him)

[REDACTED], Community Plan For Holloway

Receive our [email newsletter](#) once every couple of weeks.

Follow us on [Twitter](#) or [Facebook](#) for more frequent updates.

On Fri, 7 Aug 2020 at 17:47, [REDACTED] peabody.org.uk> wrote:

Hi all

I've just realised I have a call with LBI officers relating to our initial designs for the older people's housing at 3:30-4:30 next Thursday. [REDACTED] will be on that call also. Is there an alternative time that would work for the Women's Building call? I would like to be able to attend this.

[REDACTED]

From: Ward, Diarmaid <Diarmaid.Ward@islington.gov.uk>

Sent: 07 August 2020 17:14

To: Community Plan for Holloway <plan4holloway@gmail.com>

Cc: [REDACTED]

<[REDACTED]>

[REDACTED]

Subject: [External] Re: Today's meeting

Do you know who sent this email?

This is an external email and may not be genuine. Please don't reply or click on any links in this email unless you're absolutely sure who sent the email. If you need help deciding please contact the IT Service Desk.

Hi [REDACTED]
3pm on 13th Aug is fine for me
[REDACTED] if this suits everyone, can you set it up?
Thanks
Diarmaid
Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Community Plan for Holloway <plan4holloway@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, August 7, 2020 3:50:15 PM
To: Ward, Diarmaid <Diarmaid.Ward@islington.gov.uk>
Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: Re: Today's meeting

Hi Diarmaid
Wondering if you have any news on possible dates to meet next week?
For us, the 13th or 14th would work well. Perhaps we can do 3-4.30 on the Thursday again?
All the best - [REDACTED] (pronouns he/him)
[REDACTED], **Community Plan For Holloway**
Receive our [email newsletter](#) once every couple of weeks.
Follow us on [Twitter](#) or [Facebook](#) for more frequent updates.
On Tue, 4 Aug 2020 at 12:14, Ward, Diarmaid <Diarmaid.Ward@islington.gov.uk> wrote:

Thanks everyone for taking part the meeting

I think we made great progress and I agree with [REDACTED] that we actually have lots in common in relation to the site

I will action the things that we talked about and look forward to seeing everyone again soon

All the best

Diarmaid

From: Community Plan for Holloway <plan4holloway@gmail.com>
Sent: 30 July 2020 17:20
To: Ward, Diarmaid <Diarmaid.Ward@islington.gov.uk>; [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Subject: Today's meeting

Hi all

I feel today's meeting went well and I'm glad to come away with a feeling that, essentially, our views have a lot in common. I welcome this move to better communication between us all and am writing in regards to scheduling the next meeting. I have only been able to include here those people for whom I already have an email contact – LBI and Peabody please circulate this with your colleagues, and I shall do the same with WBWG members.

Let's try and find a 1.5 hour slot, with an understanding that it will be tricky to find a moment suitable to everyone, especially as some people are (finally!) making space to get out of London and have a holiday. Karen Sullivan wrote to say that she was sorry she could not join us today, so hopefully she will be able to join us next time.

I imagine that we are probably looking at the week beginning August 10th. Perhaps if LBI can come back with a few options, we can progress from there. The WBWG meets once a fortnight and our next meeting will be in the evening on August 12th, so for us I imagine meeting on August 13th/14th would work well – perhaps we could do 3-4.30pm on Thursday (13th) again.

There are of course other discussions to be had around the best methodology for us to cooperate moving forwards, including discussing the possibility of a feasibility study, but for now let's work on getting a date booked in as a priority. I will check in with Bonnie and send over the feasibility study outline document as soon as possible.

All the best - [REDACTED] (pronouns he/him)

[REDACTED] Community Plan For Holloway

Receive our [email newsletter](#) once every couple of weeks.

Follow us on [Twitter](#) or [Facebook](#) for more frequent updates.

This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. If you have received it in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer. Please be aware that information in this email may be confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected.

This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. If you have received it in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer. Please be aware that information in this email may be confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected.

Any views set out in this email are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of the Peabody Group. This email is confidential and intended solely for the use of the person to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, please do not use or forward or share the email in any way, and let Peabody know by calling 020 7021 4444. Details of the main landlord entities in the Peabody Group are: Peabody Trust, Peabody South East Limited: registered address: 45 Westminster Bridge Road, London SE1 7JB Exempt charities registered with the Financial Conduct Authority and the Regulator of Social Housing Full details of the above entities and other legal entities in the Peabody Group can be found on our web-site:

www.peabody.org.uk

This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. If you have received it in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer. Please be aware that information in this email may be confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected.

Cc:

Hi all

I understand that we moved this forward by a week so that the architects could present some updates around amendments they are incorporating? This should therefore be an agenda item.

I believe that the council's consultation on the draft brief has been ongoing, so perhaps we can hear about progress there.

All the best - [REDACTED] (pronouns he/him)

Receive our [email newsletter](#) once every couple of weeks.

On Fri, 18 Sep 2020 at 11:47, Community Plan for Holloway

<plan4holloway@gmail.com> wrote:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84129921829?>

Meeting ID: 841 2992 1829

All the best - [REDACTED] (pronouns he/him)

Receive our [email newsletter](#) once every couple of weeks.

On Fri, 18 Sep 2020 at 08:57, I

Apologies [REDACTED], after confirming 11.30am, we now have an urgent meeting which I cannot shift. Of all the responses I received, all had availability later in the day on the Tuesday, therefore please would you kindly send an update for 2.30pm. Apologies again and thanks very much.

Sent: 17 September 2020 19:07

To: [REDACTED] >

Cc:

100

[REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Subject: Women's Building Co-Production meeting, Tuesday Sep 29th, 11.30am-1pm

Hi all

The date/time chosen is Tuesday Sep 29th, from 11.30am-1pm

Hope you can make it. Let's discuss agenda points in advance.

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84129921829?pwd=bUpuRzRDeEowS2o2dTRlSjBWT3NQUT09>

Meeting ID: 841 2992 1829

Passcode: 466608

All the best - [REDACTED] (pronouns he/him)

[REDACTED], **Community Plan For Holloway**

Receive our [email newsletter](#) once every couple of weeks.

Follow us on [Twitter](#) or [Facebook](#) for more frequent updates.

On Wed, 16 Sep 2020 at 09:10, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] wrote:

Dear Colleagues

The meeting will be deferred to w/c 28th September.

Please can you let me know your availability for all slots:

Monday 28th at 12 noon;

Tuesday 29th between 10am and 4pm;

Wednesday 30th between 10am and 2pm.

Thank you.

[REDACTED] Executive PA to:

Cllr Diarmuid Ward, Executive Member for Housing and Development

Cllr Dave Poyser, Chair of Environment & Regeneration Scrutiny Committee

Cllr Mick O'Sullivan, Chair of Housing Scrutiny Committee

Cllr Osh Gantly, Chair of Health and Care Scrutiny Committee

Cllr Vivien Cutler, Chair of Children's Services Scrutiny Committee

Cllr Theresa Debono, Chair of Policy & Performance Scrutiny Committee

Resources Department, Democratic Services

Islington Council

Room 107

Town Hall

Upper Street

London N1 2UD

Tel: [REDACTED]

Alternative Contact: [REDACTED]

In accordance with the General Data Protection Regulations 2018, please note that any personal data you have sent to us for the purpose of assisting you with casework or an enquiry will, if necessary, be shared with colleagues in the Council to enable us to provide a reply. If the enquiry relates to casework which involves an external organisation, such as a social housing provider, we will share your data with them for the purpose of progressing your enquiry. If you wish to withdraw consent for us to hold or process your data please reply to this email address.

web: www.islington.gov.uk

Follow us on [Twitter@IslingtonBC](#) and [@IslingtonLife](#)

Sent: 14 September 2020 11:02

To: Community Plan for Holloway <xxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxx.xxx>; [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: Women's Building Co-Production meeting, Monday 21st September

Dear All

Please would you let me know your availability for a further meeting as follows:
PM on Monday 21st September.

Any time on 22nd.

Thank you.

[REDACTED] Executive PA to:

Cllr Diarmaid Ward, Executive Member for Housing and Development
Cllr Dave Poyser, Chair of Environment & Regeneration Scrutiny Committee
Cllr Mick O'Sullivan, Chair of Housing Scrutiny Committee
Cllr Osh Gantly, Chair of Health and Care Scrutiny Committee
Cllr Vivien Cutler, Chair of Children's Services Scrutiny Committee
Cllr Theresa Debono, Chair of Policy & Performance Scrutiny Committee
Resources Department, Democratic Services
Islington Council
Room 107
Town Hall
Upper Street
London N1 2UD
Tel: [REDACTED]

Alternative Contact: [REDACTED]

In accordance with the General Data Protection Regulations 2018, please note that any personal data you have sent to us for the purpose of assisting you with casework or an enquiry will, if necessary, be shared with colleagues in the Council to enable us to provide a reply. If the enquiry relates to casework which involves an external organisation, such as a social housing provider, we will share your data with them for the purpose of progressing your enquiry. If you wish to withdraw consent for us to hold or process your data please reply to this email address.

web: www.islington.gov.uk

Follow us on **Twitter@IslingtonBC** and **@IslingtonLife**

This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. If you have received it in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer. Please be aware that information in this email may be confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected.

This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. If you have received it in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer. Please be

aware that information in this email may be confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected.

This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. If you have received it in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer. Please be aware that information in this email may be confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Women's Building feasibility study
Date: 14 July 2023 13:16:17

From: Ward, Diarmaid <Diarmaid.Ward@islington.gov.uk>

Sent: 11 August 2020 16:52

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: plan4holloway@gmail.com; Sullivan, Karen <Karen.Sullivan@islington.gov.uk>; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Women's Building feasibility study

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for your email.

I'm happy to discuss this further, but as you'd expect, I would need an awful lot more detail before committing the council to this financially (and of course, there is no budget for this, so I'd to try and find the money as well!)

My initial questions are

Who is the donor? Can I speak to them directly? It isn't easy for the council to enter into partnership on a project if we don't know who the other party is.

What is the purpose of the study? How does its purpose differ from the planning brief currently being consulted on?

All the best

Diarmaid

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 07 August 2020 17:50

To: Ward, Diarmaid <Diarmaid.Ward@islington.gov.uk>

Cc: plan4holloway@gmail.com

Subject: Women's Building feasibility study

Hello Diarmaid.

I'm sorry I didn't get back to you yesterday as I'd planned, but I didn't have much more information.

However, the donor is still keen to fund the feasibility study with a grant of up to £10 thousand, so long as they can be assured that it will be of value to the project, i.e. taken into account by both LBI and Peabody.

The contractor they have in mind is The Social Investment Consultancy, who are revisiting their proposal in the light of both [REDACTED] Draft Brief and the Peabody master plan.

[REDACTED], CEO of the Holloway Neighbourhood Group/Old Fire Station Community Centre, and [REDACTED] have both agreed to be part of the a three-person committee to supervise the contract. I'm hoping the third person, representing women's groups, will agree to come on board soon.

You said you had some questions, which you wanted to take offline. I'd be happy to talk on the phone or respond by email.

Looking forward to hearing from you,
[REDACTED]

From: Ward, Diarmaid [<mailto:Diarmaid.Ward@islington.gov.uk>]

Sent: 07 August 2020 17:14

To: Community Plan for Holloway

Cc: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Subject: Re: Today's meeting

Hi [REDACTED]
3pm on 13th Aug is fine for me
[REDACTED] if this suits everyone, can you set it up?
Thanks
Diarmaid
Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Community Plan for Holloway <plan4holloway@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, August 7, 2020 3:50:15 PM
To: Ward, Diarmaid <Diarmaid.Ward@islington.gov.uk>
Cc: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Subject: Re: Today's meeting

Hi Diarmaid
Wondering if you have any news on possible dates to meet next week?
For us, the 13th or 14th would work well. Perhaps we can do 3-4.30 on the Thursday again?
All the best - [REDACTED] (pronouns he/him)
[REDACTED], **Community Plan For Holloway**
Receive our [email newsletter](#) once every couple of weeks.
Follow us on [Twitter](#) or [Facebook](#) for more frequent updates.
On Tue, 4 Aug 2020 at 12:14, Ward, Diarmaid <Diarmaid.Ward@islington.gov.uk> wrote:

Thanks everyone for taking part the meeting

I think we made great progress and I agree with [REDACTED] that we actually have lots in common in relation to the site

I will action the things that we talked about and look forward to seeing everyone again soon

All the best

Diarmaid

From: Community Plan for Holloway <plan4holloway@gmail.com>
Sent: 30 July 2020 17:20
To: Ward, Diarmaid <Diarmaid.Ward@islington.gov.uk>; [REDACTED]
<[REDACTED]>
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Subject: Today's meeting

Hi all

I feel today's meeting went well and I'm glad to come away with a feeling that,

essentially, our views have a lot in common. I welcome this move to better communication between us all and am writing in regards to scheduling the next meeting. I have only been able to include here those people for whom I already have an email contact – LBI and Peabody please circulate this with your colleagues, and I shall do the same with WBWG members.

Let's try and find a 1.5 hour slot, with an understanding that it will be tricky to find a moment suitable to everyone, especially as some people are (finally!) making space to get out of London and have a holiday. Karen Sullivan wrote to say that she was sorry she could not join us today, so hopefully she will be able to join us next time.

I imagine that we are probably looking at the week beginning August 10th. Perhaps if LBI can come back with a few options, we can progress from there. The WBWG meets once a fortnight and our next meeting will be in the evening on August 12th, so for us I imagine meeting on August 13th/14th would work well – perhaps we could do 3-4.30pm on Thursday (13th) again.

There are of course other discussions to be had around the best methodology for us to cooperate moving forwards, including discussing the possibility of a feasibility study, but for now let's work on getting a date booked in as a priority. I will check in with Bonnie and send over the feasibility study outline document as soon as possible.

All the best - [REDACTED] (pronouns he/him)

[REDACTED], **Community Plan For Holloway**

Receive our [email newsletter](#) once every couple of weeks.

Follow us on [Twitter](#) or [Facebook](#) for more frequent updates.

This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. If you have received it in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer. Please be aware that information in this email may be confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected.

This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. If you have received it in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer. Please be aware that information in this email may be confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected.