

Fenwick Resident Engagement Panel (REP) Meeting
Thursday 17/8/17, 6.30pm, Regeneration Hub, 66 Willington Road

Present:

Christian Brunschen (CB, chair)	Resident Rep (Leaseholder)
Marjorie McIntyre (MM, vice chair)	Resident Rep (Tenant)
Stephen Davies (SD)	Resident Rep (Leaseholder)
Cllr Christiana Valcarcel (CV),	Ward member, Larkhall ward
Cllr Andy Wilson	Ward member, Larkhall ward
Cllr Paul McGlone (PM)	Deputy Leader of the Council (Investment and Partnerships)
Rachel Sharpe (RS)	Director Strategic Programmes, Lambeth Council
Jonny Moore (JM)	Housing Regeneration Team, Lambeth Council
Rob Lansbury (RL)	Independent Resident Advisor (STUF)

Apologies: Sofie Reynolds, John Hayton, Cllr Marsha De Cordova, Vaughan Grandin, Bashir Miah, Patrick Clark (TfL).

	Action
<p>1) Welcome</p> <p>CB chaired the meeting. Officers and REP members introduced themselves.</p>	
<p>2) Minutes of last Meeting (15.6.17).</p> <p>CB commented that CB arrived late at the meeting and as Deputy Chair MM chaired the meeting in CBs absence.</p> <p>SD stated that the minute stating <i>“Some REP member responded by highlighting that outside of this meeting, people don’t really care whether the DM is Mace Ltd or someone else. It is more important that the appointed DM organisation work well with the residents”</i> was not accurate and did not reflect what a number of residents he had spoken to felt.</p> <p>CB accepted this but also that some may not care if it is Mace or someone else.</p> <p>RS suggested to take out the sentence starting <i>“Some REP member responded by highlighting that outside of this meeting, people don’t really care whether the DM is Mace Ltd or someone else”</i></p>	

Other than these two corrections, the minutes were accepted as accurate.

3) Matters arising/Action.

JM reported that Bashir contacted the Garage team about the resident concerns raised at the REP meeting.

Tim Roberts, Parking and Garage Officer responded and advised that they will send a member of their team to inspect for possible misuse. They have requested if the garage number associated with the nuisance could be provided.

Regarding how the garage lettings were advertised, it was advised that the garage team posted adverts for available Lambeth garages several times in Lambeth Talk magazine, and had received a good response. This magazine goes to all residents across the whole borough, but priority is given to residents on the estate that apply. As of last month, there are still eleven garages available on Fenwick Estate so if any local residents are interested, they should contact garage team.

The garage team contact details are below:

Tim Roberts
Parking & Garages Officer
Housing Services
London Borough of Lambeth
Phone: 020 7926 6385
Email: TCRoberts@lambeth.gov.uk

SD said that the misuse is still ongoing and will send details of which garage is being misused.

JM provided an update regarding Vulnerable residents.

JM reported that a revised Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) is underway for the first 3 estates – Knights Walk, South Lambeth and Westbury. It is planned that the EIAs will be submitted as part of the Compulsory Purchase Order process. The purpose of the EIA exercise is to identify the possible adverse impact to local residents that are going through the regeneration process. The identification of vulnerable residents and their needs is paramount to this exercise. The result of the project will be, where possible, incorporated in to the Housing Regeneration programme activities.

A housing needs survey is being carried out across the programme by the Decant team. The purpose of the survey is to assess the households rehousing requirements, which will include any medical assessments and/or aids and adaptations requirements. The housing needs survey will highlight any vulnerable residents, this information will be followed up with the

appropriate action to effectively manage any adverse impact to vulnerable residents.

A combined children and adults safeguarding training session has been arranged to take place for the Housing Regeneration team, date of training 23.10.17.

The Housing Regeneration team has begun to share information with the Adult Social Care (ASC) team. To date there hasn't been a significant issue to share or refer to ASC.

A protocol to share information with Adults & Health and Children's Services is now in place. To date there hasn't been an issue to share or refer to Adults & Health and Children's Services.

The Directors of Adults & Health and Children's Services team have been provided with a briefing to inform their teams and key stakeholders, e.g. health services, of the regeneration programme and how to make contact with the team if required.

The Housing Regeneration team is aiming to appoint an officer to provide support or to signpost vulnerable residents to the appropriate agency, who require support through the regeneration process. It is hoped the appointment of an officer will take place later this year.

AW stated that the Council must also be aware of residents who no longer use services but are still vulnerable and ensure that these residents receive the support they need and that services can share information about such h residents.

AW would also like to know how many residents who are identified by the Housing Regeneration team as part of the HNS are then referred to Adults & Health and Children's Services.

RS stated that the thresholds are quite high for accessing Adults & Health and Children's Services and that it would be useful to have a broader view of vulnerability.

AW stated that the Council needed to be mindful of the confidentiality and sensitive around sharing of information for vulnerable residents. JM reported that so far there have been no issues in the sharing of information with either Adults & Health and Children's Services, and that protocols have been put in place to respect these issues.

CB asked about the timing of the Initial Demolition Notices. PM stated that there are a number of things going on at the present time, and that the IDN could be issued next year. There are technical issues as to why it is required, but the timing can wait.

<p>RL reported that first bit of case work has arisen on Right to Buys (RTBs), regarding a household who wish to buy but are having affordability issues. They have enquired about a cash incentive scheme which Lambeth do not offer. RL residents may apply for the RTB ahead of the IDN, but may not be able to afford it.</p> <p>PM replied that this is one of the risks in terms of not issuing the IDN.</p> <p>AW reminded that there may be opportunities for tenants to access home ownership through shared ownership on regeneration estates.</p> <p>RS stated that if people are considering the RTB option they need to fully understand the implications of the RTB and what the Key Guarantees are.</p> <p>MM queried if tenants can still apply for RTB as she understood the RTB was no longer applicable to regeneration estates.</p> <p>PM replied that as part of the tenancies, leases, and housing management consultation it will be asked as part of the consultation about if the RTB should remain for tenants under the new tenancy.</p>	
<p>4) Regeneration Updates</p> <p>4.1 DMT Procurement update</p> <p>Rachel Sharpe & Cllr McGLone provided an update regarding the DMT procurement.</p> <p>PM stated that whilst this is not a good story, neither is it typical of procurement processes. Since the last meeting, and on legal advice, Cllr McGLone took the decision to terminate the procurement process and therefore not to award the contract to Mace. Cllr McGLone apologised to residents for this on behalf of the Council.</p> <p>This was based on legal advice regarding technical issues with the procurement process. The decision was made as to avoid any further waste of time or taxpayers money. Work on the legal claim will continue.</p> <p>It is now the Council's priority to move forward with the project. In terms of progressing, officers are currently working on a strategy to proceed.</p> <p>One potential way forward is that residents would be involved in the process of selecting the development management team in the same way as previously, by participating in an exhibition and interviews.</p> <p>Another option is that the council selects the development management team, but subsequently involves residents in the selection of the architects who would work for the development manager.</p>	

Both of these are subject to further analysis regarding procurement and legal issues.

MM asked what technical services does the DMT cover.

JM replied that this includes planning, financial viability, CPO, site surveys, amongst others.

AW asked who chooses the materials as this is something residents are particularly concerned about. Is this the architects? AW also said that residents went through a long process previously and their recommendations were not felt to be met, how can it be ensured residents have a meaningful influence on the decision next time. AW felt that the proportion (20%) of the scoring that residents were responsible for was not enough, and that the weighting should be more under a new exercise.

SD recounted that there was a disagreement in the interviews where one of the bidders said on a previous project they wanted to use an expensive brick. Is that not what the Council should want?

RS pointed out that there is big difference between using expensive material and achieving value for money. The Council would be concerned if an architect wants to use expensive bricks, there needs to be a balance between value for money and quality.

SD stated his thanks for Cllr McGlone's apologies, and his thanks that the decision was taken. SD stated that he wanted a bigger say on who the contractor would be.

JM clarified that this process is not the procurement process for the contractor. That will be later on in the project. However the DMT we will be seeking to appoint could run the procurement process for the contractor.

SD stated that he does not have confidence on how the Council will do the procurement process and that he wants residents to be involved in the appointment.

CB stated that It should be specified that the DMT team should involve residents in the process.

RS clarified that resident involvement is specified within the Key Guarantees.

CB asked if Mace could be involved in the re-procurement, and if so, can the people who were involved last time not be involved this time round.

RS clarified that there wasn't any conflict of interest found, and the reason for terminating the process was a technical one.

CB replied that even if there isn't a conflict of interest - it will look like there is one.

AW said that there is mistrust in decision-making.

SD asked if there could there be another legal challenge.

JM replied that yes there could be.

AW said that inevitably there will be different people involved in the process this time round, and that we need to regain trust in the process.

RL stated that one of the criticisms in the process last time is that residents only had 1 day to visit the exhibition, and even if you did attend you had to score them in one day, and that this time resident involvement would need to be done in a different way.

RS suggested that teams can be asked to send the personnel named in the proposal to any interview or exhibition.

MM said that there should be continuity among the staff working as part of the team on the project.

CV asked what if someone moves on from the team?

JM clarified that one of the criteria in the scoring can be about staff continuity.

PM asked the group if the approach described as Option B above acceptable? Cllr McG is time important among residents' concerns.

CB said that trust is more important than time. It is understood that the regeneration process can take time.

SD said that he wants to ask 2 people, AW & RL what their opinions are.

RL said that he has experienced the 2nd option, and that any reporting can be difficult, where there are different elements reporting back to an overall project manager. He also said that for some residents he has spoke to, then time is important, and if time is important, then go with Option B.

AW said that if residents can influence the process then the preference is Option B.

CB asked if we can make a decision now or reflect and report back at the next meeting.

SD said that the purpose of the REP is to represent the estate and so should make a recommendation now.

RS suggested that the council go away and do some more work and come back with a more worked up proposal.

The group agreed with this approach.

4.2 Housing Need Survey

JM reported that the Housing Need Survey for council tenants on Fenwick estate is underway & started in late July 2017.

Every Wednesday and Thursday, Paul Gordon, from the decant team and Bashir have been visiting residents at their homes to carry out the housing need survey. There are morning and afternoon appointments were offered.

The purpose of the survey is to understand the housing needs of all tenants and get up to date information about residents. Also to raise awareness about the regeneration and answer the queries residents may have about the regeneration project. As well as to provide details of the support the Council will provide to help existing tenant through this process.

The team are scheduling visits by block by blocks and to date they have sent letter to Fenwick place, Cottage Grove and Willet House and seen around 50 tenants (about 20%).

They will be moving across the estate and over the next few months, until they have visited all tenants on the estate.

If any tenants would like to have an housing need visit in advance of the team scheduling, they should contact Bashir Miah 0207 926 3607 or Paul Gordon on 07904 088857 to arrange an appointment.

4.3 Regeneration 'hub' Opening

JM reported that the regeneration Hub is now open. The team will be running drop-ins from here, as will the Independent Advisers. The Drop-in time are:

- Every Tuesday (from 5th September) - 10am - 5pm
- Every other Monday (next one is 11th September due to bank Holiday) 5pm - 8pm.

4.4 Tenancies, leases & housing management consultation

Tenancies, leases & housing management consultation is due to start in September for 6 weeks. Booklets regarding tenancies, leases & housing management will be sent to all residents.

<p>We will be running specific consultation events on the estate - drop-ins focused on tenancies & leases & the IA will be organising a workshop & drop-ins.</p> <p>AW asked will the 55 units still be used for Fenwick residents.</p> <p>JM said that as far as he is aware yes, the 55 units will be used as a first decant for Fenwick tenants. This would be subject to a phasing plan, and that to aid the decant process, the 55 units could be used for those tenants in the first phase.</p>	
<p>5) Fenwick South Update</p> <p>TfL are still working through the procurement process with contractors. The timescales will be confirmed later in the summer, when they will also be able to give residents and stakeholders an update on the next steps, surveys, etc.</p> <p>In the meantime, if there are any questions, please contact Patrick Clark patrickclark@tfl.gov.uk or by phone on 07590 600389</p>	
<p>6) Independent Advisor's (IA) Feedback</p> <p>RL reported that the IAs got legal advice on the tenancies and leases in order to influence the documents ahead of the consultation. Cllr McGlone wished to thank the IAs for their very useful contributions to the development of the tenancy and lease documents.</p> <p>The IA are continuing to support tenants and leaseholders.</p> <p>RL reported that Simon Sochas is leaving. The REP expressed their thanks to Simon for his work.</p> <p>RL reported that there has been a couple of unfortunate deaths on the estate. CB asked to send Christine the REPs best wishes.</p>	
<p>7) Resident REP feedback</p> <p>SD said that he felt residents have already stated everything they wished to raise.</p>	
<p>8) AOB</p> <p>JM reported back on a query raised by Vaughan Grandin regarding the fees leaseholders can expect for valuations on early buybacks.</p>	

The Council's view of reasonable fees is based on the range of fees experienced with homeowners going through the process so far; the Council now has 20 purchases completed and a similar number in progress.

The majority of homeowners dealt with have arranged their own valuation; and the fees homeowners have sought reimbursement for have defined the level viewed to be reasonable.

Regarding fee enquiries generally, it has been found that there can be confusion about how they are quoted, ie valuation & hourly rate for negotiation, and the general scope. The Council is aware that some surveyors are offering, and therefore quoting fees for services that go beyond the 'red book' valuation and subsequent negotiation - eg. acting as the homeowner's agent.

This is not relevant for the early buybacks, where homeowners are approaching the council. The Council are seeking to avoid unnecessary expenditure on fees, but are mindful that homeowners should use a valuer who they wish to; therefore the Council offer to contribute if a surveyor's fees are beyond the view of reasonable.

Similarly, on the subject of the time allowed for negotiation, experience of completed buybacks has been that the negotiation process can be quite quick. The two valuers exchange their evidence and they are either able to either to agree a resolution quickly, or they are not; so focussing the valuers' mind has been useful from the point of view of speed and efficiency.

CB asked if there are figures as to what the valuations are costed at.

RS said that there is a range. These can be provided.

9) Date of Next Meeting:

The next meeting will be at 6.30pm, 21st Of September, at 66 Willington Rd.