

CENTRAL HILL RESIDENTS' ENGAGEMENT PANEL

Tuesday 3 November: 19.00 – 20.30
Upper Norwood Resource Centre, Central Hill Estate

Attendees:

1. Jonathan Croucher (JC) *Chair of Central Hill Resident Engagement Panel*
2. Karen Bennett (KB)
3. Nicola Curtis (NC)
4. Victor Hernandez (VH)
5. Tayo Richards (TR)
6. Clifford Grant (CG)
7. Glen Searle (GS)
8. Andrea Rose (AR)
9. Pauline Porteous (PP)
10. Councillor Bennett (MB) *Cabinet Member for Housing / Councillor Gipsy Hill Ward*
11. Fiona Cliffe (FC) *LB Lambeth*
12. Marcus Shukla (MS) *LB Lambeth*
13. Brendan Kilpatrick (*PRP Architects*)

1.	Introductions & Apologies	Action
	<p>Slight changes were made to the minutes in light of Lucy's comments - however apologies were received from her.</p> <p>It was also stated that Rosalind Thompson had not attended any meetings. NC said that she contacted RT who wished to remain part of the group however had family commitments and looked after disabled children.</p> <p>PP was introduced to the group and was interested in being a tenant representative. The group welcomed her.</p>	
2.	Matters arising	
	<p>JC provided feedback on a meeting he attended with VH with Lambeth's Scrutiny Committee. The meeting focused on experiences on the 6 regeneration estates in the borough. JC highlighted the issues on Cressingham Gardens Estate, particularly the view held by some tenants that they had been intimidated by other residents, specifically leaseholders. JC added that it was important to remember the different needs of tenants and leaseholders on each estate and different views in relation to the future of the estate – although his experience was that residents would like to remain on the estate in improved homes.</p> <p>On Myatts Field,KB stated that there were concerns of properties being undervalued on estate regeneration schemes. MB explained the valuation process: all valuers will be RICS approved, an initial valuation will be undertaken, if the homeowner is not satisfied with the outcome they can appoint another valuer – paid for by Lambeth – and any difference in valuations will be negotiated. The position that 12 leaseholders were made homeless was not true</p> <p>Key Guarantees for leaseholders – VH added that more work needed to be done on this document. FC confirmed that an officer within the</p>	<p><i>Action – invite JH to a future</i></p>

	<p>Regeneration Team was further developing the Key Guarantees to include feedback provided by residents on Central Hill -where possible.</p> <p>In terms of the shared equity option for leaseholders VH queried the 60% requirement within the Offer for Homeowners asking how it had been agreed and if conditions would apply.</p>	<p><i>meeting to talk about the equity share offer</i></p>
<p>3.</p>	<p>Investment needs for the estate (including updates from recent meetings)</p>	
	<p>FC informed the group that the investment data had been provided by Lambeth Housing Management's Capital Investment Team. An additional REP had taken place to discuss the findings and a separate meeting with Jim Martin (independent Quantity Surveyor) had also taken place.</p> <p>Notes of the REP/officer meeting were made available.</p>	
<p>4.</p>	<p>Taking forward the options</p>	
	<p>FC outlined the 3 possible options for regenerating Central Hill.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Refurbishment / infill ii. Part retention iii. Redevelopment (of entire estate) <p>The options would be assessed against costs, resources, additional homes – specifically affordable homes and deliverability.</p> <p>MB explained the cross-subsidy – sale of land could be used to pay for refurbishment or development of new properties. Part-retention: FC explained that some existing would be in better condition than others. FC also added that looking at options was part of a process and that those viable/ deliverable only would be presented to the wider estate with an explanation as to why they are not being considered.</p> <p>VH requested an open book financial assessment; MB said that the information would be in line with the financial information in the South Lambeth Cabinet Report – <i>links below</i>.</p> <p>http://moderngov.lambeth.gov.uk/documents/s77326/South%20Lambeth%20Appendix%20B%20Design%20Options%20Analysis.pdf</p> <p>http://moderngov.lambeth.gov.uk/documents/s77334/South%20Lambeth%20Appendix%20J%20-%20South%20Lambeth%20-%20financial%20summary.pdf</p> <p>BK said that PRP are still going through the figures with their cost consultants (Mace). He added that PRP would like to develop some design principles with residents; i.e. balconies, environmental sustainability. BK added that the display boards are being developed for the consultation. It was agreed that any consultation materials would be presented to REP members before being used at public events.</p> <p>It was agreed that the redevelopment designs being progressed would be brought to the group – then the full options and deliverability of these.</p> <p>KB raised the issue of 'garden-grabbing' stating that gardens are no</p>	<p><i>VH's request for all data could not be given.</i></p> <p>Separate meeting to be arranged: 16/11 (to be confirmed.)</p> <p>Action – to check council's position on gardens with Planning</p>

	<p>longer categorized as brownfield. BK said this was not the case for regeneration, but would check with his planning colleagues.</p> <p>KB also asked the about whether gardens are being re-provided.BK said that there would be gardens, but where properties were not at ground level, external space would be balconies.</p> <p>NC said she currently had 3 patios.</p> <p>KB stated that residents on Plane Tree Walk had been told by FC they would be made to leave the estate and have no choice in the matter. FC said this was not the case. MS explained the position of Lambeth officers visiting in 2's and those residents at PTW had not yet been visited by the Regeneration Team.</p> <p>FC said they had spoken to a lady who had said 'residents' had been giving misinformation to some households.</p> <p>FC spoke to KB & NC to ask that the people that they had met should be advised to come to the surgery, & that the Newsletter would have information about LBL staff having identification.</p>	<p>Meeting to take place on Tuesday 17 November to look at options</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p>Consultation</p>	
	<p>FC informed the group that the Regeneration Team had undertaken door knocking and spoken to numerous people at the surgeries which are being held at the Resource Centre every Tuesday. FC added that the Council would be recruiting additional resources to support engagement particularly from those households not engaged so far.</p> <p>PP asked if there would be a ballot on preferred regeneration option. FC replied that residents' views would be considered however a decision would also be based on the number of new homes provided and affordability.</p> <p>TR asked if the residents could oppose regeneration. JC said that it would be important for the Resident Adviser to be appointed to provide advice on legal challenges.</p> <p>Newsletters – FC said that all newsletters would be sent to REP members in advance of being mailed out to the wider estate for comments and observations.</p> <p>REP meeting with Residents: 17 October 2015. TR stated that the meeting was not objective and some REP members were using it to support a campaign against the regeneration. VH showed the group a copy of the PowerPoint presentation and said he would be happy to share the video. JC emphasised the need to appoint an Independent Resident Adviser. KB said that some residents on the estate felt that the REP was siding with the Council. JC urged unity amongst REP members.</p>	<p>Next Central Hill newsletter to be shared with residents before publication</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p>Support for Resident Engagement Panel members</p>	
	<p><u>Independent Resident Adviser</u></p> <p>TR added that feedback on the appointment of an Independent Resident Adviser would be provided by 5.11.2015</p> <p><u>Independent Surveyor</u></p>	<p><i>Update: REP members agreed to appoint PPCR – FC has since confirmed the</i></p>

	<p>Jim Martin, an independent surveyor from Martin Arnold Ltd had been appointed to work with residents. NC said that the group had a positive experience of working with Jim Martin and that he had recently visited the estate. Jim was appointed to review the investment costs identified for refurbishment and estate requirements.</p> <p><u>Independent Design Advisor</u></p> <p>MS added that Westbury Estate had recently appointed an independent design advisor to work with residents during the consultation. He added that this had been warmly received by residents and Central Hill REP members could do the same. REP members agreed to look at CVs and provide a shortlist for interviewing (3 from 7) once agreed.</p>	<p><i>appointment</i></p> <p>MS to send Design Adviser CVs to REP members</p>
<p>6. Timetable</p>		
	<p>VH stated that a meeting needed to take place with Lambeth officers to talk about the Key Guarantees for Homeowners and Tenants. FC confirmed that a session on 'Homes for Lambeth' (the Council's SPV for the estate regeneration programme) and the Key Guarantees would be held in the coming weeks.</p> <p>MS and FC proposed a period of consultation for the end of November and early December. This was rejected by residents who felt it was too close and were concerned about information not being provided in time for the events. It was agreed that the consultation should commence in the New Year and the REP to be consulted initially on the approach taken with residents. This would be put in the Newsletter.</p>	<p>FC to confirm potential dates for a session on Guarantees and the SPV</p> <p>Consultation on regeneration to take place in New Year</p>
<p>7. AOB</p>		
	<p>FC informed the group that the 20th Century Society had applied for the estate to be listed. MB said this was an issue for central government – not Lambeth.</p>	
<p>Date of next formal REP meeting: Tuesday 1 December 2015</p>		