

# CENTRAL HILL RESIDENT ENGAGEMENT PANEL

Tuesday 2 February 2016: 19.00 – 20.30  
Upper Norwood Resource Centre, Central Hill Estate

## Attendees:

1. Jonathan Croucher (JC) *Chair of Central Hill Resident Engagement Panel*
2. Nicola Curtis (NC) - tenant
3. Clifford Grant (CG) - leaseholder
4. Glen Searle (GS) – leaseholder
5. Christina Searle – (with Glen)
6. Councillor Bennett (MB) *Cllr Gipsy Hill Ward*
7. Councillor Jenny Braithwaite (JB) *Cllr Gipsy Hill Ward*
8. Fiona Cliffe (FC) *LB Lambeth*
9. Marcus Shukla (MS) *LB Lambeth*
10. Pauline Portious (PP)
11. Abraham Nomafo (AN)

1.	Introductions & Apologies	Action
	<p>Introductions received from:</p> <p>Karen Bennett, Lucy Pyne, Andrea Rose, Victor Hernandez and Cllr Francis.</p>	
2.	Minutes and matters arising	
	<p>Pamela provided a definition of PTAL, explaining that it is used in transport planning a lower PTAL meant that less local public transport is available, a higher PTAL means more. Pamela advised that the Central Hill Estate is defined as being in the suburban area, with a generally lower PTAL score. Resident members of the REP requested that further information on PTAL is provided in advance of public consultation.</p> <p>Tenancy Strategy and Tenancy Policy – shared with AN; to be circulated to the REP members via email.</p>	
3.	Consultation and approach (Lambeth)	
	<p>Lambeth Council MB informed the group that a decision to regenerate the estate should now be taken in June 2016. This was because of the following main factors: the need to procure a design adviser to work with residents to analyse the proposals put forward by PRP so far, and to develop 'Design Principles' for the estate. Additional time would also allow Architects for Social Housing to submit a proposal of their own, as they had done on Knight's Walk. MB advised the group that a May decision could not be undertaken due to restrictions placed on local government during elections (Mayoral election).</p> <p>MB said that there needed to be constructive dialogue with ASH. NC said that she would contact ASH.</p> <p>Residents expressed concern regarding further delays. JC asked if there would be a commitment to an early buyback for leaseholders – MB confirmed that key guarantees would not apply until a decision had been</p>	<p><b>LBL officers to develop timetable showing consultation</b></p> <p><b>NC to email FC. ASH have estate wide consultation on 20/2. Communication with ASH is that they will not attend a REP.</b></p>

	<p>reached however residents could still request an early buyback. The group was informed that a buyback policy was being developed. NC requested similar support for tenants who wished to move off the estate.</p> <p>FC advised that consultation week commencing 15 Feb will no longer apply and this would be more likely that a pre-consultation period would commence 27<sup>th</sup> February. FC said that this session should tell the 'story' of regeneration on the estate – why refurbishment can't be considered, infill, etc...</p>	
<b>4.</b>	<b>Question and answers – prepared by Reverend Croucher</b>	
	<p>NC felt that JC's Q&amp;As covered the general feeling on the estate. JC – advised that this is a source document for publication ahead of consultation. AN said that this could inform the 'residents aspirations' document.</p>	
<b>5.</b>	<b>PPCR consultation events</b>	
	<p>AN explained he was running a total of 13 engagement events at three venues across the estate (Housing Officer, Resource Centre and Day Centre. AN will talk about key guarantees and invite wider population.</p> <p>AN said that there would be A1 boards with key guarantees etc. there would also be discussions about what the REP has been going through. The estate would be split up for engagement purposes and there will be household visits etc. Tues, Weds and Thurs evenings.</p> <p>AN confirmed the first event would be taking place on 9<sup>th</sup> February.</p> <p>A report on the conclusions would be presented to the REP.</p>	<b>MS to arrange access to Day Centre for AN</b>
<b>6.</b>	<b>Appointment of Design Advisers</b>	
	<p>The group was advised that the original thinking was February for a design adviser to be appointed but this would now be extended. AN stated that all 7 CABA advisers should be contacted, review the scope of the brief and budget. Feeling that 5 days is not enough. The REP will help choose design adviser. Pamela – CABA are going to come back to confirm. GS said that he had the names of three advisers that the REP preferred and would shared with the group.</p>	<b>GS to circulate to REP</b>
<b>7.</b>	<b>Feedback on display boards</b>	
	<p>FC discussed the display boards and stated that changes had been made as per the initial feedback at the meeting on 26<sup>th</sup> of January.</p> <p>NC said that infill plots figure feels low compared to on other parts of the estate. ASH proposal includes developing infill sites, perception that they could develop more there.</p> <p>NC recommended that maps are resized and made to the same scale. Also requested that the maps are to the same scale and include the numbers for infill. A key and north point need to be added and the colour of the roofs changed.</p>	<b>Boards to be circulated to group members for comments (to be returned by 9.2.2016).</b>

	FC advised that design / space standards would also be included (Lambeth Local Plan, GLA etc.).	
8.	Other	
	<p>FC advised that the pre-qualification questionnaire was to be published – part of the OJEU process. (This stage is where development teams would advise of their skills, experience, etc.).</p> <p>FC had copies available.</p> <p>FC also re-iterated that residents would be part of the appointment of a potential development team for CH, post the long-listing process.</p>	
<b>Date of next meeting: Tuesday 1 March 2016</b>		