

CENTRAL HILL RESIDENT ENGAGEMENT PANEL (CONSULTATION FORWARD PLANNING MEETING)

Tuesday 26 January 2016: 19.00 – 20.30
Upper Norwood Resource Centre, Central Hill Estate

Attendees:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Abraham Nomafo, PPCR (AN) <i>Chair</i> 2. Karen Bennett (KB) - leaseholder 3. Nicola Curtis (NC) - tenant 4. Victor Hernandez (VH) - leaseholder 5. Clifford Grant (CG) - leaseholder 6. Lucy Pyne (LP) - leaseholder 7. Glen Searle (GS) - leaseholder 8. Andrea Rose (AR) - tenant | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 9. Councillor Bennett (MB) <i>Cabinet Member for Housing / Cllr Gipsy Hill Ward</i> 10. Fiona Cliffe (FC) <i>LB Lambeth</i> 11. Marcus Shukla (MS) <i>LB Lambeth</i> 12. Zeke Osho (ZO) <i>PRP Architects</i> 13. Ron Houston (RH) <i>PPCR</i> |
|--|--|

1.	Introductions & Apologies	Action
	Apologies were received from Rev. Croucher. It was agreed that AN would chair the meeting.	
2.	Consultation forward plan comments, questions and feedback	
	<p><u>General</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Boards 7 and 12 were not part of this review. FC explained that the option of retaining the Gipsy Hill houses was still being assessed financially – the outcome of this would need to be made available. FC emphasised that the consultation would not include a Test of Opinion or ballot, but the views of the residents would be presented to Cabinet. LP – what happens if everyone says no to regeneration? MB stated that this would mean LBL has to talk about the refurbishment programme and explain why it is not viable. He added that consultation findings have an affect but are not the only consideration. FC – If we ask for people’s opinions, we have to be clear about the reason for consulting: “The purpose of the consultation is...” There will be a board on this. AN – said that LBL will <u>not</u> be consulting on undeliverable options. <p><u>Refurbishment Option</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The financial position of the HRA was briefly explained What is the local spend for Central Hill HRA? “Where does the Central Hill money go?” – a pie chart to be included, showing how monies are spent including service charges. MB explained that it is only since 2010 that local councils have 	HRA spend / pie chart to be included on board

	<p>been able to keep their own rental receipts, previously they were pooled at Central Government, and then councils were given an allocation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Previously there had been funding for Decent Homes – a government-led scheme gave money to Lambeth Living , as to receive this investment funding Lambeth needed to create an ALMO. • Rents increases have been kept low since 2010 - in 2009 under the old formula they went up 17% • FC stated that the LHS/investment deficit (for major works) was reported as £56 million and was increasing. <i>(Cabinet Feb 2016 identifies this shortfall as £85 million)</i> <p><u>In-fill Consideration</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NC – Can ASH do a presentation to the estate? (Ron Houston added that ASH provided some good input on Knights Walk); FC confirmed that the council would lead the consultation process and would only consult on deliverable options. • It was agreed that ASH should initially present to the REP (a number of members did not know about this work). • NC – Board 6 – ASH think they can get a lot more homes on the vacant land. <p><i>ASH approached 8th Feb 2016. They would not present to the REP – but had organised a public meeting on 20th (Part of the Save Central Hill Campaign)</i></p> <p><u>Redevelopment/Design Options</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RH said that there should be diagrams of walkways • Calculation of PTAL to be given to the group. • LP – wanted the colour of properties changing from green as this presented the rebuilt estate as having a lot of open green space. Zeke to make changes. • NC – maps of the estate need to be the same size, with a key and to scale. • MB – 3D drawing of the estate shows it as viewed from Central Hill (south of the estate) 	<p>Update – this figure is now confirmed as £85 million</p> <p>NC/FC to update on possibility of ASH attending the REP.</p> <p>LBL need detail of proposed option to evaluate - & determine if this is deliverable</p> <p>Update on PTAL to be provided at Feb 2nd meeting of REP</p> <p>Zeke to update boards</p>
Other		
	<p><u>Financial modelling</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VH wanted the 80% assumption for leaseholder removed; JH will outline why this figure has been included at the Financial 	

	<p>Modelling workshop on Feb 8th. MB said that 80% was based on the MFN project and more recently, on Cressingham. The Council could not assume that everyone was going to remain.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> VH said that apparently LBL has £24 million leaseholder buybacks and vacant possession costs - & queried whether this was enough. This would be addressed at the meeting with Julian Hart on the viability testing. <p><u>Key Guarantees</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Early buybacks – agreed that this would be included within the updated Key Guarantees. <p><u>Collation of Consultation Results</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NC – Misgivings about the way the data from the PRP consultation in Jan 2015 was derived. She said they wanted someone independent to collate the survey results to be reported to Cabinet. FC said that Local Dialogue would be carrying out this role. <p>At the meeting comments were raised that were deemed to be of a racist nature which were challenged by AN.</p>	<p>Meeting 8/2/16</p> <p>The Terms of Reference for the group needs to be reinforced & appropriate action taken.</p>
--	---	--