

## Resident Engagement Panel minutes: Tuesday 5 April 2016 (7.00 – 9.00pm)

### Christ Church, Highland Road, Gipsy Hill

#### Attendees

- Jonathan Croucher (Chair) – JC
- Ron Houston (PPCR) – RH
- Pamela Kovakovich – PK
- Nicola Curtis – NC
- Norman Bennett – NB
- Glenn Searle – GS
- Victor Hernandez – VH
- Matthew Bennett (Cabinet Member for Housing / Councillor Gipsy Hill Ward) – MB
- Fiona Cliffe (Programme Manager, LB Lambeth) – FC
- Felix Shaw (Local Dialogue) – FS
- Andrea Rose – AR

#### Apologies

Cllr Jenny Brathwaite, Cllr Niranjana Francis, Karen Bennett

<b>March Minutes</b>	
<p>The minutes did not get signed off as it was agreed that they would be circulated to Lucy and Karen to review against their notes.</p> <p>Amendment: It was agreed the following addition would be made to the draft minutes:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>MB advised that there would be an early buyback policy. He added that the Council needed to work up in more detail how this would be financed.</i></p> <p>NB was attending on behalf of KB</p> <p>.</p>	
<b>Update from ASH</b>	
<p>FC told the group that ASH were not able to attend the April REP and wanted to reschedule for 2-3 weeks' time. She added that only options that can be delivered would formally be consulted on with all residents. Lambeth would review the ASH proposal. Architects and Planning officers were reviewing the ASH proposals that they had received and would provide feedback prior to the meeting. NC said that she had been approached by ASH for a Quantity Surveyor.</p> <p><b>Update from ASH is that they have 'a planning consultant and, possibly a structural advisor, and cost consultant';</b></p> <p>She said that they had other needs in order to firm up their proposal. MB added that it is up to ASH to make their proposal credible and they present their proposal to the REP. NC added that she does not feel that the council has looked at refurbishment seriously. JC added that there is a view that infill was not properly considered and that residents would be unhappy if it was felt that ASH's proposal was simply brushed aside. MB added that what ASH propose will be considered.</p>	<p><i>Action – RH to contact Geraldine Dening about requirements</i></p> <p><i>Action – If issues from the resident engagement was that more information was required then this could be made available at the next exhibition</i></p>

<p><b>Up-date – Commentary on ASH proposals sent out 14<sup>th</sup> April to all.</b>  <b>Waiting for dates ASH will be available for REP from ASH.</b></p>	
<p><b><u>Exhibitions</u></b></p>	
<p>FC informed the group that the exhibitions had been positive with approximately 126 households attending altogether with Saturday 5 March being the busiest day (in total, 22% of households on the estate attended – 94 residents / 425 resident households).</p> <p>JC said this seemed low. FC responded to say that a large number of people from off the estate – nearby or absentee landlords – also attended. VH added that engagement with tenants was still low and did not feel that they were being fully represented.</p> <p>FS summarised his draft report on the events stating there is a clear difference in the views of tenants and leaseholders and that leaseholders generally had a less favourable view of the events / regeneration. In total, there were 51 forms returned to date. NB said this seemed low and FC had previously said at the exhibition that there were 113 surveys. FC said the numbers discussed was the running total of people attending the (Saturday) event, not returned surveys. FC added that not everyone has returned surveys and this was not unusual. FS added that the deadline for more feedback forms was April 15<sup>th</sup> and would circulate the updated report after this date. NC asked to see all the copies of the feedback forms with individual names hidden. FS said that this would be possible and also copies of all comments received could also be included in the report. MB said that all the comments and feedback should be provided after the deadline of April 15<sup>th</sup> and appended to the final report.</p> <p>NC said that she did not like the way Lambeth asked the questions in the feedback survey or how the answers were interpreted.</p> <p>FC said there hadn't been resolution on a survey agreed between the REP members and PPCR, so only feedback on the exhibition information had been sought.</p> <p>RH added that the feedback numbers so far were too small to make it a meaningful quantitative exercise. He also added that the timing of the exercise is important and that residents would need for example, full information on the Key Guarantees before responding. FC added that the Council is still in the 'engagement' stage and that the formal consultation period would take place later with a final exhibition clearly stating what the Council is consulting on.</p> <p>RH added that residents who had not so far been engaged needed to be targeted.</p> <p>FC added that there is a lot of misinformation going around the estate and that the REP should refer people to PPCR or the Regeneration Team.</p> <p>MB added that it was evident that residents wanted more information on the Gipsy Hill retention and it would be useful for the Council to know what they needed.</p>	<p><b><i>Action: FS to provide a redacted version of completed surveys and include comments in the final copy of the report</i></b></p> <p><b><i>All</i></b></p>

VH queried the consultation approach and said that LBL and the REP needed to sit down and agree the questions. FC said that consultation is ultimately the Council's consultation but that we can get something out together

JC added that the Council has been quite open at the exhibition about what the option is. NC disagreed and said that the language used so far as 'wishy-washy'

Next steps

FC told the REP that Lambeth had told the 'story' of the option appraisal – what could and could not be delivered. The next stage would be made a lot more user friendly, giving information on 'what will happen it me', key guarantees, etc..

JC asked if it was possible for Lambeth to clearly state that it is demolition; MB added that the consultation could say "this is going to be considered by Cabinet"

**Training and workshops**

FC told the group that Metwork – an urban design organisation appointed by the Council – are running training sessions focusing on design, density and landscaping. [The programme of training was shared with the REP]. FC added that more events are lined up and these are outlined in a letter being distributed to the estate. VH added that each training session should include why the estate has been designed as it is; FC added that the sessions were not being run by Lambeth but by Metwork. She told the REP that along with training the idea is for a series of 'Residents Aspirations' to be produced which could then be included within the papers for Cabinet.

NC added that she was not interested in design issues but what would happen to people who live on the estate, not new residents who will live on CH. FC said that the training was being opened up to all Central Hill residents; most REP members had said they did not want to remain on Central Hill.

NC said that the REP wanted financial training. This was being provided by PPCR.

MB said that it might be useful to share the masterplanning objectives from the Cabinet report for Westbury Estate (who did similar training). The design principles / masterplan objectives will then form a design brief to the masterplanners and Development Management Team (DMT) appointed to take forward the regeneration of Central Hill Estate. RH added at a regeneration project in Hackney, residents were involved in the masterplan from day one. would be the case on CH. MB added that residents were involved in the DMT appointments on other estates, and the same would take place for CH. JC added that Lambeth needed to clearly outline the expectation of resident involvement throughout the process.

JC enquired about the latest situation with the Design Adviser – as this was also stated in the document presented by Metwork – and expressed his frustration with the delay in this appointment. FC and PK said that CABE had been difficult to deal with and arrangements had stalled.

RH told the group that the Design Adviser would be useful for looking at both LBL and ASH's proposals. MB told the group that

PPCR

**Action: Westbury Estate masterplanning objectives to be shared with REP (MS to source)**

**Action: FC and PK to discuss Design Adviser support arrangements**

<p>the Cabinet decision would not make a decision on design but on the number of homes to be built and the general design principles. PK said that it would be useful to look at the Westbury brief for Design Advisers</p>	
<p><b>OJEU</b></p>	
<p>FC advised that the Pre-Qualifying Questionnaire had been sent out. This was to all prospective organisations who were interested in submitting a tender for Development Management Team work (a 'long list'). This questionnaire is about who the organisations are and what they have done</p> <p>FC explained the make-up of DMTs: they include project managers, urban designers and architects, cost consultants &amp; surveyors amongst others.</p> <p>FC said that 7 consortia have stated their interest for this part of the procurement. Lambeth would reduce the long list down to about 4 or 5 companies. VH asked if the leaseholder buybacks would be the responsibility of the DMT – FC clarified that Lambeth would still be responsible for buybacks and that Lambeth would be 'clienting' the DMT. FC confirmed that Lambeth would appoint the DMTs and not Homes for Lambeth.</p>	<p><b>Action: FC to email the group with each aspect of the DMT</b></p>
<p><b>Savills – Homes for Lambeth</b></p>	
<p>NC asked what relationship she has with Savills as a tenant. MB informed the group that there was no relationship and clarified that Savills had been appointed by Lambeth in an advisory capacity to help Homes for Lambeth attain Registered Provider status. MS added that this appointment was to aid with the registration process (particularly getting HfL registered with the Homes and Communities Agency).</p> <p><b>Update: Lambeth has clarified the role that Savills will fulfil relating to Homes for Lambeth's registration:</b>  <a href="http://estateregeneration.lambeth.gov.uk/what-is-savills-role-in-homes-for-lambeth">http://estateregeneration.lambeth.gov.uk/what-is-savills-role-in-homes-for-lambeth</a>]</p>	
<p><b>AOB</b></p>	
<p>JC asked if the Key Guarantees are binding. MB replied to say the guarantees would be binding and would be bound by Lambeth as the owner of Homes for Lambeth. The Council would ensure that the Key Guarantees are being delivered. MB added that the guarantees had already been reviewed by TPAS (Tenant Participation and Advisory Service) who have found that they compared well to other regeneration schemes.</p> <p>NB asked if Lambeth has any intention to re-establish Lambeth Living. MB replied by saying there was no desire to bring back Lambeth Living and that the company had been formally closed.</p> <p>NC told the group that she spoke to a couple of residents about the following issues:</p>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A resident was told at an event that adult children would not be treated as part of the household for re-housing</li> <li>- An elderly couple was told at an event that they would be given one room less if they remained on the estate but 2 rooms less if they moved off the estate</li> </ul> <p>FC said that is important that misinformation was corrected. Rehousing issues would be looked at individually and only after a decision had been reached.</p> <p>NC told the group that most of the misinformation was coming from Lambeth and said it appeared that the Council is trying to keep residents on the estate.</p> <p>FC agreed to visit the residents with NC. JC said that both of the residents should be referred to PPCR, who would visit. FC said NC should give evidence of this, as this &amp; previous (incorrect) statements challenged the integrity of officers.</p> <p>JC added that it was possibly time for another QA to be produced. FC said that any rehousing was important for residents and could be part of future exhibitions.</p> <p>MB said that he would need to confirm the Cabinet decision date – he hoped this would be July.</p> <p>VH asked about the heritage board (used at the exhibition). FC advised that Lambeth’s heritage planner had identified some areas of heritage interest on the estate and this would be considered as part of any masterplanning process. This was separate from the Listing application.</p>	<p>NC/PPCR</p>
<p><b>DATE OF NEXT MEETING: TUESDAY 3 MAY 2016 AT CHRIST CHURCH, HIGHLAND RD</b></p>	