

# CENTRAL HILL RESIDENT ENGAGEMENT PANEL

Tuesday 3 May 2016: 19.00 – 20.30  
Christ Church, Highland Road, Upper Norwood

## Attendees:

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1. Jonathan Croucher (JC) Chair of Central Hill Resident Engagement Panel | 10. Fiona Cliffe (FC) <i>LB Lambeth</i>   |
| 2. Nicola Curtis (NC) – tenant  | 11. Marcus Shukla (MS) <i>LB Lambeth</i>  |
| 3. Clifford Grant (CG) – leaseholder                                      | 12. Felix Shaw (FS) <i>Local Dialogue</i> |
| 4. Glen Searle (GS) – leaseholder   | 13. Ron Houston (RH) <i>PPCR</i>          |
| 5. Karen Bennett (KB) – leaseholder                                       | 14. Pamela Kovachich (PK) <i>PPCR</i>     |
| 6. Lucy Pyne (LP) – leaseholder   |   |
| 7. Andrea Rose (AR) – tenant  |   |
| 8. Victor Hernandez (VH) – leaseholder                                    |   |
| 9. Councillor Bennett (MB) <i>Cllr Gipsy Hill Ward</i>                    |   |

1.	Introductions & Apologies	Action
	<p>Apologies were received from:</p> <p>Councillor Brathwaite and Abraham Nomafo.</p> <p>The group was informed of the passing of Cllr Francis. A by-election is to be held on the 9th July.</p>	
2.	Minutes and matters arising	
	<p>JC said that if there were any changes or issues with the April minutes that these should be emailed to him and Fiona.</p>	<p><b>All</b></p>
3.	Results from exhibition	
	<p>FS shared an updated version of the report with the group. Since the April 15<sup>th</sup> deadline for feedback forms to be posted, the total number of returned forms is 85. This meant that 33 extra forms had been received in the post.</p> <p>NC queried if all the feedback forms had been fully completed – FS advised that not all of the forms had been completed entirely but this was not unusual. FS to confirm the number of completed forms.</p> <p>FC said that redacted copies of the feedback forms will be scanned and made available.</p> <p>FS informed the group that the updated report included feedback on the design principles and resident aspirations (on page 11). There was also a comments summary including a random selection of comments from the events.</p> <p>KB said it was unclear why some comments would be positive and negative and that those critical of regeneration were classed as negative. FC advised that this was related to the event, there was not a question on whether residents wanted refurbishment or redevelopment.</p>	<p><b>FS</b></p>

***[The options that couldn't be delivered were explained the Council's position on refurbishment/ in-fill, etc.]***

FS added that the additional feedback forms had made little overall difference to the % of residents who spoke favourably about the events or not. FS shared the results / qualitative feedback with the group. KB said she could not understand that some leaseholders supported redevelopment (in relation to their investment).

KB said that the March events were advertised at short notice and more time was required in future. She felt that door knocking was too close to the event. FC explained the position that the door knocking had taken place throughout the previous week – there was then further follow-ups to catch people in.

***[The following efforts had been made to publicise the March exhibitions –***

- ***Newsletter with key dates posted to all residents on February 18<sup>th</sup>***
- ***30 posters distributed across the estate on February 22-23<sup>rd</sup>***
- ***Market researchers visited households on the estate from March 1 to 3 with follow-up leaflet drops on March 5.]***

NC told the group that she had a list of questions about the report that she would send to FS by Tuesday 10<sup>th</sup> May.

NC

She also said that she did not like the feedback questionnaire from the beginning.

***[As reported at the previous meeting, the survey intended was not agreed between the REP and PPCR.]***

VH added that there was not a single comment about demolition in the summary. MB responded to say that the feedback was really about identifying where additional information was required and helping the Council ascertain how useful people found the events(s). He added that the comments are only a sample but it was still useful to see the split in responses by tenure.

The Role of the REP

KB asked if the REP was part of the Council's formal consultation. MB responded to say that the REP was technically engagement as the REP helped shaped the consultation approach. KB said that there was no point in the REPs as they had not achieved anything. MB disputed this and said that the REP had helped make changes, such as the boards used for the exhibition.

KB said that she felt that the REP could not say things to other residents and asked if she could share minutes with residents. FC confirmed that once each set of minutes had been agreed by the group they were public and added that all previous minutes are on the internet.

JC stated when the initial development proposals were seen by the group before going out to the estate, so he had asked that these were not shared.

KB said that FC had been quoted in the Architects' Journal saying that the REP is not representative of the estate. MB confirmed that he was quoted in the journal and did not say that.

***[The article 21/4/16 relates to the estate and not the REP]***

JC confirmed that his view on the REP was it was the Council's way of saying: "tell us what you think". He agreed with the frustrations expressed by some group

members particularly in relation to the delay in getting information but said that it had achieved things. VH said that he felt if it was residents' opinions then they do not change anything and added that it was for this reason tenants no longer attend the meetings.

KB said that she felt the Council has not been honest about Homes for Lambeth and that there was nothing in the report about a change in tenancy and Homes for Lambeth.

JC said that there were clearly issues in the meeting and asked the group to consider if the REP is a constructive forum

VH said that if Lambeth wants to work with residents it should prepare the consultation properly, starting with the Key Guarantees. He added that developing the questionnaire together had not been an example of good partnership working.

MB said that the purpose of the REP was to work through options for the estate; ranging from refurbishment to full development. For the formal consultation the Council should not consult on options that could not be delivered – part of the decision on the Cressingham JR. The REP's role was to consider the Council's position – to do this they had worked with e.g. Jim Martin, etc.

FC said the ToR outlined that the REP were representatives of all residents, and that a key objective was for the group to act as a 'sounding board' for the estate.

NC said that the REP members started the process with open minds but had been 'played like fiddles' by the Council. She added that the REP did not trust a word that the Council says. She questioned why residents had only recently found out about the HfL governance and board structure; MB responded by saying that this was shared with Tenants Council and Leaseholder Council for the joint meeting initially.

***(The presentation at T&L Council was on the agenda – but the meeting dissolved before this item).***

He added that contrary to what was posted on the Save Central Hill website, he was not the owner of Homes for Lambeth.

At this point (8.40pm) the meeting was adjourned by the Chair after a member of the REP left temporarily. He asked the resident members of the group to speak to RH about what should happen next; the resident REP members spoke with RH and PK for twenty minutes.

### **Next Steps**

After the adjournment, NC informed the group that REP would like to invite the Council to a public meeting, chaired by Reverend Croucher, where only residents from the estate are invited. Questions could be included on the invite and presented to the Council before the event.

MB said that because of pre-election rules (ahead of the by-election) there may a restriction on the kind of activity / engagement that the Council could agree to and would be easier if a meeting took place after this (later on in June).

The rest of the agenda was not considered.

<p>VH asked about the financial training; this was being provided by PPCR and that dates would be confirmed in the near future.</p> <p>The Council's 'What You Said' event on the 14<sup>th</sup> May would continue &amp; the meeting with ASH would be arranged.</p> <p><b><i>[On legal advice it was considered that would be better that a booklet with this information be delivered to all residents rather than have a public event within the by-election period]</i></b></p>	
<b>Date of next meeting: to be confirmed</b>	

DRAFT