

Minutes of the Central Hill REP

6th June 2017

Present: Karen Bennett, Nicola Curtis, Victor Hernandez, Andrea Rose, Abraham Nomafo, Pam Kovachich (part), Jonathan Croucher (chair), Fiona Cliffe, Lucy Payne

Apologies: Mutoka, Helen Redd

		Action
1.	<p>Purpose of Meeting</p> <p>Jonathan outlined the purpose of the meeting in relation to going forward with the resident engagement post the cabinet decision. He had met with Sue Foster and Rachel Sharpe and was prepared to remain as the chair of the group.</p> <p>He outlined that one of the challenges of the REP had been the behaviour at meetings which had not always been conducive to effective conversation. Whilst there were frustrations, it was important that the meetings were conducted politely. If complaints were made at meetings and were not immediately able to be resolved, they either needed to be withdrawn, or made formally. Jonathan also said that from his perspective the position had been made worse by the council appearing to end effective engagement with the group back in September 2016. The residents had justifiable concerns about missed deadlines and missing information. The Council needed to take more care and be open when situations changed.</p> <p>He gave the members of the group the opportunity to raise their issues and concerns about the process, before moving on to the proposed engagement structure.</p>	
2.	<p>Engagement Structure</p> <p>Fiona outlined the proposed consultation structure.</p> <p>Issues arising from this:</p> <p>Jonathan thought it would be useful to establish the design and engagement group and then establish the project group.</p> <p>Nicola said there should be positions for members of the T&RA on the project group and that those currently on the REP should have an automatic place on the group.</p> <p>Fiona said that the current REP could express an interest on being on the new group, but there should not automatically be positions available.</p> <p>Abraham said that within the ToR there is the option to have different groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Membership of the Panel should be representative of the different groups living on an estate (tenants, resident leaseholders and resident freeholders) and, where applicable, any other major group of residents.</i> <p>Fiona to come back on this.</p> <p>Lucy had concerns in relation to how these new members would be identified and appointed.</p>	FC

	<p>Fiona said that to date there had been 20 applications of interest. This would not be considered until the threat of JR had passed and that HfL could borrow & cover the interest costs of these purchases.</p> <p>Fiona to come back on when the funding structure will be in place.</p> <p>Victor asked what would happen if the JR was on the Key Guarantees not the Central Hill decision.</p> <p>Fiona said that the old/2015 guarantees would then apply if the decision was seen not to have followed process.</p> <p>Victor said that did not include the Early Buy-back.</p> <p>Within the expression of interest & within the newsletter, there is a section in relation to if homeowners who needed to be considered as a priority. 6 households have already been approved as priority cases.</p>	FC
9.	<p>Moving Forward</p> <p>It was agreed that meetings needed to be constructive and courteous. Fiona said the council had a duty of care for officers – there is now a team on Central Hill. There was also a lot of misinformation on the estate – it was Lambeth’s & PPCR’s role to correct this. However if residents are on different groups - specifically Save Central Hill, they should not put their name to information from the engagement meetings that they knew was incorrect. Fiona referenced a specific letter that had been circulated on the estate and some comments about the integrity of the tenancy officer that she had been told about on the SCH facebook page. Karen denied that she or SCH had done anything that undermined the engagement process - SCH were an independent body that could say whatever it wanted. She said that she intended to continue to fight the redevelopment through JR, planning process and any other means possible. She wanted to be on the REP so she knew what was going on. Tempers flared and Jonathan called the meeting to order. He expressed his concern that the group had to communicate calmly and address disagreement civilly or people would not join in the engagement process. Karen said she would therefore resign from the engagement process and left the meeting. Disappointment was expressed that this matter had not been raised in the earlier discussion when concerns about the past were being aired. But it was agreed that while emotions were still running high, the meetings had to remain calm and civil going forward.</p>	
10.	<p>Martin Arnold report</p> <p>Fiona had copies of the report from Jim Martin which identified £40mil of works. This was given to residents who wanted it. Although the council had said that the £18 mil would not address all the issues on the estate it had not made available the report – as it was not part of the option appraisal process.</p>	