

Central Hill - Resident Project Team

30/1/2018

Attendees:

Jonathan Croucher (Chair)
Cllr Matthew Bennett
Jed Young - Lambeth
Karen Bennett - Resident
Fiona Cliffe – Lambeth (p. Minutes)
Peter Culley - Resident
Tony Dyer - Resident
Victor Hernandez - Resident
Angela Masters - Resident
Mutoka Namakambo – Lambeth (p. Minutes)
Rosemary Porter - Resident
Helen Reed - PPCR

Apologies: Nicola Curtis

1.	Introductions were made – including Jed Young the new Assistant Director for Housing Regeneration	
2.	<u>Terms of Reference</u> These were passed around for signature and everyone at the meeting signed. Note – NC had given hers in separately.	
3.	<u>Homes for Lambeth</u> Business Plan JY talked through the position on HfL. In January cabinet agreed the business plan. This covered the governance of HfL, including the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) and the Articles of Association. This gave the council's financial commitment to HfL. The plan will be reviewed annually, both for review and scrutiny. The current plan gives the activities for the forthcoming year, with the pipeline of schemes for the next 4 years – this includes Central Hill	
3. 3.1	<u>Tenancies and Leases</u> After extensive consultation these have been agreed. The main changes were the contractual RTB for existing tenants. This would be equivalent to the statutory RTB The key issue for members had been the position of delivering new affordable homes that could then be sold. This would not apply to new tenants.	
3.2	MB said that the receipts from a RTB could be used in full by HfL. VH asked what the impact of this would be on the BP. Due to the level of expected sales and the ability to fully use receipts this impact should not be large.	

	<p>MB explained that within Lambeth the numbers of RTB sales had reduced from 250/annum to 25/annum over Lambeth's 24,000 stock. KB asked about the grounds for eviction.</p> <p>It was explained that the mandatory grounds for possession had been removed – the Lifetime Assured Tenancy therefore needed court action in line with the Secure Tenancy.</p> <p>HR said that a number of tenants might have moved from CH on the basis they wanted to retain their RTB.</p> <p>These tenants would be written to advise of the change, giving them the option to return.</p>	Lambeth
3.3	<p>Risks</p> <p>VH asked about the issues of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The number of affordable homes delivered 2. Costs 3. Buy-back costs <p>JY said there was a risk with the model of funding from private sector cross subsidy. The model going forward would have a buffer of 10% - across all schemes. If this was not required the surplus would be used to deliver more affordable homes.</p> <p>In terms of costs there would be Quantity Surveyors on all schemes and costs would be bench-marked with other developments. There would also be a central sense check across all schemes.</p> <p>In terms of the buy-backs. FC said that in early models the numbers of homeowners remaining on CH was reduced to 20%, this did have a marginal impact on viability – the main impact was on cashflow. If homes were not used as a shared ownership home for a current homeowner, they could be sold at full market amount.</p> <p>JY agreed to give a written response on this.</p>	JY
4.	<p>Housing Management - Lambeth</p> <p>PC said that since the cabinet decision there seemed to be a reduction of services on Central Hill – lighting, etc.</p> <p>KB asked how Lambeth could loan HfL £300 million, when repairs and investment weren't being carried out.</p> <p>JY explained the different budgets for Lambeth. Although the General Fund had the capacity to borrow, the Housing Revenue Account – where housing costs came from, could not.</p> <p>Legally these budgets were ring-fenced.</p> <p>In relation to concerns raised about housing management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A comparison of the cost & numbers of repairs on Central Hill would be given • MB would walkaround with residents and officers – both in the daytime & night. • A letter would go out to all households about the fact all repairs should be taking place – it was business as normal. 	<p>MB/HM</p> <p>MB – email went to HM 31.1.18</p> <p>HM</p>
5.	<p>Housing Management – HfL</p> <p>Feedback was taken as part of the engagement process, this is on-going.</p> <p>Service Charges</p>	

	<p>PC asked about the cost of service charges Ackerman rents & service charges would be circulated – along with other schemes coming forward, e.g. Lollard St. These charges can be passed to the DMT to work against.</p> <p>There was also a discussion about what housing benefit covered. Parking charges – KB enquired whether they would be parking charges applied. FC responded after the meeting on the 1st Feb to the group.</p>	<p>Completed.</p> <p>Completed.</p>
6.	<p>Early buy backs JY explained the buyback prioritisation process. Currently 17 cases have been completed or in progress at CH. They have been no refusal for early buybacks – in some cases more information has been requested. KB questioned the prioritisation process that though this has been agreed there are caveats subject to funding.</p> <p>CG walked into the Project Group meeting and expressed his objection to the regeneration. This lasted approx. 5 minutes and left.</p> <p>VH asked how much money was left in the pot following prioritisation. JY - £19.7 million has been agreed, with a total of £100 million potentially required. Borrowing has to be serviced to fund buybacks and so some lettings need to be carried out to facilitate this borrowing. Lettings agents are to be appointed in March. On demand buybacks will be in the summer following lettings of buybacks to service the interest. It was considered that the Engagement & Communication should review the advertising of this. JY explained that normally buybacks take place when they are needed and this is part of support being provided to do buybacks before that.</p>	
7.	<p>Update - DMT The recommendation for the DMT appointment will be published next week. FC explained that resident group who were part of the interview workshop and interviews will be arranged to discuss the procurement process. VH enquired on who makes the recommendation? FC explained that is it officers based on the process with all the scoring – including the aspects with resident input. The report will go public after the resident meeting. This will be published for 5 days then a call in period before sign-off by Cllr McGlone. There is also a standstill period and then contract needs to be signed. Project group members will get an email to say the report has been published. It will be approximately 8 weeks+ before the DMT are seen on site.</p>	<p>Meeting arranged for 8.2.18</p> <p>Regen. team</p>
8.	<p>Updates – Decant position MN provided updates on current decant position.</p>	

	<p>63 voids in total, 31 are being used as TA, 8 to be used let out as AST, 8 are currently beyond repair lettable standards and require more works but these will be reviewed later, 6 are being used for housing management (being used as temp for Lambeth secure tenants who require works in their existing homes), 10 are having either voids works or in the process of being let out.</p> <p>There are 13 pending voids (where notice has been given)</p> <p>Housing needs survey – 166 surveys have been carried out to date. 139 tenanted and 27 homeowners. The majority of tenanted wish to remain with 82 keeping their options open - a lot of tenants are still putting themselves on the transfer list.</p> <p>Post meeting correction - With homeowners 60% wish to move off the estate with 40% wanting to remain. Some have decided to submit an expression of interest, again to keep their options open.</p>	
9.	<p>Updates – Independent Advisor including changed scope of works</p> <p>HR left the meeting at this point.</p> <p>FC explained that the last IA contract is coming to and we need to procure another IA. The scope was works was circulated to the group prior to the meeting. One major change in the scope of work was 75% of services from IA to be resident front facing. It is a 70:30, quality: price assessment, with 40% of the scoring to be based on the interviews. Members were asked if they wanted to sit on the panel and the following members agreed, PC, RP, TD and VH.</p> <p>Members were also advised that the DMT would also have their own engagement consultant.</p> <p><i>Post meeting – a meeting has been agreed for 8.2.18, after the DMT meeting.</i></p>	
10.	<p>AOB</p> <p>FC informed the group that it was proposed that modular pods would be located at Roman Rise and these were for temporary accommodation. The site would still be considered as part of the redevelopment.</p> <p>The Project group agreed to meet bi-monthly every 3rd Tuesday. Next meeting 20.03.18 at 7pm.</p> <p>Meeting finished at 9:15pm.</p>	