

Cressingham Garden Estate - Resident Engagement Panel (REP)

Venue: The High Tree Community Development Trust,

Time: 7pm – 9pm

Minutes of the meeting - Monday 1st February 2016

Present:

Cllr Mary Atkins – Chair (MA)	Ward Member, Tulse Hill Ward
Nicholas Greaves (NG)	Resident Rep. (Tenant)
Edward Ogundele (EO)	Independent Resident Advisor, Strategic Urban Future/JVM Ltd (StUF)
George Sodoropoulos	Freeholder, substitute for Fatima Elmoudden
Jason Hepworth (JHep)	Resident Rep (Tenant)
Sarah Coyte (SC),	Capacity Building Officer, LBL
Julian Hart (JH)	Capital Programme Manager, LBL
Bashir Miah (BM), minutes	Housing Project Officer, LBL
Jackie Amma Thomas (JAT)	Housing Project Officer, LBL
Andrew Jacques (AJ)	Repairs coordinator, Housing Management, LBL
Abbas Raza (AR)	Local Dialogue, community engagement consultancy

Apologies:

Cllr Marcia Cameron (MC)	Ward Member, Tulse Hill Ward
Christine Makhoulf (CM)	New Resident Rep. (Tenant)
Gerlinde Gniewosz(GG),	Resident Rep (Leaseholder)
Tom Keene(TK)	Resident Rep. (Leaseholder)
Fatima Elmoudden (FE)	Resident Rep. (Freeholder))
Pauline Foster(PF)	Housing Development Manager, LBL

1.0 Welcomes.

- 1.1 Chair welcomed everyone.
- 1.2 It was noted that JAT will be attending the meeting as she may become further involved in supporting the project.

2.0 Minutes of the last meeting –11th January 2016

- 2.1 BM read out an email from TK, where he confirmed that he was unable to attend the meeting as his wife has given birth to a baby

girl. He also raised some comments in the email, which the members of the REPs noted:

- 2.1.1 His objections to the accuracy of the previous minutes.
 - 2.1.2 His comments in regard to the availability of the Hunter's report.
 - 2.1.3 He was not clear on how the meeting will be conducted and decisions were made.
- 2.2 REP members were very pleased with news and congratulated TK and his wife for the birth of their daughter.
- 2.3 REP members reviewed the minutes and were satisfied that the minute was a true reflection of the discussion that took place. TK's other comments were addressed under the matter arising.
- 2.4 NG reported that Fatima was unwell.

3.0 Actions

- 3.1 AJ confirmed that the TRA has the keys to the Notice Board.
- 3.2 NG informed that CM has a key. AR also stated that CM has offered to put up posters for him on the Notice Board.
- 3.3 JH confirmed that there were large font booklets made available at the Community Engagement Exhibition on 20th Jan 2015. Also the availability of information in other languages was advertised at the event. In the future, it will be advertised on any information circulated to the residents.
- 3.4 EO has highlighted that he has not received any translation request from any resident yet.
- 3.5 EO reported that the training event for the new and the existing members has not been organised. He was currently planning to organise after March, when he hoped all the member of the panels will be in place.

Action: Training events for reps to be organised in April 16.
Action EO

4.0 Matter Arising

4.1 In response to TK comment about the Hunter's report. AJ clarified that following GG request for the Hunter's report; he had agreed to provide an estate wide schedule of the works, which contained the most up to date information. He pointed out that the Hunter report was a superseded document and the current scope of the works was not based on the Hunter report. He pointed out that he will check with his colleagues to find out where the report was and make it available to the regeneration team to upload on their website. He reiterated that when published on the website, it should be clarified that the current scope of works were not based on this report.

Action: AJ to provide Hunter's report to the estate regeneration team for uploading to the website.

4.2 In respect to TK's comments about the conduct of meeting and decisions making process, MA clarified that this group was a consultation panel; REP members do not have a vote on actions other than the running of the REP itself. She pointed out that she might have confused the issue at the last meeting, where there were discussions about having an Independent Chair. She pointed out that the REP members will have a choice on selecting their Chair but the panel will not be making decision for the Council. It is a consultation body.

4.3 NG commented that members should have a vote on agreeing the ToR as it relates to how the meeting will be conducted. He and some other REP members have signed the document. It cannot go on with some members refusing to sign the ToR.

4.4 EO commented that the ToR should be adopted as it provides clarification on the code of conduct, the business and objectives of the REP.

4.5 It was recognised that ToR need to be signed and agreed as soon as possible. April 2016 was accepted as reasonable deadline to get everyone sign up to it.

5.0 **Housing Management/ Leaseholder S20 update**

5.1 AJ reported that a number of observations were received from the residents on the estate and currently they were in the process of responded to these individuals.

- 5.2 AJ confirmed that a consultation event for the works was due to be organised on the estate. Currently the date has not been confirmed, but the announcement was imminent.
- 5.3 JH requested that AJ liaise with AR to ensure there was no clash with the regeneration team's events and the housing management's team events. – **Action AJ/AR**
- 5.4 EO requested if they could organise a separate event for tenants and separate event for leaseholders in relation to the works.
- 5.5 AJ clarified that there was difficulty in running two separate events on different occasions due to the management of staff resources. However, it could be possible to organise such events to have an hour long separate session for tenants only and leaseholders only session on the day of the event.
- 5.6 NG commented that in practice this separation does not work, it tended to get dominated by the issues of one particular group at the expense of the other group. Furthermore, it became difficult to exclude anyone participating if they were already at the event.
- 5.7 The Chair requested if AR could review and see if you can hold two separate events for different tenure group.

Action: AJ confirmed to let everyone know the date of the event and have another review to see two separate consultation events were possible. (i.e. leaseholders only session and tenants only session).

- 5.8 JHep requested clarification on whether the works to be carried out were done on the basis that the regeneration was going ahead.
- 5.9 JH clarified that the Council has decided to go ahead with current work programme, rather than rejig the project again. If the decision in March was to go ahead with refurbishment only then then this could be reviewed and any additional works could be added to it.

6.0 Project Update

- 6.1 AR reported on the consultation process. He explained that 62 people attended the exhibition on 20th January and a further 19 people

attended the Saturday's event. At these events all the options were presented and people were encouraged to submit their feedback.

- 6.2 AR further explained that the Green retrofitting subgroup/workshop was held as scheduled. GG was able to present a People Plan. Huw Jones from the Council was available at the workshop, who was working on a passivhaus project in Ackerman Road, Lambeth.
- 6.3 JH commented that GG had not yet circulated full Sturgis Green Retrofitting report.
- 6.4 NG commented that as a tenant on the estate he has not seen the report.

Action – GG to issue Sturgis report prior to the next Green retrofitting subgroup, scheduled on 16th Feb 16

- 6.5 AR confirmed that the viability subgroup/ workshop was held as scheduled. GG, one other resident and a non-resident attended the workshop. The Council's finance team answered questions and clarified issues of viability and the HRA Business Plan.
- 6.6 EO commented that the workshop/subgroup meeting was generally positive and although there were information demands from residents, there was clear clarification from the Council on what information will be made available and what will not be available due to confidentiality, commercial sensitivity, etc.
- 6.7 JH confirmed that the Council will make available the cabinet paper for budget setting for this year. It was noted that the second viability workshop was scheduled on 18th February 2016.
- 6.8 MA requested attendance sheet – **Action AR to circulate attendance sheet for Green Retrofitting subgroup and viability subgroup.**
- 6.9 The dates of all the forthcoming events were noted. It was confirmed that the final exhibition will be held on 25th February 16.
- 6.10 NG suggested that the calendar of consultation events are put on the estate notice board.- **Action AR**

6.11 AR clarified that Local dialogue will produce report on the various consultation events and feedback received. Currently only 8 feedbacks had been received. However, it was noted that closing date for receiving feedback was 19th Feb 2016. This will provide approx. 1 week to collate the information and produce report.

6.12 JH commented that Q&As live document will be uploaded on the website and regularly updated.

6.13 MA requested that links to Q&A was provided - **Action – BM/JH**

7.0 Independent Resident Advisor & Resident Reps Feedback

7.1 NG circulated proposed new communication strategy for conducting the business of the REP (see enclosed), in particular he highlighted that Agenda should be circulated with timeslot and the Chair strictly adhere to it. A separate Action log was produced with clear time scale for completing the tasks. He commented that previously there was separate action log for this meeting and for some reason this was no longer been issued.

7.2 EO commented that group should give the new proposal a chance to see if it's improved the meeting with respect to a time agenda, etc.

7.3 JH suggested that a document register would be useful to include as part of the action logs and added that the Council will review this proposal and look into the issue, particularly the suggestion about the response times.

7.4 NG highlighted the concerns about the proposed loss of 'secure tenancy' under the regeneration programme.

7.5 EO commented that the tenants were very unhappy to lose their secure tenancy. It was unacceptable to them. He has reviewed a number of other schemes and no one was doing this to an existing sitting secure tenants. All other regeneration scheme in London were allowing existing secure tenant to preserve their secure tenancies. He highlighted that the Enfield scheme was different from Cressingham Garden. They are developing on a site where there were no sitting secure tenants. He requested that Lambeth should show the evidence why it cannot or will not provide secure tenancy to

existing secure tenant. If was breaking new ground it will be useful to see this.

7.6 JH commented that most of the information exists.

7.7 It was proposed that a tenancy workshop be scheduled for 11th February 2016, 6.30pm -8pm, to discuss the issues around secure tenancy, impact on rents and other tenancy related issues.

**Action: Event to be publicised to all tenants on the estate –
Action AR &project team**

8.0 AOB
None

Date of Next Meeting:

Monday 7th March 2016, Venue: High Tree Community Development