

Cressingham Garden Estate - Resident Engagement Panel (REP)

Venue: The High Tree Community Development Trust,

Time: 7pm – 8.30pm

Minutes of the meeting - Monday 7th March 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)
Gerlinde Gniewosz(GG),	Resident Rep (Leaseholder)
Tom Keene(TK)	Resident Rep. (Leaseholder)
Pauline Foster(PF)	Housing Development Manager, LBL
Bashir Miah (BM), minutes	Housing Project Officer, LBL
Abbas Raza (AR)	Local Dialogue, community engagement consultancy

Apologies:

Cllr Marcia Cameron (MC)	Ward Member, Tulse Hill Ward
Christine Makhlouf (CM)	New Resident Rep. (Tenant)
Fatima Elmoudden (FE)	Resident Rep. (Freeholder))
Andrew Jacques (AJ)	Repairs coordinator, Housing Management, LBL
Julian Hart (JH)	Capital Programme Manager, LBL

1.0 Welcomes.

1.1 Chair welcomed everyone.

1.2 GS stated that he has submitted a list of questions, which he would like the Council to answer.

1.3 AR/PF confirmed that they have received the questions and will be responding soon.

2.0 Minutes of the last meeting –1st February 2016

2.1 Minutes was agreed.

2.2 GG commented that she was not happy that an action was recorded against her name without her knowledge. The action GG was

referring to was that she would share the Sturgis reports, not The People's Plan. GG confirmed that the reports have now been submitted as part of the People's Plan to the Council.

- 2.3 The Chair advised GG that the action was not a new one, it was an action brought forward from a previous meeting where GG was present. The Chair asked for the "People's plan" to be circulated to all the REP members.
- 2.4 TK and GG raised issue of inaccurate minutes and requested a process to amend minutes to be implemented.

[Post Note: Following the meeting PF circulated the links to all the REP members.]

3.0 Matter Arising & Actions.

- 3.1 Action Logs was circulated and update was provided.
- 3.2 NG asked about the communication protocol that he had distributed at the last meeting. He would like feedback on this, particularly if and when the Council is going to adopt it. A response to this was required urgently, 7 days deadline was suggested. **Action JH**
- 3.3 There was a major debate on the Q&As. GG/TK raised their concerns on how the Q&As were updated. They have requested a simple tracking system to establish what has been updated.
- 3.4 The Chair was in agreement and requested that some form of version control was introduced in Q&As publication.
- 3.5 AR confirmed that they will liaise with Paul Simpson and look to review it. – **Action AR/PS**
- 3.6 GG raised a series of points around finances, firstly she stated that the HRA headroom debt was incorrect and the Council has further debt headroom than publicised. Secondly, GG stated there were no maintenance figures in option 5. She would like this to be corrected as soon as possible. She thinks if the maintenance figure was included then option 5 would be fundamental flawed (weathertight repairs and ongoing maintenance).
- 3.7 GG added that the new homes will be in a poor state of repair within a few years, if there are no provision for maintenance included in the programme.

- 3.8 GG requested that Cllr Atkins should raise this point with the Council as a Members Enquiry. MA did not agree but said she would ask about service charges in Option 5. – **Action MA**
- 3.9 TK questioned MA on subsidence claims and quoted Tall Survey that states majority of issues instead come from lack of repairs.
- 3.10 GG highlighted the issues regarding Japanese Knotweed on the estate. She asked how it is being incorporated in the implementation of the regeneration. She wanted to know what plans the Council had in managing the Japanese Knotweed on the estate. She has raised this question several times but has not had an answer. TK and GG requested clear statement/policy on how this issue would be addressed.
- 3.11 NG pointed out the Area Office is aware of the situation and have long term plans in place to manage and treat the Japanese Knotweed problem. The current TRA need to keep it in check with the Area Office.

4.0 Housing Management/ Leaseholder s20 Updates.

- 4.1 It was reported that AJ has given his apologies as he was on leave. In his email he stated that resident consultation will take place this month.
- 4.2 Date of the consultation events could not be confirmed. It was agreed Housing Management to advise residents of the 2 major repair consultation dates, which are schedule to take place this month as soon as possible. Members are expecting a response to this matter as a matter of urgency. – **Action AJ**
- 4.3 REP members expressed their concerns that there were no officers present from the Housing Management department.
- 4.4 A series of repair issues were reported by TK and GG. TK commented that he is working with the Area Office and other residents to address some of the outstanding repair issues. TK and other residents feel the estate is not being repaired due to the imminent regeneration of the estate.
- 4.5 TK reported that they are challenging £45K worth of repair works and liaising with the Area Office team.

5.0 Project Update

- 5.1 PF reported that consultation has been now completed for this stage. A Cabinet report will be published on 11th March 2016. The recommendation on the report will be for option 5, which is to redevelop the whole estate.
- 5.2 She reported that if the Cabinet were to approve Option 5, then the council would start the procurement process for the recruitment of the Development Management Team to take forward the next stage of the scheme.
- 5.3 TK asked about formal consultation structure for the Key Guarantees. He wanted a comprehensive explanation of the consultation process undertaken as he was informed it would conclude in April/May but residents were given last opportunity to comment in mid-February.
- 5.4 PF responded by stating the consultation process on Key Guarantees will be carried out at a programme level and will be led by Paul Simpson. She will request Paul Simpson provides a full explanation on the consultation process.

Action : PS to provide details on the Key Guarantees consultation process, including the details on the format and timeline.

- 5.5 GG raised issues about the affordability of the new homes for residents.
- 5.6 The chair commented that the Council is in the process of producing case studies showing different scenarios and how they affect and benefit different group of residents. TK and GG stated this was too late in the process and should have been undertaken earlier.
- 5.7 TK and GG concerned that policies for older tenants and homeowners and young people had not been developed.

6.0 Independent Resident Advisor & Resident Reps Feedback

- 6.1 EO reported that currently he is not running any drop ins. From the residents that he has spoken they are waiting to find out what the cabinet decision will be.

- 6.2 GG reported a Market Researcher had visited her and had advised her that said Market Researcher was homeless. GG advised the meeting that she was very distressed about this and thought it was inappropriate to be sending homeless people to visit her.
- 6.3 EO commented that the Council should check that the door knocking staff are professionally trained, they should not discuss their personal issues.
- 6.4 PF clarified that this team is managed by a different section of the Council and will raise the matter with the relevant manager to ensure all the Market Researcher are briefed about their conduct on the estate. She requested if GG could provide further details about the incident it would help to identify the person. PF apologised and agreed that officers should not refer to their personal issues.
- 6.5 NG raised a few points in reference to the TPAS report, which was a critique of the key guarantees. Listed below are the points raised
- Key Guarantee 11, provide help with re-housing to all affected households during process. NG highlighted that he agreed with TPAS review and said that this needed to be more specific and for there to be a clear policy, rather than adhoc approach.
 - Key guarantee 14, “handyperson service”, description of vulnerability and the service needs to be more explicit.
- 6.6 TK commented that payment may need to be made upfront.
- 6.7 The decant and housing needs assessment was discussed in detail. GG was particularly concerned about vulnerable residents (especially residents with Dementia and Alzheimer’s) from all tenures and how they will be decanted and supported.
- 6.8 PF assured REP members that the Council has an obligation to assist and support all residents. Appropriate support will be provided to resident on a case by case basis, depending on their individual needs.
- 6.9 EO commented that the Council will need to deal with rehousing vulnerable residents regardless of the tenure and should ensure policies are in place to manage this.
- 6.10 GG said she had concerns with the design standards and how it will address the needs of vulnerable people, e.g. introducing stairwells. GG also stated there were issues with the design standards building in isolation and anti-social behaviour. TK and GG requested clear statement on how this issue would be addressed.

6.11 GG asked about the SLAM wellbeing assessment – what has happened to it? Will the Council be following up on the outcome of the assessment?

Action : Estate regeneration project team to review

7.0 AOB

None

Date of Next Meeting:

Monday 11th April 2016. Venue: Scout Hut behind High Trees Community Development Trust.