

Fenwick Resident Engagement Panel (REP) Meeting

Thursday 16/6/16, 6.30pm, Fenwick Hall

Present:

Christian Brunschen (Chair)	Resident Rep (Leaseholder)
Marjorie McIntyre(Vice Chair)	Resident Rep (Tenant)
Katrina Davy (KD)	Resident Rep (Tenant)
D Valentine?	(Tenant)
Ron Laidley (RL)	Resident Rep (Tenant)
Brenda Ayaa (BA)	Resident Rep (Tenant)
David Lurie(DL)	Resident Rep (Leaseholder)
Sofie Reynolds(SR)	Resident Rep (Leaseholder)
Vaughan Grandin (VG)	Resident Rep (Leaseholder)
Rob Lantsbury (RL)	Independent Resident Advisor (STUF)
Simon Sochas (SS)	Independent Resident Advisor (STUF)
Pauline Foster (PF)	Housing Development Manager, Estate Regeneration Team, Lambeth Council
Jonny Moore (JM)	Interim Programme Manager, Estate Regeneration Team, Lambeth Council
Bashir Miah (BM)	Housing Project Officer, Estate Regeneration Team, Lambeth Council

Apologies:

John Hayton (JH) (Leaseholder), Cllr Marsha De Cordova, Cllr Andrew Wilson

	Action
1) Welcome Everyone introduced themselves. It was noted that Pauline Foster, Housing Development Manager attended to give an overview about the Equality Impact Assessment and understand the issues around vulnerable residents.	
2) Minutes of Meeting. Minute was accepted as a true reflection of the meeting.	

<p>3) Matter arising/Action.</p> <p>It was noted that a draft minutes was circulated in advance (2 weeks) of the meeting and changes/amendment were incorporated.</p> <p>The TOR will be discussed as an agenda item.</p> <p>KD commented that she feels there was still confusion about the clarification provided for Adult child. She was concerned that by the time it takes to move, her children will become an adult and she will not be able to get a larger property.</p> <p>Action: It was agreed that the Estate regeneration team will organised a meeting with the Decant Officer so that KD can discuss her individual circumstance with her.</p>	<p>BM</p>
<p>4) TOR / Membership review.</p> <p>VG and some of the others resident commented that they were happy with changes suggested by DL.</p> <p>JM commented that officers have not had chance to review the changes as it was circulated today.. Officers will need to assess the implications that it will have on the Council before the ToR can be adopted.</p> <p>Action: It was agreed that JM and DL to review the changes and together come up with an agreed version. Which will be ratified at the next meeting.</p> <p>Subject to the DL and JM review, the group in principle agree to the TOR ,and recognised and understood the difficulty of the Council and are keen to have a workable document that the Council could commit to.</p> <p>Membership</p> <p>JM advised that the terraced houses on Willington Road are no longer part of the regeneration proposal and so the resident of these houses will not be affected in the same way as the residents living on the main Fenwick Estate. So the membership of the group may need to be reviewed to reflect this.</p> <p>BA who is a resident on Willington Rd commented that these houses have always been separate from Fenwick Estate and is pleased that their houses are no longer part of the regeneration proposal. BA pointed out that it is important for them now to prioritise the repairs work that need to be carried out in their homes. BA recognised that this is not the right forum and it will be unfair on Fenwick Estate residents to take the time of this group. BA highlighted that she and other residents on the street</p>	<p>JM, BM and DL</p>

<p>will need to take up the issue with another team of the Council and will also be liaising with the Kate Hoey, MP to maintain the campaign.</p> <p>Chair commented that Willington Road’s houses REP representative could attend as an observer. However, he added that there are 8 Tenants, 4 Leaseholders and 1 Freeholders REP positions available and currently the pool has healthy representation from leaseholders but tenants are under-represented. Now the houses on Willington Road are out, the numbers of tenant representatives attending will be even less.</p> <p>BM commented that he extended the invite to another tenant who expressed interest via VG , but he did not attend the meeting today.</p> <p>It was agreed that a recruitment drive may be needed to encourage residents and increase the pool of tenant’s representatives.</p> <p>Action: Independent Advisor to recruits further pools of tenants reps.</p>	<p>SC/CS/RL</p>
<p>5) Vulnerable Resident Strategy</p> <p>PF explained that she is currently working on an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) as part of the Cabinet report. The EIA looks at different equality strands which among others includes age and disability, which address the issues around supporting vulnerable residents.</p> <p>PF highlighted that the report is drawn up from the current available data the council has at its disposal. It is a live document and will be reviewed on an ongoing basis as more information becomes available. PF encouraged REP members and the Independent Advisor to feedback any information on any vulnerable resident they come across as not everyone is known to the council/ service providers, so that Council could put better plan to support these residents.</p> <p>In response to a REP member query, PF confirmed that the EIA will be an appendix to the Cabinet report. PF highlighted the council will undertake a detailed household needs survey to identify the particular needs of individuals and the Decant officers will provide the necessary support to assist residents with the moving process. Where specialist support is required, such as an Occupational Therapist, Social Worker, etc. the Council will work with these professionals and carers to provide bespoke tailored individual support to vulnerable residents.</p> <p>PF added that at a programme level the Estate Regeneration Team is considering embedding a social worker within the overall team, so that more seamless services and assistance could be provided to the affected residents.</p>	

<p>6) Regeneration Updates</p> <p>JM reported that the Cabinet report will be published 5 working days before the Cabinet meeting, scheduled on 11th July 2016. JM highlighted that the Cabinet report will consist of a recommendation for the full redevelopment of the Fenwick Estate. As part of the background report it will include as an appendices the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Options Analysis • Resident’s Brief. • Consultation Report (Make:Good) • Design Report (KCA) • Financial Options Appraisal • EIA <p>The residents will be notified where the meeting will be held and if they wish they can make a representation, details will be provided in the letter.</p> <p>Action: Notification letter</p> <p>JM added that subject to cabinet decision the Council will start the procurement process for the Development Management Team (DMT), to work on the next phase of the project, i.e. master planning, design work, etc. An exhibition of bidders will held on the Fenwick Estate, and the REP will have opportunity to meet and interview the potential bidders for this works and score them. The council will use the score and feedback received from residents from the exhibition and interview as part of the evaluation process for appointing DMT.</p> <p>A REP member queried about the 55 new build homes that will be developed on the opportunity sites along the railway line. JM advised that the 55 new home have planning permission and will be built by Transport for London (TfL). The Council is working on a development agreement and his colleague Lesley Johnson is leading on it, and will be liaising with her to get an update</p>	<p>BM/JM</p> <p>JM</p>

<p>7) Independent Advisor's (IA) Feedback</p> <p>The Independent Advisor's gave feedback on the activities they are doing on the estate.</p> <p>It was reported that to date there has not been much take up on the surgery, however there has been more success with door knocking activities , which was helping the IA to understand resident issues and building their caseworks.</p> <p>RL highlighted that following the discussion with residents, he and his colleagues found that some residents are ready to go and did not really appreciate that a regeneration project takes time. On the other hand there are some residents who are not ready. Also residents want clear clarification on what is guaranteed.</p> <p>It was noted that dedicated events will be organised shortly for different tenure group so that they can discuss particular tenure related issue with the independent advisors, which then can be feedback to the Council.</p> <p>Action: IA to publicise the events.</p> <p><u>Fenwick Estate REP, Resident Website.</u></p> <p>SS reported that website is ready and asked if any REP member wished to review the content.</p> <p>DL requested that they would like to review the website before it is launched. KD also requested that she would like to be involve in this.</p> <p>Action: SS to liaise with REP members and in particular DL and KD and launch the Fenwick Residents' Website.</p>	<p>IA</p>
<p>8) Resident REP feedback</p> <p>Some of the REP members commented that they attended anti-Regeneration group meeting and said that it appear to be led by people from outside of the estate.</p> <p>There were discussion about the providing clear information as resident could get confused. REP member asked if they could have answers to some of queries raised by Anti Regeneration Group.</p> <p>JM responded and said that from back of these meetings the Council received letters with series of questions from a number of residents, which the Council has responded. A copy is circulated to the meeting for information.</p>	

<p>RL commented that StUF did not attend the meeting as they were not invited.</p> <p>JM advised that if REP member come across any resident who require clarification, they should referred to the Independent Advisor or the Estate Regeneration Team.</p> <p>It was also noted if the decision to go ahead with regeneration proceeds, the Development Management Team will not be in place until September. It was suggested that activities and events are organised on the estate to fill the voids and provide opportunities to clarify any misunderstanding the residents may have.</p>	
<p>9) AOB VG queried about Stamp Duty. RL Clarified that normal practice is that stamp duty is usually reimburse up to the valuation of your existing home.</p> <p>It was highlighted the Council need to provide detail of the valuation process. Also provide detail about the early buy back process. It was noted and the REP recognised that the Council will need to assess the demand for early buy back and manage the expectation. A prioritisation will be developed subject to demand.</p>	
<p>10) Date of Next Meeting Thursday 28th July at 6.30pm, Fenwick Hall</p>	