

**Central Hill Residents Panel Meeting**  
**Tuesday 23rd March 2017, 7pm to 9.50pm**  
**Lunham Road Day Centre**

**Attendance**

**Residents:** Nicola, Karen, Victor, Tayo, Lucy, Andrea

**Chair:** Jonathan Croucher

**LB Lambeth:** Fiona Cliffe, Sue Foster, Rachel Sharpe, Cllr Matthew Bennett, Cllr Luke Murphy

**PPCR:** Ron Houston, Pamela Kovachich

**TCC:** Name?

**Purpose of meeting:** Review information being presented to Cabinet in March 2017. LBL response to REP members' questions (see attached)

<b>1.</b>	<b>1.1</b> Jonathan welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced its purpose.
<b>2.</b>	<p><b>Questions on the Cabinet Reports – future of Central Hill and Key Guarantees</b></p> <p>2.1 See the attached document which summarises the questions raised by REP resident members and also in red, the LBL responses.</p> <p><b>Actions: None</b></p>
<b>3.</b>	<p><b>Key Guarantees (KGs) - general</b></p> <p>3.1 Rachel Sharpe explained that the KGs are as in the Cabinet report. LBL has responded to the consultation exercise and where possible, has tried to improve the KGs. These are now presented as 'principles' and 'mechanisms' for the implementation of the former. One of LBL aims was to make the KGs simpler – see para 2.7 in the Cabinet Report. Assuming approval at Cabinet, these will be re-published in new documents. The principles are the KGs and the mechanisms for their implementation may vary estate by estate and also over time.</p> <p>3.2 Nicola said that the KGs have now completely changed and that she thought in the present format – principles and mechanisms, they could be easily changed in the future. The main concern is that they are no longer specific enough.</p> <p>3.3 Karen stated that the views expressed by residents, reported and recorded in the TCC opinion survey were based on the existing KGs and not the versions in the Cabinet Report.</p> <p>3.4 Victor said that recommendation 4 in the Cabinet Report – <i>'To delegate authority to officers to adapt, when necessary (as defined in Section 2), the mechanisms by which the Key Guarantees are implemented so long as any such changes continue to deliver the adopted Key Guarantee principles.'</i> Means that the KGs are worthless if the mechanisms can be changed by LBL Officers</p> <p>3.5 Rachel said that the reasons for presenting in this way is solely to 'protect' the KGs as approved by Cabinet from external changes e.g. central government legislation.</p>

3.6 Sue Foster added that the split into principles and mechanisms may be confusing, but the detail contained in the Cabinet Report provides the confidence.

3.7 Karen further said that residents should not be put into such a vague situation, that it's not treating residents fairly and that the situation is horrendous and unbearable.

3.7 Sue responded that the aim is to have the flexibility to respond to external factors and that the delegated power to alter the mechanisms would be down to her and that she wants to assure everybody that she is committed to the KGs.

3.8 Cllr Murphy said he thought it a matter of presentation rather than content.

3.9 Cllr Bennett said that Appendix B to the KGs Cabinet Report paper provides the necessary detail, that the aim had been to try and simplify the KGs. He thought that the council had failed in this respect.

3.10 Victor raised the issue of the definition of succession – section T1 in Appendix B, Cllr Bennett responded that the aim is replicate what is in the existing Tenancy Agreement.

#### 4. Early buybacks

4.1 The Cabinet Report on the future of Central Hill states within the Finance Summary section:

*'It should be noted that the council expects to incur upfront costs of about £20m which are planned to be reimbursed by Homes for Lambeth. These upfront costs include buybacks costs to enable leaseholders to move home early if they choose to do so, development management fees, demolition and other costs associated with progressing the development scheme.'*

4.2 Jonathan reminded the meeting that Julian Hart had said at the previous REP meeting in January:

*'...that funds had been allocated to buy back leaseholders homes for the first 6 months of the scheme.'*

*Once a decision is made LBL will write to all leaseholders on the estate to get an indication of who will be bought back. This will give LBL an understanding of the scale of the buyback and then they can start programming them in. He said that part of this process would be to prioritise emergency situations first. Julian further stated that funding for the other buybacks would be made in a business case to LBL and once agreed this will allow unlimited buybacks for all Central Hill homeowners. He said his team were working on the business case and that this will have to go through the borough's process.'*

Jonathan went on to say, that what is now being presented is not 'unlimited buy backs' as Julian had previously stated.

*'Julian reiterated that there were sufficient funds available for the first 6 months of the project and when the **business case is completed and agreed, then buybacks would be unlimited**'.*

4.3 Cllr Bennett said that this would be addressed in the three months following the Cabinet decision and that the aim is to have Homes for Lambeth (HfL) set up by May 2017. HfL will be able to borrow money to finance the set up costs and buy back costs for Central Hill. He also said that buy-backs would not take place until after a potential JR application – so 3 months after the decision. He explained that the JR on Cressingham meant that the process of buy-back had to be halted, as the decision was challenged until the cabinet decision was again in place.

	<p>4.4 Ron said that using the current viability assumptions of 20% of leaseholders not returning and asking for buy backs would cost in the region of £20m, at an example estimate of valuations of £350k per property.</p> <p>4.5 Nicola said that she sees this as yet another example that consideration for the residents of the estate is not the starting point for Lambeth Council.</p>
<p><b>5.</b></p>	<p><b>Equalities Impact Assessment (EIA)</b></p> <p>5.1 Jonathan raised the REP's concerns about the process taken to complete the EIA. He further stated that the EIA should have reflected the current situation on the estate and after 2 years of working with residents, LBL had opportunities to collect this information.</p> <p>5.2 Rachel said that this had gone through a standard process whereby an equalities panel had reviewed and had signed this off.</p> <p>5.3 Cllr Bennett said that the EIA would be updated following the Cabinet decision.</p> <p>5.4 Fiona said that there had been a REP meeting in November when it was explained this EQIA presented a base position, largely from desktop information. The Housing Needs Survey would enhance this information, and it was agreed that the equality impact of redevelopment would be a regular agenda item – as well as having future reports at key decisions.</p>
<p><b>6.</b></p>	<p><b>Other matters</b></p> <p>6.1 The TCC feedback conclusions were on the agenda, but due to the lack of time only a brief discussion took place.</p> <p>6.2 Karen came back to the issue of TCC and asked for a response from TCC to her questions about the validity of the opinion survey. She said that as the feedback forms were not signed on each individual page – they could be separated, either intentionally or not.</p> <p>6.2 Aline from TCC stated that as a surveying company TCC are signed up to the Market Research Society (MRS) code of ethics and are also affiliated to the Consultation Institute. Due to lack of time residents could contact TCC. She suggested that she could respond very quickly the following day to any specific questions on their code and working practices.</p> <p>6.3 Karen and Nicola questioned the location of the Cabinet meeting at Bolney Meadow, as it is a considerable distance from the estate and means catching 2 buses to get there.</p> <p>6.4 Fiona gave the responses in relation to the speaking slots and location of the cabinet.</p> <p>6.5 Sue said that this is the venue for Cabinet meetings because the Town Hall is being re furnished, she also gave an undertaking to get back to REP resident members in regard to LBL providing transport to the venue from CH.</p> <p><b>Actions:</b></p> <p><b>Sue Foster to get back to REP resident members regarding transport to the Cabinet meeting venue.</b></p>
<p><b>7.</b></p>	<p><b>Date of next meeting</b></p>

	4 <sup>th</sup> April 2017
--	----------------------------