

**Resident engagement Panel Minutes: Tuesday 28<sup>th</sup> June 2016 (19:00 – 20:30) Christ Church,  
Highland Road, Gipsy Hill**

Attendees

- Jonathan Croucher (Chair) -JC
- Victor Hernandez – VH
- Clifford Ward – CW
- Ron Houston (PPRC) – RH
- Pamela Kovakovich (PPRC) – PK
- Nicola Curtis – NC
- Norman Bennett – NB
- Karen Bennett – KB
- Glen Searle – GS
- Andrea Rose - AR
- Matthew Bennett (Cabinet Member for Housing/Councillor Gipsy Hill Ward) – MB
- Neil Vokes (Programme Director) – NV
- Fiona Cliffe (Programme Manager) – FC
- Lauren Tyrrell (Project Officer) – LT
- Zeke Osho (PRP) – ZO
- Luke Murphy (Councillor Gipsy Hill Ward) - LM

Apologies

Cllr Jenifer Braithwaite

<b>June Minutes</b>	
1	<b>Enhanced Key Guarantees -</b>
1.1	NV explained that as part of a cabinet decision the key Guarantees are included and come into effect. Some elements of the KGs come into play immediately at the point of decision such as the homeless payment and removal costs and some do not come into play until they are needed as part of the delivery.
1.2	Current Key guarantees are in effect as they stand on all estates that have a decision so if Central Hill were to go to a decision now, the current KGs would apply.
1.3	Both CW and GS said they felt the current KGs were not a good deal for leaseholders
1.4	JC asked that in terms of the enhanced Key Guarantees, how would the REP feed in at a programme level?
1.5	This process is being determined but there would be individual information for consultation/feedback given to all Lambeth tenants and resident leaseholders, and estate/block meetings – likely run by PPCR, who carried out initial consultation on the current KGs. There will be a 6 week consultation period on the new improved key guarantees.
1.6	NV said it will be interesting in round 2 consultation to understand why the KGs are such a bad deal for leaseholders
	<b>Shared Equity/Ownership</b>

<p>1.7</p> <p>1.8</p> <p>1.9</p> <p>1.10</p> <p>1.11</p> <p>1.12</p> <p>1.13</p> <p>2.0</p>	<p>NV explained the issue in relation to the shared equity option and the implications from the EU changes. He was having a meeting that week &amp; would report back to the REP in relation to the conclusions.</p> <p><b><i>Response to issues raised above around EU regulation changes:</i></b></p> <p><b><i>The Council stands by the commitment in the Key Guarantees for resident homeowners, specifically the guarantee that any resident homeowner who wishes to continue to live on their estate will have the opportunity to do so.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>However, a recent change in EU regulations means that the Council is having to re-consider the details. There are alternatives which will allow the Council to fulfil the Key Guarantee and the Council is currently confirming the details of this approach and will consult on this as a part of the wrap up consultation to improve the Key Guarantees. The Council will also ensure that a solution is in place before any homeowner needs to take up any such offer.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>The Council wants the Key Guarantees to be the best that they can be within the legal and financial constraints it operates in. In addition we have always been open to suggestions on how the Key Guarantees can be improved. This is one of the reasons we asked TPAS, the respected tenant engagement organisation, to review them earlier in the year. The Council has been considering the TPAS findings and is looking at other ways the Key Guarantees can be improved within the legal and financial limitations the Council works within.</i></b></p> <p>VH questioned the level of equity required, was HfL/Lambeth still looking at 60% shared equity/ownership with no rent paid on the equity not owned?</p> <p>NV explained that legally this option was leaning towards more of a shared ownership model.</p> <p>JC asked where the 60% came from?</p> <p>NV explained that this was best practice commercially. <b><i>(See JC notes – Jan 2016)</i></b></p> <p>VH asked whether the level of equity without paying rent could go lower than the 60%, to say 25% for instance.</p> <p>MB said it that is what we have been looking at. How we bridge the gap between values commercially and financially?</p> <p>RH thought the 60% of value was irrelevant for the financial model. The council won't be buying the house at value, it will be building it. We need to see on paper what the key guarantees look like and have a debate about this.</p> <p><b>HfL Leases and Tenancies</b></p>	
---	---	--

2.1	<p>NV explained that we are talking to Tenants and Leaseholders Council about an independent view on the legal aspects of leases and tenancies. We want to go back to Tenants and Leaseholder Council to present a brief to proceed with the drafting of a tenancy/leaseholder contract.</p>	
3.0	<p><b>Early Buy-backs</b></p>	
3.1	<p>JC said the question about early buy-backs needs to be addressed early in the process. There is also concern from residents about a Judicial Review process and the threat that the Council will revoke the early buy-back offer.</p>	
3.2	<p>NV explained if a Cabinet decision is subject to a JR and it's found in favour of the residents this effectively revokes the decision to proceed with the scheme and thus revokes the authority given at that Cabinet decision to commence early buy-backs. The decision would need to go back to Cabinet again asking for authority to proceed with early buy-backs.</p>	
3.3	<p>MB explained the valuation process – properties are subject to a valuation by a surveyor who has to assess the value based on a scenario whereby the regeneration scheme doesn't exist.</p>	
3.4	<p>VH asked if the early-buy backs where going to be introduced in the new enhanced Key Guarantees.</p>	
3.5	<p>MB replied that yes the Council was looking to incorporate the early-buy backs to the Key Guarantees</p>	
3.6	<p>NV explained that where residents have approached the council early on and have exceptional circumstances they have been bought out. This is without the 10% homeloss compensation.</p>	
3.7	<p>GS asked about the budget for this - &amp; it was explained there was an internal budget for purchasing previous RTB homes.</p>	
4	<p><b>Equity Stake</b></p>	
4.1	<p>VH said that LBL shouldn't force leaseholders to get a bigger mortgage to increase their equity stake.</p>	
4.2	<p>KB stated that on Myatt's Field they were offered like for like. A straight swap was offered old for new, and with each regeneration project the Council does, residents get offered less and less.</p>	
4.3	<p>NV said that Myatt's Field is an exception. And he didn't know anywhere in London who has offered a like for like swap.</p>	
4.4	<p>MB – timings – trying to close down the Key Guarantees, ASH proposals review, formal consultation process – avoiding summer.</p>	

<p>5.0</p> <p>5.1</p> <p>5.2</p> <p>5.3</p> <p>5.4</p>	<p><b>ASH Proposals</b></p> <p>JC said he didn't imagine there will be any agreement in the room on the ASH proposals have been considered properly. It was agreed that discussions on the ASH proposals at a later date – potentially mid-July.</p> <p><i>The financial feasibility would be considered by PPCR – including the financial accountant. Airey Miller would not be attending a review meeting but questions that arise can be fed back to them.</i></p> <p><i>PPCR will also review the ASH proposals and report back to the group. Any further financial information shared with PPCR will also be shared with members of the REP.</i></p> <p><i>Issues raised:</i></p> <p>NV said Lambeth has reviewed the ASH proposals at a high level and provided a response on whether this submission is deliverable and feasible. It has been very difficult to review as the level of detail was limited with block plans and outline numbers.</p> <p>PRP are not independent. They are on the Lambeth's payroll. PK said that the comments made by PRP were correct – see above.</p> <p>It was questioned whether the same kind of interrogation took place for the PRP proposals. ZO said that for the OA designs the schedule would all be green, as they have to abide by these regulations when designing schemes.</p>	
<p>6.0</p> <p>6.1</p> <p>6.2</p> <p>6.3</p> <p>6.4</p> <p>6.5</p>	<p><b>Formal Consultation</b></p> <p>JC asked whether the decision would go to a Cabinet in October. The period of consultation would be 4-6 weeks</p> <p>It was confirmed that the REP can be involved in discussing the consultation, how, when and what we are consulting on, but within the confines that ultimately it is Lambeth who has the statutory duty to consult with its residents.</p> <p>LM suggested that it would be useful to talk about how this consultation has worked elsewhere and talk to people who have already been through this?</p> <p>NV explained that the consultation is to ensure residents' knowledge and understanding. Questions, exhibitions, workshops, site visits etc. all of this captures information and the views of residents.</p> <p>MB said officers should look to produce a draft consultation timeline, how long it would run for and how this would be delivered.</p>	
<p>7.0</p> <p>7.1</p>	<p><b>Brexit</b></p> <p>There was a general discussion on how this may impact on regeneration.</p>	

7.2	NV said that investment in homes would be over 40/50/60 years, so should not have the short term prospective.	
8.0	<b>Financial Model</b>	
8.2	The REP had previously had a session on the draft financial model in January, and it was explained that between then and Cabinet there would be changes to inputs.	
8.3	VH asked about the issue of modelling if 80% of leaseholders chose not to remain on the new estate.	
9.0	<b>Meeting on 2<sup>nd</sup> July</b>	
9.1	The format was agreed.  <b><i>45 households attended 21 tenants &amp; 24 leaseholders It was generally felt to be a positive meeting.</i></b>	
9.2	<i>General consensus from the group that the next REP meeting should be rescheduled.</i>	
	AOB	
9.3	There would not be an August REP. KB asked that Anna Minton, author and journalist from the Guardian be permitted to attend the next REP meeting. Will the council be able to confirm that before the next meeting please?	
9.4	NC said there was concern that the Housing Office was not aware of the regeneration issues. FC explained she attends staff meetings – including one the following week.	
9.5	It had previously been decided that their attendance at the REP would mean that the meeting might focus on management issues.	
10.0	Date of Next meeting:  <i>Agreed to be rescheduled and confirmed.</i>	

DRAFT