

# Kingsbridge Residents Steering Group Meeting

11<sup>th</sup> December 2019

## Attendance

Pam Cole Chair for this meeting – Resident  
Deirdre Benjamin – Resident  
Shantha Gowda – Resident  
Jesmin Akhter – Resident  
Cherie White – Resident  
Natalie Hajek – Resident  
Sharif Hossain – Resident

Mike Tyrrell – Resident Advocate  
Leigh Pattison – One Housing Group  
Ceire Sheehy – One Housing Group  
Christine Searle – New Mill Consultants  
Rob Lantsbury – New Mill Consultants

### 1. Welcome & introductions

Chaired welcomed residents, people introduced themselves

2. **Apologies** – David Leadbetter, Sima Rahman, Eliza Janiec, Anna Cushen.
3. **Minutes of previous meeting** – Item 3 should be spelt Sima, with this correction the minutes were accepted as an accurate record.
4. **Matters arising** – CS referred the meeting to matters arising sheet, it was agreed that the Architects brief would be on the agenda for January 8<sup>th</sup> meeting. Joint Venture to be put on an agenda at a later date.
5. **Attendance log** – RL advised the meeting that Colin had now missed 4 meetings without apologies; CS noted that had to wait until this meeting as previous meeting was inquorate. RSG agreed that New Mill to write to Colin to advise him his membership would be formally ended.

### Action New Mill

The Chair noted we needed more people and asked members to encourage friends and neighbours to consider joining. The meeting discussed how people were feeling on the estate and how long the conversation about the future had been taking. It was noted that some new people moving onto the estate that may need more time before joining. Cherie noted that some people were also leaving the estate. The meeting noted that membership of the RSG was in the newsletter and that more positive action may encourage more membership.

6. **Questionnaire update** – RL spoke to the written report, he noted that 63 residents had completed the questionnaires; a further 4 had advised that they would not be taking part for their own reasons. OHG and New Mill would continue writing to and visiting homes that had not yet responded with a further update in January and the final report in February.

The meeting noted that none of the positive responses were included in the report, RL replied that this was a fair criticism and replied that the vast majority loved the location of the estate and a close second behind this was the community on the estate. The meeting discussed the feeling of safety on the estate notwithstanding the violent incident on the estate during the summer. LP urged all the RSG members to complete the questionnaire. **Action: RSG members to complete questionnaire before next meeting.**

7. **Isle of Dogs Regeneration update** – MT updated the RSG on other estates two estates that are undergoing the same process. MT advised that all three estates are in totally different places. On the Barkantine estate, Winch, Kedge and Starboard Houses were considering their future. MT noted that Kedge House residents were desperate for something to happen and were the dominate voice on the RSG. They have appointed architects and held their second drop in looking at the initial options that had been developed taking on board the comments of residents from the 1<sup>st</sup> drop in. They had decided not to have public meetings, preferring drop in's to allow all people to take part and thus the discussion not being dominated by loudest voice as had been experienced on Barkantine in the past. Drop in's were used to showing the possibilities for the blocks, at the second drop in the boards had tick list of what residents had said and how these issues had been addressed. The boards showed business as usual, refurbishment and regeneration. MT noted that there was disappointment that some resident suggestions had not been included in refurbishment options, specifically Winch House outside space, lots of positive responses to re-build Kedge but not for Winch.

MT advised that Alice Shepherd House drop in delayed due to conflict between RSG and OHG following the recent tragic fire in one of the flats, these issues have now been discussed and first drop in session now due in January. MT noted the fire had caused lots of issues around the response and who was responsible for what. He noted that the building contained the fire within the flat directly affected with smoke damage to the rest of the block. The issue for resident's post Grenfell was the stay put policy; residents left the block during the fire and felt that OHG would be responsible for their care and welfare whereas LBTH were responsible for the emergency plan in such an incident. The recent meeting with the Borough Fire Commander had proved helpful.

MT reported that there were different relationships with TRA's on each estate, on Barkantine there was not a good relationship with TRA, at Alice Shepherd the TRA attended RSG meetings and are welcomed and helpful.

LP reported that the Bellamy & Bing Street project had proceed to a ballot in November with all 31 residents involved voting, 26 voted for the project which would now progress. LP noted that all residents have the right to return and that it was a full decant and demolition project. There were lots of 4 bed decant so this may take a while.

Following on from the earlier discussion LP advised that fire safety being involved at very beginning of design and that fire regulations being updated frequently. Residents noted that the fire at Montcalm House some while ago resulted in smoke and water damage but the fire was contained within the flat itself.

8. **Architectural services** – LP spoke to the paper and asked the RSG for its feedback. MT felt that the introduction and the service description needed to be beefed up to strengthen residents voice in the design process, MT very wary of architects lack of experience of living on estates and noted the need to take on board – that residents like to be very detailed about design issues on both new build and refurbishment options.

The meeting noted that a follow up brief on residents' wishes needed to be developed. Residents present agreed as it needed to include details such as storage and high light issues that affect residents day to day lives, and it really needs to be resident driven.

It was agreed that the architects brief would need to include information from the questionnaire; the meeting agreed the architects brief to be amended and to be signed off by MT after final report on the questionnaires completed and sent round to the RSG. To be on next meeting's agenda.

**Action: LP to amend following RSG comments, and send to MT who would then sign off and circulate to RSG.**

9. **Measured flat surveys** – LP noted that a lot of issues being raised about the size of homes in the questionnaires, she noted that OHG does not have any of the building drawings and, it will be important to know size standards as they are before approaching architects to come up with ideas. Some leaseholders may have measurements which shows shape but may not show size. Ideally OHG would like a measurement of each flat type including those flats which have had knock throughs to drying room. RSG members noted there maybe drawings with measurements from decent homes work. The RSG agreed to start this process.

**Action LP to begin measured flat surveys.**

10. **Future training** – RL spoke to his paper and noted that the 30 minute sessions would just be tasters for each topic and that the RSG could request further training sessions on issues as and when they become necessary, it was noted that design would certainly require more as and when decisions were made. RL noted that these sessions could be without OHG staff present, LP questioned this and CS clarified that it was for the RSG to decide and that some sessions would certainly need OHG input. The meeting agreed to the suggested approach.
11. **AOB** – CS noted that as the meeting was quorate that we could officially accept a new member, the RSG agreed to this.

Pam advised that she was keen to attend another meeting which may mean missing a Kingsbridge RSG, it was suggested that the other meeting date could be changed. Date of next meeting 8<sup>th</sup> January, 2020