

Kingsbridge Residents Steering Group meeting

8th January, 2020.

Attendance

David Leadbetter Chair for this meeting – Resident
Pam Cole – Resident
Eliza Janiec – Resident
Deidre Benjamin – Resident
Anna Cushen – Resident
Shantha Gowda – Resident

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

1. Welcome & introductions

David took the Chair as Pam felt unwell.

2. Apologies

Cherie, Natalie, Jasmin & Sharif. Unfortunately the meeting was not quorate as there were no representative from Montrose House present.

3. Minutes of previous meeting

RL agreed to circulate minutes to residents a week in advance of each meeting – **Action Newmill**

The meeting noted that the Alice Shepherd fire happened in October and that the tort notices around fire on Kingsbridge happened before this fire.

LP advised the meeting that the measured surveys will be undertaken shortly to enable both OHG and tenants know what size each of the 10 property types on the estate are, there maybe slight variations in the blocks, OHG will use empty flats and TRA flat in the first instance and then ask residents to gain access to measure others, some RSG members volunteered to have their property measured. DL asked if OHG needed any other information about the flats while undertaking the measured survey, LP did not feel there was.

The meeting agreed that the next training to be on architects selection. The meeting further noted that the RSG will be able to visit new build schemes elsewhere to see how these designs were built out; MT gave some examples of good and bad practice he has seen. MT noted that the visits will include new build, infills and refurbishment projects. LP agreed to bring Bellamy and Byng designs to the Steering group where residents had been heavily

involved in the design development. RL felt a word of caution was needed in regard to council planning and design officers who often had their own ideas rather than take on board residents' concerns. The meeting discussed the present "deck access" for each of the Kingsbridge blocks adds to the neighbourliness and community aspect of the estate, particularly for Montcalm and Montrose, where the access balconies face each other.

4. Matters arising from the minutes

CS advised the meeting that Colin had now been written to following the last meeting. The meeting agreed that Newmill should advise the group if Colin had or had not replied after 7 days and then members may possibly approach Colin.

5. Attendance log

Log circulated and agreed.

6. Update

Starting the conversation report – New Mill – RL spoke to the report and highlighted the response percentages on the whole estate and each of the three blocks. It was noted that Montcalm House was the lowest response rate and that Newmill and OHG would concentrate on this block up until the agreed cut-off date of the 5.2.20. The aim was to achieve 75% or above on the estate as a whole and all three blocks. It was noted that the low response rate could be down to the higher level privately rented homes.

The meeting discussed some of the issues coming out of the report. A discussion took place around neighbourliness and how there was very little nuisance created on floors of blocks. However, it was noted that there was some noise nuisance from flats above and below, the meeting felt that private tenants changed over far more frequently than OHG tenants and there was less interest from these residents. RL noted the poor conditions of some of the private tenants lived in. Both Ceire and Christine's feedback on the visits they had undertaken, noted that pram storage, lack of lifts in two blocks, 'dead' bedrooms, storage in general and damp in Montrose and Montcalm were mentioned by a fair number of residents. They both noted that Michigan was very different, in this block the discussions were on drying facilities, ventilation and poor drainage.

The meeting then discussed purpose of questionnaire, RL noted it had enabled both OHG and Newmill to get to know the estate and residents far better; Ceire was also using these visits to follow up on a number of management issues following the visits.

The meeting agreed that the final report on the questionnaire would inform the architects brief, the design issues the architect would need to take account of, how best to engage residents, turnover rate and social/economic issues. RL

noted that the final report would form the basis of a community brief for the RSG before architects and others were appointed.

The meeting then discussed issues caused by absentee leaseholders renting room by room. The meeting also discussed overcrowding on the estate, RL noted, to his surprise, that there were few overcrowded OHG tenants but a number of homes overcrowded that were either occupied by the leaseholder and family or rented out room by room or to a family who needed an extra bedroom. This was particularly the case for Montcalm House which may explain the lack of response to the questionnaire. CS advised that there had been some residents who talked about demolition in Montcalm and Montrose and set out how this subject was discussed when brought up by residents. That is, if a resident said they felt demolition was required they were asked further questions to try to ascertain 'why' this was their view.

The meeting discussed on how people who have recently moved in can be kept up to date so they will be able to have an input, CS advised that new OHG residents were given a fortnight or so before any visits and that they could complete the questionnaire at any times. The meeting noted that this arrangement worked for OHG tenants but not for private tenants who moved in without OHG knowledge.

7. Architects brief

MT advised the meeting that on behalf of residents he had met with LP following the last meeting to amend the draft brief so that it is changed to stress that residents were driving the process, particularly given architects reputation. MT noted that the amendments made, strengthened residents voice in the process. Eliza raised the issue of stakeholders as against residents in terms of weighting to each group. LP noted that residents are the key consultees, as it will only residents who will be making a decision through a ballot. LP spoke about the importance of inviting comments from the local area i.e. schools.

MT noted that para 2 should state decisions made through ballot of residents> He suggested that it be amended to read:

“The preferred options will be subject to a resident ballot (s) as there is a commitment from One Housing that the decision about the future of the homes will be made by the residents concerned.”

MT stressed that architects will need to know that this is not a typical GLA ballot on regeneration as residents will be also making a decision on refurbishment and infills as well if that were the preferred options.

Eliza asked how much time spent on the percentages in the selection criteria. Her worry was that the architect's quality of offer and their methodology of working with the RSG should be measured separately. LP noted that this was included later in the brief, it was agreed to replace experience of similar

projects to include quality of written proposal. Hopefully architects brief to be agreed at February meeting providing its quorate, request for RSG members who wanted to be part of the interview process, Pam stepped forward.

MT spoke about the way in which the Architects Selection had progressed at the other two Island projects at Alice Shepherd & Oak House and Kedge, Starboard & Winch.

MT advised that he marked the architects submissions as the residents asked him to do so. He concentrated on looking for:

- Inner London London and Tower Hamlets experience
- Evidence of listening to residents
- Experience of new build and refurbishment
- Innovation in consultation; one example was an architect using a coffee cart around the estate and around local school.

He also wanted to see a reality check, that the architects were aware of the impact on service charges, have they done their homework, have they addressed resident charter questions.

LP noted that the brief did not specify how they would be marked. Presented table to RSG interviewees to enable them to question appropriately. Open questions on brief to enable those interviewed to be properly grilled.

Examples from Poplar HARCA – Christine – engaging residents to be able to challenge architects, building confidence in residents to be able to see through the professionalism, being able to sit through the day's work to get the right people for the work, getting the papers right in the beginning to enable residents to feeling confident.

Housing design guide training to be commenced in March. New Mill to give the handouts in February to go out with the minutes.

8. Any Other Business

DL on the possible need for a further meeting other than the monthly ones as current, the meeting discussed this and agreed not yet necessary.

9. Dates of next meetings

12th February, 2020

11th March, 2020

8th April, 2020

13th May, 2020

10th June, 2020

8th July, 2020