

**Minutes of a meeting of the Kingsbridge Resident Steering
Group held on 14th October 2020
Via zoom at 7pm**

Residents Present:

Deidre Benjamin
Pam Cole - Chair
Natalie Hajek
Anna Cushen
David Ledbetter
Abeza Bibi
Shantha Gowda (joined slightly late)
Pamela Jacobs (joined late)

Others Present:

Ceire Sheehy – One Housing - CSH
Paul Handley – One Housing - PH
Rob Lantsbury – New Mill - RL
Christine Searle – New Mill – CS
Mike Tyrrell – Resident’s Advocate – MT
Rowan Riley – Haworth Tompkins architects - RR
Ken Okonkwo – Haworth Tompkins architects - KO
Chris Fellner – Haworth Tompkins architects - CF

1 Welcome & Opening the meeting

- 1.1 Pam Cole took the Chair.
- 1.2 It was noted that the meeting was quorate.
- 1.3 Three new residents had asked to become members, Abeza Bibi joined the meeting and was welcomed, Pam asked Abeza to complete the code of conduct and return it in the SAE. If it had been mislaid RL to re-send Abeza confirmed she lives in Montrose House.

2 Apologies

- 2.1 Apologies were received from:
 - Danny Waites
 - Sheik M Rahman
 - Sharif Hossain (sent late apologies)

3 Minutes of the Kingsbridge Estate RSG Meeting held on 9th September 2020

- 3.1 The minutes were agreed as a true and accurate record.

4 Matters Arising from the Minutes

- 4.1 7.4 Architects contact details sent to RSG members

8.4 Report tabled

8.5 43% voted for 57% against in the Camden ballot

8.6 Letter sent to and received by two other IOD RSG's. the group at Alice Shepherd & Oak will ask for more details, the group at Kedge, Starboard & Winch still not interested in receiving visitors from Kingsbridge

5 Options appraisal cycle 1 – Haworth Tompkins

- 5.1 Ken introduced the consultation boards, poster and website, he noted draft copies distributed previously. Ken then ran through the boards and advised the meeting that it was planned to print and distributed these as a booklet toward the end of next week.
- 5.2 Ken noted that the pages needed to be split and text made larger although not changed. HT had embellished images and included some Bangla text; they had also included Pam's comments on resident involvement.
- 5.3 There will be further opportunity to refine residents brief and more graphics on what is an options appraisal.
- 5.4 HT had taken on board the RSG comments on the importance of feedback, two events planned for 26.10.20 both virtual, HT had recently visited the estate to identify how it works and included visuals from this visit.
- 5.5 David asked about the notice boards which were quite cluttered and easily became back ground noise, Pam agreed with this point, the notice boards no longer stand out.
- 5.6 David suggested creating a show piece notice board for the estate for the purposes of this exercise, Ceire agreed to look into this but for this cycle it was suggested using the wall in front of the stairs in the short term, Pam agreed with this. Paul noted we had to check with estate services.
- 5.7 Deidre asked if the consultation booklet was to come through the doors, Ken noted this was the case.
- 5.8 Ken then went onto the website which will be launched either this Friday or the following Monday, page one starts with current news and events, links to One Housing website, will have all historical information.
- 5.9 The site also has a meet the team page, HT brief page with direct link to feedback form, stakeholder communications page and timeline page. Ken acknowledged cycle one was ambitious but wanted to target this and change it if not possible.

- 5.10 Deidre asked how easy it would be to contact HT, Ken draw people's attention to the contact buttons at the end of the website together with all contact details.
- 5.11 David asked who would be able to access the question and comments. CSH advised this would be HT, OHG, NM and MT but not RSG. IF the RSG had access to the comments, CSH noted that OHG would have to make sure that people understood that other residents would have access to comments they had made. David understood this partly but wanted further discussions on how the RSG could receive resident's comments. CF suggested passing on anonymised comments, Paul noted that OHG had to comply with data protection and would not be suitable for a public forum.
- 5.12 It was agreed that residents feedback on the boards should be made available to the RSG, even if it were simply the verbatim comments. Pam agreed this was sufficient. David asked to return to this with NM and MT looking at how this can be achieved.
- 5.13 Ken returned to the website and went through the feedback from which takes about 15 minutes to complete. If people cannot complete this electronically, CSH will do so manually.
- 5.14 Pam noted that once people started using the website they will become more confident is using it and completing the forms. HT will keep the site under constant review with a view to simplifying the pages

6 GLA Ballots – Rob Lantsbury

- 6.1 RL introduced his paper on the requirements of the GLA should a ballot be required on Kingsbridge estate.
- 6.2 He noted that the ballot would be required on any estate regeneration project seeking funding from the GLA which involves the demolition of any homes owned (or previously owned and subsequently sold through the Right to Buy or similar projects) by a housing association or council and the construction of 150 new homes (regardless of tenure).
- 6.3 He further noted that the residents who could vote were any tenants named on the tenancy agreement with OHG, any leaseholders named on the lease who were resident on the estate and any other resident who had been registered for housing with LBTH for the 12 months prior to the ballot.
- 6.4 Importantly RL emphasised that non-resident leaseholders were not entitled to a vote.

6.5 For Kingsbridge the definition of the estate was straight forward, the three blocks.

6.6 The RSG agreed to note the report

7 What is being offered by OHG on other areas – Mike Tyrell

7.1 OHG staff left the meeting at this point.

7.2 MT then presented his paper on the offer to Kedge, Starboard & Winch offer, he noted that residents were meeting every Thursday night to discuss this.

7.3 He then went through each promise after noting that the group were favouring regeneration due to the poor construction of the blocks and that the proposal was to replace the current 72 homes with 280 new homes.

7.4 RL asked if the promised relocation to Essex should you wish was realistic, MT replied that OHG were looking to work with another landlord to facilitate this.

7.5 The group then discussed the promises made with MT at some length and agreed that MT to come back on 2 or 3 months' time with an update on the offer and that RL to provide paper on shared equity.

8 Any Other Business

8.1 Meeting dates provided for next year

8.2 David asked about Paula, no further explanation given, MT noted the bereavement issue continues.

8.3 RL noted and the meeting agreed that OHG to provide future repairs and maintenance plans for the estate from OHG.