

**Minutes of a meeting of the Kingsbridge Resident Steering
Group held on 9th September 2020
Via zoom at 7pm**

Residents Present:

Deidre Benjamin
Pam Cole
Natalie Hajek
David Ledbetter
Sharif Hossain
Sheikh M. Rahman
Eliza Janiec
Abeza Bibi
Shantha Gowda (joined late)
Danny Waites

Others Present:

Ceire Sheehy – One Housing
Rob Lantsbury – New Mill
Christine Searle – New Mill
Mike Tyrrell – Resident’s Advocate
Rowan Riley – Haworth Tompkins architects
Ken Okonkwo – Haworth Tompkins architects
Amy Corrigan – Haworth Tompkins architects
Chris Fellner – Haworth Tompkins architects

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 members had asked to become members, Sheikh Rahman and Abeza Bibi joined the meeting and were welcomed, Pamela has sent her apologies. – the RSG accepted all 3 as members.

2 Apologies

- 2.1 Apologies were received from:
 - Anna Cushen
 - Pamela Jacobs
 - Shantha Gowda for lateness
 - Paula due to bereavement
 - Cherie White

3 Minutes of the Kingsbridge Estate RSG Meeting held on 11th March 2020

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

4 Matters Arising from the Minutes

4.1 There were no matters arising

5 Attendance log

5.1 The log was accepted as an accurate record, no matters arising

6 Architects appointment

6.1 Rob Lantsbury went through the architect's appointment, he explained the process, 8 practices applied, 7 were considered as one applicant failed to adhere to the process

6.2 Thereafter 3 residents, Pam, David and Sherif went through the applications and shortlisted to 3 Architects
After seeing all 3 Architects "you Tube" presentations the group agreed to interview all 3 Architects. Haworth Tompkins was appointed.

7 Haworth Tompkins

7.1 Ken thanked the group for the appointment and that HT were very excited to get started.
DL congratulated HT on their appointment.

7.2 Ken then shared a presentation which demonstrated the proposed road map on how they would be approaching the brief.

7.3 Ken then outlined the various parties involved in the process, the residents, One Housing and HT – all with different roles. Ken would be the main point of contact, supported by Amy and Rowan. He explained that all three parties needed to contact each other and explained that HT have created a dedicated email address which everyone can use to contact them.

7.4 DL asked that the email address be sent round as not all had access to the screen, Ceire agreed to email it round the following day. - CSH

7.5 KO went through the slide which demonstrated HT's past experience and concentrated on Silchester estate in west London which showed a small amount of demolition, new build and horticultural improvements. The second example was the Peabody estate in Pimlico. which involved the refurbishment of most blocks, the demolition of some run down blocks and replacement with new build and further enhancements to the communal areas.

- 7.6 KO noted that HT had no targets from OHG and had no preconceptions of where the options appraisal would take them. The options ranged from 'do nothing' all the way through to refurbishment, partial demolition and full demolition. HT would take all of these options seriously and demonstrate the pro's and con's of each option.
- 7.7 The consultation is proposed to be over five cycles throughout which- residents would be able to input and therefore impact the proposals as we move forward. It is also important to make sure any proposals fit in with the immediate neighbourhood.
- 7.8 **The aim is to arrive at one option which would be put to a residents ballot**
- 7.9 KO then went on to demonstrate the ways HT aim to consult and advise residents throughout the course of the options appraisal, he noted that the types of consultation would change due to the on-going Covid situation.
- 7.9A All the consultation events will allow for feedback for both residents and officers thus allowing all parties to learn and adapt as we go along.
- 7.9B PC asked how long this would all take, KO referred to the five cycles, cycle one would be fact finding, getting under the skin of the estate to make sure they had a solid foundation, cycle 2 will come up with initial options which will be refined until the final option is reached
- 7.9C During each cycle there will be dedicated consultation feedback on the website, period of one to ones, with an aim of 75% contact as a minimum, HT will then wrap the whole process up in a final report.
- 7.9D The cycles were indicative times, some longer, allowing for a two week break over Christmas, with a target of completing in May.
- 7.10 Danny Waites thought the time line might be ambitious with Covid and how the engagement went previously. CSH confirmed that OHG would aim to consult with all residents with a minimum aim of 75% as some people would not want to engage.
- 7.11 DW noted that the RSG may need to discuss this particularly with the ballot in mind. CSH noted that OHG would want all those who were eligible to vote to vote but could not make people vote.
- 7.12 Chris from HT noted that the first cycle is a bit tight and if they find out that each cycle needs a bit more time then HT would extend the time and the project may take a bit longer

- 7.13 On the voting, Chris felt 75% turnout compared well with local and national elections.
- 7.14 Eliza asked what the nature of feedback would be following each cycle, she also noted that 75% should be exceeded as it was a very small estate and she hoped that as near to 100% could be achieved.
- 7.15 KO replied that the RSG would be given the opportunity to comment on the consultation materials before they are shared with the wider resident body. The end of cycle report would be circulated to RSG members, Chris noted that residents can comment on consultation materials, and feedback would be received through the email address, through OHG or through personal calls, all these feedbacks would be collected and documented. Eliza noted the previous issues with feedback consultation and that the decision making was with residents and they could not rely on unstructured feedback. The RSG could not just rely on numbers of attending etc, Chris noted that the first cycle was vital, they would be asking residents about their major concerns and this feedback will be collated, HT will then report this back, very happy for the RSG to be part of this. If the RSG felt that HT were missing important opinions, then they would be happy to take on any suggestions.
- 7.16 KO asked what would be the ideal feedback method, noting the normal issues you have in reaching the whole of the estate. KO went on to say that the RSG would be vital in identifying which methods worked best where, what events worked better and what did not work at all.
- 7.17 MT noted that all residents would be contacted by OHG but not all would respond, the 75% was a minimum but agreed with Eliza that a small estate could be higher. On the feedback issue MT noted elsewhere that each resident were given a copy of their feedback so that they could be assured that their feedback was noted correctly and that a number of the responses were audited by the ITLA to overcome the trust issue.
- 7.18 Deidre backed up Eliza's comments and clarified that she felt 75% should be the minimum.
- 7.19 Natalie asked what would happen if the response rate was low, for example if only 30% of residents were reached. Ceire replied that during the previous survey they reached over 75% of general needs and resident leaseholders, if we went under this target we would need to review our methods of consultation, on other estates they were reaching 75% to 80%.

- 7.20 Amy noted that on other projects they had made consultation events as appealing as possible, they adopted different approaches to speak with different groups of people with the aim of getting the highest percentage possible. Chris clarified that if only a small amount of residents were reached during consultation they would not go to the next cycle. Natalie was very happy to receive this clarification.
- 7.21 Sheikh noted that there were a lot of private renters on the estate who would not necessarily take the consultation very seriously and that this would make the 75% difficult to achieve.
- 7.22 Ceire noted that we will make efforts to reach all residents who live at Kingsbridge regardless of tenure, and suggested the aim is to reach a minimum of 75% of one housing tenants and resident leaseholders. In many cases, tenants of leaseholders are hard to reach as we do not hold contact details for them, and they do not live at Kingsbridge long term. We can continue this conversation with the RSG as we move forward.
- 7.23 KO noted that it was important that non-resident leaseholders did not hold up progress for other resident's.
- 7.24 Natalie asked about who was eligible to vote in this regeneration scenario. RL advised the group about the GLA ballot requirements, all resident leaseholders whoever was on the lease - all tenants who are on the tenancy and adults who are on LBTH waiting list. He further noted that non-residents leaseholders do not get a vote as per the GLA requirements.
- 7.25 Eliza noted that this needs further discussion as it was possible to extend this electorate. RL to bring a paper on this.
- 7.26 KO went back to his presentation, he noted how each options would be evaluated, site analysis, surveys, housing needs, build a model of the estate as is, this will be used as a design tool, set up bespoke website, identifying stakeholders, research history of the estate, researching and reviewing previous consultation, establish feedback loop, preparing materials, devising residents brief to identify residents wish lists.
- 7.27 HP noted that the power point presentation would be circulated outside the meeting and that all feedback would be welcome
- 7.28 KO went on to say that after the preparatory work they would table initial options to the RSG, would arrange site visits to illustrate ideas, would be updating the model, then obtaining feedback to report back to the RSG and OHG.

- 7.29 Chris noted that they would be presenting designs on all the possible options and how they would look. This could include the addition of a lift through to demolition; the second cycle will show the design stage and the other 3 cycles will narrow down the options and which ones should be gone into in more detail. There will be landscape and play space workshops.
- 7.30 Sheikh noted that the options appraisal should not mention the do nothing as an option, he felt the vast majority of residents wanted something, if not full scale regeneration to happen. CSH noted that the options were deliberately very broad; if the vast majority of residents expressed they didn't want the 'do nothing' option to be taken forward it would be eliminated early on. Deidre felt that it should be on the table as an option. Chris felt that both extremes, do nothing or full scale demolition- were on the table for completeness.
- 7.31 Eliza noted that a lot of the problems were the basic maintenance of the buildings and OHG had to really catch up on the issues that was within their gift to do so.
- 7.32 Natalie asked what was the brief given to the architects, Chris clarified that they had been asked to go through the whole options appraisal without any pre conceived ideas, CSH noted that the brief for the architects was composed by the RSG with OHG and she would circulate it again tomorrow.
- 7.33 Chris clarified that they would also look at major refurbishment; KO noted that they had this experience on the Peabody estate referred to earlier.
- 7.34 KO completed the presentation to include their approach to engaging children and young people.
- 7.35 DW asked if other estates had voted on schemes without knowing about service charges. He was concerned that resident's voted with all the facts in front of them.
- 7.36 MT advised the meeting that none of the Island estates had voted in this way, he reminded the meeting that all the Island estates had stated that the ballot must be on the basis of full knowledge of service charge and rent levels, this was not the case in Camden and OHG had agreed this was a mistake. MT pointed out that the Kedge, Starboard & Winch Steering Group were clear that the offer document they were discussing would not be put top residents until it contained the information they wanted.

7.37 CSH backed up Mike's point and noted that during the process the RSG will be building the offer document and that this would be part of this.

7.38 CSH and the architects left the meeting.

8.0 **Any other business without One Housing present.**

8.1 The group agreed to extend the meeting.

8.2 Mike then outlined the issues behind the failed ballot in Camden. His view was that the estate was 20 years old with no real issues; the upshot of this was that OHG had postponed other ballots on the Island. Kedge, Starboard group were in a different position where they were desperate to press ahead with a ballot, Kedge House was a system built block beyond refurbishment. Mike further noted that the RSG had refused to go ahead until OHG had agreed to their offer document which include such issues as capping council tax, allowing leaseholders leases swaps and the potential of leaseholders paying rent owning on new properties if they own less than 50% of the equity. Mike further advised that the borough had now a regeneration panel and that he was using this group to press for the best offer as possible.

8.3 DW asked if there was any offer for adult children living at home. MT noted it hadn't come up but was negotiating that you could split households into two new homes.

8.4 MT would bring a paper to the RSG outlining the offers currently being made by OHG to the next meeting. MT

8.5 DL asked if they could have a break down on the Camden vote, MT agreed to provide this. MT

8.6 DL also asked about the invites to other RSG's. Mike replied Kedge, Starboard and Winch had said no, Alice shepherd yet to be asked as they had their first meeting, he noted that this response was not unexpected. DL asked if we could draft a letter from the RSG repeating this request could be done. Agreed that RL would provide the group a first draft. RL

Meeting ended 8.45pm