

**Minutes of a meeting of the Kingsbridge Resident Steering
Group held on 11th November 2020
Via zoom at 7pm**

Residents Present:

Pam Cole – Chair
Danny Waites
Eliza Janiec
Natalie Hajek
Anna Cushen
David Ledbetter
Sharif Hossan
Abeza Bibi
Deidre Benjamin joined the meeting late
Shantha Gowda joined the meeting late

Others Present:

Paul Handley – One Housing – PH
Paula Huzjak – 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.

2 Apologies

- 2.1 Apologies were received from:

Ceire Sheehy – One Housing, Paula introduced herself to the meeting.

3 Minutes of the Kingsbridge Estate RSG Meeting held on 14th October 2020

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

4 Matters Arising from the Minutes

- 4.1 All of these on the agenda
- 4.2 Natalie requested that the meeting introduce an action log, RL to RL

5 draft action log and send out to all members to add or subtract
Attendance log

PC noted the importance of RSG members attending and asked that New Mill to chase all members, Christine agreed to undertake this

CS

6 **Update on cycle one**

6.1 KO gave a short presentation advising they have been collecting information from surveys; the presentation was a snapshot of these surveys.

Once they have enough responses, they will be collating end of cycle report, all to be uploaded onto website, will include raw data but not personal details.

NH asked if this was the on line one or the phone calls from OHG, KO replied that it was both and also included conversations with people who did not want to respond via the survey.

NH noted that her husband had received the call from OHG and was disappointed about the quality of the survey. She asked if the meeting would receive an update from her husband on the call. PC asked the meeting and it was agreed to accept his feedback.

Peter joined the call and noted that the questions were biased towards peoples family make up but does not say if provision is adequate, the survey did not have sufficient definitions i.e. is place adequately sized, KO noted it was defined by your circumstances, Peter responded that the questions did not reflect the residents situations for example people might say that they want 15 bedrooms but not what they need.

Peter continued about the questions such as how important is the community, also what is good maintenance, what is high quality architecture. He questioned who put these together.

Peter continued to note the questions about corona virus.

NH asked who put the questions together and did they read through them?

The questions that asked residents if they agreed or disagreed i.e. did the homes meet modern standards with no definition of what modern standards meant, similarly, what is an energy efficiency home, what is an easy to maintain home, there were a number of questions which would need following up. Peter would be submitting his issues on the survey in writing.

KO noted that they had knowledge of who is responding and the second part of the survey was to develop a resident brief. It was reinforcing the information already gained.

PH noted this was the first round of engagement of the Options Appraisal, he agreed that they want subjective opinions of where they lived and this is the point of cycle one. PH noted that this was the start of a 12 month process; later in the process surveys will be more pointed and less subjective.

MT asked if PH can respond to these questions to explain what was the intention behind the questions and the reasons behind them, PH agreed to do so.

PH

The meeting felt that the questions mixed up the family composition and the size of flats.

KO carried on with presentation, reached 68% of eligible residents against target of 75%, 41 on line responses, 22 meaningful conversations.

Key themes split up to represent the survey, going forward the residents brief will evolve and the first part will change significantly as it would ask for feedback on proposals.

Majority of residents understood the team and the timescale; most were comfortable accessing stuff on line but a minority found the remote consultation difficult.

Majority of residents wanted change but on a sliding scale.

KO then listed the headlines of the survey's findings about people's homes and blocks, the presentation to be circulated with the minutes for completeness.

It was noted that HT and OHG came up with the questions, EJ felt the survey was not fit for purpose and thus she had no confidence in the results, she felt that the questions did not assist in any decision making, she did not share HT confidence in the results of the survey. EJ also noted the link to the remote drop in's a few weeks ago didn't work and asked how many residents attended these drop in's?

Abeza asked about the leaseholders issues concerning shared equity, RL noted this was later on the agenda. Abeza also asked about Council Tax.

David agreed with Eliza points, he also noted that the repeat of the remote drop in, the link had been repeated and this was

disappointing. He also noted the importance of getting information out prior to the meetings. He also wanted to know who was compiling and interrogating all these questions and supported the idea of coming up with their own questions. DL noted that there was a significant issue of trust.

HT &
OHG

Danny noted that the time of year affected peoples answer, he reiterated the history of consultation which had been poor for residents

KO noted his brief was to carry out an Options Appraisal and come up with a range of options, Danny noted that the previous experience of a company called 'Soundings' was an exercise of leading questions exercise to back up a now discredited engagement process.

KO felt that the next stage which would come up with a range of proposals and that this cycle was the foundations.

CF noted that there was an issue on the questions not being weighted, HT were not trying to put words into people's mouths, the next stage would include proposals, he also noted that HT were not coming to conclusions in this cycle.

MT noted this was that the response was not a surprise and wondered if the responses were measured against the range of all the options i.e. how does each set of answer affect a retention option or the redevelopment option. CF added that this cycle should have attempted to prioritise resident's issues and aspirations.

HT

NH noted that the survey should everyone wanted everything, how would HT be able to go forward from this basis. She also felt that the survey was so generic they could all be answered yes. She noted that the questions were answered at other estates; she felt it was a template from the project stone days and it was, she feared, a tick box exercise and had no quality to it.

PH noted this cycle was to obtain peoples unvarnished thoughts and opinions, the presentation was a snap shoot with broad themes, there would be a much more detailed report at a later date.

NH noted that there were a number of repeated issues such as security, maintenance and other issues, why did OHG just advise the architects of these issues rather than have another survey.

PC noted that the fear is that the further we go on in the process the issues raised by residents tonight would not be answered

EJ asked if OHG had provided with the repeated repairs issues and stock condition survey, KO advised this has been provided. EJ asked if OHG had provided the jobs log for the estate, PH advised that this would be provided for the second cycle. EJ also noted that HT were not communications experts and that the frustration was that the lack of a communications strategy had led to this impasse.

PH responded that he disagreed, he agreed there was not a uniform comms strategy as every estate and residents were very different.

KO noted that the iterative way of progress through the proposed cycles was different and would be specific to the Kingsbridge estate.

Sharif questioned the sign off on the first cycle, people obviously not happy with the questions and the RSG would therefore not be able to sign this off. The RSG had to agree the first cycle.

PH noted that cycle 1 was to obtain background information, the OA was a long process and would become more and more specific to the Kingsbridge as it continued. Once designs were in front of residents the more specific questions would be.

PC noted that the further we go on in the process without these questions being answered residents feared that the process would be driven through without taking residents with them.

NH voiced the frustration of OHG not handing over the basic information.

NH asked what if the group do not accept the report for cycle one, David agreed this was a possibility and also wanted to reserve the right to come back to issues at any time.

KO responded that there were no decisions being made at this stage and there are questions being asked that people did not have enough information to answer either at all or fully.

He also noted it would be extremely difficult to get consensus on the questions and that the meeting was questioning the usefulness of the questions and the responses. HT will be recording all the feedback to allow anyone to give any response or any feedback they wanted.

FT noted that the CAD drawings were beginning which identified a lot of physical issues with the estate and how they could be addressed. He hoped that the next cycle would introduce proposals for the estate and thus not frustrating residents with

another round of questions that had been asked previously.

NT agreed this was Ok but at each cycle we should pause to test the quality and the work undertaken in each cycle and that there would be halt, probably at the design stage to ensure that all the RSG members had access to sufficient information on building regulations, planning, density and all the other issues an estate like Kingsbridge brought up.

KO noted that it was his job to communicate what the issues were with all of the options that would be put forward. KO noted that the next stage was to give residents an opportunity to respond to options and this would identify which was most important to residents.

- 6.2 Report will include full raw data but not names or addresses or any other information that would enable residents to identify either the people or the address of the respondent..

7 GDPR

- 7.1 RL noted that this was a matter arising from the last meeting. RL was to do a briefing paper however the legislation was too complicated to do so. He did note that OHG had a dedicated officer responsible for GDPR and that Paul would be responding on their behalf.
- 7.2
- 7.3 PH answered people given verbatim copy of survey, any meaningful conversation summarised and sent back to residents, and made available to MT, New Mill and HT as we have data sharing agreements. These three parties would be able to test the data presented.
- 7.4 GDPR officer asked to provide statement; in short there are both legal and good practice reasons why OHG cannot share raw data with the RSG. As well as data sharing agreement NM or MT or HT have no personal contacts on the estate, if you know fellow
- 7.5 residents you may be able to identify them, even more importantly in law, some residents may have vulnerabilities revealed in the surveys which make them identifiable to other residents which was not allowed.

The feedback to RSG has to be via reports, information can be verified by NM and MT and both could they can sit in on one to one meetings. NH asked if RSG could carry out their own surveys, PH advised yes they could but there would be GDPR issues about residents revealing personal information.

Danny asked what level of data being shared with third parties, PH

advised that this would just be the surveys completed, will be on need to know basis and relevant to their function. In this case it would be restricted to the surveys.

MT noted that other RSG's have asked for a check on 10% on raw data, others have asked to carry out their own survey to check that it mirrored the OHG survey. It would also be possible for MT to check 10% and NM to check a further 10%

NH asked who was the project manager, Paul advised Paula was the project manager, NH asked for the project plan which Paul agreed to send and provide further details if required although noted that it was always fluid.

KO noted that the website noted who would be able to see who would their information

EJ asked if there was a process/procedure outlining the check that MT and NM was allowed to check and requested this process. MT described how this worked elsewhere.

EJ was concerned that the RSG was able to question the conclusions being drawn from the surveys, she also requested that the raw data is overlapped with demographic and topographic information. This would allow the RSG to interpret why residents wanted for example a bigger kitchen or better drying area.

Paul agreed to supply the process requested, EJ noted she needed to know how the data is recorded, processed and compiled into the reports/presentations. KO explained briefly the process they were adopting.

MT noted that the issues will be included in the actions list and responded to at the next meeting, PH agreed this would be the case and that the RSG should consider how they would like the surveys checked.

8 **R & M**

8.1 Deferred

9 **Conversation on slip way**

PH advised that all the information OHG had was an email from Cllr Wood which had been sent on to PC.

MT noted that the RSG want to invite Cllr Wood and the Docklands Sailing Centre to present their thinking to the RSG. MT felt that it

was to build a pontoon in the river to continue their sailing activities.

DL asked that any stakeholders involved in the slip way to come to the next meeting, this was agreed. It was noted that the DSC manager was away until January

10 **Equity loan discussion**

Deferred

11 **A O B**

OHG and HT left the meeting. RL agreed to compile the minutes and the action log, he will send the action log around to RSG members as soon as possible and that this would form the agenda for the resident only meeting.

He then explained the usefulness of the action log to track issues and then escalate. He also agreed that the action log should be on the agenda at the beginning of the RSG meeting.

EJ suggested that the use of google drive etc. could be used to make this sort of information accessible as long as OHG pay for it.

RL and CS will be reminding RSG members about the resident's only meeting together with the RSG and noted that this meeting was on the 25.11.20.