

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

**Residents Present:**

Pam Cole – Chair  
Natalie Hajek  
Anna Cushen  
David Ledbetter  
Sharif Hossan joined and left and then re-joined

**Others Present:**

Cllr Mufeedah Bustin – LBTH - MB  
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 not quorate.

**2 Apologies**

2.1 Apologies were received from:

- Deidre Benjamin
- Shantha Gowda
- Eliza Janiec
- Cllr Gold

Ceire Sheehy – One Housing,  
Paula Huzjak – One Housing.

**3 Minutes of the Kingsbridge Estate RSG Meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup>  
November 2020**

- 3.1 Unable to agree as meeting was not quorate

**4 Matters Arising from the Minutes**

Rolled over to next meeting

**6 Action plan**

- 6.1 RL presented the action log item by item, the updated action log will

be discussed at the next RSG meeting.

All present agreed that 2 weeks were the minimum RSG members needed to digest reports, cycle one been out for one week, one week more for comment

## **7 R & M issues over last five years**

7.1 Not discussed, rolled over to next meeting.

## **8 Response to OHG email of 24.11.20**

8.1 Not discussed, rolled over to next meeting.

## **9 Cycle 1 report**

Report circulated, KO ran over the headlines and asked if there were any questions after. DL wondered how useful this would be without being quorate as no decisions could be made. Natalie agreed with David.

DL also noted that just having the cycle one report for a week and cycle two report just now meant that they did not have enough time to ingest the information. Discussion ensued noting that minutes could not be agreed and that the R & M issue and the action log

Paul H noted cycle one report was a feedback report and presents residents responses to survey, it had no decisions with it, it is the first getting to know you survey to allow HT to get to know the estate etc. Essentially an information only report with no conclusions or decisions. NH asked how it could seen as successful, PH replied that HT would be the arbiter of this if it gave them the information they needed.

Natalie asked if the data had been tested by NM or MT? PH replied that the data had not been scrutinised by NM or MT as the 75% had not been reached. He did note that the surveys had been copied back to all respondents and report included verbatim replicated in the report.

It was agreed that MT and NM would verify the data now the feedback has reached 75%.

PH noted that HT had been sent R & M information for the last five years. NH asked how this information was sent, PH noted it was a spreadsheet detailing all the repairs raised against Kingsbridge for the last five years, again NM or MT could verify this. The spreadsheet also included costs etc. PH noted that this information was not typical at this stage of an OA.

DL & NH asked if it was possible to provide this information with personal information taken out. PH noted it was extremely detailed and ran to 100's pages; PH would have to check as the raw data could allow people to be identified but did state that both MT & NM could verify that the information had been sent.

NH asked if the group could come up with requests of what they wanted from the data and if it could be shared with TRA, PH agreed for this.

MT noted HT work should be informed in the main by stock condition survey, and that R & M spend is there to inform HT of the areas a refurb option would be concerned with.

In order to fulfil the RSG request, MT asked if PH could extract number of jobs by trade and internal and external etc. PH agreed that this could be provided by interrogating the codes.

DL asked if the two older blocks could be split down into the three staircases. He was after the information relating to the general upkeep of the estate. PH noted it was important that the RSG was clear what they wanted out of the data as it related to the stock options appraisal. PC noted that listening to residents in her role over the last 25 years; residents are fed up about a number of issues around R & m, missed appointments, poor workmanship, wasted time and money.

NH noted the information was needed to see if or not the estate was being run down. PH noted that R&M was not really the role of the RSG, DL disagreed, R & M was very much needed whatever the decision made about the SOA.

PH noted that driving the improvement of the R&M service was not in the RSG remit although it was for the TRA.

CF responded to the conversation that the stock condition survey and the R & M spend would not determine whether or not buildings are to be knocked down, this might be decided by subsidence, roof beams or major structural issues, none of the information they supported this and that every aspect could be repaired. The current OA process cannot double up in looking at the estate and also correcting OHG R&M service. He also noted that cycle one makes no decisions.

NH noted decisions could only be made once full costs were known and that there had been cases where estates deliberately run down thus leaving the residents with no other choice than to choose regeneration.

KO on the options so far, can pursue options within existing buildings, he reiterated there were no decisions to be made, he did not feel that the R & M information would hold up the work at this stage but may do later. He noted if there was a recurring issue then this would need to be taken into account with refurbishment proposals. It would not, in his view, prevent cycle 2 boards being looked at.

PH agreed with Ken and noted there was no decision to be taken at the moment, he noted they were a long way away from any decisions on which avenues to be taken, the OA was at least 12 months process. KO wondered if it was worthwhile running through the cycle 2 proposals, he acknowledged and it was agreed that it would have to be run through again as a future meeting.

The meeting agreed that the RSG provide a list of information they wanted on R & M information, PH to agree to provide this, to be put on the action log.

NH and PH discussed how the OA would work, at some point costs would need to be determined on any or all of the options being explored, this is at least a 12 months process and the financial aspects had not been started in cycle one but cycle five. PH also noted that OA process and any subsequent vote would decide which proposals would be taken forward.

RL offered and it was agreed that NM would provide a set of options for the resident only meeting.

It was then decided to go through the action log.

## 10 **Cycle 2 proposals**

KO had 15 minutes to go through, will need to go through again at a future RSG, KO went through the draft report and the cycle two boards divided between information from the survey etc. and the second part about proposals, HT will be adding a video to talk through the options to ensure all can understand the report/consultation boards

All five options taken through to cycle 3, all five options. PC noted the video would be very useful, he then went through the report/presentations noting the consultation fatigue and highlighted the issues brought up by residents ie lack of lifts on two blocks, damp, cold, overcrowding.

The presentation went onto look at pedestrian and vehicle use and

routes through the estate. Looking at green space and parking, looked at bin stores and recycling, overlooking from other properties, river walk wall removal, existing trees, comparison between present home size and London plan size.

He then ran through the five options and the actions arising from each one.

Last boards describe what is included in each option.

12 **AOB**

Draft