



# Minutes of the Residents Meeting

Wednesday 11<sup>th</sup> April 2018

## **Present**

Residents: Candida, Kim, Lesley, Jill, Heidi, Pam, Arthur, Ahmed, Glen, Deidre, Maggie  
Advisor: Mike  
Apologies: Jackie, Eliza, Maureen, (Danny, Sue, Cherie, Salek)

## **A. Minutes – Agreed subject to RH’s comments**

## **B. Advisor’s Report – see attached**

1. SCS Scrutiny
2. It is disappointing that there do not seem to be any records available showing the history of the works done either from TH, Toynbee, or even OHG. This seems to have led to a considerable number of inaccuracies.(see report)
3. The Questions from Residents following the survey have been collected and are awaiting responses from OH. There are 76 questions to date.
4. Chris Worby is doing a scrutiny report for TH on the SCS which we will have a copy of. We would like to be able to discuss this with him.
5. There has not been a surveyor / architect resident who is willing to be coopted so this has been re-advertised in the newsletter, but if necessary we could get a non resident if this is required following Chris Worby’s Report.

## **C. Response to Richard Hill’s Meeting**

1. The 4EF has to be clearer about what it sees as the way forward so there is the option for us to be a part of the initiative rather than following OH’s lead.
2. There does not seem to be a clear idea from OHG on the role they want residents to have.
3. Should the 4EF have a view on whether it is better for OH to propose their ideas for residents to react to, or to have a more bottom up vision through resident engagement?
4. Engagement Strategy – Residents should have the same kind of involvement in housing services through the TRAs as the 4EF has earned.
5. The SCS summary sent to each household has not been made any more accessible and does not provide any useful extra information. Although it is the same information as was available at the exhibitions, there are not staff to answer questions, or anywhere queries can be sent. Who is the Project Coordination Team?  
There was no attempt at trying to relate this information to the residents who did not come to the exhibitions.
6. The next JV meeting will be about going through the questions raised by the SCS.
7. RH’s message on the display boards at the SCS exhibitions was much more responsive than the one in the published summary. Why was this felt necessary?
8. There still seems to be a general feeling on estates “what’s the point of engaging with OH - they are going to do what they want anyway”.

#### **D. Island Neighbourhood Planning Forum – Short Plan**

1. NPF Inspector Public Hearing - the 4EF has been asked to give evidence on the estate regeneration. Mike is attending and anyone who is coming does need to register beforehand. This is not a discussion or question time - the inspector asks certain people to respond to his/her concerns / queries.
2. There needs to be a collective response from the 4EF but the context has changed since it was produced as the GLA regeneration guidance has made certain issues clearer and the NP cannot conflict with this or the Borough's plan.
3. We will have a discussion before the hearing to decide what the position of the 4EF is following our letter to the Inspector, nominate who should respond to the questions and what we can agree to say.

#### **E. TRA Panel**

Following frustrations from the TRAs about OH's response to their concerns, OH have agreed support an improved and more responsive group to replace the 4Chairs. 2 members will be nominated from each of the Island OH TRAs and the residents will chair and set the agenda.

#### **F. AOB**

- G. The 4EF newsletter is perceived by some people as being the opinions of OH. We can make it clearer on the newsletters that it is independently written from the residents point of view.