



Minutes of the Residents Meeting

Wednesday 20th June 2018

Present

Residents: Candida, Kim, Lesley, Heidi, Pam, Arthur, Ahmed, Deidre, Maggie, Jackie, Eliza, Maureen, Glen

Advisor:

Apologies: Mike, Jill, Cherie

Minutes – the minutes of the meeting with OH and Richard Hill on 13th June 2018 were agreed.

Feedback from the last meeting with Richard Hill

2. Barkantine had some critical comments from residents in the blocks affected – “OH cannot be trusted, they were always going to do it anyway”.
3. There needs to be clear documents which tie down any promises made by OH.
4. St Johns - Residents do not always distinguish between services and development opportunities and so the issues get treated as being the same.
5. The Housing Office and Community Centre on Samuda could be used to help rehouse Alice Shepherd and Oak from St Johns which would have implications for Samuda’s alternative potential redevelopment so it can’t be looked at in isolated areas.
6. OH say they are not thinking of building “towers” as they are uneconomical.
7. Kingsbridge – some residents have been going round with a straw poll asking about preferences.
8. This was brought up at a meeting to set up the TRA. This has now been elected.

Where we are now?

9. As this was the first we had heard of the 3 areas we were quite nonplussed by this announcement as we did not see this as an option at this stage.

The day after the meeting the 4EF chair urged Richard to withdraw the targeted areas.

10. He would not do this as he wanted to be transparent. He is not looking at this from the residents point of view.

11. RH had not brought this up with TH when he met with them a few days previously.
12. By Saturday, following the Wednesday meeting, the letter had gone out.
13. Richard met with Candida and Arthur on the 20th to try to understand OH's thinking and to see if there could be other ways forward.

RH made it clear that OH can't fund consultation on all 4 estates.

14. There is an opportunity for other areas to be included, but is this likely?

The role of the 4EF needs clarifying now.

Should we be focussing on trying to identify other areas that need working on?

15. OH is open to working with a consultant/expert on engaging hard to reach residents over the summer in conjunction with the 4EF
16. They do want to do a lot of the consultation in-house.
17. The opportunity to engage with the whole estate to build a master-vision has now been lost.
18. There seems to have been quite a lot going on behind the scenes in OH that we don't know about.
19. In any "conversation" with residents, full, open information needs to be given to residents and especially about the deals that may be given.
20. It is easier to consult with a limited area than a whole estate.
21. There seems to be pressure to get planning again following Project Stone, which there does not need to be.
22. We made the mistake of failing to get agreement for the engagement strategy while OH kept delaying.
23. We need to have a statement that any discussion should be clearly identified as NOT being consultation or engagement. This should be built in to any conversation.
24. Consultation does not start until options are presented.
25. Residents need to be aware of the financial implications in any consultations like how much rents and service charges increase, which they certainly will, and shared equity implications etc. (Financial appraisals).

The way forward

26. We agree that we keep engaging with OH and that we work with them to develop the workshops on engagement.
27. It was suggested that Candida meet with Steve Douglas, the new OH Chair.

28. Because Project Stone has been given up, this is being used as a reason to trust OH.
29. There are new resident engagement in place for the services delivery side of OH.
30. We need to be clear about our expectations and what our approach to the discussion would look like.
31. Before we start giving residents information about their rights and options, there needs to be a context for them to relate the information to. The engagement needs to provide this.
32. We might change the 4EF logo, colours and strap line so it distances us from OH
33. Do we now still consider ourselves partners with OH or a campaign group?
34. We need to have a clearer idea about the timelines for engagement
35. We could try to find out why didn't OHG talk to TH about their intentions.
36. The previous OH management had committed to an engagement strategy – this has been reneged on.
37. We want an independent engagement strategy - this principle still stands.
38. There is no process where we can suggest other areas that could be considered for a conversation.
39. OH seems to be trying to take back the initiative again and trying to undermine residents input through the 4EF.

Newsletter

40. A newsletter from us will make our position clear.
41. Possible issues to cover:
42. We need to make clear any discussion or engagement will not be a part of any consultation
43. What is the 4EF view on this?
44. What we have been doing and why we have been doing it.
45. The only people who can make any decision about anything are the residents in the block.
46. We did not know about this and have not been any part of the consultation about it.
47. We played a big part in stopping Project Stone.
48. We have built up a lot of information about the development process.
49. It needs to be clear we are not on board with OHG – we did not agree to this. There needs to be independent advice on engagement

50. OH has committed to a joint workshop about a consultation strategy.
51. The purpose of the workshop is to decide on the engagement process, but we cannot make a decision on this. This can only explore the possibilities. Residents should make the final decisions about how the consultation should be done.
52. The 4EF and residents should work with the TRAs on their estates

What do we need answers to?

53. Why they went ahead when do not agree with it?
54. Why didn't we know about OH's intentions before they were a done deal?
55. Are OH really committed to having engagement workshops?
56. Is the 4EF going to be working with OH any more.
57. What kind of timescale are we going to be looking at?
58. Why are they doing some blocks and not others that residents still feel need doing?
59. Are we holding them account and can we do anymore to strengthen this?
60. The 4EF's role is to ensure the proper process is followed and the residents voice is heard – is this still true?
61. What do OH mean by a "conversation" – is it just another way of pretending they are in a discussion and then doing what they want.
62. How did 4EF come to this decision?