

**Minutes of a meeting of the Resident Steering Group for Alice Shepherd House & Oak House held on 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2019 at the St Johns Community Centre**

**Residents Present:**

Ashley Lowther – Alice Shepherd House  
 Jane McGregor – Alice Shepherd House  
 Sharon Holmes – Oak House  
 Alia Begum – Alice Shepherd House  
 Sulfa Begum – Alice Shepherd House  
 Noel Redmond – Alice Shepherd House  
 Cynthia Owusu – Alice Shepherd House

**St Johns TRA Committee Members Present:**

Jill Skeels – TRA Vice Chair  
 Jackie Campbell – TRA Secretary  
 Maureen Mallett – TRA Committee Member

**Others Present:**

Lee Page – Independent Resident Adviser – TPAS  
 Mike Tyrrell – Residents Advocate  
 Leila Arefani – One Housing Group  
 Paul Handley – One Housing Group  
 Mynul Islam – One Housing Group  
 Alison White – One Housing Group

**Apologies:**

Nadia Mahmood – Alice Shepherd House  
 Shanaz Chowdhury – Oak House  
 Laura Tracey – Alice Shepherd House  
 Darren Brown – Alice Shepherd House

<b>1</b>	<b>Welcome &amp; Introduction</b>	
<b>1.1</b>	MT welcomed everyone to the meeting. The apologies that were given are noted above.	
<b>2</b>	<b>Minutes of the Meeting held on 24<sup>th</sup> June 2019</b>	
<b>2.1</b>	The minutes of the meeting held on 24 <sup>th</sup> June were approved.	
<b>3</b>	<b>Matters Arising</b>	
<b>4.1</b>	Discussed under Matters Arising. It was confirmed that LP would visit those members not in attendance	<b>LP reported back on how successful he had been in contacting members of the steering group who had not attended for some time. He</b>

		<b>was then requested to review the attendance list and contact those who had not attended to advise that they have been removed from the steering group in accordance with the terms of reference</b>
<b>5.2</b>	LP agreed that a Project Plan was required and that he would raise this with OHG. There was a discussion on the various stages of the project and how long this might take	<b>On the agenda</b>
<b>5.3</b>	A brief discussion was then had on the surveys being carried out by OHG and LP was asked to request updates from OHG on what had been carried out and for the final reports to be circulated to the group. He was also asked to obtain copies of any photos taken as part of the surveys for future newsletters to show the work being undertaken.	<b>Surveys are ongoing with some on-site and others to be commenced.</b>
<b>5.4</b>	Residents mentioned that the noticeboards within the blocks had been cleared. It was accepted that the new management arrangements had changed but the clearance had also removed the cleaning schedules and these should be returned. It was also raised that the main doors to Alice Shepherd House had not been working for the past 2 weeks.	<b>Still outstanding. AW reported that there had been a change in cleaning schedules and they were being updated across the stock. ASH/OH still outstanding. AW to chase.</b>
<b>6.2</b>	Concern was expressed over the intention to appoint from the framework agreement as residents had been under the impression that this would be an open tender process having decided against using the Mayor of London's panel. Following the discussion, it was agreed that LP would raise the concerns with OHG and that the agreement of the RSG to this appointment method would be dependent on the number of architectural practices who formed list in the framework agreement.	<b>LP reported that having established that the framework agreement had 8 architectural practices authorisation to proceed had been given by the group outside of the meetings.</b>  <b>LA confirmed that this was for the options appraisal process only but that the framework agreement would also be used in any future procurement of services.</b>

6.3	LP was further asked to find out the length of the framework agreement, whether it was for the Options Appraisal process only and whether or not there was any choice in the use of the framework agreement?	<b>PH explained that the agreement was new and hadn't been in place when previous discussions had taken place with the steering group. A brief discussion on OJEU (EU requirements) procurement took place</b>
9.1	A query was raised regarding the group having access to legal advice which had previously been promised. LP to raise with OHG. MT said that this had been discussed with regard to any offer document which emerged from the project	<b>PH confirmed OHG would pay for legal advice for the group if required</b>
4	<b>Attendance</b>	
4.1	Discussed under Matters Arising. It was confirmed that LP would review the attendance and contact those who have not been attending to advise that they have been removed from the group. PH said that others may become interested as the project developed and events were held.	<b>LP</b>
5	<b>One Housing Group response to Steering Group questions</b>	
5.1	<p>PH stated that the responses given are for a particular point in time and may change as the project develops. Some may fall away as they relate to an option that isn't chosen and others would develop based on the views expressed during the project.</p> <p>For some of the questions there may not be a definitive answer that he can give as elements such as financial planning will impact and then be amended as residents wish to change elements and decide on priorities. The response isn't for general circulation as it will lead to confusion but an FAQ sheet will be developed and a 'live' document will be published, and updated, on the website.</p> <p>Ultimately, there will come a point where a line in the sand is drawn and this is what will be entered into the offer document ahead of the ballot. Residents can then make a decision based on this.</p> <p>There are some things that OHG can commit to at the outset e.g. no changes to rent levels and tenancy rights. These will be shared with residents.</p> <p>SH asked about a commitment to meet any increase in council</p>	

	<p>tax levels. PH responded by saying he thought this would be likely but he can't make a commitment at this stage until the financial analysis of an option is undertaken. There was then a brief discussion about the possible need to trade off elements of the future design in order to achieve the things that matter most to residents.</p> <p>AL said she had concerns about the quality of information currently available around the service charges and queried if this would be clearer? PH said that he hoped it would as the appointed architect would be expected to cost all of the proposed elements and these would form part of the financial analysis.</p> <p>PH said that once the architects were on board he saw there being two key documents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key pledges to residents</li> <li>• Resident friendly version of the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)</li> </ul> <p>These would need to be available at the first event in September/October.</p>	
<b>6</b>	<b>Newsletter</b>	
6.1	LP presented a draft newsletter which was agreed subject to a minor change on the opening times of the local office.	
6.2	LP also tabled a 2-page summary of the findings of the survey carried out by OHG. It was agreed that this would be added to the newsletter subject to any comments from the steering group.	<b>LP</b>
6.3	There was a discussion on the proposed booklet prepared by OHG. A number of views were expressed over the reported findings which appear to be contradictory in some areas. AW explained that the data was what had been said to them but that, as the responses to the questions were open rather than from a pre-determined list, they had attempted to group them into common headings as far as possible. PH stated that the main reasons for the survey was to allow AW/MI to get a feel for the block and to try and pick up any general trends.	
6.4	It was agreed that the booklets would be delivered in addressed envelopes to increase the likelihood that residents would read them.	<b>AW/MI</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Project Plan</b>	
7.1	PH presented an 'ideal' project plan which lasted for 9 months and then compared it to a real life example which took 13	

	months to complete although the overall appraisal process took nearer to 19 months to complete. As it was resident led the actual plan didn't follow a defined sequence of events but reflected the need to look again at some aspects and to provide further clarification and detail.	
7.2	The brief for the architects has been issued with a deadline for responses of 31 <sup>st</sup> July. It was agreed that, NM, JM & SH would form the selection panel together with MT & LP to advise. Shortlisting would be dependent on the number of proposals received.	
<b>8</b>	<b>Date of next meeting</b>	
8.1	The date of the next meeting is 27 <sup>th</sup> August 2019	
<b>9</b>	<b>Any Other Business with OHG present</b>	
9.1	A query was raised regarding the installation of a bike shed at ASH. No-one appears to be aware that it was coming and there was unhappiness as to its location. AW will find out where this has come from	<b>AW</b>
9.2	SB raised the issue of the CCTV to the block and that it only appears to cover the car park and not those entering/leaving it. Can this be checked?	<b>AW</b>
9.3	There was a discussion about the cleaning standards to the block. There was a feeling that these had deteriorated following a recent deep clean and the removal of the cleaning schedules. It was acknowledged that there were residents not disposing of their rubbish correctly and leaving it on the balconies. There was a query as to why no action appears to be taken against these residents?	<b>AW</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>Any Other Business without OHG officers</b>	
10.1	JS asked how we can ensure that any promises made in the Offer Document are kept as past experience with the stock transfer showed that promises weren't kept.  LP stated that that was the role of the ITA to ensure that anything agreed by residents was firstly in the Offer Document and then to ensure that such promises were kept as part of the project as it continued.	
10.2	SH raised the issue about capping any leaseholder contribution to £10,000. This will be added to the questions previously	

	submitted to OHG.	
10.3	A brief discussion was held on the arrangements for any ballot with the group confirming their preference for one vote per household not per tenant/leaseholder.	
<b>11</b>	<b>Meeting Close</b>	
<b>11.1</b>	The meeting closed at 9.15 pm.	

Draft