

Meeting of the Kingsbridge Resident Steering Group

12th February, 2020.

Attendance

Pam Cole (PC) – Chair Resident
David Leadbetter (DL – Resident
Eliza Janiec(EJ)– Resident
Deidre Benjamin (DB)– Resident
Cherie White(CW) – Resident
Sharif Hossain (SH) – Resident

Mike Tyrrell (MT) – Residents Advocate
Leigh Pattison (LP)– One Housing
Ceire Sheehy (CSH)– One Housing
Christine Searle(CS) – New Mill Consultants
Rob Lantsbury (RL) – New Mill Consultants

Item 1. Welcome and introductions

- 1.1 PC took the chair; attendees introduced themselves and noted the meeting was quorate.

Item 2. Apologies

- 2.1 Apologies were received from:
Shantha Gowda – Resident
Natalie Hajek – Resident
Anna Cushen – Resident

Item 3. Minutes of meeting 8th January - Accuracy

- 3.1 On page 1DL emphasised that he meant whether or not any other items in the flats needed surveying, LP replied that yes they would but at the moment the measurement survey was all that was required. CSH noted 5 flats had been surveyed.DB asked about the 10 flat types, CSH explained the 10 OHG had taken note of.
- 3.2 DB asked what a dead bedroom meant,MT noted this was a bedroom directly off the living room.
- 3.3 DL and PC had spoken to Colin Hammond, it seemed that Colin would not re-join the group at the moment but may do in the future.CS noted that there had been no reply to New Mill/OHG/Mike Tyrrell following the letter to Colin.
- 3.4 Item 6 in page 2 should be changed from:

The meeting discussed some of the issues coming out of the report. A discussion took place around neighbourliness and how there was very little nuisance created on floors of blocks. However, it was noted that there was

some noise nuisance from flats above and below, the meeting felt that private tenants changed over far more frequently than OHG tenants and there was less interest from these residents.

To:

The meeting discussed some of the issues coming out of the report. A discussion took place around neighbourliness and how there was very little nuisance between neighbours on the same floor. However, it was noted that there was some noise nuisance from flats above and below

- 3.5 Page 3, Second paragraph should add in that it was the ITLA's observation on the absentee leasehold issues from having carried out the home visits .
- 3.6 EJ asked how OHG was attempting to contact absentee leaseholders as part of this process and how OHG would approach the management of absentee leaseholders.
- 3.7 MT noted that one of the biggest themes across the estates on the Isle of Dogs is the issues caused by absentee leaseholders.
- 3.8 The minutes should include weighting assigned to each group when selecting architects, Eliza noted and it was agreed that the decision to appoint architects would be a resident led decision.
- 3.9 Page 4 no comments
- 3.10 With these changes the meeting accepted the minutes as correct.

Item 4. Matters arising from minutes

- 4.1 EJ advised the meeting that she had not had time to complete questionnaire.
- 4.2 The meeting noted that the measurement surveys had been carried out for five property types.
- 4.3 The meeting noted that the minutes were now being sent out a week beforehand for each meeting

Item 5. Attendance log

- 5.1 CS advised the meeting that this was the fifth meeting Danny had not attended without apologies, the January meeting was not quorate and therefore could not consider this. After some discussion the meeting agreed that New Mill to write to Danny to ask if he intended to remain a member and to remind him he would be welcome to re-join should he decide he could not commit at the moment. Also agreed that New Mill to write to other members who have left asking if they would want to re-join, CS to provide list. This letter to stress things are moving on and now at an important stage.

Item 6. Starting the conversation questionnaire presentation

- 6.1 RL presented the top level results of the starting the conversation questionnaire. It was agreed that New Mill to email the presentation to RSG members.
- 6.2 RL noted that he had, for the purpose of this presentation, reported on those responses that had scored 3 or more similar answers and had not included one off comments that many residents had made. A separate list would be produced of the one off comments made. (action NM) He further advised the CSH had produced a more in-depth summary for each block which was circulated to the meeting. Some discussion took place around how the results might differ between RL and CSH documents as responses could appear under different questions. For example, CSH had grouped together all the residents' who responded that they would like a lift whether they had answered under the 'home' or the 'block' question.
- 6.3 Following the presentation it was agreed that New Mill and OHG would write to all those who took part thanking them for doing so and that a booklet would follow showing the results of the work. MT suggested and the RSG agreed that the next New Mill newsletter should refer to the results of the questionnaire. This would be sent out over next during the next two weeks.
- 6.4 The RSG noted that the work would provide a very useful base for the brief used to inform the appointment of any architects. The RSG further noted that the base results from the questionnaire would be built on with further engagement as the project progressed.
- 6.5 EJ felt that the project could be a big scheme and it is essential that residents get to make the big decision. The rest of the RSG agreed and all of the RSG would need to be involved in this work. MT agreed but pointed out any decision on the future of the estate would be made by all residents and not just the RSG.
- 6.6 RL noted that MT had provided a very useful template to report back to the RSG the detailed responses from each block to next RSG. The meeting discussed how it helps with architect's appointment and how it could also assist the TRA in its work.

Item 7. Architects Brief and Appointment

- 7.1 MT explained that the interviews would be a day long process and would include a presentation, examples of new build and refurb and a set of questions. On other estates MT had been involved in the interviews, following up on the question where he felt that the architects had not responded to the residents questions.
- 7.2 CW requested that any appointment would need to highlight eco-friendly practices as a priority MT noted the changes in the planning guidance that had just been issued by LBTH in January 2020 which sets out clearly what is expected on green issues.

- 7.3 PC, EJ, DL and SH volunteered to serve on the RSG appointment panel (7.4
The RSG then asked what would happen once the architects are appointed LP advised that, typically, there would be a meet the architects sessions, follow up one to ones and other engagement opportunities/events that will build on the engagement and develop a picture of the estate and individuals, this gives the opportunity to build on the introductory questionnaire.
- 7.5 LP advised the meeting that the selection of architects would come from OHG development framework which has 10 practices on it. The current procurement rules mean that we use a framework of consultants, in this case architects, which has been arrived at through a robust tendering process using the OJEU requirements.
- 7.6 EJ noted that like with the selection of the ITLA, RSG members had been promised at a previous meeting that they were allowed to put forward their own suggested architects, but it seemed they would not be allowed to do so with the architect selection. The meeting discussed this issue at some length.
- 7.7 The RSG discussed the OJEU rules as they related to the architects framework, 10 architects appointed. MT asked how many architects from the framework had been selected through a resident lead interview process. LP advised PRP had been chosen elsewhere on the two other island projects, MT noted therefore no one has had experience of the others. The choice remained between the architects on the framework., and order to tender to additional practices OHG would need to go back through an additional OJEU process.
- 7.8 The RSG agreed that the architect's eco-friendly criteria must be included in any selection process.
- 7.9 It was agreed that LP to circulate the list of architects on OHG frameworks to all RSG members.
- 7.10 LP noted the architects brief as amended by the RSG could now be ratified as this RSG meeting was quorate. After some discussion it was agreed that the amended brief for the architects isto be sent out Thursday 13.2.20 to RSG members who had until Monday 17.2.20 to respond, it was agreed that if a RSG member had not responded by then it would be accepted that the RSG agreed with the amended criteria, it was agreed that the amendments would be highlighted.
- 7.11 It was further agreed that New Mill to check RSG minutes from April 2019 onwards to ensure that any discussion on the architect's selection which had been made previously would not be undermined by the process now being adopted and that this check be completed by Monday 17.2.20 with the results being emailed to the RSG, OHG and MT. If the minutes check reveals no previous discussion and with the RSG agreement on the criteria agreed by Monday 17.2.20 the OHG will send out the invitation to tender to all 10 architects by the end of week beginning 17.2.20.

- 7.12 It was agreed that the appointments panel convene to discuss the questions and that members of the panels from Alice Shepherd & Oak and Kedge, Starboard & Winch be invited to attend to discuss their experience.

Item 8. Any other business

- 8.1 DB asked about the steps for the project, RL explained briefly and agreed to produce a step by step guide for RSG members.
- 8.2 EJ volunteered to assist with presentation tools, agreed to add intro line to each letter.
- 8.3 CW informed the RSG that there was an event next week (Friday 21st February, 8am) at the Houses of Parliament regarding youth empowerment seminar with new MP and young mayor, invite is open to all.
- 8.4 DL noted the TRA was now operating, now that it has just had access to 4 Montrose House, they will be holding open meetings as soon as possible.
- 8.5 LP to see if the Barkantine Surgery poster can be put on notice boards across the Kingsbridge Estate.
- 8.6 In a response to a question on the status of the residents charter, MT advised the residents charter has been responded to by OHG and is now being used by the Kedge Starboard and Winch RSG to develop the Landlords Offer. There is still some disagreement between OHG and residents around whether or not the document is or will be legally binding This remains a difference of opinion.

Item 9. Date of next meetings

11th March, 2020
8th April, 2020
13th May, 2020
10th June, 2020
8th July, 2020