

**Minutes of a meeting of the Resident Steering Group for Alice
Shepherd House & Oak House held on 26th September 2020
Meeting held via Zoom**

Residents Present:

Sharon Holmes – Oak House
Habib Ahmod – Alice Shepherd House
Cynthia Owusu – Alice Shepherd House
Nadia Mahmoud – Alice Shepherd House

Others Present:

Lee Page – Independent Resident Adviser – TPAS
Mike Tyrrell – Residents Advocate
Mynul Islam – One Housing
Emma Leigh Price – One Housing
Leila Arefani – One Housing
Spyros Katsaros – PRP Architects
Roumpini Perakaki – PRP Architects

Apologies:

Darren Brown – Alice Shepherd House

1 Welcome & Introduction

1.1 The apologies that were given are noted above.

2 Notes of the Meeting held on 24th August 2020

2.1 SH commented that her statement regarding the decision of both blocks being treated independently, rather than as one, was not recorded. MT stated that JM had also raised this in his discussions with her.

In response LA said she would re-check and circulate OH's previous response.

LA

2.2 The notes of the meeting held on 24th August 2020 were approved subject to this note.

3 Matters Arising

3.1 OH were asked what action had been taken with regard to those unable to take part in zoom meetings?

MI stated that he had spoken to NR and OH are arranging to

supply a tablet for him. It was suggested and agreed that TN should be contacted as well.

MI

4 Attendance

4.1 No current issues.

5 PRP Report

5.1 LA introduced this item with a brief overview of recent actions. The July booklet set out an initial set of designs, across all options, All households had had the opportunity to give their views and 80% of households had been spoken to by OH officers, via the phone with each conversation averaging 30-40 minutes.

5.2 SK gave a brief overview of the action by PRP once the feedback had been received from residents. He illustrated this with a short PowerPoint presentation. The feedback report is due to be published by the end of this week/early next week (*post meeting note – OH were asked to delay the feedback report in order to allow for residents to query the summary of their views provided. This was agreed and the report would allow for feedback up to 14th October*)

5.3 Each household has been written to giving a summary of their views as recorded by OH and allowing them an opportunity to challenge anything they felt was incorrect. A brief discussion was had as the SG members haven't received this. MI stated that the letters had been sent to the mail room at OH on Friday (24th) so may still be on their way (*post meeting note – SG members confirmed receipt of the letters*)

5.4 The feedback report would be circulated to all residents and the process will then move to examining each option in more detail given the initial feedback of views.

5.5 The intention is to look at how all options can be improved to make them more popular and to score better in the viability assessments. There will then be an opportunity for residents to give further feedback.

5.6 As this feedback loop continues consideration will be given to what is the least popular option, what won't work in terms of viability and thereby slowly reduce the available options. Emphasised that all options are still there for the next round of consultation.

- 5.7 MI stated that the conversations that had been held to date that OH had been clear that this was not a consultation on a final design but, at this stage, was more about the general concepts. It was regrettable that the use of models on a face to face level hadn't been possible as it had proved useful elsewhere in clarifying what was being sought by residents.
- 5.8 LA there are a number of months to go in the process and it was helpful to see which options weren't attracting support as much as those that are. Still hopeful that there will be opportunities after Christmas for more personal contact/physical events. However, there was no benefit to OH in pushing the process without residents being part of it.
- 5.9 Some discussion was held over the proposed 20 storey development (either infill or as part of a larger redevelopment) as the area falls outside of the councils designated area for tall buildings. OH to check with Planning Consultants as the area is right on the boundary of the designated area and planners might be willing to consider this as part of a wider scheme.
- 5.10 SH asked if there would be a full breakdown of responses in the feedback report. Yes,
- 5.11 NM asked who had had input into the design aspects of the proposals? Can the community input? LA thought this was a good idea and will look to invite interested residents to some specific design meetings. SK happy to arrange. NM, SH & CO all interested in attending
- 5.12 SH asked how was the decision reached as to what options residents favoured. MI stated that the individual feedback letters could specify how the views were being interpreted and residents can challenge this if they feel their views are not correctly represented. However, the letters wouldn't state the overall feedback – just for each household.
- 5.13 CO queried if all of the work was carried out pre-lockdown. LA said that much of the work had been undertaken during 'lockdown'

OH

LA/SK

6 Update from OH

- 6.1 LA stated that OH were intending to give feedback and progress at future meetings
- 6.2 Re-confirmed that the next round of consultation is due to take place in November and design meetings are now to be

arranged.

- 6.3 OH are hoping to hold a 'gazebo' event in the next few weeks in the car park to allow residents to speak to officers (socially distanced). This will be slightly less formal than normal. Happy to address questions on the process, feedback, design etc.

7.0 Tpas Newsletter

- 7.1 LP sought any feedback on the draft previously circulated. Agreed to re-circulate prior to printing **LP**

8.0 Future Consultation Timetable

- 8.1 Covered under previous items

9.0 Date of Next Meeting

- 9.1 NM asked if it was possible to change the day of the week for the next meeting (scheduled for Monday 26th October) as she was now undertaking an online course that clashed. LP agreed to seek views of the SG **LP**

10.0 Any Other Business with OHG Officers present

- 10.1 Query as to whether there could be models available for the events in the next few weeks? Good idea but probably for a date in a few months time (New Year)

10.0 Any Other Business without OHG Officers present

- 10.1 MT Has received a letter from residents on another regeneration project (Kingsbridge) seeking to attend other SG meetings and offering for SG members to attend their meetings if desired. Agreed to invite one member to attend this SG as an observer. NM possibly interested in reciprocating. **LP**

- 10.2 Concern was expressed about whether residents would be able to challenge their individual feedback and have this accounted for in the overall feedback assessment given the tight timescales. Agreed to request OH allow 14 days for challenge before compiling the overall feedback report. **LP**

Meeting closed at 9.00 pm