

**Minutes of a meeting of the Resident Steering Group for Alice  
Shepherd House & Oak House held on 24<sup>th</sup> May 2021  
Meeting held via Zoom**

**Residents Present:**

Nadia Mahmoud – Alice Shepherd House  
Jane McGregor – Alice Shepherd House  
Darren Brown – 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

**Apologies:**

Sharron Holmes – Oak House  
Jill Skeels – St John's TRA

**1 Welcome & Introduction**

1.1 The apologies that were given are noted above.

**2 Notes of the Meeting held on 29<sup>th</sup> March 2020**

2.1 Accepted as a true record of the meeting

**3 Matters Arising**

3.1 5.10 Hard copies of the presentation at the last meeting had been circulated to the SG

**4 Attendance**

4.1 No current issues.

**5 Consultation/Exhibition – 8<sup>th</sup> & 12<sup>th</sup> June 2021**

5.1 LA shared a document showing the layout of the proposed event. She recapped the reason for the exhibition which is an opportunity to re-start the engagement which hadn't been able to take place due to the pandemic.

5.2 Residents need to be able to see how previous feedback had shaped where the project was currently at. The event needs to cover a few things as a result. Mixed feedback on the options so far. We'd undertaken consultation, had a big pause

and now needs to re-start properly.

- 5.3 The event is proposed to have more workshop based rather than exhibition base and this will have a mix of the approaches. There will be a large marquee to cover the basketball area with a number of display boards and then some smaller marquees for workshop based topics. Almost going back a step. Will cover
- options for parking
  - options for building heights and styles
  - types of outdoor space (balconies etc.)
- 5.4 Restrictions will apply so probably no more than 20 residents at any one time.
- 5.5 LA then talked through what will be on the boards. There will be feedback forms, post it notes and opportunities for residents to talk through options with PRP, Tpas & OH.
- 5.6 MT queried approach. LA explained that their understanding was that residents wanted the opportunity to talk through options that SG had already discussed. Want to encourage more discussion. Not sure people had seen the process so far. Impression that there was a demand to sit and ask questions. NM liked the idea. JM thought it was a good thing to take a step back.
- 5.7 No update on design from August 2020 all options still available. Door knocking and leafletting next week to raise awareness.

## 6 **Project Timeline**

- 6.1 LP introduced this as he had spoken to a number of people over recent drop-ins who felt that we were much further ahead than we were and that there was to be a ballot very shortly.
- 6.2 LA shared a detailed project timeline that OH are working to which shows that the ballot was anticipated to take place in February 2022
- 6.3 LA suggested a post event newsletter to give feedback from the event and a timeline. JM agreed that people need to be made aware that the ballot isn't going to be in the next month or two. Residents need to know that they have a decision and it isn't just what OH want.
- 6.4 LA said that further events planned in September & November 2021 and the final option presented in January

2022. The offer document needs to be distributed at least 3 weeks before balloting and then a 4 week period for ballot.

6.5 NM would like the SG to receive a copy of the timeline. Happy with the timeline shown. LA said that they would circulate a 'slimmed down version (without OH notes). Keen to read the offer document!

6.6 Happy to share the KSW offer document as an example (may have similar issues). JM queried when the offer document was circulated – before any ballot.

6.7 MT talked through the process of how the Offer Document was put together on KSW. Getting the small print (the really detailed stuff) in is important. Council liked the document.

**OH to circulate the KSW offer document**

## **7.0 Date of Next Meeting**

7.1 28<sup>th</sup> June 2021

## **8.0 Any Other Business with OHG Officers present**

8.1 LP asked questions that SH had submitted. Could the proposed block of 12 homes on the North end just have Oak Hse residents? LA to look at. She also asked if the increase in working from home had been taken into account. LA felt this would be a good discussion to have with PRP.

8.2 NM wanted to know about Public Liability Insurance – would the playgrounds being gated impact on this? There was also a lot of information about KSW on the Island Facebook place. Is this the right place for it? LA didn't know about the insurance but will ask the insurance team

**LA**

8.3 MT said he hadn't seen it but would have a look

8.4 JM raised the issue about street parking. Non-existent at the moment. LA said accessible parking would need to be provided under planning but that the council requires developments to be a car free development so any new residents wouldn't be entitled to permits. A general discussion around demand was held and noted that a number of residents had street parking permits not specific for ASH.

## **9.0 Any Other Business without OHG Officers present**

9.1 JM stated it was good to take a step back as it might help get

more involved. LP felt it was 50/50 as to how quickly residents want things to move forward. JM felt that those who wanted to move quickly were those who want to get out of the block. She felt that this was swayed by those residents who wanted a move anyway and that the overcrowding should be dealt with anyway, not just through redevelopment. DB spoke for partial redevelopment (leaving ASH standing).

- 9.2 MT reminded everyone to make sure these views were expressed at the exhibition. JM suggested that moving the proposed tower further north in the development might satisfy more residents by lessening the density on the south side of the design. She would want a dual aspect flat.
- 9.3 DB asked if the infill option was still there as no-one liked it? LP said everything was still on the table.
- 9.4 MT mentioned that on another scheme had made offers of independent accommodation for adult children of tenants. This had also happened on a council scheme in Stepney. Referred to offer document to KSW residents (paragraph 9 page 20).
- 9.5 Discussion regarding the ability to move out of the borough. It was explained that this is more difficult but that they could work towards reciprocal arrangements with other boroughs.
- 10.00 Meeting closed at 9.00 pm**