

# **Minutes of a meeting of the Resident Steering Group for Alice Shepherd House & Oak House held on 26<sup>th</sup> July 2021**

## **Hybrid Meeting held In Person/Zoom**

### **Residents Present:**

Nadia Mahmoud – Alice Shepherd House  
Jane McGregor – Alice Shepherd House  
Ashley Lowther – Alice Shepherd House  
Sharon Holmes – Oak House

### **Others Present:**

Lee Page – Independent Resident Adviser – TPAS  
Mike Tyrrell – Residents Advocate  
Leila Arefani – One Housing  
Roumpini Perakaki – PRP  
Phil Dibsdale - SQW

### **Apologies:**

Jill Skeels – St John's TRA  
Darren Brown – Alice Shepherd House  
Mynul Islam – One Housing  
Emma Leigh Price – One Housing  
Paul Handley – One Housing

## **1 Welcome & Introduction**

1.1 The apologies that were given are noted above.

## **2 Notes of the Meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> June 2021**

2.1 Accepted as a true record of the meeting

## **3 Matters Arising**

3.1 3.2 LA has emailed NM

3.2 5.3 LP undertook some of the follow-up calls to obtain feedback as requested.

3.3 6.4 the timeline has been emailed to the SG. LP distributed hard copies.

3.4 The meeting re works to Alice Shepherd has taken place but there was a commitment to provide a letter of apology to residents which hasn't been forthcoming. LA to feedback to the appropriate team for action. **LA**

3.5 A plan of action had been promised together with a mock up of what the works would look like. Scaffolding remains but no work has been done. Speaks to a lack of trust that residents have One Housing..

3.5 Information was emailed to SH

3.6 9.4 website for the project is live and details have been emailed to the SG

#### **4 Attendance**

4.1 AI raised the issue of SG members who haven't attended for sometime. LP agreed to speak to those who have been absent for more than 3 meetings with or without apologies being given. **LP**

#### **5 Report from PRP on the feedback from the June Exhibition**

5.1 LA introduced the item. Summary report includes feedback obtained since the event through 1-2-1 calls. This has taken longer than expected so the full report is still being produced. This will be published online (and some hard copies) and includes .all feedback given by residents.

5.2 RP shared a powerpoint presentation on the feedback. 39 attendees (29 households) and 62 feedback forms (80% engagement rate). Attendees included 2 local residents and 2 councillors.

5.3 LA talked through the planning process as this is how local residents get an opportunity to comment on any proposals. JM felt that the proposed heights of the current design might be a problem. One Housing will meet with the council before ballot to get advice on the application as they would need to consider what will be allowed. One Housing have recently contacted LBTH to start pre-planning discussions. No dates set for a meeting yet.

5.4 RP spoke to the aims of the exhibition and noted that there had been

- 62 feedback forms
- 123 comments collected from the exhibition
- 89 comments at the open space workshop table
- 60 comments from the buildings workshop table
- 40 comments from the homes workshop table

5.5 The feedback forms had also indicated the preferred option at the current time

- Option 1 - 4%
- Option 2 - 9%
- Option 3 - 17%
- Option 4.1 - 2%
- Option 4.2 - 1%
- Option 5.1 - 4%
- Option 5.2 - 9%
- Option 6 - 54%

5.6 Unhappiness was expressed over the fact that all votes would be considered together rather than each block deciding on their own future.

5.7 A brief discussion took place over the number of votes. LA explained the arrangements as set out by the Mayor of London (MoL) guidance – all named tenants and leaseholders together with anyone living in the property who has been registered for housing with the council for 12 months prior to the issue of the offer document. This has changed from the original argument 1 vote per household. Due to the introduction of the MoL guidance. This applies where GLA funding is provided.

**LP to  
provide  
written  
guidance  
on voting**

5.8 LA explained the provision of new social rent homes as a percentage of those built (above those being reprovided). The flats to be built for sale have to generate enough funds to build all of the socially rented homes (as well as those sold). Of the additional homes built 35% have to be for social rent.

5.9 RP went through the options together with the comments made at the exhibition on each one. Infill (option 4) was the least popular. No breakdown has been given yet as to the views coming from Oak House residents as opposed to those in Alice Shepherd House. Full report can provide breakdown from feed-back forms (not from post-it notes).

5.10 Any new development would have to be car-free but existing residents who have car-parking can retain it. This includes on street permits from the Council – allows you to change cars but you can't get it back if given up at any point. MT shared details from website.

5.11 RP gave more details as to the comments and concerns from each of the workshops. SH raised a concern regarding the minimum requirements for noise insulation. Too specific for this stage, studies would be undertaken later if required.

5.12 LA said that residents would get a newsletter giving this feedback in the next few weeks. Hard copies will be provided

for the SG.

## 6.0 Report from SQW on the financial option appraisal

6.1 PD shared a slide showing the Gross Development Value (GDV) of each option and the Viability Gap – LA explained this was the difference between the anticipated value and the cost of provision – a negative value makes it unviable. The slide is slightly different to that circulated a part of the exhibition booklet.

6.2 Where the figures are close there is the possibility of making changes that will bridge the gap e.g. the split between private sale and rent etc.

6.3 PD then shared a spreadsheet which showed the 6 options and the viability gaps both with and without GLA grant funding. It further considered the option should GLA grant be available for the re-provided homes (this isn't currently known). The greater the negative value the less *financially* viable the option. Options 1 – 3 are all financially unviable as they don't generate any additional value – they purely cost money.

6.4 The figures indicated that even with funding the infill options were not viable. This is also the least popular option with residents.

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
Alice Shepherd House & Oak House - Option Financial Viability Analysis						Jul-21						
Cost Options			Baseline Option 1	Landscape Option 2	Refurbishment Option 3							
			£m	£m	£m							
			-0.71	-1.15	-2.3 to -10.3							
Development Options												
Development Options Planning Policy Compliant Tenure Split (65:35 net new)			Infill Development		Partial Redevelopment				Full Redevelopment @£800psm			
			Option 4.1	% of GDV	Option 4.2	% of GDV	Option 5.1	% of GDV	Option 5.2	% of GDV	Option 6	% of GDV
			£m		£m		Oak Retained £m		AS Retained £m		£m	
GLA Grant Exc Reprovision			-2.91	16%	-1.9	16%	-9.48	11%	-2.59	4%	-6.7	5%
GLA Grant Inc Reprovision			NA		NA		-3.28	3%	-1.68	3%	0.38	

6.5 The full and partial redevelopment options see the viability gap reduced to levels that can be addressed through other means. This could be through altering the split between social

and private housing. Alternatively, the number of 1,2 or 3 bedroom homes provided could be altered.

6.6 As it stands the full redevelopment option is within financially viability parameters both with and without grant being paid on the replacement homes. The partial redevelopment option sees both options within the viability range if grant is paid on replacement homes but only on Option 5.2 if grant isn't payable on replacement homes. PD explained that this was because the number of re-provided homes is so small if only Oak House is re-provided.

6.7 LA explained that it was currently unclear from the GLA whether or not grant is payable on the reprovision of homes that are demolished. LA will find out if it used to be paid on past developments

**LA**

6.8 LA confirm that it will be proposed that options 2, 3 and 4 would be dropped as unaffordable, but elements of the refurbishment option (option 3) would be added to option 5 (for the block not demolished) to create a hybrid option 5. More tweaks will be undertaken to bridge the gap but that these options will form the basis of the next event with explanation as to why the other options could not be taken forward.

6.9 In response to SH, LA confirmed that Option 5.1 would also have to be dropped if no grant was payable on the re-provided homes.

6.10 LA confirmed that no response had been received from GLA – dates for a response had been put back repeatedly. They have said that previous grants allocated should be used as a basis for current estimates.

6.11 PD said this was currently a process of elimination e.g. Option 4 was not only unpopular with residents but was also financially unviable. It therefore seems obvious that this option be dropped. Other options are more popular and also more financially viable.

6.13 LA confirmed that we were looking at approximately 350 homes (including the 84 re-provided homes).

## **7.0 Next Steps**

7.1 Largely covered under the previous item but LA confirmed that the next event would take place at the end of September/early October – LP said he couldn't make anything

on 25<sup>th</sup> September 2021. Agreed to look at Tuesday 28<sup>th</sup> September and Saturday 2<sup>nd</sup> October 2021. Agreed to hold in the car park area again.

- 7.2 One Housing have spoken to Hill Homes regarding arranging a visit to the new development at ????. Set for 18<sup>th</sup> September 2021. Potentially more than one time for groups to look at what is being provided. Should be able to look inside some flats before they are occupied. Those present agreed to speak to their neighbours in early September to gauge interest. LP to email wider SG members re visit and for SG members to feed back to LP to then pass onto One Housing. Newsletter from One Housing will also highlight visit. **LP**

## **8.0 Date of Next Meeting**

8.1 23<sup>rd</sup> August 2021

8.2 Further Meeting Dates were agreed as follows

- 27<sup>th</sup> September 2021
- 25<sup>th</sup> October 2021
- 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2021
- 24<sup>th</sup> January 2022

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

9.1 AL, raised the issue of maintenance on site as it's not currently very good – bin areas rancid and have been asking for a jet wash for 6 weeks.

9.2 SH raised issue of squatters in 50p Club – currently a Techno Party in progress! LA not aware what's happening but will check. This is the 3<sup>rd</sup> set of squatters who have move in. **LA**

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

9.1 AL raised the issue of SG members who haven't been attending. Agreed that LP would contact those who have been missing meetings and they should be removed from the SG. **LP**

9.2 MT said that the opening of the community centres might be pushed back past the original September date that had been planned. MT to circulate email received. **MT**

9.3 NM raised the difficulty she had experienced in trying to get her husband as a joint tenant. Would this impact on the ballot and who could vote. MT said this had been an issue elsewhere but had worked throughout the ballot process to get all changed.

9.4 A discussion took place around the rules of succession.

9.5 AL raised the issue of drafting the residents offer that was in the timeline. Who was responsible for drafting this. It was agreed that LP would approach Island House to try and book a room for a meeting in the next few weeks.

**LP**

**10.00 Meeting closed at 9.30 pm**