

## KSW Resident Steering Group.

### Minutes

Meeting Date – 3<sup>rd</sup> Feb 2022 – 6.30pm - via Zoom

Residents	Initial	Others	Initial
Keeley Vincent - Kedge	KV	Ray Coyle – Open Communities - ITA	RC
Tony Rae - Kedge	TR	Mynul Islam - OH	MI
Leanne Ward - Kedge	LW	Odysseas Tzaferis - PRP	OT
Lubo Kostadinova - Starboard	LK	Kieran Butler - PRP	KB

#### **1 Welcome**

1.1 RC welcomed all to the virtual meeting.

#### **2 Apologies**

2.1 Mike Tyrrell, Marie Batchelor, Leila Arefani, Emma Price, Trina Morgan

#### **3 Minutes of meeting held on 2<sup>nd</sup> December 2021**

3.1 Minutes were accepted as a true record of the meeting

#### **4 Matters Arising.**

4.2 (4.2) **Completed**

4.3 (5.13) **Completed**

4.4 (5.14) 1-2-1s with residents who did not attend the November design sessions have resumed

4.5 (5.14) PRP to produce report on resident feedback from November design event once 1-2-1s are complete.

4.6 (7.3) **Completed**

4.7 (8.1) Issue around parking permits and residents taking them to decant properties. Check outcome.....

#### **5 Update from PRP on November event and questions from RPG**

- 5.1 **KB** gave a summary of the feedback from the design events held in November last year. Some of the block formations changed slightly resulting in a larger, more enclosed, open space in the middle of the development. Still 278 homes on the site.
- 5.2 There will be some roof terrace overlooking Tiller Rd and there will be 20 re-provided parking places. Residents at the November events were generally supportive of the new development. Some concern was raised about potential noise from the roof terraces.
- 5.3 There will be a pet area for walking dogs as well as a play area for children. **LK** asked about the cost of rooftop amenities in terms of service charges. **MI** confirmed that there is a cost element to services provided and said the level of service charges has not yet been decided as the scheme will continue to change and be tweaked throughout the detailed design. **MI** added that information on costs could be provided at future design events.
- 5.4 **MI** added that the roof top amenities could be low maintenance with benches etc in order to lessen the impact on service charges. He added that OH and PRP are very aware of the implications of services and will take this into account, along with residents, in the design process.
- 5.5 **KB** said that PRP can provide examples of other sites with no/low maintenance for roof amenity areas at the next design event. **RC** asked if residents could be taken to a site where there is no/low cost roof amenity space. **MI** said he would look into this and feed back

**ACTION – MI to feedback on potential site visits**

- 5.6 **OT** said that communal and amenity space is designed to provide opportunities for social interaction between resident and this was brought up by some residents at previous events.
- 5.7 **KB** went on to summarise some of the internal designs of flats and touched on Open plan living areas, storage space and separate bathrooms and WC. **OT** added that this information from the events is crucial in shaping the design of the new homes and environment.
- 5.8 **RC** said that some residents were keen to have 'swivel' windows that they could clean themselves – like the ones installed at New Union Wharf. Also that some residents

do not like the floor to ceiling windows as they can limit where furniture and radiators are placed within a room. **KB** said PRP are moving away from floor to ceiling windows as they can result in over-heating in the summer months.

- 5.9 **OT** said that the swivel window design has to be discussed with OH given potential safety issues and that no decision has been made on this as yet. **KB** said that the OH team are still carrying out 1-2-1 interviews with those residents who did not attend the event – so that a fuller picture is available on this. These 1-2-1s should be complete in the next couple of weeks and this will be followed by a feedback report on residents comments to be taken forward to the next stage of the design process.
- 5.10 **RC** asked about the planned design work shops to be held over February and March. **MI** said that February will be taken up with the procurement of a Joint Venture partner and that the workshops will be moved back to March/April.
- 5.11 **RC** said that we should aim to improve on the turnout for the next design event given earlier comments by **LK** on the financial implications of providing service charges and that less than half of households attended the November event.
- 5.12 **LK** asked about the build cost when having amenities on the roofs of buildings – will it increase the cost of the flats. **MI** said that once the JV partner is on board they will be in a better place to look at the effects of these on building costs.

## **6 Update from OH and questions from RSG**

- 6.1 **MI** said that around 10% of residents have been uploaded to the LBTH bidding system with their priority bidding numbers. There are teething problems with the system in that it is automated and does not have the flexibility to deal with 'like-for-like' moves. There are also problems in the system recognising 'adult children' in the decant process. OH is liaising with LBTH on this.
- 6.2 **MI** said that the first person to be decanted off the estate is due imminently and it is an adult child of a tenant. Any resident who is bidding on the system and gets shortlisted should keep **MI** and Emma informed as they have a lot of administration to take care of including home loss payments.
- 6.3 **LW** asked how it is decided who gets their bidding numbers first. **MI** said it started off with who applied on LBTH web site but now it is now down to how OH works

through the system with residents. If a resident wants to go through the process ASAP then MI will prioritise them

- 6.4 **MI** said that he and Emma would be working their way through the 1-2-1s of those who did not attend the November design events.
- 6.5 **MI** confirmed that the prospective bidders for the Joint Venture (JV) company have been short listed to three organisations – Mount Anvil, Hill and Taylor Wimpey. The procurement process will involve RSG members meeting the three shortlisted companies in an informal walk around the estate. This will be followed, at a later date, by formal questions in an interview setting.
- 6.6 **RC** suggested the best way to approach this is to form a small sub-group of residents to meet and question the prospective JVs and he will be speaking to RSG members to set this up.
- 6.7 **LK** asked how the shortlisting had been done and that he didn't think any of the three shortlisted companies were in the top five companies operating in London. **MI** said that some of the initial bidders saw this as quite a small site relatively speaking, and did not follow up with formal bids. Other initial bidders were not keen on working on projects where residents play a fundamental part in the process.
- 6.8 **RC** said that he is aware that all three are involved in similar projects and have good reputations in the sector.
- 6.9 **KV** asked **MI** if he had addressed her issue of being told she is only eligible for a one bed property even though she is currently in a two bed. **MI** said that it was down to the inflexibility of the council's system in recognising anything out of the ordinary like 'like-for-like' in the decant process.
- 6.10 **KV** said that LBTH can only advise that she downsize to a 1 bed but they cannot insist on it. **MI** said this was the case and that regardless of which type of property or where the property is, **KV** will be getting like-for-like. **MI** said he is talking to a council officer about the best way to address this and whether it is something that OH could take on, rather than the council. **MI** said he would update **KV** after he had spoken to the council officer

**ACTION – MI to liaise with KV on his meeting with the council officer**

6.11 **LW** asked that if tenants were interested in any of the Riverside stock would they have to go on another waiting list. **MI** said that OH would contact the relevant borough and inform them they have someone looking at one of their properties. MI explained that not all boroughs have 100% nomination rights like LBTH do and that some councils have 75% which means that housing associations can nominate prospective tenants. This may make it slightly less difficult to rehouse people in other areas.

**7 Any Other Business with OH present**

None

**8 Any Other Business without OH present**

None

**9 Date of next meeting**

Thursday 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2022 at 6.30 via zoom.

Draft