

Minutes of a meeting of the Resident Steering Group for Alice Shepherd House & Oak House held on 24th January 2022

Hybrid Meeting held In Person/Zoom

Residents Present:

Jane McGregor – Alice Shepherd House
Ashley Lowther – Alice Shepherd House
Cynthia Owusu – Alice Shepherd House
Habib Amod – Alice Shepherd House
Nadia Mahmood – Alice Shepherd House
Sharon Holmes – Oak House

Others Present:

Maggie Phillips – St Johns TRA
Lee Page – Independent Resident Adviser – TPAS
Mike Tyrrell – Residents Advocate
Emma Leigh Price – One Housing
Leila Arefani – One Housing
Mynul Islam – One Housing
Andy Smith – SQW
Sonali Campion – Civica Election Services
Murni Misra – Civica Election Services

Apologies:

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 22nd November 2021

2.1 Accepted as a true record of the meeting

3 Matters Arising

3.1 NM Queried if only one of the proposed blocks for the site of Alice Shepherd House was to be used for social housing?

3.2 LA said that this was likely to be the case although won't be confirmed until detailed design stage. It is not yet decided which of the two blocks it would be and there would be no difference in appearance externally. NM said that she was under the impression that all blocks would be mixed tenure and AL said that blocks of single tenure types are not what had been asked for.

3.3 The case of one ASH resident was raised. She had told others that she was being offered a place in the New Union

**MT/LP to
check**

Wharf development. The OH team are unaware of this case and cannot discuss individual household circumstances anyway, but will look into the matter.

- 3.4 MT said that there will be some tenants who want to move back to the blocks on ASH site and NM questioned how the selection process for those who want to move back would be undertaken and be fair?
- 3.5 LA said that whilst she was aware some tenants would want to move back she did not believe this to be many given the feedback OH have had so far. The Offer Document would make it clear that there would be an opportunity to move back.
- 3.6 MP said that the people in the room needed to work together and points raised by tenants need to be addressed. OH needed to know why people were saying what they are and why there seemed to be a lack of trust?

4 Introduction to Civica Election Services

- 4.1 Civica representatives talked through the process for the ballot and gave details of their background and the range and nature of ballots they had conducted for a wide range of organisations.
- 4.2 The ballot would be held over a period of 24 days and residents will be able to vote in a number of ways (post/text/online etc). LA stated that the process to check who was residents and therefore eligible to vote was taking place and the final list would be given to Civica.
- 4.3 NM asked how potential fraud would be picked up? Civica explained the checks they have in place to ensure that this doesn't happen.
- 4.4 It was clarified that the result of the ballot would be based only on those who actually vote. Residents who decide not to vote at all will not be counted either for or against the proposal.
- 4.5 In response to SH, Civica said that the final report would be made to One Housing but that they would also write to all residents giving the result. Exactly when this would happen will depend on whether or not there were any concerns about any of the votes cast.

5 Financial Presentation on the requirement for 350 homes (SQW)

- 5.1 MT congratulated AS on a very clear briefing note that had been supplied ahead of the last exhibition.
- 5.2 MT queried the value of the sale value used in the calculations which appeared to be low. If the value of the sales is increased would this mean that less homes need to be built to fund the replacement of homes and therefore bring the proposed density down? AS said that it would require the sale value of the homes to increase much more than the build costs – in practice build costs usually track sales values. It would also depend on other factors such as the deal entered into with the company appointed to build the homes and what the Council require.
- 5.3 AS presented details of assumptions made in calculation the financial viability and how the value of £800 per square foot was reached and how this compared to other developments on the Isle of Dogs (presentation to be shared post meeting). He also said that sales values in E14 had increased by 2% since 2020. Values were increased by proximity to DLR rather than river views.
- 5.4 All of the financial viability calculations would have to be updated as part of the planning application as this is required by the Council. If the 35% of new homes target for social housing isn't met then the scheme will have to be independently values. The design shows 35% of the new homes will be for social housing and this results in 56% of the overall total being for social housing (including re-provided homes).
- 5.5 LA said that the current thinking was that Block B would be for the social housing and Block C for private sale but that this isn't decided for sure and will be confirmed as part of detailed design stage. Build quality and materials would be the same for both blocks. One Housing was a social housing provider and, as an organisation, would not seek to prioritise private homes over social housing in terms of quality etc. The project was showing a small loss at present, but we will work through detailed design to minimise this.
- 5.6 LA confirmed that One Housing had not yet started talking to building contractors. They need the result of the ballot before doing so. On previous projects to date this has been via an open tender and not to a preferred list of companies.
- 5.7 JM asked if rent revenue had been taken into account at all. AS said yes (35/40 years to reach capital value) but obviously not for sold homes.

5.8 SH said that the layout of the existing flat in Oak House was incorrect. LA to check. LA

6.0 Initial Feedback from January Exhibition

6.1 In light of the time it was agreed to pass over this item.

7.0 Timetable for Offer Document/Ballot

7.1 Concern was raised that the ballot was being rushed and that there hadn't been sufficient opportunity to agree the Offer Document.

7.2 LA stated that the landlord offer would be sent to residents on Monday 14th February. Residents would have two weeks to read it before voting opens on Tuesday 1st March. During that two-week period One Housing will hold some door-knocking and drop in events with Mike and Lee to answer any questions residents have on the landlord offer. One Housing regeneration staff won't be around the estate during the voting period.

LA stated that there was quite a tight timetable in order to get the offer document printed and distributed for 14th February. Agree that any comments on the draft would need to be submitted to One Housing by Wednesday 2nd February and a provisional meeting date of 3rd February 2022 was agreed to review comments and One Housing's response.

8.0 Q & A Meeting - 27th January 2022

8.1 The SG was unhappy that OH will not be present. LA explained that they would be unable to answer any of the questions at the meeting and would need to check before giving a response.

9.0 Date of Next Meeting

9.1 28th March 2022 (post ballot)

9.2 Further Meeting Dates were agreed as follows

- ~~25th April 2022~~ *If the ballot result is in favour of*
- ~~23rd May 2022~~ *redevelopment the project will break for 2 months*
- 27th June 2022
- 25th July 2022

10.0 Any Other Business with OHG Officers present

10.1 Not considered

11.0 Any Other Business without OHG Officers present

11.1 Not considered

12.00 Meeting closed at 9.00 pm