

## **Resident Steering Group Meeting for Alice Shepherd House & Oak House**

**Monday 22<sup>nd</sup> May 2023**

**St John's Community Centre, Glengall Grove, E14**

### **Attendance**

#### **Residents:**

Ashley Lowther (AL)  
Jane McGregor [JM]  
Nadia Mehmood [NM]  
Cynthia Owumo (CO)

#### **One Housing Group:**

Leila Arefani – Regeneration Manager [LA]  
Shaun Simpson – Regeneration Officer [SS]  
Mynul Islam – Project Manager (MI) via zoom  
Saba Choudhury – Head of Acquisitions and Planning (SC)  
Carlos Delgado – Project Manager, New Business and Partnerships (CD)

#### **Residents Advocate.:**

Mike Tyrrell [MT]

#### **ITLA:**

Ray Coyle – Open Communities, Chair [RC]

### **1. Welcome, introductions and apologies**

1.1. RC took the Chair and welcomed attendees. Apologies were received from Sharon Holmes (resident) and Murselin Islam (Open Communities)

### **2. Minutes of RSG meeting of 24<sup>th</sup> April 2023**

These were accepted as a true record of what was discussed at the meeting

### **3 Matters Arising**

3.1 Re: 3.4 – An early conversation is required with the successful JVP on the provision of a community centre to replace the 50p club. RC has added this to the Action Table and added that conversation had taken place with the three JVP candidates to date.

3.2 Re 4.2 – This was about what would happen if one of the four shortlisted companies dropped out. LA said that one of the unsuccessful bidders could be brought in to replace but this would be tricky as the other three candidates are well into the process now. Both SC and RC said the chances of one dropping out was pretty remote. SC added that the reason for shortlisting four was in case one dropped out and this would still leave three in the running and not a two-horse race.

SC added that OHG had carried out some 'soft market testing' at the start of the process,

with eleven interested parties and three of them dropped out leaving eight in place.

3.3 Re 4.4 – MT said it was important to get across to the candidates the popularity of the linear block nature of Alice Shepherd House. La said she would invite SC and CD the next zoom catch-up session as well as the next RPG meeting - COMPLETED

3.4 Re 4.7 - Visits to sites the four candidates have provided. This can be arranged. SC said this will not be part of the formal procurement process and will take place after the candidates have submitted their bidding proposals. The sub group can then feedback on the visits and - this can feed into the assessment process. The visits should take place in the first half of July and it would be good to take more tenants on these visits.

3.5 Re 4.14 – SS to check out the situation at No 48. LA said that new carpeting and plastering has been arranged for the flat and that SS has arranged to visit the tenant in the property this coming Friday (26<sup>th</sup> May).

3.6 Re 4.17 – Decision on timing of the planning application. LA said that SC would touch on this as part of her presentation at this meeting.

#### **4 Update from OHG and Questions from Residents**

##### **Procurement Process**

- 4.1. SC started the presentation by highlighting the fact that the objective is to select a JV partner to work with OHG and residents to deliver what was agreed in the Landlord Offer and what resident voted for in the ballot.
- 4.2. JM asked what the 'Third Party' meant on page 3 of the presentation. SC said that sometimes developers will have a main contractor to construct the development and the four shortlisted candidates do their own constructing but there may be times when they might bring in a specialist building. JM asked if the RSG would be involved in looking at any 3<sup>rd</sup> party that might be brought in. SC said this would be worth clarifying with the candidates at formal interview stage.
- 4.3. SC then pointed out the difference between a developer and a contractor and said that all four JV candidates were developer/contractors and that three of them (Lovell, Hill and Countryside) build things for other people as contractors while Mount Anvil only build for themselves. MT gave an example of one of the JV candidates being brought in to an estate, as a contractor, to complete the job.
- 4.4. SC said there will be a slightly different approach to Tiller Rd in that there will be more flexibility here as nothing is set in stone, except for the principles set out in the Landlord Offer Document. AL asked what the differences were with Tiller Rd. SC said that what we have here is a set of principles to produce a design and it is not something fixed or set in stone that we will try to make work. This will be done in partnership with OHG, the community, the GLA, LBTH and the developer.
- 4.5. AL asked if the things that might change are what the residents have requested. SC said that there are promises in the Landlord Offer such as room sizes, meeting

housing need and a deck access block no higher than Alice Shepherd House – all of these are the basic principles the developer will work to.

- 4.6. SC said that there were 4 companies who were not shortlisted to make the final eight and explained why this was the case. The final shortlist of four are the biggest in the sector. JM asked if OHG would go back to the list if one of the final four candidates dropped out. SC said this would depend on timing and how far down the procurement process we were at and that OHG would be happy to go forward with three candidates as they all submitted strong bids.
- 4.7. A general discussion took place about the numbers invited for interview. SC said they will make it clear to candidates not to go over the suggested number. SC added that RSG visits to site the candidates are already involved in will be added to slide 6 of the presentation 'Procurement Process – What Happened Now'. JM asked that the sites be as local as possible.
- 4.8. JM asked how much say the residents will have in the selection. SC said that the resident input forms part of the 'quality' element of the scoring which is 50% of the score overall. The site visits will not be part of the scoring as they are not part of the formal process but feedback from the visits will be taken on board by OHG.
- 4.9. JM was concerned that OHG may go with one Candidate while the resident go for another. SC said that if the resident prefer a candidate that didn't score as highly as the successful candidate, there will be discussion with the RSG and the wider community on how to take this forward, with the possibility of a 2<sup>nd</sup> interview of candidates.
- 4.10. JM was concerned that said that Countryside Partners sourced a lot of their resources from abroad. SC said this was only in relation to the communal heating systems. JM said we need to clarify this at interview stage SEE ACTION TABLE
- 4.11. NM asked what level of input would Riverside's 'insight' group have in the procurement process. SC said that various people within Riverside will effectively sign off on the process and ensure that due process was followed. They will not play a part in the actual selection process.
- 4.12. NM asked how much say will LBTH have and if they will pushback on any elements of planning. SC said OHG will be in constant touch with LBTH as well as the GLA to ensure they are up to date with what is being proposed – so that there will be no surprises.
- 4.13. JM raised concern on the Sales and Marketing section in slide 7 of the presentation, asking about potential sales abroad and Airbnb properties. SC said this will be one of the questions asked of the candidates, whether their marketing strategy is looking at sales abroad or will they be looking at sales at home first. The airbnb issue is more about management than development as it is not known at the time of sale what the intention of the buyer is. SC added that they will be asking bidders about their marketing strategy given that it will be new homes within an existing community and this will be scored on responses.

4.14. SC added that, in terms of Airbnb, they will look to restrict what people can do through their leases. CD said that Lovell stated on the walkabout that they try to stick to selling at home rather than abroad. NM said that sales are now happening in Tower Hamlets, by block rather than by units. SC said this is unlikely to happen here as there are not so many units.

4.15. SC said that there is a balancing act in terms of the JV partners, as for-profit companies, looking to maximise profit alongside OHGs objective of providing good quality homes. SC then touched on HACT – as a framework for measuring social value. NM asked if the RSG can have a copy of the framework. SC said they could send members a link to the framework.

**ACTION – OHG to provide a link to the HACT framework**

4.16 NM raised concerns about Section 106 contributions not being a direct benefit to the community by potentially being used by the council on other things. SC said that there are some S106 contributions which have to be made EG if you are increasing the number of children on a site there are specific contribution that have to be made in relation to this and these contributions are set by formulas. However in terms of the affordable housing S106, OHG does not pay contributions, they provide the housing.

4.17 AL asked who oversees all of the social value elements of the contract in terms of numbers of apprenticeships etc. SC said that this will be monitored by the joint venture supervisor, part of the team overseeing the procurement process - Arcadis. If they do not deliver on the level of social value agreed, OHG can fine them. SC added that they will make sure there is a clear line of communication so that the community can complain if the level of social value is not being delivered.

4.18 SC added that there will be a joint venture board made up of a 50-50 split between OHG and the developer and they will address any concerns and complaints around social value.

4.19 On the overall project time table, NM asked if the council could use delaying tactics. SC said this could be the case but there are ways of minimising this. EG for 'non-determination' – not meeting the legal deadline, OHG can put in an appeal. However the appeal can take some time. The key here is to ensure the council know where we are and are up to date on developments so there are no great surprises landing on their desk.

4.20 SC added that there are various departments within the council who have input into the planning application and these all need to be on board to ensure a smooth process. MT said that the current timetable is a slight change to what was in place and what has been sent out in the 4estates newsletter. JM said that it has to be made clear to the community that timetables are not set in stone and changes will happen. NM thanked SC for delivering the presentation.

4.21 LA said that the formal interviews will take place in St Johns community centre, the 50p club or in Club55 depending on availability. They are looking at week

commencing 19<sup>th</sup> June with two interviews per day, over two days. AL said she will not be available that week and NM said she will do her best but cannot commit due to child care issues. SC said that OHG can support NM with her child care requirements.

- 4.22 AL said would not be available for the formal JVP interviews on Tuesday 27<sup>th</sup> June. MT said he was not available for interviews week commencing 26<sup>th</sup> June. RC suggested the back of week commencing 12<sup>th</sup> June – maybe the 14<sup>th</sup>, 15<sup>th</sup>, or 16<sup>th</sup>. Thus is too soon for most parties. July 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> have been put forward on a provisional basis. OHG to check with JV candidates

**ACTION – OHG to feedback on availability of JV candidates on these dates**

- 4.23 SC suggested that we come up with four dates for the site visits to JV candidates projects – and that it does not need to be the same faces on the visits – this can be widened out to more interested people on the estate. OHG will try to arrange these dates before school breaks up. RC clarified that the four site visits would have to be between the formal interviews (provisionally 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup> July) and school break up (22<sup>nd</sup> July). NM suggested that someone film the site visit so these can be fed back to residents on the wider estate.

**ACTION – OHG TO COME BACK WITH DATES FOR THE FOUR SITE VISITS**

**Housing Needs Visit And Report**

- 4.24 LA said there has been little movement since the last meeting due mainly to resident not responding or answering the phone etc. NM said that the drop-in sessions should be publicised in the notice board at the entrance to Alice Shepherd House and RC added that Open Communities can do some door knocking on those who have still to complete the housing needs survey.

**Update On Voids And Decants**

- 4.25 There is still only one person who has moved out of Oak House although some are bidding and waiting for viewings. A couple of households have taken up the adult children moves and are pursuing this.
- 4.26 LA said a newsletter is being prepared which will have updates on the above as well as highlighting the questions asked at the estate event on 26<sup>th</sup> April. MT sent NM the questions asked by residents at the event. The responses from OHG will be in the newsletter. LA added that the drop-in flat (31) will have new flooring laid.

**5. AOB with OHG present**

- 5.1 JM asked for clarity on her situation if any of her adult children move out and get their own place. She is currently in a 3 bed and expects to get a three bed regardless of whether any of the adult children move out- following the 'like for like' discussions prior to the ballot. JM said that LA had said in a meeting that she was

entitled to Like for Like. LA said she doesn't remember saying this but that she would check with OHG to see if this is the case.

5.2 LA said that 'like for like' is the base commitment for everyone unless there is overcrowding and a bigger property is required. She added that it is a LBTH regeneration policy to offer adult children a higher priority when bidding. She would have to check if the policy says you would lose a bedroom if an adult child moved out. MT asked does this mean that it is 'like for like' regardless of under occupancy. LA said that is correct and advised that a single person in a 3 bed can expect like for like. However if there are adult children involved, OHG will have to check with LBTH if their policy on rehousing adult children would mean the reduction of a bedroom in the new property. AL said it was her understanding that if an adult child takes a property then you would lose a room.

#### **ACTION – LA to clarify the situation**

5.3 AL asked about a situation where a family were in a two bed and there were two adult children of the same sex. If one takes advantage of the higher bidding priority and moves out, the family will still require a two bed property. LA confirmed this was the case.

5.4 JM said she was upset at what is in effect breaking up families and that the adult children cannot secure a place on the new development. MT pointed out that a family in Kedge house on Tiller Rd accepted a property on Kingsbridge to get round this problem. JM was worried that she moves into a smaller property on the estate and her adult Children couldn't keep up with payment on their flat and there would be no room for them to move back in with her.

#### **6. AOB without OHG present**

6.1 AL asked about residents in Alice Shepherd House getting priority bidding status. NM also said there is a lack of clarity among some Alice Shepherd residents about when they get priority bidding and decant status. The RSG will continue to ask for a formal response on this from OH.

**Action – OH to provide a continual update on progress.**

6.2 CO asked if she could play a part in the JV candidate interview process as well as the site visits. RC said it would be great to have her play a part and suggested she attend the last of the meet and greet sessions this coming Tuesday morning.

#### **7. Date of next three meetings**

- Monday 26 June 2023
- Monday 24 July 2023
- Monday 28<sup>th</sup> August 2023 (Bank Holiday)