

Resident Steering Group Meeting for Alice Shepherd House & Oak House

26th Jan 2026

31 Alice Shepherd House and via Zoom

Residents:

Cynthia Owusu (CO)
Sasha Manley (SM)
Alia Begum (AB)
Salma Begum (SB)
Angela Greenaway

Resident Advocate

Mike Tyrrell (MT)

ITLA:

Murselin Islam– Open
Communities, (MI) Chair

Riverside

Paula Huzjak (PH)
Paul Handley (PaH)

1. Welcome, introductions and apologies.

1.1 MI took the Chair and welcomed attendees. Salma Begum (SB) from No 30 Alice Shepherd House joined the meeting for the first time and said she would like to attend these meetings going forward. RSG welcomed Salma Begum (SB).

1.2 Apologies – Daniel Palman, Isaac Amoah and Ray Coyle. Jane McGregor came in person to give her apology. MI said Sharon Homes has moved off the estate and she has informed MI that she will not be joining these meeting anymore. Sharon Homes has also informed the RSG WhatsApp group.

2. Minutes of Nov 24th RSG meeting – Agreed

3. Matters Arising

3.1(2.13) PH to find out Riverside incentives for giving up spare room - PH said Riverside do not have incentives for giving up spare room.

3.2 (2.20) Riverside will discuss with LBTH Alia Begum's registration process and early OT assessment – PH said they have started discussing the issue with LBTH and it is in progress. AB will be sorting out the necessary paperwork required.

3.3 (4.4) (4.4) Hill still to organise site visits as soon as possible to show their work and that of the architects – **Due.**

3.4 (4.5) (4.6) DP still to find example of schemes where height have been reduced through the process – **Due.**

3.5 (4.6) MI to send an electronic copy of the flow chart to RSG members. A final copy to be distributed by Riverside to RSG members before issuing to the rest of the residents - MI has distributed the flow chart and no specific comment has been

received. Riverside will issue the version to rest of the residents, and a larger printed copy will be on view at 31 Alice Shepherd House.

4. Update by Riverside

4.1 PaH said they are currently finalising the contract between Riverside and Hill. The contract negotiations are taking priority hence not much progress on other areas. A contract to build on this site is huge and complicated and this work has been going on for nearly a year now. SM asked whether it is normal for contract negotiation to take such a long time to conclude. PaH and MT said it is normal and used Tiller Road as an example where it took nearly 18 months to conclude and during that time they paused all other project works as well. It was also at the tail end of the pandemic.

4.2 PaH said Hill has agreed to 'work at risk' on this site which means all the works that Hill has done so far are done at their own risk as there is no contract with Riverside. This means the costs incurred by Hill are expected to be recovered from Riverside once a contract is signed. Riverside is hoping to conclude the contract talks by mid-March 2026 as there are only couple of issues (confidential) remaining. MT asked PaH for an example. PaH said normally this would cover various aspect of designing/building a new development e.g. who is responsible for decanting, who is responsible for paying for what, by what date responsible parties have to have everybody to move, what happens if everybody is not being moved by the agreed date etc. Every aspect of these issues need to be negotiated and agreed.

4.3 AG asked what made Hill so unique to be the developer for this project. CO said Hill was genuine in their approach, it was less corporate and more residents needs oriented. Their presentation and interview was more transparent and more connecting. MT said Hill is also a family business, so you know who to go to over any big issue. AB said residents visited projects delivered by Hill as well as the other developers. Residents felt the approach from Hill was more genuine and practical. MT and MI added working 'at risk' shows the interest and commitment from Hill as well.

4.4 AG said there is money to be made from the project which is also keeping Hill motivated. PaH said as a developer anyone would prefer to have good business or else it won't make sense as a business. For Riverside, it is a 'Non-profit' organisation, and its objective is to provide more housing to local people and if any money is made, it needs to be re-invested into the business. PaH said even though Riverside has worked with Hill on other projects, every project is unique and this one is a joint venture which is different in nature. PaH said a joint venture is an arrangement between Riverside and Hill where both parties are equal partners and are equally responsible, investing equal amount of money and making decision equally. In terms of Bellamy and Byng site it is owned by Mount Anvil, and they are building according to their design.

4.5 AB said it still feel like it is taking too long if Oak House has planning permission. PH said both Oak House and Alice Shepherd House are part of the same regeneration

programme. Oak House is being decanted first as it is the smaller block and is Phase One. PaH said the planning application for Oak House has not yet been submitted but should be by this coming Autumn. There are six residents (mix of tenant and leaseholder) left in Oak House. MT said it is important to keep asking about voids as any delay in decanting Oak House will delay the project. PaH said it is always helpful to get one of the blocks empty so that demolition can start as soon as planning permission is secured. AG asked whether leaseholders could hold the project back if they do not get the price they want. PA said the Demolition Notice has been served on Oak House, so they have to move out eventually. MT said normally landlords are generous during the negotiation process so as to get the job done. However, if it reaches the courts it can become very difficult for leaseholders to negotiate further.

4.6 SB asked if there are any incentives available to Alice Shepherd House residents. PH said only Oak House residents have decant status currently. Residents at Alice Shepherd will have decant status once planning permission is secured. MT said for those people who do find their suitable property through the bidding process they will rightly still qualify for Home Loss payment (currently £8100). AG asked what support will be in place for those who want to move back on site, triggering a second move. PaH said there will not be a second Home Loss payment, but residents will receive help with the second move (moving costs paid). SB asked about Riverside's internal waiting list. PH said they do have an internal waiting list which requires completing an application form. This option also requires residents to be prepared to move outside the borough.

4.7 Residents asked about an update on the request for site visits. PH said Hill has identified sites and but has not provided any dates/details as yet. Riverside will raise the issue with Hill. After a general discussion the meeting agreed that it will best to have a site visit before the start of the residents consultation event/s so that residents can contribute during the design consultation and influence the design features, based on what they liked and did not like on the visits. PaH said he would like to have the consultation starting from April but this depends on Hill's preparation. AG asked what will happen to void properties in the future. PH said they will form part of the council's temporary accommodation but if it is close to demolition dates, they would have guardians. AG requested dates for the next round of consultation events by the next RSG meeting. PaH said this cannot be guaranteed but they will try.

Action – Riverside to ensure site visit takes place before residents consultation.

5. AOB with Riverside – none

6. AOB without Riverside

6.1 MT reminded residents about the discussion in the last RSG about the Tiller Road planning application committee meeting on play facilities for the over 11s and the approach by Borough to take charge of the new community facility in Tiller Road

6.2 MT asked the residents whether they would like to protect the activities they have at the 50p Club. Residents said that it needs to be an open process where current groups work to bid for the management, but external organisation may need to work with them to prepare a bid for the management of the facility to best serve the community as current users may not have all the skills and experience to make such a bid. MT said residents/current users may want to consider working with a local organisation on the bidding for the management and that process can include others. MT said Island House did bid for the community facility at Tiller Road and it maybe good to have a discussion with them.

6.3 After further discussion the meeting decided to invite David Chesterton (who has experience on planning issues on play areas) to the February RSG and Paul Rogers from Island House for the March RSG.

Action – MT to invite David Chesterton for February RSG and Paul Rogers from Island House for March RSG.

7. Date of next meeting – 23rd February 2026