

**Resident Steering Group Meeting for Alice Shepherd House & Oak House**  
**22<sup>nd</sup> September 2025**  
**31 Alice Shepherd House and via Zoom**

**Residents:**

Cynthia Owusu (CO)  
Jane McGregor (JM)  
Sharon Holmes (SH) via zoom  
Sasha Manley (SM)  
Angela Greenway (AG)

**Resident Advocate**

Mike Tyrrell, Chair (MT)

**ITLA:**

Murselin Islam– Open  
Communities, (MI)

**Riverside**

Paula Huzjak (PH)  
Isaac Amoah (IA)

**Hill**

Daniel Palman (DP)

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

1.1 MT took the Chair and welcomed attendees.

1.2 Apologies – Ray Coyle.

**2. Minutes of RSG meeting of July 2025**

2.1 These were accepted as a true record of the meeting

**3. Matters arising**

3.1 (3.1) MI to share January presentation and July consultation boards. PH to send the consultation boards to MI – Completed.

3.2 PH would inform the RSG if any progress made – no update at this stage.

3.3 (3.4) IA has shared a list with SH of areas where Riverside properties are available. A newsletter will inform wider residents about areas outside of Tower Hamlets where Riverside have a number of properties available – completed.

3.4 (4.11) PH and Hill will give feedback on the planning meeting at the next RSG meeting – to be discussed as part of project update.

3.5 MI to send example service charges of Tiller Road to RSG members as well as the table showing Council Tax charges by band for 2025/6 to be added to these minutes – MI to send example service charges after this meeting. JM said changes in the council tax

band will significantly increase the council tax which will put some residents in serious difficulties. MT said that on projects he has worked on with new builds, all the new properties go up by at least two bands.

**Action - MI to send example service charges after this meeting.**

#### **4. Update from Riverside/ Hill**

4.1 DP said the meeting with planners took place on 31<sup>st</sup> July but they are still waiting for feedback. The feedback has been delayed and is expected anytime soon. Meeting with the Highways team took place separately on 27<sup>th</sup> August as they could not attend the main meeting. RSG will be updated as soon they get the feedback. DM said this delay is making it difficult for them to progress with design works at the moment, as they need to take on board their comments alongside those made by residents at the last consultation event.

**Action - RSG will be updated as soon they get the feedback.**

4.2 JM asked who Hill has met so far from LBTH and what has been discussed. DP said they have met with the case officer (who would be dealing with day-to-day application or pre-application issues), sustainability officers, highways officers, housing team member and refuse team member. Hill has presented what has been shown to the RSG and what was shown at the consultation event including building, location of parking, refuse etc.

4.3 JM and SH said residents were against the 17-storey building (southern block) but now Hill has shown this plan to the council. DP said the 10-storey plan was part of the PRP original plan and since Hill came on board and with the changes required to fit in two staircases, they have had to redesign and are now sharing their ideas with residents and LBTH, but it does not mean that this plan is now fixed. They are still working to get a viable scheme. SH said residents views need to be reflected in the plan. DP said the RSG meeting and consultation events are providing a lot of feedback for the planning of the scheme. It is important to wait for feedback form the planners at this stage which may well include the heights of the block/s.

4.4 SH said only 50% of the residents attended the consultation events and asked how many actually provided feedback. DP said that it was a mixture of written and verbal feedback, notes on the plan and hand written comments. In addition, residents who did not attend, have been contacted for their feedback. SH said she has not received any design documentation (July consultation boards and January presentation pack). MI confirmed it was sent on 6<sup>th</sup> August to all RSG members; he will resend the information to SH.

**Action – MI to resend the information to SH.**

4.5 MT asked about any in-meeting feedback from planners. DP said it was very high-level feedback around numbers of affordable housing, decant strategy, refuse strategy

and bin collection, Hill's understanding of the tenures, children's play areas and open space requirements.

4.6 DP thanked those who have completed Housing Needs Surveys. This will help Hill to progress and lock in the design brief for the architects and work through the floor plans/layouts with residents over the coming months.

4.7 DP said they are looking into finishing off the website by next week that will have all the relevant project information for residents. PH said the website will be promoted through newsletters, emails and during consultation events.

**Action – To promote through newsletters, emails and during consultation events.**

4.8 Residents again expressed their dissatisfaction about the height of a 17 storey block. DP said it is an iterative process, and it takes time to develop a scheme by working with residents. He added that since the ballot, changes have taken place re regulation and that that it is not just about the re-provision of existing homes but also the delivery of additional affordable homes as well as residents preferences re design. All of this can impact on height.

4.9 MT summarised going forward his understanding that Hill/Riverside will take on board feedback from the planners and resident's feedback from the event as well as feedback from residents who did not manage to attend the event. PH confirmed this to be the case.

4.10 A letter went out to residents on 24<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup> July that covers confirmation of existing housing needs.

4.11 In addition, the letter offered an appointment for those who want to provide feedback. Riverside would then meet with them to discuss the information presented at the July event. Some residents have taken up the option to provide feedback while others have already provided feedback via the form that went out with the letters. MT suggested sending out another reminder letter to residents for feedback and option for an appointment. PH agreed.

**Action – Riverside to send out another reminder letter to residents for feedback and option for an appointment.**

4.12 DP said there will be more consultation events over the coming months and Riverside and Hill will have more pre-app meetings with planners before reaching planning application stage, so there are more opportunities for residents preferences. After the planning application submission, the council will carry out statutory consultation with residents and other stakeholders. If any amendments are required, LBTH will carry out further consultation on amended plan/s. MT provided the example of Tiller Road second round statutory consultation due to an amendment on the plan after first round of statutory consultation.

4.13 AG suggested having a file folder with hard copies of all types of letters, leaflets, project plans, and records of events at 31 Alice Shepherd House so that when residents drop-in on Wednesdays they can look at information on how the project/plans have evolved over the time.

**ACTION - PH agreed to set a folder with all relevant information and place it at 31 Alice Shepherd House.**

4.14 Residents asked about bin types and collection points. DP said traditional bin stores with doors are planned for the scheme rather than the underground type. Doors will be fob keyed with different types of bins for different types of refuse. There will be no bin chute. MT and residents raised concerns with this as people have to carry their rubbish bags all the way to the bin store then enter it to put refuse in to the correct bin. MT said that this is a disastrous solution as on other schemes he has worked on, residents have feared going in to the bin room because of rats, and as a result rubbish is not put into the bins. They are also difficult for disabled residents to use. DP said they have not gone into that level of details and will have a look into this. MT also suggested ensuring that nothing faces Stewart Street as this may invite residents from the other side of the street to use the bins. DP acknowledged these problems and added that management of the bin stores can be an issue as well. He added that there will be further discussion on this as part of waste strategy.

4.15 Riverside Update – PH said there are two moves from Oak House. One has already moved and the other move is imminent. Conversations with leaseholder are in progress but not concluded yet. A resident from Alice Shepherd House has been offered a property via Home Connection, Riverside’s own internal listing. These are all permanent moves. There are four social tenants and three leaseholders left in Oak House, the remainder are occupied by guardians. Residents are being informed of areas where Riverside have properties when they contact the team and also information has been sent out through newsletter. IA meets with the Letting and Voids team every week to keep a check on properties that are void or about to become void in order to match them with residents’ requirements. Home Connection properties are not available for adult children. Those who have started moving out will be eligible to receive the home-loss payment (does not include adult child). Two residents have already received the payment. PH said at Alice Shepherd voids property will be let as temporary accommodation. SH said she will respond to PH/IA’s email, she did not have enough time recently to reply.

## **5. Questions/queries from RSG**

5.1 AG asked PH to explain the term ‘freeze’ when it comes to housing need; and what impact it will have on any change in housing needs of residents as the project progresses. PH said the architect requires information now for the designs to be presented at the next consultation so that the needs of existing residents are catered for. Of course this will change over time, and further freeze dates as the project progresses will have to take into consideration any changes to household needs. At the moment the architect needs to know how many homes to build (re-

provide) as well as the size of homes etc. AG asked if potential changes to households' needs (size of household, health conditions etc) which might, for example, require an extra room for family member/carer – will be taken into account after the 'freeze'.

5.2 SA said the Offer Document states 'like for like' but it does not explain the position if the 'adult children housing option' is taken up in terms of the impact on the main tenant. Residents were under the impression that the 'adult children housing option' is a separate issue from the 'like for like' promise in the Offer Document and Riverside didn't explained that these two could be interlinked. If this was known, many residents would not have voted for it. JM agreed and wanted it noted that this issue is stressing her out and making her ill. PH said these are LBTH policies and that it is not Riverside's decision and that she cannot see how any promise could have been made about this in the Landlord Offer while Riverside is signed up to the Common Housing Register. After further discussion on this issue meeting agreed that MT will investigate minutes of earlier meetings at the start of the regeneration process and will report back to residents. PH will request a statement from Paul Handley regarding this issue. SH said the group needs to write to the LBTH about the situation and ask for a consideration for extra bedroom/like for like issue.

**Action - MT will investigate minutes of earlier meetings at the start of the regeneration process and will report back to residents.**

**Action - PH will request a statement from Paul Handley regarding this issue.**

5.3 SH and JM said the 'freeze' should be delayed until needs for number of bedroom situation is clarified. MT said in other project this a common practice and without these numbers the architects really cannot make any design progress. There will be further stages which will result in more freeze dates. MI provided an example of Southwark Council project and how two bedroom and one-bedroom homes in one block been turned into three-bedroom larger family homes. PH said the 'freeze' is a starting point for architects not a finishing point.

**Action - Next newsletter to clarify the 'freeze' term, and perhaps 'lock' may be a better term.**

5.4 PH and MT explained other stages of consultation over the course of the project that will allow residents to choose internal layouts (open plan or not), internal colour schemes and floor levels. SM asked whether residents need to do two internal design consultation if they make two moves. PH said it will not be required as by that time residents would be making a decision on their permanent home. PH reiterated that the event in July was a high-level discussion and that there will be numerous consultation/discussions before the final design is reached. Residents should not worry about the final design at this stage as there is considerable consultations still to take place.

5.5 AG asked whether she would have a choice of floors for the first decant move to southern block (if she chooses to have second move). PH said she should be able to do so as there will be more social housing homes than what is required. There will be a schedule of properties that will help with those decision. SH asked when residents will know about the split (number of different size properties). PH said this information should be available by the next round of consultation events. MT said he is expecting this information and other layout information from Hill after they receive the feedback from the planners.

5.6 AG suggested having a meeting where residents can ask their choice of questions and receive answers from Hill/Riverside and for it to be minuted. SH and JM supported this suggestion and said there has only been one Q & A session since the beginning of the project.

**Action - PH will look into the suggestion further.**

## **6. AOB without Riverside**

6.1 Residents suspect Riverside intentionally withheld information about the link between 'like for like', 'downsizing' and 'adult child option' to achieve a positive ballot result. JM and SH said their health has been affected by this issue. SH said the effect of stress and anxiety caused by this should be minuted as it was not minuted the last time it was discussed. MT said the Teviot estate has a few residents who are facing similar issues.

6.2 SH said residents in Alice Shepherd House have not yet got to the stage she is at, about arguing over the size of her property and whether it is a 2 bed 3 person or 2 bed 4 person property and that this could impact on other residents. MT asked SH about the bedroom sizes recorded in her tenancy. **SH will inform MT by Friday.** She added that both her bedrooms are doubles so it is a 2 bed 4 person unit according to her tenancy. MT said the 1957 Housing Act defined a double room as being over 110sq feet and that this has not changed under subsequent legislation. SM said her bedrooms meet the 2 bed 4 person spec which will probably be the case in other 2 bed properties in Alice Shepherd House. Residents should check their tenancy agreements for this information.

**6.3 Action - MT said he will request PH to confirm that every replacement two bed home in phase two will be 2 bed 4 person - as is the case at Tiller Road.**

6.4 SH said PH informed her that her home is 70sq metres which would be wrong according to the Energy Performance Certificate.

**Action - MT to ask PH for the measurement of homes based on the plan for the Right to Buy, which is more reliable than other sources.**

**6.5 Action - MT to follow up with PH about garage use by non-residents.**

7. Date of next meeting  
Monday 27<sup>th</sup> October 2025.