

Resident Steering Group Meeting for Alice Shepherd House & Oak House
Monday 24th February 2025
St John's Community Centre and via Zoom

Residents:

Cynthia Owusu (CO)
Sharon Holmes (SH) via zoom
Angela Greenaway (AG)
Jane McGregor (JM)

Riverside

Paula Huzjak (PH) via zoom

Hill (Joint Venture Partner)

Dan Palman (DP)

Resident Advocate

Mike Tyrrell

ITLA:

Ray Coyle – Open Communities,
Chair (RC) via zoom
Murselin Islam (MI)

1. Welcome, introductions and apologies.

1.1 RC took the Chair and welcomed attendees. There was no need for introductions or apologies

2. Minutes of RSG meeting of January 2025

These were accepted as a true record of the meeting with the following corrections:

2.1 SH said at 4.7 it should read her *'internal doors are much heavier than her front entrance door'* (see Matters Arising below) and as a result she does not think her street door is a fire door. PH said her team is chasing the information from the other team and will let her know once information received about when was the last time the the front entrance door got checked.

2.2 SH said at 5.2 it should read *'sparrows'* rather than *'parrots'*.

2.3 SH said at 7.1 it should read *'dishwasher'* rather than *'washing machine'*.

3 Matters Arising

3.1 (6.5) AG wanted to know when will the timeline and commitment table be displayed at 31 Alice Shepherd House.

ACTION – PH to complete.

3.2 (3.3) Extra bedroom and related issues – This is discussed in agenda item 5 below.

3.3 (6.6) Adult-child housing issue – This is discussed in agenda item 5 below.

4. Update from Riverside/ Hill

4.1 PH said they are still working on the issue of the adult-child and related questions. Once the FAQ is complete it will be circulated to Alice Shepherd House residents

4.2 PH said Isaac has nearly completed the Housing Needs survey and some residents need help updating their housing application and supporting documents.

4.3 DP said Hill have achieved a lot through information gathering about the site and now have a better idea of how the scheme massing might look (shared in the last RSG meeting). They are aiming to conclude this process by next week then concentrate on the next stage - designs that reflects the requirements from the housing needs survey.

4.4 RC asked about the next residents engagement event. PH said they are aiming for first week in April. JM asked when the first design/shape of the buildings will be presented to the community as the residents do not want a completed design presented to them. MT asked whether this could be during the April event. DP said the April event will be looking at the massing of the buildings with input from residents. MT said the event should seek the feedback of residents on the initial massing and feedback on this input at the following event. PH said the initial massing the RSG seen in the last meeting has been developed a bit further with more information – this will be on show at the April consultation event.

4.5 RC said it is very important that wider community – other than the RSG – are involved in this and said the April event needs to be promoted and publicised to ensure this.

4.6 MT said residents liked the high number of ground floor maisonettes from the previous plans (PRP) but what has recently been shown is only a few ground floor maisonettes, due to the planners request for public open space in front of the phase one block. DP said no decisions have been made on the numbers and that they are aware of the preferences. He said Hill have to accommodate all the required standards (plant rooms, bins, bike spaces, parking etc). MT suggested providing these requirement in the taller block and maximise the ground floor maisonettes in this linear block. DP noted the issue. PH said everything that goes into the planning application will be explained and the reasoning will be given to residents. Trees along Manchester Road have a Tree Protection Order (TPO) which will have influenced the design. RC said it is crucial that decisions such as this, and the justification for them, are communicated clearly to the RSG.

4.7 SH asked for examples of what was liked/not liked by the planners at LBTH. DP said the planners liked the rational for the southern block (phase one), how trees are protected, the linear block with open landings and the tower elements. Planners had some reservation on options for the northern site (phase 2) and have given a steer on a third option which will be developed a bit further on. Planners did not like the two towers on the northern site because of the impact on neighbours re daylight/sunlight issues.

5. Commitments in landlord Offer

5.1 General lengthy discussion took place re bedroom entitlement for tenants if they want to take advantage of LBTH adult-child initiative. Tenants not happy that they will

have to downsize if the adult child option is taken up. They said they were told previously that the new homes would be like for like and nothing in the offer document stated that this would be affected by adult children moving out. In a worst case scenario, tenants would still want to, have one extra bedroom. SH said she has checked LBTH policy which says tenants will be entitled to one extra bedroom even if adult children move out as part of a regeneration programme. RC said Riverside's own policy states that tenant can under occupy by one bedroom but that it is the policy of LBTH which matters here.

5.2 RC said he has checked through the minutes from the time OC started as ITLA and found no reference to this. It may have been discussed when the previous ITLA was in place but OC does not have access to these minutes. MT advised that all the minutes are on the \$EF website. SH said this might not have been minuted but it was discussed at very early stage of the project.

5.3 CO said it needs to be ensured that all current tenants get priority when the block is complete, before anyone on the waiting list gets offered a home and she is concerned that this might not happen. MT said that Riverside have confirmed that first priority is for current tenants and that residents staying on the estate should be allocated a home/plot number in the relevant building/floor off-plan. He suggested that once a home is chosen, residents should receive a formal confirmation letter from Riverside confirming the allocated plot/floor/flat. MT added once homes are allocated, this should allow Hills to work with residents to choose the colour scheme for their internals i.e. bathroom, kitchen etc.

5.4 RC discussed the relevant parts of the Landlord Offer re commitments made to tenants as well as tenant aspirations and highlighted the relevant parts and asked all to go through the information - as it is related to a lot of what we are discussing at this meeting - and come back with comments/queries. RSG agreed to take back the papers and comeback to Ray/Murselin with any comments.

ACTION - MI to email the relevant pages to all RSG members.

5.5 JM said the landlord Offer was delivered to all residents prior to the ballot and asked the RSG members to check whether it contains the same wording that OC is asking them to read now, to ensure nothing has been changed.

5.6 AG asked when the planning application is going to be submitted. MT said that when he asked the question he was advised that it has changed from Summer to Autumn.

6 AOB without Riverside

None

7 Date of next meeting

Monday 24th March 2025