

Joint meeting 2.11.16

Present:

Residents: Arthur, Ahmed, Maggie, Geraldine, Jill, Pam, Danny, Tracey, Candida, Glen
Joint Venture: Anthony (A), Robert (A), Chris Hageman (OH Head of Major Projects), Tom
Dobson (Quad)

Advisor to 4EF: Mike Tyrrell

Apologies: Jackie, Maureen, Sarah, Alex.

Options Appraisal (Mike and Robert were not present for this discussion)

Tom Watson from Quad gave a presentation about the methodology that could be used for the Options Appraisal. The presentation document is the background homework - it will not be informing any decisions but is exploring the parameters.

Issues discussed:

1. Residents do not feature in the Key Drivers Section - it is all about bricks and mortar. Residents and TH comments should change this emphasis.
2. The Objectives and Outcomes need to reflect people's lives and the social value of the homes and community here now. Change should not be seen as inevitable.
3. It is important to emphasize the increase and importance of the social housing.
4. The pressure being put on the Utilities and Infrastructure are a major concern for the community.
5. Data from the Stock Condition Survey will be a major influence on the Appraisal.
6. Possible options should not worry residents as you can't reject an option before it is formed.

7. The options based on the 20% and 40% "worst condition" blocks is based on current OH data and can well change with more up to date information.
8. Any information used to consult or inform residents needs to be in a very understandable way to avoid misunderstanding. Only the realistic options would be presented.
9. The financial assessment options show the value over 30 years.
10. High Leaseholder numbers, CIL, and investment in social, educational and health facilities as well as the infrastructure and utilities increase the development costs considerably.
11. The costs are assuming there will be no GLA or G'ment funding.
12. Of the 35% affordable, 30% is social rents and 70% intermediate affordable rents.
13. The JV has not opted into the Heseltine 'sink estate' funding.
14. The residents will probably have a different starting point on the Social Impact Mapping and may want to define the impact in another way.
15. *Next Steps*: residents need to decide their response and what changes they want to see.

Action: to be discussed at next resident 4EF meeting?

JV Consultation:

16. Kingsbridge is not officially engaged in consultation and misunderstandings have arisen. In order to give the answers to the Kingsbridge questions some weight, a slightly more formal approach was used, but this is not binding on residents or considered as being part of a process.
17. Residents do need to have a clear idea of the structure of the consultation strategy and process so they can feel in control of what happens to information and the views they give.
18. The consultation process will be put on hold for the time being until the advisor can look at some examples of successful practice and make some recommendations.

OH Role:

19. Some 4EF resident members are finding themselves vulnerable to criticism from their estate groups for engaging with OH about development in the 4EF. OH's low profile has not begun to address trust issues with residents and there is still a lot of negative response to any consideration of development or even engagement.
20. OH managers need to engage with 4EF and develop a strategy to start building trust with residents.

Action – Chris and Robert

21. It was agreed that the Island Area Board does not need to be part of our engagement or the advisors consultation.
22. Progress in the last few months between the JV, the 4EF, Soundings and the residents has been difficult because there are lots of different expectations and considerations but we are making slow progress. The appointment of an advisor should ease this.

Stock Condition Survey (SCS):

23. This is probably going to be done by TH so there have been issues about liability and ownership as it will be done on behalf of the residents
24. In the first instance an independent SCS surveyor will probably look at the data available, its suitability and identify what information is still required. The advisor needs to coordinate this.
25. There will be a difference in interpreting the data depending on whether it was done for maintenance, refurbishment, or redevelopment purposes.
26. It would help if this could be progressed asap but we are in the council's hands.

Action – Advisor to liaise

Resident Representation Structure:

27. This will probably need to be a group based on formally elected representatives from existing interested groups. Whether all those groups have to be constitutional needs to be considered.
28. This may need to be done soon as communication needs to be established between the JV and residents in a more multi-lateral way as there is a perception of secrecy and misinformation can thrive.

Action - Advisor

Advisor's Role

- a. Investigating schemes like Woodberry Down and Aberfeldy so we can learn from what works and doesn't, what went wrong as well as right - how developers have been able to work successfully with residents. What resident consultation structures have been successful.
- b. Looking at successful Resident's Charters.
- c. Attending residents' meetings, (but not approaching the Area Board at the moment)
- d. Writing a draft constitution for the new representative group.
- e. Liaise with the leading officer at TH about the mayor's working group, subgroups, stock condition, etc.
- f. Stock Condition – explore the different appropriate levels of investigation e.g. SCS's are different for funders, developers, HA's or planners.
- g. The advisor needs to be on the panel to appoint any surveyor involved in assessing or doing a SCS.

Managing Advisor

- h. There needs to be a format / place where info is shared within the group so each estate feels included and decisions are transparent.
- i. A short summary of the advisor's activities will be available for Forum meetings.