



Residents Meeting

12th April 2017

Present: Candida (chair), Arthur, Pam, Glen, Jackie, Maureen, Jill, Ahmed, Maggie
Advisor: Mike
Apologies: Tracy, Danny, Sue, Eliza, Lee, Monirul, Sheikh Rahman

The Chair reminded members that it is important that views, opinions and comments which are a part of the 4EF formal process of gathering and considering information, need to be aired and shared in the meeting, rather than in confidential conversations at other times.

1. Matters Arising from the Minutes of the Joint Meeting:

1. The Mayor's working group was not happy about a discussion of a ballot without the alternatives being available to consider. The Mayor needs an effective way to gauge whether there is support from the residents for a development scheme.
2. Argent has made it clear that at this stage they are unhappy about a ballot and are looking at some alternative options. (Voting is discussed later in the agenda)

2. Advisor's Report

The report is attached, these are comments and discussions arising:

1. SCS – information about the inside of inspected properties will not be available as this is covered by Data Protection.
2. Consultation Options – which option should we recommend?
3. We need to identify community and resident led drivers as an alternative to developer's drivers that will inform the Options to be considered.
4. JV drivers and Resident led ones may diverge, so it may be tricky finding common ground.
5. Community and resident drivers need to come from everyone effected and be the result of thorough consultation.
6. The drivers will inform the Options so they will determine the kind of development that is offered so it is important to get them right.
7. Many Estate redevelopments in London have been problematic and unpopular because the drivers and Options have been developer, HA or LA led.
8. The role of the consultation consultant (CC) will be crucial to developing the vision which can inform the community based drivers. They will have to be experienced and open to working within our framework.
9. The CC will need to have the trust of the residents and be selected by them for this to avoid the problems Soundings had.
10. Option 2 was agreed but with some revisions.
11. Deregulation - HAs have had some more deregulation which makes it easier for them to sell off properties.

3. Feedback from Kings Cross visit:

1. Environmentally it was very attractive but some the residential architecture was quite visually boring, and the density / outlooks caused concerns.
2. The more expensive properties are not selling as well as they have in the past, but the midrange apartments are sought after.

3. Argent have paid attention to the community and cultural aspects, and it definitely has a unique sense of place.

4. Voting and Ballots.

Following the discussion with the JV about their concerns about a ballot, members reviewed the pros and cons:

1. A vote safeguards the residents against a plan being pushed through without their agreement.
2. The developer has to come up with a proposal that is good enough to be voted for. It motivates them to do more than the legal minimum.
3. Any CPO's will need to have evidence that the offer was reasonable and a majority vote could provide this.
4. A vote is usually yes or no – there are no variations or ways to gauge a range of opinions or the grey areas.
5. It might be quite easy to get a yes result by appealing to specific groups (e.g. Non resident Leaseholders or overcrowded properties) and then there is a mandate to develop everybody.
6. Votes are a risk to the developer – it can halt their proposals in its tracks, or make them promise more than they want.
7. The information that feeds the vote can be misleading and manipulative (as the publicity for the stock transfer demonstrates)
8. The point in the process at which the vote takes place could have different results or expectations (beginning/end).
9. It must always be very clear throughout the process what is being voted for and what the consequences are at every stage.
10. Surveys to test opinion are very flawed as they can be fairly superficial responses.
11. Influential community leaders can sway a vote.
12. Discussion, careful consideration, arguing, challenging opinions and questioning should be an opportunity for every resident, in small, local, focussed groups.
13. The CC should have a lot of experience and passion to guide us through this process; the Consultation Strategy needs to reach out to where people are and in a way residents relate to

5. Consultation Consultant (CC) Long List

For the list of possible CCs see the attached report

1. Examples of good consultation / development can be found on the redevelopment of the Packington Estate in Islington and of the South Kilburn Estate.
2. As we are looking to have consultation at specific focussed points rather than for the whole project, the Public Relation Options are probably not viable.
3. To help us short list we can have a 1st tier vetting where all the long listed consultants give a short presentation and answer questions.
4. We will write a draft brief to include the revised options. Mike will discuss these at the JV coordinators meeting next week.
5. The JV can add to the long/short list.

6. JV Proposed Workstream

1. This has been revised from the version the JV presented at the previous meeting. It now includes the 4EF drivers, Options Appraisal and Consultation process.
2. As OH has claimed that the cost of maintaining the Estates exceeds the income, a request will be made for the documentation on the works carried out following the stock transfer, the last major works, and Barkantine's Estate Action refurbishment, and the Estates' maintenance programmes so it can be cross referenced with information from the SCS.

3. This will be requested when the SCS has been completed.