



Residents / OH Meeting

28th June 2017

Present

Residents: Maggie (Chair) Glen, Danny, Ahmed, Jackie, Maureen, Jill, Eliza, Pam, Arthur,

OH: Leila, Chris

Advisor: Mike

Apologies: Candida, Tracy (Sue, Lee, Monirul, Sheikh)

1 Feedback from OH

a. Re. JG's letter.

OH has withdrawn their bid to the GLA for Kingsbridge and the GLA will confirm it taken it out the programme.

b. The Kingsbridge letter will go out soon.

c. The consultation process was supposed to start during the summer but this has been paused so that trusting relationships can be rebuilt and the new CEO will be in place. Argent may be involved again then.

d. OH wants to reinforce the resident led process, that is how they want to take the process forward.

e. Argent still want to continue with the project. Their USA partner should not make any difference.

f. If Argent were to drop out OH would seek another partner.

g. The reference to "the outcome of ongoing consultation on the Kingsbridge" in the JG response is unacceptable. No consultation has been going on. It could be described as "market research" or PR, but definitely not consultation.

h. Do OH have the resources to do the Options Appraisal on its own without a partner?

i. It seems to many residents that there is just one option for Project Stone: Argent's big development.

j. There needs to be a process to see if residents want to go on the development route - it must not be seen to be predetermined.

k. Is the GLA bid just indicative (this is not shown on the screen shots for the bid)? The system shows this an "approved supplier bid". Apparently the software was unable to show it as only "indicative"

l. How do OH and Argent spend £2m on this project so far?

m. If a new Development partner is needed, OH sees no reason why they would not consider consulting with residents about the appointment of a new partner.

n. We will not start looking at consultants until the SCS has reported back and that will probably be the first thing to consult on.

o. The surveyors will be feeding back findings to residents, not OH, and an advisor with a special skill-set will probably help them communicate the implications to residents.

p. **What do residents want OH do to try to address the trust issues?**

q. The area board is not being seen as a way to build trust. Just putting their names on the website is not going to be the answer.

r. What is the right way forward for OH to set up transparency - would OH consider elections from resident groups? What is the recruitment criteria for the area boards at the moment?

s. How much do OH value the contribution we make. In £hours we are a very valuable resource.

t. Arthur and Mike will work on a response to JG's letter and this will include some feedback on trust issues.

2 Stock Condition Survey

- a. Hunters have done all their surveys.
- b. They have done some Leaseholders on St Johns to make up the numbers in blocks where there are not enough tenants.
- c. Additional surveys on pipe work, lifts, refuse chutes, insulation, cold bridging, etc on the high rise are being done as extra checks, so are delaying the completion.
- d. The cladding is being tested by OH, not by Hunters.

3 Independent Consultation Process

- a. This will not happen until after the SCS is finished and will probably involve the JV
- b. A Board will need to be set up to appoint the consultant
- c. We need to agree the brief and long list procedure. (OH will add to long list as well)
- d. Short interviews can be held to help short list.
- e. The 4EF needs to comment on, discuss and agree the brief – should this happen before the SCS results are through?
- f. The strategy should all be in place by Christmas.
- g. When the consultation gets going that will address some of the uncertainty - we need to find the balance with this and doing it steadily and thoroughly without being pressured.
- h. OH/JV has the opportunity to develop a model process / best practice for consulting with residents effectively on projects like these.
- i. There is no timeline or target dates as it has to be done at the resident's pace.

Residents only part of meeting

4 Trust issues and Response to JG's letter

- a. Hearing tenants voices and not listening to their concerns was an issue at the Grenfell fire - so the composition of resident boards may be changed as a result.
- b. TRA's are asking practical questions of OH and we don't get a response from OH staff who are supposed to find out information. E.g. Fire escapes. This makes it difficult for TRA's to work with OH and have confidence in it.
- c. We really want to change the structure so there is genuine 2 way communication and the CEO does not get the wrong impression, as seems to be the case at the moment.
- d. Are the actions in the 'fire assessments' actually carried out. It is all very well saying we have had a full assessment done, but it is the actions that are going to make the residents safe, not the assessment.
- e. James Murray will be invited to come to walk around and attend a meeting. ACTION: Mike?
- f. Umesh Desai wants to come so needs a date (12th July) ACTION: Mike
- g. Introduction to Richard Hill and invite to October meeting. ACTION: Arthur

5 AOB

- a. Planning Forum - they will try and keep everything in and anything that is not included will put in as Community Wishes/Guidelines.

- b. We will write to the GLA and ask them to confirm the bid is withdrawn and that they will not consider any plans on our estates and for any proposals should be considered under the continuous bidding process. There needs to be formal confirmation that they have withdrawn consideration.

ACTION: Mike to write to Janet Trench.

6 To be considered:

- I. When they employ the consultant the consultation will have officially started.
- II. If we wait for the SCS results, will the consultant be up and running enough to respond to the results and be prepared for the Options Appraisal.