



Residents Meeting
6th September 2017

Present	Residents: Maggie (Chair) , Danny, Jackie, Maureen, Jill, Pam, Arthur, , Glen, Ahmed Advisor: Mike	
Apologies	Candida, Eliza, Tracy, Sue, (Lee, Monirul, Sheikh)	
		Action
1.	We need to decide how to respond to the ultimatum from OH to begin setting up a process to appoint a consultant for the consultation process.	
	Points made in the General discussion	
2.	We still need to see the stock condition survey before we can decide.	
3.	OH was originally doing this redevelopment for maintenance purposes – they say this is not the case now it is for other reasons.	
4.	There will be a full consultation at some time, we cannot stop that.	
5.	We can't appoint the consultation consultants (we do not have the power or mandate to make that decision). The residents will make that decision.	
6.	We need a consultant to to advise us on how to do the consultation process and how to work with residents to make this decision.	
7.	OH should have the same interest as ourselves in taking the residents along with this.	
8.	Are we influential enough to change OH's intentions?	
9.	Can TH show their hand. OH has not consulted with them about the consultation.	
10.	OH have never said what their idea of better is so there is still more information needed on what will be consulted on.	
11.	Rachel Blake is meeting with the new OH CEO soon and can put TH's concerns forward.	
12.	Once we start going down any consultation route they can say "gotcha!"	
13.	OH needs the project for financial reasons so need to push on with it.	
14.	We need to know OH intentions and options are – this should become evident from our meeting with the new CEO.	
15.	If OH won't fund our own consultant, we need to look for other funding. CW has offered us the money for previous support like this.	
16.	The SCS needs to be carefully interpreted for people on each estate. How is OH going to present this to residents in a fair way?	
17.	Who are we now dealing with following the changes in the directorate and as Argent are not on the scene anymore – who is directing Leila to push this forward.	

18.	We need to be reasonable all the time to keep our credibility.	
19.	To remain credible OH needs to share all the information and consult very thoroughly - even though there are no obligations to do that.	
20.	Can John Biggs put in writing that he requires a right to vote before he will agree to any CPO's.	TBC as action
21.	An alternative to voting was used in Lambeth recently – is this really going to be acceptable as residents still challenged it validity.	
22.	A resident led process is not a token consultation. We require a model of excellence which can show what a successful process can be.	
23.	Are we being a buffer stopping the residents from finding out what is happening. We are trying to communicate effectively through our newsletter - but should we be having more public meetings?	
24.	If the mayor is going to back the vote the voting process, it must be seen to be fair.	
25.	What is the council's role in the proposed consultation board, if at all?	
26.	Why is OH proposing undue haste and deadline setting – they have taken a lot of time to get it this far, why now? What is pre-empting this haste?	
27.	How can there be the same consultation on all 4 estates – it will not be a one size fits all, and any development is likely to take 20 years anyway – according to OH original proposals.	
28.	What is "resident led" really meaning from OH's point of view. With the OH board's unpredictability and lack of empathy for residents, it is questionable what they might mean by it.	
29.	The consultation board will be much more complicated than proposed - each estate has a different timescale, who chairs it, dispute resolution, what if residents disagree	
30.	Are there different models of consultation available – our consultant will help us with this.	
31.	A genuine resident led process would be giving all the information in all ways and then giving a vote for residents to decide. If it is done any other way it not resident led but HA led manipulated / led.	
32.	Any process needs to be clearly signposted and clear right at the beginning otherwise we will have been consulted already without realising it.	
33.	Resident led is not a standard consultation plan made by someone and residents might agree to it. It is a plan that has been meaningfully developed / emerged from / by the residents. We might be developing something that doesn't exist.	
34.	We should not be making decisions but we could be steering it in a better way.	
35.	Consultation needs to be tailored to all the different groups so everyone has an input.	
36.	Talking to George C will give us more confidence in how to go forwards.	
37.	Use him to discuss what has worked and what might be successful on our estates.	

38.	New CEO - is his commitment to Project Stone to continue with it or to review it.	
39.	We can tell OH that we are exploring our ideas about consultation- we are not accepting their brief or responding to their brief.	
	Decisions:	
40.	We will apply for other funding for a consultant like George, independently and without OH's involvement to help us work out what a resident led process is like.	
41.	We will approach CW for independent funding for the consultant	Mike and Maggie
42.	We will approach George Cochran to see if he is willing to come and talk with us and discuss some ideas / ways forward.	Mike
43.	We will write to Cllr Rachel Blake informing TH of the position OH has put us in and to try to get an indication from the OH CEO how he will be involving TH in the consultation process.	Mike and Arthur
	AOB	
44.	Mike will circulate a route for the CEO's visit later in the month. Does Richard need a break before the meeting, and we might provide refreshments.	Mike
45.	What do Kingsbridge residents think about being listed - there are implication about it re lifts etc. It is felt that residents are generally in favour of this.	