



Minutes of the Joint Meeting

Wednesday 13th June 2018

Phoenix Heights Community Centre

with Richard Hill, OHG CEO

Present

Residents: Candida, Jill, Heidi, Pam, Arthur, Ahmed, Glen, Maggie, Jackie, Maureen, Kim, Deidre

OHG: Richard Hill, Chris Hageman, Leila Arefani, Paul Handley,

Advisor: Mike

Apologies: Lesley, Cherie, Eliza

Apologies and Introductions

A. Minutes – 25.4.18 agreed

B. Richard's Presentation

1. Any ideas presented at the meeting are only possible ways of moving forward, no decisions or agreements have been made.
 2. OHG has a new chair, Steve Douglas.
 3. There have been more community and youth activities on the Island.
 4. OH is trying to be more transparent and open about what its intentions are.
 5. The SCS has been a useful piece of work.
 6. There is a case for some work to go ahead on the Island even if Project Stone has gone.
 7. We need to be clear about where OH wants to be. There has been a lot of uncertainty for a few years so OH wants to give some ideas about what might be expected.
 8. Project Stone was very top down and has been seen as misjudged.
 9. The option to demolish and rebuild has been abandoned.
-

C. OH preferred Approach

1. The resident led process of engagement should include ideas that can be consulted on rather than talks about talks.
 2. OH, 4EF and residents should walk together to work up options to be considered as options.
-

D. What would Engagement look like? – Discussion Points

1. There needs to be a variety of approaches. What role, then, would external professionals play?
 2. There has been some successful OH engagement in Camden recently.
 3. Unless the consultation is adequate, any vote would be turned down.
 4. All 4 estates will not be tackled at once and which areas, blocks, estates etc will be tackled will be decided within the engagement strategy.
 5. The options are open ended at the moment about how this works.
 6. Top down Project Stone did not work, but the process needs to recognise that both residents and Oh have an important role to play.
 7. Sometimes OH's expertise in identifying options is more useful than doing it from a complete bottom up approach.
-

8. There needs to be a balance between structural drivers (eg the state of the buildings) and community and quality of life drivers. The softer approaches need to be important too (eg ASB etc)
9. Trust is still an issue so a OH led approach might cause concern. Building trust is going to have to be fundamental to this.
10. OH is working through some of its issues which undermine trust and this may take a while but that does not mean structural problems shouldn't be addressed at the same time.
11. There is still a divide between how OH thinks about engagement and residents' experiences and expectations.
12. Options will come from identified objectives and these will evolve. The problems experienced by residents need to define the objectives.
13. We could talk to some residents in Camden to get feedback about their process.
14. OH wants to consider other options like Extra Care for the Island as well as "like for like".
15. Rather than look at homes through the prism of problems, instead, we could look at what residents like about their homes.
16. There needs to be a balanced conversation, starting from a blank sheet of paper where people can explore the community and the home they want.
17. The GLA may want it to be denser than residents, but the GLA is not driving this.
18. OHG seems to divide development and services into separate compartments where residents see it as a single entity.
19. OH will start talking to customers about their experiences about repairs.
20. Residents want OH to be seen to be addressing their problems rather than words.
21. The potential to improve some residents' homes should not be held up because the repairs service needs sorting out. They can be done in parallel.
22. How can OH be trusted to build / refurbish homes if they can't show they can repair them.

E. Which areas of which estates should be focused on?

1. Some of our estate properties perform poorly or have some design problems. This may have been identified by the SCS or by residents' feedback.
2. There are a number of issues identified on Kingsbridge, for example, where OH would want to talk to residents to explore solutions that may throw up a range of options.
3. This is an opportunity to engage with residents about what they think and to have the conversation... without any expectations.
4. Another identified area is Alice Shepherd and Oak House, Samuda Estate Office and community centre.
5. Kedge, Starboard and Winch on Barkantine is the third area and may be considered because there are considerations with the print work development, Tiller baths and the Energy Centre.
6. Developing small areas like this does affect the viability and potential of both Barkantine and Samuda estates as a whole.
7. Discussions about the potential areas need to be handled carefully as when it is opened up there needs to be the opportunity to get accurate information and clarity that there are no plans, just the beginning of the conversation.
8. Why weren't these problems responded to following the Hunters survey in 2006, how will leaseholders be able to pay for this, and who will have the vote?
9. How do we reconcile the position that some residents will be engaged with extensively but the whole estate that is affected, will not be.
10. OH wants to give residents some certainty and security and wants to start addressing problems.

-
11. Some general principles about offers etc need to be established as part of the conversation.

 12. There will be a strong commitment to local social housing at the beginning of any scheme considered.

 13. 4EF was hoping to agree on an engagement strategy before any steps were made towards consultation. This has now been taken on by OH without involvement of the residents, workshops, consultants etc.

 14. Can OH put all the details and information it has when it starts to look at the options into the public domain, so the options can be as transparent as possible?

 15. OH wants to keep the options as open as possible.

 16. Agreeing to have a ballot is the bare minimum (because of the London Mayor). OH was reluctant to commit to doing this before. Like for like is not a commitment, however.

 17. There were 3 criteria to decide which 3 areas might be in the spotlight at first: SCS performance, Design Issues, Area of Change.

 18. Residents may jump to conclusions about demolition but OH wants it to be clear that it is just opening up the discussion about what could happen if residents want it.

 19. Is this approach going to be better than other regeneration schemes?

 20. OH hopes that it will be a more sensitive approach.

 21. How is the Estate realm going to improve as a result of this piecemeal approach? It will be difficult because there isn't enough funding to do everything.

 22. If improvements are made to the initial target areas, that would give some degree of certainty for the other areas that they will be secure for the next few years.

 23. There will be an independent consultant to work up the options appraisals, jointly appointed with residents.

 24. There should be ballots on all the options in the appraisal.

 25. Any mention of the proposals in newsletters must be carefully done, so OH will do a letter at the same time as the 4EF but sent separately.

 26. As 3 areas have now been identified we have lost then opportunity to reach residents with thorough engagement to identify areas residents prioritise.

 27. The 4EF wanted to build a proposal through engagement rather than us having to respond/reject/accept OH's suggestions.

Next meeting

Wednesday 20th June, Residents, instead of going to Packington estate.
