



Minutes of the Residents' Meeting

Wednesday 10th October 2018

Present

Residents: Candida (chair), Kim, Lesley, Pam, Arthur, Ahmed, Deidre, Eliza, Maureen, Glen, Jill,

Advisor: Mike

Consultant: Damian Tissier (Microfish)

Apologies: Jackie, Danny, Heidi, Maggie, (Cherie)

Resident Engagement and Steering Groups

Damian Tissier introduced himself and explained his background and experience.

Observations:

- 1 OH does not seem to have been very good at valuing feedback and information from residents. They do not seem to see residents as a community but as consumers/customers.
- 2 The way OH has selected the targeted areas could be seen as confusing, using their own criteria rather than the residents', and indicates they are reluctant to engage meaningfully with residents or the whole estate. Does this mean they do not trust residents to be able to make informed decisions.
- 3 The Green paper following Grenfell is likely change the way Has have to relate to residents in the future.
- 4 The GLA has had some interesting discussions about engagement and maybe quite critical of HA engagement.
- 5 Residents need to find a way of putting pressure onto OH to change their way of relating.

Discussion

- 6 CEO RH has recognised there are problems within the organisation but is focussed on solving internal problems rather than listening to residents.
- 7 OH has started taking initiatives on their own which is against the notion of being resident led which the 4EF had understood RH had intended.
- 8 The team OH wants to set up on the Island sounds like the beginnings of consultation and that they want to go straight to residents, bypassing the 4EF partnership and involvement.
- 9 OH doesn't have a good history of engaging with residents and building trust. There has been little transparency despite that being promised, and OH's initiatives appear to be rather underhand.

10. The 4EF should not feel too despondent because it has achieved a lot – Project Stone has gone, the SCS proved that the information it was based on was faulty.

Proposals/Conclusions

11. There should be a locally produced “estate improvement plan”. This should be overseen by the resident group (TRA/Steering Gp). This might include what residents want from regeneration, setting some principles about what the brief should be that informs the options, and indicates what improvements the residents and OH would plan, with a timescale.
12. One of the the main “conversations” should be about how do we improve the management of OH, not only about what should be redeveloped. The redevelopment team have an agenda to push. This is different from an Estate management agenda. Some residents may see redevelopment as a priority, others may not.
13. The door-knocking proposed by the OH Island Team may be about getting residents to agree to OHG ideas rather than really listening to what residents really want. Past experience has made residents cynical about OH strategies for collecting residents views.
14. Residents should be made aware that whole scale redevelopment can be very destructive to communities, health, personal finances. It is not just about having a nice new home.
15. One way forward would be that a resident group (TRA, Steering Group or combination of both) looks at an estate improvement plan which then identifies where and how their estate is developed. This would give all the residents an understanding of how their homes will improved in the foreseeable future.
16. This may not fit with OH’s concerns about not over-stretching themselves and giving unreasonable expectations to resident.
17. Decanting an estate like Kingsbridge will be difficult as it is not easy to find so much empty property to decant into. It has to be done through the Common Housing Register with the agreement of Has and LAs
18. Preparing an equitable deal acceptable to both residents and OH will also be very difficult. It is hard to ensure that residents are not worse off while the landlord offer will have to satisfy enough residents to ensure the ballot is successful.
19. OH is in a difficult position about any offers or proposals it makes because they are not trusted by many residents.

Damian’s Conclusions

20. To get to a position where OH take residents and the 4EF seriously.
21. The steering groups, through the residents groups, should be established and lead the process.
22. If this doesn’t work, meet with the OH Chair and explain our position – lack of trust, OH’s high-handed approach to residents and lack of meaningful engagement, lack of transparency, etc.

23. If this doesn't work then use press and council influence – use any leverage we can.
24. We need to be clear about what OH *are* doing and what they *should be* doing. What do they see as good practise, what is accepted as best practise within the sector, and how does it compare to the London Mayor's good practise guide.
25. We need a "best practise Communications and Engagement strategy" which groups can use and hold up to OH.
26. We need to discuss and advise on how the balance / relationship between the steering gp and the TRA best serves the residents of each estate.
27. The initial question should be something like "How do you see the future of your block, your estate?" rather than "How would you like to be redeveloped?" or "what kind of redevelopment would you like?"
28. Who should lead those discussions? – not OH but residents?
29. Should the steering groups just be from the focussed blocks/areas? This may exclude the rest of the estate in some cases, and some people who have a more extensive understanding about this (eg from the 4EF) may not have the opportunity to share their knowledge.

Minutes and Matters Arising

30. Chairs action to meet with the CEO - The chair thought that meeting RH would not be helpful at this stage until we were clearer about OH's intentions and we would see what response we had from Paul before deciding on our next steps. Mike will still see the Council Officers to keep them informed.
31. Add to the minutes that Paul said that establishing the Island Team had been discussed with the OH Board and that they had agreed.

Review the Purpose of the 4EF

32. As OH has been taking the initiative and now seems to be driving the process, what is the role of the 4EF?
33.
 - Helping OH to improve their strategies and have an overview of their intentions.
 - Using our experiences to guide them from the residents perspective.
 - This is a partnership not for us to be told what OH are doing.
 - Sometimes we will have to lead.
34. Our main role is to collect information and monitor, to pass this on to local groups to support them in making informed decisions. We support and guide, and do not make decisions which should be made by residents.
35. Keeping the estates linked and communicating.

36. The JV meetings – are they meant to be a partnership? This needs clarifying.
37. The way forward – bring this up as the first item on the agenda at the next JV meeting.
38. 4EF meetings are residents’ meetings and we invite OH and other participants to attend. We need to clarify who is attending from OH and in what capacity.
39. As OH and other participants are guests at the meeting they need to be treated with due respect and consideration. Because our homes are obviously quite an emotive issue for resident members, we nevertheless have to behave in an appropriate manner.

AOB

40. “Fair deals and standard offers” – Glen’s paper on this will be higher up the agenda at the next meeting to ensure it gets discussed.