

CENTRAL HILL RESIDENTS' ENGAGEMENT PANEL

Tuesday 1 December: 19.00 – 20.30
Upper Norwood Resource Centre, Central Hill Estate

Attendees:

1. Jonathan Croucher (JC) *Chair of Central Hill Resident Engagement Panel*
2. Karen Bennett (KB)
3. Nicola Curtis (NC)
4. Victor Hernandez (VH)
5. Clifford Grant (CG)
6. Christina Searle (CS)
7. Andrea Rose (AR)
8. Abraham Namoyo – (AN) _ PPCR
9. Councillor Bennett (MB) *Cabinet Member for Housing / Councillor Gipsy Hill Ward*
10. Fiona Cliffe (FC) *LB Lambeth*
11. Huw Jones (HJ) *LB Lambeth (minutes)*

Apologies

Marcus Shukla
Tayo Richards

1.	Introductions & Apologies	Action
	<p>The draft minutes of the meeting from Nov 2015 were circulated.</p> <p>Christine Searle was at the meeting in place of Glen. JC said that the group should formally agree her attendance at this meeting. This was agreed by the group.</p>	
2.	Matters arising	
	<p>Key Guarantee documents and protocols</p> <p>The view from residents was that they need to see these documents and comment on them ASAP. Concerns were raised that if these documents are delivered late then residents will have insufficient time to review and comment on them before consultation</p> <p>Fiona said that the draft copies of the key guarantees have already been provided with comments and returned to the REP.</p> <p>NC said there had been a delay in getting responses.</p> <p><i>Meetings to discuss CH issues held on 8th & 15th Sept. Responses given 14th Oct</i></p> <p>Additional comments/queries were with Maurice Soden & Lambeth have committed to circulate the final copies before Christmas.</p> <p>FC stated that some of the processes and protocols may still be work in progress – but an up-date would be given.</p> <p>Concerns were also that the tenancy agreement & leasehold documentation for Homes for Lambeth were not available.</p> <p><i>A draft tenancy agreement was available as part of the Oct 12 SPV Cabinet report.</i></p>	

	<p>Although there was not a lease agreement available at this moment in time, AN said there were standard documents available used by Housing Associations.</p> <p>Residents expressed concerns that documents affecting Central Hill had been created without REP input. Cllr Bennett explained that many documents were common across the housing programme and had been developed with input from Tenants Council.</p> <p>Decant Policy Residents concerned that the Draft Decant Policy is available online and had not been shared with the REP.</p> <p><i>This document was appended to the July 2015 Cressingham Report, and would have been consulted with residents post the Cabinet decision. There was an issue that the date of this document seemed to be incorrect – Nov 15.</i></p> <p>As advised MS is looking at the policies for re-housing.</p> <p>Advert for Development Teams There was also the PID for the advert for the development team (DT) in the European Journal for Central Hill & Fenwick FC explained what this document was, and would be used subject to the decision in April 16. The time to procure a development team through this process was extensive – and so the advert had to go out prior to the decision. Residents would be fully involved in the process to appoint a DT – as is happening with the other estates.</p> <p><i>Although the Cabinet Report of December 2014 gave the authority for officers to procure development teams for all sites; the group should have been informed of the timing of this.</i></p> <p>Lambeth to make future efforts to circulate all documents affecting Central Hill to REP.</p> <p>Refurbishment Option CS said she was concerned that it had been said that this option could not be afforded, despite it saying in the Nov minutes that this would be considered.</p> <p>FC clarified position on options appraisal –the intention is to only consult formally with the whole estate on options which are viable and deliverable. Council believes that the refurbishment option is not viable and agreed to share cost information (Bailey Garner) report which demonstrates this.</p> <p>Generally JC noted that this consultation was likely to reach a point where the REP holds some views which are different to the Council's position on the CH regeneration process. To move forward this could be addressed by a letter stating all points of difference which could then be included in any further decision making (ie. cabinet reports).</p>	<p><i>Sent 7/12/12 – although had been given to Jim Martin in October.</i></p>
3.	Consultation Timetable - draft	

	<p>VH said this was too tight and did not give the REP enough time to review the options before consultation.</p> <p>This would be reviewed and would work back from the April Cabinet date.</p> <p>Clr B said that March 2016 for the report to be drafted could be reduced.</p> <p>FC to review for consideration by the group.</p>	FC – 7/12/15
4.	Judicial Review – Cressingham Gardens	
	<p>Cllr B said that the Cressingham Gardens JR decision is public and can be reviewed in detail online.</p>	
5.	AOB	
	<p>NC said there was concern about the recent tree pruning on the estate – why was this work undertaken and was it an indication of future redevelopment?</p> <p>FC confirmed that she had no knowledge of the tree works prior to speaking to a tree surveyor on site. This was work that was undertaken routinely by the housing management service, the issue should be raised at the meetings with the TRA & housing management. And no, this was not connected to any regeneration decision.</p>	
6.	Next Meeting	
	<p>The meeting to review the options that can and cannot be delivered will take place on 14th December.</p> <p>The residents again voiced their concern that this important information was delayed.</p>	
Date of next formal REP meeting: Tuesday 5 January 2016		