

Central Hill Residents Panel Meeting
Tuesday 1st November 2016, 7pm to 9pm
Central Hill Resource Centre

Attendance

Residents: Nicola, Karen, Andrea, Clifford, Jonathon (Chair)

LB Lambeth: Fiona Cliffe

PPCR: Abraham, Helen (minutes)

Purpose of meeting: General update and to review the Equalities Impact Assessment

1.	<p>Minutes of last REP meeting</p> <p>1.1 Jonathon opened the meeting stating that its focus was to update residents and that the minutes of the last meeting should be signed off at the next full REP meeting.</p>
2.	<p>Equality Impact Assessment (EIA)</p> <p>2.1 Fiona introduced the EIA specifically produced for Central Hill Estate. She explained that the document would accompany the December cabinet report that will make the final decision about the regeneration going ahead. The report would be a baseline (starting point) for the estate as it currently stands. The data was gathered from various LBL sources (e.g. Northgate, Housing Needs Survey, etc.)</p> <p>2.2 Jonathon asked about the purpose of the EIA and who made the assessment.</p> <p>2.3 Fiona stated that any major decision about the regeneration needed to consider who will be impacted by the decision. The EIA is a baseline and will be reviewed when further decisions are made and updated as the regeneration progresses.</p> <p>2.4 Residents stated that the EIA was based on old information and therefore not up to date and that there was no information about translation of the document. They further stated that some current documents had been sent out by LBL without translation support included. One resident produced an example of a recent letter.</p> <p>2.5 Fiona stated that a full Housing Needs Survey (HNS) will be undertaken to consider housing need of tenants and homeowners. The previous HNS (which was used to pull down the data in the EIA) will not be used to ascertain current needs. She further added that LBL are working with PPCR to explore how best to undertaken translations to meet the varying language needs of residents. She further explained that the EIA suggests that overall, the short term impact on residents is negative, whilst the long term impact was positive for all of the different groups. Council officers made the assessment.</p> <p>2.6 The following key points about the content of the EIA and its impact on existing residents were as follows:</p> <p>a) LGBT community needs have not been adequately addressed and it is the community that keep residents safe and that 'Secure by Design' was not enough to address safety for</p>

residents in this respect. The EIA therefore did not understand residents within this community enough.

b) Point A above also applied to **older people**.

Residents stated that established communities police themselves and the trust between the community on Central Hill has taken 20 years to establish.

2.7 Residents referred to Myatts Fields and the lack of **community cohesion** between the private and social housing residents (e.g. children not being able to play outside without private residents complaining). Residents also felt that the views of private residents were given priority over social tenants and that the impact therefore had been negative, and that the community had been broken up as some social tenants did not return to the estate.

2.8 Residents also felt the EIA did not adequately address the link between **single parents** (larger number of female headed households on the estate) and the benefit cap. They asked whether there had been any assessment of single parents living on CH and one resident felt that there were judgements being made about tenants who were on **housing benefits**. Residents also talked about the impact on widening the community and how this would affect schools and local amenities.

2.9 Fiona talked about rent levels for the new homes. She also suggested that community development is needed to support the regeneration and saw the role to help establish the new community as part of the REPs role.

2.10 Residents felt that the social and economic aspects of the EIA were not tailored enough toward the estate and did not reflect what actually happens on the ground. Residents asked that the information captured should feed into **rent and council tax levels**.

2.11 PPCR stated that the EIA needed to reflect the locality much better and that the document was too broad.

2.12 Residents asked about those who wrote the EIA and asked for **an independent assessment** of the impact. This was because the assessment was produced by LBL and its programme managers and seemed to support LBLs recommendation to regenerate the estate. The EIA was not independent enough.

2.13 Fiona stated that the EIA will go to the EIA Panel and to external advisors to review.

2.14 Residents talked about the EIA's references to the **Black population** which they found patronising and provided a certain view of black residents.

2.15 Fiona stated that the EIA is there to help improve all households however if you take the statics together there is a bigger impact on the Black community.

2.16 Residents state that the EIA does not reflect or understand the impact on **taking a person out of the community** – Portuguese and older people were used as examples to explain the impact.

2.17 Fiona stated that the **local lettings plan** will be a tool used to keep the community together (where possible).

2.18 Residents also raised concerns about tenants having a **dilemma between keeping their secure tenancies and staying in the local community**. They were also highly concerned about

	<p>the potential of selling Homes for Lambeth (HfL) later down the line and they felt that lots of residents would not come back to the community because keeping their secure tenancy was more important. It was suggested that there would be no need for the Triple Lock if HfL could not be sold.</p> <p>2.19 Jonathon stated that the EIA needed more credibility and needed to better acknowledge that there are also negatives to the regeneration longer term.</p> <p>2.20 Residents felt that there are various reports that stated the impact of regeneration on communities is high and not always positive.</p> <p>2.21 Overall residents felt the EIA was not an impact assessment but a collection of data and the EIA needs to be written as a local impact assessment.</p> <p>2.22 Residents requested that the EIA and LBL acknowledge the negative impact on residents which was not accurately reflected with the document.</p> <p>2.23 PPCR asked for clarification about what the next stages for the EIA were and how residents could feed into this. Feedback can be sent to Fiona or PPCR.</p> <p>Action: Fiona to clarify how residents' views above will be fed into the EIA.</p>
3.	<p>Key Guarantees (KG)</p> <p>3.1 Residents stated that they were not clear about the offer to residents under KG6 to provide, <i>'to provide advice and support to you, if you choose to seek rehousing either elsewhere in Lambeth or outside of the borough.'</i> It was felt that this KG was misleading as Fiona had emailed another REP member stating that moves outside of the borough were almost impossible as the LBL did not have any arrangements in place to assist this.</p> <p>3.2 PPCR suggested that LBL work with other boroughs to offer an 'inter-borough' transfer scheme which had been used elsewhere and could be set up to support residents to move out Lambeth more easily.</p> <p>3.3 Fiona stated that this had been discussed in some depth at last meeting the REP had which included aids and adaptations.</p> <p>3.4 Residents asked if the support was already in place or whether it was based on medical needs. They further stated that the KG was deliberately misleading as residents may now be in favour of the regeneration based upon this offer of 'support' that in effect was not available. This could therefore falsely sway their opinion and support for the regeneration going ahead.</p> <p>3.5 There was some debate about how the statement was being interpreted and the meaning of the statement. Jonathon said that if LBL cannot offer 'support' then it should say 'advice' only. He requested that the Council remove this as it is deliberately misleading. Fiona felt that the wording could be interpreted in different ways and that it needed to be clearer.</p> <p>3.6 Residents stated that not everybody is going through the details of the documents with a fine tooth comb and are taking the offer at face value. The strongly stated that if LBL are making guarantees to residents then LBL should be ensuring that the documents are correct. There was a suggestion that LBL write to all residents to explain their position on this area of the KG.</p>

	<p>3.7 PPCR stated that they were running workshops to go through the KGs, lease and tenancy agreement and that they would ensure residents were clear about what was being offered as this was an option that LBL cannot deliver.</p> <p>3.8 Fiona stated that a colleague of hers had mentioned the SW London nomination scheme whereby residents had an option to move to Croydon but this scheme was limited.</p> <p>3.9 PPCR noted that in previous schemes (i.e. stock transfer) the tenancy agreement has been mirrored and he proposed that this could also be done by LBL.</p> <p>3.10 Residents stated that moving means changing schools for children and that any proposals should mean that residents are not worse off. One residents stated that a like for like offer should be made to residents and that LBL should not been seen as profiting from or penalising residents. Residents should be assured that rents are not higher and are paying the same rent. This same argument should also apply to leaseholders. The resident further stated that LBL would be benefiting from the profit made on the new properties and this could be passed onto residents in the form of a like for like property and a rented property at current rent levels for the estate. It was felt that LBL could mitigate some of the damage it is causing.</p> <p>3.11 One resident proposed that residents were more likely to support the scheme if LBL had made these concessions. She stated that the scheme cannot be supported because it is neither fair nor just and that LBL needed to be genuine and show more respect for the residents. Residents further stated that Home Swaps had not been considered.</p> <p>3.12 Jonathon stated that this argument (although made very eloquently) had already been put to LBL throughout the process and the council had rejected it. He further stated that this had been a long process for residents and that LBL had not heard their voice. He asked FC to convey this to the LBL lead officers.</p> <p>3.13 Residents stated that they wanted to be reasonable and work with LBL but LBL had made mistakes and did not learn from them. The referred to the EIA and said that the approach to this showed no concern for residents.</p> <p>3.14 It was also stated that the length of the process had stopped residents' aspirations such as improving their homes, selling up and moving on. This was not an option at the moment.</p> <p>3.15 PPCR outlined the work being done with the other ITA services working on the regeneration estates across Lambeth. He said that the changes to the KGs were of concern and gave an example of the early buy backs that were missing from the enhanced set.</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PPCR to add 'inter-borough' transfer scheme to list of KG questions for LBL and clarity about supporting people to move home. • Fiona to convey 3.5 and 3.12 to LBL programme lead officers.
4.	<p>Choice based lettings</p> <p>4.1 One residents spoke of contact she had had with another resident who was asking about the Band A offer within the KGs. Residents wanted to know how they needed to apply to be on Band A if they were not already on it. Residents also talked about Cressingham Gardens Judicial Review</p>

	<p>was partly to stop LBL doing what they did previously. Residents also felt that Cllr Bennett's comments on social media, stating that whatever the outcome the Council will carry on regardless was not helpful.</p> <p>4.2 Fiona stated that should could not comment on Cressingham but is happy to answer question where she can. She also stated that the Allocations officer had attended some of the drop in sessions and was advising on this.</p> <p>4.3 Jonathon stated that if there is a Judicial Review then everything (including the Band A offer) and the KGs stops until it is resolved. Fiona confirmed this.</p> <p>4.4 One resident asked for clarity on how Band A was preferential given the numbers already within Band A.</p> <p>Action: Fiona to clarify how residents will be transferred onto the system.</p>
5.	<p>Communication</p> <p>5.1 Residents stated that the way in which LBL had communicated with them had been poor. Similarly to 3.12 above, it was felt that LBL could have provided residents with information much earlier rather than allowing them to find out what was going on from other sources.</p> <p>5.2 Jonathon pointed out the Fiona was not the local councillor but was available and hearing the points made. He further stated that the decision makers were in no doubt aware of the feelings of residents on CH.</p> <p>5.3 Fiona stated that she had heard what residents had said and that the offer to residents had not changed. If the scheme goes ahead, Fiona assured residents that she will continue to work with them to get the best scheme for CH.</p> <p>5.4 PPCR outlined the work being done with the other ITA services working on the regeneration estates across Lambeth. A further example was the change to the Zero Rent share option lease being consulted upon without the lease being available for the ITAs to consult on.</p> <p>5.5 Residents suggested that in terms of rents, LBL should move away from the term 'affordable' as this was being confused with council level rents. They further stated that gaps in information leads to concerns which causes stress and anxiety.</p> <p>5.6 Fiona stated the key issue for the enhanced KGs being distributed at a later date was the changing EU Directive.</p> <p>Action: PPCR to circulate TPAS review of KGs to REP members as this reviewed against policy, council's statutory requirements in terms of the offer to residents.</p>
6.	<p>Finances</p> <p>6.1 Residents stated that they would consider going to court but that this was not cost effective and would use residents' money. They again raised their concerns about rents and stated that these were in effect high enough and the LB should not need to take more money from tenants if it wasn't necessary.</p>

<p>7.</p>	<p>Early buy backs</p> <p>7.1 Residents asked what the situation was with early buy backs.</p> <p>7.2 Fiona explained that a process had been developed for the early buy backs and stated that a draft process will be sent out to the REP to view next week. She stated that the process would include prioritising which properties will be purchased early. She further stated that the revenue streams from renting the properties once empty would help pay for the buy backs.</p> <p>7.3 Jonathon stated that this was a U-turn on the offer which had been reiterated by Cllr Bennett that anyone who wanted a property purchased would be able to do so and that there was not prioritisation mention until now. The process was now fundamentally different to what residents were led to believe. He further stated that residents specifically asked if prioritisation was part of the process and Cllr Bennett had said no. Now the process was 'priority only' rather than 'open to all at any time'. This was not stated within the KGs.</p> <p>7.4 Residents also raised their concerns about potential caveats in valuations, residents who cannot sell due to regeneration hanging in the air (blight).</p> <p>7.5 Fiona outlined the current and next stages of the process as follows:</p> <p>October-November – now in week 3 of the consultation which is due to finish on 14th for the 'Future of Central Hill Estate' document and 21st November for the KGs.</p> <p>12th December – Cabinet will make it decision</p> <p>Homes for Lambeth to be incorporated early in 2017</p> <p>Heritage listing of the estate did not go through. Bins and Bunker were the only areas that were considered but the Heritage Society for listing.</p> <p>Actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PPCR to bring this issue back to LBL alongside the other ITAs. • Jonathon to take this issue up with Cllr Matthew Bennett
<p>8.</p>	<p>REP membership</p> <p>8.1 Residents wanted to know what would happen with the REP once a decision is made in December.</p> <p>8.2 Fiona stated that if the regeneration goes ahead the REP would be refreshed to reflect the split of tenants and homeowners more accurately to the estate's makeup (as per the Scrutiny Panel's earlier decision). PPCR clarified that Fiona needed to get some further advice in terms of recruiting new members.</p> <p>8.3 PPCR stated that due to delays in information it had not been possible to work more closely with the community as there has been little information to give until quite recently. He also stated that residents were not confident that things will happen due to the length of time taken to get to this stage.</p> <p>8.4 Residents felt that the REP's focus would be on design however there was still a need for a group to work through the KGs, tenancy agreements and leases and the EIA so that residents can still input fully into these document. They suggested that LBL should set up other groups to focus on particular areas related to regeneration and so that residents can still be representatives.</p>

	<p>8.5 Jonathon suggested that this needs further definitions on what the REP is – not going over old ground, and that going forward it needed to be clearer as to the purpose of the group, it's role and what form of operations it will be involved in.</p> <p>8.6 One resident raised the issue of another REP member whose status as a resident and their capacity to be on the REP was still awaiting confirmation from LBL about this. It was agreed that LBL needed to decide this and that Fiona would follow this up.</p> <p>8.7 Fiona stated that this was a decision from LBL and that she had already emailed today to ask for this to be followed up.</p> <p>8.8 Jonathon felt this was not a satisfactory answer as the decision had been outstanding for too long.</p> <p>8.9 PPCR asked Fiona if there will be a timeline and plan going forward that will include the next steps.</p> <p>8.10 Fiona stated this will be in place before Christmas for residents.</p> <p>Actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fiona to get clarity on position of resident on the REP • Fiona to provide timeline going forward for residents before Christmas • Fiona to clarify if other groups can be established to follow through work on documents presented to residents
9.	<p>TCC Surveys</p> <p>9.1 One resident said that she and a PPCR consultant had feed into previous survey questions but none of the suggestions had been included.</p> <p>9.2 Residents raised concerns about how TCC (independent company employed by LBL) were carrying out consultation surveys. The issues they raised were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clarification that they were being carried out in a professional way (collecting information for residents, ensuring its accuracy, etc.) - Residents not been asked to sign the forms to say the information collected is correct - Residents not being allowed to complete the surveys themselves - Residents not given the option of approving the information written on their behalf. <p>9.3 Fiona clarified that around 200 surveys had been completed.</p> <p>9.4 Residents suggested that as the information collected could not be verified as the genuine views of residents the survey should be null and void.</p> <p>9.5 Residents stated that the surveyors were also telling residents that they had been trained by LBL and were asking about whether residents wanted refurbishment as an option which is not actually available to residents.</p> <p>Action: Fiona to check with TCC how they are carrying out the surveys and what questions they are asking residents and feed back to the REP.</p>

10	<p>Additional post meeting comments added by FC</p> <p>10.1. The following comments / points are responses from FC to the minutes and address some of the points above (please see specific point in brackets).</p> <p>10.2 Inclusion in EIA: Key to the success of the redevelopment will be to create a Central Hill community which embraces both the existing community and the new households moving in to the area. Key to this will be a community development programme, led by Lambeth, Homes for Lambeth and the community (in response to section 2.6).</p> <p>10.3 Inclusion in EIA: The gender split on the Central Hill Estate is broadly similar to the wider Lambeth Council tenants split, which indicates there are approximately 20% more female headed households than male headed households as seen on Central Hill Estate. 19% of all households are identified as single parent households- with children under 16, a large proportion of whom will be female, and 42% single households, again with a high proportion of female only households due to the age profile of the estate (in response to section 2.8)</p> <p>10.4 Inclusion in EIA: This EQIA is the first step in evaluating the impact of the redevelopment of Central Hill for different groups of residents; it uses data from a number of sources to create a base position to further evaluate the impact of change on communities. Actions to both test and mitigate any negative aspects of redevelopment will be further developed as part of any redevelopment. For example, looking at the health and well-being of the community going through substantial change (in response to section 2.11).</p> <p>10.5 Inclusion in the EIA: This has carried out by experienced council staff and at this stage it is not a full analysis of the needs and requirements of different communities, but is the start of taking forward the impact of regeneration on all households on Central Hill (in response to section 2.12).</p> <p>10.6 The Equalities Panel is made up of councillors from both Labour and others. Their comments and concerns have been included within the final draft of the EQIA (in response to section 2.13).</p> <p>10.7 Inclusion in EQIA: Overall, the Council considers that regeneration will improve the lives of the majority of its residents; specifically as there is no other option currently available that will address the investment requirements of Central Hill, leaving a high number of households (specifically tenants) living in unimproved homes, which can directly impact on their health (in response to section 2.19)</p> <p>10.8 As part of the regeneration process the council will be aware of resident groups who might be adversely affected by both the regeneration programme and also the move to a new/different home. We will monitor the impact of change on the different communities and try and mitigate any negative impact. Also part of the process will be carrying out satisfaction surveys for resident moving both on and off the scheme, to both determine its success and also develop lessons learned to improve our service to all households (in response to 2.20)</p> <p>10.9 Inclusion in the EIA - see 2.12 (in response to section 2.21).</p> <p>10.10 This did not relate to the Council's consultation feedback (in response to 9.1).</p> <p>10.11 Industry standards are that consultation can take place on Sundays – but with limited hours. Email from Fiona on these issues (in response to 9.2).</p> <p>10.12 This was not what the questions asked (in response to 9.6)</p>
11	<p>AOB</p> <p>No other business was discussed.</p>