

Notes of the Central Hill Resident Meeting 5/9/2019

Present:

Rev Jonathan Croucher
 Catherine Pengelly – resident
 Peter Culley – resident
 Angela Masters – resident (with option to return)
 Sabine Martel/Florence/Louise– residents
 Andrea Rose - resident
 Michaela Burton- resident
 Cllr Peter Elliott
 Nicola Curtis - resident
 Pam Kovachich – PPCR
 Fiona Cliffe – HfL

Apologies:

Cllr Matthew Bennett
 Jason Emile
 Tunde Akinyooye

1	<p>JC welcomed everyone. He said the purpose of the group was to take forward the regeneration of Central Hill – even though some members may personally have different views. ToR to be circulated to all group – to be considered before the next meeting when they will be signed..</p>	All
2.	<p>Up-dates JE’s report was discussed. PE asked if he could see the viability test for Roman Rise. FC said there were restrictions on the information that could be made available. However, the modelling shows that the scheme is not viable in its own right as HfL want this to be all affordable, cross subsidised by other ‘small sites’.</p> <p>The impact of demolition/development on the surrounding residents, particularly asbestos removal was thought to be a concern. CP asked whether an independent asbestos surveyor could be appointed. FC said that an asbestos surveyor & controlled removal would be part of a planning approval. The letter to residents in Romany Prospect will be re-circulated. This gave residents the opportunity to discuss their housing position & potential move. SM asked whether the building compound set up for the hostel site would be removed once the building was finished. FC said that in principle this would happen but would depend on the timing and location of future phases.</p> <p>The general view was that HfL/Lambeth ‘just needed to get on with it’. Residents wanted to know when work would start on the hostel site and. FC said that go ahead for the hostel site was expected this month and that 3 architect practices are tendering for the contract – one was involved in the</p>	FC

	<p>previous selection process and achieved high resident votes from both the exhibition and interview process. The aim was to get the hostel built and residents moved in.</p> <p>There were also questions about consultation, FC said that residents would be consulted once the massing has been developed and those living outside the estate would be consulted through the planning process.</p> <p>There was concern that nothing would start on the estate itself until construction on the hostel site was completed. FC said that the masterplanning process for Central Hill Estate will develop in tandem and has already started - the Arups engineering report was expected the following week.</p>	
3.	<p>Housing Management TA could not make the meeting, due to area forum clashes.</p> <p>Residents spoke of significant areas of disrepair on the estate, NC said that many issues are being tackled now but the major problem area is the leaking of balconies into properties below. NC also reminded everyone that Dominic is on site on Tuesdays, and that there have been significant improvements in the service since he started.</p> <p>Senior HM staff have said that an investment programme will be put in place when the timing of the phasing is known</p>	
4.	<p>Timeline This was something that residents want, as they need to know how to plan their lives. FC said that most residents would not have to move for 5-10 years. This was felt to be too long and residents wanted to know who was determining the programme for Central Hill. FC said the development programme was determined by a number of factors, including finance, for both Lambeth & HfL. A request was made that someone who makes the strategic decisions for Lambeth & HfL should attend one of the next meetings.</p> <p>It was agreed that the next meeting would focus on the key questions that need to be answered.</p>	All
5.	<p>HfL Staff Jatinder Takhar is the new Chief Exec. Rohul Miah will be the resident engagement officer for CH.</p>	
6.	<p>Voids FC said that the information that could be given out had been resolved – so the figures on moves & use would be circulated. There were 148 properties where residents had moved – this included the number of properties that were empty at the start of the programme. Of these 44 were homeowners, 14 had been let with another 5 where tenants were about to move in. Contractors were now looking at carrying out the void works in the remaining properties. The group raised concern on how long this was taking and NC said that the slow turnaround of voids was having an implication on both HRA income and spend.</p>	FC

7.	AOB PE said that he felt that the Ownership and Stewardship Panel should have a tenant and an opposition councillor on.	
8.	Next Meeting – Group thought that Helen Hayes should be invited.	