

Central Hill - Resident Project Team

22/03/2018

Attendees:

Jonathan Croucher (Chair)
Fiona Cliffe – Lambeth
Tunde Akinyooye – Lambeth
Mutoka Namakambo – Lambeth
Peter Culley – Resident
Karen Bennett - Resident
Nicola Curtis - Resident
Tony Dyer - Resident
Angela Masters - Resident
Rosemary Porter – Resident
Helen Reed - PPCR

Apologies: Victor Hernandez

1.	Minutes and Matters Arising Minutes of the last meeting were agreed.	
2.	Housing Management TA attended the meeting to address issues. The walkabout cannot happen during PERP with councillors. It was agreed that a walkabout with residents and housing management would take place – regen. officers and the IA would not attend. NC gave an update that she went on a walkabout with members and she felt there is progress on the repairs, paving, lighting and other issues. Individual repairs were discussed: o/s 11 Oakwood Drive there is a light that is out. This was noted by TA. At the Area Forum meeting- internal and communal repairs will have service review. It was agreed that Project group members can attend the estate walkabout with a day visit and night visit. This will be arranged by HM within the next couple of days. Residents can attend both walkabouts if they wish to do so. TA provided feedback on repairs. Cost comparisons were carried out and Central Hill had higher repairs costs. Issues may be coming from how feedback is being provided to residents. TA reported that an estate action plan has been drafted and this will be used to feedback to residents on a monthly residents. KB stated that the quality of works is unsatisfactory, quality inspections are not being carried out, contractors not turning up and perception that contractors are still being paid. Residents stated that money is being spent but works are not being carried out and quality	HM

	<p>is poor. They has been some improvements in repairs since TA has been managing.</p> <p>PC queried why Lambeth don't refuse to pay contractors unless there is a resident signature on the job? There was general feeling that the new development should have this policy that no job should be paid unless there is a resident signature.</p> <p>TA informed group that there will be a dedicated officer who will be the point of contact for residents to feedback on repairs.</p> <p>KB asked that a letter should go out to all residents to inform them that the estate will have different quality control, with details on the officer, how they can get in touch with the officer.</p> <p>Other housing management issues were discussed and TA took notes of all issues raised.</p>	<p>HM</p> <p>HM</p>
3.	<p>RTB</p> <p>FC updated group that some residents may have moved because they didn't have the right to buy. The letter is scheduled to go out across the programme in the summer to all secure tenants who have moved away can have the option to return. A draft copy to be issued to the group.</p>	
4.	<p>VIABILITY</p> <p>A written response was brought to the meeting about the level of homeowners who might stay on the estate, following on from the last meeting.</p> <p>KB queried about the funding of the buybacks. FC informed group that the buybacks will be let out on the private market and that income will be paying back the interest on the loan of buying back the home.</p> <p>PC explained this was like getting a re-mortgage and then only paying the interest.</p> <p>A discussion took place about the number of affordable homes and private homes to be delivered. Residents raised concerns about the number of affordable homes to be delivered and that more private homes would be delivered especially with the land values increasing not just in Lambeth but across London. FC explained about the cross-subsidy that to build an affordable home private homes were needed. Potentially if a higher value, could mean more affordable.</p>	
5.	<p>VOIDS</p> <p>RP queried why voids were taking so long. There is a long term void at Northwood Way where it has stood empty since December. Regeneration to investigate and get back to the group</p>	<p>KM</p>

	KB queried when the modular pods will be installed and where? FC to come back with update on where this temporary initiative was.	FC
6.	<p>Development Management Team & Engagement Consultant</p> <p>Mace will be appointed – subject to contract. There was no call-in. FC explained that there was a request for a call-in but it did not apply. There was also no challenge from other bidders – part of the procurement process. NC stated that she tried to call-in the decision. FC explained that the next stage is to discuss & sign the contract. While that is happening an engagement consultant of Mace will be taking place and this will go to the Engagement & Communication Group. Part of the DMA/contract will include the promises made by Mace as part of the procurement, including the interview process.</p> <p>The engagement consultants will be appointed by Mace. HR asked what the input from residents will be. FC stated that this will be a Mace procurement but they want resident input in choosing the engagement consultant. As it is not a public procurement, the procedure is not as controlled.</p> <p>JC queried what the group thought of the engagement procurement. Resident's feedback was they wanted to have more of a say. HR stated that residents should have more on being on the engagement panel for the Mace appointment.</p> <p>Residents wanted to know how Mace will choose their engagement consultants and they would like to know the names of the engagement consultants.</p> <p>JC to write to Lambeth about level of resident input into the engagement consultants.</p> <p>Mace Appointment NC stated that the contract for Cressingham was £6.6m and why was it £15.3m for Central Hill? FC said this was not a fee but a budget with a review at each RIBA stage – the architectural stages were available in the resource centre. FC to provide a further written response.</p>	<p>FC</p> <p>Rev. JC</p> <p>FC</p>
7.	<p>Independent Advisor appointment process</p> <p>The mini-competition for the IA cannot begin until the framework contract is signed. Residents will be informed when this will be done.</p> <p>FC informed that following procurement advice only 3 residents, a procurement and Lambeth officer would be at the interview panel.</p>	

	<p>NC said residents don't trust what they receive at face value hence why the questioning of information received. They feel frustrated because of the lack of clarity and transparency of the information being provided to residents</p> <p>PC stated that this is a reduction on resident involvement, & he would step down if required</p> <p>HR spoke about her experience on other procurement, e.g. why only 4 questions, the length of time of being allocated for the interviews, FC stated that there are four questions – 2 at a programme level & 2 to be written by residents. The programme questions & the question for submission were brought to the 'interview' group for review.</p> <p>NC asked why the details changed from the last meeting to this meeting. FC explained the procurement advice.</p> <p>NC brought a copy of the last procurement report that was delivered to her. NC accused FC of drip-feeding information to residents. HR responded to NC about the framework approach. Residents said they were not happy that they were not told about the framework. NC wanted to know why residents were not given a copy of the delegated report issued in January 2018.</p> <p>FC stated residents were sent a link to all the reports. An email will be sent out to residents with details of a schedule of information about the IA procurement to date. She apologised that hard copies of the procurement report were not made available – the link to the report was within a report to the RPG on the 30th Jan.</p> <p>JC informed that it is important that communication is key.</p>	<p>FC – framework approach discussed Oct 17 & onwards.</p>
8.	<p>Updates</p> <p>Decant 66 voids on central Hill, 31 used as TA, 10 DEVO (high void costs), 8 to be used as ASTs, 6 used for housing management and 11 in progress (voids works being carried out or ready to let)</p> <p>Buybacks 9 completed and 12 approved and in progress. 55 expression of interest from homeowners received.</p> <p>Housing needs assessment 200 completed to date.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 35 homeowners completed - 37% wish to remain and 62% wish to move away. • 100 secure tenants completed. 61% wish to remain, 18% wish to move away and 21% wish to have the option to return. 	

7.	Date of Next Meeting 5 TH June at the Resources Centre at 7pm.	
----	---	--