

Minutes of a meeting of the Resident Steering Group for Alice Shepherd House & Oak House held on 3rd June 2019 at the St Johns Community Centre

Residents Present:

Ashley Lowther – Alice Shepherd House
 Jane McGregor – Alice Shepherd House
 Nadia Mahmood – Alice Shepherd House

St Johns TRA Committee Members Present:

Maggie Phillips – TRA Chair
 Jill Skeels – TRA Vice Chair
 Jackie Campbell – TRA Secretary
 Maureen Mallett – TRA Committee Member

Others Present:

Lee Page – Independent Resident Adviser – TPAS
 Mike Tyrrell – Residents Advocate
 Leila Arafani – One Housing Group
 Alison White – One Housing Group
 Mynul Islam – One Housing Group

Apologies:

Darren Brown – Alice Shepherd House
 Sharon Holmes – Oak House

1	Welcome & Introduction	
1.1	MT welcomed everyone to the meeting. Those present introduced themselves and welcomed Mynul Islam who has been appointed to the OHG regeneration team. The apologies that were given are noted above.	
1.2	It was noted that with only three residents present and none from Oak House the meeting wasn't quorate and therefore no decisions could be made. The information discussed was therefore for information only.	
2	Minutes of the Meeting held on 29th April 2019	
2.1	The minutes of the meeting held on 29th April 2019 were noted and deferred to the next meeting for approval.	
3	Matters Arising	
3.1	Matters Arising	
3.2.7	Residents on the RSG wanted the same	OHG reported that all

	<p>reassurances on Oak House. They were concerned that the varying damp issues are not accounted for in the survey, especially given that they understand one of the properties is a long-term vacancy as the tenants have been temporarily decanted to find the source of the dampness. SH reported that despite works, the dampness is returning to her home. Therefore, OHG were requested to confirm what further surveys are required at Oak and a timetable for implementing them, and as to why the vacant property was not given to Hunters to survey.</p>	<p>reported issues of dampness had been dealt with and that there wasn't any ongoing structural issue with the block. SH had agreed that her previously reported issues had been addressed. The conversation at the previous meeting concerned a void property which was stated to have been vacated due to water penetration/damp. OHG reported that there were no current voids in the block or any issue where tenants had been temporarily moved to allow works to be undertaken.</p>
4.1	Non-attendance at meetings	<p>AW has spoken to AB regarding missed attendance. AB not in attendance tonight but agreed to accept given the meeting was at Eid. Matter to be reviewed at the next meeting.</p>
5.2	Code of Conduct	<p>AW had contacted all group members regarding the need to sign the Code. Due to low attendance tonight the matter to be raised again at the next meeting.</p>
6.4	Tpas newsletter	<p>Delivered by LP on 23/5</p>
7.2	Starting the Conversation	<p>Report is on tonight's agenda (item 8)</p>
8.2	TRA newsletter w/c 20 th May	<p>Delivered w/c 20/5</p>
10.1	Additional block surveys.	<p>Expecting quotes for</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measured survey • Topographical survey • Internal measured survey

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Structural survey (Oak House) • Utilities survey <p>To be returned w/c 10/6 and available for the RSGB meeting on 24/6</p>
10.2	Architects brief.	Item 6 on the agenda
10.3	Use of car park at Alice Shepherd House	<p>AW reported on concerns raised around use of car park. All non-resident permits will not be renewed. Issue around OHG staff parking there for long period has been addressed via a reminder to staff.</p> <p>The group clarified that they weren't concerned about the sale of under used spaces to non-residents but the use of the car park area by people running a business.</p>
11.1	Outstanding questions to OHG by the Group	Item 7 on the agenda
11.2	Circulate asbestos report	MT has circulated the reports to the RSG
11.3	Why are OHG removing asbestos?	AW clarified that it wasn't standard practice but it was undertaken where works would otherwise have resulted in the asbestos being damaged.
4	Attendance	
4.1	It was noted that the meeting was not quorate and apologies had only been received from two RSG members. It was felt that Eid might have prevented some members from attending. OHG were asked to speak to AB & TN in particular re continued absence.	AW
4.2	Due to the meeting being inquorate no decisions can be made. Any items that require a decision can be discussed and the view as to the action to be taken will need to be ratified at the next	

	meeting of the RSG.	
5	Chairing of Resident Steering Group Meetings	
5.1	LP stated that he would normally expect the RSG to be Chaired by a resident member. Those present considered the current arrangements and felt that they still wished for MT to chair the meetings given his knowledge and experience. AL agreed to becoming Vice-Chair. Agreed to re-visit this matter in September.	
6	Brief for Architect appointment	
6.1	<p>LP presented a brief paper considering the options of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • appointing an architect and other professional consultants independently • using the Mayor of London's approved list whereby the required consultants are appointed as a package <p>The various advantages/disadvantages were discussed with the recommendation that separate appointments are made in order to better ensure that all meet the requirements of the RSG.</p>	
6.2	LP was requested to provide training on procurement and the process involved at the next meeting of the RSG on 24 th June.	LP
6.3	OHG are seeking approval of the general brief supplied to the RSG in order to progress the appointment process. To be discussed again at the next meeting.	
7	OHG response to residents questions	
7.1	Paul Handley's (PH) response to the 61 questions raised by the group was presented. Both MT & LP expressed their thanks for the level of detail supplied and that OHG had provided responses at this stage even to questions to which the answers may change as the project developed. It was acknowledged that the amount of detail contained was too much for this meeting but that PH would attend the July meeting of the RSG in order to respond to any questions that the RSG may have.	
7.2	It was noted that this response was for the RSG only at this stage and that a FAQ sheet will be drafted for wider circulation which will set out responses in an easier to understand format for those not as involved in the project.	AW
8	Starting the Conversation report	
8.1	AW presented the first draft of the report based on the responses	

	to the survey of all residents in Alice Shepherd House and Oak House. The final report will be issued in A5 format.	
8.2	AW was thanked for the work undertaken and addressed questions arising from the stated findings. There was some doubt as to the actual data on which the report is based and LP & MT were asked to undertake a 10% check on the raw data to ensure the accuracy of the findings. Both LP & MT have signed data sharing agreements with OHG so are able to do so.	MT & LP
9	Newsletters – frequency of future issues	
9.1	It LP sought clarification as to how often residents would wish to receive newsletters on the project as it moves forward. It was agreed that newsletters would be issued every 2 months with them alternating between the TRA and Tpas. They would not be more than 2 sides of A4.	MT & LP
10	Date of next meeting	
10.1	It was agreed that the next meeting would be on 24 th June and would be for RSG members only without OHG being present. This would enable LP to explain to the wider RSG his role and that of an Independent tenant Advisor (ITA)	LP
10.2	PH would be invited to the meeting on 22 nd July to respond to questions on the response to the 61 questions from the RSG.	PH
11	Any Other Business With OHG Being Present	
11.1	None	
12	Any Other Business Without OHG Being Present	
12.1	There was a general discussion concerning the ability of OHG to maintain the blocks whatever option was chosen for the future of the blocks.	
12.2	Whilst the appointment of Rhys Jones was welcomed it was felt that he was only working on the potential areas for regeneration in order to ensure that residents were more accepting of the idea of regeneration. The current reporting system used by OHG was not fit for purpose and there was no confidence that OHG can maintain the blocks in the future	
12.3	As part of the project the RSG would like to know the extent of overcrowding within the blocks	AW

12.4	Clarification was also sought as to the number of leaseholders in each block as the current figures supplied were thought to be wrong.	AW
12.5	There was a discussion on the surveys being undertaken and how they would inform the options appraisal process	
13	Meeting Close	
13.1	The meeting closed at 9pm.	

Draft