

# **Minutes of a meeting of the Resident Steering Group for Alice Shepherd House & Oak House held on 27th July 2020 at the St Johns Community Centre**

## **Residents Present:**

Sharon Holmes – Oak House

## **Others Present:**

Lee Page – Independent Resident Adviser – TPAS

Mike Tyrrell – Residents Advocate

Mynul Islam – One Housing

Leila Arefani – One Housing

## **Apologies:**

Abdullah Bourne – Alice Shepherd House

Darren Brown – Alice Shepherd House

Paul Handley – One Housing

Emma Leigh Price – One Housing

## **1 Welcome & Introduction**

1.1 The apologies that were given are noted above.

## **2 Notes of the Meeting held on 27<sup>th</sup> January 2020**

2.1 The notes of the meeting held on 24<sup>th</sup> February 2020 were noted but couldn't be approved as the meeting was not quorate.

## **3 Matters Arising**

3.1 As the previous meeting was so long ago there were no specific matters arising that were still relevant

## **4 Attendance**

4.1 There was a general discussion around the lack of SG members who are not attending the online meetings. Contact to be made to see if there is scope for improving attendance. OH made a fresh commitment to look at assistance that could be given to enable residents to take part.

**LP**

4.2 MT stated that he had spoken to a couple of SG members and their concerns about virtual meetings were around the fact that the lockdown had been eased and that a number of facilities were now open. They want to explore the possibility of socially distanced meetings in the large space afforded by the Community Centre. LA responded that as an employer OH had to recognise the responsibility to staff not to place

them at risk. Similarly, there is a duty of care to residents. SH enquired if residents could sign a disclaimer? LP responded that this wouldn't remove the employer/employee risk/duty of care. This is also the situation with most housing organisations. SH felt that some of the difficulties are the use of small screens, lack of sufficient internet connections or even the impact of family members being present. OH happy to speak to anyone outside of SG meetings to discuss support that they could provide.

LP stated that of the SG members who have attended online meetings the feedback has been quite positive. Difficult to get around a general unwillingness to use the format but this looks like being the only means of meeting for the foreseeable future.

## **5 Consultation document- feedback**

- 5.1 MI reported that the initial contact with the wider resident population had shown a general satisfaction with the hard copy booklet that had been distributed outlining a range of options that could be developed. To date OH have attempted to contact 51 of the 84 homes with 25 residents giving feedback. Conversations are taking 30-40 minutes on average and the aim is to achieve a minimum of a 75% response rate. Feedback on follow-up phone calls has been positive in fully understanding the options.
- 5.2 As would be expected the views being expressed are mixed with the longer standing residents (10+ years) seeming to be more in favour of change. Generally, the designs were liked but there had been a lot of questions around the potential timeline and when the ballot would take place.
- 5.3 There was a discussion around how the ballot voting would work and whether both blocks would need to vote for the same option for it to happen. SH expressed her concern that Oak House residents would not have the ability to have a real say in the option chosen if the larger Alice Shepherd House residents voted for something they didn't like. The ballot methodology needs to be agreed but LA stated that allowing one block to have a veto or opt out wouldn't really work. LA will discuss voting arrangements with PH whilst OH's position on this is clear they will look at how reassurance can be provided. **LA**
- 5.4 LA stated that not all the viability issues had been worked through yet. One reason being that they usually find a small number of options are preferred so the financial performance can then be specific to those. MT stated that on other projects the viability issue had supported the resident's

preferences.

- 5.5 In terms of the QR code link to videos, there have been less than 10 views of each and it seems that residents tend to view the video linked to their preferred option.
- 5.6 Viability is still being worked on so there will effectively be 3 events but the gap between the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> events will be slightly condensed.

## **7 Project Timeline**

- 7.1 The next 'event' is scheduled for September 2020. This will see the narrowing down of the options to those with most interest, likely to get planning permission etc. However, details of this are not likely to be ready in time for the next meeting of the SG. There was a discussion as to when the event should therefore take place as any consultation information should be considered by the SG before being circulated more widely. This might mean either an additional date for the SG or for the event to slip until after the September meeting of the SG.

## **8 Date of Next Meeting**

- 8.1 24<sup>th</sup> August 2020.

## **9.0 Any Other Business with OHG Officers present**

- 9.1 None

## **10.0 Any Other Business without OHG Officers present**

- 10.1 None

**Meeting closed at 8.30 pm**