

**Minutes of a meeting of the Resident Steering Group for Alice
Shepherd House & Oak House held on 27th October 2020
Meeting held via Zoom**

Residents Present:

Sharon Holmes – Oak House
Habib Ahmod – Alice Shepherd House
Cynthia Owusu – Alice Shepherd House
Nadia Mahmoud – Alice Shepherd House
Ashley Lowther – Alice Shepherd House
Jane McGregor – Alice Shepherd House

Others Present:

Lee Page – Independent Resident Adviser – TPAS
Mike Tyrrell – Residents Advocate

Apologies:

Darren Brown – Alice Shepherd House

1 Welcome & Introduction

1.1 The apologies that were given are noted above.

2 Minutes of the Meeting held on 26th September 2020

2.1 The minutes of the previous meeting were not discussed or approved

3 Matters Arising

3.1 N/A

4 PRP

5.1 LP introduced this item as the reason that he and MT wanted to meet the SG without officers of OH present was due to the recent discovery that PRP had also been the architects responsible for preparing the Project Stone document which set out a vision for the redevelopment of a number of OH estates across the Island and which would have seen a huge increase in density and homes for sale. As the SG members were aware this had been strongly opposed and, eventually, rejected by OH.

5.2 The initial discussion covered the history of Project Stone and the changes in the landlord for the estate since the transfer from the Council, which had then led to the new landlord proposing Project Stone.

5.3 Project Stone itself had been concealed from residents and

the OH Chief Executive had denied its existence at a public meeting until confronted with the document. Concerns expressed that the current project was just this under a different guise.

- 5.4 MT expressed the view that the current financial position would bar OH from carrying out the regeneration to all four of the estates as Project Stone proposed anyway. He stated that Bellamy & Byng had already seen an increase in the number of homes to be sold in order to be able to deliver it.
- 5.5 JM had emailed the group stating that the current proposed designs resembled the Project Stone plans for then estate and, whilst a closer look showed this to be limited to three blocks for the site, it had been noted that the architects for the current project, PRP, were also the practice behind the Project Stone designs. The PRP partner, Richard Harvey, is named on both projects. The discussion then centred around a breach of trust in the current project with all members feeling that PRP had lied by omission in failing to declare their role with Project Stone. It was felt that OH officers would have been aware of this connection as well.
- 5.6 It was noted that the submission document from PRP for the current project made no mention of the Project Stone either in the introduction or the team biographies. The members of the SG selection panel all stated that, had they known of the Project Stone connection, PRP would not have been appointed.
- 5.7 The discussion covered questions being asked by residents and that had been covered in the '60 questions' asked of OH. MT stated he would share a document which outlined the summary of promises being made to residents at Kedge, Starboard and Winch SG

6 Options Appraisal Ballot

- 6.1 AL raised the issue that she had originally raised at the SG meeting in September 2019 when the following had been recorded in the minutes
- “A query was raised as to whether the RSG could dismiss the appointed architect before the end of the Options Appraisal process if they were failing to consider the views of the RSG and/or failing to look at all the options in sufficient detail. LP agreed to check with OHG on the terms of the appointment.”*
- Having checked the minutes after this time she hadn't seen a response to the question. LP undertook to find out what had happened.

LP

6.2 Question as to when OH agreed to individual block ballots?

6.3 Agreed that OH would be asked to refresh the responses to the previously asked questions and MT said that the SG could ask for any ballot results to be reported by block for clarity.

6.4 LP suggested that short test of opinion be conducted with residents of both blocks to see what their preferred option was at this stage and with the information provided so far. This is non-binding but may resolve the issue as to whether or not there were differences of opinion between the blocks. Draft to be circulated for approval.

LP

7.0 Design Options

7.1 The SG were clear that the initial designs that had been circulated were not very good and that there was a feeling amongst residents, whatever their preferred option, that there needed to be improvement on what was being offered under each option.

7.2 The SG felt that PRP had failed to engage with residents to build in what they wanted to see in the design options. The options are being developed in isolation from residents.

7.3 The SG stated that PRP/OH had lost the confidence of residents through this lack of engagement and their hidden involvement with Project Stone

8.0 Next Steps

8.1 Agreed to undertake the test of opinion and LP to write to OH to express the feelings of the SG. Agreed not to meet on 10th November, pending a response from OH on the issues of concerns.

LP

9.0 Any Other Business

9.1 Discussion around the need to enable all of the SG to participate virtually and LP said that he had learnt today that authorisation had been given for OH to purchase a tablet for AL and thought that NR had already been provided with one. He wasn't sure of the position re the provision of data and would check.