**Carpenters Destination Steering Meeting**

**Wednesday 14th August 2019, 6.30pm – 8:00pm**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Resident 1 |  | Resident 3  |  |
| Resident 2 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Rob Williams (Chair) | Source Partnership | Jane Jolly  | Newham Council |
| Carol Squires  | Source Partnership  | Jan Rowley  | Newham Council |
| Natalie Adubofour | Source Partnership  | Joanna Hansford  | Newham Council |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Item**  | **Action** |
| **1.0** | **Welcome and introductions**  |  |
| **1.1** | There were no apologies received, although some residents had indicated they may not be able to attend. |  |
| **2.0** | **Notes of the previous meeting and matters arising**  |  |
| **2.1** | The notes of the previous meeting were agreed as a true record  |  |
| **2.2****2.3****2.4****2.5** | The following matters arising were discussed:Ongoing issues with the estate were noted – plants growing out of the garages and the sides of tower blocksJR confirmed that there is not a pot of money for meanwhile projects, and Newham would need to apply for funding from the Good Growth Fund.The suggestion of possibly creating a sub-group of residents to report on issues with the estate and its condition was raised. RW suggested that there were a number of options, and he would come back to the next meeting with some suggestions. | **RW** |
| **3.0** | **Procurement**  |  |
| **3.1** | **Architects Appointment** The Architects appointed to complete the options review are Proctor and Mathews/Metropolitan Workshop. They will be carrying out work up until spring 2020 focusing on developing the options and design workshops, and will work alongside Newham on any viability questions.  |  |
| **3.2****3.3** **3.4****3.5****3.6** | **Brief of Property Advisor** JH confirmed amendments had been made to the brief sections on collaboration with residents and was awaiting approval of the final document. JH added that she would be meeting with JR and liaising with some residents to organise resident training sessions. JH outlined the short list of consultants using the Crown Commercial Services framework, which included five consultants.**Procurement** The Council would be looking at other ways the group could get involved with procurement by holding further resident training sessions. **Appointing Permanent ITRA** The Council would be procuring the permanent ITRA in due course, and developing the draft brief was discussed. JJ asked for volunteers to meet with her outside of the main CDSG meetings to draft the brief, and would contact members separately. The aim was to complete the procurement of the longer term ITRA by the end of the year when Source Partnership’s contract would end.**Resident Ballot** The Council is also looking to appoint an independent service to manage the Residents’ Ballot, and JJ would be seeking advice from the GLA regarding what this means i.e. contract size and timescales for procurement in the lead up to the Ballot. CDSG members will have the opportunity of being involved in the procurement of this service. **Masterplan** It was mentioned that the procurement of architects responsible for developing the masterplan will also act as the lead consultants and will provide their own planning consultants and engineers. Due to this being a large contract, the Council will need Cabinet approval.  | **JH****ALL** |
| **4.0** | **Draft Terms of Reference and Code of Conduct** |  |
| **4.1****4.2****4.3****4.4** | The Draft Terms of Reference were tabled with minor additions as required by the Council’s Governance team. These included reference to co-production, clarification on how members were elected to the group and the need for members to complete confidentiality agreements and declarations of interest forms.Clarification was requested on what the Council means by co-production - JR agreed to bring a copy of the Custom House definition of co-production to the next meeting. **Code of Conduct** JJ highlighted the following items included in the Code of Conduct:* Mutual respect of each other
* The Chair’s role is to deal with any queries or non-compliance with the Terms of Reference and Code of Conduct
* Regular review the Terms of Reference and Code of Conduct

The members approved the Terms of Reference and Code of Conduct. | **JR** |
| **5.0** | **Update on CDSG Walkabout – 1/8/19**  |  |
| **5.1****5.2****5.3****5.4****5.5****5.6****5.7** | Group members had conducted a walkabout on 1 August; a summary of feedback from the walkabout was circulated. Common issues identified on the walkabout included:* The general upkeep and cleanliness of the estate
* Refuse disposal issues and dumping
* Estate lighting

It was suggested that the ground in the ball cage could be grass rather than concrete.There were concerns regarding the condition of the estate and the majority understood the opportunity to develop the open spaces around the base of the tower blocks. JJ is currently liaising with the Neighbourhood Services team to set up joint estate inspections with residents and officers. The Steering Group suggested looking at structuring them to incorporate ways of generating suggestions for the design proposals.**Mayors Walkabout – 9/8/19**It was discussed that no major changes could be made to the cycle lane but the idea of having different road symbols was welcomed. Comments regarding traffic lights were raised. An anonymised version of the Carpenters issues log maintained by JJ would be provided to the next CDSG meeting.JR announced that following the walkabout with the Mayor, the zebra crossing that residents had requested for Carpenters Road to provide safe crossing for school children would be in place before the end of the year. | **JJ****JJ** |
| **6.0**  | **Carpenters Residents Charter**  |  |
| **6.1****6.2****6.3****6.4****6.5** | The Group reviewed the Residents’ Charter and made a number of recommendations and suggestions:Section 1 – Principles of the Charter* Update name from the Joint Residents’ Steering Group to the Carpenter’s Destination Steering Group
* All references to the TMO should be removed and, in some places, replaced with either CDSG or engagement with the wider resident community
* Reference to the London Plan, design and space standards and information on potential phasing
* Item 1.2 - make clear the different groups of tenants e.g. with the right to return. Also need to refer to private tenants and temporary tenants, as they are significant groups but will have different rights
* Item 1.3 - include clarification on how the Charter is legally enforceable
* Agree where copies of the Charter are kept and can be accessed
* Item 1.10 – remove the statement regarding two designated TMO representatives and confirm the group has ‘up to’ 12 members
* Define how the proportionality of tenures will be reviewed/calculated

 **Section 2 – Commitment to all council tenants*** Item 2.1C - there was ambiguity of what tenants would be offered by LBN if under-occupying their homes and this needed to be clarified. LBN needed to check what the intent of the Charter was as it implied offers could be refused if not the same type of accommodation
* A statement was needed to clarify if the commitments applied to residents being decanted off the estate and/or returning. The Charter is particularly unclear on the commitments for returning residents
* Item 2.1E - LBN to seek legal advice on the definition of rents, as there were now different types of affordable rent and the process for rent levels was no longer valid.
* Item 2.3A - include officer contact details responsible for the decants
* Item 2.3G - include a clear definition of how garages are managed

**Section 3 Rehousing and the right to return*** Item 3.1 – what was interpreted as ‘reasonable’? It was recommended that LBN considers a process like Hackney Council’s Exceptional Cases Plan to help develop a clear definition
* Item 3.6 – review level of compensation
* Item 3.8 – look at wording as DH standard has changed since the Charter was drafted in 2012, reference up to date information on LBN commitments
* Item 3.15 - section to be rewritten and include information on new build and refurbished properties generally and what priority would be given to residents
* LBN should allow residents with the right to return some flexibility to choose the property they return to and include resident choice items
* Item 3.16 - considering that the majority of residents were decanted from the estate over 10 years ago, the Council should be more generous by providing residents with the full range of items mirroring the first decant disturbance allowance. Throughout the document, it needs to be made clear what refers to the first decant and what refers to returning to the estate
* Item 3.19 - this section of the charter should be included under the section on design, which cannot be completed until the option/s being developed are clear i.e. new build, refurbishment or both
* General points: the Charter needs to Include information about what happens with rehousing support for private tenants and temporary tenants from the homeless list
* Can residents be offered option for residents to organise their own removal or will it be the council’s responsibility/will there be options for both?

**Section 4 – Compensation** * **A**ll figures presented in the charter from 2012 should be updated to represent figures for 2019. The Council should review all non-statutory amounts, including the suggested unit prices for carpets/curtains etc.
* Item 4.5 – unclear what ‘later’ means
* Item 4.15 – consider an advance payment of £500 to contribute to the refitting, clarity needed on all items for return to the estate, which should mirror the first decant. Replace medium range with equivalent. Remove the requirement for residents to be expected to ‘maximize the use’ of existing carpets and curtains, as unfair given the timescales. Need clarity on ‘new build homes’ offer to returners and what fixtures could be considered
* Item 4.16 - The Land Tribunal case Johnson v Paddington Churches HA (2005) is out of date and should be removed

**Section 5 Homeowners*** Item 5.2 - update information on RICS /CPA
* Item 5.4 - agreed this should be discussed with the leaseholder/freeholder sub-group
* Item 5.8 – more than one surveyor should be recommended –provide a list to select from?
* Item 5.12E – update information on the Valuation Tribunal and include information to explain when a CPO has been issued what the options are
* Item 5.13 - update figures
* Item 5.16 - £75,000 cap
* Item 5.26 - clarify who will be offered Shared Equity and Shared Ownership schemes. It currently indicates this would be all homeowners, subject to caveats
* Item 5.26A - it was questioned whether this item was referring to a lease swap, and if LBN would be offering this as an option?
* Item 5.26 D – remove reference to ‘12’ Equity Transfer opportunities
* Item 5.26F – the Council should be flexible on the 50% equity share, as some resident may find this difficult and a range of approaches will be needed

JJ to lead on the initial updating and arrange for review by the Council’s Legal and Allocations teams, with Source Partnership providing support where required. | JJ/SP |
| **7.0** | **Date of the next meeting** |  |
| **7.1** | Date to be advised - it was agreed that the next meeting would be held before workshop No. 4 in September if possible.  |  |