**The Carpenters Destination Steering Group Meeting**

**Thursday, 25 July 2019, 6:30pm – 8:00pm**

**Attendees:**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Resident 1 |  |  | Resident 5 |  |
| Resident 2 |  |  | Resident 6 |  |
| Resident 3 |  |  | Resident 7 |  |
| Resident 4 |  |  | Joanna Hansford | Newham Council |
| Rob Williams (Chair) | Source Partnership |  | Jane Jolly | Newham Council |
| Carol Squires | Source Partnership |  | Jan Rowley | Newham Council |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Item**  | **Action** |
| **1.0** | **Welcome and Introductions**  |  |
| 1.1 | All attendees introduced themselves, with apologies received from Bill Mitchell and Joan Shield. |  |
| **2.0** | **Notes of Previous meeting & Matters Arising**  |  |
| 2.1 | The notes were agreed as a true record. |  |
| 2.2 | The following matters arising require action:* RW and XX are still to meet to discuss vulnerable residents
* The Residents’ Charter (2012 signed-off version) requires some updating but no promises are to be reduced and Source Partnership and Newham will suggest some enhancements. JJ to forward copies of the current Charter to AN and SB.
* The Council is to enter into a data sharing agreement with Source Partnership to enable them to contact returning tenants to encourage them to participate in workshops and other events
 | **RW / XX****RW / CS****JJ****JJ / JR** |
| **3.0** | **Terms of reference (ToR)** |  |
| 3.1 | These were generally agreed and there was a discussion about non-attendance and a Code of Conduct - JJ agreed to draft a simple Code of Conduct for consideration by the Carpenters Destination Steering Group (CDSG) at the next meeting. | **JJ** |
| **4.0** | **Report from Residents’ Workshop on 18 July 2019 and Residents’ Brief** |  |
| 4.1 | RW summarised the feedback (report circulated in advance) from the Workshop held on 18 July regarding Refurbishment Options - key issues raised by the CDSG were:* Clearer information about what would be included in a refurbishment package is needed, including costs to homeowners
* Options information is needed over the approach to each of the tower blocks, impact on plans of retaining or demolition, the opportunities that would be presented
* Ideas for use of refurbished blocks i.e. mix and any tenure issues
* The impact of retaining or demolishing blocks on viability
* The infill new-build was generally well received
 |  |
| 4.2 | The CDSG felt that although the attendance was higher than the first workshop, there is still evidence of consultation fatigue and a lack of trust in the Council. XX reported that they had met with another returning tenant and they had been cynical about the Council’s intentions and how meaningful the consultation actually is. The key message about a Residents’ Ballot on the preferred option needs to be communicated, emphasising that residents really do have a choice. | **ALL** |
| 4.3 | The CDSG felt that communications regarding the consultation need to be clearer, for example how many homes in total would be needed to achieve 50% genuinely affordable rented homes and information about costs. It was also felt that the progress following the restart of the process last November needed to be publicised, so that the Council’s engagement with residents is seen as achieving something - RW to include in the next Newsletter planned for August. | **RW** |
| 4.4 | The CDSG identified the need for clarity about the availability of funding for each option and what funding would be used to pay for each option.  | **JR** |
| 4.5 | JR reported that the Council had received a Freedom of Information Request (FOI) regarding refurbishment costs, and that a response is being prepared internally to be provided in the Autumn - this will also be shared with CDSG. | **JR** |
| **5.0** | **Procurement** |  |
| 5.1 | **Architects Appointment**JH reported that the four short-listed Architects’ practices (Levitt Bernstein, Proctor & Matthews, Studio Partington and Pitman Tozer) will be interviewed and an appointment made for the remaining workshops by mid–August. |  |
| 5.2 | A further procurement will take place to appoint a practice to work up a Master Plan leading to a Residents' Ballot; the CDSG will be actively involved in that selection process. The question was asked about the funding for the external consultants and JH explained that there was an agreed budget for these as agreed by the Council Cabinet in December 2018. |  |
| 5.3 | SB asked that a glossary of common terms used within regeneration be produced to assist the CDSG with their role – JJ to draft for the next meeting. | **JJ** |
| 5.4 | **Brief for Property Advisor**JH tabled the brief for the property advisor and explained that their role would be to test the financial viability of the options. JH further explained that a framework (pre-approved list) of five suppliers would be used to speed up the appointment, and that CDSG can have an input into the brief and the appointment - JH agreed to circulate the names of the suppliers to the CDSG. CS suggested that the advisor should be resident friendly and able to explain complex information to CDSG in an easy to understand way - JH to alter the sections on collaboration accordingly. XX and RS agreed to take part in the procurement process. | **JH****XX / RS / JH** |
| 5.4 | JH agreed to produce a timeline showing key procurements for CDSG involvement | **JH** |
| **6.0** | **Meanwhile Projects**  |  |
| 6.1 | **Jupp Road Footbridge** **-** works totalling £255,000 with covering on bridge, or £150,000 for just securing the areas used by homeless / rough sleepers. The CDSG felt that this was expensive and not a meanwhile use, but a problem that the Council needs to solve by design from other budgets. The previous idea of a café was in the region of £1million - JR to refer this internally. | **JR** |
| 6.2 | **Refurbishment of ‘the cage’ adjacent to the Docklands Community Centre -** providing a 5-a-side pitch to be managed by the Docklands Centre at a cost of £380,000. The CDSG felt that this was also very expensive and that the use of the facility was not aimed at residents of the estate and the reduced number of children living there. It was felt a more multi-use games area was desirable, but that the long-term play and sports facilities should be considered further and included in any master-plan rather than as a meanwhile proposal. |  |
| 6.3 | **Community Gardening -** at a cost of £25,000 was felt to be something worth pursuing, but further details and locations for gardening and allotments needed to be identified. It was felt that the biggest impact would be in the square by the shops rather than where suggested. JH to explore locations and report back to the next meeting, it was further noted that the growing season is halfway through for 2019. | **JH** |
| 6.4 | **Activities in the Community Hub -** a number of activities have been suggested and it was agreed that the most popular ones should be trialled, but the need to be properly promoted and funded - JJ will liaise with colleagues about this. | **JJ** |
| **7.0** | **Any Other Business** |  |
| 7.1 | **Walk around the Carpenters Estate**Due to the extreme heat and lack of time remaining, it was agreed that the walkabout would take place next week on Thursday 1st August commencing at 5pm. | **ALL** |
| 7.2 | **Housing Management Services**It was noted that there have been some improvements notably around signage, but there remains considerable problems with the appearance of the estate with refuse areas over flowing and insecure; obvious fly-tipping not being cleared for well over a month now - JR agreed to raise this internally as this is undermining any confidence in the Council. | **JR** |
| **8.0** | **Date of next CDSG meeting** |  |
| 8.1 | The next meeting will be agreed once a date is set for the next Community Workshop, but it was proposed that it should occur before the workshop for the CDSG to feed into the proposal. |  |