

## Ebury Bridge Community Futures Group – Meeting 14

6<sup>th</sup> June 2018, 6.30pm – 8.30pm

Regeneration Base, 15 – 19 Ebury Bridge Road, Ebury Bridge Estate

---

### MEMBERS ATTENDANCE:

- Teresa Wickham [TW] Chairperson
- Mohammed Eisa [ME]
- Sheila Martin [SM]
- Fiona Quick [FQ]
- Laura Buttigieg
- Yolande Gaston
- Charlotte Pragnell [CP] – via Phone

### APOLOGIES:

- Rachel Riley [RR]
- Tammy Dowdall [TD]
- Mike Smith [MS]
- Stephen Rusbridge [SR]

### WCC OFFICERS AND CONSULTANTS:

- Councillor Rachael Robathan [CRR] – Cabinet Member Finance, Property & Regeneration
- Jodie McCarthy-Mills [JMM] – Senior Regeneration Project Manager
- Martin Crank [MC] – Communications and Engagement Manager
- Gelina Menville [GM] – Ebury Bridge Community Engagement Team
- Louis Blair [LB] - First Call Housing (Independent Resident Advisor)
- Hassan Ahmed [HA] – Ebury Bridge Community Engagement Team
- Abdel Belabbes [AB] - Ebury Bridge Community Engagement Team

**NOTES:** *This document provides a summary of the discussions which took place during the meeting including questions and respective responses that were raised during the session.*

#### **1. Welcome and Introductions from Chair**

TW opened the meeting by welcoming everybody and provided introductions, including welcoming CRR and asking the two new members of the Community Engagement Team (CET) Hassan Rahman and Abdul Belabbes to introduce themselves.

TW informed the group of the Cabinet Meeting where the recommendation will be discussed is due to take place on 2<sup>nd</sup> July [**Update – meeting is now being held on 9<sup>th</sup> July**], at the Strand starting at 7pm. The CFG are formally invited to attend. TW asked if anyone had any objections to do so. All members present were happy for the invitation to attend.

#### **2. Notes of last meeting**

The notes of the last meeting were reviewed page by page and matters discussed. All amendments will be made before being published online. Amendments:

Pg 2 – What does DDA mean? Disability Discrimination Act 2005.

Matters arising:

SM – Gates are still being left open with cars accessing the estate without permission – GM provided an update from CWH about the Gurda key. **Action:** MC to raise issue with CWH to investigate parking enforcement measures.

TW - Design must be DDA compliant. Residents have complained about the poor routes through the estate and not having level access into their blocks.

FQ queried the of Right to Return for businesses; was this a pledge or not? TW explained a retail strategy is needed to understand the what offers could be made to businesses. JMM confirmed this would form the next stage of work, if approved in July. GM added that the next session with the business' is next week, where we will engage and understand what their initial thoughts are now that a preferred scenario 7 is being consulted on.

TW gave an update on her first meeting with the Ward Councillors, Andrea and Murrad. It was a productive meeting and it has been agreed that regular (every 6-8 weeks) meetings will be held.

### **3. Action Points Review**

Each item was reviewed in turn and updated on the Action Point List.

JMM explained that the new CWH Operations Manager (Peter) is now in post, however there have been conversations with other residents and community groups about accessing the space at 1 Wainwright House (Community Engagement Centre). As such the RA should continue to sign out the key and arrange bookings through the Community Engagement Team (CET). SM was comfortable with this approach for RA access.

FQ enquired whether there was a date missing from Item 3. TW corrected; the date in question was on the list – **20<sup>th</sup> June**, 6:30pm, Meeting 15.

MC – Regeneration estate visit - Woodbury Downs in Hackney on the 16<sup>th</sup> June.

MC - Meet the team style poster can now be completed as team complement is now complete.

TW confirmed that maintenance works on the estate have now started as witnessed this afternoon on a walkabout, however the Edgson Gate is still being mis-used and must to held as a top priority for CWH. Shed doors and pipework being painted has already started to brighten up the estate.

SM - The current standard of paving repairs around the estate needs to be improved (there is too much spacing in between paving) as it presents a trip hazard for residents. JMM & TW assured that the pavement tiles will be brought to the CWH. **Action:** JMM to raise issue with CWH to investigate.

### **4. Project Update**

JMM gave an update on the engagement taking place during the consultation period, to ensure residents have received their brochure and have the opportunity to comment and provide their thoughts on Scenario 7.

GM explained the engagement activities including a number of pop-ups, door knocking exercises, and late night opening of the Regeneration Base until 7pm on Tuesdays, Wednesday and Thursday during the consultation period.

JMM & TW both noted the residents' engaging with the pop up stand on the estate this afternoon. AB/HR concluded that general feedback from the pop up stands so far is residents have been informed thoroughly on the regeneration proposals.

MC added that the CET visited vulnerable and elderly residents to provide addition support and information regarding preferred scenario. And that 'Key Pledges' made clear to everyone from the outset of the project, for example the right to return which will ensure the community stays together.

Clarification about what data is being collated for the housing needs assessment and equalities. JMM clarified that currently the Equalities Impact Assessment has been undertaken using publicly held data (ward and Acorn data) however as part of the consultation period residents are being asked to complete an Equalities Survey. This is not a Housing Needs Survey, as this piece of work would only start if the recommendation is approved in July.

MS – Wildlife pond to be retained under community charter. MC reassured the group that any design will re-provide the community gardens as they have always been recognised as a valuable community asset.

#### **5. Resident Association (RA) update/Feedback from meeting 31st May**

FQ discussed attending the recent Resident's Association meeting on behalf of the Community Futures Group and updated the group on the meeting at Edgson House on 31<sup>st</sup> May. 20 residents attended with the majority being leaseholders.

FQ described the meeting as "lively & engaging" and informative for those in attendance. Questions were raised about scenario 7 including where the "80% in favour" had come from. This was clarified as 80% engaged in the process since July 2017.

SM praised FQ for her presentation at the meeting and said that it was well received. given by FQ was to a high standard. SM also commented that this is the reason why she felt that a resident from the CFG would be better received, due to some resident's mistrust of the Council.

FQ shared with the group some of the discussion points, and read aloud a number of questions that residents had raised with her during the meeting.

SM enquired about the process to which Scenario 7 was decided upon as she was unable to provide an answer at the RA. JMM commented that the recommendation is a culmination of the work that the Council has been doing over the last 10 months, with the engagement and design teams, the residents and the Community Futures Group to test and then assess the scenarios against the key criteria. This assessment, in which the Community Futures Group have been heavily involved in has concluded in a scenario provided the maximum benefit for the Council and the Residents of Ebury Bridge Estate.

TW stated that the CFG have been more involved in the process than the wider community and so have shaped and influenced this process more than most. Whilst the CFG did not want to put forward a recommendation, all of the information has been shared at CFG meetings for feedback and comment at every meeting, including going through financial viability, the engagement levels/demographics on the estate, reviewing all of the residents' feedback from engagement events, understanding the feedback from the market and more recently before a preferred scenario was chosen exploring the pros and cons of each of the 8 scenarios.

JMM & TW encouraged further efforts from SM and FQ to help us engage with those RA residents about the scenario and ensure that they have answers and information to provide clarity on the current situation.

GM requested that FQ share the list of questions to be added to the CFG minutes, and also for the Council to be able to provide a response. This was seconded by JMM, stating that by virtue of the discussion taking place at this meeting, that the information should be included as part of the consultation to help answer the questions that are causing worry.

There was a discussion about providing this list of questions raised at the RA meeting, formally to the Council in order to provide a response, either personally or through a newsletter or factsheet. FQ felt that as they were her personal notes taken from the meeting, and not the formally agreed meeting minutes, the RA might not be comfortable with this. **Action:** FQ to confirm with the Chair of the RA, as their minutes were yet to be approved, if the list of questions could be shared.

MC commented that the questions that were raised at the meeting, where in the main, not new questions, and questions that had both been asked and answered before across the community, not just via the RA. As such some will be addressed in the next newsletter.

LB stated that if certain members of the community might not want to engage with the Team that they could always contact him – First Call Housing on 020 8682 9576, [louis.blair@first-call-housing.com](mailto:louis.blair@first-call-housing.com). Residents are able to talk in confidence and home visits can be arranged at the residents' convenience.

TW thanked FQ for all her hard work in preparing and attending the RA on behalf of the CFG.

SM put forward that door knocking could be an effective strategy, which was agreed by FQ, JMM & TW

FQ put forward a suggestion box for residents to drop leaflets which would be provided by the engagement team to encourage the community's engagement. JMM expressed concern that a suggestion box may be too one-sided of an approach to communication and doesn't encourage engagement.

FQ stated that as the summer holidays approach that this might see a drop-in engagement from the community and suggested that a strong message/update about the project is communicated to all residents before the summer break.

FQ commented that community charter leaflet produced by the Community Futures Group was successful in its purposes with residents in the community as a way of helping residents understand

how they can seek commitments from the council to ensure that they can influence any future designs.

## **6. Community Charter Meeting – Progress and next steps**

The community charter is a CFG led document. A leaflet was developed by the CFG, led by FQ, to help residents understand the importance of this document for residents. This leaflet has also been shared on social media.

FQ explained the rationale behind the community charter Traceability Matrix and explained that this would help to track residents input into the charter and what makes the final cut. Each CFG member was provided with a copy of the Tractability Matrix to review.

JMM commented to importance of keeping the charter requests flexible as at this stage the Council have not employed a delivery partner. If it becomes to specific the Council may not be able to commit to it, as it could have a negative impact on the procurement process.

CRR will share the CFG's Community Charter leaflet internally with senior officers, and start to have a conversation about how exactly how the Council will work with the CFG moving forward, to help support the CFG to engage and listen to residents.

TW commented that it was important to understand what residents want to see for the future, in 10-15 years' time and beyond. Look at best practice, industry firsts in building and construction methods to lessen fuel bills, reduce carbon footprint and be set a national standard of exemplar regeneration.

MC suggested to think about the areas you would like to have influence over – sustainability, design of open spaces, picking a delivery partner etc.

TW suggested that ensuring that any new buildings are future proofed and should be built to maximise the advantages that technological brings. An example was given of using sensors and retina (eye) recognition technology to support residents with dementia in the event of them not being able to find their way home.

FQ reminded the group that they had last discussed having a completed charter by September, and requested this to be moved to October; TW said that there was no problem in doing so.

JMM added that there is no fixed deadline for the charter document and that this work will be ongoing. If the CFG felt that they no longer wished to include it in the Cabinet report this is totally their choice, and would not lessen the impact of this documents in the longer term.

FQ felt and the group agreed that it was important to include something with the recommendation report.

MC suggested a draft high-level structure of the key headers could therefore be included with the Cabinet Report, it doesn't have to be the fully worked up charter.

CP asked when will the developer process be started? JMM commented that there is a while to go, but that the CFG will be invited to take part of the process at the appropriate time. This will include

looking at who each developer bidding is, what their experience is, what they are offering for residents.

#### **7. Group suggestions for further comms during consultation period**

FQ's notes from RA meeting will be used to form a FAQ fact sheet and MC to produce Newsletter to circulate to residents.

Community Engagement Team to continue outreach to community. JMM commented that now MC has returned, outreach through door-knocking can be prioritised and every door will be knocked at to gauge opinion and ensure that all residents have received the information.

GM shared an idea to encourage the participation of "local stakeholders" including any service providers to residents of the estate (i.e: anyone with influence, such as the local priest, GP, Youth Worker) to be invited to a stakeholder lunch. To engage with the project team and help ensure that key stakeholders have up to date and accurate information about what is happening to ensure that they are able to provide additional support. **Action:** GM to organise stakeholder lunch.

LBU – Suggested other forms of communications other than the brochure as it is quite a heavy read for those who are not avid readers or to whom English is a second language. Use shorter simpler language, perhaps daily messages like they have at underground stations. Consider options for those with basic literacy skills and translation services.

LBU also had the idea to use a bulletin/message board outside the office to communicate with residents.

JMM commented that post a decision in July the messaging will become a lot clearer as the direction of travel will have been set.

FQ suggested that some members from the group co-hosted the community charter session on 18<sup>th</sup> June.

#### **8. AOB**

TW asked each member in turn if they had any other business.

YG gave her apologies for the next meeting.

SM gave her apologies for the trip on 16<sup>th</sup> June, and 2<sup>nd</sup> July Cabinet Meeting as away on holiday. Local letting policy to be discussed at next meeting

#### **9. Date of next meeting**

Wednesday **20<sup>th</sup> June 2018**, 630pm