

**Ebury Bridge Community Futures Group – Meeting 2**  
8<sup>th</sup> November 2017, 6pm – 8pm  
Ebury Youth Club, Edgson House Basement, Ebury Bridge Estate

---

**MEMBERS ATTENDANCE:**

- Fiona Quick [FQ]
- Mike Smith [MS]
- Mohammed Eisa [ME]
- Rachel Riley [RR]
- Rhoda Torres [RT]
- Shaista Miah [SM]
- Stephen Rusbridge [SR]
- Tammy Dowdall [TD]
- Waleed Shaath [WS]

**APOLOGIES:**

- Carly Taplin [CT]
- Kari Haslam [KH]

**WCC OFFICERS:**

- Chris Le May [CLM] - Ebury Bridge Community Engagement Team
- Gelina Menville [GM] - Ebury Bridge Community Engagement Team
- Louis Blair [LB] – First Call Housing (Independent Resident Advisor)
- Martin Crank [MC] – Ebury Bridge Community Engagement Team
- Tom McGregor [TM] – Director of Housing
- Tony Hutchinson [TH] – Senior Regeneration Programme Manager

**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.*

**Welcome and Introduction**

TM opened the meeting by welcoming everybody. He explained that he would be chairing the meeting in the absence of an appointed independent chair. TM starting the introductions with himself, and followed round the room. Each person present introduce themselves and where they lived, officers provided their roles within the project.

**Review meeting notes from 25 October 2017**

Following a review of each page by exception, the following amendments were agreed:

Page 3, dates of future meeting should read:

- Wednesday 29<sup>th</sup> November
- Wednesday 20<sup>th</sup> December (*provisional date for informal Christmas gathering*)

Subject to those amendments the notes of the meeting were agreed.

**Terms of reference sign off**

TM explained that the final ToR had been put together using some of the feedback received and that the group would now be asked to sign the final document.

RR stated that she thought that this meeting was to further discuss the ToR and was not expecting to sign them today.

TM explained that it was important to get the framework for this group agreed as soon as possible. He explained that in his experience these groups work well when there is an agreed framework, and that everybody is clear on the purpose of the group, its aims and work streams.

MC explained that all possible suggestions put forward by the group were picked up although it was not possible to incorporate those requests that are not in line with Council policy.

TM suggested that the accepted amendments were explained by those who had made the suggestion. Rhoda, Fiona and Rachel read and gave explanation to the group as appropriate.

TM offered RR the opportunity to go through those items suggested that were not accepted, concentrating on the big issues due to time. The items were discussed in turn, however it was widely accepted that some of the items did not make the ToR document but should be picked up elsewhere.

### *1. Background*

Page 1. RR felt that a Right to return should be offered to everyone within the community including the businesses.

MC explained the pledges stated in the ToR were as agreed by the Council, as such should not be altered by this particular group. It was accepted however that if the group felt strongly about this it is something that could be discussed at a later stage.

FQ explained that this would be an item for the RAID register, to ensure that it remains on the group's radar. This was also suggested in respect of the request to insert the word 'current' into the pledge pertaining to good local shopping.

### *2. The futures Group*

Page 1. RR asked why residents would not be able to have a vote and why this could not be included in the Terms of Reference.

MC explained that the Council has made its' position clear that no vote will be given, and this is in line with the Mayors draft guidelines to regeneration.

GM added that a vote would simply produce an opinion at on one fixed moment in the process, based on a limited set of factors which could change as the process progresses. The Council made a commitment (at the 28<sup>th</sup> June 2017 Resident Meeting) that the new proposal would be looked at with the community allowing them to be more involved the process, working with the Council and the Design Team. The Community Futures Group has been formed to work with the Council and influence the proposals as they are developed.

### *Objectives*

Page 2. RR asked what information is the CFG expected to receive from the design team and what outputs are expected as a group.

MC explained that the idea is for the group to get information ahead of the public and that the design team will work with the CFG to test messages and gather feedback to ensure that when the wider community are presented with information it is in a way that they will understand and find helpful.

FQ added this as an item to the RAID register as an assumption.

### *3. Membership*

Page 4. WS requested that the group be given a list of all stakeholders, their interests and thoughts about the project.

GM explained that whilst the stakeholder mapping diagram can be shared, we do not yet know in depth the opinion of each stakeholder, as this forms part of the work undertaken in this process.

*Chair*

MC explained that an advert had now been issued for an independent chair for the group. The advert closes on 30<sup>th</sup> November. MC agreed that he would email the link and that those who wish to get involved with the interview panel should let him know.

<https://www.wig.co.uk/career/independent-chair--community-futures-group--ebury-bridge-renewal---westminster-city-council-.html>

TM asked if people were comfortable to sign the terms of reference following the discussion which has just taken place.

TD stated that as she only joined the meeting this week, she was unable to provide input at the first meeting. MC confirmed that the document was sent to TD at the same time as everyone else, and that provided an opportunity for TD to comment.

TM explained that nobody is forced to sign up to the ToR, however the CFG cannot be formed without this initial agreement and ToR framework.

All 9 members present signed and returned the document.

TM thanked the group for signing the ToR and confirmed that the group is now officially formed.

### **Project Update/Engagement Timeline**

MC explained that the Listening Period was closed as of the 31<sup>st</sup> October and we are now entering the design process. MC gave the number of who chose to engage with the process and team as: 132 households completing the listening survey, 90 attendees across the listening panels meetings, plus people contacting on the site team at the Community Engagement Centre.

MC further explained that the design process will allow this group to start to meet with the designers, and they will start to look at how this group can influence the design engagement. This includes being introduced to the team on 15<sup>th</sup> November, where they will look at the materials for the community event taking place on 22<sup>nd</sup>/23<sup>rd</sup> November.

In December the group will start to look at thematic design themes again of a public consultation event, due to take place before Christmas.

In the New Year, the design team will start to look at the long list of options and how they can be reduced to a short list. The CFG will be vital to this 'whittling down' process.

LB asked if Arup will work with the group to explain the design option engagement process. MC confirmed that this is correct. They will explain the design process from now until taking a preferred scheme forward.

What happens if a preferred scheme cannot be reached?

TM explained that it is a combination of factors that are required to take a scheme forward, including making sure the finances work and ensuring that it is acceptable in terms of planning. The team will work to ensure that by the end of the process all aspects have been explored to ensure that a viable scheme can be taken forward. This includes acceptance from the community.

TM also stated the Council appreciate that this scheme has resulted in people's lives being put on hold, as such the Council is committed to making this work, as soon as possible to provide surety to the community.

FQ explained that this is why ToR is key to the work of this group and that all decisions taken by the group must be in line with the ToR.

TM offered the group the opportunity to request attendance from Senior Members of the Council to answer the groups' questions at the appropriate time.

### **Leasehold policy consultation**

Tony Hutchinson (TH) Senior Regeneration Programme Manager was introduced to the group. TH explained that the Council's leasehold policy hadn't changed since 2014 and that the Council have been wanting to review this for some time. Work starting on this review and have taken place over the past year, with the document now ready for consultation.

TH stated that the consultation period was due to start on 13<sup>th</sup> November and will run until 15<sup>th</sup> January. This is a borough wide consultation exercise but the policy only applies to those who are going through regeneration and have their estates earmarked for renewal.

TH then proceeded through a pre-prepared presentation, of which copies were handed to the group to follow. In essence the presentation explained the changes being proposed to the current policy.

RT asked if there were any schemes where leaseholder had actually returned to new homes. TH confirmed that there were no schemes across the borough that had been completed and so no leaseholders currently have returned to new properties.

A copy of the slide show presentation can be found at the end of this document.

### **Any Other Business**

RT asked who the main point of contact for the group was. MC confirmed that he was the main point of contact and he can be contact using the [eburybridge@westminster.gov.uk](mailto:eburybridge@westminster.gov.uk) email address.

RT gave her apologies for next week's meeting.

**Attachment 1:** Ebury Bridge Estate – Community Futures Group Meeting, 8<sup>th</sup> November 2017  
Updated Leaseholder Policy – consultation