

Imperial Wharf Resident Steering Group Meeting Minutes

Gladesmore School, Tuesday 09 February 2016. 18:30-20:30

Attendees

RSG members: Esther Hailey (EH), Patricia Waters (PW), Beatrice Fazoranti (BF), Bridgette Daley (BD), Hersh Schneck (HS)

Officers: Michael Baker (MB) Homes for Haringey, Shannon Francis (SF) Haringey Council, Charmaine O'Jon- Gordon (COJG) Homes for Haringey, Ciaran Quigley (CQ) Haringey Council, Sue Witherspoon (SW) Haringey Council

Apologies:

Agenda Item		Action
1.0	Welcome/introduction	
2.0	Previous meeting minutes and actions	
2.1	Item 2.1 of 10 November minutes: MB explained to group Homes for Haringey procedure to consult with residents does not require translated versions of information to be sent out unless this is requested in a specific language by a resident. The request for translated information is on the reverse of the letter headed paper that was used with the parking consultation information giving residents the opportunity to request this in their language. EH stated she thought this was unfair and contributed to the low response rate. It has been agreed that these comments will be taken back to Oreain Robinson and Jennie Sami to respond to the group in writing to close the matter.	Michael
2.2	Item 4.4 of 10 November minutes. BF stated this was a misrepresentation of the point she was making. The following sentence will be omitted "Beatrice feels that her communication with Ivan has made Hackney more aware of their AAP is impacting on Imperial Wharf residents". RSG agreed the remainder of the minutes as accurate.	Michael
3.0	Estate Renewal Rehousing and Payments Policy (ERRP) Estate Renewal Rehousing and Payments Policy intro	
3.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SW explained her role as part of the strategic team involved to consult on this policy. 	

<p>3.2</p>	<p>Impact on Tenants</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The consultation does not mean that any further decisions for development of the estate has taken place. The policy is specific to apply to estates IF regeneration takes place. • Important decisions need to be made as to how the council will manage the process and financial implications of regeneration, therefore it is necessary that those all tenants need to have their say on this policy. • Group members collectively stated that the wording of the consultation documents and the timing have further fuelled the existing distrust between the residents and the council. • CQ explained any proposal to change an existing policy must go through consultation. • BF stated this consultation being sent out to residents who have been going through a consultation about the future of their estate will inevitably confuse matters and has led to people thinking key decisions have already been made. This will not encourage people to participate with consultation. • CQ will consider further communication to go out to try and clarify this. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SW explained estates which undergo regeneration will not cause tenants to become homeless, as the council has an obligation to find suitable alternative accommodation for its tenants. • Tenants - The council aims to rehouse whole families, that is, provide suitable alternative housing that meets the needs of the family. • Where a family consisting of adult children is overcrowded, the council will try and find housing to suit larger families but if this is particularly difficult, then there is an Exceptions Panel that will meet to consider cases individually. • Adults still living with parents could be offered accommodation of their own but only where they give up larger homes such as a four bed, or three bed adapted property. • "Haringey's Housing Policy – Guidance on bedroom entitlement" attached. • SW explained tenants living on an estate where a decision has been made to undertake regeneration will be placed into Band A to bid for alternative accommodation. 	<p>Shannon</p>
------------	--	----------------

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 12 months before the start of any demolition, if bidding is not successful, the council will provide a single offer for alternative accommodation. If tenants do not take this up the council will seek possession via a court order. • Courts will only grant this if it is agreed the offer made by the council is a suitable one, i.e. meets the needs of the family/person. • BD, “the council is not building any homes and there is a housing shortage, are there enough houses vacant to bid for to guarantee successful bidding?” • SW, Only about 5% of those on the housing bidding system are in Band A , increasing the likelihood of successful bidding • SW, once properties on estates undergoing regeneration are vacant they could be used for temporary accommodation. • Can tenants bid out of borough? • SW, No, we cannot offer what we do not have. Officers will work individually with tenants who are being decanted to help them bid successfully • CQ, if tenant would like the option to bid out of borough, they should state it in the consultation survey • EH, if all Imperial Wharf is subject o Hackney’s AAP, why are they involved in this consultation? • SW, because Haringey are still the landlords. The management of the estate and its residents is Haringey Council/Homes for Haringey’s responsibility. • SW, residents need to take this opportunity to let the council know what they think and what they would like should their estate go through regeneration. 	
3.3	<p>Impact on Freeholders & Leaseholders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Freeholders – SW, freeholders will be offered full market value plus 10% for homeless disturbance; home loss only available for resident leaseholders and freeholders. • Freeholders will have to arrange a valuation survey and the Council will also have the property valued. Both parties will then agree a price for the value of the property. • If parties can not agree, the matter can go to the Leaseholders Valuation Tribunal (LVT). • Non-resident leaseholders will only be offered the market value, not the 10% home loss payment. 	
3.4	<p>RSG concerns</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why has Imperial Wharf only just received this? • CQ, Council wanted to meet with specific groups to explain the need to be involved in the consultation before or close to when the information was sent out. • Has this only been sent out to estates vulnerable to 	

	<p>regeneration?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CQ, it is a borough wide consultation which is why it is accessible online. • Can a list of the estates that has received this document be shared? • SF, Yes. CQ to provide list to be distributed with the minutes. • Group does not feel Haringey are transparent. If only estates currently “at risk” have been spoken to and received this through the post, a large part of the borough has not been included in something that could affect them in the future. It feels intentionally strategic to only consult with vulnerable estates, and no-one is explaining why that is. • SW, because of the timing of the consultation and the complexity of regeneration, it can be difficult to provide straight forward answers, at the beginning; the Council may have to develop a range of alternative plans before finding one that tenants and the Council can agree on, and which works financially. • BF, these consultations make residents feels the efforts put into engaging with the council over the last year has been a waste. A lot of time has been put into building up trust with the council and now it feels like Haringey are not being totally truthful. 	Shannon/Ciaran
<p>4.0</p> <p>4.1</p>	<p>Stamford Hill AAP – Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EH stated residents have been informed by Hackney that the estate is not included in the AAP • SF circulated a map showing the boundary of AAP which clearly included the Imperial Wharf Estate clarifying the fact that nothing has changed. Council still identifying cost of investment needs to determine viable options and will review and update all the work that has already taken place. • BD asked whether Cross Rail 2 will affect Lemsford Close. SF advised that, Cross Rail 2 is managed by Transport for London (TfL) and details on their proposed route can be found on their website. If any decisions affect any council housing stock, TfL will have to consult with the Council. For further information on Cross Rail 2, please see the following website: www.consultations.tfl.gov.uk/crossrail2/october2015 • The draft AAP is still scheduled to be produced in June 2016. • The venue and dates for Hackney’s AAP workshops will be advertised in the estate newsletters and on estate notice boards 	Shannon

5.0	Community Centre Update	
5.1	Refurbishments works to the centre still on schedule, expected completion end February 2016.	
5.2	COJG, decision regarding the long-term management of the centre is still being discussed. The option to hand it over to a residents' association is an option. RA will require at least 5-6 committed individuals to make it work. COJG is currently working on a 2/3 year business plan. Further consultation with Imperial Wharf residents will need to take place to understand what the community would most like to use the centre for.	
5.3	Initially it is expected the centre will be used by council officers and community meetings.	
5.4	EH cigarette bins in front and rear, under roof canopy should be boarded up and made pigeon proof. MB will raise this and feed back to group.	Michael

Next meeting:

Date: 10 May 2016 (TBC)

Time: 6:30-8:30pm

Venue: Craven Park Community Centre