

**NOTES OF CANNING TOWN RESIDENTS' STEERING GROUP MEETING
HELD VIRTUALLY ON 15.6.23 at 6pm**

AGENDA

	Item:	Item Lead:
1.	Welcome and introductions, minutes and actions	Sarah-Jane
2.	Design update	Mark, Shade
3.	Engagement update	Demi
4.	Newman Francis update	Sarah-Jane
5.	Any other business	All

Present:

Residents:

Ibironke O
Judith J (group Chair)
Edward R
Fawsia E
Sheila A

NewmanFrancis:

Sarah-Jane Day (Chaired) - Canning
Town Sen'r Engagement Consultant
Kamahl Ahmet - Project Officer

Notes (from recording) - Clare
Maybury

London Borough of Newham:

Mark Green – Regeneration Programme
Lead
Rubaiyna Oozeer – Corporate Comms
Lead for Housing Regeneration and
Community Wealth-Building
Caroline Pillay – Assistant Director
Community Wealth - Building Lead
Tim Chaudry - Senior Regeneration
Manager
Dami Segun - LBN resident involvement

Design Team (Jestico & Wyles)

Athina Stylianoidi – architect at J&W
Ricardo Bobisse - Co-Design process

1. Welcome and introductions

- 1.1. Sarah-Jane welcomed everyone to the meeting and apologised for the lateness of the minutes. Mark introduced new attendees.

2 Minutes of the previous meeting (18.5.23)

2.1 Update on actions:

(3.1.1) **Mark** to follow up on Housing representation at residents' meetings and on joined-up working: on agenda

(3.1.1) **Judith** to share with Mark her correspondence with Housing (Donna Morelli) concerning problems with the refurbishment: received

(3.1.1) **Mark** to share an updated contact list of council representatives who may be contacted: this would be in the next LBN newsletter to residents

(4.4.3) **Sarah-Jane** to re-circulate Terms of Reference and add to future agenda:
action stands

- 2.1.1 Mark updated on a previous action to request an update on housing refurbishment activity. The Assistant Director of Housing Services would be attending future meetings. There would also be an initial site walkabout with councillors, Housing & Regeneration and residents, to come up with a task list.
- 2.1.2 *This process has taken place before and nothing has happened – why is this different?* There would now be senior Housing and councillor representation to hear issues first hand, with things like leaseholder repairs then addressed at future meetings
- 2.1.3 *For those who now want to leave, due to slow progress and unresolved issues, will a contact be given to help deal with this?* This would now happen, and everyone would be invited. A housing-focussed meeting would also be further considered.

3 Design update (given by Mark and Athena)

- 3.1 Mark shared a presentation, showing the master plan area and the three estates for ballot. Designs were re-shared. There had been a number of revisions, in consultation with residents. Building regulations consultations had also impacted the designs (for example, a new post-Grenfell government regulation ensuring a second staircase in buildings over 30m. This would reduce the number of dwellings by 63 across the master-plan but would not reduce the size of the rooms).
- 3.1.1 Hill were appointed and working on initial stages, including surveys, design work, costings and quotes. Construction of the 147 homes would start later in the year.
- 3.1.2 Household composition: There were currently 326 properties across the estate, including some voids being refurbished. Residents in secure tenancies and temporary accommodation would be housed under the council duty; others wishing to move away would be able to.
- 3.1.3 *Which households won't be re-housed as a council responsibility?*
Those declaring as homeless would be assessed and may not have legal rights to public support if they had their own financial means. Those not under the council's duty to re-house would also include those in Design Guardian roles preserving empty buildings.
- 3.1.4 Distribution of tenancy types showed how capacity could be built by moving people around and creating vacant possession.
- 3.1.5 *Is Edwin St still in the regeneration? Will they be included in the ballot?*
Edwin St was in the masterplan and would be included as improvements would still be made in the hard scaping / landscaping areas.
- 3.1.6 Security was now needed for temporary residents and secure tenants about the timetable for moving: New homes being built now on Vincent St would enable nearly two-thirds (2/3) of residents to be offered accommodation on-site in new homes. This would include all those needing 1- and 2-bed homes, but there was currently still a need for larger properties. The Design team had been looking at how to create additional capacity for those left out.

- 3.1.7 *Would that affect the size of rooms?*
Only the number of dwellings would be affected, with a possible reduction of 63.
- 3.1.8 *How would someone now in a 2-bed but needing a 3-bed soon be affected?*
The scheme was now at an early planning and building stage. Housing needs would be re-assessed before allocations are made. Plans were currently working with existing information, but it was recognised that this would change. The council wanted to ensure those in most housing need now can move quickly, but ongoing updates would be made throughout the process.
- 3.1.9 *Which bits of Vincent St are being re-housed from?*
Those in temporary accommodation and secure tenants currently on the estate would receive an offer of social and affordable housing but would not be forced to accept.
- 3.1.10 *The Steering Group have not yet discussed residents' willingness to move to another part of the estate, for example further away from shops, transport and facilities. How will this be dealt with?*
In the next phase of development, a local letting policy would be developed and start to prioritise residents, working together to make allocations. There may be an opportunity to develop a policy that enables temporary relocation before moving to a final location, recognising specific estate requirements.
- 3.1.11 *Temporary and secure tenants' right to buy is currently suspended due to the regeneration, and new builds will not allow the right to buy. This creates a 'double whammy'.*
This was true concerning the suspension. New-builds were exempt from right-to-buy for 15 years after which the right-to-acquire would be available.
- 3.1.12 *For some, suspension has been going on for 19 years as the process takes so long. Now we hear this will go on for another 15 years.*
These were national, not local rules, and not within the council's power to affect
- 3.1.13 *Why is there no offer to secure tenants who have had right-to-buy suspended for so long to enable them to buy something elsewhere in the borough?*
For secure tenants, a mutual exchange may be arranged with another secure tenant elsewhere in the borough, with right-to-buy as long as there is no demolition order on that property. The restriction is linked to the property, not the tenant.
- 3.1.14 *That has not been made clear to residents and the loss of right-to-buy is unfair. Any property becoming vacant should be being offered to a secure tenant without the need to do a mutual exchange. This is divisive between groups and will not secure a Yes vote.*

ACTION Mark and Caroline to find out more about exercising the right-to-buy through moving

- 3.1.15 *The council is required to do works and repairs and has continued to take leaseholders' payments, but the repairs not been done. Can we find our own valuations and providers?*
Yes, leaseholder-provided valuations would be considered alongside LBN ones and may go ahead at an agreed price.

- 3.1.16 *As a result of the Council not doing leaseholder repairs, the market price may fall and the leaseholder lose out. This is not the fault of the leaseholder and seems to be a deliberate approach by the council.*

ACTION Mark and Caroline to consider the issues of falling values due to repairs not being completed

- 3.1.17 *Communication on these and other issues is almost impossible, and this makes me just want to move from the council. Responsibilities are not clear.*

ACTION Mark to pick this up directly with the resident concerned and take the issue forward for others in the same situation.

- 3.1.18 There was a shortfall of about 50 larger homes. Current plans were to accelerate an additional building on part of the vacant homes site, giving an extra 60 homes.

- 3.1.19 In response to feedback and wider agendas (climate, retrofit, refurbishment), Edwin and Ferrier were looking at opportunities to promote retention and reduce the number of homes and homeowners affected. Options would be shared with the wider community. This mainly affected four properties where residents would still be part of the ballot process and be able to vote.

- 3.1.20 Landlord offer: the three estates would be balloted at the same time, giving affordable housing residents the opportunity to move in the first phase

- 3.1.21 Pre-approval would be sought from Cabinet in July for a ballot in the coming months. Proposed changes concerning temporary accommodation and Vincent St plans would also be outlined.

- 3.1.22 **Meanwhile strategy** for the Rathbone/Tant Ave/Baldock St corner site, discussed at the last meeting, would be brought back to the SG as proposals developed.

- 3.1.23 A number of housing allocations issues were raised by residents:

- *Why has bidding been suspended for people on the re-housing list in temporary accommodation?*
- *Many of those involved have had their bidding right suspended after their move to the area. If the ballot is unfavourable most would not want to remain. It is not clear who to speak to about this but it needs to be on the next agenda.*
- *What is the position of those placed without choice in temporary accommodation (following homelessness), who had their bidding right withdrawn, and now have secure status?*

ACTION Mark to investigate further, capture actions and signpost individuals concerned to the right places in the Allocations team.

- 3.2** Athena shared a presentation due to be publicly shared at the weekend. This showed the masterplan, including the latest changes (reported above), and showing connections east-west and north-south. Construction was due to start soon. Fewer properties would be demolished; a gateway park area was included, meeting places incorporated, and mature trees retained. A new square at Vincent St would also be created. In response to the co-design process, designs now included water features and mature trees, play areas, seating, good lighting and security and enabled good connections. Further focused co-design workshops would look in more detail at play-spaces and landscaping.

3.2.1 *Resident feedback on the designs was positive, and all involved so far were commended. This was the kind of light, bright, positive environment needed by residents. Concerns remained, however, that questions must be answered for people to feel secure they would be part of the development.*

3.2.2 *How will LBN ensure maintenance will continue once the beautiful development is in place? If this is not done, things will once again deteriorate.*

The Design team were trying to ensure sustainability and maintainability by the use of the right materials, which would age well and be long-lasting. The team were working closely with advisors to design easily maintained landscaping, for example including natural water drainage. It was hoped the new environment would also be respected by residents who had been involved in the process and would want to maintain improvements. Space would also be open to the whole community, not just residents, and this would help areas to be kept looking good. Plans would be discussed in far more detail in further workshops to get resident views and feedback.

[The Design team were thanked and left the meeting]

4 Engagement

4.1 Dami shared a presentation in response to the questions about the ballot, and explained:

4.1.1 The ballot was a London mayoral requirement for projects of a certain size including demolition and rebuilding; had funding attached and was supported by LBN and Newham's Mayor.

4.1.2 There would be one vote for the whole area, with a simple majority result: Yes would mean LBN could continue with the planning application and construction, with ongoing resident input and partnership. No would mean plans would have to be reconsidered by senior members of LBN and Cabinet.

4.1.3 Eligibility was set by the London Mayor and GLA.

4.1.4 *Will it include those who have been moved out of the area?*

About 30 households, where the secure tenant would have been moved by the council for regeneration, would have the right to return and the right to vote. These had been included in all communications about the regeneration.

4.1.5 *There is an unfairness for those temporarily housed for many years, having to move out and not being given the right to return. Many of these are families with children who started their lives in such temporary accommodation and are now due to leave primary school. A comprehensive way to approach their inclusion is needed in order to avoid future mass protest. A further 7 issues relating to the ballot also need to be taken far more seriously. They have been raised with Mark.* There was now more commitment for senior council officers to attend SG meetings and address some of these issues. The right to return was within the council's power but the right to vote was not, as it sat with the GLA.

Action Judith to forward concerns to Mark

Action Mark and the SG to meet in person in July to discuss the landlord offer and ballot in more detail.

- 4.1.6 Independent body Civica would run the ballot and communicate directly with residents. Voting would be done using various methods and would run for 26 days. The process was outlined.
- 4.1.7 Summer engagement programmes were shared.
- 4.1.8 Different methods of campaigning were planned to ensure the fullest involvement of all residents, and the SG's involvement in outreach was welcomed.
- 4.1.9 *Residents again stressed the need to ensure the issues raised would be addressed and people treated fairly, in order for the SG to be able to add a supportive forward to the ballot documentation.*

ACTION Newman-Francis, Dami to add the Landlord Offer to the agenda for detailed discussion

ACTION Mark to ensure the experience at Custom House and Carpenters is included

5 Newman-Francis update

5.1 Outreach had continued with the sentiments surveys and checking household and contact details toward the ballot. Results headlines were shared, including:

- 5.1.1 86% were aware of the regeneration, 12% were not
- 5.1.2 67% were in favour, 13% not
- 5.1.3 20% thought it would have a positive impact through improved housing and environment; those who thought it would not have concerns about housing options, were reluctant to move or did not want to see change
- 5.1.4 Residents thought potential benefits included improved housing quality, while concerns included affordable housing worries, disruption during construction, and community displacement
- 5.1.5 The summary was that people were largely positive, but felt improvements were needed in communications and information-sharing

ACTION S-J to investigate why one resident was not asked these questions, although there would be many more such opportunities to give views.

- 5.1.6 An in-depth analysis would now be made by LBN, particularly around lack of clarity.

ACTION S-J survey to be shared with SG for comments and further discussion.

6 Next meeting

The July meeting would be in person, date to be arranged

7 AOB

- 7.1 An LBN-led **summer holiday programme** was being planned, to be shared with the SG. This would include producing artwork to become part of the regeneration hoardings.
- 7.2 There would be a **Community Day** the coming Saturday from 12:00-16:00.

The meeting closed at 20:10