



Central West Leaseholders Meeting
Minutes of the Meeting held online at 6:00 PM on 27 January 2025.
Draft expires 10/02/2025

Attendees

CW Leaseholders	CW	Central West Residents
Sandi Arthur (SA)	CW	Central West Resident
Yvonne Barnes (YB)	CW	Central West Resident
Ben Guest (BG)	CW	Central West Resident
Cassandra Hamilton (CH)	CW	Central West Resident
Katarina Jencova (KJ)	CW	Central West Resident
Lee Jones (LJ)	CW	Central West Resident
Tracy Long (TL)	CW	Central West Resident
Douglas Moat (DM)	CW	Central West Resident
Natalia Saagen (NS)	CW	Central West Resident
Syed Momin (Chair)	NFL	NewmanFrancis
Daniel Newman (DN)	NFL	NewmanFrancis

Agenda

1. Introduction
2. Summary of Findings & Recommendations
3. Resident Feedback
4. Next Steps

Recording

The meeting was recorded and a copy is available upon request.

1	Introductions	Actions
1.1	<p>The Chair welcomed everyone and thanked them for attending the meeting, expressing appreciation to all residents who provided valuable feedback over the past couple of months since the initial compensation offer was shared with residents on the 5th of December.</p> <p>The Chair briefly updated residents on the gathering of their input, concerns, and recommendations, in the sharing of a report detailing key findings from those discussions and engagements with The Guinness Partnership/Shepherds Bush Housing Association (TGP/SBHA.)</p> <p>The Chair reiterated residents' call for a meeting, with the purpose of making a formal representation via NewmanFrancis to TGP/SBHA board meeting on 29/01/2025—ensuring that their critical points were conveyed effectively.</p>	

2	Summary of Findings & Recommendations	Actions
2.1	DN reported that residents' raised concerns about; the calculation methodology used to determine compensation, questioning the benchmarking process and how figures were arrived at. The scope of compensation, noting key omissions such as: long-term mental health impacts, inability to sell properties, continued full service charge payments despite reduced services, and the Memorandum of Agreement, particularly its restrictions towards future claims. DN concluded that the full findings were in the report sent directly to residents.	
2.2	DN outlined the key recommendations made to TGP/SBHA regarding the compensation framework. NewmanFrancis proposed the development of a transparent and inclusive compensation framework, structured around three key areas: 1. Past compensation – addressing historical service failures. 2. Interim compensation – covering ongoing disruptions. 3. Future compensation – ensuring support for unresolved issues. DN concluded that the full recommendations were in the report shared with residents via email on Friday 24 th January 2025.	

3	Resident Feedback	Actions
3.1	Residents raised concerns about meetings: the structure (i.e., lack of residents' involvement to the agendas/contents), degrees of slippage, and cancellations. ACTION: NFL to raise with TGP/SBHA about future meetings inviting residents to add to the agenda of that meeting – with residents proposing more meetings, than the non-face to face communications.	TGP/ SBHA/NFL
3.2	KJ opposed large discrepancies in compensation between similar households - understanding that each household was individual – but without clear principles there should not be communicated drastic differences of 2-3,000 or 10,000 pounds within the same building. KJ supported lease extensions as a necessary provision, raising a second point, KJ warned against presenting specific resident figures to requests to TGP/SBHA, as it could weaken residents' position on lease extensions and other requests. Residents did not oppose. ACTION: NFL to add KJ's points to the formal representation.	NFL

3.3	BG expressed frustration that residents several years repeatedly requesting the same mitigations, only to be told they were not possible—yet they are now being implemented. Highlighted SBHA’s resistance, even when residents provided expert assessments, and stressed the severe impact on families, vulnerable residents, and children. BG emphasised that residents endured 3.5 years of inadequate temporary mitigations, despite repeatedly pushing SBHA for solutions. Argued that compensation should reflect the prolonged delays and the significant unpaid time residents spent engaging with SBHA to resolve issues. Residents did not oppose. ACTION: NFL to add BG’s points to the formal representation.	NFL
3.4	LJ reiterated other residents and questioned the timeline for interim and full compensation payments and expressed lack of confidence in TGP/SBHA’s ability to complete remediation works on schedule - based on current experiences. LJ highlighted the frustrations over cancelled meetings, stressing the need for regular meetings focused on residents’ concerns, not just the TGP/SBHA or NewmanFrancis’ agenda, and a cessation to delayed meetings following important decisions awaited by residents. Residents did not oppose. ACTION: NFL to add LJ’s points to the formal representation.	NFL
3.5	DM described the compensation offer as insulting, noting that it was initially 10% of market value during the buyback offer but later reduced to £5,000, which residents found unacceptable. DM criticised TGP/SBHA’s reasoning, arguing that residents wanting to leave should have been prioritised. DM emphasised that residents are being forced to stay and endure ongoing issues due to TGP/SBHA’s refusal to buy back properties. DM stressed that compensation must be substantial, financial, and per person, rejecting non-monetary solutions like lease extensions. Residents did not oppose. ACTION: NFL to add DM’s points to the formal representation.	NFL
3.6	TL questioned whether lease extensions are already covered under new government legislation, suggesting that some residents may be misinformed about needing to request them. TL raised concerns about potential NDAs or legal restrictions in the memorandum of agreement, arguing that if TGP/SBHA were acting in goodwill, they should not seek to prevent future claims. TL described the approach as feeling more like a “poor bribe” than fair compensation. ACTION: NFL to look into any potential government legislation and update residents.	NFL
3.7	BG called for a clear, unified compensation proposal from residents rather than ongoing back-and-forth discussions. BG suggested that residents agree on a reasonable ballpark figure to present to Shepherds Bush, creating a stronger negotiating position. BG warned that without a concrete demand, negotiations could drag on indefinitely with only minor increases to TGP/SBHA’s initial offer.	
3.8	NS demanded individual compensation assessments, stating that each leaseholder has a separate contract and should not be treated collectively. NS reiterated that residents requested a buyback on 8 June 2021 and feel trapped by Shepherds Bush, insisting that their position has not changed. NS rejected any compensation linked to March 2025, writing that the temporary heating solution is unsuitable and residents must wait for the installation of an electrical combi boiler. NS refused to sign a Memorandum of Agreement while unresolved issues, such as faulty windows, remain unaddressed—highlighting that window replacements are not scheduled until 2027, requiring compensation.	
3.9	The Chair acknowledged that Shepherds Bush recognised their initial compensation offer (December 5th) was unacceptable and assured residents that a revised offer with more information will be shared in early February. Stated that this next stage should reflect	NFL

	resident feedback and NewmanFrancis recommendations. The Chair reiterated that Shepherds Bush has not yet outlined plans for interim and future compensation, which remains a key concern. ACTION: The Chair recognised the negative resident sentiment toward the current process and emphasised communicating an understanding of their frustrations to TGP/SBHA board.	
3.10	<p>CH expressed concern that residents are discussing compensation without setting a clear financial figure, leaving room for TGP/SBHA to return with another insufficient offer. CH questioned why TGP/SBHA initially proposed an offer they already knew was inadequate.</p> <p>CH called for a defined negotiation process, where residents present a specific demand, rather than reacting to offers. CH raised concerns that without this, the process could drag on indefinitely. CH asked NewmanFrancis whether they have experience negotiating compensation for leaseholders and what residents should realistically expect. CH stressed the need for a clear roadmap and timeframe, stating that she does not want to still be discussing compensation in eight months. Residents did not oppose. ACTION: NFL to add CH's points to the formal representation.</p>	NFL
3.11	<p>LJ questioned the frequency of TGP/SBHA board meetings, noting that all substantive decisions require board approval and urging NewmanFrancis to confirm the schedule to prevent unnecessary delays. LJ expressed concern that individual negotiations could slow down the process, asking whether one resident holding out for a higher offer could delay compensation for everyone else. LJ warned against overcomplicating compensation categories, emphasising that the total compensation pot is unlikely to increase significantly, regardless of how residents frame their claims. LJ criticised the lack of urgency and tangible outcomes, stating that meetings have become repetitive without clear progress. LJ urged NewmanFrancis to push for action rather than repeatedly taking residents' issues away for discussion. Residents did not oppose. ACTION: NFL to add LJ's points to the formal representation.</p>	NFL
3.12	<p>DM argued that compensation should be handled through private negotiations between TGP/SBHA and individual leaseholders, rather than a collective agreement for the entire building. DM stressed that what is acceptable for one household may not be acceptable for another, and residents should have the freedom to accept or negotiate offers based on their personal circumstances. DM criticised the one-size-fits-all approach, pointing out that flats with different occupancy levels are being offered the same amount, which he described as unfair. DM expressed frustration that the process feels like a repeat of the failed buyback scheme, with residents jumping through hoops for no result. Residents did not oppose. ACTION: NFL to add DM's points to the formal representation.</p>	NFL
3.13	<p>SA suggested that residents should have been asked upfront what they felt was a fair and reasonable compensation amount during the impact assessment surveys, so that TGP/SBHA would have had clearer data to consider. SA expressed concern that interim payments could be used as a way for TGP/SBHA to avoid further increases, but acknowledged that no one would receive less than £5,000, which could serve as a baseline for future negotiations. SA questioned whether TGP/SBHA's next offer would be final or negotiable, asking if residents would face a "take it or leave it" scenario with no further room for discussion. SA understood that residents accepting £5,000 in February would not delay higher negotiations for others, supporting the idea that some could settle early while others continue pushing for more. Residents did not oppose. ACTION: NFL to add SA's points to the formal representation.</p>	NFL

3.14	BG urged TGP/SBHA to reinstate a reasonable buyback option for residents who want to leave, arguing that some should have the choice to exit rather than negotiate compensation for staying. BG suggested that TGP/SBHA should put forward a clear offer for those who wish to sell and move on. BG supported a tiered compensation structure that accounts for different circumstances, recognising that some residents, such as families with disabilities, have been more severely impacted than others. BG expressed frustration that residents have pushed for a buyback option for years, only for it to be withdrawn when not everyone agreed. BG stressed that it is time for those who need to leave due to financial or career reasons to be given the opportunity to do so. Residents did not oppose. ACTION: NFL to add BG's points to the formal representation.	NFL
3.15	TL suggested that TGP/SBHA are being too narrow-minded in their approach and that a slightly more generous compensation offer could resolve many issues. TL recalled past discussions where it was noted that an additional lump sum—such as £10,000—could make a significant difference, allowing some residents to move on, rent out their flats, or simply feel less frustrated with the process. TL argued that a small increase in the offer would benefit both residents and TGP/SBHA, as fewer people would feel the need to continuously chase emails and push back on negotiations. TL stressed that a higher offer now could bring the process to a close more quickly, rather than prolonging disputes over minor amounts. Residents did not oppose. ACTION: NFL to add TL's points to the formal representation.	NFL
3.16	YB expressed frustration over the lengthy and exhausting process, questioning who ultimately controls decisions—Shepherds Bush or Guinness. Argued that Guinness, not Shepherds Bush, holds real authority and should be the focus of negotiations. YB highlighted research suggesting that Shepherds Bush was deregulated due to mismanagement, leading to Guinness taking control. Stated that Shepherds Bush is merely an intermediary, while Guinness manages the financial decisions. YB accused the landlord of using small compensation offers and gifts (radiators, air fryers) as a PR tactic, rather than addressing the real financial capacity they have to resolve issues. YB claimed that millions of pounds have been allocated to address Shepherds Bush's problem properties, including this one, and questioned why buybacks and better compensation are not being considered. YB called for greater transparency on how compensation funds are being allocated, rejecting £5,000 as an inadequate offer, given the financial burdens residents have endured. Residents did not oppose. ACTION: NFL to add YB's points to the formal representation.	NFL

4	Next Steps	Actions
4.1	<p>DN recapped the agreed contents for the residents' formal representation to the TGP/SBHA Board meeting on Wednesday, 29th January 2025.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A clear compensation timeline, road map, and payment plan. 2. A structured compensation negotiation framework. 3. An update on the interim payment request made at the last meeting (08/01/2025). 4. Regular meetings co-set up by and involving residents, not just TGP/SBHA. 5. Detailed breakdown of compensation levels, including the base payment. 6. Individual case assessments, allowing residents to negotiate private compensation. 7. Transparency and fairness—compensation must be benchmarked against similar cases. 8. Compensation must not be linked to other households. 9. Interim payments must not delay the full compensation offer. 10. A higher, more generous offer to allow some residents to settle now. 11. A full breakdown of what is being compensated for. 	NFL

	12. Clarification of the relationship between Guinness Partnership and Shepherds Bush, confirming who makes decisions. 13. Publication of the TGP/SBHA board meeting schedule. 14. Confirmation that compensation payments do not require unanimous resident agreement.	
4.2	Next meeting: To be set following the TGP/SBHA Board decision – February 2025	
	Meeting ended at 7:28 pm	

DRAFT