

**Notes of the Residents Regeneration Group Meeting**  
held on 9<sup>th</sup> October 2003 at  
215 The Broadway

**Present:** West Hendon Residents – as per attendance list attached  
Sheila Morcombe MHT  
Yvonne Harrison MHT  
Angela Wheeler AA  
Caroline Powis LBB  
Lee Mariconda LBB  
Jonathan Lloyd Owen LBB  
Anne Byrne LBB

**Apologies:** Carol Benford  
Martin Montague

**1.0 Matters arising/notes of last meeting**

With reference to the ALMO presentation at the last meeting, Andrew Graham asked whether Housing Benefit is paying double in council tax and rent towards the cost of setting up the ALMO. LBB confirmed that the set up costs are paid from the Housing Revenue Account and so rents are footing the bill.

Jon Lloyd Owen asked residents whether they had received copies of the ALMO video yet. No one had. An offer was made to make arrangements to show the video at 215 if anyone was unable to get access to view the video elsewhere.

**2.0 Keeping our promises, the agreement between MHT and LBB**

Jon Lloyd Owen and Yvonne Harrison gave a presentation on getting from the Pledge to a binding legal document with MHT and Bell House Joseph (BHJ)

Jon ran through the principles elements for the regeneration that apply to West Hendon of:

- Master plan principles
- New Homes
- Secure tenants – options and rights
- Owner occupiers- options
- Allocations and re housing
- Neighborhood management
- The building works

The legal agreement:

The main documents, which make up the legal package, will be as follows:

- Heads of terms – this is being negotiated at present. This will set out the council obligations, MHT/ BHJ obligations, details of the legal transfer of land and the key promises in the pledge.
- The Principle Development agreement – this will be entered into by May 2004. It will govern the development of the new estate over the next 10/12 years. It sets the standards, builds on the pledge, shows how the new estate will be delivered, details specific obligations for all parties and will have the business plan attached to it. It is not too prescriptive and needs to be a bit flexible to respond to the changes that tenants may want. It will be comprehensive and ensure that the promises are not lost.
- A project monitoring agreement – a longer-term arrangement with structures and processes about how MHT/BHJ performance will be monitored and checked, and who/how residents will be consulted.

Questions were raised amongst the RRG about the financial model and the business plan. These were not familiar to residents. It was agreed that information on the principles and some details, as available, would be presented to RRG at a meeting in January.

Consultation:

So far the work that the RRG, Planning and development and management groups have been doing will be fed into the principle development agreement (PDA). The policies for the future management of the estate will be based on the work being done now. Summaries will be brought to RRG for discussion and agreement. For example the allocations policy. The pledge document says that no one will be required to live in a home higher than the level they currently live at. This will become part of the final allocations policy.

The details that are needed to confirm that the pledge can be delivered are still being worked up. That's the current position. So far it confirms that MHT can deliver the pledge, if any thing cannot be delivered then MHT will come to RRG to discuss.

Timetable:

RRG had some further questions:

Q. When do the window sizes get agreed?

A. The outline planning submission in November is not the deadline for the window sizes.

Q. Where have all the houses gone they seem to have disappeared from plans? Also the width at 3.8m is an issue.

A. Yvonne was confused by this and agreed to respond

Q. Can we look at houses elsewhere on visits?

A. This has already been offered and no one turned up.

Q. Which is the ruling legal document planning or heads of terms?

A. The outline planning submission demonstrates that the pledge can be delivered; the principle rule is that the heads of terms are King and not the outline planning. The pledge is a minimum basic guarantee.

Q. Andrew Graham wished his question noted - Can we be assured that the future of West Hendon is based on a 'Need not Greed basis?' or is it just lining BHJ pockets?

A. Opinion was noted and MHT/LBB assurance given that need was paramount.

Q. What will MHT stance be on subletting?

A. The management group will be looking at this.

Agreement to the following was made:

- more visits to house in due course
- business plan training from AA in January
- The Pledge should be compared to the agreements made so far to see just how much it matches – MHT to do this
- The planning process should be looked at by the P&D group. The group should look again at some training offered by 'Glass House' - P&D group to consider

### 3.0 Updates from groups

P&D – another meeting will be arranged before the planning is submitted Management – the last one was postponed and no new date yet. This will be rescheduled and a series of meetings planned.