

**Pembury Estate Residents' Association (PERA)**  
**Executive Committee Meeting with Peabody**  
**Minutes**

---

<b>Date</b>	6.30 pm, Tuesday 15 July 2021
<b>Venue</b>	Zoom meeting online
<b>Present</b>	Senait Mebrahtu (PERA Co-Chair), Richard Harris (PERA Co-Chair), Lesley Borzoni, Stephen Knight, Ash Patel, Simon Mercer (Block A Atkins Square Branch Secretary), In attendance from Peabody: Emma Comer, Dele Fatogun, Kerry-Ann Waldo.

---

<b>Agenda item</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>1. Appointment of facilitator</b>	SeM appointed.	
<b>2. Apologies for absence</b>	Elizabeth Houghton, Lottie Story, Jose Alberto Sainz	
<b>3. Minutes of previous meeting</b>	Minutes of 8 June 2021 approved.	
<b>4. Legal case against Bellway</b>	<p>Written Question: <i>“Considering there are claims in place with NHBC, what is the purpose of the case with Bellway? Without sharing specifics, how will the outcome affect leaseholders?”</i></p> <p>EC: We “twin-track” defects cases. Opening the NHBC claims case and the Bellway court case at the same time puts more pressure on Bellway. It works to leaseholders’ advantage. It means we are not waiting for one thing to finish before doing the next thing.</p> <p>SiM: Is it going to get to the result quicker, as we have no clue where the responsibility lies. Are we waiting for NHBC to give out loads of money and force Bellway to fix it?</p> <p>EC: The two tracks run separately. If NHBC accept a claim and Bellway agree to do the work, that gets done. If the NHBC claim isn’t successful but the claim against Bellway would succeed, we go for that. We go to Bellway as the original building contractor to reduce costs. The idea is to end up with the building you paid for.</p> <p>SiM: Is there a difference between what needs to be done for remediation and what needs to be done for the EWS1 form?</p> <p>EC: We presented everything to NHBC through our solicitors. The process is we say something is a latent defect, Bellway says that at the time of build the defect was in fact</p>	

	<p>acceptable, and this then takes time to get to what is agreed.</p> <p>SiM: What has been agreed?</p> <p>EC: We've had a first response from NHBC. We are keeping our court claims open in case NHBC doesn't cover everything. Each block has its own claim. The court claims were filed before the end of the limitation periods.</p> <p>SK: What is the effect of the NHBC letter of 25 June 2021 which accepts the claim for Block D Atkins Square (i.e. 13 Atkins Square)?</p> <p>EC: The fact that NHBC have accepted the claim is not a guarantee that leaseholders will not have to pay out. We are expecting a firmer response from NHBC after their consultation with Bellway and we are chasing that up. NHBC accept there are cavity barriers with Block D Atkins Square which need to be investigated further but Bellway will need to remediate them. NHBC speak to Bellway.</p>	
<b>5. Remediation plan</b>	<p>RH: What is in the plan to reassure us that leaseholders are not under undue stress waiting for a long-term outcome?</p> <p>EC: I will speak with the communications team.</p> <p>Written Question: <i>“Peabody to explain the stages that are being undertaken to get to completed remediation, including a high level set of steps and update on the process up to the present time.”</i></p> <p>EC: Until we finish work with NHBC we cannot give the steps for the remediation plan.</p> <p>❖ Remediation plan will be on the agenda for the next meeting.</p>	<p>EC will check what the available options are for providing reassurance, and respond by Wednesday 21 July 2021.</p>
<b>6. NHBC</b>	<p>Written Question: <i>“Who at Peabody is responsible for overseeing these claims?”</i></p> <p>EC: At present Emma Comer, Head of New Homes and Quality.</p> <p>Written Question: <i>“What are Peabody plans for informing leaseholders? The current process of individuals having to phone up and chase NHBC for a claim that has been lodged by Peabody is untenable.”</i></p> <p>EC: This will arise from the communications plan. It will mean we don't have to have each individual resident chasing up.</p>	

	<p>Written Question: <i>“Why has Peabody not informed leaseholders on the progress of the NHBC so far?”</i></p> <p>EC: It has just taken that long – we got our first proper response on 21 June 2021. The NHBC has had limited resources.</p> <p>Written Question: <i>“How will Peabody/NHBC ensure that the remediation fixes will cover the requirements of the EWS1 form?”</i></p> <p>EC: On remediation projects we work with a fire engineer, who then signs off the EWS1. They are part of the project team from design onwards.</p> <p>Written Question: <i>“How will Peabody/NHBC ensure that the fire defects (such as missing cavity barriers and sheathing) that are breaches of regulations are completed if they aren’t required for the EWS1?”</i></p> <p>EC: We pursue latent defects whether or not they are required for the EWS1.</p>	
<p><b>7. Development of the Old Community Centre</b></p>	<p>SK: Can we move the existing berry bushes outside the Old Community Centre before they are destroyed? The residents on the community gardens can do the work.</p> <p>DF: I need to check the timescales for the work and get back to you.</p> <p>SM &amp; RH explained that there had been a lack of communication from Peabody or the developers about the practical steps that will be involved in the construction process. There was not a single poster to advertise the meeting.</p> <p>DF: We clearly need another meeting so that Peabody can consult.</p> <p>Written Question: <i>“Peabody to confirm when the meeting of the 22 June, arranged by the Development Team and Faithdean, was organised.”</i></p> <p>DF: I cannot answer. I will have to go back to Andy. I sent Andy the questions and he didn’t come back to me.</p> <p>Written Question: <i>“Peabody to confirm the specific details of the actions taken to inform residents of this meeting and the dates those actions were completed on.”</i></p> <p>DF: Again, Andy will need to answer.</p>	<p>DF to check the timescales behind the building work and the offer to move the berry bushes.</p> <p>DF to report back to Andy in Peabody that the communication hasn’t reached residents and ask for the answers to the unanswered questions on the agenda.</p> <p>DF to organise a further meeting with residents on this issue.</p> <p>DF to provide the response to the original consultation on the new development.</p> <p>By 29 July 2021 DF to provide an update on the</p>

	<p>Written Question: “<i>Peabody to confirm their policy on what is considered to be ‘meaningful consultation’ with residents.</i>”</p> <p>DF: I can provide that separately. I take it you are more specifically referring to this particular issue, so I will get Andy to send you something on that.</p> <p>RH: We still don’t have an update on the opening of the outdoor gym.</p>	outdoor gym's opening.
<b>8. Service Charges</b>	<p>Written Question: “<i>Some blocks on the estate have seen a disproportionate increase in their service charge, relative to their size. Peabody to explain how service charge is calculated, and how it accounts for the size of a block.</i>”</p> <p>DF: Claire Cooper was supposed to come and answer that. She is on leave. I spoke to her replacement, John Darkin. He has no awareness about the service charges. He has asked me to obtain relevant emails.</p>	<p>LS to provide to DF the emails she has sent to Claire Cooper so they can be passed on to John Darkin to be answered.</p> <p>DF to then provide the responses.</p>
<b>9. AOB</b>	<p><u>Update on police access</u></p> <p>DF: There is a liaison group with the police, the Hackney Downs Partnership Meeting. I have asked them to put the RA on the invite list to the meeting.</p> <p>RH: These sorts of meetings don’t really involve residents, and attempts at resident involvement with police have fallen away. Such meetings should be constant.</p> <p>DF: I can ask some people from the Safer Neighbourhood Team to come to the RA.</p> <p>SK: Residents plainly hadn’t been asked about whether they want police to have access to their buildings. What will Peabody do to check if residents are okay with this and if they aren’t, then to revoke access?</p> <p>DF: We aren’t going to be revoking access because of the levels of ASB. If residents have a strong view about police not being around we can look into that. We can do a survey.</p> <p>SK: The RA can provide resourcing to ensure we reach out to residents for a survey.</p> <p>DF: We will take that.</p>	DF to respond to this before next meeting.
	<p><u>Anti-social behaviour on the estate by non-residents</u></p> <p>DF: We are putting up information on all noticeboards about the identities of neighbourhood managers and caretaker information. The information about contacting</p>	DF to put details of this on notice boards.

	<p>police about ASB was meant to be added as well but this did not happen. It will be posted by the end of July.</p> <p>Regarding CCTV, Peabody is changing the signposting around the estate, and is auditing the estate to check it is correct.</p>	
	<p><u>Estate inspections</u></p> <p>DF: We will arrange to restart the walkabouts. A representative from estate services can also come to meetings to assist with caretaking issues etc.</p>	
	<p><u>Pigeons</u></p> <p>RH: There have been a lot of complaints about pigeons nesting under solar panels, and pigeons on balconies.</p> <p>DF: I will look into getting a bird of prey to come round.</p>	<p>DF to look into getting a bird of prey to come round the Estate.</p>
	<p><u>Barbecue</u></p> <p>The RA is planning a community barbecue, and has been in touch with Susan Dobre.</p> <p>AP: Are there any locations we cannot do?</p> <p>DF: Other than where the current development is, let me speak to Neighbourhood Managers, but I can't see where there would be restrictions.</p>	<p>DF to investigate making a contribution from Peabody. SM &amp; RH to liaise with DF.</p>

**Date and time of next meeting: 6.30pm Thursday 12 August 2021 on Zoom – link to be circulated.**