

## **Meeting between Barking Reach Residents Association And BRL**

**9 April 2018, at BRL offices, Fielders Crescent, Barking, 7pm.**

### **Minutes as amended 9/5/18**

**Present:** Matt Carpen, Louis Chau, BRL, Pete Mason, Venilia Amorim, Barking Reach Residents Association

#### **1. Road works on Thames Road**

The residents association raised issues regarding car access and bus transport. EL1 buses are not running through the estate. Louis Chau responded: TfL reports buses cannot run round the terminus in Mallards Road if there are buses waiting there so it is sticking to its proposal to terminate at the school weekdays 6am to 9pm, from where buses run back to Barking via the estate. Other issues pending further meeting with TfL and Thames View residents latter this week.

#### **2. Parking**

Application for planning permission has been submitted to council and has been well received in general.

#### **3. Community Interest Company (CIC)**

Matt is examining various models for governance of the CIC, including Olympic Park Authority, Peabody Estate, Grosvenor Estate, but has nothing in writing as yet. BRL will indicate a preferred route, possibly a trust based model. It must be effective and transparent. The Residents Association raised the motion passed at the last residents association meeting on the 21 March:

**“The residents should have a clear majority on the board of the CIC.”** Passed by 15 votes to none with none abstaining.

The chair of the residents association said what the residents required was a democratic model where residents elect a governing body, with a majority of residents on it, which oversees the expertise of appointed officials who carry out the various works. Matt pointed out that when BRL was granted its planning permission the council proposed a model of governance in the form of the CIC.

The residents' association chair put forward the view that decisions regarding the financing of the development of the estate were guided by government cuts to local authorities which were political decisions and did not undermine the case for local democracy, and in regard to the running of the estate once developed, this should be money generating. The council is deprived of these funds and in this way local democracy is strangled. The best model to run those aspects of the estate covered by the CIC remains one of a resident majority on the governing body. Otherwise poor decisions are likely to be imposed on residents and they will organise against the CIC and nothing will have changed.

BRL and BRRA agreed to will meet again soon, once a proposal is ready from BRL.

#### **4. Link Parking**

The residents association presented two motions passed on link parking by the two previous public meetings, and discussed a third in relation to the cycle path on Galleons road:

4.1 Link Parking to cease ticketing residents parked in their own bays:

**“We call on BRL to instruct Link Parking to cancel all tickets issued to residents who were parked in their own bays and to cancel all court cases pending on this issue, since residents’ leases and tenancy agreements do not make provision for permits.”**

And:

**4.2. “We call on BRL to instruct Link Parking to cancel all tickets issued to residents who were parked in their own bays and to cancel all court cases pending on this issue, since residents’ leases and tenancy agreements do not make provision for permits.”**

BRL is meeting with Link Parking and will revert back.

4.3. A cycle lane resolution was passed by the residents association which noted that cyclists should not be encouraged to cycle on the pavement down Galleons Drive as a question of health and safety, particularly for children playing on the pavement. This was discussed.

BRL stated they are in agreement with the Council that the cycle network should be expanded as per the early design phases to encourage cycling in the area. It is a planning judgement that we support with the Council.

## **5. Heating**

The association presented its motion on heating in the four blocks of flats affected by the loss of heating last December, **“That the costs of the temporary heating should not be put on the service charge.”**

Residents want compensation and a report of the situation with the heating as now three of the four blocks are assisted by the installation of temporary heating equipment.

Matt commented that the situation with the heating in the flats was not acceptable. He had written to the landlords two weeks ago and was giving them time to respond and will write again.

## **6. Service Charge**

The association explained that we had written several times to Pinnacle to discuss the service charge but without a response. Matt had spoken with Ben who had fed back that he will meet with individuals singly but not with a delegation from the Residents Association.