

MILE END ESTATE MANAGEMENT BOARD

Thursday, 10th June 2010 at 7.00pm.

The Centre, Maha Buildings, Merchant Street, London E3

MINUTES

PRESENT	APOLOGIES
<u>Board members</u> Colin Antoine (CA) - Vice Chair (British St.) Dave O'Keefe (DO) – British St. Bernie Cameron (BC) - MEB Chair Len Layton (LL) – Eric St. Estate Board Member Anne Balaam (AB) – Treby St. Mohammed Sultan Haydar (MSH) – Bede Estate Akhllaqur Choudhury (AC) – British St. Vice Chair	
<u>In attendance</u> Lene Milaa (LM) – Mile End Residents Association (MERA) Mark Taylor (MT – MERA) Jenny Healey (minutes)	

ITEM		ACTION
	Meeting commenced at 7.30pm.	
1	<p>One item was scheduled for the agenda, for which MT and LM from MERA were invited to attend.</p> <p>MERA</p> <p>1.1 MT gave a brief history of MERA, formed by a group of residents in August 2009. It then branched out to incorporate other elements, such as Safer Neighbourhoods initiatives and investigating the potential for summer projects for children in the area.</p> <p>1.2 LM flagged up that MERA requested official recognition from EeH, but that they are experiencing difficulties in knowing how to proceed with this.</p> <p>1.3 CA pointed out that MERA's aims seem very far-reaching and LL underlines that in this way, they do not purely function as a tenants association.</p> <p>1.4 DO suggested that official recognition of MERA would also be problematic, because neither MT or LM were represented in the previous elections.</p> <p>1.5 BC said that MERA's remit stretches beyond EeH and that</p>	

	<p>therefore, not only EeH interests would be represented. LM pointed out that the membership issue, based on boundaries outside of EeH, was proving problematic in this situation.</p>	
1.6	<p>LL outlined that MERA's direct complaints to the Planning Department should have been discussed with the Board in the first instance and DO added that MERA's action had subsequently undermined the Board.</p>	
1.7	<p>BC said that although he understood what MT and LM were hoping to achieve and that it was their entitlement to complain to the Planning Department directly, he perceived their actions as challenging and that it was not likely that EeH would officially recognise them.</p>	
1.8	<p>CA asked what MERA's expectations of recognition were and MT elaborated that they would like help with hosting a drop-in centre, for example, at the old pram shed location. CA warned against potential duplication of surgeries/drop-ins.</p>	
1.9	<p>MT expressed that the possibility of MERA representatives becoming Board members previously (and opening communication lines via this route) had not been possible, as they could not have met the conditions of membership before. Discussion ensued and LL clarified to MT and LM that the Board acts as a buffer between tenants and EeH, but that there was no conflict in voicing planning objections whilst being a board member.</p>	
1.10	<p>BC and LL suggested that emails should be exchanged between MERA and the board and additional/emergency meetings scheduled in order to deal with issues such as the planning complaints. In this way, intervention can take place before the Planning Department has to become involved.</p>	
1.11	<p>MT suggested that there has been a misunderstanding between MERA and EeH in this instance.</p>	
1.12	<p>Although recognition was contested by LL, BC and DO, they pointed out that they had no issue with the principle of MERA representatives joining the Board.</p>	
1.13	<p>LM suggested that EeH was inefficient in raising awareness and consulting with its tenants. LL and AB pointed out that they have worked hard to ensure awareness and CA cites previous questionnaire drives, consultations and open days to demonstrate this.</p>	
1.14	<p>DO mentioned that although it may appear that EeH is inefficient in consulting with tenants, in reality, many residents do not make the effort to become involved in consultations or read updates on estate concerns.</p>	
1.15	<p>MT asked for BC's assistance in finding out why the planning application was contravened in the example of tarmac being laid</p>	

<p>1.16</p> <p>1.17</p>	<p>instead of the proposed 'pavours'. BC agreed to investigate this for the benefit of the estate.</p> <p>DO illustrated that approved planning permission is only a guideline for subsequent works, which can be over-ruled and it is possible that exceptions are made. In light of this, MT agreed to wait and see if the pavours replace the tarmac once all works are complete in the area.</p> <p>BC voiced concern in that MERA have not been consulting with the Board up until this point. LL suggested that MERA collaborate with EeH more and CA encouraged them to bring questions to them in future.</p>	<p>Bernie Cameron</p>
<p>Meeting closed at 8.30pm</p>		



Signed

Bernie Cameron
Chair of the Mile End Estate Management Board

Date14/06/2010.....