

Additional Response for Residents Questions

Reaffirming the EDB as a resident led budget

Issue: The Estate Development Budget was originally established as a resident led fund, with the process led by representatives from Residents Associations. West residents agreed unanimously that this founding principle is being eroded, with the process now being led by officers, rather than residents. They want the principle of a resident-led budget reaffirmed and acted on.

Background:

EDB process of application and funding has changed beyond recognition.

Although the EDB process has been discussed at some meetings, the nature and extent of the changes were not clearly put and debated. Some residents on the EDB panel, for example, were not consulted or involved and only realised the extent of the changes when asked to score bids at the West EDB meeting.

West residents feel that the present system encourages top-down solutions. For example, residents were told that the old system was unfair and what changes had to be made.

A better procedure would have been to put forward clearly the arguments about why the system was unfair; discuss this with residents; agree whether or not it was unfair; look together at what to do about it and come to a joint solution.

The EDB used to be a simple process that really facilitated involvement. It is now more difficult and less helpful. For example, at Woods House the EDB was a quick way of accessing a small amount of money for their garden, which made a big difference to the volunteer gardeners. Last time Woods House applied for this their bid was rejected.

Action: Ask that the Council recognise and acknowledge the issues residents are raising

Reaffirm that the EDB is a resident led process

Engage with residents about what this means in practise.

Response

The majority of the question above has been addressed in the response send out with the main residents questions. The response below is to address the highlighted sentences in the question.

The Community engagement team have been in contact with residents at Woods House to clarify this point. Residents at Woods House confirmed that no EDB bid application was made for the garden at Woods House and therefore no bid has been rejected.

Clarification of response

There was an additional response to this question included that was duplicated from another questions. The response at the bottom of the question from the community engagement team (below the response about glyphosate) was the correct response and should read as below.

5. AGM requirements

Issue:

Residents have been told they must have a generic mobile phone and email address to meet the council's recognition criteria for Residents Associations.

It was agreed it is important residents have an easy way of contacting their Association, but it should be up to the Association to decide what works best for them. One solution should not be imposed by the council.

Action:

Request for more discussion on (a) how best to facilitate communication between residents and their Association and (b) a more flexible approach to how this is done.

Response

Community Engagement Team

Thank you for your question. We sent out some AGM guidance to offer support for residents associations with AGMs going forward. In the letter, we stated that new requirements are for residents to have an association phone number and email address. Apologies for the lack of clarity in our initial letter, we acknowledge that these requirements should be flexible for each association and that the community engagement team can support associations in acquiring the phones, phone numbers and email addresses on how they can be used. There is not the expectation for residents to be "on call" or the phone number to be accessible at all times. One example of use could be, that the could be "office hours", the groups could advertise around their area that the phone numbers are available on a certain few hours a week for people to contact them.