

BA/RCC CONSULTATION WITH RESIDENTS ON THE CITY'S NEW RESIDENT CONSULTATION MODEL

Summary of results and recommendations

1 Background

The City is in the process of revising its consultation processes with residents, and formalising this into a protocol and a series of steps it intends to follow when consulting with residents.

In an initiative led by the Town Clerk's department, several City departments have worked together to formalise these suggestions into a set of processes that officers will be able to follow with the aim of achieving the best outcome for all parties. The proposed process sets out a model for consultation on City-led projects such as street scene improvements or other local initiatives, such as the forthcoming Cultural Hub proposals. It excludes planning and licensing applications, where consultation processes are governed by statute.

The consultation model is appended to this report.

The Assistant Town Clerk asked the chair of the Barbican Association and the Chairman of the Residents' Consultation Committee to consult with their members and Barbican residents on the proposed model, to allow for modifications prior to its introduction.

This report presents a summary of the outcomes of the consultation with residents and with house groups. It also makes several recommendations to the RCC. These are that the committee should endorse the model, subject to a number of relatively minor modifications, and then seek to review the consultation model again, after it has been operational for a period of 12-18 months.

A further report will be prepared which incorporates some of the material presented here, along with feedback from the Barbican Association General Council and the Residents Consultative Committee which will be presented to the BRC and to the Assistant Town Clerk. This will incorporate all recommendations made by the RCC and the BA.

2 Consultation method

A short questionnaire was used to collect opinions and feedback to the proposals. Residents and House Groups were asked to participate. A briefing document was jointly prepared by the BA and RCC chairmen to which the City's draft consultation model was appended (the introductory letter is appended to this report). This invitation was sent by email directly to all House Group chairs, and was distributed to residents in electronic form via the Barbican Estate Office's email broadcast

system. It was also posted on Barbican Talk (a widely used resident's community forum).

In addition, those residents contacted by email (House Groups and residents on the BEO email list) were also provided with the respective chairmen's email addresses and given the option to respond in writing in that way.

In addition to the initial invitation to participate in the survey, a reminder was issued by email and also on Barbican Talk one week prior to the close of the consultation, stating that the consultation would close in a few days' time.

2.1 Period of consultation

As the information was provided to the BA and RCC late in November 2013, the consultation was delayed until after the Christmas period. The initial invitation and information was despatched on the 3rd January 2014. Reminders were issued on the 17th January and the questionnaire closed on the 23rd January.

2.2 Limitations

Due to limitations of time and resource, only online methods of contact were used. The BEO email broadcast reaches approximately 1,200 residents. There are around 2,100 flats on the Barbican Estate, and over 3,000 residents. Barbican Talk is read not just by residents because it is a public forum that anyone can join.

It is important therefore to understand that this consultation method would not reach residents who are less engaged in Barbican Estate matters, and therefore favours those who tend to be more engaged. While this is an artefact of all consultation exercises, it does mean care must be applied in drawing inferences on matters where low engagement with residents is particular concern.

2.3 Questionnaire design

The consultation questionnaire consisted of six questions, although participants would see a only four, due to routing based on the answers at Q1. The text of the questionnaire is reproduced below:

Q1 Are you in favour or against the residents consultation process which is being proposed by the City of London?

- In favour, as proposed
- In favour, if modification(s) can be made
- Against
- Not sure

If *in favour if modifications can be made* at Q1

Q2 What modifications would you like the City to make to the proposed consultation process?
open comment

If *against* at Q1

Q3 Please describe your objections to the proposed consultation process:
open comment

If *in favour or not sure* at Q1

Q4 Do you have any comments or observations on the proposed consultation process?
open comment

Q5 Is there anything else you would like to say?
open comment

Q6 Where is your flat or house?

- Barbican Estate
- Elsewhere in the City of London
- Do not reside in the City of London

Please provide your contact details. We will only use this information for validation purposes, and to let you know about the outcome of this consultation. We will not pass this information on to anyone else.

Your name (write in) _____

Email address (write in) _____

Thank you for providing this feedback. If you provided your email address, we will contact you with information on the outcome of this consultation.

Question 6 was used to validate that participant was a Barbican resident.

3 Results

3.1 Response

87 people engaged with the questionnaire and answered the first question. 49 people then continued on to answer the other questions and provide comments; 38 only answered the first question. Three house groups also provided written submission by email to the BA Chair, two of which also responded to the consultation questionnaire.

Most responses were received within a few days of either the invitation or the reminder. Unusually in exercises like this, the reminder yielded more responses than the initial

invitation – which may be explained by the launch day (3rd January) being at the end of the Christmas holiday period.

| Date received | Number of responses |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 3 January: invitations sent | 19 |
| 4-7 January | 10 |
| 11-16 January | 4 |
| 17 January: reminders sent | 26 |
| 18-20 January | 25 |
| 21-23 January | 3 |
| Total responses received | 87 |

3.2 Agreement with the proposal

A majority of those who responded to the QI said they were in agreement the proposal, and a few more said they would agree, if modifications could be made. Four of those went on to suggest modifications (two of whom were making submissions from house groups).

63% of those responding agreed in full or in part with the proposals; among those who completed the questionnaire, and provided comments, agreement was much higher: 78%.

Only two residents disagreed: one who left a comment and one who did not complete any other questions after the first question.

| | All who responded | Complete response given | Incomplete response given |
|---------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Total | 87 | 49 | 38 |
| Agree | 48 55% | 34 69% | 14 37% |
| Agree, with modifications | 7 8% | 4 8% | 3 8% |
| Agree (all above) | 55 63% | 38 78% | 17 45% |
| Disagree | 2 2% | 1 2% | 1 3% |
| Not sure | 30 34% | 10 20% | 20 53% |

3.2.1 Disagreement

Only two participants stated they disagreed with the proposals. One left no comment. The other made the following objection:

“The Barbican Association lacks the democratic mandate to represent residents as it has less than 50% of residents as members.”

The 2013 return of membership the BA made to the City in 2013, in order to maintain its RTA status, it recorded a 63% membership rate. Membership of the BA is voluntary, though in practice, the BA does not differentiate between those who are members and those who are not, in engaging with, or advocating for residents.

No outright objections were received in relation to the proposed consultation. A number of improvements or amendments were suggested, which are recorded below.

3.3 Points relevant to the RCC

The consultation model proposed largely relates to the City's local authority projects. The RCC has now been established for eleven years and already offers a formal set of processes which exceed those outlined in the model, for consultation between the City as landlord and Barbican Estate residents specifically, over landlord/tenant and service charge matters. It is the lack of any such protocol for other matters which this model seeks to address. The RCC's remit is therefore unchanged.

As expected, the majority of comments received related most directly to the BA route in the model. However, several comments arose which should be considered by the RCC.

3.3.1 Differentiating between landlord/tenant and local authority

More clarity was sought in defining what should be consulted via the BA or the RCC route.

"I think there needs to be more clarification about who makes the decision about what really is a landlord/tenants issue and what a local authority/ residents issue. There seems to me to be considerable scope for 'grey areas' ..."

"The stage 2 division between RCC and BA should be really backed up with some practical examples, something like: information about an increase of service charge will be passed through RCC (is that right?) and whether the benches in front of the lake should be facing Gilbert house or not will be passed through BA etc. Otherwise it is hard to imagine what not-service chargeable and service chargeable initiatives imply."

Several residents found it hard to understand what is a landlord/tenant and what is a local authority matter.

The proposed model does the recent change in relation to the RCC, that it has replaced the BA as the primary channel of consultation and communication on other works carried out on the Barbican Estate which are managed by the BEO – principally public realm works. This change, which was explained in the introductory letter to the consultation, should help to simplify the division. It was not specifically commented on by any participating in the questionnaire.

3.3.2 Support for using the RCC as a first point of contact for relevant matters

Several comments were generally supportive and indicated trust in the ability of the RCC and the BA to bring balance in representing residents.

"As long as there is a culture of openness to listen to objections with significant support, rather than to see consultation as a 'tick box' exercise and a necessary step between formulating a proposal and implementing it with minimum changes. Informal consultation with experienced BA/RCC committee members who would

have a good feel for what will generate significant objections would be useful (is this done already?)”

3.3.3 Importance of ensuring the BA and RCC work together effectively

Several made points that it was important that both BA and RCC work in close co-operation. Members of both group may feel that this is already achieved, but this may not be communicated to all residents.

Several went as far as to say it was important that the process should not put the BA and RCC in opposition to each other, or cause conflict.

“It's unclear whether these proposals are intended to divide the agendas of the BA and the RCC, or whether there will be duplicate discussion between the two committees concerning the same issues? Clearly this would involve the same people (partly) discussing the same things wearing different hats. ... In general I suggest it would be wise to avoid a system which carries a risk of pitting BA against RCC. Both these committees are essentially merely advisory and they ought to work together to ensure consistency and power in any necessary negotiations.”

3.3.4 Timing

One issue that may arise under this model is availability of the relevant groups to consult. The model does not make any explicit reference to timescales – e.g. how long a period should be allowed for a consultation. As the questionnaire for this short consultation has shown, the timing of the launch of a consultation, and the period given can have a major impact on engagement.

The RCC meets only five times a year, and some of the meetings are spaced out, e.g. over the summer period.

One responding resident made an oblique reference to this concern:

“As there will be heavier reliance on the Barbican Association, it is important that it be structured, staffed and funded in a way that will ensure it carries out its responsibilities consistently well and in a timely fashion.”

It is not realistic to expect more resources to be available for either the BA or the RCC. It is therefore important for the model to recognise that, in relation to the RCC in particular, timescales and timing are important and should be agreed in advance.

3.3.5 Completing the feedback loop – providing information on outcomes

While these comments did not specifically mention the RCC, they are particularly relevant to the committee. Several participants point out the importance of having information on decisions and outcomes. This is important not only to allow them to know what is happening, having had their interest raised; but it is important in giving the process of consultation credibility, so that those engaging can know that their views have been heard, and taken into consideration.

“You need to ensure that you have a complete loop that not only consults but that you then put feedback into the consultation system. This complete loop ensures that residents are listened too, any alterations are then explained to residents and they have another time to see how these alterations are.”

“The more transparent the whole process of consultation is the more residents will feel confident that their views are being listened too. In the past oct [sic] have

consulted but that seems to be the end of the process. Complete transparency and involve not in the whole feedback loop will bring about better understanding about how decisions that effect us are made.”

“I should like to emphasise the importance of the City putting effort into ‘you said, we did’ in developing trust and mutual respect between the City and residents.”

One suggested that the BEO should use BarbicanTalk as a channel to residents:

Might it be possible for the estate office additionally to post important communications as they affect residents onto the Barbicantalk website?

However, the Barbican Talk website is not exclusive to residents, and it is not possible to know whether those making comments are residents or not. It is also not universally popular with residents, some of whom dislike the harsh tone of some of the discussion, which deters them from participating or reading it.

3.3.6 Flexibility; using more than one channel

One participant commented that there appeared to be too many different ways of communicating, which made it confusing; others asked that there should be flexibility to use the appropriate channels to reach all residents when consultation takes place.

While online communication is faster and cheaper, not all residents have access to it.

“If consultation only is through the Internet, you may have a biased view. Please consider those who don't use Internet and how consultation could access them.”

4 Conclusions

The model as proposed appears to be well-designed and broadly acceptable to residents and house groups.

Many residents however, found the model confusing and difficult to understand, and more effort will be required to ensure the plans and processes followed, when explained to residents, are clear and easy for them to understand.

Concerns about the potential for conflict between the BA and the RCC seem unlikely to arise, due to the close communication and working relationship that exists between both of those bodies, and their various working parties and subcommittees - and the cross-representation there is on all of them. Care should be taken to ensure this is not lost in future. The concerns indicate that the working practices and harmonious relationships of these groups are not always understood by those who are outside them – indicating the need for better communication in particular of the work of the RCC.

There are also particular concerns over the communication of outcomes. This has often been cited as a problem in the past, and it would appear that a part of the aim of the new model is to improve this too. However, the model as presented is light on detail in relation to communicating outcomes and places a much greater emphasis on the dissemination of information about what is being consulted on, rather than the next stages, once decisions or a revised plan have been made. This is critical for the credibility of any consultation process and will harm future engagement if it is not addressed.

Neither does the model acknowledge that some consultation activities are genuinely ongoing – the RCC being an example of that – and that some consultation exercises may involve several cycles of engagement over a long period of time.

4.1 Recommendations

On the basis of the response received to the consultation model, I am recommending:

1. That the committee should recommend that the model should be adopted by the City, incorporating the revisions that we propose.
2. That these amendments should be sought to:
 - (a) Place greater emphasis on the communication of results and outcomes beyond the ‘you said; we did’ reports, largely deal with detailed matters
 - (b) Request the use of offline as well as online methods for consultation, as long as they are required.
 - (c) Provide examples, in order to make the distinction between landlord/tenant, managed by the estate, other City initiatives and statutory consultations can be understood by officers as well as residents.
 - (d) Make observations in relation to timescales and timing, and how these relate to a committee that meets only 5 times a year.
3. Furthermore, that the success of the model should be reviewed after 12-18 months of operation, when it should be brought before this committee again for further comment.

5 Next steps

The chairman of the RCC and the Chair of the BA will develop this interim report into a report for the Assistant Town Clerk. The report will be enlarged to contain recommendations from the BA and the RCC for additions or changes to the proposed consultation model. A number of recommendations relating principally to the BA’s role, were made at the BA’s General Council meeting on the 23 January.

Recommendations by RCC members (including any further recommendations arising from discussion at committee) will also be incorporated in the report, which will be circulated to all members prior to submission.

Tim Macer
Chairman, RCC
24 January 2014

Annex I Listing of the comments received

Modifications sought to the proposal

I think there needs to be more clarification about who makes the decision about what really is a landlord/tenants issue and what a local authority/ residents issue. There seems to me to be considerable scope for "grey areas" and potential tension bwtween RCC and BA on some important issues. The BRC has a lot / number of members who do not live here and perhaps increasingly (reduction in Government local authotity grant to C o L) the Barbican is an obvious source of income ie the RCC and BA must maintain cloe working links.

The main point of consultation is that residents feel confident that their view are listened too. You need to ensure that you have a complete loop that not only consults but that you then put feedback into the consultation system. This complete loop ensures that residents are listened too, any alterations are then explained to residents and they have another time to see how these alterations are . So consultation is about the whole, not just the first stage but how are you going to feedback the ideas and alterations back to residents who made comments. This makes consultation more than a one way system. Thanks

Consulted bodies - BA, RCC, House groups - must be given the opportunity to review & provide additional, unedited, commentary to go up to Committee/Members/Town clerk in any final report.

This is to ensure that consultation methodology & interpretation of results is delivered in a fashion agreed by all parties to represent actual positions.

Recent consultations have shown invalid statistical approaches (surveying active users of facilities to determine if the facility is successful weights towards yes, as those who find the facility unusable... dont use it, and are thus not surveyed), and have glossed over methodological shortcomings that prevent particular results being returned.

It is important that consultation not only occurs, but that it effectively obtains & represents the views of the consulted parties; whether by accident or design previous consultations have failed to do this, and simply ensuring that a 'consultation process' occurs will not ensure it is effective. Giving all stakeholders an opportunity to copmment on the process, and contextualise the considered results will ensure more effective participation by all required.

5.1 Objection to the proposal

The Barbican Association lacks the democratic mandate to represent residents as it has less then 50% of residents as members.

5.2 Comments and observations from those agreeing to the proposal or those unsure

Proposals seem comprehensive and represent an improvement on existng arrangements.

Not sure I understand why this arrangement is better than what we have, although I am sure a lot of time and thought has gone into developing it!

Might it be possible for the estate office additionally to post important communications as they affect residents onto the Barbicantalk website?

I believe there is already a forum for police and local authorities.

Looks sensible to me.

It's unclear whether these proposals are intended to divide the agendas of the BA and the RCC, or whether there will be duplicate discussion between the two committees concerning the same issues? Clearly this would involve the same people (partly) discussing the same things wearing different hats.

In general I suggest it would be wise to avoid a system which carries a risk of pitting BA against RCC. Both these committees are essentially merely advisory and they ought to work together to ensure consistency and power in any necessary negotiations.

I also feel it important to foster a friendly cooperative relationship between the Corporation and the BA/RCC - conflict imposed by rigid division is not likely to be helpful to either party - of residents and of administration (as a Local Authority and Landlord).

It all looks unnecessarily bureaucratic, even clumsy to me.....

It seems fairly sensible; I hope that on the very rare occasions when matters are time-critical, they will be forwarded quickly.

I should like to emphasise the importance of the City putting effort into "you said, we did" in developing trust and mutual respect between the City and residents.

Rather than pages and pages of bland text, I should like to see the City offer a brief post-decision meeting, if requested by residents.

Our bad experience in Cromwell Tower was the City's rationale for rejecting the agreement we had come to with Montcalm over their licence application and offering a much less restrictive set of conditions. When we queried this we were told by the Secretary of the Panel that if we didn't like it we could appeal! David Graves subsequently winkled out on our behalf a bit more information, but it was very frustrating that the City refused to discuss it.

Essential BA is main conduit in the process.

As there will be heavier reliance on the Barbican Association, it is important that it be structured, staffed and funded in a way that will ensure it carries out its responsibilities consistently well and in a timely fashion.

As long as there is a culture of openness to listen to objections with significant support, rather than to see consultation as a "tick box" exercise and a necessary step between formulating a proposal and implementing it with minimum changes. Informal consultation with experienced BA/RCC committee members who would have a good feel for what will generate significant objections would be useful (is this done already?)

5.3 Further comments

All participants were asked if they had anything else to say. Four comments were received:

I am pleased that you have included some flexibility in the consultation process as it is sometimes difficult to predict every circumstance at the outset.

We welcome the CoL intention to improve the consultation process with residents.

The more transparent the whole process of consultation is the more residents will feel confident that their views are being listened too. In the past we have consulted but that seems

to be the end of the process. Complete transparency and involve not in the whole feedback loop will bring about better understanding about how decisions that effect us are made.

Ps equality of opportunity to response to consultation, not all use the same system, some like face to face, other via Internet. If consultation only is through the Internet, you may have a biased view. Please consider those who don't use Internet and how consultation could access them

It is frustrating seeing how ponderously slow the process of dealing with the Podium level (Ben Johnson) gardens has been. For those of us who love seasonal colour or at least a variety of greenery, the empty beds and horrendous, stiff monotone ugly grasses are both depressing and devaluing our living experience here. Birds and other wildlife are not drawn to this style of gardening. If this were the City employees' own back garden, I feel they would hasten to improve it. Walking through it every day to work is awful. Knowing that there will be nothing better for another two years is just appalling. We love living in the City but would dearly love to be allowed our old gardens back in some form.



From the chair of the
BARBICAN ASSOCIATION



and the chairman of the
BARBICAN RESIDENTS CONSULTATION COMMITTEE

To all Barbican Residents

3 January 2014

Dear residents

As we announced in the most recent BA Newsletter, the City is in the process of revising its consultation processes with residents, and formalising this into a protocol and a series of steps it intends to follow when consulting with residents. In this letter we wish to introduce the process to Barbican residents, and explain the principal changes as we see them. We would like to hear what you think about these proposals – in essence, the new consultation process is at the moment open for consultation. At the end, we will explain how you can provide us with your views.

The background to developing a consultation protocol

Over the past year, the BA has been in discussion with the City about the way in which it consults with residents. We are pleased to say that the City has responded positively with regards to a number of suggestions we have made on how consultations could be improved. We based these suggestions on the experiences of the BA and the RCC across a wide range of consultations run by the City, identifying examples of good practice and suggesting improvements where things have not worked so well.

In an initiative led by the Town Clerk's department, several City departments have worked together to formalise these suggestions into a set of processes that officers will be able to follow with the aim of achieving the best outcome for all parties. The proposed process sets out a model for consultation on City-led projects such as street scene improvements or other local initiatives, such as the forthcoming Cultural Hub proposals. It excludes planning and licensing applications, where consultation processes are governed by statute.

The principal aims of the residents' consultation model is to establish processes that will ensure:

- consultation with residents before options are decided upon,
- full disclosure of information on timescales
- a feedback process that tells residents what has been decided and also tells them which committee the proposals will go to and when

By clarifying which City committee any matter will go to for a decision should also ensure that residents have a chance to lobby their ward members prior to a decision being made.

Attached to this letter is a diagram provided by the City that describes the proposed process. This was presented to us by Peter Lisley, Assistant Town clerk, Steve Presland, Built Environment (responsible for streetscene and public real improvements), and Michael Bennett of the BEO. We agreed to consult Barbican residents on the proposals, and to provide the City with all feedback.

Residents as tenants and residents as citizens

You will see the proposal is to divide the process of consultation into two main routes depending on whether the issue is between the City as landlord and its residents as tenants (in which case it goes via the RCC) or whether it is the City acting as local authority and residents are its citizens (in which case it goes via the BA).

We think it is fair to say that the RCC process is a well-worn one and has not really changed, but officers wanted to include it for the sake of explicitness and completeness.

Key commitments from the City

The new elements appear on the side of the flowchart that names the BA as the main route to consultation. Important changes here are undertakings from the City to consult as early as possible before options are closed off and to be explicit about the process being followed. Officers have taken on board most of the comments we made, and we view these commitments as a welcome development.

The Barbican Association as a channel to House Groups

The fact that initial notification to house groups of some projects is via the BA is not in any way an encroachment by the BA on the autonomy of house groups. It reflects the reality that the BA maintains an up to date list of house group chairs and it is easier for City officers to use the BA as its initial channel of communication to all relevant house groups if they are seeking a meeting.

If the matter is relevant to only one part of the Estate, the BA is well placed to identify all the house groups should be involved (which may not just be the adjacent block). It also reflects what in practice happens now. In the case of bigger projects, where there is going to be a public meeting or exhibition, all residents will be also informed directly – by notices or even by individual letter.

Your comments wanted

As noted, this consultation process is now itself out for consultation, and we have agreed to co-ordinate the feedback from residents, House Group Committees and from the BAGC and RCC on all aspects of this proposed new process.

There will be discussion of these proposals at the next Barbican Association General Council meeting, on the 23rd January, followed by discussion on aspects relating to the RCC, at the RCC meeting on the 3rd February. We will then write to the Town Clerk with all feedback received, and the recommendations of both our committees.

You can either send us your feedback directly, or you may prefer to speak to your House Group Chair, or the nominated representatives for your block on either the RCC or the BAGC. All the contact details can be found in the latest Barbicanews (published by the Estate Office), or in the recent issue of Barbican Life, delivered to all Barbican residences.

We have set up a simple online feedback survey to collect your comments. To access the feedback survey, follow this link: <http://eSurv.org?u=BAconsult13>

Yours sincerely

Jane Smith
BA Chair

Tim Macer
RCC Chairman

To access the City's consultation proposal, follow this link:
<http://bit.ly/CoLcrcPlan>

A Guide to Consulting on Schemes in and around the Barbican Estate

This is the framework to use where there is no statutory-mandated forms of consultation, for example, on planning issues where there is a separately agreed process, or the so-called "Section 20 consultations" under the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 (where we are legally required to consult leaseholders paying variable service charges before a carrying out qualifying works or entering into a long-term agreement for the provision of services).



Ideas and Initiatives may originate from Corporate Strategies, legal requirements, or health and safety considerations. Members, Residents and other stakeholders may also instigate initiatives through a variety of forums or groups.

Initiatives will only begin the journey of consultation once all relevant departments (Town Clerk's, Comptroller's Chamberlain's, City Surveyor's), and particularly the Estate Office, have had a chance to comment.

At this stage, the Project Leads will arrange to meet or brief Members of the Cripplegate and Aldersgate wards to outline proposals and seek their endorsement. The Chairmen/Deputy Chairmen of the relevant spending committee, eg Girls School, Barbican Centre Board, GSMD will be included where appropriate.

STAGE 2 – Introducing the consultation – Which forum?

Where aspects of the initiative could be relevant to either forum, initial feedback should be sought from the BA and RCC Chairmen in deciding the most appropriate route to take.

The City Corporation has a legal obligation to consult under the Landlord and Tenant Act 1988 on matters relating housing management which specifically affect residents of the Estate.

If the initiative is a Landlord/Tenant issue (ie, service-chargeable or will be managed by the Barbican Estate Office)

Residents Consultation Committee (RCC)

If the initiative is not Service-chargeable

Barbican Association (BA)

The Barbican Association will be the first "entry port" for consultations relating to street works/ Environmental Enhancement and other schemes.

STAGE 3 – Launching the Consultation

The principal goal of consultation is to assess the impact of the proposals on the community of affected users.

Where practicable, consultees will be offered more than one option.

Consultees will be advised of the proposed time and date of the formal decision making at Committee and updated on any unanticipated changes to the process.

Consultees will also be told how to obtain information on the outcome of consultations.

A report will be submitted to the Residents Consultation Committee (RCC).

Target: House Groups

Information will be made available on: www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/barbicanestate

The Barbican Association (BA) will act as a conduit to disseminate information to the various House Groups and to BA General Council members and BA members generally and link to www.barbicanassociation.com

BA meetings and Sub-Committee meetings will provide an opportunity for Project Officers to give updates.

If it is possible, Project Updates will be included in the BA Newsletter.

Target: Residents

Information will be made available on: www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/barbicanestate

There will be project updates put up on notice boards in lift lobbies in communal areas of the Barbican Estate.

If a specific group of affected Residents can be identified (e.g. a specific bloc), Letters will be sent.

Drop-in Sessions will be held in the Residents Meeting Room so Residents can speak to Project Officers.

There will be email broadcast to residents on the database held by the Barbican Estate Office (which has over 1200 residents who have agreed to receive updates on projects/services).

We will look to include residents from adjacent areas, particularly Golden Lane, Milton Court, Roman House, etc. if appropriate.

Target: Users

Notices will be placed on affected sites.

For large works— street scene improvement schemes, we will use display modules or 'Pods' to attract attention of users of areas affected, if it is practicable and useful. We will locate these on affected sites, and they will have information or images of end-products so users can visualise what it is proposed.

We will use Social Media (Twitter, Facebook) to enable users to give feedback easily. We will for example have QR Barcode on signage to allow bypassers to scan web addresses and find out more information

STAGE 4 – Reporting on the Outcome of Consultation Exercise

Report to BRC with a Resolution from RCC

Communication Plan for dissemination among residents

Reports to other Committees in accordance with Projects Approvals Procedure, etc., including a summary of consultation undertaken.

YOU SAID, WE DID reports to Barbican Association (for dissemination among Members and House Groups) and displayed on notices on affected sites, noticeboards and on www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/barbicanestate

Reports to other Committees in accordance with Projects Approvals Procedure, etc., including a summary of consultation undertaken.

Feedback needs to be on a 'YOU SAID, WE DID' format. Any changes resulting from the consultation need to be explained in detail as well as any significant comment which, for practical reasons, could not be taken on board.



Glossary of Terms

Barbican Residential Committee (BRC). A City of London formal Committee established to address landlord issues. Comprised solely of elected CoL Members.

Barbican Estate Residents Consultation Committee (RCC). Comprising a representative from all 21 House Groups, a rep from the Barbican Association General Council. This Committee meets 4 times per year and sees all non-confidential papers 2 weeks or so in advance of them being received by the BRC. There are a number of Working Parties including Service Level Agreement, Gardens Advisory Group, Asset Maintenance, Beech Gardens Landscaping.

Barbican Association General Council (BA, also BAGC). This is a recognised Tenants Association with elected Members prohibited from standing for office. All 21 House Groups are represented and the Council acts on behalf of the occupiers of the approx. 2000 dwellings on the estate. There are a number of sub committees including Licensing, Planning, Security, Communications, Sustainability, Access.

Barbican Occupiers Users Group (BOUG). An officer from the City Surveyor's service is currently chairman of this group which includes representatives of the Barbican Estate office, Local Schools , Barbican Centre, Department of Built Environment, Open Spaces and RCC representative.

House Group Committees. Some 21 House Group Committees, most of which are recognised Tenants Association. There is varying activity among House Groups, which means that consultation solely among House Group Committees cannot be relied upon always to reach all residents. They are however an important part of the Barbican governance structure.