



## **'ONE NORBITON, WORKING TOGETHER'**

**Meeting Title:** Neighbourhood and Environment sub group  
**Date and Time:** Thursday 29<sup>th</sup> November 4pm  
**Venue Address:** Piper Hall, Piper Road  
**Chair:** Dr Mike D'Souza  
**Secretary**  
**Invitees** All interested One Norbiton Committee Members, Simon Oelman, Denise Parry

### **Possible AGENDA items for first 3 meetings**

1. Review of previous work done by former Housing Sub Group  
(See attached 'Action Plan', (Appendix 1).
2. The offer of and office for One Norbiton.
- 3 Environment clean up with a ONTF (One Norbiton Task Force)
- 4 Possible tasks for ONTF in Norbiton:
  - a) Fences;
  - b) Signage;
  - c) Temporary Decoration of places with planning blight;
5. Best way of obtaining residents' view the best spend for £75K.  
A possible job for our (? enlarged) Consultant panel
- 6 Mezzanine Project – Exploration of an idea (Appendix 2)
- 7 People's Courts for neighbour disputes and devising a system of Housing credits for use in resolving interpersonal issues  
  
–Exploration of an idea (Appendix 3)
8. Representing the Residents of unrepresented social housing areas ie:  
Norbiton Common Rd, Norbiton Hall etc
- 10 representing the Norbiton voice on service contracts
11. Additional items suggested by members

## Appendix 2

### Project

### Mezzanine

There is unused space on the Mezzanine floors of each Tower Block in the CRE. 16 new flats could be created here if certain problems could be solved.

- A flat in Kingston is worth at least £200k. Therefore if all these spaces were renovated they would be worth £3.2 Million.
- If the cost of conversion was ~£50 to 75k per flat, to create new flats in all mezzanine spaces would cost ~£1 million
- If half of these new flats were sold to private buyers this would:-
  - 1) Generate a net profit of £2.2 million for the estate
  - 2) Remove dangerous unused areas on the estate that are currently used for drug dealers.
  - 3) Create some work for NEETs and other local unemployed
  - 4) Produce a potentially valuable social mix within the estate of tenants and owner-occupied with a *gain* rather than loss of public housing stock.

### Problems

- A. Solving lift and Fire escape issues
- B. Raising the needed upfront capital
- C. Getting agreements through existing bureaucratic systems
- D. Hidden costs

## Appendix 3

Project Housing Credits and People's Courts

### **Preamble**

A great amount of stress is caused by neighbour disputes. These may result in big legal fees when they are not sorted out early enough. In the Public sector these costs are paid by the taxpayer and are rarely publicized. (Data needed) The cost benefits of setting up a local voluntary People's Court should therefore involve comparisons with existing services.

A large number of disputes between neighbours on our estates are due to antisocial and often noisy behaviour. (Data needed ) Sometimes the complainant may have mental disorders like depression (which may increase their sensitivity to normal noises) or have more serious mental illness creating the delusion of a problem where there is none.

Another common occurrence is causing disturbance while under the influence of alcohol etc or the playing of loud music or illegal activities like drug dealing and prostitution. Clearly a People's court would need to work in close harmony with the police and only be suitable to deal with a small proportion of these more serious problems. However they may have a very useful part to play where the problems involve personality issues.

Earning Housing credit to give priority in choice of flat etc could be a useful way of rewarding good neighborliness.

### **The Theory**

As with a substantial proportion of substance abuse, the reason why personality disordered behaviour may occur, is to escape from the stresses of isolation and failure. The consequences of bad neighbour behaviour is that the person doing it gets attention which is better than social isolation although not as good as the social respect, love and affection everyone really desires. The public response to it however is at present that of a big stick and no carrot. This is both highly expensive (particularly when it comes to legal action) and paradoxically counter-productive since some sort of attention was what was being sought all along.

This proposal would be to try a big carrot and a small stick. The former would be to treat the complaint itself as a cry for help and involve the complainant in community activity using the small stick of withdrawing housing credit etc as a sanction.