

Tustin Low Rise Resident Project team

Meeting Date: 11 July 2019 – Tustin TRA Room – Grasmere Point

Present	Initials	Present	Initials
Andrew Eke	AE	Sophie Hall-Thompson	SHT
Edward Ashdown	EA	Emmanuel James	EJ
Onome James	OJ	Emma Taylor	ET
Neil Kirby	NK	Mike Tyrrell	MT
Tim Cutts	TG	Neal Purvis	NP
Keith Malyon	KM	Ellis Knibbs	EK
Paulette Kelly	PK	Christine Knibbs	CK
Kerry Knibbs	KK	Andrew Johnson	AJ
Michael Scorer	MS		

Apologies for absence; Andy Chaggar, Lee Walkley.

1. Introductions around the table

AE was pleased to see residents from a variety of ages and blocks engaging with the process.

2. Minutes of Meeting 18 June

2.1 The minutes were agreed as accurate. They will be uploaded to the website at <https://www.southwark.gov.uk/housing/major-works-and-new-homes/new-homes/the-tustin-estate>

3. Draft Engagement Plan

3.1 MT introduced the draft Engagement Plan that had been circulated by email. It will be monitored and updated at each PG meeting. He noted that one to one sessions with individual residents will happen during September when there will be a housing needs survey to set out what homes are needed for the residents who live on the estate now. There are a variety of different kinds of events to engage different groups of residents on the estate, including coffee mornings. He asked for suggestions on how to improve the Engagement Plan.

3.2 AE suggested public events more regularly to build and maintain momentum and avoid gossip and rumours around the estate. MT suggested there could be a public event in October when the architects are appointed.

3.3 ET asked how the Council will provide information to residents with English as a second language. She suggested backing up the hardcopy delivery of the newsletter with email versions, digital reminders for important information, and the use of electronic means to target residents with relevant information. Older people were increasingly using social media such as Facebook. NK noted that the Tustin part of the Council website is up and running.

3.4 AJ has information on residents vulnerability and profile. **AJ to pass resident information to MT and SH-T.**

3.5 AE noted that some of the Businesses on the estate had helped to contact residents in the towers during the major works. When the TRA hub is active that will be a useful resource and will attract residents from a variety of age groups and backgrounds.

3.6 There was a discussion on how to involve young people on the estate. CK noted that there are problems with ASB and young people hanging around in some common parts of blocks, and many residents find their behaviour intimidating.

3.7 ET suggested asking Andy Chaggar (AC) for help with this as he works for an organisation working with young people.

3.8 NP noted a housing association had success engaging young people with chips and chat session using a chip van.

3.9 AE explained that community wardens had been able to make contact with young people in the past. A visible presence was needed. Issues were focussed on Heversham, particularly little Heversham at present.

3.10 MT thanks residents for their ideas. **MT to meet with AE to find out more about the nature of the ASB, and bring ideas to the next meeting on how to address this, and he will contact AC. MT to update the Resident Engagement Plan and report on it at each meeting.**

3.11 There was a discussion about the Offer Document and whether it would only be produced if there was a Ballot on demolition and new build. MT explained that it is a formal offer to Tenants, Leaseholders and Freeholders from LBS. Many of the ideas in the Offer Document would be developed from the Residents Manifesto. There would be an Offer from the Council whether there was refurbishment or newbuild. This approach had been used on Ledbury where the Cabinet Member for Housing had written to all residents setting out the Councils offer in April 2018.

3.12 NP noted the Labour Party Manifesto commitment in 2018 to have a Ballot on estates where regeneration is proposed. MS explained that the Council worked on the basis of the Council Plan. The Council was developing its policy on Estate Ballots. **NK to report on Council Estate Ballot ideas to future TPG meeting.** The proposal on Tustin could be for rebuild but would not be regeneration. The difference is that this plan is developed from the grassroots with the residents.

3.13 ET asked how the Councils Great Estates policy related to this. NK explained that the Great Estates policy was predominantly for estates where the Council was doing infill newbuild, and included landscaping works to other parts of the estate. Ideas for Tustin are more fundamental than that, looking at major improvements. NK suggested that if there were bids from Tustin, the Council could look to bring these forward to improve the estate now. **NP to circulate Great Estates information to all TPG members.**

3.14 AE asked whether residents living in the blocks where there are repairs needed now could be moved to the Hidden Homes currently being developed in the Tustin Towers. The Local Letting Scheme offers 50% of the new homes to Tustin Estate residents. Here was an opportunity with 100% to help residents living in poor conditions across the estate. **MS replied that the Council is developing new policy and he will respond to the August TPG meeting.**

3.15 AE suggested that some residents wanted the Feasibility Study and developing of the Offer to move more quickly so the future of the estate was clear sooner. NK said this could be a questions asked to the architects in the selection process on how they could work to produce results more quickly. The Council wanted to go at the pace the residents are comfortable at.

4.0 Report on General Meeting and Drop in Sessions

4.1 MS reported that the Council was pleased to see so many residents at the General Meeting for estate residents. He was impressed with the questions residents asked and they had made the Council think deeply about the issues facing a variety of different residents. He was aware that there would need to be consideration of work to blocks to keep them in a reasonable condition during any large scale programme that takes several years across the estate. This will have to be factored into the plans and the finance. He had raised issues with the Call Centre to try to improve the service to Tustin residents. He was considering what presence the Council needed on the estate to improve the repair service.

4.2 AE reported that some residents needed to talk to Council staff face to face and found it difficult to relate just through a telephone. Heversham is the next largest block after the towers and residents were unsure about the process and how it would affect them. Hillbeck has chronic repair problems. Bowness is above the shops and residents had heard that there would be new development of Aldi opposite. Most residents were in a stage where they wanted to engage with the Council because of their concern about the what the future might be. Residents in the low rise felt left behind as they could see works happening to the Towers.

4.3 MS reported that he had talked to the manager of the Call Centre about the flags on the system relating to major works. He would check this had been followed up.

4.4 NK noted that there had been many questions raised at the General Meeting. One tenant had raised 50 questions. The Council will follow up on this with a written response to tenants who raise individual queries, and general information in future newsletters.

4.5 NP drew TPG members to the notes of the General Meeting. He had received minor amendments to these and **NP will issue the General Meeting minutes to the Council to upload on the Tustin website.**

4.6 MT reported that 12 people had attended the two drop in session and he had written to each of them to confirm the information they had received verbally. He had stressed that residents should look at all options and not just the one they favoured to make sure they influenced the options. Many of the concerns raised had come from leaseholders.

4.7 ET asked how many leaseholders and freeholders there are on the estate. SHT circulated a profile of tenure. SHT to check with all bought properties in Manor Grove are freeholders, or if there are leaseholders. Some freeholders pay Service Charge and some do not.

4.8 SHT and KK raised questions about private tenants on the estate. **NP asked any private tenants questions to be directed to him and he will visit those tenants at home.**

5.0 Update on the Appointing Architects

5.1 SHT reported that a TPG sub group meeting had met to look at the draft brief for the Architect Feasibility Study. There had been considerable concerns raised by residents that the brief did not relate to the Residents Manifesto, and that it was a large and technical document that was not provided before the meeting. This made it extremely difficult for residents to have meaningful input.

5.2 AE suggested the Council abide by the protocols mentioned in the Draft Feasibility and Masterplanning Brief, in 3.2.6 *Protocol for Consideration of New Development Proposals*. The meeting had made it feel like the document was a *fait accompli* This should be issued to the TPG so they could see what it is. **MT to issue this to TPG on 12.7.19.**

5.3 Members of the **TPG to send any written comments on Draft Brief to SHT by 19 July. SHT to update and re-issue draft brief to TPG members on 26 July.**

5.4 The Council would like to agree the Brief for the Architects by 9 August. When the Draft Brief is updated and re-issued **NP and TPG to consider whether to have a TPG only meeting to comment further or provide written comments to the Council.**

5.5 ET asked about the list of possible architects to invite that had been issued. She was concerned that some architects had worked on the Aylesbury, and there was widespread community concern about the process on the Aylesbury. NK explained that the architects had provided design work that had led to a planning application that had been broadly supported by the community. The community issues on the Aylesbury had been primarily relating to the Compulsory Purchase Order process and the architects had not been involved in that part of the work. NK was interested TPG comments and ideas on who should be invited to tender. The Council expects larger architectural practices to involve smaller and local architectural practice in their team to be involved in the tender.

5.6 NK explained that work architects will do will take into account residents views, the Housing Needs Analysis, the Stock Condition Survey, Costing Information. Residents living on the estate know the locality better than the architects do.

5.7 MT suggested that there are particular experience and skills that would be relevant to this work, such as work with LBS Planning Dept., experience of refurbishment, ability to work with and listen to residents.

5.8 MS noted that the Council would carry out analysis to look at the long term refurbishment and repair costs and compare this to costs for demolition and rebuild.

5.9 MT suggested that he will repeat the messages in several newsletters that no decision has been taken, and explain how a decision will be made.

6.0 ITLA Training and Sessions for Leaseholders and Freeholders

6.1 NP circulated suggested dates and topics for training with TPG members to develop knowledge of the process and feed into what is needed in the Offer to Residents.

6.2 Dates are

TPG Training

Feasibility and Master Planning – what is and how does it work?	Thursday 8 August
Planning Permission – what is allowed and not allowed at Tustin? Process for a Masterplan	Thursday 5 September
Assessing the architects proposals	Date to be agreed
What is involved in a: Housing Needs Assessment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stock Condition Survey • Equality Impact Assessment • Cost and Viability Analysis 	Thursday 3 October
Tenants’ Rights and Moving Home	Thursday 7 November

Leaseholder and Freeholders

What is in your lease?	Thursday 22 August
------------------------	--------------------

Your responsibility – Council responsibility. (Leaseholders Only)	
Options for Leaseholders and Freeholders – what has been offered elsewhere. What do we need on Tustin?	Thursday 26 September
Leaseholder Freeholder meeting with Council representatives	Thursday 24 October

7.0 Any Other Business

7.1 There were comments on the Draft Newsletter. KM suggested that the photo should be different on each edition, so they did not look like the previous one.

7.2 ET suggested as the newsletter grows that there should be a panel on the front page identifying content inside to get residents to open the newsletter.

7.3 AE was keen to see more publicity for the Training and Apprenticeships. NK explained there is a Council wide programme and that could be included in the newsletter.

7.4 AE asked for the newsletter to publicise the Council's Resident Involvement Review.

7.5 AE asked for Council help for the TCA to set up the Community Hub in the Grasmere TCA Room. **NK to work on this with AE.**

7.6 MT reported that the Council was looking at the Local Letting Scheme policy, which could affect lettings to Hidden Homes in Tustin Towers, at Cabinet in September.

8 Future Meetings

- 8.1 15 August
- 12 September
- 17 October
- 14 November
- 12 December

Neal Purvis – 12th July 2019