

Tustin Estate Project Group Meeting

Thursday 12 September

Tustin TRA Room, Grasmere Point

Present	Initials	Present	Initials
Andrew Eke	AE	Susan Holyhead	SH
Andy Chaggar	AC	Richard Jones (Electoral Reform Services)	RJ
Awa Sawadogo	AS	Tim Cutts (LBS)	TC
Ellis Knibbs	EK	Neil Kirby (LBS)	NK
Emma Taylor	ET	Mike Tyrell (LBS)	MT
Kerry Knibbs	KK	Ian Simpson (ITLA, Chair)	IS
Paulette Kelly	PK	Stephen Moore (ITLA, Minutes)	SM

Apologies were received from Sophie Hall-Thompson and Neal Purvis.

1. Introductions

1.1 IS took the Chair and welcomed everyone to the meeting.

2. Minutes of the meeting of 15 August

2.1 The Minutes were agreed as an accurate record.

3. Resident engagement plan – update

3.1 MT provided a summary of the engagement plan and invited questions.

3.2 ET asked if there were any coffee mornings planned this month, as none had been advertised. NK said a date could be arranged soon.

3.3 AE asked what the timetable was for one-to-one visits to residents' homes. MT said 40 visits out of 296 households had taken place so far. AE requested a plan of action so that progress could be monitored. MT said he was drafting a separate letter to let residents know the importance of getting involved in the process.

3.4 KK asked whether there had been a great response on the doorstep so far as people she had spoken to are not very interested are not very interested. MT advised that very few people contacted had declined to get involved and that any encouragement from RPG members for their neighbours to contribute would be welcome.

3.5 AC asked how many attempts were being made to contact each resident. MT said at least three attempts would be made, and AC said he thought that was reasonable.

4. Comments on draft newsletter

4.1 ET felt two weeks' notice for the first meeting was not enough for some residents. MT disagreed, pointing out that advertising events too far in advance risks residents forgetting about them. ET asked whether Southwark could inform people of dates several weeks in advance so they could reserve the date and then issue a reminder nearer the time.

4.2 AE said resident awareness is still not high, and many become defensive when they are asked questions about the scheme. He said we collectively need to find a way of taking residents with us.

4.3 AC suggested including a phone number in the newsletter to allow residents to call and arrange a meeting / visit at their convenience. MT agreed to add this to the newsletter.

4.4 AC also suggested a rule of thumb to give three to four weeks' notice of events. MT said three weeks was not unusual in these schemes.

4.5 IS invited comments from residents on the newsletter, and whether it was good to go as-is or needed anything changing.

4.6 TC asked MT to add details of a consultation event on 19 September about a nearby park. MT agreed.

5 Update on LBS ballot policy and Electoral Reform Services

5.1 MT explained that GLA policy is that a single 'yes' or 'no' vote is required, therefore multiple proposals will need to be whittled down first. He circulated three sample documents that had been used to consult residents on the Ledbury Estate, explaining they were simply an example of the kind of approach that could be used here (a consultation questionnaire / survey paper, a report on the vote, and the vote breakdown).

5.2 Ledbury residents were able to vote by post, use a ballot box on the estate, or vote by phone using an LBS consultation 'hub' off-site. The report set out the residents' responses (they were invited to assign a score to each option, and the report weighted each option accordingly).

5.3 MT said it was an example of a method that could be used to whittle down options, and that the best way to run it independently of LBS was to let Open Communities oversee it. He said the Ledbury approach is highly likely to be the same here.

5.4 KK asked if there would be an awareness campaign to get residents who are not living on the estate to vote. MT confirmed there would be an awareness campaign through door to door visits during the offer document period; but the vote is only for residents who live on the estate.

- 5.5 AE asked what the preferable percentage would be for resident engagement in the process, pointing out that many vulnerable and elderly residents might not be able to fully engage. He asked that someone from LBS attend the TRA meeting next week. NK said LBS is looking at how best to engage all residents, and wants a high turnout. They are working with Open Communities on indicative ballots, but are at an early stage so they don't have an answer yet. MT clarified that the GLA policy does not set a minimum turnout figure.
- 5.6 AL asked what the timeline would be for three sets of surveys. MT said it depends how many options are developed – the more options there are, the more surveys are needed.
- 5.7 AE asked if residents could suggest options as part of the process, and MT said LBS would welcome options from the residents, .
- 5.8 IS clarified that the ballot has to follow GLA guidance, however flimsy it might seem, but the actual consultation on how the final option is arrived at for the final vote is down to LBS. MT said that method would be developed with residents.
- 5.9 AC asked if LBS could set out what it thought the process should be.
- 5.10 IS clarified that the Ledbury Estate paperwork is an example of what could be done, rather than it being prescriptive. RJ said the Ledbury process looked very robust. MT added that this was LBS trying to make sure residents have the opportunity to decide how they arrive at the final 'yes/no' question, and he had been asked by Open Communities to bring along an example of how that might be done.
- 5.11 RJ said a bespoke approach could be accommodated. Explaining the approach, he said the question on ballot papers tends to be, 'Are you in favour of x, yes or no?' and is accompanied by a report on what has happened so far and what the offer on the table is now. ERS is there to facilitate residents' feedback and to count the votes. He said every estate is unique and so every ballot has been slightly different, as what works on one estate might not work on another.
- 5.12 ERS posts a vote to every eligible resident on an estate. The question is succinct. There is a pre-paid envelope to return the voting paper, or alternatively residents can vote online. Ballot boxes can be stationed on the estate, and even telephone voting provided, where qualitative feedback can be recorded. Ballots are open for 21 days, extendable to 24 days if desired. The local authority is informed of the results 24-48hrs after the ballot closes. ERS can inform residents of the result directly, or the local authority could do it.
- 5.13 PK asked what could be done to engage residents with English as a second or other language, or who do not speak English at all. MT said these people would be identified during the door-to-door visits and LBS had access to translators who could translate the necessary documents throughout the process, not just at the vote.
- 5.14 AE asked which of the voting options was the most secure. RJ said they are all equally secure and ERS has "banking grade" security – only one level below "military grade". No-one at ERS – or anyone else, including LBS staff – will ever know how anyone voted.
- 5.15 AE requested that the council webpage for the project should include a link to the survey.

5.16 IS suggested sending out reminder letters part-way through the voting period to every eligible voter who has not voted by then.

5.17 ET asked what ERS' relationship was with LBS. NK said ERS will be used for the trial. They are a very trusted name in their field and LBS wanted to bring them in early on in the process. ET asked if ERS could also be brought in to handle the 'whittling down' of options. MT confirmed that would be possible.

5.18 AC asked for the PGM minutes to be uploaded to the website as the most recent are from July. MT agreed to do this, but only minutes confirmed as accurate are added, and so as only this meeting has confirmed the August minutes, they would not be on the website yet.

5.19 IS thanked RJ for coming.

5.20 Neal Purvis to send around the latest draft of the Engagement Plan.

6 Update on appointing architects and process

6.1 NK said six architects were putting together proposals – all are very keen and aware of the timescales. The next stage is undertaking the interviews, and deciding who should be on the interview panel. NK does not want it dominated by council officers. He said the panel would comprise:

- two council officers;
- Neal Purvis from Open Communities;
- a representative from the school (headteacher, governor or someone from the PTA);
- a representative from the local businesses;
- AE as chair of the TRA;
- other TRA representatives as desired.

NK asked for suggestions of suitable times to interview three architects' practices and hear their presentations, noting that it is best for them all to take place on the same day, over an estimated period of four hours.

6.2 AE said he was grateful to NK for trying to get residents involved, and asked which of the residents present would like to take part. NK said he was very keen to see a representative from the low-rise homes be involved as they are directly affected by the scheme, as well as leaseholders and freeholders.

6.3 AC asked if they had to take place on the same day and NK said it's the best way of keeping all the architects' proposals fresh in the mind, and avoids the complications of co-ordinating multiple diaries across multiple dates.

6.4 AL asked if other residents could sit in and observe the interviews, and MT agreed. NK said the interviews were an open process, the architects would not be discussing anything

confidential. What he needs on the panel are residents who have got the time to engage fully in the process. He clarified there would not be any council observers.

6.5 ET said it would be ideal but unwieldy to have a representative from each tenancy type present, and have input into the questions the architects will be asked. NK explained the process and how it works.

6.6 IS asked NK to clarify how the residents' feedback from the earlier public event with the architects will be taken into account in the formal selection process. NK said LBS wanted to capture that, and do so quickly, so it can be fed into the selection process.

6.7 AE said he would expect to see the lead architect from each practice on the estate, in order to take them seriously.

6.8 AL asked how the representative from each group of residents would be able to adequately represent the views of members of that group (e.g. leaseholders). MT said personal opinions were fine as representative views were not needed at this stage.

6.9 ET (freeholder), KK (tenant) and AL (leaseholder) volunteered to join the interview panel alongside AE.

6.10 NK suggested two suitable venues for the interviews – Tooley Street (ground floor) or the school, and confirmed transport could be arranged for residents if required. He said there will be a clear evaluation criteria and selection process, which LBS is committed to.

6.11 The afternoon of Friday 4 October was suggested as suitable by ET.

7 Update on planning applications in Old Kent Road Area Action Plan

7.1 TC talked through the summary document of the various planning applications already granted and in the pipeline for the surrounding area. **Neal to send the document to all recipients.**

8 Update on Hidden Homes in Tustin Towers

8.1 MT said 13 homes have been ringfenced for people in priority need on the estate, and these will be advertised directly to estate residents. Only Tustin residents will be able to bid for them. LBS will send residents a letter with further details of the properties available in the weeks that they are advertised so that everyone who can bid will be aware.

9 Matters arising from minutes of meeting 15 August

9.1 No further matters were raised.

10 Any other business

10.1 No other business was raised.

11 Dates of future meetings

11.1 The next meeting has already been arranged for 10 October.

Date	Meeting	Invited
Thursday 26 September	Leaseholder and Freeholder Meeting Options for Leaseholders and Freeholders – what has been offered elsewhere. What do we need on Tustin?	Tustin Low Rise Leaseholders and Freeholders
Thursday 3 October	TPG Training Session What is involved in a: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing Needs Assessment • Stock Condition Survey • Equality Impact Assessment • Cost and Viability Analysis 	Tustin Project Group – Residents Only
Thursday 10 October	Tustin Project Group Meeting	TPG and LBS
Thursday 24 October	Leaseholder Freeholder meeting with Council representatives	Tustin Low Rise Leaseholders and Freeholders with LBS
Thursday 7 November	Tenants' Rights and Moving Home	
Thursday 14 November	Tustin Project Group Meeting	TPG and LBS
Thursday 12 December	Tustin Project Group Meeting	TPG and LBS