

Tustin Estate Project Group

Design Meeting

15.1.20.

1.0 Present

Residents		Common Ground	
Lee Harrison	LH	Tom Kennedy	TK
Andrew Eke	AE	David Hills	DH
Andy Chaggar	AC	Deborah Saunt	DS
Kerry Knibbs	KK	Nick Hayhurst	NH
Maria Palumbo	MP		
Francis Phillip	FP	LBS	
Paulette Kelly	PK	Sophie Hall-Thompson	SH
Open Communities		Tim Cutts	TC
Neal Purvis	NP	Mike Tyrrell	MT
		Sophie Williams	SW
Apologies for Absence			
Amelia Leeson	AL	Emma Trott	ET

1.

2. Update from Common Ground

2.1 DH noted that the it was possible the boundary of school could change slightly. If works were done to the school, the objective was to provide one move with continuous operation and no temporary decant.

2.2 DS summarised the feedback Common Ground has received from residents.

2.3 There are lots of boundaries on estate. The route to school from the Old Kent Road is very sociable. Some areas of the estate have limited overlooking. Common Ground's aim is to try to design 'eyes on the street'.

2.4 When residents were asked what you like and do not like on the estate, their first positive was that the estate is well connected.

2.5 The four options being tested in the Feasibility Study are:

Option 1 improve inside the homes and repair blocks

Option 2 Provide Option 1 plus add new buildings in more space to provide more money to improve the homes and the estate.

Option 3 keep some, add some, build some new

Option 4 demolish and build all new homes

2.6 The last presentation had been to the November Public meeting. There would be a presentation of more developed ideas to the 5 February Estate Wide meeting.

2.7 At the November event opinions were recorded green yes red no. At Heversham, most votes went to new build.

2.8 At Kentmere few people voted.

2.9 At Bowness more people preferred rebuild

2.10 At Manor Grove more people preferred to keep the buildings and refurbish.

2.11 There was not a high turnout at any block so this gives an indication but it is not possible to draw sound overall conclusions

2.12 Since November when Common Ground have met people they have asked about certain themes.

- Character and identify.
- Public Realm and Safety
- Density and Parking
- Space Standards and Tenure
- Community Use and Employment

2.13 Common Ground have used the coffee cart to engage people.

2.14 MP suggested that many people were in a hurry during the school run, and on their way to work. Other times would work better to engage those who do not work.

2.15 DS confirmed that the information collected from the Drop in Sessions will be available online. There will be other opportunities for working residents to engage at other times.

2.16 Option 1 includes Improvement with better lighting CCTV, Decent Homes Standard, improved landscaping.

2.17 Option 2 includes Infill development, which could be building at rear of Bowness , and at Manor Grove on garages or a row of house at North of Manor Grove

2.18 There could be infill between Heversham and Ilderton Road or next to little Heversham.

2.19 FP asked if new homes be small? DS replied no. Modern space standards are larger than in the recent past.

2.20 LH asked if the tenanted Manor Grove houses would be refurbished. DH Yes in Option 1 and 2.

2.21 KK asked will there still have green space for dogs? DS replied Yes.

2.22 DS outlined the need to keep the same number of car parking spaces as the existing car parking.

2.23 LH asked would the Council rehouse existing overcrowded families? MT explained that there would be a phasing programme to work out how to best use homes with the information from the stock condition survey.

2.24 AE noted the Residents Manifesto set out expectations on how to deal with households who are overcrowded.

- 2.25 MP asked if the proposals would reduce the number of parking spaces in Manor Grove as there are already have parking problems. DS explained that there would be the same number of parking spaces as now. There would not be more parking spaces. New households on the estate would not automatically get a parking space.
- 2.26 DH explained with the details of the Stock Condition Survey – everyone would know more about the cost of work to existing homes and blocks, and that would inform how much infill may be needed.
- 2.27 All options preserve current level of parking, new homes are car free.
- 2.28 Common Ground will summarise winners and losers, pros and cons with each option as it develops. There will be some examples of how these options could work on the visits for residents, organised by Common Ground on 8 and 15 January
- 2.29 For Option 4 the Masterplan would it be like if the estate was re-imagined, with the School at heart of estate, lots of trees, and a variety of different types of housing, to provide for a rich mix of people at different stages of their life.
- 2.30 One option considered was whether there should be new building on more traditional street pattern. Putting the street back, could help security as people feel safer on a street.
- 2.31 The new Tube station will probably be opposite Iceland. There will be more people in the area. Within Tustin there should be nice green routes.
- 2.32 There is an Overground Station planned at Surrey Canal. This could connect with Hornshay St. One issues for design is how easy it is to walk through the estate. Vehicles would not be able to cross the estate.
- 2.33 FP was worried about thieves and bandits able to run through estate. AE was clear that residents do not want the estate to be a thoroughfare for people to walk through. It is important that design makes people feel safer.
- 2.34 DS explained the trips will look at local examples of before and after improvements and redevelopment.
- 2.35 AE asked where Older People’s Dwellings could be located? DS replied at Manor Grove and Hillbeck
- 2.36 There was a discussion about where green space could be located. It could be between school and Heversham. Set out as a common, or you could spread green space out across the estate in smaller packets for different use as a grid.
- 2.37 Option 3 – Demolish some and keep others would involve keeping Bowness, the Tustin towers, Heversham and Manor Grove, with Kentmere, Ullswater and Hillbeck being demolished and replaced with new build homes.
- 2.38 The school would be at centre of estate. There would be a walk from Bowness along common – lower houses in front of (West) Heversham, and Back gardens facing back gardens. Front doors would open onto park and would be lower than Heversham.

- 2.39 Older people could live in the heart of estate looking over green area, near school or a quieter place.
- 2.40 KK was worried about overlooking and children in block, would lead to lots of noise.
- 2.41 Nick explained there would be 21m to overlooking window which compared to 10m in most Victorian streets.
- 2.42 From OKR to Hillbeck Close on the site of Ullswater and Hillbeck, there could be new homes and a walk through the estate joining the estate road at Manor Grove.
- 2.43 One of the most important questions is where the front entrance of the school is compared to the green space.
- 2.44 KK asked how high the newbuild would be next to the school. It was proposed at 6 storeys.
- 2.45 AE noted that any new build at Sylvan Grove would have its height limited due to proximity of school. There are trees between Ambleside and Bowness and the school
- 2.46 Residents were interested in how the new buildings would look compared to old buildings. The visits will pick up this issue.
- 2.47 There were two different layouts for Option 4, Common and Grid, with three versions that keep Manor Grove and one with Manor Grove demolished.
- 2.48 There are currently 43 homes at Manor Grove, the proposal was for 50% bigger homes, at 3 storey to provide more homes and more density.
- 2.49 There was a discussion about Podium blocks, with cars on ground floor, and a courtyard on the first floor inside block.
- 2.50 An example of a podium block would be Trafalgar Place at the Elephant. The front doors open outside at the ground floor.
- 2.51 FP asked if the new homes would be at Council rent. MT confirmed all the new tenanted homes would be at council rents.
- 2.52 Option 4.1A includes Heversham, Bowess, Hillbeck, Ullswater, and Kentmere all demolished. Manor Grove kept. There would be a Common in the middle of the estate. New homes provided next to Manor Grove would be low.
- 2.53 There could be another tower on the site of Little Heversham. If the tower included the homes for sale it could generate money to pay for other works across the estate.
- 2.54 AE was concerned that housing for sale should not be concentrated in one block. He was concerned to make sure freeholder are included. The focus should be about buildings, not tenure.
- 2.55 DS noted the proposals must include some benefits for tower residents, who will vote in the ballot. DS wondered whether tower residents want to come home to a big car park, or could parking between the towers be put under another block, so there could be a garden at the base of the towers.

- 2.56 AE noted there will be a new concierge and CCTV that will link in to the rest of the estate. The TCA is talking to the police about how to make this work well.
- 2.57 Option 4.2e involves complete demolition with new building at Manor Grove, on a grid pattern. There would be a busy public space on the Old Kent Road. It would not be possible to see through the estate from the outside. On entering the estate it would be welcoming but not open. The heights of proposed blocks are 8 storeys on OKR where it is currently 5 storeys. Across the estate it would be 6 storeys, with up to 8 storey on Ilderton Road.
- 2.58 Inside the blocks would be shared private garden for block residents only. Only example on Tustin Estate now is Kentmere. Residents will see examples of this on the visits. There are no houses in this version.
- 2.59 Option 4.2A Blocks demolished except Manor Grove which is retained with a grid pattern.
- 2.60 There would be a green area size of Mint St park. 40 sq m – 50 sq m
- 2.61 There are examples of denser homes with gardens on the roof, courtyards and balconies on first floor.
- 2.62 This version includes public open space and private open space, footways, Community use and estate roads.
- 2.63 KK explained children on the estate used to be able to use Multi Use Games Area (MUGA) when the school was closed. It cannot be used now. .
- 2.64 KK noted that the darkest area of the estate was next to Kentmere at the end of Heversham.
- 2.65 There are currently 296 homes on the estate. A partial rebuild around a Common would give
- 2.66 Option 4.1 Common would provide 1100 new homes, or if Manor Grove was retained 819. With new houses on Manor Grove this would provide 876
- 2.67 MP asked if new homes on Manor Grove would be freehold? DH replied as present the designs were tenure blind.
- 2.68 AC noted there was strong support to retain the homes in Manor Grove. Many residents were not happy with current offer from the Council around new homes.
- 2.69 AE noted a variety of views of those living in Manor Grove.
- 2.70 DH noted Common Ground will keep options until they have feedback, and more information on the viability of each option.
- 2.71 DS asked residents present which options they preferred.
- 2.72 PK was concerned that a large open space invites people from off the estate in, and that as the estate will be in the middle of two stations, we need to have our quiet space.
- 2.73 AC noted lots of separate spaces would probably mean less social cohesion.

- 2.74 AE asked if the Manor Grove new build proposals were standalone houses. DH replied they are all houses, not maisonettes with a shared garden at back, and roof garden.
- 2.75 KK asked if someone with a disability did not want to move off estate, would the new homes meet their needs? DS replied the new homes would be suitable for people with disabilities.
- 2.76 LH noted he did not want to lose his garden. He loves living in Manor Grove.
- 2.77 AE noted the TRA will discuss which is the best option for the whole estate.

N. Purvis 28.1.20.