

## Tustin Estate Project Team Meeting

Thursday 27 February 2020 at the Ledbury TRA Hall

### MINUTES

Present	Initials	Present	Initials
Andy Chaggar	AC	Nick Hayhurst (Common Ground)	NH
Paulette Kelly	PK	Mike Tyrell (Southwark Council)	MT
		Neil Kirby (Southwark Council)	NK
Neal Purvis (Open Comms, Chair)	NP	Sophie Hall-Thompson (Southwark)	SH
		Bob Forrest (Hunters)	BF
		Cassidy Curls (Altair)	CC
		Aaron Elliot (Altair)	AE
		Sarah Marshall (Mott MacDonald)	SM

#### 1. Introductions

- 1.1. NP took the Chair and welcomed everyone to the meeting.
- 1.2. Apologies for accuracy were received from residents Lee Walkley, Andrew Eke, Maria Palumbo, and Amelia Leeson. Apologies were received from Ian Simpson from Open Communities.

#### 2. Minutes of the Estate Project Team meeting of 13 February

- 2.1. The minutes were accepted as accurate with two correction:
  - 2.1.1. AC had asked 'why residents had chosen their preferred option? As this would be useful in developing further iterations of the proposed options.' (para 4.4).
  - 2.1.2. Hillsbeck, should be Hillbeck (para 4.6).

#### 3. Update on Stock Condition Survey

- 3.1. BF circulated an update report that showed how the Stock Condition Survey V4 had been updated since the TEPG had last considered it in V3.
- 3.2. Details that had been added to V3 were Soutwark QHIP standards, including kitchen and bathroom renewal to Council Rented Homes, with an adjustment to remove any double counting.
- 3.3. Works from Southwark Council's Fire Risk Assessment (FRA) inspection have been added in.
- 3.4. Costs of Mechanical and Electrical works to take account of heat being provided into the communal boiler from South East London Combined Heat and Power Plan from

2023/24. Costs for boiler house installation to make use of this. Further costs are awaited for the communal pipework installation.

3.5. Outstanding costs to be added in for the final Stock Condition Survey report are:

- The report and costs for structural for any works needed at 81 Manor Grove.
- Cyclical and responsive repair costs. Void reservicing costs are included.
- Remove kitchen and bathroom improvement costs as they are part of the Southwark QHIP standards.

3.6. The V3 overall costs to bring and maintain homes at Southwark Standard was £27.3m, the V4 costs are £32.9m.

3.7. Neil Kirby explained SELCHP provides heat from the plant just over the border into Lewisham at Surrey Canal Road. It will be piped to the estate boiler house. BF confirmed Manor Grove was excluded. **BF to check whether Bowness is included or excluded from proposed SELCHP works.**

3.8. BF confirmed that the drains were not causing structural issues at 81 Manor Grove. Further investigation is underway to identify the cause. When the cause is understood, the options for other homes in Manor Grove will be considered.

3.9. MK confirmed that the structural engineers report for 81 Manor Grove will be made available to residents.

3.10. BF noted that some works could lead to an increase in the asbestos works. He gave the example of an asbestos panel behind the radiator in Hillbeck. If the radiator is removed, the panel would also have to be removed. This would be included in the final version of the Stock Condition Survey report.

3.11. BF noted the void costs were based on the LBS average void reservicing costs and the frequency with which voids appeared on the estate.

3.12. The CCTV drain survey contractor has been chosen after 3 quotes. This will identify costs for the drains. The current Stock Conditions Survey includes a contingency based on the drain survey from the school.

3.13. There may be a requirement to update communal doors due to changes in FRA certification of fire doors. The costs will be updated to exclude double counting.

3.14. BF made clear that the works had been grouped in the early years to make good use of scaffold, but the Stock Condition Survey was not a programme of works. LBS would need to decide, if and where refurbishment is the chosen option, how to group works and over how many years to programme them.

3.15. AC asked if the amount in the detailed spreadsheet projected to be paid by FH on Manor Grove for estate costs was an average based on the number of households. BF confirmed this was the case and that actual amounts could go up or down based on individual title deeds.

#### **4. Update on Option Appraisal Viability and Cost Benefit Analysis**

- 4.1. AE outlined the method used in the Viability Appraisal to compare each of the Options by identifying the costs and benefits, in financial form, of each option. The Stock Condition Survey gave most of the input information to do this for Option 1. For Options 2-4 the designs from Common Ground were being costed to provide cost information as the basis for comparison.
- 4.2. **AE confirmed that a worked example of how the Viability model works would be available from 16.3.20.**
- 4.3. AE noted that where leaseholders and freeholders are recharged, there is a zero cost to the Council. Costs for rented homes are paid back through rents.
- 4.4. The new accommodation schedules for Option 2-4 needed to be costed.
- 4.5. AC noted that residents needed to see a digestible version of the Viability Assessment, but also be able to scrutinise the detail. **AE agreed to provide this.**
- 4.6. There was a discussion on rent levels. The rents for new homes will be Council Rents.
- 4.7. NK note that the GLA funding for new build homes will be included in the model, and the Council has asked the GLA for clarification on the use of GLA grant for shared equity and re-provision of council homes. It looked like grant would pay for both of these.
- 4.8. NP asked a series of questions on the input information for the Viability Option Model.
- 4.9. Sales values are from local current sales values, including new build homes for sale in Malt St.
- 4.10. As moving leaseholders and freeholders from the existing homes to new homes is broadly cost neutral to the Council, there is not an assumption on how many resident leaseholders or freeholders would stay on the estate.
- 4.11. Commercial rents in new build are assumed to be 5% higher than the existing rents for the commercial premises in Bowness House, current Council commercial premises with an annual inflation increase. There is based on an uplift assumed for the arrival of the tube station.
- 4.12. The new build costs are bespoke costs for different design of homes, and take account of existing Southwark Council new build.
- 4.13. The assumption is that there will not be any homes at market rent. Rented homes will be at Council Rent levels.
- 4.14. Acquisition costs include the statutory compensation package.
- 4.15. The interest rate for Council borrowing is based on the current Public Works Loan Board (PWLB) rate of 3.5%.
- 4.16. CC introduced the approach to the Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA) to compare the costs and to try and express as money the benefits of each option. Issues identified by residents as important had been included in the CBA. These were public space and green space, parking, employment and training, health and wellbeing.

- 4.17. Some factors identified by residents, that were less important for residents will be assessed using qualitative methods, including social infrastructure, environmental quality, and moving related factors.
- 4.18. The factors assessed qualitatively will be put into a grid and each option considered on a Red, Amber, Green (RAG) assessment to allow comparison between each option.
- 4.19. Pride of Place and Community Cohesion will be assessed through benchmarking of similar Case Study options.
- 4.20. Housing and placemaking will be assessed through comparing the options for people living on the estate now.
- 4.21. CC noted that Option 1 does not deal with existing Housing Need, whereas Option 4 would lead to everyone being housed in homes suitable for their need. Disruption to households is a factor that will be assessed, including the time that works take, and the amount of disruption for residents.
- 4.22. Employment and apprenticeship opportunities currently takes into account construction jobs and the increase in commercial space. It needs to take into account jobs other than construction jobs. LBS to investigate data to reflect non construction training opportunities. The Council has the contractual basis for construction apprenticeships in place but had not always delivered the number of places expected.
- 4.23. **CC confirmed that the costs of Council Tax being higher in new homes would be included in the evaluation.**

## 5. Equality Impact Assessment

- 5.1. SM outlined the responsibilities of the Council to take into account the impact on those households with the protected characteristics in formulating and choosing options. If there were options where households with particular protected characteristics have negative impacts, the Council should try to mitigate these impacts.
- 5.2. The EqIA will be presented on a RAG grid for each option along with existing mitigation measures. There will be a summary table with the assessment and detailed tables showing RAG before and after mitigation.
- 5.3. SM explained that the phasing would have an effect on the impacts on households and how and when they are felt.
- 5.4. The draft report will be available on 16 March for TEPG to study.

## 6. Update from Common Ground Architects

- 6.1. **NH** gave a short on screen presentation on the Options and how they have developed since the previous estate wide drop in meeting in February. There will be an Option 4 with some redevelopment of Manor Grove only on the sites of the existing garages, and an Option 4 with complete redevelopment of Manor Grove.

- 6.2. AC was concerned about mortgage advisors view of shared equity. This will be part of the discussion at the LBS meeting with homeowners on 18 March.
- 6.3. NH outlined updates since the previous versions of designs had been displayed. Option 2 includes infill around the perimeter of the estate with no loss of parking spaces.
- 6.4. Option 3 includes partial demolition at Kentmere, Hillbeck and Ullswater and newbuild infill. Bowness and Manor Grove remain, and there are new buildings on the periphery.
- 6.5. The school would change shape. New homes between Heversham and the 'common' would be two to three stories in height.
- 6.6. NH outlined Option 4 which would be Option 3 plus demolition at Heversham, Bowness and Manor Grove.
- 6.7. There would be 3 storey new houses at Manor Grove, with sufficient to rehouse every existing tenant and resident freeholder from Manor Grove.
- 6.8. Buildings would be higher on Ilderton Road (up to 12 storeys) and lower towards the common.

## **7. Any Other Business**

- 7.1. SHT suggested a Drop In Session for residents on a Saturday in March between 3pm and 5pm in the afternoon to give access for residents who found it difficult to get to weekday meetings.

## **8. Matters Arising from the Meeting of 23.1.20**

- 8.1. (3.4) Hunters had broken down stock condition costs between leaseholder, freeholder and tenanted homes.
- 8.2. **(3.5) NH to check that information on the Southwark Standard is included in Common Ground information for meeting on 2.3.20.**
- 8.3. (3.8) Bowness costs are not significantly different to other blocks now most of the costs are included.
- 8.4. (6.2) SHT had provide TEPG with map of the sub areas that census data was drawn from.

N. Purvis

1.3.20.