

Tustin Estate Project Team Meeting

Thursday 12 March 2020 at the Tustin TRA Hall

MINUTES

Present	Initials	Present	Initials
Andy Chaggar	AC	David Hill (Common Ground)	DH
Emma Taylor (part of meeting)	ET	Mike Tyrell (Southwark Council)	MT
Kerry Knibbs	KK	Neil Kirby (Southwark Council)	NK
Paulette Kelly	PK	Sophie Hall-Thompson (Southwark)	SH
Maria Palumbo	MP	Tim Cutts (Southwark Council)	TC
Andrew Eke (part of meeting)	AE	Tom Woods (Common Ground)	TW
Neal Purvis (Open Comms, Chair)	NP		

Apologies for Absence

Amelia Leeson, Lee Harrison, Andrew Eke (for lateness)

Ian Simpson (Open Communities)

1. Introductions

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

2. Minutes of the Estate Project Team meeting of 27 February

2.1. The minutes were accepted as accurate with one correction:

2.1.1. The meeting took place at the Ledbury TRA Hall.

3. Report from Estatewide meeting 2 March

3.1. MT outlined the main issue that the meeting dealt with was updated options proposed for the estate. There was an Option 4A with Manor Grove retained with some infill which was a new alternative in response to feedback from residents. This will be listed as Option 5 in the 'whittling down' consultation process.

3.2. MP made clear she was not happy, and felt that options had not been explained clearly. She had a conversation with a resident who did not understand that Option 4 involved complete demolition of Manor Grove.

3.3. MP stated that the Option Appraisal brief stated that Manor Grove would be shown in and out for Options 2 -4, and Manor Grove residents understood they would be able to opt out.

- 3.4. MT replied that Option 4 was a redevelopment option for the whole estate, and that following resident feedback on the previous designs, Option 4A meant no homes would be demolished at Manor Grove, with complete demolition and new build for the rest of the estate.
- 3.5. AC raised sub options that had been discussed at previous meetings. The interest of residents outside of Manor Grove was clear, with demolition of Manor Grove, there was a chance residents from other parts of the estate with housing need for larger homes could get a house.
- 3.6. DH noted that Option 4 is complete redevelopment of the estate and Option 4A is retain Manor Grove with infill. If residents wanted to retain Manor Grove they option on the table was Option 4A.
- 3.7. MP had raised the lack of clarity on Option 4 and Option 4A with one of the architect team at the estatewide meeting. They had checked with one of their colleagues before they were clear that Option 4 was demolition and Option 4A was retain Manor Grove with infill.
- 3.8. SHT said that Option 4A had been developed to address the concerns of some Manor Grove residents at previous consultation events that there needed to be an Option that retained Manor Grove.
- 3.9. NK outlined the options from Option 1 through to Option 3. With Option 1 there are no new homes on the estate, Option 2 is refurbishment with some infill at Manor Grove, Option 3 includes some demolition of other blocks, and refurbishment with some infill at Manor Grove. Option 4, the complete redevelopment option, provides around 50 more homes across the estate than Option 4A. NK confirmed that Option 4A will be listed as Option 4 in the consultation and Option 5 will be the complete Demolition and redevelopment Option.
- 3.10. AC reported that there had been consensus among the 16 Manor Grove freeholders who had attended the meeting on 11 March that the freeholders at Manor Grove did not want to move, and were concerned that redevelopment of Manor Grove would mean they would no longer remain freeholders. The option offered as part of the estatewide consultation should include for Manor Grove homes to be retained, while providing newbuild across the rest of the estate.
- 3.11. MT reported that the newsletter and explanation to be provided before consultation would make clear what Option 4 and Option 5 would mean for Manor Grove.
- 3.12. PK gave feedback on the estatewide meeting. The had been very useful to help residents understand the developments nearby that already had planning consent. She was concerned that there was not more time for residents to talk to all of the consultants who were at the meeting to get more of an idea of the work each of them were doing and what this meant for the future of the estate. She had been told that the school was not part of the proposals, although this had later been corrected. PK was concerned that not all residents were able to discuss the full impact of the updated proposals in the time that was available.

- 3.13. TK suggested residents could make use of the drop in sessions on Thursdays and now also on Saturday afternoons.
- 3.14. PK was aware that many residents on the estate did not yet know where the new TCA hall was, and that some vulnerable residents were not able to get there.
- 3.15. NK explained that all residents will get a printed updated version of the Options, that will be produced in large print for those who need it. **LBS to provide drafts for RPG to comment before finalising.**

4. Design Visit 28 February

- 4.1. The visit had been delayed from 14 February due to the threat of extreme weather. PK reported that fewer residents attended than at the first Design Visit. The weather had been poor so it had not been possible to walk around at every estate.
- 4.2. Residents were impressed with the design and the square and the finish of the homes at the Packington Estate in Islington. It had been a pity that it was not possible to get to look inside any of the homes.
- 4.3. Residents were not keen on the estate where there was infill as there was so much difference between the old and new homes.
- 4.4. Residents wanted to see specialist older peoples dwellings and this had not been possible on the visit.
- 4.5. SHT suggested further visits to LBS new build sites.
- 4.6. **Common Ground to provide structured feedback from residents on the visits to TEPG.**

5. Consultation on Options – Timeline and Process

- 5.1. MT circulated a consultation questionnaire that had been updated since the Meeting Papers had been distributed. The consultation questionnaire will be sent to all residents on the Tustin Consultation Electoral Roll, along with the Residents' Manifesto. The consultation ballot paper can be returned to a Ballot Box, it can be collected by Open Communities or residents can vote online. The TCA Hall will be open every day during the consultation period.
- 5.2. The results of the consultation will be reported block by block.
- 5.3. AC had tried to engage with this process, but was very concerned with how the process was moving. He had raised concerns that the process was moving too quickly on multiple occasions. The options and ideas were set out in an indicative timetable, that had hardened to become final options at the 2 March meeting at the school. The options that he and others at Manor Grove had requested with an opt out for Manor Grove was not being offered. An offer of Shared Equity for the freeholders at Manor Grove was significantly less than they had at present with a freehold. Many mortgage lenders were not interested in lending on a shared equity home. 8 Manor Grove freeholders had emailed the Strategic Director of Housing and Modernisation, and Councillors with this view. AC also said the phrase "final

options” had not been included in the Feb newsletter advertising the 2 March meeting. This had been introduced on event flyers after project group feedback

- 5.4. NK replied that LBS had made changes as a result of representations by residents including Manor Grove freeholders. The consultation process had been delayed until 21 March to follow the LBS meeting with leaseholders and freeholders. NK stated this was a week’s delay. AC said this was a meaningless token gesture and that he felt that his own representations were being used unfairly by LBS. This makes him uncomfortable providing further feedback that might be misinterpreted. *(Post meeting note: the consultation has been postponed due to measures to restrict the spread of the corona virus).*
- 5.5. MT noted that the results would be reported block by block in response to a request from TEPG members.
- 5.6. AC was concerned that there was no option to opt in or out, and asked why this was not part of the consultation ballot?
- 5.7. MT replied that this is a decision to be taken by the whole estate and the Council will take into consideration the views expressed by residents in all parts of the estate in reaching a decision on what Option is included in the ballot carried out by ERS. AC said that GLA rules only required the final vote to be estate wide. There was nothing preventing sub-votes first. AC felt that the only reason to deny sub-votes was that LBS didn’t want them. AC also felt that the term “into consideration” was too vague and provided no clarity. AC said he believed that there no precedents for this process with freeholders in the borough and that proceeding without more detail and forethought is reckless.
- 5.8. SHT notes that residents who felt they needed more information could have one to one sessions with LBS staff to better understand the options.
- 5.9. MT agreed to look again at the design of the consultation ballot questionnaire to include space for residents to say why they had chosen their favoured option.

6. Resident Engagement Plan update

- 6.1. MT identified the changes in the Resident Engagement Plan. **LBS will organise some smaller group meetings to engage residents before and during the consultation period.**
- 6.2. The meeting of homeowners with the Council is Wednesday 18 March. **LBS will mail homeowners directly to publicise this.**
- 6.3. The Common Ground allotment garden will be constructed behind Heversham on Friday 20 and Saturday 21 March.
- 6.4. AC was concerned that communication has been poor throughout the process and the digital engagement had been particularly poor. AC reminded LBS officers that these concerns had been feedback repeatedly at project meetings and via email.
- 6.5. MP suggested another public meeting was needed to make sure residents understand options properly.

6.6. NK noted that the involvement from those blocks that had been under represented was increasing, and the Council was looking at all contact to identify and focus on addresses where there had not been any contact during the process. There had been 5 residents at the first Saturday Drop in.

7. Comments on Draft Newsletter

7.1. TEPG were asked to provide any comments on the Draft Newsletter to MT by 12 noon on 16.3.20.

8. Draft Offer Document

8.1. There had been no changes to the Draft Offer Document. NP noted the issues and questions raised in the Block Meetings need to be addressed in the Draft Offer Document. AC reiterated his earlier concerns about the lack of detail and forethought in relation to freeholders.

9. Report from Open Community Block Meetings

9.1. NP update the TEPG on the two block meetings that had taken place since the Paper was drafted. There had been 4 residents at the Kentmere and Hillbeck leaseholder meeting, and 16 residents at the Manor Grove freeholders meeting. The discussion in earlier parts of the TEPG meeting had set out the concern among Manor Grove freeholders that Shared Equity leases were not a suitable option for freeholders.

10. Matters Arising from the Minutes of Meeting 15th January

10.1. (4.6) NK reported that Heversham and the towers were the blocks under represented in consultation. See 6.6 above.

10.2. (7.6) **bring the proposed voting pack to 24th February meeting (MT). – Outstanding – this will now be circulated by email.**

10.3. (9.3) Boards from the 2 March drop in session had been uploaded to Tustin website.

10.4. (10.1) **Circulation space in new homes to be included in the Offer Document. SHT is pulling together a log of design issues to include.**

10.5. (10.3) **Offer Document to include a graphic explaining how support for homeowners, e.g. shared equity would work. -LBS**

10.6. (11.3) AE reported that the Repairs Team had agreed not to take any action on the garages without consulting the TCA.

10.7. (11.4) **NP to provide Common Ground Community Programme to TEPG members.**

10.8. (12.1) SHT reported that the standard of works for the common parts, including bin stores was being amended and will be included in the Offer Document. The costing will be included in the Stock Condition Survey.

11. Matters Arising from the Tustin Estate Project Group Minutes of 27th February

11.1. (3.7) NK confirmed that SELCHP and district heating would not be installed in Bowness in the case of refurbishment.

11.2. (4.2) AE confirmed that a worked example of how the Viability model works would be made available from the 16.3.20. - Outstanding.

11.3. (4.5) AE agreed to provide this in draft form of CBA for discussion and input before a final version is agreed and released more widely..- Outstanding

11.4. (8.2) Common Ground had included information on the information at the 2 March meeting to explain the Southwark Standard for refurbishment.

11.5. The Southwark Standard is still being developed (at para 3.5). **ACTION: Bring further details of the Standard and its implications to the next meeting (SH).**

12. Any other business

12.1. AC summed up his, and his neighbours in Manor Grove's frustrations with the process. He felt that this key stage, it felt rushed with limited time to meet to clarify questions.

12.2. NK undertook to respond quickly to the questions raised by the Manor Grove freeholders with Michael Scorer.

13. Dates of future meetings

13.1. The next meeting will be on Thursday 26 March, 7 pm at the TRA Hall.

Neal Purvis

16.3.20.