

Tustin Estate Project Group Meeting

Thursday 9 July

Held virtually via Zoom

- Accurate Minutes -

Present	Initials	Present	Initials
Amelia Leeson	AL	David Hills (Common Ground)	DH
Andrew Eke	AE	Neil Kirby (LBS)	NK
Andy Chaggar	AC	Mike Tyrell (LBS)	MT
Francis Phillip	FP	Tim Cutts (LBS)	TC
Maria Palumbo	MP	Neal Purvis (ITLA, Chair)	NP
Paulette Kelly	PK	Stephen Moore (ITLA, Minutes)	SM
Juliette Wodzicki	JW	Seth Scafe-Smith	SS
		Maisha Akil Scafe-Smith	MS

Apologies were received from Ian Simpson (Open Communities). Neal Purvis Chaired the meeting.

1. Introductions

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

2. Minutes of TEPG meeting 12.3.20

- 2.1 The following changes to the Minutes were suggested, and the Minutes agreed as an accurate record overall with these changes reflected within them:
- 2.2 p2 – meeting held at Ledbury TRA Hall, not Tustin
- 2.3 p3, para 3.5 – The last sentence to be deleted.
- 2.4 p3, para 3.10 – Penultimate line “...should include an option Manor Grove with no infill” be amended to “...should include an option for Manor Grove homes to be retained”.
- 2.5 p4, para 5.3 – amended “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.”
- 2.6 p5, para 5.4 – After leaseholders and freeholders, add “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.”

- 2.7 p5, para 5.7 – Addition of AC’s comment “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.”
- 2.8 p5, para 6.4 – Addition “AC reminded LBS officers that these concerns had been feedback repeatedly at project meetings and via email.”
- 2.9 p6, para 8.1 – Addition of AC’s comment that there is less detail than residents wanted about freeholders’ options in Manor Grove.
- 2.10 FP requests a hard copy of the draft minutes be supplied to him for the next meeting, NP agreed.**

3. Update from LBS on work completed since March

- 3.1 NK said they have recently been able to pick up the work programme again since the coronavirus lockdown in March; in the interim, resources have been diverted away from this project and many staff have been working to deliver the council’s response to the virus.
- 3.2 The reduction in restrictions over the last month has allowed for further thinking about how to move the consultation forward, with safety of participants the top priority and meaning come necessary changes to approach.
- 3.3 LBS has restarted engagement with businesses, some studies and other pieces of work – most activities are now up and going. The council is still very committed to going ahead with it and it remains one of the council’s priorities.

4. Resident Engagement Plan Update

- 4.1 MT said he has also been busy helping with the council’s Covid-19 response, including arranging temporary accommodation.
- 4.2 MT said the plan is to restart engagement and remind residents where we are in the process. The draft monthly newsletter has been circulated for comment and review.
- 4.3 They are looking at how to do engagement activities virtually – face-to-face might be possible in future but not at the moment. His staff are working from home, MT himself is at the site office on the Ledbury Estate. Where his staff have previously carried out home visits, now they will have to be done over the phone. The proposal for the whittling down ballot is that it will take place 25 August to 15 September. An updated Draft Offer Document will be circulated before the August TEPG meeting. Voting will

take place by SMS text and email and we LBS will be sending out a display board pack as part of that – they type you would see at a physical exhibition. We have been a high level of engagement using this method elsewhere; 77 per cent achieved in the Isle Of Dogs.

- 4.4 In October architects will do further design work on the preferred option. Then there will be a fourth round of phone calls to all residents. The plans will go to January's LBS Cabinet meeting for approval and subject to that approval, Open Communities will be contacting residents making sure everyone is aware of what the offer is, and the vote will take place in February 2021.
- 4.5 FP asked that all communication with residents about the vote should be clearly marked as important so it is not ignored. MT said Open Communities would be calling residents to make sure they understand what the offer is and why it is important.
- 4.6 AC thanked LBS officers for their efforts helping deliver the LBS Covid-19 response, and pointed to a discrepancy between the newsletter and Resident Engagement Plan about the whittling-down vote, and it would be helpful for the newsletter to say that the vote is ongoing for a number of weeks. AC was glad LBS had embraced digital comms even if only because forced. The Isle of Dogs example shows the benefits of this. Email updates would be really useful as residents have been asking for them. NP said RPG email updates are sent to anyone who has asked for them. MT said he would add a paragraph to the newsletter about email updates.**
- 4.7 AC said there had been a breakdown in trust due to the way the engagement process ended in March, and asked when can he expect a response to matters raised in the March RPG meeting? NK said the team had responded to two sets of emails in March and May, but needed to pick up any questions people still had. A meeting that was scheduled then postponed as lockdown came into force, with freeholders and leaseholders, is now scheduled for 29 July.
- 4.8 AC said he felt the concerns raised by email had not been addressed yet. NK conceded the substantive points had not been responded to yet, but they should be able to respond by early next week.
- 4.9 PK asked whether there would still be a ballot box in the TRA hall for the whittling-down vote, as not everyone will be able to get online to vote. MT said it was still likely, but LBS need to consider how it works in line with social distancing.
- 4.10 AL asked whether there was a minimum turnout threshold that needed to be met to make the votes valid. MT said there was no minimum threshold at the moment, but turnout historically had always been over 50 per cent. NP said publicising the vote will be key, including phone calls and socially-distanced appointments to ensure that people understand and know how to express their opinion.
- 4.11 MP said she has raised on previous occasions that tenants in Manor Grove do not understand the consequences of the different options and the differences between them. They have asked for more meetings to explain the options but nothing has been done about it. MT said a draft of the information on Options will be available next week, and he wants to be sure all residents understand the impact of the plans and what they mean for them.

5. Comments on Draft Newsletter

- 5.1 MT talks through the contents of the Draft Newsletter, including that the whittling-down vote will take place from 26 August to 15 September. This means they will know by the end of September what the estate's preferred option is.
- 5.2 MT said they are still looking at what they can physically provide in the TRA hall. NP asked when MT would know when the TRA hall could be used as part of the engagement exercise. MT said it depended on the further lifting of lockdown restrictions; if they remain unchanged from now, the whole process would have to take place over the phone and via online meetings via Microsoft Teams, for example.
- 5.3 NP asked if people thought the FAQs were clear and answered what people needed to know. AE said that the process so far is missing feedback from officers to comments made by residents. MT said he agreed changes needed to be made and he would speak with Sophie tomorrow about how to do that. NP said there needed to be information on other methods of voting in the newsletter as well. MT said it would be included.
- 5.4 AC asked if the information sent out previously could be sent out again. NP suggests that (1) a letter is sent to all residents who are eligible to vote, telling them they are eligible to vote, and (2) the newsletter says this has happened, and directs any resident who believes they are eligible but has not received the letter to get in touch ASAP. MT agreed.
- 5.5 AL asked for more detail in the FAQs about how to vote.
- 5.6 MT said he would update the list of eligible voters to reflect those who have left the estate, and the newer arrivals who now meet the minimum 12-month residency threshold for voting rights.
- 5.7 Further comments to be received by MT by 5pm on 13.7.20., on the draft newsletter.

6. Summary of Consultants' Reports

- 6.1 NP said his summary report concentrates on the new things to come out of the 250-page Stock Condition Survey, such as the concrete survey. He has tried to explain the method and share the early conclusions of the Cost-Benefit Analysis. The Equality and Health Impact Assessment compares Tustin to the rest of Southwark and the rest of the country, but there is limited information at the moment. The full report will be uploaded onto the LBS website but the summaries were intended as a taster for residents.
- 6.2 NP asked the RPG if they wanted any more meetings with the consultants or architects to explain anything. TEPG to keep this option open. AC was interested in the environmental impacts of each option and how this compared. He was particularly interested in refurbishment and new build at Manor Grove. This had been part of the architect selection process.
- 6.3 NP said that as the full reports become available, they will be published online and there will be updates at future meetings, and the matters can be revisited as needed then.

7. Draft Offer Documents

- 7.1 NP asked MT when the new draft offer document would be ready for others to see. MT said the last update was 10 March. **The new draft can be made available to residents by the 17.7.20.**
- 7.2 NP asked when residents will get responses to the issues and questions they have raised. **NK said these will also be ready by 17.7.20.**

9. Matters Arising from the Meeting 12.3.20

- 9.1 (3.15) NP asked when they would see the new drafts of the information for residents ahead of the whittling-down vote. There was a discussion on timescales. AE asked several times if more time was needed. NK was not of the view that more time was needed. Residents were concerned that the process could not be resident led if residents did not fully understand what they were asked to make decisions on. **NK to circulate a draft before 16.7.20.**
- 9.2 (4.6) NP thanked DH for providing the documents.
- 9.3 (5.7) TEPG had asked how residents views block by block would be taken into account in the consultation on the whittling down process. AC felt this paragraph was too vague. **NK to provide a response with more detail by 17.7.20.**
- 9.4 (6.1) Resident Engagement Plan – NP suggests looking at ways to do smaller meetings, perhaps outdoors, with limited numbers of residents. Can this be done? MT said it wouldn't be possible at the moment, but might be possible if the Government guidelines change in future.
- 9.5 (6.2) NP said the rescheduled meeting for freeholders and leaseholders is now 29 July. NK confirmed homeowners will all be given at least 7 days' notice.
- 9.6 (10.2) Originally from the January 2020 meeting, the proposed voting pack and what people will see. This has been discussed tonight.
- 9.7 (10.4) NP said DH needs to ensure details of circulation space and design issues are included in the offer document both internally and in the common parts.
- 9.8 (10.7) NP sent the Common Grounds Community Programme to TEPG members by WeTransfer, but some indicated they had not received the link. NP said he would try again.
- 9.9 (10.7) MS said that they will be able to get to work again soon on the community garden now that lockdown restrictions are easing. NP asked if engagement via football was happening now as well. SS said it was part of the community events programme, including the BBQ, but they could not go ahead at the time due to the lockdown, so they now need to reassess what they can offer, including the careers element, which is important to them.

- 9.10 (10.8) NP confirmed that costing of the works in common parts have been included in the Stock Condition Survey.
- 9.11 (11.2) Example of how the viability model works – **NK said LBS can get this information out by 17.7.20.**
- 9.12 (11.3) Draft from of the CBA. **NK said LBS can get this information out by 17.7.20.**
- 9.13 (11.5) Further details of the Southwark Standard for refurbishment – NK said this is the national Decent Homes standard with replacement kitchens and bathrooms. This needs to be set out clearly in the Information on the Options document.
- 9.14 AE suggested that when the “hidden homes” are completed, in the lower floors of the Tower Blocks, it would be a good opportunity for residents to visit, to get a good idea of the fixtures and fittings, sense of scale.
- 9.15 NP suggested it would be a good idea to hold another meeting before the next scheduled meeting on 13 August. It was agreed in principle and NP will circulate options for the end of July and check in with MT and Sophie on Monday.

10. Any Other Business

- 10.1 AC said that lots of commitments are made for various documents, he hopes LBS officers are going to take their time and respond thoughtfully. He looks forward to the responses due and hopes they address the concerns expressed.
- 10.2 AE said all TRA members are eligible for two free face masks from the TRA, thanks to funding from the council.

Stephen Moore 12.7.20.